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#### Abstract

Let $\varphi: \mathbb{R}^{n} \times[0, \infty) \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ satisfy that $\varphi(x, \cdot)$, for any given $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$, is an Orlicz function and that $\varphi(\cdot, t)$ is a Muckenhoupt $A_{\infty}$ weight uniformly in $t \in(0, \infty)$. The weak Musielak-Orlicz Hardy space $W H^{\varphi}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ is defined to be the set of all tempered distributions such that their grand maximal functions belong to the weak Musielak-Orlicz space $W L^{\varphi}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$. For parameter $\rho \in(0, \infty)$ and measurable function $f$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n}$, the parametric Marcinkiewicz integral $\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}$ related to the Littlewood-Paley $g$-function is defined by setting, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$,


$$
\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}(f)(x):=\left(\int_{0}^{\infty}\left|\int_{|x-y| \leq t} \frac{\Omega(x-y)}{|x-y|^{n-\rho}} f(y) d y\right|^{2} \frac{d t}{t^{2 \rho+1}}\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

where $\Omega$ is homogeneous of degree zero satisfying the cancellation condition.
In this article, we discuss the boundedness of the parametric Marcinkiewicz integral $\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}$ with rough kernel from weak Musielak-Orlicz Hardy space $W H^{\varphi}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ to weak Musielak-Orlicz space $W L^{\varphi}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$. These results are new even for the classical weighted weak Hardy space of Quek and Yang, and probably new for the classical weak Hardy space of Fefferman and Soria.

## 1. Introduction

Suppose that $S^{n-1}$ is the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^{n}(n \geq 2)$ equipped with normalized Lebesgue measure $d \sigma$. A function $\Omega(x)$ defined on $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ is said to be in $L^{q}\left(S^{n-1}\right)$

[^0]with $q \geq 1$ if $\Omega(x)$ satisfies the following conditions:
\[

$$
\begin{gather*}
\Omega(\lambda x)=\Omega(x) \text { for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \text { and } \lambda \in(0, \infty)  \tag{1.1}\\
\int_{S^{n-1}} \Omega(x) d \sigma\left(x^{\prime}\right)=0  \tag{1.2}\\
\int_{S^{n-1}}|\Omega(x)|^{q} d \sigma\left(x^{\prime}\right)<\infty \tag{1.3}
\end{gather*}
$$
\]

where $x^{\prime}:=x /|x|$ for any $x \neq 0$. For parameter $\rho \in(0, \infty)$ and measurable function $f$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n}$, the parametric Marcinkiewicz integral $\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}$ is defined by setting, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$,

$$
\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}(f)(x):=\left(\int_{0}^{\infty}\left|\int_{|x-y| \leq t} \frac{\Omega(x-y)}{|x-y|^{n-\rho}} f(y) d y\right|^{2} \frac{d t}{t^{2 \rho+1}}\right)^{1 / 2}
$$

The Marcinkiewicz integral $\mu_{\Omega}^{1}$ was introduced by Stein [23] in 1958. He showed that if $\Omega \in \operatorname{Lip}_{\alpha}\left(S^{n-1}\right)$ with $\alpha \in(0,1]$, then $\mu_{\Omega}^{1}$ is bounded on $L^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ with $p \in(1,2]$ and bounded from $L^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ to weak $L^{1}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$. In 1960, Hörmander [7] proved that if $\Omega \in \operatorname{Lip}_{\alpha}\left(S^{n-1}\right)$ with $\alpha \in(0,1]$, then $\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}$ is bounded on $L^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ provided that $p \in(1, \infty)$ and $\rho \in(0, \infty)$. Note that all the results mentioned above hold true depending on some smoothness condition of $\Omega$. However, in 2009, Shi and Jiang [22] obtained the following celebrated result that $\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}$ is bounded on $L_{\omega}^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ without any smoothness condition of $\Omega$, where $\omega \in A_{p}$ and $A_{p}$ denotes the Muckenhoupt weight class.
Theorem A ([22, Theorem 1.1]). Let $\rho \in(0, \infty)$, let $p, q \in(1, \infty)$, let $q^{\prime}:=$ $q /(q-1)$, and let $\Omega \in L^{q}\left(S^{n-1}\right)$. If $\omega^{q^{\prime}} \in A_{p}$, then $\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}$ is bounded on $L_{\omega}^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$.

On the other hand, in the past four decades, there has been tremendous interest in developing the theory of Hardy spaces. Hardy space first appeared in complex analysis in the study of analytic functions on the unit disk, and its theory was one-dimensional. The higher dimensional Euclidean theory of Hardy spaces was developed by Fefferman and Stein [4] who proved a variety of characterizations for them. As everyone knows, many important operators are better behaved on Hardy space $H^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ than on Lebesgue space $L^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ in the range $p \in(0,1]$. For example, when $p \in(0,1]$, the Riesz transforms are bounded on Hardy space $H^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$, but not on the corresponding Lebesgue space $L^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$. Therefore, one can consider $H^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ to be a very natural replacement for $L^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ when $p \in(0,1]$. Moreover, when studying the endpoint estimate for various important operators, the weak Hardy space $W H^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ naturally appears and proves to be a good substitute of Hardy space $H^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ with $p \in(0,1]$. For instance, if $\delta \in(0,1], T$ is a $\delta$-Calderón-Zygmund operator and $T^{*}(1)=0$, where $T^{*}$ denotes the adjoint operator, of $T$, it is known that $T$ is bounded on $H^{p}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ for any $p \in(n /(n+\delta), 1]$ (see [1]), but $T$ may be not bounded on $H^{\frac{n}{n+\delta}}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$; however, Liu [18] proved that $T$ is bounded from $H^{\frac{n}{n+\delta}}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ to $W H^{\frac{n}{n+\delta}}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$.

Recently, Ky [12] introduced a new Musielak-Orlicz Hardy space $H^{\varphi}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$, which unifies the classical Hardy space (see [4]), the weighted Hardy space (see [24]), the Orlicz Hardy space (see [8]-[11]), and the weighted Orlicz Hardy space.

Its spatial and time variables may not be separable. Later, Liang, Yang, and Jiang [16] further introduced a weak Musielak-Orlicz Hardy space $W H^{\varphi}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$, which covers the weak Hardy space (see [5]), the weighted weak Hardy space (see [21]), the weak Orlicz Hardy space, and the weighted weak Orlicz Hardy space as special cases. Various equivalent characterizations of $W H^{\varphi}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ by means of maximal functions, atoms, molecules, and Littlewood-Paley functions, and the boundedness of Calderón-Zygmund operators in the critical case were obtained in [16]. Apart from interesting theoretical considerations, the motivation behind the study of Musielak-Orlicz-type space comes from applications to elasticity, fluid dynamics, image processing, nonlinear PDEs, and the calculus of variation (see, e.g., [2]; more Musielak-Orlicz-type spaces are referred to in [3], [6], [15], [19], [20]).

Motivated by the above facts, a natural and interesting question arises, namely, whether the parametric Marcinkiewicz integral $\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}$ is bounded from weak Mu -sielak-Orlicz Hardy space $W H^{\varphi}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ to weak Musielak-Orlicz space $W L^{\varphi}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ under a weaker smoothness condition assumed on $\Omega$. In this article, we give an affirmative answer to this problem. What is worth mentioning here is that our results are new even for classical weighted weak Hardy space and probably new for classical weak Hardy space.

