IMPROVED BOUNDS FOR RESTRICTED PROJECTION FAMILIES VIA WEIGHTED FOURIER RESTRICTION

TERENCE L. J. HARRIS

Abstract. It is shown that if $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ is a Borel set of Hausdorff dimension $\dim A \in (3/2, 5/2)$, then for a.e. $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ the projection $\pi_\theta(A)$ of $A$ onto the 2-dimensional plane orthogonal to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 1)$ satisfies $\dim \pi_\theta(A) \geq \max \left\{ \frac{4\dim A}{9} + \frac{5}{6}, \frac{2\dim A + 1}{3} \right\}$. This improves the bound of Oberlin and Oberlin [23], and of Orponen and Venieri [25], for $\dim A \in (3/2, 5/2)$. More generally, a weaker lower bound is given for families of planes in $\mathbb{R}^3$ parametrised by curves in $S^2$ with nonvanishing geodesic curvature.

1. Introduction

This article gives improved a.e. lower bounds for Hausdorff dimension under “restricted” families of orthogonal projections. The a.e. behaviour of Hausdorff dimension under orthogonal projections was first studied in 1954 by Marstrand [18], who showed that if $A$ is a Borel set in the plane, then for $0 \leq \dim A \leq 1$ the projection of $A$ onto a.e. line through the origin has dimension equal to $\dim A$, and if $\dim A > 1$ then the projection of $A$ onto a.e. line through the origin has positive length. This was generalised to projections onto $k$-planes in $\mathbb{R}^n$ by Mattila [19], with respect to the natural rotation invariant probability measure on the Grassmannian.

Somewhat more recently, questions of this type were studied for lower dimensional submanifolds of the Grassmannian [14, 13, 7, 24, 23, 2, 15, 25], in which case the problem is more difficult. Sets of projections corresponding to planes in lower dimensional subsets of the Grassmannian are referred to as “restricted projection families”.

The first result given here is for a 1-dimensional family of 2-dimensional planes in $\mathbb{R}^3$. To state it, let $\pi_\theta$ be orthogonal projection onto the orthogonal complement of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 1)$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$, and denote the Hausdorff dimension of a set $A$ by $\dim A$. A subset of a complete separable metric space $X$ is called analytic if it is the continuous image of a Borel subset of $Y$, where $Y$ is a complete separable metric space (in particular, every Borel subset of $X$ is analytic).

Theorem 1.1. If $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ is an analytic set with $\dim A \in (3/2, 5/2)$, then

$$\dim \pi_\theta(A) \geq \max \left\{ \frac{4\dim A}{9} + \frac{5}{6}, \frac{2\dim A + 1}{3} \right\}$$

for a.e. $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$.
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This improves the previously known bounds if \( \dim A \in (3/2, 5/2) \), and makes partial progress towards Conjecture 1.6 from [7], for the special curve \( \gamma(\theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 1) \). This conjecture asserts that \( \dim \pi_\theta(A) \geq \min \{ \dim A, 2 \} \) for a.e. \( \theta \), where \( \gamma \) can be any curve with nonvanishing geodesic curvature in \( S^2 \). By a rescaling argument (see Lemma A.1 in [25]), Theorem 1.1 continues to hold if the curve \( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 1) \) is replaced by any circle in \( S^2 \) which is not a great circle.

The best currently known bounds will be summarised here, omitting some results which have since been superseded. For \( \dim A \leq 1 \), the sharp a.e. lower bound \( \dim \pi_\theta(A) \geq \min \{ \dim A, 1 \} \) was obtained by Järvenpää, Järvenpää, Ledrappier, and Leikas [14], and in this range the lower bound still holds if the curve is replaced by any other circle in \( S^2 \) (even a great circle). For a great circle this result is the best possible, as can be seen by considering a set with dimension between 1 and 2 contained in the plane of the great circle.

Oberlin and Oberlin [23] proved

\[
\dim \pi_\theta(A) \geq \frac{3 \dim A}{4}, \quad \dim A \in (1, 2]
\]

\[
\dim \pi_\theta(A) \geq \dim A - \frac{1}{2}, \quad \dim A \in (2, 2.5]
\]

\[
\mathcal{H}^2(\pi_\theta(A)) > 0, \quad \dim A \in (2.5, 3],
\]

for a.e. \( \theta \in [0, 2\pi) \), which (prior to Theorem 1.1) was the best known a.e. lower bound for \( \dim A \geq 2.25 \), whilst the inequality \( \dim A > 5/2 \) remains the best known sufficient condition that ensures \( \mathcal{H}^2(\pi_\theta(A)) > 0 \) almost everywhere.

In [25] Orponen and Venieri proved the sharp a.e. equality \( \dim \pi_\theta(A) = \dim A \) for \( \dim A \in (1, 3/2] \), and gave the a.e. lower bound

\[
\dim \pi_\theta(A) \geq 1 + \frac{\dim A}{3}, \quad \dim A \in (3/2, 3].
\]

Prior to Theorem 1.1 the lower bound in (1.2) was the record for \( 3/2 < \dim A < 9/4 \). A comparison between Theorem 1.1 and prior results is shown in Figure 1.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 uses the decomposition of a fractal measure into “good” and “bad” parts, and a wave version of the “refined Strichartz inequality”, both recently used on the planar distance set problem in [8] (this decomposition is based on earlier ideas from [16, 28, 26]). The “bad” part is bounded using the key lemma from Orponen and Venieri’s proof of (1.2), whereas the “good” part is bounded through the refined Strichartz inequality, and by augmenting the Fourier-analytic approach of Oberlin-Oberlin with an “improvement due to localisation” technique related to the uncertainty principle (I learnt this technique from [3, Lemma 2.3]). These two bounds are converted to a projection theorem by adapting Liu’s \( L^2 \)-method from [17].

The lower bound (1.1) of Oberlin and Oberlin holds more generally for planes parametrised by curves in \( S^2 \) with nonvanishing geodesic curvature. The proof of the Orponen-Venieri lemma relies crucially on the constant height property of the curve \( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 1) \), so the “good-bad” decomposition does not seem directly applicable to this more general setting. For this more general problem, the following theorem gives an improvement to the lower bound (1.1) in the intermediate range; the proof uses the previously mentioned “localisation” technique, without the “good-bad” decomposition (see Subsection 1.1 for notation).
Theorem 1.2. Let $\gamma : [a, b] \to S^2$ be a $C^2$ curve with $\det (\gamma, \gamma', \gamma'')$ nonvanishing, and let $\pi_{\theta} = \pi_{\theta,\gamma}$ be projection onto $\gamma(\theta)^\perp$.

Fix $\alpha \in (0, 3)$, and let $\nu$ be a Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}^3$ with $\text{diam supp} \nu \leq C$. If $\alpha \leq 5/2$ and $t < \min \{\alpha, \max \{1 + \alpha^2, \alpha - 1/2\}\}$, then

$$\int_a^b I_t (\pi_{\theta} \# \nu) \, d\theta \lesssim_{\alpha, t, C} c_\alpha (\nu) \mathcal{H}^\alpha (\mathbb{R}^3),$$

and if $\alpha > 5/2$, then

$$\int_a^b \|\pi_{\theta} \# \nu\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}^\alpha)} \, d\theta \lesssim_{\alpha, C} c_\alpha (\nu) \mathcal{H}^\alpha (\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Consequently, for any analytic subset $A$ of $\mathbb{R}^3$,

$$\dim \pi_{\theta} (A) = \dim A, \quad \dim A \in [0, 1]$$

$$\dim \pi_{\theta} (A) \geq \frac{\dim A + 1}{2}, \quad \dim A \in (1, 2]$$

$$\dim \pi_{\theta} (A) \geq \dim A - \frac{1}{2}, \quad \dim A \in (2, 5/2]$$

$$\mathcal{H}^\alpha (\pi_{\theta} (A)) > 0, \quad \dim A > 5/2,$$

for a.e. $\theta \in [a, b]$.

The second part of Theorem 1.2 improves the bound of Oberlin-Oberlin (see (1.1)) and also Orponen’s bound from [24] Theorem 1.8 in the range $1 < \dim A < 2$ (the bound from [24] is qualitative; given as $1 + \sigma (\dim A)$ for an unspecified positive function $\sigma$ of $\dim A > 1$). By generalising the proof of Theorem 1.1 and using Theorem 1.2 to get a compromised version of Lemma 2.1 (as in Appendix A), it may be possible to improve (1.5) to $\dim \pi_{\theta} (A) \geq \min \{\dim A, \max \{\frac{2 \dim A}{3}, \frac{2 \dim A + 1}{3}\}\}$ when $\dim A < 5/2$, which would verify Conjecture 1.6 from [7] for $\dim A \in (1, 4/3]$. 

Figure 1. The conjectured and best known a.e. lower bounds for $\dim \pi_{\theta} (A)$, with $\dim A \in (1, 5/2)$.
Theorem 1.1 will be proved in Section 2. In Section 3 Theorem 1.2 and Proposition 3.3 will both be deduced as consequences of the more general Theorem 3.1, the proof of which occupies most of Section 3.

1.1. Notation. Given a set E in Euclidean space, let \( N_\delta(E) \) be the open \( \delta \)-neighbourhood of \( E \). If \( E \) is a box, let \( CE \) be the box with the same centre but with side lengths scaled by \( C \). Let \( H^s \) be the \( s \)-dimensional Hausdorff measure in Euclidean space. For \( \alpha \geq 0 \) and a positive Borel measure \( \mu \) supported in the unit ball of \( \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \), define

\[
c_\alpha(\mu) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \frac{\mu(B(x, r))}{r^\alpha}.
\]

By Frostman’s Lemma (see [4, 12, 21]), the Hausdorff dimension \( \dim B \) of a Borel (or analytic) set \( B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \) is the supremum over all \( \alpha \in [0, d+1] \) for which there exists a nonzero Borel measure \( \mu \) supported on \( B \) with finite \( c_\alpha(\mu) \). Hausdorff dimension can also be characterised through the energy

\[
I_\alpha(\mu) := \int \int |x - y|^{-\alpha} d\mu(x) d\mu(y) = c_{\alpha,d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \left| \xi \right|^{\alpha-(d+1)} |\hat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 d\xi,
\]

where \( \alpha \in (0, d+1) \); the last integral is called the Fourier energy of \( \mu \). For \( s \in \mathbb{R} \), define the homogeneous Sobolev norms by

\[
\|\mu\|^2_{H^s} = \|\mu\|^2_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \left| \xi \right|^{2s} |\hat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 d\xi,
\]

so that \( \|\mu\|^2_{H^{\alpha-(d+1)}} \) and \( I_\alpha(\mu) \) are equivalent for \( \alpha \in (0, d+1) \). A Borel measure \( \mu \) with \( c_\alpha(\mu) < \infty \) satisfies \( I_s(\mu) < \infty \) for any \( s < \alpha \), and if \( I_\alpha(\mu) < \infty \) then \( 0 < c_\alpha(\mu \restriction_A) < \infty \) for some Borel set \( A \subseteq \text{supp} \mu \); see e.g. [22, Chapter 2].

Given measurable spaces \( X, Y \), a measure \( \mu \) on \( X \) and a measurable function \( f : X \to Y \), define the pushforward measure \( f_\# \mu \) on \( Y \) by \( (f_\# \mu)(E) = \mu (f^{-1}(E)) \).

For a curve \( \gamma : [a, b] \to S^2 \) and fixed \( R > 0 \), define

\[
\Gamma_R(\gamma) = \{ \rho \gamma(\theta) : \theta \in [a, b], R/2 \leq \rho \leq R \}.
\]

Let \( \Gamma(\gamma) = \Gamma(\gamma) \). More generally, for a nonempty bounded open set \( \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \) and a function \( G \in C^2(\overline{\Omega}, S^d) \), let

\[
\Gamma_R(G) = \{ \rho G(y) : y \in \Omega, R/2 \leq \rho \leq R \},
\]

and let \( \Gamma(G) = \Gamma(1)(G) \).

2. Projections onto the planes \( (\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 1) \perp \)

2.1. Setup and preliminaries. Define \( \gamma : [0, 2\pi) \to S^2 \) by \( \gamma(\theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 1) \), and let \( \pi_\gamma : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \gamma(\theta) \perp \) be orthogonal projection onto the 2-dimensional plane \( \gamma(\theta) \perp \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3 \). Let \( |\cdot| = |\cdot| \mod 2\pi \) denote the distance on \([0, 2\pi)\) which naturally identifies this interval with the unit circle.

For any parameter \( K \geq 1 \), the truncated cone \( \Gamma_1 \) has a covering by boxes of dimensions \( K^{-1} \times 1 \times K^{-2} \); these will be referred to as the “standard” \( K^{-1} \)-boxes or caps. They come from the standard covering of \( S^1 \) by rectangles of dimensions \( K^{-1} \times K^{-2} \).

The notation used for the wave packet decomposition here will be similar to that from [8] for ease of comparison. Let \( \epsilon \) be a very small number, which will be sent
to zero at the end of the proof. Let $\Gamma_\mathbb{R}$ be the entire light cone with both forward and backward parts:

$$\Gamma_\mathbb{R} = \{ \lambda \gamma(\theta) : \theta \in [0, 2\pi), \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \}.$$ 

Fix a large positive integer $J$ to be chosen later. For each integer $j \geq J$ and $0 \leq k < j$, construct a finitely overlapping cover of $[\mathcal{N}_{2j-k}(\Gamma_{2j} \cup -\Gamma_{2j}) \setminus \mathcal{N}_{2j-k-1}(\Gamma_\mathbb{R})]$ with boxes $\tau = \tau_{j,k}$ of dimensions $2^{j-k} \times 2^j \times 2^{j-k}$.

For fixed $j$ and $k$, let $\Lambda_{j,k}$ be the set of boxes $\tau = \tau_{j,k}$ corresponding to $j$ and $k$. Each box $\tau \in \Lambda_{j,k}$ is such that $2^{-j/2}$ is contained in a standard box $\bar{\tau}$ at scale $2^{-j/2}$ for the cone $\Gamma_1 \cup -\Gamma_1$. When $k = j$ the boxes $\tau \in \Lambda_{j,j}$ are defined similarly, except that they cover the set $\mathcal{N}_j'(\Gamma_{2j} \cup -\Gamma_{2j})$. The wave packet decomposition is set up in this way to apply a change of variables later; the $L^2$ integral of the “good” part of $\hat{\mu}$ over the conical ring contained in the union of the boxes $\tau \in \Lambda_{j,k}$ will have a fixed Jacobian under this change of variables, and after rescaling by $2^{k-j}$ on the Fourier side this integral will correspond to a more standard $L^2$ conical average of the “good” part of $\hat{\mu}$ over the cone, through duality will be controlled using decoupling theory for the cone. The extra rescaling step causes the wave packet decomposition used here to be slightly more complicated than in [5].

This construction can be done in such a way that the boxes $1.1\tau$ are finitely overlapping as $j$ and $k$ vary, and that $\text{dist}(\tau_{j,k}, \Gamma_\mathbb{R}) \sim 2^{j-k}$ for all $j$ and $k$. Let $\{\psi_{\tau}\}_{j,k,\tau \in \Lambda_{j,k}}$ be a smooth partition of unity subordinate to the cover of the set $\bigcup_{j \geq J} \bigcup_{0 \leq k \leq j} \bigcup_{\tau \in \Lambda_{j,k}} \tau$ by the sets $1.1\tau$, such that each $\psi_{\tau}$ has compact support in $1.1\tau$. Then

$$1 = \sum_{j \geq J} \sum_{k=0}^{j} \sum_{\tau \in \Lambda_{j,k}} \psi_{\tau} \text{ on } \bigcup_{j \geq J} \bigcup_{0 \leq k \leq j} \bigcup_{\tau \in \Lambda_{j,k}} \tau.$$ 

Fix a small $\delta > 0$ with $\delta \ll \epsilon$, to be chosen after $\epsilon$. For each triple $(j, k, \tau)$ with $j \geq J$ and $\tau \in \Lambda_{j,k}$, construct a finitely overlapping cover of the ball of radius 2 around the origin in $\mathbb{R}^3$, with tubes $T$ of dimensions $2^{-j}2^{k(1/2+\delta)} \times 2^{-j}2^{k(1/2+\delta)} \times (10 \cdot 2^{-(j-k)})$.

Each rescaled set $2^{j-k}T$ is a roughly a tube of diameter $\approx 2^{-k/2}$ and length $\sim 1$, with direction normal to the cone at the rescaled box $2^{-j}\tau$ (which has dimensions $\approx 2^{-k/2} \times 1 \times 2^{-k}$). Each tube is a collection of boxes dual to the corresponding cap $\tau$, which are shorter in the middle direction. Let $\mathbb{T}_{j,k,\tau}$ be the set of tubes corresponding to $\tau \in \Lambda_{j,k}$. Let $\{\eta_T\}_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{j,k,\tau}}$ be a smooth partition of unity subordinate to this cover of $B_3(0, 2)$. For each $T \in \mathbb{T}_{j,k,\tau}$, define $M_T$ by

$$M_T f = \eta_T \overline{\widetilde{\psi_{\tau} f}} = \eta_T \mathcal{F}^{-1}(\psi_{\tau} \mathcal{F}(f)),$$

for Schwartz $f$. Let

$$\mathbb{T}_{j,k} = \bigcup_{\tau \in \Lambda_{j,k}} \mathbb{T}_{j,k,\tau}, \quad \mathbb{T} = \bigcup_{j=J}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=0}^{j} \mathbb{T}_{j,k}.$$
Fix a positive smooth function $\mu$ supported in the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^3$, identified with the measure $\mu \, dx$. The set of “bad” tubes will be the set of tubes with “large” $\mu$ measure, where “large” is defined so that the contribution coming from these “bad” tubes can be handled by the lemma of Orponen-Venieri (Lemma 2.1). The contribution from the remaining “good” tubes will be controlled using Fourier analysis, which is (roughly) where the improvement over the Orponen-Venieri bound comes from.

