

BMO on Weighted Bergman Spaces over Tubular Domains

JIAQING DING¹, HAICHO LI^{2,*}, ZHIYUAN FU³, YANHUI ZHANG⁴

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we characterize Bounded Mean Oscillation (BMO) and establish their connection with Hankel operators on weighted Bergman spaces over tubular domains. By utilizing the space BMO, we provide a new characterization of Bloch spaces on tubular domains. Next, we define a modified projection operator and prove its boundedness. Furthermore, we introduce differential operators and demonstrate that these operators belong to Lebesgue spaces on tubular domains. Finally, we establish an integral representation for Bergman functions using these differential operators.

1. Introduction

BMO plays a critical role in harmonic analysis and has been extensively studied, with significant contributions from researchers such as Garnett [1] and Fefferman-Stein [2]. Zhu [11] studied BMO in the unit ball, providing an equivalent characterization that has influenced later research. Békollé et al. [20] extended the investigation to BMO on bounded symmetric domains, while Pau et al. [13] considered the weighted BMO within the unit ball.

The Bloch space is characterized by its invariance under biholomorphic transformations and Möbius maps, highlighting its significance in complex analysis. And its properties have been studied by many authors ([3], [4], [5], [8], [15], [9], [10] and [17]), with extensions from the unit disk to the unit ball, and further to the unbounded domain of the Siegel upper half-plane. For the cases of the unit disk and unit ball, many foundational results have established equivalences with L^∞ spaces. Further studies in the Siegel upper half-plane have explored analogous characterizations, although these come with limitations for specific range of p . In this paper, we mainly consider another unbounded domains, such as tubular domain T_B . Following the approach taken in the cases of the unit ball and Siegel upper half-plane, we utilize invariant gradients to define the Bloch space \mathcal{B} over T_B .

The main ideas of this paper are inspired by the works of Liu [19] and Zhu [11], with Zhu's work in particular investigating key results concerning BMO and Bloch space within the unit ball. In contrast, our work extends these results to tubular domains, providing a broader framework for understanding the relationship between these spaces and their applications. While Si [17] has explored similar results to the Siegel upper half-plane.

In this paper, we obtain four main results. First, we establish a characterization of the BMO_α^p on T_B by the bounded Hankel operators on weighted Bergman spaces. Utilizing BMO_α^p , we derive a new characterization of Bloch space. Additionally,

Key words and phrases. BMO, Bergman space, Bloch space, differential operator, tubular domain.

*Corresponding author. The research of the second author was supported by NSFC (Grant No. 12326407 and 12071155); the fourth author was supported by NSFC (No.11971042).

we demonstrate that the Bergman kernel does not belong to $L^1_\alpha(T_B)$ within the tubular domains, thereby introducing a modified kernel function \widetilde{K}_α and a modified projection operator \widetilde{P}_α . We also prove that the modified projection from $L^\infty(T_B)$ to $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ is bounded and provide a kind of integral representation for Bergman functions.

Theorem A For $r > 0$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, and $p(\alpha + 1) > \lambda + 1$, let $f \in L^p_\lambda(T_B)$, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (a) $f \in BMO_r^p$.
- (b) $f = f_1 + f_2$ with $f_1 \in BO$ and $f_2 \in BA^p$.
- (c) $H_f^{(\alpha)}$ and $H_{\overline{f}}^{(\alpha)}$ are both bounded on $A_\lambda^p(T_B)$.

Following the characterization of BMO_r^p in Theorem A, we now investigate the relationship between BMO and the Bloch spaces defined on tubular domains.

Theorem B Let $H(T_B)$ be the space of holomorphic functions in T_B . For any $r > 0$, we have

$$\mathcal{B} = H(T_B) \cap BMO_r^p,$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}_0 = H(T_B) \cap VMO_r^p.$$

Moreover, $\|f\|_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\|f\|_{BMO_r^p}$ are equivalent.

Next, we will consider a new space

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{B}} := \{f \in \mathcal{B} : f(\mathbf{i}) = 0\},$$

where $\mathbf{i} := (0', i)$, and $0' = (0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$.

The Bloch space on the unit ball is known to be equivalent to $L^\infty(\mathbb{B}_n)$ when considered under the projection operator P_α . We aim to extend this relationship to tubular domains. However, due to Forreli-Rudin type estimates showing that the Bergman kernel does not belong to $L^1_\alpha(T_B)$ on tubular domains, it becomes necessary to define a modified kernel function, \widetilde{K}_α , and a corresponding modified projection operator, \widetilde{P}_α , from $L^\infty(T_B)$ to $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$, as described below:

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{K}_\alpha &:= K_\alpha(z, w) - K_\alpha(\mathbf{i}, w), \\ \widetilde{P}_\alpha f(z) &:= \int_{T_B} \widetilde{K}_\alpha(z, w) f(w) dV_\alpha(w), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{i} := (0', i)$.

Theorem C \widetilde{P}_α is a bounded projection from $L^\infty(T_B)$ to $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$.

For $\alpha > -1$, we define the integral operator \mathcal{T}_α as follows:

$$\mathcal{T}_\alpha f(z) = \frac{\Gamma(n+1+\alpha)}{2^{n+1}\pi^n \Gamma(\alpha+1)} \int_{T_B} \frac{\rho(w)^\alpha}{\rho(z, w)^{n+1+\alpha}} f(w) dV(w),$$

where $dV(z)$ denotes the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{C}^n .

Theorem D Suppose that $1 \leq p < \infty$, $\lambda > -1$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy

$$\begin{cases} \alpha > \frac{\lambda+1}{p} - 1, & 1 < p < \infty, \\ \alpha \geq \lambda, & p = 1. \end{cases}$$

If $f \in A_\lambda^p(T_B)$ then

$$f = \frac{(2i)^N \Gamma(1+\alpha)}{\Gamma(1+\alpha+N)} \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\rho^N \mathcal{L}_n^N f)$$

for any $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

The structure of this paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we introduce key terminology and preliminary results. Section 3 is dedicated to the first two theorems, namely Theorem A and Theorem B. In Section 4, we focus on establishing the last two theorems, Theorem C and Theorem D.

Additionally, the notation $A \lesssim B$ means that there is a positive constant C such that $A \leq CB$, and the notation $A \simeq B$ means that both $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$ hold.

2. Preliminaries and Auxiliary Results

2.1. Preliminaries. Let \mathbb{C}^n be the n -dimensional complex Euclidean space. For any two points $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ and $\bar{w} = (\bar{w}_1, \dots, \bar{w}_n)$ in \mathbb{C}^n , we write

$$z \cdot \bar{w} := z_1 \bar{w}_1 + \dots + z_n \bar{w}_n,$$

$$|z'|^2 := |z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2 + \dots + |z_{n-1}|^2,$$

where $z' = (z_1, \dots, z_{n-1})$.

The set

$$T_B = \{z = x + iy, x \in \mathbb{R}^n, y \in B \subset \mathbb{R}^n\}$$

is a tubular domain in an n -dimensional complex space \mathbb{C}^n , where

$$B := \left\{ y = (y', y_n) : |y'|^2 < y_n, y' = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \right\}.$$

We define the space $L_\alpha^p(T_B)$, which consists of all Lebesgue measurable functions f on T_B , with the norm given by:

$$\|f\|_{L_\alpha^p(T_B)} = \left\{ \int_{T_B} |f(z)|^p dV_\alpha(z) \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty,$$

where $dV_\alpha(z) = (y_n - |y'|^2)^\alpha dV(z)$, $\alpha > -1$, and $dV(z)$ denotes the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{C}^n .

Let $A_\alpha^p(T_B)$ denote the weighted Bergman space on T_B . Since the valuation functional is bounded, so $A_\alpha^p(T_B)$ is the closed subspace of $L_\alpha^p(T_B)$. It is easy to know that, when $1 \leq p < \infty$, the space $A_\alpha^p(T_B)$ is a Banach space with the norm $\|\cdot\|_p$. Specially, when $p = 2$, $A_\alpha^2(T_B)$ is a Hilbert space.

