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Abstract. Let $\mu$ be a nonnegative Radon measure on $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ which only satisfies $\mu(B(x, r)) \leqslant$ $C_{0} r^{n}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}, r>0$, with some fixed constants $C_{0}>0$ and $n \in(0, d]$. In this paper, a new characterization for the space $\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)$ of Tolsa in terms of the John-Strömberg sharp maximal function is established.
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## 1. Introduction

Let $\mu$ be a nonnegative Radon measure on $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ which only satisfies the growth condition that there exist $C_{0}>0$ and $n \in(0, d]$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$ and $r>0$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu(B(x, r)) \leqslant C_{0} r^{n} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $B(x, r)$ is the open ball according to the usual Euclidean metric with the center at $x$ and the radius $r$. Such a measure $\mu$ in (1.1) is not necessarily doubling, which is a key assumption in the classical theory of harmonic analysis. Recall that $\mu$ is said to be doubling if there exists $C>0$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$ and $r>0$, $\mu(B(x, 2 r)) \leqslant C \mu(B(x, r))$. During the recent years, it was shown that many results on the Calderón-Zygmund theory remain valid for non-doubling measures. One of the main motivations for extending the classical theory to the non-doubling context was the solution of several questions related to analytic capacity, like Vitushkin's
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conjecture or Painlevé's problem; see [10], [11], [13] or survey papers [12], [14], [15], [16] for more details.

In [9], Tolsa found a suitable substitute for the classical BMO space in this setting, which is denoted by $\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)$. This space is small enough to posses the properties such as the John-Nirenberg inequality and big enough for Calderón-Zygmund operators which are bounded on $L^{2}(\mu)$ to be also bounded from $L^{\infty}(\mu)$ into $\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)$. It should be pointed out that BMO-type spaces with non-doubling measures were also considered by Mateu, Mattila, Nicolau and Orobitg in [5], as well as by Nazarov, Treil and Volberg in [7]. However, none of them can guarantee both the above mentioned properties at the same time.

The purpose of this paper is to establish a new characterization for $\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)$ in terms of the John-Strömberg sharp maximal function. Our result shows that as in the case that $\mu$ is the $d$-dimensional Lebesgue measure, a measurable function $f$ belongs to $\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)$ if and only if its John-Strömberg sharp maximal function is in $L^{\infty}(\mu)$, and the local integrability of $f$ is superfluous in the definition of $f \in \operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)$. To state this result more precisely, we first recall some definitions and notation.

By a cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d}$ we mean a closed cube whose sides are parallel to the axes and centered at some point of $\operatorname{supp} \mu$, and we denote its side length by $l(Q)$. If $\mu\left(\mathbb{R}^{d}\right)<\infty$, we also regard $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ as a cube. Let $\alpha, \beta$ be two positive constants. We say that a cube $Q$ is $(\alpha, \beta)$-doubling if it satisfies $\mu(\alpha Q) \leqslant \beta \mu(Q)$, where and in what follows, given $\lambda>0$ and any cube $Q, \lambda Q$ denotes the cube with the same center as $Q$ whose radius is $\lambda$ times that of $Q$. It was pointed out by Tolsa (see [9, pp. 95-96]) that if $\beta>\alpha^{n}$, then for any $x \in \operatorname{supp} \mu$ and any $R>0$ there exists an $(\alpha, \beta)$-doubling cube $Q$ centered at $x$ with $l(Q) \geqslant R$, and that if $\beta>\alpha^{d}$, then for $\mu$-almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$ there exists a sequence of $(\alpha, \beta)$-doubling cubes $\left\{Q_{k}\right\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ centered at $x$ with $l\left(Q_{k}\right) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. In the sequel, by a doubling cube we mean a $\left(2, \beta_{d}\right)$-doubling cube, where $\beta_{d}$ is a constant such that $\beta_{d}>2^{d}$.

For any cube $Q$, let $\widetilde{Q}$ be the smallest doubling cube which has the form $2^{k} Q$ with $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup\{0\}$. For two cubes $Q_{1} \subset Q_{2}$, set

$$
K_{Q_{1}, Q_{2}}=1+\sum_{k=1}^{N_{Q_{1}, Q_{2}}} \frac{\mu\left(2^{k} Q_{1}\right)}{\left[l\left(2^{k} Q_{1}\right)\right]^{n}}
$$

where $N_{Q_{1}, Q_{2}}$ is the first positive integer $k$ such that $l\left(2^{k} Q_{1}\right) \geqslant l\left(Q_{2}\right)$.
As usual, $L_{\text {loc }}^{1}(\mu)$ denotes the set of all locally integrable functions with respect to $\mu$. We now recall the definition of $\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)$ given by Tolsa in [9].