More explicitly, given $\alpha \in (3/2,3]$ (to be fixed later, corresponding to the “dimension” of $\mu$), define

\begin{equation}
\alpha^* = \max \left\{ \frac{\alpha}{3} + 1, \alpha - \frac{1}{2} \right\} - \epsilon.
\end{equation}

For each $j \geq J$ and $k$ with $0 \leq k \leq j$, let $\{B_l\}_l$ be a finitely overlapping cover of $B_j(0,1)$ by balls of radius $2^{-(j-k)}$, and let $\{\phi_{j,k,l}\}_l$ be a smooth partition of unity subordinate to this cover. Let $\mu_{j,k,l} = \phi_{j,k,l} \mu$. Define the set of “bad” tubes corresponding to $\tau \in \Lambda_{j,k}$ by

\begin{equation}
T_{j,k,\tau,b} = \left\{ T \in T_{j,k,\tau} : \mu_{j,k,l} \left( 5 \cdot 2^{100\delta - \alpha^*} \right) 2^{-\alpha(j-k)} \right\}.
\end{equation}

and let

\begin{equation}
T_{j,k,\tau,g} = T_{j,k,\tau} \setminus T_{j,k,\tau,b}.
\end{equation}

Let

\begin{equation}
T_{j,k,b} = \bigcup_{\tau \in \Lambda_{j,k}} T_{j,k,\tau,b}, \quad T_{j,k,g} = \bigcup_{\tau \in \Lambda_{j,k}} T_{j,k,\tau,g}.
\end{equation}

Similarly let

\begin{equation}
T_b = \bigcup_{j=J}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=0}^{j} T_{j,k,b}, \quad T_g = \bigcup_{j=J}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=0}^{j} T_{j,k,g}.
\end{equation}

Define the “bad” part of $\mu$ by summing over the “bad” tubes with $k$ bounded away from zero in the following quantitative sense:

\begin{equation}
\mu_b = \sum_{j=J}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{j} \sum_{\tau \in \Lambda_{j,k}} \sum_{T \in T_{j,k,\tau,b}} M_T \mu.
\end{equation}

Define the “good” part of $\mu$ by

\begin{equation}
\mu_g = \mu - \mu_b.
\end{equation}

For the specific function $\mu$ used later, only finitely many values of $j$ in (2.3) will be non-negligible, so there will not be any convergence issues in the infinite sum.

To bound the average $L^1$ norm of the pushforward of the “bad” part of a measure, the following lemma from Orponen and Venieri’s work on the same problem will play a crucial role.

\textbf{Lemma 2.1} (\cite{25} Lemma 2.3 for $s < 9/4$ and \cite{23} for $s \geq 9/4$). Let $s \in [0,5/2)$ and let $\nu$ be a compactly supported Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}^3$ such that $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^3} \nu(B(x, r)) \leq C_1$ and $\text{diam (supp} \, \nu) \leq C_2$, where $C_1, C_2$ are positive constants. Fix

\begin{equation}
\kappa > \max \left\{ 0, \min \left\{ \frac{2s}{3} - 1, \frac{1}{2} \right\} \right\}.
\end{equation}
Then there exist \( \delta_0, \eta > 0 \), depending only on \( C_1, C_2, s \) and \( \kappa \) such that
\[
\nu \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \mathcal{H}^1 \{ \theta \in [0, 2\pi) : \pi_{\theta \#} \nu \left( B(\pi_{\theta}(y), \delta) \right) > \delta^{s-\kappa} \} \geq \delta^\eta \} \leq \nu \left( \mathbb{R}^3 \right) \delta^\eta,
\]
for all \( \delta \in (0, \delta_0) \).

The \( \nu \left( \mathbb{R}^3 \right) \) factor is not given explicitly in [25], but follows from their proof. A proof that the case \( s \geq 9/4 \) follows from the main inequality in [23] is also given in Appendix A.

2.2. Main part of the proof.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let \( \dim E = (3/2, 5/2) \) and assume without loss of generality that \( A \) is a subset of the unit ball. Let \( \epsilon > 0 \), and let \( \nu \) be a compactly supported probability measure on \( A \) satisfying an \( \alpha \)-Frostman condition, where \( \alpha = \dim A - \epsilon < 3/2 \). Let \( E \subseteq [0, 2\pi) \) be a compact set such that
\[
\dim \pi_{\theta} \supp \nu < s - 200\sqrt{\epsilon} \quad \text{for every } \theta \in E,
\]
where
\[
(2.5) \quad s := \max \left\{ \frac{4\alpha}{9} + \frac{5}{6} \frac{2\alpha + 1}{3} \right\}.
\]

Let \( \epsilon' > 0 \) be arbitrary. The proof will be carried out by showing \( \mathcal{H}^1(E) \lesssim_{s, \epsilon'} \epsilon' \), letting \( \epsilon' \to 0 \), and then letting \( \epsilon \to 0 \). For \( \delta_0, \eta > 0 \) to be specified later (depending on \( \epsilon \)), let \( \delta_1 > 0 \) be such that \( \delta_1 < \delta_0/4 \) and \( \delta_1^\alpha < \epsilon' \) (the exact choice of \( \delta_1 \) will also be made later, but after \( \delta_0 \) and \( \eta \); see the paragraphs after (2.20) and (2.66)). For each \( \theta \in E \), let \( \{ B(z_i(\theta), \delta_i(\theta)) \}_i \) be a cover of \( \pi_{\theta} \supp \nu \) by balls of dyadic radii \( \delta_i(\theta) < \delta_1 \), such that
\[
(2.6) \quad \sum_i \delta_i(\theta)^{s'} - 100\sqrt{\epsilon} < \epsilon'
\]
(measurability issues of the function \( \theta \mapsto \delta_i(\theta) \) will be ignored, they can be dealt with similarly to the proof of Lemma 2.1 in [11]). Let
\[
D_{\theta}^j = \bigcup_{\delta_i(\theta)=2^{-j}} B(z_i(\theta), \delta_i(\theta)),
\]
and let \( \tilde{D}_{\theta}^j \) be the \( 2^{-j} \) neighbourhood of \( D_{\theta}^j \). Let
\[
(2.7) \quad \nu_j = \nu * \phi_j, \quad \phi_j(x) = 2^{3j} \phi(2^j x),
\]
for a smooth positive bump function \( \phi \) equal to 1 on the unit ball, satisfying \( 0 \leq \phi \leq 1 \) everywhere and vanishing outside \( B(0, 2) \). For each \( \theta \in E \),
\[
(2.8) \quad 1 = \nu(A) \leq \sum_{j>\log_2 \delta_1} \pi_{\theta \#} \nu(D_{\theta}^j) \lesssim \sum_{j>\log_2 \delta_1} \int_{D_{\theta}^j} \pi_{\theta \#} \nu_j \ d\mathcal{H}^2,
\]
the last inequality follows by expanding out each summand of the right hand side and applying Fubini, the assumption that \( \phi = 1 \) on the unit ball, and the 1-Lipschitz property of the projections \( \pi_{\theta} \) (as in [17], p.7), see also (2.68) for the formula for the density \( \pi_{\theta \#} \nu_j \). Integrating (2.8) over \( \theta \in E \) gives
\[
\mathcal{H}^1(E) \lesssim \sum_{j>\log_2 \delta_1} \int_{E} \int_{D_{\theta}^j} \pi_{\theta \#} \nu_j \ d\mathcal{H}^2 \ d\theta.
\]
Hence there exists a single $j_0 > |\log_2 \delta|$, which may depend on $E$ and $\epsilon'$, such that

\[ \mathcal{H}(E) \leq j_0^2 \int_E J_{\theta_{\#}} \nu_{j_0} d\mathcal{H}^2 d\theta \]

(2.9)

\[ \leq j_0^2 \int_0^{2\pi} \| \pi_{\theta_{\#}} \mu_b \|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}^2)} d\theta + j_0^2 \int_E J_{\theta_{\#}} \nu_{j_0} \| d\mathcal{H}^2 d\theta, \]

where

\[ \mu := \nu_{j_0}, \]

and the $J$ in the “good-bad” decomposition will be chosen later (depending on $j_0$ and $\epsilon$; see (2.66)). The proof will proceed by showing each term in (2.9) is $\lesssim \epsilon'$, from which the theorem will essentially follow.

Assume the first term in (2.9) dominates. If the angle of a tube $T$ is not roughly equal to the angle of projection $\theta$, then $\pi_{\theta_{\#}}(M_T \mu)$ is negligible (the proof of this is via nonstationary phase, and will be postponed until Subsection 2.3). To be more precise, for each $\tau \in J_{\theta_{\#}}$ let $\angle \tau$ be the angle corresponding to $\tau$. For the forward (resp. backward) light cone, this angle can be defined as the value of $\phi$ such that the line through $(\cos \phi, \sin \phi, 1)$ (resp. $(\cos \phi, \sin \phi, -1)$) passes through the barycentre of the unique standard box $\tilde{T}$ at scale $2^{-k/2}$ containing $2^{-\gamma} \tau$. Use the notation $\angle \tau^*$ to denote $(\pi + \angle \tau)$ mod $2\pi$ if $\tau$ lies in the forward light cone, and $\angle \tau^* = \angle \tau$ if $\tau$ lies in the backward light cone. Use $\angle \tau^* = \pi + \angle \tau$ mod $2\pi$ if $\tau(T)$ lies in the forward light cone, and $\angle \tau^* = \pi + \angle \tau$ mod $2\pi$ if $\tau(T)$ lies in the backward light cone. For each $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, the first integrand in (2.9) satisfies

\[ \| \pi_{\theta_{\#}} \mu_b \|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}^2)} = \left\| \sum_{j=J}^\infty \sum_{k=[j\epsilon]} \sum_{\tau \in J_{\theta_{\#}}} \sum_{T \in T_{j,k,\tau,b}} \pi_{\theta_{\#}}(M_T \mu) \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}^2)} \]

\[ \leq \sum_{j=J}^\infty \sum_{k=[j\epsilon]} \sum_{\tau \in J_{\theta_{\#}}} \sum_{T \in T_{j,k,\tau,b}} \| \pi_{\theta_{\#}}(M_T \mu) \|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}^2)} \]

\[ = \sum_{j=J}^\infty \sum_{k=[j\epsilon]} \sum_{\tau \in J_{\theta_{\#}}} \sum_{T \in T_{j,k,\tau,b}} \left\| \pi_{\theta_{\#}}(M_T \mu) \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}^2)} \]

\[ + \sum_{j=J}^\infty \sum_{k=[j\epsilon]} \sum_{\tau \in J_{\theta_{\#}}} \sum_{T \in T_{j,k,\tau,b}} \| \pi_{\theta_{\#}}(M_T \mu) \|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}^2)}. \]

By Lemma 2.2, the second term is $\lesssim_{\epsilon, N} 2^{-J N}$, and therefore

(2.10)

\[ \| \pi_{\theta_{\#}} \mu_b \|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}^2)} \]

\[ \lesssim_{\epsilon, N} 2^{-J N} + \sum_{j=J}^\infty \sum_{k=[j\epsilon]} \sum_{\tau \in J_{\theta_{\#}}} \sum_{T \in T_{j,k,\tau,b}} \| \pi_{\theta_{\#}}(M_T \mu) \|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}^2)}. \]

By the formula (2.68) for the pushforward density, the $L^1$ norm of the pushforward satisfies $\| \pi_{\theta_{\#}} f \|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}^2)} \leq \| f \|_1$ for any $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$; this will be applied to $f =
$MT\mu$. The function $\tilde{\psi}_{\tau}$ decays rapidly outside the box $\tau'$ centred at 0 with dual dimensions to $\tau$, and this box is smaller than $T$ by at least a factor of $2^{k\delta}$ in every direction, so by Fubini the operator $MT$ satisfies $\|MT\mu\|_1 \lesssim_N \mu(T) + 2^{-kN}$. Hence

$$\|\pi_{\theta}\#(MT\mu)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq \|MT\mu\|_1 \lesssim_N \mu(T) + 2^{-kN}.$$ 

Putting this into (2.10) yields

$$\|\pi_{\theta}\#(MT\mu)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim_{\delta,N} 2^{-JN} + \sum_{j=J}^{\infty} \sum_{k=\lfloor j/\epsilon \rfloor}^{j} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_{j,k,\tau,b}} \mu(T).$$

This will be simplified using “essential disjointness” of the inner two sums. Let

$$B_{j,k}(\theta) = \bigcup_{\tau \in \Lambda_{j,k}} \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_{j,k,\tau,b}} 2T.$$

For each $\theta$, the number of $\tau$’s occurring in the third sum of (2.11) is $\lesssim 2^{k\delta}$, so (2.11) becomes

$$\|\pi_{\theta}\#(MT\mu)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \lesssim_{\delta,N} 2^{-JN} + \sum_{j=J}^{\infty} \sum_{k=\lfloor j/\epsilon \rfloor}^{j} 2^{k\delta} \mu(B_{j,k}(\theta)).$$

Define

$$B_{j,k} = \left\{(\theta, x) \in [0, 2\pi) \times \mathbb{R}^3 : x \in B_{j,k}(\theta)\right\}.$$ 

Integrating (2.12) over $[0, 2\pi)$ gives

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \|\pi_{\theta}\#(MT\mu)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} d\theta \lesssim_{\delta,N} 2^{-JN} + \sum_{j=J}^{\infty} \sum_{k=\lfloor j/\epsilon \rfloor}^{j} 2^{k\delta} \int_0^{2\pi} \mu(B_{j,k}(\theta)) d\theta$$

$$= 2^{-JN} + \sum_{j=J}^{\infty} \sum_{k=\lfloor j/\epsilon \rfloor}^{j} 2^{k\delta} (\mathcal{H}^1 \times \mu)(B_{j,k}).$$

If $(\theta, x) \in B_{j,k}$, then there is a “bad” tube $T \in \mathcal{T}_{j,k,\tau}$ such that $x \in 2T$, corresponding to a cap $\tau$ with $|\angle(\tau)^* - \theta| \leq 10^3 2^{k(-1/2+\delta)}$. Assume that $\tau$ lies in the forward light cone, so that $\angle(\tau)^* = \angle \tau + \pi$ and $\angle T^* = \angle T$. The tube $T$ is normal to the cone at $\tau$ (i.e. normal to cone at $2^{-J}\tau$), which means that $\angle T^* = \angle T$ mod $\pi$, where $\angle T$ is such that $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\cos \angle T, \sin \angle T, 1)$ is the direction of $T$. Hence

$$|\angle(T)^* - \theta| \leq 10^3 2^{k(-1/2+\delta)}.$$ 

This holds similarly if $\tau$ lies in the backward light cone.

Since the angle of $T$ is roughly in the direction of $\theta$, the image of $T$ under $\pi_{\theta}$ is approximately a disc of the same radius, and the “bad” tube assumption means the projected measure fails a Frostman condition. The Orponen-Venieri lemma (Lemma 2.14) gives a bound on the measure of those points which fail a Frostman condition in many directions, so this will now be used to bound (2.13).

By the definition of “bad” tubes in (2.22), the tube $T$ satisfies

$$\mu_{j,k,l} \left(5 \cdot 2^{\frac{5\delta}{2}} T\right) \geq 2^{\frac{5}{2}(100\delta - \alpha^*)} - \alpha(j-k),$$
for some $l$. By (2.14),
\[
5 \cdot \frac{10}{2} T \subseteq \pi^{-1}_\theta \left( B \left( \pi_\theta(x), 10^7 \cdot 2^{-j+k(1/2+2\delta)} \right) \right),
\]
and so
\[
(2.15) \quad \left( \pi_{\#} \mu_{j,k,l} \right) \left( B \left( \pi_\theta(x), 10^7 \cdot 2^{-j+k(1/2+2\delta)} \right) \right) \geq \mu_{j,k,l} \left( 5 \cdot \frac{10}{2} T \right) \geq 2^{\frac{1}{2} \left( 100\delta - \alpha \right) - \alpha(j-k)}.
\]

Let $B_{j,k,l}$ be the set of points $(\theta,x) \in B_{j,k}$ such that the outer parts of (2.15) hold for $l$, and such that $x \in 20B_l$. More explicitly,
\[
B_{j,k,l} := \left\{ \left( \theta,x \right) \in \left[ 0, 2\pi \right) \times 20B_l : \left( \pi_{\#} \mu_{j,k,l} \right) \left( B \left( \pi_\theta(x), 10^7 \cdot 2^{-j+k(1/2+2\delta)} \right) \right) \geq \mu_{j,k,l} \left( 5 \cdot \frac{10}{2} T \right) \right\}.
\]

Using the parameter $\eta > 0$ (yet to be chosen), let $Z_{j,k,l}$ be the set of $x$’s such that
\[
(2.16) \quad \int_0^{2\pi} \chi_{B_{j,k,l}}(\theta,x) \, d\theta \geq \left( 2^k(-1/2+2\delta) \right)^{\eta}.
\]

Informally, $x \in Z_{j,k,l}$ means that $x$ has lots of “bad” tubes passing through it, whose projections are discs failing a Frostman condition. The points in $Z_{j,k,l}$ will be bounded using the Orponen-Venieri lemma (Lemma 2.1), whilst the points outside $Z_{j,k,l}$ will be bounded using the negation of (2.16). By (2.15), $B_{j,k} \subseteq \bigcup_l B_{j,k,l}$, so each summand of (2.13) satisfies
\[
(\mathcal{H}^1 \times \mu)(B_{j,k}) \leq \sum_l (\mathcal{H}^1 \times \mu)(B_{j,k,l})
= \sum_l (\mathcal{H}^1 \times \mu)(B_{j,k,l} \cap (\left[ 0, 2\pi \right) \times Z_{j,k,l}))
+ \sum_l (\mathcal{H}^1 \times \mu)(B_{j,k,l} \setminus (\left[ 0, 2\pi \right) \times Z_{j,k,l})).
\]

To bound the second sum, write $m \sim l$ if $\text{supp} \mu_{j,k,m} \cap 20B_l \neq \emptyset$ (the number of such $m$ is $\ll 1$). Then
\[
\sum_l (\mathcal{H}^1 \times \mu)(B_{j,k,l} \setminus (\left[ 0, 2\pi \right) \times Z_{j,k,l}))
\leq \sum_l \sum_{m \sim l} (\mathcal{H}^1 \times \mu_{j,k,m})(B_{j,k,l} \setminus (\left[ 0, 2\pi \right) \times Z_{j,k,l}))
\leq \sum_l \sum_{m \sim l} \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus Z_{j,k,l}} \int_0^{2\pi} \chi_{B_{j,k,l}}(\theta,x) \, d\theta \, d\mu_{j,k,m}(x)
\leq \left( 2^k(-1/2+2\delta) \right)^{\eta},
\]
by the inequality in (2.16) defining $Z_{j,k,l}$. Since $\delta \ll \eta \ll 1$ (\delta has not been chosen yet, but it may be chosen after $\eta$), putting the previous bound into (2.17) and then
The choice of \( J \) (made later in (2.66)) is \( J = (j_0 \epsilon) / (2C) \) for a large absolute constant \( C \), so by choosing \( \delta_1 \) small enough (depending on \( \epsilon' \), \( \eta \) and \( \delta_0 \)) and using \( j_0 > (\log_2 \delta_1) \), the quantity \( j_0^2 2^{-(J \epsilon \eta) / 4} \) will be much smaller than \( \epsilon' \), which shows that \( \mathcal{H}^1(E) \leq \epsilon' \) if the first integral in (2.9) dominates.

