

THE MUCKENHOUP T CONDITION

ZOE NIERAETH

ABSTRACT. The goal of this paper is to unify the theory of weights beyond the setting of weighted Lebesgue spaces in the general setting of quasi-Banach function spaces. We prove new characterizations for the boundedness of singular integrals, and pose several conjectures and partial results related to the duality of the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator. Furthermore, we give an overview of the theory applied to weighted variable Lebesgue and Morrey spaces.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Muckenhoupt condition beyond weighted Lebesgue spaces. A fundamental problem in the theory of singular integrals is:

(P) *Given a class of spaces X , under which conditions do we have $T : X \rightarrow X$ for all Calderón-Zygmund operators T ?*

When the class of spaces is the class of weighted Lebesgue spaces $L_w^p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for exponents $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and weights w , a very satisfying answer to (P) can be given through the Muckenhoupt A_p condition

$$[w]_p := \sup_Q \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q w^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q w^{-p'} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} < \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all cubes $Q \subseteq \mathbf{R}^d$, p' denotes the Hölder conjugate of p , and the average is interpreted as an essential supremum when the corresponding exponent is infinite. Moreover, this condition is intricately linked the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator

$$Mf := \sup_Q \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |f| dx \right) \mathbf{1}_Q.$$

When normalizing our weights using the multiplier approach (see [LN24a, Section 3.4]) in the definition of weighted Lebesgue spaces

$$\|f\|_{L_w^p(\mathbf{R}^d)} := \|wf\|_{L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)} = \begin{cases} \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} |wf|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} & \text{if } p < \infty; \\ \text{ess sup}_{\mathbf{R}^d} |wf| & \text{if } p = \infty, \end{cases}$$

we have the following classical characterizations:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and let w be a weight. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) $T : L_w^p(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L_w^p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for all Calderón-Zygmund operators T ;
- (ii) $R_j : L_w^p(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L_w^p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for all Riesz transforms, R_j , $j = 1, \dots, d$;
- (iii) $M : L_w^p(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L_w^p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ and $M : L_{w^{-1}}^{p'}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L_{w^{-1}}^{p'}(\mathbf{R}^d)$;

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 42B25; Secondary: 46E30.

Key words and phrases. Banach function space, Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator, Muckenhoupt weights, Calderón-Zygmund operators.

Z. N. is supported by the grant Juan de la Cierva formación 2021 FJC2021-046837-I, the Basque Government through the BERC 2022-2025 program, by the Spanish State Research Agency project PID2020-113156GB-I00/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and through BCAM Severo Ochoa excellence accreditation SEV-2023-2026.

(iv) $1 < p < \infty$ and $w \in A_p$.

See, e.g., [Gra14]. Note that we need to assume both bounds of M in (iii) to exclude the exponents $p = 1$ and $p = \infty$. If we had assumed initially that $1 < p < \infty$, then it would suffice to only have $M : L_w^p(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L_w^p(\mathbf{R}^d)$.

To consider (P) beyond the setting of weighted Lebesgue spaces, we formally define a quasi-Banach function space X to be a complete quasi-normed space of measurable functions on \mathbf{R}^d which satisfies the ideal property: if $f \in X$ and $|g| \leq |f|$, then $g \in X$ and $\|g\|_X \leq \|f\|_X$; and the property that the semi-norm

$$\|g\|_{X'} := \sup_{\|f\|_X=1} \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} |fg| dx$$

is a norm. The latter property is equivalent to the saturation property (see [LN24a] for an overview). When the triangle inequality is satisfied, we say that X is a Banach function space. We say that a quasi-Banach function space X satisfies the Muckenhoupt condition if $\mathbf{1}_Q \in X$ and $\mathbf{1}_Q \in X'$ for all cubes Q , and there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that for all cubes Q we have

$$\|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_X \|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_{X'} \leq C|Q|.$$

In this case we write $X \in A$ and denote the smallest possible constant C by $[X]_A$. Note that for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and w a weight we have $L_w^p(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A$ if and only if $w \in A_p$, with

$$[L_w^p(\mathbf{R}^d)]_A = [w]_p.$$

We say that a quasi-Banach function space X satisfies the Fatou property if:

- For every sequence $0 \leq f_n \uparrow f$ with $\sup_{n \geq 1} \|f_n\|_X < \infty$, we have $f \in X$ with $\|f\|_X = \sup_{n \geq 1} \|f_n\|_X$.

It was shown in [Rut16] that (i)-(iii) remain equivalent when replacing $L_w^p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ by a Banach function space X with the Fatou property in Theorem 1.1. However, rather than (iv) being equivalent, the Muckenhoupt condition is now a strictly weaker condition. To formulate the result, we say that a collection of cubes \mathcal{S} is called sparse if there exists a pairwise disjoint collection $(E_Q)_{Q \in \mathcal{S}}$ of subsets $E_Q \subseteq Q$ satisfying $|E_Q| \geq \frac{1}{2}|Q|$, and write

$$A_{\mathcal{S}} f := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \langle |f| \rangle_Q \mathbf{1}_Q, \quad \langle f \rangle_Q := \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q f dx.$$

Then we have:

Theorem 1.2. *Let X be a Banach function space satisfying the Fatou property. The following are equivalent:*

(i) *For all Calderón-Zygmund operators T there is a $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|Tf\|_X \leq C\|f\|_X, \quad f \in X \cap L_c^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d);$$

(ii) *For all Riesz transforms R_j , $j = 1, \dots, d$, there is a $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|R_j f\|_X \leq C\|f\|_X, \quad f \in X \cap L_c^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d);$$

(iii) *$M : X \rightarrow X$ and $M : X' \rightarrow X'$.*

(iv) *$A_{\mathcal{S}} : X \rightarrow X$ uniformly with respect to all sparse collections \mathcal{S} ;*

Moreover, any of these equivalent properties imply

(v) $X \in A$,

but the converse does not hold in general.

Remark 1.3. Suppose T is a (sub)linear operator for which there is a $C > 0$ such that

$$(1.1) \quad \|Tf\|_X \leq C\|f\|_X, \quad f \in X \cap L_c^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d).$$

When X is order-continuous (for example, when $X = L_w^p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for $p < \infty$ or, more generally, when X is s -concave for some $s < \infty$), this is equivalent to the boundedness of $T : X \rightarrow X$. The reason that the full boundedness of M appears in (iii) without this extra assumption, is because in the case that $T = M$, the Fatou property of X suffices to show that (1.1) is equivalent to $M : X \rightarrow X$.

The most difficult implication is (ii) \Rightarrow (iii), a proof of which can be found in [Rut16]. The implication (iii) \Rightarrow (iv) is contained in [LN24b, Lemma 3.4], and the implication (iv) \Rightarrow (i) follows from sparse domination of Calderón-Zygmund operators, see [Ler13].

The implication (iii) \Rightarrow (v) only requires $M : X \rightarrow X_{\text{weak}}$; see [Nie23, Proposition 4.21]. Finally, a counterexample to (v) \Rightarrow (iii) can be found in [DHHR11, Theorem 5.3.4], with an explicit construction of an exponent function $\frac{3}{2} \leq p(\cdot) \leq 3$ for which the variable Lebesgue space $X = L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R})$ satisfies the Muckenhoupt condition, but M is not bounded on X .

Under the additional assumption that X is r -convex and s -concave for some $1 < r < s < \infty$, i.e., there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all finite $\mathcal{F} \subseteq X$ we have

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |f|^r \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \right\|_X \leq C \left(\sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_X^r \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}, \quad \left(\sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_X^s \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \leq C \left\| \left(\sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |f|^s \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \right\|_X,$$

Rutsky proves in [Rut14, Rut19] that the conditions (i)-(iii) are also equivalent to the assertion

- $T : X \rightarrow X$ for some Calderón-Zygmund operator T defined on $L^2(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for which both T and T^* are non-degenerate.

Here, we say that an operator T is non-degenerate if there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $\ell > 0$ there is an $x_\ell \in \mathbf{R}^d$ such that for all cubes Q with $\ell(Q) = \ell$, all $0 \leq f \in L^1(Q)$, and all $x \in Q + x_\ell \cup Q - x_\ell$, we have

$$|Tf(x)| \geq C\langle f \rangle_Q.$$

We will show that the equivalence holds without the convexity and concavity assumption, as long as we assume the weaker assumption that X is order-continuous. A quasi-Banach function space X is called order-continuous if:

- For every sequence $0 \leq f_n \downarrow 0$ in X , we have $\|f_n\|_X \downarrow 0$.

Any quasi-Banach function space that is s -concave for some $s < \infty$ is order-continuous. We will show that we only need T itself to be non-degenerate, and no further assumption needs to be made on T^* :

Theorem A. *Let X be an order-continuous Banach function space with the Fatou property. Then any the following statements are equivalent to any of the equivalent statements (i)-(iii) in Theorem 1.2:*

- (vi) $T : X \rightarrow X$ for some non-degenerate linear operator T ;
- (vii) there is a $C > 0$ such that for all finite collections of cubes \mathcal{F} and all sequences $(f_Q)_{Q \in \mathcal{F}}$ in X , we have

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{F}} \langle f_Q \rangle_Q^2 \mathbf{1}_Q \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_X \leq C \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{F}} |f_Q|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_X.$$

Moreover, in this case we have

$$\sup_{\mathcal{S} \text{ is sparse}} \|A_{\mathcal{S}}\|_{X \rightarrow X} \lesssim_d \|T\|_{X \rightarrow X}^2,$$

and C can be chosen such that

$$\sup_{S \text{ is sparse}} \|A_S\|_{X \rightarrow X} \lesssim_d C^2 \leq \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X} \|M\|_{X' \rightarrow X'}.$$

The equivalence of both (vi) and (vii) to the other statements are based on a deep result in the theory of Euclidean structures in operator theory from [KLW23], and we present it in Section 3.4.

Remark 1.4. Under the assumption that X is s -concave for some $s < \infty$, the square function estimate (vii) can be related to random sums through the Khintchine-Maurey inequality [HNVW17, Theorem 7.2.13]. More precisely, this inequality says that if \mathcal{F} is a finite collection of cubes and $(\varepsilon_Q)_{Q \in \mathcal{F}}$ is a Rademacher sequence over a probability space (Ω, \mathbb{P}) , then for all $0 < p < \infty$ we have

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{F}} |f_Q|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_X \sim_{X,p,s} \left\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{F}} \varepsilon_Q f_Q \right\|_{L^p(\Omega; X)}.$$

Thus, to prove (vii) when X is s -concave, it suffices to show that for some/all $0 < p, q < \infty$ we have

$$\left\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{F}} \varepsilon_Q \langle f_Q \rangle_Q \mathbf{1}_Q \right\|_{L^q(\Omega; X)} \lesssim \left\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{F}} \varepsilon_Q f_Q \right\|_{L^p(\Omega; X)}.$$

This condition is precisely the R -boundedness in X of the family of averaging operators, see also [HNVW17, Proposition 8.1.3].

1.2. Duality of the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator. When $1 < p < \infty$, the bounds $M : L_w^p(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L_w^p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ and $M : L_{w^{-1}}^{p'}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L_{w^{-1}}^{p'}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ are equivalent. Thus, only one of them needs to be assumed in (iii) in Theorem 1.1. This opens up the problem of characterizing the spaces satisfying this duality property:

(Q) *Given a class of spaces X , when is it true that if $M : X \rightarrow X$, then also $M : X' \rightarrow X'$?*

Several characterizations of this problem are scattered throughout the literature, and we provide a list of some of them in Theorem 4.4 below.

Partial answers to (Q) do exist outside of weighted Lebesgue spaces: it was shown by Dening in [Die05] that if $X = L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is a variable Lebesgue space with exponent function $p(\cdot)$ satisfying

$$(1.2) \quad 1 < \text{ess inf } p \leq \text{ess sup } p < \infty,$$

then we have $M : X \rightarrow X$ if and only if $M : X' \rightarrow X'$. For this, he introduced a stronger version of the Muckenhoupt condition that we call the *strong Muckenhoupt condition* A_{strong} . We write $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$ if there is a $C > 0$ such that for every pairwise disjoint collection of cubes \mathcal{P} and all $f \in X$ we have

$$(1.3) \quad \left\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \langle f \rangle_Q \mathbf{1}_Q \right\|_X \leq C \|f\|_X.$$

In this case we let $[X]_{A_{\text{strong}}}$ denote the smallest possible C . This condition reduces back to the Muckenhoupt condition $X \in A$ if one only considers collections \mathcal{P} consisting of single cubes. Moreover, as the operator inside the norm on the left-hand side of (1.3) is dominated by Mf , this condition is weaker than $M : X \rightarrow X$. Nevertheless, Dening shows that if $X = L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ and (1.2) holds, then $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$ is equivalent to $M : X \rightarrow X$. For the proof of his duality result, it now remains to note that $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$ if and only if $X' \in A_{\text{strong}}$.

This duality result of Diening was extended by Lerner [Ler17] to weighted variable Lebesgue spaces $X = L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$, under the additional assumption that $w^{p(\cdot)} \in A_{\text{FW}}$, where we write $w \in A_{\text{FW}}$ when

$$[w]_{\text{FW}} := \sup_Q \frac{1}{w(Q)} \int_Q M(w \mathbf{1}_Q) dx < \infty.$$

It is unclear whether this condition on the weight can be removed or not. Moreover, Lerner left open the question whether the boundedness $M : X \rightarrow X$ is equivalent to $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$ in the weighted setting, see Section 5.2 below.

Generally, by the symmetry of the definition of the (strong) Muckenhoupt condition, for any Banach function space X with the Fatou property, it is true that $X \in A$ or $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$ if and only if, respectively, $X' \in A$ or $X' \in A_{\text{strong}}$. Thus, any class of spaces X for which $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$ implies $M : X \rightarrow X$ satisfies a version of Diening's duality result. This implication is not true in general: the space $X = L^1(\mathbf{R}^d)$ satisfies the strong Muckenhoupt condition, but not boundedness of M . However, the maximal operator is *weakly* bounded on $L^1(\mathbf{R}^d)$. In general, one can show that the strong Muckenhoupt condition of X implies the weak-type bound $M : X \rightarrow X_{\text{weak}}$, where

$$\|f\|_{X_{\text{weak}}} := \sup_{\lambda > 0} \|\lambda \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \mathbf{R}^d : |f(x)| > \lambda\}}\|_X.$$

This result was already shown for variable Lebesgue spaces in [DHHR11]. Additionally, for spaces satisfying a certain structural property introduced in [Ber99], one can show that $X \in A$ is equivalent to $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$. We write $X \in \mathcal{G}$ if there is a $C > 0$ such that for every pairwise disjoint collection of cubes \mathcal{P} and every $f \in X, g \in X'$ we have

$$\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X \|g \mathbf{1}_Q\|_{X'} \leq C \|f\|_X \|g\|_{X'}.$$

The smallest possible constant is denoted by $[X]_{\mathcal{G}}$. This property holds for (weighted) Lebesgue spaces by Hölder's inequality. Further examples include (weighted) variable Lebesgue spaces with exponent functions satisfying global log-Hölder continuity. We refer the reader to Section 5 for an overview. We also give a new characterization of the condition $X \in \mathcal{G}$ in Theorem 3.9 below.

The following result captures the relations between the various notions of boundedness of the maximal operator and Muckenhoupt conditions:

Theorem B. *Let X be a Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d with the Fatou property. Consider the following statements:*

- (a) $M : X \rightarrow X$;
- (b) $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$;
- (c) $M : X \rightarrow X_{\text{weak}}$;
- (d) $X \in A$.

Then (a) \Rightarrow (b) \Rightarrow (c) \Rightarrow (d) with

$$[X]_A \leq \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X_{\text{weak}}} \lesssim_d [X]_{A_{\text{strong}}} \leq \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}.$$

Moreover, if $X \in \mathcal{G}$, then (b)-(d) are equivalent, with

$$[X]_{A_{\text{strong}}} \leq [X]_{\mathcal{G}} [X]_A.$$

This result is proven in Theorem 3.14 and Corollary 3.16 below.

A condition that the known classes of spaces for which the implication in (Q) is true have in common, is that they are all r -convex and s -concave for some $1 < r < s < \infty$. This motivates the following formal conjecture:

Conjecture C. *Let $1 < r < s < \infty$ and let X be an r -convex and s -concave Banach function space. Then $M : X \rightarrow X$ if and only if $M : X' \rightarrow X'$.*

Additionally, we can ask if in this case we have $M : X \rightarrow X$ if and only if $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$. If Conjecture C is true, then this removes the necessity of the condition $w^{p(\cdot)} \in A_\infty$ in [Ler17]. Not only would it simplify checking the conditions for (1.2), but it would also simplify the assumptions required on the space where both $M : X \rightarrow X$ and $M : X' \rightarrow X'$ are needed, such as in Rubio de Francia extrapolation results (see, e.g., [CMM22, Nie23]), or as in the extrapolation of compactness theorem [LN24b, Theorem A].

This conjecture does not apply when dealing with spaces that are either not r -convex, or not s -concave. The latter is the case, for example, for weighted Morrey spaces $M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)$:

$$\|f\|_{M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)} := \sup_Q \left(\frac{1}{|Q|^{1-\frac{p}{q}}} \int_Q |fw|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Indeed, as long as $1 < p < q < \infty$, this space is p -convex, but not s -concave for any $s < \infty$. To be able to tackle spaces such as these, we also formulate the following stronger conjecture more closely related to the formulation of (P):

Conjecture D. *Let $1 < s < \infty$, and let X be an s -concave Banach function space. If $M : X \rightarrow X$, then $M : X' \rightarrow X'$.*

When X satisfies the Fatou property, X is r -convex or s -concave if and only if X' is s' -convex or r' -concave, so the validity of Conjecture D would imply the validity of Conjecture C (noting that any r -convex and s -concave space is reflexive, and, hence, satisfies the Fatou property by [LN24a, Corollary 3.16.]).