This article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall some notions concerning Muckenhoupt weight, growth function, and weak Musielak-Orlicz Hardy space. Then we present the boundedness of $\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}$ from $W H^{\varphi}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ to $W L^{\varphi}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ (see Theorems 2.7, 2.8, and 2.10 and Corollary 2.9 below). In Section 3, with the help of some auxiliary lemmas and the atomic decomposition theory of $W H^{\varphi}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$, we present the proofs of our main results.

Finally, we adopt the following notational conventions. Let $\mathbb{Z}_{+}:=\{1,2, \ldots\}$ and $\mathbb{N}:=\{0\} \cup \mathbb{Z}_{+}$. For any $\beta:=\left(\beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{n}\right) \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$, let $|\beta|:=\beta_{1}+\cdots+\beta_{n}$ and $\partial^{\beta}:=\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{1}}\right)^{\beta_{1}} \cdots\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{n}}\right)^{\beta_{n}}$. Throughout this article, the letter $C$ will denote a positive constant that may vary from line to line but will remain independent of the main variables. The symbol $P \lesssim Q$ stands for the inequality $P \leq C Q$. If $P \lesssim$ $Q \lesssim P$, then we will write $P \sim Q$. For any sets $E, F \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$, we use $E^{\complement}$ to denote the set $\mathbb{R}^{n} \backslash E,|E|$ its $n$-dimensional Lebesgue measure, $\chi_{E}$ its characteristic function, and $E+F$ the algebraic sum $\{x+y: x \in E, y \in F\}$. For any $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lfloor s\rfloor$ denotes the unique integer such that $s-1<\lfloor s\rfloor \leq s$. If there are no special instructions, any space $\mathcal{X}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ is denoted simply by $\mathcal{X}$. For instance, $L^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{n}\right)$ is simply denoted by $L^{2}$. For any set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}, t \in[0, \infty)$, and measurable function $\varphi(\cdot, t)$, let $\varphi(E, t):=\int_{E} \varphi(x, t) d x$ and let $\{|f|>t\}:=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}:|f(x)|>t\right\}$. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}, r \in(0, \infty)$, and $\alpha \in(0, \infty)$, we use $B(x, r)$ to denote the ball $\left\{y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}:|y-x|<r\right\}$ and $\alpha B(x, r)$ to denote $B(x, \alpha r)$, as usual.

## 2. Notions and main results

In this section, we first recall the definition of the weak Musielak-Orlicz Hardy space $W H^{\varphi}$, and then we present the boundedness of the parametric Marcinkiewicz integral $\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}$ from weak Musielak-Orlicz Hardy space $W H^{\varphi}$ to weak MusielakOrlicz space $W L^{\varphi}$.

Recall that a nonnegative function $\varphi$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n} \times[0, \infty)$ is called a Musielak-Orlicz function if, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}, \varphi(x, \cdot)$ is an Orlicz function on $[0, \infty)$ and, for any $t \in[0, \infty), \varphi(\cdot, t)$ is measurable on $\mathbb{R}^{n}$. Here a function $\phi:[0, \infty) \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ is called an Orlicz function if it is nondecreasing, $\phi(0)=0, \phi(t)>0$ for any $t \in(0, \infty)$, and $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \phi(t)=\infty$.

Given a Musielak-Orlicz function $\varphi$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n} \times[0, \infty), \varphi$ is said to be of uniformly lower- (resp., upper-) type $p$ with $p \in \mathbb{R}$ if there exists a positive constant $C:=C_{\varphi}$ such that, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}, t \in[0, \infty)$, and $s \in(0,1]$ (resp., $s \in[1, \infty)$ ),

$$
\varphi(x, s t) \leq C s^{p} \varphi(x, t)
$$

The critical uniformly lower-type index of $\varphi$ is defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
i(\varphi):=\sup \{p \in \mathbb{R}: \varphi \text { is of uniformly lower-type } p\} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Observe that $i(\varphi)$ may not be attainable, namely, $\varphi$ may not be of uniformly lower-type $i(\varphi)$ (see [14, p. 415] for more details).

Definition 2.1.
(i) Let $q \in[1, \infty)$. A locally integrable function $\varphi(\cdot, t): \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ is said to satisfy the uniformly Muckenhoupt condition $\mathbb{A}_{q}$, denoted by $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_{q}$, if there exists a positive constant $C$ such that, for any ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ and $t \in(0, \infty)$, when $q=1$,

$$
\frac{1}{|B|} \int_{B} \varphi(x, t) d x\left\{\underset{x \in B}{\operatorname{ess} \sup }[\varphi(x, t)]^{-1}\right\} \leq C
$$

and, when $q \in(1, \infty)$,

$$
\frac{1}{|B|} \int_{B} \varphi(x, t) d x\left\{\frac{1}{|B|} \int_{B}[\varphi(x, t)]^{-\frac{1}{q-1}} d x\right\}^{q-1} \leq C .
$$

(ii) Let $q \in(1, \infty]$. A locally integrable function $\varphi(\cdot, t): \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ is said to satisfy the uniformly reverse Hölder condition $\mathbb{R} \mathbb{H}_{q}$, denoted by $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{H}_{q}}$, if there exists a positive constant $C$ such that, for any ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ and $t \in(0, \infty)$, when $q \in(1, \infty)$,

$$
\left\{\frac{1}{|B|} \int_{B} \varphi(x, t) d x\right\}^{-1}\left\{\frac{1}{|B|} \int_{B}[\varphi(x, t)]^{q} d x\right\}^{1 / q} \leq C
$$

and, when $q=\infty$,

$$
\left\{\frac{1}{|B|} \int_{B} \varphi(x, t) d x\right\}^{-1} \underset{x \in B}{\operatorname{ess} \sup } \varphi(x, t) \leq C .
$$

Define $\mathbb{A}_{\infty}:=\bigcup_{q \in[1, \infty)} \mathbb{A}_{q}$. It is well known that if $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_{q}$ with $q \in(1, \infty]$, then $\varphi^{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{A}_{\varepsilon q+1-\varepsilon} \subset \mathbb{A}_{q}$ for any $\varepsilon \in(0,1]$ and $\varphi^{\eta} \in \mathbb{A}_{q}$ for some $\eta \in(1, \infty)$. Also, if $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_{q}$ with $q \in(1, \infty)$, then $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_{r}$ for any $r \in(q, \infty)$ and $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_{d}$ for some $d \in(1, q)$. Thus, the critical weight index of $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_{\infty}$ is defined as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
q(\varphi):=\inf \left\{q \in[1, \infty): \varphi \in \mathbb{A}_{q}\right\} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the uniformly Muckenhoupt (resp., reverse Hölder) condition, we have the following property as the classical case.

Lemma 2.2 ([12, Lemma 4.5]). Let $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_{q}$ with $q \in[1, \infty)$. Then there exists a positive constant $C$ such that, for any ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}, \lambda \in(1, \infty)$, and $t \in(0, \infty)$,

$$
\varphi(\lambda B, t) \leq C \lambda^{n q} \varphi(B, t)
$$

Lemma 2.3 ([13, Lemma 3.5]). Let $r \in(1, \infty)$. Then $\varphi^{r} \in \mathbb{A}_{\infty}$ if and only if $\varphi \in \mathbb{R H}_{r}$.