(2.13) results in

\[
\int_0^{2\pi} \| \pi_{\theta \# \mu_0} \|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}^2)} \, d\theta \\
\lesssim \eta 2^{-(J \epsilon \eta) / 4} + \sum_{j=J}^{2 J} \sum_{k=\lfloor j/2 \rfloor}^j \sum_{l=1}^l 2^{k \delta} (\mathcal{H}^1 \times \mu)(B_{j,k,l} \cap ([0, 2\pi) \times Z_{j,k,l})).
\]

It remains to bound the sum on the right hand side. By the definitions of \( Z_{j,k,l} \) and \( B_{j,k,l} \),

\[
(\mathcal{H}^1 \times \mu)(B_{j,k,l} \cap ([0, 2\pi) \times Z_{j,k,l})) \\
\leq (\mathcal{H}^1 \times \mu) ([0, 2\pi) \times Z_{j,k,l}) \\
\sim \mu(Z_{j,k,l}) \\
= \mu \{ x \in 20B_1 : \mathcal{H}^1 \{ \theta \in [0, 2\pi) : (\theta, x) \in B_{j,k,l} \} \geq 2^k \theta^{(-1/2+2\delta)} \} \\
= \mu \{ x \in 20B_1 : \mathcal{H}^1 \{ \theta \in [0, 2\pi) : (\pi_{\theta \# \mu_{j,k,l}}) (B_{\pi_\theta(x), 10^{-7} \cdot 2^{-j+k(1/2+2\delta)}) \} \} \\
\geq 2^{\frac{1}{2} (100\delta - \alpha^*) - \alpha(j-k)} \} \geq 2^{k(-1/2+2\delta)}^{\eta}
\]

\[(2.19) \]

\[
\lesssim 2^{-\alpha(j-k)} \lambda \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \mathcal{H}^1 \{ \theta \in [0, 2\pi) : (\pi_{\theta \# \lambda}) (B_{\pi_\theta(x), 2^k(-1/2+2\delta)}) \} \} \\
\geq 2^{k(-1/2+2\delta)} \} \geq 2^{k(-1/2+2\delta)} \eta,
\]

where

\[
\lambda := 2^{\alpha(j-k)} \cdot [A_{j,k} \# (\mu \chi_{20B_1})],
\]

and \( A_{j,k} \) is the map \( x \mapsto 10^{-7} \cdot 2^{-j-k} x \). The measure \( \lambda \) is supported in a ball of diameter \( \leq 1 \), and satisfies \( c_\alpha(\lambda) \leq 1 \) by the dimension property of \( \mu = \nu_{j_0} \) inherited from the dimension assumption on \( \nu \) (see (2.7)). The total mass of \( \lambda \) satisfies \( \lambda (\mathbb{R}^3) = 2^{\alpha(j-k)} \mu(20B_1) \). Applying Lemma 2.1 to (2.19) therefore gives

\[
(\mathcal{H}^1 \times \mu)(B_{j,k,l} \cap ([0, 2\pi) \times Z_{j,k,l})) \lesssim \epsilon \mu(20B_1) \left(2^{k(-1/2+2\delta)} \right) \eta,
\]

where \( \delta_0 \) and \( \eta \) are now chosen to be very small quantities that work in Lemma 2.1 (they may depend on \( \epsilon \)). Since \( \delta \ll \eta \ll 1 \), summing over \( l \) and putting this into (2.18) gives

\[
\int_0^{2\pi} \| \pi_{\theta \# \mu_0} \|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}^2)} \, d\theta \lesssim \epsilon 2^{-(J \epsilon \eta) / 4}.
\]

The choice of \( J \) (made later in (2.66)) is \( J = (j_0 \epsilon) / (2C) \) for a large absolute constant \( C \), so by choosing \( \delta_1 \) small enough (depending on \( \epsilon' \), \( \eta \) and \( \delta_0 \)) and using \( j_0 > (\log_2 \delta_1) \), the quantity \( j_0^2 2^{-(J \epsilon \eta) / 4} \) will be much smaller than \( \epsilon' \), which shows that \( \mathcal{H}^1(E) \lesssim \epsilon' \) if the first integral in (2.9) dominates.
Now suppose the second integral in (2.9) dominates. Applying Cauchy-Schwarz to the double integral in (2.9) gives

\[
\mathcal{H}^1(E) \lesssim j_0 \sup_{\theta \in E} \mathcal{H}^2 \left( D_{\theta}^{(2)} \right) \int_0^{2\pi} \| \pi_{\theta\#} \mu_g \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}^2)}^2 \ d\theta
\]

\[
\lesssim j_0^4 2^{j_0(s-2-100\sqrt{\gamma})} \int_0^{2\pi} \| \pi_{\theta\#} \mu_g \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}^2)}^2 \ d\theta,
\]

by (2.6).

For each \( \theta \in [0, 2\pi] \) let \( U_\theta : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3 \) be the unitary operator satisfying

\[
U_\theta \left( \frac{\gamma'(\theta)}{\gamma'(\theta)} \right) = e_1, \quad U_\theta \left( \gamma(\theta) \times \frac{\gamma'(\theta)}{\gamma'(\theta)} \right) = e_2, \quad U_\theta \gamma(\theta) = e_3,
\]

where the \( e_i \) are the standard basis vectors in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \). This rotates the image of \( \pi_\theta \) to \( \mathbb{R}^2 \times \{0\} \). Since \( \mathcal{H}^2 \) is a rotation invariant measure on \( \mathbb{R}^3 \),

\[
2^{j_0(s-2-100\sqrt{\gamma})} \int_0^{2\pi} \| \pi_{\theta\#} \mu_g \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathcal{H}^2)}^2 \ d\theta
\]

\[
= 2^{j_0(s-2-100\sqrt{\gamma})} \int_0^{2\pi} \| U_\theta \pi_{\theta\#} \mu_g \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)}^2 \ d\theta
\]

\[
\lesssim_\mathcal{N} 2^{-j_0 N} + 2^{-j_0 \epsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \int_0^{2\pi} |\eta|^{s-50\sqrt{\gamma}-2} |\tilde{\mu}_g(\eta_1 \gamma'(\theta) + \eta_2 \gamma(\theta) \times \gamma'(\theta))|^2 \ d\theta \ d\eta.
\]

The formula \( \tilde{\mu}_g = \tilde{\mu}_g \circ T^* \) for a linear map \( T \) was used to obtain the last line, combined with Plancherel and the rapid decay of the Fourier transform of \( \mu_g = (\nu * \phi_{j_0})_g \) outside \( B(0, 2^{j_0(1+\delta)}) \), where \( \delta < \epsilon/100 \). When a change of variables is applied to (2.22) to rewrite the integral in terms of the Fourier energy of \( \mu \), the corresponding Jacobian blows up near the light cone. For this reason, the integral will be broken into two parts; one piece can be written in terms of the Fourier energy of \( \mu \), the other behaves like the \( L^2 \)-average of \( \tilde{\mu}_g \) over the cone (at various scales) and can be bounded using decoupling theory for the cone.

Define \( \kappa \) by

\[
\kappa = 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{10^5}
\]

and define \( s' \) by

\[
s' = s - 50\sqrt{\gamma} = \max \left\{ \frac{4\alpha}{9} + \frac{5}{6}, \frac{2\alpha + 1}{3} \right\} - 50\sqrt{\gamma},
\]

where the second equality comes from the definition of \( s \) in (2.3). The other parts being similar, it will suffice to bound the part of the integral in (2.22) over the positive quadrant, which may be written as

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^2_+} \int_0^{2\pi} |\eta|^{s'-2} |\tilde{\mu}_g(\eta_1 \gamma'(\theta) + \eta_2 \gamma(\theta) \times \gamma'(\theta))|^2 \ d\theta \ d\eta
\]

\[
= \int_{\eta_1 > \eta_2 \geq 0} \int_0^{2\pi} |\eta|^{s'-2} |\tilde{\mu}_g(\eta_1 \gamma'(\theta) + \eta_2 \gamma(\theta) \times \gamma'(\theta))|^2 \ d\theta \ d\eta
\]

\[
+ \int_{0 \leq \eta_1 \leq \eta_2} \int_0^{2\pi} |\eta|^{s'-2} |\tilde{\mu}_g(\eta_1 \gamma'(\theta) + \eta_2 \gamma(\theta) \times \gamma'(\theta))|^2 \ d\theta \ d\eta.
\]
To bound the first integral, in (2.26), let

\[(2.28) \quad \xi = \xi(\eta_1, \eta_2, \theta) = \eta_1 \gamma'(\theta) + \eta_2 \gamma(\theta) \times \gamma'(\theta).\]

The scalar triple product formula \(\det(a, b, c) = \langle a \times b, c \rangle\) gives

\[(2.29) \quad \frac{d\xi}{d\eta_1 d\eta_2 d\theta} = \det (\gamma' \gamma \gamma') = \langle \gamma' \times (\gamma \gamma'), \eta_1 \gamma'' + \eta_2 \gamma \times \gamma'' \rangle = \eta_1 \gamma(\theta)/2, \gamma'' \rangle = -\frac{\eta_1}{4},\]

where the last equality follows from

\[0 = \frac{d}{d\theta} \langle \gamma, \gamma' \rangle = \frac{1}{2} + \langle \gamma, \gamma'' \rangle,\]

since \(\gamma\) is a curve in the unit sphere with speed \(1/\sqrt{2}\).

By the definition of \(\kappa\), in (2.23), if \(2^j \leq |\eta|/\sqrt{2} \leq 2^{j+1}\) and \(j \geq J\) the domain of integration in (2.26) has distance \(\gtrsim 2^j (1 - \epsilon)\) from the light cone \(\Gamma_R\), and on the Fourier side \(\hat{\mu}_b\) is essentially supported on a \(\sim 2^{((1-i)\rho)}\) neighbourhood of \(\Gamma_R\) (see the definition of \(\mu_b\) and \(\mu_g\) in (2.3) and (2.4)). Hence \(\hat{\mu}_g\) is equal to \(\hat{\mu}\) plus a rapidly decaying error term, on the domain of the integration in (2.26) (if \(j < J\) the error is \(\lesssim \epsilon\) by the definition of \(\mu_b\)). Applying the change of variables from (2.28) to the integral in (2.26) therefore results in

\[(2.30)\]

\[\int_{|\eta| > \sqrt{2} \gtrsim 0} \int_{0}^{2\pi} |\eta|^{s' - 2} |\hat{\mu}_g (\eta_1 \gamma'(\theta) + \eta_2 \gamma(\theta) \times \gamma'(\theta))|^2 d\theta d\eta \lesssim \epsilon 2^{3J} + \int_{|\xi| > \sqrt{2} - \kappa} |\hat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \lesssim \epsilon 2^{3J},\]

since \(s' - 2 - \kappa < \alpha - 3\) by the definition of \(\kappa\) in (2.23). This bounds the integral in (2.26).

For the remaining integral, in (2.27), define \(r\) and \(t\) as functions of \(\eta_1\) and \(\eta_2\) by

\[(2.31) \quad r^2 = \eta_1^2 + \eta_2^2, \quad \eta_2 = rt,\]

so that the corresponding Jacobian is

\[(2.32) \quad \begin{vmatrix} dr dt \\ d\eta_1 d\eta_2 \end{vmatrix} = \frac{\sqrt{1 - t^2}}{r}.\]

Let \(C > 2\) be a large constant to be chosen later, and let

\[(2.33) \quad \gamma(\theta) = \sqrt{1 - t^2} \gamma'(\theta) + t \gamma(\theta) \times \gamma'(\theta).\]
Using the change of variables from (2.28) and (2.31), it will be shown that the integral in (2.29) satisfies
\[
\int_{0<\eta_1<\eta_2} \int_0^{2\pi} |\eta|^{s'-2} |\tilde{\mu}_g (\eta_1 \gamma' (\theta) + \eta_2 \gamma (\theta))|^2 \, d\theta \, d\eta
\]
(2.34)
\[
\lesssim_{\varepsilon} 1 + \sum_{j \geq (1-\kappa)^{-1}} \sum_{k=\lfloor 2j (1-\kappa) \rfloor}^{\lfloor j (1-\kappa) \rfloor} 2^{-j} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \frac{2^{j(s'-1)}}{\sqrt{1-t^2}} |\tilde{\mu}_{g} (r \gamma (\theta))|^2 \, d\theta \, dr \, dt
\]
(2.35)
\[
\quad + \sum_{j \geq (1-\kappa)^{-1}} \sum_{k=\lfloor 2j (1-\kappa) \rfloor}^{\lfloor j (1-\kappa) \rfloor} 2^{-j} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \int_{0}^{2\pi} \frac{2^{j(s'-1)}}{\sqrt{1-t^2}} |\tilde{\mu}_{g} (r \gamma (\theta))|^2 \, d\theta \, dr \, dt
\]
(2.36)
\[
\lesssim_{\varepsilon} 1
\]
(2.37)
\[
\quad + \sum_{j \geq (1-\kappa)^{-1}} \sum_{k=\lfloor 2j (1-\kappa) \rfloor}^{\lfloor j (1-\kappa) \rfloor} 2^{j(s'+k)/2} \int_{\mathcal{N}_{C;2^{-2j}}(\Gamma) \setminus \mathcal{N}_{C;1-2^{-j}}(\Gamma_{R})} |\tilde{\mu}_{g} (2^j \xi)|^2 \, d\xi
\]
(2.38)

The first bound, in (2.31), (2.35) and (2.36), is a straightforward consequence of the change of variables in (2.31) and dyadic decomposition. Proving the second bound is essentially equivalent to showing that (2.35) is bounded by (2.37). To verify this, it suffices to change variables in each summand (using (2.29) and (2.32)), and check that the equality
\[
r \sqrt{1-t^2} \gamma' (\theta) + rt \gamma (\theta) \times \gamma' (\theta) = 2^{j} \xi
\]
(2.39)

where
\[
2^{-j} \leq r \leq 2^j, \quad 2^{-(k+1)} \leq 1-t \leq 2^{-k},
\]
implies that \( \xi \in \mathcal{N}_{C;2^{-2j}}(\Gamma) \setminus \mathcal{N}_{C;1-2^{-j}}(\Gamma_{R}) \), provided \( C \) is large enough; to simplify notation \( \Gamma \) is used here to denote the set of points \((\xi, |\xi|)\) in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) with \( 1/10 \leq |\xi| \leq 10 \), and \( \Gamma_{R} \) is the entire light cone. Division of (2.39) by \( 2^j \) gives
\[
2^{-j} \leq r \leq 2^j, \quad 2^{-k} \leq 1-t \leq 2^{-k}, \quad 2^{-2^{j-k}/2} \leq \lambda_1 \leq 2 \cdot 2^{-k/2}
\]
(2.40)

By computing the cross product explicitly, this can be written as
\[
\xi = \frac{\lambda_2}{\sqrt{2}} \gamma (\theta + \pi) - \lambda_1 \gamma' (\theta + \pi)
\]
(2.41)
where the implicit constant in \( O (h^2) \) is uniform. Then \( h \) satisfies \( |h| \lesssim \lambda_1 \), and therefore \( \text{dist} (\xi, \Gamma) \lesssim \lambda_2^2 \lesssim 2^{-k} \). Hence \( \xi \notin \mathcal{N}_{C;2^{-2j}}(\Gamma_{R}) \) provided \( C \) is chosen large enough. Moreover, (2.41) and the lower bound on \( \lambda_1 \) in (2.40) imply that \( \text{dist} (\xi, \Gamma_{R}) \gtrsim \lambda_2 \gtrsim 2^{-k} \), and so \( \xi \notin \mathcal{N}_{C;1-2^{-j}}(\Gamma_{R}) \) provided \( C \) is chosen large enough. This verifies that (2.35) is bounded by (2.37).
It remains to bound the sums in (2.37) and (2.38). The terms in (2.37) will be bounded first; by the uncertainty principle, bounding the terms in (2.38) will essentially be equivalent to bounding those terms in (2.37) with $k$ close to $j$. For each $k$ in (2.37), assume first that the corresponding $j$ satisfies $j \geq J$ (the other terms will be bounded trivially). Let $\rho = 2^{-j-k}$ and define $\mu_{g,\rho^*}$ by $\hat{\mu}_{g,\rho^*}(\xi) = \hat{\mu}_g(\rho \xi)$. Correspondingly, define $MT_{\rho^*} \mu$ by $\hat{MT}_{\rho^*} \mu(\xi) = \hat{MT}_\mu(\rho \xi)$. Define $\eta_{T,1/\rho}$ by $\eta_{T,1/\rho}(x) = \eta_T(x/\rho)$, and define $\psi_{\tau,\rho}$ by $\psi_{\tau,\rho}(\xi) = \psi_{\tau}(\rho \xi)$. Let $\{B_m\}$ be a finitely overlapping cover of $B(0,2\rho)$ by unit balls and let $\{\psi_m\}$ be a smooth partition of unity subordinate to this cover. Let $\phi$ be a positive smooth function supported in $N_{2C}(2^k \Gamma) \setminus N_{(2C)^{-1}}(\Gamma_R)$, with $\phi \sim 1$ on $N_C(2^k \Gamma) \setminus N_{(2C)^{-1}}(\Gamma_R)$, such that

\begin{equation}
(2.42) \quad \left| \hat{\phi}(x) \right| \lesssim N 2^{2k} |x|^{-N}.
\end{equation}

The integral in the summand of (2.37) satisfies

\begin{align}
(2.43) & \quad \int_{N_{C_{2^{-k}}}(\Gamma) \setminus N_{C_{2^{-1-k}}}(\Gamma_R)} \left| \hat{\mu}_g(2^j \xi) \right|^2 \, d\xi \\
& \quad \lesssim \int \phi(2^k \xi) \left| \hat{\mu}_{g,\rho^*}(2^k \xi) \right|^2 \, d\xi \\
& \quad = \frac{1}{2^{3k}} \int \phi(\xi) \left| \sum_m \psi_m \hat{\mu}_{g,\rho^*}(\xi) \right|^2 \, d\xi \\
& \quad \lesssim \frac{\rho^{3k^2}}{2^{3k}} \sum_m \int \phi(\xi) \left| \psi_m \hat{\mu}_{g,\rho^*}(\xi) \right|^2 \, d\xi \\
(2.44) & \quad + \frac{1}{2^{4k}} \sum_{\text{dist}(B_m,B_n) \geq \rho^*^2} \left| \int \phi(\xi) \psi_m \hat{\mu}_{g,\rho^*}(\xi) \psi_n \hat{\mu}_{g,\rho^*}(\xi) \, d\xi \right|.
\end{align}

By Plancherel and by (2.42), the summands in (2.45) satisfy

\begin{equation}
(2.46) \quad \left| \int \phi(\xi) \psi_m \hat{\mu}_{g,\rho^*}(\xi) \psi_n \hat{\mu}_{g,\rho^*}(\xi) \, d\xi \right| \lesssim N 2^O(j) \rho^{-cN}.
\end{equation}

By taking $N$ large, this shows that the terms in (2.45) can essentially be ignored, and it remains to bound the sum in (2.44). This will be done through the refined Strichartz inequality for the cone (Theorem 2.29, the precise statement and proof of which is postponed until Subsection 2.4).