Definition 1. Let $\varrho \in(1, \infty)$ be fixed. We say that $f \in L_{\mathrm{loc}}^{1}(\mu)$ is in the space $\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)$ if there exists some constant $C_{1} \geqslant 0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{Q} \frac{1}{\mu(\varrho Q)} \int_{Q}\left|f(x)-m_{\widetilde{Q}}(f)\right| \mathrm{d} \mu(x) \leqslant C_{1} \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and for any two doubling cubes $Q_{1} \subset Q_{2}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|m_{Q_{1}}(f)-m_{Q_{2}}(f)\right| \leqslant C_{1} K_{Q_{1}, Q_{2}} \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the supremum is taken over all cubes centered at some point of supp $\mu$, and $m_{Q}(f)$ denotes the mean value of $f$ on $Q$, that is,

$$
m_{Q}(f)=\frac{1}{\mu(Q)} \int_{Q} f(y) \mathrm{d} \mu(y)
$$

The minimal constant $C_{1}$ in (1.2) and (1.3) is defined to be the $\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)$ norm of $f$ and denoted by $\|f\|_{\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)}$.

For a cube $Q$ with $\mu(Q) \neq 0$ and a real-valued $\mu$-measurable function $f$, we define the median value of $f$ on the cube $Q$, denoted by $m_{f}(Q)$, to be one of the numbers such that

$$
\mu\left(\left\{y \in Q: f(y)>m_{f}(Q)\right\}\right) \leqslant \frac{1}{2} \mu(Q)
$$

and

$$
\mu\left(\left\{y \in Q: f(y)<m_{f}(Q)\right\}\right) \leqslant \frac{1}{2} \mu(Q)
$$

For the case $\mu(Q)=0$, we define $m_{f}(Q)=0$. If $f$ is complex-valued, the median value $m_{f}(Q)$ of $f$ is defined by

$$
m_{f}(Q)=m_{\operatorname{Re}(f)}(Q)+\mathrm{i}_{\operatorname{Im}(f)}(Q)
$$

where $\mathrm{i}^{2}=-1$.
Let $0<s<1$. For any fixed cube $Q$ and $\mu$-measurable function $f$, we define the quantity $m_{0, s ; Q}(f)$ by

$$
m_{0, s ; Q}(f)=\inf \left\{t>0: \mu(\{y \in Q:|f(y)|>t\})<s \mu\left(\frac{3}{2} Q\right)\right\}
$$

if $\mu\left(\frac{3}{2} Q\right) \neq 0$, and $m_{0, s ; Q}(f)=0$ if $\mu\left(\frac{3}{2} Q\right)=0$. The John-Strömberg sharp maximal function $M_{0, s}^{\sharp} f$ for any $\mu$-measurable function $f$ is defined by

$$
M_{0, s}^{\sharp} f(x)=\sup _{Q \ni x} m_{0, s ; Q}\left(f-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right)+\sup _{\substack{x \in Q \subset R \\ Q, R \text { doubling }}} \frac{\left|m_{f}(Q)-m_{f}(R)\right|}{K_{Q, R}} .
$$

For the case that $\mu$ is the $d$-dimensional Lebesgue measure, this sharp maximal operator was introduced by John [3] and then rediscovered by Strömberg [8].

Using $M_{0, s}^{\sharp}$, we introduce the function space $\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)$ as follows.

Definition 2. Let $s \in(0,1)$. A $\mu$-measurable function $f$ is said to belong to the space $\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)$ if $M_{0, s}^{\sharp} f \in L^{\infty}(\mu)$. Moreover, $\left\|M_{0, s}^{\sharp} f\right\|_{L^{\infty}(\mu)}$ is defined to be the $\operatorname{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)$ norm of $f$ and denoted by $\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}$.

The main purpose of this paper is to establish the coincidence between the space $\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)$ and the space $\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)$ in a certain range of $s$.

Theorem 1. Let $s \in\left(0, \beta_{d}^{-2} / 2\right)$. The space $\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)$ and the space $\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}$ $(\mu)$ coincide with equivalent norms.

Remark 1. If $\mu$ is the $d$-dimensional Lebesgue measure, it was proved by Strömberg in [8] that $\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)=\operatorname{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)$ if and only if $s \in(0,1 / 2]$. A crucial ingredient in Strömberg's proof is Lemma 3.6 therein, which heavily depends on the doubling property of the considered measure $\mu$. It is not clear so far if there is a proper substitution of Lemma 3.6 in [8] when $\mu$ is a nonnegative Radon measure only satisfying (1.1).

