

RIESZ AND REVERSE RIESZ ON MANIFOLDS WITH QUADRATICALLY DECAYING CURVATURE

DANGYANG HE

ABSTRACT. We study Riesz and reverse Riesz inequalities on manifolds whose Ricci curvature decays quadratically. First, we refine existing results on the boundedness of the Riesz transform by establishing a Lorentz-type endpoint estimate. We then explore the relationship between the Riesz and reverse Riesz transforms, proving that the reverse Riesz, Hardy, and weighted Sobolev inequalities are essentially equivalent. Our approach relies on an asymptotic formula for the Riesz potential, combined with an extension of the so-called harmonic annihilation method.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	6
3. Endpoint Estimate for Riesz Transform	7
4. From Hardy to Reverse Riesz	9
5. From Reverse Riesz to Weighted Sobolev	13
6. From Weighted Sobolev to Hardy	16
7. Proof of Theorem 1.3	17
References	19

1. INTRODUCTION

Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold equipped with the Riemannian volume measure $d\mu$ (also denoted by $d\text{vol}$). Denote by ∇ and Δ the associated Riemannian gradient and Laplace-Beltrami operator, respectively, which satisfy the following relationship:

$$\int g\Delta f d\mu = \int \nabla f \cdot \nabla g d\mu$$

for all $f, g \in C_c^\infty(M)$. Then, one can define the Riesz transform by $\nabla\Delta^{-1/2}$. In [36], Strichartz initiated the question of what extent of the classical harmonic analysis of the Laplacian on Euclidean space can be extended to the Riemannian setting. A critical problem in this context is to determine the range of boundedness of $\nabla\Delta^{-1/2}$ on L^p spaces. That is, for what $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, one can establish inequality:

$$(R_p) \quad \|\nabla f\|_p \leq C\|\Delta^{1/2}f\|_p, \quad \forall f \in C_c^\infty(M).$$

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 42B20, 47F05

Keywords and Phrases. Riesz transform, reverse Riesz inequality, Hardy's inequality, weighted Sobolev inequality, Ricci curvature.

Moreover, the study of (\mathbf{R}_p) also leads to the concept of reverse Riesz inequality:

$$(\mathbf{RR}_p) \quad \|\Delta^{1/2} f\|_p \leq C \|\nabla f\|_p \quad \forall f \in C_c^\infty(M).$$

For the past several decades, to study the Riesz and reverse Riesz inequalities, much attention has been paid to the manifolds satisfying the so-called volume doubling condition: for any $x \in M$ and $R \geq r > 0$,

$$(\mathbf{D}_\mu) \quad \frac{V(x, R)}{V(x, r)} \leq C \left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^\mu,$$

where $B(x, r)$ denotes the geodesic ball centered at x with radius r and $V(x, r) = \mu(B(x, r))$ denotes the volume of the ball. It is also known that (\mathbf{D}_μ) implies the following reverse doubling property

$$(\mathbf{RD}_\nu) \quad C \left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^\nu \leq \frac{V(x, R)}{V(x, r)},$$

for some $0 < \nu \leq \mu$.

Another frequently used condition in this context is the Poincaré inequality. Recall that one says M satisfies L^q -Poincaré inequality ($1 \leq q < \infty$) if for any ball B with radius $r > 0$,

$$(\mathbf{P}_q) \quad \int_B |f - f_B|^q d\mu \leq Cr^q \int_B |\nabla f|^q d\mu, \quad \forall f \in C^\infty(B),$$

where $f_B = V(B)^{-1} \int_B f d\mu$.

We start by introducing some results about the Riesz transform. By [9], we know that the conjunction of (\mathbf{D}_μ) and (\mathbf{DUE}) implies (\mathbf{R}_p) for all $1 < p \leq 2$, where (\mathbf{DUE}) refers to the on-diagonal upper bound for heat kernel:

$$(\mathbf{DUE}) \quad e^{-t\Delta}(x, x) \leq \frac{C}{V(x, \sqrt{t})}, \quad \forall x \in M.$$

In fact, it follows from [16] that under the assumption of (\mathbf{D}_μ) , (\mathbf{DUE}) self-improves to

$$(\mathbf{UE}) \quad e^{-t\Delta}(x, y) \leq \frac{C}{V(x, \sqrt{t})} e^{-\frac{d(x, y)^2}{ct}}, \quad \forall x, y \in M.$$

While for $p > 2$, a result from [2] indicates that under the assumptions of (\mathbf{D}_μ) , (\mathbf{P}_2) and a L^q -estimate for the gradient of heat kernel (for some $q > 2$), (\mathbf{R}_p) holds for $2 \leq p < q$. In [7], the authors consider the connected sum $\mathbb{R}^n \# \mathbb{R}^n$ for $n \geq 3$ (see [18] for a more detailed discussion of connected sums) and prove that (\mathbf{R}_p) on such manifold only holds for $1 < p < n$. Subsequently, the authors of [23] generalize the above result by considering a class of non-doubling manifolds, which fail to meet both (\mathbf{D}_μ) and (\mathbf{P}_2) , see also [21].

The boundedness of the Riesz transform can also be examined from the view of Ricci curvature. Let $o \in M$ be a fixed. We say M has *quadratically decaying curvature* if its Ricci curvature satisfies property (see [30] for details):

$$(\mathbf{QD}) \quad \text{Ric}_x \geq -\frac{\delta^2}{r(x)^2} g_x, \quad \forall x \in M,$$

where $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, and g stands for the Riemannian metric. Here, we use notation $r(x) = d(x, o)$. Manifolds with conical ends and the connected sums of several copies of \mathbb{R}^n are two typical examples which satisfy this (\mathbf{QD}) condition; see [7, 19, 20, 29, 30]. By [3], it is well-known that (\mathbf{R}_p) holds for all $1 < p < \infty$ on manifolds with non-negative Ricci curvature.

To go further, let us further introduce two assumptions. The first one is the volume comparison condition. That is, for any $R \geq 1$ and any $x \in \partial B(o, R)$, we have

$$(VC) \quad V(o, R) \leq CV(x, R/2).$$

Then, [6, Theorem 2.4] tells us (VC) + (QD) implies (D $_{\mu}$) and (DUE). The second assumption is the so-called "relatively connected to an end" condition (we may denote it by (RCE) through this article). Suppose M has at most finitely many ends. Then, we say M satisfies (RCE) if there exists a constant $\theta \in (0, 1)$ such that for all $R \geq 1$ and all $x \in \partial B(o, R)$, there is a continuous path $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow B(o, R) \setminus B(o, \theta R)$ and a geodesic ray $\tau : [0, \infty) \rightarrow M \setminus B(o, R)$ such that

$$\bullet \gamma(0) = x, \gamma(1) = \tau(0), \quad \bullet \text{length}(\gamma) \leq R/\theta.$$

This (RCE) condition generalise the (RCA) condition introduced in [17] to the setting of manifolds with finitely many ends. For more details about (RCE), we refer readers to [17, 6].

Next, by [6, Theorem A], under the assumptions of (QD), (VC), (RCE) and (RD $_{\nu}$) ($\nu > 2$) for "anchored balls", the Riesz transform is bounded on L^p for $1 < p < \nu$. Note that this result is sharp in the sense of $\mathbb{R}^n \# \mathbb{R}^n$, see [7].

As noted above, on certain classes of manifolds, inequality (R $_p$) only holds over a bounded range of exponents, in contrast to the Euclidean setting. This naturally prompts the question of whether a suitable endpoint estimate for $\nabla \Delta^{-1/2}$ exists.

Before introducing the endpoint results, we have to recall some notations from Lorentz spaces. We say $f \in L^{p,q}$ ($0 < p, q \leq \infty$) if the quasi-norm

$$\|f\|_{(p,q)} = \begin{cases} \left(\int_0^\infty (t^{1/p} f^*(t))^q \frac{dt}{t} \right)^{1/q}, & q < \infty, \\ \sup_{t>0} t^{1/p} f^*(t) = \sup_{\lambda>0} \lambda d_f(\lambda)^{1/p}, & q = \infty. \end{cases}$$

is finite, where f^* denotes the decreasing rearrangement function: $f^*(t) = \inf\{\lambda > 0; d_f(\lambda) \leq t\}$, and d_f is the usual distribution function i.e. $d_f(\lambda) = \mu(\{x; |f(x)| > \lambda\})$.

In [24], building on the framework introduced in [23], the author establishes a Lorentz-type endpoint estimate. Specifically, it is shown that $\nabla \Delta^{-1/2}$ is bounded on $L^{p_0,1}$, yet it is not bounded from $L^{p_0,p}$ to $L^{p_0,q}$ for any $1 < p < \infty$ and $p \leq q \leq \infty$, where p_0 is the endpoint exponent for the boundedness of the Riesz transform. This finding aligns with the result in [29], which demonstrates that on a class of conic manifolds, $\nabla \Delta^{-1/2}$ fails to be of weak type bounded at the endpoint.

