

A counterexample to a weak-type estimate for potential spaces and tangential approach regions

Javier Soria*

Dept. Appl. Math. and Analysis
University of Barcelona
E-08071 Barcelona, SPAIN
E-mail: soria@mat.ub.es

Olof Svensson

Dept. of Science and Technology
Campus Norrköping, Linköping University
SE-601 74 Norrköping, SWEDEN
E-mail: olosv@itn.liu.se

November 7, 2018

Abstract

We show that for every nontrivial potential space $L_K^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, there exists an approach region for which the associated maximal function is of weak-type, but the boundedness for the completed region is false, which is in contrast with the nontangential case.

Mathematics Subject Classification 2000: 42B25, 42B20.

Keywords: Potential spaces, maximal functions, approach regions.

*Research partially supported by Grants BFM2001-3395 and 2001SGR00069.

1 Introduction

In [NS84] it was proved that Fatou's theorem holds on regions Ω , larger than cones (but still nontangential), by means of the boundedness of the associated maximal function M_Ω . One of the key points in that proof is that one could replace the given region, by a larger region $\widehat{\Omega}$ obtained by adding a cone at any point of Ω , and then prove that the boundedness of the two maximal functions M_Ω and $M_{\widehat{\Omega}}$ are equivalent. This seems geometrically very natural, since the difference, at any point, between $\widehat{\Omega}$ and Ω , is just the canonical approach region (i.e., a cone).

In [NRS82] Fatou's theorem was extended to some tangential approach regions, when the functions were assumed to have some a priori smoothness (they belonged to a potential space). This result was later on generalized in [RS97] to characterize all the approach regions (under a completion hypothesis similar to the one in [NS84]) for which the convergence holds for the potential spaces.

The main result of this paper is to show that, contrary to the case of [NS84], the assumptions on the region assumed in [RS97], which is natural as we mentioned before, from the point of view of convergence, turns out to give different boundedness results for the corresponding maximal operators. In order to clarify this statement, let us introduce some notations:

Let $P_t(x)$ be the Poisson kernel in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} . Given a set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$, we define the maximal function:

$$M_\Omega f(x) = \sup_{(y,t) \in \Omega_x} |P_t * f(y)|,$$

where $\Omega_x = x + \Omega$.

If $r : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is an increasing function, then we define the "cone" for the function r as:

$$\Gamma_r(x, t) = \{(y, s) : |x - y| \leq r(s) - r(t)\}.$$

If $r(t) = t$, then $\Gamma_t = \Gamma$ is a nontangential cone.

We say that Ω satisfies the r -condition if $\Gamma_r(x, t) \subset \Omega$ for all $(x, t) \in \Omega$. For example, in the case of nontangential approach, $r(t) = t$ and the r -condition is the cone condition of [NS84]. The function r is determined, in each case, from the potential space under consideration.

The potential space considered here is $L_K^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$:

$$L_K^1(\mathbb{R}^n) = \{f : f = K * F, F \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\}.$$

The kernel K is positive and integrable, but unbounded ($K(0) = \infty$), nonnegative and radial (if $|x| = |y|$, then $K(x) = K(y)$), and decreasing (if $|x| \leq |y|$, then $K(x) \geq K(y)$). We consider the following norm on the potential space $L_K^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$:

$$\|f\|_{L_K^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \inf_{f=K*F} \|F\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

For the space $L_K^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have that if $r_K(t) = \|P_t * K\|_\infty^{-1/n}$, then the region $\Gamma_K = \Gamma_{r_K}$ is tangential, under the above assumptions on the kernel K (see [NRS82]). This can be expressed as

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{r_K(t)}{t} = \infty. \quad (1.1)$$

In case of the Bessel potential spaces $L_\alpha^1(\mathbb{R}^n) = \{F * G_\alpha : F \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)\}$ (where G_α is the Bessel potential), then $r_{G_\alpha}(t) = t^{1-\alpha/n}$.

As a consequence of Theorem 2.6 in [RS97], we know that if Ω satisfies the r_K -condition, then $M_\Omega : L_K^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if and only if $|\Omega(t)| \leq C(r_K(t))^n$, for all $t > 0$, where $\Omega(t) = \{x : (x, t) \in \Omega\}$.

Given an approach region Ω , we can always define the smallest region containing Ω , satisfying the r_K -condition as follows:

$$\widehat{\Omega}_K = \{(y, t) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} : \exists(x, s) \in \Omega, |x - y| \leq r_K(t) - r_K(s)\}.$$

Then it is easy to show that $\widehat{\Omega}_K$ satisfies the r_K -condition, and $\Omega \subset \widehat{\Omega}_K$.