Remark 2. Let $\mu$ be an absolutely continuous measure on $\mathbb{R}^{d}$, namely, such that there exists a weight $\omega$ such that $d \mu=\omega \mathrm{d} x$. Lerner [4] also established the John-Strömberg characterization of $\mathrm{BMO}(\omega)$ in [5].

We now give some applications of Theorem 1.

Corollary 1. Let $f$ be a measurable function with respect to $\mu$. If $f$ satisfies (1.3) for doubling cubes, then $f \in \operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)$ if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup _{Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d}} \frac{1}{\mu\left(\frac{3}{2} Q\right)} \mu\left(\left\{y \in Q:\left|f(x)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right|>t\right\}\right)=0 . \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\varphi$ be a strictly increasing and nonnegative function on $[0, \infty)$ such that

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(t)=\infty
$$

Denote by $\varphi^{-1}$ the inverse function of $\varphi$. Notice that for any cube $Q$,

$$
m_{0, s ; Q}\left(f-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right) \leqslant \varphi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{s \mu\left(\frac{3}{2} Q\right)} \int_{Q} \varphi\left(\left|f(x)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right|\right) \mathrm{d} \mu(x)\right) .
$$

From this and Theorem 1, we immediately deduce the following conclusion.

Corollary 2. Let $f$ be a measurable function with respect to $\mu$. If $f$ satisfies (1.3) for doubling cubes, $\varphi(|f|)$ is $\mu$-locally integrable and

$$
\sup _{Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d}} \frac{1}{\mu\left(\frac{3}{2} Q\right)} \int_{Q} \varphi\left(\left|f(x)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right|\right) \mathrm{d} \mu(x)<\infty
$$

then $f \in \operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)$.
We remark that Corollary 2 when $\varphi(r)=r^{p}$ with $p \in(0,1)$ was obtained in [1], which was used to obtain the boundedness of some operators in $\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)$ and Lebesgue spaces with non-doubling measures; see [1] and [6]. Other typical examples of $\varphi$ satisfying Corollary 2 are

$$
\varphi(t)=\underbrace{\log (\ldots \log }_{k}\left(e^{k}+t\right) \ldots)
$$

with $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
Throughout the paper, we always denote by $C$ a positive constant which is independent of the main parameters, but it may vary from line to line. A constant with subscript such as $C_{1}$ does not change in different occurrences. The symbol $A \lesssim B$ means that $A \leqslant C B$, and the symbol $A \sim B$ means that $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$. For a $\mu$-measurable set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^{d}$, we denote by $\chi_{E}$ the characteristic function of $E$.

## 2. Proofs of Theorem 1 and Corollary 1

We begin with some preliminary lemmas. The following Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 are special cases of Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 2.3 in [2], respectively. For reader's convenience, we still present some details here.

Lemma 1. Let $s \in\left(0, \beta_{d}^{-1} / 2\right]$ and let $Q$ be a doubling cube. If $f$ is real-valued, then

$$
\left|m_{f}(Q)\right| \leqslant m_{0, s ; Q}(f) .
$$

Proof. If $f$ is real-valued and $m_{f}(Q) \geqslant 0$, we have
$\left\{y \in Q:|f(y)| \geqslant\left|m_{f}(Q)\right|\right\}=\left\{y \in Q: f(y) \geqslant m_{f}(Q)\right\} \cup\left\{y \in Q: f(y) \leqslant-m_{f}(Q)\right\} ;$ and if $m_{f}(Q)<0$, then
$\left\{y \in Q:|f(y)| \geqslant\left|m_{f}(Q)\right|\right\}=\left\{y \in Q: f(y) \geqslant-m_{f}(Q)\right\} \cup\left\{y \in Q: f(y) \leqslant m_{f}(Q)\right\}$.

Therefore, by the definition of $m_{f}(Q)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu\left(\left\{y \in Q:|f(y)| \geqslant\left|m_{f}(Q)\right|\right\}\right) \geqslant & \max \left\{\mu\left(\left\{y \in Q: f(y) \geqslant m_{f}(Q)\right\}\right),\right. \\
& \left.\mu\left(\left\{y \in Q: f(y) \leqslant m_{f}(Q)\right\}\right)\right\} \geqslant \mu(Q) / 2
\end{aligned}
$$

This fact implies that for any $t>0$ satisfying

$$
\mu(\{y \in Q:|f(y)|>t\})<s \mu\left(\frac{3}{2} Q\right)
$$

we have that $t \geqslant\left|m_{f}(Q)\right|$; otherwise we have a contradiction

$$
\mu\left(\left\{y \in Q:|f(y)| \geqslant\left|m_{f}(Q)\right|\right\}\right)<s \mu(2 Q) \leqslant \frac{1}{2} \mu(Q)
$$

Then the desired conclusion follows by taking the infimum over $t$, which completes the proof of Lemma 1.