As exemplified by $X = L^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d)$, Conjecture D is false if the concavity assumption is removed. Another example in the class of Morrey spaces is given in Example 5.11 below.

As a special case of [Nie23, Theorem 4.22], if an operator T satisfies

$$\|T\|_{L_w^1(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L_w^{1,\infty}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \leq \phi([w]_1)$$

for some increasing function ϕ and all $w \in A_1$, then for all Banach function spaces X with the Fatou property for which $M : X \rightarrow X$, we have

$$\|T\|_{X' \rightarrow (X')_{\text{weak}}} \leq 2\phi(2\|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}).$$

In particular, this implies that if $M : X \rightarrow X$, then we also have

$$(1.4) \quad \|M\|_{X' \rightarrow (X')_{\text{weak}}} \lesssim_d \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X},$$

and, uniformly in all sparse collections \mathcal{S} ,

$$(1.5) \quad \|A_{\mathcal{S}}\|_{X' \rightarrow (X')_{\text{weak}}} \lesssim_d (1 + \log \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}) \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}$$

by the weak-type A_1 bound of [DLR16].

Since (1.4) already holds under the weaker assumption $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$ by Theorem B, one might wonder if (1.5) also holds under a weaker assumption. We show that this is indeed the case under the assumption that there is an $r > 1$ for which $X^r \in A_{\text{strong}}$, where

$$\|f\|_{X^r} := \| |f|^{\frac{1}{r}} \|_X^r.$$

We obtain:

Proposition E. *Let X be a quasi-Banach function space for which there is an $r > 1$ such that $X^r \in A_{\text{strong}}$. Then $A_{\mathcal{S}} : X' \rightarrow (X')_{\text{weak}}$ uniformly in all sparse collections \mathcal{S} , with*

$$\sup_{\mathcal{S}} \|A_{\mathcal{S}}\|_{(X') \rightarrow (X')_{\text{weak}}} \lesssim_d r'(1 + \log r') \|M\|_{X' \rightarrow (X')_{\text{weak}}} [X^r]_{A_{\text{strong}}}^{\frac{1}{r}}.$$

The proof follows along the same lines of the one in [DLR16], but with a modification at the end of the proof inspired by the one used in [Ler20]. It can be found below as Theorem 3.11.

Remark 1.5. The condition of the existence of an $r > 1$ for which $X^r \in A_{\text{strong}}$ is weaker than $M : X \rightarrow X$. Indeed, if $M : X \rightarrow X$, then it was shown in [LO10] that there is an $r > 1$ (with $r' \approx_d \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}$, see [Nie23, Theorem 2.34]) for which also $M : X^r \rightarrow X^r$, and hence $X^r \in A_{\text{strong}}$. Such a self-improvement condition does not exist for A_{strong} , as is exemplified by the fact that $L^1(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A_{\text{strong}}$, but $L^1(\mathbf{R}^d)^r = L^{\frac{1}{r}}(\mathbf{R}^d) \notin A_{\text{strong}}$ for any $r > 1$.

1.3. Organization. This paper is organized as follows:

- In Section 3 we give an overview of several variants of the Muckenhoupt condition and their properties, as well as their relation to the boundedness of the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator. Moreover, we discuss the notion of A_p -regularity, and its connection to vector-valued estimates.
- In Section 4 we discuss the question (Q), prove characterizations of it, provide several partial results, and provide a criterion for its failure.
- In Section 5 we give an overview of some of the literature and some applications of the theory in (weighted) variable Lebesgue, Morrey, and block spaces.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation. We write $A \lesssim B$ or $B \gtrsim A$ when there is a constant $C > 0$ such that $A \leq CB$. If the constant C depends on certain parameters $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots$, then we sometimes write $A \lesssim_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots} B$ to signify this. We write $A \approx B$ when $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$. A similar convention holds for the notation $A \approx_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots} B$.

Throughout this paper $d \geq 1$ is an integer signifying the dimension of \mathbf{R}^d . By a cube in \mathbf{R}^d we mean a cube with sides parallel to the coordinate axes.

2.2. Quasi-Banach function spaces. Let (Ω, μ) be a σ -finite measure space, and let $L^0(\Omega)$ denote the space of measurable functions on Ω .

Definition 2.1. Let $X \subseteq L^0(\Omega)$ be a complete quasi-normed vector-space. We say that X is a *quasi-Banach function space over Ω* if it satisfies:

- *Ideal property:* If $f \in X$ and $g \in L^0(\Omega)$ with $|g| \leq |f|$, then $g \in X$ with $\|g\|_X \leq \|f\|_X$;
- *Saturation property:* For every $E \subseteq \Omega$ with $\mu(E) > 0$ there is an $F \subseteq E$ for which $\mu(F) > 0$ and $\mathbf{1}_F \in X$.

We denote the optimal constant $K \geq 1$ for which

$$\|f + g\|_X \leq K(\|f\|_X + \|g\|_X)$$

for all $f, g \in X$ by K_X . If $K_X = 1$, we say that X is a *Banach function space over Ω* .

By the ideal property we have $f \in X$ if and only if $|f| \in X$, with

$$\||f|\|_X = \|f\|_X.$$

The saturation property is equivalent to various other properties, such as the existence of a *weak order unit*, i.e., a function $u \in X$ satisfying $u > 0$ a.e., or the property that the seminorm

$$\|g\|_{X'} := \sup_{\|f\|_X=1} \int_{\Omega} |fg| \, d\mu$$

is a norm, see [LN24a, Proposition 2.5]. The space

$$X' := \{g \in L^0(\Omega) : fg \in L^1(\Omega) \text{ for all } f \in X\}$$

equipped with $\|\cdot\|_{X'}$ is called the *Köthe dual* of X . If X is a Banach function space over Ω , then so is X' . However, X' might not satisfy the saturation property if X is a *quasi-Banach* function space over Ω , e.g., $X = L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)$ with $0 < p < 1$ satisfies $X' = \{0\}$.

We define the following convergence properties:

- *Fatou property*: For every sequence $(f_n)_{n \geq 1}$ in X and f in $L^0(\Omega)$ satisfying $0 \leq f_n \uparrow f$ and $\sup_{n \geq 1} \|f_n\|_X < \infty$, we have $f \in X$ with $\|f\|_X = \sup_{n \geq 1} \|f_n\|_X$;
- *Order-continuity*: For every sequence $(f_n)_{n \geq 1}$ in X satisfying $0 \leq f_n \downarrow 0$, we have $\|f_n\|_X \downarrow 0$.

The Köthe dual of a quasi-Banach function space satisfies the Fatou property by the monotone convergence theorem. By the Lorentz-Luxemburg theorem, a Banach function space X over Ω satisfies the Fatou property if and only if $X'' = X$. Moreover, order-continuity is equivalent to the canonical embedding $X' \hookrightarrow X^*$ being an isomorphism. In particular, X is reflexive if and only if X satisfies the Fatou property and X and X' are order-continuous, see [LN24a, Corollary 3.16]. Both the Fatou property and order-continuity are sufficient conditions for the equality

$$\|f\|_X = \sup_{\|g\|_{X'}=1} \int_{\Omega} |fg| d\mu,$$

respectively due the Lorentz-Luxemburg theorem and the Hahn-Banach theorem.

Proofs and further details related to these spaces and their properties can be found in the survey [LN24a] and the book [Zaa67].

2.3. Convexity and concavity. Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over Ω and let $0 < r \leq s \leq \infty$. Then X is called *r-convex* if there is a constant $M^{(r)}(X) \geq 1$ such that for all finite $\mathcal{F} \subseteq X$ we have

$$\left\| \left(\sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |f|^r \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \right\|_X \leq M^{(r)}(X) \left(\sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_X^r \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}$$

and *s-concave* if there is a constant $M_{(s)}(X) \geq 1$ such that for all finite $\mathcal{F} \subseteq X$ we have

$$\left(\sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_X^s \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \leq M_{(s)}(X) \left\| \left(\sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |f|^s \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \right\|_X,$$

where the sums are replaced by a supremum when $r = \infty$ or $s = \infty$. Any quasi-Banach function space X is ∞ -concave with $M_{(\infty)}(X) = 1$ by the ideal property, and X is a Banach function space if and only if it 1-convex with $M^{(1)}(X) = 1$.

If X is *r-convex* or *s-concave*, then X' is respectively *r'-concave* or *s'-convex*, with

$$M_{(r')}(X') \leq M^{(r)}(X), \quad M^{(s')}(X') \leq M_{(s)}(X).$$

If a quasi-Banach function space X is *r-convex* and *s-concave*, then there exists an equivalent quasi-norm on X for which $M^{(r)}(X) = M_{(s)}(X) = 1$, see [LT79, Theorem 1.d.8].

If X is *s-concave* for some $s < \infty$, then X is order-continuous. If X is *r-convex* and *s-concave* for some $1 < r \leq s < \infty$ and $M^{(r)}(X) = M_{(s)}(X) = 1$, then X is (super)reflexive, and, hence, has the Fatou property, and X and X' are order-continuous.

For $0 < p < \infty$, the *p-concavification* of a quasi-Banach function space X over Ω is defined as

$$X^p := \{f \in L^0(\Omega) : |f|^{\frac{1}{p}} \in X\}, \quad \|f\|_{X^p} := \| |f|^{\frac{1}{p}} \|_X^p.$$

Then X is *r-convex* or *s-concave* if and only if X^p is respectively $\frac{r}{p}$ -convex or $\frac{s}{p}$ -concave with

$$M^{\frac{r}{p}}(X^p) = M^{(r)}(X)^p, \quad M_{(\frac{s}{p})}(X^p) = M_{(s)}(X)^p.$$

If X is both *r-convex* and *r-concave*, then, by [Mey75], it is equal to $L_w^r(\Omega)$ for some weight w .

2.4. Factorization. Given two quasi-Banach function spaces X, Y over Ω , we define $X \cdot Y$ as the space of $f \in L^0(\Omega)$ for which there exist $0 \leq h \in X, 0 \leq k \in Y$ such that $|f| \leq hk$, with the seminorm

$$\|f\|_{X \cdot Y} := \inf \|h\|_X \|k\|_Y,$$

where the infimum is taken over all $0 \leq h \in X, 0 \leq k \in Y$ satisfying $|f| \leq hk$. This is again a quasi-Banach function space over Ω with $K_{X \cdot Y} \leq 2K_X K_Y$.

For any $0 < \theta < 1$ and pair of quasi-Banach function spaces X_0, X_1 over Ω , we call

$$X_0^{1-\theta} \cdot X_1^\theta$$

the *Calderón-Lozanovskii product* of X_0 and X_1 with parameter θ . Using Young's inequality, one can show that

$$K_{X_0^{1-\theta} \cdot X_1^\theta} \leq K_{X_0}^{1-\theta} K_{X_1}^\theta.$$

In particular, if X_0 and X_1 are Banach function spaces, then so is $X_0^{1-\theta} \cdot X_1^\theta$. Moreover, in this case the Lozanovskii duality theorem (see [Loz69, Theorem 2], [CNS03, Appendix 7]) states that

$$(X_0^{1-\theta} \cdot X_1^\theta)' = [(X_0)']^{1-\theta} \cdot [(X_1)']^\theta.$$

In particular, setting $X_0 = L^\infty(\Omega)$, this implies that for any Banach function space over Ω we have

$$(2.1) \quad (X^\theta)' = (X')^\theta \cdot L^1(\mathbf{R}^d)^{1-\theta} = (X')^\theta \cdot L^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}}(\mathbf{R}^d).$$

2.5. Mixed-norm spaces. Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d , and let Y be a quasi-Banach function space over Ω , where (Ω, μ) is a σ -finite measure space. Equipping $\mathbf{R}^d \times \Omega$ with the product measure, we define $X[Y]$ as the space of those $f \in L^0(\mathbf{R}^d \times \Omega)$ for which for which $y \mapsto f(x, y) \in Y$ for a.e. $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$ and $x \mapsto \|y \mapsto f(x, y)\|_Y \in X$, with

$$\|f\|_{X[Y]} := \|\|f\|_Y\|_X := \|x \mapsto \|y \mapsto f(x, y)\|_Y\|_X.$$

This space is a quasi-Banach function space over $\mathbf{R}^d \times \Omega$ with $K_{X[Y]} \leq K_X K_Y$.

If X and Y are order-continuous or have the Fatou property, then $X[Y]$ also has these respective properties. If X and Y are Banach function spaces, it was shown by Bukhvalov [Buh75] that

$$X[Y]' = X'[Y'].$$

Moreover, he showed in [Buk87] (see also [Mal89]) that if X_0, X_1, Y_0, Y_1 are Banach function spaces and Y_0, Y_1 have the Fatou property, then for all $0 < \theta < 1$

$$(2.2) \quad X_0[Y_0]^{1-\theta} \cdot X_1[Y_1]^\theta = (X_0^{1-\theta} \cdot X_1^\theta)[Y_0^{1-\theta} \cdot Y_1^\theta].$$

The bounds of the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator M correspond to the bounds of a certain linear operator \mathcal{M} defined on a mixed-norm space. Indeed, let \mathcal{Q} denote the (countable) collection of cubes in \mathbf{R}^d with rational corners and define the map

$$\mathcal{M}((f_Q)_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}) := (\langle f \rangle_Q \mathbf{1}_Q)_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}.$$

Then we have $M : X \rightarrow X$ if and only if $\mathcal{M} : X[\ell^\infty] \rightarrow X[\ell^\infty]$, where we have indexed ℓ^∞ over \mathcal{Q} . As a matter of fact, we have the following result:

Proposition 2.2. *Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $M : X \rightarrow X$;
- (ii) $\mathcal{M} : X[\ell^\infty] \rightarrow X[\ell^\infty]$.

In this case we have

$$\|M\|_{X \rightarrow X} = \|\mathcal{M}\|_{X[\ell^\infty] \rightarrow X[\ell^\infty]}.$$

Furthermore, if X is a Banach function space with the Fatou property, then the following are equivalent:

- (iii) $M : X' \rightarrow X'$;
- (iv) $\mathcal{M} : X[\ell^1] \rightarrow X[\ell^1]$.

In this case we have

$$\|M\|_{X' \rightarrow X'} = \|\mathcal{M}\|_{X[\ell^1] \rightarrow X[\ell^1]}.$$

Proof. For (i) \Rightarrow (ii), let $f = (f_Q)_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \in X[\ell^\infty]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{M}((f_Q)_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}})\|_{X[\ell^\infty]} &\leq \|M(\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} |f_Q|)\|_X \leq \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X} \left\| \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} |f_Q| \right\|_X \\ &= \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X} \|f\|_{X[\ell^\infty]}. \end{aligned}$$

proving that $\mathcal{M} : X[\ell^\infty] \rightarrow X[\ell^\infty]$ with $\|\mathcal{M}\|_{X[\ell^\infty] \rightarrow X[\ell^\infty]} \leq \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}$.

Conversely, noting that for $f \in X$ we have $(|f|)_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \in X[\ell^\infty]$ with $\|(|f|)_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \|_{X[\ell^\infty]} = \|f\|_X$, we have

$$\|Mf\|_X = \|\mathcal{M}((|f|)_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}})\|_{X[\ell^\infty]} \leq \|\mathcal{M}\|_{X[\ell^\infty] \rightarrow X[\ell^\infty]} \|f\|_X,$$

proving that (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii) with the stated equality.

For (iii) \Rightarrow (iv), let $f = (f_Q)_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \in X[\ell^1]$ and $g \in X'$ with $\|g\|_{X'} = 1$. Then, since

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \langle f_Q \rangle_{1,Q} \mathbf{1}_Q |g| \, dx = \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} |f_Q| \langle g \rangle_{1,Q} \mathbf{1}_Q \, dx$$

for all $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} |g| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} |\langle f_Q \rangle_Q| \mathbf{1}_Q \, dx &\leq \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} |f_Q| \langle g \rangle_{1,Q} \mathbf{1}_Q \, dx \leq \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \|f\|_{\ell^1} M g \, dx \\ &\leq \|M\|_{X' \rightarrow X'} \|f\|_{X[\ell^1]}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\|\mathcal{M}f\|_{\ell^1} \in X$ with

$$\|\mathcal{M}f\|_{X[\ell^1]} \leq \|M\|_{X' \rightarrow X'} \|f\|_{X[\ell^1]},$$

as desired.

Finally, for (iv) \Rightarrow (iii), we use the fact that $X'[\ell^\infty] = X[\ell^1]'$ so that, for $g \in X'$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|Mg\|_{X'} &= \|(\langle g \rangle_{1,Q} \mathbf{1}_Q)_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}\|_{X'[\ell^\infty]} \\ &= \sup_{\|f\|_{X[\ell^1]}=1} \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} |f_Q| \langle g \rangle_{1,Q} \mathbf{1}_Q \, dx \\ &= \sup_{\|f\|_{X[\ell^1]}=1} \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \langle f_Q \rangle_{1,Q} \mathbf{1}_Q |g| \, dx \\ &\leq \sup_{\|f\|_{X[\ell^1]}=1} \|\mathcal{M}(|f|)\|_{X[\ell^1]} \|g\|_{X'} \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{M}\|_{X[\ell^1] \rightarrow X[\ell^1]} \|g\|_{X'}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the result. \square

By the interpolation formula (2.2) and Hölder's inequality, this yields the following corollary:

Corollary 2.3. *Let X be a Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d with the Fatou property. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $M : X \rightarrow X$, $M : X' \rightarrow X'$
- (ii) $\mathcal{M} : X[\ell^r] \rightarrow X[\ell^r]$ for all $1 \leq r \leq \infty$.