In order to bound (2.44), by partitioning the wave packet decomposition of $\mu_{g,\rho^*}$ into $\lesssim 1$ measures and applying the triangle inequality, it may be assumed that any two caps in the wave packet decomposition of $\mu_{g,\rho^*}$ are non-adjacent. Similarly it may be assumed that any two tubes in the wave packet decomposition of $\mu_{g,\rho^*}$ corresponding to the same cap $\tau$ are non-adjacent. By the constraints on the support of $\phi$, the only caps $\tau$ in the sum defining $\mu_{g,\rho^*}$ that contribute substantially to (2.44) are those corresponding to $j', k'$ with

\begin{equation}
(2.47) \quad |j - j'| \leq C', \quad |k - k'| \leq C',
\end{equation}
for some large constant $C'$ depending only on $C$. Write $2^{j'} \sim 2^{j}$ and $2^{k} \sim 2^{k'}$ if $j'$ and $k'$ satisfy (2.47). Then for fixed $m$,

\[
(2.48) \quad \int \phi(\xi) \left| \hat{\psi}_{m\mu_{g},\rho'}(\xi) \right|^2 d\xi 
\]

\[
\lesssim N 2^{-kN} + \int \left| \sum_{j'=2^{j'}} \sum_{k'=2^{k'}} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{A}_{j',k'}} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_{j',k',\tau,g}} \sum_{\rho \cap \rho T \cap 2B_m \neq \emptyset} \mathcal{F} \left( \psi_{m \mu_{T,\rho,\mu}}(\xi) \right) \right|^2 d\xi.
\]

Since the caps are non-adjacent, and the tubes corresponding to the same cap are non-adjacent, the terms in the sum are essentially orthogonal. Hence

\[
(2.49) \quad (2.48) \lesssim N 2^{-kN} + \sum_{j'=2^{j'}} \sum_{k'=2^{k'}} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{A}_{j',k'}} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_{j',k',\tau,g}} \sum_{\rho \cap \rho T \cap 2B_m \neq \emptyset} \int \left| \mathcal{F} \left( \psi_{m \mu_{T,\rho,\mu}}(\xi) \right) \right|^2 d\xi.
\]

The decay term can be ignored, so it remains to bound the sum in (2.49). The integral in (2.48) is essentially the $L^2$ average of $\hat{\mu}_g$ over the cone (ignoring rescaling). The usual way of controlling the $L^2$ averages of $\hat{\mu}$ over the cone (or sphere) uses duality and Cauchy-Schwarz to reduce the problem to bounding $\|Ef\|_{L^2(\mu)}$, where $Ef$ is a Fourier extension operator and $H$ is a weight function corresponding to $\mu$. Since $\mu_g$ is not a positive measure this duality step will be slightly more involved, but it still works by extracting the measure $\mu$ out of $\mu_g$ as follows. By Plancherel,

\[
(2.50) \quad \sum_{j'=2^{j'}} \sum_{k'=2^{k'}} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{A}_{j',k'}} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_{j',k',\tau,g}} \sum_{\rho \cap \rho T \cap 2B_m \neq \emptyset} \int \left| \mathcal{F} \left( \psi_{m \mu_{T,\rho,\mu}}(\xi) \right) \right|^2 d\xi
\]

\[
\lesssim \sum_{j'=2^{j'}} \sum_{k'=2^{k'}} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{A}_{j',k'}} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_{j',k',\tau,g}} \sum_{\rho \cap \rho T \cap 2B_m \neq \emptyset} \int \left| (M_{T,\rho^*} \mu)(x) \right|^2 dx
\]

\[
= \sum_{j'=2^{j'}} \sum_{k'=2^{k'}} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{A}_{j',k'}} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_{j',k',\tau,g}} \sum_{\rho \cap \rho T \cap 2B_m \neq \emptyset} \frac{1}{\rho} \int (M_{T,\rho^*} \mu)(x) \eta_T \left( \frac{x}{\rho} \right) \left[ \int \psi_{\tau^*} \left( \frac{x}{\rho} - y \right) d\mu(y) \right] dx
\]

\[
(2.51) \quad = \int \sum_{j'=2^{j'}} \sum_{k'=2^{k'}} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{A}_{j',k'}} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_{j',k',\tau,g}} \sum_{\rho \cap \rho T \cap 2B_m \neq \emptyset} [(M_{T,\rho^*} \mu) \eta_{T,1/\rho}] \ast \psi_{\tau^*} d(\rho \# \mu),
\]

where $\rho \# \mu$ is the pushforward of $\mu$ under $y \mapsto \rho y$. To simplify the notation, let $\mathcal{W}$ be the entire set of (inflated) tubes $T$ occurring in (2.51):

\[
\mathcal{W} = \bigcup_{j'=2^{j'}} \bigcup_{k'=2^{k'}} \bigcup_{\tau \in \mathcal{A}_{j',k'}} \left\{ S = 2^{4k} \rho T : T \in \mathcal{T}_{j',k',\tau,g} : \rho T \cap 2B_m \neq \emptyset \right\},
\]

and for each such $S$ let

\[
(2.52) \quad f_S = [(M_{T,\rho^*} \mu) \eta_{T,1/\rho}] \ast \psi_{\tau^*}.
\]
By Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\int \left| \sum_{S \in \mathcal{W}} f_S \, d\rho_{\#} \mu \right|^2 \lesssim_N \left( \int \left| \sum_{S \in \mathcal{W}} f_S \right|^2 \, d\mu_m \right)^{1/2} \left\| \mu_m \right\|^{1/2} + 2^{-KN},$$

where $\mu_m$ is the restriction of $\rho_{\#} \mu$ to $\mathbb{Q}^d B_m$. After some minor adjustments and mollifications, this will be in a form which can be handled by the refined Strichartz inequality; the application of which is the final major step in the proof. Each $f_S$ is essentially supported in a rescaled tube $S$ of dimensions

$$\sim 2^{k(-1/2+\delta)} \times 2^{k(-1/2+\delta)} \times 2^{k/2}.$$

Each $f_S$ has Fourier transform $\hat{f}_S$ essentially supported in a cap of dimensions

$$\sim 2^{k/2} \times 2^{k} \times 1,$$

near the cone $2^k \Gamma$. Each rescaled tube $S$ has direction normal to the corresponding cap $\tau$, and the tubes in $\mathcal{W}$ are distinct. Let $f = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{W}} f_S$, so that $\hat{f}$ is essentially supported in a ball around the origin of radius $C''2^k$ for some sufficiently large constant $C''$. Let $\varphi$ be a smooth non-negative bump function equal to 1 on $B(0,C'')$ and supported in $B(0,2C'')$, and let $\hat{\varphi}_k(\xi) = \varphi(\xi/2^k)$. Then

$$|\hat{f} - \hat{\varphi}_k| \lesssim_N 2^{-kN},$$

and so by Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$|f|^2 \lesssim_N |f \ast \hat{\varphi}_k|^2 + 2^{-kN} \lesssim |f|^2 \ast |\hat{\varphi}_k| + 2^{-kN}.$$

Putting this into the integral in (2.53) gives

$$\int \left| \sum_{S \in \mathcal{W}} f_S \right|^2 \, d\mu_m = \int |f|^2 \, d\mu_m + \frac{2^k}{1 + 2^k |x|^{N'}}.$$ 

It remains to bound $\int |f|^2 \, d\mu_{m,k}$. By pigeonholing and the triangle inequality, there is a subset $\mathcal{W}' \subseteq \mathcal{W}$ such that $\|f_S\|_2$ is constant up to a factor of 2 as $S$ ranges over $\mathcal{W}'$, and

$$\int |f|^2 \, d\mu_{m,k} \lesssim_N \log (2^k) \int \left| \sum_{S \in \mathcal{W}'} f_S \right|^2 \, d\mu_{m,k} + 2^{-kN}.$$

Cover the support of $\mu_{m,k}$ with $2^{-k/2} \mathbb{Q}^3$-lattice cubes $Q$, and partition the cubes $Q$ according to the dyadic number of tubes $S \in \mathcal{W}'$ such that $2S$ intersects $Q$. By pigeonholing again, there is a union $Y$ of $2^{-k/2} \mathbb{Q}^3$-lattice cubes $Q$, such that each $Q$ intersects the same dyadic number $M$ of tubes $2S$ with $S \in \mathcal{W}'$ (up to a factor of 2), and such that

$$\int \left| \sum_{S \in \mathcal{W}'} f_S \right|^2 \, d\mu_{m,k} \lesssim \log (2^k) \int_Y \left| \sum_{S \in \mathcal{W}'} f_S \right|^2 \, d\mu_{m,k}.$$
Let $p = 6$ and $p' = 3$, so that $\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'}$. By Hölder’s inequality, the integral in the right hand side of (2.54) satisfies

\[
\int_Y \left| \sum_{S \in \mathbb{W}'} f_S \right|^2 \, d\mu_{m,k} \leq \left\| \sum_{S \in \mathbb{W}'} f_S \right\|_{L^{2p'}(Y)}^2 \left( \int_Y \mu_{m,k}^{p'/2} \right)^{2/p'}.
\]

Hence it remains to bound each term of the product in (2.55). Any tube $S \in \mathbb{W}'$ can be written as $S = 2^{\frac{k}{p} + (1/2+\delta)}$, where $T$ is a tube of dimensions \( \sim 2^{-j+k(1/2+\delta)} \times 2^{-j+k(1/2+\delta)} \times (10 \cdot 2^{-j-k}) \), and $\mu \left( \frac{5}{2} \cdot 2^{\frac{k}{p} + T} \right) \lesssim 2^{k[(50\delta - \alpha^*)/2] - \alpha(j-k)}$ by the definition of $\mu_{y}$ (see (2.22) and (2.41)). Since $j \geq J$, the measure $\mu_{m,k}$ satisfies

\[
\mu_{m,k}(4S) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{4S} \zeta_k(x-y) \, dx \, d(\rho_{y}\mu)(y) \lesssim N, \delta \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \int_{4S \cap B(y,2^{-k(1-\delta)})} \zeta_k(x-y) \, dx \, d(\rho_{y}\mu)(y) + 2^{-kN}
\]

\[
\leq \int_{SS} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \zeta_k(x-y) \, dx \, d(\rho_{y}\mu)(y) + 2^{-kN}
\]

\[
\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d(\rho_{\mu})(y) + 2^{-kN}
\]

\[
= \int_{\frac{5}{2} \cdot 2^{\frac{k}{p} + T}} d\mu(y) + 2^{-kN}
\]

\[
\lesssim 2^{k[(50\delta - \alpha^*)/2] - \alpha(j-k)}.
\]

This can be interpreted as saying that “good” tubes for $\mu$ are automatically “good” tubes for its mollified version $\mu_{m,k}$. Similarly, by the uncertainty principle, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $r > 0$,

\[
\mu_{m,k}(B(x,r)) \lesssim 2^{-\alpha(j-k)r^\alpha}, \quad \|\mu_{m,k}\|_{\infty} \lesssim 2^{3k-j\alpha},
\]

see e.g. [3] Lemma 3.1 for a proof. The second term of the product in (2.55) therefore satisfies

\[
\int_Y \mu_{m,k}^{p'/2} \lesssim 2^{(3k-j\alpha)p'/2-1} \int_Y d\mu_{m,k}
\]

\[
\lesssim \frac{2^{(3k-j\alpha)p'/2-1}}{M} \sum_{S \in \mathbb{W}'} \int_{4S} d\mu_{m,k}
\]

\[
\lesssim 2^{k[3(p'/2-1)/2+\alpha^*/2+\alpha] - \alpha(jp'/2) - \alpha(jp'/2) / 2}
\]

(2.56)

This bounds the second term in (2.55). Applying (2.56), then rescaling and applying Theorem 2.3 (the refined Strichartz inequality) to each term in (2.55) gives

\[
(2.57) \quad \left\| \sum_{S \in \mathbb{W}'} f_S \right\|_{L^{p'}(Y)} \left( \int_Y \mu_{m,k}^{p'/2} \right)^{1/p'} \|\mu_{m}\|^{1/2}
\]

\[
\lesssim_{\epsilon, \delta} 2^{(3k-jp'/2-1)/2} \|\mu_{m}\|^{1/2} \left( \sum_{S \in \mathbb{W}'} \|f_S\|_{2}^{2} \right)^{1/2}.
\]
Applying Plancherel twice to the functions $f_S$ (see (2.52)) yields

$$
\|f_S\|_2 \lesssim \|M_{T,\rho^*}\|_2 .
$$

Putting this chain of inequalities together will conclude the bound on (2.44). To summarise, each of the main terms in (2.44) satisfies

$$
\int \phi(\xi) \left| \hat{\psi}_m \mu_{g,\rho^*}(\xi) \right|^2 d\xi 
$$

\[ \lesssim_N \int \left| \sum_{\delta T \in \mathbb{W}} F(\psi_m M_{T,\rho^*}\mu)(\xi) \right|^2 d\xi + 2^{-kN} \quad \text{(by (2.48))} \]

(2.58)

\[ \lesssim \sum_{\delta T \in \mathbb{W}} \int \left| M_{T,\rho^*}\mu(x) \right|^2 dx + 2^{-kN} \quad \text{(by (2.50))} \]

\[ = \int \sum_{\delta T \in \mathbb{W}} \left[ (M_{T,\rho^*}\mu)\eta_{T,1/\rho} \right] \* \hat{\psi}_{T,\rho} \, d(\rho\#\mu) + 2^{-kN} \quad \text{(by (2.51))} \]

\[ \leq \left( \int \left| \sum_{\delta T \in \mathbb{W}} f_S \right|^2 \mu_{\rho,m_{\delta T}} \right)^{1/2} \|\mu_m\|^{1/2} + 2^{-kN} \quad \text{(by (2.53))} \]

(2.54)

\[ \lesssim_N \log(2^k)^{3/2} \left( \int Y \left( \sum_{\delta T \in \mathbb{W}} f_S \right)^2 \mu_{m_{\delta T}} \right)^{1/2} \|\mu_m\|^{1/2} + 2^{-kN} \quad \text{(by (2.54))} \]

\[ \leq \log(2^k)^{3/2} \left\| \sum_{\delta T \in \mathbb{W}} f_S \right\|_{L^p(Y)} \left( \int \mu_{m_{\delta T}}^{p'/2} \right)^{1/p'} \|\mu_m\|^{1/2} + 2^{-kN} \quad \text{(by (2.55))} \]

\[ \lesssim c_\delta \, 2^{k \left( 1 + \frac{1}{p'} - \frac{1}{p} \right)} \|\mu_m\|^{1/2} \left( \sum_{\delta T \in \mathbb{W}} \|M_{T,\rho^*}\mu\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \quad \text{(by (2.57))} . \]

The sum in the last line is the same as the one in (2.58), so division gives

\[ \sum_{\delta T \in \mathbb{W}} \int \left| M_{T,\rho^*}\mu(x) \right|^2 dx \lesssim_{c_\delta,N} \sum_{\delta T \in \mathbb{W}} 2^{k \left( \frac{1}{p'} - \frac{1}{p} \right) - \alpha/2} \|\mu_m\| + 2^{-kN} . \]

Putting this bound into (2.58) gives

\[ \int \phi(\xi) \left| \hat{\psi}_m \mu_{g,\rho^*}(\xi) \right|^2 d\xi \lesssim_{c_\delta,N} 2^{k \left( \frac{1}{p'} - \frac{1}{p} \right) - \alpha/2} \|\mu_m\| + 2^{-kN} \]

\[ \leq 2^{k \left( \frac{1}{p'} - \frac{1}{p} \right) - \alpha/2} \|\mu_m\| + 2^{-kN} . \]

Summing over $m$, putting this into (2.44), and using (2.46) for the off-diagonal terms, yields

(2.59)

\[ \int \left| N_{2_{\alpha} C_2}^k(G) \backslash N_{2_{\alpha} C_1 - 2_{\alpha} - k}^k(G) \right| \left| \mu_{g,\rho^*}(2^j \xi) \right|^2 d\xi \lesssim_{c_\delta} 2^{k \left( \frac{1}{p'} - \frac{1}{p} + 2\alpha \right) - \alpha/2} \|\mu_m\| + 2^{-kN} . \]
Since $k \geq \frac{n}{10}$, putting this into (2.37) gives

$$\sum_{j \geq (1-\epsilon)^{-1}} \sum_{k=2j(1-\epsilon)^{-1}}^{\lfloor j(1-\epsilon) \rfloor} \int_{N_{C_{2-j}(\Gamma)} \setminus N_{C_{2-j}(\Gamma_{k})}} 2^{js+k/2} |\tilde{\mu}_g (2^j \xi)|^2 \, d\xi \lesssim_{\epsilon, \delta} 2^{CJ}$$

for a sufficiently large constant $C$, since $p' = 3$, $\alpha > 3/2$ and by the definition of $s'$ in (2.24). This bounds the sum in (2.37).