Now for any $\mu$-measurable function $f$, we define the doubling local maximal function $M_{0, s}^{d} f$ by

$$
M_{0, s}^{d} f(x)=\sup _{Q \ni x, Q \text { doubling }} m_{0, s ; Q}(f) .
$$

Lemma 2. Let $s \in\left(0, \beta_{d}^{-1}\right)$. Then for any $\lambda>0$,

$$
\mu\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}:|f(x)|>\lambda\right\} \leqslant \mu\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}: M_{0, s}^{d} f(x) \geqslant \lambda\right\}\right)\right.
$$

Proof. We first claim that

$$
\mu\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}: \chi_{\left\{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d}:|f(y)|>\lambda\right\}}(x)>\beta_{d} s\right\}\right) \leqslant \mu\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}: M_{0, s}^{d} f(x) \geqslant \lambda\right\}\right) .
$$

In fact, the Lebesgue differentiation theorem tells that for $\mu$-a.e. $x$ such that $|f(x)|>\lambda$, there is a doubling cube $Q$ containing $x$ such that

$$
\mu(\{y \in Q:|f(y)|>\lambda\})>s \mu\left(\frac{3}{2} Q\right)
$$

while for any $t>m_{0, s ; Q}(f)$ we have

$$
\mu(\{y \in Q:|f(y)|>t\})<s \mu\left(\frac{3}{2} Q\right) .
$$

These facts indicate that $m_{0, s ; Q}(f) \geqslant \lambda$ and hence $M_{0, s}^{d} f(x) \geqslant \lambda$.
Observe that for $s \in\left(0, \beta_{d}^{-1}\right)$,

$$
\left.\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}:|f(x)|>\lambda\right\}\right) \subset\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}: \chi_{\left\{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d}:|f(y)|>\lambda\right\}}(x)>\beta_{d} s\right\} .
$$

The desired conclusion of Lemma 2 then follows directly.

Lemma 3. For any fixed $q>0$ and a real-valued function $f \in \operatorname{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)$, let $f_{q}(x)=f(x)$ when $|f(x)| \leqslant q$, and $f_{q}(x)=q f(x) /|f(x)|$ when $|f(x)|>q$. Moreover, for each $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d}$, let

$$
m_{f}^{q}(Q)=\min \left(m_{f}^{+}(Q), q\right)-\min \left(m_{f}^{-}(Q), q\right)
$$

where $m_{f}^{+}(Q)=\max \left(m_{f}(Q), 0\right)$ and $m_{f}^{-}(Q)=-\min \left(m_{f}(Q), 0\right)$. Then for any cubes $Q$ and $R$,

$$
\left|m_{f}^{q}(Q)-m_{f}^{q}(R)\right| \leqslant\left|m_{f}(Q)-m_{f}(R)\right|
$$

and

$$
\left|f_{q}-m_{f}^{q}(Q)\right| \leqslant\left|f-m_{f}(Q)\right| .
$$

Proof. We only prove the first conclusion of this lemma by similarity. Without loss of generality, we may assume $m_{f}(Q)<m_{f}(R)$. We then have the following three cases.

Case 1. $m_{f}(Q)>0$ and $m_{f}(R)>0$. In this case, $m_{f}^{q}(Q)=\min \left(m_{f}(Q), q\right)$ and $m_{f}^{q}(R)=\min \left(m_{f}(R), q\right)$. A trivial computation yields to that if $m_{f}(Q) \geqslant q$ and $m_{f}(R) \geqslant q$, then $\left|m_{f}^{q}(Q)-m_{f}^{q}(R)\right|=0$; if $m_{f}(Q)<q$ and $m_{f}(R)<q$, then

$$
\left|m_{f}^{q}(Q)-m_{f}^{q}(R)\right|=\left|m_{f}(Q)-m_{f}(R)\right| ;
$$

and if $m_{f}(Q)<q \leqslant m_{f}(R)$, then

$$
\left|m_{f}^{q}(Q)-m_{f}^{q}(R)\right|=q-m_{f}(Q) \leqslant\left|m_{f}(Q)-m_{f}(R)\right|
$$