The orthogonal projection from $L_\alpha^2(T_B)$ to $A_\alpha^2(T_B)$ is the following integral operator:

$$P_\alpha f(z) = \int_{T_B} K_\alpha(z, w) f(w) dV_\alpha(w),$$

with the Bergman kernel ([7])

$$K_\alpha(z, w) = \frac{2^{n+1+2\alpha} \Gamma(n+1+\alpha)}{\Gamma(1+\alpha) \pi^n} \left((z' - \bar{w}')^2 - 2i(z_n - \bar{w}_n) \right)^{-n-1-\alpha}.$$

For convenience, we introduce the following notation:

$$\rho(z, w) = \frac{1}{4} \left((z' - \bar{w}')^2 - 2i(z_n - \bar{w}_n) \right)$$

and let $\rho(z) := \rho(z, z) = y_n - |y'|^2$. Then the Bergman kernel of T_B is

$$K_\alpha(z, w) = \frac{\Gamma(n+1+\alpha)}{2^{n+1} \pi^n \Gamma(\alpha+1) \rho(z, w)^{n+1+\alpha}}.$$

Moreover, for $\alpha, \lambda > -1$, let $1 \leq p < \infty$, P_α can be extend to $L_\lambda^p(T_B)$, and P_α is a bounded projection from $L_\lambda^p(T_B)$ onto $A_\lambda^p(T_B)$ if and only if $p(\alpha+1) > \lambda+1$, see [16, Lemma 3.4].

For $f \in L_\alpha^p(T_B)$, let M_f denote the multiplication operator induced f , the Hankel operator with symbol f is denote by

$$H_f^\alpha = (\mathbf{I} - P_\alpha)M_fP_\alpha,$$

where \mathbf{I} is the identity operator.

Let $bT_B := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : \rho(z) = 0\}$ denote the boundary of T_B . Then $\widehat{T_B} := T_B \cup bT_B \cup \{\infty\}$ is the one-point compactification of T_B . Also, let $\partial\widehat{T_B} := bT_B \cup \{\infty\}$. Thus, $z \rightarrow \partial\widehat{T_B}$ means $\rho(z) \rightarrow 0$ or $|z| \rightarrow \infty$.

Let \mathcal{M}_+ be the set of all positive Borel measure μ such that

$$\int_{T_B} \frac{d\mu(z)}{|\rho(z, \mathbf{i})|^t} < \infty,$$

for some $t > 0$.

And let the complex matrix

$$\mathbf{B}(z) := (b_{ij}(z))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} = \frac{1}{n+1+\alpha} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \bar{z}_i \partial z_j} \ln K_\alpha(z, z) \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$$

be the Bergman matrix of T_B . For a C^1 curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow T_B$, we define

$$l(\gamma) = \int_0^1 \langle \mathbf{B}(\gamma(t))\gamma'(t), \gamma'(t) \rangle dt,$$

and call β the Bergman metric on T_B , where

$$\beta(z, w) = \inf\{l(\gamma) : \gamma(0) = z, \gamma(1) = w\}.$$

Let $D(z, r)$ denote the Bergman metric ball at z with radius r . Thus

$$D(z, r) = \{w \in T_B : \beta(z, w) < r\}.$$

Let $|D(z, r)| = V_\alpha(D(z, r))$. For a locally integrable function f on T_B , we define a function \widehat{f}_r on T_B as follows:

$$\widehat{f}_r(z) = \frac{1}{|D(z, r)|} \int_{D(z, r)} f(w) dV_\alpha(w),$$

and $\widehat{f}_r(z)$ is the integral mean of f over $D(z, r)$. For fixed $r > 0$ and $f \in L_\alpha^p(T_B)$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, we define the mean oscillation of f at z in the Bergman metric as follows:

$$MO_r(f)(z) = \left(\frac{1}{|D(z, r)|} \int_{D(z, r)} |f(w) - \widehat{f}_r(z)|^p dV_\alpha(w) \right)^{1/p}.$$

The space BMO_r^p consists of those functions $f \in L_\alpha^p(T_B)$ such that

$$\|f\|_{BMO_r^p} = \sup\{MO_r(f)(z) : z \in T_B\} < \infty.$$

We denote by $C_0(T_B)$ the space of complex-valued continuous functions f on T_B such that $f(z) \rightarrow 0$ as $z \rightarrow \partial\widehat{T_B}$. We say that $f \in VMO_r$ if $MO_r(f) \in C_0(T_B)$.

For a continuous function f on T_B , any $r > 0$, let

$$\omega_r(f)(z) = \sup\{|f(z) - f(w)| : w \in D(z, r)\}.$$

The function $\omega_r(f)(z)$ is called the oscillation of f at z in the Bergman metric. Let BO_r denote the space of continuous functions f such that

$$\|f\|_{BO_r} = \sup\{\omega_r(f)(z) : z \in T_B\} < \infty.$$

Recall that the Berezin transform over T_B is denoted by

$$B_\alpha f(z) = \int_{T_B} f(w) |k_z^\alpha(w)|^2 dV_\alpha(w), \quad z \in T_B,$$

where

$$k_z^\alpha(w) = K_\alpha(w, z) / \sqrt{K_\alpha(z, z)}, \quad w \in T_B.$$

Actually, the Berezin transform is bounded on $L_\alpha^p(T_B)$ for $1 \leq p < \infty$, see [7].

Let BA_r^p denote the spaces of all functions on T_B with the property that $\widehat{|f|_r^p}(z) \in L^\infty(T_B)$. From [16, Theorem 6.1], we know that $\widehat{|f|_r^p}(z)$ is bounded if and only if $B_\alpha(|f|^p)(z)$ is bounded, so which means BA_r^p is independent of r , simply write BA^p for BA_r^p .

2.2. Cayley transform and automorphism. We will use the transform $\Phi : \mathbb{B}_n \rightarrow T_B$ as follows, see [7]

$$\Phi(z) = \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}z'}{1+z_n}, i \frac{1-z_n}{1+z_n} - i \frac{z' \cdot z'}{(1+z_n)^2} \right), \quad z \in \mathbb{B}_n. \quad (2.1)$$

And it is not hard to calculate that

$$\Phi^{-1}(w) = \left(\frac{2iw'}{i+w_n + \frac{i}{2}w' \cdot w'}, \frac{i-w_n - \frac{i}{2}w' \cdot w'}{i+w_n + \frac{i}{2}w' \cdot w'} \right), \quad w \in T_B.$$

For each fixed $z \in T_B$, we give the holomorphic automorphism of T_B as follows:

$$h_z(u) := \left(u' - z', u_n - \operatorname{Re} z_n - iu' \overline{z'} + \frac{i|z'|^2}{2} + \frac{i\overline{z'} \cdot z'}{4} + \frac{i u' \cdot z'}{4} \right).$$

Obviously, $h_z(u)$ is a holomorphic automorphism of T_B . Hence, the mapping $\sigma_z := \delta_{\rho(z)}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \circ h_z$ is a holomorphic automorphism of T_B . Simple calculations show that $\sigma_z(z) = \mathbf{i} := (0', i)$ and

$$(J_{\mathbb{C}}\sigma_z)(u) = \boldsymbol{\rho}(z)^{-\frac{n+1}{2}}, \quad (2.2)$$

where $(J_{\mathbb{C}}\sigma_z)(u)$ stands for the complex Jacobian of σ_z at u .

Through the Cayley transform, a class of Möbius transformations of T_B induced by φ_ξ is given by

$$\tau_z := \Phi \circ \varphi_{\Phi^{-1}(z)} \circ \Phi^{-1}. \quad (2.3)$$

Obviously $\Phi(0) = \mathbf{i}$, $\tau_z(z) = \mathbf{i}$.

To examine the properties of holomorphic functions on tubular domains, it is crucial to understand the behavior of holomorphic mappings from the unit ball to these domains. The following key lemma, adapted from [7], highlights essential properties of such mappings:

Lemma 2.1. *The following properties hold for holomorphic mapping Φ from \mathbb{B}_n to T_B :*

(i) *The real Jacobian of Φ at $z \in T_B$ is*

$$J_R(\Phi(z)) = \frac{2^{n+1}}{|1+z_n|^{2(n+1)}}. \quad (2.4)$$

(ii) *The real Jacobian of Φ^{-1} at $z \in T_B$ is*

$$(J_R\Phi^{-1})(z) = \frac{1}{4|\boldsymbol{\rho}(z, \mathbf{i})|^{2(n+1)}}. \quad (2.5)$$

(iii) *The identity*

$$1 - \langle \Phi^{-1}(z), \Phi^{-1}(w) \rangle = \frac{\rho(z, w)}{\rho(z, \mathbf{i})\rho(\mathbf{i}, w)} \quad (2.6)$$

holds for all $z, w \in T_B$, where $\mathbf{i} = (0', i)$.