Definition $2.4\left(\left[12\right.\right.$, Definition 2.1]). A function $\varphi: \mathbb{R}^{n} \times[0, \infty) \rightarrow[0, \infty)$ is called a growth function if the following conditions are satisfied:
(i) $\varphi$ is a Musielak-Orlicz function;
(ii) $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_{\infty}$;
(iii) $\varphi$ is of uniformly lower-type $p$ for some $p \in(0,1]$ and of uniformly uppertype 1 .

Throughout this paper, we always assume that $\varphi$ is a growth function.
Recall that the weak Musielak-Orlicz space $W L^{\varphi}$ is defined to be the space of all measurable functions $f$ such that, for some $\lambda \in(0, \infty)$,

$$
\sup _{t \in(0, \infty)} \varphi\left(\{|f|>t\}, \frac{t}{\lambda}\right)<\infty
$$

equipped with the quasinorm

$$
\|f\|_{W L^{\varphi}}:=\inf \left\{\lambda \in(0, \infty): \sup _{t \in(0, \infty)} \varphi\left(\{|f|>t\}, \frac{t}{\lambda}\right) \leq 1\right\}
$$

In what follows, we denote by $\mathcal{S}$ the space of all Schwartz functions and by $\mathcal{S}^{\prime}$ its dual space (namely, the space of all tempered distributions). For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{S}_{m}$ be the space of all $\psi \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfying $\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{S}_{m}} \leq 1$, where

$$
\|\psi\|_{\mathcal{S}_{m}}:=\sup _{\substack{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{n} \\|\alpha| \leq m+1}} \sup _{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}}(1+|x|)^{(m+2)(n+1)}\left|\partial^{\alpha} \psi(x)\right|
$$

Then, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in \mathcal{S}^{\prime}$, the nontangential grand maximal function $f_{m}^{*}$ of $f$ is defined by setting, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{m}^{*}(x):=\sup _{\substack { \psi \in \mathcal{S}_{m} \\
\begin{subarray}{c}{|y-x|<t \\
t(0, \infty){ \psi \in \mathcal { S } _ { m } \\
\begin{subarray} { c } { | y - x | < t \\
t ( 0 , \infty ) } }\end{subarray}} \sup _{t}\left|f * \psi_{t}(y)\right|, \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, for any $t \in(0, \infty), \psi_{t}(\cdot):=t^{-n} \psi(\dot{\bar{t}})$. When

$$
\begin{equation*}
m=m(\varphi):=\left\lfloor n\left(\frac{q(\varphi)}{i(\varphi)}-1\right)\right\rfloor \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

we denote $f_{m}^{*}$ simply by $f^{*}$, where $q(\varphi)$ and $i(\varphi)$ are as in (2.2) and (2.1), respectively.

Definition 2.5 ([16, Definition 2.3]). Let $\varphi$ be a growth function as in Definition 2.4. The weak Musielak-Orlicz Hardy space $W H^{\varphi}$ is defined as the space of all $f \in \mathcal{S}^{\prime}$ such that $f^{*} \in W L^{\varphi}$ endowed with the quasinorm

$$
\|f\|_{W H^{\varphi}}:=\left\|f^{*}\right\|_{W L^{\varphi}}
$$

Remark 2.6. Let $\omega$ be a classic Muckenhoupt weight, and let $\phi$ be an Orlicz function.
(i) If $\varphi(x, t):=\omega(x) \phi(t)$ for all $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \times[0, \infty)$, then $W H^{\varphi}$ goes back to weighted weak Orlicz Hardy space $W H_{\omega}^{\phi}$, and particularly, when $\omega \equiv 1$, the corresponding unweighted space is also obtained.
(ii) If $\varphi(x, t):=\omega(x) t^{p}$ for all $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \times[0, \infty)$ with $p \in(0,1]$, then $W H^{\varphi}$ goes back to weighted weak Hardy space $W H_{\omega}^{p}$, and particularly, when $\omega \equiv 1$, the corresponding unweighted space is also obtained.

Before stating our main results, we recall some notions about $\Omega$. For any $q \in$ $[1, \infty)$ and $\alpha \in(0,1]$, a function $\Omega \in L^{q}\left(S^{n-1}\right)$ is said to satisfy the $L^{q, \alpha}$-Dini condition if

$$
\int_{0}^{1} \frac{\omega_{q}(\delta)}{\delta^{1+\alpha}} d \delta<\infty
$$

where

$$
\omega_{q}(\delta):=\sup _{\|\gamma\|<\delta}\left(\int_{S^{n-1}}\left|\Omega\left(\gamma x^{\prime}\right)-\Omega\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right|^{q} d \sigma\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right)^{1 / q}
$$

and $\gamma$ denotes a rotation on $S^{n-1}$ with $\|\gamma\|:=\sup _{y^{\prime} \in S^{n-1}}\left|\gamma y^{\prime}-y^{\prime}\right|$. For any $\alpha, \beta \in$ $(0,1]$ with $\beta<\alpha$, it is trivial to see that if $\Omega$ satisfies the $L^{q, \alpha}$-Dini condition, then it also satisfies the $L^{q, \beta}$-Dini condition. We thus denote by $\operatorname{Din}_{\alpha}^{q}\left(S^{n-1}\right)$ the class of all functions which satisfy the $L^{q, \beta}$-Dini conditions for all $\beta<\alpha$. For any $\alpha \in(0,1]$, we define

$$
\operatorname{Din}_{\alpha}^{\infty}\left(S^{n-1}\right):=\bigcap_{q \geq 1} \operatorname{Din}_{\alpha}^{q}\left(S^{n-1}\right)
$$

A routine computation gives rise to

$$
\operatorname{Din}_{\alpha}^{r}\left(S^{n-1}\right) \subset \operatorname{Din}_{\alpha}^{q}\left(S^{n-1}\right) \quad \text { if } 1 \leq q<r \leq \infty
$$

and

$$
\operatorname{Din}_{\alpha}^{q}\left(S^{n-1}\right) \subset \operatorname{Din}_{\beta}^{q}\left(S^{n-1}\right) \quad \text { if } 0<\beta<\alpha \leq 1
$$

The main results of this article are as follows, the proofs of which are given in Section 3.

Theorem 2.7. Let $\rho \in(0, \infty)$, let $\alpha \in(0,1]$, let $\beta:=\min \{1 / 2, \alpha\}$, and let $\varphi$ be a growth function as in Definition 2.4 with $p \in(n /(n+\beta), 1)$. Suppose that $\Omega \in L^{r}\left(S^{n-1}\right) \cap \operatorname{Din}_{\alpha}^{1}\left(S^{n-1}\right)$ with $r \in(1, \infty]$. If $q$ and $\varphi$ satisfy one of the following conditions:
(i) $r \in(1,1 / p]$ and $\varphi^{r^{\prime}} \in \mathbb{A}_{p \beta /[n(1-p)]}$,
(ii) $r \in(1 / p, \infty]$ and $\varphi^{1 /(1-p)} \in \mathbb{A}_{p \beta /[n(1-p)]}$,
then $\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}$ is bounded from $W H^{\varphi}$ to $W L^{\varphi}$.
Theorem 2.8. Let $\rho \in(0, \infty)$, let $\alpha \in(0,1]$, let $\beta:=\min \{1 / 2, \alpha\}$, and let $\varphi$ be a growth function as in Definition 2.4 with $p \in(n /(n+\beta), 1]$. Suppose that $\Omega \in \operatorname{Din}_{\alpha}^{q}\left(S^{n-1}\right)$ with $q \in(1, \infty)$. If $\varphi^{q^{\prime}} \in \mathbb{A}_{(p+p \beta / n-1 / q) q^{\prime}}$, then $\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}$ is bounded from $W H^{\varphi}$ to $W L^{\varphi}$.