Before presenting our results, let us briefly discuss the motivation behind these endpoint estimates. In [7], the authors study the connected sums $M = \mathbb{R}^n \# \mathbb{R}^n$ and show that on a compactification of M , which we denote by \overline{M} , the Riesz potential exhibits an asymptotic form:

$$(1.1) \quad \Delta^{-1/2}(x, y) \sim \sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} a_j(x) |y|^{-j}, \quad x \in \overline{M}, \quad |y| \rightarrow \partial \overline{M},$$

where a_{n-1} is a nontrivial harmonic function on \overline{M} . In particular, when $M = \mathbb{R}^n$, a similar asymptotic behavior holds with $a_{n-1} = 1$.

Applying a gradient operator in the x -variable, the maximum principle ensures that ∇a_{n-1} does not vanish, leading to a leading term in the y -variable that decays like $|y|^{1-n}$ near the boundary. The function $|y|^{1-n}$ can only pair boundedly with functions in L^p for $p < n$, which in a sense explains why the boundedness range of the Riesz transform terminates at $p = n$. By contrast, when $M = \mathbb{R}^n$, the gradient annihilates the leading term because $a_{n-1} = 1$.

Consequently, the kernel then decays like $|y|^{-n}$ near the boundary, making it can be boundedly pair with functions in L^p for all $1 < p < \infty$.

Next, to address the endpoint issue, note that for $M = \mathbb{R}^n \# \mathbb{R}^n$, a straightforward calculation shows that $|y|^{1-n}$ lies in the Lorentz space $L^{\frac{n}{n-1}, \infty}(\partial \overline{M})$. By duality, this implies that $|y|^{1-n}$ should be able to pair with functions in $L^{n,1}$. Although the asymptotic expansion (1.1) has only been verified on $\mathbb{R}^n \# \mathbb{R}^n$, one may naturally conjecture that it holds for a broader class of manifolds.

Our first result supplements [6, Theorem A] and can be stated as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold satisfying (QD), (VC), (RCE) and reverse doubling condition for "anchored balls" i.e.*

$$(RD_\nu^o) \quad C \left(\frac{R}{r} \right)^\nu \leq \frac{V(o, R)}{V(o, r)}, \quad \forall R \geq r > 0.$$

for some $\nu > 2$. Then, the Riesz transform, $\nabla \Delta^{-1/2}$, is of restricted weak type (ν, ν) . That is

$$\|\nabla \Delta^{-1/2} f\|_{(\nu, \infty)} \leq C \|f\|_{(\nu, 1)}$$

for all $f \in C_c^\infty(M)$.

We note that the condition $\nu > 2$ is not essential; see also [6, Remark 3.1], the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 already imply (R_p) for all $1 < p \leq 2$, independent of ν . Consequently, a Lorentz-type endpoint result at $p = \nu$ for $1 < \nu \leq 2$ carries no additional significance; see also Remark 2.3 below.

In our next investigation, we study the reverse Riesz inequality. By [10, Proposition 2.1], it is well-known that on any complete Riemannian manifolds, (R_p) implies $(RR_{p'})$. However, the converse is not always true. Therefore, the following two natural questions arise: how to prove such a reverse inequality, and why is (RR_p) less demanding (compare to prove (R_p))? For the first question, a natural way is to use the duality argument directly ([10, Proposition 2.1]). For examples, by [9], (D_μ) and (DUE) implies (R_p) for $1 < p \leq 2$ and hence by duality, (RR_p) holds for $p \geq 2$,

To address the above reverse Riesz problems more thoroughly, we present the following three illustrative examples. First, by establishing a Calderón–Zygmund decomposition for Sobolev functions, Auscher and Coulhon [1] showed that the conjunction of (D_μ) and (P_q) (for some $1 \leq q < 2$) implies (RR_p) for all $q < p < \infty$. Under the same assumptions, however, one can only derive (R_p) for $1 < p < 2 + \epsilon$ (for some $\epsilon > 0$). Second, in [27], one considers the Dirichlet Laplacian outside some convex bounded obstacle in \mathbb{R}^d ($d \geq 3$). By establishing a Littlewood–Paley theory, prove that (RR_p) is valid for all $1 < p < \infty$, whereas (R_p) only holds for $1 < p < d$; see [26] for the analogous result when $d = 2$. Third, in a recent article [25], the author examines a class of manifolds that does not satisfy either (D_μ) or (P_q) (for $1 \leq q \leq 2$), and for which the Riesz transform is only L^p -bounded on a finite interval. Nonetheless, by using the so-called harmonic annihilation method, the results there still confirm that (RR_p) holds for every $1 < p < \infty$. Further details can be found in [1, 27, 26, 22, 25].

To describe our next result, one recalls for $1 \leq p < \infty$, the L^p Hardy's inequality holds on M if

$$(H_p) \quad \|f/r(\cdot)\|_p \leq C \|\nabla f\|_p, \quad \forall f \in C_c^\infty(M).$$

Another ingredient of the statement is the so-called weighted Sobolev inequality. We say M satisfies weighted Sobolev inequality if

$$(WS_p^\mu) \quad \|f/\rho(\cdot)\|_{(p^*,p)} \leq C\|\nabla f\|_p, \quad \forall f \in C_c^\infty(M), \quad p^* = \frac{\mu p}{\mu - p},$$

where $1 \leq p < \mu$ and

$$\rho(x) = \frac{r(x)}{V(o, r(x))^{1/\mu}}.$$

Note that here we ask for a Lorentz quasi-norm $L^{p^*,p}$ on the left of (WS_p^μ) , which is the sharpest form of Sobolev inequality in the sense of \mathbb{R}^n ; see [4, 32].

We present our next result in the following way.

Theorem 1.2. *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold satisfying (QD) , (VC) , (RD_ν) ($\nu > 1$), and (RCE) . Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) (H_p) holds for $p \in (1, \nu)$,
- (ii) (RR_p) holds for $p \in (1, \nu)$,
- (iii) (WS_p^μ) holds for $p \in (1, \nu)$, where $\mu \geq \nu$ is the doubling exponent in (D_μ) .

In this article, rather than adapting the approach from [1] (see also [12]) based on conditions (D_μ) and (P_q) , we focus on the intrinsic connection between (RR_p) and the Riesz transform itself. Specifically, we extend the harmonic annihilation method introduced in [25] to manifolds with quadratically decaying curvature.

To elaborate our method; see also [25], let us again consider $M = \mathbb{R}^n \# \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $f, g \in C_c^\infty(\overline{M})$ such that g is supported near the boundary $\partial\overline{M}$. We consider bilinear form $\langle \Delta^{1/2} f, g \rangle$. By using a suitable resolution to identity, we have by (1.1),

$$(1.2) \quad \langle \Delta^{1/2} f, g \rangle = \langle \nabla f, \nabla \Delta^{-1/2} g \rangle \sim \left\langle \nabla f, \int_{\partial\overline{M}} \sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} \nabla a_j(x) |y|^{-j} g(y) dy \right\rangle.$$

While by integration by parts, the leading coefficient ∇a_{n-1} vanishes since a_{n-1} is harmonic, which implies

$$\langle \Delta^{1/2} f, g \rangle \sim \left\langle f, \int_{\partial\overline{M}} \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} \Delta a_j(x) |y|^{-j} g(y) dy \right\rangle.$$

Let $Q(x)$ be some potential. We rewrite the above bilinear form as

$$\langle \Delta^{1/2} f, g \rangle \sim \left\langle \frac{f(x)}{Q(x)}, \int_{\partial\overline{M}} \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} Q(x) \Delta a_j(x) |y|^{-j} g(y) dy \right\rangle.$$

Finally, we reduce the problem to the estimates of the left and right entries of the above bilinear form separately.

By restricting our attention to manifolds with quadratically decaying curvature, our method explains why (RR_p) is comparatively easier to satisfy than (R_p) : in the above bilinear setting, the problematic leading coefficient ∇a_{n-1} disappears.

Next, under additional geometric assumptions on the manifold, we essentially recover the result of [12, Corollary 1.4]. In [12], the authors establish a Calderón–Zygmund decomposition for Sobolev functions which was established in [1], and then use it to prove the reverse inequality. Here, however, we offer an alternative proof that leverages the intrinsic connection between the Riesz and reverse Riesz transforms.

We recall that M is said to have bounded geometry if and only if its Ricci curvature is bounded from below and its radius of injectivity is strictly positive.

Theorem 1.3. *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold with bounded geometry satisfying (QD), (VC), (RD $_{\nu}$) ($\nu > 1$) and (RCE). Then, (RR $_p$) holds on M for all $p \in (1, \nu) \cup [2, \infty)$.*

2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout the paper, we use notations $A \lesssim B$, $A \gtrsim B$ and $A \simeq B$ to denote $A \leq cB$, $A \geq cB$ and $cB \leq A \leq c^{-1}B$ respectively for some constant $c > 0$. We also write $dx = d\mu(x) = d\text{vol}(x)$ for simplicity.