Case 2. $m_{f}(Q) \leqslant 0$ and $m_{f}(R) \leqslant 0$. In this case, $m_{f}^{q}(Q)=-\min \left(-m_{f}(Q), q\right)$ and $m_{f}^{q}(R)=-\min \left(-m_{f}(R), q\right)$. Exactly as in Case 1, we also have

$$
\left|m_{f}^{q}(Q)-m_{f}^{q}(R)\right| \leqslant\left|m_{f}(Q)-m_{f}(R)\right| .
$$

Case 3. $m_{f}(Q) \leqslant 0<m_{f}(R)$. In this case, $m_{f}^{q}(Q)=-\min \left(-m_{f}(Q), q\right)$ and

$$
m_{f}^{q}(R)=\min \left(m_{f}(R), q\right)
$$

Thus, if $-m_{f}(Q) \geqslant q$ and $m_{f}(R) \geqslant q$, then $\left|m_{f}^{q}(Q)-m_{f}^{q}(R)\right|=0$; if $-m_{f}(Q)<q$ and $m_{f}(R)<q$, then

$$
\left|m_{f}^{q}(Q)-m_{f}^{q}(R)\right|=\left|m_{f}(Q)-m_{f}(R)\right| ;
$$

if $m_{f}(R)<q \leqslant-m_{f}(Q)$, then

$$
\left|m_{f}^{q}(Q)-m_{f}^{q}(R)\right|=q+m_{f}(R) \leqslant\left|m_{f}(Q)-m_{f}(R)\right| ;
$$

and if $-m_{f}(Q)<q \leqslant m_{f}(R)$, then

$$
\left|m_{f}^{q}(Q)-m_{f}^{q}(R)\right|=q-m_{f}(Q) \leqslant\left|m_{f}(Q)-m_{f}(R)\right|
$$

Combining these estimates then leads to the first conclusion of Lemma 3.
Lemma 4. For any given $f \in L_{\text {loc }}^{1}(\mu)$, let $\|f\|_{\text {。 be defined to be the minimal }}$ constant $C_{2} \geqslant 0$ such that

$$
\sup _{Q \ni x} \frac{1}{\mu(2 Q)} \int_{Q}\left|f(y)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right| \mathrm{d} \mu(y) \leqslant C_{2},
$$

and for any two doubling cubes $Q \subset R$,

$$
\left|m_{f}(Q)-m_{f}(R)\right| \leqslant C_{2} K_{Q, R}
$$

Then $\|\cdot\|_{0}$ is a norm of $\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)$, which is equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_{\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)}$.
Lemma 4 was established by Tolsa in [9, p.116]. Based on this, we identify $\|f\|_{\text {o }}$ with $\|f\|_{\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)}$. Moreover, by Remark 2.7 of [9], we can also replace $\mu(2 Q)$ by $\mu(\varrho Q)$ with any fixed $\varrho>1$ in Lemma 4 to obtain other equivalent norms of $\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)$.

Proof of Theorem 1. It is easy to verify that if $f \in \operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)$, then for any cube $Q$,

$$
m_{0, s ; Q}\left(f-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right) \leqslant \frac{s^{-1}}{\mu\left(\frac{3}{2} Q\right)} \int_{Q}\left|f(x)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right| \mathrm{d} \mu(x),
$$

and so

$$
\|f\|_{\operatorname{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)} \lesssim s^{-1}\|f\|_{\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)}
$$

To see the inverse, if we can prove that for all real-valued functions $f \in$ $\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|f\|_{\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)} \lesssim\|f\|_{\operatorname{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}, \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

then for any function $f \in \operatorname{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)$ with $f=f_{1}+i f_{2}$, where $f_{1}$ and $f_{2}$ are the real and the imaginary part of $f$ respectively, since $\left\|f_{1}\right\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}$ and $\left\|f_{2}\right\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}$ are both no more than $\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}$, we then also have that (2.1) holds for any $f \in \mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)$ and this would complete the proof of Theorem 1.

To prove (2.1), if $\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}=0$, the definition of $\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}$ tells us on the one hand that for any doubling $Q$ and $R, m_{f}(Q)=m_{f}(R)$, and on the other
hand that $\sup _{Q} m_{0, s ; Q}\left(f-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right)=0$. Therefore there is a constant $Z$ such that for any doubling cube $Q, m_{f}(Q)=Z$ and so $m_{0, s ; Q}(f-Z)=0$ for any doubling cube $Q$. This via Lemma 2 shows that $f(x)=Z$ for $\mu$-almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$, and then $\|f\|_{\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)}=0$.