Corollary 2.9. Let $\rho \in(0, \infty)$, let $\alpha \in(0,1]$, let $\beta:=\min \{1 / 2, \alpha\}$, and let $\varphi$ be a growth function as in Definition 2.4 with $p \in(n /(n+\beta), 1]$. Suppose that $\Omega \in \operatorname{Din}_{\alpha}^{\infty}\left(S^{n-1}\right)$. If $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_{p(1+\beta / n)}$, then $\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}$ is bounded from $W H^{\varphi}$ to $W L^{\varphi}$.

Theorem 2.10. Let $\rho \in(0, \infty)$, let $\Omega \in L^{q}\left(S^{n-1}\right)$ with $q \in(1, \infty]$, and let $\varphi$ be a growth function as in Definition 2.4 with $p:=1$ and $\varphi^{q^{\prime}} \in \mathbb{A}_{1}$. If there exists a positive constant $C$ such that, for any $y, h \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ and $M, t \in(0, \infty)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{|x| \geq M|y|}\left|\frac{\Omega(x-y)}{|x-y|^{n}}-\frac{\Omega(x)}{|x|^{n}}\right| \varphi(x+h, t) d x \leq \frac{C}{M} \varphi(y+h, t), \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

then $\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}$ is bounded from $W H^{\varphi}$ to $W L^{\varphi}$.
Remark 2.11.
(i) It is worth noting that Corollary 2.9 can be regarded as the limit case of Theorem 2.8 by letting $q \rightarrow \infty$.
(ii) Theorems 2.7 and 2.8 and Corollary 2.9 jointly answer the question: When $\Omega \in \operatorname{Din}_{\alpha}^{q}\left(S^{n-1}\right)$ with $q=1, q \in(1, \infty)$ or $q=\infty$, respectively, what kind of additional conditions on $\varphi$ and $\Omega$ can we use to deduce the boundedness of $\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}$ from $W H^{\varphi}$ to $W L^{\varphi}$ ?
(iii) Let $\omega$ be a classic Muckenhoupt weight, and let $\phi$ be an Orlicz function.
(a) When $\varphi(x, t):=\omega(x) \phi(t)$ for all $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \times[0, \infty)$, we have $W H^{\varphi}=$ $W H_{\omega}^{\phi}$. In this case, Theorems 2.7, 2.8, and 2.10 and Corollary 2.9 hold true for weighted weak Orlicz Hardy space. Even when $\omega \equiv 1$, the corresponding unweighted results are also new.
(b) When $\varphi(x, t):=\omega(x) t^{p}$ for all $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \times[0, \infty)$, we have $W H^{\varphi}=$ $W H_{\omega}^{p}$. In this case, Theorems 2.7, 2.8, and 2.10 and Corollary 2.9 are new for weighted weak Hardy space. Even when $\omega \equiv 1$, the corresponding unweighted results are probably new.

## 3. Proofs of main results

To show our main results, we need some auxiliary notions and lemmas.
Definition 3.1 ([12, Definition 2.4]). Let $\varphi$ be a growth function as in Definition 2.4.
(i) A triplet $(\varphi, q, s)$ is said to be admissible if $q \in(q(\varphi), \infty]$ and $s \in$ $[m(\varphi), \infty) \cap \mathbb{N}$, where $q(\varphi)$ and $m(\varphi)$ are as in (2.2) and (2.4), respectively.
(ii) For an admissible triplet $(\varphi, q, s)$, a measurable function $a$ is called a ( $\varphi, q, s)$-atom if there exists some ball $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$ such that the following conditions are satisfied:
(a) $a$ is supported in $B$;
(b) $\|a\|_{L_{\varphi}^{q}(B)} \leq\left\|\chi_{B}\right\|_{L^{\varphi}}^{-1}$, where

$$
\|a\|_{L_{\varphi}^{q}(B)}:= \begin{cases}\sup _{t \in(0, \infty)}\left[\frac{1}{\varphi(B, t)} \int_{B}|a(x)|^{q} \varphi(x, t) d x\right]^{1 / q}, & q \in[1, \infty) \\ \|a\|_{L^{\infty}}, & q=\infty\end{cases}
$$

and

$$
\left\|\chi_{B}\right\|_{L^{\varphi}}:=\inf \left\{\lambda \in(0, \infty): \varphi\left(B, \lambda^{-1}\right) \leq 1\right\}
$$

(c) $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}} a(x) x^{\gamma} d x=0$ for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}^{n}$ with $|\gamma| \leq s$.

Definition 3.2 ([16, Definition 3.2]). For an admissible triplet $(\varphi, q, s)$ as in Definition 3.1, the weak atomic Musielak-Orlicz Hardy space $W H_{a t}^{\varphi, q, s}$ is defined as the space of all $f \in \mathcal{S}^{\prime}$ satisfying that there exist a sequence of $(\varphi, q, s)$-atoms, $\left\{a_{i, j}\right\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}}$, associated with balls $\left\{B_{i, j}\right\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}}$, and a positive constant $C$ such that $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \chi_{B_{i, j}}(x) \leq C$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $f=\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \lambda_{i, j} a_{i, j}$ in $\mathcal{S}^{\prime}$, where $\lambda_{i, j}:=\widetilde{C} 2^{i}\left\|\chi_{B_{i, j}}\right\|_{L^{\varphi}}$ for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}$, and $\widetilde{C}$ is a positive constant independent of $f$.

Moreover, define

$$
\|f\|_{W H_{\mathrm{at}}^{\varphi, q, s}}:=\inf \left\{\inf \left\{\lambda \in(0, \infty): \sup _{i \in \mathbb{Z}}\left\{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i}}{\lambda}\right)\right\} \leq 1\right\}\right\}
$$

where the first infimum is taken over all decompositions of $f$, as above.
Lemma 3.3 ([16, Theorem 3.5]). Let $(\varphi, q, s)$ be an admissible triplet as in Definition 3.1. Then

$$
W H^{\varphi}=W H_{\mathrm{at}}^{\varphi, q, s}
$$

with equivalent quasinorms.
Lemma 3.4. For any $\alpha \in(0,1]$ and $q \in[1, \infty)$, suppose that $\Omega$ satisfies the $L^{q, \alpha}$-Dini condition. Let $\rho \in(0, \infty)$, let $\beta:=\min \{1 / 2, \alpha\}$, and let $b$ be a multiple of $a(\varphi, \infty, s)$-atom associated with some ball $B\left(x_{0}, r\right) \subset \mathbb{R}^{n}$.
(i) If $q=1$, then there exists a positive constant $C$ independent of $b$ such that, for any $R \in[2 r, \infty)$,

$$
\int_{R \leq\left|x-x_{0}\right|<2 R}\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}(b)(x)\right| d x \leq C\|b\|_{L^{\infty}} R^{n}\left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{n+\beta}
$$