And moreover,

$$1 - |\Phi^{-1}(z)|^2 = \frac{\rho(z)}{|\rho(z, \mathbf{i})|^2}, 1 + [\Phi^{-1}(z)]_n = \frac{1}{\rho(z, \mathbf{i})}.$$

(iv) *The identity*

$$\rho(z, w) = \rho(\Phi(\xi), \Phi(\eta)) = \frac{1 - \langle \xi, \eta \rangle}{(1 + \xi_n)(1 + \eta_n)} \quad (2.7)$$

holds for all $z, w \in T_B$, where $\xi = \Phi^{-1}(z), \eta = \Phi^{-1}(w)$.

(v) For any $z \in T_B$, $\alpha > -1$ and $r > 0$ we have

$$V_\alpha(D(z, r)) \simeq \rho(z)^{n+1+\alpha}. \quad (2.8)$$

2.3. The Bloch space. In this section, we introduce the definition of the Bloch space on T_B . It is important to note that, while the Siegel upper half-space and the unit ball are biholomorphically equivalent, a clear and straightforward definition of the Bloch space on T_B has not been previously provided. To ensure that the Bloch space possesses Möbius invariance, we first introduce the invariant gradient.

For $z \in T_B$, let $(b_{i,j})$ denote an $n \times n$ Hermitian matrix and $(b^{i,j})$ its inverse. Set $b(z) = \det(b_{i,j}(z))$. Define

$$B(z) = (b_{i,j}(z)) = \frac{1}{n+1+\alpha} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \bar{z}_i \partial z_j} \ln K_\alpha(z, z) \right), 1 \leq i, j \leq n.$$

Let $Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{n-1}, -\frac{1}{2})$, the matrix I_{n-1} is an $n-1$ dimensional identity matrix, and

$$A(y) = Y'Y, \quad I' = \begin{pmatrix} I_{n-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$(b_{i,j}(z)) = \frac{\frac{1}{2}(y_n - |y'|^2)I' + A(y)}{(y_n - |y'|^2)^2} = \frac{1}{\rho(z)^2} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\rho(z)}{2}I_{n-1} + y'^T y' & -\frac{1}{2}y'^T \\ -\frac{1}{2}y' & \frac{1}{4} \end{pmatrix},$$

and we can get the inverse matrix

$$(b^{i,j}(z)) = \rho(z) \begin{pmatrix} 2I_{n-1} & 4y'^T \\ 4y' & 4(y_n + |y'|^2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad b(z) = \frac{1}{(2\rho(z))^{n+1}}.$$

From [6], it is well known that the Laplace-Beltrami operator associated with the Bergman kernel K is the differential operator $\tilde{\Delta}$ defined by

$$\tilde{\Delta} = \frac{2}{b} \sum_{i,j} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_i} \left(b b^{i,j} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} \left(b b^{i,j} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_i} \right) \right\}.$$

Then substituting the above into the operator, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Delta} = 8\rho(z) \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_j} + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} 2y_j \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_n \partial \bar{z}_j} \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} 2y_j \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \bar{z}_n \partial z_j} + 2(y_n + |y'|^2) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \bar{z}_n \partial z_n} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

The operator $\tilde{\Delta}$ is often referred to the invariant Laplacian, see [14], since it has the following property.

Lemma 2.2.

$$\tilde{\Delta}(g \circ \psi) = (\tilde{\Delta}g) \circ \psi \quad \text{for all } \psi \in \text{Aut}(T_B),$$

where g is $C^2(T_B)$ and $\text{Aut}(T_B)$ denote the group of automorphisms of T_B .

Proof. From cayley transform, so we let

$$\Phi(z) = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n) = \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}z'}{1+z_n}, i \frac{1-z_n}{1+z_n} - i \frac{z' \cdot z'}{(1+z_n)^2} \right), \quad z \in \mathbb{B}_n.$$

Though (2.3), let $\psi = \Phi \circ \varphi_{\Phi^{-1}(z)} \circ \Phi^{-1}$, and $\psi(z) = \mathbf{i}$. For the unit ball \mathbb{B}_n , the Laplace-Beltrami operator denote by $\tilde{\Delta}_{\mathbb{B}_n}$, then from [6], we have

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{\mathbb{B}_n} = 4(1 - |z|^2) \sum_{i,j=1}^n [\delta_{i,j} - \bar{z}_i z_j] \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_i},$$

where $\delta_{i,j}$ is the Kronecker delta. And

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{\mathbb{B}_n}(f \circ \varphi) = (\tilde{\Delta}_{\mathbb{B}_n} f) \circ \varphi,$$

where f is $C^2(\mathbb{B}_n)$, and $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{B}_n)$.

By Φ is holomorphic mapping, means $\frac{\partial w_i}{\partial \bar{z}_j} = 0$, then using the following complex version of the chain rule (see [21]):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial g}{\partial z_j} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_i} \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial z_j} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{w}_i} \frac{\partial \bar{w}_i}{\partial z_j} \right), \\ \frac{\partial g}{\partial \bar{z}_j} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial w_i} \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial \bar{z}_j} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{w}_i} \frac{\partial \bar{w}_i}{\partial \bar{z}_j} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For any $j = 0, \dots, n-1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial(f \circ \Phi)}{\partial \bar{z}_j} &= \sqrt{2} \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{i})}{\partial \bar{w}_j}, \\ \frac{\partial^2(f \circ \Phi)(0)}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_j} &= 2 \frac{\partial^2 f(\mathbf{i})}{\partial w_j \partial \bar{w}_j}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial(f \circ \Phi)}{\partial \bar{z}_n} &= 2i \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{i})}{\partial \bar{w}_n}, \\ \frac{\partial^2(f \circ \Phi)(0)}{\partial z_n \partial \bar{z}_n} &= 4 \frac{\partial^2 f(\mathbf{i})}{\partial w_n \partial \bar{w}_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$(\tilde{\Delta}g)(\mathbf{i}) = \tilde{\Delta}_{\mathbb{B}_n}(g \circ \Phi)(0).$$

Moreover, for $w \in \mathbb{B}_n$, we can choose $\varphi_w \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{B}_n)$, $\varphi_w(0) = w$, and $\Phi \circ \varphi_w$ is still a holomorphic mapping from \mathbb{B}_n to T_B , so

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\Delta}_{\mathbb{B}_n}(g \circ \Phi)(w) &= \tilde{\Delta}_{\mathbb{B}_n}(g \circ \Phi)(\varphi_w(0)) \\ &= \tilde{\Delta}_{\mathbb{B}_n}(g \circ \Phi \circ \varphi_w)(0) \\ &= (\tilde{\Delta}g) \circ (\Phi \circ \varphi_w(0)) \\ &= (\tilde{\Delta}g) \circ (\Phi(w)).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $z \in T_B$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\tilde{\Delta}g) \circ \psi(z) &= (\tilde{\Delta}g)(\mathbf{i}) = \tilde{\Delta}_{\mathbb{B}_n}(g \circ \Phi)(0) \\ &= \tilde{\Delta}_{\mathbb{B}_n}(g \circ \Phi) \circ \varphi_{\Phi^{-1}(z)}(\Phi^{-1}(z)) \\ &= \tilde{\Delta}_{\mathbb{B}_n}(g \circ \Phi \circ \varphi_{\Phi^{-1}(z)}) \circ (\Phi^{-1}(z)) \\ &= \tilde{\Delta}(g \circ \Phi \circ \varphi_{\Phi^{-1}(z)} \circ \Phi^{-1})(z) \\ &= \tilde{\Delta}(g \circ \psi)(z).\end{aligned}$$

□

If u and v are $C^2(T_B)$ functions, then from [6],

$$\tilde{\Delta}(uv) = u\tilde{\Delta}v + 2(\tilde{\nabla}u)v + v\tilde{\Delta}u,$$

where $\tilde{\nabla}u$ is the vector field defined by

$$\tilde{\nabla}u = 2 \sum_{i,j} b^{i,j} \left\{ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \bar{z}_i} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} + \frac{\partial u}{\partial z_j} \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_i} \right\}.$$

Furthermore, if f in $H(T_B)$, it's not hard to check that

$$\tilde{\Delta}|f|^2 = 2(\tilde{\nabla}f)\bar{f} = 2|\tilde{\nabla}f|^2.$$

In particular, we have

$$|\tilde{\nabla}f|^2 = 2 \sum_{i,j} b^{i,j} \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_i} \frac{\partial \bar{f}}{\partial z_j}.$$

Hence, from the invariance property of $\tilde{\Delta}$, we have

$$|\tilde{\nabla}(f \circ \psi)| = |\tilde{\nabla}f \circ \psi| \quad \text{for all } \psi \in \text{Aut}(T_B).$$

Therefore, the operator $|\tilde{\nabla}|$ is usually called invariant gradient of T_B .