Moreover, we have

$$\|\mathcal{M}\|_{X[\ell^r] \rightarrow X[\ell^r]} \leq \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}^{\frac{1}{r'}} \|M\|_{X' \rightarrow X'}^{\frac{1}{r}}.$$

Proof. Let $f \in X[\ell^r]$. By (2.2) we have

$$(2.3) \quad X[\ell^r] = X[\ell^\infty]^{\frac{1}{r'}} \cdot X[\ell^1]^{\frac{1}{r}},$$

showing that we can pick $0 \leq g \in X[\ell^\infty]$, $0 \leq h \in X[\ell^1]$ for which $|f_Q| \leq g_Q^{\frac{1}{r'}} h_Q^{\frac{1}{r}}$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Thus, by Hölder's inequality,

$$\left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} |\langle f_Q \rangle_Q|^r \mathbf{1}_Q \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \langle g_Q \rangle_Q^{\frac{r}{r'}} \langle h_Q \rangle_Q \mathbf{1}_Q \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq \|\mathcal{M}g\|_{\ell^\infty}^{\frac{1}{r'}} \|\mathcal{M}h\|_{\ell^1}^{\frac{1}{r}}.$$

Hence, by (2.3),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{M}f\|_{X[\ell^r]} &\leq \|\mathcal{M}g\|_{X[\ell^\infty]}^{\frac{1}{r'}} \|\mathcal{M}h\|_{X[\ell^1]}^{\frac{1}{r}} \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{M}\|_{X[\ell^\infty] \rightarrow X[\ell^\infty]}^{\frac{1}{r'}} \|\mathcal{M}\|_{X[\ell^1] \rightarrow X[\ell^1]}^{\frac{1}{r}} \|g\|_{X[\ell^\infty]}^{\frac{1}{r'}} \|h\|_{X[\ell^1]}^{\frac{1}{r}}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking an infimum over all possible $|f| \leq g^{\frac{1}{r'}} h^{\frac{1}{r}}$, the result follows from Proposition 2.2. \square

2.6. Weak-type spaces. In the same way the weak-type space $L^{p,\infty}(\Omega)$ can be obtained from $L^p(\Omega)$, one can obtain a weak-type space X_{weak} from a quasi-Banach function space X .

Definition 2.4. Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over Ω . Then the *weak-type space* X_{weak} is defined as the space of those $f \in L^0(\Omega)$ for which $\mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: |f(x)| > \lambda\}} \in X$ for all $\lambda > 0$ and

$$\|f\|_{X_{\text{weak}}} := \sup_{\lambda > 0} \|\lambda \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: |f(x)| > \lambda\}}\|_X < \infty.$$

Since

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: |f(x)+g(x)| > \lambda\}} \leq \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: |f(x)| > \frac{\lambda}{2}\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: |g(x)| > \frac{\lambda}{2}\}},$$

we have that X_{weak} is a quasi-normed space with $K_{X_{\text{weak}}} \leq 2K_X$. As a matter of fact, it is also a quasi-Banach function space:

Proposition 2.5. *Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over Ω . Then X_{weak} is also a quasi-Banach function space over Ω for which $X \hookrightarrow X_{\text{weak}}$ with*

$$\|f\|_{X_{\text{weak}}} \leq \|f\|_X$$

for all $f \in X$. If X satisfies the Fatou property, then so does X_{weak} . Moreover, for all measurable sets $E \subseteq \Omega$ we have $\mathbf{1}_E \in X$ if and only if $\mathbf{1}_E \in X_{\text{weak}}$ with

$$\|\mathbf{1}_E\|_{X_{\text{weak}}} = \|\mathbf{1}_E\|_X.$$

Proof. The first assertion can be found in [Nie23, Proposition 4.20]. For the final assertion, note that

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \Omega: \mathbf{1}_E(x) > \lambda\}} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{1}_E & \text{if } \lambda \in (0, 1); \\ 0 & \text{if } \lambda \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Thus, if $\mathbf{1}_E \in X_{\text{weak}}$, then $\mathbf{1}_E \in X$ and

$$\|\mathbf{1}_E\|_{X_{\text{weak}}} = \sup_{\lambda \in (0,1)} \lambda \|\mathbf{1}_E\|_X = \|\mathbf{1}_E\|_X,$$

as desired. \square

3. A ZOO OF MUCKENHOUP T CONDITIONS

3.1. The Muckenhoupt condition. The Muckenhoupt condition in a quasi-Banach function space X over \mathbf{R}^d is closely related to the boundedness of averaging operators over cubes. Indeed, for a cube Q , the operator

$$T_Q f := \langle f \rangle_{1,Q} \mathbf{1}_Q,$$

where $\langle f \rangle_{1,Q} := \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |f| dx \right)$, satisfies $T_Q : X \rightarrow X$ if and only if $\mathbf{1}_Q \in X$ and $\mathbf{1}_Q \in X'$. As a matter of fact, we have the following:

Proposition 3.1. *Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d and let Q be a cube. Then $T_Q : X \rightarrow X$ if and only if $\mathbf{1}_Q \in X$ and $\mathbf{1}_Q \in X'$, with*

$$\|T_Q\|_{X \rightarrow X} = |Q|^{-1} \|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_X \|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_{X'}.$$

Proof. First suppose that $\mathbf{1}_Q \in X$ and $\mathbf{1}_Q \in X'$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_Q f\|_X &= \langle f \rangle_{1,Q} \|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_X = (|Q|^{-1} \|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_X \|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_{X'}) \|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_{X'}^{-1} \|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^d)} \\ &\leq (|Q|^{-1} \|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_X \|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_{X'}) \|f\|_X, \end{aligned}$$

proving that $T_Q : X \rightarrow X$ with

$$(3.1) \quad \|T_Q\|_{X \rightarrow X} \leq |Q|^{-1} \|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_X \|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_{X'}.$$

For the converse, let $0 < u \in X$ be a weak order unit. Fix a cube Q . Then we have

$$\langle u \rangle_{1,Q} \mathbf{1}_Q = T_Q u \in X.$$

Since $\langle u \rangle_{1,Q} > 0$, it follows that $\mathbf{1}_Q \in X$. Next, we note for all $f \in X$ we have

$$\|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^d)} = \langle f \rangle_{1,Q} |Q| = \frac{|Q|}{\|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_X} \|\langle f \rangle_{1,Q} \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X \leq \|T_Q\|_{X \rightarrow X} \frac{|Q|}{\|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_X} \|f\|_X.$$

Hence, $\mathbf{1}_Q \in X'$ with

$$\|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_{X'} \leq \|T_Q\|_{X \rightarrow X} \frac{|Q|}{\|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_X},$$

proving the result. Moreover, combining this last inequality with (3.1) proves the desired norm equality. \square

Note that we can just as well have defined the averaging operators with respect to the linearized averages

$$\tilde{T}_Q f = \langle f \rangle_Q \mathbf{1}_Q, \quad \langle f \rangle_Q = \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q f dx.$$

Indeed, this follows from the observation that $|\tilde{T}_Q f| \leq T_Q f = \tilde{T}_Q(|f|)$, and the fact that $\| |f| \|_X = \|f\|_X$ by the ideal property.

Proposition 3.1 motivates the following definition of the Muckenhoupt condition:

Definition 3.2. Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d . We say that X satisfies the *Muckenhoupt condition* A and write $X \in A$ when for all cubes Q we have $\mathbf{1}_Q \in X$, $\mathbf{1}_Q \in X'$, and

$$[X]_A := \sup_Q |Q|^{-1} \|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_X \|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_{X'} < \infty.$$

Since

$$|Q| = \|\mathbf{1}_Q \mathbf{1}_Q\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^d)} \leq \|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_X \|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_{X'}$$

for any cube Q , we have $[X]_A \geq 1$. Moreover, since the Muckenhoupt condition requires that $\mathbf{1}_Q \in X$ and $\mathbf{1}_Q \in X'$ for all cubes Q , any space $X \in A$ has the property that X' is saturated and, hence, is a Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d . Indeed, this follows from the

fact that we can pick a sequence of cubes that increases to \mathbf{R}^d combined with [LN24a, Proposition 2.5(ii)].

By Proposition 3.1, the condition $X \in A$ is characterized by the uniform (weak) boundedness of the averaging operators T_Q :

Proposition 3.3. *Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $X \in A$;
- (ii) $T_Q : X \rightarrow X$ uniformly over all cubes Q ;
- (iii) $T_Q : X \rightarrow X_{weak}$ uniformly over all cubes Q .

Moreover, in this case we have

$$(3.2) \quad [X]_A = \sup_Q \|T_Q\|_{X \rightarrow X} = \sup_Q \|T_Q\|_{X \rightarrow X_{weak}}.$$

Proof. The equivalence (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii) and the first equality in (3.2) follow from the operator norm equality in Proposition 3.1. The equivalence (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii) and the second equality in (3.2) follows from the fact that by Proposition 2.5 we have

$$\|T_Q f\|_X = \langle f \rangle_{1,Q} \|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_X = \langle f \rangle_{1,Q} \|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_{X_{weak}} = \|T_Q f\|_{X_{weak}}$$

for all cubes Q and $f \in X$. This proves the result. \square

Note that the equivalence (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii) was already shown in [Ber99].

We say that a (sub)linear operator T is non-degenerate if there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $\ell > 0$ there is an $x_\ell \in \mathbf{R}^d$ such that for all cubes Q with $\ell(Q) = \ell$, all $0 \leq f \in L^1(Q)$, and all $x \in Q + x_\ell \cup Q - x_\ell$, we have

$$|Tf(x)| \geq C \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q f \, dx \right).$$

Note that this includes, e.g., the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator M with $x_\ell = 0$, $C = 1$, but also linear operators such as the Hilbert transform, or any of the Riesz transforms. The proof of the following result follows the lines of the proof of [Gra14, Theorem 7.4.7].

Proposition 3.4. *Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d with the Fatou property and let T be a non-degenerate operator for which $T : X \rightarrow X_{weak}$. Then $X \in A$ with*

$$[X]_A \leq C^{-2} \|T\|_{X \rightarrow X_{weak}}^2,$$

where C is the constant in the definition of non-degeneracy.

Proof. Let $f \in X \cap L_c^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d)$, let Q be a cube, and let $0 < \lambda < C \langle f \rangle_{1,Q}$. Then for

$$P \in \{Q + x_{\ell(Q)}, Q - x_{\ell(Q)}\}$$

we have

$$P \subseteq \{x \in \mathbf{R}^d : |T(|f| \mathbf{1}_Q)(x)| > \lambda\},$$

which, by the ideal property of X , means that $\mathbf{1}_P \in X$ with

$$\lambda \|\mathbf{1}_P\|_X \leq \|T\|_{X \rightarrow X_{weak}} \|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X.$$

Taking a supremum over $0 < \lambda < C \langle f \rangle_{1,Q}$, we conclude that

$$(3.3) \quad \langle f \rangle_{1,Q} \|\mathbf{1}_P\|_X \leq C^{-1} \|T\|_{X \rightarrow X_{weak}} \|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X.$$

Note that since $\ell(P) = \ell(Q)$, applying this with Q replaced by $Q_+ := Q + x_{\ell(Q)}$ and $f = \mathbf{1}_{Q_+} \in X$ proves that

$$\|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_X \leq C^{-1} \|T\|_{X \rightarrow X_{weak}} \|\mathbf{1}_{Q_+}\|_X,$$

where we used that $Q_+ - x_{\ell(Q)} = Q$. Thus, by (3.3),

$$\|T_Q f\|_X \leq C^{-1} \|T\|_{X \rightarrow X_{\text{weak}}} \|\langle f \rangle_{1,Q} \mathbf{1}_{Q_+}\|_X \leq C^{-2} \|T\|_{X \rightarrow X_{\text{weak}}}^2 \|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X.$$

As for any $f \in X$ we can pick a sequence $f_n \in X \cap L_c^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d)$ with $0 \leq f_n \uparrow |f|$, we can extend this bound to all $f \in X$ by the Fatou property of X . By Proposition 3.3, we conclude that $X \in A$ with

$$[X]_A \leq C^{-2} \|T\|_{X \rightarrow X_{\text{weak}}}^2,$$

as desired. \square

3.2. Generalized Muckenhoupt conditions. Several further operators related to the boundedness of M and the Muckenhoupt condition with respect to more general averaging operators have appeared in the literature. Given a collection of cubes \mathcal{P} and $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbf{R}^d)$, we define

$$A_{\mathcal{P}} f := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} T_Q f = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \langle f \rangle_{1,Q} \mathbf{1}_Q.$$

For $0 < \eta < 1$ we say that a collection of cubes \mathcal{S} is η -sparse if there exists a pairwise disjoint collection $(E_Q)_{Q \in \mathcal{S}}$ of subsets $E_Q \subseteq Q$ for which $|E_Q| \geq \eta|Q|$. We will call \mathcal{S} sparse if it is $\frac{1}{2}$ -sparse.

Definition 3.5. Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d .

- We say that X satisfies the *strong Muckenhoupt condition* and write $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$ if there is a $C > 0$ such that for every pairwise disjoint collection of cubes \mathcal{P} and all $f \in X$ we have

$$\|A_{\mathcal{P}} f\|_X \leq C \|f\|_X.$$

The smallest possible constant C is denoted by $[X]_{A_{\text{strong}}}$.

- We say that X satisfies the *sparse Muckenhoupt condition* and write $X \in A_{\text{sparse}}$ if there is a $C > 0$ such that for every sparse collection of cubes \mathcal{S} and all $f \in X$ we have

$$\|A_{\mathcal{S}} f\|_X \leq C \|f\|_X.$$

The smallest possible constant C is denoted by $[X]_{A_{\text{sparse}}}$.

Since for pairwise disjoint collections \mathcal{P} and $0 < \theta < 1$ we have

$$(A_{\mathcal{P}} f)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \langle f \rangle_{1,Q}^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \mathbf{1}_Q \leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \langle |f|^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \rangle_{1,Q} \mathbf{1}_Q$$

by Hölder's inequality, we conclude that

$$[X^\theta]_A \leq [X]_A^\theta, \quad [X^\theta]_{A_{\text{strong}}} \leq [X]_{A_{\text{strong}}}^\theta.$$

By Theorem 4.2 below, a variant of this result also holds for the condition $X \in A_{\text{sparse}}$.

The strong Muckenhoupt condition was originally introduced by Diening in the context of Musielak-Orlicz spaces – in particular for variable Lebesgue spaces – in [Die05]. The sparse Muckenhoupt condition was used in the recent paper [LN24b] by Lorist and the author to prove a dual self-improvement result related to the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator.

Since for each cube Q the collection $\mathcal{P} = \{Q\}$ is pairwise disjoint with $A_{\mathcal{P}} = T_Q$, it follows from Proposition 3.3 that if $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$, then $X \in A$. Moreover, since any pairwise disjoint collection of cubes is sparse (with $E_Q = Q$), any $X \in A_{\text{sparse}}$ also satisfies $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$. Thus, we have the chain of implications

$$X \in A_{\text{sparse}} \Rightarrow X \in A_{\text{strong}} \Rightarrow X \in A,$$

with

$$[X]_A \leq [X]_{A_{\text{strong}}} \leq [X]_{A_{\text{sparse}}}.$$

In the definition of A_{sparse} , it suffices to check the result for sparse collections contained in a dyadic grid as follows from the 3^d -lattice theorem combined with the fact that the sparsity constant $\frac{1}{2}$ could be replaced by any other $0 < \eta < 1$. For the definition of a dyadic grid and related properties we refer the reader to [LN18]. This latter statement about the sparsity constant follows from the following result:

Proposition 3.6. *Let \mathcal{D} be a dyadic grid, let $0 < \eta < 1$, and let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ be a finite η -sparse collection. Then for all $0 < \nu < 1$ and all $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ there exists a ν -sparse collection $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ such that*

$$A_{\mathcal{S}}f \lesssim_d \frac{1}{\eta(1-\nu)} A_{\mathcal{E}}f.$$

We point out that this is certainly known, but as we could not find a direct proof in the literature, we have added a proof as part of Lemma A.1 below for completeness.

We have the following duality relations of the generalized Muckenhoupt conditions.

Proposition 3.7. *Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d . If $X \in A$, then X' has the saturation property and, hence, is a Banach function space. Moreover, we have $X' \in A$ with*

$$[X']_A \leq [X]_A.$$

If X is a Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d with the Fatou property, then $X \in A$ if and only if $X' \in A$ with

$$[X']_A = [X]_A.$$

Analogous statements hold if A is replaced by A_{strong} or A_{sparse} .

Proof. The saturation property follows from the fact that we can pick a sequence of cubes that increases to \mathbf{R}^d and [LN24a, Proposition 2.5(ii)].