It remains to bound the sum in (2.38), which may be written as

$$\sum_{j \geq (1-\epsilon)^{-1}} 2^{j(s'-1)} \int_{1-2^{-j(1-\epsilon)}}^1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-t^2}} \left( \int_{2^{j-1}}^{2^j} \int_0^{2\pi} |\tilde{\mu}_g (r^\gamma_t(\theta))|^2 \, d\theta \, dr \right) \, dt.$$

The function $\mu_g$ is supported in the ball of radius 100 centred at the origin, and therefore satisfies $\mu_g = \mu_g \varphi$ for a smooth non-negative bump function $\varphi$ equal to 1 on this ball, which vanishes outside $B(0,200)$. Hence for $r, \theta$ and $t$ in the domain of integration in (2.61), the Schwartz decay of $\varphi$ gives

$$|\tilde{\mu}_g (r^\gamma_t(\theta))| \lesssim_{N} (|\tilde{\mu}_g| * \zeta_N) (r^\gamma_t(\theta)),$$

where $\zeta_N(x) = \frac{1}{1+x^2}$. The function $\zeta_N$ is essentially constant on unit balls, and therefore so is $|\tilde{\mu}_g| * \zeta_N$. By the definition of $\gamma_t$ in (2.33) and similar working to (2.41), this implies that

$$|\tilde{\mu}_g (r^\gamma_t(\theta))| \lesssim_{N} 2^{j(c_N)} (|\tilde{\mu}_g| * \zeta_N) \left( r \sqrt{2} \gamma (\theta + \pi - \frac{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{1-t^2}}{t}) \right),$$

on the domain of integration in (2.61). Applying Cauchy-Schwarz gives

$$|\tilde{\mu}_g (r^\gamma_t(\theta))|^2 \lesssim_{N} 2^{j(c_N)} (|\tilde{\mu}_g|^2 * \zeta_N) \left( r \sqrt{2} \gamma (\theta + \pi - \frac{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{1-t^2}}{t}) \right).$$

Hence the integral in (2.61) satisfies

$$\sum_{j \geq (1-\epsilon)^{-1}} 2^{j(s'-1)} \int_{1-2^{-j(1-\epsilon)}}^1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-t^2}} \left( \int_{2^{j-1}}^{2^j} \int_0^{2\pi} |\tilde{\mu}_g (r^\gamma_t(\theta))|^2 \, d\theta \, dr \right) \, dt \lesssim_{N} 2^{j(-1/2+3c_N)} \int_{2^{j-1}}^{2^j} \int_0^{2\pi} \left( |\tilde{\mu}_g|^2 * \zeta_N \left( r \sqrt{2} \gamma (\theta) \right) \right) \, d\theta \, dr.$$

(2.62)
By the essentially constant property of $\zeta_N$, this double integral satisfies
\[
\int_{2^{j-1}}^{2^j} \int_0^{2\pi} \left( |\tilde{\mu}_g|^2 \ast \zeta_N \right) \left( \frac{r}{\sqrt{2}} \gamma(\theta) \right) \, d\theta \, dr \\
\leq N 2^{-j} \int_{N^j} \left( |\tilde{\mu}_g|^2 \ast \zeta_N \right) (\xi) \, d\xi \\
\leq N 2^{-j} \int_{B(0,2^j)} \left[ \int_{N^j} \left| \tilde{\mu}_g (\xi - y) \right|^2 \, d\xi \right] \, dy + 2^{-jeN} \\
\leq 2^{-j} \int_{N^j} \left| \tilde{\mu}_g (\xi) \right|^2 \, d\xi + 2^{-jeN}.
\] (2.63)

This integral is essentially a special case of the integral in (2.43) with $k \approx j$; if $j \geq J$ then similar working to that used to obtain (2.59) gives
\[
\int_{N^j} \left| \tilde{\mu}_g (\xi) \right|^2 \, d\xi \lesssim \delta, \epsilon \lesssim 2^{j \left[ 3 - \alpha + \frac{1}{p}(-3 + 2\alpha - \alpha^*) + 10^7 \epsilon \right]}.
\] (2.64)

Putting all of this together, the sum in (2.38) satisfies
\[
\sum_{j \geq (1-\epsilon)^{-1}} 2^{(s-1)} \int_{1-2\epsilon(1-\epsilon)}^{1-\epsilon} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - t^2}} \times \\
\left( \int_{2^{j-1}}^{2^j} \int_0^{2\pi} \left| \tilde{\mu}_g (r\gamma_1(\theta)) \right|^2 \, d\theta \, dr \right) \, dt \\
\lesssim N 2^{CJ} + \sum_{j \geq \max \{ J, (1-\epsilon)^{-1} \}} 2^{(s-3/2 + 3N\epsilon)} \int_{2^{j-1}}^{2^j} \int_0^{2\pi} \left( |\tilde{\mu}_g|^2 \ast \zeta_N \right) (r\gamma(\theta)) \, d\theta \, dr \quad \text{(by (2.62))} \\
\lesssim N 2^{CJ} + \sum_{j \geq \max \{ J, (1-\epsilon)^{-1} \}} 2^{(s-5/2 + 3N\epsilon)} \int_{N^j} \left| \tilde{\mu}_g (\xi) \right|^2 \, d\xi + 2^{-jeN} \quad \text{(by (2.63))} \\
\lesssim_{\delta, \epsilon} 2^{CJ} + \sum_{j \geq \max \{ J, (1-\epsilon)^{-1} \}} 2^j \left[ s' + \frac{1}{p}(-3 + 2\alpha - \alpha^*) + 4N\epsilon \right] \quad \text{(by (2.64))} \\
(2.65) \quad \lesssim 2^{CJ},
\]
for some large constant $C$, since $p' = 3$, by the definition of $s'$ in (2.24), and by taking $N \sim \epsilon^{-1/4}$. Putting (2.60) and (2.65) into (2.37) and (2.38) shows that the integral in (2.21) satisfies
\[
\int_{0 \leq \eta_1 \leq \eta_2} \int_0^{2\pi} \left| \eta \right|^{s'-2} \left| \tilde{\mu}_g (\eta_1 \gamma_1(\theta) + \eta_2 \gamma(\theta) \times \gamma_1(\theta)) \right|^2 \, d\theta \, d\eta \lesssim_{\epsilon} 2^{CJ}.
\]

Putting this and the bound for (2.20) (from (2.30)) into (2.25), then into (2.22) and then into (2.21) gives
\[
\mathcal{H}^1 (E) \lesssim_{\epsilon} J_0^4 2^{-j_0^2} 2^{CJ}.
\]
At this point, choose
\[(2.66)\] \[J = \lfloor (j_0 \epsilon)/(2C) \rfloor,\]
so that
\[H^1(E) \lesssim \epsilon',\]
provided \(\delta_1\) is sufficiently small (depending on \(\epsilon'\)), since \(j_0 > \log_2 \delta_1\). This finishes the proof in the case where the second term of (2.34) dominates. Since \(H^1(E) \lesssim \epsilon'\) in either case and \(\epsilon'\) is arbitrary (with the implicit constant independent of \(\epsilon'\)), this implies that \(H^1(E) = 0\). By inner regularity of the Lebesgue measure on \([0, 2\pi)\), this shows that
\[\dim \pi_\theta(A) \geq \dim \pi_\theta(\text{supp } \nu) \geq \max \left\{ \frac{4\alpha}{9} + \frac{5}{6}, \frac{2\alpha + 1}{3} \right\} - 200\sqrt{\epsilon},\]
for a.e. \(\theta \in [0, 2\pi)\). Since a countable union of measure zero sets has measure zero, sending \(\epsilon \to 0\) along a countable sequence finishes the proof. \(\square\)

2.3. Nonstationary phase. The following lemma roughly states that if the angle of a tube \(T\) is not equal to the angle of projection \(\theta\), then \(\pi_\theta(M_T f)\) is negligible. Recall the notation \(\angle(\tau)^* = (\pi + \angle(\tau)) \pmod{2\pi}\) if \(\tau\) lies in the forward light cone, \(\angle(\tau)^* = \angle(\tau)\) if \(\tau\) lies in the backward light cone, \(\angle(T)^* = \angle(T)\) if \(\tau(T)\) lies in the forward light cone, and \(\angle(T)^* = (\pi + \angle(T)) \pmod{2\pi}\) if \(\tau(T)\) lies in the backward light cone.

**Lemma 2.2.** Fix \(\theta \in [0, 2\pi)\) and a cap \(\tau \in \Lambda_{J,k}\). If
\[(2.67)\] \[|\angle(\tau)^* - \theta| \geq 10^3 2^k (1/2 + \delta),\]
then for any positive smooth function \(f\) supported in the unit ball of \(\mathbb{R}^3\) and for any \(T \in T_{J,k,\tau}\),
\[\|\pi_\theta(M_T f)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3, \eta d^3)} \lesssim_N 2^{-kN} \|f\|_1,\]
for arbitrarily large \(N\).

**Proof.** Assume that \(\tau\) lies in the forward light cone; the proof for the backward light cone is similar. For any smooth function \(g\) supported in the unit ball and any \(x \in \gamma(\theta)^\perp\),
\[(2.68)\] \[(\pi_\theta g)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g \left( x + t\gamma(\theta) \right) dt,\]
where the density \((\pi_\theta g)(x)\) is defined by
\[\int_F (\pi_\theta g)(x) d\mathcal{H}^2(x) = (\pi_\theta g)(F),\]
for any Borel set \(F \subseteq \gamma(\theta)^\perp\). Applying (2.68) and then Fubini to the function \(g = M_T f\) shows that for any \(x \in \gamma(\theta)^\perp\),
\[(2.69)\] \[(\pi_\theta M_T f)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(y) \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta_T(x + t\gamma(\theta)) \tilde{\psi}_\tau(x + t\gamma(\theta) - y) dt \right] dy.\]
The innermost integral is
\[(2.70)\] \[\int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta_T(x + t\gamma(\theta)) \tilde{\psi}_\tau(x + t\gamma(\theta) - y) dt \]
\[= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \psi_\tau(\xi) e^{2\pi i \langle \xi, x - y \rangle} \left[ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta_T(x + t\gamma(\theta)) e^{2\pi it \langle \xi, \gamma(\theta) \rangle} dt \right] d\xi.\]
By integrating by parts \( m \) times, the innermost integral of this is

\[
(2.71) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta_T(x + t\gamma(\theta)) e^{2\pi it(\xi, \gamma(\theta))} \, dt = \left(\frac{-1}{2\pi i (\xi, \gamma(\theta))}\right)^m \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{2\pi it(\xi, \gamma(\theta))} \left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)^m \eta_T(x + t\gamma(\theta)) \, dt.
\]

Therefore it will suffice to show that the right hand side of \((2.71)\) is \( \lesssim 2^{-2k\delta m} \), in size for any \( m \). By \((2.70)\) it may be assumed that the variable \( \xi \) occurring in \((2.71)\) lies in \( \tau \). Assume without loss of generality that \( \angle \tau = 0 \). By translating \( x \) it may be further assumed that \( T \) is centred at the origin. Since \( \angle \tau = 0 \) this means that

\[
T = U A \left( [0,1]^3 \right),
\]

where \( A : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3 \) is the linear map

\[
(x_1, x_2, x_3) \mapsto (2^{-j+k(1/2+\delta)} x_1, 2^{-j+k(1/2+\delta)} x_2, 2^{-j-k} x_3),
\]

and \( U \) is the unitary defined through the standard basis by

\[
e_1 \to \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (1,0,1), \quad e_2 \to e_2, \quad e_3 \to \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-1,0,1).
\]

By \((2.67)\),

\[
(2.72) \quad \varepsilon := |\theta - \pi| \geq 10^3 2^{k(-1/2+\delta)}.
\]

Write

\[
\xi = \frac{\xi_1}{\sqrt{2}} (1,0,1) + \xi_2 (0,1,0) + \frac{\xi_3}{\sqrt{2}} (1,0,1), \quad \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3 \in \mathbb{R}.
\]

Since \( \xi \in \tau \), the coefficients \( \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3 \) satisfy

\[
(2.73) \quad \frac{2j}{10} \leq \xi_1 \leq 10 \cdot 2^j, \quad |\xi_2| \leq 10 \cdot 2^{j-k/2}, \quad \frac{2j-2k}{10} \leq |\xi_3| \leq 10 \cdot 2^{j-k}.
\]

The inner product of \( \xi \) and \( \gamma(\theta) \) is

\[
(2.74) \quad \langle \xi, \gamma(\theta) \rangle = \frac{\xi_1}{2} (1 + \cos \theta) + \frac{\xi_2 \sin \theta}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\xi_3}{2} (1 - \cos \theta).
\]

Hence by \((2.72), (2.73), (2.74)\) and the triangle inequality,

\[
(2.75) \quad |\langle \xi, \gamma(\theta) \rangle| \geq 2^j \varepsilon^2 \quad (\geq 2^j \delta).\]

It remains to bound the integrand of \((2.71)\). The function \( \eta_T \) can be written as

\[
\eta_T(x) = \eta(A^{-1} U^* x)
\]

\[
= \eta \left( 2^{-j+k(1/2+\delta)} \left( \frac{x_1 + x_3}{\sqrt{2}} \right), 2^{-j+k(1/2+\delta)} x_2, 2^{j-k} \left( \frac{x_3 - x_1}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \right),
\]

where \( \eta \) is a smooth function vanishing outside \( B(0,2) \) and satisfying \( \eta \sim 1 \) on \([0,1]^3\). Hence

\[
(2.76) \quad \eta_T(x + t\gamma(\theta)) = \eta(A^{-1} U^* x + tA^{-1} U^* \gamma(\theta)),
\]

and it will suffice to bound \( A^{-1} U^* \gamma(\theta) \). By the definition of \( U \),

\[
U^* \gamma(\theta) = \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} ((1,0,1), \gamma(\theta)), \langle (0,1,0), \gamma(\theta) \rangle, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \langle \gamma(\theta), (-1,0,1) \rangle \right),
\]
and so
\[ A^{-1}U^*\gamma(\theta) = \left( \frac{2j^{-(1/2+\delta)}}{\sqrt{2}} \right) ((1,0,1), \gamma(\theta)) \]
\[ 2j^{-(1/2+\delta)} ((0,1,0), \gamma(\theta)), \frac{2j^{-k}}{\sqrt{2}} ((-1,0,1)) \].

Hence by the definition of \( \varepsilon \) and the assumption in (2.72)
\[ (2.77) \quad |A^{-1}U^*\gamma(\theta)| \lesssim \varepsilon 2j^{-(1/2+\delta)}. \]

Differentiating (2.76) \( m \) times and using (2.77) gives
\[ (2.78) \quad \left| \left( \frac{d}{dt} \right)^m \eta_T(x + t\gamma(\theta)) \right| \lesssim_m \left( \varepsilon 2j^{-(1/2+\delta)} \right)^m. \]

Putting (2.75) and (2.78) into (2.71) and then using (2.72) gives
\[ \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta_T(x + t\gamma(\theta)) e^{2\pi it\langle \xi, \gamma(\theta) \rangle} dt \right| \lesssim_m 2^{-2k\delta m}. \]

Putting this into (2.71), then (2.70) and (2.69), and then taking \( m \) large enough, gives
\[ \| \pi_{\theta\#} M_T f \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, H^2)} \lesssim N \| f \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, H^2)}^{1-2kN}. \]

Since \( M_T f \) is supported in a ball of radius \( \sim 1 \), this gives
\[ \| \pi_{\theta\#} M_T f \|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3, H^2)} \lesssim N \| f \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, H^2)}^{1-2kN}. \]

2.4. **Refined Strichartz inequality.** Fix \( R \geq 1 \) and \( \varepsilon, \delta > 0 \). The proof of the refined Strichartz inequality for the cone in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) given here is similar to the paraboloid case from [8], with a few extra steps (similar to those in [9]) needed to deal with the obstruction that boxes dual to \( R^{-1/2} \)-caps in the cone do not intersect \( R^{1/2} \) cubes in a clean way. Let \( Y \) be a union of disjoint cubes \( Q \) of side length \( R^{-1/2} \), all contained in \( B_R = B_3(0, R) \). The cone
\[ \Gamma = \{ (\xi, |\xi|) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 1 \leq |\xi| \leq 2 \} \]
has a finitely overlapping cover by boxes (or caps) \( \theta \) of dimensions
\[ 1 \times R^{-1/2} \times R^{-1}. \]

For each \( \theta, B_R \) has a finitely overlapping cover by tubes \( T \) of dimensions
\[ R^{(1/2)(1+\delta)} \times R^{(1/2)(1+\delta)} \times 3R, \]
with long axis normal to the cone at \( \theta \). Let \( T_\theta \) be the set of tubes corresponding to \( \theta \) and let \( T = \bigcup_\theta T_\theta \).

**Theorem 2.3.** Let \( p = 6 \). There exists \( \delta_0 \ll \varepsilon \) such that the following holds whenever \( \delta \in (0, \delta_0) \). Suppose that
\[ f = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{W}} f_T, \]
where \( \mathcal{W} \subseteq T \) is nonempty, and \( f_T |_{B_R} \) is essentially supported in \( T \) with \( \widehat{f_T} \) essentially supported in \( \theta(T) \). Assume that \( \| f_T \|_2 \) is constant over \( T \in \mathcal{W} \) up to a
factor of 2, and that each $Q \subseteq Y$ is such that $Q$ intersects at most $M$ tubes $2T$ with $T \in \mathcal{W}$, where $M \geq 1$. Then

$$
\|f\|_{L^p(Y)} \leq C_{\epsilon, \delta} R^\epsilon \left( \frac{M R^{3/2}}{|W|} \right)^\frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{T \in \mathcal{W}} \|f_T\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2}.
$$

Remark 2.4. The definition assumed here for “$f_T|_{B_R}$ is essentially supported in $T$” will be that $\|f_T\|_{L^2(B_R \setminus T)} \lesssim_N R^{-N} \|f_T\|_2$ for every $N \geq 1$. Similarly “$\tilde{f}_T$ is essentially supported in $\theta(T)$” will mean that $\|\tilde{f}_T\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \theta(T))} \lesssim_N R^{-N} \|f_T\|_2$.

Proof of Theorem 2.5. The proof is by induction on scales. By dyadic pigeonholing of the cubes $Q \subseteq Y$, it may be assumed that each cube contributes equally to the left hand side of (2.79), up to a factor of 2. Create a finitely overlapping cover of $\mathcal{W}$, the cone $\Gamma$ with larger boxes $Q$ of dimensions $2 \times R^{-1/4} \times R^{-1/2}$, and for each $\tau$, create a finitely overlapping cover of $B_R$ by boxes $\square$ of dimensions $R^{1/2}(1+\delta) \times R^{3/4}(1+\delta) \times R$, with directions dual to $\tau(\square)$. Each $T \in \mathcal{W}$ has a finitely overlapping cover by boxes $T'$ of dimensions $R^{1/4+\delta/2} \times R^{1/2+\delta/2} \times R$, with long axis normal to $\theta(T)$ and short axis in the flat direction of $\theta(T)$. For each $T'$ in the cover of $T$ define $\theta(T') = \theta(T)$ and $f_{T'} = \chi_{T'} f_T$, where the functions $\chi_{T'}$ form a smooth partition of unity such that each $\chi_{T'}$ is essentially supported in $T'$ with Fourier transform supported in a box of dimensions $R^{-1/4} \times R^{-1/2} \times R^{-1+\delta/10}$, centred at the origin and with axis directions dual to $T'$. Such a partition can be constructed using the Poisson Summation Formula; the functions $\chi_{T'}$ may be complex valued but satisfy $|\chi_{T'}| \leq 1$.

For each $T'$ there are $\leq 1$ caps $\tau$ such that $\theta(T') \subseteq \tau$, so each $\theta(T')$ can be identified with exactly one such $\tau = \tau(\theta(T'))$. Similarly, for this $\tau$, the tube $T'$ can be identified with exactly one set $\square = \square(\tau(\theta(T')))$ corresponding to $\tau$ such that $T' \subseteq \square$. Each $T$ can be similarly identified with 1 set $\square$ (this is not trivial, but requires only some elementary geometry of the cone). For each dyadic value $\sigma$, let

$$
\mathcal{W}_{\square, \sigma} = \{ T' : T' \subseteq T \text{ for some } T \in \mathcal{W} \},
$$

\[ \theta(T') \subseteq \tau(\square), \quad T' \subseteq \square, \quad \|f_{T'}\|_2 \in [\sigma, 2\sigma], \]

where the use of $\subseteq$ in (2.80) is an abuse of notation, referring to the previous identifications. For each dyadic value $\mu$ let $\mathcal{W}_{\square, \sigma, \mu}$ be the subset consisting of those $T'' \in \mathcal{W}_{\square, \sigma}$ such that the number of boxes $T''$ in $\mathcal{W}_{\square, \sigma}$ in the larger tube $T$ containing $T'$ lies in $[\mu, 2\mu)$. Let

$$
f_{\square, \sigma, \mu} = \sum_{T' \in \mathcal{W}_{\square, \sigma, \mu}} f_{T'},
$$
Then \( f = \sum_{\Box, \sigma, \mu} f_{\Box, \sigma, \mu} \). Each \( \Box \) has a finitely overlapping cover by boxes \( Q_{\Box} \) of dimensions
\[
R^{1/4 + \delta/4} \times R^{1/2 + \delta/4} \times R^{3/4 + \delta/4},
\]
with the same axis orientations as \( \Box \). For each \( \Box \) let \( \{ \chi_{Q_{\Box}} \}_{Q_{\Box}} \) be a smooth partition of unity, such that each \( \chi_{Q_{\Box}} \) decays rapidly outside \( Q_{\Box} \cap \mathcal{N}_{R^{1/2}}(Q_{\Box}) \), and has Fourier transform supported in a box of dimensions
\[
R^{-1/4} \times R^{-1/2 + \delta} \times R^{-1/2 + \delta},
\]
centred at the origin and with long direction in the flat direction of \( \tau(\Box) \). The compromise on the control of the Fourier support in the last coordinate is necessary for the spatial control in the long direction of \( Q_{\Box} \).