In the nontangential case it was proved in [NS84] that $M_\Omega : L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if and only if $M_{\widehat{\Omega}} : L^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. However, we will show in Theorem 2.1 that under the above conditions on K , and hence (1.1) holds, then this equivalence fails in general. This is somehow surprising, since $M_{\Gamma_K} : L_K^1(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (see [NRS82]). Therefore, even though the boundary convergence holds within both Ω and the ‘‘cone’’ Γ_K , it fails for the completed region $\widehat{\Omega}_K$.

2 Main theorem

We now prove our main result, namely that the characterization in [NS84] does not hold for tangential regions: a maximal operator M_Ω can be of weak type (1,1) while the maximal operator for the completed region, $M_{\widehat{\Omega}_K}$ fails to be of weak type (1,1).

Theorem 2.1. *For each of the potential spaces $L_K^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, there exists a region Ω with the following properties:*

(i) Ω satisfies the cone condition.

(ii) $|\Omega(t)| \leq C(r_K(t))^n$.

(iii) $|\{M_\Omega f > \lambda\}| \leq C \frac{\|f\|_{L_K^1}}{\lambda}$.

(iv) $\frac{|\widehat{\Omega}_K(t)|}{(r_K(t))^n}$ is unbounded.

(v) $M_{\widehat{\Omega}_K}$ is not of weak type $(1,1)$.

The proof uses the following lemma from [Sjö83].

Lemma 2.2. *Assume the operators T_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots$, are defined in \mathbb{R}^n by*

$$T_k f(x) = \sup_{s \in I_k} (K_s * |f|)(x), \quad (2.1)$$

where the K_s are integrable and non-negative in \mathbb{R}^n , and the index sets I_k are such that $T_k f$ are measurable for any measurable f . Let for each $i = 1, \dots, n$ a sequence $(\gamma_{ki})_{k=1}^\infty$ be given with $\gamma_{ki} \geq \gamma_{k+1,i} > 0$ and assume the T_k are uniformly of weak type $(1,1)$, and

$$\text{supp } K_s \subset \{x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n; |x_i| \leq \gamma_{ki}, i = 1, \dots, n\}, s \in I_k,$$

and

$$\int K_s^* \leq C_0, \quad s \in \bigcup_k I_k,$$

where for $s \in I_k$

$$K_s^*(x) = \sup\{K_s(x+y); |y_i| \leq \gamma_{k+N,i}, i = 1, \dots, n\} \quad (2.2)$$

for some fixed natural number N . Then the operator

$$Tf(x) = \sup_k T_k f(x),$$

is of weak type $(1,1)$.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. For simplicity, we will usually drop the subscript K , and we will write $r(t) = r_K(t)$, although for the regions Γ_K we will keep it. Also, we only consider the case $n = 1$ (higher dimensions require minor modifications).

We start with the construction of the region Ω : for this we choose a set of points ω from which we obtain the region Ω by completing ω with nontangential cones.

To construct ω , we define a curve $\gamma(t)$,

$$\gamma(t) = N(t)r(t),$$

where $N(t)$ is an integer valued function that tends to infinity as $t \rightarrow 0$. There are some restrictions on how fast $N(t)$ may increase, which will be explained below.

The first condition on $N(t)$ is that $\gamma(t) = N(t)r(t)$ should tend to zero as $t \rightarrow 0$. We also need a sequence t_k decreasing to 0 fast enough, the precise meaning of this is described later on.

Consider the tangential curve $(\gamma(t), t)$, for small $t > 0$. If we compare the curve $\gamma(t)$ to the curve $r(t)$, which defines the region Γ_K , we get

$$\frac{\gamma(t)}{r(t)} = N(t) \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } t \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.3)$$

This shows that γ is well outside Γ_K .

Now choose a starting level, t_1 , this will need to be small, exactly how small, will be made clear below. Let $x_1^1 = \gamma(t_1)$. The first $N(t_1)$ points in the set ω are

$$\{(x_i^1, t_1) : x_i^1 = x_1^1 - ir(t_1), 0 \leq i \leq N(t_1) - 1\}.$$

These points (x_i^1, t_1) have to be well outside the nontangential cone Γ . More precisely:

$$\gamma(t_1) - (N(t_1) - 1)r(t_1) = r(t_1) > 3t_1.$$

If t_1 is small enough this is true, due to the tangentiality of Γ_K (see (1.1)), and we choose t_1 to be any such number.

