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ABSTRACT

Let $G_1, \ldots, G_k$ and $H$ be vector spaces over a finite field $\mathbb{F}_p$ of prime order. Let $A \subset G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k$ be a set of size $\delta |G_1| \cdots |G_k|$. Let a map $\phi : A \to H$ be a multi-homomorphism, meaning that for each direction $d \in [k]$, and each element $(x_1, \ldots, x_{d-1}, x_{d+1}, \ldots, x_k)$ of $G_1 \times \ldots \times G_{d-1} \times G_{d+1} \times \ldots \times G_k$, the map that sends each $y_d$ such that $(x_1, \ldots, x_{d-1}, y_d, x_{d+1}, \ldots, x_k) \in A$ to $\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_{d-1}, y_d, x_{d+1}, \ldots, x_k)$ is a Freiman homomorphism (of order 2). In this paper, we prove that for each such map, there is a multiaffine map $\Phi : G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k \to H$ such that $\phi = \Phi$ on a set of density $\left( \exp^{O(k)}(O_{k,p}(\delta^{-1})) \right)^{-1}$, where $\exp(t)$ denotes the $t$-fold exponential.

Applications of this theorem include:

- a quantitative inverse theorem for approximate polynomials mapping $G$ to $H$, for finite-dimensional $\mathbb{F}_p$-vector spaces $G$ and $H$, in the high-characteristic case,
- a quantitative inverse theorem for uniformity norms over finite fields in the high-characteristic case, and
- a quantitative structure theorem for dense subsets of $G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k$ that are subspaces in the principal directions (without additional characteristic assumptions).

§1 Introduction

The classical theorem of Freiman, in the context of vector spaces over finite fields, can be stated as follows.

**Theorem 1** (Freiman’s theorem in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$). Suppose that $A \subset V$, where $V$ is a finite-dimensional vector space over $\mathbb{F}_p$. Suppose that $|A + A| \leq K|A|$. Then, there is a coset $C$ of a subspace in $V$ such that $|C| \leq O_K(|A|)$ and $|C \cap A| \geq \Omega_K(|A|)$.

Freiman proved this theorem initially in the setting of finite subsets of integers $\mathbb{Z}$. In [28], Ruzsa found a highly influential new proof of this result. That proof was generalized to all abelian groups by Green and Ruzsa in [14]. The strongest result of this form was given by Sanders in [29].

An important ingredient in Freiman’s proof was the notion of a Freiman homomorphism. When $G$ and $H$ are abelian groups and $A \subset G$ is a subset, we say that $\phi : A \to H$ is a (Freiman) homomorphism of order $k$, or simply $k$-homomorphism, if whenever $a_1, \ldots, a_k, b_1, \ldots, b_k \in A$ satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i = \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_i$, then $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \phi(a_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \phi(b_i)$ holds as well. In particular, 2-homomorphisms are maps that respect
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all additive quadruples \((a, b, c, d)\) such that \(a + b = c + d\) in the given set \(A\). These maps can be thought of as approximate analogues of linear maps. Indeed, if we combine Freiman’s theorem with the Balog-Szemeredi-Gowers theorem [1], [9], we may obtain the following result.

**Theorem 2.** Let \(V\) and \(H\) be vector spaces over \(\mathbb{F}_p\), let \(A \subset V\) be a subset of size at least \(\delta|V|\) and let \(\phi : A \to H\) be a 2-homomorphism. Then there is an affine map \(\psi : V \to H\), and a subset \(A' \subset A\) of size \(\Omega_\delta(|V|)\) such that \(\phi(a) = \psi(a)\) for all \(a \in A'\).

The main result of this paper is a generalization of Theorem 2 to the setting of multivariate maps. We begin by giving a definition of a class of functions that have the same relationship to Freiman homomorphisms that multilinear maps have to linear maps. That is, they are functions of several variables that are Freiman homomorphisms in each variable separately. A formal definition is as follows.

**Definition 3** (Freiman multi-homomorphisms). Let \(G_1, \ldots, G_k\) and \(H\) be finite-dimensional vector spaces over \(\mathbb{F}_p\), and let \(A \subset G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k\). A function \(\phi : A \to H\) is a Freiman multi-homomorphism of order \(k\) if for every \(d \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}\) and every \((a_1, \ldots, a_{d-1}, a_{d+1}, \ldots, a_k) \in G_1 \times \ldots \times G_{d-1} \times G_{d+1} \times \ldots \times G_k\), the map from \(\{x_d \in G_d : (a_1, \ldots, a_{d-1}, x_d, a_{d+1}, \ldots, a_k) \in A\}\) to \(H\) defined by the formula \(x_d \mapsto \phi(a_1, \ldots, a_{d-1}, x_d, a_{d+1}, \ldots, a_k)\) is a Freiman homomorphism of order \(k\).

We shall also call these multi-\(k\)-homomorphisms. Indeed, often we shall simply call them multi-homomorphisms, in which case, as with Freiman homomorphisms, it should be understood that \(k = 2\).

Our main theorem is an inverse theorem for multi-homomorphisms. It is trivial that any multiaffine map \(\phi : G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k \to H\) is a multi-homomorphism. Moreover, the restriction of \(\phi\) to any subset of \(G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k\) is also a multi-homomorphism. The theorem gives a sort of converse: given a multi-homomorphism \(\phi\) defined on a dense subset of \(G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k\), it must agree with a multiaffine map on a large subset.

**Theorem 4** (Inverse theorem for multihomomorphisms). For every \(k \in \mathbb{N}\) there is a constant \(D_k^{\text{mh}}\) such that the following statement holds. Let \(G_1, \ldots, G_k\) and \(H\) be finite-dimensional vector spaces over \(\mathbb{F}_p\). Let \(A \subset G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k\) be a set of size at least \(\delta|G_1| \cdots |G_k|\), and let \(\phi : A \to H\) be a multi-homomorphism. Then there is a multiaffine map \(\Phi : G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k \to H\) such that \(\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_k) = \Phi(x_1, \ldots, x_k)\) for at least \(\left(\exp(D_k^{\text{mh}}(O_k,p(\delta^{-1})))\right)^{-1}|G_1| \cdots |G_k|\) elements \((x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in A\), where \(\exp^{(t)}\) denotes the \(t\)-fold iterated exponential.

**Remark.** We may bound \(D_k^{\text{mh}}\) by \(C3^k(k+1)!\) for some absolute constant \(C\).

**Uniformity norms.** In order to give further motivation for Theorem 3, we need to recall the definition of the sequence of uniformity norms \(\| \cdot \|_{U_k}\). These norms were introduced in [3], and played an essential role in obtaining a new proof of Szemerédi’s theorem that gave quantitative bounds.
such that $\sum_{i=1}^k \varepsilon_i a_i$.

remarkable results along these lines. In \cite{17}, Green, Tao and Ziegler proved such a result in the setting correlation with a structured function such as a polynomial phase function. There are a couple of uniformity norms was obtained: given any large uniformity norms. This was the strategy of the proof in \cite{9}, where a local inverse theorem for $k$-progression of length $k+1$ (and hence complexity $k-1$) inside $A$ satisfies $|N^{-2} n_{AP} - \delta k^3| = O_k(\varepsilon)$. Thus, in order to prove Szemerédi’s theorem, one needs to understand the structure of functions with complexity here, but in the context of arithmetic progressions, where the complexity of an arithmetic progression of length $k$ is $k-2$, this statement can be formalized as follows.

**Proposition 6.** Let $N$ be a sufficiently large prime, let $A \subset \mathbb{Z}_N$ be a set of size $\delta N$ and suppose that $\|1_A - \delta\|_{U_{2k}} \leq \varepsilon$. Then the number $n_{AP}$ of arithmetic progressions of length $k+1$ (and hence complexity $k-1$) inside $A$ satisfies $|N^{-2} n_{AP} - \delta k^3| = O_k(\varepsilon)$.

This led to efforts to generalize the result to a strong inverse theorem, where one has a global correlation with a structured function such as a polynomial phase function. There are a couple of remarkable results along these lines. In \cite{17}, Green, Tao and Ziegler proved such a result in the setting of $\mathbb{Z}_N$, while in the case of $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ as the ambient group, Bergelson, Tao and Ziegler obtained analogous result \cite{12} (with a further refinement by Tao and Ziegler \cite{14}). In both cases, the family of structured functions is explicitly described, but it is more complicated than just the polynomial phases, so we shall not give the definitions here. However, in the so-called ‘high-characteristic case’, $k \leq p$, polynomial phases are again sufficient. Similar results in this direction were proved by Szegedy \cite{20} and jointly by Antolín Camarena and Szegedy \cite{7}. (See also \cite{18}, \cite{19}, \cite{22}.)

None of the results mentioned so far gave quantitative bounds on the correlation when $k > 3$. Relatively recently\footnote{The result appeared on arXiv in November 2018.}, there was another major breakthrough when Manners \cite{23} proved quantitative bounds\footnote{If we write $c_k(\delta)$ for the guaranteed correlation bound $|E_{\delta} f(x) g_{\delta R}(x)| \geq c_k(\delta)$, where $g_{\delta R}$ is the structured function, when $\|f\|_{U_{2k}} \geq \delta$, and if $E_0 \subset E_1 \subset \ldots$ is the Grzegorczyk hierarchy (i.e. functions in $E_1$ are linear, functions in $E_2$ are polynomial, functions in $E_3$ use a bounded number of exponentials, etc.) then good bounds means that all $n \mapsto c_k(n^{-1})^{-1}$ belong to some fixed $E_i$. Before Manners’s result, the proofs depended on regularity lemmas of increasing order, which led to $n \mapsto c_k(n^{-1})^{-1}$ being higher and higher in the Grzegorczyk hierarchy.} for the strong inverse theorem in the $\mathbb{Z}_N$ case.
When it comes to the quantitative bounds (i.e. the good bounds) in the $\mathbb{F}_p^n$ case, the first such result was proved by Green and Tao for the $\| \cdot \|_{U^3}$ norm \cite{g4}. The only other such result was proved by authors in \cite{gt}, in the case of large characteristic ($p \geq 5$). The key ingredient, from which the inverse theorem for $U^4$ norm follows easily, is Theorem \ref{thm:inverse} for the case of two variables. (This theorem is implicit in that paper.) Our main application is thus to generalize the main result of \cite{gt} and obtain a quantitative version of the strong inverse theorem for the $U^k$ norm in $\mathbb{F}_p^n$, in the high-characteristic case $p \geq k$. This application is the main motivation for Theorem \ref{thm:inverse}.

**Theorem 7.** Suppose that $p \geq k$ and that $f : \mathbb{F}_p^n \to \mathbb{D}$ is a function such that $\| f \|_{U^k} \geq \delta > 0$ (where $\mathbb{D}$ is the unit disc in $\mathbb{C}$). Then there is a polynomial $g : \mathbb{F}_p^n \to \mathbb{F}_p$ of degree at most $k-1$ such that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} f(x) \exp \left( \frac{2\pi i}{p} g(x) \right) \right| = \Omega_{k,p} \left( \left( \exp(O_k(1)) O_{k,p}(\delta^{-1}) \right)^{-1} \right).$$

As in the case of $U^4$ norm in \cite{gt}, this theorem follows reasonably straightforwardly from Theorem \ref{thm:inverse}. Given that this deduction is not hard and given that Theorem \ref{thm:inverse} does not require any characteristic assumption, it is plausible that a proof of the full quantitative inverse theorem for uniformity norms over finite fields is now within reach.

**Other applications.** As well as Theorem \ref{thm:inverse}, some other results also follow from Theorem \ref{thm:inverse}. Among these, the closest in spirit to the inverse theorem for uniformity norms is an inverse theorem for approximate polynomials. For groups $G, H$ and an element $a \in G$, define the **discrete derivative** $\Delta_a$ as the operator that maps a function $f : G \to H$ to the function $\Delta_a f$ defined by the formula $\Delta_a f(x) = f(x+a) - f(x)$. It is not hard to prove that when $G$ and $H$ are finite-dimensional vector spaces over $\mathbb{F}_p$ and $d < p$, a function $f : G \to H$ is a polynomial of degree at most $d$ if and only if the condition

$$\Delta_{a_1} \ldots \Delta_{a_{d+1}} f(x) = 0$$

holds for all $a_1, \ldots, a_{d+1}, x \in G$. By an **approximate polynomial** we mean a function that satisfies this condition for large collection of parameters but not necessarily all. Our next result is that such functions are necessarily related to polynomials of the usual kind.

**Theorem 8 (Inverse theorem for approximate polynomials).** Suppose that $p > d$. Let $G$ and $H$ be finite-dimensional vector spaces over $\mathbb{F}_p$ and let $f : G \to H$ be a function such that

$$\Delta_{a_1} \ldots \Delta_{a_{d+1}} f(x) = 0$$

for at least $\delta|G|^{d+2}$ choices of $a_1, \ldots, a_{d+1}, x \in G$. Then there is a polynomial $\psi : G \to H$ of degree at most $d$ such that $f(x) = \psi(x)$ for at least $c|G|$ elements $x \in G$, where $c = \Omega_{d,p} \left( \left( \exp(O_d(1)) O_{d,p}(\delta^{-1}) \right)^{-1} \right)$.

Before proceeding further, we pause for a moment to discuss the relationship between Theorems \ref{thm:inverse} and \ref{thm:inverse} (in a qualitative sense, ignoring also the assumption $p > d$). While Theorem \ref{thm:inverse} implies Theorem \ref{thm:inverse},
reasonably straightforwardly, the reverse implication is not entirely clear. To see why not, fix a function 
\( \phi : G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k \to H \) that satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 4. We may define a vector space 
\( G^+ = G_1 \oplus G_2 \oplus \ldots \oplus G_k \) and view \( \phi \) as a function on \( G^+ \). It is not hard to see that \( \phi \) becomes 
an approximate polynomial of degree at most \( k \) on \( G^+ \) in the sense of Theorem 8. Assuming that 
Theorem 8 has been proved, we can find a polynomial \( \psi : G^+ \to H \) of degree at most \( k \) that agrees 
with \( \phi \) on a dense set. However, the structure of polynomials on \( G^+ \) is more general than that of 
multiaffine maps on \( G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k \), so additional arguments are needed to complete the implica 
tion of theorems in this direction. For example, if we set \( G_1 = G_2 = F_p^m \) and \( H = F_p^m \), and set \( \phi_i(x, y) = 2x_1y_1 \) and \( \psi_i(x, y) = x_1^2 + y_1^2 \) for all \( i \in [m] \), then \( \phi = \psi \) on a dense set. In particular, the argument 
above would identify \( \phi \) with a polynomial of degree 2 (but not a multiaffine map), and still be correct 
(although not as strong as possible).

At first sight, we expect that an inverse theorem should be significantly easier to prove when the 
object with approximate properties that we wish to understa nd also has a strong algebraic structure.\(^3\) However, \(^3\) where Tao and Ziegler prove the inverse theore 
m for uniformity norms in the case of algebraic objects called ‘non-classical polynomials’ is an example of how this intuition can be misleading.

A final point is that Theorem 4 does not suffer from the low-characteristic issues that are present 
in Theorem 8.

Another application that we included in this paper is related to Bogolyubov’s method. Its classical 
version can be stated as follows.

**Proposition 9** (Bogolyubov lemma). Suppose that \( A \subset G \) is a set of density \( \delta \) and that \( G \) is a 
finite-dimensional vector space over \( \mathbb{F}_p \). Then \( A + A - A - A \) contains a subspace of codimension 
\( O_\delta(1) \).

The proof of the above statement actually gives more information than this. It shows that given 
any function \( f : G \to \mathbb{D} \), and any \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there is a subspace \( V \) of codimension \( O_\varepsilon(1) \) such that 
on each coset of \( V \) the values of \( f * f * f * f \) vary by at most \( \varepsilon \). Thus, we may approximate the 
iterated convolution of any function in the \( L^\infty \) norm by a highly structured function. In this paper, 
we also prove a multidimensional generalization of this phenomenon. To state it, given a function 
\( f : G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k \to \mathbb{C} \), we define its convolution in direction \( d \) as

\[
C_d f(x_1, \ldots, x_{d-1}, y_d, x_{d+1}, \ldots, x_k) = \mathbb{E}_{z_d \in G_d} f(x_1, \ldots, x_{d-1}, y_d + z_d, x_{d+1}, \ldots, x_k) f(x_1, \ldots, x_{d-1}, z_d, x_{d+1}, \ldots, x_k).
\]

\(^3\)In our case, we want to show that a polynomial of degree \( d \) on \( G^+ \) (instead of arbitrary function) that is simultaneously 
a multi-2-homomorphism on a dense subset of \( G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k \) (the approximate property) necessarily comes from a global 
multiaffine map.
One way of describing what happens in the one-variable case is to say that we find a linear map \( \phi: G \to F_l \) for some small \( l \) such that the iterated convolution is roughly constant on the inverse image of each \( y \in F_l \). Our next theorem is a very similar statement for iterated convolutions in different directions: the main difference is that \( \phi \) is now a multilinear map, and a technical difference is that the approximation is valid for a set of inverse images that covers most of the domain rather than all of it.

It will be convenient to use the shorthand \( G[k] \) for \( G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k \) and \( x[k] \) for \( (x_1, \ldots, x_k) \).

**Theorem 10 (Approximating multiconvolutions).** Let \( f: G[k] \to D \) be a function, let \( d_1, \ldots, d_r \in [k] \) be directions such that every direction is included at least once, and let \( \varepsilon > 0 \). Then there exist

- a positive integer \( l = \exp(\theta_1(1)) \left( O_k, p(r)^2 \varepsilon^{-O_k, p(1)} \right) \),
- a multiaffine map \( \phi: G[k] \to F_l \),
- a subset \( M \subset F_l \), such that \( |\phi^{-1}(M)| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|G[k]| \),
- a function \( c: M \to D \) such that for every \( \mu \in M \) and every \( x[k] \in \phi^{-1}(M) \) we have that

\[
\left| C_{d_r} \ldots C_{d_1} C_k \ldots C_1 C_k \ldots C_1 f(x_k) - c(\mu) \right| \leq \varepsilon.
\]

Unlike previous applications, deducing Theorem 10 from Theorem 4 requires significantly more work. It is also central to the proof of Theorem 4, and in fact our argument takes the following recursive form: for each \( k \) we use Theorem 10 for \( k \) to prove Theorem 10 for \( k \), and then we use Theorem 10 for \( k \) to prove Theorem 10 for \( k+1 \). We shall return to a discussion of Theorem 10 in the next section, where we give an outline of the proof.

Finally, we use Theorem 10 in an easy and straightforward manner to deduce statements that are closer in spirit to Proposition 9. Such results were established in the case of two variables (where one convolves two-dimensional sets several times in principal directions to obtain biaffine structure) by Bienvenu and Lê and by the authors independently, and the bounds in the problem were improved by Hosseini and Lovett. The two-variable version was also used by Bienvenu and Lê in the study of correlations of the M"obius function with quadratic polynomials over \( \mathbb{F}_q[t] \) in [6].

One appealing further corollary is a structure theorem for subsets of \( G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k \) that are subspaces in each principal direction.

**Theorem 11.** Let \( G_1, \ldots, G_k \) be \( \mathbb{F}_p \)-vector spaces. Suppose that \( X \subset G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k \) is a set of density \( \delta \) such that for each \( d \in [k] \) and each \( (x_1, \ldots, x_{d-1}, x_{d+1}, \ldots, x_k) \in G_1 \times \ldots \times G_{d-1} \times G_{d+1} \times \ldots \times G_k \)\(^4\)

\(^4\) Actually, we use a slightly weaker version of Theorem 10, see Theorem 44. It turns out that additional control provided by \( L^\infty \)-approximation is not important in this proof, \( L^3 \) approximation is sufficient. The stronger version is useful in another application.
the set $\{y_d \in G_d : (x_1, \ldots, x_{d-1}, y_d, x_{d+1}, \ldots, x_k) \in X\}$ is a (possibly empty) subspace. Then, there are $r \leq \exp(O(1))(O_k,p(\delta^{-1})))$, sets $I_1, \ldots, I_r \subset [k]$ and multilinear forms $\alpha_i : \prod_{j \in I_i} G_j \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$ for $i \in [r]$ such that

$$\left\{ (x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k : (\forall i \in [r]) \alpha_i\left( (x_j : j \in I_i) \right) = 0 \right\} \subset X.$$

We also derive related results for general finite fields, when the choice of the field plays a non-trivial role.

**Comparison with other works.** Before Manners’s proof [25], all proofs of the inverse theorem for general $U^k$ norms (as opposed to results for specific small values of $k$) relied on regularity or non-standard analysis. The main novelty of our proof is that we avoid such arguments in the case of vector spaces over finite fields. Let us now say a few words about how this paper differs from [25]. Although similar in spirit, the approaches taken in [25] and in this paper are nevertheless disjoint in the sense that there is no obvious way of generalizing our proof to deal with $\mathbb{Z}_n$ or Manners’s proof to deal with $\mathbb{F}_p^n$. The main obstacle that stands in the way of adapting our proof to $\mathbb{Z}_N$ is that we rely heavily on a quantitative inverse theorem for biased multilinear forms (i.e., the partition versus analytic rank problem). Such a result is not known in the setting of $\mathbb{Z}_N$. Indeed, even the corresponding conjecture has not yet been articulated. On the other hand, Manners’s proof depends heavily on the assumption that the ambient group has bounded rank and no small subgroups, which is the opposite situation to that of $\mathbb{F}_p^n$. Also, the main result of [25] is actually a variant of Theorem 8 for $\mathbb{Z}_N$ rather than of Theorem 4 – that is, it concerns polynomials rather than multilinear functions.

**Acknowledgements.** LM would like to acknowledge the support of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia, Grant ON174026. WTG is supported by a Royal Society 2010 Anniversary Research Professorship.

## §2 Overview of proof

Recall that Theorem 4 is the inverse theorem for multi-homomorphisms, and Theorem 10 is our result about approximating multiconvolutions. The proof of Theorem 4 splits into the following stages.

**Step 1.** Assuming Theorem 4 for $k$, we prove Theorem 10 for $k$. The proof relies on the standard Bogolyubov argument (in fact, for efficiency in the number of convolutions we use a related result of Bourgain), together with some algebraic manipulation arguments already present in our previous paper [10], based on some ideas in [3] and the inclusion-exclusion formula. The new ingredient that was not present in the two-dimensional case is the use of a solution to the partition rank versus analytic rank problem, which is required in the more general case and about which we shall say more later.

**Step 2.** We define certain sets of points, which we call arrangements, that correspond to taking convolutions in certain sequences of directions. For example, in two dimensions, convolving first in
the vertical direction and then in the horizontal direction gives rise to vertical parallelograms, which are configurations of the form \((x, y_1), (x, y_1 + h), (x + w, y_2), (x + w, y_2 + h)\). With each arrangement we associate a sequence of lengths, which is an element of \(G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k\) that can be obtained from points in the arrangement by using convolution operations. For instance, the lengths associated with a vertical parallelogram are its width and height – the elements \(w \in G_1\) and \(h \in G_2\) above. Since all points in the arrangements we consider belong to the domain of \(\phi\), we may define the \(\phi\) value of an arrangement as an appropriate linear combination (in fact, a \(\pm 1\) combination) of the values of \(\phi\) at its points. In this step, we show that a positive proportion of pairs of arrangements with the same lengths have the same \(\phi\) value.

**Step 3.** We use an algebraic form of the dependent random choice method to find a subset of points in the domain of \(\phi\) such that the proportion of pairs of arrangements of same lengths that have the same \(\phi\) value is not merely positive, but close to 1.

**Step 4.** Combining the work in the previous step with Theorem \[10\], we find a new map \(\phi' : A' \to H\), where \(A' \subset V\) for some variety \(V, |A'| \geq (1-o(1))|V|\), and \(\phi'\) is not just a multi-homomorphism but has the stronger property of being a restriction of an affine map in each principal direction. We call such maps multiaffine, and use the term global multiaffine map for maps whose domain is the whole of \(G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k\). Moreover, \(\phi'\) is related to the initial map \(\phi\) in a sufficiently algebraically strong sense that once we show that \(\phi'\) coincides with a global multiaffine map on a dense set, we may deduce the same for \(\phi\).

**Step 5.** The next step is a slight digression from the main flow of the argument, in which we study extensions of biaffine maps defined on quasirandom biaffine varieties. This is similar to arguments from \[10\], but the arguments presented here are more streamlined and there are some new ones as well (for example, proving that a convolution of a biaffine map is automatically biaffine once a small error set has been removed, provided that the density of lines in the convolution direction is close to 1).

**Step 6.** We prove a ‘simultaneous biaffine regularity lemma’ which tells us that we may partition any given variety using pieces of lower complexity so that on most planes in the principal directions we get quasirandom biaffine varieties. This fits well with results of previous sections and allows us to extend them to the multiaffine setting.

**Step 7.** Finally, we show that a multiaffine map defined on almost all of a variety coincides on a large set with a global multiaffine map. This is done via a two-step argument. Very crudely put, we show that in the original variety, say of codimension \(r\), we may densify the domain to density \(1 - \epsilon\) for arbitrarily small \(\epsilon\). Then in each step we remove one of the \(r\) forms used to define the variety, at the cost of decreasing the density from \(1 - \epsilon\) to \(1 - O(\epsilon^{\Omega(1)})\). Provided \(\epsilon\) is small enough, we are able to finish the proof.

---

\(5\)In this paper, by *variety* in \(G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k\) we mean the zero set of a multiaffine map \(\alpha : G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k \to H\).
The organization of the paper follows these steps, but before we start with the proof, we include a section that contains a number of auxiliary results that will be used frequently later in the paper.

**Uses of the inverse theorem for biased multilinear forms.** A recurring theme in this paper is the use of the inverse theorem for biased multilinear forms – Theorem 30. As anticipated in the introduction to [26], here we employ Theorem 30 as a substitute for regularity lemmas. More precisely, the uses of the theorem can be roughly split into three categories:

(i) applications of its corollaries (see Corollary 37) to varieties with the goal of finding regular pieces of varieties,

(ii) application of the simultaneous biaffine regularity lemma (Theorem 74), which allows us to partition any given variety in a structured way so that almost every piece intersected with almost every plane in principal directions becomes quasirandom, and

(iii) direct applications of the theorem itself to relevant multilinear forms (see the proofs of Theorem 83 and Theorem 86).

This is one of the major differences from our previous work [10], where we did not require a result such as Theorem 30 since we considered only the case of bi-homomorphisms, for which the theorem has an easy proof.

§3 Preliminaries

**Notation.** As above, we write $\mathbb{D} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 1\}$ for the unit disk. We use the standard expectation notation $\mathbb{E}_{x \in X}$ as shorthand for the average $\frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{x \in X}$, and when the set $X$ is clear from the context we simply write $\mathbb{E}_x$. As in [26], we use the following convention to save writing in situations where we have many indices appearing in predictable patterns. Instead of denoting a sequence of length $m$ by $(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, we write $x_{[m]}$, and for $I \subseteq [m]$ we write $x_I$ for the subsequence with indices in $I$. This applies to products as well: $G_{[k]}$ stands for $\prod_{i \in [k]} G_i$ and $G_I = \prod_{i \in I} G_i$. For example, instead of writing $\alpha : \prod_{i \in I} G_i \to \mathbb{F}$ and $\alpha(x_i : i \in I)$, we write $\alpha : G_I \to \mathbb{F}$ and $\alpha(x_I)$. This notation is particularly useful when $I = [k] \setminus \{d\}$ as it saves us writing expressions such as $(x_1, \ldots, x_{d-1}, x_{d+1}, \ldots, x_k)$ and $G_1 \times \ldots \times G_{d-1} \times G_{d+1} \times \ldots \times G_k$.

We extend the use of the dot product notation to any situation where we have two sequences $x = x_{[n]}$ and $y = y_{[n]}$ and a meaningful multiplication between elements $x_iy_i$, writing $x \cdot y$ as shorthand for the sum $\sum_{i=1}^n x_iy_i$. For example, if $\lambda = \lambda_{[n]}$ is a sequence of scalars, and $A = A_{[n]}$ is a suitable sequence of maps, then $\lambda \cdot A$ is the map $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i A_i$.

Frequently we shall consider ‘slices’ of sets $S \subseteq G_{[k]}$, by which we mean sets $S_{x_I} = \{y_{[k]\setminus I} : (x_I, y_{[k]\setminus I}) \in S\}$, for $I \subseteq [k], x_I \in G_I$. (Here we are writing $(x_I, y_{[k]\setminus I})$ not for the concatenation of the sequences $x_I$ and $y_{[k]\setminus I}$ but for the ‘merged’ sequence $z_{[n]}$ with $z_i = x_i$ when $i \in I$ and $z_i = y_i$ otherwise.) If $I$ is a singleton $\{i\}$ and $z_i \in G_i$, then we shall write $S_{z_i}$ instead of $S_{z_{\{i\}}}$.
index $i$ will be clear from the context and it will be convenient to omit it. For example, $f(x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, a, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_k)$.

More generally, when $X_1, \ldots, X_k$ are finite sets, $Z$ is an arbitrary set, $f : X_1 \times \ldots \times X_k = X_{[k]} \to Z$ is a function, $I \subseteq [k]$ and $x_i \in X_i$ for each $i \in I$, we define a function $f_z : X_{|I|} \to Z$, by mapping each $y_{[k] \setminus I} \in X_{|I|}$ as $f_z(y_{[k] \setminus I}) = f(x_I, y_{[k] \setminus I})$. When the number of variables is small – for example, when we have a function $f(x, y)$ that depends only on two variables $x$ and $y$ instead of on indexed variables – we also write $f_z$ for the map $f_z(y) = f(x, y)$.

Let $G, G_1, \ldots, G_k$ be finite-dimensional vector spaces over a finite field $F$, and let $\chi : F \to \mathbb{D}$ be a non-trivial additive character on $F$. For maps $f, g : G \to \mathbb{C}$, we write $f \oplus g$ for the function defined by $f \oplus g(x) = \mathbb{E}_{g \in G} f(x + y)g(y)$. Given a map $f : G_1 \times \ldots \times G_k \to \mathbb{C}$, we can rewrite the definition of the convolution in direction $d$ as

$$C_d f(x_{[k] \setminus \{d\}}, y_d) = f_{x_{[k] \setminus \{d\}}} \oplus f_{y_d} = \mathbb{E}_{x_d \in G_d} f(x_{[k] \setminus \{d\}}, x_d + y_d)f(x_{[k] \setminus \{d\}}, x_d).$$

Fix a dot product $\cdot$ on $G$. The Fourier transform of $f : G \to \mathbb{C}$ is the function $\hat{f} : G \to \mathbb{C}$ defined by $\hat{f}(r) = \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} f(x)\chi(-r \cdot x)$.

Throughout the paper, unless explicitly stated otherwise, the implicit constants in the big-Oh notation depend on $p$ and $k$ only.

**Additional asymptotic notation.** In the later parts of the paper, we use $C$ notation as placeholders for positive constants whose values are not important. E.g.

$$(\forall x, y > 1) \ x \geq C \cdot y^C \implies x \geq 100y^2 \log y$$

is a shorthand for

$$(\exists C_1, C_2 > 0)(\forall x, y > 1) \ x \geq C_1 y^{C_2} \implies x \geq 100y^2 \log y.$$\n
Formally, let $x, y_1, \ldots, y_m$ be variables, let $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ let parameters, let $X, Y_1, \ldots, Y_m \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be sets, let $f : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function and let $P(x, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ be a proposition whose truth value depends on $x, y_1, \ldots, y_m$, we define

$$(\forall x \in X)(\forall y \in Y_1) \ldots (\forall y \in Y_m) x \geq f(y_1, \ldots, y_m; C, \ldots, C) \implies P(x, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$$

to be a shorthand for

$$(\exists C_1 > 0) \ldots (\exists C_n > 0)(\forall x \in X)(\forall y \in Y_1) \ldots (\forall y \in Y_m) x \geq f(y_1, \ldots, y_m; C_1, \ldots, C_n) \implies P(x, y_1, \ldots, y_m).$$

(1)

We also use notation

$$(\forall x \in X)(\forall y \in Y_1) \ldots (\forall y \in Y_m) x \leq f(y_1, \ldots, y_m; C, \ldots, C) \implies P(x, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$$
which is defined by changing $\geq$ with $\leq$ in the full expression above. Since this is an unusual notation, we provide a few more examples.

\[(\forall x > 2)(\forall y > 0)\ x \geq C \cdot y \implies x \log x \geq 1000y\]
\[(\forall x > 0)(\forall y > 2)\ x \leq C \cdot y \implies 1000x \leq y \log y\]
\[(\forall xy, z > 1)\ x \geq C \cdot y^2 + C \cdot z^3 \implies x \geq yz + y + 1\]
\[(\forall x > 1)(\forall y > 1)\ x \geq C \cdot y^2 \implies \exp(\sqrt{x}) \geq y^{100}\]
\[(\forall x \in (0,1))(\forall y \in (0,1))\ x \leq C \cdot y^2 \implies \sqrt{x} \leq \frac{y}{100}\]

When the sets $X, Y_1, \ldots, Y_m$ are clear from the context, we drop the universal quantifier part in the expressions above. For example, if we already know that $x$ and $y$ take values in $(0,1)$, then the last example may be written as

\[x \leq C \cdot y^C \implies \sqrt{x} \leq \frac{y}{100}\]

To help readability, we also adopt $c$ notation, which has the same logical meaning as $C$, but indicates that the property holds provided the implicit constant is sufficiently small. On the other hand, we shall think of $C$ as a sufficiently large constant. Using $c$, the last example may be written as

\[x \leq c \cdot y^C \implies \sqrt{x} \leq \frac{y}{100}\]

Finally, if we have some parameters $s_1, \ldots, s_m$ that are fixed beforehand (in our case these will almost always be the size of the field $p$ and the number of variables $k$) we may write $C_{s_1,\ldots,s_m}$ and $c_{s_1,\ldots,s_m}$ to indicate that implicit constants depend on these parameters. This has the effect of adding $(\forall s_1, \ldots, s_m)$ at the beginning of the expression $[\setminus]$, and replacing $C_i$ by $C_i(s_1, \ldots, s_m)$. However, these dependencies will be clear from the context, so we shall mostly be using $C$ and $c$ notation without the parameters explicitly written out.

### 3.1. Useful inequalities and identities

We record the following standard fact as a lemma. It is a direct consequence of Parseval’s identity.

**Lemma 12.** Let $f : G \to \mathbb{D}$ be a map. For $\varepsilon > 0$ there are at most $\varepsilon^{-2}$ values of $r \in G$ such that $|\hat{f}(r)| \geq \varepsilon$.

**Lemma 13** (Easy case of Young’s inequality). Let $f : G \to \mathbb{C}$ be a function. Then $\|f\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|f\|_{L^1}$.

**Corollary 14.** Let $X$ be an arbitrary set. Let $f : X \times G \to \mathbb{C}$ and $g : X \to G$ be two maps. Define $F : X \to \mathbb{C}$ by $F(x) = \hat{f}_x(g(x))$. Then $\|F\|_{L^q(X)} \leq \|f\|_{L^q(X \times G)}$. 
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Lemma 17. Let \( f, g : X \to \mathbb{D} \). Then

\[
\|F\|_{L^{q}(X)}^{q} = \mathbb{E}_{x \in X} \|f(x) - g(x)\|_{q}^{q} \leq \mathbb{E}_{x \in X} \|\hat{f}(x)\|_{1}^{q} \leq \mathbb{E}_{x \in X} \|\hat{f}(x)\|_{1},
\]

as desired.

Proof. By expanding out and using Lemma 13 we obtain

\[
\mathbb{E}_{x \in X} \left( \mathbb{E}_{y \in G} |f(x, y)| \right)^{q} \leq \mathbb{E}_{x \in X} \mathbb{E}_{y \in G} |f(x, y)|^{q} = \|f\|_{L^{q}(X \times G)},
\]

taking the \( \|f\|_{L^{q}} \) root, we obtain

\[
\|f\|_{L^{q}}^{q} = \|f\|_{1}^{q} \leq 2 \|f\|_{f} \leq 2 \|f\|_{L^{q}}^{q}.
\]

We recall the following lemma which is implicit in \cite{9}.

Lemma 15. Let \( f, g : G \to \mathbb{D} \). Then

\[
\left( \mathbb{E}_{d} |\mathbb{E}_{x} \hat{f}(x) g(x + d)| \right)^{2} \leq \min \left\{ \sum_{r} |\hat{f}(r)|^{4}, \sum_{r} |\hat{g}(r)|^{4} \right\}.
\]

Proof. We prove that the expression is at most \( \sum_{r} |\hat{f}(r)|^{4} \), which is sufficient.

\[
\left( \mathbb{E}_{d} |\mathbb{E}_{x} \hat{f}(x) g(x + d)| \right)^{2} = \left( \mathbb{E}_{d} |\hat{g}(x)|^{2} |\hat{f}(x + d)| \right)^{2} = \left( \sum_{r} |\hat{g}(r)|^{2} |\hat{f}(r)|^{2} \right)^{2}
\]

\[
\leq \left( \sum_{r} |\hat{g}(r)|^{4} \right) \left( \sum_{r} |\hat{f}(r)|^{4} \right) \leq \left( \sum_{r} |\hat{g}(r)|^{2} \right) \left( \sum_{r} |\hat{f}(r)|^{2} \right)
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{r} |\hat{f}(r)|^{4}.
\]

Lemma 16. Let \( f, g, h : X \to \mathbb{C} \) be functions such that \( \|f\|_{L^{\infty}}, \|h\|_{L^{\infty}} \leq 1 \). Then

\[
\left\| |f|^{2} h - |g|^{2} h \right\|_{L^{q}} \leq (2 + \|f - g\|_{L^{2q}}) \|f - g\|_{L^{2q}}.
\]

Proof. We have

\[
\left\| |f|^{2} h - |g|^{2} h \right\|_{L^{q}}^{q} = \mathbb{E}_{x} \left( |f(x)|^{2} - |g(x)|^{2} \right) h(x) \right\|_{L^{q}}^{q} \leq \mathbb{E}_{x} |f(x)|^{2} - |g(x)|^{2} \right\|_{L^{q}}^{q}
\]

\[
= \mathbb{E}_{x} |f(x) - g(x)|^{2} \mathbb{E}_{x} \left| f(x) + g(x) \right| \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{x} |f(x)| - |g(x)|} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{x} |f(x)| + |g(x)|}
\]

\[
= \|f - g\|_{L^{2q}} \left\| 2 \right\| + \left( |g| - |f| \right) \right\|_{L^{2q}}^{q}
\]

Taking the \( q \)th root, we obtain

\[
\left\| |f|^{2} h - |g|^{2} h \right\|_{L^{q}} \leq \|f - g\|_{L^{2q}} \left\| 2 \right\| + \left( |g| - |f| \right) \right\|_{L^{2q}}^{q}
\]

as claimed.

Lemma 17. Let \( f, g : G[k] \to \mathbb{C} \) be maps such that \( \|f\|_{L^{\infty}} \leq 1 \) and \( \|f - g\|_{L^{2q}} \leq \varepsilon \). Then for any \( d \in [k] \),

\[
\|C_{d} f - C_{d} g\|_{L^{q}} \leq 4 \varepsilon + 2 \varepsilon^{2},
\]
Proof. This is a simple consequence of the Cauchy-Schwarz and $L^q$-norm triangle inequalities. Without loss of generality $d = k$. We have

\[
\| C_k f - C_k g \|_{L^q} = \mathbb{E}_{x[k] \in G[k]} \left| \mathbb{E}_{y_k \in G_k} f(x_{[k-1]}, x_k + y_k) f(x_{[k-1]}, y_k) - \mathbb{E}_{y_k \in G_k} g(x_{[k-1]}, x_k + y_k) g(x_{[k-1]}, y_k) \right|^q
\]

\[
= \mathbb{E}_{x[k] \in G[k]} \left| \mathbb{E}_{y_k \in G_k} f(x_{[k-1]}, x_k + y_k) (f(x_{[k-1]}, y_k) - g(x_{[k-1]}, y_k)) \right|^q
\]

\[
+ \mathbb{E}_{x[k] \in G[k]} \left| \mathbb{E}_{y_k \in G_k} f(x_{[k-1]}, x_k + y_k) - g(x_{[k-1]}, x_k + y_k) \right|^q \mathbb{E}_{y_k \in G_k} g(x_{[k-1]}, y_k) \right|^q
\]

\[
\leq 2^{q-1} \mathbb{E}_{x[k] \in G[k]} \left| \mathbb{E}_{y_k \in G_k} f(x_{[k-1]}, x_k + y_k) (f(x_{[k-1]}, y_k) - g(x_{[k-1]}, y_k)) \right|^q
\]

\[
+ 2^{q-1} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{x[k] \in G[k]} \left( \mathbb{E}_{y_k \in G_k} |f(x_{[k-1]}, y_k)|^2 \right) \mathbb{E}_{z_k \in G_k} |f(x_{[k-1]}, z_k) - g(x_{[k-1]}, z_k)|^2 \right]^q
\]

\[
= 2^{q-1} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{x[k-1] \in G[k-1]} \left( \mathbb{E}_{y_k \in G_k} |f(x_{[k-1]}, y_k)|^2 \right) \mathbb{E}_{z_k \in G_k} |f(x_{[k-1]}, z_k) - g(x_{[k-1]}, z_k)|^2 \right]^q
\]

\[
\leq 2^{q-1} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{x[k-1] \in G[k-1]} \left( \mathbb{E}_{y_k \in G_k} |f(x_{[k-1]}, y_k)|^2 \right) \mathbb{E}_{z_k \in G_k} |f(x_{[k-1]}, z_k) - g(x_{[k-1]}, z_k)|^2 \right]^q
\]

\[
\leq 2^{q-1} \left( \sum_{k=1}^q \| f \|_{L^{q_k}}^q + \| g \|_{L^{q_k}}^q \right) \| f - g \|_{L^{q_k}} \leq 2^{q-1} \left( \sum_{k=1}^q \| f \|_{L^{q_k}}^q + \| g \|_{L^{q_k}}^q \right) \| f - g \|_{L^{q_k}}.
\]

The lemma follows after taking the $q$th root. \qed

If we allow more convolutions, we can get approximations in the $L_{\infty}$ norm.

Lemma 18. Let $f, g : G[k] \to \mathbb{C}$ be maps such that $\| f \|_{L^\infty}, \| g \|_{L^\infty} \leq 1$, and let $d_1, \ldots, d_r \in [k]$ be directions such that $\{d_1, \ldots, d_r\} = [k]$ (allowing repetition of directions). Then

\[
\left\| C_{d_1} \ldots C_{d_r} f - C_{d_1} \ldots C_{d_r} g \right\|_{L_{\infty}} \leq 2^r \| f - g \|_{L^1}.
\]

Before proceeding with the proof, we derive an explicit formula coming from expanding out convolutions. It is notationally complex, but it is essentially a straightforward generalization of the following simple special case. If $k = 2$ and $h : G_1 \times G_2 \to \mathbb{C}$, then $C_2 h(x, b) = \mathbb{E}_y h(x, y + b) h(x, y)$ and

\[
C_1 C_2 h(a, b) = \mathbb{E}_{x, y_1, y_2} h(x + a, y_1 + b) h(x + a, y_1) h(x, y_2 + b) h(x, y_2).
\]

That is, $C_2 h(x, b)$ is the average of a suitable product over ‘vertical edges’ of height $b$ in column $x$, and $C_1 C_2 h(a, b)$ is the average over ‘vertical parallelograms’ made out of pairs of such edges. If we
were to convolve again in direction 1, then the value at \((t, b)\) would be an average over pairs of vertical parallelograms of the same height, and with widths that differ by \(t\), and so on. In general, each time we convolve in some direction, we duplicate the previous configuration in a certain way, so after \(r\) convolutions the number of points in a configuration is \(2^r\).

**Lemma 19.** Let \(h : G[k] \to \mathbb{C}\) be a function, let \(d_1, \ldots, d_r \in [k]\) be directions and let, for each \(d \in [k]\), \(j_d, 1, \ldots, j_d, d\) be those \(i\) such that \(d_i = d\), sorted in increasing order. Let \(x[k] \in G[k]\). For parameters \(\alpha = (\alpha^1, \alpha^2, \alpha^3, \ldots, \alpha^r) \in G_{d_1} \times G_{d_2} \times \cdots \times G_{d_r}\), and \(\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}^r\), define a point \(p^{\alpha, \varepsilon} \in G[k]\) by setting

\[
p^{\alpha, \varepsilon}_d = \varepsilon_{j_d, 1} \cdot \cdots \cdot \varepsilon_{j_d,d} x_d + \varepsilon_{j_d,2} \cdot \cdots \cdot \varepsilon_{j_d,d} \frac{a_d^{j_d, 1}}{e_{[j_d, 1]} - 1} + \cdots + \varepsilon_{j_d, d} \frac{a_d^{j_d, d - 1}}{e_{[j_d, d - 1]} - 1} + a_d^{j_d, d}.
\]

Then

\[
C_{d_1} \cdots C_{d_r} h(x[k]) = \mathbb{E}_{\alpha \in G_{d_1}} C_{d_2} \cdots C_{d_r} h(x[k]) \prod_{\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}^r} \text{Conj}^{r - 1 - |\varepsilon|} h(p^{\alpha, \varepsilon}),
\]

where \(|\varepsilon| = \varepsilon_1 + \cdots + \varepsilon_r\), and \(\alpha\) ranges over all choices of parameters in \(G_{d_1} \times G_{d_2} \times \cdots \times G_{d_r}\), and \(\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}^{|2, r|}\) (note indexing by \(2, \ldots, r\) instead of \(1, \ldots, r - 1\), define points \(s^{b, \varepsilon}, t^{c, \varepsilon} \in G[k]\) (we suppress \(a^1\) from the notation) by setting

\[
s^{b, \varepsilon}_d = \begin{cases} 
\varepsilon_{j_d, 1} \cdot \cdots \cdot \varepsilon_{j_d,d} x_d + \varepsilon_{j_d,2} \cdot \cdots \cdot \varepsilon_{j_d,d} \frac{b_d^{j_d, 1}}{e_{[j_d, 1]} - 1} + \cdots + \varepsilon_{j_d, d} \frac{b_d^{j_d, d - 1}}{e_{[j_d, d - 1]} - 1} + b_d^{j_d, d} & \text{when } d \neq d_1 \\
\varepsilon_{j_d, d} (a^1 + x_d) + \varepsilon_{j_d,2} \cdot \cdots \cdot \varepsilon_{j_d,d} \frac{b_d^{j_d, 2}}{e_{[j_d, 2]} - 1} + \cdots + \varepsilon_{j_d, d} \frac{b_d^{j_d, d - 1}}{e_{[j_d, d - 1]} - 1} + b_d^{j_d, d} & \text{when } d = d_1
\end{cases}
\]

and

\[
t^{c, \varepsilon}_d = \begin{cases} 
\varepsilon_{j_d, 1} \cdot \cdots \cdot \varepsilon_{j_d,d} x_d + \varepsilon_{j_d,2} \cdot \cdots \cdot \varepsilon_{j_d,d} \frac{c_d^{j_d, 1}}{e_{[j_d, 1]} - 1} + \cdots + \varepsilon_{j_d, d} \frac{c_d^{j_d, d - 1}}{e_{[j_d, d - 1]} - 1} + c_d^{j_d, d} & \text{when } d \neq d_1 \\
\varepsilon_{j_d, d} (a^1 + x_d) + \varepsilon_{j_d,2} \cdot \cdots \cdot \varepsilon_{j_d,d} \frac{c_d^{j_d, 2}}{e_{[j_d, 2]} - 1} + \cdots + \varepsilon_{j_d, d} \frac{c_d^{j_d, d - 1}}{e_{[j_d, d - 1]} - 1} + c_d^{j_d, d} & \text{when } d = d_1.
\end{cases}
\]

By the induction hypothesis, we have

\[
C_{d_2} \cdots C_{d_r} h(x[k]) \comp_{i \in \{0, 1\}^{|2, r|}} \text{Conj}^{r - 1 - |\varepsilon|} h(s^{b, \varepsilon}),
\]

and

\[
C_{d_2} \cdots C_{d_r} h(x[k]) \comp_{i \in \{0, 1\}^{|2, r|}} \text{Conj}^{r - 1 - |\varepsilon|} h(t^{c, \varepsilon}).
\]
Rename the parameters and points by setting $a_i^{1,\varepsilon} = b_i^{1,\varepsilon}, a_i^{0,\varepsilon} = c_i^{1,\varepsilon}$ for each $i \in [2, r]$ and each $\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}^{2d}$, and setting $p^{a,(1,\varepsilon)} = s^{b,\varepsilon}, p^{a,(0,\varepsilon)} = t^{c,\varepsilon}$ for each $\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}^{2r}$. Write $a = (a^1, a^2, a^3, \ldots, a^r)$.

Then

$$C_{d_1} \ldots C_{d_r} h(x|k) = \mathbb{E}_{a \in G_{d_1}} \ldots \mathbb{E}_{a \in G_{d_r}} (C_{d_1} \ldots C_{d_r} h(x|k) \cdot (x_{d_1} + a^{1}) \ldots (x_{d_r} + a^{1}))$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{a \in G_{d_1}} \ldots \mathbb{E}_{a \in G_{d_r}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{d_1}^{j_1}} \ldots \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{d_r}^{j_r}} h(s^{b,\varepsilon}) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{d_1}^{j_1}} \ldots \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{d_r}^{j_r}} h(t^{c,\varepsilon}) \right)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{a \in G_{d_1}} \ldots \mathbb{E}_{a \in G_{d_r}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{d_1}^{j_1}} \ldots \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{d_r}^{j_r}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{d_1}^{j_1}} \ldots \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{d_r}^{j_r}} h(p^{a,(1,\varepsilon)}) \right) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{d_1}^{j_1}} \ldots \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{d_r}^{j_r}} h(p^{a,(0,\varepsilon)}) \right)$$

It remains to check that points $p^{a,\varepsilon}$ have the form described in the statement. For coordinates $d \neq d_1$, this is clear, since $j_d,i = 1$ if and only if $d = d_1, i = 1$. Let $\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}^{2r}$. Then

$$p^{a,(1,\varepsilon)} = \sum_{j \in \{1, 2\}} \mathbb{E}_{a \in G_{d_1}} \ldots \mathbb{E}_{a \in G_{d_r}} \left( x_{d_1} + a^{1} \ldots x_{d_r} + a^{1} \right) \prod_{i=1}^{r} \left( j_i^{a,1} \cdot x_{d_i}^{j_i} + a_{i}^{1}, j_i^{a,2} \cdot x_{d_i}^{j_i} + a_{i}^{2} \right)$$

and

$$p^{a,(0,\varepsilon)} = \sum_{j \in \{1, 2\}} \mathbb{E}_{a \in G_{d_1}} \ldots \mathbb{E}_{a \in G_{d_r}} \left( x_{d_1} + a^{1} \ldots x_{d_r} + a^{1} \right) \prod_{i=1}^{r} \left( j_i^{a,1} \cdot x_{d_i}^{j_i} + a_{i}^{1}, j_i^{a,2} \cdot x_{d_i}^{j_i} + a_{i}^{2} \right)$$

as desired.

**Proof of Lemma 18.** Let $x|k \in G_{|k|}$. Use the same notation as in the proof of Lemma 13. That lemma implies that

$$C_{d_1} \ldots C_{d_r} f(x|k) - C_{d_1} \ldots C_{d_r} g(x|k) = \mathbb{E}_{a \in G_{d_1}} \ldots \mathbb{E}_{a \in G_{d_r}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{r} \mathbb{E}_{c \in \{0, 1\}^{2r}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{d_i}^{j_i}} f(p^{a,\varepsilon}) \right) \mathbb{E}_{a \in G_{d_1}} \ldots \mathbb{E}_{a \in G_{d_r}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{d_i}^{j_i}} g(p^{a,\varepsilon}) \right) \right)$$

Order all elements of $\{0, 1\}^{r}$ as $\varepsilon^1, \ldots, \varepsilon^{2r}$. Then

$$\left| C_{d_1} \ldots C_{d_r} f(x|k) - C_{d_1} \ldots C_{d_r} g(x|k) \right| = \left| \mathbb{E}_{a \in \{0, 1\}^{r}} \sum_{j \in \{1, \ldots, 2r\}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{r} \mathbb{E}_{c \in \{0, 1\}^{2r}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{d_i}^{j_i}} f(p^{a,\varepsilon}) \right) \mathbb{E}_{a \in G_{d_1}} \ldots \mathbb{E}_{a \in G_{d_r}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{d_i}^{j_i}} g(p^{a,\varepsilon}) \right) \right) \right|$$

15
random variables, so by Hoeffding’s inequality
\[ \leq \sum_{i \in [2^r]} \mathbb{E}_a |(f - g)(p^{a,\varepsilon})| \]
\[ = 2\varepsilon \|f - g\|_{L^1}, \]
since for each \( \varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}^r \), the point \( p^{a,\varepsilon} \) ranges uniformly over all \( G_{[k]} \) as \( a \) ranges over \( G_{d_1} \times G_{d_2}^{[0,1]} \times G_{d_3}^{[0,1]^2} \times \ldots \times G_{d_r}^{[0,1]r-1} \), which is due to (3) and the fact that all directions are present in \( d_1, \ldots, d_r \) (just look at the parameters \( a_{\varepsilon[i|d_i,}\cdot_{d_i-1]} \), \( d \in [k] \) for any fixed choice of the other ones).

\[ \square \]

### 3.2. Bourgain’s approximation theorem

In this subsection, we recall a result of Bourgain [4] that single convolutions can be well approximated in \( L^2 \) by finite truncations of Fourier expansions. The reason for giving a proof is that the result is implicit in the original paper, and we could not locate a reference that proves it for \( \mathbb{F}_p^n \).

**Theorem 20** (Bourgain’s approximation theorem for convolutions). Let \( p \) be a prime, let \( G \) be a finite-dimensional vector space over \( \mathbb{F}_p \) and let \( \chi \) be a non-trivial additive character on \( \mathbb{F}_p \), and let \( f : G \to \mathbb{D} \). For every \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1/100) \), there exists \( \sigma \geq \exp \left(- (\varepsilon^{-1} \log p)^{O(1)} \right) \) with the following property. Let \( S \subseteq G \) be any set that contains every \( r \) such that \( |\hat{f}(r)| \geq \sigma \). Then

\[ \left\| f \mp f(x) - \sum_{r \in S} |\hat{f}(r)|^2 \chi(x \cdot r) \right\|_{L^2(x)} \leq \varepsilon. \]

Note that this result holds equally for the \( L^q \) norm (except that the constants in the bound on \( c \) now depend on \( q \)), since \( f \mp f \) and the approximating sum are bounded by 1 in the supremum norm.