With this in mind, we will use the invariant gradient to directly define the Bloch space on T_B . The form of the invariant gradient is given by:

$$\left| \tilde{\nabla}f(z) \right|^2 = 4\rho(z) \left(2\rho(z) \left| \frac{\partial f(z)}{\partial z_n} \right|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left| \frac{\partial f(z)}{\partial z_j} + 2y_j \frac{\partial f(z)}{\partial z_n} \right|^2 \right)$$

for $f \in H(T_B)$.

We define the Bloch space of T_B , denoted by \mathcal{B} , using invariant gradients. It is the space of functions $f \in H(T_B)$ such that

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{B}} := \sup\{|\tilde{\nabla}f(z)| : z \in T_B\} < \infty.$$

Clearly, this defines only a semi-norm, which is invariant under the action of $\text{Aut}(T_B)$. The little Bloch space, denoted by \mathcal{B}_0 , is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{B}_0 := \{f \in \mathcal{B} : \tilde{\nabla} f \in C_0(\widehat{T_B})\},$$

where $C_0(\widehat{T_B}) = \{f \in C(\widehat{T_B}) : \lim_{z \rightarrow \partial \widehat{T_B}} |f(z)| = 0\}$.

Next, we define the differential operator as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_n := \frac{\partial}{\partial z_n}, \quad \mathcal{L}_j := \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} + 2y_j \frac{\partial}{\partial z_n}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n-1.$$

For $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, which \mathbb{N}_0 denotes the set of non-negative integers, we write

$$\mathcal{L}^\gamma := (\mathcal{L}_1)^{\gamma_1} \dots (\mathcal{L}_n)^{\gamma_n}.$$

The properties of the Bloch space will be established using the differential operator introduced earlier.

We will consider a new space

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}} := \{f \in \mathcal{B} : f(\mathbf{i}) = 0\},$$

where $\mathbf{i} := (0', i)$.

Using τ_z , we establish the relationship between the invariant gradients on T_B and \mathbb{B} as follows. For any $f \in H(T_B)$, it is straightforward to verify that:

$$|\tilde{\nabla} f(\mathbf{i})| = \sqrt{2} |\nabla(f \circ \Phi)(0)|, \quad (2.10)$$

then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\nabla} f(z)| &= |\tilde{\nabla}(f \circ \tau_z)(\mathbf{i})| = \sqrt{2} |\nabla(f \circ \tau_z \circ \Phi)(0)| \\ &= \sqrt{2} |\nabla(f \circ \Phi \circ \varphi_{\Phi^{-1}(z)})(0)| \\ &= \sqrt{2} |\tilde{\nabla}_{\mathbb{B}}(f \circ \Phi)(\Phi^{-1}(z))| \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

for all $z \in T_B$.

2.4. Some auxiliary results. In order to establish our main theorems, we provide several auxiliary results that will support our proofs. We will omit most of the proofs for brevity.

Lemma 2.3 ([7, Therom 2]). *There exists a positive integer N such that for any $0 < r \leq 1$ we can find a sequence $\{a_k\}$ in T_B with the following properites:*

- (1) $T_B = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} D(a_k, r)$;
- (2) The sets $D(a_k, r/4)$ are mutually disjoint;
- (3) Each point $z \in T_B$ belongs to at most N of the sets $D(a_k, r)$.

Lemma 2.4 ([7, Lemma 2]). *Let $r, s > 0, t > -1$, and $r + s - t > n + 1$, then*

$$\int_{T_B} \frac{\rho(w)^t}{\rho(z, w)^r \rho(w, u)^s} dV(w) = \frac{C_1(n, r, s, t)}{\rho(z, u)^{r+s-t-n-1}} \quad (2.12)$$

for all $z, u \in T_B$, where

$$C_1(n, r, s, t) = \frac{2^{n+1} \pi^n \Gamma(1+t) \Gamma(r+s-t-n-1)}{\Gamma(r) \Gamma(s)}.$$

In particular, let $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$, if $t > -1, s - t > n + 1$, then

$$\int_{T_B} \frac{\rho(w)^t}{|\rho(z, w)|^s} dV(w) = \frac{C_1(n, s, t)}{\rho(z)^{s-t-n-1}}.$$

Lemma 2.5 ([18, Theorem 2.2]). *Suppose that $1 \leq p < \infty$, $\lambda > -1$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} \alpha > \frac{\lambda+1}{p} - 1, & 1 < p < \infty, \\ \alpha \geq \lambda, & p = 1. \end{cases}$$

If $f \in A_\lambda^p(T_B)$, then $f = \mathcal{T}_\alpha f$.

Lemma 2.6. *For any $r > 0$, the inequalities*

$$|\rho(z, u)| \simeq |\rho(z, v)|$$

hold for all $z, u, v \in T_B$ with $\beta(u, v) < r$.

Lemma 2.7 ([16, Lemma 3.7]). *For any $z, w \in T_B$, we have*

$$2|\rho(z, w)| \geq \max\{\rho(z), \rho(w)\}. \quad (2.13)$$

Lemma 2.8. *Let $1 \leq p < \infty$, $r > 0$, and $f \in L_\alpha^p(T_B)$, then $f \in BMO_r^p$ if and only if there is a constant λ_z such that, for all $z \in T_B$, with*

$$\frac{1}{|D(z, r)|} \int_{D(z, r)} |f(w) - \lambda_z|^p dV_\alpha(w) \leq C.$$

Proof. If $f \in BMO_r^p$, then the inequality holds when $\lambda_z = \widehat{f}_r(z)$.

Conversely, assume that the above inequality holds for all $z \in T_B$, so by the triangle inequality, and Holder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{|D(z, r)|} \int_{D(z, r)} |f(w) - \widehat{f}_r(z)|^p dV_\alpha(w) \right)^{1/p} \\ & \leq \left(\frac{1}{|D(z, r)|} \int_{D(z, r)} |f(w) - \lambda_z|^p dV_\alpha(w) \right)^{1/p} + |\widehat{f}_r(z) - \lambda_z| \\ & = \left(\frac{1}{|D(z, r)|} \int_{D(z, r)} |f(w) - \lambda_z|^p dV_\alpha(w) \right)^{1/p} + \left| \frac{1}{|D(z, r)|} \int_{D(z, r)} (f(w) - \lambda_z) dV_\alpha(w) \right| \\ & \leq 2 \left(\frac{1}{|D(z, r)|} \int_{D(z, r)} |f(w) - \lambda_z|^p dV_\alpha(w) \right)^{1/p} \\ & \leq 2C. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 2.9. *Let $r > 0$ and f be a continuous function on T_B . Then $f \in BO_r$ if and only if there exists a constant C such that*

$$|f(z) - f(w)| \leq C(\beta(z, w) + 1)$$

for all $z, w \in T_B$. Furthermore, BO_r is independent of r , so we will simply write BO for BO_r .

Proof. It is similar with [17, Lemma 3.3], so we omit it. □

In particular, we also have the following result:

Corollary 2.10. *If $f \in \mathcal{B}$, then*

$$|f(z) - f(w)| \leq \frac{\|f\|_{\mathcal{B}} \beta(z, w)}{\sqrt{2}}$$

for all $z, w \in T_B$.

3. Proofs of the Main Results: Theorems A and B

In this section, we provide the proofs of our main results, **Theorems A and B**, which characterize the relationships between BMO_r^p and properties of holomorphic functions. **Theorem A** states that the following conditions are equivalent:

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose $r > 0$, $1 \leq p < \infty$, and $p(\alpha + 1) > \lambda + 1$, let $f \in L_\lambda^p(T_B)$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) $f \in BMO_r^p$.
- (b) $f = f_1 + f_2$ with $f_1 \in BO$ and $f_2 \in BA^p$.
- (c) $H_f^{(\alpha)}$ and $H_{\bar{f}}^{(\alpha)}$ are both bounded on $A_\lambda^p(T_B)$.

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (b): It suffices to show that $BMO_r^p \subset BO + BA^p$. Given $z, w \in T_B$ with $\beta(z, w) < r$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \widehat{f}_r(z) - \widehat{f}_r(w) \right| &\leq \left| \widehat{f}_r(z) - \widehat{f}_{2r}(z) \right| + \left| \widehat{f}_{2r}(z) - \widehat{f}_r(w) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|D(z, r)|} \int_{D(z, r)} \left| f(u) - \widehat{f}_{2r}(z) \right| dV_\lambda(u) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{|D(w, r)|} \int_{D(w, r)} \left| f(v) - \widehat{f}_{2r}(z) \right| dV_\lambda(v). \end{aligned}$$

By Holder's inequality, and Lemma 2.6, so

$$\left| \widehat{f}_r(z) - \widehat{f}_r(w) \right| \leq C \|f\|_{BMO_{2r}^p}.$$

It is straightforward to show that $\widehat{f}_r(z)$ is continuous on T_B . Therefore, we have $\widehat{f}_r(z) \in BO$.