For the next assertion, let $f \in X$, $g \in X'$, and \mathcal{P} a collection of cubes. Then

$$\|f(A_{\mathcal{P}}g)\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^d)} = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \langle f \rangle_{1,Q} \langle g \rangle_{1,Q} |Q| = \|(A_{\mathcal{P}}f)g\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^d)} \leq \|A_{\mathcal{P}}\|_{X \rightarrow X} \|f\|_X \|g\|_{X'}$$

so that

$$(3.4) \quad \|A_{\mathcal{P}}\|_{X' \rightarrow X'} = \sup_{\substack{\|f\|_X=1 \\ \|g\|_{X'}=1}} \|f(A_{\mathcal{P}}g)\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^d)} \leq \|A_{\mathcal{P}}\|_{X \rightarrow X}.$$

From this we conclude the first assertion. The final assertion follows from the fact that the inequality (3.4) is now an equality by the Lorentz-Luxemburg theorem. \square

The strong Muckenhoupt condition A_{strong} appears to be a strictly stronger condition than the Muckenhoupt condition A outside of weighted Lebesgue spaces. An example where this is the case is given in [DHHR11, Theorem 5.3.4], where an exponent function $p(\cdot)$ is given for which the variable Lebesgue space $X = L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R})$ satisfies $X \in A$, but not $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$.

Definition 3.8. Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d . We say that X satisfies the structural property \mathcal{G} and write $X \in \mathcal{G}$ if there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all pairwise disjoint collections of cubes \mathcal{P} and all $f \in X$, $g \in X'$ we have

$$(3.5) \quad \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X \|g \mathbf{1}_Q\|_{X'} \leq C \|f\|_X \|g\|_{X'}.$$

We define $[X]_{\mathcal{G}}$ as the smallest possible constant C in the above inequality.

It is shown in [Ber99] that if X is a Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d with the Fatou property satisfying $X \in \mathcal{G}$, then $X \in A$ and $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$ are equivalent. Moreover, in this case we have

$$[X]_{A_{\text{strong}}} \leq [X]_{\mathcal{G}} [X]_A.$$

Using Hölder's inequality, (3.5) holds if X is both r -convex and r -concave for some $r \geq 1$, with $C = M^{(r)}(X)M_{(r)}(X)$. However, this example is very limited, as the Kolmogorov-Nagumo theorem asserts that the only possible space that is both r -convex and r -concave is $X = L_w^r(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for some weight w .

In the setting of $\mathbf{R}_+ = [0, \infty)$ rather than \mathbf{R}^d , it was shown in [Kop04] that if (3.5) holds with the collection \mathcal{P} replaced by any collection of pairwise disjoint sets, then we must be in the above situation where $X = L_w^r(\mathbf{R}_+)$ for some weight w . However, non-trivial examples of when (3.5) holds were also provided. Indeed, under a modified version of (3.5) to the space $[0, 1]$, this was shown to hold for the variable Lebesgue space $X = L^{p(\cdot)}([0, 1])$ with exponents $p(\cdot)$ satisfying

$$|p(x) - p(y)| |\log |x - y|| \leq C.$$

An explicit counterexample in this setting is also constructed. We discuss further examples in Section 5.2. The proof uses a Banach function space analogue of the average $\langle f \rangle_{1,Q}$. Indeed, defining

$$\|f\|_{X_Q} := \frac{\|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|}{\|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_X}$$

for a cube Q , we note that for $X = L^1(\mathbf{R}^d)$ we have $\|f\|_{X_Q} = \langle f \rangle_{1,Q}$. In general, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all cubes Q and all $f \in X$ we have

$$\langle f \rangle_{1,Q} \leq C \|f\|_{X_Q},$$

if and only if $X \in A$, where the smallest possible C is given by $[X]_A$. Indeed, this follows from the observation that the above inequality is just a rewrite of the boundedness of the averaging operator T_Q , combined with Proposition 3.3.

We have the following sufficient conditions for the equivalence of $X \in A$ and $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$, generalizing the ideas of [DHHR11, Section 7.3]:

Theorem 3.9. *Let X be a Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d with the Fatou property. Consider the following statements:*

- (a) $X \in \mathcal{G}$;
- (b) There are $C_2, \tilde{C}_2 > 0$ such that for all pairwise disjoint collections of cubes \mathcal{P} and all $f \in X$ supported in $\bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} Q$ we have

$$\tilde{C}_2^{-1} \|f\|_X \leq \left\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \|f\|_{X_Q} \mathbf{1}_Q \right\|_X \leq C_2 \|f\|_X;$$

- (c) There is a $C_3 > 0$ such that for all pairwise disjoint collections of cubes \mathcal{P} and all $f \in X$ we have

$$\left\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \|f\|_{X_Q} \mathbf{1}_Q \right\|_X \leq C_3 \|f\|_X.$$

Then (a) \Leftrightarrow (b) \Rightarrow (c) with optimal constants satisfying

$$C_2 = C_3, \quad \max\{C_2, \tilde{C}_2\} \leq [X]_{\mathcal{G}} \leq C_2 \tilde{C}_2.$$

If $X \in A$, then (c) $\Rightarrow X \in A_{\text{strong}}$, with

$$[X]_{A_{\text{strong}}} \leq C_3 [X]_A.$$

Proof. For (a) \Rightarrow (b), we define ℓ_X as the Banach function space over \mathcal{P} with the counting measure as the space of sequences $(a_Q)_{Q \in \mathcal{P}}$ satisfying

$$\|(a_Q)_{Q \in \mathcal{P}}\|_{\ell_X} := \sup_{\|h\|_{\ell^\infty[X]} \leq 1} \left\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} a_Q h_Q \mathbf{1}_Q \right\|_X < \infty.$$

For any $f \in X$ supported in $\bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} Q$, the sequence $h_Q := \frac{f \mathbf{1}_Q}{\|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X}$ satisfies $\|h\|_{\ell^\infty[X]} = 1$, proving that

$$\|f\|_X = \left\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X h_Q \mathbf{1}_Q \right\|_X \leq \|(\|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X)_{Q \in \mathcal{P}}\|_{\ell_X}.$$

Conversely, note that for any $h \in \ell^\infty[X]$ with $\|h\|_{\ell^\infty[X]} \leq 1$ and any $g \in X'$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X h_Q \mathbf{1}_Q |g| \, dx &\leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X \|h_Q\|_X \|g \mathbf{1}_Q\|_{X'} \\ &\leq [X]_g \|f\|_X \|g\|_{X'}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking a supremum over $g \in X'$ with $\|g\|_{X'} = 1$ and $h \in \ell^\infty[X]$ with $\|h\|_{\ell^\infty[X]} = 1$, we conclude that any $f \in X$ supported in $\bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} Q$ satisfies

$$\|f\|_X \leq \|(\|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X)_{Q \in \mathcal{P}}\|_{\ell_X} \leq [X]_g \|f\|_X.$$

Setting $F := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \|f\|_{X_Q} \mathbf{1}_Q$ and noting that $\|F \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X = \|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X$, we have

$$\|f\|_X \leq \|(\|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X)_{Q \in \mathcal{P}}\|_{\ell_X} = \|(\|F \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X)_{Q \in \mathcal{P}}\|_{\ell_X} \leq [X]_g \|F\|_X,$$

and

$$\|F\|_X \leq \|(\|F \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X)_{Q \in \mathcal{P}}\|_{\ell_X} = \|(\|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X)_{Q \in \mathcal{P}}\|_{\ell_X} \leq [X]_g \|f\|_X,$$

proving (b) with $\max\{C_2, \tilde{C}_2\} \leq [X]_g$, as desired.

For (b) \Rightarrow (a), fix $f \in X$, $g \in X'$, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. For each $Q \in \mathcal{P}$ we pick $h_Q \in X$ with $\|h_Q\|_X \leq 1$ such that

$$\|g \mathbf{1}_Q\|_{X'} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \int_Q |h_Q| |g| \, dx.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X \|g \mathbf{1}_Q\|_{X'} &\leq (1 + \varepsilon) \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X \int_Q |h_Q| |g| \, dx \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon) \left\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_X h_Q \mathbf{1}_Q \right\|_X \|g\|_{X'} \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon) \tilde{C}_2 \left\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \|f\|_{X_Q} \|h_Q\|_X \mathbf{1}_Q \right\|_X \|g\|_{X'} \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon) C_2 \tilde{C}_2 \|f\|_X \|g\|_{X'}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ proves the assertion.

As (b) \Rightarrow (c) is immediate, it remains to prove the final assertion. Suppose $X \in A$ and let $f \in X$. Then, since $\langle f \rangle_{1,Q} \leq [X]_A \|f\|_{X_Q}$ for any cube Q , we have

$$\|A_{\mathcal{P}} f\|_X \leq [X]_A \left\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \|f\|_{X_Q} \mathbf{1}_Q \right\|_X \leq C_3 [X]_A \|f\|_X.$$

Thus, $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$ with $[X]_{A_{\text{strong}}} \leq C_3 [X]_A$, as desired. \square

Remark 3.10. In the literature, the condition (a) has been written as $X \in \mathcal{G}(B)$ (see [Ber99]), $X \in G(\Pi_*)$ (see [Kop04]), or just $X \in \mathcal{G}$ (see, e.g., [DHHR11, Section 7.3], [CDH11]).

We will see below in Corollary 3.16 that if $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$ and $X \in A$ are equivalent in a class of Banach function spaces with the Fatou property, then both of these conditions are characterized by the weak-type bound $M : X \rightarrow X_{\text{weak}}$, and

$$\|M\|_{X \rightarrow X_{\text{weak}}} \lesssim_d [X]_{A_{\text{strong}}}.$$

Turning to the proof of Proposition E, we observe that if $X^r \in A_{\text{strong}}$ for some $r > 1$, then also $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$ and thus $X' \in A_{\text{strong}}$ by Proposition 3.7. Hence,

$$\|M\|_{X' \rightarrow (X')_{\text{weak}}} \lesssim_d [X']_{A_{\text{strong}}} \leq [X]_{A_{\text{strong}}} \leq [X^r]_{A_{\text{strong}}}^{\frac{1}{r}}.$$

Theorem 3.11. *Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d . Suppose there is an $r > 1$ for which $X^r \in A_{\text{strong}}$. Then for all sparse collections \mathcal{S} we have $A_{\mathcal{S}} : X' \rightarrow (X')_{\text{weak}}$ with*

$$\sup_{\mathcal{S}} \|A_{\mathcal{S}}\|_{(X') \rightarrow (X')_{\text{weak}}} \lesssim_d r'(1 + \log r') \|M\|_{X' \rightarrow (X')_{\text{weak}}} [X^r]_{A_{\text{strong}}}^{\frac{1}{r}}.$$

The proof follows along the same lines of the one in [DLR16], but with a modification at the end of the proof inspired by the one used in [Ler20].

Proof of Theorem 3.11. By the 3^d lattice theorem and Lemma A.1 we may assume that $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ for some dyadic grid \mathcal{D} , and

$$(3.6) \quad \sum_{Q' \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{S}}(Q)} |Q'| \leq \frac{1}{2} |Q|.$$

Moreover, by the Fatou property of $(X')_{\text{weak}}$, we may assume that \mathcal{S} is finite. Let $g \in X'$ and $f \in X$ with $\|f\|_X = 1$. Then we want to show that for all $\lambda > 0$ we have

$$\lambda \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \mathbf{1}_{\{A_{\mathcal{S}}g > \lambda\}} |f| \, dx \lesssim r'(1 + \log r') \|M\|_{X' \rightarrow (X')_{\text{weak}}} [X^r]_{A_{\text{strong}}}^{\frac{1}{r}} \|g\|_{X'}.$$

By replacing g by $\frac{2g}{\lambda}$, it suffices to consider the case $\lambda = 2$. Set

$$E := \{A_{\mathcal{S}}g > 2\} \setminus \{M^{\mathcal{D}}g > \frac{1}{4}\}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \mathbf{1}_{\{A_{\mathcal{S}}g > 2\}} |f| \, dx &\leq \int_E |f| \, dx + \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \mathbf{1}_{\{M^{\mathcal{D}}g > \frac{1}{4}\}} |f| \, dx \\ &\leq \int_E |f| \, dx + 4 \|M^{\mathcal{D}}g\|_{(X')_{\text{weak}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $M^{\mathcal{D}} : X' \rightarrow (X')_{\text{weak}}$, it remains to estimate the other term.

Using the notation from Lemma A.2, we denote the maximal elements of \mathcal{S}_m by \mathcal{S}_m^* , and note that by Kolmogorov's Lemma we have

$$\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}_m(Q_0)} \langle f \rangle_{r,Q} |Q| \leq 2 \int_{Q_0} M_r^{\mathcal{D}(Q_0)} g \, dx \lesssim r' \langle f \rangle_{r,Q_0} |Q_0|.$$

Thus, it follows from Lemma A.2, Hölder's inequality, and the fact that

$$\bigcup_{Q_0 \in \mathcal{S}_m^*} Q_0 \subseteq \{M^{\mathcal{D}}g > 4^{-(m+1)}\},$$

that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E |f| \, dx &\leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 4^{-m} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}_m} \int_{F_m(Q)} |f| \, dx \\ &\leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 4^{-m} 2^{-\frac{2m}{r'}} \sum_{Q_0 \in \mathcal{S}_m^*} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}_m(Q_0)} \langle f \rangle_{r,Q} |Q| \\ &\lesssim r' \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 4^{-m} 2^{-\frac{2m}{r'}} \sum_{Q_0 \in \mathcal{S}_m^*} \langle f \rangle_{r,Q_0} |Q_0| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq r' \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 4^{-m} 2^{-\frac{2m}{r'}} \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \mathbf{1}_{\{M^{\mathcal{D}}g > 4^{-(m+1)}\}} A_{\mathcal{S}_m^*} (|f|^r)^{\frac{1}{r}} dx \\
&\leq 4r' \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 2^{-\frac{2m}{r'}} \|Mg\|_{(X')_{\text{weak}}} \|A_{\mathcal{S}_m^*} (|f|^r)^{\frac{1}{r}}\|_{X^r} \\
&\lesssim r'(1 + \log r') \|M\|_{X' \rightarrow (X')_{\text{weak}}} [X^r]_{A_{\text{strong}}}^{\frac{1}{r}} \|g\|_{X'}.
\end{aligned}$$

The assertion follows. \square

It is not true that if $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$, then there is an $r > 1$ for which $X^r \in A_{\text{strong}}$. A counterexample is the space $X = L^1(\mathbf{R}^d)$. However, this self-improvement is true for the condition $X \in A_{\text{sparse}}$:

Theorem 3.12. *Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d . If $X \in A_{\text{sparse}}$, then there is an $r_0 > 1$ such that for every $1 < r \leq r_0$ we have $X^r \in A_{\text{sparse}}$, and*

$$[X^r]_{A_{\text{sparse}}}^{\frac{1}{r}} \lesssim_{d, K_X} [X]_{A_{\text{sparse}}}.$$

We will use the following result based on the sharp reverse Hölder theorem of [HP13]:

Lemma 3.13. *Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d for which $M : X \rightarrow X$. Then there is a dimensional constant $C_d > 1$ such that for any $1 < r < \infty$ satisfying*

$$r' \geq C_d K_X \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}$$

and each $f \in X$, there exists a weight $w \geq |f|$ satisfying $\|w\|_X \leq 2K_X^2 \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X} \|f\|_X$, and

$$\langle w \rangle_{r, Q} \lesssim_d \langle w \rangle_{1, Q}$$

for all cubes Q .

Proof. As we will see in Proposition 3.18 below, for every $f \in X$ there exists a $w \in A_1$ for which

$$\|w\|_X \leq 2K_X^2 \|f\|_X, \quad [w]_1 \leq 2K_X \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}.$$

By the sharp reverse Hölder theorem of [HP13], any such w satisfies

$$\langle w \rangle_{r, Q} \lesssim_d \langle w \rangle_{1, Q}$$

as long as $r' \geq C_d [w]_{\text{FW}}$ for a certain $C_d > 1$. In particular, since

$$[w]_{\text{FW}} \leq [w]_1 \leq 2K_X \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X},$$

this is the case for r satisfying

$$r' \geq 2C_d K_X \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X},$$

proving the result. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.12. Let \mathcal{S} be a sparse collection, and let $f \in X^r$, where r satisfies

$$r' \geq C_d K_X \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X} =: r'_0.$$

Since M satisfies sparse domination, the assertion $X \in A_{\text{sparse}}$ implies that $M : X \rightarrow X$. Hence, since $|f|^{\frac{1}{r}} \in X$, by Lemma 3.13 we can pick a weight $w \geq |f|^{\frac{1}{r}}$ satisfying

$$\|w\|_X \lesssim_{K_X} \|f\|_{X^r}^{\frac{1}{r}}, \quad \langle w \rangle_{r, Q} \lesssim \langle w \rangle_{1, Q}$$

for all cubes Q . Since $\|\cdot\|_{\ell^r} \leq \|\cdot\|_{\ell^1}$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|A_{\mathcal{S}} f\|_{X^r}^{\frac{1}{r}} &= \left\| \left(\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}} \langle |f|^{\frac{1}{r}} \rangle_{r, Q}^r \mathbf{1}_Q \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \right\|_X \leq \left\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}} \langle w \rangle_{r, Q} \mathbf{1}_Q \right\|_X \\
&\lesssim_d \|A_{\mathcal{S}} w\|_X \leq [X]_{A_{\text{sparse}}} \|w\|_X
\end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim_{K_X} [X]_{A_{\text{sparse}}} \|f\|_{X^r}^{\frac{1}{r}}.$$

Thus, $X^r \in A_{\text{sparse}}$ with

$$[X^r]_{A_{\text{sparse}}}^{\frac{1}{r}} \lesssim_{d, K_X} [X]_{A_{\text{sparse}}},$$

as desired. \square

3.3. Bounds of the Hardy-Little maximal operator. The Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator M is defined by

$$Mf := \sup_Q T_Q f.$$

Moreover, for a collection of cubes \mathcal{P} we set $M^{\mathcal{P}} f := \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} T_Q f$. The generalized Muckenhoupt conditions are directly related to boundedness properties of M . Indeed, if X is a Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d with the Fatou property, we have the following chain of implications:

$$\begin{aligned} M : X \rightarrow X, M : X' \rightarrow X' &\Rightarrow X \in A_{\text{sparse}} \Rightarrow M : X \rightarrow X \\ &\Rightarrow X \in A_{\text{strong}} \Rightarrow M : X \rightarrow X_{\text{weak}} \Rightarrow X \in A \end{aligned}$$

with

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} [X]_A &\leq \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X_{\text{weak}}} \lesssim_d [X]_{A_{\text{strong}}} \leq \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X} \\ &\lesssim_d [X]_{A_{\text{sparse}}} \lesssim \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X} \|M\|_{X' \rightarrow X'}. \end{aligned}$$

More precisely, we have the following result:

Theorem 3.14. *Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d . Then we have the following assertions:*

(a) *If $M : X \rightarrow X_{\text{weak}}$, then $X \in A$ with*

$$[X]_A \leq \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X_{\text{weak}}}.$$

(b) *If $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$ and X has the Fatou property, then $M : X \rightarrow X_{\text{weak}}$ with*

$$\|M\|_{X \rightarrow X_{\text{weak}}} \lesssim_d [X]_{A_{\text{strong}}}.$$

(c) *If $M : X \rightarrow X$, then $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$ with*

$$[X]_{A_{\text{strong}}} \leq \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}.$$

(d) *If $X \in A_{\text{sparse}}$ and X has the Fatou property, then $M : X \rightarrow X$ with*

$$\|M\|_{X \rightarrow X} \lesssim_d [X]_{A_{\text{sparse}}}.$$

(e) *If X is a Banach function space with the Fatou property, then*

$$M : X \rightarrow X, \quad M : X' \rightarrow X'$$

if and only if $X \in A_{\text{sparse}}$, with

$$(3.8) \quad \max \{ \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}, \|M\|_{X' \rightarrow X'} \} \lesssim_d [X]_{A_{\text{sparse}}} \lesssim \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X} \|M\|_{X' \rightarrow X'}.$$

The Fatou property is assumed in (b) and (d) so that

$$\sup_{\mathcal{F}} \|M^{\mathcal{F}} f\|_X = \|Mf\|_X,$$

where the supremum is over all finite collections of cubes \mathcal{F} . It can be removed if the conclusion is replaced by the boundedness of $M^{\mathcal{F}}$ uniformly over all finite \mathcal{F} .