**Proposition 21.** Let \( s_1, \ldots, s_k \in \mathbb{F}_p^n \) be independent. Then

\[ \mathbb{P}_{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \left( \left| \sum_{i \in [k]} \chi(s_i \cdot x) \right| \geq kt \right) \leq 4 \exp \left(- \frac{t^2 k}{4} \right). \]

**Proof.** Let \( X_i = \text{Re} \chi(s_i \cdot x) \) for each \( i \). Then \( X_1, \ldots, X_k \) are independent and identically distributed random variables, so by Hoeffding’s inequality

\[ \mathbb{P}_{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \left( \left| \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in [k]} X_i \right| \geq \frac{t}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{kt^2}{4} \right). \]

Similarly, if we define \( Y_i = \text{Im} \chi(s_i \cdot x) \), then the \( Y_i \) satisfy

\[ \mathbb{P}_{x \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \left( \left| \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in [k]} Y_i \right| \geq \frac{t}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{kt^2}{4} \right). \]

Since \( \left| \sum_{i \in [k]} \chi(s_i \cdot x) \right|^2 \leq \left| \sum_{i \in [k]} X_i \right|^2 + \left| \sum_{i \in [k]} Y_i \right|^2 \), the claim follows. \[ \square \]
Proof of Theorem 20. Write $N = |G|$ and let $R \subseteq G$. Then

$$f \neq f(x) = \sum_r |\hat{f}(r)|^2 \chi(r \cdot x) = \sum_r |\hat{f}(r)|^2 \chi(r \cdot x) + \sum_{i=0}^\infty \sum_{r \in L_i} |\hat{f}(r)|^2 \chi(r \cdot x),$$

where $L_i = \{ r \in G \setminus R : (1 - \varepsilon)^{i+1} < |\hat{f}(r)| \leq (1 - \varepsilon)^i \}$. We shall refer to $L_i$ as the $i^{th}$ layer. By the way we defined layers, we have that the sum restricted to each layer is close to a simpler-looking exponential sum:

$$\left| \sum_{r \in L_i} |\hat{f}(r)|^2 \chi(r \cdot x) - (1 - \varepsilon)^i \sum_{r \in L_i} \chi(r \cdot x) \right| \leq \sum_{r \in L_i} (1 - \varepsilon)^i - (1 - \varepsilon)^{i+1} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \varepsilon} \sum_{r \in L_i} |\hat{f}(r)|^2.$$

Since $\sum_r |\hat{f}(r)|^2 \leq 1$, we have in particular that

$$\left| f \neq f(x) - \sum_{r \in R} |\hat{f}(r)|^2 \chi(r \cdot x) - \sum_{i=0}^{i_0} (1 - \varepsilon)^i \sum_{r \in L_i} \chi(r \cdot x) \right| \leq 3\varepsilon,$$

provided that $\varepsilon < 1/2$, where we choose $i_0$ to be minimal such that $\sqrt{N} \geq (1 - \varepsilon)^{i_0}/2$.

For each layer $L_i$, we define the bad set $B_i$ to be $\{ x \in G : \sum_{r \in L_i} \chi(r \cdot x) > \varepsilon |L_i| \}$. Now we split $L_i$ into independent sets $I_1, \ldots, I_m$ of size $k = \left\lceil \log_p \left( \frac{2}{\varepsilon} |L_i| \right) \right\rceil$, until at most $\frac{2}{\varepsilon} |L_i|$ elements remain. By Proposition 21, for each independent set $I$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{x \in G} \left( \sum_{r \in I} \chi(r \cdot x) \geq \varepsilon \frac{|I|}{4} \right) \leq 4 \exp \left( - \frac{\varepsilon^2 k}{64} \right).$$

If $\sum_{r \in I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_m} \chi(r \cdot x) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \sum_{j \in [m]} |I_j|$, then $\sum_{r \in I_j} \chi(r \cdot x) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{4} |I_j|$ for at least $\frac{2}{\varepsilon} m$ of the sets $I_j$. Hence, by double counting,

$$|B_i| \leq 16\varepsilon^{-1} \exp \left( - \frac{\varepsilon^2 k}{64} \right) N \leq 16\varepsilon^{-1} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{2} |L_i| \right)^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{64 \log p}} N.$$

Thus, if a layer is large enough, then the relevant sum is rarely large enough to contribute to the Fourier expansion.

Say that a layer $L_i$ is small if $|L_i| \leq \varepsilon^2 (1 - \varepsilon)^{-\frac{i}{4}}$, and otherwise that it is large. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the set of all $i \in [i_0]$ such that $S_i$ is a small layer. Then

$$\left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{r \in L_i} |\hat{f}(r)|^2 \chi(r \cdot x) \right| \leq \sum_{i=0}^\infty \varepsilon^2 (1 - \varepsilon)^{\frac{i}{4}} \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{1 - \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon}} \leq 3\varepsilon.$$

Let $J > 0$ be a constant to be chosen later. Define $T = \{ i \geq J : L_i \text{ is large} \}$. Then

$$\sum_{i \in T} |L_i| \leq \sum_{i \in T} 16\varepsilon^{-1} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{2} |L_i| \right)^{-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{64 \log p}} N$$
In the penultimate line we used the inequality $1 - (1 - \varepsilon)^c \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Take $J$ such that the expression in the last line becomes less than $\varepsilon N$. Then for each $\varepsilon > 0$, we may find $\sigma = O\left(\frac{2^{13} \varepsilon^{-8} \log p)128 \varepsilon^{-2} \log p}{\varepsilon^2}ight)^{-1}$ such that

$$\left| f \mp f(x) - \sum_{r \in R} |\hat{f}(r)|^2 \chi(x \cdot r) - \sum_{r \in G \setminus R, |\hat{f}(r)| \geq \sigma} |\hat{f}(r)|^2 \chi(x \cdot r) \right| \leq 10\varepsilon$$

for all but at most $10\varepsilon N$ values of $x$. The theorem follows after a slight rescaling of $\varepsilon$. \qed

### 3.3. Linear algebra results

Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a finite field of size $f$.

**Lemma 22.** Let $G$ be a vector space over $\mathbb{F}$. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_r \in G$ and let $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_r \in \mathbb{F}$. Let $u_0 + U$ be a coset in $G$. Then the following are equivalent.

(i) There exists $y \in u_0 + U$ such that $x_i \cdot y = \lambda_i$ for each $i \in [r]$.

(ii) $\sum_{i \in [r]} \mu_i (\lambda_i - x_i \cdot u_0) = 0$ for every $\mu \in \mathbb{F}^r$ such that $\sum_{i \in [r]} \mu_i x_i \in U^\perp$.

**Proof.** (i) implies (ii). Suppose that $\mu \in \mathbb{F}^r$ satisfies $\sum_{i \in [r]} \mu_i x_i \in U^\perp$. Let $y \in u_0 + U$ be such that $x_i \cdot y = \lambda_i$ for each $i \in [r]$. Let $w = y - u_0 \in U$. Then,

$$\sum_{i \in [r]} \mu_i (\lambda_i - x_i \cdot u_0) = \sum_{i \in [r]} \mu_i \lambda_i - \sum_{i \in [r]} \mu_i x_i \cdot (y - w) = \sum_{i \in [r]} \mu_i (\lambda_i - y \cdot x_i) + w \cdot \left( \sum_{i \in [r]} \mu_i x_i \right) = 0$$

as desired.

(ii) implies (i). Take a maximal subset of $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ whose non-zero linear combinations do not lie in $U^\perp$. Without loss of generality it is $x_1, \ldots, x_s$ for some $s \leq r$. We claim that the function $u \mapsto (x_i \cdot u : i \in [s]) \in \mathbb{F}^s$ is a surjection from $U$ to $\mathbb{F}^s$. Indeed, if not, then there is some $0 \neq \nu \in \mathbb{F}^s$ such that for each $u \in U$, $\sum_{i \in [s]} \nu_i x_i \cdot u = 0$. However, this implies that $\nu \cdot x \in U^\perp$, which is impossible. In particular, there is some $u \in U$ such that for each $i \in [s]$, $x_i \cdot u = \lambda_i - u_0 \cdot x_i$. If we set $y = u + u_0$, we get that $y \in u_0 + U$ and $x_i \cdot y = \lambda_i$ for all $i \in [s]$. To finish the proof, we use property (ii).
Let \( i \in [s + 1, r] \). By the choice of \( s \), there exists \( \mu \in \mathbb{F}^s \) such that \( x_i - \sum_{j \in [s]} \mu_j x_j \in U^\perp \). By property (ii) we get

\[
(\lambda_i - x_i \cdot u_0) = \sum_{j \in [s]} \mu_j (\lambda_j - x_j \cdot u_0) = \sum_{j \in [s]} \mu_j x_j \cdot u = x_i \cdot u.
\]

This implies that \( y \cdot x_i = \lambda_i \) for \( i \in [s + 1, r] \) as well. \( \square \)

**Lemma 23** (Random coset intersection lemma). Let \( G \) be a finite-dimensional vector space over \( \mathbb{F} \), and let \( S \) be a set of size \( \delta |G| \). Suppose that \( x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_r \in G \) are chosen uniformly and independently at random. Let \( N = |\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{F}^r : x_0 + \lambda \cdot x \in S \}| \). Then

\[
\mathbb{E} N = \delta f^r
\]

and

\[
\mathbb{P}\left( |N - \mathbb{E} N| \leq \lambda \mathbb{E} N \right) \geq 1 - f^{-r} \lambda^{-2} \delta^{-1}.
\]

**Proof.** A simple calculation gives

\[
\mathbb{E} N = \mathbb{E} \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^r} \mathbb{I}(x_0 + \lambda \cdot x \in S) = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^r} \mathbb{P}(x_0 + \lambda \cdot x \in S) = f^r \delta.
\]

We have an equally simple calculation for the second moment:

\[
\mathbb{E} N^2 = \mathbb{E} \sum_{\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{F}^r} \mathbb{I}(x_0 + \lambda \cdot x \in S) \mathbb{I}(x_0 + \mu \cdot x \in S) = \sum_{\lambda \neq \mu} \mathbb{P}(x_0 + \lambda \cdot x, x_0 + \mu \cdot x \in S) + \sum_{\lambda} \mathbb{P}(x_0 + \lambda \cdot x \in S)
\]

\[
\leq (f^{2r} - f^r) \delta^2 + f^r \delta.
\]

Hence, \( \text{var} N \leq f^r \delta \), which gives

\[
\mathbb{P}\left( |N - \mathbb{E} N| \leq \lambda \mathbb{E} N \right) \geq 1 - \mathbb{P}\left( |N - \mathbb{E} N|^2 \geq \lambda^2 (\mathbb{E} N)^2 \right) \geq 1 - \frac{\lambda^{-2} \text{var} N}{(\mathbb{E} N)^2}
\]

\[
\geq 1 - f^{-r} \lambda^{-2} \delta^{-1},
\]

as desired. \( \square \)

**Lemma 24.** Let \( p \) be a prime. Suppose that \( V \leq G \) is a subspace of a vector space over \( \mathbb{F}_p \). Let \( v_0 \in G \), let \( A \subset v_0 + V \) be a set of size greater than \( \frac{1}{2} |v_0 + V| \) and let \( \phi : A \rightarrow H \) be a map such that \( \phi(a) + \phi(b) = \phi(c) + \phi(d) \) whenever \( a, b, c, d \in A \) satisfy \( a + b = c + d \). Then there is a unique affine map \( \psi : v_0 + V \rightarrow H \) that extends \( \phi \).

**Proof.** For each \( x \in v_0 + V \), take \( a, b, c \in A \) such that \( x = a + b - c \) and set \( \psi(x) = \phi(a) + \phi(b) - \phi(c) \).

To see why such elements \( a, b, c \) exist, we first pick \( a \in A \) arbitrarily and then observe that since \( |A| \geq \frac{1}{2} |v_0 + V| \), the intersection \( A \cap ((x - a) + A) \) is non-empty. We now check that \( \psi \) has the claimed properties.

We first show that \( \psi \) is well-defined. Suppose that \( a, b, c, a', b', c' \in A \) are such that \( a + b - c = a' + b' - c' \) and \( k \in \mathbb{F}_p \), then

\[
\psi((a + k) + (b - k) - (c + k)) = \psi((a + b - c) + k) = \psi(a + b - c) + k = \psi(a) + \psi(b) - \psi(c) + k.
\]
$a' + b' - c'$. We need to show that $\phi(a) + \phi(b) - \phi(c) = \phi(a') + \phi(b') - \phi(c')$. Since $|A| > \frac{3}{4}|v_0 + V|$, the set $A \cap (a + b - A) \cap (a' + b' - A)$ is non-empty. Take an arbitrary element $s$ inside this set. Let $t = a + b - s$ and $t' = a' + b' - s$. Thus, $t, t' \in A$, and we have

$$\phi(a) + \phi(b) = \phi(s) + \phi(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(a') + \phi(b') = \phi(s) + \phi(t').$$

Using this and the equality $t - c = a + b - s - c = a' + b' - s - c' = t' - c'$, we have

$$\phi(a) + \phi(b) - \phi(c) = \phi(s) + \phi(t) - \phi(c)$$

$$= \phi(s) + \phi(t') - \phi(c')$$

$$= \phi(a') + \phi(b') - \phi(c'),$$

as desired.

The fact that $\psi(x) = \phi(x)$ for every $x \in A$ follows from the choice $\psi(x) = \phi(x) - \phi(x) + \phi(x)$.

Finally, we check that $\psi$ is affine. Let $x, y, z, w \in v_0 + V$ be such that $x + y = z + w$. Take an arbitrary $a \in A$. Observe that since $|A| > \frac{3}{4}|v_0 + V|$, the set $A \cap (A + x - a) \cap (A + y - a) \cap (A + z - a) \cap (A + w - a)$ is non-empty. Let $b$ an arbitrary element of this set. Then, $b + a - x, b + a - y, b + a - z, b + a - w \in A$ as well. Hence, $\psi(x) + \psi(y) - \psi(z) - \psi(w) = \left( \phi(a) + \phi(b) - \phi(a + b - x) \right) + \left( \phi(a) + \phi(b) - \phi(a + b - y) \right)$$-$\left( \phi(a) + \phi(b) - \phi(a + b - z) \right) - \left( \phi(a) + \phi(b) - \phi(a + b - w) \right)$

$$= \phi(a + b - z) + \phi(a + b - w) - \phi(a + b - x) - \phi(a + b - y)$$

$$= 0,$$

completing the proof. \[\square\]

**Lemma 25.** Let $p$ be a prime and let $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{100})$. Suppose that $G$ and $H$ are finite-dimensional $\mathbb{F}_p$-vector spaces, and that $\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3 : G \to H$ are three maps such that $\rho_1(x_1) - \rho_2(x_2) = \rho_3(x_1 - x_2)$ holds for at least a $1 - \epsilon$ proportion of the pairs $(x_1, x_2) \in G \times G$. Then there is an affine map $\alpha : G \to H$ such that $\rho_3(x) = \alpha(x)$ for at least $(1 - \sqrt{\epsilon})|G|$ of $x \in G$.

**Proof.** Let $\Omega = \{(x_1, x_2) \in G \times G : \rho_1(x_1) - \rho_2(x_2) = \rho_3(x_1 - x_2)\}$. Call an element $y \in G$ a popular difference if $y = x_1 - x_2$ for at least $(1 - \sqrt{\epsilon})|G|$ of $(x_1, x_2) \in \Omega$. Then there are at least $(1 - \sqrt{\epsilon})|G|$ popular differences in $V$. We claim that $\rho_3$ is a $2$-homomorphism on the set of popular differences $D$. For each $d \in D$, define the set $R(d) = \{x \in G : (x + d, x) \in \Omega\}$.

Let $d_1, d_2, d_3, d_4 \in D$ be an additive quadruple: that is, a quadruple such that $d_4 - d_3 + d_2 - d_1 = 0$. Consider the set

$$\left( R(d_1) \cap R(d_2) \right) + d_2 \cap \left( R(d_3) \cap R(d_4) \right) + d_3,$$

which is non-empty, since $\sqrt{\epsilon} < 1/4$. Let $y$ be an arbitrary element of that set. Then $y - d_2 \in R(d_1) \cap R(d_2)$ and $y - d_3 \in R(d_3) \cap R(d_4)$, so we have $(y - d_2 + d_1, y - d_2), (y, y - d_2), (y, y - d_3), (y -
\(d_3 + d_4, y - d_3 \in \Omega\). Hence,

\[
\rho_3(d_4) - \rho_3(d_3) + \rho_3(d_2) - \rho_3(d_1) \\
= \left(\rho_1(y - d_3 + d_4) - \rho_2(y - d_3)\right) - \left(\rho_1(y) - \rho_2(y - d_3)\right) \\
+ \left(\rho_1(y) - \rho_2(y - d_2)\right) - \left(\rho_1(y - d_2 + d_1) - \rho_2(y - d_2)\right) \\
= \left(\rho_1(y - d_3 + d_4) - \rho_1(y) + \rho_1(y) - \rho_1(y - d_2 + d_1)\right) \\
- \left(\rho_2(y - d_3) - \rho_2(y - d_3 + d_4) + \rho_2(y - d_2) - \rho_2(y - d_2)\right) = 0,
\]

as desired. But \(\rho_3\) is a 2-homomorphism on a subset of \(V\) of size at least \((1 - \sqrt{\epsilon})|G|\), so the claim follows from Lemma \(24\).

We also need a combination of these two results, in the case when the domain of the map \(\phi\) is a dense subset of the coset but the number of additive quadruples respected by \(\phi\) is significantly higher than expected.

**Corollary 26.** There is an absolute constant \(\varepsilon_0 > 0\) such that the following holds. Let \(p\) be a prime, let \(\epsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)\) and let \(\eta > 0\). Suppose that \(V \leq G\) and \(H\) are finite-dimensional \(\mathbb{F}_p\)-vector spaces, that \(v_0 \in G\), and that \(X \subset v_0 + V\) is a set of size at least \((1 - \varepsilon)|V|\). Let \(\phi : X \to H\) be a map such that the number of quadruples \(a, b, c, d \in X\) with \(\phi(a) + \phi(b) = \phi(c) + \phi(d)\) and \(a + b = c + d\) is at most \(\eta|V|^3\). Then there are a subset \(X' \subset X\) and an affine map \(\psi : v_0 + V \to H\) such that \(|X \setminus X'| \leq O(\eta^{1/4})|V|\) and \(\psi(x) = \phi(x)\) for all \(x \in X'\).

**Proof.** We say that a pair \((a, b) \in X^2\) is good if there are at most \(\sqrt{\eta}|V|\) elements \(c \in X\) such that \(a - b + c \in X\) and \(\phi(a) - \phi(b) \neq \phi(a - b + c) - \phi(c)\). Otherwise, the pair is bad. The number of bad pairs in \(X\) is at most \(2\sqrt{\eta}|V|^2\).

We now show that there are at most \(O(\sqrt{\eta}|V|^5\) sextuples \((a, b, c, d, e, f) \in X^6\) such that \(a - b + c = d - e + f\), but \(\phi(a) - \phi(b) + \phi(c) \neq \phi(d) - \phi(e) + \phi(f)\). There are at most \(O(\sqrt{\eta}|V|^5\) such sextuples where additionally \((a, b)\) or \((d, e)\) is a bad pair, so without loss of generality we may assume that both these pairs are good. There are at least \(|X \cap (X - a + b) \cap (X - d + e)| \geq 3|X| - 2|V| \geq (1 - 3\varepsilon)|V|\) elements \(x \in X\) such that \(a - b + x, d - e + x \in X\). Hence, for \((1 - 3\varepsilon - 2\sqrt{\eta}|V|)\) elements \(x \in X\), we have \(a - b + x, d - e + x \in X\), \(\phi(a) - \phi(b) = \phi(a - b + x) - \phi(x)\) and \(\phi(d) - \phi(e) = \phi(d - e + x) - \phi(x)\). Therefore, each such sextuple gives rise to at least \(\frac{1}{2}|V|\) elements \(x \in X\) such that \(a - b + x, d - e + x \in X\) and

\[
\phi(a - b + x) - \phi(x) + \phi(c) = \phi(a) - \phi(b) + \phi(c) \neq \phi(d) - \phi(e) + \phi(f) = \phi(d - e + x) - \phi(x) + \phi(f),
\]

from which it follows that

\[
\phi(a - b + x) + \phi(c) \neq \phi(d - e + x) + \phi(f).
\]

Double-counting proves the upper bound claimed for the number of such sextuples.
Now define a map $\tilde{\phi}$ as follows. For fixed $x \in v_0 + V$, if there is a value $h \in H$ such that $\phi(a) - \phi(b) + \phi(c) = h$ for all but at most $\sqrt{\eta}|V|^2$ triples $(a, b, c) \in X^3$ such that $a - b + c = x$, set $\tilde{\phi}(x) = h$. Let $\tilde{X}$ be the set of all such $x \in v_0 + V$. Thus, $\tilde{\phi}$ is a map from $\tilde{X}$ to $H$. Note that $|(v_0 + V) \setminus \tilde{X}| = O(\eta^{1/4}|V|)$.

We claim that $\tilde{\phi}$ respects all but $O(\eta|V|^3)$ additive quadruples in $\tilde{X}$. Consider any $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in \tilde{X}$ such that $x_1 + x_2 = x_3 + x_4$ but $\tilde{\phi}(x_1) + \tilde{\phi}(x_2) \neq \tilde{\phi}(x_3) + \tilde{\phi}(x_4)$. For each $a \in X$ consider the set $X \cap (\bigcap_{i=1}^4 X - x_i + a)$. The size of this intersection is at least $(1 - 5\varepsilon)|V|$, so there are at least $\frac{1}{2}|V|^2$ pairs $a, b \in X$ such that $c_i = x_i - a + b \in X$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. By definition of $\tilde{X}$, this means that for at least $(\frac{1}{2} - 4\sqrt{\eta})|V|^2$ pairs $a, b \in X$, the elements $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4$ also belong to $X$ and $\tilde{\phi}(x_i) = \phi(a) - \phi(b) + \phi(c_i)$ for each $i$. Thus,

$$
\phi(c_1) + \phi(c_2) - \phi(c_3) - \phi(c_4) = (\tilde{\phi}(x_1) - \phi(a) + \phi(b)) + (\tilde{\phi}(x_2) - \phi(a) + \phi(b)) - (\tilde{\phi}(x_3) - \phi(a) + \phi(b)) - (\tilde{\phi}(x_4) - \phi(a) + \phi(b)) \neq 0
$$

for at least $\frac{1}{2}|V|$ quadruples $(c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4) \in X^4$ such that there is some $d \in V$ with $c_i = x_i + d$ for each $i$. The claim now follows from double-counting.

We may now apply Corollary 2 to find an affine map $\psi : v_0 + V \to H$ such that $\phi(x) = \tilde{\psi}(x)$ for all but $O(\sqrt{\eta}|V|)$ elements $x \in \tilde{X}$. Hence,

$$
\phi(a) - \phi(b) + \phi(c) = \psi(a - b + c)
$$

for all but at most $\eta^{1/4}|V|^3$ triples $(a, b, c) \in X^3$.

Finally, define $X' \subset X$ as the set of all $x \in X$ such that for all but at most $\sqrt{\eta}|V|^2$ of choices of $a, b \in X$ such that $a + b - x \in X$, we have $\phi(x) = \phi(a) + \phi(b) - \phi(a + b - x)$. Thus, $|X \setminus X'| \leq O(\sqrt{\eta}|V|)$. If $\phi(x) \neq \psi(x)$ for $x \in X'$, then, we get at least $\frac{1}{2}|V|^2$ of $(a, b) \in X^2$ such that

$$
\psi(x) \neq \phi(x) = \phi(a) - \phi(a + b - x) + \phi(b).
$$

By (3), we see that $\phi(x) \neq \psi(x)$ may happen for at most $\eta^{1/4}|V|$ elements $x \in X'$, which completes the proof.

We also need the combination of Freiman’s theorem and the Balog-Szemerédi-Gowers theorem that we mentioned in the introduction (Theorem 2). Using Sanders’s bound for Freiman’s theorem, it takes the following form.

**Theorem 27.** Let $p$ be a prime and let $G$ and $H$ be finite-dimensional vector spaces over $\mathbb{F}_p$. Let $A \subset G$ and let $\psi : A \to H$ be a map that respects at least $c|G|^3$ additive quadruples - that is, there are at least $c|G|^3$ choices of $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in A^4$ such that $x_1 + x_2 = x_3 + x_4$ and $\phi(x_1) + \phi(x_2) = \phi(x_3) + \phi(x_4)$. Then there is an affine map $\alpha : G \to H$ such that $\alpha(x) = \psi(x)$ for $\exp(-\log^{O(1)}(c^{-1}))|G|$ values $x \in G$.

### 3.4. Approximating multiaffine varieties

22
As above, let $\mathbb{F}$ be a finite field of size $f$. Let $G \subset \mathcal{P}([k])$ be a collection of sets. We say that $G$ is a down-set if it is closed under taking subsets. We also say that a multiaffine map $\alpha : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}_p^r$ is $G$-supported if it can be written in the form $\alpha(x_{[k]}) = \sum_{I \in G} \alpha_I(x_I)$ for some multilinear maps $\alpha_I : G_I \to \mathbb{F}_p^r$. We say that a variety is $G$-supported if its defining map is $G$-supported.

**Remark.** In this subsection, the explicit constants and the implicit constants in big-Oh notation depend on $k$ only, and no longer on the field $\mathbb{F}$.

We recall the following results from [26]. The first states that a variety can always be approximated from the outside by a variety of low codimension. (This statement is mainly interesting when the variety is dense, since otherwise any sufficiently small low-rank variety containing it will work.) The second is a generalization that states that a collection of varieties defined by multilinear maps that belong to a low-dimensional subspace can be simultaneously approximated from the outside by a similar collection where the varieties all have low codimension.

**Lemma 28** (Approximating dense varieties externally simultaneously [26]). Let $A : G_{[k]} \to H$ be a multiaffine map. Then for every positive integer $s$ there is a multiaffine map $\phi : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}^s$ such that $A^{-1}(0) \subset \phi^{-1}(0)$ and $|\phi^{-1}(0) \setminus A^{-1}(0)| \leq \chi(A^{-1}(0))$. If, additionally, $A$ is linear in coordinate $c$, then so is $\phi$. Moreover, if $G \subset \mathcal{P}([k])$ is a down-set and if $A$ is $G$-supported, then $\phi$ is also $G$-supported.

**Lemma 29** (Approximating dense varieties externally simultaneously [26]). Let $A_1, \ldots, A_r : G_{[k]} \to H$ be multiaffine maps. Let $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exist $s \leq r + \log \epsilon^{-1}$ and multiaffine maps $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_r : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}^s$ such that for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^r$ we have $(\lambda \cdot A)^{-1}(0) \subset (\lambda \cdot \phi)^{-1}(0)$ and $|(\lambda \cdot \phi)^{-1}(0) \setminus (\lambda \cdot A)^{-1}(0)| \leq \epsilon |G_{[k]}|$. If additionally each map $A_i$ is linear in coordinate $c$, then so are the maps $\phi_i$. Moreover, if $G \subset \mathcal{P}([k])$ is a down-set and if each $A_i$ is $G$-supported, then so is each $\phi_i$.

Recall the notation $\lambda \cdot \phi$ appearing in the lemma denotes the multilinear map $\sum_{i \in [r]} \lambda_i \phi_i$, and similarly for $\lambda \cdot A$.

We also recall the following definitions from [26]. Let $S \subset G_{[k]}$ and let $\alpha : G_{[k]} \to H$ be a multiaffine map. A layer of $\alpha$ is any set of the form $\{x_{[k]} \in G_{[k]} : \alpha(x_{[k]}) = \lambda\}$, for $\lambda \in H$. We say that layers of $\alpha$ internally $\epsilon$-approximate $S$, if there are layers $L_1, \ldots, L_m$ of $\alpha$ such that $S \supset L_i$ and $|S \setminus \left( \bigcup_{i \in [m]} L_i \right)| \leq \epsilon |G_{[k]}|$. Similarly, we say that layers of $\alpha$ externally $\epsilon$-approximate $S$, if there are layers $L_1, \ldots, L_m$ of $\alpha$ such that $S \subset \bigcup_{i \in [m]} L_i$ and $\left| \bigcup_{i \in [m]} L_i \setminus S \right| \leq \epsilon |G_{[k]}|$. In the next lemma, $\chi$ is an arbitrary non-trivial additive character.

**Theorem 30** (Strong inverse theorem for maps of low analytic rank [26]). For every positive integer $k$ there are constants $C = C_k, D = D_k > 0$ with the following property. Suppose that $\alpha : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}$ is

---

6The claim that $\phi$ is $G$-supported does not appear in [26], but follows from the proof given in that paper, since for each $i$, $\phi_i(x_{[k]}) = A_i(x_{[k]} \cdot h_i)$ for some $h_i \in H$.

7Again, the claim that the $\phi_i$ are $G$-supported does not appear in [26], but follows easily from the proof.
a multilinear form such that \( \mathbb{E}_{x[k]} \chi(\alpha(x[k])) \geq c \), for some \( c > 0 \). Then there exist a positive integer \( r \leq C \log_D^D(\varepsilon^{-1}) \) and multilinear maps \( \beta_i : G_{[k]} \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \) and \( \gamma_i : G_{[k]} \setminus I_i \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \) with \( \emptyset \neq I_i \subset [k-1] \) for each \( i \in [r] \), such that
\[
\alpha(x[k]) = \sum_{i \in [r]} \beta_i(x[I_i])\gamma_i(x[k]\setminus I_i).
\]
for every \( x[k] \in G_{[k]} \).

Remark. In a qualitative sense, this theorem was first proved by Bhowmick and Lovett in [4], generalizing an approach of Green and Tao [10]. An almost identical result to the one stated here was obtained independently by Janzer in [23] (who had previously obtained tower-type bounds in this problem [22]).

The least number \( r \) such that \( \alpha \) can be expressed in terms of \( r \) pairs of forms \( (\beta_i, \gamma_i) \) as above is called the partition rank of \( \alpha \), and is denoted \( \text{prank} \alpha \). This notion was introduced by Naslund in [27]. Also, the quantity \( \mathbb{E}_{x[k]} \chi(\alpha(x[k])) \) is called the bias of \( \alpha \), written \( \text{bias} \alpha \). The quantity \( -\log_D^D \text{bias} \alpha \) was called the analytic rank of \( \alpha \) by the first author and J. Wolf, who showed that it has useful properties [13]. Thus, high bias, or equivalently low analytic rank, implies low partition rank.

Theorem 31 (Simultaneous approximation of varieties [24]). For every positive integer \( k \), there are constants \( C = C_k, D = D_k > 0 \) with the following property. Let \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and let \( B_1, \ldots, B_r : G_{[k]} \rightarrow H \) be multiaffine maps. For each \( \lambda \in \mathbb{F}^r \), let \( Z_\lambda = \{ x[k] \in G_{[k]} : \sum_{i \in [r]} \lambda_i B_i(x[k]) = 0 \} \). Then there exist a positive integer \( s \leq C\left( r \log_{|\mathbb{F}|}(|\mathbb{F}|^{-1}) \right)^D \) and a multiaffine map \( \beta : G_{[k]} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^s \) such that for each \( \lambda \in \mathbb{F}^r \), the layers of \( \beta \) internally and externally \( \varepsilon \)-approximate \( Z_\lambda \).

Moreover, if \( G \) is a down-set and the maps \( B_1, \ldots, B_r \) are \( G \)-supported, then so is the map \( \beta \).

Remark. The original statement only has the internal approximation part of the claim. The external approximation is easily obtained using Lemma [29].

Theorem 32 (Structure of a set of dense columns of a variety [24]). For every positive integer \( k \) there are constants \( C = C_k, D = D_k > 0 \) with the following property. Let \( \alpha : G_{[k]} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^r \) be a multiaffine map. Let \( S \subset \mathbb{F}^r \) and \( \varepsilon > 0 \). Let \( X \) be the set of \( \varepsilon \)-dense columns: that is,
\[
\{ x[k-1] \in G_{[k-1]} : |\{ y \in G_k : \alpha(x[k-1], y) \in S \}| \geq \varepsilon |G_k| \}
\]
Then there exist a positive integer \( s \leq C\left( r \log_{|\mathbb{F}|}(|\mathbb{F}|^{-1}) \right)^D \) and a multiaffine map \( \beta : G_{[k-1]} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^s \) such that the layers of \( \beta \) \( \varepsilon \)-internally and \( \varepsilon \)-externally approximate \( X \).

\(^{\text{There is a slight difference in bounds, in [24] the constant } C \text{ depends on the field as well.}}\)

\(^{\text{This follows from the proof in [24]. One can generalize Proposition 20 in that paper by changing } P[k-1] \text{ to the down-set } G. \text{ The induction base is again trivial and the new maps come from inverse theorem for maps of high bias, which keeps maps } G\text{-supported.}}\)
Moreover, if $G$ is a down-set and $\alpha$ is $G$-supported, then we may take $\beta$ to be $G'$-supported, where $G' = G \cap \mathcal{P}([k - 1])$.

We now deduce that dense varieties necessarily contain varieties of low-codimension. We say that a multiaffine variety $V \subset G[k]$ is multilinear if it is of the form $V = \bigcap_{i \in [s]} \{x[k] \in G[k] : \alpha_i(x_{I_i}) = 0\}$ for some multilinear maps $\alpha_i : G_{I_i} \to \mathbb{F}^{r_i}$ – that is, if the multiaffine maps used to define it are in fact multilinear.

We begin with a lemma.

**Lemma 33.** Suppose that $M \subset G[k]$ is a multilinear set. That is, suppose that for every direction $d \in [k]$ and every $x[k] \setminus \{d\} \in G[k] \setminus \{d\}$, the set $M_{x[k] \setminus \{d\}}$ is a (possibly empty) subspace of $G_d$. Let $B \subset M$ be a non-empty variety of codimension $s$. Then $M$ contains a multilinear variety of codimension $O(s)$.

**Proof.** Splitting the multiaffine map $\beta : G[k] \to \mathbb{F}^s$ that defines $B$ into its multilinear pieces, we get multilinear maps $\beta_I : G_I \to \mathbb{F}^s$ and values $\lambda_I \in \mathbb{F}^s$, $\emptyset \neq I \subset [k]$ such that

$$B^0 = \bigcap_{\emptyset \neq I \subset [k]} \{x[k] \in G[k] : \beta_I(x) = \lambda_I\} \subset M.$$

We shall show that for each $d \in [0, k]$ there are positive integers $s_d = O(s)$, multilinear maps $\beta_I^d : G_I \to \mathbb{F}^{s_d}$ and values $\lambda_I^d \in \mathbb{F}^{s_d}$, $\emptyset \neq I \subset [k]$, such that $\lambda_I^d = 0$ when $I \cap [d] \neq \emptyset$ and

$$B^d = \bigcap_{\emptyset \neq I \subset [k]} \{x[k] \in G[k] : \beta_I^d(x_I) = \lambda_I^d\} \subset M.$$

We prove this by induction on $d$, taking $d = 0$ as the base case, which plainly holds. Suppose that the statement holds for some $d \in [0, k - 1]$. Let $y[k] \in B^d$ be an arbitrary element. Consider the set

$$B^{d+1} = \left( \bigcap_{\emptyset \neq I \subset [k]} \left\{ x[k] \in G[k] : \beta_I^d(x_I) = 0 \right\} \right) \cap \left( \bigcap_{\emptyset \neq I \subset [k]} \left\{ x[k] \in G[k] : \beta_I^d(x_I) = \lambda_I^d \right\} \right) \cap \left( \bigcap_{\emptyset \neq I \subset [k]} \left\{ x[k] \in G[k] : \beta_{I \setminus \{d+1\}}^{d+1}(x_{I \setminus \{d+1\}}, y_{d+1}) = \lambda_I^{d+1} \right\} \right).$$

Note that $B^{d+1}$ is non-empty since $(y[k] \setminus \{d+1\}, d + 1 : 0) \in B^{d+1}$. It remains to check that $B^{d+1} \subset M$, other properties are evident. Let $x[k] \in B^{d+1}$. When $d + 1 \in I$, we have $\beta_I^d(x_I) = 0$ and $\beta_{I \setminus \{d+1\}}^{d+1}(x_{I \setminus \{d+1\}}, y_{d+1}) = \lambda_I^{d+1}$, and hence that $\beta_I^d(x_{I \setminus \{d+1\}}, x_{d+1} + y_{d+1}) = \lambda_I^d$. But $(x_{I \setminus \{d+1\}}, y_{d+1})$ and $(x_{I \setminus \{d+1\}}, x_{d+1} + y_{d+1})$ belong to $M$. Since $M$ is a multilinear set, it contains $x[k]$, as desired.

**Corollary 34.** Let $V \subset G[k]$ be a variety of density $\delta > 0$. Then $V$ contains a non-empty variety $B$ of codimension $O(\log^O(1) \delta^{-1})$. Moreover, if $V$ is multilinear, then we may take $B$ to be multilinear as well.

10Once again, the proof in [28] can be straightforwardly modified to give this slightly stronger version. The previous theorem and Lemma 13 of that paper are used to define the desired map, and both respect the notion of $G'$-supported maps. Note that $\alpha_i(x[k]) = \alpha_i'(x_{[k-1]}) + A_i(x_{[k-1]} \cdot x_k)$ implies that $\alpha_i$ and $A_i$ are $G'$-supported.
Proof. Let $V = \{ x \in G_{[k]} : \alpha(x) = 0 \}$ for some multiaffine map $\alpha : G_{[k]} \to H$. Define a multiaffine form $\tilde{\alpha} : G_{[k]} \times H \to \mathbb{F}$ by $\tilde{\alpha}(x_{[k]}, h) = \alpha(x_{[k]}) \cdot h$, where $\cdot$ is an inner product on $H$. Notice that

$$V = \left\{ x_{[k]} \in G_{[k]} : |\{ h \in H : \tilde{\alpha}(x_{[k]}, h) = 0 \}| = |H| \right\}$$

and that $|\{ h \in H : \tilde{\alpha}(x_{[k]}, h) = 0 \}| \leq p^{-1}|H|$ if $x_{[k]} \notin V$. Apply Theorem 32 to obtain the desired low-codimensional variety $B$ inside $V$.

If $V$ is in fact a multilinear variety, then the additional conclusion follows from Lemma 33. □

In the rest of this subsection, we slightly strengthen the stated results in a straightforward manner. For maps $f, g : X \to \mathbb{C}$, we shall write

$$f \approx_{L^p} g$$

as shorthand for $\|f - g\|_{L^p} \leq \varepsilon$. It will also sometimes be convenient to have a similar notation when we have two complicated expressions that both define functions of a variable such as $x_{[k]}$ and we want to say that the functions are close in $L_p$. In such a case we will write

$$f(x_{[k]}) \approx_{L^p, x_{[k]}} g(x_{[k]})$$

The variable $x$ should be understood as a dummy variable in this notation, so the left-hand side is referring not to the complex number $f(x_{[k]})$ but to the function $x_{[k]} \mapsto f(x_{[k]})$.

**Proposition 35.** Let $c_1, \ldots, c_n \in \mathbb{D}$ and let $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}$ be multiaffine forms. Let $\varepsilon > 0, p \geq 1$ and $d \in [k]$. Then, we may find a positive integer $l = O\left((\varepsilon^{-1}n)^{O(p)}\right)$, constants $\tilde{c}_1, \ldots, \tilde{c}_l \in \mathbb{D}$, and multiaffine forms $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_l : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}$, such that the map $f : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{C}$ defined by $f(x_{[k]}) = \sum_{i \in [n]} c_i \chi(x_i(x_{[k]}))$ satisfies the property

$$C_d f \approx_{L^p} \sum_{i \in [l]} \tilde{c}_i \chi \circ \psi_i.$$

Moreover, if $G$ is a down-set and the maps $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_n$ are $G$-supported, so are the maps $\psi_1, \ldots, \psi_l$.

**Remark.** We could have stated this proposition using external and internal approximation phrasing, but that would be more cumbersome.

**Proof.** Without loss of generality $d = k$. For each $i \in [n]$ let $\phi_i(x_{[k]}) = \Phi_i(x_{[k-1]}) \cdot x_k + \alpha_i(x_{[k-1]})$ for multiaffine maps $\Phi_i : G_{[k-1]} \to G_k$ and $\alpha_i : G_{[k-1]} \to \mathbb{F}$. We expand

$$C_k f(x_{[k]}) = \mathbb{E}_{y_k} f(x_{[k-1]}, x_k + y_k) = \sum_{i,j \in [n]} c_i \tilde{c}_j \mathbb{E}_{y_k} \chi \left( \Phi_i(x_{[k-1]}) \cdot x_k + (\alpha_i - \alpha_j)(x_{[k-1]}) + (\Phi_i(x_{[k-1]} - \Phi_j(x_{[k-1]})) \cdot y_k \right)$$

$$= \sum_{i,j \in [n]} c_i \tilde{c}_j \mathbb{E}_{y_k} \chi \left( \Phi_i(x_{[k-1]}) \cdot x_k + (\alpha_i - \alpha_j)(x_{[k-1]}) \right) 1(\Phi_i(x_{[k-1]}) - \Phi_j(x_{[k-1]}) = 0).$$
For each $i, j \in [n]$ apply Lemma 28 to find multiaffine maps $\beta_{ij} : G_{[k-1]} \to \mathbb{F}^{t_{ij}}$, where $t_{ij} = O\left(p(\log_r(\varepsilon^{-1}n))\right)$, such that
\[
\{x_{[k-1]} \in G_{[k-1]} : \Phi_i(x_{[k-1]}) - \Phi_j(x_{[k-1]}) = 0\} \subseteq \{x_{[k-1]} \in G_{[k-1]} : \beta_{ij}(x_{[k-1]}) = 0\}
\]
and
\[
|\{x_{[k-1]} \in G_{[k-1]} : \beta_{ij}(x_{[k-1]}) = 0, \Phi_i(x_{[k-1]}) - \Phi_j(x_{[k-1]}) \neq 0\}| \leq \frac{\varepsilon p}{2p^2 n^2} |G_{[k-1]}|.
\]
Then for each $i, j \in [n]$ we have
\[
\chi\left(\Phi_i(x_{[k-1]}) \cdot x_k + (\alpha_i - \alpha_j)(x_{[k-1]})\right) \mathbb{1}\left(\Phi_i(x_{[k-1]}) - \Phi_j(x_{[k-1]}) = 0\right)
\]
\[
= \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{F}^{t_{ij}}} f_{t_{ij}} \chi\left(\Phi_i(x_{[k-1]}) \cdot x_k + (\alpha_i - \alpha_j)(x_{[k-1]}) + \nu \cdot \beta_{ij}(x_{[k-1]})\right),
\]
and the claim follows.

**Theorem 36** (Fibres theorem). For every $i \leq k$, there are constants $C = C_{i,k}$ and $D = D_{i,k}$ such that the following holds. Let $B \subset G_{[k]}$ be a non-empty variety of codimension $r$ and let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Then we may find

- $s \leq C\left(r + \log_r(\varepsilon^{-1})\right)^D$,
- a multiaffine map $\beta : G_{[i]} \to \mathbb{F}^s$,
- a union $U$ of layers of $\beta$ of size $|U| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|G_{[i]}|$, and
- a map $c : \mathbb{F}^s \to [0, 1]$,

such that
\[
\left|\left|G_{[i+1,k]}^{-1}B_{x_{[i]}} - c(\beta(x_{[i]}))\right|\right| \leq \varepsilon
\]
for every $x_{[i]} \in U$. Moreover, if $G \subset \mathcal{P}[k]$ is a down-set, $G^{(i)} = G \cap \mathcal{P}[i]$, and $B$ is defined by maps that are $G$-supported, then $\beta$ can be taken to be $G^{(i)}$-supported.

**Proof.** We prove the claim by downwards induction on $i$. For $i = k$, let $\alpha : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}^r$ be a map such that $B = \{x_{[k]} \in G_{[k]} : \alpha(x_{[k]}) = 0\}$. Set $\beta = \alpha$, so $s = r$, and for each $u \in \mathbb{F}^s$ let $c(u) = 1$ if $u = 0$ and let $c(u) = 0$ otherwise.

Assume now that the claim holds for $i+1$ and let $\eta > 0$. Apply the inductive hypothesis with $\eta$ as the approximation parameter. We get

- $s \leq C\left(r + \log_r(\eta^{-1})\right)^D$,
- a $G^{(i+1)}$-supported multiaffine map $\beta : G_{[i+1]} \to \mathbb{F}^s$,
- a union $U$ of layers of $\beta$ of size $|U| \geq (1 - \eta)|G_{[i+1]}|$, and
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Apply Theorem 32 to find \( s \) for each 
\[
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{find } G_{i+1}\nslash U. \text{ Suppose that } x_{[i]} \in G_{[i]} \text{ is such that } |F_{x_{[i]}}| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{G_{i+1}}. \text{ Then,}
\end{array} \right.
\]
\[
\left| G_{i+1, t}^{-1} |B_{x_{[i]}}| - \mathbb{E}_{x_{i+1} \in G_{i+1}} c(\beta(x_{[i+1]})) \right|
\]
\[
= |G_{i+1}|^{-1} \sum_{x_{i+1} \in G_{i+1}} \left( G_{i+2, k}^{-1} |B_{x_{[i+1]}}| - c(\beta(x_{[i+1]})) \right)
\]
\[
\leq |G_{i+1}|^{-1} \sum_{x_{i+1} \in G_{i+1}\setminus F_{x_{[i]}}} \left| G_{i+2, k}^{-1} |B_{x_{[i+1]}}| - c(\beta(x_{[i+1]})) \right|
\]
\[
+ |G_{i+1}|^{-1} \sum_{x_{i+1} \in F_{x_{[i]}}} \left| G_{i+2, k}^{-1} |B_{x_{[i+1]}}| - c(\beta(x_{[i+1]})) \right|
\]
\[
\leq \eta + \varepsilon/4.
\]
Apply Theorem 32 to find \( s' \leq O((s \log f)(f^{\varepsilon-1}))^{O(1)} \) and a \( \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \)-supported multiaffine map \( \beta' : G_{[i]} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^{s'} \) whose layers externally \((\varepsilon/100)\)-approximate the set \( \{ x_{[i]} \in G_{[i]} : |F_{x_{[i]}}| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{G_{i+1}} \} \). Note that \( |F| \leq \frac{f^2}{100} G_{i+1} \), provided \( \eta \leq \frac{8}{100} \). Hence, there is a union \( U' \) of layers of \( \beta' \) of size \( |U'| \geq (1-\varepsilon/10)|G_{[i]}| \) such that for each \( x_{[i]} \in U', |F_{x_{[i]}}| \leq \frac{f^2}{G_{i+1}} \).

We now need to understand how the image of the map \( y_{i+1} \mapsto \beta(x_{[i]}, y_{i+1}) \) depends on \( x_{[i]} \).

For each \( j \in [s] \) the map \( \beta_j : G_{i+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \) is a \( \mathcal{G}^{(i+1)} \)-supported multiaffine form, so we may find \( \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \)-supported multiaffine maps \( \Gamma_j : G_{[i]} \rightarrow G_{i+1} \) and \( \gamma_j : G_{[i]} \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \), such that \( \beta_j(x_{[i+1]}) = \Gamma_j(x_{[i]}) \cdot x_{i+1} + \gamma_j(x_{[i]}) \) for each \( x_{[i+1]} \in G_{i+1} \). Apply Theorem 33 to the maps \( \Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_s \). We obtain a positive integer \( t = O\left( (s + \log f)^{-1} \right) \) and a \( \mathcal{G}^{(i)} \)-supported multiaffine map \( \rho : G_{[i]} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^t \) such that the layers of \( \rho \) internally and externally \((f^{-s^2 \cdot s} \eta)\)-approximate the sets \( \{ x_{[i]} \in G_{[i]} : \lambda \cdot \Gamma(x_{[i]}) = 0 \} \), for each \( \lambda \in \mathbb{F}^s \). For a subspace \( \Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{F}^s \) with a basis \( \lambda^{(1)}, \ldots, \lambda^{(s)} \), first approximate each variety \( \{ x_{[i]} \in G_{[i]} : \lambda^{(j)} \cdot \Gamma(x_{[i]}) = 0 \}\) internally by layers of \( \rho \). Then for each \( \mu \in \mathbb{F}^s \setminus \Lambda \) approximate externally the variety \( \{ x_{[i]} \in G_{[i]} : \mu \cdot \Gamma(x_{[i]}) = 0 \} \). This gives us an internal approximation of 
\[
\left\{ x_{[i]} \in G_{[i]} : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda) \lambda \cdot \Gamma(x_{[i]}) = 0 \right\} \setminus \bigcup_{\mu \in \mathbb{F}^s \setminus \Lambda} \left\{ x_{[i]} \in G_{[i]} : \mu \cdot \Gamma(x_{[i]}) = 0 \right\}
\]
\[
= \left\{ x_{[i]} \in G_{[i]} : \lambda \in \mathbb{F}^s : \lambda \cdot \Gamma(x_{[i]}) = 0 \right\} = \Lambda
\]
by layers of \( \rho \) with error of density at most \( f^{-s^2} \eta \).

The number of subspaces of \( \mathbb{F}^s \) is at most \( f^{s^2} \). Therefore there is a union \( U'' \) of layers of \( \rho \) of size \( |U''| \geq (1-\eta)|G_{[i]}| \) such that for each layer \( L \subseteq U'' \), there is a subspace \( \Lambda_L \subseteq \mathbb{F}^s \) such that 
\[
\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{F}^s : \lambda \cdot \Gamma(x_{[i]}) = 0 \} = \Lambda_L
\]
for every $x_{[i]} \in L$. Thus by Lemma 22, when $x_{[i]} \in L$, the image of the map $y_{i+1} \mapsto \beta(x_{[i]}, y_{i+1})$ is

$\gamma(x_{[i]}) + \Lambda^+_L$.

When $x_{[i]} \in L \subset U''$, we may rewrite

$$E \sum_{x_{i+1} \in G_{i+1}} c(\beta(x_{[i+1]})) = |G_{i+1}|^{-1} \sum_{x_{i+1} \in G_{i+1}} c\left(\Gamma(x_{[i]}) \cdot x_{i+1} + \gamma(x_{[i]})\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{|\Lambda^+_L|} \sum_{u \in \gamma(x_{[i]}) + \Lambda^+_L} c(u).$$

The quantity in the last line depends only on $\gamma(x_{[i]})$ and $\rho(x_{[i]})$. Hence, for any set of the form

$\{\beta' = \lambda_1\} \cap \{\gamma = \lambda_2\} \cap \{\rho = \lambda_3\}$

such that $\{\beta' = \lambda_1\} \subset U'$ and $\{\rho = \lambda_2\} \subset U''$, there is a quantity $\tilde{c}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \in [0, 1]$ such that for each $x_{[i]} \in \{\beta' = \lambda_1\} \cap \{\gamma = \lambda_2\} \cap \{\rho = \lambda_3\}$,

$$\left| |G_{i+1, k}|^{-1} |B_{x_{[i]}}| - \tilde{c}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \right| \leq \eta + \varepsilon/4.$$

Choose $\eta = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{100}$ so that the necessary bounds are satisfied, and the proof is complete. \(\square\)

**Corollary 37** (Simultaneous Fibres theorem). For every $i \leq k$ there are constants $C = C_{i,k}$ and $D = D_{i,k}$ such that the following holds. Let $\beta : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}^r$ be a multiaffine map and let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Then we may find

- a positive integer $s \leq C\left(r + \log f \varepsilon^{-1}\right)^D$,
- a multiaffine map $\gamma : G_{[i]} \to \mathbb{F}^s$, and
- a union $U$ of layers of $\gamma$ of size $|U| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|G_{[i]}|$, such that for each layer $L$ of $\gamma$ inside $U$, there is a map $c : \mathbb{F}^r \to [0, 1]$ with the property that

$$\left| |G_{i+1, k}|^{-1} |\{y_{i+1, k} \in G_{i+1, k} : \beta(x_{[i]}, y_{i+1, k}) = \lambda\}| - c(\lambda) \right| \leq \varepsilon$$

for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^r$ and every $x_{[i]} \in L$. Moreover, if $G \subset \mathcal{P}[k]$ is a down-set, $G^{(i)} = G \cap \mathcal{P}[i]$, and $\beta$ is $G$-supported, then $\gamma$ can be taken to be $G^{(i)}$-supported.

**Proof.** Consider a modified map $\tilde{\beta} : G_{[k]} \times \mathbb{F}^r \to \mathbb{F}^r$, defined by the formula $\tilde{\beta}(x_{[k]}, \lambda) = \beta(x_{[k]}) - \lambda$, which is $\tilde{G}$-supported, where $\tilde{G} = \{A \cup \{k+1\} : A \in G\} \cup G$. Let $B = \{(x_{[k]}, \lambda) \in G_{[k]} \times \mathbb{F}^r : \tilde{\beta}(x_{[k]}, \lambda) = 0\}$ and write $\mathcal{H} = \{A \cup \{k+1\} : A \in G^{(i)}\} \cup G^{(i)}$. Apply Theorem 22 to $B$, with parameter $\tilde{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon f^{-r}$, to get an $\mathcal{H}$-supported map $\psi : G_{[i]} \times \mathbb{F}^r \to \mathbb{F}^s$, for a positive integer $s = O\left((r + \log f \varepsilon^{-1})^O(1)\right)$ and a union of layers $\tilde{U}$ of $\psi$ of size $|\tilde{U}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon f^{-r})|G_{[i]}||\mathbb{F}^r|$, such that for each layer $L$ inside $\tilde{U}$ there is some constant $c$ such that

$$\left| |G_{i+1, k}|^{-1} |B_{x_{[i]}, \lambda}| - c \right| \leq f^{-r}\varepsilon$$

(4)

for every $(x_{[i]}, \lambda) \in L$.