(ii) If $q \in(1, \infty)$, then there exists a positive constant $C$ independent of $b$ such that, for any $R \in[2 r, \infty)$ and $t \in(0, \infty)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{R \leq\left|x-x_{0}\right|<2 R}\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}(b)(x)\right| \varphi(x, t) d x \\
& \quad \leq C\|b\|_{L^{\infty}}\left[\varphi^{q^{\prime}}\left(B\left(x_{0}, 2 R\right), t\right)\right]^{1 / q^{\prime}} R^{n / q}\left(\frac{r}{R}\right)^{n+\beta}
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. The proof of this lemma, the details of which we omit, can be completed by the method analogous to that used in the proof of [17, Lemma 4.4].
Proof of Theorem 2.7. We need only consider the case $r \in(1, \infty)$, since the case $r=\infty$ can be derived from the case $r=2$. Indeed, when $r=\infty$, a routine computation gives rise to $2>1 / p$. If Theorem 2.7 holds true for $r=2$, then by $\Omega \in L^{\infty}\left(S^{n-1}\right) \subset L^{2}\left(S^{n-1}\right), 2>1 / p$, and $\varphi^{1 /(1-p)} \in \mathbb{A}_{p \beta /[n(1-p)]}$, we know that Theorem 2.7 holds true for $q=\infty$. We now turn to the proof of Theorem 2.7
under case $r \in(1, \infty)$. We claim that, in either Theorem 2.7(i) or Theorem 2.7(ii), there exists some $d \in(1, p \beta /[n(1-p)])$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi^{r^{\prime}} \in \mathbb{A}_{d} \quad \text { and } \quad \varphi^{1 /(1-p)} \in \mathbb{A}_{d} \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

We only prove (3.1) under case (ii) since the proof under case (i) is similar. By $\varphi^{1 /(1-p)} \in \mathbb{A}_{p \beta / n(1-p)}$, we see that there exists some $d \in(1, p \beta /[n(1-p)])$ such that $\varphi^{1 /(1-p)} \in \mathbb{A}_{d}$. On the other hand, note that $r^{\prime}<1 /(1-p)$. Then $\varphi^{r^{\prime}} \in \mathbb{A}_{d}$, as claimed.

Let $(\varphi, \infty, s)$ be an admissible triplet as in Definition 3.1. By Lemma 3.3, we know that, for any $f \in W H^{\varphi}=W H_{\mathrm{at}}^{\varphi, \infty, s}$, there exists a sequence of multiples of ( $\varphi, \infty, s$ )-atoms, $\left\{b_{i, j}\right\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}}$, associated with balls $\left\{B_{i, j}\right\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}}$, such that

$$
f=\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} b_{i, j} \quad \text { in } \mathcal{S}^{\prime}
$$

$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \chi_{B_{i, j}}(x) \lesssim 1$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z},\left\|b_{i, j}\right\|_{L^{\infty}} \lesssim 2^{i}$ for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}$, and

$$
\|f\|_{W H^{\varphi}} \sim \inf \left\{\lambda \in(0, \infty): \sup _{i \in \mathbb{Z}}\left\{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i}}{\lambda}\right)\right\} \leq 1\right\}
$$

Thus, our problem reduces to proving that, for any $\gamma, \lambda \in(0, \infty)$ and $f \in W H^{\varphi}$,

$$
\varphi\left(\left\{\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}(f)\right|>\gamma\right\}, \frac{\gamma}{\lambda}\right) \lesssim \sup _{i \in \mathbb{Z}}\left\{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i}}{\lambda}\right)\right\}
$$

To show this inequality, we may assume without loss of generality that there exists $i_{0} \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\gamma=2^{i_{0}}$. Let us write

$$
f=\sum_{i=-\infty}^{i_{0}-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} b_{i, j}+\sum_{i=i_{0}}^{\infty} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} b_{i, j}=: F_{1}+F_{2}
$$

We estimate $F_{1}$ first. From Theorem A with $\Omega \in L^{r}\left(S^{n-1}\right)$ and $\varphi^{r^{\prime}} \in \mathbb{A}_{d}$ (see (3.1)), Minkowski's inequality, $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \chi_{B_{i, j}}(x) \lesssim 1$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, and the uniformly upper-type 1 property of $\varphi$, we deduce that, for any $\lambda \in(0, \infty)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi & \left(\left\{\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}\left(F_{1}\right)\right|>2^{i_{0}}\right\}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) \\
& =\int_{\left\{\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}\left(F_{1}\right)\right|>2^{i_{0}}\right\}} \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x \\
& \leq 2^{-d i_{0}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}}\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}\left(F_{1}\right)(x)\right|^{d} \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x \\
& \lesssim 2^{-d i_{0}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}}\left|F_{1}(x)\right|^{d} \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x \\
& \lesssim 2^{-d i_{0}}\left\{\sum_{i=-\infty}^{i_{0}-1}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n}}\left|\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} b_{i, j}(x)\right|^{d} \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x\right]^{1 / d}\right\}^{d}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \lesssim 2^{-d i_{0}}\left\{\sum_{i=-\infty}^{i_{0}-1} 2^{i}\left[\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right)\right]^{1 / d}\right\}^{d} \\
& \lesssim 2^{-d i_{0}}\left\{\sum_{i=-\infty}^{i_{0}-1} 2^{i}\left[2^{i_{0}-i} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i}}{\lambda}\right)\right]^{1 / d}\right\}^{d} \\
& \lesssim 2^{(1-d) i_{0}}\left(\sum_{i=-\infty}^{i_{0}-1} 2^{(1-1 / d) i}\right)^{d} \sup _{i \in \mathbb{Z}}\left\{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i}}{\lambda}\right)\right\} \\
& \sim \sup _{i \in \mathbb{Z}}\left\{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i}}{\lambda}\right)\right\}, \tag{3.2}
\end{align*}
$$

which is desired.
Next let us deal with $F_{2}$. Denote the center of $B_{i, j}$ by $x_{i, j}$ and the radius by $r_{i, j}$. Set

$$
A_{i_{0}}:=\bigcup_{i=i_{0}}^{\infty} \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \widetilde{B_{i, j}}
$$

where $\widetilde{B_{i, j}}:=B\left(x_{i, j}, 2(3 / 2)^{\left(i-i_{0}\right) /(n+\beta)} r_{i, j}\right)$. To show that

$$
\varphi\left(\left\{\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}\left(F_{2}\right)\right|>2^{i_{0}}\right\}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) \lesssim \sup _{i \in \mathbb{Z}}\left\{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i}}{\lambda}\right)\right\}
$$

we cut $\left\{\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}\left(F_{2}\right)\right|>2^{i_{0}}\right\}$ into $A_{i_{0}}$ and $\left\{x \in\left(A_{i_{0}}\right)^{\complement}:\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}\left(F_{2}\right)(x)\right|>2^{i_{0}}\right\}$.
For $A_{i_{0}}$, from Lemma 2.2 with $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_{p(1+\beta / n)}\left(\right.$ since $\left.\varphi^{1 /(1-p)} \in \mathbb{A}_{p \beta /[n(1-p)]}\right)$, and the uniformly lower-type $p$ property of $\varphi$, it follows that, for any $\lambda \in(0, \infty)$,

$$
\begin{align*}
\varphi\left(A_{i_{0}}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) & \leq \sum_{i=i_{0}}^{\infty} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \varphi\left(\widetilde{B_{i, j}}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) \\
& \lesssim \sum_{i=i_{0}}^{\infty} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}}\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{\left(i-i_{0}\right) p} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) \\
& \lesssim \sum_{i=i_{0}}^{\infty} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}}\left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{\left(i-i_{0}\right) p} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i}}{\lambda}\right) \\
& \lesssim \sup _{i \in \mathbb{Z}}\left\{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i}}{\lambda}\right)\right\}, \tag{3.3}
\end{align*}
$$

which is also desired.
It remains to estimate $\left(A_{i_{0}}\right)^{\complement}$. Applying the inequality $\|\cdot\|_{\ell^{1}} \leq\|\cdot\|_{\ell^{p}}$ with $p \in(0,1)$, we conclude that, for any $\lambda \in(0, \infty)$,

$$
\varphi\left(\left\{x \in\left(A_{i_{0}}\right)^{\complement}:\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}\left(F_{2}\right)(x)\right|>2^{i_{0}}\right\}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right)
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \leq 2^{-i_{0} p} \int_{\left(A_{i_{0}}\right)}\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}\left(F_{2}\right)(x)\right|^{p} \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x \\
& \leq 2^{-i_{0} p} \sum_{i=i_{0}}^{\infty} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \int_{\left(\widetilde{\left.B_{i, j}\right)}\right)}\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}\left(b_{i, j}\right)(x)\right|^{p} \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x . \tag{3.4}
\end{align*}
$$