Proof of Theorem 3.14. Assertion (a) is [Nie23, Proposition 4.21]. For a slick proof, note that by Proposition 3.3 and the ideal property of X_{weak} we have

$$[X]_A = \sup_Q \|T_Q\|_{X \rightarrow X_{\text{weak}}} \leq \|\sup_Q T_Q\|_{X \rightarrow X_{\text{weak}}} = \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X_{\text{weak}}},$$

as desired.

For (b), by the 3^d -lattice theorem, it suffices to prove the result for $M^{\mathcal{D}}$ for a dyadic grid \mathcal{D} . Moreover, by the Fatou property of X_{weak} , it suffices to prove the result for $M^{\mathcal{F}}$ for a finite collection $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. Let $\lambda > 0$, $f \in X$, and pick a pairwise disjoint collection $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ so that $\langle f \rangle_{1,P} > \lambda$ for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and

$$\{x \in \mathbf{R}^d : M^{\mathcal{F}} f(x) > \lambda\} = \bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P.$$

Then

$$(3.9) \quad \lambda \|\mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \mathbf{R}^d : M^{\mathcal{F}} f(x) > \lambda\}}\|_X = \left\| \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \lambda \mathbf{1}_P \right\|_X \leq \|T_{\mathcal{P}} f\|_X \leq [X]_{A_{\text{strong}}} \|f\|_X.$$

Hence, taking a supremum over $\lambda > 0$ yields

$$\|M^{\mathcal{F}} f\|_{X_{\text{weak}}} \leq [X]_{A_{\text{strong}}} \|f\|_X,$$

as desired.

Assertion (c) follows from the fact that for each pairwise disjoint collection of cubes \mathcal{F} and $f \in L^0(\mathbf{R}^d)$ we have $T_{\mathcal{F}} f \leq Mf$.

To prove (d), we note that for any $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbf{R}^d)$, each dyadic grid \mathcal{D} , and each finite collection $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, there exists a sparse collection $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ so that

$$M^{\mathcal{F}} f \leq 2T_{\mathcal{S}} f.$$

Hence, the result follows from the ideal and Fatou properties of X and the 3^d -lattice theorem.

For the final assertion (e), we note that the first inequality in (3.8) follows from (c) and Proposition 3.7. For the second inequality, note that

$$\|(A_{\mathcal{S}} f)g\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^d)} = \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}} \langle f \rangle_{1,Q} \langle g \rangle_{1,Q} |Q| \leq 2 \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} (Mf)(Mg) dx \lesssim \|Mf\|_X \|Mg\|_{X'},$$

so that by the Lorentz-Luxemburg theorem we have

$$[X]_{A_{\text{sparse}}} \lesssim \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X} \|M\|_{X' \rightarrow X'}.$$

This proves the result. \square

Remark 3.15. From the proof of Theorem 3.14(b) we actually find that, if $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$, then for every dyadic grid \mathcal{D} in \mathbf{R}^d and $\lambda > 0$, we have

$$(3.10) \quad \lambda \|\mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \mathbf{R}^d : M^{\mathcal{D}} f(x) > \lambda\}}\|_X \leq [X]_{A_{\text{strong}}} \|f \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \mathbf{R}^d : M^{\mathcal{D}} f(x) > \lambda\}}\|_X.$$

To see this, note that since $T_{\mathcal{P}} f = T_{\mathcal{P}}(f \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \mathbf{R}^d : M^{\mathcal{F}} f(x) > \lambda\}})$ in (3.9), we can replace the last estimate here with the more precise bound

$$\|T_{\mathcal{P}} f\|_X \leq [X]_{A_{\text{strong}}} \|f \mathbf{1}_{\{x \in \mathbf{R}^d : M^{\mathcal{F}} f(x) > \lambda\}}\|_X.$$

The assertion (3.10) then follows from the Fatou property of X .

Combined with Theorem 3.9 we obtain the following corollary:

Corollary 3.16. *Let X be a Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d with the Fatou property. If $X \in \mathcal{G}$, then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $X \in A$;
- (ii) $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$;
- (iii) $M : X \rightarrow X_{\text{weak}}$,

with

$$[X]_A \leq \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X_{weak}} \lesssim_d [X]_{A_{strong}} \leq [X]_{\mathcal{G}}[X]_A.$$

In fact, by Theorem 3.9, for this equivalence to hold it suffices to assume the weaker condition that there is a $C > 0$ such that for every pairwise disjoint collection of cubes \mathcal{P} and all $f \in X$ we have

$$\left\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \|f\|_{X_Q} \mathbf{1}_Q \right\|_X \leq C \|f\|_X.$$

3.4. A_p -regularity. The notion of A_p -regularity of a quasi-Banach function space was widely studied in the works of Rutsky, see, e.g., [Rut14, Rut19, Rut15, Rut16]. In this section we will do a quantitative study of some of his results.

To streamline our notation, we will call a collection of weights B a *weight class* if there is an associated constant $[\cdot]_B$ with the property that $w \in B$ if and only if $[w]_B < \infty$.

Definition 3.17. Let B be a weight class and let X be a quasi-Banach function space X over \mathbf{R}^d . We say that X is *B -regular* if there exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for all $f \in X$ there exists a weight $w \in B$ with $w \geq |f|$, $w \in X$, and

$$\|w\|_X \leq C_1 \|f\|_X, \quad [w]_B \leq C_2.$$

We point out that our notation varies from that of Rutsky: since we have introduced weights using the multiplier approach instead of the change of measure approach, a space X is A_p -regular in the notation of Rutsky if and only if $X^{\frac{1}{p}}$ is A_p -regular in our current notation.

The notion of A_p -regularity can be seen as a generalization of the boundedness $M : X \rightarrow X$. Indeed, we have the following result:

Proposition 3.18. *Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d . Then*

$$M : X \rightarrow X$$

if and only if X is A_1 -regular. In this case, we can take

$$C_1 = 2K_X^2, \quad C_2 = 2K_X \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}.$$

Proof. For the direct implication, set

$$w := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{M^n f}{(2K_X)^n \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}^n},$$

where we have recursively defined $M^0 f := |f|$ and $M^{n+1} f := M(M^n f)$ for $n \geq 1$. Note that by the Riesz-Fischer property of X , see [LN24a, Section 2.1], we have $w \in X$ with

$$\|w\|_X \leq K_X \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{K_X^{n+1}}{(2K_X)^n} \|f\|_X = 2K_X^2 \|f\|_X.$$

Thus, the result follows with $C_1 = 2K_X^2$, $C_2 = 2K_X \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}$.

For the converse, note that for any $f \in X$ we have $Mf \leq Mw \leq C_2 w$ so that by the ideal property of X we have $Mf \in X$ with

$$\|Mf\|_X \leq C_2 \|w\|_X \leq C_1 C_2 \|f\|_X.$$

Thus, $M : X \rightarrow X$ with $\|M\|_{X \rightarrow X} \leq C_1 C_2$. The result follows. \square

We also have the following result relating A_p -regularity to bounds of M :

Proposition 3.19. *Let $1 \leq p < \infty$ and let X be a p -convex Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d . If X is A_p -regular, then we have:*

$$(a) \quad M : [(X^p)']^{\frac{1}{p}} \rightarrow [(X^p)']^{\frac{1}{p}} \text{ if } p > 1;$$

(b) $M : X \cdot L^{p'}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow X \cdot L^{p'}(\mathbf{R}^d)$.

Moreover, if $C_1, C_2 > 0$ are the A_p -regularity constants, then

$$\|M\|_{[(X^p)']^{\frac{1}{p}} \rightarrow [(X^p)']^{\frac{1}{p}}} \lesssim_d p' C_1 C_2^{p'}, \quad \|M\|_{X \cdot L^{p'}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow X \cdot L^{p'}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \lesssim_d p C_1 C_2^p.$$

Note that

$$(X \cdot L^{p'}(\mathbf{R}^d))' = [(X^p)']^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Proof of Proposition 3.19. For (a), let $g \in [(X^p)']^{\frac{1}{p}}$ and $f \in X^p$ with $\|f\|_{X^p} = 1$. Picking a weight $w \in A_p$ with $w \geq |f|^{\frac{1}{p}}$, $\|w\|_X \leq C_1$, $[w]_p \leq C_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} (Mg)^p |f| dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} &\leq \|Mg\|_{L_w^p(\mathbf{R}^d)} \lesssim_d p' [w]_p^{p'} \|g\|_{L_w^p(\mathbf{R}^d)} \leq p' C_2^{p'} \|g\|_{[(X^p)']^{\frac{1}{p}}} \|w\|_X \\ &\leq p' C_1 C_2^{p'} \|g\|_{[(X^p)']^{\frac{1}{p}}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Buckley's bound [Buc93], so that

$$\|Mg\|_{[(X^p)']^{\frac{1}{p}}} = \sup_{\|f\|_{X^p}=1} \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} (Mg)^p |f| dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim_d p' C_1 C_2^{p'} \|g\|_{[(X^p)']^{\frac{1}{p}}},$$

as desired.

For (b), let $f \in X \cdot L^{p'}(\mathbf{R}^d)$, pick $0 \leq h \in X$, $0 \leq k \in L^{p'}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ such that $|f| \leq hk$, and pick $w \geq h$ as in the definition of A_p regularity. Then, using Buckley's bound [Buc93] and the fact that $[w^{-1}]_{p'} = [w]_p$, we have

$$\|Mf\|_{L_{w^{-1}}^{p'}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \lesssim_d p [w^{-1}]_{p'}^p \|f\|_{L_{w^{-1}}^{p'}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \leq p C_2^p \|k\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbf{R}^d)},$$

where in the last estimate we used $|f|w^{-1} \leq hw^{-1}k \leq k$. This implies that

$$\|Mf\|_{X \cdot L^{p'}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \leq \|w\|_X \|Mf\|_{L_{w^{-1}}^{p'}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \lesssim_d p C_1 C_2^p \|h\|_X \|k\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbf{R}^d)}.$$

Taking an infimum over all $0 \leq h \in X$, $0 \leq k \in L^{p'}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ such that $|f| \leq hk$ now proves the assertion. \square

The notion of A_p -regularity is closely related to the linearization of M . Indeed, let \mathcal{Q} denote the (countable) collection of cubes in \mathbf{R}^d with rational corners and define the map

$$\mathcal{M}((f_Q)_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}) := ((f)_Q \mathbf{1}_Q)_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}.$$

By Proposition 2.2 we have $M : X \rightarrow X$ if and only if $\mathcal{M} : X[\ell^\infty] \rightarrow X[\ell^\infty]$, where we have indexed ℓ^∞ over \mathcal{Q} , and, if X is a Banach function space with the Fatou property, $M : X' \rightarrow X'$ if and only if $\mathcal{M} : X[\ell^1] \rightarrow X[\ell^1]$. Moreover, by Corollary 2.3 we have

$$M : X \rightarrow X, \quad M : X' \rightarrow X'$$

if and only if $\mathcal{M} : X[\ell^r] \rightarrow X[\ell^r]$ for all $1 \leq r \leq \infty$. When X is r -convex, we can actually expand this characterization to only requiring this bound for a single exponent:

Theorem 3.20. *Let $r_0 > 1$ and let X be an r_0 -convex Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d with the Fatou property. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $M : X \rightarrow X$, $M : X' \rightarrow X'$;
- (ii) $\mathcal{M} : X[\ell^r] \rightarrow X[\ell^r]$ for some $1 < r \leq r_0$;

Remark 3.21. Using Theorem 3.25 below, we point out that the implication (ii) \Rightarrow (i) is true for $r = 2$ without any convexity assumption on X .

Theorem 3.20 follows directly from a characterization proven by Rutsky in [Rut15]. We prove a sharp version of it:

Proposition 3.22. *Let $r > 1$ and let X be an r -convex Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d with the Fatou property. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $\mathcal{M} : X[\ell^r] \rightarrow X[\ell^r]$;
- (ii) $[(X^r)']^{\frac{1}{r}}$ is A_r -regular.
- (iii) $M : X \rightarrow X$ and $M : X' \rightarrow X'$.

In this case we can take $C_1 = 2^{\frac{1}{r}}$ in (ii), and

$$C_2 \leq 2^{\frac{1}{r}} M^{(r)}(X) \|\mathcal{M}\|_{X[\ell^r] \rightarrow X[\ell^r]}, \quad \|\mathcal{M}\|_{X[\ell^r] \rightarrow X[\ell^r]} \leq 2^{\frac{1}{r}} M^{(r)}(X) C_2.$$

The main ingredient in the proof is a version of a classical result by Rubio de Francia [Rub86]. The following version is proven in [ALV19, Lemma 3.4] (see also [Lor16, Corollary 6.1.4]).

Theorem 3.23. *Let $r \geq 1$ and let X be an r -convex Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d with the Fatou property. Let Γ be a family of (sub)linear operator on X . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) There exists a $C > 0$ such that for any finite index set \mathcal{I} and $(T_n)_{n \in \mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Gamma$, $(f_n)_{n \in \mathcal{I}} \subseteq X$, we have

$$\|(T_n f_n)_{n \in \mathcal{I}}\|_{X[\ell^r(\mathcal{I})]} \leq C \|(f_n)_{n \in \mathcal{I}}\|_{X[\ell^r(\mathcal{I})]};$$

- (ii) $[(X^r)']^{\frac{1}{r}}$ is B -regular with $C_1 = 2^{\frac{1}{r}}$, where

$$[w]_B := \sup_{T \in \Gamma} \|T\|_{L_w^r(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L_w^r(\mathbf{R}^d)}, \quad B := \{w : [w]_B < \infty\}.$$

Moreover, in this case we have

$$C_2 \leq 2^{\frac{1}{r}} M^{(r)}(X) C, \quad C \leq 2^{\frac{1}{r}} M^{(r)}(X) C_2.$$

Note that for (ii) to make sense, one needs that $X \cap L_w^r(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is dense in $L_w^r(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for any weight w so that all $T \in \Gamma$ uniquely extend to $L_w^r(\mathbf{R}^d)$. As noted by Rubio de Francia [Rub86, Page 200], this follows from the Hahn-Banach theorem.

Remark 3.24. Instead of the Fatou property (which is assumed by Rubio de Francia [Rub86]), one can assume that X is order-continuous (as is done, for example, in the versions of this result by Rutsky [Rut14, Rut19]). Actually, the only requirement for the result is that X' is norming for X .

Proof of Proposition 3.22. For (i) \Rightarrow (ii), note that this follows from Theorem 3.23 applied to the family

$$\Gamma := \{\tilde{T}_Q : Q \in \mathcal{Q}\}, \quad \tilde{T}_Q f := \langle f \rangle_Q \mathbf{1}_Q.$$

Note that in this case we have Theorem 3.23(i) with $C = \|\mathcal{M}\|_{X[\ell^r] \rightarrow X[\ell^r]}$, and Theorem 3.23(ii) with $C_1 = 2^{\frac{1}{r}}$, where now $B = A_r$ by Proposition 3.3, and C_2 as in Theorem 3.23, as desired.

The implication (ii) \Rightarrow (iii) follows from Proposition 3.19, where the Fatou property of X is used so that $Y = [(X^r)']^{\frac{1}{r}}$ satisfies $[(Y^r)']^{\frac{1}{r}} = [(X^r)']^{\frac{1}{r}} = X$ by the Lorentz-Luxemburg theorem.