We proceed inductively, assuming that we have chosen t_{k-1} , and added the $N(t_{k-1})$ points at this level to ω .

Now choose any $t_k < t_{k-1}$ satisfying

$$\gamma(t_k) + (t_{k-1} - t_k) < 2t_{k-1} \quad (2.4)$$

which is to say that after adding the nontangential cone to $(\gamma(t_k), t_k)$ the region thus obtained is contained in the nontangential cone Γ_{2t} , at height t_{k-1} . It is obvious that this cone does not intersect the previously chosen points in ω . Now add the following $N(t_k)$ points to the set ω :

$$\{(x_i^k, t_k) : x_i^k = \gamma(t_k) - ir(t_k), 0 \leq i \leq N(t_k) - 1\}.$$

This finishes the construction on the level t_k . If we continue this way, the set of points ω is obtained.

We end up with a set of points ω which are arbitrarily close to the boundary, whose number at height t_k increases to infinity as $t_k \rightarrow 0$. The region Ω is then obtained by completing ω with the nontangential cone Γ .

We still have to determine the function $N(t)$: we impose also another condition to make sure that the cross-sections of Ω will satisfy the right estimate:

$$|\Omega(t)| \leq Cr(t). \quad (2.5)$$

We start at any level t_k and move upwards to t_{k-1} . At the level t_k the region Ω consists of one part that is contained in a fixed nontangential cone with vertex at the origin, this part comes from the lower levels (see (2.4)), and here the size estimate (2.5) is obvious.

The other part consists of $N(t_k)$ points, as we move upwards, first each interval will have a size at height t which is bounded from above by t , this is the case if t is below $t_k + \frac{1}{2}r(t_k)$, the size of the union of these intervals is then bounded from above by $tN(t_k)$. For larger t the intervals will have met and the size estimate follows, if it holds while they are disjoint. If we impose on $N(t)$ that

$$tN(t) < r(t) \quad (2.6)$$

then the size of the disjoint intervals will have the correct upper bound. Since the region Γ_K is tangential, this can be achieved, while $N(t)$ tends to infinity as $t \rightarrow 0$.

If we instead complete the region Ω with the tangential region associated with the potential space L_K^1 , that is Γ_K , then $|\widehat{\Omega}_K(t)|/r(t)$ will not be bounded, since otherwise we could find a constant C such that:

$$|\widehat{\Omega}_K(t)| \leq Cr(t). \quad (2.7)$$

At levels $t \in [t_k, 2t_k]$ we will have $N(t_k)$ intervals that are almost disjoint (observe that by (2.4), $2t_k < t_{k-1}$), and the measure of the union of these intervals can be estimated from below by a constant times $N(t_k)r(t_k)$ at height $2t_k$. We thus have

$$|\widehat{\Omega}_K(2t_k)| \geq CN(t_k)r(t_k).$$

Letting $t = 2t_k$ in (2.7) we see that in order for the above estimates to be compatible, we must have

$$N(t_k)r(t_k) \leq Cr(2t_k)$$

and this is only possible if $N(t)$ is bounded, since $r(t_k) \sim r(2t_k)$ (this follows from the related relation for the Poisson kernel, $P_t(x) \sim P_{2t}(x)$). Therefore,

$\widehat{\Omega}_K$ cannot satisfy the necessary condition (2.5), and hence, $M_{\widehat{\Omega}_K}$ cannot be of weak type (1,1) (by Theorem 2.6 in [RS97]).

Now that the region Ω is defined (and we have dealt with (i), (ii), (iv), and (v) as soon as we show the existence of N), we need to prove the weak type of the maximal operator (i.e., (iii)). For a set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ and a function u defined in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} we define the maximal operator $\mathcal{M}_\Omega u(x) = \sup_{\Omega_x} |u|$. Hence, $\mathcal{M}_\Omega(P_t * f)(x) = M_\Omega f(x)$.