Below, we will give the estimate of integral

$$
\mathrm{I}:=\int_{\left(\widetilde{B_{i, j}}\right)}\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}\left(b_{i, j}\right)(x)\right|^{p} \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x
$$

For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$
E_{k}:=\left(2^{k+1} \widetilde{B_{i, j}}\right) \backslash\left(2^{k} \widetilde{B_{i, j}}\right) .
$$

It follows from Hölder's inequality that, for any $\lambda \in(0, \infty)$,

$$
\mathrm{I} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\left[\int_{E_{k}}\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}\left(b_{i, j}\right)(x)\right| d x\right]^{p}\left\{\int_{E_{k}}\left[\varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{1-p}} d x\right\}^{1-p} .
$$

On the one hand, by Lemma 2.3 with $\varphi^{1 /(1-p)} \in \mathbb{A}_{d} \subset \mathbb{A}_{\infty}$ (see (3.1)), we have $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{H}_{1 /(1-p)}}$. Thus, thanks to Lemma 2.2 with $\varphi^{1 /(1-p)} \in \mathbb{A}_{d}$, and $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}_{\mathbb{H}_{1 /(1-p)}}$, it follows that, for any $\lambda \in(0, \infty)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\{\int_{E_{k}}\left[\varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{1-p}} d x\right\}^{1-p} & \leq\left[\varphi^{\frac{1}{1-p}}\left(2^{k+1} \widetilde{B_{i, j}}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right)\right]^{1-p} \\
& \lesssim\left[\varphi^{\frac{1}{1-p}}\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right)\right]^{1-p}\left[2^{k}\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{\frac{i-i_{0}}{n+\beta}}\right]^{n d(1-p)} \\
& \lesssim\left(r_{i, j}\right)^{-n p} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right)\left[2^{k}\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{\frac{i-i_{0}}{n+\beta}}\right]^{n d(1-p)}
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand, since $d<p \beta /[n(1-p)]$, we may choose an $\widetilde{\alpha} \in(0, \alpha)$ such that $d<p \widetilde{\beta} /[n(1-p)]$, where $\widetilde{\beta}:=\min \{1 / 2, \widetilde{\alpha}\}$. By the assumption $\Omega \in \operatorname{Din}_{\alpha}^{1}\left(S^{n-1}\right)$, we know that $\Omega$ satisfies the $L^{1, \widetilde{\alpha}}$-Dini condition. Then Lemma 3.4(i) yields that

$$
\int_{E_{k}}\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}\left(b_{i, j}\right)(x)\right| d x \lesssim 2^{i}\left(r_{i, j}\right)^{n}\left[2^{k}\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{\frac{i-i_{0}}{n+\beta}}\right]^{-\widetilde{\beta}}
$$

The above three inequalities give us that, for any $\lambda \in(0, \infty)$,

$$
\mathrm{I} \lesssim 2^{i p} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\left[2^{k}\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{\frac{i-i_{0}}{n+\beta}}\right]^{n d-n d p-p \widetilde{\beta}}
$$

Substituting this inequality into (3.4) and using the uniformly lower-type $p$ property of $\varphi$, we obtain that, for any $\lambda \in(0, \infty)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \varphi\left(\left\{x \in\left(A_{i_{0}}\right)^{\complement}:\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}\left(F_{2}\right)(x)\right|>2^{i_{0}}\right\}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) \\
& \quad \lesssim 2^{-i_{0} p} \sum_{i=i_{0}}^{\infty} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} 2^{i p} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\left[2^{k}\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{\frac{i-i_{0}}{n+\beta}}\right]^{n d-n d p-p \widetilde{\beta}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \lesssim \sup _{i \in \mathbb{Z}}\left\{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i}}{\lambda}\right)\right\} \sum_{i=i_{0}}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\left[2^{k}\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{\frac{i-i_{0}}{n+\beta}}\right]^{n d-n d p-p \widetilde{\beta}} \\
& \sim \sup _{i \in \mathbb{Z}}\left\{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i}}{\lambda}\right)\right\}, \tag{3.5}
\end{align*}
$$

where the last $\sim$ is due to $d<p \widetilde{\beta} /[n(1-p)]$.
Finally, combining (3.2), (3.3), and (3.5), we obtain the desired inequality. This finishes the proof of Theorem 2.7.

Proof of Theorem 2.8. We need only consider the case $p<1$. The proof of the case $p=1$ is similar and easier. Once we prove Lemma 3.4(ii), the proof of this theorem is quite similar to that of Theorem 2.7, the major change being the substitution of

$$
\mathrm{I} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\left[\int_{E_{k}}\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}\left(b_{i, j}\right)(x)\right| \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x\right]^{p}\left[\int_{E_{k}} \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x\right]^{1-p}
$$

for

$$
\mathrm{I} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\left[\int_{E_{k}}\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}\left(b_{i, j}\right)(x)\right| d x\right]^{p}\left\{\int_{E_{k}}\left[\varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{1-p}} d x\right\}^{1-p} .
$$

But to limit the length of this article, we leave the details to the interested reader.

Proof of Corollary 2.9. By $\varphi \in \mathbb{A}_{p(1+\beta / n)}$, we see that there exists some $d \in$ $(1, \infty)$ such that $\varphi^{d} \in \mathbb{A}_{p(1+\beta / n)}$. For any $q \in(1, \infty)$, by $p>n /(n+\beta)$, some tedious manipulation yields that $(p+p \beta / n-1 / q) q^{\prime}>p(1+\beta / n)$ and hence $\varphi^{d} \in \mathbb{A}_{(p+p \beta / n-1 / q) q^{\prime}}$. Thus, we may choose $q:=d /(d-1)$ such that

$$
\varphi^{q^{\prime}}=\varphi^{d} \in \mathbb{A}_{(p+\beta / n-1 / q) q^{\prime}}
$$

and hence Corollary 2.9 follows from Theorem 2.8.
Proof of Theorem 2.10. Since the proof of Theorem 2.10 is similar to that of Theorem 2.7, we use the same notation as in the proof of Theorem 2.7. Rather than give a completed proof, we just point out the necessary modifications with respect to the estimate of $\left(A_{i_{0}}\right)^{\complement}$. Reset

$$
A_{i_{0}}:=\bigcup_{i=i_{0}}^{\infty} \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \widetilde{B_{i, j}},
$$

where $\widetilde{B_{i, j}}:=B\left(x_{i, j}, 2(3 / 2)^{\left(i-i_{0}\right) / n} r_{i, j}\right)$. For any $\lambda \in(0, \infty)$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \varphi\left(\left\{x \in\left(A_{i_{0}}\right)^{\complement}:\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}\left(F_{2}\right)(x)\right|>2^{i_{0}}\right\}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) \\
& \quad \leq 2^{-i_{0}} \int_{\left(A_{i_{0}}\right)}\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}\left(F_{2}\right)(x)\right| \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \leq 2^{-i_{0}} \sum_{i=i_{0}}^{\infty} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \int_{\left(\widetilde{B_{i, j}}\right)}\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}\left(b_{i, j}\right)(x)\right| \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x \\
& =: 2^{-i_{0}} \sum_{i=i_{0}}^{\infty} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \mathrm{I}
\end{aligned}
$$