For each dyadic triple \( (M', \sigma, \mu) \), let \( Y_{\Box, M', \sigma, \mu} \) be the union over those boxes \( Q_{\Box} \) with the property that \( Q_{\Box} \) intersects \( N \subset [M', 2M'] \) sets \( 10T' \) with \( T' \in \mathbb{W}_{\Box, \sigma, \mu} \). Define
\[
\chi_{Y_{\Box, M', \sigma, \mu}} = \sum_{Q_{\Box} \subset Y_{\Box, M', \sigma, \mu}} \chi_{Q_{\Box}}.
\]
By dyadic pigeonholing, there exists a fixed triple \( (M', \sigma, \mu) \) such that
\[
\|f\|_{L^p(Q)} \lesssim_N (\log R)^3 \left\| \sum_{\Box} \chi_{Y_{\Box, M', \sigma, \mu}} f_{\Box, \sigma, \mu} \right\|_{L^p(Q)} + R^{-N} \sup_T \|f_T\|_2,
\]
for a fraction \( \gtrsim 1/(\log R)^3 \) of the cubes \( Q \subset Y \) (the sup is not strictly necessary since \( \|f_T\| \) is essentially constant in \( T \)). By dyadically pigeonholing the remaining cubes, there exists a collection \( \mathbb{B} \) of sets \( \Box \) such that \( |\mathbb{W}_{\Box, \sigma, \mu}| \) is constant up to a factor of 2 as \( \Box \) ranges over \( \mathbb{B} \), and such that
\[
(2.81) \quad \|f\|_{L^p(Q)} \lesssim_N (\log R)^4 \left\| \sum_{\Box \in \mathbb{B}} \chi_{Y_{\Box}} f_{\Box, \sigma, \mu} \right\|_{L^p(Q)} + R^{-N} \sup_T \|f_T\|_2,
\]
for a fraction \( \gtrsim 1/(\log R)^4 \) of the cubes \( Q \subset Y \), where \( Y_{\Box} = Y_{\Box, M', \sigma, \mu} \) for the fixed triple \( (M', \sigma, \mu) \) and for each \( \Box \). By dyadically pigeonholing the remaining cubes again, there is a dyadic number \( M'' \) and a fraction \( \gtrsim 1/(\log R)^5 \) of the cubes \( Q \subset Y \) satisfying \((2.81)\), such that each cube \( 2Q \) intersects \( \sim M'' \) different sets \( Y_{\Box} \), as \( \Box \) ranges over \( \mathbb{B} \). Let \( Y' \) be the union over these remaining cubes \( Q \subset Y \).

The \( R^{1/2} \)-cubes \( Q \) are smaller than the sets \( \Box \) by at least a factor of \( R^{3/2} \) in every direction, which means that for every cap \( \tau \), each \( R^{1/2} \)-cube \( Q \) intersects \( \lesssim 1 \) sets \( \Box \in \mathbb{B} \) corresponding to \( \tau \). Moreover, since the short axis of each box \( Q_{\Box} \) points in the long direction of \( \tau(\Box) \), the functions \( \chi_{Y_{\Box}} f_{\Box, \sigma, \mu} \) each have Fourier transform essentially supported in \( R^{2\theta} \tau(\Box) \) away from the origin. Applying the decoupling theorem for the cone \([13] \) Theorem 1.2\) to \((2.81)\) therefore gives
\[
\|f\|_{L^p(Q)} \lesssim_{N, \epsilon, \delta} R^{\epsilon/4 + O(\delta)} \left( \sum_{\Box \in \mathbb{B}} \left\| \chi_{Y_{\Box}} f_{\Box, \sigma, \mu} \right\|_{L^p(2Q)}^2 \right)^{1/2} + R^{-N} \sup_T \|f_T\|_2
\]
\[
\lesssim R^{\epsilon/4 + O(\delta)} (M')^{\frac{\sigma}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} \left( \sum_{\Box \in \mathbb{B}} \left\| \chi_{Y_{\Box}} f_{\Box, \sigma, \mu} \right\|_{L^p(2Q)}^p \right)^{1/p} + R^{-N} \sup_T \|f_T\|_2.
\]
Taking both sides to the power \( p \) and summing over \( Q \subseteq Y' \) yields

\[
(2.82) \quad \|f\|_{L^p(Y)} \lesssim (\log R)^5 \|f\|_{L^p(Y')}
\]

\[
\lesssim_{N, \epsilon, \delta} R^{p/3} (M')^{\frac{\epsilon}{p} - \frac{1}{p}} \left( \sum_{R \in B} \|f_{\square, \sigma, \mu}\|_{L^p(Y)}^p \right)^{1/p} + R^{-N} \sup_T \|f_T\|_2.
\]

After applying a Lorentz rescaling \( L \) on a given \( \square \), the set \( \square \) will become a cube of side lengths \( \approx R^{1/2} \). The boxes \( Q_\square \) become cubes \( L(Q_\square) \) of radius \( R^{1/4+\delta/4} \). The boxes \( T' \) are contained in tubes \( L(T') \) of dimensions

\[
\frac{R^{1/4+\delta/2}}{50} \times \frac{R^{1/4+\delta/2}}{50} \times \frac{R^{1/2}}{50}
\]

normal to the rescaled boxes \( L(\theta(T')) \), and the rescaled version of each \( f_T \) has Fourier transform supported in the \( \sim R^{-1/2} \) neighbourhood of \( L(\theta(T')) \). For a given cube \( L(Q_\square) \), the number of tubes \( 2L(T') \) intersecting \( L(Q_\square) \) is \( \lesssim M' \) by the pigeonholing step. Assume inductively that the theorem holds with \( R \) replaced by any \( \tilde{R} \leq R^{3/4} \). Applying Lorentz rescaling and this inductive assumption at scale \( \approx R^{1/2} \) to each summand of \( (2.82) \) gives

\[
\|f_{\square, \sigma, \mu}\|_{L^p(Y)} \lesssim_{\epsilon, \delta} C_{\epsilon, \delta} R^{p/2+O(\delta)} \left( \frac{M'R^{-3/2}}{|W_{\square, \sigma, \mu}|} \right)^{\frac{\epsilon}{p} - \frac{1}{p}} \left( \sum_{T' \in W_{\square, \sigma, \mu}} \|f_{T'}\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2}.
\]

Putting this into \( (2.82) \), and recalling that \( |W_{\square, \sigma, \mu}| \) is essentially constant as \( \square \) ranges over \( B \), gives

\[
(2.83) \quad \|f\|_{L^p(Y)} \lesssim_{\epsilon, \delta} C_{\epsilon, \delta} R^{p/2+6p+O(\delta)}
\]

\[
\times \left( \frac{M'M''R^{-3/2}}{|W_{\square, \sigma, \mu}|} \right)^{\frac{\epsilon}{p} - \frac{1}{p}} \left( \sum_{R \in B} \left( \sum_{T' \in W_{\square, \sigma, \mu}} \|f_{T'}\|_2^2 \right)^{p/2} \right)^{1/p}.
\]

By the dyadically constant assumption on \( |W_{\square, \sigma, \mu}| \), the dyadically constant assumption \( \|f_T\|_2 \sim c \) in the theorem statement, and the dyadically constant property of \( \|f_T\|_2 \) from \( (2.80) \),

\[
\sum_{\square \in B} \left( \sum_{T' \in W_{\square, \sigma, \mu}} \|f_{T'}\|_2^2 \right)^{p/2} \lesssim \|W_{\square, \sigma, \mu}\| \left( \frac{c^2}{\mu} \right)^{p/2} \lesssim \|W_{\square, \sigma, \mu}\| \left( \sum_{T \in W} \|f_T\|_2^2 \right)^{p/2}.
\]

Taking both sides to the power \( 1/p \) gives

\[
\left( \sum_{\square \in B} \left( \sum_{T' \in W_{\square, \sigma, \mu}} \|f_{T'}\|_2^2 \right)^{p/2} \right)^{1/p} \lesssim \|W_{\square, \sigma, \mu}\|^{1/p} \left( \sum_{T \in W} \|f_T\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2}.
\]
Putting this into (2.83) gives

\[
\|f\|_{L^p(Y)} \lesssim_{\epsilon, \delta} C_{\epsilon, \delta} R^{5\epsilon/6 + O(\delta)} \times \left( \frac{M' M'' R^{-3/2}}{|W| \mu} \right)^{\frac{1}{p'} - \frac{1}{p}} \left( \frac{|B||W|,\sigma,\mu}{|W| \mu} \right)^{1/p} \left( \sum_{T \in \mathcal{W}} \|f_T\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2}.
\]

It remains to bound the two terms out the front of the right hand side. For the second term,

\[
|W| \mu = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{W}} \mu \gtrsim \sum_{\Box \in \mathcal{B}} T' \in \mathcal{W}_{\Box, \sigma, \mu} 1 \sim |B||W|,\sigma,\mu|.
\]

Division gives

\[
(2.85) \quad \frac{|B||W|,\sigma,\mu|}{|W| \mu} \lesssim 1,
\]

which bounds the second bracketed term in (2.84). For the first term in (2.84), fix any cube \(Q \subseteq Y'\). Then

\[
M' M'' \leq \sum_{\Box \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{Y \cap 2Q \neq \emptyset} M'
\]

\[
\lesssim \sum_{\Box \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{Y \cap 2Q \neq \emptyset} \frac{M'(Q \cap 3Q)}{m(Y \cap 3Q)}
\]

\[
\lesssim \sum_{\Box \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{Y \cap 2Q \neq \emptyset} \sum_{T' \in \mathcal{W}_{\Box, \sigma, \mu}} \frac{m(Q \cap 3Q)}{m(Y \cap 3Q)}
\]

\[
\lesssim \sum_{\Box \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{Y \cap 2Q \neq \emptyset} \sum_{T' \in \mathcal{W}_{\Box, \sigma, \mu}} \frac{m(Q \cap 3Q)}{m(Y \cap 3Q)}
\]

\[
\lesssim \sum_{\Box \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{Y \cap 2Q \neq \emptyset} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{W}_{\Box, \sigma, \mu}} 1
\]

\[
\lesssim \mu M,
\]

where \(T'(T')\) is the large tube such that \(T'\) is part of the cover of \(T\). Putting (2.85) and (2.86) into (2.84) gives

\[
\|f\|_{L^p(Y)} \lesssim_{\epsilon, \delta} C_{\epsilon, \delta} R^{5\epsilon/6 + O(\delta)} \left( \frac{MR^{-3/2}}{|W|} \right)^{\frac{1}{p'} - \frac{1}{p}} \left( \sum_{T \in \mathcal{W}} \|f_T\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2}.
\]

The induction will close if \(\delta\) is small enough compared to \(\epsilon\), and if \(R \geq R_0\) for some large constant \(R_0\), depending on \(\epsilon\) and \(\delta\), which is large enough to eliminate implicit constants (the theorem holds with constant \(C_{\epsilon, \delta}\) if \(R \leq R_0\)). This finishes the proof. \(\square\)
3. Projections onto 2-dimensional planes: Proofs of Theorem 1.2 and of Proposition 3.3

Theorem 1.2 (and a higher dimensional result, Proposition 3.3) will both be deduced as corollaries of the following more general theorem. To state it, let

$$\text{dim} \{ \alpha \beta \} \quad \text{and if} \quad \min \quad \text{deduced as corollaries of the following more general theorem. To state it, let}$$

Proof of Theorem 3.1.

Let $\Omega$ be a nonempty bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ and fix $F, G \in C^2(\overline{\Omega}, S^d)$, such that $(F,G) \equiv 0$,

$$\text{rank} (GDF) \equiv d, \quad \text{rank} (FGD) \equiv \text{rank} DGF \equiv d - 1,$$

and

$$\min_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} |\det (F(y) \quad G(y) \quad DGF(y) + \lambda DGDG(y))| > 0,$$

where $DF$ and $DG$ denote the $(d+1) \times (d-1)$ matrices of partial derivatives of $F$ and $G$. Let $\pi_y$ be projection onto $\text{span}\{F(y), G(y)\}$.

Fix $\alpha \in (0, d+1)$, and let $\mu$ be a Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ with $\text{diam supp } \mu \leq C$. If $s < \min \{ \alpha, \beta_G(\alpha) + \frac{1}{2} \}$ then

$$\int_{\Omega} I_s(\pi_y \mu) \, dy \lesssim_{\alpha, s, C, F, G, \Omega} c_\alpha(\mu) \mu \left( \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \right),$$

and if $\min \{ \alpha, \beta_G(\alpha) + \frac{1}{2} \} > 2$, then

$$\int \| \pi_y \mu \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}; \mathcal{H}^2)} \, dy \lesssim_{\alpha, C, F, G, \Omega} c_\alpha(\mu) \mu \left( \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \right).$$

Consequently, by Frostman’s Lemma, for any analytic set $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$,

$$\text{dim } \pi_y(B) \geq \min \left\{ 2, \text{dim } B, \beta_G(\text{dim } B) + \frac{1}{2} \right\} \quad \text{for a.e. } y \in \Omega,$$

and if $\min \{ \text{dim } B, \beta_G(\text{dim } B) + \frac{1}{2} \} > 2$ then $\text{H}^2(\pi_y(B)) > 0$ for a.e. $y \in \Omega$.

In Subsection 3.1 Theorem 1.2 and Proposition 3.3 will both be deduced as corollaries by verifying the conditions of Theorem 3.1 in each case.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Assume that $\Omega = (0, 1)^{d-1} + B(0, \delta)$ for some small $\delta > 0$; without loss of generality it suffices to bound the integral over $(0, 1)^{d-1}$. Given $\alpha$ and $\mu$ with $c_\alpha(\mu) < \infty$, let

$$\epsilon \in \left( 0, \min \left\{ \frac{\alpha}{4}, \frac{1}{20(d+1)^2} \right\} \right).$$
Set

$$\alpha^* = \min \left\{ 2, \alpha - \varepsilon, \beta(\alpha) + \frac{1}{2} - 10(d + 1)\varepsilon^{1/4} \right\}, \quad \kappa = 1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2(d - 1)}. \tag{3.6}$$

Then \(\alpha^* > 0\) and \(\kappa \in (0, 1)\) by (3.3).

For each \(y \in [0, 1]^{d-1}\) let \(U_y : \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \to \mathbb{R}^{d+1}\) be a unitary satisfying

\[U_y F(y) = e_1, \quad U_y G(y) = e_2,\]

such that the \(U_y\)'s are piecewise continuous in \(y\). The average of the squared \(H^{\alpha^*, 2} (\mathbb{R}^2)\)-norm of the pushforward measure under projection and rotation is

$$\int_{[0, 1]^{d-1}} \|U_y \# \pi_y \# \mu\|^2_{H^{\alpha^*, 2} (\mathbb{R}^2)} \, dy \sim \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\eta|^{\alpha^* - 2} \int_{[0, 1]^{d-1}} |\mu (\eta F(y) + \eta_2 G(y))|^2 \, dy \, d\eta. \tag{3.7}$$

To prove the theorem it suffices to show that (3.7) \(\lesssim \max \{I_{\alpha}(\mu), \|\mu\| c_\alpha(\mu)\}\). To show this, by symmetry it suffices to bound the integral over the positive quadrant \(\mathbb{R}^2_+\). This integral can be written as

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2_+} |\eta|^{\alpha^* - 2} \int_{[0, 1]^{d-1}} |\mu (\eta F(y) + \eta_2 G(y))|^2 \, dy \, d\eta \tag{3.8}$$

$$= \int_{\eta_1 > \eta_2 \geq 0} |\eta|^{\alpha^* - 2} \int_{[0, 1]^{d-1}} |\mu (\eta F(y) + \eta_2 G(y))|^2 \, dy \, d\eta \tag{3.9}$$

$$+ \int_{0 \leq \eta_1 \leq \eta_2} |\eta|^{\alpha^* - 2} \int_{[0, 1]^{d-1}} |\mu (\eta F(y) + \eta_2 G(y))|^2 \, dy \, d\eta.\tag{3.10}$$

Let

$$\xi = \xi(\eta, y) = \eta_1 F(y) + \eta_2 G(y).$$

Then

$$\left| \frac{d\xi}{dy} \right| = |\det (F(y) \quad G(y) \quad \eta_1 DF(y) + \eta_2 DG(y))| \gtrsim \eta_1^{d-1},$$

by the assumption in (3.4). Applying the change of variables from (3.10) to the integral in (3.8) therefore results in

$$\int_{\eta_1 > \eta_2 \geq 0} |\eta|^{\alpha^* - 2} \int_{[0, 1]^{d-1}} |\mu (\eta F(y) + \eta_2 G(y))|^2 \, dy \, d\eta \lesssim \|\mu\|^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} |\xi|^{\alpha^* + (1 - \kappa)(d - 1) - (d + 1)} |\mu (\xi)|^2 \, d\xi \lesssim \|\mu\| c_\alpha(\mu) + I_\alpha(\mu),$$

since \(\alpha^* + (1 - \kappa)(d - 1) < \alpha\) by (3.6).