One of [6]'s main results, which is the one we continue to study here, can be described in the following way.

Theorem 2.1. [6, Theorem A] *Assume (M, g) is a complete Riemannian manifold satisfying (QD), (VC) and (RCE). If furthermore, M satisfies (RD $_{\nu}^{\circ}$) for some $\nu > 2$, then the Riesz transform, $\nabla\Delta^{-1/2}$, is bounded on L^p for all $p \in (1, \nu)$.*

Remark 2.2. Here, as also remarked in [6, Remark 3.1], we note that the aforementioned result also holds for $1 < \nu \leq 2$. However, since the assumptions already imply (R $_p$) for all $1 < p \leq 2$ (see Remark 2.3 later), the case where $1 < \nu \leq 2$ is not that interesting. In particular, we will use this observation in our argument later.

We say M satisfies the relative Faber-Krahn inequality if there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that for all $x \in M$, $R > 0$ and any open subset $\Omega \subset B(x, R)$, we have

$$(FK) \quad \lambda_1(\Omega) \gtrsim R^{-2} \left(\frac{\mu(\Omega)}{V(x, R)} \right)^{-2/\alpha},$$

where $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ stands for the smallest eigenvalue of the Laplacian on Ω for the Dirichlet boundary condition.

Remark 2.3. Although not explicitly stated in Theorem 2.1, $\nabla\Delta^{-1/2}$ is also of weak type $(1, 1)$. Indeed, by combining results from [6], [9], and [14], one obtains the following chain of implications: the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 imply (FK), and, by [14], (FK) is equivalent to the conjunction of (D $_{\mu}$) and (DUE). Finally, as established in [9], (D $_{\mu}$) and (DUE) ensure that $\nabla\Delta^{-1/2}$ is bounded on L^p for $p \in (1, 2]$ and of weak type $(1, 1)$.

The main idea of [6] is to decompose the kernel of $\nabla\Delta^{-1/2}$ into three parts with respect to the following regimes: for some $\kappa \geq 4$,

- (1) $\{(x, y) \in M \times M \setminus \{x = y\}; d(x, y) \geq \kappa^{-1}r(x), r(y) \leq \kappa r(x)\}$.
- (2) $\{(x, y) \in M \times M \setminus \{x = y\}; d(x, y) \leq \kappa^{-1}r(x)\}$.
- (3) $\{(x, y) \in M \times M \setminus \{x = y\}; r(y) \geq \kappa r(x)\}$.

For simplicity, we write $\nabla\Delta^{-1/2} = T_1 + T_2 + T_3$, where $T_j(x, y)$ is the kernel of Riesz transform restricted to the regime (j) , ($j = 1, 2, 3$). The following lemma is a combination of [6, Proposition 4.1, 4.2; Lemma 3.2] (also see Remark 2.2).

Lemma 2.4. [6] *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold satisfying (QD), (VC), (RCE) and (RD $_{\nu}^{\circ}$) for some $\nu > 1$. We have the following results:*

- (i) T_1 is bounded on L^p for all $p \in (1, \infty)$.
- (ii) T_2 is bounded on L^p for all $p \in (2, \infty)$.
- (iii) T_3 has kernel estimate: for any $x, y \in M$,

$$|T_3(x, y)| \lesssim \frac{r(y)}{r(x)} \frac{1}{V(o, r(y))}.$$

Next, for later use (the proof of Theorem 1.3), one considers M satisfying (QD) and bounded geometry condition. We keep the notations from [12] for convenience.

Definition 2.5. Let $o \in M$ and $r_0 > 0$. We say that the ball $B = B(x, r)$

- (i) is remote if $r \leq r(x)/2$,
- (ii) is anchored if $x = o$,
- (iii) is admissible if B is remote or anchored with radius $r \leq r_0$.

Definition 2.6. M is said to satisfy L^q -Poincaré inequality on the end if for every admissible ball B ,

$$(PE_q) \quad \|f - f_B\|_{L^q(B)} \lesssim r \|\nabla f\|_{L^q(B)}, \quad \forall f \in \text{vol}^\infty(B),$$

where r is the radius of B .

The following lemma is a direct consequence of [6, Theorem 2.4] and [12, Theorem 2.3].

Lemma 2.7. Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold with bounded geometry which satisfies (QD), (RD $_\nu$) ($\nu > 1$), (VC) and (RCE). Then, one deduces

- (i) (D $_\mu$) and (DUE) hold on M .
- (ii) The following version L^p -Hardy inequality holds

$$\int_M \left(\frac{|f(x)|}{1+r(x)} \right)^p dx \lesssim \int_M |\nabla f|^p dx, \quad \forall f \in C_c^\infty(M)$$

for all $1 \leq p < \nu$.

Proof. For (i), see [6, Theorem 2.4] or Remark 2.3. Next, for (ii), [34, Theorem 5.6.5] guarantees (PE $_q$) holds on M for all $q \geq 1$ (since M satisfies (QD)). Therefore, it follows by [12, Theorem 2.3], see also [31], that (D $_\mu$), (RCE), (PE $_q$) and (RD $_\nu$) imply the above L^p Hardy's inequality for all $1 \leq p < \nu$. □

3. ENDPOINT ESTIMATE FOR RIESZ TRANSFORM

In this section, we give a quick proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Recall notations from Section 2. We decompose the Riesz transform into three parts:

$$\nabla \Delta^{-1/2} = T_1 + T_2 + T_3.$$

It follows by Lemma 2.4 (also see [6, Proposition 4.1, 4.2]) that T_1, T_2 are bounded on L^ν and hence are of restricted weak type (ν, ν) . Therefore, it suffices to study operator

$$\mathcal{T} : f \mapsto r(\cdot)^{-1} \int_{B(o, \kappa r(\cdot))^c} \frac{r(y)}{V(o, r(y))} |f(y)| dy.$$

Define function

$$\mathcal{G}_x(y) = \frac{r(y)}{V(o, r(y))} \chi_{M \setminus B(o, \kappa r(x))}(y).$$

It follows by Hardy-Littlewood inequality and Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}f(x) &\leq r(x)^{-1} \int_0^\infty f^*(t) \mathcal{G}_x^*(t) dt \\ &\leq r(x)^{-1} \|f\|_{(\nu, 1)} \|\mathcal{G}_x\|_{(\nu', \infty)}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{G}_x\|_{(\nu', \infty)}^{\nu'} &= \sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda^{\frac{\nu}{\nu-1}} \text{vol}(\{y \in M; \mathcal{G}_x(y) > \lambda\}) \\ &= \sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda^{\frac{\nu}{\nu-1}} \text{vol}\left(\left\{y \in M; r(y) \geq \kappa r(x) \quad \text{and} \quad V(o, r(y)) < \frac{r(y)}{\lambda}\right\}\right) \\ &:= \sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda^{\frac{\nu}{\nu-1}} \text{vol}(\mathcal{I}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that since $r(y) \geq \kappa r(x)$, one deduces by (RD_ν^o)

$$\left(\frac{r(y)}{\kappa r(x)}\right)^\nu \lesssim \frac{V(o, r(y))}{V(o, \kappa r(x))}.$$

Hence, for $y \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$V(o, r(y)) < \frac{r(y)}{\lambda} = \frac{\kappa r(x)}{\lambda} \frac{r(y)}{\kappa r(x)} \leq C \frac{\kappa r(x)}{\lambda} \frac{V(o, r(y))^{1/\nu}}{V(o, \kappa r(x))^{1/\nu}}.$$

This implies

$$V(o, r(y)) \leq C \lambda^{\frac{-\nu}{\nu-1}} \left(\frac{r(x)}{V(o, \kappa r(x))^{1/\nu}}\right)^{\frac{\nu}{\nu-1}}.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vol}(\mathcal{I}) &\leq \text{vol}\left(\left\{y \in M; V(o, r(y)) \leq C \lambda^{\frac{-\nu}{\nu-1}} \left(\frac{r(x)}{V(o, \kappa r(x))^{1/\nu}}\right)^{\frac{\nu}{\nu-1}}\right\}\right) \\ &\leq C \lambda^{\frac{-\nu}{\nu-1}} \left(\frac{r(x)}{V(o, \kappa r(x))^{1/\nu}}\right)^{\frac{\nu}{\nu-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

It is now plain that

$$\|\mathcal{G}_x\|_{(\nu', \infty)} \lesssim \frac{r(x)}{V(o, \kappa r(x))^{1/\nu}}.$$

To this end, one concludes that

$$\mathcal{T}f(x) \lesssim \frac{\|f\|_{(\nu, 1)}}{V(o, \kappa r(x))^{1/\nu}}.$$

The proof is then complete since $V(o, \kappa r(x))^{-1/\nu} \in L^{\nu, \infty}$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda^\nu \text{vol}(\{x \in M; V(o, \kappa r(x))^{-1/\nu} > \lambda\}) \\ &= \sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda^\nu \text{vol}(\{x \in M; V(o, \kappa r(x)) < \lambda^{-\nu}\}) \\ &\lesssim 1. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.1. We mention that this result is sharp in the Lorentz sense. Indeed, by [29], the Riesz transform on metric cone is not even of weak type (p_0, p_0) , where p_0 is an endpoint in the metric cone setting. Some similar results could be found in [24] and the author's Ph.D. thesis.