For any $\lambda \in(0, \infty)$, let us write

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{I} \leq & \int_{\left(\widetilde{B_{i, j}}\right)^{\mathrm{c}}}\left(\int_{0}^{\left|x-x_{i, j}\right|+r_{i, j}}\left|\int_{|x-y| \leq t} \frac{\Omega(x-y)}{|x-y|^{n-\rho}} b_{i, j}(y) d y\right|^{2} \frac{d t}{t^{2 \rho+1}}\right)^{1 / 2} \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x \\
& +\int_{\left(\widetilde{B_{i, j}}\right)^{c}}\left(\int_{\left|x-x_{i, j}\right|+r_{i, j}}^{\infty} \cdots\right)^{1 / 2} \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x=: \mathrm{I}_{1}+\mathrm{I}_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Below, we will first estimate $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ and then estimate $\mathrm{I}_{2}$.
For $\mathrm{I}_{1}$, noting that $x \in\left(\widetilde{B_{i, j}}\right)^{\complement}$ and $y \in B_{i, j}$, we know that

$$
|x-y| \sim\left|x-x_{i, j}\right| \sim\left|x-x_{i, j}\right|+r_{i, j}
$$

which, together with the mean value theorem, implies that

$$
\left|\frac{1}{|x-y|^{2 \rho}}-\frac{1}{\left(\left|x-x_{i, j}\right|+r_{i, j}\right)^{2 \rho}}\right| \lesssim \frac{r_{i, j}}{|x-y|^{2 \rho+1}}
$$

From Minkowski's inequality for integrals, the above inequality, and Hölder's inequality, it follows that, for any $\lambda \in(0, \infty)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{I}_{1} \leq \int_{\left(\widetilde{B_{i, j}}\right)^{\mathrm{c}}}\left[\int_{B_{i, j}}\left|\frac{\Omega(x-y)}{|x-y|^{n-\rho}} b_{i, j}(y)\right|\left(\int_{|x-y|}^{\left|x-x_{i, j}\right|+r_{i, j}} \frac{d t}{t^{2 \rho+1}}\right)^{1 / 2} d y\right] \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x \\
& \lesssim 2^{i}\left(r_{i, j}\right)^{1 / 2} \int_{\left(\widetilde{\left.B_{i, j}\right)^{c}}\right.}\left(\int_{B_{i, j}} \frac{|\Omega(x-y)|}{|x-y|^{n+1 / 2}} d y\right) \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x \\
& \sim 2^{i}\left(r_{i, j}\right)^{1 / 2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{B_{i, j}}\left[\int_{E_{k}} \frac{|\Omega(x-y)|}{|x-y|^{n+1 / 2}} \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x\right] d y \\
& \lesssim 2^{i}\left(r_{i, j}\right)^{1 / 2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{B_{i, j}}\left(\int_{E_{k}} \frac{|\Omega(x-y)|^{q}}{|x-y|^{n+1 / 2}} d x\right)^{1 / q} \\
& \times\left(\int_{E_{k}} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{n+1 / 2}}\left[\varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right)\right]^{q^{\prime}} d x\right)^{1 / q^{\prime}} d y .
\end{aligned}
$$

On the one hand, $x \in E_{k}$ and $y \in B_{i, j}$ imply that $\theta r_{i, j}<|x-y|<5 \theta r_{i, j}$, where $\theta:=2^{k}(3 / 2)^{\left(i-i_{0}\right) / n}$. Therefore, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\int_{E_{k}} \frac{|\Omega(x-y)|^{q}}{|x-y|^{n+1 / 2}} d x\right)^{1 / q} & \leq\left(\int_{\theta r_{i, j}<|z|<5 \theta r_{i, j}} \frac{|\Omega(z)|^{q}}{|z|^{n+1 / 2}} d z\right)^{1 / q} \\
& =\left(\int_{S^{n-1}} \int_{\theta r_{i, j}}^{5 \theta r_{i, j}} \frac{\left|\Omega\left(z^{\prime}\right)\right|^{q}}{u^{n+1 / 2}} u^{n-1} d u d \sigma\left(z^{\prime}\right)\right)^{1 / q} \\
& \sim\left(\theta r_{i, j}\right)^{-1 / 2 q} .
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand, according to Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3 with $\varphi^{q^{\prime}} \in \mathbb{A}_{1}$, it follows that, for any $\lambda \in(0, \infty)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\int_{E_{k}} \frac{1}{|x-y|^{n+1 / 2}}\left[\varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right)\right]^{q^{\prime}} d x\right)^{1 / q^{\prime}} \\
& \quad \sim\left(\theta r_{i, j}\right)^{-n / q^{\prime}-1 / 2 q^{\prime}}\left\{\int_{E_{k}}\left[\varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right)\right]^{q^{\prime}} d x\right\}^{1 / q^{\prime}} \\
& \quad \lesssim\left(\theta r_{i, j}\right)^{-n / q^{\prime}-1 / 2 q^{\prime}}\left[\varphi^{q^{\prime}}\left(4 \theta B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right)\right]^{1 / q^{\prime}} \\
& \quad \lesssim\left(\theta r_{i, j}\right)^{-n / q^{\prime}-1 / 2 q^{\prime}} \theta^{n / q^{\prime}}\left[\varphi^{q^{\prime}}\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right)\right]^{1 / q^{\prime}} \\
& \quad \lesssim\left(\theta r_{i, j}\right)^{-n / q^{\prime}-1 / 2 q^{\prime}} \theta^{n / q^{\prime}}\left(r_{i, j}\right)^{-n / q} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

If we plug the above two inequalities back into $\mathrm{I}_{1}$, we obtain that, for any $\lambda \in$ $(0, \infty)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{I}_{1} & \lesssim 2^{i}\left(r_{i, j}\right)^{1 / 2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \int_{B_{i, j}}\left(\theta r_{i, j}\right)^{-1 / 2 q}\left(\theta r_{i, j}\right)^{-n / q^{\prime}-1 / 2 q^{\prime}} \theta^{n / q^{\prime}}\left(r_{i, j}\right)^{-n / q} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d y \\
& \sim 2^{i} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \theta^{-1 / 2} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) \sim 2^{i}\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{\frac{i-i_{0}}{2 n}} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