Let $g = f - \widehat{f}_r$, we show that $g \in BA^p$. By triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\widehat{|g|}_r^p(z) \right]^{1/p} &= \left(\frac{1}{|D(z, r)|} \int_{D(z, r)} \left| f(u) - \widehat{f}_r(u) \right|^p dV_\lambda(u) \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{|D(z, r)|} \int_{D(z, r)} \left| f(u) - \widehat{f}_r(z) \right|^p dV_\lambda(u) \right)^{1/p} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{|D(z, r)|} \int_{D(z, r)} \left| \widehat{f}_r(z) - \widehat{f}_r(u) \right|^p dV_\lambda(u) \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \|f\|_{BMO_r^p} + \omega_r(\widehat{f}_r)(z) \\ &\leq C. \end{aligned}$$

So, $g \in BA^p$, $f = \widehat{f}_r + (f - \widehat{f}_r) \in BO + BA^p$.

(b) \Rightarrow (c): For $f \in BO$, and $g \in A_\lambda^p(T_B)$, from Lemma 2.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| H_f^{(\alpha)} g(z) \right| &= |(I - P_\alpha)(fg)(z)| \\ &\leq \int_{T_B} |f(z) - f(w)| |g(w) K_\alpha(z, w)| dV_\alpha(w) \\ &\leq C \int_{T_B} \frac{\beta(z, w) + 1}{|\rho(z, w)|^{n+1+\alpha}} |g(w)| dV_\alpha(w). \end{aligned}$$

From [17], for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we know that

$$\beta(z, w) \leq 2^{2\varepsilon-1} \frac{|\rho(z, w)|^{2\varepsilon}}{\rho(z)^\varepsilon \rho(w)^\varepsilon},$$

then the operator

$$Tg(z) := \int_{T_B} \frac{\beta(z, w) + 1}{|\rho(z, w)|^{n+1+\alpha}} |g(w)| dV_\alpha(w)$$

is bounded on $A_\lambda^p(T_B)$, see [16, Lemma 3.4].

Next, for $f \in BA^p$, it follows from [16, Lemma 6.1], let $d\mu_f(z) = |f(z)|^p dV_\lambda(z)$. Given $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by S_t the vector spaces of functions f that are holomorphic in T_B and satisfy the condition:

$$\sup_{z \in T_B} |\rho(z, \mathbf{i})|^t |f(z)| < \infty,$$

and it is dense in $A_\lambda^p(T_B)$ when $t > n + 1/2$. So, let $g \in S_t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| H_f^{(\alpha)} g \right\|_{A_\lambda^p(T_B)} &= \|fg\|_{A_\lambda^p(T_B)} + \|P_\alpha(fg)\|_{A_\lambda^p(T_B)} \\ &\lesssim \|fg\|_{A_\lambda^p(T_B)} = \int_{T_B} |g(z)|^p d\mu_f(z) \\ &\leq C \int_{T_B} |g(z)|^p dV_\lambda(z). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $H_f^{(\alpha)}$ and $H_{\bar{f}}^{(\alpha)}$ are both bounded on $A_\lambda^p(T_B)$.

(c) \Rightarrow (a): Inspired by [13], for $f \in L_\lambda^p(T_B)$, and any $z \in T_B$, we can define the function as follows:

$$\mathbf{MO}_\lambda f(z) := \|fh_z - B_\lambda f(z)h_z\|_{L_\lambda^p(T_B)},$$

and

$$f_z(w) = \frac{P_\alpha(\bar{f}h_z)(w)}{h_z(w)}, \quad w \in T_B,$$

where $h_z(w) = \frac{K_\lambda(z, w)}{\|K_\lambda(z, \cdot)\|_{A_\lambda^p}}$.

By (2.13), it is easy to know that

$$|K_\lambda(z, w)| \leq 2^{n+1+\lambda} K_\lambda(z, z),$$

and

$$\|K_\lambda(z, \cdot)\|_{A_\lambda^p}^p = \int_{T_B} \frac{\rho(w)^\lambda}{|\rho(z, w)|^{p(n+1+\lambda)}} dV(w) \asymp \rho(z)^{(1-p)(n+1+\lambda)}.$$

Thus, let $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$, we have

$$\left(\int_{T_B} |f(w)h_z(w)|^p dV_\lambda(w) \right)^{1/p} \leq 2^{n+1+\lambda} \|K_\lambda(z, \cdot)\|_{A_\lambda^p}^{q-1} \left(\int_{T_B} |f(w)|^p dV_\lambda(w) \right)^{1/p},$$

which implies that $\overline{f}h_z \in L_\lambda^p(T_B)$. The function f_z and $P_\alpha(\overline{f}h_z)$ are both well-defined, see [16, Lemma 3.4]. Then, similarly to [17, Lemma 4.4], from Lemma 2.5, we have $\overline{f_z(z)} = B_\lambda f(z)$ and $P_\alpha(\overline{f_z}h_z)(w) = B_\lambda f(z)h_z(w)$.

And actually,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{MO}_\lambda^p f(z) &= \|fh_z - B_\lambda f(z)h_z\|_{L_\lambda^p(T_B)}^p \\ &= C \int_{T_B} \frac{|f(w) - B_\lambda f(z)|^p}{|\rho(z, w)|^{p(n+1+\lambda)}} \rho(z)^{(p-1)(n+1+\lambda)} dV_\lambda(w) \\ &\geq C \int_{D(z, r)} \frac{|f(w) - B_\lambda f(z)|^p}{\rho(z)^{n+1+\lambda}} dV_\lambda(w) \\ &\geq \frac{C}{|D(z, r)|} \int_{D(z, r)} |f(w) - B_\lambda f(z)|^p dV_\lambda(w), \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 2.8, if $\mathbf{MO}_\lambda f$ is finite, then $f \in BMO_r^p$.

Using $P_\alpha(\overline{f_z}h_z)(w) = B_\lambda f(z)h_z(w)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{MO}_\lambda f(z) &= \|fh_z - B_\lambda f(z)h_z\|_{L_\lambda^p(T_B)} \\ &= \|fh_z - P_\alpha(\overline{f_z}h_z)\|_{L_\lambda^p(T_B)} \\ &\leq \|fh_z - P_\alpha(fh_z)\|_{L_\lambda^p(T_B)} + \|P_\alpha(fh_z) - P_\alpha(\overline{f_z}h_z)\|_{L_\lambda^p(T_B)} \\ &\leq \|H_f^{(\alpha)}h_z\|_{L_\lambda^p(T_B)} + \|P_\alpha\|_{L_\lambda^p(T_B)} \|\overline{f}h_z - f_z h_z\|_{L_\lambda^p(T_B)} \\ &= \|H_f^{(\alpha)}h_z\|_{L_\lambda^p(T_B)} + \|P_\alpha\|_{L_\lambda^p(T_B)} \|\overline{f}h_z - P_\alpha(\overline{f}h_z)\|_{L_\lambda^p(T_B)} \\ &= \|H_f^{(\alpha)}h_z\|_{L_\lambda^p(T_B)} + \|P_\alpha\|_{L_\lambda^p(T_B)} \|H_{\overline{f}}^{(\alpha)}h_z\|_{L_\lambda^p(T_B)}. \end{aligned}$$

So, if both $H_f^{(\alpha)}$ and $H_{\overline{f}}^{(\alpha)}$ are bounded on $A_\lambda^p(T_B)$, then $f \in BMO_\alpha^p$. \square

Before we prove the second main result, Theorem B, it is necessary to introduce several key lemmas.

Lemma 3.2. *For any fixed $\alpha' \in \mathbb{N}_0^{n-1}$, then we have*

$$|(z' - w')^{\alpha'}| \lesssim |\rho(z, w)|^{\frac{|\alpha'|}{2}},$$

for all $z, w \in T_B$.