□

4. FROM HARDY TO REVERSE RIESZ

In this section, we verify the implication (i) \implies (ii) in Theorem 1.2.

As mentioned before, under the assumptions (QD), (VC) and (RCE), M satisfies (D $_{\mu}$) and (DUE). Then, a result of [15] guarantees the estimate for time-derivative of heat kernel:

$$|\partial_t e^{-t\Delta}(x, y)| \lesssim \frac{1}{tV(x, \sqrt{t})} e^{-\frac{d(x, y)^2}{ct}}, \quad \forall x, y \in M, \quad \forall t > 0.$$

Recall that $o \in M$ is a fixed point and we use notion $r(x) = d(x, o)$ for all $x \in M$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold satisfying (QD), (VC), (RD $_{\nu}$) ($\nu > 1$) and (RCE). Then, (H $_p$) implies (RR $_p$) for all $p \in (1, \nu)$.*

Proof of Theorem 4.1. First of all, by [6, Theorem A] and duality, we only need to confirm (RR $_p$) for

$$(4.1) \quad p \in \begin{cases} (1, \nu), & 1 < \nu \leq 2, \\ (1, \frac{\nu}{\nu-1}], & \nu > 2. \end{cases}$$

Let $o \in M$ be fixed. By [8], there exists a smooth function η_{ϵ} ($\epsilon > 0$) such that

- $\text{supp}(\eta_{\epsilon}) \subset B(o, 4\epsilon/3)$,
- $\eta_{\epsilon} = 1$ on $B(o, \epsilon)$,
- $\|\eta_{\epsilon}\|_{\infty} + \epsilon\|\nabla\eta_{\epsilon}\|_{\infty} + \epsilon^2\|\Delta\eta_{\epsilon}\|_{\infty} \lesssim 1$.

Let $\kappa \geq 4$. Then $\eta_{\kappa^{-1}r(y)}(x)$ is a smooth function supported in the regime: $\{4r(y) \geq 3\kappa r(x)\}$.

Next, for the Riesz transform, $\nabla\Delta^{-1/2}$, we have resolution to identity

$$\nabla\Delta^{-1/2} = \int_0^{\infty} \nabla e^{-t\Delta} \frac{dt}{\sqrt{\pi t}}.$$

Denote by $p_t(x, y)$ the heat kernel. We may decompose

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla\Delta^{-1/2}(x, y) &= \int_0^{\infty} \eta_{\kappa^{-1}r(y)}(x) \nabla p_t(x, y) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{\pi t}} + \int_0^{\infty} [1 - \eta_{\kappa^{-1}r(y)}(x)] \nabla p_t(x, y) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{\pi t}} \\ &:= R_1(x, y) + R_2(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Note that R_2 is supported in the range $\{(x, y) \in M \times M \setminus \{x = y\}; r(y) \leq \kappa r(x)\}$. Obviously,

$$|R_2(x, y)| \lesssim T_1(x, y) + T_2(x, y),$$

where T_1, T_2 (introduced in Lemma 2.4) are operators of $\nabla\Delta^{-1/2}$ restricted to the domains:

$$\{(x, y) \in M \times M \setminus \{x = y\}; r(y) \leq \kappa r(x), d(x, y) \geq \kappa^{-1}r(x)\},$$

and

$$\{(x, y) \in M \times M \setminus \{x = y\}; d(x, y) \leq \kappa^{-1}r(x)\}$$

respectively. Then, it follows by Lemma 2.4, also see [6, Proposition 4.1, 4.2], that

$$(4.2) \quad \|R_2\|_{q \rightarrow q} \lesssim \|T_1 + T_2\|_{q \rightarrow q} \lesssim 1$$

for all $q \in (2, \infty)$.

Now, let $f, g \in C_c^{\infty}(M)$ with $\|g\|_{p'} = 1$. We consider inner product

$$\langle \Delta^{1/2} f, g \rangle = \left\langle \int_0^{\infty} \Delta e^{-t\Delta} f \frac{dt}{\sqrt{\pi t}}, g \right\rangle.$$

By the positivity and self-adjointness of Δ ,

$$\langle \Delta e^{-t\Delta} f, g \rangle = \langle f, \Delta e^{-t\Delta} g \rangle = \langle \nabla f, \nabla e^{-t\Delta} g \rangle, \quad \forall t > 0.$$

Hence,

$$\langle \Delta^{1/2} f, g \rangle = \left\langle \nabla f, \int_0^\infty \nabla e^{-t\Delta} g \frac{dt}{\sqrt{\pi t}} \right\rangle = \langle \nabla f, R_1 g \rangle + \langle \nabla f, R_2 g \rangle.$$

By (4.2), it is plain that

$$|\langle \nabla f, R_2 g \rangle| \leq \|\nabla f\|_p \|R_2 g\|_{p'} \lesssim \|\nabla f\|_p.$$

Therefore, we may focus on the following bilinear form

$$\mathcal{I}(f, g) := \int_M \nabla f(x) \cdot \int_M \int_0^\infty \eta_{\kappa^{-1}r(y)}(x) \nabla p_t(x, y) g(y) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{\pi t}} dy dx.$$

Apply integration by parts to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(f, g) &= \int_M f(x) \int_M \int_0^\infty \eta_{\kappa^{-1}r(y)}(x) \Delta_x p_t(x, y) g(y) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{\pi t}} dy dx \\ &\quad - \int_M f(x) \int_M \int_0^\infty \nabla_x [\eta_{\kappa^{-1}r(y)}(x)] \cdot \nabla p_t(x, y) g(y) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{\pi t}} dy dx. \end{aligned}$$

The following estimate is crucial.

Lemma 4.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.1, one has*

$$\int_0^\infty |\nabla_x [\eta_{\kappa^{-1}r(y)}(x)] \cdot \nabla p_t(x, y)| + |\eta_{\kappa^{-1}r(y)}(x) \Delta_x p_t(x, y)| \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \lesssim \frac{\chi_{r(x) \leq 4\kappa^{-1}r(y)/3}}{r(y)V(o, r(y))}.$$

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Recall that on M (see for example [6, Section 3.2, 3.3]), we have gradient estimate

$$|\nabla p_t(x, y)| \leq \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} + \frac{1}{r(x)} \right] \frac{C}{V(x, \sqrt{t})} e^{-\frac{d(x,y)^2}{ct}}, \quad \forall x, y \in M, \quad \forall t > 0.$$

Note that for $r(y) \geq \kappa r(x)$, $d(x, y) \simeq r(y)$. Moreover, for $x \in \text{supp}(\nabla \eta_R)$ ($R > 0$), we have $r(x) \simeq R$ (to be precise, in our situation, $\nabla \eta_R$ supports on $\{\kappa^{-1}r(y) \leq r(x) \leq 4\kappa^{-1}r(y)/3\}$). It is then plain that by (D $_\mu$),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{r(x)^2} |\nabla_x [\eta_{\kappa^{-1}r(y)}(x)]| |\nabla p_t(x, y)| \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} &\lesssim \int_0^{r(x)^2} \frac{\chi_{r(x) \simeq r(y)}}{r(y)} \frac{e^{-\frac{d(x,y)^2}{ct}}}{V(x, \sqrt{t})} \frac{dt}{t} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\chi_{r(x) \simeq r(y)}}{r(y)V(x, r(y))} \int_0^{r(y)^2} e^{-\frac{r(y)^2}{ct}} \left(\frac{r(y)}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^\mu \frac{dt}{t} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\chi_{r(x) \leq 4\kappa^{-1}r(y)/3}}{r(y)V(o, r(y))}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one can use (RD $_\nu$) instead:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{r(x)^2}^\infty |\nabla_x [\eta_{\kappa^{-1}r(y)}(x)]| |\nabla p_t(x, y)| \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} &\lesssim \int_{r(x)^2}^\infty \frac{\chi_{r(x) \simeq r(y)}}{r(y)r(x)} \frac{e^{-\frac{d(x,y)^2}{ct}}}{V(x, \sqrt{t})} \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\chi_{r(x) \simeq r(y)}}{r(y)^2 V(o, r(y))} \int_{r(y)^2}^\infty e^{-\frac{r(y)^2}{ct}} \left(\frac{r(y)}{\sqrt{t}} \right)^\nu \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\chi_{r(x) \leq 4\kappa^{-1}r(y)/3}}{r(y)V(o, r(y))}. \end{aligned}$$