For the remaining integral in (3.9), define \(r\) and \(t\) as functions of \(\eta_1\) and \(\eta_2\) by

$$r^2 = \eta_1^2 + \eta_2^2, \quad \eta_2 = rt, \tag{3.11}$$

so that

$$\left| \frac{dr \, dt}{d\eta_1 \, d\eta_2} \right| = \frac{\sqrt{1 - t^2}}{r}.$$
Using the change of variables from (3.10) and (3.11), the integral in (3.9) will be shown to satisfy
\[
\int_{0<\eta_1 \leq \eta_2} |\eta|^{\alpha_s-2} \int_{[0,1]^{d-1}} |\hat{\mu} (\eta_1 F(y) + \eta_2 G(y))|^2 \, dy \, d\eta
\]
\[
\lesssim_\epsilon 1
\] (3.12)
\[
+ \sum_{j \geq (1-\epsilon)^{-1}} \sum_{k=\lfloor 2j(1-\epsilon) \rfloor}^{\lfloor 2j(1-\epsilon) \rfloor - 1} \int_{1-2^{-(k+1)}}^{2^j} \int_{[0,1]^{d-1}} \frac{2^{2(j-\alpha_s-1)}}{1-t^2} |\hat{\mu} (r \Gamma G(y))|^2 \, dy \, dr \, dt
\]
\[
+ \sum_{j \geq (1-\epsilon)^{-1}} \int_{1-2^{-(j-1)-(1-\epsilon)}}^{2^j} \int_{[0,1]^{d-1}} \frac{2^{2(j-\alpha_s-1)}}{1-t^2} |\hat{\mu} (r \Gamma G(y))|^2 \, dy \, dr \, dt
\]
\[
\lesssim_\epsilon 1
\] (3.13)
\[
+ \sum_{j \geq (1-\epsilon)^{-1}} \sum_{k=\lfloor 2j(1-\epsilon) \rfloor}^{\lfloor 2j(1-\epsilon) \rfloor - 1} \int_{\mathcal{N}_{C2^{-k}}(\Gamma(G) \cup \frac{4}{3} \Gamma(G))} 2^{2j\alpha_s + \frac{k}{2}} |\hat{\mu} (2^j \xi)|^2 \, d\xi
\]
\[
+ \sum_{j \geq (1-\epsilon)^{-1}} \int_{1-2^{-(j-1)-(1-\epsilon)}}^{2^j} \int_{[0,1]^{d-1}} \frac{2^{2(j-\alpha_s-1)}}{1-t^2} |\hat{\mu} (r \Gamma G(y))|^2 \, dy \, dr \, dt,
\] (3.14)

where \(C > 2\) is a large constant to be chosen in a moment,
\[
\Gamma G(y) := \sqrt{1-t^2} F(y) + t G(y),
\]
and \(\Gamma(G)\) assumes \(G\) has domain \([0, 1]^{d-1} + B(0, \delta)\). The only preceding inequality that does not follow from the change of variables and a dyadic decomposition is that (3.12) is bounded by (3.13). To see this, it suffices to check that the equality
\[
r\sqrt{1-t^2} F(y) + r t G(y) = 2^j \xi,
\]
\(2^{j-1} \leq r \leq 2^j\)
implies that \(\xi \in \mathcal{N}_{C2^{-k}}(\Gamma(G) \cup \frac{4}{3} \Gamma(G))\). Division of (3.15) by \(2^j\) gives
\[
\xi = \lambda_1 F(y) + \lambda_2 G(y), \quad \text{where} \quad |\lambda_1| \leq 2^{1/2} \cdot 2^{-k/2} \quad \text{and} \quad 1/4 \leq \lambda_2 \leq 1.
\] (3.16)

By the assumption (3.3) in the proposition and by compactness,
\[
F(y) = D G(y) x,
\]
for some \(x \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}\) with \(|x| \lesssim_{F, \Gamma(1)} 1\). Letting \(h = \frac{\lambda_2 x}{\lambda_1}\) in (3.16) gives
\[
\xi = \lambda_2 G(y + h) + O(h^2)\),
\]
where the implicit constant is uniform depending only on \(G\) (using the \(C^2\) extension of \(F, G\) to \([0, 1]^{d-1} + B(0, \delta)\) if necessary; it may be assumed \(y + h\) lies in \([0, 1]^{d-1} + B(0, \delta)\) since there are only finitely many \(j\)'s with corresponding \(2^{-k/2}\) comparable to \(\delta\). Since \(x\) is uniformly bounded, \(h\) satisfies \(|h| \lesssim \lambda_1\), and therefore dist(\(\xi, \Gamma(G) \cup \mathbb{R}^{d-1}\))
\[ \frac{1}{2} \Gamma(G) \lesssim \lambda^2 \lesssim 2^{-k}. \] Hence \( \xi \in \mathcal{N}_{C_{2^{-k}}(\Gamma(G) \cup \frac{1}{2} \Gamma(G))} \) provided \( C \) is chosen large enough. This verifies that (3.12) is bounded by (3.13).

It remains to bound the sums in (3.13) and (3.14). Let \( \rho = 2^{j-k} \) and let \( \mu_\rho \) be the pushforward measure \( \nu_{\# \mu} \), which is defined by \( \mu_\rho(E) = \mu(\rho^{-1} E) \) for any Borel set \( E \). Let \( \{ B_m \} \) be a finitely overlapping cover of \( B(0, \rho) \) by unit balls and let \( \{ \psi_m \} \) be a smooth partition of unity subordinate to this cover. Let \( \zeta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}) \) be a smooth bump function equal to 1 on \( \lambda \) by unit balls and let \( \zeta \) be the pushforward of the Lebesgue measure on \( (0, 1)^{d-1} + B(0, \delta) \times [2^{k-2}, 2^k] \) under \( (y, \lambda) \mapsto \lambda G(y) \), and define \( \phi \) on \( \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \) by

\[
\phi(\xi) = 2^{k(d-1)}(\nu_k * \zeta)(\xi)
= 2^{k(d-1)} \int \zeta(\xi - \eta) d\nu_k(\eta)
= 2^{k(d-1)} \int_{[0,1]^{d-1} + B(0, \delta)} \int_{2^{k-1}}^1 \zeta(\xi - \lambda G(y)) d\lambda dy.
\]

Then \( \phi \) has support in \( \mathcal{N}_{2C'}(\Gamma_G \cup \Gamma_{G_{k-1}}(G)) \), with \( \phi \sim 1 \) on \( \mathcal{N}_C(\Gamma_G \cup \Gamma_{G_{k-1}}(G)) \), where \( C' \) is now chosen large enough to ensure this. The inverse Fourier transform of \( \phi \) satisfies

\[
|\hat{\phi}(x)| \lesssim N^{2k} |x|^{-N},
\]

since \( \zeta \) is Schwartz. Hence

\[
\int_{\mathcal{N}_{C_{2^{-k}}(\Gamma_G \cup \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_G)}} |\hat{\mu}(2^j \xi)|^2 d\xi 
\lesssim \int \phi(2^k \xi) |\hat{\mu}_\rho(2^k \xi)|^2 d\xi
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2(d+1)k} \int \phi(\xi) \left| \sum_m \psi_m \mu_\rho(\xi) \right|^2 d\xi
\leq \rho^{(d+1)k} \sum_m \int_{\mathcal{N}_{2C'2^{-k}}(\Gamma_G \cup \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_G)} |\hat{\psi}_m \mu_\rho(2^k \xi)|^2 d\xi
\]
\[
+ \frac{1}{2(d+1)k} \sum_{\text{dist}(B_m, B_n) \gtrsim \rho^2} \left| \int \phi(\xi) \hat{\psi}_m \mu_\rho(\xi) \hat{\psi}_n \mu_\rho(\xi) d\xi \right|.
\]

By the definition of \( \beta(\alpha) \) (see (3.2)), the summands in (3.17) satisfy

\[
\int_{\mathcal{N}_{2C'2^{-k}}(\Gamma_G \cup \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_G)} |\hat{\psi}_m \mu_\rho(2^k \xi)|^2 d\xi \lesssim N^{2k} \| \psi_m \mu_\rho \| c_\alpha(\mu_\rho) 2^{k(\varepsilon - \beta(\alpha) - 1)}.
\]

By the version of Plancherel’s Theorem for measures (see e.g. [22, Eq. 3.27]), the summands in (3.15) satisfy

\[
\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \phi(\xi) \hat{\psi}_m \mu_\rho(\xi) \hat{\psi}_n \mu_\rho(\xi) d\xi \right| = \left| \int \int \phi(x - y) \psi_m(x) \psi_n(y) d\mu_\rho(x) d\mu_\rho(y) \right|
\lesssim N^{(d+1)k} \rho^{-2} N \| \psi_m \mu_\rho \| \| \psi_n \mu_\rho \|.
\]
Substituting (3.19) and (3.20) with $N = \lceil \epsilon^{-4} \rceil$ into (3.17) and (3.18) gives

$$
\int_{Nc^{\alpha-1} \Gamma(G) \cup \Gamma(G)} |\hat{\mu} (2^j \xi)|^2 \, d\xi 
\lesssim \epsilon \rho^{(d+1)2} \|\mu\| c_\alpha(\mu) 2^{k(\alpha - \beta(\alpha) - 1)} + 2^{-k} \rho^{2\alpha} \|\mu\|^2 
\leq \|\mu\| c_\alpha(\mu) \left( 2^{j((d+1)^2 - \alpha)} 2^{k(\alpha - \beta(\alpha) - 1 + \epsilon)} + 2^{-2k + \frac{1}{2}} \right) 
\lesssim \|\mu\| c_\alpha(\mu) 2^{j((d+1)^2 - \alpha)} 2^{k(\alpha - \beta(\alpha) - 1 + \epsilon)},
$$

since $k \leq j(1 - \epsilon)$ and $\epsilon$ is small (see the definition in (3.5)). Applying this bound to (3.13) gives

$$
\lesssim \epsilon \|\mu\| c_\alpha(\mu) \sum_{j \geq (1 - \kappa)^{-1}} 2^{j(\alpha^* - \alpha + (d+1)^2)} \sum_{k = \lceil 2j(1 - \epsilon) \rceil}^{j(1 - \epsilon)} 2^{k(\alpha - \beta(\alpha) - \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)} \lesssim \epsilon \|\mu\| c_\alpha(\mu),
$$

by the definition of $\alpha^*$ and $\kappa$ in (3.6). This finishes the bound on (3.13).

It remains to bound the integral in (3.14). Let $\zeta_N(x) = \frac{1}{1 + |x|^N}$ for some large $N$ to be chosen later. Then $|\tilde{\mu}| \lesssim_N |\tilde{\mu}| * \zeta_N$ since $\mu = \mu \varphi$ for a fixed Schwartz function $\varphi$ equal to 1 on the unit ball. Hence

$$
(3.21) \quad \int_{[0,1]^d - 1} |\tilde{\mu}(r G_t(y))|^2 \, dy \lesssim_N \int_{[0,1]^d - 1} (|\tilde{\mu}| * \zeta_N)(r G_t(y))^2 \, dy.
$$

Cover the cube $[0,1]^{d-1}$ with cubes of side length $1/M$. If $M$ is large enough, then by the assumptions on $F$ and $G$ from (3.8), in each cube $F(y)$ can be written as $F(y) = DG(y)x_y$, where $x$ is a smooth function of $y$ in each cube with $|x| \lesssim 1$ and the Jacobian of $y \mapsto x_y$ is $\lesssim 1$. Hence

$$
G_t(y) = \sqrt{1 - t^2} F(y) + tG(y) = tG \left( y + \frac{x_y \sqrt{1 - t^2}}{t} \right) + O \left( 2^{-j(1 - \epsilon)} \right),
$$

where the implicit constant is uniform. Using the essentially constant property of $\zeta_N$ gives, with $2^{j-1} \leq r \leq 2^j$,

$$
(|\tilde{\mu}| * \zeta_N)(r G_t(y)) \lesssim_N 2^{j\epsilon N} (|\tilde{\mu}| * \zeta_N) \left( rG \left( y + \frac{x_y \sqrt{1 - t^2}}{t} \right) \right).
$$

Combining this with (3.21) and applying the change of variables $\tilde{y} = y + \frac{x_y \sqrt{1 - t^2}}{t}$ gives, for $j$ large enough,

$$
\int_{[0,1]^{d-1}} |\tilde{\mu}(r G_t(y))|^2 \, dy \lesssim_N 2^{j\epsilon N} \int_{[0,1]^{d-1} + B(0,\delta)} (|\tilde{\mu}| * \zeta_N)(r G_t(y))^2 \, dy.
$$
where \( t \geq 2^{-j(1-\epsilon)} \). Putting this into the two innermost integrals of (3.14) and applying Minkowski’s inequality results in

\[
\int_{2^{j-1}}^{2^j} \int_{[0,1]^{d-1}} |\widehat{\mu} (rG_t(y))|^2 \, dy \, dr \\
\lesssim_{\epsilon} N 2^{3jN} \int_{2^{j-1}}^{2^j} \int_{[0,1]^{d-1}+B(0,\delta)} (|\widehat{\mu} \ast \zeta_N| (rG(y))^2 \, dy \, dr
\]

(3.22)

\[
\lesssim_{\mu} 2^{3jN} \left( \int_{B(0,2^{j}\sqrt{\gamma})} \left( \int_{2^{j-1}}^{2^j} \int_{[0,1]^{d-1}+B(0,\delta)} |\widehat{\mu}_{z,t} (rG(y))|^2 \, dy \, dr \right)^{1/2} \right)^2 \\
+ 2^{j(\epsilon-1)} N + (d+1)\sqrt{\gamma} \|\mu\|^2,
\]

where for each \( t \in [1/2, 1] \) and \( z \in B \left( 0, 2^{j}\sqrt{\gamma} \right) \), \( \mu_{z,t} \) is the complex measure defined by

\[
\int f(x) \, d\mu_{z,t}(x) = \int f(tx)e^{2\pi i(z, x)} \, d\mu(x).
\]

The positive measure \( |\mu_{z,t}| \) has support of comparable size to \( \mu \) and satisfies \( c_{\alpha}(|\mu_{z,t}|) \lesssim c_{\alpha}(\mu) \), so applying the triangle inequality and the definition (see (3.1)) of \( \beta(\alpha) \) to (3.22) gives

\[
\int_{2^{j-1}}^{2^j} \int_{[0,1]^{d-1}} |\widehat{\mu} (rG_t(y))|^2 \, dy \, dr \lesssim_{\epsilon} \|\mu\|c_{\alpha}(\mu) 2^{j((d+1)\sqrt{\gamma}+\epsilon)2j(1-\beta(\alpha))},
\]

by choosing \( N \sim \epsilon^{-3/4} \), since \( \epsilon \) is very small. Putting this into (3.14) yields

\[
(3.14) \lesssim_{\epsilon} \|\mu\|c_{\alpha}(\mu)
\]

\[
+ \|\mu\|c_{\alpha}(\mu) \sum_{j \geq (1-\epsilon)^{-1}} 2^{j(\alpha^{*} - \beta(\alpha) + (d+1)\sqrt{\gamma} + \epsilon^{1/4})} \int_{1-2(j-1)(1-\epsilon)}^{1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-t^2}} \, dt
\]

\[
\lesssim \|\mu\|c_{\alpha}(\mu) \left( 1 + \sum_{j \geq (1-\epsilon)^{-1}} 2^{j(\alpha^{*} - \beta(\alpha) - \frac{1}{2} + (d+1)\sqrt{\gamma} + \epsilon^{1/4})} \right)
\]

\[
\lesssim \|\mu\|c_{\alpha}(\mu)
\]

by the definition of \( \alpha^{*} \) in (3.6).

This bounds the remaining piece, finishing the bound on (3.9), which in turn bounds (3.7) and finishes the proof. \( \square \)

### 3.1. Weighted Fourier restriction inequality for curves of nonvanishing torsion, and proof of Theorem 1.2

The proof of Theorem 1.2 will require the following (sharp) Fourier restriction inequality from [23] (see also [5]).

**Theorem 3.2** ([23, Theorem 1.1]). If \( \gamma : [a, b] \to S^2 \) is \( C^2 \) with \( \det (\gamma' \gamma'') \) nonvanishing, then for any \( \epsilon > 0 \) and \( \alpha \in [0, 3] \),

\[
(3.23) \quad \int_{a}^{b} \int_{1/2}^{1} |\widehat{\mu}(R \rho \gamma'(\theta))|^2 \, dp \, d\theta \leq C_{\epsilon, \gamma} \|\mu\|c_{\alpha}(\mu) R^{c-\beta(\alpha)},
\]
and
\begin{equation}
\int_{\mathcal{N}_{1/t}(\gamma(t))} |\tilde{\mu}(R|t|)^2| \ d|t| \leq C_{t,\gamma} \|\mu\| c_\alpha(\mu) R^{-1-\beta(\alpha)},
\end{equation}
for all $R \geq 1$ and any positive Borel measure $\mu$ supported in the unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^3$, where
$$
\beta(\alpha) := \begin{cases} 
\alpha, & \alpha \in [0, 1/2] \\
1/2, & \alpha \in (1/2, 1] \\
\alpha/2, & \alpha \in (1, 2] \\
\alpha - 1, & \alpha \in (2, 3].
\end{cases}
$$

In [23, Theorem 1.1], the dependence on $\|\mu\|$, $c_\alpha(\mu)$ in (3.23) and (3.24) is not made explicit, but follows from the proof in [23] (more precisely, the $c_\alpha(\mu)$ term comes from [23, Lemma 3.1], and the $\|\mu\|$ term comes through deducing [23, Eq. 3.1] from [23, Eq. 3.4]). In [23] the left hand side of (3.23) is replaced by the localised version
$$
\int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \mu(R\rho(t, \phi(t), 1)) | R\rho(t, \phi(t), 1) |^2 \ d\rho \ dt,
$$
under the assumption that $\phi : [-1/2, 1/2] \to \mathbb{R}$ is $C^2$ with nonvanishing first and second derivatives. The version in (3.24) can be deduced from the local version by localising around $t = 0$, rotating so that $\gamma(0) = (0, 0, 1)$, $\gamma'(0) = \frac{\gamma'}{\sqrt{\gamma}}(1, 1, 0)$, letting $t = \gamma_1(\theta)$, $\rho = \rho_1(\theta)$, $\phi(t) = \gamma_1(\theta)$ and making the change of variables from $(\rho, \theta)$ to $(\rho, t)$. Under this change of variables, $\phi$ satisfies
$$
\phi'(0) = \frac{\gamma_1'(0)}{\gamma_1(0)} = 1, \quad \phi''(0) = \frac{1}{\gamma_1''(0)} \det (\gamma(0), \gamma'(0), \gamma''(0)) \neq 0,
$$
which verifies the nonvanishing first and second derivative conditions in a neighbourhood of $0$. The version in (3.24) is equivalent to the one in (3.23) by the uncertainty principle (the implication (3.24) $\Rightarrow$ (3.23) is shown in [23, Eq. 3.2]). Alternatively, the version in (3.24) is the one proved directly in [23, Eq. 3.1] (again for the localised curve $(t, \phi(t), 1)$, but the version in (3.24) follows similarly to (3.23)).

Finally, Theorem 3.2 is only stated in [24] for $\alpha > 1$, but the case $\alpha \leq 1$ follows from Theorem 1 in [24] (see also [20, Theorem 3.8]), whose proof is much simpler than the $\alpha > 1$ case. The assumptions of [24, Theorem 1] are satisfied with $a = 1/2$ and $b = 2$ by rotation invariance and the Van der Corput lemma.