For $\mathrm{I}_{2}$, it is apparent from $t>\left|x-x_{i, j}\right|+r_{i, j}$ that $B_{i, j} \subset\left\{y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}:|x-y| \leq t\right\}$. From this, the vanishing moments of $b_{i, j}$, and Minkowski's inequality for integrals, it follows that, for any $\lambda \in(0, \infty)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{I}_{2}=\int_{\left(\widetilde{B_{i, j}}\right)^{\mathrm{c}}}\left(\int_{\left|x-x_{i, j}\right|+r_{i, j}}^{\infty}\left|\int_{|x-y| \leq t} \frac{\Omega(x-y)}{|x-y|^{n-\rho}} b_{i, j}(y) d y\right|^{2} \frac{d t}{t^{2 \rho+1}}\right)^{1 / 2} \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x \\
& \leq \int_{\left(\widetilde{\left.B_{i, j}\right)}\right.}\left[\int_{B_{i, j}}\left|\frac{\Omega(x-y)}{|x-y|^{n-\rho}}-\frac{\Omega\left(x-x_{i, j}\right)}{\left|x-x_{i, j}\right|^{n-\rho}}\right|\left|b_{i, j}(y)\right|\left(\int_{\left|x-x_{i, j}\right|}^{\infty} \frac{d t}{t^{2 \rho+1}}\right)^{1 / 2} d y\right] \\
& \times \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x \\
& =C \int_{\left(\widetilde{\left.B_{i, j}\right)^{\mathrm{c}}}\right.}\left(\int_{B_{i, j}}\left|\frac{\Omega(x-y)}{|x-y|^{n-\rho}\left|x-x_{i, j}\right|^{\rho}}-\frac{\Omega\left(x-x_{i, j}\right)}{\left|x-x_{i, j}\right|^{n}}\right|\left|b_{i, j}(y)\right| d y\right) \\
& \times \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x \\
& \leq C \int_{\left(\widetilde{\left.B_{i, j}\right)^{\text {c }}}\right.}\left(\int_{B_{i, j}}\left|\frac{\Omega(x-y)}{|x-y|^{n-\rho}\left|x-x_{i, j}\right|^{\rho}}-\frac{\Omega(x-y)}{|x-y|^{n}}\right|\left|b_{i, j}(y)\right| d y\right) \\
& \times \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x \\
& +C \int_{\left(\widetilde{B_{i, j}}\right)^{\text {c }}}\left(\int_{B_{i, j}}\left|\frac{\Omega(x-y)}{|x-y|^{n}}-\frac{\Omega\left(x-x_{i, j}\right)}{\left|x-x_{i, j}\right|^{n}}\right|\left|b_{i, j}(y)\right| d y\right) \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x \\
& =: C\left(\mathrm{I}_{21}+\mathrm{I}_{22}\right) \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

On the one hand, the mean value theorem yields that, for any $x \in\left(\widetilde{B_{i, j}}\right)^{\complement}$ and $y \in B_{i, j}$,

$$
\left|\frac{1}{\left|x-x_{i, j}\right|^{\rho}}-\frac{1}{|x-y|^{\rho}}\right| \sim \frac{\left|y-x_{i, j}\right|}{|x-y|^{\rho+1}} \lesssim \frac{\left|y-x_{i, j}\right|^{1 / 2}}{|x-y|^{\rho+1 / 2}} \lesssim \frac{\left(r_{i, j}\right)^{1 / 2}}{|x-y|^{\rho+1 / 2}}
$$

which, together with the same argument as that used in $\mathrm{I}_{1}$, implies that, for any $\lambda \in(0, \infty)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{I}_{21} & \lesssim 2^{i} \int_{\left(\widetilde{B_{i, j}}\right)^{\mathrm{c}}}\left(\left.\int_{B_{i, j}} \frac{|\Omega(x-y)|}{|x-y|^{n-\rho} \mid} \frac{1}{\left|x-x_{i, j}\right|^{\rho}}-\frac{1}{|x-y|^{\rho}} \right\rvert\, d y\right) \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x \\
& \lesssim 2^{i}\left(r_{i, j}\right)^{1 / 2} \int_{\left(\widetilde{B_{i, j}}\right)^{\mathrm{c}}}\left(\int_{B_{i, j}} \frac{|\Omega(x-y)|}{|x-y|^{n+1 / 2}} d y\right) \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x \\
& \lesssim 2^{i}\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{\frac{i-i_{0}}{2 n}} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand, the condition (2.5) gives that, for any $\lambda \in(0, \infty)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{I}_{22} \lesssim 2^{i} \int_{\left|y-x_{i, j}\right|<r_{i, j}} \int_{\left|x-x_{i, j}\right|>(3 / 2)^{\left(i-i_{0}\right) / n} r_{i, j}}\left|\frac{\Omega(x-y)}{|x-y|^{n}}-\frac{\Omega\left(x-x_{i, j}\right)}{\left|x-x_{i, j}\right|^{n}}\right| \\
& \times \varphi\left(x, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x d y \\
& \sim 2^{i} \int_{|y|<r_{i, j}} \int_{|x|>(3 / 2)^{\left(i-i_{0}\right) / n} r_{r_{i, j}}}\left|\frac{\Omega(x-y)}{|x-y|^{n}}-\frac{\Omega(x)}{|x|^{n}}\right| \varphi\left(x+x_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d x d y \\
& \lesssim 2^{i} \int_{|y|<r_{i, j}}\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{\frac{i-i_{0}}{n}} \varphi\left(y+x_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) d y \lesssim 2^{i}\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{\frac{i-i_{0}}{2 n}} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Collecting the estimates of $\mathrm{I}_{1}, \mathrm{I}_{21}$, and $\mathrm{I}_{22}$, we obtain that, for any $\lambda \in(0, \infty)$,

$$
\mathrm{I} \lesssim \mathrm{I}_{1}+\mathrm{I}_{21}+\mathrm{I}_{22} \lesssim 2^{i}\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{\frac{i-i_{0}}{2 n}} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right)
$$

and hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi\left(\left\{x \in\left(A_{i_{0}}\right)^{\complement}:\left|\mu_{\Omega}^{\rho}\left(F_{2}\right)(x)\right|>2^{i_{0}}\right\}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) & \leq 2^{-i_{0}} \sum_{i=i_{0}}^{\infty} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \mathrm{I} \\
& \lesssim 2^{-i_{0}} \sum_{i=i_{0}}^{\infty} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} 2^{i}\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{\frac{i-i_{0}}{2 n}} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i_{0}}}{\lambda}\right) \\
& \lesssim \sup _{i \in \mathbb{Z}}\left\{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}} \varphi\left(B_{i, j}, \frac{2^{i}}{\lambda}\right)\right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last $\lesssim$ is due to the uniformly lower-type 1 property of $\varphi$. The proof is completed.
Remark 3.5. We should point out that if $\varphi$ is a growth function of uniformly lower-type 1 and of uniformly upper-type 1 , then $W H^{\varphi}=W H_{\varphi(\cdot, 1)}^{1}$ and $W L^{\varphi}=$
$W L_{\varphi(\cdot, 1)}^{1}$. In fact, there exists a positive constant $C$ such that, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ and $t \in(0, \infty)$,

$$
C^{-1} t \varphi(x, 1)=C^{-1} t \varphi(x, t / t) \leq \varphi(x, t) \leq C t \varphi(x, 1)
$$

which implies that

$$
\sup _{t \in(0, \infty)} \varphi(\{|f|>t\}, t) \sim \sup _{t \in(0, \infty)} \varphi(\{|f|>t\}, 1) t
$$

Hence, we have $W L^{\varphi}=W L_{\varphi(\cdot, 1)}^{1}$. Analogously, $W H^{\varphi}=W H_{\varphi(\cdot, 1)}^{1}$.
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