As for the second part of the integral, recall time-derivative estimate:

$$|\partial_t p_t(x, y)| \leq \frac{C}{tV(x, \sqrt{t})} e^{-\frac{d(x, y)^2}{ct}}, \quad \forall x, y \in M, \quad \forall t > 0.$$

One deduces

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty |\eta_{\kappa^{-1}r(y)}(x)| |\Delta_x p_t(x, y)| \frac{dt}{\sqrt{t}} &\lesssim \int_0^\infty \frac{t^{-\frac{3}{2}} \chi_{r(x) \leq 4\kappa^{-1}r(y)/3}}{V(x, \sqrt{t})} e^{-\frac{r(y)^2}{ct}} dt \\ &\lesssim \int_0^{r(y)^2} \frac{t^{-\frac{3}{2}} \chi_{r(x) \leq 4\kappa^{-1}r(y)/3}}{V(o, r(y))} \left(\frac{r(y)}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^\mu e^{-\frac{r(y)^2}{ct}} dt \\ &\quad + \int_{r(y)^2}^\infty \frac{t^{-\frac{3}{2}} \chi_{r(x) \leq 4\kappa^{-1}r(y)/3}}{V(o, r(y))} \left(\frac{r(y)}{\sqrt{t}}\right)^\nu e^{-\frac{r(y)^2}{ct}} dt \\ &\lesssim \frac{\chi_{r(x) \leq 4\kappa^{-1}r(y)/3}}{r(y)V(o, r(y))} \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

Define operator

$$\mathcal{T} : u \mapsto r(\cdot) \int_{B(o, 3\kappa r(\cdot)/4)^c} \frac{u(y)}{r(y)V(o, r(y))} dy.$$

The next ingredient of the proof is the following.

Lemma 4.3. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.1, \mathcal{T} is of weak type (q', q') for all $1 < q < \infty$.*

Proof of Lemma 4.3. By Hölder's inequality, for all $1 < q < \infty$,

$$|\mathcal{T}u(x)| \lesssim r(x) \|u\|_{q'} \left(\int_{B(o, 3\kappa r(\cdot)/4)^c} \frac{dy}{r(y)^q V(o, r(y))^q} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

Introduce the Riemann-Stieljes measure: $V(r) = V(o, r)$. One infers that by setting $\delta = 3\kappa r(x)/4$ and integrating by parts, the integral on the RHS above equals

$$\int_\delta^\infty \frac{1}{r^q V(r)^q} dV(r) = -\frac{1}{\delta^q V(\delta)^{q-1}} - \int_\delta^\infty V(r) [-qr^{-q-1}V(r)^{-q} dr - qV(r)^{-q-1}r^{-q} dV(r)].$$

Hence, one concludes

$$\int_\delta^\infty \frac{1}{r^q V(r)^q} dV(r) \lesssim \frac{1}{\delta^q V(\delta)^{q-1}} + \int_\delta^\infty \frac{1}{r^{q+1} V(r)^{q-1}} dr.$$

By (RD _{ν}),

$$\frac{1}{V(r)^{q-1}} \lesssim \frac{\delta^{\nu(q-1)}}{V(\delta)^{q-1}} r^{-\nu(q-1)}.$$

Consequently, for all $1 < q < \infty$,

$$\int_\delta^\infty \frac{1}{r^{q+1} V(r)^{q-1}} dr \lesssim \frac{\delta^{\nu(q-1)}}{V(\delta)^{q-1}} \int_\delta^\infty r^{-q-1-\nu(q-1)} dr \lesssim \delta^{-q} V(\delta)^{1-q}.$$

Immediately, we deduce

$$|\mathcal{T}u(x)| \lesssim \frac{\|u\|_{q'}}{V(o, r(x))^{\frac{q-1}{q}}}.$$

As a consequence, for all $\lambda > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vol}(\{x \in M; |\mathcal{T}u(x)| > \lambda\}) &\lesssim \text{vol}\left(\left\{x \in M; V(o, r(x)) < \left(\frac{\|u\|_{q'}}{\lambda}\right)^{q'}\right\}\right) \\ &\lesssim \left(\frac{\|u\|_{q'}}{\lambda}\right)^{q'}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e. \mathcal{T} is of weak type (q', q') for all $1 < q < \infty$. \square

Now, by interpolation, one gets in particular that for p in the range (4.1),

$$\|\mathcal{T}g\|_{p'} \lesssim \|g\|_{p'}.$$

Therefore, by Hardy inequality (H_p), and Lemma 4.2, Lemma 4.3

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{I}(f, g)| &\leq \left| \int_M f(x) \int_M \int_0^\infty \eta_{\kappa^{-1}r(y)}(x) \Delta_x p_t(x, y) g(y) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{\pi t}} dy dx \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_M f(x) \int_M \int_0^\infty \nabla_x [\eta_{\kappa^{-1}r(y)}(x)] \cdot \nabla p_t(x, y) g(y) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{\pi t}} dy dx \right| \\ &\lesssim \int_M \frac{|f(x)|}{r(x)} |\mathcal{T}g(x)| dx \lesssim \left\| \frac{f(\cdot)}{r(\cdot)} \right\|_p \|\mathcal{T}g\|_{p'} \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla f\|_p \|g\|_{p'}. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows by duality

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta^{1/2} f\|_p &\leq \sup_{\|g\|_{p'}=1} |\langle \nabla f, R_1 g \rangle| + \sup_{\|g\|_{p'}=1} |\langle \nabla f, R_2 g \rangle| \\ &\lesssim \sup_{\|g\|_{p'}=1} |\mathcal{I}(f, g)| + \sup_{\|g\|_{p'}=1} \|\nabla f\|_p \|R_2 g\|_{p'} \\ &\lesssim \|\nabla f\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Theorem 4.1 is now complete. \square

Remark 4.4. Note that the above proof can also be used to show the implication: (iii) \implies (ii). Indeed, by the argument above, one only needs to show the inner product $\mathcal{I}(f, g)$ is bounded by some constant multiple of $\|\nabla f\|_p \|g\|_{p'}$. Now, instead of treating \mathcal{T} in Lemma 4.3, we consider operator

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}} : u \mapsto \frac{r(\cdot)}{V(o, r(\cdot))^{1/\mu}} \int_{B(o, 3\kappa r(\cdot)/4)^c} \frac{u(y)}{r(y)V(o, r(y))} dy.$$

By some similar estimates as in Lemma 4.3, one checks that

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}u(x)| \lesssim \frac{\|u\|_{q'}}{V(o, r(x))^{1/q'+1/\mu}} = \frac{\|u\|_{q'}}{V(o, r(x))^{1/(q^*)}},$$

where $q^* = \frac{\mu q}{\mu - q}$ for all $1 < q < \nu \leq \mu$. Immediately, one concludes that $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ is of weak type $(q', (q^*)')$. Hence, by interpolation, one deduces for all $0 < s \leq \infty$,

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}u\|_{((p^*)', s)} \lesssim \|u\|_{(p', s)}, \quad \forall u \in C_c^\infty(M).$$

Choosing $s = p'$, one confirms by Lemma 4.2 and (WS_p ^{μ}) that

$$|\mathcal{I}(f, g)| \lesssim \int_M \frac{f(x)}{\rho(x)} |\tilde{\mathcal{T}}g(x)| dx \leq \|f/\rho\|_{(p^*, p)} \|\tilde{\mathcal{T}}g\|_{((p^*)', p')} \lesssim \|\nabla f\|_p \|g\|_{p'}$$

as desired.

Remark 4.5. It is also worth mentioning that in the above proof, the (\mathbf{RD}_ν) condition can be weakened to (\mathbf{RD}_ν^o) . Additionally, it is interesting to note that the harmonic leading coefficient, within the setting of manifolds satisfying the (\mathbf{QD}) curvature condition, appears in exactly the same range as the case studied in [25], i.e. the range where $r(y) \gtrsim r(x)$. The proof of Theorem 4.1 closely follows the approach in [25, Theorem 1.3], where a so-called implicit harmonic annihilation is employed.

5. FROM REVERSE RIESZ TO WEIGHTED SOBOLEV

In this section, we study weighted Sobolev inequality. Classically, one studies Sobolev inequality in the form

$$(5.1) \quad \left(\int_M |f|^{\frac{np}{n-p}} dx \right)^{\frac{n-p}{np}} \lesssim \left(\int_M |\nabla f|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad 1 \leq p < n,$$

where n usually stands for the dimension of M . However, such inequality can be disturbed by very simple perturbation of the geometry. For instance, on the cylinder $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$, (5.1) fails for any $1 \leq p < n + m - 1$. This simple example in a sense suggests that, generally speaking, the topological dimension may not reflect the "real" geometry of a manifold.