Now we assume $\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}>0$. For each fixed cube $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d}$, set $Q^{\prime}=\frac{4}{3} Q$. Let $B$ be a positive constant which will be determined later. Recalling that $s \in$ $\left(0, \beta_{d}^{-2} / 2\right)$, we can take $\gamma>\beta_{d}$ such that $\gamma s<\beta_{d}^{-1} / 2$. For $\mu$-a.e. $x \in Q$ such that

$$
\left|f(x)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right|>B\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)},
$$

by the Lebesgue differentiation theorem there is a doubling cube $Q_{x}$ centered at $x$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
m_{Q_{x}}\left(\chi_{\left\{y \in \mathbb{R}^{d}:\left|f(y)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right|>B\|f\|_{\text {RBMO }_{0, s}(\mu)}\right\}}\right)>\gamma s . \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, we can suppose that $Q_{x}$ is the biggest doubling cube satisfying (2.2) with side length $2^{-k} l(Q)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $l\left(Q_{x}\right) \leqslant l(Q) / 10$. By Besicovitch's covering theorem, there exists an almost disjoint subfamily $\left\{Q_{i}\right\}_{i}$ of $\left\{Q_{x}\right\}_{x}$ such that

$$
\left\{x \in Q:\left|f(x)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right|>B\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}\right\} \subset \bigcup_{i} Q_{i}
$$

Because $Q_{i}$ satisfies (2.2) and $Q_{i} \subset Q^{\prime}$, it is easy to see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i} \mu\left(Q_{i}\right) & <\gamma^{-1} s^{-1} \sum_{i} \mu\left(\left\{x \in Q_{i}:\left|f(x)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right|>B\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}\right\}\right) \\
& \leqslant \gamma^{-1} s^{-1} \mu\left(\left\{x \in Q^{\prime}:\left|f(x)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right|>B\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}\right\}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Notice that the definition of $M_{0, s}^{\sharp} f(x)$ implies that for any $\varepsilon>0$,

$$
\mu\left(\left\{y \in Q^{\prime}:\left|f(y)-m_{f}\left(\widetilde{Q^{\prime}}\right)\right|>\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}+\varepsilon\right\}\right)<s \mu\left(\frac{3}{2} Q^{\prime}\right)
$$

Therefore, if we can show that there exists a constant $C_{3}>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|m_{f}\left(\widetilde{Q^{\prime}}\right)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right| \leqslant C_{3}\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

by taking $\varepsilon=\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}$ and $B>C_{3}+2$ we then have

$$
\begin{align*}
\sum_{i} \mu\left(Q_{i}\right) & \leqslant \gamma^{-1} s^{-1} \mu\left(\left\{x \in Q^{\prime}:\left|f(x)-m_{f}\left(\widetilde{Q^{\prime}}\right)\right|>2\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}\right\}\right)  \tag{2.4}\\
& <\gamma^{-1} \mu(2 Q)
\end{align*}
$$

We now prove (2.3). In fact, if $l(\widetilde{Q}) \leqslant l\left(\widetilde{Q^{\prime}}\right)$, then $\widetilde{Q} \subset 4 \widetilde{Q^{\prime}}$. Setting $Q^{\prime \prime}=\widetilde{4 \widetilde{Q^{\prime}}}$, by Lemma 2.1 in [9], we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|m_{f}\left(\widetilde{Q^{\prime}}\right)-m_{f}\left(Q^{\prime \prime}\right)\right| & \leqslant K_{\widetilde{Q^{\prime}}, Q^{\prime \prime}}\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)} \\
& \lesssim\left(K_{\widetilde{Q^{\prime}}, 4 \widetilde{Q^{\prime}}}+K_{4 \widetilde{Q^{\prime} Q^{\prime \prime}}}\right)\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)} \\
& \lesssim\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|m_{f}\left(Q^{\prime \prime}\right)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right| \leqslant K_{\widetilde{Q}, Q^{\prime \prime}}\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)} & \lesssim K_{Q, Q^{\prime \prime}}\|f\|_{\operatorname{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)} \\
& \lesssim\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}
\end{aligned}
$$

We then see that

$$
\left|m_{f}\left(\widetilde{Q^{\prime}}\right)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right| \leqslant\left|m_{f}\left(\widetilde{Q^{\prime}}\right)-m_{f}\left(Q^{\prime \prime}\right)\right|+\left|m_{f}\left(Q^{\prime \prime}\right)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right| \lesssim\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)} .
$$