Let $\gamma : G_{[i]} \to (\mathbb{F}^s)^{r+1}$ be the $G^{(i)}$-supported multiaffine map defined by

$$\gamma(x_{[i]}) = \left(\psi(x_{[i]}, 0), \psi(x_{[i]}, e_1), \ldots, \psi(x_{[i]}, e_r)\right),$$
where \(e_1, \ldots, e_r\) is the standard basis of \(\mathbb{F}^r\). Given a layer \(L = \{(x_i, \lambda') \in G_i \times \mathbb{F}^r : \psi(x_i, \lambda') = u\}\) and some \(\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^r\), we have

\[
L_\lambda = \{x_i \in G_i : \psi(x_i, \lambda) = u\} \\
= \{x_i \in G_i : (1 - \sum_{j \in [r]} \lambda_j)\psi(x_i, 0) + \lambda_1\psi(x_i, e_1) + \cdots + \lambda_r\psi(x_i, e_r) = u\} \\
= \bigcup_{u \in (\mathbb{F}^r)^{r+1}} \{x_i \in G_i : \gamma(x_i) = u\}. \\
\]

Hence, \(L_\lambda\) is a union of layers of \(\gamma\). Let \(U\) be the union of those layers \(K\) of \(\gamma\) such that for each \(\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^r\), the layer \(K\) appears in the decomposition above for some \(L_\lambda\), where \(L \subset U\) is a layer of \(\psi\). In other words, \(U\) is the union of all layers \(K\) of \(\gamma\) such that \(K \times \{\lambda\} \subset U\) for every \(\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^r\). Since \(|\bar{U}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon|\mathbb{F}^r|)|G_i| |\mathbb{F}^r|\), we have that \(|U| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|G_i|\). Finally, if \(x_i \in K\) for some layer \(K\) of \(\gamma\) inside \(U\), then for every \(\lambda\) there is some layer \(L \subset U\) of \(\psi\) such that \(K \subset L_\lambda\). Let \(c(\lambda)\) be the relevant constant for \(L_\lambda\) in \([\mathbb{F}^r]_\lambda\). Then for every \(x_i \in K\) and every \(\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^r\),

\[
|G_{[i+1,k]}|^{-1} |\{y_{[i+1,k]} \in G_{[i+1,k]} : \beta(x_i, y_{[i+1,k]}) = \lambda\}|-c(\lambda)| = |G_{[i+1,k]}|^{-1}|B_{x_i,\lambda}|-c(\lambda)\leq \varepsilon,
\]

which completes the proof. \qed

Let \(\alpha : G_{[k]} \to H\) be a multiaffine map. Let \(\mathcal{F}\) be the collection of subsets of \([k]\) such that \(\alpha(x_{[k]}) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{F}} \alpha_I(x_I)\) for non-zero multilinear maps \(\alpha_I : G_I \to H\) (these maps are the multilinear parts of \(\alpha\)). Equivalently, \(\mathcal{F}\) is the minimal collection of sets such that \(\alpha\) is \(\mathcal{F}\)-supported. We define \(\text{supp} \alpha\) to be the down-set generated by \(\mathcal{F}\), in other words the set \(\{A \subset [k] : (\exists B \in \mathcal{F}) A \subset B\}\). That is, \(\text{supp} \alpha\) is the minimal down-set \(\mathcal{G}\) such that \(\alpha\) is \(\mathcal{G}\)-supported. We say that a multiaffine map \(\beta : G_{[k]} \to H\) is of lower order than \(\alpha\) if \(\text{supp} \beta\) contains none of the maximal elements of \(\text{supp} \alpha\) (with respect to inclusion). When \(\alpha\) is fixed, we simply say that \(\beta\) is of lower order. For varieties, we say that \(U\) is of lower order than \(V\) if the multiaffine maps used to define \(U\) and \(V\) satisfy the corresponding condition. Again, when \(V\) is fixed, we say that \(U\) is of lower order.

Further, when \(\alpha : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}^r\) is a multiaffine map such that each \(\alpha_i\) is multilinear on \(G_{I_i}\), where \(I_i\) is the set of coordinates on which \(\alpha_i\) depends, we say that \(\alpha\) is mixed-linear. We say that a variety is mixed-linear if it is a layer of a mixed-linear map.

**Theorem 38.** Let \(\alpha : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}^r\) be a mixed-linear map, with \(\alpha_i : G_{I_i} \to \mathbb{F}\). Let \(\nu \in \mathbb{F}^r\) and let \(V = \{x_{[k]} : \alpha(x_{[k]}) = \nu\}\). Let \(X \subset V\) be a set of size \(|X| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|V|\) and let \(\xi > 0\). Then there exist a lower-order variety \(U \subset G_{[k-1]}\) of codimension \(O((r + \log \xi)^{O(1)})\), a subset \(X' \subset X \cap (U \times G_k)\), and an element \(a_{[k]} \in X'\), such that \(|X'| \geq (1 - O(\varepsilon^{O(1)} + \xi^{O(1)})|V \cap (U \times G_k)|, V \cap (U \times G_k) \neq \emptyset\), and for each \(x_{[k]} \in X', (x_{[i+1,k]}, a_{[i+1,k]}) \in X'\), \(x_{[i]}\) for each \(i \in [0, k]\). Moreover, there is \(\delta > 0\) such that for each \(x_{[k-1]} \in U \cap V^{[k-1]}\), \(|V_{x_{[k-1]}[\delta]}| = \delta|G_k|\), where

\[
V^{[k-1]} = \{x_{[k-1]} \in G_{[k-1]} : (\forall i \in [r]) I_i \subset [k-1] \implies \alpha_i(x_{I_i}) = \nu_i\}. 
\]
Proof. We prove the claim by induction on $k$. Suppose the claim holds for $k-1$. Let $\mathcal{I} = \{i \in [r] : k \in I_i\}$. Let $W = \{x_{[k]} \in G_{[k]} : (\forall i \in \mathcal{I}) \alpha_i(x_{i[L_i]}) = \nu_i\}$. Then $V = W \cap V^{[k-1]}$. In fact, when $x_{[k]} \in V^{[k-1]}$ then $V_{x_{[k-1]}} = W_{x_{[k-1]}}$, while $V_{x_{[k-1]}} = \emptyset$ when $x_{[k]} \in G_{[k]} \setminus V^{[k-1]}$. Apply Theorem 30 in direction $G_k$ to variety $W$ with parameter $\mathbf{f}^{-kr} \xi$ to find a positive integer $s \leq \mathcal{C}(r + \log_k \xi^{-1})$, a multiaffine map $\mathbf{g} : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}^s$ of lower-order than $\alpha$, and a collection $M \subset \mathbb{F}^s$ of values $U$ such that $\{(x_{[k-1]} \in G_{[k-1]} : \gamma(x_{[k-1]}) \in M) \geq (1 - \mathbf{f}^{-kr} \xi)|G_{[k]}|$, with the property that for every $\mu \in M$ there exists a constant $c_\mu \in [0, 1]$ such that $|V_{x_{[k-1]}\in M}| = c_\mu |G_k|$ for every $x_{[k]} \in V^{[k-1]}$ such that $\gamma(x_{[k-1]}) = \mu$.

We also have

$$\sum_{\mu \in M} |X \cap (\{(\gamma = \mu) \times G_k\})| \geq |X| \mathbf{f}^{-kr} \xi|G_{[k]}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|V| - \mathbf{f}^{-kr} \xi|G_k| \geq (1 - \varepsilon - \xi)|V|$$

$$\geq (1 - \varepsilon - \xi) \sum_{\mu \in M} |V \cap (\{(\gamma = \mu) \times G_k\})|.$$

Hence, there is a choice of $\mu \in M$ such that $V \cap (\{(x_{[k-1]} \in G_{[k-1]} : \gamma(x_{[k-1]}) = \mu\} \times G_k)$ is non-empty and

$$|X \cap (\{(x_{[k-1]} \in G_{[k-1]} : \gamma(x_{[k-1]}) = \mu\} \times G_k)| \geq (1 - \varepsilon - \xi)|V \cap (\{(x_{[k-1]} : \gamma(x_{[k-1]}) = \mu\} \times G_k)|.$$

Write $V' = V \cap (\{(x_{[k-1]} : \gamma(x_{[k-1]}) = \mu\} \times G_k)$ and set

$$X' = \{x_{[k]} \in X : \gamma(x_{[k-1]}) = \mu, |X_{x_{[k-1]}}| \geq (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon} - \sqrt{\xi})|V_{x_{[k-1]}}|\}.$$

Since there is $c > 0$ such that $|V_{x_{[k-1]}\in M}| = c|G_k|$ for each $x_{[k-1]} \in V^{[k-1]}$ with $\gamma(x_{[k-1]}) = \mu$, we have that

$$|X'| \geq (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon} - \sqrt{\xi})|V'| > 0.$$

By averaging, there is some $a_k \in G_k$ such that

$$|(X')_{a_k}| \geq (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon} - \sqrt{\xi})|V'|_{a_k} > 0.$$

We may now apply the induction hypothesis to $(X')_{a_k}$ and $(V')_{a_k}$. We obtain a lower-order variety $U' \subset G_{[k-1]}$ of codimension $O(r + \log_k \xi^{-1})^{O(1)}$, a subset $X'' \subset (X')_{a_k} \cap U'$, and an element $a_{[k-1]} \in X''$, such that $|X''| \geq (1 - O(c^{O(1)} + \xi^{O(1)}))|V'_{a_k} \cap U'|$ for each $x_{[k-1]} \in X''$ and each $i \in [k - 1]$. We claim that $a_{[k]}, (X'' \times G_k) \cap X', V' \cap ((V'_{a_k} \cap U') \times G_k)$ have the desired properties.

First,

$$V' \cap ((V'_{a_k} \cap U') \times G_k) = V \cap ((\{(x_{[k-1]} : \gamma(x_{[k-1]}) = \mu\} \cap U' \cap W_{a_k}) \times G_k),$$

is indeed a variety obtained from $V$ by intersecting it with a lower-order variety of the codimension claimed. (Recall that $W$ was previously defined as $\{x_{[k]} \in G_{[k]} : (\forall i \in \mathcal{I}) \alpha_i(x_{i[L_i]}) = \nu_i\}$. Also recall that $V = W \cap V^{[k-1]}$ holds.) Next,

$$|(X'' \times G_k) \cap X'| = \sum_{x_{[k-1]} \in X''} |X'_{x_{[k-1]}}|$$
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Without loss of generality

Finally, for each $x_{[k]} \in (X'' \times G_k) \cap X'$ we need to show that $(x_{[i]}, a_{[i+1,k]}) \in (X'' \times G_k) \cap X'$ for $i \in [k]$ as well. Since $X'' \subset X'_{a_k}$, we already know that $(x_{[k-1]}, a_k) \in (X'' \times G_k) \cap X'$. Now suppose that $i \in [k-2]$. Then since $x_{[k-1]} \in X''$, we know that $(x_{[i]}, a_{[i+1,k-1]}) \in X''$. But again $X'' \subset X'_{a_k}$, so $(x_{[i]}, a_{[i+1,k]}) \in X'$, which completes the proof.

Let $A \subset G_{[k]}$. We say that a map $\phi : A \rightarrow H$ is multiaffine if for each $d \in [k]$ and $x_{[k]\setminus[d]} \in G_{[k]\setminus[d]}$ there is an affine map $\psi : G_d \rightarrow H$ such that for every $y_d \in A_{x_{[k]\setminus[d]}}$ we have $\phi(x_{[k]\setminus[d]}, y_d) = \psi(y_d)$.

**Proposition 39.** Assume that the underlying field is $\mathbb{F}_p$. Let $\alpha : G_{[k]} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^r$ be a mixed-linear map, with $\alpha_1 : G_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$. Let $\nu \in \mathbb{F}_p^r$ and let $V = \{x_{[k]} : \alpha(x_{[k]}) = \nu\}$. Suppose that $X \subset V$ is a set of size $|X| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|V|$ and let $\phi : X \rightarrow H$ be a multi-2-homomorphism. Let $\xi > 0$. Then there exist a lower-order variety $U \subset G_{[k]}$ of codimension $O((r + \log_p \xi^{-1})^{O(1)})$ and a subset $X' \subset X \cap U$ of size

$$(1 - O(\varepsilon^{O(1)} + \xi^{O(1)}))|V \cap U| > 0$$

such that $\phi|_{X'}$ is multiaffine.

**Remark.** By modifying $\xi$ appropriately, we may strengthen the conclusion slightly to

$$|X'| \geq (1 - O(\varepsilon^{O(1)} - \xi)|V \cap U|.$$  

(5)

**Proof.** We show that for each $d \in [0, k]$, there exist a lower-order variety $U \subset G_{[k]}$ of codimension $O((r + \log_p \xi^{-1})^{O(1)})$ and a subset $X' \subset X \cap U$ of size $(1 - O(\varepsilon^{O(1)} + \xi^{O(1)}))|V \cap U|$ such that for each $d' \in [d]$, $\phi$ is a restriction of an affine map on each line in direction $G_{d'}$. The statement of the proposition then becomes the case $d = k$.

We prove the claim by induction on $d$. Note that the base case $d = 0$ is trivial. Suppose now that the claim has been proved for some $d \in [0, k - 1]$ and let $X'$ and $U$ be the relevant objects. Without loss of generality $U$ is also defined by a mixed-linear map.$^{11}$ Let $|X'| = (1 - \varepsilon')|V \cap U|$, where

$^{11}$For a multiaffine map $\gamma : G_{[k]} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^d$ that defines $U = \{\gamma = 0\}$, we may write it as $\gamma(x_{[k]}) = \sum_{i \in F} \gamma_i(x_{[k]}), \gamma_i : G_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^i$ is multilinear. Let $\tilde{\gamma} : G_{[k]} \rightarrow (\mathbb{F}^i)^F$ be the concatenation of maps $\gamma_i$. Then layers of $\gamma$ (and in particular $U$) are unions of layers of $\tilde{\gamma}$, so we may average over latter, and $\tilde{\gamma}$ is mixed-linear.
for every and let \( \phi \) and let \( I \) such that \( k \). We prove the result by induction on

Proof. Claim. Assume that the underlying field is \( \mathbb{F}_p \). Let \( X \subset G[k] \) be a set of density at least \( 1 - \varepsilon \) and let \( \phi : X \to H \) be a multi-homomorphism. Then there is a unique multi-affine map \( \Phi : G[k] \to H \) such that \( \Phi(x[k]) = \phi(x[k]) \) for a \( 1 - O(\varepsilon^{\Omega(1)}) \) proportion of the \( x[k] \in G[k] \).

Proof. We prove the result by induction on \( k \). For \( k = 1 \), it follows from Lemma 24. Assume now that the result holds for some \( k - 1 \geq 1 \) and that \( X \) and \( \phi \) are given. Let \( Y = \{ x_k \in G[k] : |X_{x_k}| \geq (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon})|G[k-1]| \} \). Then \( |Y| \geq (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon})|G[k]| \). Apply the induction hypothesis to each \( X_{x_k} \), \( x_k \in Y \) to get a unique multi-affine map \( \Phi_{x_k} \) that coincides on a dense subset of points in \( X_{x_k} \) with the map \( \phi(\cdot, x_k) \). For \( x_k \in Y \) and \( x[k-1] \in G[k-1] \) define \( \Phi(x[k-1], x_k) = \Phi_{x_k}(x[k-1]) \). We claim that \( \Phi \) is a multi-homomorphism on \( G[k-1] \times Y \). It suffices to prove that for all \( x_k^{(i)} \) in \( Y \) such that \( x_k^{(1)} + x_k^{(2)} = x_k^{(3)} + x_k^{(4)} \) we also have \( \Phi(x[k-1], x_k^{(1)}) + \Phi(x[k-1], x_k^{(2)}) = \Phi(x[k-1], x_k^{(3)}) + \Phi(x[k-1], x_k^{(4)}) \). But note that \( |\cap_{i \in [4]} X_{x_k^{(i)}}| \geq (1 - 4\varepsilon)|G[k-1]| \) and that on this set

\[
x_{[k-1]} \mapsto \Phi(x_{[k-1]}, x_k^{(1)}) + \Phi(x_{[k-1]}, x_k^{(2)}) - \Phi(x_{[k-1]}, x_k^{(3)}) - \Phi(x_{[k-1]}, x_k^{(4)}) = 0.
\]

But this map is a global multi-affine map on \( G[k-1] \). The next claim will imply that it is itself zero.

Claim. Suppose that \( \psi : G[k] \to H \) is a multi-affine map. Then \( \psi = 0 \) or \( \psi \) has at least \( p^{-k}|G[k]| \) non-zero values.
Proof of claim. Suppose that \( \psi \neq 0 \). Without loss of generality \( H = \mathbb{F}_p \), i.e. \( \psi \) is a multiaffine form (view \( H \) as \( \mathbb{F}_p^* \) and take \( \psi \) which is a non-zero map). Then, \( \psi \) takes value 1, so \( \{ x[k] : \psi(x[k]) = 1 \} \) is a non-empty variety of codimension 1. Therefore it has density at least \( p^{-k} \). (See Lemma 11 in [26].)

Finally, since for each \( x[k-1] \in G[k-1] \) the map that sends each \( x_k \in Y \) to \( \Phi(x[k-1], x_k) \) is a Freiman homomorphism, by Lemma 25 it is a restriction of a unique global affine map. For each \( x[k-1] \) extend the map \( \Phi(x[k-1], \cdot) \) from \( Y \) to the whole of \( G_k \) using this global affine map. As above, the resulting map is a global multiaffine map.

We also need the following observation of Lovett [24].

**Lemma 41 (Lovett [24]).** Let \( \alpha : G[k] \to \mathbb{F} \) be a multiaffine form with multilinear parts \( \alpha_I \), and let \( \chi : \mathbb{F} \to \mathbb{C} \) be an additive character. Then

\[
\left| \mathbb{E}_{x[k]} \chi(\alpha(x[k])) \right| \leq \mathbb{E}_{x[k]} \chi(\alpha(x[k])) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.
\]

### 3.5. Box norms

Let \( X \) and \( Y \) be finite sets. For a function \( f : X \times Y \to \mathbb{C} \), we define its **box norm** by the formula

\[
\|f\|_{\Box(X,Y)} = \left( \mathbb{E}_{x_1,x_2 \in X} \mathbb{E}_{y_1,y_2 \in Y} f(x_1,y_1)f(x_2,y_2) f(x_1,y_2)f(x_2,y_1) \right)^{1/4}.
\]

The box norm satisfies the following Cauchy-Schwarz-like inequality.

**Lemma 42.** Let \( f_{11}, f_{12}, f_{21}, f_{22} : X \times Y \to \mathbb{C} \) be four functions. Then

\[
\left| \mathbb{E}_{x_1,x_2 \in X} \mathbb{E}_{y_1,y_2 \in Y} f_{11}(x_1,y_1)f_{12}(x_1,y_2)f_{21}(x_2,y_1)f_{22}(x_2,y_2) \right| \leq \|f_{11}\|_{\Box(X,Y)} \|f_{12}\|_{\Box(X,Y)} \|f_{21}\|_{\Box(X,Y)} \|f_{22}\|_{\Box(X,Y)}.
\]

In particular, we have the following useful corollary.

**Corollary 43.** Suppose that \( f : X \times Y \to \mathbb{C} \), \( u : X \to \mathbb{C} \) and \( v : Y \to \mathbb{C} \) are three functions. Then

\[
\left| \mathbb{E}_{x \in X, y \in Y} u(x)v(y)f(x,y) \right| \leq \|u\|_2 \|v\|_2 \|f\|_{\Box(X,Y)}.
\]

### §4 An \( L^p \) approximation theorem for mixed convolutions

Recall the following piece of notation that we introduced earlier. For two maps \( f, g : X \to \mathbb{C} \), we write \( f(x) \approx_{L^q} g(x) \) to mean that \( \|f - g\|_{L^q} \leq \epsilon \). If the variable and the underlying space are clear, we omit the \( x \) from \( \approx_{L^q,x} \) and write simply \( \approx_{L^q} \). The main result of this section is the following, which is proved using Theorem 3 for \( k - 1 \) as an inductive hypothesis. Throughout this section we write \( \chi \) for the function defined on \( \mathbb{F}_p \) that takes \( x \) to \( \omega^x \), where \( \omega = e^{2\pi i/p} \).
Theorem 44. Let $p$ be a prime, let $\varepsilon > 0$, and let $q \geq 1$. Let $G_1, \ldots, G_k$ be finite-dimensional vector spaces over $\mathbb{F}_p$ and let $f : G[k] \to \mathbb{D}$. Then there exist

- a positive integer $l = \exp((2k+1)(D_{k-1}^{nh}+2)) \left( O(\varepsilon^{-O(q)}) \right)$,
- constants $c_1, \ldots, c_l \in \mathbb{D}$, and
- multiaffine forms $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_l : G[k] \to \mathbb{F}_p$ such that

$$c_k \cdots c_1 c_k \cdots c_1 f \approx_{L^q} \sum_{i \in [l]} c_i \chi \circ \phi_i.$$ 

The constant $D_{k-1}^{nh}$ in the above statement comes from the conclusion of Theorem 4. The proof of Theorem 44 consists of two parts. In the first we find multilinear structure in the set of large Fourier coefficients of the mixed convolutions, and in the second we exploit this structure to obtain an exponential-sum approximation.

4.1. Multilinearity of large Fourier coefficients

We begin by generalizing Lemma 13.1 from [3]. We say that $(x[k], y[k], z[k], w[k])$ is a $d$-additive quadruple if $x_i = y_i = z_i = w_i$ for every $i \neq d$ and $x_d, y_d, z_d, w_d$ is an additive quadruple – that is, $x_d - y_d + z_d - w_d = 0$. We say that a map $\sigma$ respects this $d$-additive quadruple if $\sigma(x[k]) - \sigma(y[k]) + \sigma(z[k]) - \sigma(w[k]) = 0$. Our next lemma says that convolution in a given direction gives rise to many additive quadruples in that direction, in the following sense.

Lemma 45. Let $f : G[k] \to \mathbb{D}$ and let $d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_r \in [k]$. Let $j, j_0 \in [k]$ be distinct and suppose that $j = d_i$ for some $i$. Set

$$g = C_{d_r} \cdots C_{d_1} f,$$

let $S \subset G[k] \setminus \{j_0\}$ be a set of size at least $\delta|G[k] \setminus \{j_0\}|$, and let $\sigma : S \to G_{j_0}$ be a map such that

$$|g_{x[k] \setminus \{j_0\}}(\sigma(x[k] \setminus \{j_0\}))| \geq c$$

whenever $x[k] \setminus \{j_0\} \in S$. Then the number of $j$-additive quadruples respected by $\sigma$ is at least $\delta^4 c^3 |G[k] \setminus \{j, j_0\}|$.

Proof. By assumption,

$$\delta^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_{x[k] \setminus \{j_0\} \in G[k] \setminus \{j_0\}} S(x[k] \setminus \{j_0\}) \left| g_{x[k] \setminus \{j_0\}}(\sigma(x[k] \setminus \{j_0\})) \right|^2$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{x[k] \setminus \{j_0\} \in G[k] \setminus \{j_0\}} S(x[k] \setminus \{j_0\}) \mathbb{E}_{u_{j_0}, v_{j_0} \in G_{j_0}} g(x[k] \setminus \{j_0\}, u_{j_0}) g(x[k] \setminus \{j_0\}, v_{j_0}) \chi \left( (v_{j_0} - u_{j_0}) \cdot \sigma(x[k] \setminus \{j_0\}) \right)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{x[k] \setminus \{j_0\} \in G[k] \setminus \{j_0\}} S(x[k] \setminus \{j_0\}) \mathbb{E}_{u_{j_0}, v_{j_0} \in G_{j_0}} C_{d_r} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x[k] \setminus \{j_0\}, u_{j_0}) \mathbb{C}_{d_r} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x[k] \setminus \{j_0\}, v_{j_0}) \chi \left( (v_{j_0} - u_{j_0}) \cdot \sigma(x[k] \setminus \{j_0\}) \right)$$
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Setting $h_j = v_{j_0} - u_{j_0}$, we can rewrite the last expression as
\[
\mathbb{E}_{x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}} \in \mathbb{G}(k \setminus \{j_0\}) \ u_{j_0}, h_{j_0} \in \mathbb{G}_{j_0} \ S(x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}})C_{d_e} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}}, u_{j_0}) \\ C_{d_e} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}}, u_{j_0} + h_{j_0}) \chi(h_{j_0} \cdot \sigma(x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}})),
\]
\[(6)\]

Now let us fix $u_{j_0}, h_{j_0} \in G_{j_0}$, $y_r \in G_{d_{1,r}}^{(0,1)}$, \ldots, $y_2 \in G_{d_{2}^{(0,1)^{r-1}}, x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}} \in G_{k \setminus \{j_0\}}$. We write the indices of $y_i$ in the superscript, so $y_r = (y_{r_1}^0, y_{r_1}^1)$, and so on. For $i \in [r]$ and $a \in \{0,1\}^{r-i}$ define the point $x^{i,a} \in G_{[k]}$ as follows. First, set $x^{r,0} = (x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}}, u_{j_0})$ and $x^{r,1} = (x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}}, u_{j_0} + h_{j_0})$. Then we may rewrite (6) as
\[
\delta_c^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_{x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}} \in \mathbb{G}(k \setminus \{j_0\}) \ u_{j_0}, h_{j_0} \in \mathbb{G}_{j_0} \ S(x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}})C_{d_e} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x^{r,0})C_{d_e} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x^{r,1}) \chi(h_{j_0} \cdot \sigma(x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}})).
\]
\[(7)\]

Next, for $i \in [r - 1]$ and $a \in \{0,1\}^{r-i}$, define
\[
x^{i,(a,0)} = (x^{i+1,a}_{[k] \setminus \{d_{i+1}\}}, d_{i+1} : y_{i+1}^a) \quad \text{and} \quad x^{i,(a,1)} = (x^{i+1,a}_{[k] \setminus \{d_{i+1}\}}, d_{i+1} : x^{i+1,a}_{d_{i+1}} + y_{i+1}^a).
\]

We introduced this notation in order to obtain the equation
\[
C_{d_{i+1}} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x^{i+1,a}) = \mathbb{E}_{y_{i+1}} \ C_{d_1} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x^{i,(a,1)})C_{d_1} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x^{i,(a,0)}).
\]
\[(9)\]

Returning to (6) and using (7), we obtain
\[
\delta_c^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_{x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}} \in \mathbb{G}(k \setminus \{j_0\}) \ u_{j_0}, h_{j_0} \in \mathbb{G}_{j_0} \ S(x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}})C_{d_e} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x^{r,0})C_{d_e} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x^{r,1}) \chi(h_{j_0} \cdot \sigma(x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}}))
= \mathbb{E}_{x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}} \in \mathbb{G}(k \setminus \{j_0\}) \ u_{j_0}, h_{j_0} \in \mathbb{G}_{j_0} \ S(x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}})C_{d_{r-1}} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x^{r-1,0})C_{d_{r-1}} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x^{r-1,1})
= \cdots
= \mathbb{E}_{u_{j_0}, h_{j_0}} \ S(x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}}) \chi(h_{j_0} \cdot \sigma(x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}})) \prod_{a \in \{0,1\}^{r-i}} \text{Conj}^{r-l+\sum_{i \in [r-l+i]} a_i}C_{d_i} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x^{l,a}),
\]
for any $l \in [r]$, where Conj$^e$ stands for the conjugation operator applied $e$ times (so a conjugation is performed if and only if $e$ is odd).

Let $l$ be the largest index such that $d_l = j$. Then
\[
\delta_c^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_{x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}} \in \mathbb{G}(k \setminus \{j_0\}) \ u_{j_0}, h_{j_0} \in \mathbb{G}_{j_0} \ S(x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}}) \chi(h_{j_0} \cdot \sigma(x_{[k] \setminus \{j_0\}}))
\prod_{a \in \{0,1\}^{r+1-i}} \left( \text{Conj}^{r-l+\sum_{i \in [r-l+i]} a_i}C_{d_{l-1}} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x^{l,a}_{[k] \setminus \{d_l\}}, d_l : y_l^a) \right),
\]
\[36\]
The way we chose \( l \) guarantees that \( x^{l,a}_{d_i} = x_j \). Therefore,

\[
\delta^2 \leq \frac{E}{x_{(k)\setminus\{j_0\}}} \frac{E}{u_{j_0} h_{j_0}} \frac{E}{y_{r,\ldots,y_{l}}} \left| \frac{E}{x_j} S(x_{(k)\setminus\{j_0\}}) \chi\left(h_{j_0} \cdot \sigma(x_{(k)\setminus\{j_0\}})\right) \right.
\]

\[
\left( \prod_{a \in \{0,1\}^{r+1-l}} \left( \text{Conj} \left( \sum_{i \in [r+1]} \alpha_i \right) C_{d_{i-1}} \ldots C_{d_1} f(x^{l,a}_{[k]\setminus\{d_i\}}; d_i : y_i^a + x^{l,a}_{d_i}) \right) \right)
\]

\[
\left( \prod_{a \in \{0,1\}^{r+1-l}} \left( \text{Conj} \left( \sum_{i \in [r+1]} \alpha_i \right) C_{d_{i-1}} \ldots C_{d_1} f(x^{l,a}_{[k]\setminus\{j_0\}}; j : y_i^a + x_j) \right) \right)
\]

\[
\leq \frac{E}{x_{(k)\setminus\{j_0\}}} \frac{E}{u_{j_0} h_{j_0}} \frac{E}{y_{r,\ldots,y_{l}}} \left| \frac{E}{x_j} S(x_{(k)\setminus\{j_0\}}) \chi\left(h_{j_0} \cdot \sigma(x_{(k)\setminus\{j_0\}})\right) \right.
\]

\[
\left( \prod_{a \in \{0,1\}^{r+1-l}} \left( \text{Conj} \left( \sum_{i \in [r+1]} \alpha_i \right) C_{d_{i-1}} \ldots C_{d_1} f(x^{l,a}_{[k]\setminus\{j_0\}}; j : y_i^a + x_j) \right) \right)
\]

\[
(10)
\]

After the change of variables \( y_i^a \mapsto t_j + y_i^a, t_j \in G_j \) this becomes

\[
\left( \prod_{a \in \{0,1\}^{r+1-l}} \left( \text{Conj} \left( \sum_{i \in [r+1]} \alpha_i \right) C_{d_{i-1}} \ldots C_{d_1} f(x^{l,a}_{[k]\setminus\{j_0\}}; j : y_i^a + x_j) \right) \right)
\]

\[
(11)
\]

Write \( p \) for the tuple (of elements and sequences of elements of spaces \( G_1, \ldots, G_k \))

\[
p = (x_{(k)\setminus\{j_0\}}, u_{j_0}, h_{j_0}, y_r, \ldots, y_{l})
\]

and for fixed \( p \), define maps \( F_p, H_p : G_j \rightarrow \mathbb{D} \) by

\[
F_p(w_j) = S(x_{(k)\setminus\{j_0\}}, w_j) \chi \left( h_{j_0} \cdot \sigma(x_{(k)\setminus\{j_0\}}, w_j) \right)
\]

and

\[
H_p(w_j) = \prod_{a \in \{0,1\}^{r+1-l}} \left( \text{Conj} \left( \sum_{i \in [r+1]} \alpha_i \right) C_{d_{i-1}} \ldots C_{d_1} f(x^{l,a}_{[k]\setminus\{j_0\}}; j : y_i^a + w_j) \right)
\]

Rewriting (11), we obtain

\[
\delta^2 \leq \frac{E}{p \ t_j} \left| \frac{E}{x_j} F_p(x_j) H_p(x_j + t_j) \right|
\]

Lemma 15 yields

\[
\delta^4 \leq \frac{E}{p} \sum_r \left| \widetilde{F}_p(r) \right|^4
\]
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Let $m$ be a positive integer.

Proof. Once we have obtained the set $S$ of density $\delta_i = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)$ for each $x[k]\{j_0\} \in S$, then $\delta_i = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)$ such additive quadruples coming from $(S_i)_{x[k]\{j_0\}}$. Then $|T| \geq \frac{1}{2} \delta_i e^6 |G[k]\{j_0\}|$. By Corollary 2.1, for each $x[k]\{j_0\} \subseteq T$ we may find an affine map $\alpha : G[k] \rightarrow G[k]$ and a set $Y_{x[k]\{j_0\}} \subseteq (S_i)_{x[k]\{j_0\}}$ of size $\exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \delta_i e^6 |G[k]\{j_0\}|\right)$ such that $\sigma(x[k]\{j_0\}) = \alpha(x[k]\{j_0\})$ for all $x[k]\{j_0\} \in Y_{x[k]\{j_0\}}$. Thus, taking $S_{i+1} = S_i \cap \left( \bigcup_{x[k]\{j_0\} \subseteq T} \{x[k]\{j_0\} \times Y_{x[k]\{j_0\}} \right)$ completes the proof of the inductive step.

Once we have obtained the set $S_{k-1}$, we see that $\sigma|S_{k-1}$ is a multi-homomorphism. By Theorem 3, there is a global multiaffine map $\mu : G[k] \rightarrow G[k]$ such that $\mu(x[k]\{j_0\})$ holds for at least $\left( \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} e^6\right)\right)^{-1} |G[k]\{j_0\}|$ of $x[k]\{j_0\} \in S_{k-1} \subseteq S$, which completes the proof.

Corollary 47. Let $f, d_1, \ldots, d_r$ and $g$ be as in Corollary 44, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exist a positive integer $m = \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} e^6\right)\left(O((\log \varepsilon)^{-1})\right)$, multiaffine maps $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m : G[k]\{j_0\} \rightarrow G[j_0]$ and a set $S \subseteq G[k]\{j_0\}$ of size at least $\left(1 - \varepsilon\right) |G[k]\{j_0\}|$ such that $r_{j_0} \in \left\{ \mu_1(x[k]\{j_0\]), \ldots, \mu_m(x[k]\{j_0\}) \right\}$ for every $x[k]\{j_0\} \in S$ and every $r_{j_0} \in G[j_0]$ such that $\left| g_{x[k]\{j_0\}}(r_{j_0}) \right| \geq \varepsilon$. 38
Proof. We iteratively define multiaffine maps $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m : G[|\{j_0\}] \to G_{j_0}$ as follows. If at the $i$th step there is a set $A \subset G[|\{j_0\}]$ of size at least $\varepsilon |G[|\{j_0\}]|$ such that for each $x[|\{j_0\}]$ there exists an element $\sigma(x[|\{j_0\}]) \in G_{j_0} \setminus \mu_i(x[|\{j_0\}])$ such that $|g_{x[|\{j_0\}]i}(\sigma(x[|\{j_0\}]))| \geq \varepsilon$, then we may apply Corollary \[\text{[22]}\] to find a multiaffine map $\mu_{i+1} : G[|\{j_0\}] \to G_{j_0}$ such that $\sigma(x[|\{j_0\}]) = \mu_{i+1}(x[|\{j_0\}])$ holds for $\left(\exp(D^m_{h_1-1} + 1) (O((\log \varepsilon^{-1})O(1)))^{-1} |G[|\{j_0\}]| \right)$ elements $x[|\{j_0\}]$ of $A$.

Since by Lemma \[\text{[2]}\] the number of $\varepsilon$-large Fourier coefficients of each $g_{x[|\{j_0\}]}$ is at most $\varepsilon^{-2}$, this procedure terminates after at most $\varepsilon^{-2} \exp(D^m_{h_1-1} + 1) (O((\log \varepsilon^{-1})O(1)))$ steps, as desired. \[\square\]

4.2. Obtaining the approximation

For the Fourier coefficient at $r$ of a very long expression $E$, we write $|E|^\times (r)$ instead of $\hat{E}(r)$.

**Proposition 48.** Let $q \geq 1$, let $f : G[k] \to \mathbb{D}$ and let $\{d_1, \ldots, d_r\} = [k]$ (where $r$ may be greater than $k$). Then there exist a positive integer $l = \exp(D^m_{h_1-1} + 2) (O((\varepsilon^{-1})O(q)))$, multiaffine maps $\mu_i : G[|\{d_r\}] \to G_{d_r}$, $\lambda_i : G[k] \to \mathbb{F}_p$, and constants $c_i \in \mathbb{D}$ for $i \in [l]$, such that

$$C_{d_r} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x[k]) \approx_{L^q, x[k]} \sum_{i \in [l]} c_i \left| C_{d_r-1} \cdots C_{d_1} f_{x[k]}(d_r) \right|^\times \left( \mu_i(x[k]) \right)^2 \lambda_i(x[k]).$$

**Proof.** Using Theorem \[\text{[24]}\] for the $L^q$ norm for each $x[|\{d_r\}] \in G[|\{d_r\}]$, after choosing a suitable $\eta = \exp \left( - (\varepsilon^{-1} \log p)^O(q) \right)$, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}_{x[|\{d_r\}] \sim_d} \left| C_{d_r} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x[k]) - \sum_{s_{d_r} \in G_{d_r}} \left| C_{d_r-1} \cdots C_{d_1} f_{x[k]}(d_r) \right|^\times (s_{d_r}) \right|^q \geq \eta$$

is at most $(\varepsilon/4)^q$, which implies that

$$C_{d_r} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x[k]) \approx_{L^q, x[k]} \sum_{s_{d_r} \in G_{d_r}} \left| C_{d_r-1} \cdots C_{d_1} f_{x[k]}(d_r) \right|^\times (s_{d_r}) \chi(s_{d_r} : x_{d_r}).$$

This is already an approximation in the $L^q$ norm; it remains to modify it to the desired form.

Let $\varepsilon_1 = (\varepsilon/8)^q$. Apply Corollary \[\text{[27]}\] to find a positive integer $m_1 = \exp(D^m_{h_1-1} + 1) (O_p((\varepsilon^{-1})O(q)))$, multiaffine maps $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_{m_1} : G[|\{d_r\}] \to G_{d_r}$, and a set $S \subset G[|d_r\}]$ of size at least $(1 - \varepsilon_1) |S|_{d_r}$, such that $s_{d_r} \in \{\mu_i(x[k]) \mid i \in [m_1]\}$ for every $x[k] \in S$ and every $s_{d_r} \in G_{d_r}$ for which $\left| C_{d_r-1} \cdots C_{d_1} f_{x[k]}(d_r) \right|^\times (s_{d_r}) \geq \eta$.

Using the inclusion-exclusion principle we may write

$$\mathbb{1}(s_{d_r} \in \{\mu_i(x[k]) \mid i \in [m_1]\}) = \sum_{\emptyset \neq I \subset [m]} (-1)^{|I|+1} \mathbb{1}(\forall i \in I) \mu_i(x[k]) = s_{d_r}.$$
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For each non-empty $I \subseteq [m_1]$, fix an arbitrary element elt$(I) \in I$. We get

$$C_{d_r} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x[k]) \overset{\epsilon/2}{\approx} L^r_{x[k]} \sum_{s_{d_r} \in G_{d_r}} \mathbb{1}(s_{d_r} \in \{\mu_i(x[k]\setminus\{d_r\}) : i \in [m_1]\}) \left|C_{d_r-1} \cdots C_{d_1} f_{x[k]\setminus\{d_r\}}\right|^2 \chi(s_{d_r} \cdot x_{d_r}) \tag{12}$$

Observe that we might have added more Fourier coefficients in the approximation sum for some $x[k]\setminus\{d_r\}$, but this would not make the approximation from Theorem 20 worse, since that theorem says that a sum that includes all the large Fourier coefficients is a good approximation.

Now for $\emptyset \neq I \subseteq [m_1]$, $B_I = \left\{x[k] \setminus \{d_r\} \in G[k] \setminus \{d_r\} : \mu_i(x[k] \setminus \{d_r\}) \text{ are equal for } i \in I\right\}$ is a variety in $G[k] \setminus \{d_r\}$. Therefore (12) gives us that

$$\left|C_{d_r} \cdots C_{d_1} f_{x[k]\setminus\{d_r\}}\right|^2 \left(\mu_{\text{elt}(I)}(x[k]\setminus\{d_r\})\right) \overset{\epsilon/2}{\approx} L^r_{x[k]} \sum_{\emptyset \neq I \subseteq [m_1]} (-1)^{|I|+1} B_I(x[k]\setminus\{d_r\}) \tag{13}$$

For each $\emptyset \neq I \subseteq [m_1]$, apply Lemma 28 to $B_I$ to find a multiaffine map $\gamma_I : G[k] \setminus \{d_r\} \to \mathbb{P}_p^t$, for some $t_I = O(q(m_1 + \log p \epsilon^{-1}))$, such that $B'_I = \left\{x[k] \setminus \{d_r\} \in G[k] \setminus \{d_r\} : \gamma_I(x[k] \setminus \{d_r\}) = 0\right\}$ has the properties that $B_I \subseteq B'_I$ and that

$$|B'_I \setminus B_I| \leq \frac{(\epsilon/2)^q}{2(q+1)m_1} |G[k] \setminus \{d_r\}|.$$

From (13) we deduce that

$$\left|C_{d_r} \cdots C_{d_1} f_{x[k]}\right|^2 \overset{\epsilon}{\approx} L^r_{x[k]} \sum_{\emptyset \neq I \subseteq [m_1]} (-1)^{|I|+1} B'_I(x[k]\setminus\{d_r\}) \tag{14}$$

$$= \sum_{\emptyset \neq I \subseteq [m_1]} \sum_{x'[\setminus d_r] \in \mathbb{P}_p^t} (-1)^{|I|+1} B'_I(x'[\setminus d_r]) \chi(\gamma_I(x'[\setminus d_r]) \cdot x_{d_r})$$

which completes the proof. $\square$
Let us now write $C_{1,s}$ to mean

$$C_{1}C_{1-1} \ldots C_{i-s+2}C_{i-s+1}$$

where the convolution directions are taken modulo $k$ and we allow $s$ to be greater than $k$.

The next proposition says that we may decrease the dependence on coordinates in the ‘non-character’ term of the approximation sum. To simplify notation, the variables $a_{i_0}, a_{i_0-1}^{(0,1)}, \ldots, a_{i_0-J+1}^{(0,1)}$ that appear in the statement below are assumed to have the property that $a_{i_0-j}^{(0,1)}$ is a sequence of elements $a_{i_0-j}^{e}$ in $G_{i_0-j}$ with indices $e \in \{0, 1\}^J$. Thus, superscripts are indices in the sequence, while the subscripts indicate to which group $G_{i}$ the elements belong. The expectation is taken over all such elements as usual. Also, the expression $a_{i_0-J+1}, \ldots, a_{i_0}$ that appears in the last line of the statement is a shortening of $a_{i_0-J+1}, a_{i_0-J+2}, \ldots, a_{i_0}$.

**Proposition 49.** Let $q \geq 1$ and let $f : G[k] \to \mathbb{D}$. Let $\mu : G[k] \setminus \{i_0\} \to G_{i_0}$ be a multiaffine map, let $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $J \in [k]$. Let $s \geq k + J - 1$ and let $i_0 \in [k]$. Write $K_{k,J} = 2J(D_{k-1}^{mn} + 2)$. Then, there exist

- a positive integer $l = \exp(K_{k,J}) \left( O(\varepsilon^{O(1)}) \right)$,
- multiaffine maps $\lambda_i : G[k] \setminus \{i_0\} \to \mathbb{F}_p$, $\mu_i : G[k] \setminus \{i_0-i\} \to G_{i_0-j}$ for $i \in [l]$, and $\alpha_e : G[k] \to \mathbb{F}_p$ for $e \in \{0, 1\}^{J-1}$, and
- constants $c_i \in \mathbb{D}$ for $i \in [l]$,

such that if $J \in [k-1]$, then

$$\left[ C_{i_0-1,s}f_{(x[k] \setminus \{i_0\})} \right] \left( \mu(x[k] \setminus \{i_0\}) \right) \approx_{L^q(x[k] \setminus \{i_0\})} \sum_{i \in [l]} c_i \chi \left( \lambda_i(x[k] \setminus \{i_0\}) \right) \left[ \prod_{e \in \{0, 1\}^{J-1}} \left| C_{i_0-1-J,s-J}f_{(x[k] \setminus \{i_0-j_0-1, \ldots, j_0\})} \right| \left| a_{i_0-j_0-1} \right| \right] \left( \sum_{a_{i_0-j_0-1} \in a_{\{0, 1\}^{J-1}}} \left( \mu_i(x[k] \setminus \{i_0-j_0-j+1, \ldots, i_0\}) \right) \right) \left( \alpha_e(x[k] \setminus \{i_0-j_0-j+1, \ldots, i_0\}) \right)^2$$

and when $J = k$,

$$\left[ C_{i_0-1,s}f_{(x[k] \setminus \{i_0\})} \right] \left( \mu(x[k] \setminus \{i_0\}) \right) \approx_{L^q(x[k] \setminus \{i_0\})} \sum_{i \in [l]} c_i \chi \left( \lambda_i(x[k] \setminus \{i_0\}) \right).$$

**Proof.** We prove the claim by induction on $J$. Let $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ be a small parameter to be chosen later. Apply Proposition 49 to find $l^{(1)} = \exp(D_{k-1}^{mn} + 2) \left( O_p((\varepsilon_1)^{O(1)}) \right)$, multiaffine maps $\mu_i^{(1)} : G[k] \setminus \{i_0-1\} \to G_{i_0-1}$, $\lambda_i^{(1)} : G[k] \to \mathbb{F}_p$ and constants $c_i^{(1)} \in \mathbb{D}$ for $i \in [l^{(1)}]$, such that

$$C_{i_0-1,s}f_{(x[k] \setminus \{i_0\})} \approx_{L^q(x[k] \setminus \{i_0\})} \sum_{i \in [l^{(1)}]} c_i^{(1)} \left[ C_{i_0-2,s-1}f_{(x[k] \setminus \{i_0-1\})} \right] \left( \mu_i^{(1)}(x[k] \setminus \{i_0-1\}) \right) \left( a_{i_0-j} \right) \left( \alpha_e \right)^2 \chi \left( \lambda_i^{(1)}(x[k]) \right).$$
By Corollary 14 (in which we view $G_{[k]}$ as $G_{[k]\{i_0\}} \times G_{i_0}$), we get
\[
[C_{i_0-1:s-1:f_{x_{[k]\{i_0\}}}}]^{\epsilon} (\mu(x_{[k]\{i_0\}})) \leq \sum_{i \in [t(1)]} c^{(1)}_{i_0} \left[ C_{i_0-2:s-1:f_{x_{[k]\{i_0-1,i_0\}}}} \right]^{\epsilon} \left( \mu^{(1)}_i(x_{[k]\{i_0-1,i_0\}}; a_{i_0}) \right)^2 \chi \left( \lambda^{(1)}_i(x_{[k]\{i_0\}}; a_{i_0}) - \mu(x_{[k]\{i_0\}}; a_{i_0}) \right). (14)
\]
This proves the base case $J = 1$ if we set $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon$. We now proceed to prove the inductive step, assuming that the claim holds for some $J \geq 1$. We also keep the notation $\epsilon_1, \lambda^1, \mu^1$, and so on, for the remainder of the argument, where $\epsilon_1$ is to be chosen later and is not necessarily equal to the value above, which was just the choice for the base case.

For each $i \in [t(1)]$, apply the induction hypothesis for $J$ and $i_0 - 1, s - 1, \epsilon_2, L^2_J$ instead of $i_0, s, \epsilon, L^2_J$, where $\epsilon_2 > 0$ will be chosen later, to
\[
[C_{i_0-2:s-1:f_{x_{[k]\{i_0-1\}}}}]^{\epsilon_2} (\mu^{(1)}_i(x_{[k]\{i_0-1\}})) \leq \sum_{j \in [t^{(2)}_J]} c^{(2)}_j \chi \left( \lambda^{(2)}_j(x_{[k]\{i_0-1\}}) \right) \left[ C_{i_0-2:s-1:J,f_{x_{[k]\{i_0-1,i_0-1\}}}} \right]^{\epsilon_2} \left( \mu^{(2)}_j(x_{[k]\{i_0-1,i_0-1\}}; a_{i_0-1,j}; a_{i_0-1,j}) \right)^2 \chi \left( \lambda^{(2)}_j(x_{[k]\{i_0-1,i_0-1\}}; a_{i_0-1,j}; a_{i_0-1,j}) \right). (15)
\]
Plug the approximation from (13) into the right hand side of (14) and use Lemma 16 to obtain that
\[
[C_{i_0-1:s-1:f_{x_{[k]\{i_0\}}}}]^{\epsilon_1 + f^{(1)}_2} \leq \sum_{i \in [t(1)]} c^{(1)}_{i_0} \left[ C_{i_0-2:s-1:J,f_{x_{[k]\{i_0-1,i_0-1\}}}} \right]^{\epsilon_2} \left( \mu^{(1)}_i(x_{[k]\{i_0-1\}}; b_{i_0}) \right) \left[ C_{i_0-2:s-1:J,f_{x_{[k]\{i_0-1,i_0-1\}}}} \right]^{\epsilon_2} \left( \mu^{(2)}_j(x_{[k]\{i_0-1,i_0-1\}}; a_{i_0-1,j}; b_{i_0}) \right) \chi \left( \lambda^{(1)}_i(x_{[k]\{i_0\}}; b_{i_0}) - \mu(x_{[k]\{i_0\}}; b_{i_0}) \right) \chi \left( \lambda^{(2)}_j(x_{[k]\{i_0-1,i_0-1\}}; b_{i_0}) - \mu(x_{[k]\{i_0-1,i_0-1\}}; b_{i_0}) \right). (16)
\]
where $b_{i_0}$ means that $b_{i_0}$ appears in the expression for $J \leq k - 2$ and does not appear if $J = k - 1$. This happens for only two occurrences of $b_{i_0}$ above, since in the relevant places the dependence on $x_{i_0}$ has already disappeared.
Expanding out the outer square in this expression produces two copies of each variable \( a_{i_0-j}^{(1)} \), which we index as \( a_{i_0-j}^{(1),1} \). We think of \( a_{i_0-j}^{(1)} \) as the first copy and of \( a_{i_0-j}^{(1),1} \) as the second. Write \( a^{(3),i}_{k_0} = a^{(2),i}_{k_0} \) and \( a^{(3),i}_{k_0} = -a^{(2),i}_{k_0} \). Then expression [14] becomes

\[
\sum_{i \in [l^{(1)}]} c_{i_0}^{(1)} (c_{i_0}^{(2),1}) c_{i_0}^{(2),i} \chi(b_{k_0}^{(1)} (x[k] \setminus \{i_0\}) \cdot b_{k_0}^{(2),i} (x[k] \setminus \{i_0\})) = \sum_{j_0, j_1 \in [l^{(2)}]} c_{j_0}^{(2),i} c_{j_1}^{(2),j} \chi(b_{k_0}^{(1)} (x[k] \setminus \{i_0\}) \cdot b_{k_0}^{(2),j} (x[k] \setminus \{i_0\})).
\]

For \( i \in [l^{(1)}], j_0, j_1 \in [l^{(2)}] \), define multiaffine maps \( \rho_{i,j_0,j_1} : G_{[k]} \setminus \{i_0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p \) by

\[
\chi(\lambda_{j_0}^{(1)} (x[k] \setminus \{i_0\}) \cdot b_{i_0}^{(1)} (x[k] \setminus \{i_0\})) = -\rho_{i,j_0,j_1} (x[k] \setminus \{i_0\}) \cdot b_{i_0}^{(1)} (x[k] \setminus \{i_0\}).
\]

For \( x[k] \setminus \{i_0\} \in G_{[k]} \setminus \{i_0\} \), define a map \( F_{i,j_0,j_1} : x[k] \setminus \{i_0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p \) by

\[
F_{i,j_0,j_1} (x[k] \setminus \{i_0\}) (z_{i_0}) = \sum_{a_{i_0-j}^{(1)},a_{i_0-j}^{(2),i},a_{i_0-j}^{(2),i} \in \mathbb{F}_p} \chi(a^{(3),i}_{k_0} (x[k] \setminus \{i_0\}) \cdot a^{(2),i}_{k_0-j} \cdot a^{(2),i}_{k_0-j} \cdot z_{i_0}) \bigg| \chi(b_{k_0}^{(1)} (x[k] \setminus \{i_0\}) \cdot b_{k_0}^{(2),i} (x[k] \setminus \{i_0\})) \bigg|^2.
\]

where again \( z_{i_0} \) means that \( z_{i_0} \) appears if \( J \leq k - 2 \) and does not appear for \( J = k - 1 \).

With this notation, the right-hand-side of [17] becomes

\[
\sum_{i \in [l^{(1)}], j_0, j_1 \in [l^{(2)}]} c_{i_0}^{(1)} c_{j_0}^{(2),i} c_{j_1}^{(2),j} \chi(b_{k_0}^{(1)} (x[k] \setminus \{i_0\}) \cdot b_{k_0}^{(2),j} (x[k] \setminus \{i_0\})) F_{i,j_0,j_1} (b_{i_0}^{(1)} (x[k] \setminus \{i_0\})) = \sum_{i \in [l^{(1)}], j_0, j_1 \in [l^{(2)}]} c_{i_0}^{(1)} c_{j_0}^{(2),i} c_{j_1}^{(2),j} \chi(\tau_{i,j_0,j_1} (x[k] \setminus \{i_0\})) F_{i,j_0,j_1} (x[k] \setminus \{i_0\}) \bigg| \chi(b_{k_0}^{(1)} (x[k] \setminus \{i_0\}) \cdot b_{k_0}^{(2),j} (x[k] \setminus \{i_0\})) \bigg|^2.
\]

We now explicitly distinguish the cases \( J \in [k - 2] \) and \( J = k - 1 \). Suppose first that \( J = k - 1 \). In this case \( F_{i,j_0,j_1} \) does not depend on \( x[k] \) so we may simply write \( F_{i,j_0,j_1} \). Let \( \varepsilon_3 > 0 \) be a
constant to be specified later. For each \(i, j_0, j_1\) let \(R_{i,j_0,j_1} = \{r_{i,j_0,j_1} : \ldots, r_{n_{i,j_0,j_1}}\}\) be the set of Fourier coefficients such that \(|[F_{i,j_0,j_1}]^\wedge (r_{i,j_0,j_1})| \geq \varepsilon_3\). By Lemma 22, we have that \(n_{i,j_0,j_1} \leq \varepsilon_3^{-2}\). Hence,

\[
\chi \left( \tau_{i,j_0,j_1} (x[k]\{i_0\}) \right) \left[ F_{i,j_0,j_1} \right] \left( F_{i,j_0,j_1} \right) \leq \varepsilon_3^{L''(x[k]\{i_0\}) \chi \left( \tau_{i,j_0,j_1} (x[k]\{i_0\}) \right) \sum_{j_2 \in [n_{i,j_0,j_1}]} \left[ F_{i,j_0,j_1} \right] \left( r_{i,j_0,j_1}^{i,j_0,j_1} \right) \left( \rho_{i,j_0,j_1} (x[k]\{i_0\}) \right) = r_{i,j_0,j_1} \right)
\]

(20)

Let \(\varepsilon_4 > 0\). Apply Lemma 28 to \(x[k]\{i_0\} \in G[k]\{i_0\} : \rho_{i,j_0,j_1} (x[k]\{i_0\}) = r_{i,j_0,j_1}\) to find \(t_{i,j_0,j_1,j_2} \leq \log_p \varepsilon_4^{-1}\) and a multifinear map \(\gamma_{i,j_0,j_1,j_2} : G[k]\{i_0\} \to \mathbb{R}^{t_{i,j_0,j_1,j_2}}\) such that

\[
\{\rho_{i,j_0,j_1} = r_{i,j_0,j_1}\} \subseteq \{\gamma_{i,j_0,j_1,j_2} = 0\}
\]

and

\[
|\{\gamma_{i,j_0,j_1,j_2} = 0\} \setminus \{\rho_{i,j_0,j_1} = r_{i,j_0,j_1}\}| \leq \varepsilon_4 |G[k]\{i_0\}|.
\]

Going back to (20), we get

\[
\chi \left( \tau_{i,j_0,j_1} (x[k]\{i_0\}) \right) \left[ F_{i,j_0,j_1} \right] \left( F_{i,j_0,j_1} \right) \leq \varepsilon_3^{L''(x[k]\{i_0\}) \chi \left( \tau_{i,j_0,j_1} (x[k]\{i_0\}) \right) \sum_{j_2 \in [n_{i,j_0,j_1}]} \left[ F_{i,j_0,j_1} \right] \left( r_{i,j_0,j_1}^{i,j_0,j_1} \right) \left( \gamma_{i,j_0,j_1,j_2} (x[k]\{i_0\}) = 0\right) \]

\[
= \sum_{j_2 \in [n_{i,j_0,j_1}]} \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{F}^{t_{i,j_0,j_1,j_2}}} p^{-t_{i,j_0,j_1,j_2}} \chi \left( \tau_{i,j_0,j_1} (x[k]\{i_0\}) \right) \left[ F_{i,j_0,j_1} \right] \left( r_{i,j_0,j_1}^{i,j_0,j_1} \right) \chi \left( \nu \cdot \gamma_{i,j_0,j_1,j_2} (x[k]\{i_0\}) \right).
\]

Combine this with (17) and (19) to get

\[
[C_{i_0-1;f} x[k]\{i_0\}] \left( \mu (x[k]\{i_0\}) \right) \leq \varepsilon' \sum_{i_0 \in [l(1)]} C_{i_0}^{(1)} \epsilon_{j_0}^{(2,i_0)} C_{j_0}^{(2,i)} \epsilon_{j_0}^{(2,i)} p^{-t_{i,j_0,j_1,j_2}} \left[ F_{i,j_0,j_1} \right] \left( r_{i,j_0,j_1}^{i,j_0,j_1} \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{i_0 \in [l(1)]} C_{i_0}^{(1)} \epsilon_{j_0}^{(2,i_0)} C_{j_0}^{(2,i)} \epsilon_{j_0}^{(2,i)} p^{-t_{i,j_0,j_1,j_2}} \left[ F_{i,j_0,j_1} \right] \left( r_{i,j_0,j_1}^{i,j_0,j_1} \right)
\]

\[
\chi \left( \tau_{i,j_0,j_1} (x[k]\{i_0\}) \right) + \nu \cdot \gamma_{i,j_0,j_1,j_2} (x[k]\{i_0\}),
\]

where

\[
\varepsilon' = \varepsilon_1 + \frac{l(1)}{4} \varepsilon_2 + \sum_{i_0 \in [l(1)]} \left( \varepsilon_4 \sum_{j_0,j_1 \in [l(2,i)]} \varepsilon_4 \right).
\]

Choose \(\varepsilon_1 = \frac{\varepsilon_3}{4}, \varepsilon_2 = \frac{\varepsilon_1}{4}, \varepsilon_3 = \frac{\varepsilon_1}{4}, \varepsilon_4 = \frac{\varepsilon_3}{4}\) to finish the proof. The number of summands in the approximation above is at most

\[
\exp \left( K_{k,r} + D_{k-1}^{\text{inh}} + 2 \right) \left( O(\varepsilon - O(q)) \right) \leq \exp \left( K_{k,r+1} \right) \left( O(\varepsilon - O(q)) \right)
\]

as claimed.
Now assume that $J \in [k - 2]$. We claim that the large Fourier coefficients of $F_{x[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\}}$ depend multilinearly on $x[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\}$. The proof is similar to that of Lemma [4].