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.** Assume $\Omega = (a, b)$, and let $\gamma : [a, b] \to S^2$ be a $C^2$ curve with nonvanishing spherical torsion $\det (\gamma, \gamma', \gamma'')$. Without loss of generality assume that $\gamma$ has unit speed. Let $F = \gamma'$ and $G = \gamma \times \gamma'$, so that $\gamma' = \text{span} \{F, G\}$. Differentiating both sides of $\langle \gamma, \gamma' \rangle = 0$ gives $\langle \gamma, \gamma'' \rangle = -1$, and hence
$$
\text{rank} (G \ DF) = \text{rank} (\gamma \times \gamma'') = 2.
$$
For the other condition in (3.23),
\begin{equation}
DG = (\gamma \times \gamma')' = \gamma \times \gamma'' = -\det (\gamma, \gamma', \gamma'') \gamma'.
\end{equation}
The last equality can be seen by expanding out $\gamma \times \gamma''$ in the basis $\gamma, \gamma', \gamma \times \gamma'$. In this expansion, the coefficient of $\gamma$ is clearly zero, and differentiating $\langle \gamma \times \gamma', \gamma \times \gamma' \rangle$ shows that the coefficient of $\gamma \times \gamma'$ is zero. The coefficient of $\gamma'$ can then be found.
through the scalar triple product formula \( \det (a \ b \ c) = \langle a, b \times c \rangle \). Eq. (3.25) implies that
\[
\text{rank} (F \ DG) = \text{rank} (\gamma' \ \gamma \times \gamma'') = 1 = \text{rank} \gamma \times \gamma'' = \text{rank} DG.
\]
This automatically implies (3.3). By [7, Lemma 3.2], the curve \( \gamma \times \gamma' \) has nonvanishing spherical torsion since \( \gamma \) has nonvanishing spherical torsion. Substituting the value of \( \beta(\alpha) \) from Theorem 3.2 and applying Theorem 3.1 with \( d = 2 \) therefore gives (3.3) and (1.4).

3.2. Weighted Fourier restriction for the cone, and projections onto 2-dimensional planes in higher dimensions. For \( d \geq 2 \) let \( \Gamma^d \) be the \( d \)-dimensional truncated cone in \( \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \):
\[
\Gamma^d := \left\{ (\xi, |\xi|) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} : \frac{1}{2} \leq |\xi| \leq 1 \right\}.
\]
For \( d = 2 \), \( \Gamma^2 \cap S^2 = \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 1) : \theta \in [0, 2\pi) \right\} \) is the curve from before, which serves as the model example of a curve on the sphere \( S^2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3 \) with strictly positive geodesic curvature. For \( d \geq 2 \), \( \Gamma^d \cap S^d \) is a codimension 1 submanifold of \( S^d \) with second fundamental form corresponding to a constant multiple of the identity matrix at every point, and it therefore serves as a simple example of a codimension 1 submanifold of \( S^d \) which is “positively curved”; meaning the second fundamental form is everywhere strictly positive definite. A restricted family of projections parametrised by \( \Gamma^d \cap S^d \) will be constructed here using vector fields on the sphere \( S^{d-1} \).

A function \( F : S^{d-1} \to \mathbb{R}^d \) is called a vector field on \( S^{d-1} \) if \( \langle F(x), x \rangle = 0 \) for every \( x \in S^{d-1} \). A vector field \( F : S^{d-1} \to \mathbb{R}^d \) on \( S^{d-1} \) is called linear if there exists a \( d \times d \) matrix \( A \) such that \( F(x) = Ax \) for every \( x \in S^{d-1} \), and \( F \) is called a unit vector field if \( |F| \equiv 1 \). A \( d \times d \) matrix \( A \) corresponds to a linear vector field on \( S^{d-1} \) if and only if \( A^* = -A \). It is well known that there are no nonvanishing continuous vector fields on \( S^{d-1} \) if \( d \) is odd. Assume then that \( d \) is even, fix a linear unit vector field \( A \) on \( S^{d-1} \) (e.g. multiplication by \( i \)), and for \( v \in S^{d-1} \) let \( \pi_v = \pi_v, A \) be the orthogonal projection onto the 2-dimensional plane
\[
\text{span} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (v, -1), (Av, 0) \right\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}.
\]
This family forms a \( (d - 1) \)-dimensional submanifold of the \( 2(d-1) \)-dimensional Grassmannian \( \text{Gr}(d + 1, 2) \). If \( d = 2 \), the family in (3.26) parametrises the planes orthogonal to \( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 1) \), so this generalises the projection family occuring in Theorem 3.1.

Proposition 3.3. Fix an even integer \( d \geq 4 \). For any analytic subset \( B \) of \( \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \),
\[
\dim \pi_v (B) = \dim B, \quad \dim B \in [0, 2]
\]
\[
\mathcal{H}^d (\pi_v (B)) > 0, \quad \dim B > 2,
\]
for \( \mathcal{H}^{d-1} \)-a.e. \( v \in S^{d-1} \).

The Peres-Schlag projection theorem does not imply Proposition 3.3, since the family of projections fails their transversality condition (see Appendix B). Moreover, Proposition 3.3 is not implied (at least not for all possibilities) by the results of [14, 13] for more general families of planes without curvature assumptions. It
seems likely that Proposition 3.3 could also be proved more directly via sublevel set estimates, but if an analogous projection family $\pi_d$ existed for $d = 3$, then this Fourier analytic method would give the sharp projection theorem, and this would not (trivially) follow from sublevel set estimates. If the number of vector fields is increased so that the projections are onto $k$-dimensional planes with $k \geq 3$, e.g. span $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v,-1), (A_1v,0), (A_2v,0)\}$, then the sharp bound can be proved by a simple change of variables without Fourier restriction.

For $\alpha \in [0,d+1]$ let $\beta(\alpha, \Gamma^d)$ be the supremum over all $\beta \geq 0$ satisfying

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\hat{\mu}(R \xi)|^2 \ d\sigma_{\Gamma}(\xi) \lesssim_{\beta} c_\alpha(\mu) \mu(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}) R^{-\beta},
$$

for all $R > 0$ where $\sigma_{\Gamma}$ is the surface measure on the truncated cone $\Gamma^d$. By ignoring constant factors, $\sigma_{\Gamma}$ is essentially equal to the pushforward of the Lebesgue measure on $B(0,1) \setminus B(0,1/2)$ under $\xi \mapsto (\xi, |\xi|)$.

For $d \geq 4$, the currently known lower bound on $\beta(\alpha, \Gamma^d)$ is

$$
(\alpha, \Gamma^d) \geq \begin{cases} 
\alpha, & \alpha \in \left[0, \frac{d-1}{2}\right] \\
\alpha - \frac{1}{2} \left(\alpha - \frac{(d-1)}{2}\right), & \alpha \in \left[\frac{d-1}{2}, \frac{d+1}{2}\right] \\
\alpha - 1 + \frac{d-\alpha}{d-1}, & \alpha \in \left(\frac{d+1}{2}, d\right] \\
\alpha - 1, & \alpha \in (d, d+1] 
\end{cases}
$$

(3.27)

Only the first bound, due to Mattila, will be used here. The same lower bound holds and is sharp for $d = 3$; this is due entirely to [3] (the lower bound $\beta(\alpha, \Gamma^d) \geq \alpha - 1$ holds for any $d \geq 2$ as a straightforward consequence of duality and Plancherel [3, 3]).

Proof of Proposition 3.3 Let $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be an analytic set. Let $\phi : B_{d-1}(0,1) \to S^{d-1}$ be the map

$$
y \mapsto \left(y, \sqrt{1 - |y|^2}\right).
$$

For the first part define $\tilde{G}, \tilde{F} : S^{d-1} \to S^d$ by

$$
\tilde{G}(v) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v,-1), \quad \tilde{F}(v) = (Av,0),
$$

Define $G, F : B_{d-1}(0,1/2) \to S^d$ by $G = \tilde{G} \circ \phi$ and $F = \tilde{F} \circ \phi$, so that

$$
G(y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(y, \sqrt{1 - |y|^2}, -1\right) \in S^d \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R},
$$

and

$$
F(y) = \left(A \left(\frac{y}{\sqrt{1 - |y|^2}}\right), 0\right) \in S^d \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}.
$$

Then $F$ is a diffeomorphism onto its $(d-1)$-dimensional image, and therefore rank $DF \equiv d - 1$. Hence

$$
\text{rank} \ (G \quad DF) = d.
$$
since the last entry of \( G \) is everywhere nonzero. The derivative of \( G \) is the \((d+1) \times (d-1)\) matrix

\[
DG(y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{I_{d-1}}{\sqrt{1-|y|^2}} \\
0
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

Moreover,

\[
F(y) = \sqrt{2} \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} (Ay)_j \frac{\partial G}{\partial y_j}.
\]

This can be checked by comparing with the formula for \( DG(y) \); the only nontrivial equality to check is in the \( d \)-th coordinate, which holds since \( A \) is a vector field on \( S^{d-1} \). This implies that

\[
\text{rank } (A \quad DG) \equiv \text{rank } DG = d - 1,
\]

which verifies (3.3).

For (3.1), let \( U \) be the set \((1, \infty) \times \mathbb{R} \times B_{d-1}(0, 1/2)\) and define \( H: U \to \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \) by \( H(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, y) = \lambda_1 F(y) + \lambda_2 G(y) \). Then for any positive function \( g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}) \) supported in \( H(U) \),

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \left( \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 \right)^{d/2} (g \circ H)(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, y) \, d\lambda_1 \, d\lambda_2 \, dy
\]

\[
= \int_{1}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{B_{d-1}(0,1/2)} \left( \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 \right)^{d/2} (g \circ H)(\lambda_1 \lambda_2, y) \, d\lambda_1 \, d\lambda_2 \, dy
\]

\[
\lesssim \int_{1}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{S^{d-1}} \left( \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 \right)^{d/2} g \left( \frac{\lambda_1 Av + \lambda_2 v}{-\lambda_2} \right) \, d\sigma(v) \, d\lambda_1 \, d\lambda_2
\]

\[
= \int_{1}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{S^{d-1}} \left( \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 \right)^{d/2} g \left( \frac{\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2}{-\lambda_2}^{1/2} v \right) \, d\sigma(v) \, d\lambda_1 \, d\lambda_2
\]

\[
\lesssim \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \int_{S^{d-1}} r^{d-1} \, d\sigma(v) \right| \, dr \, d\lambda_2
\]

\[
= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} |\det DH(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, y)| |(g \circ H)(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, y)| \, d\lambda_1 \, d\lambda_2 \, dy.
\]

It follows that

\[
|\det DH(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, y)| = |\det \begin{pmatrix} F(y) & G(y) \end{pmatrix} \lambda_1 DF(y) + \lambda_2 DG(y)|
\]

\[
\gtrsim \left( \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 \right)^{d/2},
\]

for all \( \lambda_1 \geq 1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( y \in B_{d-1}(0, 1/2) \). Setting \( \lambda_1 = 1 \) gives

\[
\min_{\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}, y \in B_{d-1}(0, 1/2)} |\det \begin{pmatrix} F(y) & G(y) \end{pmatrix} DF(y) + \lambda DG(y)| > 0,
\]

which verifies (3.4) with \( \Omega = B_{d-1}(0, 1/2) \).

Applying Theorem 3.1 and using symmetry gives

\[
\dim \pi_v(B) \geq \min \left\{ 2, \dim B, \beta \left( \dim B, \Gamma^{d} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \right\} \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^{d-1}\text{-a.e. } v \in S^{d-1},
\]
and $\mathcal{H}^2(\pi_v(B)) > 0$ for $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}$-a.e. $v \in S^{d-1}$ if $\min \{\dim B, \beta(\dim B, \Gamma^d) + \frac{1}{2}\} > 2$. Since $d \geq 4$, the lower bound for $\beta(\cdot, \Gamma^d)$ in (3.27) shows that

$$\beta(\dim B, \Gamma^d) + \frac{1}{2} \geq \min \{2, \dim B\},$$

with strict inequality if $\dim B \neq 2$. Hence

$$\dim \pi_v(B) = \dim B, \quad \dim B \in [0, 2]$$

$$\mathcal{H}^2(\pi_v(B)) > 0, \quad \dim B > 2,$$

for $\mathcal{H}^{d-1}$-a.e. $v \in S^{d-1}$. This proves Proposition 3.3.

\[ \square \]

**Appendix A. Proof that the Oberlin-Oberlin inequality implies Lemma 2.1 when $s \geq 9/4$**

**Proof of Lemma 2.1** for $s \geq 9/4$. As before, issues of measurability will be ignored since they can be dealt with similarly to the proof of Lemma 2.1 in §11. Let $\eta > 0$ be a small constant to be chosen, and let

$$Z = Z(\delta) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^3 : H^1 \{\theta \in [0, 2\pi) : \pi_y \nu (B(\pi_y(y), \delta)) > \delta^s \} \geq \delta^2\}.$$

It is required to show that $\nu(Z) \leq \nu(\mathbb{R}^3) \delta^2$ for all $\delta$ sufficiently small. It suffices to prove that $\nu(Z') \leq \nu(\mathbb{R}^3) \delta^2\eta$, where $\nu(Z) \leq \nu(Z')\delta^\eta$ and

$$Z' = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^3 : H^1 \{\theta \in [0, 2\pi) : \nu (A(y, t, 2t) \cap \pi_y^{-1}(B(\pi_y(y), \delta))) > \delta^s + \eta - \kappa\} \geq \delta^2\},$$

for some $t \geq \delta$ with $t \leq 1$, where $t$ is found by dyadic pigeonholing (as in e.g. [25]), and $A(y, t, 2t) = B(y, 2t) \setminus B(y, t)$. The lemma will be derived from the outer parts of the following claimed inequality:

\[ (A.1) \]

$$\nu(Z) t^s \delta^{s-1} + 100 \eta \lesssim (\nu \times \nu) \{(y, x) \in Z' \times \mathbb{R}^3 : x \sim y\} \lesssim \nu(\mathbb{R}^3) t^s \delta^{s-1} + 100 \eta;$$

where $x \sim y$ means that $x \in A(y, t, 2t)$ and $|\pi_y(x - y)| < \delta$ for some $\theta \in H(y)$, where

$$H(y) := \{\theta \in [0, 2\pi) : \nu (A(y, t, 2t) \cap \pi_y^{-1}(B(\pi_y(y), \delta))) > \delta^s + \eta - \kappa\}.$$  

The lower bound in (A.1) is essentially the same as [25, Eq. 2.12], so it suffices to prove the upper bound.

By Fubini,

\[ (\nu \times \nu) \{(y, x) \in Z' \times \mathbb{R}^3 : x \sim y\} \]

\[ = \int_{Z'} \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x \sim y} d\nu(x) d\nu(y) \]

\[ \lesssim t^{s-1} \int_{Z'} \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x \sim y} \int_{(0, 2\pi) : |\pi_y(x - y)| < 100\delta} d\theta d\nu(x) d\nu(y) \]

\[ \lesssim t^{s-1} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{100\delta} \left(\frac{\delta}{|\pi_y(x - y)|}\right)^{s-\kappa+100\eta} d\theta d\nu(x) d\nu(y) \]

\[ \lesssim t^{s-\kappa-1} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{100\delta} I_{s-\kappa+100\eta}(\pi_y \nu) d\theta \]

\[ \lesssim \nu(\mathbb{R}^3) t^{s-\kappa-1} + 100 \eta, \]
where the last inequality is from \([23]\) (see also Theorem \([1.2]\), and holds provided \(\eta\) is chosen small enough to ensure that \(s - \kappa + 100\eta < s - 1/2\). This finishes the proof of (A.1); the lemma then follows by cancelling the common factor in the outer two parts of (A.1) and choosing \(\delta_0\) small enough. \(\square\)

**Appendix B. Failure of Transversality**

Peres and Schlag’s Theorem 4.8 from [27] gives a projection theorem for a general family of projections satisfying a transversality condition. Here it will be shown that this transversality condition is not satisfied by the family of projections occurring in Proposition [63]. Let \(Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}\) be an open connected set. Let \(v : Q \to S^d\) parametrise the open upper hemisphere smoothly. Define \(\Pi : Q \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \to \mathbb{R}^2\) by

\[
\Pi(\lambda, x) = \left( \langle x, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \begin{array}{c} v(\lambda) \\ -1 \end{array} \right) \rangle, \langle x, \left( Av(\lambda) \right) \rangle \right).
\]

For distinct \(x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}\), let

\[
\Phi_\lambda(x, y) = \Pi(\lambda, x) - \Pi(\lambda, y) = \Pi(\lambda, z), \quad z := \frac{x - y}{|x - y|}.
\]

Write \(x = (x', x_{d+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}\), so that for fixed \(x\),

\[
\partial_\lambda \Pi(\lambda, x) = \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \langle x', \partial_\lambda v(\lambda) \rangle, \langle -Ax', \partial_\lambda v(\lambda) \rangle \right).
\]

The derivative of \(\Phi_\lambda(x, y)\) with respect to \(\lambda \in Q\) is therefore the \(2 \times (d - 1)\) matrix

\[
D_\lambda \Phi_\lambda(x, y) = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \langle z', \partial_\lambda v(\lambda) \rangle & \cdots & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \langle z', \partial_{d-1} v(\lambda) \rangle \\
\langle -Az', \partial_\lambda v(\lambda) \rangle & \cdots & \langle -Az', \partial_{d-1} v(\lambda) \rangle
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

The \(\beta\)-transversality condition is: for any fixed compact \(\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}\), there exists a constant \(C_\beta > 0\) such that for all for all \(\lambda \in Q\) and all distinct \(x, y \in \Omega\), the condition

\[(B.1) \quad |\Pi(\lambda, z)| \leq C_\beta |x - y|^\beta,\]

implies that

\[(B.2) \quad \det \left( D_\lambda \Phi(x, y) \right) \left[ D_\lambda \Phi(x, y) \right]^* \geq C_\beta^2 |x - y|^{2\beta}. \]

This definition is from [27, 6]; the one in [27] has an extraneous condition (probably a typo).

Let \(\Omega\) be the closed unit ball centred at the origin, and suppose for a contradiction that the \(\beta\)-transversality condition is satisfied for some positive constant \(C_\beta\), for some \(\beta \geq 0\). Fix any \(\lambda \in Q\) and define \(x, y \in \Omega\) by

\[x = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \left( \begin{array}{c} v(\lambda) \\ 1 \end{array} \right) = -y, \quad \text{so that} \quad x - y = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \begin{array}{c} v(\lambda) \\ 1 \end{array} \right).\]

The left hand side of (B.1) vanishes. Since the tangent space to any point on \(S^{d-1}\) is the plane orthogonal to that point, all entries in the top row of \(D_\lambda \Phi(x, y)\) are zero. Hence the \(2 \times 2\) matrix \(D_\lambda \Phi(x, y) \left[ D_\lambda \Phi(x, y) \right]^*\) has at most 1 nonzero entry, and its determinant vanishes. Therefore (B.2) contradicts the assumption that \(C_\beta\) is positive.
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