Proof. For each fixed $z \in T_B$, we define the following holomorphic self-mapping of T_B :

$$h_z(u) := \left(u' - z', u_n - \operatorname{Re} z_n - iu'\overline{z'} + \frac{i|z'|^2}{2} + \frac{i\overline{z'} \cdot z'}{4} + \frac{iu' \cdot z'}{4} \right).$$

All these mappings are holomorphic automorphisms of T_B . In particular, we have

$$h_z(z) = \rho(z)\mathbf{i},$$

where $\mathbf{i} = (0', i)$. Also, an easy calculation shows that

$$\boldsymbol{\rho}(h_z(u), h_z(v)) = \boldsymbol{\rho}(u, v).$$

Note that

$$4|\boldsymbol{\rho}(u, \mathbf{s}\mathbf{i})| = |u'^2 - 2iu_n + 2s| \geq |u'|^2,$$

$$\begin{aligned} 4|\boldsymbol{\rho}(u, \mathbf{s}\mathbf{i})| &\geq 4|\boldsymbol{\rho}(u, \mathbf{i})| \geq 4\operatorname{Re}\boldsymbol{\rho}(u, \mathbf{i}) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \operatorname{Re}u_k^2 + 2\operatorname{Im}u_n + 2 \\ &\geq \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \operatorname{Re}u_k^2 + 2\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (\operatorname{Im}u_k)^2 + 2 \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (\operatorname{Re}u_k)^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (\operatorname{Im}u_k)^2 + 2 \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} |u_k|^2 + 2, \end{aligned}$$

for any $u \in T_B$ and any $s > 0$. Taking $u = h_z(w)$ and $s = \boldsymbol{\rho}(z)$ in the above inequality, and associating the previous argument, we get

$$|(h_z(w))'|^2 \lesssim |\boldsymbol{\rho}(h_z(w), \boldsymbol{\rho}(z)\mathbf{i})| = |\boldsymbol{\rho}(h_z(w), h_z(z))| = |\boldsymbol{\rho}(w, z)|.$$

Consequently,

$$|(z' - w')^{\alpha'}| \lesssim |(z' - w')|^{\alpha'} = |(h_z(w))'|^{\alpha'} \lesssim |\boldsymbol{\rho}(z, w)|^{\frac{\alpha'}{2}},$$

as desired. \square

Lemma 3.3. *For $f \in H(T_B)$, then*

$$|f(z) - f(w)| \leq \sup_{u \in \gamma} |\tilde{\nabla} f(u)| \beta(z, w) / \sqrt{2},$$

where γ is a geodesic joining z to w in the Bergman metric.

Proof. Let $\beta_{\mathbb{B}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denote the Bergman metric of \mathbb{B} . From [9] that

$$|h(\xi) - h(\eta)| \leq \sup_{\zeta \in \Gamma} |\tilde{\nabla}_{\mathbb{B}} h(\zeta)| \beta_{\mathbb{B}}(\xi, \eta)$$

for $h \in H(\mathbb{B})$ and $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{B}$, where Γ is a geodesic joining ξ to η with respect to $\beta_{\mathbb{B}}(\cdot, \cdot)$. It is known that Φ sends the geodesic of \mathbb{B} with respect to $\beta_{\mathbb{B}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ to the geodesic of T_B with respect to $\beta(\cdot, \cdot)$, and from [12, Proposition 1.4.15], we have the following

$$\beta(z, w) = \beta_{\mathbb{B}}(\Phi^{-1}(z), \Phi^{-1}(w)) \quad (3.1)$$

for any $z, w \in T_B$. Therefore, let $z = \Phi(\xi)$, $w = \Phi(\eta)$, $u = \Phi(\zeta)$ and $\gamma = \Phi(\Gamma)$ be the geodesic joining z to w with respect to $\beta(\cdot, \cdot)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f(z) - f(w)| &= |(f \circ \Phi)(\xi) - (f \circ \Phi)(\eta)| \\ &\leq \sup_{\zeta \in \Gamma} |\tilde{\nabla}_{\mathbb{B}}(f \circ \Phi)(\zeta)| \beta_{\mathbb{B}}(\xi, \eta) \\ &= \sup_{u \in \gamma} \frac{|\tilde{\nabla} f(u)|}{\sqrt{2}} \beta(z, w), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses (2.11), as desired. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose $r > 0$, $\alpha > -1$ and $p > 0$. There exists a positive constant C such that*

$$|\tilde{\nabla}f(z)|^p \leq \frac{C}{|D(z,r)|} \int_{D(z,r)} |f(w)|^p dV_\alpha(w)$$

for all $f \in H(T_B)$ and all $z \in T_B$.

Proof. From [15, Lemma 2.4], for $g \in H(\mathbb{B})$, there exists a positive constant C depending on r such that

$$|\nabla g(0)|^p \leq C \int_{D_{\mathbb{B}}(0,r)} |g(\eta)|^p dV_\alpha(\eta).$$

Then, for any $f \in H(T_B)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla(f \circ \Phi)(0)|^p &\leq C \int_{D_{\mathbb{B}}(0,r)} |f \circ \Phi(\eta)|^p dV_\alpha(\eta) \\ &\leq C \int_{D(\mathbf{i},r)} \frac{|f(w)|^p}{|\boldsymbol{\rho}(w, \mathbf{i})|^{2(n+1+\alpha)}} dV_\alpha(w) \\ &\leq C \int_{D(\mathbf{i},r)} |f(w)|^p dV_\alpha(w), \end{aligned}$$

the last inequality uses the inequality (2.13), so $|\boldsymbol{\rho}(w, \mathbf{i})| \geq 1/2$. By (2.10), we have

$$|\tilde{\nabla}f(\mathbf{i})|^p \leq C \int_{D(\mathbf{i},r)} |f(w)|^p dV_\alpha(w).$$

Replacing f by $f \circ \sigma_z^{-1}$ in the above inequality, we obtain

$$|\tilde{\nabla}f(z)|^p \leq C \int_{D(\mathbf{i},r)} |f \circ \sigma_z^{-1}(w)|^p dV_\alpha(w) = \frac{C}{|D(z,r)|} \int_{D(z,r)} |f(w)|^p dV_\alpha(w),$$

where the last equality uses (2.2) and (2.8). The proof of this lemma is completed. \square

We state two key lemmas, lemma 3.5 and lemma 3.6, which are crucial for proving **Theorem B**. Using Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.3, as discussed above, these new lemmas can be proven straightforwardly using a similar approach to that in [17]. Therefore, we omit the details.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose $r > 0$, $p \geq 1$, $\alpha > -1$ and $f \in H(T_B)$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) $f \in \mathcal{B}$.
- (b) There exists a positive constant C such that

$$\frac{1}{|D(z,r)|} \int_{D(z,r)} |f(w) - f(z)|^p dV_\alpha(w) \leq C$$

for all $z \in T_B$.

- (c) There exists a positive constant C such that

$$\frac{1}{|D(z,r)|} \int_{D(z,r)} |f(w) - \hat{f}_r(z)|^p dV_\alpha(w) \leq C$$

for all $z \in T_B$.

- (d) There exists a positive constant C with the property that for every $z \in T_B$ there is a complex number c_z such that

$$\frac{1}{|D(z, r)|} \int_{D(z, r)} |f(w) - \lambda_z|^p dV_\alpha(w) \leq C.$$

Lemma 3.6. Suppose $r > 0$, $p \geq 1$, $\alpha > -1$ and $f \in H(T_B)$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- (a) $f \in \mathcal{B}_0$.
(b) There is

$$\frac{1}{|D(z, r)|} \int_{D(z, r)} |f(w) - f(z)|^p dV_\alpha(w) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } z \rightarrow \partial \widehat{T}_B.$$

- (c) There is

$$\frac{1}{|D(z, r)|} \int_{D(z, r)} |f(w) - \widehat{f}_r(z)|^p dV_\alpha(w) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } z \rightarrow \partial \widehat{T}_B.$$

- (d) For every $z \in T_B$ there is a complex number c_z such that

$$\frac{1}{|D(z, r)|} \int_{D(z, r)} |f(w) - c_z|^p dV_\alpha(w) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } z \rightarrow \partial \widehat{T}_B.$$

And now recall that

$$MO_r(f)(z) = \left(\frac{1}{|D(z, r)|} \int_{D(z, r)} |f(w) - \widehat{f}_r(z)|^p dV_\alpha(w) \right)^{1/p},$$

and the space BMO_r^p consists of those functions $f \in L_\alpha^p(T_B)$ such that

$$\|f\|_{BMO_r^p} = \sup \{MO_r(f)(z) : z \in T_B\}.$$

From Lemma 3.5 and 3.6, we conclude that the quantities $\|f\|_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\|f\|_{BMO_r^p}$ are equivalent. Therefore, **Theorem B** is proved.