**Multilinearity claim.** Let $S \subset G[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\}$ be a set of density $\delta$ and let $\sigma : S \to G_{i_0}$ be a map such that

$$\left| \left[ F_{x[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\}} \right]^{(\sigma(x[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\}))} \right| \geq \xi$$

for every $x[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\} \in S$. Let $d \in [k] \setminus \{i_0 - J, i_0\}$. Then $\sigma$ respects at least $\delta^4 \xi^8 |G_d|^2 |G[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\}|$ $d$-additive quadruples whose points lie in $S$.

**Proof of multilinearity claim.** We have

$$\delta^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_{x[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\}} S(x[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\}) \left| \left[ F_{x[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\}} \right]^{(\sigma(x[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\}))} \right|^2$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{x[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\}} S(x[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\}) \mathbb{E}_{a_{i_0}} \chi(-\sigma(x[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\}) \cdot a_{i_0})$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{a_{i_0}^{(0,1)} a_{i_0}^{(1,2)} a_{i_0}^{(1,3)}} \left( \prod_{e \in \{0,1\}^J} \chi(\alpha_{e}^{(3,1)}(x[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\]; a_{i_0}^e - J, \ldots, a_{i_0}^{e_{i_0-1} - 1} + a_{i_0}^{e_{i_0}}))^2 \right) \right|^2.$$ 

Again, expanding out the outer square of this expression produces two copies of each $a_{i_0}^{j+1}$, which we denote by $a_{i_0}^{j+1}$. Index the first copy by $a_{i_0}^{j+1}(1)_{i_0}$ and the second by $a_{i_0}^{j+1}(2)_{i_0}$. Then the right-hand-side becomes

$$\mathbb{E}_{x[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\}} S(x[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\}) \mathbb{E}_{a_{i_0}} \chi(-\sigma(x[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\}) \cdot (a_{i_0}^1 - a_{i_0}^0)$$

$$+ \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}_{j+1}} (-1)^{e_1} \alpha_{e}^{(3,1)}(x[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\]; a_{i_0}^e - J, \ldots, a_{i_0}^{e_{i_0-1} - 1} + a_{i_0}^{e_{i_0}}))$$

$$\prod_{e \in \{0,1\}_{j+1}} \left| \left[ F_{x[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\}} \right]^{(\sigma(x[k]\{i_0-J,i_0\}))} \right|^2.$$ 

(21)

Before proceeding, we first deal the case $d = i_0 - J - 1$ separately. By the triangle inequality, we get

$$\delta^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_{x[k]\{i_0-J-1,i_0\}} S(x[k]\{i_0-J-1,i_0\}) \chi(-\sigma(x[k]\{i_0-J-1,i_0\}) \cdot (a_{i_0}^1 - a_{i_0}^0)$$

$$+ \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}_{j+1}} (-1)^{e_1} \alpha_{e}^{(3,1)}(x[k]\{i_0-J-1,i_0\]; a_{i_0}^e - J, \ldots, a_{i_0}^{e_{i_0-1} - 1} + a_{i_0}^{e_{i_0}}))$$

$$\prod_{e \in \{0,1\}_{j+1}} \left| \left[ F_{x[k]\{i_0-J-1,i_0\}} \right]^{(\sigma(x[k]\{i_0-J-1,i_0\}))} \right|^2.$$
By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we deduce that
\[
\delta^2 \xi^4 \leq \sum_{e \in \{0, 1\}^{J+1}} (-1)^e \alpha^{(3, i)}_e \left( (a^{e_0}_i, \ldots, a^{e_{|2|}}_{i+1}) \right)
\]
where the last equality arose from the change of variables \( u_{i_0} = J - y_{i_0} - 1 \).

Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality again to obtain
\[
\delta^4 \xi^8 \leq \sum_{e \in \{0, 1\}^{J+1}} (-1)^e \alpha^{(3, i)}_e \left( (a^{e_0}_i, \ldots, a^{e_{|2|}}_{i+1}) \right)
\]
where the last equality arose from the change of variables \( u_{i_0} = J - y_{i_0} - 1 \).
\[ \chi\left(\sigma(x[k]|i_0-J-1,i_0]; y_{i_0-J-1} - u_{i_0-J-1}) - \sigma(x[k]|i_0-J-1,i_0]; y_{i_0-J-1})\right) \cdot (a_{i_0}^1 - a_{i_0}^0) \]

\[ \chi\left(\sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^{J+1}} (-1)^{e_1} \alpha_e^{(3)} \chi(x[k]|i_0-J-1,i_0]; a_{i_0-J-1}^e, \ldots, a_{i_0-1}^e, a_{i_0}^e) \right) \]

\[ - \alpha_e^{(3)} \chi(x[k]|i_0-J-1,i_0]; a_{i_0-J-1}^e, \ldots, a_{i_0-1}^e, a_{i_0}^e) \right) \]

\[ \chi\left(\sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^{J+1}} (-1)^{e_1} \alpha_e^{(3)} \chi(x[k]|i_0-J-1,i_0]; a_{i_0-J-1}^e, \ldots, a_{i_0-1}^e, a_{i_0}^e) \right) \]

The \( \chi \) terms that have \( \alpha_e^{(3,i)} \) in their argument make no contribution since the \( \alpha_e^{(3,i)} \) are multiaffine maps and cancel out. Thus we end up with

\[ \delta^8 \chi \leq \mathbb{E}_{x[k]|i_0-J-1,i_0} \mathbb{E}_{x_{i_0-J-1}} \mathbb{E}_{y_{i_0-J-1}} S(x[k]|i_0-J-1,i_0); x_{i_0-J-1} - u_{i_0-J-1} \]

\[ S(x[k]|i_0-J-1,i_0); y_{i_0-J-1} - u_{i_0-J-1} \]

\[ \mathbb{I}\left(\sigma(x[k]|i_0-J-1,i_0]; y_{i_0-J-1} - u_{i_0-J-1} \right) \]

\[ - \sigma(x[k]|i_0-J-1,i_0]; y_{i_0-J-1} - u_{i_0-J-1} \right) = 0 \]

which is exactly the density of \( d \)-additive quadruples in \( S \) that are respected by \( \sigma \). This completes the proof of the multilinearity claim in the case \( d = i_0 - J - 1 \).

Now assume that \( d \neq i_0 - J - 1 \) and return to \([21]\). Write \( L \) for the smallest positive integer that satisfies \( k|L + d - 1 - i_0 \). As it turns out, the rest of the argument works only when \( L \geq J + 3 \), and this is reason we proved the case \( d = i_0 - J - 1 \) separately, since otherwise we would need a bound of the form \( s \geq k + J + 1 \) instead of just \( s \geq k + 1 \).

Expanding out the Fourier coefficients in the last line of \([21]\) produces additional variables \( a_{i_0-J-1}^{e,0}, a_{i_0-J-1}^{e,1} \) for each \( e \in \{0,1\}^{J+1} \) and we get

\[ \delta^8 \chi \leq \mathbb{E}_{x[k]|i_0-J-1,i_0} S(x[k]|i_0-J-1,i_0) \cdot (a_{i_0}^1 - a_{i_0}^0) \]

\[ \mathbb{E}_{a_{i_0-J-1}} \mathbb{E}_{a_{i_0-1}} \mathbb{E}_{a_{i_0}} \left( \chi\left(\sigma(x[k]|i_0-J-1,i_0); (a_{i_0}^1 - a_{i_0}^0) \right) \right) \]

\[ \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^{J+1}} (-1)^{e_1} \alpha_e^{(3)} \chi(x[k]|i_0-J-1,i_0]; a_{i_0-J-1}^e, \ldots, a_{i_0-1}^e, a_{i_0}^e) \right) \]

\[ \prod_{e \in \{0,1\}^{J+2}} \left( \text{Conv}^{e,J+2} C_{i_0-2-J-1-J} f(x[k]|i_0-J-1,i_0]; a_{i_0-J-1}^e, \ldots, a_{i_0-1}^e, a_{i_0}^e) \right) \]

\[ \chi\left(\left(\sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^{J+2}} (-1)^{e_{J+2}} \mu_{J+2} f(x[k]|i_0-J-1,i_0]; a_{i_0-J-1}^e, \ldots, a_{i_0-1}^e, a_{i_0}^e) \right) \right) \]

(Expanding out convolutions up to coordinate \( d \))
Add a new variable $t_d \in G_d$ and make the change of variables $b_d^e \mapsto b_d^e + t_d$ when $e_L = 1$. By the triangle inequality, we get
\[
\delta t^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_{t_d} \mathbb{E}_{x \in d} \left( S(x|k_{[i_0-J_0, i_0+J_0]}(d)) \chi \left( \sigma(x|k_{[i_0-J_0, i_0+J_0]}(d)) \cdot (a_{i_0}^0 - a_{i_0}^0) + \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^{J+1}} (-1)^e \alpha^{(3, i)}(x|k_{[i_0-J_0, i_0+J_0]}(d)) a_{i_0}^{e_{i_0} - J}, \ldots, a_{i_0}^{e_{i_0} - 1}, a_{i_0}^{e_1}) \right) \right) \]
\[
\left( \prod_{e \in \{0,1\}^{J+1} : e_L = 1} \text{Conj} \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^{J+2} \in \mathcal{C}_{d-1,s+1-L} f \left( [k|k_{[i_0-J_0, i_0+J_0]}(d)] = b_d^e - e_L x_d, \ldots, b_d^{e_{i_0} - J}, a_{i_0}^{e_{i_0} - J - 1}) \right) \right)
\]
\[
\text{Write}
\]
\[
p' = (a_{i_0}^{0,1}^2, \ldots, a_{i_0}^{0,1}^{J+2}, b_{i_0}^{0,1}^{J+3}, \ldots, b_d^{0,1}^L)
\]
and
\[
p = (x|k_{[i_0-J_0, i_0+J_0]}(d)), a_{i_0}^{0,1}, p') = (x|k_{[i_0-J_0, i_0+J_0]}(d))a_{i_0}^{0,1}, \ldots, a_{i_0}^{0,1}^{J+2}, b_{i_0}^{0,1}^{J+3}, \ldots, b_d^{0,1}^L).\]

For a fixed sequence $p$ define maps $U_p, V_p : G_d \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ by
\[
U_p(z_d) = S(x|k_{[i_0-J_0, i_0+J_0]}(d)) ; z_d) \chi \left( \sigma(x|k_{[i_0-J_0, i_0+J_0]}(d)) ; z_d) \cdot (a_{i_0}^1 - a_{i_0}^0) + \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^{J+1}} (-1)^e \alpha^{(3, i)}(x|k_{[i_0-J_0, i_0+J_0]}(d)) ; z_d) \right)
\]
\[
\left( \prod_{e \in \{0,1\}^{J+2} : e_L = 1} \text{Conj} \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^{J+2} \in \mathcal{C}_{d-1,s+1-L} f \left( [k|k_{[i_0-J_0, i_0+J_0]}(d)] = b_d^e - e_L x_d, \ldots, b_d^{e_{i_0} - J}, a_{i_0}^{e_{i_0} - J - 1}) \right) \right)
\]
and
\[
V_p(z_d) = \prod_{e \in \{0,1\}^{J+2} : e_L = 1} \text{Conj} \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^{J+2} \in \mathcal{C}_{d-1,s+1-L} f \left( [k|k_{[i_0-J_0, i_0+J_0]}(d)] = b_d^e - e_L x_d, \ldots, b_d^{e_{i_0} - J}, a_{i_0}^{e_{i_0} - J - 1}) \right) \right)
\]
Recall that

\[
\xi(0) = \left( e^{[j+3]} - e^{[j+2]} a_{i_0}^{[j-1]} - \ldots - a_{i_0}^{[2]} a_{i_0}^{[1]} \right).
\]

Expression (22) simplifies to

\[
\delta \xi^2 \leq E \left( \mathbb{E}_{p} \left| U_p(x_d) V_p(x_d + t_d) \right| \right).
\]

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma 13

\[
\delta^2 \xi^2 \leq E \left( \mathbb{E}_{p} \left| U_p(x_d) V_p(x_d + t_d) \right| \right)^2 \leq E \sum_p \left| U_p(r) \right|^4.
\]

(24)

Recall that \( p = (x[k] \setminus ([i_0, \ldots, i_0] \cup \{d\}), a_{i_0}^{(0,1)}, p') \) where \( p' \) is defined in (23). Note that \( U_p \) can be written as

\[
U_p(z_d) = S(x[k] \setminus ([i_0, \ldots, i_0] \cup \{d\}); z_d) \chi(\beta_{p'}^{(0)}(x[k] \setminus ([i_0, \ldots, i_0] \cup \{d\}); z_d, a_{i_0}^{0}) + \beta_{p'}^{(1)}(x[k] \setminus ([i_0, \ldots, i_0] \cup \{d\}); z_d, a_{i_0}^{1})
\]

\[
+ \sigma(x[k] \setminus ([i_0, \ldots, i_0] \cup \{d\}); z_d) \cdot (a_{i_0}^1 - a_{i_0}^0)
\]

where \( \beta_{p'}^{(0)}, \beta_{p'}^{(1)} : G_{[k] \setminus ([i_0, \ldots, i_0] \cup \{d\})} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p \) are suitable multiaffine maps. From (24) we obtain

\[
\delta^2 \xi^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_{p} \sum_{r_d} \left| \tilde{U}_p(r_d) \right|^4
\]

\[
= \mathbb{E}_{p'} \mathbb{E}_{x[k] \setminus ([i_0, \ldots, i_0] \cup \{d\}); a_{i_0}^{(0,1)}, z_d} \left( \prod_{j \in [4]} S(x[k] \setminus ([i_0, \ldots, i_0] \cup \{d\}); z_d^j) \right)
\]

\[
\chi\left( \sum_{j \in [4]} \left( -1 \right)^j \beta_{p'}^{(0)}(x[k] \setminus ([i_0, \ldots, i_0] \cup \{d\}); z_d^j, a_{i_0}^{0}) + \left( -1 \right)^j \beta_{p'}^{(1)}(x[k] \setminus ([i_0, \ldots, i_0] \cup \{d\}); z_d^j, a_{i_0}^{1})
\]

\[
\chi\left( \sum_{j \in [4]} \left( -1 \right)^j \sigma(x[k] \setminus ([i_0, \ldots, i_0] \cup \{d\}); z_d^j) \cdot (a_{i_0}^1 - a_{i_0}^0) \right) \cdot \left( \sum_{j \in [4]} \left( 1 \right)^j \chi \left( \tilde{U}_p(r_d) \right) \left| \tilde{U}_p(r_d) \right|^4
\]

\[
= \mathbb{E}_{x[k] \setminus ([i_0, \ldots, i_0] \cup \{d\}); a_{i_0}^{(0,1)}, z_d} \left( \prod_{j \in [4]} S(x[k] \setminus ([i_0, \ldots, i_0] \cup \{d\}); z_d^j) \right)
\]

\[
\chi\left( \sum_{j \in [4]} \left( -1 \right)^j \sigma(x[k] \setminus ([i_0, \ldots, i_0] \cup \{d\}); z_d^j) \cdot (a_{i_0}^1 - a_{i_0}^0) \right) \cdot \left( \sum_{j \in [4]} \left( 1 \right)^j \chi \left( \tilde{U}_p(r_d) \right) \left| \tilde{U}_p(r_d) \right|^4
\]

(24)
This is exactly the density of those $d$-additive quadruples in $S$ that are respected by $\sigma$, which completes the proof of the multilinearity claim.

In a similar way to what we did in the proof of Corollary 17, we use the multilinearity claim to deduce the following further claim.

Claim. Let $\varepsilon_3, \xi > 0$ be given. Then, there exist

- a positive integer $l^{(3)} = \exp(D_{\text{mph}}^{(3)}) \left( \exp \left( O((\log(\varepsilon_3^{-1} \xi^{-1}))(1)) \right) \right)$,
- multiaffine maps $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_{l^{(3)}} : G_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]} \to G_{i_0}$, and
- a set $S \subseteq G_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]}$ of size $|S| \geq (1 - \varepsilon_3)|G_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]}|

such that $r_{i_0} \in \{ \sigma_j(x_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]}) : 1 \leq j \leq l^{(3)} \}$ for every $x_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]} \in S$ and every $r_{i_0} \in G_{i_0}$ such that $\left| F_{x_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]}}(r_{i_0}) \right| \geq \xi$.

Proof of claim. We iteratively find maps $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_j$. At the $j^{\text{th}}$ step, assuming that $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_{j-1}$ have been found, we select those large Fourier coefficients that have not yet been covered by these maps. If there are at most $\varepsilon_3|G_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]}|$ points $x_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]}$ whose $\xi$-large Fourier coefficients of $F_{x_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]}}^{i_0,j_0,j_1}$ are not all covered, the procedure terminates. Otherwise, we may therefore find a set $S \subseteq G_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]}$ of density at least $\varepsilon_3$, and a map $\sigma : S \to G_{i_0}$ such that $\left| F_{x_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]}}^{i_0,j_0,j_1}(r_{i_0}) \right| \geq \xi$ for every $x_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]} \in S$.

Apply the multilinearity claim and Corollary 27 for each direction in $[k] \setminus [i_0 - J, i_0]$ to $\sigma$, as in the proof of Corollary 17, to find a subset $S' \subset S$ of size $\exp \left( - \log(\varepsilon_3^{-1} \xi^{-1})O(1) \right)|G_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]}|$ such that $\sigma$ is a multi-homomorphism on $S'$. Now apply Theorem 3 to $S'$ and $\sigma$ to find a global multiaffine map $\sigma_j : G_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]} \to G_{i_0}$ such that $\sigma_j(x_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]}) = \sigma(x_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]})$ for

$$\exp(D_{\text{mph}}^{(3)}) \left( \exp \left( O((\log(\varepsilon_3^{-1} \xi^{-1}))(1)) \right) \right)^{-1}|G_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]}|$$

of the points $x_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]} \in G_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]}$. From this and Lemma 12, we see that the procedure terminates after $l^{(3)} = \xi^{-2} \exp(D_{\text{mph}}^{(3)}) \left( \exp \left( O((\log(\varepsilon_3^{-1} \xi^{-1}))(1)) \right) \right)$ steps, as desired, and the claim is proved.

We now complete the proof of Proposition 49. Let $\varepsilon_3 > 0$. For each $i \in [l^{(1)}], j_0, j_1 \in [l^{(2,i)}]$, by the claim just proved there exist

$$l^{(3,i,j_0,j_1)} = \exp(D_{\text{mph}}^{(3)}) \left( \exp \left( O((\log(\varepsilon_3^{-1}))(1)) \right) \right),$$

multiaffine maps $\sigma_1^{(i,j_0,j_1)}, \ldots, \sigma_{l^{(3,i,j_0,j_1)}}^{(i,j_0,j_1)} : G_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]} \to G_{i_0}$ and a set $S^{(i,j_0,j_1)} \subset G_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]}$ of size $|S^{(i,j_0,j_1)}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon_3)|G_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]}|$ such that $r_{i_0} \in \{ \sigma_j^{(i,j_0,j_1)}(x_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]}) : j \in [l^{(3,i,j_0,j_1)}] \}$ for every $x_{[k]\setminus[i_0-J,i_0]} \in S^{(i,j_0,j_1)}$ and every $r_{i_0} \in G_{i_0}$ such that $\left| F_{x_{[k]\setminus[i_0-j_1]}}^{i_0,j_0,j_1}(r_{i_0}) \right| \geq \varepsilon_3$. 
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For each subset $\emptyset \neq I \subset [l^{(3, i, j_0, j_1)}]$ pick an element $\elt(I) \in I$. We get

$$\chi \left( \tau_{i, j_0, j_1} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right) \left[ F \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right] \chi \left( \tau_{i, j_0, j_1} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right) \left( \rho_{i, j_0, j_1} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right)
$$

$$= \chi \left( \tau_{i, j_0, j_1} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right) \left[ \frac{(-1)^{|I|+1}}{l^{(3, i, j_0, j_1)}} \right] \left( \sigma_{\elt(I)} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right)
$$

$$= \chi \left( \tau_{i, j_0, j_1} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right) \sum_{\emptyset \neq I \subset [l^{(3, i, j_0, j_1)}]} (-1)^{|I|+1} \left[ F \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right] \chi \left( \tau_{i, j_0, j_1} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right) \left( \sigma_{\elt(I)} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right)
$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$, and for each $i \in [l^{(1)}], j_0, j_1 \in [l^{(2, i)}], \emptyset \neq I \subset [l^{(3, i, j_0, j_1)}]$ apply Lemma 28 to find multi-affine maps $\gamma_{i, j_0, j_1} : G[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \to \mathbb{R}^{l^{(3, i, j_0, j_1)}},$ where $t_{i, j_0, j_1, I} \leq q \log p \varepsilon^{-1},$ such that

$$\left\{ x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \in G[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} : (\forall j_2 \in I) \rho_{i, j_0, j_1} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) = \sigma_{j_2} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right\} \subseteq \left\{ x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \in G[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} : \gamma_{i, j_0, j_1} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) = 0 \right\}
$$

and

$$\left| \left\{ x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \in G[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} : \gamma_{i, j_0, j_1} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) = 0 \right\} \right| \leq \varepsilon_i^2 \left| G[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right|.
$$

Then

$$\chi \left( \tau_{i, j_0, j_1} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right) \sum_{\emptyset \neq I \subset [l^{(3, i, j_0, j_1)}]} (-1)^{|I|+1} \left[ F \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right] \chi \left( \tau_{i, j_0, j_1} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right) \left( \sigma_{\elt(I)} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right)
$$

$$= \chi \left( \tau_{i, j_0, j_1} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right) \sum_{\emptyset \neq I \subset [l^{(3, i, j_0, j_1)}]} (-1)^{|I|+1} \left[ F \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right] \chi \left( \tau_{i, j_0, j_1} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right) \left( \sigma_{\elt(I)} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right)
$$

$$\approx_{l^{(3, i, j_0, j_1)}} \varepsilon_i \left[ x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right] \chi \left( \tau_{i, j_0, j_1} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right) \sum_{\emptyset \neq I \subset [l^{(3, i, j_0, j_1)}]} (-1)^{|I|+1} \left[ F \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right] \chi \left( \tau_{i, j_0, j_1} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right) \left( \sigma_{\elt(I)} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right)
$$

Combining (7), (3), (25) and (26), and writing

$$\varepsilon' = \varepsilon_1 + l^{(1)} \varepsilon_2 + \sum_{i \in [l^{(1)}]} \left( 2\varepsilon_3 \right)^{1/4} + 2^{l^{(3, i, j_0, j_1)}} \varepsilon_4
$$

we get

$$\left[ C_{i_0-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right] \right] \chi \left( \mu \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right) \approx_{L^4, x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \}} \sum_{i \in [l^{(1)}]} \sum_{j_0, j_1 \in [l^{(2, i)}]} \chi \left( \tau_{i, j_0, j_1} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right) \left( \sigma_{\elt(I)} \left( x[k] \setminus \{i_0 \} \right) \right)
$$
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Proof of Theorem 44. We begin the proof by applying Proposition 48. It provides us with a positive integer \( l(1) = \exp(D_{k+1}^{mh} + D_{k+1}^{mh} + D_{k+1}^{mh} + 4) \left( O(\varepsilon^{-O(q)}) \right) = \exp(K_{k+1}^{mh} + 4) \left( O(\varepsilon^{-O(q)}) \right) \), which proves Proposition 48.

We are now ready to prove the main approximation result for mixed convolutions.

**Proof of Theorem 44.** We begin the proof by applying Proposition 48. It provides us with a positive integer \( l(1) = \exp(D_{k+1}^{mh} + D_{k+1}^{mh} + D_{k+1}^{mh} + 4) \left( O(\varepsilon^{-O(q)}) \right) = \exp(K_{k+1}^{mh} + 4) \left( O(\varepsilon^{-O(q)}) \right) \), which proves Proposition 48.

We are now ready to prove the main approximation result for mixed convolutions.
such that
\[ [C_{k-1} \ldots C_1 C_k \ldots C_1 f_{x[x_{k-1}]},^\wedge (\mu_i(x_{k-1}))]^{\epsilon_2} \approx L^{2q,x_{k-1}} \sum_{j \in [l^{(2,i)}]} c_j^{(2,i)} \chi (\lambda_j^{(2,i)}(x_{k-1})). \]

By Lemma 16, we get, provided \( \epsilon_2 \leq 1 \), for each \( i \in [l^{(1)}] \),
\[ c_i [C_{k-1} \ldots C_1 C_k \ldots C_1 f_{x[x_{k-1}]},^\wedge (\mu_i(x_{k-1}))]^{2} \chi (\lambda_i(x_{k})) \approx L^{q,x_{k}} \sum_{j \in [l^{(2,i)}]} c_j^{(2,i)} \chi (\lambda_j^{(2,i)}(x_{k-1}))^{2} \chi (\lambda_i(x_{k})). \]

Returning to (27), we get
\[
C_k \ldots C_1 C_k \ldots C_1 f(x_{k}) \approx L^{q,x_{k}} \sum_{i \in [l^{(1)}]} c_i [C_{k-1} \ldots C_1 C_k \ldots C_1 f_{x[x_{k-1}]},^\wedge (\mu_i(x_{k-1}))]^{2} \chi (\lambda_i(x_{k}))
\]
\[
\epsilon/2 \approx L^{q,x_{k}} \sum_{i \in [l^{(1)}]} c_i \sum_{j \in [l^{(2,i)}]} c_j^{(2,i)} \chi (\lambda_j^{(2,i)}(x_{k-1}))^{2} \chi (\lambda_i(x_{k}))
\]
\[
= \sum_{i \in [l^{(1)}]} c_i c_j^{(2,i)} c_{j_2}^{(2,i)} \chi (\lambda_j^{(2,i)}(x_{k-1}) - \lambda_j^{(2,i)}(x_{k-1}) + \lambda_i(x_{k})).
\]

Taking \( \epsilon_2 = \min\{1, \epsilon/(6l^{(1)})\} \), we obtain the desired approximation and the number of summands is
\[ \exp((2k+1)(D_{p_{k-1}}^{th}+2)) \left(O(\varepsilon^{-O(q)})\right). \]

\[ \blacksquare \]

4.3. Further Convolutions

We now show that, as one would expect, further convolutions can only help with the approximation.

Theorem 50. Let \( f : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{D}, \) let \( d_1, \ldots, d_r \in [k] \) be directions, let \( q \geq 1 \) and let \( \varepsilon > 0 \). Then there exist

- a positive integer \( l = \left( \exp((2k+1)(D_{p_{k-1}}^{th}+2)) \left(O(\varepsilon^{-O(q)})\right) \right)^{2O(q)}q^{O(r)} \),
- constants \( c_1, \ldots, c_l \in \mathbb{D} \), and
- multiaffine forms \( \phi_1, \ldots, \phi_l : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}_p \)

such that
\[
C_{d_r} \ldots C_{d_1} C_k \ldots C_1 f \approx L^{q} \sum_{i \in [l]} c_i \chi \circ \phi_i.
\]
Write ε/2 \approx L^{2^q} to find \( f^{(0)}(x) = \exp\left( (2k+1)(D^m_{k-1}+2) \right) \left( O\left( \varepsilon^{-O(2^r q)} \right) \right), \) constants \( c_1^{(0)}, \ldots, c_l^{(0)} \in \mathbb{D}, \) and multi-affine forms \( \phi_1^{(0)}, \ldots, \phi_l^{(0)} : G[k] \to \mathbb{F}_p \) such that

\[ C_k \ldots C_1 C_k \ldots C_1 f \approx L^{2^r q} \sum_{i \in [2^r q]} c_i^{(0)} \chi \circ \phi_i^{(0)}. \]

Write \( \varepsilon_s = \frac{\varepsilon}{2^s \varepsilon}. \) By induction on \( s \in [0,r], \) we now show that there exist a positive integer \( l^{(s)} = (r\varepsilon^{-1} f^{(0)}) 2^{O(r \varepsilon^{O(s)})}, \) constants \( c_1^{(s)}, \ldots, c_l^{(s)} \in \mathbb{D}, \) and multi-affine forms \( \phi_1^{(s)}, \ldots, \phi_l^{(s)} : G[k] \to \mathbb{F}_p \) such that

\[ C_{d_s} \ldots C_{d_1} C_k \ldots C_1 C_k \ldots C_1 f \approx L^{2^r q} \sum_{i \in [l^{(s)}]} c_i^{(s)} \chi \circ \phi_i^{(s)}. \]

The base case is already proved. Suppose that the claim holds for some \( s \in [0,r-1]. \) Let \( g(x) = \sum_{i \in [l^{(s)}]} c_i^{(s)} (\phi_i^{(s)}(x)). \) Apply Lemma 57 to obtain that

\[ C_{d_{s+1}} \ldots C_{d_1} C_k \ldots C_1 C_k \ldots C_1 f \approx L^{2^r q} C_{d_{s+1}} g. \]

By Proposition 33, there exist a positive integer \( l^{(s+1)} = O\left( (r^{1-\varepsilon} f^{(s)}) 2^{O(r \varepsilon^{O(s)})} \right), \) constants \( c_1^{(s+1)}, \ldots, c_l^{(s+1)} \in \mathbb{D}, \) and multi-affine forms \( \phi_1^{(s+1)}, \ldots, \phi_l^{(s+1)} : G[k] \to \mathbb{F}_p \) such that

\[ C_{d_{s+1}} g \approx L^{2^r q} \sum_{i \in [l^{(s+1)}]} c_i^{(s+1)} \chi \circ \phi_i^{(s+1)}. \]

The claim follows after an application of the triangle inequality for the \( L^{2^r q} \) norm. \( \square \)

\section{The Existence of Respected Arrangements}

We now give a formal definition of an arrangement of points in \( G[k]. \) We begin by defining an \( \emptyset \)-arrangement of lengths \( l[k] \in G[k] \) to be a sequence of length 1 that consists of the single term \( l[k]. \) Then, given a sequence \( d_1, \ldots, d_r, \) of elements of \( [k], \) a \( (d_r, d_{r-1}, \ldots, d_1) \)-arrangement of lengths \( l[k] \in G[k] \) is a sequence \( (q_1, q_2) \) of length \( 2^r \) obtained by concatenating two \( (d_{r-1}, \ldots, d_1) \)-arrangements \( q_1 \) and \( q_2 \) (for \( r = 1, q_1 \) and \( q_2 \) are \( \emptyset \)-arrangements), where \( q_1 \) has lengths \( (l[d_{r-1}+1], l_{d_r}+y, l_{d_r+1,k}] \) and \( q_2 \) has lengths \( (l_{d_r-1}, y, l_{d_r+1,k}] \) for some \( y \in G[d_r]. \)

If additionally we are given a map \( \phi \) and an arrangement \( q \) whose points lie in \( \text{dom} \phi, \) we define \( \phi(q) \) recursively as \( \phi(l[k]) \) if \( q \) is an \( \emptyset \)-arrangement, and \( \phi(q) = \phi(q_1) \cdot \phi(q_2) \) if \( q \) is the concatenation of \( q_1 \) and \( q_2 \) as above. The main result of this section is the following theorem. Recall that a multi-\( k \)-homomorphism is a function that restricts to a Freiman homomorphism of order \( k \) whenever all but one of the coordinates are fixed (so what we have been calling a multi-homomorphism is a multi-2-homomorphism).
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Theorem 51. Let $A \subset G_{[k]}$ be a set of density $\delta$, and let $\phi : A \rightarrow H$ be a multi-$2^{3k}$-homomorphism. Then there are

- a set $B \subset G_{[k]}$ of density $\Omega(\delta O(1))$, and
- a map $\psi : B \rightarrow H$,

such that for each $l_{[k]} \in B$ there are $\Omega(\delta O(1)|G_{[k]}|^{2^{3k}-1})$ $k$-tuples $(q^{(1)}, \ldots, q^{(k)})$ with the property that $q^{(i)}$ is an $(i-1, i-2, \ldots, 1, k, \ldots, 1, k, \ldots, 1, i)$-arrangement\footnote{There are $3k$ directions in the description of the arrangement.} of lengths $l_{[k]}$ whose points lie inside $A$ and $\phi(q^{(i)}) = \psi(l_{[k]})$.

For this proof, we also need a more structured version of arrangements. To this end, we define a grid $\Gamma$ to be a product $X_1 \times \ldots \times X_k$, where each $X_i = \{x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, \ldots, x_{i,n_i}\}$ is a tuple in $G_i$. Thus, a grid $\Gamma$ consists of $r_1 \cdots r_k$ points, each of the form $\Gamma_{[k]} = (x_{i,j_1}, \ldots, x_{k,j_k})$, where $j_i \in [r_i]$ (the indexing in $\Gamma$ is inherited from indexing in each $X_i$). We shall consider only grids such that the cardinality of each $X_i$ is a power of 2. We define the $d$-halves of a grid $\Gamma$ to be the pair of grids $X_{[d-1]} \times Y \times X_{[d+1,k]}$ and $X_{[d-1]} \times Z \times X_{[d+1,k]}$, where $Y$ is the tuple consisting of the first $r_d/2$ elements of $X_d$ and $Z$ is the tuple of the last $r_d/2$ elements of $X_d$. The lengths of a grid are given by a sequence $l_{[k]}$ that is defined recursively for each $d \in [k]$ by $l_d = l(X_d) = l(Y_d) - L(Z_d)$, where $Y_d$ is the first half of the tuple $X_d$ and $Z_d$ is the second half, provided $|X_d| \geq 2$. If $|X_d| = 1$, we take $l_d$ to be the single element in $X_d$. (Thus, $l_d$ is a $\pm 1$-combination of the elements of $X_d$, and the signs are given by the Morse sequence.)

Now let $A \subset G_{[k]}$ be a subset of density $\delta$, and fix some directions $d_{[r]}$ and constants $\eta_{[r]}$. For each $i \in [r]$, let $s^j_{[k]}$ be the sequence of quantities $s^j_i = 2^{\left|\{j' \in [i] : d_{j'} = j\}\right|}$ for $j \in [k]$. We say that a grid $\Gamma = X_{[k]}$ is $i$-adequate if $|X_j| = s^j_i$ for all $j \in [k]$ and all points of the grid lie in $A$. We now recursively define objects that we call $(d_{[i]}, \eta_{[i]})$-candidate grids and $(d_{[i]}, \eta_{[i]})$-good grids with respect to $A$. First, each point (or more precisely singleton grid) that lies in $A$ is $(\emptyset, \emptyset)$-good. Next, a grid $\Gamma = X_{[k]}$ is a $(d_{[i]}, \eta_{[i]})$-candidate if it is $i$-adequate and both its $d_i$-halves are $(d_{[i-j]}, \eta_{[i-j]})$-good. Secondly, $\Gamma = X_{[k]}$ is $(d_{[i]}, \eta_{[i]})$-good, if it is a $(d_{[i]}, \eta_{[i]})$-candidate and the number of $(d_{[i]}, \eta_{[i]})$-candidate grids of the form $X_{[d_i-1]} \times Y \times X_{[d_i+1,k]}$ with $l(Y) = l(X_{d_i})$ is at least $\eta_{[G_{d_i}]}|X_{d_i}|^{-1}$.

Lemma 52. The number of $i$-adequate grids is at least $\delta^2 \prod_{j \in [k]} |G_j|^{s^j_i}$.

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on $i$. For $i = 0$, the claim is trivial. Suppose the claim holds for some $i \geq 0$. Let $n_{X_{[k] \setminus (d_i)}}$ be the number of $(i - 1)$-adequate grids of the form $X_1 \times \ldots \times X_{d_i-1} \times Y_{d_i} \times X_{d_i+1} \times \ldots \times X_k$ for a suitable tuple $Y_{d_i}$ in $G_{d_i}$. By the induction hypothesis,

$$\sum_{X_{[k] \setminus (d_i)}} n_{X_{[k] \setminus (d_i)}} \geq \delta^{2^{i-1}} \prod_{j \in [k]} |G_j|^{s^j_{i-1}}.$$  

where $X_j$ in the sum ranges over all $s^j_{i-1}$-tuples in $G_j$. We are interested in the quantity

$$\sum_{X_{[k] \setminus (d_i)}} n_{X_{[k] \setminus (d_i)}}^2.$$  
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The desired bound follows from Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. \hfill \Box

**Lemma 53.** Suppose that the numbers \( \eta[r] \) satisfy that \( \eta_{i+1} \geq 8\eta_i \). Then the number of \( i \)-adequate grids \( \Gamma = X[k] \) that are not \( (d[i], \eta[i]) \)-good is at most \( 2\eta_i \prod_{j \in [k]} |G_j|^{s[j]} \).

**Proof.** We prove the claim by induction on \( i \). Since all points in \( A \) are \( (\emptyset, \emptyset) \)-good, the base case (that is, the case \( i = 0 \)) trivially holds. Assume that the claim holds for some \( i-1 \), so the number of \( i \)-adequate grids that are not \( (d[i], \eta[i]) \)-candidates is at most \( 4\eta_{i-1} \prod_{j \in [k]} |G_j|^{s[j]} \). To count \( i \)-adequate grids that are \( (d[i], \eta[i]) \)-candidates but not \( (d[i], \eta[i]) \)-good, we set \( n_{X[k] \setminus \{d[i]\}; l} \) to be the number of \( i \)-adequate grids of the form \( X_1 \times \ldots \times X_{d_i-1} \times Y_{d_i} \times X_{d_i+1} \times \ldots \times X_k \) such that \( l(Y_{d_i}) = l \). We prove the claim by induction on \( i \). For \( i \) trivially holds. Assume that the claim holds for some \( i \). The proof is now complete. \hfill \Box

For a map \( \phi : A \to H \) and a grid \( \Gamma = X_1 \times \ldots \times X_k \) with points that lie in \( A \), we define \( \phi(\Gamma) \) recursively as follows. If \( Y_d \) and \( Z_d \) are the first and second half of \( X_d \), then \( \phi(\Gamma) = \phi(X_1 \times \ldots \times X_{d-1} \times Y_d \times X_{d+1} \times \ldots \times X_k) - \phi(X_1 \times \ldots \times X_{d-1} \times Z_d \times X_{d+1} \times \ldots \times X_k) \). If \( \Gamma = \{ x[k] \} \) is a singleton, then \( \phi(\Gamma) = \phi(x[k]) \). Note that \( \phi(\Gamma) \) is well-defined. To see this, write \( |e| \) for the number of ones in a binary sequence \( e \). Enumerate each tuple \( X_i \) of size \( 2^n \) using binary sequences \( e \in \{0,1\}^{n_i} \), ordered by \( \sum_{j \in [n_i]} e_j 2^j \). Thus \( X_i = (x_i,e)_{e \in \{0,1\}^{n_i}} \). Then \( \phi(\Gamma) \) becomes

\[
\phi(\Gamma) = \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^{n_1} \ldots e_k \in \{0,1\}^{n_k}} (-1)^{|e^1| + \ldots + |e^k|} \phi(x_1,e^1, \ldots , x_k,e^k),
\]
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which is independent of the choice of the order of directions in computing the value.

The relevance of \( (d_{[i]}, \eta_{[i]}) \)-candidates and \( (d_{[i]}, \eta_{[i]}) \)-good grids stems from the following fact.

**Lemma 54.** Let \( i \geq 0 \), let \( \mathcal{G}_i \) be the set of \( (d_{[i]}, \eta_{[i]}) \)-good grids, and let \( \phi : A \rightarrow H \) be a multi-2i-homomorphism. Then for each \( \Gamma \in \mathcal{G}_i \) there is a set \( \mathcal{A}_\Gamma^i \) of \( (d_{[i]}) \)-arrangements whose points lie in \( A \) and whose lengths are the same as those of \( \Gamma \), such that

\[ |\mathcal{A}_\Gamma^i| \geq \prod_{j \in [i]} (\eta_j |G_{d_j}|)^{2^{i-j}}, \]

and

\[ \phi(q) = \phi(\Gamma) \quad \text{for every } q \in \mathcal{A}_\Gamma^i. \]

**Proof.** For \( i = 0 \), \( \Gamma \) is a single point and we simply set \( \mathcal{A}_\Gamma^0 = \{ \{ \} \} \). Now suppose that the claim holds for some \( i - 1 \geq 0 \). Let \( \Gamma = X_1 \times \ldots \times X_k \) be a \( (d_{[i]}, \eta_{[i]}) \)-good grid with lengths \( l_{[k]} \). We define \( \mathcal{A}_\Gamma^i \) as follows. First, let \( M_{d} \) be the set of \( m_{d_i} \in G_{d_i} \) such that there are tuples \( Y_{d_i}, Z_{d_i} \) in \( G_{d_i} \) with \( l(Y_{d_i}) = l_{d_i} + m_{d_i} \) and \( l(Z_{d_i}) = m_{d_i} \) and \( X_1 \times \ldots \times X_{d_i-1} \times Y_{d_i} \times X_{d_i+1} \times \ldots \times X_k \) and \( X_1 \times \ldots \times X_{d_i-1} \times Z_{d_i} \times X_{d_i+1} \times \ldots \times X_k \) are \( (d_{[i-1]}, \eta_{[i-1]}) \)-good. Write \( \Gamma_1(m_{d_i}), \Gamma_2(m_{d_i}) \) for the choice of such \( (d_{[i-1]}, \eta_{[i-1]}) \)-good grids for \( m_{d_i} \). Since \( \Gamma \) is \( (d_{[i]}, \eta_{[i]}) \)-good, we have \( |M_{d_i}| \geq \eta_i |G_{d_i}| \). Then define \( \mathcal{A}_\Gamma^i \) to be the set of all concatenations \( (q_1, q_2) \) where \( q_1 \in \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma_1}^{i-1}(m_{d_i}) \) and \( q_2 \in \mathcal{A}_{\Gamma_2}^{i-1}(m_{d_i}) \) for each \( m_{d_i} \in M_{d_i} \). It remains to check that this collection of sets satisfies the claimed properties.

**Property (i).** Note that if \( q = (q_1, q_2) \in \mathcal{A}_\Gamma^i \), then \( m_{d_i} \) is determined by the corresponding length of \( q_2 \), so each \( q \) comes from exactly one \( m_{d_i} \). By the inductive hypothesis, we have

\[ |\mathcal{A}_\Gamma^i| = \sum_{m_{d_i} \in M_{d_i}} |\mathcal{A}_{\Gamma_1}^{i-1}(m_{d_i})||\mathcal{A}_{\Gamma_2}^{i-1}(m_{d_i})| \geq \eta_i |G_{d_i}| \left( \prod_{j \in [i-1]} (\eta_j |G_{d_j}|)^{2^{i-1-j}} \right)^2 = \prod_{j \in [i]} (\eta_j |G_{d_j}|)^{2^{i-j}}. \]

**Property (ii).** Let \( q = (q_1, q_2) \in \mathcal{A}_\Gamma^i \). Then there are \( d_i \)-halves \( \Gamma_1 \) and \( \Gamma_2 \) of some \( \Gamma' = X_1 \times \ldots \times X_{d_i-1} \times Y_{d_i} \times X_{d_i+1} \times \ldots \times X_k \) where \( l(Y_{d_i}) = l(X_{d_i}) \). Since \( \phi \) is a 2i-homomorphism in direction \( d_i \), we have \( \phi(\Gamma) = \phi(\Gamma') \). By definition, \( \phi(\Gamma') = \phi(\Gamma_1) - \phi(\Gamma_2) \). By the inductive hypothesis and the definition of \( \phi \) on arrangements, we get that \( \phi(q) = \phi(q_1) - \phi(q_2) = \phi(\Gamma_1) - \phi(\Gamma_2) \), as required.

**Proof of Theorem 54.** Set \( \eta_i = \frac{8^i 2^{i+k}}{8^{i+k+1}} \). Let

\[ (d^i_{3k}, \ldots, d^i_1) = (i - 1, i - 2, \ldots, 1, k, \ldots, 1, k, \ldots, 1, k, \ldots, i). \]

Then, by Lemmas 52 and 53, the number of \( 8 \times \ldots \times 8 \) grids \( \Gamma \) that are \( (\eta_{[3k]}, d^i_{[3k]}) \)-good for all \( i \in [k] \) (the property of being \( i \)-adequate is the same for each \( i \in [k] \)) is at least \( \frac{2^{i+k}}{8} |G_{[k]}| \). Hence, there is a set \( B \subset G_{[k]} \) of density at least \( \frac{2^{i+k}}{8} \) such that for each \( l_{[k]} \) \in \( B \), there is a grid \( \Gamma \) of lengths \( l_{[k]} \) which is \( (\eta_{[3k]}, d^i_{[3k]}) \)-good for all \( i \in [k] \). Define \( \psi(l_{[k]}) = \phi(\Gamma) \) for such \( \Gamma \). Apply Lemma 54 to finish the proof.

**§6 Densification of Respected Tuples of Arrangements**
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In this section, we show that it is possible to pass to a subset where almost all arrangements of same length have the same \( \phi \) value.

**Theorem 55.** Let \( A \subseteq G_{[k]} \) be a set of density \( \delta \), and let \( \phi : A \to H \) be a multi-\( 2^{3k} \)-homomorphism. Assume that \( |G_i| \geq k^p(3^k+1)^{\delta - O(1)} \) for each \( i \in [k] \), and let \( \varepsilon > 0 \). For each subset \( A' \subseteq A \) let \( \mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}(A') \) be the set of all \( k \)-tuples \((q_1, \ldots, q_k)\) for which each \( q_i \) is an \((i,1],[k,1],[k,1],[k,i+1])\)-arrangement with points in \( A' \) and \( q_1, \ldots, q_k \) have the same lengths. Then there exists a subset \( A' \subseteq A \) such that

\[
|\{(q_1, \ldots, q_k) \in \mathcal{Q} : \phi(q_1) = \cdots = \phi(q_k)\}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|\mathcal{Q}| \geq (\delta \varepsilon)^{O(1)}|G_{[k]}|^{8k}.
\]

We say that \((q_1, \ldots, q_k)\) is generic if after omitting the first point\(^\dagger\) from each of \( q_2, \ldots, q_k \) the remaining \( k8^k - (k - 1) \) points are linearly independent as elements of \( G_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes G_k \). We also say that \((q_1, \ldots, q_k)\) is respected if \( \phi(q_1) = \cdots = \phi(q_k) \). Thus, the above theorem above claims that we can guarantee that there are several tuples of arrangements, and most of them are respected.

**Lemma 56.** The number of non-generic \((q_1, \ldots, q_k)\) is at most \( p^{k(8^k+1)} \left( \frac{1}{|G_1|} + \cdots + \frac{1}{|G_k|} \right)|G_{[k]}|^{8k} \).

Before we proceed with the proof, we explain how to parametrize \((i,1],[k,1],[k,1],[k,i+1])\)-arrangements. For fixed lengths \( l_{[k]} \) and parameters \( u^{i,1} \in G_i, u^{i,2} \in G_{i-1}, \ldots, u^{i,3k} \in G_{i+1}^{3k-1} \), we can define an \((i,1],[k,1],[k,1],[k,i+1])\)-arrangement with points \((x^{i,\varepsilon})_{\varepsilon \in \{0,1\}^{3k}}\) by

\[
x^{i,\varepsilon}_{i-j+1} = \varepsilon j + 2k \left( \varepsilon j + k (\varepsilon j_{i-j+1} + u^{i,j}_{i,j-k+1}) + u^{i,j+2k}_{i,j-k+1} \right) + u^{i,j}_{i,j-k+1}
\]

for \( j \in [k] \), where the arithmetic in the coordinate index is carried out modulo \( k \) and the points are ordered according to their image under the map \( \varepsilon \mapsto (1 - \varepsilon_1)2^{3k-1} + (1 - \varepsilon_2)2^{3k-2} + \cdots + (1 - \varepsilon_{3k}) \).

Thus, the first point is indexed by \((1,1,\ldots,1)\). The parameters \( u^{i,1}, \ldots, u^{i,3k} \) arise naturally out of the recursive definition of arrangements.

**Proof of Lemma 56.** Let \( \mathcal{I} = ([k] \times \{0,1\}^3)^k \setminus ([2,k] \times \{(1, \ldots, 1)\}) \). Write \( S_d \subseteq G_d \) for the multiset of parameters that belong to \( G_d \). That is, it consists of \( l_d \) and \( u^{i,j}_{i,j-k+1} \) for each \( i \in [k] \), each \( j \in [3k] \), and each \( \varepsilon \in \{0,1\}^{j-1} \) such that \( k|i+1 - j - d \). We claim that if the parameters in \( S_d \) are linearly independent for every \( d \in [k] \), then the points \((x^{i,\varepsilon})_{(i,\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{I}}\) are linearly independent in \( G_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes G_k \). Note that for each \( d \in [k] \), there are at most \( p^{k(8^k+1)} \) different linear combinations that can be satisfied by elements in \( S_d \). Thus, there are at most

\[
p^{k(8^k+1)} \left( \frac{1}{|G_1|} + \cdots + \frac{1}{|G_k|} \right)|G_{[k]}|^{8k}
\]

choices of parameters such that some \( S_d \) is not linearly independent.

Thus, assume the linear independence of each \( S_d \) and therefore that each \( S_d \) is a proper set instead of a multiset.

\(^\dagger\)Recall that an arrangement is a sequence, so has an indexing of points.
In what follows we shall write $u_{i}^{j} \mid \varepsilon \mid j-1$ even when $j \leq 0$, when we interpret it to be $l_{d}$, where $d \in [k]$ satisfies $k|1-j-d$. We now partition $I = I_{1} \cup \ldots \cup I_{3k+1}$ as follows. For $j \in [3k]$, set $I_{j} = \left\{ (i, (\varepsilon', 0, 1, \ldots, 1)) : i \in [k], \varepsilon' \in \{0, 1\}^{3k-j} \right\}$ (the zero is followed by $j-1$ ones) and $I_{3k+1} = \{(1, (1, 1, \ldots, 1))\}$. We prove that the given points are linearly independent by showing that the points $(x^{(j)}_{i})_{(i, \varepsilon) \in I_{1} \cup \ldots \cup I_{j}}$ are linearly independent for each $j$. But if we set $j' = 3k-j$ and take $r \in [0, k-1]$ such that $k|1-j+r$, this claim is immediate from the fact that

$$u^{i,j'-r-1}_{\varepsilon} \otimes \ldots \otimes u^{i,j'-k+1}_{\varepsilon} \otimes u^{i,j'}_{\varepsilon} \otimes u^{i,j'-k}_{\varepsilon} \otimes \ldots \otimes u^{i,j'-r}_{\varepsilon}$$

appears only in $x^{(j)}_{i}$ for $(i, \varepsilon) \in I_{j}$, and in no other point of index in $I_{1} \cup \ldots \cup I_{j}$ (we use $l_{1} \otimes \ldots \otimes l_{k}$ for $I_{3k+1}$). The listed tensor products of elements are independent in $G_{1} \otimes \ldots \otimes G_{k}$ since each $S_{d}$ is a linearly independent set.