Finally, (iii) \Rightarrow (i) follows from Corollary 2.3. \square

We end this section with the proof of Theorem A. This requires a version of Theorem 3.23 without any convexity assumption on the space. The following is [KLW23, Theorem 2.3.1] (see also [Lor16, Theorem 4.6.2]):

Theorem 3.25. *Let X be an order-continuous Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d with the Fatou property, and let Γ be a family of bounded linear operators on X . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) There exists a $C_1 > 0$ such that for any finite index sets \mathcal{I} and $(T_n)_{n \in \mathcal{I}} \subseteq \Gamma$, $(f_n)_{n \in \mathcal{I}} \subseteq X$, we have

$$\|(T_n f_n)_{n \in \mathcal{I}}\|_{X[\ell^2(\mathcal{I})]} \leq C_1 \|(f_n)_{n \in \mathcal{I}}\|_{X[\ell^2(\mathcal{I})]};$$

- (ii) For every $f_1, f_2 \in X$ there exists a weight w such that

$$\sup_{T \in \Gamma} \|T\|_{L_w^2(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L_w^2(\mathbf{R}^d)} \leq C_2, \quad \|f_1\|_{L_w^2(\mathbf{R}^d)} \leq 1312 \|f_1\|_X, \quad \|f_2\|_X \leq 1312 \|f_2\|_{L_w^2(\mathbf{R}^d)}.$$

In this case C_1 and C_2 can be chosen such that $C_1 \approx C_2$.

Proof of Theorem A. First, we show that (i) \Rightarrow (vi) \Rightarrow (iii), proving the equivalence of (vi) with (i)-(iii).

For (i) \Rightarrow (vi), pick any non-degenerate Calderón-Zygmund operator T , such as one of the Riesz transforms. For (vi) \Rightarrow (iii), by Theorem 3.14(e) it suffices to show that $X \in A_{\text{sparse}}$.

By the Grothendieck theorem (see, e.g., [Kri74, Theorem 3]), we have $\tilde{T} : X[\ell^2] \rightarrow X[\ell^2]$, where $\tilde{T}((f_n)_{n \geq 1}) = (T f_n)_{n \geq 1}$. Thus, by Theorem 3.25 with $\Gamma := \{T\}$, we find that (ii) also holds. Since $T : X \rightarrow X$, by Proposition 3.4 we have $X \in A$ and, for any w constructed as in (ii),

$$[w]_2 \lesssim \|T\|_{L_w^2(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L_w^2(\mathbf{R}^d)} \lesssim \|\tilde{T}\|_{X[\ell^2] \rightarrow X[\ell^2]} \lesssim \|T\|_{X \rightarrow X}.$$

Since $X \in A$, for any finite sparse collection of cubes \mathcal{S} we have $A_{\mathcal{S}} f \in X$ when $f \in X$. For fixed $f \in X$ we apply (ii) with $f_1 = f$, $f_2 = A_{\mathcal{S}} f$. Then, by the A_2 -bound for sparse operators,

$$\|A_{\mathcal{S}} f\|_X \lesssim \|A_{\mathcal{S}} f\|_{L_w^2(\mathbf{R}^d)} \lesssim_d [w]_2^2 \|f\|_{L_w^2(\mathbf{R}^d)} \lesssim \|T\|_{X \rightarrow X}^2 \|f\|_X.$$

By the Fatou property of X , we can extend this result to any sparse collection \mathcal{S} , proving that $X \in A_{\text{sparse}}$ with

$$[X]_{A_{\text{sparse}}} \lesssim_d \|T\|_{X \rightarrow X}^2.$$

The assertion follows.

To prove the equivalence of (vii) with (i)-(iii), we first prove (iii) \Rightarrow (vii). By Corollary 2.3 we have

$$\|\mathcal{M}\|_{X[\ell^2] \rightarrow X[\ell^2]} \leq \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|M\|_{X' \rightarrow X'}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Since we can take $C = \|\mathcal{M}\|_{X[\ell^2] \rightarrow X[\ell^2]}$ in (vii), this proves the assertion. Conversely, we proceed analogous to the implication (vi) $\Rightarrow X \in A_{\text{sparse}}$ above, except this time we take the family

$$\Gamma := \{\tilde{T}_Q : Q \text{ a cube}\}, \quad \tilde{T}_Q f := \langle f \rangle_Q \mathbf{1}_Q.$$

For this family, Theorem 3.25(i) is precisely our assumption (vii), with $C = C_1$. Thus, since

$$\sup_Q \|T_Q\|_{L_w^2(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L_w^2(\mathbf{R}^d)} = [w]_2$$

by Proposition 3.3, proceeding as above yields

$$[X]_{A_{\text{sparse}}} \lesssim_d C^2.$$

The assertion follows. \square

4. DUALITY OF THE HARDY-LITTLEWOOD MAXIMAL OPERATOR

The general duality question (Q) is posed for Banach function spaces rather than the more general *quasi*-Banach function spaces. It is worth noting that it is not true that if M is bounded on a quasi-Banach function space X , then X can be renormed to a Banach function space. For example, the Lorentz space $X = L^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for $p \in (1, \infty)$ and $q \in (0, 1)$ is a quasi-Banach function space on which M is bounded that is not a Banach function space. However, we claim that solving (Q) as posed is sufficient to also conclude the result for any quasi-Banach function space X . Indeed, if M is bounded on X , then X'

is a Banach function space, and thus X'' is also a Banach function space. It is actually possible to show that then M is also bounded on the Banach function space X'' . Since $X''' = X'$, we can now simply replace X by X'' in (Q) to obtain the desired conclusion.

This duality result was originally shown in [Nie23, Proposition 2.27], and we give a brief proof based on the linearization \mathcal{M} here:

Theorem 4.1. *Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d with the Fatou property. If $M : X \rightarrow X$, then also $M : X'' \rightarrow X''$ with*

$$\|M\|_{X'' \rightarrow X''} \leq \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}.$$

Proof. By the second assertion of Proposition 2.2 and the fact that $X''' = X'$, the conclusion is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{M} : X'[\ell^1] \rightarrow X'[\ell^1].$$

But, with the same proof as the one of (iii) \Rightarrow (iv) in Proposition 2.2, this follows from $M : X \rightarrow X$ with

$$\|\mathcal{M}\|_{X'[\ell^1] \rightarrow X'[\ell^1]} \leq \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X},$$

proving the result. \square

To pass bounds of M from X to X' , we note that by the original result of Fefferman and Stein [FS71], we have

$$(4.1) \quad \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} (Mf)^p |g| dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim_d p' \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} |f|^p (Mg) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

for all $p > 1$ and all $f, g \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbf{R}^d)$. This can be used to establish that $M : (X')^\theta \rightarrow (X')^\theta$ for any $0 < \theta < 1$. As a matter of fact, we have the following general duality results:

Theorem 4.2. *Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d with the Fatou property. Suppose that $M : X \rightarrow X$. Then the following assertions hold:*

(a) $M : (X')^\theta \rightarrow (X')^\theta$ for all $0 < \theta < 1$ with

$$\|M\|_{(X')^\theta \rightarrow (X')^\theta} \lesssim_d \frac{1}{1-\theta} \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}^\theta;$$

(b) $M : [(X')^\theta]^\prime \rightarrow [(X')^\theta]^\prime$ for all $0 < \theta < 1$ with

$$\|M\|_{[(X')^\theta]^\prime \rightarrow [(X')^\theta]^\prime} \lesssim_d \frac{1}{\theta} \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X};$$

(c) $(X')^\theta \in A_{\text{sparse}}$ for all $0 < \theta < 1$ with

$$[(X')^\theta]_{A_{\text{sparse}}} \lesssim_d \frac{1}{\theta} \frac{1}{1-\theta} \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}^{1+\theta}.$$

Qualitatively, these statements follow from extrapolation, see [Nie23, Theorem 4.16, Remark 4.17]. We will give an alternative direct proof of (a) using (4.1), and an alternative proof of (b) using Proposition 3.19. Note that (a) also follows from Proposition 3.19, but we would get a worse dependence on the operator norm.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. For (a) and (b), note that by Theorem 4.1 we may assume that X is a Banach function space by replacing X by X'' . Moreover, by the 3^d -lattice theorem, it suffices to prove the result with M replaced by $M^{\mathcal{D}}$ for a dyadic grid \mathcal{D} . We also set $p := \frac{1}{\theta} > 1$.

To prove (a), let $g \in (X')^\theta$. Then, by (4.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|Mg\|_{(X')^\theta} &= \sup_{\|f\|_X=1} \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} (Mg)^p |f| dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim_d p' \sup_{\|f\|_X=1} \left(\int_{\mathbf{R}^d} |g|^p (Mf) dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\leq p' \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}^{\frac{1}{p}} \| |g|^p \|_{X'}^{\frac{1}{p}} = \frac{1}{1-\theta} \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}^\theta \|g\|_{(X')^\theta}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

For (b), note that by (2.1) we have $[(X')^{\theta}]' = X^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot L^{p'}(\mathbf{R}^d)$. Thus, the result follows from Proposition 3.19 applied to the space $X^{\frac{1}{p}}$, using the observation that since X is A_1 -regular with constant $C_2 \lesssim \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}$ and for any $w \in A_1$ we have

$$[w^{\frac{1}{p}}]_p^p \leq [w]_1$$

the space $X^{\frac{1}{p}}$ is A_p -regular with $C_2 \lesssim \|M\|_{X \rightarrow X}^{\frac{1}{p}}$.

To statement (c) follows from Theorem 3.14(e) applied to the space $(X')^{\theta}$, combined with (a) and (b). The assertion follows. \square

We point out that (a) and (b) in Theorem 4.2 imply that if $M : X \rightarrow X$, then, for any $0 < \theta < 1$, the space $Y := (X')^{\theta}$ satisfies

$$(4.2) \quad M : Y \rightarrow Y, \quad M : Y' \rightarrow Y'$$

This observation results in the following characterizations for boundedness of M on a space and its Köthe dual, which were originally proven in [LN24b]:

Corollary 4.3. *Let X be a Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d with the Fatou property. Consider the statement*

$$(i) \quad M : X \rightarrow X \text{ and } M : X' \rightarrow X'.$$

If X is s_0 -concave for some $1 < s_0 < \infty$, then (i) is equivalent to

$$(ii) \quad M : [(X')^{s'}]' \rightarrow [(X')^{s'}]' \text{ for some } s_0 \leq s < \infty.$$

If X is r_0 -convex for some $1 < r_0 < \infty$, then (i) is equivalent to

$$(iii) \quad M : (X^r)' \rightarrow (X^r)' \text{ for some } 1 < r \leq r_0.$$

Moreover, in these situations we respectively have

$$\|M\|_{X \rightarrow X} \lesssim_d s' \|M\|_{[(X')^{s'}]' \rightarrow [(X')^{s'}]'}, \quad \|M\|_{X' \rightarrow X'} \lesssim_d s \|M\|_{[(X')^{s'}]' \rightarrow [(X')^{s'}]'}$$

and

$$\|M\|_{X \rightarrow X} \lesssim_d r' \|M\|_{(X^r)' \rightarrow (X^r)'}, \quad \|M\|_{X' \rightarrow X'} \lesssim_d r \|M\|_{(X^r)' \rightarrow (X^r)'}$$

Proof. For (ii) \Rightarrow (i), apply Theorem 4.2 to the space $[(X')^{s'}]'$ with $\theta := \frac{1}{s'}$. For (iii) \Rightarrow (i), apply Theorem 4.2 to the space $(X^r)'$ with $\theta := \frac{1}{r}$.

For (i) \Rightarrow (iii), by Theorem 3.14(e) we have $X \in A_{\text{sparse}}$. Then by Theorem 3.12 we can pick an $1 < r \leq r_0$ for which $X^r \in A_{\text{sparse}}$. Another application of Theorem 3.14(e) now proves (iii). By symmetry, the implication (i) \Rightarrow (ii) can be proven analogously, replacing X by X' and r by s' . The result follows. \square

Thus, in relation to (Q), we find that if $M : X \rightarrow X$ and X is s_0 -concave for some $1 < s_0 < \infty$, then $M : X' \rightarrow X'$ if and only if $M : [(X')^{s'}]' \rightarrow [(X')^{s'}]'$ for some $s_0 \leq s < \infty$.

Next, we provide a list featuring several known characterizations of (Q). For this, we define the sharp maximal operator

$$M^\sharp f = \sup_Q \left(\frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q |f - \langle f \rangle_Q| dx \right) \mathbf{1}_Q, \quad \langle f \rangle_Q = \frac{1}{|Q|} \int_Q f dx$$

Theorem 4.4. *Let X be a Banach function space with the Fatou property. Suppose that $M : X \rightarrow X$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $M : X' \rightarrow X'$;
- (ii) X' is A_{FW} -regular;

(iii) there is a $C > 0$ such that for all $f \in X$ satisfying $|\{x \in \mathbf{R}^d : |f(x)| > \lambda\}| < \infty$ for all $\lambda > 0$

$$\|f\|_X \leq C \|M^{\sharp, D} f\|_X;$$

(iv) $M : (X^\theta)' \rightarrow (X^\theta)'$ for some $0 < \theta < 1$;

The equivalence of (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii) follows from [Rut19, Proposition 7], where Rutsky proves that if a Banach function space X over \mathbf{R}^d is A_{FW} -regular and there is a $0 < \theta < 1$ for which $M : X^\theta \rightarrow X^\theta$, then also $M : X \rightarrow X$. Since $M : X \rightarrow X$ implies that $M : (X')^\theta \rightarrow (X')^\theta$ for all $0 < \theta < 1$ by Theorem 4.2, this proves the assertion.

The characterization (i) \Leftrightarrow (iii) is contained in the work of Lerner [Ler10, Corollary 4.3]. Perhaps interestingly, one can also prove the implication (ii) \Rightarrow (iii) directly by using the weighted Fefferman-Stein inequality

$$\|f\|_{L_w^1(\mathbf{R}^d)} \lesssim \|M^\sharp f\|_{L_w^1(\mathbf{R}^d)},$$

valid for any $w \in A_{FW}$. As a matter of fact, since this bound is true for any weight $w \in C_p$ for some $p > 1$, one can weaken (ii) even further.

The equivalence (i) \Leftrightarrow (iv) can be shown using a different characterization of Lerner obtained in the very recent note [Ler24]. Here, he shows that (i) is equivalent to the unboundedness of a certain function

$$\phi_X : (0, 1) \rightarrow [1, \infty)$$

that satisfies $\phi_{X^p} = (\phi_X)^p$ for any $p > 0$. In particular, this means that (i) $\Leftrightarrow \phi_X$ is unbounded $\Leftrightarrow \phi_{X^\theta}$ is unbounded. Since $M : X \rightarrow X$ also implies $M : X^\theta \rightarrow X^\theta$, this last assertion is equivalent to (iv), as desired.

Finally, we give a criterion for when the implication in (Q) fails:

Proposition 4.5. *Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d for which $X' \neq \{0\}$. If $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{R}^d} \in X$, then we do not have $M : X' \rightarrow X'$.*

Proof. If $M : X' \rightarrow X'$, then for all $g \in X'$ we have $Mg = (Mg)\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{R}^d} \in L^1(\mathbf{R}^d)$, which is only possible when $X' = \{0\}$. The result follows by contraposition. \square

This result applies, in particular, when $M : X \rightarrow X$, since then X' is saturated. Thus, we get the following corollary:

Corollary 4.6. *Let X be a quasi-Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d for which $M : X \rightarrow X$ and $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{R}^d} \in X$. Then we do not have $M : X' \rightarrow X'$.*

5. EXAMPLES OF CLASSES OF SPACES

5.1. **Unweighted variable Lebesgue spaces.** Given $1 \leq p < \infty$, we define

$$\phi_p(t) := \frac{1}{p} t^p, \quad \phi_\infty(t) := \infty \mathbf{1}_{(1, \infty)}(t).$$

For an exponent function $p : \mathbf{R}^d \rightarrow [1, \infty]$ and

$$\rho_{p(\cdot)}(f) := \int_{\mathbf{R}^d} \phi_{p(x)}(|f(x)|) dx,$$

the variable Lebesgue space $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is defined as the space of $f \in L^0(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for which there is a $\lambda > 0$ such that $\rho_{p(\cdot)}(\lambda^{-1}f) < \infty$, with the Luxemburg norm

$$\|f\|_{L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)} := \inf\{\lambda > 0 : \rho_{p(\cdot)}(\lambda^{-1}f) \leq 1\}.$$

Then $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is a Banach function space over \mathbf{R}^d with the Fatou property, and

$$L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)' = L^{p'(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d),$$

where $\frac{1}{p'(x)} := 1 - \frac{1}{p(x)}$. Setting

$$p_- := \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{x \in \mathbf{R}^d} p(x), \quad p_+ := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{x \in \mathbf{R}^d} p(x),$$

the space $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is p_- -convex, and p_+ -concave.

The following is a deep result by Diening [Die05, Theorem 8.1], which implies that Conjecture C is true in the class of variable Lebesgue spaces:

Theorem 5.1. *Let $p : \mathbf{R}^d \rightarrow [1, \infty]$ with $1 < p_- \leq p_+ < \infty$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $M : L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$;
- (ii) $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A_{\text{strong}}$.

Since $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A_{\text{strong}}$ if and only if $L^{p'(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A_{\text{strong}}$ by Proposition 3.7, this result directly implies that

$$M : L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad M : L^{p'(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L^{p'(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d),$$

verifying Conjecture C in this class of spaces.