Remark 1. The equivalences in Theorem A provide a foundational framework for understanding functions in BMO_r^p , which directly informs the characterization of the Bloch space in Theorem B. By identifying the Bloch space as the intersection of holomorphic functions and BMO_r^p , Theorem B highlights the significance of analytic properties established in Theorem A. Together, these results enhance our understanding of the interrelationships between these function classes and their applications in complex analysis.

4. Proofs of the Main Results: Theorems C and D

To establish that the projection operator \widetilde{P}_α is bounded, we first introduce the integral operator $T_{a,b,\gamma'}$. We will then demonstrate that $T_{a,b,\gamma'}$ is bounded on $L_s^p(T_B)$.

Given $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha > -1$ and $\gamma' \in \mathbb{N}_0^{n-1}$, we define the integral operator $T_{a,b,\gamma'}$ by

$$T_{a,b,\gamma'} f(z) := \rho(z)^a \int_{T_B} \frac{|(z' - w')^{\gamma'}| \rho(w)^b}{|\rho(z, w)|^{n+1+a+b+\frac{|\gamma'|}{2}}} f(w) dV_\alpha(w), \quad z \in T_B.$$

Before we proceed with the proof of the theorem, it is important to highlight Lemma 4.1, which serves as a foundational tool in our analysis. We now state this lemma as a crucial step in our argument.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$. If $-pa < s + 1 < p(b + 1)$, then $T_{a,b,\gamma'}$ is bounded on $L_s^p(T_B)$.*

Proof. In the special case when $\gamma' = 0'$, this has been shown in [7, Theorem 1]. To prove the general case, by Lemma 3.2, we have

$$|T_{a,b,\gamma'} f(z)| \lesssim T_{a,b,0'}(|f|)(z).$$

□

We now proceed to prove our third result, **Theorem C**.

Theorem 4.2. \widetilde{P}_α is a bounded projection from $L^\infty(T_B)$ to $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$.

Proof. Let $f \in L^\infty(T_B)$. Obviously, $\widetilde{P}_\alpha f(\mathbf{i}) = 0$,

$$\mathcal{L}_j(\widetilde{P}_\alpha f)(z) = \frac{\Gamma(n+2+\alpha)}{2^{n+2}\pi^n \Gamma(\alpha+1)} \int_{T_B} \frac{\overline{w}_j - \overline{z}_j}{\rho(z,w)^{n+2+\alpha}} f(w) dV_\alpha(w),$$

for all $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$.

By a simple calculation, we can get

$$\rho(z)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left| \mathcal{L}_j(\widetilde{P}_\alpha f)(z) \right| \leq \frac{\Gamma(n+2+\alpha)}{2^{n+2}\pi^n \Gamma(\alpha+1)} \rho(z)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{T_B} \frac{|\overline{w}_j - \overline{z}_j|}{|\rho(z,w)|^{n+2+\alpha}} dV_\alpha(w) \cdot \|f\|_\infty,$$

and

$$\rho(z) \left| \mathcal{L}_n(\widetilde{P}_\alpha f)(z) \right| \leq \frac{\Gamma(n+2+\alpha)}{2^{n+2}\pi^n \Gamma(\alpha+1)} \rho(z) \int_{T_B} \frac{1}{|\rho(z,w)|^{n+2+\alpha}} dV_\alpha(w) \cdot \|f\|_\infty.$$

By applying Lemma 4.1, we obtain $\left\| \widetilde{P}_\alpha f \right\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq C \|f\|_\infty$, which completes the proof. □

We now proceed to prove the last result, **Theorem D**. First, we introduce the following proposition, which establishes the boundedness of a crucial linear operator.

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose $1 \leq p < \infty$, $t > -1$, for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, then the map $f \mapsto \rho^{(\gamma)} \mathcal{L}^\gamma f$ is a bounded linear operator from $A_t^p(T_B)$ into $L_t^p(T_B)$. In particular, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the map $f \mapsto \mathcal{L}_n^N f$ is a bounded linear operator from $A_t^p(T_B)$ into $A_{t+2N}^p(T_B)$.*

Proof. Let λ be sufficiently large such that $p(\lambda + 1) > t + 1$. Then by Lemma 2.5, we have

$$f(z) = c_\lambda \int_{T_B} \frac{\rho(w)^\lambda}{\rho(z,w)^{n+1+\lambda}} f(w) dV(w),$$

where $c_\lambda = \frac{\Gamma(n+1+\lambda)}{2^{n+1}\pi^n \Gamma(\lambda+1)}$. For any $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^\gamma \left\{ \frac{1}{\rho(z,w)^{n+1+\lambda}} \right\} &= C(n, \lambda, \gamma) \frac{\left(\frac{1}{2}(z' - \overline{w}') - y'i\right)^{\gamma'}}{\rho(z,w)^{n+1+\lambda+|\gamma|}} \\ &= C(n, \lambda, \gamma) \frac{\left(\frac{1}{2}(z' - \overline{z}' + \overline{z}' - \overline{w}') - y'i\right)^{\gamma'}}{\rho(z,w)^{n+1+\lambda+|\gamma|}} \\ &= C(n, \lambda, \alpha) \frac{(\overline{z}' - \overline{w}')^{\gamma'}}{\rho(z,w)^{n+1+\lambda+|\gamma|}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $C(n, \lambda, \gamma)$ is a constant depending on n , λ and γ . Additionally, note that $|\gamma| = \langle \gamma \rangle + |\gamma'|/2$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |\boldsymbol{\rho}^{\langle \gamma \rangle} \mathcal{L}^\gamma f(z)| &\lesssim \boldsymbol{\rho}(z)^{\langle \gamma \rangle} \int_{T_B} \frac{|(z' - w')^{\gamma'}| \boldsymbol{\rho}(w)^\lambda}{|\boldsymbol{\rho}(z, w)|^{n+1+\lambda+|\gamma|}} |f(w)| dV(w) \\ &= T_{\langle \gamma \rangle, \lambda, \gamma'}(|f|)(z). \end{aligned}$$

The proposition now follows directly from Lemma 4.1. \square

Theorem 4.4. *Suppose that $1 \leq p < \infty$, $\lambda > -1$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfy*

$$\begin{cases} \alpha > \frac{\lambda+1}{p} - 1, & 1 < p < \infty, \\ \alpha \geq \lambda, & p = 1. \end{cases}$$

If $f \in A_\lambda^p(T_B)$ then

$$f = \frac{(2i)^N \Gamma(1 + \alpha)}{\Gamma(1 + \alpha + N)} \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\rho}^N \mathcal{L}_n^N f)$$

for any $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

To prove this theorem, we divide the proof into two separate lemmas, each addressing a distinct case. We begin by considering the case where $p = 1$ and $\lambda = \alpha$.

Lemma 4.5. *Theorem 4.4 holds for $p = 1$ with $\lambda = \alpha$.*

Proof. Suppose that $f \in A_\alpha^1(T_B)$. Let $\gamma > \alpha$, by Lemma 2.5, we have

$$f(z) = c_\gamma \int_{T_B} \frac{\boldsymbol{\rho}(w)^\gamma}{\boldsymbol{\rho}(z, w)^{n+1+\gamma}} f(w) dV(w)$$

for all $z \in T_B$. Then it is easy to show that

$$\mathcal{L}_n^N f(z) = (n+1+\gamma)_N (-i/2)^N c_\gamma \int_{T_B} \frac{\boldsymbol{\rho}(w)^\gamma}{\boldsymbol{\rho}(z, w)^{n+1+\gamma+N}} f(w) dV(w),$$

where $(n+1+\gamma)_N$ is the Pochhammer symbol denoted by $(a)_k = a(a+1)\cdots(a+k-1)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\rho}^N \mathcal{L}_n^N f)(z) &= c_\alpha \int_{T_B} \frac{\boldsymbol{\rho}(w)^{\alpha+N} \mathcal{L}_n^N f(w)}{\boldsymbol{\rho}(z, w)^{n+1+\alpha}} dV(w) \\ &= c_\alpha (n+1+\gamma)_N (-i/2)^N c_\gamma \\ &\quad \times \int_{T_B} \frac{\boldsymbol{\rho}(w)^{\alpha+N}}{\boldsymbol{\rho}(z, w)^{n+1+\alpha}} \left(\int_{T_B} \frac{\boldsymbol{\rho}(u)^\gamma}{\boldsymbol{\rho}(w, u)^{n+1+\gamma+N}} f(u) dV(u) \right) dV(w). \end{aligned}$$

By Fubini's theorem and Lemma 2.4, for any $z \in T_B$, the above double integral equals to