We can, without loss of generality, assume that the function F is positive. First we split the kernel $K_t(x) = P_t * K(x)$ into two parts, the local part of the kernel and the tail:

$$K_t(x) = (\chi_{|x| < 3\gamma(t)} + \chi_{|x| > 3\gamma(t)}) K_t(x) = K_{1,t} + K_{2,t}.$$

First we consider the tail, $K_{2,t}$. We need to estimate the following

$$(K_{2,t} * F)(x + x'), \text{ where } (x', t) \in \Omega \subset \{(y, t) : |y| \leq \gamma(t)\}.$$

Assuming, $|x'| \leq \gamma(t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (K_{2,t} * F)(x + x') &= \int_{\{|y| > 3\gamma(t)\}} K_t(y) F(x + x' - y) dy \\ &= \int_{\{|y+x'| > 3\gamma(t)\}} K_t(y + x') F(x - y) dy \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} K_t(y/2) F(x - y) dy. \end{aligned}$$

We know that since K is radially decreasing, the same is true for K_t , and the boundedness of $\mathcal{M}_\Omega(K_{2,t} * F)$ then follows from Lemma 2.2 in [NRS82].

We now turn to the local part of the kernel; i.e., $K_{1,t}$. Let ω_k be the part of ω whose points have the second coordinate equal to t_k :

$$\omega_k = \{x; (x, t_k) \in \omega\}.$$

Let

$$\Omega_k = (\omega_k + \Gamma) \cap \{(x, t); x \in \mathbb{R}, t_k \leq t \leq t_{k-1}\}$$

for $k > 1$, and for $k = 1$ let $\Omega_1 = \omega_1 + \Gamma$. Then $\Omega \subset \Gamma_{3t} \cup (\cup \Omega_k)$. We split the operator as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_\Omega(K_{1,t} * F)(x) &\leq \sup_k \mathcal{M}_{\Omega_k}(K_{1,t} * F)(x) + \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_{3t}}(K_{1,t} * F)(x) \\ &= \sup_k T_k F(x) + \mathcal{M}_{\Gamma_{3t}}(K_{1,t} * F)(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $T_k F(x) = \mathcal{M}_{\Omega_k}(K_{1,t} * F)(x)$.

To use Lemma 2.2 we need uniform weak type (1,1) estimates for the operators T_k , and they also have to fit the terminology of Lemma 2.2, which we will do below. The main advantage of the lemma is that we can assume t is in a fixed interval, away from 0.

To obtain the weak type (1,1) estimate, we first consider the part of Ω_k which lies between the levels t_k and $2r(t_k)$, which is $\Omega_k^1 = \{(x, t) \in \Omega_k; t_k < t < 2r(t_k)\}$. This part, Ω_k^1 , consists of $N(t_k)$ non-tangential cones with vertices at the points (x_i^k, t_k) , $i = 0, \dots, N(t_k) - 1$. Let $\Omega_{k,i}^1 = ((x_i^k, t_k) + \Gamma) \cap \Omega_k^1$, for $i = 0, \dots, N(t_k)$, where we define $x_{N(t_k)}^k = 0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{M}_{\Omega_k^1}(K_{1,t} * F)\|_{1,\infty} &\leq \left\| \sup_{0 \leq i \leq N(t_k)-1} \mathcal{M}_{\Omega_{k,i}^1}(K_{1,t} * F) \right\|_{1,\infty} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{N(t_k)-1} \|\mathcal{M}_{\Omega_{k,i}^1}(K_{1,t} * F)\|_{1,\infty} \quad (2.8) \\ &\leq N(t_k) \|\mathcal{M}_{\Omega_{k,N(t_k)}^1}(K_{1,t} * F)\|_{1,\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from translation invariance. The operator needs to be bounded uniformly in k so we need to see that the factor $N(t_k)$ does not cause any problem. To proceed, we make a dyadic decomposition of the kernel $K_{1,t}$, and we get (F is positive),

$$\begin{aligned} (K_{1,t}(x)\chi_{|x|<3\gamma(t)}) * F &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{[C \log \gamma(t)/t]} (K_{1,t}(2^{k-1}t)\chi_{|x|<2^k t}) * F \\ &\leq C \sum_{k=1}^{[C \log \gamma(t)/t]} (2^{k-1}t)(K_{1,t}(2^{k-1}t)\frac{1}{2^{k-1}t}\chi_{|x|<2^k t}) * F \\ &\leq C \sum_{k=1}^{[C \log \gamma(t)/t]} (2^{k-1}t)K_{1,t}(2^{k-1}t)MF(x) \\ &\leq CMF(x) \int_t^{\gamma(t)} K_{1,t}(x)dx, \end{aligned}$$

where $MF(x)$ is the usual Hardy-Littlewood maximal function. In order to bound (2.8) uniformly in k , we must find a bound on the integral times $N(t_k)$, for which we replace the limits with the smallest (respectively the largest) t allowed; i.e.,

$$N(t_k) \int_{t_k}^{\gamma(t_{k-1})} K_{1,t}(x)dx \leq N(t_k) \|P_t\|_{L^1} \int_{t_k}^{\gamma(t_{k-1})} K(x)dx.$$

The remaining integral in the right hand side decreases to 0 as t_k tends to 0, i.e. $k \rightarrow \infty$, since both limits in the integral then tend to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Thus

by choosing $N(t)$ to increase slowly enough to ∞ as $t \rightarrow 0$, we can bound the above expression uniformly in k . This is the final restriction on $N(t)$. We have thus seen that it is always possible to find an unbounded $N(t)$ satisfying the above restrictions, as long as the kernel K satisfies our assumptions.