In [31], the author proved that on any complete n -dimensional Riemannian manifolds M ($n \geq 3$). If M has non-negative Ricci curvature and satisfies (\mathbf{RD}_ν^o) with some $\nu > 2$, then it admits a weighted Sobolev inequality

$$(5.2) \quad \left(\int_M |f/\rho_o|^{\frac{np}{n-p}} dx \right)^{1-p/n} \lesssim \int_M |\nabla f|^p dx, \quad \forall f \in C_c^\infty(M),$$

with $p = 2$ and

$$\rho_o(x) = \frac{r(x)}{V(o, r(x))^{1/n}}.$$

Subsequently, it follows by [37, Theorem 1.1], a special case, that if one further assumes Poincaré inequality (\mathbf{P}_q) and (\mathbf{D}_n) for some $1 \leq q < \min(\nu, n)$, then (5.2) holds with the same weight ρ_o for $q \leq p < \min(\nu, n)$.

On \mathbb{R}^n , it is well-known that by [32], the Sobolev inequalities admit its sharpest form

$$\|f\|_{(\frac{np}{n-p}, p)} \lesssim \|\nabla f\|_p, \quad 1 \leq p < n.$$

Then, it was proved by Bakry, Coulhon, Ledoux and Saloff-Coste [4] that the classical Sobolev inequality, including its sharpest Lorentz form, can be obtained by a family of "weak type" Sobolev inequalities.

In what follows, we may prove the weighted Sobolev inequality in a different way. The idea is based on [27, Lemma 5.4], see also [28], where the authors proved Hardy type inequalities via the estimates of Riesz potential. In particular, we verify the implication (ii) \implies (iii) in Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 5.1. *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold satisfying (\mathbf{D}_μ) , (\mathbf{RD}_ν) , (\mathbf{DUE}) . Then, (\mathbf{RR}_p) implies (\mathbf{WS}_p^μ) for all $1 < p < \nu$.*

Proof. Since $\Delta^{1/2}C_c^\infty(M)$ is dense in $L^q(M)$ for $1 \leq q < \infty$, see [33, Lemma 1], one only needs to show

$$\mathcal{T} : u \mapsto \rho(\cdot)^{-1} \Delta^{-1/2} u(\cdot)$$

is bounded from $L^p \rightarrow L^{p^*,p}$ for all $1 < p < \nu$ and $u \in C_c^\infty(M)$.

Using the resolution to identity, we have

$$\Delta^{-1/2} = \int_0^\infty e^{-t\Delta} t^{-1/2} dt,$$

where we omit the non-essential constant.

It is well-known that by [16], the conjunction of (D_μ) and (DUE) implies (UE) . Thus, one has kernel estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}(x, y) &\leq \rho(x)^{-1} \int_0^\infty \frac{C}{V(x, \sqrt{t})} e^{-\frac{d(x,y)^2}{ct}} t^{-1/2} dt \\ &\lesssim \rho(x)^{-1} \frac{1}{V(x, d(x, y))} \int_0^{d(x,y)^2} \frac{V(x, d(x, y))}{V(x, \sqrt{t})} e^{-\frac{d(x,y)^2}{ct}} t^{-1/2} dt \\ &\quad + \rho(x)^{-1} \frac{1}{V(x, d(x, y))} \int_{d(x,y)^2}^\infty \frac{V(x, d(x, y))}{V(x, \sqrt{t})} e^{-\frac{d(x,y)^2}{ct}} t^{-1/2} dt. \end{aligned}$$

By (D_μ) , the first term above is thus bounded by

$$\frac{d(x, y)^\mu}{\rho(x)V(x, d(x, y))} \int_0^{d(x,y)^2} e^{-\frac{d(x,y)^2}{ct}} t^{\frac{1-\mu}{2}-1} dt \lesssim \frac{d(x, y)}{\rho(x)V(x, d(x, y))}.$$

While for the second term, one uses (RD_ν) instead and bounds it above by

$$\frac{d(x, y)^\nu}{\rho(x)V(x, d(x, y))} \int_{d(x,y)^2}^\infty e^{-\frac{d(x,y)^2}{ct}} t^{\frac{1-\nu}{2}-1} dt \lesssim \frac{d(x, y)}{\rho(x)V(x, d(x, y))},$$

since $1 < \nu/p < \nu$.

Define

$$\epsilon(x) = \frac{\|u\|_p^{p/\mu}}{V(x, r(x))^{1/\mu} \mathcal{M}(u)(x)^{p/\mu}},$$

where \mathcal{M} stands for the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function. We set

$$\mathcal{O} = \{x \in M; \epsilon(x) \leq 1\}.$$

For $x \in \mathcal{O}$, we proceed in a standard way.

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{T}u(x)| &\lesssim \frac{1}{\rho(x)} \int_{d(x,y) \leq \epsilon(x)r(x)} \frac{d(x, y)}{V(x, d(x, y))} |u(y)| dy \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\rho(x)} \int_{d(x,y) \geq \epsilon(x)r(x)} \frac{d(x, y)}{V(x, d(x, y))} |u(y)| dy := \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{J}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that by (D_μ)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I} &= \rho(x)^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^\infty \int_{\epsilon(x)r(x)/2^{j+1} < d(x,y) \leq \epsilon(x)r(x)/2^j} \frac{d(x, y)}{V(x, d(x, y))} |u(y)| dy \\ &\lesssim \frac{V(x, r(x))^{1/\mu}}{r(x)} \sum_{j=0}^\infty \frac{\epsilon(x)r(x)}{2^j} \frac{1}{V(x, \epsilon(x)r(x)/2^{j+1})} \int_{B(x, \epsilon(x)r(x)/2^j)} |u(y)| dy \\ (5.3) \quad &\lesssim \epsilon(x)V(x, r(x))^{1/\mu} \mathcal{M}(u)(x) = \mathcal{M}(u)(x)^{1-p/\mu} \|u\|_p^{p/\mu}. \end{aligned}$$

As for \mathcal{J} , one deduces by Hölder's inequality

$$\mathcal{J} \leq \rho(x)^{-1} \|u\|_p \left(\int_{B(x, \epsilon(x)r(x))^c} \frac{d(x, y)^{p'}}{V(x, d(x, y))^{p'}} dy \right)^{1/p'}.$$

Introduce Riemann-Stieljes measure: $V(r) = V(x, r)$. One infers by integrating by parts, that the above integral equals (set $R = \epsilon(x)r(x)$ for a moment)

$$\int_R^\infty \frac{r^{p'}}{V(r)^{p'}} dV(r) = \left[\frac{r^{p'}}{V(r)^{p'-1}} \right]_{r=R}^\infty - \int_R^\infty V(r) \left(p' r^{p'-1} V(r)^{-p'} dr - p' V(r)^{-p'-1} r^{p'} dV(r) \right),$$

which gives

$$\int_R^\infty \frac{r^{p'}}{V(r)^{p'}} dV(r) \lesssim \left| \left[\frac{r^{p'}}{V(r)^{p'-1}} \right]_{r=R}^\infty \right| + \int_R^\infty \frac{r^{p'-1}}{V(r)^{p'-1}} dr.$$

Note again by (\mathbf{RD}_ν) , one infers

$$\frac{r^{p'-1}}{V(r)^{p'-1}} \lesssim \frac{R^{\nu(p'-1)}}{V(R)^{p'-1}} r^{-\nu(p'-1)+p'-1}.$$

Consequently, since $1 < p < \nu$, one concludes

$$\mathcal{J} \lesssim \|u\|_p \frac{V(x, r(x))^{1/\mu}}{r(x)} \frac{\epsilon(x)r(x)}{V(x, \epsilon(x)r(x))^{1/p}}.$$

Now, recall that for $x \in \mathcal{O}$, one has $\epsilon(x) \leq 1$. Then, (\mathbf{D}_μ) guarantees that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} &\lesssim \epsilon(x) \|u\|_p V(x, r(x))^{1/\mu-1/p} \left(\frac{V(x, r(x))}{V(x, \epsilon(x)r(x))} \right)^{1/p} \\ (5.4) \quad &\lesssim \epsilon(x)^{1-\mu/p} \frac{\|u\|_p}{V(x, r(x))^{1/p^*}} = \mathcal{M}(u)(x)^{1-p/\mu} \|u\|_p^{p/\mu}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, one considers $x \in \mathcal{O}^c$. It is plain that by a similar argument above and the assumption $\epsilon(x) \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{T}u(x)| &\lesssim \frac{1}{\rho(x)} \int_{d(x, y) \leq r(x)} \frac{d(x, y)}{V(x, d(x, y))} |u(y)| dy \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\rho(x)} \int_{d(x, y) \geq r(x)} \frac{d(x, y)}{V(x, d(x, y))} |u(y)| dy \\ &\lesssim V(x, r(x))^{1/\mu} \mathcal{M}(u)(x) + \frac{\|u\|_p}{V(x, r(x))^{1/p^*}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{\|u\|_p}{V(x, r(x))^{1/p^*}} \lesssim \frac{\|u\|_p}{V(o, r(x))^{1/p^*}}. \end{aligned}$$