**Proposition 57.** Suppose that $\pi : H \to \mathbb{F}^{t}$ and $\psi : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}^{t}$ are linear and multilinear maps chosen independently and uniformly at random. Suppose that $(q_{1}, \ldots, q_{k})$ is generic and that each $q_{i}$ has lengths $l_{[k]}$. Say that a point $x_{[k]}$ is kept if $\pi \circ \phi(x_{[k]}) = \psi(x_{[k]})$. Then

$$\mathbb{P}\left((q_{1}, \ldots, q_{k}) \text{ kept} \right) \begin{cases} p^{-t(k^{8k}-(k-1))} & \text{if } \phi(q_{1}) = \cdots = \phi(q_{k}), \\ \leq p^{-t(k^{8k}-(k-2))} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Proof.** Let us begin by fixing an arbitrary affine map $\pi : H \to \mathbb{F}^{t}$ and conditioning on that as the $\pi$ that is chosen. Let $x^{i}$ be the first point of $q_{i}$ for $i \in [2, k]$. Since the tuple of arrangements is generic, and multilinear maps on $G_{[k]}$ are linear on $G_{1} \otimes \ldots \otimes G_{k}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\forall x \in q_{1} \cup \ldots \cup q_{k} \setminus \{x^{2}, \ldots, x^{k}\} \mid \pi(\phi(x)) = \psi(x)\right) = p^{-t(k^{8k}-(k-1))}.$$  

Hence, for any choice of $\pi$

$$\mathbb{P}\left((q_{1}, \ldots, q_{k}) \text{ kept} \right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\left(\forall x \in q_{1} \cup \ldots \cup q_{k} \setminus \{x^{2}, \ldots, x^{k}\} \mid \pi(\phi(x)) = \psi(x)\right) \text{ and } \left(\forall i \in [2, k] \mid \pi(\phi(p^{i})) = \psi(l_{[k]})\right)\right)$$

(from the first part of the condition we have that $\pi(\phi(q_{1})) = \psi(l_{[k]})$)

$$= \mathbb{P}\left(\left(\forall x \in q_{1} \cup \ldots \cup q_{k} \setminus \{x^{2}, \ldots, x^{k}\} \mid \pi(\phi(x)) = \psi(x)\right) \text{ and } \left(\forall i \in [2, k] \mid \pi(\phi(q_{i})) = \pi(\phi(q_{1}))\right)\right)$$

$$= p^{-t(k^{8k}-(k-1))} \mathbb{1}(\pi(\phi(q^{1})) = \cdots = \pi(\phi(q^{k}))).$$

Now let us also take $\pi$ uniformly at random. Then by the above,

$$\mathbb{P}\left((q_{1}, \ldots, q_{k}) \text{ kept} \right) = p^{-t(k^{8k}-(k-1))}\mathbb{P}\left(\pi(\phi(q^{1})) = \cdots = \pi(\phi(q^{k}))\right).$$

The probability that $\pi(\phi(q^{1})) = \cdots = \pi(\phi(q^{k}))$ is 1 if the tuple is respected and at most $p^{-k}$ otherwise.

\[59\]
Proof of Theorem 55. Let $N$ be the number of $k$-tuples $(q_1, \ldots, q_k)$ such that $q_i$ is an $([i, 1], [k, 1], [k, 1], [k, i + 1])$-arrangement with points lying inside $A$ and $q_1, \ldots, q_k$ have the same lengths. Let $N_{\text{resp}}$ be the number of those $(q_1, \ldots, q_k)$ such that $\phi(q_1) = \cdots = \phi(q_k)$ and let $N_{\text{nongen}}$ be the number of those $(q_1, \ldots, q_k)$ that are not generic. By Lemma 53

$$N_{\text{nongen}} \leq p^{k(\delta k^2 + 1)} \left( \frac{1}{|G_1|} + \cdots + \frac{1}{|G_k|} \right) |G_k|^k.$$ 

We obtain the inequality

$$|G_k|^k \geq N \geq N_{\text{resp}} = \Omega(\delta^O(1)) |G_k|^k.$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)

Let $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $\pi : H \to \mathbb{F}^t$ and $\psi : G_k \to \mathbb{F}^t$ be linear and multilinear maps chosen independently and uniformly at random. Let $A' = \{x_k \in A : \pi(\phi(x_k)) = \psi(x_k)\}$ and, similarly to the above, let $N'$ be the number of tuples $(q_1, \ldots, q_k)$ such that $q_i$ is an $([i, 1], [k, 1], [k, 1], [k, i + 1])$-arrangement with points lying inside $A'$ and $q_1, \ldots, q_k$ have the same lengths, and let $N'_{\text{resp}}$ be the number of such tuples for which $\phi(q_1) = \cdots = \phi(q_k)$. By Proposition 57 and inequality (29), we see that

$$\mathbb{E} N'_{\text{resp}} - \varepsilon^{-1}(N' - N'_{\text{resp}}) \geq p^{t((k-1)-k\delta_k)} (N'_{\text{resp}} - N_{\text{nongen}}) - \varepsilon^{-1} p^{t((k-2)-k\delta_k)} |G_k|^k$$

$$\geq p^{t((k-1)-k\delta_k)} \delta^O(1) \left( 1 - p^{-t\delta-O(1)} \varepsilon^{-1} \right) |G_k|^k,$$

provided that $|G_i| \geq kp^{k(\delta k + 1)} \delta^{-O(1)}$ for each $i \in [k]$. Pick $t = O(\log \delta^{-1} + \log \varepsilon^{-1})$ such that $p^{-t\delta-O(1)} \varepsilon^{-1} \leq 1/2$. Then there is a choice of $A'$ such that $N'_{\text{resp}} \geq (1-\varepsilon)N'$ and $N'_{\text{resp}} = \delta^O(1) \varepsilon^O(1) |G_k|^k$, as claimed.

\section{Obtaining a nearly multi-affine piece}

The goal of this section is to obtain a highly structured set of lengths $L$ on which the map $\psi$ given by common $\phi$-values of arrangements (as in Theorem 53) is actually multi-affine, in the sense that for each line in one of the $k$ directions there is a global affine map that coincides with $\psi$ on the intersection with $L$. The structure we are after is given by subsets of density $1 - o(1)$ inside varieties of bounded codimension. The main result will be obtained by applying the following proposition in each direction.

Proposition 58. Let $A \subset G_k$ be a set of density $\delta$ and let $\phi : A \to H$. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 0.1^{-4})$ be given. Let $Q$ be the set of all $(q_1, \ldots, q_k)$ such that $q_i$ is a $([i, 1], [k, 1], [k, 1], [k, i + 1])$-arrangement with points in $A$ and $q_1, \ldots, q_k$ have the same lengths. Write $Q_{x_k}$ for the set of $(q_1, \ldots, q_k) \in Q$ such that each $q_i$ has lengths $x_k$. Let $X \subset G_k$ be a subset such that for each $x_k \in X$, there is a value $\psi(x_k) \in H$ such that

$$\left| \left\{ (q_1, \ldots, q_k) \in Q_{x_k} : \phi(q_1) = \cdots = \phi(q_k) = \psi(x_k) \right\} \right| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|Q_{x_k}|,$$

and

$$\sum_{x_k \in X} |Q_{x_k}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|Q|.$$
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Let \(d \in [k]\) be a direction. Then there exist a positive integer \(t = \exp\left(\frac{(2k+1)(D_{\text{max}}+2)}{2}\right)\) (in the sense that for each \(x[k] \in G[k]\) there is an affine map \(\rho : G[k] \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^t\), and a collection of disjoint sets \((S^\lambda)_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^t}\) such that \(S^\lambda \subset \{x[k] \in G[k] : \alpha(x[k]) = \lambda \}\), and \(\psi\) is multiaffine (in the sense that for each \(x[k] \in G[k]\) there is an affine map \(\rho : G[k] \rightarrow H\) such that \(\rho(yd) = \psi(yd)\) for all \(yd \in S^\lambda_{x[k]\setminus\{d\}}\)), and

\[
\sum_{x[k] \in \cup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^t} S^\lambda} |Q_{x[k]}| = \left(1 - O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})\right)|Q|.
\]

The main result of this section follows easily from the proposition above, by applying it to each direction \(d \in [k]\).

**Theorem 59.** Suppose that the assumptions of Proposition \(\mathcal{A}\) hold. Then there exist a non-empty variety \(V\) of codimension \(\exp\left(\frac{(2k+1)(D_{\text{max}}+2)}{2}\right)\) (in the sense that for each \(d \in [k]\) and each \(x[k]\setminus\{d\} \in G[k]\setminus\{d\}\) there is an affine map \(\rho : G[k] \rightarrow H\) such that \(\rho(yd) = \psi(yd)\) for all \(yd \in B_{x[k]\setminus\{d\}}\)).

**Proof of Proposition \(\mathcal{A}\).** Write

\[
\begin{align*}
 f^{(1,i)}(x[k]) &= C_{i} \cdots C_{i} C_{k} \cdots C_{i} C_{k} \cdots C_{i+1} A(x[k]), \\
 f^{(2,i)}(x[k]) &= C_{i-1} \cdots C_{i} C_{k} \cdots C_{i} C_{k} \cdots C_{i} C_{k} \cdots C_{i+1} A(x[k])
\end{align*}
\]

and

\[
g_i = |G_{i+1}|^{2^{k-2} + 2^{k-2} + 2^{k-2}} |G_{i+2}|^{2^{k-3} + 2^{k-3} + 2^{k-3}} \cdots |G_{i-1}|^{2^{k-1} + 2^{k-1} + 2^{k-1}} |G_i|^{2^{k-1} + 2^{k-1} + 2^{k-1}}.
\]

The number of \([(i, 1), [k, 1], [k, i+1])\)-arrangements in \(A\) of lengths \(x[k]\) is exactly

\[
f^{(1,i)}(x[k]) \cdot g_i^2 |G_i|,
\]

and the number of \([(i-1, 1), [k, 1], [k, i+1])\)-arrangements in \(A\) of lengths \(x[k]\) is

\[
f^{(2,i)}(x[k]) \cdot g_i.
\]

Thus,

\[
Q_{x[k]} = \left( \prod_{i \in [k]} f^{(1,i)}(x[k]) \right) \cdot |G[k]|^{2^{k-1}}.
\]

Let \(Y \subset G[k]\) be the set of all \(x[k] \in G[k]\) such that there is a value \(\theta(x[k]) \in H\) with the property that \(\phi(q) = \theta(x[k])\) for at least \(\frac{2}{3}\) of the \([(d-1, 1), [k, 1], [k, d+1])\)-arrangements \(q\) of lengths \(x[k]\) with points in \(A\). This value \(\theta(x[k])\) is clearly unique. Note also that for each \(x[k] \in X\), the proportion of \([(d, 1), [k, 1], [k, d+1])\)-arrangements \(q\) in \(A\) of lengths \(x[k]\) such that \(\phi(q) = \psi(x[k])\) is at least \(1 - \varepsilon\).
Write $w(x[k]) = \prod_{i \in [k]\setminus \{d\}} f^{(1,i)}(x[i]) \in [0, 1]$. We think of this quantity as the ‘weight’ of the point $x[k]$. As a consequence of Theorem 51, we have that
\[
E_{x[k]} w(x[k]) f^{(1,d)}(x[k]) = \Omega(\delta^{O(1)}).
\] (30)

**Step 1.** We show that $Y$ is large. Suppose that $x[k] \in X$. Then each $y_d \notin Y_{x[k]\setminus\{d\}}$ produces at least
\[
\frac{1}{4} f^{(2,d)}(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, x_d + y_d) f^{(2,d)}(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, y_d) g^2
\]
$([d, 1], [k, 1], [k, 1], [k, d + 1])$-arrangements $q$ of lengths $x[k]$ such that $\phi(q) \neq \psi(x[k])$. Thus,
\[
|G_d|^{-1} \sum_{y_d \in Y_{x[k]\setminus\{d\}}} f^{(2,d)}(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, x_d + y_d) f^{(2,d)}(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, y_d) \geq (1 - 4\varepsilon) f^{(1,d)}(x[k]).
\]
Similarly, each $x_d + y_d \notin Y_{x[k]\setminus\{d\}}$ produces at least
\[
\frac{1}{4} f^{(2,d)}(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, x_d + y_d) f^{(2,d)}(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, y_d) g^2
\]
$([d, 1], [k, 1], [k, 1], [k, d + 1])$-arrangements $q$ of lengths $x[k]$ such that $\phi(q) \neq \psi(x[k])$. Thus
\[
\sum_{x[k] \in X} w(x[k]) \sum_{y_d \in Y_{x[k]\setminus\{d\}} \cap \{Y_{x[k]\setminus\{d\}} - x_d\}} f^{(2,d)}(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, x_d + y_d) f^{(2,d)}(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, y_d)
\]
\[
\geq (1 - 8\varepsilon)|G_d| \sum_{x[k] \in X} w(x[k]) f^{(1,d)}(x[k])
\]
\[
\geq (1 - 9\varepsilon)|G_d| \sum_{x[k] \in G_d} w(x[k]) f^{(1,d)}(x[k])
\]
\[
= (1 - 9\varepsilon) \sum_{x[k] \in G_k} w(x[k]) \sum_{y_d \in G_d} f^{(2,d)}(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, x_d + y_d) f^{(2,d)}(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, y_d). \tag{31}
\]

**Step 2.** Recall that $\theta$ is defined as the most frequent value of $\phi(q)$, where $q$ ranges over $([d - 1, 1], [k, 1], [k, 1], [k, d + 1])$-arrangements in $A$ of lengths $x[k]$. In this step, we relate $\theta$ and $\psi$. Note also that when $y_d \in Y_{x[k]\setminus\{d\}} \cap \{Y_{x[k]\setminus\{d\}} - x_d\}$, then we get at least
\[
\frac{g^2}{4} f^{(2,d)}(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, x_d + y_d) f^{(2,d)}(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, y_d) g^2
\]
arrangements $q$ of lengths $x[k]$ such that $\phi(q) = \theta(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, x_d + y_d) - \theta(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, y_d)$. Hence, if $\theta(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, x_d + y_d) - \theta(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, y_d) = \psi(x[k])$, then these arrangements satisfy that $\phi(q) \neq \psi(x[k])$. Thus, using (31), we get
\[
\sum_{x[k] \in X} w(x[k]) \sum_{y_d \in Y_{x[k]\setminus\{d\}} \cap \{Y_{x[k]\setminus\{d\}} - x_d\}} \mathbb{1}(\theta(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, x_d + y_d) - \theta(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, y_d) = \psi(x[k]))
\]
\[
f^{(2,d)}(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, x_d + y_d) f^{(2,d)}(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, y_d)
\]\n
\[^{1}\text{We do not use the full strength of the Theorem as we merely need the existence of many tuples of arrangements with the same lengths. In particular, the map } \phi \text{ plays no role in this deduction, so we do not have to fulfill the requirements on } \phi \text{ in Theorem 51.}\]

62
\[ \geq (1 - 13\varepsilon) \sum_{x_{[k]} \in G_{[k]}} w(x_{[k]}) \sum_{y_d \in G_d} f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k] \setminus \{d\}}, x_d + y_d, y_d) f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k] \setminus \{d\}}, y_d). \] (32)

**Step 3.** In this step we apply the approximation theorem for mixed convolutions and elucidate the structure of the approximation sum. Let \( \xi > 0 \) be a constant to be specified later. For each \( i \in [k] \setminus \{d\} \), apply Theorem 50 to \( A \) for the \( L^k \) norm to obtain a positive integer \( l^{(i)} = \exp((2k+1)(D^{\text{min}}_{k-1}+2)) \left( O(\xi^{-O(1)}) \right) \), constants \( c_1^{(i)}, \ldots, c_{\ell^{(i)}}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{D} \), and multiaffine forms \( \phi_1^{(i)}, \ldots, \phi_{\ell^{(i)}}^{(i)} : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}_p \), such that

\[ f_{[d]}^{(1,i)}(x_{[k]}) = C_1 \ldots C_k C_1 \ldots C_k \ldots C_k \ldots C_{i+1} A(x_{[k]}) \approx_{L^k, x_{[k]}} c_j^{(i)} \chi(\phi_j^{(i)}(x_{[k]})) \]

and apply Theorem 50 one more time to \( A \) to obtain a positive integer \( l^{(2,d)} = \exp((2k+1)(D^{\text{min}}_{k-1}+2)) \left( O(\xi^{-O(1)}) \right) \), constants \( c_1^{(2,d)}, \ldots, c_{\ell^{(2,d)}}^{(2,d)} \in \mathbb{D} \), and multiaffine forms \( \phi_1^{(2,d)}, \ldots, \phi_{\ell^{(2,d)}}^{(2,d)} : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}_p \), such that

\[ f_{[d]}^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]}) = C_{d-1} \ldots C_1 C_k \ldots C_1 C_k \ldots C_k \ldots C_{i+1} A(x_{[k]}) \approx_{L^k, x_{[k]}} c_{j}^{(2,d)} \chi(\phi_j^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]})). \]

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (applied several times), we have that

\[ \mathbb{E}_{x_{[k]}} f_{x_{[k]}}^{(1, d)} \geq \delta^{2k} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_{x_{[k]}} f_{x_{[k]}}^{(2, d)} \geq \delta^{2k-1}. \] (33)

Write \( l = \left( \sum_{i \in [k] \setminus \{d\}} l^{(i)} \right) + l^{(2,d)} \). Define maps \( \phi : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}^l \) and \( c, \tilde{w} : \mathbb{F}^l \to \mathbb{C} \) by

\[ \phi = (\phi_1^{(1)}, \ldots, \phi_{d-1}^{(d-1)}, \phi_1^{(2,d)}, \phi_{d+1}^{(d+1)}, \ldots, \phi^{(k)}), \]

\[ c(\lambda) = \sum_{j \in [l^{(2,d)}]} c_j^{(2,d)} \chi(\lambda_{s_d+j}) \]

and

\[ \tilde{w}(\lambda) = \prod_{i \in [k] \setminus \{d\}} \left( \sum_{j \in [l^{(i)}]} c_j^{(i)} \chi(\lambda_{s_i+j}) \right), \]

where the \( s_i \) are offsets such that \( s_i + [l^{(i)}] \) are indices inside \([l]\) that correspond to the map \( \phi^{(i)} \) in the definition of \( \phi \) (and \( s_d \) corresponds to \( \phi^{(2,d)} \)). Then

\[ \left\| f_{[d]}^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]}) - c(\phi(x_{[k]})) \right\|_{L^p, x_{[k]}} \leq \xi \] (34)

and

\[ \left\| w - \tilde{w} \circ \phi \right\|_{L^1} = \left\| \prod_{i \in [k] \setminus \{d\}} f_{x_{[k]}}^{(1,i)} - \prod_{i \in [k] \setminus \{d\}} \left( \sum_{j \in [l^{(i)}]} c_j^{(i)} \chi(\phi_j^{(i)}) \right) \right\|_{L^1} \]

Writing \( \sum_{j \in [l^{(i)}]} c_j^{(i)} \chi(\phi_j^{(i)}) = f^{(1,i)} - \left( f^{(1,i)} - \sum_{j \in [l^{(i)}]} c_j^{(i)} \chi(\phi_j^{(i)}) \right) \), expanding and using the triangle inequality, we get

\[ \left\| w - \tilde{w} \circ \phi \right\|_{L^1} \leq \left\| \prod_{i \in I} f_{x_{[k]}}^{(1,i)} - \left( \prod_{i \in I} \left( f^{(1,i)} - \sum_{j \in [l^{(i)}]} c_j^{(i)} \chi(\phi_j^{(i)}) \right) \right) \right\|_{L^1}. \]
Using the fact that \( \|f^{(1,i)}\|_{L^\infty} \leq 1 \), we bound this from above by
\[
\sum_{I \subseteq \{k\} \setminus \{d\}} \prod_{i \in \{k\} \setminus \{d\} \setminus I} \left( f^{(1,i)} - \sum_{j \in [l(i)]} c^{(i)}_j \chi \circ \phi^{(i)}_j \right) \leq 1.
\]

We then apply by Hölder’s inequality to conclude that
\[
\left\| w - \tilde{w} \circ \phi \right\|_{L^1} \leq \sum_{I \subseteq \{k\} \setminus \{d\}} \prod_{i \in \{k\} \setminus \{d\} \setminus I} \left( f^{(1,i)} - \sum_{j \in [l(i)]} c^{(i)}_j \chi \circ \phi^{(i)}_j \right) \leq 2^k \xi. \tag{35}
\]

Without loss of generality we may assume that \( c : \mathbb{F}^l \to [0, 1] \), since we have \( f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]}) \in [0, 1] \) and thus we may simply replace \( c(\lambda) \) by \( \max\{\min\{\text{Re} c(\lambda), 1\}, 0\} \). Such a change does not worsen the bound in (34). Similarly, without loss of generality \( \tilde{w} : \mathbb{F}^l \to [0, 1] \).

Note that
\[
\mathbb{E}_{x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}} \mathbb{E}_{y_d, z_d \in G_d} \left| f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d) f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, z_d) - c(\phi(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d)) c(\phi(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, z_d)) \right|
\]
\[
\leq \mathbb{E}_{x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}} \mathbb{E}_{y_d, z_d \in G_d} \left| f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d) - c(\phi(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d)) \right| \left| f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, z_d) - c(\phi(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, z_d)) \right|
\]
\[
\leq 2 \mathbb{E}_{x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}} \mathbb{E}_{y_d \in G_d} \left| f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d) - c(\phi(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d)) \right| \leq 2 \xi. \tag{36}
\]

By (34) we also have that
\[
\mathbb{E}_{x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}} \mathbb{E}_{y_d, z_d \in G_d} \left| w(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d - z_d) c(\phi(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d)) c(\phi(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, z_d)) \right|
\]
\[
\geq \mathbb{E}_{x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}} \mathbb{E}_{y_d \in G_d} w(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d - z_d) f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d) f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, z_d) - 2 \xi
\]
\[
= \mathbb{E}_{x_{[k]}} w(x_{[k]}) f^{(1,d)}(x_{[k]}) - 2 \xi
\]
\[
= \Omega(\delta \Theta(1)), \tag{37}
\]
provided that \( \xi \) is sufficiently small, which we may achieve with \( \xi = \Omega(\Theta(1)) \). Using (34), we also have
\[
\mathbb{E}_{x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}} \mathbb{E}_{y_d, z_d \in G_d} \tilde{w}(\phi(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d - z_d)) c(\phi(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d)) c(\phi(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, z_d)) = \Omega(\delta \Theta(1)) \tag{38}
\]
once again provided \( \xi \) is sufficiently small. Again, we may find \( \xi = \Omega(\Theta(1)) \) that works (with slightly modified implicit constants).
Write \( \phi : G[k] \to \mathbb{F}_p^l \) as \( \phi(x[k]) = \phi'(x[k]) + \tau(x[k]\setminus\{d\}) \), where \( \phi' \) is linear in the \( d \)th coordinate and \( \tau \) is multiaffine. Thus, \( \phi'_j(x[k]) = \Phi_j(x[k]\setminus\{d\}) \cdot x_d \) for a multiaffine map \( \Phi_j : G[k]\setminus\{d\} \to G_d \). Apply Theorem 31 to \( \Phi \) and obtain a positive integer \( t = O\left(\left(\log p, \xi^{-1}\right)\right) \) and a multiaffine map \( \beta : G[k]\setminus\{d\} \to \mathbb{F}_p^l \) such that for each \( \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^l \), the set \( Z_\lambda = \{x[k]\setminus\{d\} \in G[k]\setminus\{d\} : \sum_{i \in [l]} \lambda_i \Phi(x[k]\setminus\{d\}) = 0\} \) is internally and externally \( (\epsilon p^{-l}, \epsilon^2) \)-approximated by the layers of \( \beta \). For \( \Lambda \leq \mathbb{F}_p^l \), consider the set \( \left( \bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} Z_\lambda \right) \setminus \left( \bigcup_{\lambda \notin \Lambda} Z_\lambda \right) \). Approximate the sets \( Z_\lambda \) in the intersection internally and the sets \( Z_\lambda \) in the union externally by collections of layers \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \) of \( \beta \), respectively. The union of layers in \( L_1 \setminus L_2 \) thus internally \( (\epsilon p^{-l}, \epsilon^2) \)-approximates the given set. Since the number of subspaces \( \Lambda \leq \mathbb{F}_p^l \) is at most \( p^2 \), we deduce that there is a union \( U \) of layers of \( \beta \) of size

\[
|U| \geq (1 - \xi)|G[k]\setminus\{d\}|
\]

such that for each layer \( L_\mu = \{x[k]\setminus\{d\} : \beta(x[k]\setminus\{d\}) = \mu\} \subset U \) there is a subspace \( \Lambda_\mu \leq \mathbb{F}_p^l \) such that

\[
\{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^l : \lambda \cdot \Phi(x[k]\setminus\{d\}) = 0\} = \Lambda_\mu
\]

for every \( x[k]\setminus\{d\} \in L_\mu \). Write \( M \) for the set of \( \mu \in \mathbb{F}_p^l \) such that \( L_\mu \subset U \). This implies that for each \( \mu \in M \) and each \( x[k]\setminus\{d\} \in L_\mu \),

\[
\text{Im} \left( y_d \mapsto \phi'(x[k]\setminus\{d\}), y_d \right) = \Lambda_\mu^\perp.
\]

Thus, when \( x[k]\setminus\{d\} \in L_\mu \) and \( \tau(x[k]\setminus\{d\}) = \lambda \), then

\[
\text{Im} \left( y_d \mapsto \phi(x[k]\setminus\{d\}), y_d \right) = \lambda + \Lambda_\mu^\perp.
\]

**Step 4.** In this step, we move from using \( w \) as our system of weights to using \( \tilde{w} \), which has more algebraic structure. This will allow us to find a structured set with an affine map that coincides with the map \( y_d \mapsto \psi(x[k]\setminus\{d\}), y_d \), using Lemma 23. Combine (32), (33), (37), (38) and (39) to obtain

\[
\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^l} \sum_{\mu \in M} \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda_\mu^\perp} \sum_{\beta(x[k]\setminus\{d\}) = \lambda} \sum_{\phi'(x[k]) = \nu} c(\lambda + \nu_1 + \nu_2) \sum_{x_d \in X_{x[k]\setminus\{d\}}^{\lambda + \nu_1}} \sum_{\phi'(x[k]) = \nu_2} w(x[k])
\]

\[
\sum_{y_d \in Y_{x[k]\setminus\{d\}}} 1 \left( \theta(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, x_d + y_d) - \theta(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, y_d) = \psi(x[k]) \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^l} \sum_{\mu \in M} \sum_{\beta(x[k]\setminus\{d\}) = \lambda} \sum_{x_d \in X_{x[k]\setminus\{d\}}} \sum_{y_d \in Y_{x[k]\setminus\{d\}}} \sum_{\phi'(x[k]) = \mu} 1 \left( \theta(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, x_d + y_d) - \theta(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, y_d) = \psi(x[k]) \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{x[k]\in X} \sum_{y_d \in Y_{x[k]\setminus\{d\}}} 1 \left( \theta(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, x_d + y_d) - \theta(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, y_d) = \psi(x[k]) \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{x[k]\in X} \sum_{y_d \in Y_{x[k]\setminus\{d\}}} 1 \left( \theta(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, x_d + y_d) - \theta(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, y_d) = \psi(x[k]) \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{x[k]\in X} \sum_{y_d \in Y_{x[k]\setminus\{d\}}} 1 \left( \theta(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, x_d + y_d) - \theta(x[k]\setminus\{d\}, y_d) = \psi(x[k]) \right)
\]
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\[
\begin{align*}
&c(\phi(x_{[k]\{d}\}, x_d + y_d))c(\phi(x_{[k]\{d}\}, y_d)) \\
\geq & \sum_{x_{[k]}' \in X} \sum_{y_d \in Y_{x_{[k]}'\{d\}} \cap (Y_{x_{[k]'\{d\}}-x_d})} \mathbb{1}\left(\theta(x_{[k]\{d}\}, x_d + y_d) - \theta(x_{[k]\{d}\}, y_d) = \psi(x_{[k]'})\right) \\
&\sum_{x_{[k]}' \in X} \sum_{y_d \in Y_{x_{[k]}'\{d\}} \cap (Y_{x_{[k]'\{d\}}-x_d})} \mathbb{1}\left(\theta(x_{[k]\{d}\}, x_d + y_d) - \theta(x_{[k]\{d}\}, y_d) = \psi(x_{[k]'})\right) \\
&f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]\{d\}}, x_d + y_d) f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]\{d\}}, y_d) - 2 |G_d||G_{[k]}| \\
&\geq (1 - 13 \varepsilon) \sum_{x_{[k]}' \in G_{[k]}} \sum_{y_d \in G_d} f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]'\{d\}}, x_d + y_d) f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]'\{d\}}, y_d) - 3 |G_d||G_{[k]}| \\
&\geq (1 - 13 \varepsilon - O(\delta^{-O(1)}) \sum_{x_{[k]}' \in G_{[k]}} \sum_{y_d \in G_d} c(\phi(x_{[k]'\{d\}}, x_d + y_d))c(\phi(x_{[k]'\{d\}}, y_d)) \\
= & (1 - 13 \varepsilon - O(\delta^{-O(1)}) \sum_{\lambda \in P^l_{\mu} x_{[k]'\{d\}} \in G_{[k]'\{d\}}} \sum_{\mu \in M} \sum_{x_{[k]'\{d\}}} \sum_{y_d \in G_d} c(\phi(x_{[k]'\{d\}}, x_d + y_d))c(\phi(x_{[k]'\{d\}}, y_d)) \\
\geq & (1 - 13 \varepsilon - O(\delta^{-O(1)}) \sum_{\lambda \in P^l_{\mu} x_{[k]'\{d\}} \in G_{[k]'\{d\}}} \sum_{\mu \in M} \sum_{\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \Lambda_{\mu}} \sum_{x_{[k]'\{d\}}} c(\lambda + \nu_1 + \nu_2)c(\lambda + \nu_2) \sum_{x_d \in G_d} \sum_{y_d \in G_d} \mathbb{1}\left(\theta(x_{[k]'\{d\}}, x_d + y_d) - \theta(x_{[k]'\{d\}}, y_d) = \psi(x_{[k]'})\right) \\
\sum_{\lambda \in P^l_{\mu} x_{[k]'\{d\}} \in G_{[k]'\{d\}}} \sum_{\mu \in M} \sum_{\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \Lambda_{\mu}} c(\lambda + \nu_1 + \nu_2)c(\lambda + \nu_2) \mathbb{1}\left(\theta(x_{[k]'\{d\}}, x_d + y_d) - \theta(x_{[k]'\{d\}}, y_d) = \psi(x_{[k]'})\right)
\end{align*}
\]

Using (38) and (39), we deduce that

\[
\sum_{\lambda \in P^l_{\mu} x_{[k]'\{d\}} \in G_{[k]'\{d\}}} \sum_{\mu \in M} \sum_{\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \Lambda_{\mu}} c(\lambda + \nu_1 + \nu_2)c(\lambda + \nu_2) \mathbb{1}\left(\theta(x_{[k]'\{d\}}, x_d + y_d) - \theta(x_{[k]'\{d\}}, y_d) = \psi(x_{[k]'})\right)
\]
\[ (1 - 13\varepsilon - O(\delta^{-O(1)})) \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}} \sum_{\mu \in M} \sum_{x_0, \ldots, y_0 \in G_{\lambda} - G_{\mu}} c(\lambda + \nu_1 + \nu_2) \hat{\psi}(\nu_1 + \nu_2) \sum_{x_0 \in G_{\nu_1}} \sum_{y_0 \in G_{\nu_2}} 1 \quad (42) \]

We may find \( \xi = \Omega(\delta^{O(1)} \varepsilon) \), which would allow us to replace the constant at the beginning of the penultimate line by \( (1 - 14\varepsilon) \).

Recall that \( U = \{ x[k], \{ d \} \in G_{\lambda} : \beta(x[k], \{ d \}) \in M \} \). Let \( \tilde{X} \) be the set of all pairs \( (x[k], \{ d \}, \nu_1) \in U \times \mathbb{P}_d \) such that \( \nu_1 \in \Lambda_{\beta(x[k], \{ d \})}^+ \) and

\[
\sum_{\nu_2 \in \Lambda_{\beta(x[k], \{ d \})}^+} c(\lambda(x[k], \{ d \}) + \nu_1 + \nu_2) c(\lambda(x[k], \{ d \}) + \nu_2) \hat{\psi}(\lambda(x[k], \{ d \}) + \nu_1) \sum_{x_0 \in X(x[k], \{ d \})} \sum_{y_0 \in Y(x[k], \{ d \}) \cap (Y(x[k], \{ d \}) - x_0)} \sum_{\phi'(x[k], \{ d \}) = \nu_1} \sum_{\phi'(x[k], \{ d \}, y_0) = \nu_2} \sum_{\phi'(x[k], \{ d \}) = \nu_1} \sum_{\phi'(x[k], \{ d \}, y_0) = \nu_2} 1 \left( \theta(x[k], \{ d \}, x_0 + y_0) - \theta(x[k], \{ d \}, y_0) = \psi(x[k]) \right) 
\]\
\[
\geq (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \sum_{\nu_2 \in \Lambda_{\beta(x[k], \{ d \})}^+} c(\tau(x[k], \{ d \}) + \nu_1 + \nu_2) c(\tau(x[k], \{ d \}) + \nu_2) \hat{\psi}(\tau(x[k], \{ d \}) + \nu_1) \sum_{x_0 \in G_{\nu_1}} \sum_{y_0 \in G_{\nu_2}} 1 > 0.
\]

For each \( (x[k], \{ d \}, \nu_1) \in \tilde{X} \), average over \( \nu_2 \in \Lambda_{\beta(x[k], \{ d \})}^+ \) to find \( \nu_2 \) such that

\[
\sum_{x_0 \in X(x[k], \{ d \})} \sum_{y_0 \in Y(x[k], \{ d \}) \cap (Y(x[k], \{ d \}) - x_0)} \sum_{\phi'(x[k], \{ d \}) = \nu_1} \sum_{\phi'(x[k], \{ d \}, y_0) = \nu_2} 1 \left( \theta(x[k], \{ d \}, x_0 + y_0) - \theta(x[k], \{ d \}, y_0) = \psi(x[k]) \right) 
\]\
\[
\geq (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \sum_{x_0 \in G_{\nu_1}} \sum_{y_0 \in G_{\nu_2}} 1 > 0.
\]

Apply Lemma 28 to find a subset \( X'_{x[k], \{ d \}, \nu_1} \subset \{ x_0 \in X(x[k], \{ d \}) : \phi'(x[k]) = \nu_1 \} \) such that \( |X'_{x[k], \{ d \}, \nu_1}| \geq (1 - 2\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \left| \{ x_0 \in G_d : \phi'(x[k]) = \nu_1 \} \right| \) and there is an affine map \( \rho : G_d \to H \) such that \( \rho(y_0) = \psi(x[k], \{ d \}) \) for all \( y_0 \in X'_{x[k], \{ d \}, \nu_1} \). Note that we require \( \varepsilon < 10^{-4} \).

Hence, when \( (x[k], \{ d \}, \nu_1) \in \tilde{X} \), by definition we have in particular

\[
\left| \{ x_0 \in X(x[k], \{ d \}) : \phi'(x[k]) = \nu_1 \} \right| \sum_{\nu_2 \in \Lambda_{\beta(x[k], \{ d \})}^+} c(\tau(x[k], \{ d \}) + \nu_1 + \nu_2) c(\tau(x[k], \{ d \}) + \nu_2) \hat{\psi}(\tau(x[k], \{ d \}) + \nu_1) \sum_{y_0 \in G_{\nu_2}} 1
\]
Thus,

\[
\sum_{\nu_2 \in \Lambda^+_{\beta(x[k]\{d\})}} c(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_1 + \nu_2) c(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_2) \tilde{w}(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_1) \sum_{x_d \in X_{\beta(x[k]\{d\})}} \sum_{y_d \in G_d} 1 \\
= (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \sum_{\nu_2 \in \Lambda^+_{\beta(x[k]\{d\})}} c(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_1 + \nu_2) c(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_2) \tilde{w}(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_1) \sum_{x_d \in G_d} \sum_{y_d \in G_d} 1 \\
= (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \left\{ x_d \in G_d : \phi'(x[k]) = \nu_1 \right\} \sum_{\nu_2 \in \Lambda^+_{\beta(x[k]\{d\})}} c(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_1 + \nu_2) c(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_2) \tilde{w}(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_1) \sum_{y_d \in G_d} 1 > 0.
\]

Thus,

\[
|X'_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}| \sum_{\nu_2 \in \Lambda^+_{\beta(x[k]\{d\})}} c(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_1 + \nu_2) c(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_2) \tilde{w}(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_1) \sum_{y_d \in G_d} 1 \\
\geq (1 - 3\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \left\{ x_d \in G_d : \phi'(x[k]) = \nu_1 \right\} \sum_{\nu_2 \in \Lambda^+_{\beta(x[k]\{d\})}} c(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_1 + \nu_2) c(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_2) \tilde{w}(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_1) \sum_{y_d \in G_d} 1 > 0.
\]

Define \(a_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}^{(1)}\), \(a_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}^{(2)}\) and \(a_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}^{(3)}\) by

\[
a_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}^{(1)} = \sum_{\nu_2 \in \Lambda^+_{\beta(x[k]\{d\})}} c(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_1 + \nu_2) c(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_2) \tilde{w}(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_1) \sum_{x_d \in G_d} \sum_{y_d \in G_d} 1, \\
a_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}^{(2)} = \sum_{\nu_2 \in \Lambda^+_{\beta(x[k]\{d\})}} c(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_1 + \nu_2) c(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_2) \tilde{w}(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_1) \sum_{x_d \in G_d} \sum_{y_d \in G_d} 1 \left( \theta(x[k]\{d\}, x_d + y_d) - \theta(x[k]\{d\}, y_d) = \psi(x[k]) \right), \\
a_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}^{(3)} = |X'_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}| \sum_{\nu_2 \in \Lambda^+_{\beta(x[k]\{d\})}} c(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_1 + \nu_2) c(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_2) \tilde{w}(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_1) \sum_{y_d \in G_d} 1.
\]

By definition of \(\tilde{X}\), we have that when \((x[k]\{d\}, \nu_1) \in \tilde{X}\), then \(a_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}^{(2)} \geq (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon}) a_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}^{(1)}\). From (42) we have \(a_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}^{(3)} \geq (1 - 3\sqrt{\varepsilon}) a_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}^{(1)}\). Using this notation, (42) becomes

\[
\sum_{x[k]\{d\} \in U} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \Lambda^+_{\beta(x[k]\{d\})}} a_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}^{(2)} \geq (1 - 14\varepsilon) \sum_{x[k]\{d\} \in U} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \Lambda^+_{\beta(x[k]\{d\})}} a_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}^{(1)}.
\]
This further gives

$$14\varepsilon \sum_{x[k]\{d\} \in U} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \Lambda_{\beta}^+(x[k]\{d\})} a_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}^{(1)} \geq \sum_{x[k]\{d\} \in U} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \Lambda_{\beta}^+(x[k]\{d\})} (a_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}^{(1)} - a_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}^{(2)}) \geq \sqrt{\varepsilon} \sum_{x[k]\{d\} \in U} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \Lambda_{\beta}^+(x[k]\{d\})} a_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}^{(1)}.$$ 

Hence,

$$\sum_{x[k]\{d\} \in U} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \Lambda_{\beta}^+(x[k]\{d\})} a_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}^{(3)} \geq (1 - 3\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \sum_{x[k]\{d\} \in U} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \Lambda_{\beta}^+(x[k]\{d\})} a_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}^{(1)} \geq (1 - 3\sqrt{\varepsilon})(1 - 14\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \sum_{x[k]\{d\} \in U} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \Lambda_{\beta}^+(x[k]\{d\})} a_{x[k]\{d\},\nu_1}^{(1)}.$$ 

Simplify the bound slightly by using $(1 - 3\sqrt{\varepsilon})(1 - 14\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \geq 1 - 20\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ and expand out to get

$$\sum_{(x[k]\{d\},\nu_1) \in \hat{X}} \sum_{x \in X'_{x[k]\{d\}}} \sum_{\nu_2 \in \Lambda_{\beta}^+(x[k]\{d\})} \sum_{y_d \in G_d} c(\phi(x[k]\{d\}, x_d + y_d)) c(\phi(x[k]\{d\}, y_d)) \tilde{w}(\phi(x[k]))$$

$$= \sum_{(x[k]\{d\},\nu_1) \in \hat{X}} |X'_{x[k]\{d\}}| \sum_{\nu_2 \in \Lambda_{\beta}^+(x[k]\{d\})} \sum_{y_d \in G_d} \delta(x[k], y_d = y_d = \nu_2)$$

$$\geq (1 - 20\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \sum_{x[k]\{d\} \in U} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \Lambda_{\beta}^+(x[k]\{d\})} c(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_1 + \nu_2) c(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_2) \tilde{w}(\tau(x[k]\{d\}) + \nu_1)$$

$$= (1 - 20\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \sum_{x[k]\{d\} \in U} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \Lambda_{\beta}^+(x[k]\{d\})} \sum_{x_d \in G_d} \sum_{y_d \in G_d} \sum_{\nu_2 \in \Lambda_{\beta}^+(x[k]\{d\})} c(\phi(x[k]\{d\}, x_d + y_d)) c(\phi(x[k]\{d\}, y_d)) \tilde{w}(\phi(x[k])).$$

(44)

**Step 5.** We now stop using $c$ and return to using $f^{(2,d)}$. Recall that $C$ and $c$ indicate positive constants, as explained in the notational part of the preliminary section of the paper (see expression (14) and discussion surrounding it). This notation is used near the end of the argument in this step. We
have

\[
\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{F}^1} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \Lambda^2 \setminus \mathcal{F}} \sum_{x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \in \tilde{X}_{\nu_1}} \sum_{x_d \in X'_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \setminus \tau} \tilde{w}(\phi(x_{[k]})) f^{(1,d)}(x_{[k]} | G_d) \]

\[
= \sum_{(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, \nu_1) \in \tilde{X}} \sum_{x_d \in X'_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \setminus \tau} \tilde{w}(\phi(x_{[k]})) f^{(1,d)}(x_{[k]} | G_d) \]

\[
= \sum_{(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, \nu_1) \in \tilde{X}} \sum_{x_d \in X'_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \setminus \tau} \tilde{w}(\phi(x_{[k]})) \sum_{y_d \in G_d} f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \cup \{x_d + y_d\}) f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \cup \{x_d\}, y_d) \]

Using (38), we see that this is at least

\[
\sum_{(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, \nu_1) \in \tilde{X}} \sum_{x_d \in X'_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \setminus \tau} \tilde{w}(\phi(x_{[k]})) \sum_{y_d \in G_d} c(\phi(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \cup \{x_d + y_d\}), c(\phi(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \cup \{x_d\}), y_d) - 2|G_{[k]}| |G_d| \]

\[
= \sum_{(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, \nu_1) \in \tilde{X}} \sum_{x_d \in X'_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \setminus \tau} \tilde{w}(\phi(x_{[k]})) \sum_{\nu_2 \in \Lambda^2_{\beta'} \setminus \tau} \sum_{y_d \in G_d} c(\phi(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \cup \{x_d + y_d\}), c(\phi(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \cup \{x_d\}), y_d) \]

\[
\geq (1 - 20\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \sum_{x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \in U} \sum_{x_d \in G_d} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \Lambda^2_{\beta'} \setminus \tau} \sum_{\nu_2 \in \Lambda^2_{\beta'} \setminus \tau} \sum_{y_d \in G_d} c(\phi(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \cup \{x_d + y_d\}), c(\phi(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \cup \{x_d\}), y_d) \]

\[
= (1 - 20\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \sum_{x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \in U} \sum_{x_d \in G_d} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \Lambda^2_{\beta'} \setminus \tau} \sum_{\nu_2 \in \Lambda^2_{\beta'} \setminus \tau} \sum_{y_d \in G_d} f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \cup \{x_d + y_d\}) f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \cup \{x_d\}, y_d) \]

by (38). Using (39) in a similar way to the way we used it above, we have that this is at least

\[
(1 - 20\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \sum_{x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \in U} \sum_{x_d \in G_d} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \Lambda^2_{\beta'} \setminus \tau} \sum_{\nu_2 \in \Lambda^2_{\beta'} \setminus \tau} \sum_{y_d \in G_d} f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \cup \{x_d + y_d\}) f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \cup \{x_d\}, y_d) \]

\[
= (1 - 20\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \sum_{x_{[k]} \in G_{[k]}} \sum_{y_d \in G_d} \tilde{w}(\phi(x_{[k]})) f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \cup \{x_d + y_d\}) f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \cup \{x_d\}, y_d) - 5|G_{[k]}| |G_d| \]

which by (32) is at least

\[
(1 - 20\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \sum_{x_{[k]} \in G_{[k]}} \sum_{y_d \in G_d} \tilde{w}(\phi(x_{[k]})) f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \cup \{x_d + y_d\}) f^{(2,d)}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}} \cup \{x_d\}, y_d) - 5|G_{[k]}| |G_d| \]

\[
= (1 - 20\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \sum_{x_{[k]} \in G_{[k]}} \tilde{w}(\phi(x_{[k]})) f^{(1,d)}(x_{[k]} | G_d) - 5|G_{[k]}| |G_d| \]
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Provided that \( \xi \leq c \delta^C \), we may use (34) and (35) to deduce that this is at least

\[
(1 - 20 \sqrt{\varepsilon} - O(\delta^{-O(1)})\xi) \sum_{x[k]\in G[k]} \tilde{w}(\phi(x[k])) f^{(1,d)}(x[k]) |G_d|.
\]

There is a choice of \( \xi = \Omega(\delta^{-O(1)})\varepsilon \), implying \( 1 - 20 \sqrt{\varepsilon} - O(\delta^{-O(1)})\xi \geq 1 - 21 \sqrt{\varepsilon} \), which allows us to simplify the bound above.

**Step 6.** We now stop using \( \tilde{w} \) and return to using \( w \). Using (34) and (35), we obtain

\[
\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{d}'} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \Lambda^d_{p+1}} \sum_{x[k]\in G[k]} \sum_{x_d \in X_{\nu_1}} w(x[k]) f^{(1,d)}(x[k]) \geq (1 - 21 \sqrt{\varepsilon} - O(\delta^{-O(1)})\xi) \sum_{x[k]\in G[k]} w(x[k]) f^{(1,d)}(x[k]).
\]

Again, there is a choice \( \xi = \Omega(\delta^{-O(1)})\varepsilon \) which allows simplification of the constant in the last line to \( 1 - 22 \sqrt{\varepsilon} \).

**Step 7.** Finally, we put the sets \( X'_{x[k]\setminus \{d\}, \nu_1} \) together and organize them in the desired form. Let \( P \) be the set of all \((\lambda, \mu, \nu_1) \in \mathbb{P}_{d}^t \times M \times \mathbb{P}_{d}^t\) such that \( \nu_1 \in \Lambda^d_{p+1} \) and

\[
\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{d}'} \sum_{\nu_1 \in \Lambda^d_{p+1}} \sum_{x[k]\in G[k]} \sum_{x_d \in X_{\nu_1}} w(x[k]) f^{(1,d)}(x[k]) \geq (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \sum_{x[k]\in G[k]} w(x[k]) f^{(1,d)}(x[k]).
\]

Define a multi-affine map \( \gamma : G[k] \to \mathbb{P}_{d}^t \times \mathbb{P}_{d}^t \times \mathbb{P}_{d}^t \) by

\[
\gamma(x[k]) = \left( \tau(x[k]\setminus \{d\}), \beta(x[k]\setminus \{d\}), \phi'(x[k]) \right).
\]

For \((\lambda, \mu, \nu_1) \in P\), define \( S^{(\lambda, \mu, \nu_1)} \) as

\[
S^{(\lambda, \mu, \nu_1)} = \left\{ x[k]\in G[k] : x[k]\setminus \{d\} \in X_{\nu_1}, x_d \in X'_{x[k]\setminus \{d\}, \nu_1}, \tau(x[k]\setminus \{d\}) = \lambda, \beta(x[k]\setminus \{d\}) = \mu \right\},
\]

and for completeness set \( S^{(\lambda, \mu, \nu_1)} = \emptyset \) for the remaining choices of \((\lambda, \mu, \nu_1) \in \mathbb{P}_{d}^t \times \mathbb{P}_{d}^t \times \mathbb{P}_{d}^t\). Clearly, for all \((\lambda, \mu, \nu_1) \in \mathbb{P}_{d}^t \times \mathbb{P}_{d}^t \times \mathbb{P}_{d}^t \), we have

\[
S^{(\lambda, \mu, \nu_1)} \subset X \cap \{ x[k]\in G[k] : \gamma(x[k]) = (\lambda, \mu, \nu_1) \}.
\]

By the way we obtained sets \( X'_{x[k]\setminus \{d\}} \), we see that \( \psi_{S^{(\lambda, \mu, \nu_1)}} \) is affine in direction \( d \) in the sense described in the statement of the proposition. It remains to check that

\[
\sum_{(\lambda, \mu, \nu_1) \in P} \sum_{x[k]\in S^{(\lambda, \mu, \nu_1)}} w(x[k]) f^{(1,d)}(x[k]) = (1 - O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})) \sum_{x[k]\in G[k]} w(x[k]) f^{(1,d)}(x[k]).
\]
Inequality (45) implies that
\[
\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_p, \mu \in \mathbb{M}, \nu_1 \in \Lambda^+} 1 \left( \lambda, \mu, \nu_1 \notin P \right) \sum_{x \in X_\lambda, \nu_1} w(x) f^{(1,d)}(x)
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_p, \mu \in \mathbb{M}, \nu_1 \in \Lambda^+} 1 \left( \lambda, \mu, \nu_1 \notin P \right) \sum_{x \in X_\lambda, \nu_1} w(x) f^{(1,d)}(x)
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_p, \mu \in \mathbb{M}, \nu_1 \in \Lambda^+} 1 \left( \lambda, \mu, \nu_1 \notin P \right) \left( \sum_{x \in G_\lambda, \nu_1} w(x) f^{(1,d)}(x) - \sum_{x \in G_\lambda, \nu_1} w(x) f^{(1,d)}(x) \right)
\]
\[
\leq 22 \sqrt{\varepsilon} \sum_{x \in G_\lambda} w(x) f^{(1,d)}(x).
\]

The desired inequality (46) now follows from this and (45) and the proof is complete. If \( \xi \leq c\delta^{C^c} \), then the required bounds on \( \xi \) are satisfied.

**Proof of Theorem 3.** For each \( d \in [k] \), apply Proposition 5.5 in direction \( d \) to obtain a positive integer \( t^{(d)} = \exp\left( (2k+1)(D^{\text{lin}})_1^2 + 2 \right) \left( O((\delta\varepsilon)^{-O(1)}) \right) \), a multi-affine map \( \alpha^{(d)} : G_\lambda \to \mathbb{R}^{t^{(d)}} \), and a collection of disjoint sets \( (S^{(d),\lambda})_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_p^{t^{(d)}}} \) such that \( S^{(d),\lambda} \subseteq \{ x \in G_\lambda : \alpha^{(d)}(x) = \lambda \} \cap X \), \( \psi|_{S^{(d),\lambda}} \) is affine in direction \( d \) for each \( \lambda \in \mathbb{P}_p^{t^{(d)}} \), and
\[
\sum_{x \in G_\lambda} |Q_{x|\lambda}| = \left( 1 - O(\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \right) |Q|,
\]
where \( Q \) and \( Q_{x|\lambda} \) have the same meaning as in Proposition 5.5. Write \( \alpha = (\alpha^{(1)}, \ldots, \alpha^{(k)}) \). For each tuple \( \lambda = (\lambda^{(1)}, \ldots, \lambda^{(k)}) \) such that \( \lambda^{(d)} \in \mathbb{P}_p^{t^{(d)}} \), define \( S^{\lambda} \subseteq G_{[k]} \) by
\[
S^{\lambda} = \bigcap_{d \in [k]} S^{(d),\lambda^{(d)}} \subset X \cap \{ x^{(d)} \in X^{(d)} : \alpha^{(d)}(x^{(d)}) = \lambda(x^{(d)}) \}. 
\]
Then for each \( \lambda, \psi|_{\mathcal{S}^\lambda} \) is multiaffine in the sense explained in the statement of the theorem, and

\[
\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^{(1)} \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathbb{F}_p^{(k)}} \sum_{x_{[k]} \in \mathcal{S}^\lambda} |Q_{x_{[k]}}| = \left( 1 - O(\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon}) \right) \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^{(1)} \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathbb{F}_p^{(k)}} \sum_{x_{[k]} \in \mathcal{G}_{[k]}^\lambda} |Q_{x_{[k]}}|. \tag{47}
\]

Let \( \xi > 0 \). As in the proof of Proposition 38 (Step 3), for each \( i \in [k] \), apply Theorem 50 to \( A \) for the \( L_k \) norm to obtain a positive integer \( m_i = \exp \left( (2k+1)(D_{m_i}^{[k]} + 2) \right) \left( O(\xi^{-O(1)}) \right) \), constants \( c_1^{(i)}, \ldots, c_{m_i}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{D} \), and multiaffine forms \( \phi_1^{(i)}, \ldots, \phi_{m_i}^{(i)} : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}_p \) such that

\[
f^{(1,i)} = C_{1} \ldots C_{1} C_{k} \ldots C_{1} C_{k} \ldots C_{i+1} A \sum_{j \in [m_i]} c_j^{(i)} \circ \phi_j^{(i)}. \]

Write \( \phi = (\phi^{(1)}, \ldots, \phi^{(k)}) \) and define \( c : \mathbb{F}_p^{m_1} \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathbb{F}_p^{m_k} \to [0,1] \) by

\[
c(\mu^{(1)}, \ldots, \mu^{(k)}) = \min \left\{ \max \left\{ \Re \left( \prod_{i \in [k]} \left( \sum_{j \in [m_i]} c_j^{(i)} \chi(\mu_j^{(i)}) \right) \right), 0 \right\}, 1 \right\},
\]

where \( \mu_d \in \mathbb{F}_p^{m_d} \). Similarly to (39), we obtain that

\[
\mathbb{E}_{x_{[k]} \in \mathcal{G}_{[k]}} \left| Q_{x_{[k]}} - c(\phi(x_{[k]}))|G_{[k]}^{\lambda}|^{-2k} \right| \leq 2^k \xi.
\]

Recall also from (34) that

\[
\mathbb{E}_{x_{[k]} \in \mathcal{G}_{[k]}} |Q_{x_{[k]}}| = \Omega(\delta^{O(1)})|G_{[k]}^{\lambda}|^{2k}.
\]

Returning to (47), we obtain

\[
\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^{(1)} \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathbb{F}_p^{(k)}} \sum_{x_{[k]} \in \mathcal{S}^\lambda} c(\phi(x_{[k]})) = \left( 1 - O(\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon}) - O(\delta^{-O(1)}) \xi \right) \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^{(1)} \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathbb{F}_p^{(k)}} \sum_{x_{[k]} \in \mathcal{G}_{[k]}^\lambda} c(\phi(x_{[k]})) > 0.
\]

Pick \( \xi = \Omega(\delta^{O(1)}) \) so that \( 1 - O(\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon}) - O(\delta^{-O(1)}) \xi \) becomes just \( 1 - O(\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon}) \). Average over \( \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^{(1)} \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathbb{F}_p^{(k)} \) and \( \mu \in \mathbb{F}_p^{m_1} \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathbb{F}_p^{m_k} \) to find values such that

\[
\sum_{x_{[k]} \in \mathcal{S}^\lambda} c(\mu) = (1 - O(\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon})) \sum_{x_{[k]} \in \mathcal{G}_{[k]}^\lambda} c(\mu) > 0,
\]

which gives

\[
| \mathcal{S}^\lambda \cap \{ \phi = \mu \}| = (1 - O(\sqrt[4]{\varepsilon}))| \{ x_{[k]} : \alpha(x_{[k]}) = \lambda \} \cap \{ x_{[k]} : \phi(x_{[k]}) = \mu \} | > 0,
\]

as desired. \( \square \)

§8 Biaffine maps on biaffine varieties
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8.1. Quasirandomness of biaffine varieties

A very useful property that some but not all biaffine varieties have is that if we regard them as bipartite graphs, then those bipartite graphs are quasirandom. In such a situation we shall call the varieties themselves quasirandom. More precisely we make the following definition.