As a matter of fact, Conjecture D is also true in this setting. Indeed, [DHHR11, Theorem 4.7.1.] states that if $M : L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$, then we must have $p_- > 1$. Thus, since $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is s -concave for some $s < \infty$ if and only if $p_+ < \infty$, we are in the setting of Theorem 5.1, proving that $M : L^{p'(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L^{p'(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$, as desired.

We note that a different characterization in terms of the exponent function $p(\cdot)$ was obtained by Lerner in [Ler23a], which yields an alternative proof of this duality result. The question of whether Theorem 5.1 is valid even if $p_+ = \infty$ is still open.

As shown in [DHHR11, Theorem 5.3.4], it is not true that $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A$ implies that $M : L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$. Nonetheless, it was shown by Kopalani in [Kop07] that if $p : \mathbf{R}^d \rightarrow [1, \infty]$ satisfies $1 < p_- \leq p_+ < \infty$ and is constant outside of a bounded set, then actually $X \in A$ suffices to conclude that $M : X \rightarrow X$:

Theorem 5.2. *Let $p : \mathbf{R}^d \rightarrow [1, \infty]$ with $1 < p_- \leq p_+ < \infty$ be constant outside of a bounded set. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $M : L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$;
- (ii) $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A$.

In particular, using Theorem 3.14 we conclude that for an exponent function as in the above theorem, the boundedness $M : L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is characterized by any of the following conditions:

- $M : L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)_{\text{weak}}$;
- $X \in A_{\text{strong}}$;
- $X \in A$.

And thus, by Proposition 3.7, also by any of these statements with $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ replaced by the Köthe dual $L^{p'(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$.

Following [DHHR11, Section 4.1], we say that an exponent function $p : \mathbf{R}^d \rightarrow [1, \infty]$ is globally log-Hölder continuous, if it is local log-Hölder continuous, i.e., there is a $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{p(x)} - \frac{1}{p(y)} \right| \leq \frac{C_1}{\log(e + \frac{1}{|x-y|})}$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^d$, and it satisfies the log-Hölder decay condition, i.e., there exist $C_2 > 0$, $p_\infty \in [1, \infty]$ such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{p(x)} - \frac{1}{p_\infty} \right| \leq \frac{C_2}{\log(e + |x|)}$$

for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$.

Global log-Hölder continuity of an exponent function serves as a sufficient condition for the strong Muckenhoupt condition. As a matter of fact, we have the following result:

Theorem 5.3. *Suppose $p : \mathbf{R}^d \rightarrow [1, \infty]$ is globally log-Hölder continuous. Then the following assertions hold:*

- (a) $L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A_{strong}$ with $[X]_{A_{strong}} \lesssim_{d, C_1, C_2} 1$;
- (b) If $p_- > 1$, then $M : L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ with

$$\|Mf\|_{L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \lesssim_{d, C_1, C_2} (p_-)' \|f\|_{L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)}.$$

The first result is proven in [DHHR11, Theorem 4.4.8]. Note that by Theorem 3.14(b) this also implies that

$$M : L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)_{\text{weak}}.$$

The second result, as well as a history of this problem, can be found in [DHHR11, Theorem 4.3.8] and the paragraph that follows it.

Global log-Hölder continuity implies the structural property $X \in \mathcal{G}$ of Theorem 3.9 related to the equivalence of the Muckenhoupt condition and the strong Muckenhoupt condition. Defining

$$\langle f \rangle_{p(\cdot), Q} := \frac{\|f \mathbf{1}_Q\|_{L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)}}{\|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_{L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)}},$$

the following result follows from Theorem 3.9 and [DHHR11, Theorem 7.3.22]:

Theorem 5.4. *Suppose $p : \mathbf{R}^d \rightarrow [1, \infty]$ is globally log-Hölder continuous. Then for every pairwise disjoint collection of cubes \mathcal{P} and any $f \in L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ supported in $\bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} Q$ we have*

$$\left\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} \langle f \rangle_{p(\cdot), Q} \mathbf{1}_Q \right\|_{L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \widetilde{\approx}_{d, C_1, C_2} \|f\|_{L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)}.$$

5.2. Weighted variable Lebesgue spaces. Given a weight w , we define $L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ through

$$\|f\|_{L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)} := \|fw\|_{L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)}.$$

It was shown in [Ler17] that Diening's duality theorem still holds in weighted variable Lebesgue spaces under the assumption that $w^{p(\cdot)} \in A_{FW}$:

Theorem 5.5. *Let $p : \mathbf{R}^d \rightarrow [1, \infty]$ with $1 < p_- \leq p_+ < \infty$, and let w be a weight for which $w^{p(\cdot)} \in A_{FW}$. If $M : L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$, then $M : L_{w^{-1}}^{p'(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L_{w^{-1}}^{p'(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$.*

This leaves open the question of whether we can remove the condition $w^{p(\cdot)} \in A_{FW}$ or not. Should Conjecture C be true, then this condition can be removed. If the exponent function is globally log-Hölder continuous, then it is shown in [CFN12, Lemma 3.4] that if $L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A$, then $w^{p(\cdot)} \in A_{FW}$, and thus, in this case, this condition is superfluous.

In view of Theorem 5.1, we pose the following conjecture:

Conjecture 5.6. *Let $p : \mathbf{R}^d \rightarrow [1, \infty]$ with $1 < p_- \leq p_+ < \infty$, and let w be a weight for which $w^{p(\cdot)} \in A_{FW}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $M : L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$;
- (ii) $L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A_{strong}$.

Global log-Hölder continuity serves as a sufficient condition for the equivalence of $L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A$ and boundedness of the maximal operator. In this setting, the Muckenhoupt condition is given by

$$[L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)]_A = \sup_Q \|w \mathbf{1}_Q\|_{L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \|w^{-1} \mathbf{1}_Q\|_{L^{p'(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)},$$

and is usually written as $w \in A_{p(\cdot)}$. The following result is proven in [CFN12, Theorem 1.5], [CDH11, Theorem 1.3]:

Theorem 5.7. *Suppose $p : \mathbf{R}^d \rightarrow [1, \infty]$ is globally log-Hölder continuous. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $M : L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)_{weak}$;
- (ii) $L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A$.

If $1 < p_- \leq p_+ < \infty$, then, additionally, the above conditions are equivalent to

- (iii) $M : L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)$.

In view of Theorem 5.3 and Corollary 3.16, one can ask if the condition $L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A_{strong}$ is also equivalent to (i)-(ii). This is indeed the case, as follows from Theorem 3.9 combined with several observations in the literature:

Proposition 5.8. *Let $p : \mathbf{R}^d \rightarrow [1, \infty]$ be globally log-Hölder continuous. If $L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A$, then also $L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A_{strong}$.*

Proof. By combining Theorem 5.4 with the observation of [CDH11, Lemma 2.1] (which notes that if $X \in \mathcal{G}$ holds in the unweighted space, then it automatically also hold in the weighted space by applying the unweighted estimate to fw, gw^{-1} instead of f, g), we find that for any global log-Hölder exponent $p(\cdot)$ and any weight w we have $L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in \mathcal{G}$ with

$$[L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)]_{\mathcal{G}} = [L^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d)]_{\mathcal{G}}.$$

Hence, by Theorem 3.9, $L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A$ implies $L_w^{p(\cdot)}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A_{strong}$, as desired. \square

5.3. Morrey Spaces. For $1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty$ we define the Morrey space $M^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ as the space of $f \in L^0(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for which there is a $C > 0$ such that for all cubes Q we have

$$\left(\int_Q |f|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C |Q|^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}}.$$

Moreover, the norm $\|f\|_{M^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)}$ is defined as the smallest possible C . Then $M^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is a Banach function space with the Fatou property. When $p = q$ we have $M^{p,p}(\mathbf{R}^d) = L^p(\mathbf{R}^d)$, and when $q = \infty$ we have $M^{p,\infty}(\mathbf{R}^d) = L^\infty(\mathbf{R}^d)$ by the Lebesgue differentiation theorem. Moreover, by Hölder's inequality we have

$$L^q(\mathbf{R}^d) \subseteq M^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d).$$

The space $M^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is p -convex, but, if $q > p$, not s -concave for any $s < \infty$.

For $1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty$ we define the block space $B^{q,p}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ as the space of functions $g \in L^0(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for which there exists a sequence $\lambda \in \ell^1$ and a sequence of functions $(b_n)_{n \geq 1}$ with the property that for each $n \geq 1$ there is a cube Q_n such that $\text{supp } b_n \subseteq Q_n$ and

$$|Q_n|^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}} \left(\int_{Q_n} |b_n|^q dx \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq 1,$$

such that, pointwise a.e., we have

$$g = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n b_n.$$

The norm $\|g\|_{B^{q,p}(\mathbf{R}^d)}$ is defined as the smallest possible value of $\|\lambda\|_{\ell^1}$ for which such a representation exists. The space $B^{q,p}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is a Banach function space with the Fatou property. Moreover, it is q -concave, but, if $p > q$, not r -convex for any $r > 1$.

We define weighted variants of Morrey and block spaces by setting

$$\|f\|_{M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)} := \|fw\|_{M^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)}, \quad \|g\|_{B_w^{q,p}(\mathbf{R}^d)} := \|gw\|_{B^{q,p}(\mathbf{R}^d)}.$$

These spaces relate to each other through the Köthe duality

$$M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)' = B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d).$$

Remark 5.9. Different weighted Morrey and block spaces can be obtained by changing the underlying measure space to a weighted one, which results in the Lebesgue measure $|Q|$ being replaced by $w(Q)$ in the definition. In this section we only consider the spaces where the weight is added as a multiplier, which results in the so-called weighted Morrey spaces of Samko type [Sam09].

Conjecture **D** in this setting becomes:

Conjecture 5.10. *Let $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ and let w be a weight. If $M : B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d)$, then $M : M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)$.*

The converse implication is false. The following counterexample was communicated to us by Andrei Lerner, and is adapted from [NS17, Remark 1.12]:

Example 5.11. Let $1 < p < q < \infty$. It is shown in [Tan15, Proposition 4.2] that M is bounded on $M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ with power weights $w(x) = |x|^{\alpha d}$ if and only if $-\frac{1}{q} \leq \alpha < \frac{1}{q'}$. In particular, this holds in the case $\alpha = -\frac{1}{q}$, i.e., for

$$w(x) := |x|^{-\frac{d}{q}}.$$

However, since for this weight we have $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{R}^d} \in M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)$, it follows from Corollary 4.6 that we do not have $M : B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d)$.

As noted in the above example, Tanaka showed in [Tan15] that for any power weight $w(x) = |x|^{\alpha d}$ with $-\frac{1}{q} \leq \alpha < \frac{1}{q'}$, we have $M : M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)$. Moreover, he showed that in this case, this is precisely the Muckenhoupt condition $M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A$.

Example 5.11 shows that we don't have

$$(5.1) \quad M : B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d)$$

when $w(x) := |x|^{-\frac{d}{q}}$, which leaves open if this bound is true for the power weights in the A_q range, i.e., for $-\frac{1}{q} < \alpha < \frac{1}{q'}$. It was shown in [Nie23, Theorem 3.7] that (5.1) holds for any weight w satisfying

$$\sup_Q \langle w \rangle_{q,Q} \langle w^{-1} \rangle_{p',Q} < \infty.$$

This is satisfied by the power weights $w(x) = |x|^{\alpha d}$ with

$$-\frac{1}{q} < \alpha < \frac{1}{p'},$$

leaving the question of what happens in the range $\frac{1}{p'} \leq \alpha < \frac{1}{q'}$ open. We now show that this bound is true. This can be deduced from Theorem 1.2 and a result of Duoandikoetxea and Rosenthal from [DR20]:

Theorem 5.12. *Let $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ and let $w(x) := |x|^{\alpha d}$ for $-\frac{1}{q} < \alpha < \frac{1}{q'}$. Then we have the following assertions:*

- (a) $T : M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for all Calderón-Zygmund operators T ;
- (b) $M : M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ and $M : B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d)$.

Proof. The statement (a) follows from [DR20, Theorem 1.1], which asserts that this bound holds for any operator bounded on $L_w^2(\mathbf{R}^d)$ with respect to all $w \in A_2$. The second assertion (b) follows from (a) and Theorem 1.2. \square

As can be deduced from [DR20, Theorem 1.1], the above result actually holds for a more general class of weights.

For more general weights w satisfying $M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A$, Tanaka provides several sufficient conditions for the boundedness $M : M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ in [Tan15, Theorem 4.1]. Moreover, Duoandikoetxea and Rosenthal show in [DR21, Theorem 5.1.] that if $1 < p \leq q < \infty$, and $M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A$, then we have $M : M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ if w satisfies the condition $w(\cdot + a) \in A_{p,\text{loc}}$ for some $a \in \mathbf{R}^d$, where $w \in A_{p,\text{loc}}$ is defined through

$$[w]_{p,\text{loc}} := \sup_B \langle w \rangle_{p,B} \langle w^{-1} \rangle_{p',B},$$

where the supremum is taken over all balls $B = B(x; r)$ with $r < \frac{1}{2}|x|$. A similar result also holds for $p = 1$ when the boundedness of M is replaced by the weak-type analogue. The following question is still open:

Question 5.13. *Let $1 < p \leq q \leq \infty$ and let w be a weight. Is it true that $M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A$ if and only if $M : M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)$?*

Partial results are given in [DR22, Ler23a]. Given $1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty$ and a collection of cubes \mathcal{P} , we define the weighted Morrey space with $M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P})$ analogous to $M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)$, but this time with the defining property only being required for all $Q \in \mathcal{P}$, and

$$\|f\|_{M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P})} := \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{P}} |Q|^{-\left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}\right)} \left(\int_Q |fw|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Moreover, we set $B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}) := M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P})'$. The following was shown by Lerner in [Ler23b]:

Theorem 5.14. *Let $(x_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of points in \mathbf{R}^d with the property that there is a $\nu > 1$ such that for all $n \neq m$ we have*

$$\max\{|x_n|, |x_m|\} \leq \nu|x_n - x_m|,$$

and let \mathcal{P} be the collection of cubes centered at the points $\{x_n : n \geq 1\}$.

If $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ and w is a weight, then the following are equivalent:

- $M : M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}) \rightarrow M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P})$;
- $M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}) \in A$.

When $\{x_n : n \geq 1\} = \{0\}$, the collection $\mathcal{P} =: \mathcal{P}_0$ is the collection of all cubes centered at 0, and this result was already proven by Duoandikoetxea and Rosenthal in [DR21, Theorem 6.1]. As a matter of fact, in [DR22, Theorem 4.1] they showed that all Calderón-Zygmund operators are bounded on $M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}_0)$ if and only if

$$(5.2) \quad \sup_Q |Q|^{-1} \|w \mathbf{1}_Q\|_{M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}_0)} \|w^{-1} M(\mathbf{1}_Q)\|_{B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}_0)} < \infty.$$

Combining this with Theorem 1.2, we obtain the following characterization:

Theorem 5.15. *Let \mathcal{P}_0 denote the collection of cubes centered at 0 and let $1 < p \leq q < \infty$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $T : M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}_0) \rightarrow M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}_0)$ for all Calderón-Zygmund operators T ;
- (ii) $R_j : M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}_0) \rightarrow M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}_0)$ for all Riesz transforms R_j , $j = 1, \dots, d$;
- (iii) $M : M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}_0) \rightarrow M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}_0)$ and $M : B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}_0) \rightarrow B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}_0)$;
- (iv) $M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}_0) \in A$ and $M : B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}_0) \rightarrow B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}_0)$;
- (v) (5.2) holds.

Proof. By Theorem 1.2 and [DR22, Theorem 4.1], it suffices to prove (iv) \Rightarrow (v). For any cube Q we have

$$\|w \mathbf{1}_Q\|_{M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}_0)} \|w^{-1} M(\mathbf{1}_Q)\|_{B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}_0)} = \|\mathbf{1}_Q\|_{M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}_0)} \|M(\mathbf{1}_Q)\|_{B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d; \mathcal{P}_0)}$$

$$\leq \|M\|_{B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d;\mathcal{P}_0) \rightarrow B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d;\mathcal{P}_0)} [X]_{M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d;\mathcal{P}_0)} |Q|,$$

as desired. \square

This leads us to the following question:

Question 5.16. *Can we replace the collection \mathcal{P}_0 in Theorem 5.15 by the more general collections of Theorem 5.14?*

Considering the local nature of the Muckenhoupt condition, we conjecture that to globalize the result one would actually require the stronger condition $M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A_{\text{strong}}$:

Conjecture 5.17. *Let $1 < p \leq q < \infty$ and let w be a weight. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $T : M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for all Calderón-Zygmund operators T ;
- (ii) $R_j : M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ for all Riesz transforms R_j , $j = 1, \dots, d$;
- (iii) $M : M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ and $M : B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow B_{w^{-1}}^{p',q'}(\mathbf{R}^d)$;
- (iv) $M_w^{p,q}(\mathbf{R}^d) \in A_{\text{strong}}$.

By Theorem 1.2, statements (i)-(iii) are equivalent, and (iii) \Rightarrow (iv) follows from Theorem 3.14(c). Hence, the conjectured statement is (iv) \Rightarrow (i).