To this end, for $\lambda > 0$, it is clear that by maximal theorem

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{vol}(\{x \in M; |\mathcal{T}u(x)| > \lambda\}) &\lesssim \text{vol}(\{x \in \mathcal{O}; \mathcal{M}(u)(x)^{1-p/\mu} \|u\|_p^{p/\mu} > \lambda\}) \\
&+ \text{vol}\left(\left\{x \in M \setminus \mathcal{O}; \frac{\|u\|_p}{V(o, r(x))^{1/p^*}} > \lambda\right\}\right) \\
&\leq \frac{\|u\|_p^{p^* p/\mu} \|\mathcal{M}(u)^{1-p/\mu}\|_{p^*}^{p^*}}{\lambda^{p^*}} \\
&+ \text{vol}\left(\left\{x; V(o, r(x)) < \left(\frac{\|u\|_p}{\lambda}\right)^{p^*}\right\}\right) \\
&\lesssim \left(\frac{\|u\|_p}{\lambda}\right)^{p^*}.
\end{aligned}$$

That is \mathcal{T} is of weak type (p, p^*) for all $1 < p < \nu$. By interpolation on Lorentz spaces, see for example [13, Theorem 1.4.19], we conclude that for all $0 < s \leq \infty$,

$$\|\mathcal{T}u\|_{(p^*, s)} \lesssim \|u\|_{(p, s)}.$$

The proof of Lemma 5.1 follows by choosing $s = p$. □

Remark 5.2. It is clear to see that the above argument also proves the implication (ii) \implies (i), which generalizes the result of [28, Theorem 1.5] (this simple generalization was also mentioned in [12, Question 2.4]). In fact, one only needs to modify the estimates of \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{J} . Replacing $\rho(x) = r(x)$ and $\epsilon = 1$, a similar argument above gives

$$\mathcal{I} \lesssim \mathcal{M}(u)(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{J} \lesssim \frac{\|u\|_{p'}}{V(o, r(x))^{1/p'}}.$$

The implication (ii) \implies (i) then follows directly by maximal theorem and interpolation.

6. FROM WEIGHTED SOBOLEV TO HARDY

To end the proof of Theorem 1.2, we have to confirm the implication (iii) \implies (i). Arguably, on Euclidean space, the classical Sobolev inequality and Hardy inequality are almost "equivalent", see for example [5, Proposition 1.4.1, Proposition 1.4.3].

Lemma 6.1. *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold. Then, (WS_p^μ) implies (H_p) , where $\mu > 1$ and $1 \leq p < \mu$.*

Proof of Lemma 6.1. It is clear that by Hölder's inequality in Lorentz space,

$$\left(\int_M \left|\frac{f(x)}{\rho(x)}\right|^p \left|\frac{\rho(x)}{r(x)}\right|^p dx\right)^{1/p} \leq \left\|\frac{f}{\rho}\right\|_{(p^*, p)} \left\|\frac{\rho}{r}\right\|_{(\mu, \infty)}$$

since

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p^*} + \frac{1}{\mu}, \quad \frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{\infty}.$$

Now, by (\mathbf{WS}_p^μ) , the first term is apparently bounded by $\|\nabla f\|_p$. While for the second term, one checks easily for all $\lambda > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\rho}{r} \right\|_{(\mu, \infty)}^\mu &= \sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda^\mu \text{vol}(\{x \in M; \rho(x)/r(x) > \lambda\}) \\ &= \sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda^\mu \text{vol}(\{x \in M; V(o, r(x)) < \lambda^{-\mu}\}) \\ &\leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

The proof follows immediately. \square

7. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

This section is devoted to prove Theorem 1.3.

Note that in [12], the authors proved that under the assumptions of (\mathbf{D}_μ) , (\mathbf{UE}) , (\mathbf{RD}_ν) for some $\nu > 1$ and (\mathbf{RCE}) . Then, Poincaré on the end (\mathbf{PE}_q) ($1 < q < \min(2, \nu)$) implies (\mathbf{RR}_p) for $q \leq p < 2$. Next, as a corollary, [12, Corollary 1.7], for manifold with Ricci curvature bounded from below, satisfying (\mathbf{QD}) , (\mathbf{VC}) , (\mathbf{RCE}) and (\mathbf{RD}_ν) ($\nu > 1$), (\mathbf{RR}_p) holds for all $p \in (1, \infty)$. In the following, to better understand the interplay between Riesz and reverse Riesz transforms, we present an alternative proof by using the method established in previous sections.

Most of the arguments are followed by the proof of Theorem 4.1. We only need to make some necessary modifications. Recall notions $R_1, R_2, \mathcal{I}, \eta, \mathcal{T}$ from Section 4.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. By duality, it suffices to consider (\mathbf{RR}_p) with p in the range (4.1). The only obstacle is that the Hardy inequality we got (see Lemma 2.7) is slightly different to the normal one (\mathbf{H}_p) .

Let $f \in C_c^\infty(M)$. Pick some cut-off function $\mathcal{X} \in \text{vol}^\infty(M)$ such that $\text{supp}(\mathcal{X}) \subset B(o, 2)$ and $\mathcal{X} = 1$ on $B(o, 1)$. Split $f = f\mathcal{X} + f(1 - \mathcal{X}) := f_0 + f_1$. We start by claiming

$$(7.1) \quad \|\Delta^{1/2} f_0\|_p \lesssim \|\nabla f\|_p$$

for all p in the range (4.1).

By spectral theory, one writes

$$\Delta^{1/2} = \int_0^1 \Delta(\Delta + k^2)^{-1} dk + \int_1^\infty \Delta(\Delta + k^2)^{-1} dk := \mathcal{O}_L + \mathcal{O}_H.$$

Lemma 7.1. *Let M be a complete Riemannian manifold with bounded geometry. Then, the high energy part:*

$$\mathcal{O}_H : u \mapsto \int_1^\infty \Delta(\Delta + k^2)^{-1} u(\cdot) dk$$

satisfies

$$\|\mathcal{O}_H u\|_q \lesssim \|\nabla u\|_q, \quad \forall u \in C_c^\infty(M)$$

for all $1 < q < \infty$.

Proof of Lemma 7.1. The result is a direct consequence of duality and bounded geometry property. Let $v \in C_c^\infty(M)$ with $\|v\|_{q'} \leq 1$. By the positivity and self-adjointness of Δ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{O}_H u, v \rangle &= \left\langle \nabla u, \int_1^\infty \nabla(\Delta + k^2)^{-1} v dk \right\rangle \\ &\leq \|\nabla u\|_q \left\| \int_1^\infty \nabla(\Delta + k^2)^{-1} v dk \right\|_{q'}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the operator above applying to v is nothing but the high energy part of the Riesz transform (see [23, Proposition 5.1]). By [23, Proposition 5.1], one infers that

$$\left\| \int_1^\infty \nabla(\Delta + k^2)^{-1} v dk \right\|_{q'} \lesssim \|v\|_{q'}$$

for all $1 < q < \infty$. We mention that the proof of [23, Proposition 5.1] is employable provided that M has bounded geometry and Δ satisfies finite speed of propagation, see for example [35, 36] for a formal definition. Next, by [35], this finite speed propagation property is equivalent to the so-called Davies-Gaffney condition with respect to Δ , which holds on any complete Riemannian manifolds. The result follows by ranging all $\|v\|_{q'} \leq 1$. \square

Next, we treat the low energy part \mathcal{O}_L . Observe that

$$\Delta(\Delta + k^2)^{-1} = \text{Id} - k^2(\Delta + k^2)^{-1}.$$

Hence, for $1 < q < \infty$

$$(7.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{O}_L\|_{q \rightarrow q} &= \left\| \int_0^1 \Delta(\Delta + k^2)^{-1} dk \right\|_{q \rightarrow q} \leq \int_0^1 \|\Delta(\Delta + k^2)^{-1}\|_{q \rightarrow q} dk \\ &\leq 1 + \int_0^1 k^2 \|(\Delta + k^2)^{-1}\|_{q \rightarrow q} dk \lesssim 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by writing $(\Delta + k^2)^{-1} = \int_0^\infty e^{-t\Delta} e^{-tk^2} dt$ and using the contractivity of heat semigroup. Now, it is plain that by Lemma 7.1 and (7.2) that

$$\|\Delta^{1/2} f_0\|_p \lesssim \|f_0\|_p + \|\nabla f_0\|_p \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(B(o,2))} + \|\nabla f\|_p.$$

Note that for $x \in B(o, 2)$, one checks $1 + r(x) \leq 3$. It is then clear that by Lemma 2.7 (ii),

$$(7.3) \quad \|f\|_{L^p(B(o,2))} \lesssim \left\| \frac{f(\cdot)}{1+r(\cdot)} \right\|_p \lesssim \|\nabla f\|_p, \quad \forall 1 < p < \nu.$$

The claim (7.1) has been verified.