Assume now that $l\left(\widetilde{Q^{\prime}}\right) \leqslant l(\widetilde{Q})$, then $\widetilde{Q^{\prime}} \subset 4 \widetilde{Q}$. There is an integer $m \geqslant 1$ such that $l\left(\widetilde{Q^{\prime}}\right) \geqslant l\left(2^{m} Q\right) / 10, \widetilde{Q^{\prime}} \subset 2^{m} Q \subset 4 \widetilde{Q}$. Because $l\left(\widetilde{Q^{\prime}}\right) \sim l\left(2^{m} Q\right)$, another application of Lemma 2.1 in [9] leads to $K_{\widetilde{Q^{\prime}} 2^{2} Q} \lesssim 1$. Setting $Q_{0,1}=\widetilde{4 \widetilde{Q}}$, we then have that

$$
K_{\widetilde{Q^{\prime}, Q_{0,1}}} \lesssim K_{\widetilde{Q^{\prime}, 2^{m} Q}}+K_{2^{m} Q, 4 \widetilde{Q}}+K_{4 \widetilde{Q}, Q_{0,1}} \lesssim 1
$$

and

$$
K_{\widetilde{Q}, Q_{0,1}} \lesssim K_{\widetilde{Q}, 4 \widetilde{Q}}+K_{4 \widetilde{Q}, Q_{0,1}} \lesssim 1
$$

As a consequence,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|m_{f}\left(\widetilde{Q^{\prime}}\right)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right| & \leqslant\left|m_{f}\left(\widetilde{Q^{\prime}}\right)-m_{f}\left(Q_{0,1}\right)\right|+\left|m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})-m_{f}\left(Q_{0,1}\right)\right| \\
& \leqslant\left(K_{\widetilde{Q^{\prime}}, Q_{0,1}}+K_{\widetilde{Q}, Q_{0,1}}\right)\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)} \\
& \lesssim\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus (2.3) holds.
Our next goal is to show that there exists a constant $C_{4}>0$ such that for all $i$ and $f$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|m_{f}\left(Q_{i}\right)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right| \leqslant C_{4}\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)} . \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

To prove this, we consider the following three cases.

Case I. If $l\left(\widetilde{2 Q_{i}}\right)>10 l(\widetilde{Q})$, then there exists an integer $m \geqslant 1$ such that $\widetilde{Q} \subset 2^{m} Q_{i}$ and $l(\widetilde{Q}) \sim l\left(2^{m} Q_{i}\right) \leqslant l\left(\widetilde{2 Q_{i}}\right)$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 in [9] that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|m_{f}\left(Q_{i}\right)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right| & \leqslant\left|m_{f}\left(Q_{i}\right)-m_{f}\left(\widetilde{2 Q_{i}}\right)\right|+\left|m_{f}\left(\widetilde{2 Q_{i}}\right)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right| \\
& \leqslant\left(K_{Q_{i}, \widetilde{2 Q_{i}}}+K_{\widetilde{Q}, \widetilde{Q_{i}}}\right)\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)} \\
& \lesssim\left(K_{Q_{i}, \widetilde{2 Q_{i}}}+K_{\widetilde{Q}, 2^{m} Q_{i}}+K_{2^{m} Q_{i}, \widetilde{2 Q_{i}}}\right)\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)} \\
& \lesssim\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Case II. If $l(Q) / 10<l\left(\widetilde{2 Q_{i}}\right) \leqslant 10 l(\widetilde{Q})$, we see that $Q \subset 40 \widetilde{2 Q_{i}} \subset \widetilde{1600 \widetilde{Q}}$. Notice that

$$
K_{Q_{i}, 1600 \widetilde{Q}} \lesssim K_{Q_{i}, 40 \widetilde{2 Q_{i}}}+K_{40 \widetilde{2 Q_{i}}, \widetilde{1600 \widetilde{Q}}} \lesssim 1+K_{Q, 1600 \widetilde{Q}} \lesssim 1 .
$$

It consequently follows that

$$
\left|m_{f}\left(Q_{i}\right)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right| \lesssim\left(K_{Q_{i}, 1600 \widetilde{Q}}^{\widetilde{Q}}+K_{\widetilde{Q}, 1600 \widetilde{Q}}\right)\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)} \lesssim\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)} .
$$

Case III. If $l\left(\widetilde{2 Q_{i}}\right) \leqslant l(Q) / 10$, then for any $\delta>0$ such that $\gamma s+\delta<\beta_{d}^{-1} / 2$, we have

$$
m_{\widetilde{2 Q_{i}}}\left(\chi_{\left|f(x)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right|>B\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}}\right)<\gamma s+\delta
$$

by the choice of $Q_{i}$, which implies

$$
m_{0, \gamma s+\delta ; \widetilde{2 Q_{i}}}\left(f-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right) \leqslant B\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}
$$