**Definition 60.** Let $C_1 \subset G_1, C_2 \subset G_2$ be cosets of some subspaces inside $G_1$ and $G_2$, let $\beta : G_1 \times G_2 \to H$ be a biaffine map, and let $\lambda \in H$. The quadruple $(\beta, \lambda, C_1, C_2)$ is $\eta$-quasirandom with density $\delta$ if the variety $V = \{(x, y) \in G_1 \times G_2 : \beta(x, y) = \lambda\} \cap (C_1 \times C_2)$ satisfies

- for at least a $1 - \eta$ proportion of the elements $x \in C_1$
  $$|V_x| = \delta|C_2|,$$

- for at least a $1 - \eta$ proportion of the pairs $(x_1, x_2) \in C_1 \times C_1$
  $$|V_{x_1} \cap V_{x_2}| = \delta^2|C_2|.$$

If the cosets $C_1, C_2$, the map $\beta$ and the element $\lambda$ are clear from the context, we say that $V$ is $\eta$-quasirandom with density $\delta$.

This implies that the balanced function $\nu$ defined by $\nu(x, y) = V(x, y) - \delta$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_1, x_2 \in C_1, y_1, y_2 \in C_2} \nu(x_1, y_1) \nu(x_2, y_1) \nu(x_1, y_2) \nu(x_2, y_2)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{x_1, x_2 \in C_1} \mathbb{E}_{y \in C_2} \nu(x_1, y) \nu(x_2, y)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{x_1, x_2 \in C_1} \mathbb{E}_{y \in C_2} \mathbb{I}(\beta(x_1, y) = \lambda) \mathbb{I}(\beta(x_2, y) = \lambda) - \delta \mathbb{I}(\beta(x_1, y) = \lambda) - \delta \mathbb{I}(\beta(x_2, y) = \lambda) + \delta^2$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{x_1, x_2 \in C_1} |C_2|^{-1}|V_{x_1} \cap V_{x_2}| - \delta|C_2|^{-1}|V_{x_1}| - \delta|C_2|^{-1}|V_{x_2}| + \delta^2$$

$$\leq 12\eta,$$

and therefore that $||\nu||\square(C_1, C_2) \leq 2\eta^{1/4}$.

Using this property, we may deduce quasirandomness in direction $G_2$.

**Lemma 61.** For at least a $1 - 8\delta^2 \sqrt[4]{\eta}$ proportion of $y \in C_2$, we have $|V_y| = \delta|C_1|$, and for at least a $1 - 32\delta^4 \sqrt[4]{\eta}$ proportion of the pairs $(y_1, y_2) \in C_2 \times C_2$, we have $|V_{y_1} \cap V_{y_2}| = \delta^2|C_1|$.

**Proof.** We have

$$\mathbb{E}_{y \in C_2} |V_{y} - \delta|^2 = \mathbb{E}_{y \in C_2} \left| \mathbb{E}_{x \in C_1} \nu(x, y) \right|^2$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{x_1, x_2 \in C_1} \mathbb{E}_{y \in C_2} \nu(x_1, y) \nu(x_2, y)$$
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\[
\begin{align*}
\leq \mathbb{E}_{x_2 \in C_1, x_1 \in C_1} \mathbb{E}_{y \in C_2} \nu(x_1, y) \nu(x_2, y) \\
&\quad \text{(by Corollary 12)} \\
&\leq \|\nu\|_{\square(C_1, C_2)}.
\end{align*}
\]

Since \(V_y\) is also a coset of a subspace in \(G_1\) and \(\delta\) is already known to be the density of some coset (and thus a non-positive power of \(p\), either \(|V_y| = \delta|C_1|\) or \(|C_1|^{-1}|V_y| - \delta \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta\). The first part of the claim now follows.

Similarly, we have
\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{E}_{y_1, y_2 \in C_2} \left| C_1^{-1}|V_{y_1} \cap V_{y_2}| - \delta^2 \right|^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{y_1, y_2 \in C_2} \left| \mathbb{E}_{x \in C_1} V(x, y_1) V(x, y_2) - \delta^2 \right|^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{y_1, y_2 \in C_2} \left| \mathbb{E}_{x \in C_1} \nu(x, y_1) V(x, y_2) + \delta \nu(x, y_2) \right|^2 \\
&\leq 2 \mathbb{E}_{y_1, y_2 \in C_2} \left| \mathbb{E}_{x \in C_1} \nu(x, y_1) V(x, y_2) \right|^2 + 2 \mathbb{E}_{y_1, y_2 \in C_2} \left| \mathbb{E}_{x \in C_1} \delta \nu(x, y_2) \right|^2 \\
&= 2 \mathbb{E}_{y_1, y_2 \in C_2} \mathbb{E}_{x_1, x_2 \in C_1} \nu(x_1, y_1) V(x_1, y_2) \nu(x_2, y_1) V(x_2, y_2) \\
&\quad + 2 \mathbb{E}_{y_1, y_2 \in C_2} \mathbb{E}_{x_1, x_2 \in C_1} \delta \nu(x_1, y_2) \nu(x_2, y_2) \\
&\quad \text{(by Lemma 12)} \\
&\leq 4 \|\nu\|_{\square(C_1, C_2)},
\end{align*}
\]
completing the proof. \(\square\)

**Lemma 62.** Let \(\beta, \lambda, C_1, C_2, V , \delta, \eta\) be as above. Pick \(x_1, \ldots, x_k\) independently and uniformly from \(C_1\). Then
\[
\mathbb{P}\left( |V_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap V_{x_k}| = \delta^k |C_2| \right) \geq 1 - 8k\delta^{-2k} \sqrt{\eta}.
\]

**Proof.** We have
\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{E}_{x_1, \ldots, x_k \in C_1} \left| C_2^{-1}|V_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap V_{x_k}| - \delta^k \right|^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_1, \ldots, x_k \in C_1} \left| \mathbb{E}_{y \in C_2} V(x_1, y) \cdots V(x_k, y) - \delta^k \right|^2 \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_1, \ldots, x_k \in C_1} \left| \sum_{i \in [k]} \mathbb{E}_{y \in C_2} \delta^{i-1} \nu(x_i, y) V(x_{i+1}, y) \cdots V(x_k, y) \right|^2 \\
&\quad \text{(by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality)} \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in [k]} \mathbb{E}_{x_1, \ldots, x_k \in C_1} \mathbb{E}_{y \in C_2} \delta^{i-1} \nu(x_i, y) V(x_{i+1}, y) \cdots V(x_k, y) \\
&= k \sum_{i \in [k]} \mathbb{E}_{x_1, \ldots, x_k \in C_1} \mathbb{E}_{y \in C_2} \delta^{2i-2} \nu(x_i, y) \nu(x_i, z) V(x_{i+1}, y) V(x_{i+1}, z) \cdots V(x_k, y) V(x_k, z)
\end{align*}
\]
Lemma 63. Let $\beta, \lambda, C_1, C_2, V, \delta, \eta$ be as above, let $S \subset C_2$, and let $\varepsilon \in [20\delta^{-2} \sqrt[4]{\eta}, 1]$. Pick $x_1, \ldots, x_k$ independently and uniformly from $C_1$. Then

$$
\mathbb{P}\left( \left| S \cap V_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap V_{x_k} \right| - \delta^k |S| \geq \varepsilon |C_2| \right) = O(\varepsilon^{-2} \delta^{-4} \sqrt[4]{\eta}).
$$

Proof. Let $N$ be the random variable $|S \cap V_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap V_{x_k}|$. We then have

$$
\mathbb{E} N - \delta^k |S| = \sum_{y \in S} \mathbb{P}(y \in V_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap V_{x_k}) - \delta^k
$$

$$
= \sum_{y \in S} \mathbb{P}(x_1, \ldots, x_k \in V_{y}) - \delta^k
$$

$$
= \sum_{y \in S} (|C_1|^{-1}|V_{y}|)^k - \delta^k
$$

(by Lemma 61)

$$
\leq 8\delta^{-2} \sqrt[4]{\eta} |C_2|.
$$

Next, we estimate the variance of $N$.

\[
\text{var } N = \mathbb{E}(N^2) - (\mathbb{E} N)^2 \\
= \mathbb{E}\left( \sum_{y \in S} 1(y \in V_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap V_{x_k}) \right)^2 - \left( \mathbb{E}\left( \sum_{y \in S} 1(y \in V_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap V_{x_k}) \right) \right)^2 \\
= \sum_{y_1, y_2 \in S} \mathbb{E}1(y_1, y_2 \in V_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap V_{x_k}) - \mathbb{E}\left( 1(y_1 \in V_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap V_{x_k}) \right) \mathbb{E}\left( 1(y_2 \in V_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap V_{x_k}) \right) \\
= \sum_{y_1, y_2 \in S} \mathbb{P}(y_1, y_2 \in V_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap V_{x_k}) - \mathbb{P}(y_1 \in V_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap V_{x_k}) \mathbb{P}(y_2 \in V_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap V_{x_k}) \\
= \sum_{y_1, y_2 \in S} \mathbb{P}(x_1, \ldots, x_k \in V_{y_1} \cap V_{y_2}) - \mathbb{P}(x_1, \ldots, x_k \in V_{y_1}) \mathbb{P}(x_1, \ldots, x_k \in V_{y_2}) \\
= \sum_{y_1, y_2 \in S} \left( \frac{|V_{y_1} \cap V_{y_2}|}{|C_1|} \right)^k - \left( \frac{|V_{y_1}|}{|C_1|} \right)^k \left( \frac{|V_{y_2}|}{|C_1|} \right)^k \\
(\text{by Lemma 61}) \\
\leq 100\delta^{-4} \sqrt[4]{\eta} |C_2|^2.
\]
In the last line we considered separately those pairs \((y_1, y_2)\) where \(|V_{y_1}| \neq \delta|C_1|\), those where \(|V_{y_2}| \neq \delta|C_1|\), and those where \(|V_{y_1} \cap V_{y_2}| \neq \delta^2|C_1|\). We now use Chebyshev’s inequality to get

\[
P\left(|N - \delta^k|S| \geq \varepsilon|C_2|\right) \\ \leq \frac{\text{var } N}{(\varepsilon - 8\delta^{-2}\sqrt{\eta})^2|C_2|^2} \\ \leq \frac{1000\delta^{-4}\sqrt{\eta}}{\varepsilon^2} \\ = O(\varepsilon^{-2}\delta^{-4}\sqrt{\eta}),
\]

which concludes the proof. \(\square\)

We need the following corollaries of Lemmas 32 and 33.

**Corollary 64.** Let \(\beta, \lambda, C_1, C_2, V, \delta, \eta\) be as above and let \(r\) be the codimension of \(\beta\) (that is, \(\dim H\), where \(H\) is the codomain of \(\beta\)). Let \(x_0 \in C_1\) and let \(S \subset V_{x_0}\) be such that \(|S| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|V_{x_0}| > 0\). Let \(k \in \mathbb{N}\). Suppose that \(x_1, \ldots, x_k\) are chosen uniformly and independently from \(C_1\). Then, provided that \(\varepsilon \geq 200\delta^{-2}p^{(k+1)r}\sqrt{\eta}\),

\[
P_{x_1, \ldots, x_k}\left(|S \cap V_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap V_{x_k}| \geq (1 - 2\varepsilon)|V_{x_0} \cap V_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap V_{x_k}|\right) = 1 - O(\varepsilon^{-2}\delta^{-4}p^{2(k+1)r}\sqrt{\eta}).
\]

**Proof.** Let \(N\) and \(N_0\) be the random variables \(|S \cap V_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap V_{x_k}|\) and \(|V_{x_0} \cap V_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap V_{x_k}|\). By Lemma 33 (provided \(\varepsilon \geq 200\delta^{-2}p^{(k+1)r}\sqrt{\eta}\) so that the technical requirement in the statement of that lemma is met) we have

\[
P_{x_1, \ldots, x_k}\left(|N - \delta^k|S| \geq \frac{p^{-(k+1)r}\varepsilon}{10}|C_2|\right) = O(\varepsilon^{-2}\delta^{-4}p^{2(k+1)r}\sqrt{\eta})
\]

and

\[
P_{x_1, \ldots, x_k}\left(|N_0 - \delta^k|V_{x_0}| \geq \frac{p^{-(k+1)r}\varepsilon}{10}|C_2|\right) = O(\varepsilon^{-2}\delta^{-4}p^{2(k+1)r}\sqrt{\eta}).
\]

Thus, with probability \(1 - O(\varepsilon^{-2}\delta^{-4}p^{2(k+1)r}\sqrt{\eta})\) we have that \(\left|N - \delta^k|S|\right|, \left|N_0 - \delta^k|V_{x_0}|\right| \leq \frac{p^{-(k+1)r}\varepsilon}{10}|C_2|\). By the triangle inequality this implies that

\[
|N - N_0| \leq \delta^k|V_{x_0} \setminus S| + \frac{p^{-(k+1)r}\varepsilon}{5}|C_2| \leq \varepsilon\delta^k|V_{x_0}| + \frac{p^{-(k+1)r}\varepsilon}{5}|C_2| \leq \varepsilon N_0 + \frac{p^{-(k+1)r}\varepsilon}{10}|C_2|.
\]

To finish the proof, it remains to show that \(\frac{p^{-(k+1)r}\varepsilon}{10}|C_2| \leq \varepsilon N_0\). Observe that it is sufficient to show that \(N_0 > 0\). Indeed, since the codimension of \(\beta\) is \(r\), \(V_{x_0} \cap V_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap V_{x_k}\) has codimension at most \((k + 1)r\) inside \(C_2\), which implies

\[
N_0 = |V_{x_0} \cap V_{x_1} \cap \ldots \cap V_{x_k}| \geq p^{-(k+1)r}|C_2|.
\]

Next, we prove that \(N_0 > 0\). From \(\left|N_0 - \delta^k|V_{x_0}|\right| \leq \frac{p^{-(k+1)r}\varepsilon}{10}|C_2|\), we see that it suffices to show \(\delta^k|V_{x_0}| \geq \frac{p^{-(k+1)r}\varepsilon}{10}|C_2|\). Again, \(V_{x_0}\) is non-empty, and since the codimension of \(\beta\) is \(r\), codimension of \(V_{x_0}\) in \(C\) is at most \(r\). Thus, \(|V_{x_0}| \geq p^{-r}|C_2|\). Finally, observe that \(\delta \geq p^{-r}\); simply pick any \(x \in C_1\) with \(|V_x| = \delta|C_2|\), we know that \(|V_x| \geq p^{-r}|C_2|\) from the argument above. This completes the proof. \(\square\)
Recall that $\mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{c}$ indicate positive constants, as explained in the notational part of the preliminary section of the paper (see expression (1) and discussion surrounding it).

**Corollary 65.** Let $P \subset C_1^2$. Then provided that $\eta \leq \mathbf{c} \delta^2$, for all but $O(\delta^{-8} \sqrt{\eta} |C_2|)$ of the elements $y \in C_2$, we have

$$|P \cap V_y^2| - \delta^2 |P| \leq \frac{\eta \delta}{2} |C_1|^2.$$

**Proof.** Pick $y \in C_2$ uniformly at random. Let $N$ be the random variable $|P \cap V_y^2|$. Then

$$\mathbb{E} N = \sum_{(x_1, x_2) \in P} \mathbb{P}(x_1, x_2 \in V_y) = \sum_{(x_1, x_2) \in P} \mathbb{P}(y \in V_{x_1} \cap V_{x_2}) = \sum_{(x_1, x_2) \in P} \frac{|V_{x_1} \cap V_{x_2}|}{|C_2|}.$$

Using Lemma 62, we get that

$$|\mathbb{E} N - \delta^2 |P|| = O(\delta^{-4} \sqrt{\eta} |C_1|^2).$$

Next, we estimate the second moment of $N$. We have

$$\mathbb{E} N^2 = \sum_{(x_1, x_2), (x_3, x_4) \in P} \mathbb{P}(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in V_y) = \sum_{(x_1, x_2), (x_3, x_4) \in P} \frac{|V_{x_1} \cap V_{x_2} \cap V_{x_3} \cap V_{x_4}|}{|C_2|}.$$

Using Lemma 62 another time, we get that

$$|\mathbb{E} N^2 - \delta^4 |P|^2| = O(\delta^{-8} \sqrt{\eta} |C_1|^4).$$

By Markov’s inequality, provided $\sqrt{\eta} \geq \mathbf{C} \delta^{-4} \sqrt{\eta}$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(|N - \delta^2 |P|| \geq \sqrt{\eta} |C_1|^2) \leq \mathbb{P}(|N - \mathbb{E} N| \geq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\eta} |C_1|^2) = \mathbb{P}(|N - \mathbb{E} N| \geq \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\eta} |C_1|^4)$$

$$\leq \frac{O(\mathbb{E} N^2 - (\mathbb{E} N)^2)}{\sqrt{\eta} |C_1|^4} \leq \frac{O(\delta^{-8} \sqrt{\eta} |C_1|^4)}{\sqrt{\eta} |C_1|^4} \leq O(\delta^{-8} \sqrt{\eta}).$$

We also note that a union of a small number of quasirandom pieces is still quasirandom, with a slightly worse quasirandomness parameter.

**Lemma 66.** Let $C_1$ be a coset in $G_1$, let $U, W \leq G_2$ be subspaces such that $U \cap W = \{0\}$ and $
\dim W = d$, let $w_0 + W$ be a coset in $G_2$, and let $\beta : G_1 \times G_2 \to H$ be a biaffine map. Let $\lambda \in H$. Suppose that

$$V^w = \{(x_1, x_2) : \beta(x_1, x_2) = \lambda\} \cap (C_1 \times (w + U))$$

is non-empty and $\eta$-quasirandom with density $\delta$ for all $w \in w_0 + W$. Then

$$V^{w_0 + W} = \{(x_1, x_2) : \beta(x_1, x_2) = \lambda\} \cap (C_1 \times (w_0 + W + U))$$

is $(p^d \eta)$-quasirandom with density $\delta$.  
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Proof. By definition of quasirandomness, for each \( w \in w_0 + W \), there are at least \((1 - \eta)|C_1|\) elements \( x \in C_1 \) such that \( |V^w_x| = \delta|w + U| \). Thus, for at least \((1 - p^d\eta)|C_1|\) elements \( x \in C_1 \), for each \( w \in w_0 + W \), \( |V^w_x| = \delta|w + U| \). For such an \( x \) we thus have \( |V^w_{x_0 + W}| = \sum_{w \in w_0 + W} |V^w_x| = \delta|w_0 + W + U| \). A similar bound holds for pairs in \( C_1 \), so the larger variety is also quasirandom. \( \square \)

8.2. Convolutional extensions of biaffine maps

For a subset \( S \subset G_1 \times G_2 \), we write \( S_{u\bullet} = \{ v \in G_2 : (u, v) \in S \} \) and \( S_{u\bullet} = \{ u \in G_2 : (u, v) \in S \} \).

(We need this additional notation since previously it was understood that variables \( x_i \) belonged to \( G_1 \) and variables \( y_i \) belonged to \( G_2 \), and hence that \( S_x \) meant \( S_{x\bullet} \) and \( S_y \) meant \( S_{y\bullet} \)).

Theorem 67. For every \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) there is a constant \( \varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(k) > 0 \) such that the following holds. Let \( u_0 + U \) be a coset in \( G_1 \), let \( v_0 + V \) be a coset in \( G_2 \) and let \( \beta : G_1 \times G_2 \to \mathbb{F}^r \) be a biaffine map. Let \( \lambda \in \mathbb{F}^r \). Suppose that

\[
B = \{(x, y) : \beta(x, y) = \lambda\} \cap ((u_0 + U) \times (v_0 + V))
\]

is non-empty and \( \eta \)-quasirandom with density \( \delta \). Let \( X \subset u_0 + U \) and \( S \subset B \) be such that \( |S_{x\bullet}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon_0)|B_{x\bullet}| \) for each \( x \in X \). Let \( \phi : S \to H \) and suppose that \( \phi \) is a \( 6 \cdot 2^k \)-homomorphism in direction \( G_1 \) and a \( 2 \)-homomorphism in direction \( G_2 \).

Then provided \(|U| \geq \eta^{-C_6} \), there exist a subset \( X_{ext} \subset X \) such that \(|X \setminus X_{ext}| = O_k, p_r \Phi_k, p_r^\eta(1)|U|\), and a map \( \phi_{\text{conv}} : (X_{ext} \times (v_0 + V)) \cap B \to H \), with the following properties.

(i) \( \phi_{\text{conv}} \) is a \( 2^k \)-homomorphism in direction \( G_1 \).

(ii) \( \phi_{\text{conv}} \) is a \( 2 \)-homomorphism in direction \( G_2 \).

(iii) For each \( (x, y) \in (X_{ext} \times (v_0 + V)) \cap B \), whenever \( z_1, z_2 \in S_{x\bullet} \) are such that \( z_1 + z_2 - y \in S_{x\bullet} \), we have

\[
\phi_{\text{conv}}(x, y) = \phi(x, z_1) + \phi(x, z_2) - \phi(x, z_1 + z_2 - y).
\]

Proof. Set \( \varepsilon_0 = 2^{-k}/100 \). All the implicit constants in the asymptotic notation in the proof depend on \( k \) and \( p \) only, which we do not write explicitly to make the proof easier to read. We may immediately observe that for each \( x \in X \), we can extend the map \( y \mapsto \phi(x, y) \), defined on \( S_{x\bullet} \), to a \( 2 \)-homomorphism \( \phi_{x\text{conv}} : B_{x\bullet} \to H \), using Lemma 24. If we set \( \phi_{\text{conv}}(x, y) = \phi_{x\text{conv}}(y) \), then the map \( \phi_{\text{conv}} \) readily satisfies properties (ii) and (iii). It remains to find \( X_{ext} \) such that the restriction of \( \phi_{\text{conv}} \) to \((X_{ext} \times (v_0 + V)) \cap B\) also has property (i).

We say that an ordered quadruple \((x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in (u_0 + U)^4 \) is an additive quadruple if \( x_1 + x_2 = x_3 + x_4 \). Let \( \xi > 0 \) be a constant to be chosen later. We iteratively remove elements from \( X \). At
the \(i\)th step, we remove an element \(r_i\) if it belongs to fewer than \(\xi|U|^2\) additive quadruples whose points have not yet been removed from \(X\). The procedure terminates if there is no such element. Let \(r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_m\) be the elements of \(X\) that were removed, in this order. In particular, this means that for each \(i_1 \in [m]\), there are at most \(\xi|U|^2\) choices \((i_2, i_3, i_4)\) such that \(i_1 < i_2 < i_3 < i_4 \leq m\) and \(r_{i_4}\) is an additive quadruple. On the other hand, there are at least \(m^4/|U| - 6|U|^2\) additive quadruples consisting of distinct elements in \(\{r_1, \ldots, r_m\}\), from which we deduce that

\[
\xi m|U|^2 \geq m^4/|U| - 6|U|^2.
\]

Thus, \(m \leq \max\{2\xi^{1/3}|U|, 6\xi^{-1}\}\). Let \(X'\) be the modified set. Then each \(x \in X'\) belongs to at least \(\xi|U|^2\) additive quadruples in \(X'\).

Say that an additive quadruple \(x_{[4]}\) is **good** if \(|\bigcap_{i \in [4]} S_{x_i} \cdot | \geq (1 - 10\varepsilon_0)|\bigcap_{i \in [4]} B_{x_i} \cdot |\). Otherwise say that \(x_{[4]}\) is **bad**.

**Claim A.** The number of bad additive quadruples \(x_{[4]}\) with elements in \(X'\) is \(O(\varepsilon_0^2 p^{O(r)} \sqrt{\eta}|U|^3) = O(p^{O(r)} \sqrt{\eta}|U|^3)\).

**Proof.** Observe that a quadruple \(x_{[4]}\) of elements in \(X'\) is automatically good when

\[
\left| S_{x_i} \cap \left( \bigcap_{j \in [4]\setminus\{i\}} B_{x_j} \cdot \right) \right| \geq (1 - 2\varepsilon_0) \bigcap_{i \in [4]} B_{x_i} \cdot
\]

for each \(i \in [4]\). Using this observation, the claim follows from Corollary \[\[4\]\] and the fact that \(B_{x_1} \cdot \cap B_{x_2} \cdot \cap B_{x_3} \cdot \cap B_{x_4} = B_{x_1} \cdot \cap B_{x_2} \cdot \cap B_{x_3} \cdot \cap \cdots = B_{x_2} \cdot \cap B_{x_3} \cdot \cap B_{x_4} \cdot \cdot \cdot \).

Let \(X''\) be the set of all \(x \in X'\) that belong to at most \(\sqrt{\eta}|U|^2\) bad additive quadruples whose elements lie in \(X'\). Then \(|X' \setminus X''| = O(p^{O(r)} \sqrt{\eta}|U|)\). Thus,

\[
|X''| \geq |X| - m - O(p^{O(r)} \sqrt{\eta}|U|) \geq |X| - 6\xi^{-1} - O(p^{O(r)} \sqrt{\eta}|U|).
\]

We may without loss of generality assume that \(|X''| \geq \sqrt{\eta}|U|\), otherwise take \(X'' = \emptyset\) and the desired claim is immediately satisfied.

In particular, each \(x \in X''\) still belongs to \((\xi - O(p^{O(r)} \sqrt{\eta}))|U|^2\) additive quadruples with elements in \(X''\). We now prove that \(X''\) has the claimed properties.

Let \(a_e, b_e \in X''\) for \(e \in \{0, 1\}^k\) be such that \(\sum_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} a_e = \sum_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} b_e\) and let \(y_0 \in \bigcap_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} (B_{a_e} \cdot \cap B_{b_e} \cdot )\). For each \(x \in X''\), let \(P_x = \{(x_1, x_2) \in X'': x_1 + x_2 - x \in X''\}\). From Corollary \[\[3\]\], provided \(\eta \leq c\delta^{32}\), we see that for all but \(O(\delta^{-8} \sqrt{\eta}|U|)\) elements \(y \in B_{a_e} \cdot \),

\[
\left| P_{a_e} \cap B_{y_0}^2 \right| \leq \delta^2 |P_{a_e} | \leq 16 \sqrt{\eta}|U|^2.
\]

A similar property holds for each \(b_e\). Also, by Lemmas \[\[1\]\] and \[\[2\]\], provided \(\eta \leq c\delta^{-C}\), we obtain

\[
\left| \left\{ y \in v_0 + V : \left| B_{y} \cdot \cap X'' \right| - \delta |X''| \leq \sqrt{\eta}|U| \right\} \right| = (1 - O(p^{O(r)} \sqrt{\eta}))|v_0 + V|.
\]
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Hence, we obtain a set $Y \subset \left( \cap_{c \in \{0,1\}^k} B_{ac} \right) \cap \left( \cap_{c \in \{0,1\}^k} B_{bc} \right)$ such that

(i) $\left| \left( \cap_{c \in \{0,1\}^k} B_{ac} \right) \cap \left( \cap_{c \in \{0,1\}^k} B_{bc} \right) \right| - |Y| = O(p^{O(r) \sqrt{\ln n}} |V|)$,

(ii) $|B_{\star y} \cap X''| - \delta |X''| \leq \sqrt{\ln n} U$ for every $y \in Y$, and

(iii) $|P_{ac} \cap B_{\star y}^2| - \delta^2 |P_{ac}| \leq \sqrt{\ln n} U$ and $|P_{bc} \cap B_{\star y}^2| - \delta^2 |P_{bc}| \leq \sqrt{\ln n} U^2$ for every $y \in Y$ and every $e \in \{0,1\}^k$.

In particular, for a proportion $1 - O(p^{O(r) \sqrt{\ln n}})$ of choices of $y_1, y_2 \in \left( \cap_{c \in \{0,1\}^k} B_{ac} \right) \cap \left( \cap_{c \in \{0,1\}^k} B_{bc} \right)$ (note that this set is non-empty since it contains $y_0$), we have $y_1, y_2, y_1 + y_2 - y_0 \in Y$. Fix any such choice of $y_1, y_2$ and let $\tilde{y} \in \{y_1, y_2, y_1 + y_2 - y_0\}$.

Set $W = B_{\star \tilde{y}} - a_e$ (for an arbitrary $e$ – this is independent of the choice of $e$), $\tilde{X} = X'' \cap B_{\star \tilde{y}}$ and recursively define sets $S_i \subset \tilde{X}^{2k+2} \times W^{2k+1-2k+2-i}$, for $i \in [k+2]$ as follows. We set

$$S_1 = \left\{ (u_e, v_e, w_e, z_e : e \in \{0,1\}^k) \in \tilde{X}^{2k+2} : \left( \forall e \in \{0,1\}^k \right) (a_e, u_e + v_e - a_e, u_e, v_e) \in \tilde{X}^4 \text{ is good} \right.$$ 

$$\text{and} \quad (b_e, w_e + z_e - b_e, w_e, z_e) \in \tilde{X}^4 \text{ is good} \right\}.$$

For $i \in [k]$, once $S_i$ has been defined, we set

$$S_{i+1} = \left\{ (u_e, v_e, w_e, z_e : e \in \{0,1\}^k, (d_e^{(1)}, f_e^{(1)} : e \in \{0,1\}^{k-1}, \ldots, (d_e^{(i)}, f_e^{(i)} : e \in \{0,1\}^{k-1}) \right.$$ 

$$\in \tilde{X}^{2k+2} \times W^{2k+1-2k+2-i} : \left( \forall e \in \{0,1\}^{k-1} \right) (u_e, v_e, w_e, z_e : e \in \{0,1\}^k) (a_e, u_e + v_e - a_e, u_e, v_e) \in \tilde{X}^4$$

$$\text{and} \quad (b_e, w_e + z_e - b_e, w_e, z_e) \in \tilde{X}^4 \text{ are good} \right\}. $$

Finally, define

$$S_{k+2} = \left\{ (u_e, v_e, w_e, z_e : e \in \{0,1\}^k, (d_e^{(1)}, f_e^{(1)} : e \in \{0,1\}^{k-1}, \ldots, (d_e^{(k)}, f_e^{(k)}, g) \right.$$ 

$$\in \tilde{X}^{2k+2} \times W^{2k+1-1} : \left( \forall e \in \{0,1\}^k \right) (a_e, u_e + v_e - a_e, u_e, v_e) \in \tilde{X}^4$$

$$\text{and} \quad (b_e, w_e + z_e - b_e, w_e, z_e) \in \tilde{X}^4 \text{ is good} \right\}. $$
Claim B. For each $i \in [k+2]$, provided $\xi \geq \mathcal{C} \eta^c p^{\mathcal{C} r}$, we have

$$|S_i| = p^{-O(r)} \xi^{O(1)} |W|^{2k+2+2k^1+2k^2+2k^3+2k^4}. $$

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on $i$. The base case $i = 1$ follows from property (iii) of $Y$ listed above, from the fact that all $P_{a_e}, P_{b_e}$ are sufficiently dense, and from the fact that almost all additive quadruples involving $a_e, b_e$ are good. To show the bound in the case $i = 2$, for fixed values $v_e, z_e \in X, s_e', t_e' \in 2u_0,0,\ldots,0 + W$ (again the choice of index $a_0,0,\ldots,0$ is irrelevant, and any $a_e$ would do), for each $e \in \{0,1\}^k, e' \in \{0,1\}^{k-1}$, let

$$S_{1, v, z, s, t} = \{(u_e, w_e : e \in \{0,1\}^k) \in \tilde{X}^{2k+1} : (u_e, v_e, w_e, z_e : e \in \{0,1\}^k) \in S_1$$

$$\quad \wedge (\forall e' \in \{0,1\}^{k-1}) u(e',0) + u_{e',1} = s_{e'}, w(e',0) + w(e',1) = t_{e'} \}.$$ 

When $(u_e, w_e : e \in \{0,1\}^k), (u'_e, w'_e : e \in \{0,1\}^k) \in S_1, v, z, s, t$, for each $e' \in \{0,1\}^{k-1}$ we have $u(e',0) + u_{e',1} = u'_e(0) + u'_{e',1}$, so we can write it in the form $u'_e(0) = u(e',0) + d(1)_e, u'_e(1) = u(e',1) - d(1)_e$ for some $d(1)_e \in W$. Similarly, we can write $w'_e(0) = w(e',0) + f(1)_e, w'_e(1) = w(e',1) - f(1)_e$. Thus, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Claim A,

$$|S_2| = \sum_{v, z, s, t} |S_1, v, z, s, t|^2 - O(p^{O(r)} \sqrt{\eta}) |W|^{2k+2+2k^1+2k^2} = \xi^{O(1)} p^{-O(r)} |W|^{2k+2+2k^2}.$$ 

Assume now that the claim holds for some $i \in [2, k]$. That is, assume that

$$|S_i| = p^{-O(r)} \xi^{O(1)} |W|^{2k+2+2k^1+2k^2+2k^3+2k^4}.$$ 

Similarly to the above, for fixed values $(u_e, v_e, w_e, z_e : e \in \{0,1\}^k) \in \tilde{X}^{2k+2}, (d(1)_e, f(1)_e : e \in \{0,1\}^{k-1}) \in W^{2k}, \ldots, (d(1)^{i-2}_e, f(1)^{i-2}_e : e \in \{0,1\}^{k+1-i}) \in W^{2k+3-i}, s_e, t_e \in 2u_0,0,\ldots,0 + W$ for $e \in \{0,1\}^{k-i}$, we set

$$S_{1, v, u, z, w} = \{(d(1)^{i-1}_e, f(1)^{i-1}_e : e \in \{0,1\}^{k+1-i}) \in W^{2k+2+2k^1+2k^2+2k^3+2k^4} : (u_e, v_e, w_e, z_e : e \in \{0,1\}^k),$$

$$(d(1)_e, f(1)_e : e \in \{0,1\}^{k-1}), \ldots, (d(1)^{i-1}_e, f(1)^{i-1}_e : e \in \{0,1\}^{k+1-i}) \in S_i$$

$$\wedge (\forall e \in \{0,1\}^{k-i}) (u_{e,0,0,\ldots,0} + d(1)_e,0,0,\ldots,0 + \cdots + d(1)_e,0)$$

$$+ u_{e,1,0,0,\ldots,0} + d(1)_e,1,0,0,\ldots,0 + \cdots + d(1)_e,1,0,0,\ldots,0$$

$$\wedge (\forall e \in \{0,1\}^{k-i}) (w_{e,0,0,\ldots,0} + f(1)_e,0,0,\ldots,0 + \cdots + f(1)_e,0)$$

$$+ w_{e,1,0,0,\ldots,0} + f(1)_e,1,0,0,\ldots,0 + \cdots + f(1)_e,1,0,0,\ldots,0 \}.$$ 

When $(d(1)^{i-1}_e, f(1)^{i-1}_e : e \in \{0,1\}^{k+1-i}), (d(1)^{i-1}_e, f(1)^{i-1}_e : e \in \{0,1\}^{k+1-i}) \in S_i, v, u, z, w, d(1)^{i-1}_e, f(1)^{i-1}_e, s, t$, for each $e \in \{0,1\}^{k-1}$ we have

$$u_{e,0,0,\ldots,0} + d(1)^{i-2}_e,0,0,\ldots,0 + \cdots + d(1)^{i-2}_e,0,0,\ldots,0 + u_{e,1,0,0,\ldots,0} + d(1)^{i-2}_e,1,0,0,\ldots,0 + \cdots + d(1)^{i-2}_e,1,0,0,\ldots,0 + d(1)_e,1.$$
so we can find $d_e^{(i)} \in W$ such that $d_e^{(i-1)} = d_e^{(i)} - d_e^{(i-1)}$ and $d_e^{(i-1)} = d_e^{(i)} - d_e^{(i-1)}$. Similarly, we can write $f_e^{(i)} = f_e^{(i)} + f_e^{(i)}$ and $f_e^{(i)} = f_e^{(i)} - f_e^{(i)}$ for some $f_e \in W$. Thus, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Claim A,

$$\left|S_{t+1}\right| = \sum_{e,v,u,z,w \in \mathbb{Z}^k, d^{[t-2]}(e), f^{[t-2]}(e), t} \left|S_t\right|^2 - O(p^O(r) \sqrt{\eta}) |W|^{2k+2+2k+1-\frac{1}{2}k+1-i}$$

$$= p^{-O(r)} \xi O(1) |W|^{2k+2+2k+1-\frac{1}{2}k+1-i},$$

provided $\xi \geq C \eta^\epsilon p^{C_r}$.

Finally, assume that the claim holds for $i = k + 1$. For fixed values $(u, v, w, z : e \in \{0, 1\}^k) \in \tilde{X}^{2k+2}$, $(d^{(1)}(e), f^{(1)}(e) : e \in \{0, 1\}^{k-1}) \in W^{2k}$, ..., $(d^{(k)}(e), f^{(k)}(e) : e \in \{0, 1\}^k) \in W^4$, $s \in W$, we set

$$S_{k+1} = \left\{ (d^{(1)}(e), f^{(1)}(e)) \in W^2 : \left( (u, v, w, z : e \in \{0, 1\}^k), (d^{(1)}(e), f^{(1)}(e) : e \in \{0, 1\}^{k-1}), \ldots, (d^{(k)}(e), f^{(k)}(e)) \right) \in S_{k+1} \right\}$$

$$\land \left( u_{0,0,0} + d_0^{(1)} + \cdots + d^{(k)}(e) \right) - \left( u_{0,0,0} + f^{(1)}(e) + \cdots + f^{(k)}(e) \right) = s \right\}.$$

When $(d^{(k)}, f^{(k)}), (d^{(k)}, f^{(k)}) \in S_{k+1}$, then, similarly to before, $d^{(k)} - f^{(k)} = d^{(k)} - f^{(k)}$, so there exists $g \in W$ such that $d^{(k)} = d^{(k)} + g$ and $f^{(k)} = f^{(k)} + g$. To finish the proof, apply the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Claim A again, obtaining

$$\left|S_{k+2}\right| = \sum_{e,v,u,z,w \in \mathbb{Z}^k, d^{[k-1]}(e), f^{[k-1]}(e), t} \left|S_{k+1}\right|^2 - O(p^O(r) \sqrt{\eta}) |W|^{2k+2+2k+1-\frac{1}{2}k+1-i}$$

$$= p^{-O(r)} \xi O(1) |W|^{2k+2+2k+1-\frac{1}{2}k+1-i},$$

provided $\xi \geq C \eta^\epsilon p^{C_r}$.

**Claim C.** The number of

$$\left( (u, v, w, z : e \in \{0, 1\}^k), (d^{(1)}(e), f^{(1)}(e) : e \in \{0, 1\}^{k-1}), \ldots, (d^{(k)}(e), f^{(k)}(e), g) \right) \in (\tilde{X})^{2k+2} \times W^{2k+1-1}$$

such that

$$\left| \left( \bigcap_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} S_{u_e + v_e - u_e} \right) \cap \left( \bigcap_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} S_{v_e} \right) \cap \left( \bigcap_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} S_{w_e} \cap S_{w_e + z_e} \right) \cap \left( \bigcap_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} S_{z_e} \right) \cap \left( \bigcap_{i \in [k]} \left( \bigcap_{e \in \{0, 1\}^{k-i}} S_{u_e, i, 0, \ldots, 0 + d^{(1)}(e)} \right) \right) \cap \left( \bigcap_{i \in [k]} \left( \bigcap_{e \in \{0, 1\}^{k-i}} S_{w_e, i, 0, \ldots, 0 + f^{(1)}(e)} \right) \right) \right|$$

is
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\[
\cap S_{(u_0, \ldots, 0 + d_1^{(1)}, \ldots, 0 + \cdots + d^{(k) g})} \cap S_{(u_0, \ldots, 0 + f_0^{(1)}, \ldots, 0 + \cdots + f^{(k) g})} < (1 - 12 \cdot 2^k \varepsilon_0) \left( \bigcap_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} B_{u_e + v_e - a_e} \cap \bigcap_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} B_{v_e} \cap \bigcap_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} B_{w_e + z_e - b_e} \cap \bigcap_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} B_{z_e} \right)
\]

and all elements that appear in the subscript of \( S \) belong to \( \tilde{X} \), is \( O(\eta U^{|k|} \sqrt{\eta} U^{2^k + 2^{k+1} - 1}) \).

**Proof.** Note that when the elements \((u_e - a_e, v_e, w_e - b_e, z_e : e \in \{0, 1\}^k), (d_1^{(1)}, f_1^{(1)} : e \in \{0, 1\}^{k-1}), \ldots, (d^{(k)}, f^{(k)}), g \) are linearly independent, then the elements in the subscript of the set \( S \) on the left-hand-side, omitting the last one, are linearly independent as well. On the other hand, there is a linear relationship that all elements in the subscripts always satisfy, namely:

\[
0 = \left( \sum_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} u_e + v_e - a_e \right) - \left( \sum_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} v_e \right) - \left( \sum_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} w_e + z_e - b_e \right) + \left( \sum_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} z_e \right)
\]

\[
- \sum_{i \in [k]} \left( \sum_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} u_{e, 1, \ldots, 0} + d_1^{(1)} e_{e, 1, \ldots, 0} + \cdots + d^{(i-1)} e_{e, 1, \ldots, 0} - d_e^{(i)} \right)
\]

\[
+ \sum_{i \in [k]} \left( \sum_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} w_{e, 1, \ldots, 0} + f_1^{(1)} e_{e, 1, \ldots, 0} + \cdots + f^{(i-1)} e_{e, 1, \ldots, 0} - f_e^{(i)} \right)
\]

\[
- \left( u_0, \ldots, 0 + d_1^{(1)} + \cdots + d^{(k)} + g \right) + \left( w_0, \ldots, 0 + f_1^{(1)} + \cdots + f^{(k)} + g \right).
\]

We used the fact that \( \sum_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} a_e = \sum_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} b_e \).

The rest of the proof is identical to that of Claim A. Like that one, this claim follows from Corollary 13 (being applied to all variants of (13) where all but one occurrence of the set \( S \) on the left has been changed to \( B \), and the constant is set to 1 - 2\( \varepsilon_0 \)). \( \square \)

We now use the structure obtained to show that \( \sum_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} \phi^{\text{conv}}(a_e, y) = \sum_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} \phi^{\text{conv}}(b_e, y) \). Once this has been proved, recall that \( y \) was arbitrary among \( \{y_1, y_2, y_1 + y_2 - y_0\} \). Using the fact that \( \phi^{\text{conv}} \) is a 2-homomorphism in direction \( G_2 \), we get \( \sum_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} \phi^{\text{conv}}(a_e, y_0) = \sum_{e \in \{0, 1\}^k} \phi^{\text{conv}}(b_e, y_0) \), as desired.

Crucially, observe that whenever \( m \leq 6 \cdot 2^k \) and \( q_1, \ldots, q_{2m} \in X'' \) satisfy \( \sum_{i \in [m]} q_i = \sum_{i \in [m+1, 2m]} q_i \) and

\[
\left| \bigcap_{i \in [2m]} S_{q_i} \right| \geq \frac{3}{7} \left| \bigcap_{i \in [2m]} B_{q_i} \right|
\]

then \( \sum_{i \in [m]} \phi^{\text{conv}}(q_i, y) = \sum_{i \in [m+1, 2m]} \phi^{\text{conv}}(q_i, y) \) for any \( y \in \bigcap_{i \in [2m]} B_{q_i} \). Indeed, as usual, \( C = \bigcap_{i \in [2m]} B_{q_i} \) is a coset, and then for any \( z_1 \in C' = \bigcap_{i \in [2m]} S_{q_i} \), we have that \( C' - z_1 + y \subset C \), so
\[ C' - z_1 + y \text{ and } C' \text{ intersect, at some } z_2, \text{ say. Thus } z_2, z_1 + z_2 - y \in C' \text{ as well, so}
\]
\[
\sum_{i \in [m]} \phi^{\text{conv}}(q_i, y) = \sum_{i \in [m]} \left( \phi(q_i, z_1) + \phi(q_i, z_2) - \phi(q_i, z_1 + z_2 - y) \right)
\]
\[
= \left( \sum_{i \in [m]} \phi(q_i, z_1) \right) + \left( \sum_{i \in [m]} \phi(q_i, z_2) \right) - \left( \sum_{i \in [m]} \phi(q_i, z_1 + z_2 - y) \right)
\]
\[
= \sum_{i \in [m]} \phi^{\text{conv}}(q_i, y).
\]

(since \( \phi \) is an \( m \)-homomorphism in direction \( G_1 \) on \( S \) and all points in the arguments of \( \phi \) belong to \( S \))
\[
= \sum_{i \in [m+1,2m]} \phi(q_i, z_1) + \left( \sum_{i \in [m+1,2m]} \phi(q_i, z_2) \right) - \left( \sum_{i \in [m+1,2m]} \phi(q_i, z_1 + z_2 - y) \right)
\]
\[
= \sum_{i \in [m+1,2m]} \phi^{\text{conv}}(q_i, y).
\]

Take \( \left( (u_e, v_e, w_e, z_e : e \in \{0,1\}^k), (d^{(1)}_e, f^{(1)}_e : e \in \{0,1\}^{k-1}), \ldots, (d^{(k)}_e, f^{(k)}_e), g \right) \in \mathcal{S}_{k+2} \) such that (3) holds. Applying this observation and recalling that \( \varepsilon_0 = 2^{-k}/100 \), we get
\[
\sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^k} \phi^{\text{conv}}(v_e, \tilde{y}) = \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^k} \phi^{\text{conv}}(u_e + v_e - a_e, \tilde{y})
\]
\[
+ \sum_{i \in [k]} \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^{k-i}} \phi^{\text{conv}}(u_e,1,0,\ldots,0 + d^{(1)}_{e,1,0,\ldots,0} + \cdots + d^{(i-1)}_{e,1,0,\ldots,0} - d^{(i)}_{e,1,0,\ldots,0}, \tilde{y})
\]
\[
+ \phi^{\text{conv}}(u_{0,\ldots,0} + d^{(1)}_{0,\ldots,0} + \cdots + d^{(k)}_{0,\ldots,0} + g, \tilde{y})
\]
\[
= \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^k} \phi^{\text{conv}}(z_e, \tilde{y}) - \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^k} \phi^{\text{conv}}(w_e + z_e - b_e, \tilde{y})
\]
\[
+ \sum_{i \in [k]} \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^{k-i}} \phi^{\text{conv}}(w_e,1,0,\ldots,0 + f^{(1)}_{e,1,0,\ldots,0} + \cdots + f^{(i-1)}_{e,1,0,\ldots,0} - f^{(i)}_{e,1,0,\ldots,0}, \tilde{y})
\]
\[
+ \phi^{\text{conv}}(w_{0,\ldots,0} + f^{(1)}_{0,\ldots,0} + \cdots + f^{(k)}_{0,\ldots,0} + g, \tilde{y})
\]
\[
\tag{49}
\]

and whenever \( x[i] \) is a good additive quadruple in \( B_{\tilde{y}}, \phi^{\text{conv}}(x_1, \tilde{y}) + \phi^{\text{conv}}(x_2, \tilde{y}) = \phi^{\text{conv}}(x_3, \tilde{y}) + \phi^{\text{conv}}(x_4, \tilde{y}), \) so in particular \( \phi^{\text{conv}}(u_e) + \phi^{\text{conv}}(u_e+v_e-a_e) = \phi^{\text{conv}}(u_e)+\phi^{\text{conv}}(v_e) \) and when \( e \in \{0,1\}^{k-i},
\]
\[
\phi^{\text{conv}}(u_e,0,\ldots,0 + d^{(1)}_{e,0,\ldots,0} + \cdots + d^{(i-1)}_{e,0,\ldots,0} + \phi^{\text{conv}}(u_e,1,0,\ldots,0 + d^{(1)}_{e,1,0,\ldots,0} + \cdots + d^{(i-1)}_{e,1,0,\ldots,0})
\]
\[
= \phi^{\text{conv}}(u_e,0,\ldots,0 + d^{(1)}_{e,0,\ldots,0} + \cdots + d^{(i-1)}_{e,0,\ldots,0} + d^{(i)}_{e,0,\ldots,0}) + \phi^{\text{conv}}(u_e,1,0,\ldots,0 + d^{(1)}_{e,1,0,\ldots,0} + \cdots + d^{(i-1)}_{e,1,0,\ldots,0} + d^{(i)}_{e,1,0,\ldots,0})
\]
\]
and so on. (We look at all good quadruples listed in the definitions of the sets \( \mathcal{S}_i \)) After algebraic manipulation, we deduce that
\[
\sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^k} \phi^{\text{conv}}(a_e, \tilde{y}) = \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^k} \phi^{\text{conv}}(v_e, \tilde{y}) - \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^k} \phi^{\text{conv}}(u_e + v_e - a_e, \tilde{y}) + \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^k} \phi^{\text{conv}}(u_e, \tilde{y})
\]
\[
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\[= \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^k} \phi^{\text{conv}}(v_e, \tilde{y}) - \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^k} \phi^{\text{conv}}(u_e + v_e - a_e, \tilde{y}) + \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^{k-1}} \left( \phi^{\text{conv}}(u_e, 0, \tilde{y}) + \phi^{\text{conv}}(u_e, 1, \tilde{y}) \right)\]
\[= \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^k} \phi^{\text{conv}}(v_e, \tilde{y}) - \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^k} \phi^{\text{conv}}(u_e + v_e - a_e, \tilde{y}) + \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^{k-1}} \left( \phi^{\text{conv}}(u_e, 0 + d_e^{(1)}, \tilde{y}) + \phi^{\text{conv}}(u_e, 1 - d_e^{(1)}, \tilde{y}) \right)\]
\[= \ldots\]
\[= \ldots\]
\[= \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^k} \phi^{\text{conv}}(b_e, \tilde{y}),\]

where at each step we use the good quadruples listed in the definitions of the sets \(S_1, \ldots, S_{k+2}\), until we get the central equality, and then we use the good quadruples in the reverse order to reach the expression in the final line, thus completing the proof. Finally pick \(\xi = \eta^{\Omega(1)}\) so that the required bounds are satisfied. \(\square\)

8.3. Extending biaffine maps defined on quasirandom varieties

The main aim of this subsection is to prove that a bihomomorphism defined on almost all of a quasirandom biaffine variety agrees almost everywhere with a biaffine map defined on that variety.

**Proposition 68.** Let \(\varepsilon_0 = \frac{1}{64}\). Let \(u_0 + U\) be a coset in \(G_1\), let \(v_0 + V\) be a coset in \(G_2\), and let \(\beta : G_1 \times G_2 \to \mathbb{F}_p^r\) be a biaffine map. Let \(\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^r\). Suppose that

\[B = \{(x, y) : \beta(x, y) = \lambda\} \cap ((u_0 + U) \times (v_0 + V))\]

is non-empty and \(\eta\)-quasirandom with density \(\delta\). Provided that \(\eta \leq c \delta^C p^{-3r}\), the following holds.

Let \(X \subset u_0 + U, Y \subset v_0 + V\) and \(S \subset B\) be such that \(|S_x \cap Y| \geq (1 - \varepsilon_0)|B_x|\) for each \(x \in X\), and \(|S_y \cap X| \geq (1 - \varepsilon_0)|B_y|\) for each \(y \in Y\). Then either

(i) there exist \(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in X\) and \(y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4 \in Y\) such that \(x_1 + x_2 = x_3 + x_4, y_1 + y_2 = y_3 + y_4\) and \((x_1, y_2) \in S\) for \((i, j) \neq (1, 1)\), but \((x_1, y_1) \in B \setminus S\), or

(ii) there exist \(X' \subset X\) and \(Y' \subset Y\), such that \(\frac{|X \setminus X'|}{|u_0 + U|} \leq O(\eta^{1/2})\) and \((X' \times Y') \cap B \subset S\).

**Proof.** Without loss of generality \(S \subset X \times Y\), as we may replace \(S\) by \(S \cap (X \times Y)\) without affecting the assumptions. First remove those \(x \in X\) such that \(|B_x| \neq \delta |v_0 + V|\) and those \(y \in Y\) such that
Lemma 61, we have removed at most $8\delta^2 \sqrt{\eta} |v_0 + V|$ elements from $|X|$ and by Lemma 31, we have removed at most $8\delta^{-2} \sqrt{\eta} |v_0 + V|$ elements from $Y$. Misusing the notation slightly, keep writing $X$, $Y$ and $S$ for the modified sets. Note also that $S_{\bullet \bullet}$ and $S_{\bullet y}$ might have become slightly smaller for $x \in X$, $y \in Y$, but if we write $\varepsilon$ instead of $\varepsilon_0 + 8\delta^{-3} \sqrt{\eta}$, then this is not an issue. The new value of $\varepsilon$ is in $(0, 2\varepsilon_0)$. Let $M = ((X \times Y) \cap B) \setminus S$. We consider two cases, depending on whether $M$ is small or large. (The bounds on $|M|$ in the two cases overlap when $\eta$ is small enough.)

**Case 1:** $|M| > \Omega(\eta^{1/8} |u_0 + U||v_0 + V|)$.

Assume that there is no structure of the kind described in case (i) of the conclusion of this proposition. Start by counting, for each $y \in Y$, the number of quadruples $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in (u_0 + U)^4$ such that $(x_1, y) \in M$, $x_1 + x_2 = x_3 + x_4$ and $(x_2, y), (x_3, y), (x_4, y) \in S$. This is

$$
\sum_{x_1 \in M_{xy}, x_2, x_3 \in S_{xy}} |S_{xy}(x_1 + x_2 - x_3) - \sum_{x_1 \in M_{xy}, x_2, x_3 \in S_{xy}} |S_{xy} \cap ((x_1 + x_2) - S_{xy})| \\
\geq \sum_{x_1 \in M_{xy}, x_2, x_3 \in S_{xy}} (1 - 2\varepsilon) |B_{xy}| \\
= (1 - 2\varepsilon) |M_{xy}| |S_{xy}| |B_{xy}| \\
\geq (1 - 3\varepsilon) |M_{xy}| \delta^2 |u_0 + U|^2,
$$

where we used the fact that $S_{xy}, ((x_1 + x_2) - S_{xy}) \subset B_{xy}$. Hence, the total number of pairs $(x_{[4]}, y)$, where $x_{[4]}$ is a quadruple satisfying properties above in the row $B_{xy}$, is at least

$$(1 - 3\varepsilon) |M| \delta^2 |u_0 + U|^2.$$

Note that since $\beta$ is biaffine, we have

$$B_{x_{i1}} \cap B_{x_{i2}} \cap B_{x_{i3}} \cap B_{x_{i4}} = B_{x_{i1}} \cap B_{x_{i2}} \cap B_{x_{i3}} \cap B_{x_{i4}}.$$  (50)

Applying Lemma 12, we get that for all but $O(\delta^{-\varepsilon} \sqrt{\eta} |U|^3)$ triples $x_{[3]}$ in $(u_0 + U)^3$, the size of $|B_{x_{i1}} \cap B_{x_{i2}} \cap B_{x_{i3}}|$ is precisely $\delta^3 |v_0 + V|$. Hence, the number of quadruples $(x_{[4]}) \in (u_0 + U)^4$ such that $|\bigcap_{i \in [4]} B_{x_{i1}}| = \delta^3 |v_0 + V|$, $x_1 + x_2 = x_3 + x_4$ and there exists $y$ such that $(x_1, y) \in M$ and $(x_i, y) \in S$ for $i \in [2, 4]$, is at least

$$\frac{1}{\delta^3 |v_0 + V|} (1 - 3\varepsilon) \delta^2 |M||U|^2 - O(\delta^{-O(1)} \sqrt{\eta} |U|^3) \geq \frac{1}{2\delta |v_0 + V|} |M||U|^2 \geq \Omega(\eta^{1/8} |U|^3),$$  (51)

since $\eta \leq \varepsilon \delta^C$ and $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{8}$.