To this end, we need to confirm

$$\|\Delta^{1/2} f_1\|_p \lesssim \|\nabla f\|_p, \quad \forall p \text{ in (4.1)}.$$

It follows by a similar argument as in Section 4, we have by Lemma 4.2

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{I}(f_1, g)| &\leq \left| \int_M f_1(x) \int_M \int_0^\infty \eta_{\kappa^{-1}r(y)}(x) \Delta_x p_t(x, y) g(y) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{\pi t}} dy dx \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_M f_1(x) \int_M \int_0^\infty \nabla_x [\eta_{\kappa^{-1}r(y)}(x)] \cdot \nabla p_t(x, y) g(y) \frac{dt}{\sqrt{\pi t}} dy dx \right| \\ &\lesssim \int_M \frac{|f_1(x)|}{r(x)} |\mathcal{T}g(x)| dx. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for $x \in B(o, 1)^c$, one has $1 + r(x) \lesssim r(x)$. Thus, by Lemma 2.7 (ii) and Lemma 4.3, the above is bounded by

$$\left\| \frac{f(\cdot)}{1+r(\cdot)} \right\|_p \|\mathcal{T}g\|_{p'} \lesssim \|\nabla f\|_p \|g\|_{p'}.$$

It then follows by duality that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Delta^{1/2} f_1\|_p &\leq \sup_{\|g\|_{p'}=1} |\langle \nabla f_1, R_1 g \rangle| + \sup_{\|g\|_{p'}=1} |\langle \nabla f_1, R_2 g \rangle| \\
&\lesssim \sup_{\|g\|_{p'}=1} |\mathcal{I}(f_1, g)| + \sup_{\|g\|_{p'}=1} \|\nabla f_1\|_p \|R_2 g\|_{p'} \\
&\lesssim \|\nabla f\|_p + \|\nabla f_1\|_p \lesssim \|\nabla f\|_p + \|f\|_{L^p(B(o,2))} \\
&\lesssim \|\nabla f\|_p,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by (7.3). Combining this with (7.1), the proof of Theorem 1.3 is complete. \square

Remark 7.2. The proof of (7.3) is, in fact, a direct consequence of p -hyperbolicity of the manifold (see, for example, [38, 11]) and this p -hyperbolic property is an immediate consequence of L^p Hardy's inequality.

Acknowledgments. Part of this article is included in the author's Ph.D. thesis. I want to express my gratitude to my supervisor Adam Sikora for all the support and encouragement.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Auscher and T. Coulhon. Riesz transform on manifolds and Poincaré inequalities. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 4(3):531–555, 2005. [4](#), [5](#)
- [2] P. Auscher, T. Coulhon, X. T. Duong, and S. Hofmann. Riesz transform on manifolds and heat kernel regularity. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 37(6):911–957, 2004. [2](#)
- [3] D. Bakry. Étude des transformations de Riesz dans les variétés riemanniennes à courbure de Ricci minorée. In *Séminaire de Probabilités, XXI*, volume 1247 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 137–172. Springer, Berlin, 1987. [2](#)
- [4] D. Bakry, T. Coulhon, M. Ledoux, and L. Saloff-Coste. Sobolev inequalities in disguise. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 44(4):1033–1074, 1995. [5](#), [13](#)
- [5] A. A. Balinsky, W. D. Evans, and R. T. Lewis. *The analysis and geometry of Hardy's inequality*. Universitext. Springer, Cham, 2015. [16](#)
- [6] G. Carron. Riesz transform on manifolds with quadratic curvature decay. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 33(3):749–788, 2017. [3](#), [4](#), [6](#), [7](#), [9](#), [10](#)
- [7] G. Carron, T. Coulhon, and A. Hassell. Riesz transform and L^p -cohomology for manifolds with Euclidean ends. *Duke Math. J.*, 133(1):59–93, 2006. [2](#), [3](#)
- [8] J. Cheeger and T. H. Colding. Lower bounds on Ricci curvature and the almost rigidity of warped products. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 144(1):189–237, 1996. [9](#)
- [9] T. Coulhon and X. T. Duong. Riesz transforms for $1 \leq p \leq 2$. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 351(3):1151–1169, 1999. [2](#), [4](#), [6](#)
- [10] T. Coulhon and X. T. Duong. Riesz transform and related inequalities on noncompact Riemannian manifolds. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 56(12):1728–1751, 2003. [4](#)
- [11] B. Devyver. A perturbation result for the Riesz transform. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5)*, 14(3):937–964, 2015. [19](#)
- [12] B. Devyver and E. Russ. Reverse inequality for the riesz transforms on riemannian manifolds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.05083*, 2022. [5](#), [7](#), [16](#), [17](#)
- [13] L. Grafakos et al. *Classical fourier analysis*, volume 2. Springer, 2008. [16](#)
- [14] A. Grigor'yan. Heat kernel upper bounds on a complete non-compact manifold. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, 10(2):395–452, 1994. [6](#)
- [15] A. Grigor'yan. Upper bounds of derivatives of the heat kernel on an arbitrary complete manifold. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 127(2):363–389, 1995. [9](#)
- [16] A. Grigor'yan. Gaussian upper bounds for the heat kernel on arbitrary manifolds. *J. Differential Geom.*, 45(1):33–52, 1997. [2](#), [14](#)
- [17] A. Grigor'yan and L. Saloff-Coste. Stability results for Harnack inequalities. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 55(3):825–890, 2005. [3](#)

- [18] A. Grigor'yan and L. Saloff-Coste. Heat kernel on manifolds with ends. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 59(5):1917–1997, 2009. [2](#)
- [19] C. Guillarmou and A. Hassell. Resolvent at low energy and Riesz transform for Schrödinger operators on asymptotically conic manifolds. I. *Math. Ann.*, 341(4):859–896, 2008. [2](#)
- [20] C. Guillarmou and A. Hassell. Resolvent at low energy and Riesz transform for Schrödinger operators on asymptotically conic manifolds. II. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 59(4):1553–1610, 2009. [2](#)
- [21] A. Hassell, D. Nix, and A. Sikora. Riesz transforms on a class of non-doubling manifolds II. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 73(3):955–1003, 2024. [2](#)
- [22] A. Hassell and A. Sikora. Riesz transforms in one dimension. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 58(2):823–852, 2009. [4](#)
- [23] A. Hassell and A. Sikora. Riesz transforms on a class of non-doubling manifolds. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 44(11):1072–1099, 2019. [2](#), [3](#), [18](#)
- [24] D. He. Endpoint estimates for riesz transform on manifolds with ends. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata (1923-)*, pages 1–15, 2024. [3](#), [8](#)
- [25] D. He. Reverse riesz inequality on manifolds with ends, 2024. [4](#), [5](#), [13](#)
- [26] R. Jiang and F. Lin. Riesz transform on exterior Lipschitz domains and applications. *Adv. Math.*, 453:Paper No. 109852, 48, 2024. [4](#)
- [27] R. Killip, M. Visan, and X. Zhang. Riesz Transforms Outside a Convex Obstacle. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2016(19):5875–5921, 11 2015. [4](#), [13](#)
- [28] M. Lansade. Lower bound of Schrödinger operators on Riemannian manifolds. *J. Spectr. Theory*, 13(1):153–199, 2023. [13](#), [16](#)
- [29] H.-Q. Li. La transformation de riesz sur les variétés coniques. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences-Series I-Mathematics*, 326(10):1167–1170, 1998. [2](#), [3](#), [8](#)
- [30] J. Lott and Z. Shen. Manifolds with quadratic curvature decay and slow volume growth. *Annales scientifiques de l'École Normale Supérieure*, Ser. 4, 33(2):275–290, 2000. [2](#)
- [31] V. Minerbe. Weighted Sobolev inequalities and Ricci flat manifolds. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 18(5):1696–1749, 2009. [7](#), [13](#)
- [32] R. O'Neil. Convolution operators and $L(p, q)$ spaces. *Duke Math. J.*, 30:129–142, 1963. [5](#), [13](#)
- [33] E. Russ. Riesz transforms on graphs for $1 \leq p \leq 2$. *Math. Scand.*, 87(1):133–160, 2000. [13](#)
- [34] L. Saloff-Coste. *Aspects of Sobolev-type inequalities*, volume 289 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002. [7](#)
- [35] A. Sikora. Riesz transform, gaussian bounds and the method of wave equation. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 247:643–662, 2004. [18](#)
- [36] R. S. Strichartz. Analysis of the Laplacian on the complete Riemannian manifold. *J. Functional Analysis*, 52(1):48–79, 1983. [1](#), [18](#)
- [37] D. Tewodrose. Adimensional weighted Sobolev inequalities in PI spaces. *Ann. Fenn. Math.*, 47(1):351–379, 2022. [13](#)
- [38] M. Troyanov. Parabolicity of manifolds. *Siberian Adv. Math.*, 9(4):125–150, 1999. [19](#)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY
 Email address: dangyang.he@students.mq.edu.au, hedangyang@gmail.com