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{T_B} \rho(u)^\gamma f(u) \left(\int_{T_B} \frac{\rho(w)^{\alpha+N}}{\rho(z,w)^{n+1+\alpha} \rho(w,u)^{n+1+\gamma+N}} dV(w) \right) dV(u) \\ &= C_1(n, n+1+\alpha, n+1+\gamma+N, \lambda+N) \int_{T_B} \frac{\rho(u)^\gamma f(u)}{\rho(z,u)^{n+1+\gamma}} dV(u) \\ &= C_1(n, n+1+\alpha, n+1+\gamma+N, \alpha+N) c_\gamma^{-1} f(z). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\mathcal{T}_\alpha(\rho^N \mathcal{L}_n^N f)(z) = \frac{(-i/2)^N \Gamma(1+\alpha+N)}{\Gamma(1+\alpha)} f(z).$$

We now justify the use of Fubini's theorem. For any fixed $z \in T_B$, by Lemma 2.4 (note that $\gamma > \alpha$) and (2.13), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{T_B} \left(\int_{T_B} \frac{\rho(w)^{\alpha+N}}{|\rho(z,w)|^{n+1+\alpha} |\rho(w,u)|^{n+1+\gamma+N}} dV(w) \right) \rho(u)^\gamma |f(u)| dV(u) \\ & \leq (\rho(z)/2)^{-n-1-\alpha} \int_{T_B} \left(\int_{T_B} \frac{\rho(w)^{\alpha+N}}{|\rho(w,u)|^{n+1+\gamma+N}} dV(w) \right) \rho(u)^\gamma |f(u)| dV(u) \\ & = (\rho(z)/2)^{-n-1-\alpha} C_1(n, n+1+\gamma+N, \alpha+N) \int_{T_B} |f(u)| \rho(u)^\alpha dV(u) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the lemma is completed. \square

By applying Lemma 4.6, we can now address the remaining part of the proof.

Lemma 4.6. *Theorem 4.4 holds for $1 < p < \infty$ when $p(\alpha+1) > \lambda+1$, and for $p=1$ when $\alpha > \lambda$.*

Proof. Put

$$g := f - \frac{(2i)^N \Gamma(1+\alpha)}{\Gamma(1+\alpha+N)} \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\rho^N \mathcal{L}_n^N f).$$

Note from Proposition 4.3 that $\mathcal{L}_n^N f \in A_{\lambda+Np}^p(T_B)$. It is not difficult to see that $\mathcal{T}_\alpha(\rho^N \mathcal{L}_n^N f)$ belongs to $A_\lambda^p(T_B)$ and so does g . A simple calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_n^N g(z) &= \mathcal{L}_n^N f(z) - c_{\alpha+N} \int_{T_B} \frac{\rho(w)^{\alpha+N}}{\rho(z,w)^{n+1+\alpha+N}} \mathcal{L}_n^N f(w) dV(w) \\ &= \mathcal{L}_n^N f(z) - \mathcal{T}_{\alpha+N}(\mathcal{L}_n^N f)(z) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

By [18], since $p(\alpha+N+1) > \lambda+Np+1$ for any case.

Suppose $\mathcal{L}_n^N g \equiv 0$. Then g has the form

$$g(z) = g_{N-1}(z') z_n^{N-1} + g_{N-2}(z') z_n^{N-2} + \cdots + g_0(z')$$

with g_{N-1}, \dots, g_0 holomorphic functions of z' . It follows that

$$\mathcal{L}_n^{N-1} g(z) = (N-1)! g_{N-1}(z').$$

All that remains is to show that $g_{N-1}(z') \equiv 0$. In view of Proposition 4.3, we know that $\rho^{N-1} \mathcal{L}_n^{N-1} g \in L_\lambda^p(T_B)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \infty &> \int_{T_B} \rho(z)^{(N-1)p+\lambda} |g_{N-1}(z')|^p dV(z) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \int_{y_n > y'^2} (y_n - y'^2)^{(N-1)p+\lambda} dy_n |g_{N-1}(x' + iy')|^p dy' dx. \end{aligned}$$

However, note that the inner integral diverges for any fixed y' , implying that $g_{N-1}(z') \equiv 0$. Consequently, after a finite number of iterations, we conclude that $g \equiv 0$, thus completing the proof. \square

By combining the two previously discussed lemmas, we have successfully completed the proof of Theorem D.

References

- [1] J. Garnett, *Bounded Analytic Functions*, Academic Press, New York, 1981.
- [2] C. Fefferman and E. Stein, *H^p spaces of several variables*, Acta Math. **129** (1972), 137-193. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02392215>
- [3] J. Anderson, *Bloch functions: The basic theory*, in *Operators and Function Theory*, D. Reidel, 1985, 1-17.
- [4] J. Anderson, J. Clunie, and Ch. Pommerenke, *On Bloch functions and normal functions*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **270** (1974), 12-37. <https://doi.org/10.1515/crll.1974.270.12>
- [5] S. Axler, *The Bergman space, the Bloch space, and commutators of multiplication operators*, Duke Math. J. **53** (1986), 315-332. <https://doi.org/10.1215/S0012-7094-86-05320-2>
- [6] M. Stoll, *Invariant Potential Theory in the Unit Ball of \mathbb{C}^n* , London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series 199, Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [7] J. Liu, G. Deng, and H. Yin, *Bergman metric on a class of tubular domains*, J. Beijing Normal Univ. (Nat. Sci.) **59** (2023), 353-357.
- [8] Ch. Chu, H. Hamada, T. Honda, et al., *Bloch Space of a Bounded Symmetric Domain and Composition Operators*, Complex Anal. Oper. Theory **13** (2019), 479-492. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11785-018-0835-0>
- [9] R. Timoney, *Bloch functions in several complex variables I*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **12** (1980), 241-267. <https://doi.org/10.1112/blms/12.4.241>
- [10] D. Bekolle, *The Bloch Space and BMO Analytic Functions in the Tube over the Spherical Cone*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **102** (1988), 949-956. <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9939-1988-0934873-5>
- [11] K. Zhu, *BMO and Hankel operators on Bergman spaces*, Pacific J. Math. **155** (1992), 377-395. <https://doi.org/10.2140/pjm.1992.155.377>
- [12] S. Krantz, *Function Theory of Several Complex Variables*, Reprint of the 1992 edition, AMS Chelsea Publishing, Providence, RI, 2001.
- [13] J. Pau, R. Zhao, and K. Zhu, *Weighted BMO and Hankel operators between weighted Bergman spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **144** (2016), 3761-3773. <https://doi.org/10.1512/iumj.2016.65.5882>
- [14] M. Flensted-Jensen, *Groups and Geometric Analysis: Integral Geometry, Invariant Differential Operators, and Spherical Functions*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **17** (1985), 496-497. <https://doi.org/10.1112/blms/17.5.496>
- [15] K. Zhu, *Spaces of Holomorphic Functions in the Unit Ball*, Graduate Texts in Math., vol. 226, Springer, New York, 2005.
- [16] L. Li, J. Ding, and H. Li, *Toeplitz operators on weighted Bergman spaces over tubular domains*, arXiv preprint, 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.16439>
- [17] J. Si, *BMO and Hankel Operators on Bergman Space of the Siegel Upper Half-Space*, Complex Anal. Oper. Theory **16** (2022), 24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11785-022-01198-8>
- [18] M. Džrbashian and A. Karapetyan, *Integral representations for some classes of functions holomorphic in a Siegel domain*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **179** (1993), 91-109. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmaa.1993.1337>

- [19] C. Liu, J. Si, and H. Xu, *A uniqueness property for Bergman functions on the Siegel upper half-space*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **151** (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1090/proc/16290>
- [20] D. Békollé, C. Berger, L. Coburn, and K. Zhu, *BMO in the Bergman metric on bounded symmetric domains*, J. Funct. Anal. **93**, no. 2, 310-350 (1990). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1236\(90\)90131-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1236(90)90131-4)
- [21] W. Rudin, *Function Theory in the Unit Ball of \mathbb{C}^n* , Springer-Verlag, 1980.

1. COLLEGE OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, SOUTH CHINA AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY, GUANGZHOU, 510640, CHINA

2. COLLEGE OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, SOUTH CHINA AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY, GUANGZHOU, 510640, CHINA

3. COLLEGE OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, BEIJING TECHNOLOGY AND BUSINESS UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100048, CHINA

4. COLLEGE OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, BEIJING TECHNOLOGY AND BUSINESS UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, 100048, CHINA

Email address: djq123@stu.scau.edu.cn (J. Ding) ; hc12016@scau.edu.cn (H. Li) ; 435010980@qq.com(Z. Fu) ; zhangyanhui@th.btbu.edu.cn(Y. Zhang)