Pick any such $x_{[4]}$, and let $A = B_{x_{i1}} \cap B_{x_{i2}} \cap B_{x_{i3}} \cap B_{x_{i4}}$. Consider the set of points $P = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\} \times A \subset B$, and the set $S \cap P$. Observe that if $|S \cap P| \geq \frac{15}{16}|P|$, then we obtain the structure described in the case (i), which contradicts our assumption. Indeed, consider the set $R$ of all $y \in A$ such that $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in S_{xy}$. By the density assumption on $S \cap P$, we have that $|R| \geq \frac{3}{4}|A|$. 


Let $y_0$ be such that $(x_1, y_0) \in M$, and $x_2, x_3, x_4 \in S_{y_0}$. Since $|R| \geq \frac{3}{2}|A|$, we may find $y_1, y_2 \in R$, such that $y_1 + y_2 - y_0 \in R$ as well, by the usual argument. This produces the structure in the case (i) of the statement of the proposition, which we are assuming we do not have.

Hence, for each $x_{[4]}$ considered above we actually have that $|S \cap P| < \frac{15}{16}|P|$, where $P$ is the relevant small grid. By the pigeonhole principle, we get that for some $i \in [4]$, $|S_{x_{[4]}^i} \cap B_{x_{1}} \cap \ldots \cap B_{x_{4}}| < \frac{15}{16}|B_{x_{1}} \cap \ldots \cap B_{x_{4}}|$. Combining this with the bound (51), we obtain that for some $i \in [4]$ there are at least $\Omega(\eta^{1/8}|U|^3)$ quadruples $(x_{[4]}) \in X^4$ such that $x_1 + x_2 = x_3 + x_4$ and

$$|S_{x_{[4]}} \cap B_{x_{1}} \cap \ldots \cap B_{x_{4}}| < \frac{15}{16}|B_{x_{1}} \cap \ldots \cap B_{x_{4}}|.$$ 

We may assume without loss of generality that $i = 1$ (we no longer use the fact that $(x_1, y_0) \in M$ for some $y_0$). Recalling once again (50), we rephrase this as follows. There are $\Omega(\eta^{1/8}|U|^3)$ triples $(x_{[3]}) \in (u_0 + U)^3$ such that

$$|S_{x_{[3]}} \cap B_{x_{2}} \cap B_{x_{3}}| < \frac{15}{16}|B_{x_{1}} \cap B_{x_{2}} \cap B_{x_{3}}|.$$ 

Average once again, this time over $x_1$, to conclude that there is $x_1 \in X$ such that for $\Omega(\eta^{1/8}|U^2)$ pairs $(x_2, x_3) \in (u_0 + U)^2$, we have

$$|S_{x_{[3]}} \cap B_{x_{2}} \cap B_{x_{3}}| < \frac{15}{16}|B_{x_{1}} \cap B_{x_{2}} \cap B_{x_{3}}|,$$

and additionally, $|B_{x_{1}} \cap B_{x_{2}} \cap B_{x_{3}}| = \delta^3|v_0 + V|$. Recall that $|S_{x_{[3]}}| > \frac{31}{32}|B_{x_{[3]}}| = \frac{31}{32}\delta|v_0 + V|$. We may therefore deduce that

$$\mathbb{P}_{x_{2}, x_{3} \in u_0 + U} \left( |S_{x_{[3]}} \cap B_{x_{2}} \cap B_{x_{3}}| - \delta^2|S_{x_{[3]}}| > \frac{1}{64}\delta^3|v_0 + V| \right) = \Omega(\eta^{1/8}).$$

We now apply Lemma 63, which bounds this probability from above by $O(\sqrt[4]{\eta} \delta^{-O(1)})$, since $\eta \leq c_0^C$ (so that the condition in that lemma is satisfied). By the same bounds on $\eta$, this is a contradiction, finishing the proof in this case.

**Case 2:** $|M| \leq O(\eta^{1/16}\delta|u_0 + U||v_0 + V|)$.

Let $X'$ be the set of all $x \in X$ with the property that $|M_x| \leq \eta^{1/32}|B_x|$. Then $\eta^{1/32}\delta|v_0 + V||X \setminus X'| \leq |M|$, from which it follows that $|X \setminus X'| = O(\eta^{1/32}\delta|v_0 + V|)$. Similarly, let $Y'$ be the set of all $y \in Y$ such that $|M_y| \leq \eta^{1/32}|B_y|$ and therefore $|Y \setminus Y'| = O(\eta^{1/32}|v_0 + V|)$. We claim that $(X' \times Y') \cap B \subset S$.

Suppose to the contrary that there exists $(x_1, y_1) \in ((X' \times Y') \cap B) \setminus S$. Take $x_2, x_3$ in $B_{y_1}$ uniformly and independently at random. Then by the usual counting arguments we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(x_2, x_3, x_1 + x_2 - x_3 \notin X' \cap S_{y_1}) \geq 1 - \mathbb{P}(x_2 \notin X' \cap S_{y_1})$$

$$- \mathbb{P}(x_3 \notin X' \cap S_{y_1}) - \mathbb{P}(x_1 + x_2 - x_3 \notin X' \cap S_{y_1})$$
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By Lemma 63, we have that
\[ |(B_{x1} \cdot Y') \cap B_{x2} \cdot [\delta^2 |B_{x1} \cdot Y'|] | \leq \frac{\delta^3}{8} |v_0 + V| \]
\[ = 1 - O(\sqrt[3]{\eta}^\delta - O(1)). \]  
(53)

The technical condition on \( \xi \) in Lemma 63 is satisfied, since \( \eta \leq C \).

Applying Lemma 62 shows that
\[ \mathbb{P}_{x_2,x_3 \in u_0 + U} \left( \left( |(B_{x1} \cdot Y') \cap B_{x2} \cdot [\delta^2 |B_{x1} \cdot Y'|] | \leq \frac{\delta^3}{8} |v_0 + V| \right) \right) = 1 - O(\delta^{-O(1)} \sqrt[3]{\eta}). \]  
(54)

By \((52), \ (53)\) and \((54)\), we have a choice of \( x_2, x_3 \in (u_0 + U)^2 \) such that
\[ |(B_{x1} \cdot Y') \cap B_{x2} \cdot [\delta^2 |B_{x1} \cdot Y'|] | \geq \frac{7}{8} \delta^2 |B_{x1} \cdot Y'| \geq \frac{7}{8} (1 - O(\delta^{-3} \eta^{1/32})) \delta^3 |v_0 + V| \geq \frac{13}{16} |B_{x1} \cdot B_{x2} \cap B_{x1} \cdot B_{x3}| \]
and \( x_2, x_3, x_1 + x_2 - x_3 \in X' \cap S_{y1} \cdot Y \).

Since for each \( x \in X' \) we have \( |Y \setminus S_x| \leq \eta^{1/32} |v_0 + V| \), we obtain
\[ |Y' \cap S_{x_1} \cdot S_{x_2} \cdot S_{x_3} \cdot S_{x_1 + x_2 - x_3}| \geq |Y' \cap B_{x_1} \cdot B_{x_2} \cdot B_{x_3} \cdot B_{x_1 + x_2 - x_3}| \]
\[ \geq \left( \frac{13}{16} - 4 \delta^{-3} \eta^{1/32} \right) |B_{x1} \cdot B_{x2} \cdot B_{x3} \cdot B_{x_1 + x_2 - x_3}| \]
\[ \geq \frac{3}{4} |B_{x1} \cdot B_{x2} \cdot B_{x3} \cdot B_{x_1 + x_2 - x_3}|. \]

As usual, we obtain \( y_2, y_3 \) such that \( y_2, y_3, y_1 + y_2 - y_3 \in Y' \cap S_{x_1} \cdot S_{x_2} \cdot S_{x_3} \cap S_{x_1 + x_2 - x_3} \), which finishes the proof. \( \square \)

**Proposition 69.** There exists a constant \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \) such that the following holds. Let \( u_0, U, v_0, V, \beta, r, \eta, \delta, B \) be as in Proposition 68. Suppose that \( X \subset u_0 + U \) and \( Y \subset v_0 + V \) are such that \( |X| \geq (1 - \varepsilon_0) |u_0 + U| \) and \( |Y| \geq (1 - \varepsilon_0) |v_0 + V| \). Let \( S = B \cap (X \times Y) \) and let \( \phi : S \to H \) be a bi-homomorphism. Then, there is a subset \( X' \subset X \) such that \( |X \setminus X'| = O(\eta^O(1)|U_0|) \), a subset \( S' \subset (X' \times (v_0 + V)) \cap B \) such that \( |((X' \times (v_0 + V)) \cap B) \setminus S'| = O(\eta^O(1)|U|\ |V|) \), and a bi-homomorphism \( \phi^{ext} : S' \to H \) such that \( \phi = \phi^{ext} \) on \( S \cap S' \).

**Proof.** Let \( X' = \{ x \in X : |B_{x1} \cdot Y| \geq (1 - 2 \varepsilon_0) |B_{x1}| = (1 - 2 \varepsilon_0) \delta |V| \} \). By \( \eta \)-quasirandomness and Lemma 68, we have that \( |X \setminus X'| = O(\delta^{-6} \sqrt[3]{\eta}|U|) \). For each \( x \in X' \), we may use Lemma 24 to find an affine map \( \phi^{ext} : B_{x1} \to H \) that extends \( \phi(x, \cdot) \). Define a map \( \hat{\phi}^{ext} : (X' \times (v_0 + V)) \cap B \to H \) by setting \( \hat{\phi}^{ext}(x, y) = \phi^{ext}(y) \). We now show that \( \hat{\phi}^{ext} \) respects the vast majority of horizontal additive quadruples.

We say that an additive quadruple \( x_{[4]} \) in \( X' \) (i.e., a quadruple \( x_{[4]} \) such that \( x_1 + x_2 = x_3 + x_4 \) is
Let $S$ be the set of all $(x_{i[4]}, y)$ such that $x_{i[4]}$ is an additive quadraple in $X'$, $y \in \bigcap_{i \in [4]} B_{x_i \bullet}$, and 
$\sum_{i \in [4]} \sigma(i) \phi^\text{ext}(x_i, y) \neq 0$. Then $|S| = O\left(\delta^{O(1)} \sqrt{\eta} |U|^3 |V| \right)$. Let $Z = \{y \in v_0 + V : |S_y| \leq \frac{\sqrt{\eta}}{\sqrt{\eta}} |B_{y} \cap X'| (1 - \varepsilon_0) |B_{y} \}$, where $\varepsilon_0$ is the absolute constant from Lemma 24. Then by the work above and Lemma 24, we have that $|Z| = (1 - O(\delta^{O(1)} \sqrt{\eta})) |V|$.

On the other hand, for each $y \in Z$, $\phi^\text{ext}(\cdot, y)$ respects all but at most $\frac{\sqrt{\eta}}{\sqrt{\eta}} |U|^3$ additive quadruples in $X' \cap B_{y}$. Use Lemma 24 to find a subset $S'_y \subset X' \cap B_{y}$ such that $|(X' \cap B_{y}) \setminus S'_y| \leq \frac{\sqrt{\eta}}{\sqrt{\eta}}$ and $\phi^\text{ext}(\cdot, y)$ is a restriction of an affine map on $B_{y}$. If we define $S' = \bigcup_{y \in \mathcal{S}} S'_y \times \{y\}$, then $\phi^\text{ext}$ is a bi-homomorphism on $S'$, and $S'$ has the properties claimed.

\textbf{Proposition 70.} Let $u_0, U, v_0, V, \beta, r, \eta, \delta, B$ be as in Proposition 68. Let $\xi \in (0, \frac{c}{p^{-4r}})$. Let $S \subset B$ be a subset of size at least $(1 - \xi)|B|$ and let $\phi : S \to H$ be a bi-homomorphism. Then there is a bi-homomorphism $\phi^\text{ext} : B \to H$ such that $\phi = \phi^\text{ext}$ on a set $S' \subset S$ such that $|S'| = (1 - O(\xi p^{3r} + \eta p^r))|B|$.

\textbf{Proof.} Let $X = \{x \in u_0 + U : |S_x \bullet| \geq \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{\delta}^3}{100} p^{-3r}\right) |B_{x \bullet}| \}$. By $\eta$-quasirandomness and averaging, we have that $|X| = (1 - O(\xi p^{3r} - O(\eta p^r))) |u_0 + U|$. Using Lemma 24 for each $x \in X$ let $\phi^\text{ext}(1)(x, \cdot)$ be the affine extension of $\phi(x, \cdot)$. We claim that $\phi^\text{ext}(1)$ is a homomorphism in direction $G_1$ as well. To this end, take any $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in X$ such that $x_1 + x_2 = x_3 + x_4$ and let $y \in \bigcap_{i \in [4]} B_{x_i \bullet}$ be arbitrary. Since $\bigcap_{i \in [4]} S_{x_i \bullet} \geq \frac{3}{4} \bigcap_{i \in [4]} B_{x_i \bullet}$, there are $y_1, y_2 \in \bigcap_{i \in [4]} S_{x_i \bullet}$ such that additionally $y_1 + y_2 - y \in \bigcap_{i \in [4]} S_{x_i \bullet}$. Thus,

$$
\phi^\text{ext}(1)(x_1, y) + \phi^\text{ext}(1)(x_2, y) - \phi^\text{ext}(1)(x_3, y) - \phi^\text{ext}(1)(x_4, y) \\
= \left(\phi(x_1, y_1) + \phi(x_2, y_2) - \phi(x_3, y_1 + y_2 - y)\right) + \cdots + \left(\phi(x_4, y_1) + \phi(x_4, y_2) - \phi(x_4, y_1 + y_2 - y)\right) \\
= 0,
$$

as claimed.

Next, for each $y \in v_0 + V$, note that $|X \cap B_{y}| \geq |B_{y}| - |(u_0 + U) \setminus X| = (1 - O(\xi p^{3r} + \eta p^r)) |B_{y}| \geq \frac{\tilde{\delta}^3}{100} |B_{y}|$ and extend $\phi^\text{ext}(1)(\cdot, y)$ from $X \cap B_{y}$ to $B_{y}$, again using Lemma 24. As above, we see that this extension is a bi-homomorphism.

\textbf{Proposition 71.} Let $u_0, U, v_0, V, \beta, r, \eta, \delta, B$ be as in Proposition 68. Let $S \subset B$ be a subset of size at least $(1 - \varepsilon)|B|$. Let $\phi : S \to H$ be a bi-2-homomorphism. Then, provided $\eta \leq c \delta^C$, there is a subset $S' \subset S$ of size $(1 - O(\varepsilon) - O(\eta^3))|B|$ and a bi-homomorphism $\psi : B \to H$ such that $\phi = \psi$ on $S'$. 90
Note that Propositions 70 and 71 look almost exactly the same. The difference is in the error terms, so Proposition 70 requires that $|B \setminus S|$ is much smaller. In fact, we use Proposition 68 in the proof of Proposition 71.

**Proof.** Start by setting $X_0 = \{x \in u_0 + U : |B_{x*}| = \delta|V|\}$ and $Y_0 = \{y \in v_0 + V : |B_{y*}| = \delta|U|\}$. By $\eta$-quasirandomness and Lemma 61, we have that $|(u_0 + U) \setminus X_0| \leq \eta|U|$ and $|(v_0 + V) \setminus Y_0| \leq O(\delta^{-4} \sqrt{|V|})$.

We shall modify sets $X_0$ and $Y_0$ until the conditions in Proposition 68 are satisfied. Let $\varepsilon_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta}}$ be as in that proposition. Write $X$ for the current modification of $X_0$ and $Y$ for the current modification of $Y_0$. At each step, if there exists $x \in X$ such that $|S_{x*} \cap Y| < (1 - \varepsilon_0)|B_{x*}|$, then remove it from $X$. If there is no such $x$, but there exists $y \in Y$ such that $|S_{y*} \cap X| < (1 - \varepsilon_0)|B_{y*}|$, then remove $y$ from $Y$. At the beginning, we have $|(X_0 \times Y_0) \setminus S| \leq \varepsilon|B| \leq \varepsilon(\delta + \eta)|U||V| \leq 2\varepsilon\delta|U||V|$. Once the procedure terminates, we have

$$0 \leq |(X \times Y) \setminus S| \leq |(X_0 \times Y_0) \setminus S| - |X_0 \setminus X|\varepsilon_0|V| - |Y_0 \setminus Y|\varepsilon_0|U|,$$

so we have $|X_0 \setminus X| \leq 2\varepsilon_0^{-1}\varepsilon|U|$ and $|Y_0 \setminus Y| \leq 2\varepsilon_0^{-1}\varepsilon|V|$.

The conditions in Proposition 68 are now satisfied. We start another procedure, where we apply Proposition 68 iteratively until we obtain the structure described in (ii) of that proposition. When we get structure described in (i), i.e. when there are $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in X, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4 \in Y$ such that $x_1 + x_2 = x_3 + x_4, y_1 + y_2 = y_3 + y_4$ and $(x_i, y_j) \in S$ for $(i, j) \neq (1, 1)$, but $(x_1, y_1) \in B \setminus S$, we may add $(x_1, y_1)$ to $S$ and extend $\phi$ to $(x_1, y_1)$ by setting

$$\phi(x_1, y_1) = \frac{\phi(x_3, y_1) + \phi(x_4, y_1) - \phi(x_2, y_1)}{\sqrt{\frac{|X_1|}{|u_0 + U|} + \frac{|Y_1|}{|v_0 + V|}}} \leq O(\eta^{1/32})$$

and a bi-homomorphism $\phi : (X^{(1)} \times Y^{(1)}) \cap B \rightarrow H$, such that $\phi^{(1)} = \phi$ on $S^{(1)} = S \cap (X^{(1)} \times Y^{(1)})$. Note that $S^{(1)}$ has the desired size. In the rest of the proof, we show that we may extend $\phi^{(1)}$ to the whole of $B$.

Suppose that we have finally obtained the structure described in (ii). Thus, we may assume that there are $X^{(1)} \subset X, Y^{(1)} \subset Y$, such that $\frac{|X \setminus X^{(1)}|}{|u_0 + U|} + \frac{|Y \setminus Y^{(1)}|}{|v_0 + V|} \leq O(\eta^{1/32})$ and a bi-homomorphism $\phi^{(1)} : (X^{(1)} \times Y^{(1)}) \cap B \rightarrow H$, such that $\phi^{(1)} = \phi$ on $S^{(1)} = S \cap (X^{(1)} \times Y^{(1)})$. Note that $S^{(1)}$ has the desired size. In the rest of the proof, we show that we may extend $\phi^{(1)}$ to the whole of $B$.

Apply Proposition 68 to get a subset $X^{(2)} \subset X^{(1)}$ such that $|X^{(2)} \setminus X^{(1)}| = O(\eta^{R(1)}|U|)$, a subset $S^{(2)} \subset (X^{(2)} \times (v_0 + V)) \cap B$ such that $|(X^{(2)} \times (v_0 + V)) \setminus B| \setminus S^{(2)}| = O(\eta^{R(1)}|U||V|)$ and a bi-homomorphism $\phi^{(2)} : S^{(2)} \rightarrow H$ such that $\phi = \phi^{(2)}$ on $S^{(1)} \cap S^{(2)}$. 
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Now, as in the first step, set \( X^{(3)} = X^{(2)} \) and \( Y^{(3)} = v_0 + V \), and remove elements from \( X^{(3)} \) and \( Y^{(3)} \) iteratively, until for each \( x \in X^{(3)} \) we have \( |S_{x,y}^2 \cap X^{(3)}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon_0)|B_{x,y}| \) and for each \( y \in Y^{(3)} \) we have \( |S_{x,y}^2 \cap X^{(3)}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon_0)|B_{x,y}| \). This time, since we initially have \( |((X^{(2)} \times (v_0 + V)) \cap B) \setminus S^{(2)}| \leq O(\eta^{\Omega(1)}|U||V|) \), we end up with \( |X^{(2)} \setminus X^{(3)}| = O(\eta^{\Omega(1)}|U|) \) and \( |(v_0 + V) \setminus Y^{(3)}| = O(\eta^{\Omega(1)}|V|) \). Again, iteratively apply Proposition 68, as before. We end up with sets \( X^{(4)} \subset X^{(3)} \), \( Y^{(4)} \subset Y^{(3)} \) such that \( |X^{(3)} \setminus X^{(4)}|, |Y^{(3)} \setminus Y^{(4)}| = O(\eta^{1/32}) \), and a bi-homomorphism \( \phi^{(4)} : (X^{(4)} \times Y^{(4)}) \cap B \rightarrow H \), such that \( \phi^{(4)} = \phi \) on \( S^{(4)} = S^{(2)} \cap (X^{(4)} \times Y^{(4)}) \).

Reverse the roles of directions \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \). The price we pay is the somewhat weaker quasirandomness condition, by Lemma 61. Apply Proposition 70 to get subset \( Y^{(5)} \subset Y^{(4)} \) such that \( |Y^{(5)} \setminus Y^{(4)}| = O(\eta^{\Omega(1)}|V|) \), a subset \( S^{(5)} \subset (\{u_0 + U\} \times Y^{(5)}) \cap B \) such that \( |((u_0 + U) \times Y^{(5)} \cap B) \setminus S^{(5)}| = O(\eta^{\Omega(1)}|U||V|) \) and a bi-homomorphism \( \phi^{(5)} : S^{(5)} \rightarrow H \) such that \( \phi = \phi^{(5)} \) on \( S^{(1)} \cap S^{(2)} \cap S^{(5)} \). But, note that \( |(v_0 + V) \setminus Y^{(5)}| = \eta^{\Omega(1)}|V| \), so in fact \( |S^{(5)}| = (1 - \eta^{\Omega(1)})|B| \). We may apply Proposition 71 to finish the proof. \( \square \)

8.4. Extending biaffine maps from subvarieties of codimension 1

**Proposition 72.** Let \( u_0 + U \) and \( v_0 + V \) be cosets in \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \), respectively, and let \( \beta : G_1 \times G_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^r \) be a biaffine map. Suppose that there exists \( \delta > 0 \) such that for each \( \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^r \) the variety \( B^\lambda = ((u_0 + U) \times (v_0 + V)) \cap \{(x, y) : \beta(x, y) = \lambda\} \) is either \( \eta \)-quasirandom with density \( \delta \) or empty. Let \( \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^r \) be such that \( B = B^\lambda \) is non-empty. Let \( B^{\text{ext}} = ((u_0 + U) \times (v_0 + V)) \cap \{\beta_{[2,r]} = \lambda_{[2,r]}\} \). Let \( \phi : B \rightarrow H \) be a biaffine map. Then, provided \( \eta \leq p^{-C_r} \), there is a biaffine map \( \phi^{\text{ext}} : B^{\text{ext}} \rightarrow H \) such that \( \phi(x, y) = \phi^{\text{ext}}(x, y) \) for all but \( O(\eta^{\Omega(1)}|U||V|) \) elements \( (x, y) \in B \).

We note that the assumption that all non-empty layers have the same density \( \delta \) is automatically satisfied provided they are all quasirandom; we postpone this argument to the proof of Theorem 73.

**Proof.** If \( B^{\text{ext}} = B \), the claim is trivial, so suppose the opposite. Write also \( B^{\mu_1} = \{(x, y) \in B^{\text{ext}} : \beta_1(x, y) = \mu_1\} \). (If we were to use the notation from the statement, this would have been \( B^{(\mu_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_r)} \).)

Fix any \( \mu_1 \in \mathbb{F}_p^r \) such that \( \mu_1 \neq \lambda_1 \). Let \( (a, b) \in B^{\mu_1} \) be a point to be specified later. Let \( h_0 \in H \) be arbitrary. For \( (x, y) \in B^{\text{ext}} \), let \( \mu = \beta_1(x, y) \), and let \( z \in v_0 + V \) be such that \( (a, z), (x, z) \in B^{\mu_1} \). We define

\[
\psi(x, y; a, b; z, s, u, v, w) = \phi(x, v + y - w - \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1}(z - w)) - \phi(x, v) + \frac{\mu_1 - \mu}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} \phi(x, w) + \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} \left( \phi(u + x - a, z) - \phi(u, z) + \phi(a, s + z - b) - \phi(a, s) + h_0 \right),
\]
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where \( v, w, z \in B_{z^*}, u \in B_{z^*}, s \in B_{a^*} \) are arbitrary. We shall pick \((a, b)\) such that for almost all of \((x, y)\) there is a value \( \phi^{ext}(x, y) \) for which \( \psi(x, y; a, b; z, s, u, v, w) = \phi^{ext}(x, y) \) for almost all allowed choices of \( z, s, u, v, w \) and for which \( \phi^{ext} \) is biaffine. Also, when \((x, y) \in B\), we in fact have \( \mu = \lambda_1 \) and the expression above becomes simply

\[
\psi(x, y; a, b; z, s, u, v, w) = \phi(x, v + y - w) - \phi(x, v) + \phi(x, w) = \phi(x, y).
\]

For fixed \( x, y, a, b \) the number of choices of other arguments is \( |B_{a^*}||B_{x^*}|^2 \sum_{z \in B_{z^*}} |B_{z^*}| |B_{a^*}| = \text{constant} \). Also, \( \psi \) does not depend on the choice of \( s, u, v, w \), so we may write \( \psi(x, y; a, b; z) \) instead.

The rest of the proof will depend on three claims.

**Claim A.** For all but \( O(\delta^{-O(1)} \sqrt{|U|}/|V|^4) \) choices of \((x, y; a, b, z_1, z_2)\) such that \((a, b), (x, y) \in B^{ext}\) with \( \beta_1(a, b) = \mu_1, (a, z_1), (x, z_1), (a, z_2), (x, z_2) \in B^{\mu_1}\), we have \( B_{a^*} \cap B_{a^*} \neq \emptyset \) and \( \psi(x, y; a, b; z_1) = \psi(x, y; a, b; z_2) \).

**Proof of Claim A.** By Lemmas \( \text{[62]} \) and \( \text{[61]} \) we have that \( |B_{a^*} \cap B_{a^*}| = \delta^2|V|, |B_{a^*} \cap B_{a^*} \cap B_{a^*} \cap B_{a^*}| = \delta^3|U| \) for all but \( O(\delta^{-O(1)} \sqrt{|U|}/|V|^4) \) of the sextuples considered. Thus, assume that these equalities hold.

Let \( v, w \in B_{x^*}, s \in B_{z^*} \) be such that \( Z_1 = B_{a^*} \cap B_{x^*} \cap B_{x^*} \cap B_{a^*} \cap B_{a^*} \) is non-empty. By Lemmas \( \text{[61]} \) and \( \text{[63]} \) there are such \( v, w, s \). Take \( u \in B_{x^*} \cap B_{a^*}, e, e' \in Z_1 \) such that \( Z_2 = B_{x^*} \cap B_{a^*} \cap B_{x^*} \cap B_{a^*} \cap B_{a^*} \) and \( Z_3 = B_{x^*} \cap B_{a^*} \cap B_{x^*} \cap B_{a^*} \cap B_{a^*} \) are non-empty. By Lemma \( \text{[63]} \) we may accomplish this. Finally, take \( f \in Z_2 \) and \( f' \in Z_3 \). We have

\[
\psi(x, y; a, b; z_1) - \psi(x, y; a, b; z_2) = \phi(x, v + y - w - \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1}(z_1 - w)) - \phi(x, v + y - w - \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1}(z_2 - w))
\]

\[
+ \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} \left( \phi(x + y - a, z_1) - \phi(x + y - a, z_2) + \phi(u, z_1) - \phi(u, z_2) \right)
\]

\[
+ \phi(a, s + z_1 - b) - \phi(a, s + z_2 - b)
\]

\[
= \phi(x, v) - \phi(x, v + \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1}(z_1 - z_2)) + \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} \left( \phi(u + (x + e - e'), z_1) - \phi(u + (x + e - e'), z_2) \right)
\]

\[
+ \phi(u, z_2) + \phi(a + e - e', s + z_1 - b) - \phi(e, s + z_1 - b) + \phi(e', s + z_1 - b)
\]

\[
- \phi(a + e - e', s + z_2 - b) + \phi(e, s + z_2 - b) - \phi(e', s + z_2 - b)
\]

\[
= \phi(x, v) - \phi(x + e - e', v + \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1}(z_1 - z_2)) + \phi(e, v + \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1}(z_1 - z_2))
\]

\[
- \phi(e', v + \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1}(z_1 - z_2)) \]

\[
+ \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} \left( \phi(u + (x + e - e') - (a + e - e'), z_1) - \phi(u + (x + e - e') - (a + e - e'), z_2) \right)
\]

\[
+ \phi(u, z_2) + \phi(a + e - e', s + z_1 - b) - \phi(e, s + z_1 - b) + \phi(e', s + z_1 - b)
\]

\[
- \phi(a + e - e', s + z_2 - b) + \phi(e, s + z_2 - b) - \phi(e', s + z_2 - b)
\]

\[
= \phi(x, v) - \phi(x + e - e', v + \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1}(z_1 - z_2)) + \phi(e, v + \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1}(z_1 - z_2))
\]

\[
- \phi(e', v + \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1}(z_1 - z_2)) \]

\[
+ \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} \left( \phi(u + (x + e - e') - (a + e - e'), z_1) - \phi(u + (x + e - e') - (a + e - e'), z_2) \right)
\]

\[
\]
\begin{align*}
  &\phi(u + (x + e - e') - (a + e - e'), z_2) + \phi(u, z_2) \\
  &+ \phi(a + e - e', s + z_1 - b) - \phi(e, s + z_1 - b) + \phi(e', s + z_1 - b) \\
  &- \phi(a + e - e', s + z_2 - b) + \phi(e, s + z_2 - b) - \phi(e', s + z_2 - b) \\
  &= \phi(x, v) + \phi(e, v + \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} (z_1 - z_2)) - \phi(e', v + \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} (z_1 - z_2)) \\
  &- \phi(x + e - e', v) + \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} \phi(x + e - e', z_1 - (\mu_1 - \lambda_1)(f - f')) \\
  &- \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} \phi(x + e - e', z_2 - (\mu_1 - \lambda_1)(f - f')) \\
  &= \phi(x, v) + \phi(e, v + \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} (z_1 - z_2)) - \phi(e', v + \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} (z_1 - z_2)) \\
  &+ \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} \phi(u, z_1 - (\mu_1 - \lambda_1)(f - f')) - \phi(u, z_1) - \phi(u, z_2 - (\mu_1 - \lambda_1)(f - f')) + \phi(u, z_2) \\
  &- \phi(e, s + z_1 - b) + \phi(e', s + z_1 - b) - \phi(e', s + z_2 - b) - \phi(e, s + z_2 - b) \\
  &= \phi(e', v) - \phi(e, v) + \phi(e, v + \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} (z_1 - z_2)) - \phi(e', v + \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} (z_1 - z_2)) \\
  &+ \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} \phi(e', s + z_1 - b) - \phi(e', s + z_2 - b) - \phi(e, s + z_1 - b) + \phi(e, s + z_2 - b) \\
  &= 0,
\end{align*}

as desired. \hfill \Box

For each \((a, b) \in B^{\mu_1}\), let \(S_{(a,b)}\) be the set of all \((x, y) \in B^{\text{ext}}\) such that for all but \(|\mathcal{V}\{V\}|^2\) choices of \(z_1, z_2 \in v_0 + V\) such that \((a, z_1), (x, z_1), (a, z_2), (x, z_2) \in B^{\mu_1}\), we have \(B_{x \bullet} \cap B_{a \bullet} \neq \emptyset\) and \(\psi(x, y; a, b; z_1) = \psi(x, y; a, b; z_2)\). By Claim A,

\[ \sum_{(a, b) \in B^{\mu_1}} |S_{(a,b)}| = (1 - O(\delta^{O(1)} |\mathcal{V}|^2)) |B^{\mu_1}| |B^{\text{ext}}|. \]  \hfill (55)

For each \((x, y) \in S_{(a,b)}\), define \(\phi_{\text{ext}}^{a,b}(x, y)\) to be the most frequent value of \(\psi(x, y; a, b; z)\).

**Claim B.** For all tuples \((a, b, x, y_1, \ldots, y_4)\) such that \((x, y_i) \in S_{(a,b)}\) and \(y_1 + y_2 = y_3 + y_4\), we have

\[ \phi_{\text{ext}}^{a,b}(x, y_1) + \phi_{\text{ext}}^{a,b}(x, y_2) = \phi_{\text{ext}}^{a,b}(x, y_3) + \phi_{\text{ext}}^{a,b}(x, y_4). \]
Proof of Claim B. Take \( z \) such that \( \phi_{a,b}^\text{ext}(x,y) = \psi(x,y; a,b;z) \) for each \( i \in [4], (a,z), (x,z) \in B^\mu \) and \( B_{x.*}, B_{z.*}, B_{a.*} \neq \emptyset \). Take any \( v, w \in B_{x.*}, u \in B_{z.*}, s \in B_{a.*} \). Then by the definition of \( \psi \),
\[
\begin{align*}
\phi_{a,b}^\text{ext}(x,y) + \phi_{a,b}^\text{ext}(x,y) - \phi_{a,b}^\text{ext}(x,y) & = \phi(x, v + y - w - \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1}(z - w)) + \phi(x, v + y - w - \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1}(z - w)) \\
& \quad - \phi(x, v + y - w - \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1}(z - w)) - \phi(x, v + y - w - \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1}(z - w)) \\\n& = 0,
\end{align*}
\]
since \( \phi \) is a bi-homomorphism. \( \square \)

Claim C. For all but \( O(\delta^{-O(1)} \sqrt{\eta}|U|^4|V|^2) \) tuples \( (a,b,x_1,\ldots,x_4,y) \) such that \( (x_i,y) \in S_{(a,b)} \) and \( x_1 + x_2 = x_3 + x_4 \), we have
\[
\phi_{a,b}^\text{ext}(x_1,y) + \phi_{a,b}^\text{ext}(x_2,y) = \phi_{a,b}(x_3,y) + \phi_{a,b}^\text{ext}(x_4,y).
\]

Proof of Claim C. By Lemma \([2]\), we have \( |B_{a.*}^\mu \cap (\bigcap_{i \in [4]} B_{x.*}^\mu)| = \delta^4|V| \) for all but \( O(\delta^{O(1)} \sqrt{\eta}|U|^4) \) choices of \( (x|a), a \) such that \( x_1 + x_2 = x_3 + x_4 \). Suppose therefore that \( (a,b,x_1,\ldots,x_4,y) \) is such that \( (x_i,y) \in S_{(a,b)} \), \( x_1 + x_2 = x_3 + x_4 \) and \( |B_{a.*}^\mu \cap (\bigcap_{i \in [4]} B_{x.*}^\mu)| = \delta^4|V| \). Since \( (x_i,y) \in S_{(a,b)} \) and \( \eta \leq \delta^C \), we may find \( z \in B_{a.*}^\mu \cap (\bigcap_{i \in [4]} B_{x.*}^\mu) \) such that \( \phi_{a,b}^\text{ext}(x_i,y) = \psi(x_i,y; a,b;z) \) holds for each \( i \in [4] \). Let \( v, w \in \bigcap_{i \in [4]} B_{x.*}, u \in B_{z.*}, s \in B_{a.*} \) be arbitrary. Let \( \sigma : [4] \to \{-1,1\} \) be defined by \( \sigma(1) = \sigma(2) = 1, \sigma(3) = \sigma(4) = -1 \). Then
\[
\sum_{i \in [4]} \sigma(i) \phi_{a,b}^\text{ext}(x_i,y) = \sum_{i \in [4]} \sigma(i) \phi(x_i, v + y - w - \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1}(z - w)) \quad - \sum_{i \in [4]} \sigma(i) \phi(x_i, v) + \frac{\mu_1 - \mu}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} \sum_{i \in [4]} \sigma(i) \phi(x_i, w) \\
\quad + \frac{\mu - \lambda_1}{\mu_1 - \lambda_1} \sum_{i \in [4]} \sigma(i) \phi(u + x_i - a, z)
\]
= 0,
since \( \phi \) is a bi-homomorphism. \( \square \)

Combining (48) with Claims B and C, we conclude that there is a choice of \( (a,b) \in B^\mu \) such that \( |S_{(a,b)}| = (1 - O(\delta^{-O(1)} \eta^{O(1)}))|B^\text{ext}| \) and \( \phi_{a,b}^\text{ext} \) respects all but \( O(\delta^{-O(1)} \eta^{O(1)}|U|^4|V|^2) \) of the additive quadruples in direction \( G_1 \) and all additive quadruples in direction \( G_2 \). Apply Lemma \([2]\) to make \( \phi_{a,b}^\text{ext} \) a bi-homomorphism on a subset of \( S_{(a,b)} \) of size \( (1 - O(\delta^{-O(1)} \eta^{O(1)}))|B^\text{ext}| \). Finally, apply Proposition \([4]\) to finish the proof. \( \square \)

8.5. The main biaffine extension result
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Theorem 73. Let \( u_0 + U \) and \( v_0 + V \) be cosets in \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \), respectively, and let \( \beta : G_1 \times G_2 \to \mathbb{F}_p^* \) be a biaffine map. Suppose that for each \( \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^* \) the variety \( B^\lambda = ((u_0 + U) \times (v_0 + V)) \cap \{(x, y) : \beta(x, y) = \lambda \} \) is \( \eta \)-quasirandom with density \( \delta_\lambda \geq 0 \). Let \( \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^* \) be such that \( B = B^\lambda \) is non-empty.

Let \( S \subset B \) be a subset of size at least \((1 - \varepsilon)|B| \) and let \( \phi : S \to H \) be a biaffine map. Provided \( \eta \leq c \delta^C p^{-C'} \), we may find a global biaffine map \( \Phi : (u_0 + U) \times (v_0 + V) \to H \) such that \( \Phi(x, y) = \phi(x, y) \) for every \((x, y)\) in a subset \( S' \subset S \) of size \((1 - O(\varepsilon^{O(1)}) - O(\eta^{O(1)}))|B| \).

Proof. We first show that there is some \( \delta > 0 \) such that \( \delta_\lambda \in \{0, \delta\} \) for each \( \lambda \). To this end, suppose that \( B^\mu \) is \( \eta \)-quasirandom with density \( \delta_1 > 0 \) and \( B^\nu \) is \( \eta \)-quasirandom with density \( \delta_2 > 0 \). Then for all but \( O(\eta|u_0 + U|) \) elements \( x \in u_0 + U \) we have \( |B^\mu_x| = \delta_1|v_0 + V| \) and \( |B^\nu_x| = \delta_2|v_0 + V| \). But \( B^\mu_x \) and \( B^\nu_x \) are cosets of the same subspace, so \( |B^\mu_x| = |B^\nu_x| \), which proves \( \delta_1 = \delta_2 \).

On the other hand, we may also easily see that if \( B^\mu \) is \( \eta \)-quasirandom with density 0, it is in fact empty. Suppose on the contrary that some \((x, y)\) belongs to \( B^\mu \). Then \( |B^\mu_x| \geq p^{-r}|v_0 + V| \). Hence, for at least \( p^{-r}|u_0 + U| \) of \( x' \in u_0 + U \), we have \( |B^\mu_{x'}| > 0 \), which is a contradiction with \( \eta \)-quasirandomness provided \( \eta < p^{-r} \).

Next, for each \( i \in [r - 1] \) define biaffine map \( \beta^{(i)} : G_1 \times G_2 \to \mathbb{F}_p^{[i, r]} \) by \( \beta^{(i)}_j = \beta_j \) for \( j \in [i, r] \). Thus \( \beta^{(1)} = \beta \). We note that all layers of \( \beta^{(i)} \) are \((p^{r-1}\eta)\)-quasirandom. Indeed, if we write \( \delta_\lambda \) for quasirandomness density of layer \( B^\lambda \), and if \( \mu \in \mathbb{F}_p^{[i, r]} \), we see that
\[
|\{y \in v_0 + V : \beta^{(i)}(x, y) = \mu\}| = \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{F}_p^{[i-1]}} |B^{(\nu, \mu)}_x| = \left( \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{F}_p^{[i-1]}} \delta_{(\nu, \mu)} \right)|v_0 + V|
\]
for all but at most \( p^{i-1}\eta|u_0 + U| \) elements \( x \in u_0 + U \).

Now apply Proposition 71, and then apply Proposition 72 \( r \) times (at \( i^{th} \) step using map \( \beta^{(i)} \) in definition of biaffine varieties) to complete the proof. The work above shows that the technical conditions of Proposition 72 are satisfied at each step. \( \square \)

§9 A simultaneous biaffine regularity lemma

Throughout this section, we shall frequently consider sequences that agree with an element \( x \) on all coordinates but two, and take prescribed values on one or two of those two coordinates. In order to note these, we shall use the following conventions. The notation \((x_{[k]} \setminus \{d_1, d_2\}, d_1 y, d_2 z)\) stands for the sequence \( u_{[k]} \) such that \( u_i = x_i \) for \( i \in [k] \setminus \{d_1, d_2\} \), \( u_{d_1} = y \), and \( u_{d_2} = z \). Similarly, the notation \((x_{[k]} \setminus \{d_1, d_2\}, d_1 y)\) stands for the sequence \( u_{[k]} \setminus \{d_2\} \) such that \( u_i = x_i \) for \( i \in [k] \setminus \{d_1, d_2\} \) and \( u_{d_1} = y \), while \((x_{[k]} \setminus \{d_1, d_2\}, d_2 z)\) stands for the sequence \( u_{[k]} \setminus \{d_1\} \) such that \( u_i = x_i \) for \( i \in [k] \setminus \{d_1, d_2\} \) and \( u_{d_2} = z \).

We shall adopt the further convention that unless we specify to the contrary, additional coordinates are inserted in the obvious order. So we shall often write \((x_{[k]} \setminus \{d_1, d_2\}, y, z)\) instead of
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(x_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}},d_1y,d_2z) and (x_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}},y) instead of (x_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}},d_1y). However, we cannot abbreviate the expression (x_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}},d_2z) in this way, since the z goes in the ‘second slot’ rather than the first. (Usually there will not, strictly speaking, be any ambiguity to avoid since the sequence will be the argument of a multilinear map and we will have specified the domain of the map, but we do not want to rely on the reader’s memory to that extent.)

Broadly speaking, the main theorem of this section allows us to take a multiaffine variety, fix two coordinates, and decompose almost all 2-dimensional layers obtained by fixing the remaining coordinates into large quasirandom pieces. The precise statement is as follows.

**Theorem 74.** Let \( \eta > 0 \) and let \( d_1, d_2 \in [k] \) be two coordinates. Let \( \beta^1 : G_{[k]\setminus\{d_2\}} \to \mathbb{F}_p^m, \beta^2 : G_{[k]\setminus\{d_1\}} \to \mathbb{F}_p^{\eta^2} \) and \( \beta^{12} : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}_p^{\eta^{12}} \) be multiaffine maps. Let \( \mathcal{G} \) be a down-set such that \( \beta^{12} \) is \( \mathcal{G} \)-supported. Write each map \( \beta^1_{\mathcal{G}}(x_{[k]}) \) as \( \alpha_i(x_{[k]\setminus\{d_2\}}) + \alpha'_i(x_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}}) \) for each layer \( \mathcal{G} \), where the maps \( \alpha_i : G_{[k]\setminus\{d_2\}} \to G_{d_2}, \alpha'_i : G_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}} \to G_{d_2} \), \( \alpha_i : G_{[k]\setminus\{d_2\}} \to \mathbb{F}_p \) and \( \alpha'_i : G_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}} \to \mathbb{F}_p \) are multiaffine and in addition \( \alpha_i \) and \( \alpha'_i \) are linear (as opposed to merely affine) in coordinate \( d_1 \). Let \( \mathcal{G} = \{ S \subset [k] \setminus \{d_1,d_2\} : S \cup \{d_1,d_2\} \in \mathcal{G} \} \) and \( \mathcal{G}'' = \{ S \subset [k] \setminus \{d_1,d_2\} : S \cup \{d_1,d_2\} \in \mathcal{G} \} \). Then, there are

- positive integers \( m,t = O((r_{12} + r_1 + r_2 + \log_p \eta^{-1}) O(1)) \),
- \( \phi = (\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{r_{12}}) \), where each \( \phi_j : G_{[k]\setminus\{d_2\}} \to \mathbb{F}_p^m \) is a \( \mathcal{G}' \)-supported multiaffine map that is linear in coordinate \( d_1 \),
- a \( \mathcal{G}'' \)-supported multiaffine map \( \gamma : G_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}} \to \mathbb{F}_p^m \), and
- a union \( F \subset G_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}} \) of layers of \( \gamma \) of size \( |F| \leq \eta |G_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}}| \),

such that for each layer \( L \) of \( \gamma \) not in \( F \), there is a subspace \( \Lambda \leq \mathbb{F}_p^{\eta^{12}} \) such that for each \( x_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}} \in L \), \( u_0 \in G_{d_1}, v_0 \in G_{d_2} \) and \( \tau \in \mathbb{F}_p^{\eta^{12}} \), the biaffine variety

\[
\left[ u_0 + \left( \{ y \in G_{d_1} : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda) \lambda \cdot \phi(x_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}},d_1y) = 0 \} \right) \right.
\]

\[
\cap \left( \{ y \in G_{d_1} : \beta^1(x_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}},d_1y) = \beta^1(x_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}},d_10) \} \right)
\]

\[
\cup \left( \{ y \in G_{d_1} : (\forall i \in [r_{12}]) \alpha_i(x_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}},d_1y) = 0 \} \right)
\]

\[
\times \left[ v_0 + \left( \{ A_1^1(x_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}}), \ldots, A_{r_{12}}^1(x_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}}) \} \right. \right.
\]

\[
\cup \left( \{ A_1(x_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}},d_1u_0), \ldots, A_{r_{12}}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}},d_1u_0) \} \right)
\]

\[
\cap \left( \{ z \in G_{d_2} : \beta^2(x_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}},d_2z) = \beta^2(x_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}},d_20) \} \right)
\]

\[
\left. \left. \cap \{ (y,z) \in G_{d_1} \times G_{d_2} : \beta^{12}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}},y,z) = \tau \} \right. \right]
\]

is either \( \eta \)-quasirandom with density \( |\Lambda| p^{-r_{12}} \) or empty.
Remark. Notice that the codimension in direction $d_2$ is almost unchanged – it doubles at worst. In particular, it does not depend on $\eta$.

We begin with a lemma that will play an important role in the proof. For both the lemma and the proof we shall consider just the case $d_1 = k - 1$ and $d_2 = k$, which clearly loses no generality. For $\Lambda \subseteq F_p^{r_{12}}$, we define

$$V_\Lambda = \{ x_{[k-1]} \in G_{[k-1]} : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda) \lambda \cdot A(x_{[k-1]}) = 0 \}.$$ 

To interpret the expression $\lambda \cdot A(x_{[k-1]})$, note that $A = (A_1, \ldots, A_{r_{12}})$ is a (multiaffine) map from $G_{[k-1]}$ to $F_p^{r_{12}}$, so $\lambda \cdot A$ is the multiaffine map $\sum_{i=1}^{r_{12}} \lambda_i A_i$.

Lemma 75. Let $x_{[k-2]} \in G_{[k-2]}$ and $\Lambda \subseteq F_p^{r_{12}}$ be such that $\eta p^{-5r_{12} - r_1 - r_2} |(V_\Lambda)_{x_{[k-2]}}| > |(V_M)_{x_{[k-2]}}|$ for all $M \subseteq F_p^{r_{12}}$ such that $\Lambda \not\leq M$. Then for each $u_0 \in G_{k-1}$, $v_0 \in G_k$ and $\tau \in \Gamma^{r_{12}}$, the biaffine variety

$$B = \left[ \left( u_0 + \left( (V_\Lambda)_{x_{[k-2]}} \cap \{ y \in G_{k-1} : \beta^1(x_{[k-2]}, y) = \beta^1(x_{[k-2]}, 0) \} \cap \{ y \in G_{k-1} : (\forall i \in [r_{12}]) \alpha_i (x_{[k-2]}, y) = 0 \} \right) \right) \right. 
\times \left( v_0 + \left( (A_1' (x_{[k-2]}), \ldots, A_{r_{12}}' (x_{[k-2]})) \right) \right) \cap \left( A_1(x_{[k-2]}, u_0), \ldots, A_{r_{12}}(x_{[k-2]}, u_0) \right) \right] 
\cap \{ (y, z) \in G_{k-1} \times G_k : \beta^{12}(x_{[k-2]}, y, z) = \tau \}$$

is either $\eta$-quasirandom with density $\delta = p^{-r_{12}} |\Lambda|$ or empty.

Proof. Suppose that for the given $x_{[k-2]}$, $\Lambda$, $u_0, v_0$ and $\tau$, $B$ is neither $\eta$-quasirandom with density $\delta$ nor empty. Write

$$Y = (V_\Lambda)_{x_{[k-2]}} \cap \{ y \in G_{k-1} : \beta^1(x_{[k-2]}, y) = \beta^1(x_{[k-2]}, 0) \} 
\cap \{ y \in G_{k-1} : (\forall i \in [r_{12}]) \alpha_i (x_{[k-2]}, y) = 0 \} \leq G_{k-1}$$

and

$$Z = (A_1' (x_{[k-2]}), \ldots, A_{r_{12}}' (x_{[k-2]})) \cap \{ A_1(x_{[k-2]}, u_0), \ldots, A_{r_{12}}(x_{[k-2]}, u_0) \} \cap \{ z \in G_k : \beta^2(x_{[k-2]}, z) = \beta^2(x_{[k-2]}, 0) \} \leq G_k.$$ 

(56)

For given $y \in u_0 + Y$, we have

$$B_y \star y = \{ z \in v_0 + Z : \beta^{12}(x_{[k-2]}, y, z) = \tau \} 
= \{ z \in v_0 + Z : (\forall i \in [r_{12}]) \alpha_i (x_{[k-2]}, y) + \alpha_i' (x_{[k-2]}, y) \cdot z = \tau \} 
= \{ z \in v_0 + Z : (\forall i \in [r_{12}]) A_i(x_{[k-2]}, y) \cdot z = \tau - A_i'(x_{[k-2]} \cdot v_0 - \alpha_i (x_{[k-2]}, u_0) - \alpha_i' (x_{[k-2]}). \}$$

(57)
Recall that \( B \) is non-empty, and let \((y,z) \in B\). Let \( \lambda \in \Lambda \). Then
\[
\sum_{i \in [r_{12}]} \lambda_i A_i(x_{[k-2]}, u_0) \cdot v_0 = \sum_{i \in [r_{12}]} \lambda_i A_i(x_{[k-2]}, u_0) \cdot z,
\]
using the fact that \( z - v_0 \in \langle A_1(x_{[k-2]}, u_0), \ldots, A_{r_{12}}(x_{[k-2]}, u_0) \rangle \). But \( y - u_0 \in (V_\lambda)_{x_{[k-2]}} \), so this equals \( \sum_{i \in [r_{12}]} \lambda_i A_i(x_{[k-2]}, y) \cdot z \), so by (57) we end up with the equality
\[
\sum_{i \in [r_{12}]} \lambda_i A_i(x_{[k-2]}, u_0) \cdot v_0 = - \sum_{i \in [r_{12}]} \left( \lambda_i A'_i(x_{[k-2]}) \cdot v_0 + \alpha_i(x_{[k-2]}, u_0) + \alpha'_i(x_{[k-2]}) - \tau_i \right)
\]
(58)

From (56) we have
\[
Z^\perp = \langle A'_1(x_{[k-2]}), \ldots, A'_{r_{12}}(x_{[k-2]}) \rangle + \langle A_1(x_{[k-2]}, u_0), \ldots, A_{r_{12}}(x_{[k-2]}, u_0) \rangle \bigcup \{ z \in G_k : \beta^2(x_{[k-2]}, z) = \beta^2(x_{[k-2]}, 0) \}^\perp
\]
Observe that for each \( y \in u_0 + Y \) and each pair \((y_1, y_2) \in (u_0 + Y)^2\),
\[
\{ \lambda \in F_{p}^{r_{12}} : \lambda \cdot A(x_{[k-2]}, y) \in Z^\perp \} \supseteq \Lambda
\]
and
\[
\{ (\lambda, \mu) \in F_{p}^{r_{12}} \times F_{p}^{r_{12}} : \lambda \cdot A(x_{[k-2]}, y_1) + \mu \cdot A(x_{[k-2]}, y_2) \in Z^\perp \} \supseteq \Lambda \times \Lambda
\]
Recall from the statement that \( \delta = p^{-r_{12}}|\Lambda| \). We claim that
\begin{align*}
\text{(i)} & \text{ if } \{ \lambda \in F_{p}^{r_{12}} : \lambda \cdot A(x_{[k-2]}, y) \in Z^\perp \} = \Lambda, \text{ then either } |B_{y^*}| = \delta|v_0 + Z| \text{ or } |B_{y^*}| = 0.  \\
\text{(ii)} & \text{ if } \{ (\lambda, \mu) \in F_{p}^{r_{12}} \times F_{p}^{r_{12}} : \lambda \cdot A(x_{[k-2]}, y_1) + \mu \cdot A(x_{[k-2]}, y_2) \in Z^\perp \} = \Lambda \times \Lambda, \text{ then } |B_{y_1^*} \cap B_{y_2^*}| = \delta^2|v_0 + Z|.
\end{align*}
To prove (i), suppose that \( B_{y^*} \) is non-empty. From (57), \( |B_{y^*}| = |\{ z \in Z : (\forall i \in [r_{12}])A_i(x_{[k-2]}, y) \cdot z = 0 \}| \). Consider the linear map \( \psi : Z \to F_{p}^{r_{12}}, \psi : z \mapsto (A_i(x_{[k-2]}, y) \cdot z : i \in [r_{12}]) \). By the rank-nullity theorem, \( |B_{y^*}|/|Z| = |\text{Im } \psi|^{-1} = |(\text{Im } \psi)^\perp|^{-1} \cdot p^{-r_{12}} \). Hence,
\[
|B_{y^*}| = \left| \left\{ \lambda \in F_{p}^{r_{12}} : (\forall z \in Z) \sum_{i \in [r_{12}]} \lambda_i A_i(x_{[k-2]}, y) \cdot z = 0 \right\} \right| p^{-r_{12}}|v_0 + Z| = |\Lambda| p^{-r_{12}}|v_0 + Z| = \delta|v_0 + Z|.
\]
We now turn to (ii). First we show that if \( B_{y_1^*} \cap B_{y_2^*} \neq \emptyset \), then \( |B_{y_1^*} \cap B_{y_2^*}| = \delta^2|v_0 + Z| \). We argue similarly to (i). From (57), \( |B_{y_1^*} \cap B_{y_2^*}| = |\{ z \in Z : (\forall i \in [r_{12}])A_i(x_{[k-2]}, y_1) \cdot z = A_i(x_{[k-2]}, y_2) \cdot z = 0 \}| \). Consider the linear map \( \psi : Z \to F_{p}^{r_{12}} \) given by
\[
\psi : z \mapsto \left( (A_i(x_{[k-2]}, y_1) \cdot z : i \in [r_{12}]), (A_i(x_{[k-2]}, y_2) \cdot z : i \in [r_{12}]) \right).
\]
\[\text{In fact, most of the time the second possibility cannot occur, but we do not need to prove this fact directly, since it will follow from (ii).}\]
By the rank-nullity theorem, $|B_{y_1} \cap B_{y_2}|/|Z| = |\text{Im } \psi|^{-1} = |(\text{Im } \psi)^\perp| p^{-2r_12}$. Hence,

$$|B_{y_1} \cap B_{y_2}| = \left\{ (\lambda, \mu) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{r_12} \times \mathbb{F}_p^{r_12} : (\forall z \in Z) \sum_{i \in [r_{12}]} (\lambda_i A_i(x_{[k-2]}, y_1) + \mu_i A_i(x_{[k-2]}, y_2)) \cdot z = 0 \right\} p^{-2r_{12}} |v_0 + Z|$$

$$= \left\{ (\lambda, \mu) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{r_12} \times \mathbb{F}_p^{r_12} : \sum_{i \in [r_{12}]} (\lambda_i A_i(x_{[k-2]}, y_1) + \mu_i A_i(x_{[k-2]}, y_2)) \in Z^\perp \right\} p^{-2r_{12}} |v_0 + Z|$$

$$= |\Lambda|^2 p^{-2r_{12}} |v_0 + Z| = \delta^2 |v_0 + Z|.$$  

To finish the proof of (ii), we apply Lemma [22]. We just need to check that for $(\lambda, \mu) \in \Lambda \times \Lambda,$

$$\sum_{i \in [r_{12}]} \lambda_i (A_i'(x_{[k-2]}) \cdot v_0 + \alpha_i(x_{[k-2]}, u_0) + \alpha'_i(x_{[k-2]}) + A_i(x_{[k-2]}, y_1) \cdot v_0 - \tau_i)$$

$$+ \sum_{i \in [r_{12}]} \mu_i (A_i'(x_{[k-2]}) \cdot v_0 + \alpha_i(x_{[k-2]}, u_0) + \alpha'_i(x_{[k-2]}) + A_i(x_{[k-2]}, y_2) \cdot v_0 - \tau_i) = 0.$$

Since $y_1 - u_0, y_2 - u_0 \in Y \subset (V_\Lambda)_{x_{[k-2]}},$ this is equivalent to

$$\sum_{i \in [r_{12}]} \lambda_i (A_i'(x_{[k-2]}) \cdot v_0 + \alpha_i(x_{[k-2]}, u_0) + \alpha'_i(x_{[k-2]}) + A_i(x_{[k-2]}, u_0) \cdot v_0 - \tau_i)$$

$$+ \sum_{i \in [r_{12}]} \mu_i A_i'(x_{[k-2]}) \cdot v_0 + \alpha_i(x_{[k-2]}, u_0) + \alpha'_i(x_{[k-2]}) + A_i(x_{[k-2]}, u_0) \cdot v_0 - \tau_i) = 0,$$

which, by (ii), indeed holds.