APPENDIX A. WEAK-TYPE BOUNDS FOR SPARSE OPERATORS

Lemma A.1. *Let \mathcal{D} be a dyadic grid, let $0 < \eta < 1$, and let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ be a finite η -sparse collection. Then for all $0 < \nu < 1$ and all $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^1(\mathbf{R}^d)$ there exists a collection $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ such that*

$$A_{\mathcal{S}}f \lesssim_d \frac{1}{\eta(1-\nu)} A_{\mathcal{E}}f$$

and, if for each $Q \in \mathcal{E}$ we denote the collection of maximal cubes in \mathcal{E} strictly contained in Q by $\text{ch}_{\mathcal{E}}(Q)$, we have

$$\sum_{Q' \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{E}}(Q)} |Q'| \leq (1-\nu)|Q|.$$

In particular, \mathcal{E} is ν -sparse with $E_Q := \bigcup_{Q' \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{E}}(Q)} Q'$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{E}_0 denote the maximal cubes in \mathcal{S} . Then we have

$$A_{\mathcal{S}}f = \sum_{Q_0 \in \mathcal{E}_0} A_{\mathcal{S}(Q_0)}f,$$

where $\mathcal{S}(Q_0) := \{Q \in \mathcal{S} : Q \subseteq Q_0\}$. Fix $Q_0 \in \mathcal{E}_0$ and let

$$K := \frac{1}{1-\nu} \|A_{\mathcal{S}}\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L^{1,\infty}(\mathbf{R}^d)}$$

so that

$$E := \{x \in Q_0 : A_{\mathcal{S}(Q_0)}f(x) > K \langle f \rangle_{1,Q_0}\}$$

satisfies $|E| \leq (1-\nu)|Q_0|$. Using, e.g., [NSS24, Lemma 4.4], we obtain a pairwise disjoint collection of cubes $\text{ch}_{\mathcal{E}}(Q_0)$ of cubes in \mathcal{D} contained in Q_0 for which

$$E = \bigcup_{Q \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{E}}(Q_0)} Q,$$

and $\widehat{Q} \setminus E \neq \emptyset$ for all $Q \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{E}}(Q_0)$, where \widehat{Q} denotes the dyadic parent of Q . Then

$$\sum_{Q \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{E}}(Q_0)} |Q| = |E| \leq (1-\nu)|Q_0|,$$

as desired.

Next, note that

$$(A.1) \quad A_{\mathcal{S}(Q_0)} f \leq K \langle f \rangle_{1, Q_0} \mathbf{1}_{Q_0} + \sum_{Q \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{E}}(Q_0)} (A_{\mathcal{S}(Q_0)} f) \mathbf{1}_Q$$

Fix $Q \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{E}}(Q_0)$ and pick $\hat{x} \in \widehat{Q} \setminus E$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{Q \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{E}}(Q_0)} (A_{\mathcal{S}(Q_0)} f) \mathbf{1}_Q &= \sum_{Q \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{E}}(Q_0)} \sum_{\substack{Q' \in \mathcal{S}(Q_0) \\ \widehat{Q} \subseteq Q'}} \langle f \rangle_{1, Q} \mathbf{1}_Q + \sum_{Q \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{E}}(Q_0)} A_{\mathcal{S}(Q)} f \\ &\leq \sum_{Q \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{E}}(Q_0)} A_{\mathcal{S}(Q_0)} f(\hat{x}) \mathbf{1}_Q + \sum_{Q \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{E}}(Q_0)} A_{\mathcal{S}(Q)} f \\ &\leq K \langle f \rangle_{1, Q_0} \mathbf{1}_{Q_0} + \sum_{Q \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{E}}(Q_0)} A_{\mathcal{S}(Q)} f. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (A.1) yields

$$A_{\mathcal{S}(Q_0)} f \leq 2K \langle f \rangle_{1, Q_0} \mathbf{1}_{Q_0} + \sum_{Q \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{E}}(Q_0)} A_{\mathcal{S}(Q)} f.$$

Now define $\mathcal{E}_1 := \bigcup_{Q_0 \in \mathcal{E}_0} \text{ch}_{\mathcal{E}}(Q_0)$. Iterating this procedure with \mathcal{E}_0 replaced by \mathcal{E}_1 , we inductively obtain a collection $\mathcal{E} = \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{E}_k$ for which

$$A_{\mathcal{S}} f \leq 2K \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{E}} \langle f \rangle_{1, Q} \mathbf{1}_Q.$$

Noting that $\|A_{\mathcal{S}}\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^d) \rightarrow L^{1, \infty}(\mathbf{R}^d)} \lesssim_d \frac{1}{\eta}$ now proves the result. \square

The following lemma is extracted from the proof of the main result in [DLR16], and is used in the proof of Proposition E:

Lemma A.2. *Let \mathcal{D} be a dyadic grid, let $0 < \nu < 1$, and let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ be a finite collection satisfying*

$$(A.2) \quad \sum_{Q' \in \text{ch}_{\mathcal{S}}(Q)} |Q'| \leq (1 - \nu) |Q|$$

for all $Q \in \mathcal{S}$, where $\text{ch}_{\mathcal{S}}(Q)$ denotes the collection of the maximal cubes in \mathcal{S} strictly contained in Q . Setting

$$\mathcal{S}_m := \{Q \in \mathcal{S} : 4^{-(m+1)} < \langle f \rangle_{1, Q} \leq 4^{-m}\}$$

for $m \geq 1$, for each $Q \in \mathcal{S}_m$ there exists a subset $F_m(Q) \subseteq Q$ for which

$$|F_m(Q)| \leq (1 - \nu)^{2^m} |Q|,$$

and for each $g \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbf{R}^d)$ we have

$$\int_{\{A_{\mathcal{S}} f > 2\} \setminus \{M^{\mathcal{D}} f > \frac{1}{4}\}} |g| \, dx \leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 4^{-m} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}_m} \int_{F_m(Q)} |g| \, dx.$$

Proof. Set

$$E := \{A_{\mathcal{S}} f > 2\} \setminus \{M^{\mathcal{D}} f > \frac{1}{4}\}.$$

If $x \in E$, then for any $Q \in \mathcal{S}$ with $x \in Q$ we have $\langle f \rangle_{1, Q} \leq M^{\mathcal{D}} f(x) \leq \frac{1}{4}$. Hence, we have

$$A_{\mathcal{S}} f(x) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} A_{\mathcal{S}_m} f,$$

where

$$\mathcal{S}_m := \{Q \in \mathcal{S} : 4^{-(m+1)} < \langle f \rangle_{1, Q} \leq 4^{-m}\}$$

for $m \geq 1$.

Now fix $m \geq 1$. We let $\mathcal{S}_{m,0}$ denote the maximal cubes (with respect to inclusion) in \mathcal{S}_m . Note that these exist, as \mathcal{S} was assumed to be finite. Moreover, we iteratively define $\mathcal{S}_{m,n}$ as the maximal cubes in $\mathcal{S}_m \setminus \bigcup_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathcal{S}_{m,k}$. Again since \mathcal{S} is finite, this means that there is an $N \geq 0$ for which

$$\mathcal{S}_m = \bigcup_{n=0}^N \mathcal{S}_{m,n}.$$

For $Q \in \mathcal{S}_{m,n}$ we set $E(Q) := Q \setminus \bigcup_{Q' \in \mathcal{S}_{m,n+1}} Q'$ so that the collection $(E(Q))_{Q \in \mathcal{S}_m}$ is pairwise disjoint.

Fixing $n \geq 0$, for $Q \in \mathcal{S}_{m,n}$ we define

$$F_m(Q) := \bigcup_{\substack{Q' \in \mathcal{S}_{m,n+2^m} \\ Q' \subseteq Q}} Q'$$

so that, by (A.2),

$$|F_m(Q)| \leq (1 - \eta) \left| \bigcup_{Q' \in \mathcal{S}_{m,n+2^{m-1}}} Q' \right| \leq \dots \leq (1 - \eta)^{2^m} |Q|$$

and

$$Q \setminus F_m(Q) = \bigcup_{k=0}^{2^m-1} \bigcup_{\substack{Q' \in \mathcal{S}_{m,n+k} \\ Q' \subseteq Q}} E(Q').$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}_m} \int_{E \cap Q \setminus F_m(Q)} |g| \, dx &\leq \sum_{n=0}^N \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}_{m,n}} \sum_{k=0}^{2^m-1} \sum_{\substack{Q' \in \mathcal{S}_{m,n+k} \\ Q' \subseteq Q}} \int_{E \cap E(Q')} |g| \, dx \\ &\leq 2^m \sum_{Q' \in \mathcal{S}_m} \int_{E \cap E(Q')} |g| \, dx \\ &\leq 2^m \int_E |g| \, dx \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E |g| \, dx &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \int_E (A_{\mathcal{S}_m} f) |g| \, dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 4^{-m} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}_m} \int_{E \cap Q} |g| \, dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 2^{-m} \int_E |g| \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 4^{-m} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}_m} \int_{F_m(Q)} |g| \, dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_E |g| \, dx + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} 4^{-m} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{S}_m} \int_{F_m(Q)} |g| \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Emiel Lorist for the numerous discussions on the duality conjecture for the Hardy-Littlewood maximal operator, for providing his comments on the text, and, in particular, for pointing out [KLW23, Theorem 2.3.1], which is the key result used for proving Theorem A.

REFERENCES

- [ALV19] A. Amenta, E. Lorist, and M.C. Veraar. Rescaled extrapolation for vector-valued functions. *Publ. Mat.*, 63(1):155–182, 2019.
- [Ber99] E.I. Bereznoi. Two-weighted estimations for the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function in ideal Banach spaces. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 127(1):79–87, 1999.
- [Buc93] S. Buckley. Estimates for operator norms on weighted spaces and reverse Jensen inequalities. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 340(1):253–272, 1993.
- [Buh75] A.V. Buhvalov. Integral operators, and the representation of completely linear functionals on spaces with mixed norm. *Sibirsk. Mat. Ž.*, 16(3):483–493, 643, 1975.
- [Buk87] A.V. Bukhvalov. Interpolation of linear operators in spaces of vector functions and with a mixed norm. *Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.*, 28(1):i, 37–51, 1987.
- [CDH11] D. Cruz-Uribe, L. Diening, and P. Hästö. The maximal operator on weighted variable Lebesgue spaces. *Fract. Calc. Appl. Anal.*, 14(3):361–374, 2011.
- [CFN12] D. Cruz-Uribe, A. Fiorenza, and C. J. Neugebauer. Weighted norm inequalities for the maximal operator on variable Lebesgue spaces. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 394(2):744–760, 2012.
- [CMM22] M. Cao, J.J. Marín, and J.M. Martell. Extrapolation on function and modular spaces, and applications. *Adv. Math.*, 406:Paper No. 108520, 87, 2022.
- [CNS03] M. Cwikel, P.G. Nilsson, and G. Schechtman. Interpolation of weighted Banach lattices. A characterization of relatively decomposable Banach lattices. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 165(787):vi+127, 2003.
- [DHHR11] L. Diening, P. Harjulehto, P. Hästö, and M. Ružička. *Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces with variable exponents*, volume 2017 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.
- [Die05] L. Diening. Maximal function on Musielak-Orlicz spaces and generalized Lebesgue spaces. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 129(8):657–700, 2005.
- [DLR16] C. Domingo-Salazar, M. Lacey, and G. Rey. Borderline weak-type estimates for singular integrals and square functions. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 48(1):63–73, 2016.
- [DR20] J. Duoandikoetxea and M. Rosenthal. Boundedness of operators on certain weighted Morrey spaces beyond the Muckenhoupt range. *Potential Anal.*, 53(4):1255–1268, 2020.
- [DR21] J. Duoandikoetxea and M. Rosenthal. Muckenhoupt-type conditions on weighted Morrey spaces. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 27(2):Paper No. 32, 33, 2021.
- [DR22] J. Duoandikoetxea and M. Rosenthal. Singular and fractional integral operators on weighted local Morrey spaces. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 28(3):Paper No. 43, 26, 2022.
- [FS71] C. Fefferman and E.M. Stein. Some maximal inequalities. *Amer. J. Math.*, 93:107–115, 1971.
- [Gra14] L. Grafakos. *Classical Fourier analysis*, volume 249 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, third edition, 2014.
- [HNVW17] T.P. Hytönen, J.M.A.M. van Neerven, M.C. Veraar, and L. Weis. *Analysis in Banach spaces. Vol. II. Probabilistic methods and operator theory*, volume 67 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete*. Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [HP13] T.P. Hytönen and C. Pérez. Sharp weighted bounds involving A_∞ . *Anal. PDE*, 6(4):777–818, 2013.
- [KLW23] N.J. Kalton, E. Lorist, and L. Weis. Euclidean structures and operator theory in Banach spaces. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 288(1433):vi+156, 2023.
- [Kop04] T.S. Kopalani. On some structural properties of Banach function spaces and boundedness of certain integral operators. *Czechoslovak Math. J.*, 54(129)(3):791–805, 2004.
- [Kop07] T.S. Kopalani. Infimal convolution and Muckenhoupt $A_{p(\cdot)}$ condition in variable L^p spaces. *Arch. Math. (Basel)*, 89(2):185–192, 2007.
- [Kri74] J. L. Krivine. Théorèmes de factorisation dans les espaces réticulés. In *Séminaire Maurey-Schwartz 1973–1974: Espaces L^p , applications radonifiantes et géométrie des espaces de Banach*, pages Exp. Nos. 22 et 23, 22. Centre de Math., École Polytech., Paris, 1974.
- [Ler10] A.K. Lerner. Some remarks on the Fefferman-Stein inequality. *J. Anal. Math.*, 112:329–349, 2010.
- [Ler13] A.K. Lerner. A simple proof of the A_2 conjecture. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, (14):3159–3170, 2013.

- [Ler17] A.K. Lerner. On a dual property of the maximal operator on weighted variable L^p spaces. In *Functional analysis, harmonic analysis, and image processing: a collection of papers in honor of Björn Jawerth*, volume 693 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 283–300. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2017.
- [Ler20] A.K. Lerner. A characterization of the weighted weak type Coifman-Fefferman and Fefferman-Stein inequalities. *Math. Ann.*, 378(1-2):425–446, 2020.
- [Ler23a] A.K. Lerner. A boundedness criterion for the maximal operator on variable Lebesgue spaces. arXiv:2302.02475, 2023.
- [Ler23b] A.K. Lerner. A note on the maximal operator on weighted Morrey spaces. *Anal. Math.*, 49(4):1073–1086, 2023.
- [Ler24] A.K. Lerner. A note on the maximal operator on Banach function spaces. arXiv:2404.15671, 2024.
- [LN18] A.K. Lerner and F. Nazarov. Intuitive dyadic calculus: The basics. *Expositiones Mathematicae*, 2018.
- [LN24a] E. Lorist and Z. Nieraeth. Banach function spaces done right. *Indag. Math. (N.S.)*, 35(2):247–268, 2024.
- [LN24b] E. Lorist and Z. Nieraeth. Extrapolation of Compactness on Banach Function Spaces. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 30(3):Paper No. 30, 2024.
- [LO10] A.K. Lerner and S. Ombrosi. A boundedness criterion for general maximal operators. *Publ. Mat.*, 54(1):53–71, 2010.
- [Lor16] E. Lorist. Maximal functions, factorization, and the \mathcal{R} -boundedness of integral operators. Master’s thesis, Delft University of Technology, Delft, the Netherlands, 2016.
- [Loz69] G.Ya. Lozanovskii. On some Banach lattices. *Siberian Mathematical Journal*, 10(3):419–431, 1969.
- [LT79] J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri. *Classical Banach spaces. II*, volume 97 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1979.
- [Mal89] L. Maligranda. *Orlicz spaces and interpolation*, volume 5 of *Seminários de Matemática [Seminars in Mathematics]*. Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Departamento de Matemática, Campinas, 1989.
- [Mey75] P. Meyer-Nieberg. Ein verbandstheoretischer Beweis einer Charakterisierung von L^p -Räumen. *Arch. Math. (Basel)*, 26:284–288, 1975.
- [Nie23] Z. Nieraeth. Extrapolation in general quasi-Banach function spaces. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 285(10):Paper No. 110130, 2023.
- [NS17] S. Nakamura and Y. Sawano. The singular integral operator and its commutator on weighted Morrey spaces. *Collect. Math.*, 68(2):145–174, 2017.
- [NSS24] Z. Nieraeth, C.B. Stockdale, and B. Sweeting. Weighted weak-type bounds for multilinear singular integrals. arXiv:2401.15725, 2024.
- [Rub86] J.L. Rubio de Francia. Martingale and integral transforms of Banach space valued functions. In *Probability and Banach spaces (Zaragoza, 1985)*, volume 1221 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 195–222. Springer, Berlin, 1986.
- [Rut14] D.V. Rutsky. A_1 -regularity and boundedness of Calderón-Zygmund operators. *Studia Math.*, 221(3):231–247, 2014.
- [Rut15] D.V. Rutsky. Remarks on A_p -regular lattices of measurable functions. *Algebra i Analiz*, 27(5):153–169, 2015.
- [Rut16] D.V. Rutsky. A_1 -regularity and boundedness of Riesz transforms in Banach lattices of measurable functions. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI)*, 447:113–122, 2016.
- [Rut19] D.V. Rutsky. Corrigendum to “ A_1 -regularity and boundedness of Calderón-Zygmund operators” with some remarks (*Studia Math.* 221 (2014), 231–247) [MR3208299]. *Studia Math.*, 248(3):217–231, 2019.
- [Sam09] N. Samko. Weighted Hardy and singular operators in Morrey spaces. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 350(1):56–72, 2009.
- [Tan15] H. Tanaka. Two-weight norm inequalities on Morrey spaces. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.*, 40(2):773–791, 2015.
- [Zaa67] A.C. Zaanen. *Integration*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam; Interscience Publishers John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1967.

(Zoe Nieraeth) BCAM–BASQUE CENTER FOR APPLIED MATHEMATICS, BILBAO, SPAIN
 Email address: zoe.nieraeth@gmail.com