Thus we can estimate the maximal operator by the usual Hardy-Littlewood maximal function, which gives the weak type (1,1) for the operator $F \mapsto \mathcal{M}_{\Omega_k^1}(K_{1,t} * F)$ uniformly in k , if $k > 1$.

For the rest of Ω_k , i.e. if $2r(t_k) \leq t \leq t_{k-1}$, then $\Omega_k(t)$ consists of one interval, and we know from above that for this region we have the correct bound on the size.

Hence, the weak type (1,1) of the operator

$$F \mapsto \sup_{\substack{t > 2r(t_k) \\ (x,t) \in \Omega_k}} (K_{1,t} * F)(x),$$

follows, since the region we take the supremum over is contained in a tangential region, of the right sort. This completes the proof of the uniform weak type (1,1) of T_k , $k > 1$.

The weak type (1,1) for $\mathcal{M}_{\Omega_1}(K_{1,t} * F)$ follows by the same methods. First take that part of Ω_1 which lies between the levels t_1 and $2r(t_1)$. Again, we will get a similar expression as above and this can be dealt with the same way. When $t > 2r(t_1)$, the region Ω_1 is contained in the tangential region Γ_K , and the weak type (1,1) is proved.

Finally, we must check that our operators can be defined as in Lemma 2.2, and that they satisfy the assumptions of the lemma. Let the index set I_k be equal to Ω_k and set for $s = (x', t) \in I_k$,

$$K_s(x) = K_{1,t}(x + x').$$

Then $T_k F(x) = \sup_{s \in I_k} (K_s * F)(x)$. To estimate the support of $K_s = K_{(x,t)}$, we see that the support is largest when $t = t_{k-1}$, which is the largest t in the index set I_k . The support of $K_{1,t_{k-1}}$ is contained in the set $\{x; |x| \leq \gamma(t_{k-1})\}$, hence we can bound the support of K_s , $s \in I_k$, taking $\gamma_k = 3\gamma(t_{k-1})$. If we take $N = 2$, then we can bound the integral of K_s^* uniformly in $s \in \cup I_k$. With an x outside the support of K_s , we need only increase the support of the kernel $K_{1,t}$. If $s \in I_k$, using (2.4) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty K_s^*(x) dx &\leq \int_0^{\gamma_{k+2}} K_s^*(x) dx + \int_{\gamma_{k+2}}^\infty K_s^*(x) dx \\ &\leq \int_0^{3\gamma(t_{k+1})} K_t(0) dx + \int_{3\gamma(t_{k+1})}^\infty K_t(x - 3\gamma(t_{k+1})) dx \\ &\leq 3 \frac{\gamma(t_{k+1})}{r(t_k)} + \int_0^\infty K_t(x) dx \leq 3 \frac{t_k}{r(t_k)} + \|K_t\|_{L^1}, \end{aligned}$$

and from (1.1) it follows that this expression is uniformly bounded in k for all $s \in \cup I_k$. Lemma 2.2 now gives the weak type (1,1) for $\sup_k T_k$, and hence for $\mathcal{M}_\Omega K_{1,t}$.

Finally, we have proved a weak type estimate for both $\mathcal{M}_\Omega K_{1,t}$ and $\mathcal{M}_\Omega K_{2,t}$, and we have finished the proof of the theorem. \square

References

- [NRS82] A. Nagel, W. Rudin, and J. Shapiro, *Tangential boundary behavior of functions in Dirichlet-type spaces*, Ann. of Math. **116** (1982), 331–360.
- [NS84] A. Nagel and E. Stein, *On certain maximal functions and approach regions*, Adv. Math. **54** (1984), 83–106.
- [RS97] J.A. Raposo and J. Soria, *Best approach regions for potential spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **125** (1997), 1105–1109.
- [Sjö83] P. Sjögren, *Fatou theorems and maximal functions for eigenfunctions of the Laplace-Beltrami operator in a bidisk*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **345** (1983), 93–110.