This fact together with Lemma 1 yields

$$
\left|m_{f}\left(\widetilde{2 Q_{i}}\right)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right|=\left|m_{f-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})}\left(\widetilde{2 Q_{i}}\right)\right| \leqslant B\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)} .
$$

Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|m_{f}\left(Q_{i}\right)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right| & \leqslant\left|m_{f}\left(Q_{i}\right)-m_{f}\left(\widetilde{2 Q_{i}}\right)\right|+\left|m_{f}\left(\widetilde{2 Q_{i}}\right)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right| \\
& \leqslant K_{Q_{i}, \widetilde{2 Q_{i}}}\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}+B\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)} \\
& \lesssim\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We can now conclude the proof of Theorem 1. Let

$$
X=\sup _{Q} \frac{1}{\mu(2 Q)} \int_{Q}\left|f(x)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right| \mathrm{d} \mu(x),
$$

where the supremum is taken over all cubes $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d}$. The estimates (2.4) and (2.5) now give that due to the fact that $Q_{i}$ 's are doubling, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{\mu(2 Q)} \int_{Q}\left|f(x)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right| \mathrm{d} \mu(x) \\
& \quad \leqslant \frac{1}{\mu(2 Q)} \int_{Q \backslash \cup_{i} Q_{i}}\left|f(x)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right| \mathrm{d} \mu(x) \\
& \quad+\frac{1}{\mu(2 Q)} \sum_{i} \int_{Q_{i}}\left|f(x)-m_{f}\left(Q_{i}\right)\right| \mathrm{d} \mu(x)+C_{4}\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)} \\
& \leqslant C\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}+\frac{X}{\mu(2 Q)} \sum_{i} \mu\left(2 Q_{i}\right) \\
& \leqslant C\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}+\frac{\beta_{d}}{\gamma} X
\end{aligned}
$$

where $C>0$ is independent of $f$. If $f \in L^{\infty}(\mu)$, then $X<\infty$ and the last inequality together with $\gamma>\beta_{d}$ implies that

$$
\|f\|_{\operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)} \lesssim\|f\|_{\operatorname{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)}
$$

For a general $f \in \operatorname{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)$ we consider the function $f_{q}$ with $q>0$ in Lemma 3 . By repeating the foregoing proof we arrive at

$$
\sup _{Q} \frac{1}{\mu(2 Q)} \int_{Q}\left|f_{q}(x)-m_{f}^{q}(\widetilde{Q})\right| \mathrm{d} \mu(x) \lesssim\|f\|_{\mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)},
$$

which together with Lemma 3 and the Fatou lemma leads to the desired conclusion of Theorem 1.

Proof of Corollary 1. If $f \in \operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)$, then for any cube $Q$ and $t>0$,

$$
\frac{1}{\mu\left(\frac{3}{2} Q\right)} \mu\left(\left\{y \in Q:\left|f-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right|>t\right\}\right) \leqslant \frac{1}{\mu\left(\frac{3}{2} Q\right) t} \int_{Q}\left|f(x)-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right| \mathrm{d} \mu(x) \lesssim \frac{1}{t},
$$

and the inequality (1.4) follows directly. To prove sufficiency, we choose $s \in$ $\left(0, \beta_{d}^{-2} / 2\right)$. If $f \notin \operatorname{RBMO}(\mu)$, then $f \notin \mathrm{RBMO}_{0, s}(\mu)$ by Theorem 1. Therefore, by (1.3), there exists a sequences of cubes $\left\{Q_{j}\right\}$ such that

$$
\lim _{j \rightarrow \infty} m_{0, s ; Q_{j}}\left(f-m_{f}\left(\widetilde{Q}_{j}\right)\right)=\infty
$$

Let $A_{j}=m_{0, s ; Q_{j}}\left(f-m_{f}\left(\widetilde{Q}_{j}\right)\right)$. We then have that

$$
\mu\left(\left\{y \in Q_{j}:\left|f-m_{f}\left(\widetilde{Q}_{j}\right)\right|>A_{j} / 2\right\}\right) \geqslant s \mu\left(\frac{3}{2} Q_{j}\right)
$$

which in turn implies that

$$
\sup _{Q \subset \mathbb{R}^{d}} \frac{1}{\mu\left(\frac{3}{2} Q\right)} \mu\left(\left\{y \in Q:\left|f-m_{f}(\widetilde{Q})\right|>A_{j} / 2\right\}\right) \geqslant s .
$$

This contradicts with (1.4) and hence, completes the proof of Corollary 1.
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