Having proved observations (i) and (ii), we now suppose that

$$\left\{ (\lambda, \mu) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{r_12} \times \mathbb{F}_p^{r_12} : \lambda \cdot A(x_{[k-2]}, y_1) + \mu \cdot A(x_{[k-2]}, y_2) \in Z^\perp \right\} = \Lambda \times \Lambda$$

for a proportion at least $1 - \eta$ of the pairs $(y_1, y_2)$ in $u_0 + Y$. By property (ii), we have in particular that $B_{y_1} \neq \emptyset$. Also, by [59], we see that

$$\left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^{r_12} : \lambda \cdot A(x_{[k-2]}, y) \in Z^\perp \right\} = \Lambda$$

for a proportion at least $1 - \eta$ of elements $y \in u_0 + Y$. Hence, by properties (i) and (ii) again, we have that $|B_{y_1}| = |(\text{Im } \psi)^\perp| p^{-2r_{12}} |v_0 + Z|$ for a proportion at least $1 - \eta$ of elements $y \in u_0 + Y$, and $|B_{y_1} \cap B_{y_2}| = |(\text{Im } \psi)^\perp| p^{-2r_{12}} |v_0 + Z|$ for a proportion at least $1 - \eta$ of the pairs $(y_1, y_2) \in (u_0 + Y)^2$. Thus, $B$ is $\eta$-quasirandom with density $\delta$, which is a contradiction.

Therefore, if the given biaffine variety fails to be $\eta$-quasirandom with density $\delta$, then without loss of generality there is a pair $(\lambda, \mu) \in \mathbb{F}_p^{r_12} \times \mathbb{F}_p^{r_12}$, where $\mu \notin \Lambda$, such that

$$\lambda \cdot A(x_{[k-2]}, y_1) + \mu \cdot A(x_{[k-2]}, y_2) \in Z^\perp$$
for at least an $\eta p^{-2r_{12}}$ proportion of the pairs $(y_1, y_2) \in (u_0 + Y)^2$. Since $\dim Z^+ \leq r_2 + 2r_{12}$, by writing $d = y_2 - y_1$ and averaging we find that there exist $y_1 \in u_0 + Y$ and $w \in Z^+$ such that for at least $\eta p^{-4r_{12} - r_2} |Y|$ elements $d \in Y$, we have

$$(\lambda + \mu) \cdot A(x_{[k-2]}, y_1) + \mu \cdot A(x_{[k-2]}, d) = w.$$ 

By taking differences between values of this expression for different choices of $d$, we conclude that

$$\mu \cdot A(x_{[k-2]}, d') = 0$$

for at least $\eta p^{-4r_{12} - r_2} |Y|$ elements $d' \in Y \subset (V_\Lambda)_{x_{[k-2]}}$. This implies that

$$|(V_M)_{x_{[k-2]}}| \geq \eta p^{-4r_{12} - r_2} |Y| \geq \eta p^{-5r_{12} - r_1 - r_2} |(V_\Lambda)_{x_{[k-2]}}|$$

for $M = \Lambda + (\mu)$, which is a contradiction.

**Proof of Theorem [7].** Note that $A_{[r_{12}]}$ is $G'$-supported, where $G'$ was defined in the statement as $\{S \subset [k] \setminus \{d_2\} : S \cup \{d_1, d_2\} \in G\}$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be a parameter to be specified later. Apply Lemma 29 to $A_{[r_{12}]}$ to find $G'$-supported multiaffine maps $\phi_{[r_{12}]} : G_{[k-1]} \to \mathbb{F}_{\mathbb{F}_p}^m$, linear in coordinate $k - 1$, such that for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_{\mathbb{F}_p}^{12}$,

$$\{x_{[k-1]} \in G_{[k-1]} : \lambda \cdot A(x_{[k-1]}) = 0\} \subset \{x_{[k-1]} \in G_{[k-1]} : \lambda \cdot \phi(x_{[k-1]}) = 0\}$$

and

$$|\{x_{[k-1]} \in G_{[k-1]} : \lambda \cdot \phi(x_{[k-1]}) = 0\} \setminus \{x_{[k-1]} \in G_{[k-1]} : \lambda \cdot A(x_{[k-1]}) = 0\}| \leq p^{r_{12} - m} |G_{[k-1]}|.$$ 

Let $F_1$ be the set of all $x_{[k-2]} \in G_{[k-2]}$ with the property that there is $\Lambda \leq \mathbb{F}_{\mathbb{F}_p}^{12}$ such that

$$|\{y \in G_{k-1} : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda) \lambda \cdot \phi(x_{[k-2]}, y) = 0\}| \geq \eta r_{12} p^{-5r_{12} - r_1 - r_2 - 2r_{12}} |G_{k-1}|,$$

but

$$(V_\Lambda)_{x_{[k-2]}} \subset \{y \in G_{k-1} : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda) \lambda \cdot \phi(x_{[k-2]}, y) = 0\}.$$ 

Choose such a $\Lambda$, and let $F_1^\Lambda$ be the set of $x_{[k-2]} \in F_1$ such that this $\Lambda$ is a witness to $x_{[k-2]}$ being in $F_1$. Then

$$|F_1^\Lambda| \leq \frac{1}{2} \eta r_{12} p^{-5r_{12} - r_1 - r_2 - 2r_{12}} |G_{k-1}| \leq |\{x_{[k-1]} \in G_{[k-1]} : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda) \lambda \cdot \phi(x_{[k-1]}) = 0\} \setminus V_\Lambda|$$

$$= \left| \bigcup_{\mu \in \Lambda} \left\{x_{[k-1]} \in G_{[k-1]} : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda) \lambda \cdot \phi(x_{[k-1]}) = 0 \right\} \right|$$

$$\setminus \left\{x_{[k-1]} \in G_{[k-1]} : \mu \cdot A(x_{[k-1]}) = 0 \right\}$$

$$\leq \left| \bigcup_{\mu \in \Lambda} \left\{x_{[k-1]} \in G_{[k-1]} : \mu \cdot \phi(x_{[k-1]}) = 0 \right\} \right|$$

$$\setminus \left\{x_{[k-1]} \in G_{[k-1]} : \mu \cdot A(x_{[k-1]}) = 0 \right\}$$
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\[ \leq p^{2r_{r_2} - m}|G_{[k-1]}|, \]
from which we deduce that \(|F_1| \leq 2\eta^{-r_{r_2}} p^{6r_{r_2} + r_{r_1} + r_{r_2} + 2r_{r_2} - m}|G_{[k-2]}|\).

We now approximate \(F_1\) by layers of a multiaffine map of bounded codimension. Apply Theorem \[\text{3}\] to \(A_{[r_{r_2}]}\) to find a positive integer \(s = O\left((r_{r_2} + m)^{O(1)}\right)\) and a \(G'\)-supported multiaffine map \(\theta : G_{[k-1]} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^s\) such that for each \(\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_{r_{r_2}}^s\), the layers of \(\theta\) internally \((p^{-m}\)-approximate the set \(\{x_{[k-1]} \in G_{[k-1]} : \lambda \cdot A(x_{[k-1]}) = 0\}\). Hence, the layers of \(\theta\) internally \((p^{r_{r_2} - m}\)-approximate \(V_\Lambda\) and the layers of \(\phi\) externally \((p^{2r_{r_2} - m}\)-approximate \(V_\Lambda\).

Let \(\xi > 0\). Apply Theorem \[\text{57}\] to both \(\phi\) and \(\theta\). Note that \(G' \cap \mathcal{P}([k-2]) = G''\). We obtain positive integers \(t^{(1,1)}, t^{(1,2)} = O\left((r_{r_2} + m + \log_p \xi^{-1})^{O(1)}\right)\), \(G''\)-supported multiaffine maps \(\gamma^{(1,1)} : G_{[k-2]} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^{t^{(1,1)}}\) and \(\gamma^{(1,2)} : G_{[k-2]} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^{t^{(1,2)}}\), a union \(U_1\) of layers of \(\gamma^{(1,1)}\), and a union \(U_2\) of layers of \(\gamma^{(1,2)}\), such that \(|U_1|, |U_2| \geq (1 - \xi)|G_{[k-2]}|\) and for every layer \(L\) of \(\gamma^{(1,1)}\) inside \(U_1\), there is a map \(c^{(1,1)} : \mathbb{F}_p^{[r_{r_2} \times [m]} \rightarrow [0, 1]\) such that

\[ \left(\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^{[r_{r_2} \times [m]} \right) \left( \forall x_{[k-2]} \in L \right) \left|\left| G_{k-1}^{-1}\{\{y_{k-1} \in G_{k-1} : \phi(x_{[k-2]}, y_{k-1}) = \lambda\}\} - c^{(1,1)}(\lambda) \right| \leq \xi \right. \]  
(61)

and for every layer \(L\) of \(\gamma^{(1,2)}\) inside \(U_2\), there is a map \(c^{(1,2)} : \mathbb{F}_p^{s} \rightarrow [0, 1]\) such that

\[ \left(\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^{s} \right) \left( \forall x_{[k-2]} \in L \right) \left|\left| G_{k-1}^{-1}\{\{y_{k-1} \in G_{k-1} : \phi(x_{[k-2]}, y_{k-1}) = \lambda\}\} - c^{(1,2)}(\lambda) \right| \leq \xi \right. \]  
(62)

Write \(\gamma^{(1)} = (\gamma^{(1,1)}, \gamma^{(1,2)})\), which is also a \(G''\)-supported multiaffine map on \(G_{[k-2]}\). Let \(U = U_1 \cap U_2\), which is a union of layers of \(\gamma^{(1)}\). Let \(\Lambda \leq \mathbb{F}_p^{r_{r_2}}\). Let \(\tilde{F}_1^\Lambda\) be the union of all layers \(L\) of \(\gamma^{(1)}\) such that \(L \subseteq U\) and \(L \cap F_1^\Lambda \neq \emptyset\). We claim that \(\tilde{F}_1^\Lambda\) is small. Let \(L\) be any layer of \(\gamma^{(1)}\) inside \(\tilde{F}_1^\Lambda\). Then there is some \(\tilde{x}_{[k-2]} \in L \cap \tilde{F}_1^\Lambda\). By definition of \(\tilde{F}_1^\Lambda\), we have

\[ \left|\{y \in G_{k-1} : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda) \lambda \cdot \phi(\tilde{x}_{[k-2]}, y) = 0\}\right| \geq \eta^{r_{r_2}} p^{-5r_{r_2} - r_{r_1} - 2r_{r_2}} |G_{k-1}|, \]

but

\[ (V_\Lambda)(\tilde{x}_{[k-2]}) \subseteq \{y \in G_{k-1} : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda) \lambda \cdot \phi(\tilde{x}_{[k-2]}, y) = 0\}. \]

Let \(M_1 \subseteq (\mathbb{F}_p^{m})^{r_{r_2}}\) and \(M_2 \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^{s}\) be sets of values such that \(\bigcup_{\lambda \in M_1} \{x_{[k-1]} : \phi(x_{[k-1]}) = \lambda\}\) externally \((p^{2r_{r_2} - m}\)-approximates \(V_\Lambda\) and \(\bigcup_{\lambda \in M_2} \{x_{[k-1]} : \theta(x_{[k-1]}) = \lambda\}\) internally \((p^{r_{r_2} - m}\)-approximates \(V_\Lambda\).

(Note that \(M_1\) is the set of \(r_{r_2}\)-tuples of elements \(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_{r_{r_2}} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{m}\) such that \(\lambda_1 \mu_1 + \cdots + \lambda_{r_{r_2}} \mu_{r_{r_2}} = 0\) for every \(\lambda \in \Lambda\).) In particular,

\[ \left|\left(\bigcup_{\lambda \in M_1} \{x_{[k-1]} : \phi(x_{[k-1]}) = \lambda\}\right) \setminus \left(\bigcup_{\lambda \in M_2} \{x_{[k-1]} : \theta(x_{[k-1]}) = \lambda\}\right) \right| \leq 2p^{2r_{r_2} - m}|G_{[k-1]}|. \]

(63)

Since \(L\) is a layer of \(\gamma^{(1)}\) contained in \(U\), provided we take \(\xi = 4p^{-s - r_{r_2}}\), we have from \[\text{51}\] and \[\text{52}\] that the pairs of sequences

\[ \left(\left|\{y_{k-1} \in G_{k-1} : \phi(z_{[k-2]}, y_{k-1}) = \lambda\}\right| : \lambda \in (\mathbb{F}_p^{m})^{r_{r_2}}\right), \left(\left|\{y_{k-1} \in G_{k-1} : \theta(z_{[k-2]}, y_{k-1}) = \lambda\}\right| : \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^{s}\right) \]
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are the same for all \( z_{[k-2]} \in L \). Thus, for all \( z_{[k-2]} \in L \) we have that
\[
\left| \left( \bigcup_{\lambda \in M_1} \{ x_{[k-1]} : \phi(x_{[k-1]}) = \lambda \} \right) \right| _{z_{[k-2]}} = \left| \left( \bigcup_{\lambda \in M_1} \{ x_{[k-1]} : \phi(x_{[k-1]}) = \lambda \} \right) \right| _{\bar{x}_{[k-2]}}
\]
\[
\geq \eta r_{12} p^{5r_{12}^{-}\gamma_{r_{12}}-r_{2} r_{12}} |G_{k-1}|,
\]
and
\[
\left| \left( \bigcup_{\lambda \in M_2} \{ x_{[k-1]} : \theta(x_{[k-1]}) = \lambda \} \right) \right| _{z_{[k-2]}} = \left| \left( \bigcup_{\lambda \in M_2} \{ x_{[k-1]} : \theta(x_{[k-1]}) = \lambda \} \right) \right| _{\bar{x}_{[k-2]}}
\]
\[
\geq \frac{1}{2} \eta r_{12} p^{5r_{12}^{-}\gamma_{r_{12}}-r_{2} r_{12}} |G_{k-1}|.
\]

By (\textbf{X}), we see that the total size of all layers \( L \) of \( \gamma^{(1)} \) contained in \( U \) that intersect \( F_1^{\Lambda} \) is at most
\[
4 \eta r_{12} p^{5r_{12}^{-}\gamma_{r_{12}}+\gamma_{r_{12}}+r_{2} r_{12}-m} |G_{k-2}|.
\]
Hence, \( F_1 \) is contained in \( \tilde{F}_1 = (\bigcup_{\Lambda \leq \mathbb{F}_{p^{12}}} F_1^{\Lambda}) \cup (G_{k-2} \setminus U) \), which is still a union of layers of \( \gamma^{(1)} \), and (using the fact that the number of subspaces \( \Lambda \leq \mathbb{F}_{p^{12}} \) is at most \( p^{r_{12}} \))
\[
|\tilde{F}_1| \leq 6 \eta r_{12} p^{5r_{12}^{-}\gamma_{r_{12}}+\gamma_{r_{12}}+r_{2} r_{12}-m} |G_{k-2}|.
\]

Since \( \phi_{ij} \) is linear in coordinate \( k-1 \) for all \( i \in [r_{12}], j \in [m] \), we may find a \( G'' \)-supported multiaffine map \( \Phi_{ij} : G_{[k-2]} \to G_{k-1} \) such that \( \phi_{ij}(x_{[k-1]}) = \Phi_{ij}(x_{[k-2]}) \cdot x_{k-1} \). Notice that the set
\[
\{ \mu \in \mathbb{F}_p^{r_{12}} \times [m] : \mu \cdot \Phi(x_{[k-2]}) = 0 \}
\]
determines the sizes \( |\{ y \in G_{k-1} : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda) \lambda \cdot \phi(x_{[k-2]}, y) = 0 \}| \) for all \( \Lambda \leq \mathbb{F}_p^{r_{12}} \).

Applying Theorem \textbf{[3]} to \( \Phi_{[r_{12}] \times [m]} \) to find a \( G'' \)-supported multiaffine map \( \gamma^{(2)} : G_{[k-2]} \to \mathbb{F}_p^t \) for \( t \leq O((r_{12}m)^{O(1)}) \) such that the layers of \( \gamma^{(2)} \) internally and externally \( (p^{-m-r_{12}m^2}) \)-approximate the sets
\[
\left\{ x_{[k-2]} \in G_{[k-2]} : \{ \mu \in \mathbb{F}_p^{r_{12}} \times [m] : \mu \cdot \Phi(x_{[k-2]}) = 0 \} = M \right\}
\]
\[
= \left\{ x_{[k-2]} \in G_{[k-2]} : (\forall \mu \in M) \mu \cdot \Phi(x_{[k-2]}) = 0 \right\} \setminus \left( \bigcup_{\Lambda \leq \mathbb{F}_{p^{12}}} \{ x_{[k-2]} \in G_{[k-2]} : \lambda \cdot \Phi(x_{[k-2]}) = 0 \} \right)\]
for each $M \leq F_p^{[r_12]}$. These partition $G_{[k-2]}$. Let $F_2$ be the union of layers of $\gamma^{(2)}$ that are not fully contained in a set of this form. Then $|F_2| \leq p^{-m}|G_{[k-2]}|$. Let $F = \tilde{F}_1 \cup F_2$, which is a union of layers of $\gamma = (\gamma^{(1)}, \gamma^{(2)})$. Let $L$ be a layer of $\gamma$ such that $L \not\subseteq F$. In particular, $L \not\subseteq F_2$, so $L$ is fully contained in some set

$$\left\{ x_{[k-2]} \in G_{[k-2]} : \mu \in F_p^{[r_12]} : \mu \cdot \Phi(x_{[k-2]}) = 0 \right\} = M.$$ 

This implies that the sequence

$$\left( \left\{ y \in G_{k-1} : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda) \lambda \cdot \phi(x_{[k-2]}, y) = 0 \right\} : \Lambda \leq F_p^{[r_12]} \right)$$

is the same for all $x_{[k-2]} \in L$. Hence, there exists $\Lambda \leq F_p^{[r_12]}$ such that for each $x_{[k-2]} \in L$,

$$|\{ y \in G_{k-1} : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda) \lambda \cdot \phi(x_{[k-2]}, y) = 0 \}| \geq \eta^{r_{12}p^{-5r_{12}^2 - r_{12}r_1 - r_{12}r_2}}|G_{k-1}|$$

and for each $\Lambda' > \Lambda$

$$\eta^{p^{-5r_{12} - r_1 - r_2}}|\{ y \in G_{k-1} : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda) \lambda \cdot \phi(x_{[k-2]}, y) = 0 \}| > |\{ y \in G_{k-1} : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda') \lambda \cdot \phi(x_{[k-2]}, y) = 0 \}|.$$

By the way we defined $\tilde{F}_1$, it must be that $L \subseteq U$ and $L \cap F_1^A = \emptyset$. From the definition of $F_1^A$, we deduce that for each $x_{[k-2]} \in L$,

$$(V)_x_{[k-2]} = \{ y \in G_{k-1} : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda) \lambda \cdot \phi(x_{[k-2]}, y) = 0 \}.$$

On the other hand, from (5), for each $x_{[k-2]} \in L$ we also have

$$|(V)_x_{[k-2]}| \leq |\{ y \in G_{k-1} : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda') \lambda \cdot \phi(x_{[k-2]}, y) = 0 \}|$$

for all $\Lambda' > \Lambda$. Therefore Lemma 4 applies, and finally, for each choice of $x_{[k-2]} \in L$, $u_0 \in G_{k-1}$, $v_0 \in G_k$ and $\tau \in F_p^{[r_12]}$, the biaffine variety

$$\left[ \left( u_0 + \left\{ y \in G_{k-1} : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda) \lambda \cdot \phi(x_{[k-2]}, y) = 0 \right\} \cap \{ y \in G_{k-1} : \beta^1(x_{[k-2]}, y) = \beta^1(x_{[k-2]}, 0) \} \right) \right.$$

$$\left. \cap \{ y \in G_{k-1} : \left( \forall i \in [r_{12}] \right) \alpha_i (x_{[k-2]}, y) = 0 \} \right)$$

$$\times \left( v_0 + \left\langle A_1^1(x_{[k-2]}), \ldots, A_{r_{12}}^r(x_{[k-2]}) \right\rangle \cap \right.$$

$$\left. \left( A_1(x_{[k-2]}, u_0), \ldots, A_{r_{12}}(x_{[k-2]}, u_0) \right) \right)$$

$$\left. \cap \{ z \in G_k : \beta^2(x_{[k-2]}, z) = \beta^2(x_{[k-2]}, 0) \} \right\}$$

$$\cap \{ (y, z) \in G_{k-1} \times G_k : \beta^{12}(x_{[k-2]}, y, z) = \tau \}$$

is either $\eta$-quasirandom with density $p^{-r_{12}}|\Lambda|$ or empty. We may choose $m = O\left( r_{12} + r_1 + r_2 + \log_p \eta^{-1} \right)$ and ensure that $|F| \leq \eta|G_{[k-2]}|$.\qed
9.1. Convolutional extensions of multihomomorphisms

Recall from the introduction that when \( \alpha : G_{[k]} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^r \) is a multiaffine map such that each component \( \alpha_i \) is multilinear on \( G_{I_i} \), where \( I_i \) is the set of coordinates on which \( \alpha_i \) depends, we say that \( \alpha \) is mixed-linear. Further, we say that a variety is mixed-linear if it is a layer of a mixed-linear map.

The next theorem tells us that if we are given a multi-\( D \)-homomorphism defined on a subset \( S \) of a variety \( V \) and a set \( X \subset G_{[k]\setminus \{d\}} \) of \( (1 - \varepsilon) \)-dense columns for sufficiently small \( \varepsilon > 0 \) (that is \( X = \{ x_{[k]\setminus \{d\}} \in G_{[k]\setminus \{d\}} : |S x_{[k]\setminus \{d\}}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|V x_{[k]\setminus \{d\}}| \} \)), then convolving in direction \( d \) turns \( \phi \) into multi-\( D' \)-homomorphism \( \psi \) for some \( D' \) slightly smaller than \( D \). The gain in the theorem is that the domain of \( \psi \) is given by ‘filling’ the \( (1 - \varepsilon) \)-dense columns from \( S x_{[k]\setminus \{d\}} \) to \( V x_{[k]\setminus \{d\}} \), with a minor price that we need to remove a very small portion of columns and that we need to intersect \( V \) with a further lower-order variety of bounded codimension. Crucially, we do not make any additional assumptions on \( X \) such as being \( 1 - o(1) \) dense in a variety of bounded codimension.

**Theorem 76.** Let \( D, k, \in \mathbb{N} \). Then there exists \( \varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(D, k) > 0 \), depending only on \( D \) and \( k \), with the following property. Suppose that \( S \subset V \subset G_{[k]} \) and that \( V \) is a mixed-linear variety of codimension \( r \).

Let \( G \) be a down-set such that \( V \in G \)-supported. Write \( G' = \{ S \subset [k-1] : S \cup \{k\} \in G \} \). Let \( X \subset G_{[k-1]} \) be a set such that \( |S x_{[k-1]}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon_0)|V x_{[k-1]}| > 0 \) for every \( x_{[k-1]} \in X \), and suppose that \( \phi : S \rightarrow H \) is a multi-\( (20D) \)-homomorphism. Let \( \xi > 0 \). Then, provided \( \dim G_i \geq C_D \left( r + \log_p \xi^{-1} \right)^{C_D} \) for each \( i \in [k-1] \), there exist a positive integer \( s = O_D \left( r + \log_p \xi^{-1} \log(D) \right) \), a \( G' \)-supported multiaffine map \( \gamma : G_{[k-1]} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^s \), a collection of values \( \Gamma \subset \mathbb{F}_p^s \), and a set \( X' \subset X \), such that

(i) \( |X \setminus X'| \leq \xi |G_{[k-1]}| \),

(ii) \( |\{ x_{[k-1]} \in G_{[k-1]} : \gamma(x_{[k-1]}) \in \Gamma \}| \geq (1 - \xi)|G_{[k-1]}| \),

(iii) for each \( \lambda \in \Gamma \), the map \( \phi^{ext} : ((X' \cap \{ \gamma = \lambda \}) \times G_k) \cap V \rightarrow H \) given by the formula

\[
\phi^{ext}(x_{[k-1]}, y_1 + y_2 - y_3) = \phi(x_{[k-1]}, y_1) + \phi(x_{[k-1]}, y_2) - \phi(x_{[k-1]}, y_3),
\]

for \( x_{[k-1]} \in X' \cap \{ x_{[k-1]} : \gamma(x_{[k-1]}) = \lambda \} \) and \( y_1, y_2, y_3 \in S x_{[k-1]} \), is well-defined, has the domain claimed, and is a multi-\( D \)-homomorphism.

**Proof.** Fix any \( d \in [k-1] \). Since \( V \) is a \( G \)-supported mixed-linear variety of codimension \( r \), we can find multiaffine maps \( \beta^1 : G_{[k]} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^{r_1}, \beta^2 : G_{[k]\setminus \{d\}} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^{r_2} \) and \( \beta^{12} : G_{[k]} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^{r_{12}} \) such that

- \( r_1 + r_2 + r_{12} \leq r \),
- there are values \( \lambda^1 \in \mathbb{F}_p^{r_1}, \lambda^2 \in \mathbb{F}_p^{r_2}, \lambda^{12} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{r_{12}} \) for which

\[
V = \{ x_{[k]} \in G_{[k]} : \beta^1(x_{[k-1]}) = \lambda^1, \beta^2(x_{[k]\setminus \{d\}}) = \lambda^2, \beta^{12}(x_{[k]}) = \lambda^{12} \},
\]
- \( \beta^{12} \) is linear in coordinates \( G_d \) and \( G_k \), and
β^{12} is \{S \subset [k] : S \cup \{d, k\} \in \mathcal{G}\}-supported.

Write \(\beta^{12}_i(x|k) = A_i(x_{[k-1]}|d) \cdot x_k\), for multiaffine maps \(A_i : G_{[k-1]} \rightarrow G_k\), where the \(A_i\) are additionally linear in coordinate \(d\) and \(\mathcal{G}'\)-supported.

Let \(\eta > 0\) be a constant to be chosen later. Apply Theorem 74 with \(d_1 = d\) and \(d_2 = k\) to \(\beta^1, \beta^2\) and \(\beta^{12}\). We obtain

- positive integers \(m, s = O((r + \log p \eta^{-1})^O(1))\),
- \(\mathcal{G}'\)-supported multiaffine maps \(\psi_i^{(d)}, \ldots, \psi_{r_1d}^{(d)} : G_{[k-1]} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^m\), which are linear in coordinate \(d\),
- \(\mathcal{G}''\)-supported multiaffine maps \(\gamma^{(d)} : G_{[k-1]\{d\}} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^s\), where

\[
\mathcal{G}'' = \{S \subset [k-1] \setminus \{d\} : S \cup \{d, k\} \in \mathcal{G}\},
\]

- a collection of values \(\Gamma^{(d)} \subset \mathbb{F}^s\) such that

\[
|\{x_{[k-1]\{d\}} \in G_{[k-1]\{d\}} : \gamma^{(d)}(x_{[k-1]\{d\}}) \in \Gamma^{(d)}\}| \geq (1 - \eta)|G_{[k-1]\{d\}}|,
\]

with the property that for each \(\mu \in \Gamma^{(d)}\), there is a subspace \(\Lambda^\mu \leq \mathbb{F}^{r_1d}\) such that for each \(x_{[k-1]\{d\}} \in (\gamma^{(d)})^{-1}(\mu)\), \(u_0 \in G_{d}, v_0 \in G_k\) and \(\tau \in \mathbb{F}^{r_1d}\), the biaffine variety

\[
\left[\left(u_0 + \left\{y \in G_d : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda^\mu) \lambda \cdot \psi^{(d)}(x_{[k-1]\{d\}}, y) = 0\right\}\cap \left\{y \in G_d : \beta^1(x_{[k-1]\{d\}}, y) = \beta^1(x_{[k-1]\{d\}}, 0)\right\}\right)\times \left(v_0 + \left\{A_1(x_{[k-1]\{d\}}, u_0), \ldots, A_{r_1d}(x_{[k-1]\{d\}}, u_0)\right\}\right)\cap \left\{z \in G_k : \beta^2(x_{[k-1]\{d\}}, k^0) = \beta^2(x_{[k-1]\{d\}}, k^0)\right\}\right]
\]

is either \(\eta\)-quasirandom with density \(|\Lambda^\mu|\mathbb{F}^{-r_1d}\) or empty.

For each \(x_{[k-1]\{d\}} \in (\gamma^{(d)})^{-1}(\Gamma^{(d)})\), write \(\mu = \gamma^{(d)}(x_{[k-1]\{d\}}) \in \Gamma^{(d)}\) and define

\[
U_{x_{[k-1]\{d\}}} = \left\{y \in G_d : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda^\mu) \lambda \cdot \psi^{(d)}(x_{[k-1]\{d\}}, y) = 0\right\}\cap \left\{y \in G_d : \beta^1(x_{[k-1]\{d\}}, y) = \beta^1(x_{[k-1]\{d\}}, 0)\right\}.
\]

Take a coset \(W_{x_{[k-1]\{d\}}} \) inside \(G_d\) such that

\[
U_{x_{[k-1]\{d\}}} \oplus W_{x_{[k-1]\{d\}}} = \left\{y \in G_d : \beta^1(x_{[k-1]\{d\}}, y) = \lambda^1\right\}.
\]

For each \(u_0 \in W_{x_{[k-1]\{d\}}}\), write

\[
Y_{x_{[k-1]\{d\}}, u_0} = \left\langle A_1(x_{[k-1]\{d\}}, u_0), \ldots, A_{r_1d}(x_{[k-1]\{d\}}, u_0)\right\rangle.
\]

\(^{16}\)This \(\mathcal{G}'\) is the same as in the statement of this theorem, not the one given by Theorem 74.
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Then \(X_{X[k-1]\{d\}} \cap (u_0 + U_{X[k-1]\{d\}}) \cap (u_0 + U_{X[k-1]\{d\}}) \cap G_d \cap G_k = \beta^{12}(x_{[k-1]\{d\}}, y, z) = \lambda^{12}\) is non-empty, and therefore \(\eta\)-quasirandom with density \(|\Lambda^{\eta}|p^{-r/12}\). By quasirandomness, we see that for a proportion at least \(1 - p^{2+r/12}\eta\) of \(y \in u_0 + U_{X[k-1]\{d\}}\) we have that \(B^{v_0}\) is non-empty for every \(v_0 \in C_{X[k-1]\{d\}, u_0}\). Thus \(C_{X[k-1]\{d\}, u_0}\) is a coset in \(G_k\), and by Lemma 60
\[
\left((u_0 + U_{X[k-1]\{d\}}) \times (C_{X[k-1]\{d\}, u_0} + Y_{X[k-1]\{d\}, u_0})\right) \cap \{(y, z) \in G_d \times G_k : \beta^{12}(x_{[k-1]\{d\}}, y, z) = \lambda^{12}\}
\]
is \(\eta p^{-r}\)-quasirandom with density \(|\Lambda^{\eta}|p^{-r/12}\).

Apply Theorem \([\ref{thm:quasirandomness}]\) to
\[
X_{X[k-1]\{d\}} \cap (u_0 + U_{X[k-1]\{d\}}), \ S_{X[k-1]\{d\}} \cap \left((u_0 + U_{X[k-1]\{d\}}) \times G_k\right)
\]
and the variety
\[
\left((u_0 + U_{X[k-1]\{d\}}) \times (C_{X[k-1]\{d\}, u_0} + Y_{X[k-1]\{d\}, u_0})\right) \cap \{(y, z) \in G_d \times G_k : \beta^{12}(x_{[k-1]\{d\}}, y, z) = \lambda^{12}\}
\]
and \(X^{(d, u_0)}_{X[k-1]\{d\}}\) has the property regardless of extensions of maps described in that theorem. Let
\[
X^{(d)} = \bigcup_{x_{[k-1]\{d\}} \in G_{[k-1]\{d\}} \cap \Gamma_{[k-1]\{d\}}} \cdot \{x_{[k-1]\{d\}} \} \times X^{(d, u_0)}_{X[k-1]\{d\}}.
\]
Then \(X^{(d)} \subset X\) and \(|X \setminus X^{(d)}| = O_D(p^{O_D(\eta)}|\eta^{O_D(1)}|)|G_{[k-1]}|\), and for each \(\mu \in \Gamma^{(d)}\) and \(\mu' \in \Gamma_{[k-1]}^{(d)}\) the extension map defined by the rule described in the statement is well-defined on
\[
\left[X^{(d)} \cap (\gamma^{(d)}(\mu) \times G_d) \cap \bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda^\mu} (\lambda \cdot \psi^{(d)}(\mu')) \times G_k\right] \cap V,
\]
affine in direction \(k\), and a \(D\)-homomorphism in direction \(d\).

Finally, take \(X' = \bigcap_{x_{[k-1]}} X^{(d)}, \gamma = (\gamma^{(1)}, \psi^{(1)}, \ldots, \gamma^{(k-1)}, \psi^{(k-1)})\) and \(\Gamma = \Gamma^{(1)} \times \Gamma^{\codim \psi^{(1)}} \times \ldots \times \Gamma^{(k-1)} \times \Gamma^{\codim \psi^{(k-1)}}\). We may take \(\eta \geq \Omega_D((p^{-r})^{O_D(1)})\) to finish the proof. \(\square\)
9.2. Biaffine structure in higher dimensions

The next theorem tells us that under suitable conditions, if \( \phi \) is a multi-homomorphism defined on almost all of a low-codimensional variety, then there is a subvariety of bounded codimension and a subset \( X' \) that contains almost all its points such that for every 2-dimensional axis-aligned cross-section \( \phi \) agrees on \( X' \) with a global biaffine map. In other words, we end up in a slightly stronger position than before: the restrictions to 2-dimensional cross-sections are not just bihomomorphisms but biaffine maps that can be extended to the whole of the corresponding cross-section of \( G[k] \).

**Theorem 77.** Let \( \mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{P}([k]) \) be a down-set and let \( V \) be a \( \mathcal{G} \)-supported mixed-linear variety of codimension \( r \). Let \( \mathcal{H} \) be the down-set obtained by removing maximal elements from \( \mathcal{G} \). Let \( X \subseteq V \) be a set of size at least \( (1 - \varepsilon)|V| \). Let \( \phi : X \rightarrow H \) be a multi-homomorphism and let \( \xi > 0 \). Then there exist an \( \mathcal{H} \)-supported mixed-linear variety \( W \) of codimension \( O\left((r + \log p \xi^{-1})O(1)\right) \), such that \( V' = V \cap W \neq \emptyset \), and a set \( X' \subset V' \cap X \) of size \( (1 - O(\varepsilon O(1)) - O(\xi O(1)))|V'| \) such that for any two coordinates \( d_1 \neq d_2 \) and every \( x[k]\{d_1,d_2\} \in G[k]\{d_1,d_2\} \), there is a global biaffine map \( \phi_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\}}^{\text{glob}} : G_{d_1} \times G_{d_2} \rightarrow H \) with the property that

\[
\phi_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\}}^{\text{glob}}(y_{d_1}, y_{d_2}) = \phi(x[k]\{d_1,d_2\}, y_{d_1}, y_{d_2})
\]

for every \( (y_{d_1}, y_{d_2}) \in X'_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\}} \).

**Remark.** By modifying \( \xi \) slightly, we may improve the bound to \( |X'| = (1 - O(\varepsilon O(1)) - \xi)|V'| \) instead of the claimed bound.

**Proof.** The approach is quite similar to that of the proof of Theorem 76. Let \( (d_1^{(1)}, d_2^{(1)}), (d_1^{(2)}, d_2^{(2)}), \ldots, (d_1^{(k')}, d_2^{(k')}) \) be an enumeration of all pairs of directions in \([k]\), where \( k' = \left\lfloor \frac{k}{\xi} \right\rfloor \). By induction on \( i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, k\} \), we shall show that there exist a \( \mathcal{H} \)-supported variety \( W \) of codimension \( (r + \log p \xi^{-1})O(1) \), such that \( V' = V \cap W \neq \emptyset \), and a set \( X' \subset V' \cap X \) of size \( |X'| = (1 - O(\varepsilon O(1)) - O(\xi O(1)))|V'| \), such that for any two coordinates \( (d_1, d_2) \in \{(d_1^{(1)}, d_2^{(1)}), (d_1^{(2)}, d_2^{(2)}), \ldots, (d_1^{(i)}, d_2^{(i)})\} \), the conclusion in the statement holds.

The base case \( i = 0 \) is trivial. Now assume that the claim holds for some \( i \geq 0 \) and let \( W, V', X' \) be the relevant objects. Let \( \xi' = O(\xi O(1)) \), \( \xi'' = O(\xi O(1)) \) be such that \( |X'| \geq (1 - \varepsilon' - \xi')|V'| \). Write \( d_1 = d_1^{(i+1)} \) and \( d_2 = d_2^{(i+1)} \). Since \( V \) and \( W \) are mixed-linear so is \( V' \), and we may find multiaffine maps \( \beta^1 : G[k]\{d_2\} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^{r_1}_p, \beta^2 : G[k]\{d_1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^{r_2}_p \) and \( \beta^{12} : G[k] \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^{r}_{12} \) such that \( r_1 + r_2 + r_{12} \leq \text{codim} V' \), there are values \( \lambda^1 \in \mathbb{F}^{r_1}_p, \lambda^2 \in \mathbb{F}^{r_2}_p, \lambda^{12} \in \mathbb{F}^{r}_{12} \) for which \( V' = \{x[k] \in G[k] : \beta^1(x[k]\{d_2\}) = \lambda^1, \beta^2(x[k]\{d_1\}) = \lambda^2, \beta^{12}(x[k]) = \lambda^{12}\} \), \( \beta^{12} \) is linear in coordinates \( G_{d_1} \) and \( G_{d_2} \), and \( \beta^{12} \) is \( \{S \subset \mathcal{G} : d_1, d_2 \subseteq S\} \)-supported.

Apply Theorem 74 to \( \beta^1, \beta^2, \beta^{12} \) with parameter \( \eta > 0 \) in directions \( d_1 \) and \( d_2 \). Let \( \mathcal{G}' = \{S \subset [k] \setminus \{d_2\} : S \cup \{d_1, d_2\} \subseteq \mathcal{G}\} \) and \( \mathcal{G}'' = \{S \subset [k] \setminus \{d_1, d_2\} : S \cup \{d_1, d_2\} \subseteq \mathcal{G}\} \). These down-sets are
both contained in $H$. Note that $\beta^{12}_1(x|k|) = A_i(x|k|\{d_1\}) \cdot x_{d_2}$ for some multiaffine $A_i : G|k|\{d_2\} \rightarrow G_{d_2}$, linear in coordinate $d_1$. Then there exist

- positive integers $m, t = O\left( (r_{12} + r_1 + r_2 + \log p \eta^{-1})^{O(1)} \right)$,
- $G'$-supported multiaffine maps $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_{r_{12}} : G|k|\{d_2\} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^m$ that are linear in coordinate $d_1$,
- a $G''$-supported multiaffine map $\gamma : G|k|\{d_1,d_2\} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^t$, and
- a collection of values $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{F}_p^t$ such that $|\gamma^{-1}(\Gamma)| \geq (1 - \eta)|G|k|\{d_1,d_2\}|$,

such that for each $\mu \in \Gamma$, there is a subspace $\Lambda^{\mu} \leq \mathbb{F}_p^{rt}$ such that for each $x|k|\{d_1,d_2\} \in \gamma^{-1}(\mu)$, each $u_0 \in G_{d_1}, v_0 \in G_{d_2}$ and each $\tau \in \mathbb{F}_p^{rt}$, the biaffine variety

$$\left[ \left( u_0 + \left\{ y \in G_{d_1} : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda^{\mu}) \lambda \cdot \phi(x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}, y) = 0 \right\} \right. \right.$$

$$\left. \quad \cap \left\{ y \in G_{d_1} : \beta^1(x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}, d_1 y) = \beta^1(x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}, d_1 0) \right\} \right)$$

$$\times \left( v_0 + \left\{ (A_1(x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}, d_1 u_0), \ldots, A_{r_{12}}(x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}, d_1 u_0) \right\} \right. $$

$$\left. \cap \left\{ z \in G_{d_2} : \beta^2(x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}, d_2 z) = \beta^2(x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}, d_2 0) \right\} \right)$$

$$\cap \left\{ (y, z) \in G_{d_1} \times G_{d_2} : \beta^{12}(x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}, y_0, z_0) = \tau \right\}$$

is either $\eta$-quasirandom with density $|\Lambda^{\mu}| p^{-r_{12}}$ or empty.

For each $x|k|\{d_1,d_2\} \in \gamma^{-1}(\Gamma)$, write $\mu = \gamma(x|k|\{d_1,d_2\})$ and

$$U_{x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}} = \left\{ y \in G_{d_1} : (\forall \lambda \in \Lambda^{\mu}) \lambda \cdot \phi(x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}, d_1 y) = 0 \right\}$$

$$\cap \left\{ y \in G_{d_1} : \beta^1(x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}, d_1 y) = \beta^1(x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}, d_1 0) \right\}.$$ 

Take a coset $W_{x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}}$ inside $G_{d_1}$ such that

$$U_{x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}} \oplus W_{x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}} = \left\{ y \in G_{d_1} : \beta^1(x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}, d_1 y) = \lambda \right\}.$$ 

For each $u_0 \in W_{x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}}$, write

$$Y_{x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}, u_0} = \left( A_1(x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}, d_1 u_0), \ldots, A_{r_{12}}(x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}, d_1 u_0) \right) \cap \left\{ z \in G_{d_2} : \beta^2(x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}, d_2 z) = \beta^2(x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}, d_2 0) \right\}.$$ 

With this notation, the biaffine variety above, which we shall denote $B^{u_0,v_0,\tau}$, may be written as

$$B^{u_0,v_0,\tau} = \left( (u_0 + U_{x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}}) \times (v_0 + Y_{x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}, u_0}) \right) \cap \left\{ (y, z) \in G_{d_1} \times G_{d_2} : \beta^{12}(x|k|\{d_1,d_2\}, y, z) = \tau \right\}.$$ 
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Let $T_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\},u_0}$ be a coset in $G_{d_2}$ such that

$$Y_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\},u_0} \oplus T_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\},u_0} = \{ z \in G_{d_2} : \beta^2(x[k]\{d_1,d_2\},d_2z) = \lambda^2 \},$$

and let $C_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\},u_0}$ be the set of all $v_0 \in T_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\},u_0}$ such that $B^{u_0,v_0,\lambda^2}$ is non-empty and hence $\eta$-quasirandom with density $|\Lambda^\mu|_{p^{-r_2}}$. For each $v_0 \in C_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\},u_0}$, let $\tilde{\Lambda}(v_0)$ be the set of all $\tau \in \mathbb{F}^{r_2}_p$ such that $B^{u_0,v_0,\tau}$ is non-empty (and hence $\eta$-quasirandom with density $|\Lambda^\mu|_{p^{-r_2}}$).

**Claim A.** (i) For each $v_0 \in C_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\},u_0}$, $\tilde{\Lambda}(v_0)$ is a non-empty coset inside $\mathbb{F}^{r_2}_p$.

(ii) For each $v_0 \in C_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\},u_0}$, $\tilde{\Lambda}(v_0)$ is the same, and we may write simply $\tilde{\Lambda}$.

**Proof of Claim A.** (i): We already know that $\lambda^{12} \in \tilde{\Lambda}(v_0)$, hence the set is non-empty. On the other hand, using quasirandomness, provided $\eta r^{12} < 1$, we may find $y \in u_0 + U_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\}}$ such that $B^{u_0,v_0,\lambda^{12}} = \emptyset$ when $\tau \notin \tilde{\Lambda}(v_0)$ and $B^{u_0,v_0,\tau} \neq \emptyset$ when $\tau \in \tilde{\Lambda}(v_0)$. Hence, $\tilde{\Lambda}(v_0)$ is precisely the image of affine map $z \mapsto \beta^{12}(y,z)$, with domain $v_0 + Y_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\},u_0}$. Hence, $\tilde{\Lambda}(v_0)$ is indeed a coset inside $\mathbb{F}^{r_2}_p$.

(ii): Proceeding further, note that in fact we may pick $y \in u_0 + U_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\}}$ so that the property above holds simultaneously for all $v_0 \in C_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\},u_0}$, provided $\eta r^{12} < 1$. We may then observe that for each $v_0 \in C_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\},u_0}$, the set $\Lambda(v_0)$ is coset of subspace $I \leq \mathbb{F}^{r_2}_p$, defined as the image of linear map $z \mapsto \beta^{12}(y,z) - \beta^{12}(y,0)$, with domain $Y_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\},u_0}$. But $\lambda^{12} \in \tilde{\Lambda}(v_0)$, which implies that $\tilde{\Lambda}(v_0) = \lambda^{12} + I$, which is independent of the choice of $v_0$. \[\square\]

By Lemma 66, we see that for each $u_0 \in W_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\}}$ and $\tau \in \tilde{\Lambda}$

$$B^{u_0,\tau} = \left( (u_0 + U_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\}}) \times (C_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\},u_0} + Y_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\},u_0}) \right)$$

$$\cap \{ (y,z) \in G_{d_1} \times G_{d_2} : \beta^{12}(x[k]\{d_1,d_2\},y,z) = \tau \}$$

is $\eta r^{12}$-quasirandom with density $|\Lambda^\mu|_{p^{-r_2}}$. On the other hand, when $\tau \notin \tilde{\Lambda}$, the set given by this expression is empty. However, one also has

$$B^{u_0,\lambda^{12}} = \left( (u_0 + U_{x[k]\{d_1,d_2\}}) \times \left\{ z \in G_{d_2} : \beta^2(x[k]\{d_1,d_2\},d_2z) = \lambda^2 \right\} \right)$$

$$\cap \{ (y,z) \in G_{d_1} \times G_{d_2} : \beta^{12}(x[k]\{d_1,d_2\},y,z) = \lambda^{12} \}.$$
from which we obtain
\[
\left| \bigcup_{(x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\},u_0) \in S} (X'_{x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}} \cap ((u_0 + U_{x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}}) \times G_{d_2})) \right|
\geq (1 - \sqrt{\varepsilon}) \left| \bigcup_{(x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\},u_0) \in S} B^{u_0,\lambda^1} \right|
\geq (1 - 2\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \left| \gamma^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{d_1} \times G_{d_2} \right| \cap V'.
\]

Now apply Theorem 73 to \(X'_{x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}} \cap ((u_0 + U_{x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}}) \times G_{d_2})\) and \(B^{u_0,\lambda^1}\) for every \((x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}, u_0) \in S\).

To finish the proof, we need to find a subset \(\tilde{S} \subset \gamma^{-1}(\mu)\) and \(u_0(x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\})\) for each \((x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}) \in \tilde{S}\) such that \((x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}, u_0(x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\})) \in S\). To this end, fix a basis \(\nu^1, \ldots, \nu^{|\Lambda^\mu|}\) of \(\Lambda^\mu\) and observe that cosets of \(U_{x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}}\) that partition \(\{ y \in G_{d_1} : \beta^i(x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}, d_1 y) = \lambda^1 \}\) are cosets of the form
\[
\{ y \in G_{d_1} : \beta^i(x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}, d_1 y) = \lambda^1 \land (\forall i \in [l]) \nu^i \cdot \phi(x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}, d_1 y) = \rho_i \}
\]
for all choices of \(\rho \in \mathbb{F}_p^l\). Hence, for each \(\rho \in \mathbb{F}_p^l\), we define \(\tilde{S}_\rho\) as the set of all \((x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}, u_0) \in S\) such that \(x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\} \in \gamma^{-1}(\mu)\) and \(u_0 \in W_{x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}}\) obeys the condition
\[
u^i = \beta^i(x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}, d_1 y) = \lambda^1 \land (\forall i \in [l]) \nu^i \cdot \phi(x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}, d_1 y) = \rho_i \}
\]
Thus, \(S = \bigcup_{\rho \in \mathbb{F}_p^l} \tilde{S}_\rho\) is a partition, and each \(\tilde{S}_\rho\) has the property described above.

Note that the decomposition
\[
(\gamma^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{d_1} \times G_{d_2}) \cap V' = \bigcup_{\rho \in \mathbb{F}_p^l} \left( (\gamma^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{d_1} \times G_{d_2}) \cap V' \cap \left( \bigcup_{i \in [l]} (\nu^i \cdot \phi)^{-1}(\rho_i) \right) \times G_{d_2} \right)
\]
is also a partition, and that
\[
\bigcup_{(x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\},u_0) \in \tilde{S}_\rho} (X'_{x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}} \cap ((u_0 + U_{x[k]\setminus\{d_1,d_2\}}) \times G_{d_2}))
\]
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Theorem 78. For every positive integer \( G \subset P \) statement holds. Let \( G \) an arbitrary multiaffine map. Then there is a maximal element from \( \rho \) for each \( G \). Thus, by averaging, there is \( \rho \in \mathbb{F}_p^l \) such that

\[
X'' = \bigcup_{(x_\lbrack k\rbrack \setminus \{d_1, d_2\}, u_0) \in \delta_p} \left( X'_{x_\lbrack k\rbrack \setminus \{d_1, d_2\}} \cap \left( (u_0 + U_{x_\lbrack k\rbrack \setminus \{d_1, d_2\}}) \times G_{d_2} \right) \right)
\]

and

\[
V'' = \left( \gamma^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{d_1} \times G_{d_2} \right) \cap V' \cap \left( \left\{ (\forall i \in [l]) \nu^i \cdot \phi = \rho_i \right\} \times G_{d_2} \right)
\]

have the claimed properties, except that \( V'' \) possibly is not mixed-linear. To make it mixed-linear, look at multilinear pieces and observe that it is a union of layers of mixed-linear multiaffine map and average over layers. We may choose \( \eta = \Omega(\xi^{O(1)} p^{-O(r)}) \) so that the necessary bounds are satisfied.

\[\square\]

§10 Extending maps from nearly full varieties

10.1. Extensions from 1-codimensional subvarieties

Next theorem is a generalization of Proposition [2] to the multivariate case. Its statement is rather technical so we describe it informally beforehand. Let \( V = \alpha^{-1}(\nu) \) be a variety defined by multilinear forms \( \alpha_i : G_{I_i} \to \mathbb{F}_p \) for \( i \in [r] \), where \( \nu \in \mathbb{F}_p^r \). Assume that \( \alpha_1 \) is quasirandom with respect to other forms and consider variety defined by all forms but the first one, namely \( V' = \{ x_{\lbrack k\rbrack} : \alpha_2(x_{\lbrack k\rbrack}) = \nu_2, \ldots, \alpha_r(x_{\lbrack k\rbrack}) = \nu_r \} \).

Now, suppose that \( \phi \) is a multiaffine map defined on \( 1 - o(1) \) proportion of \( V \). Then, we may extend \( \phi \) to most of \( V' \cap W \), for a lower-order variety \( W \), using an explicit formula.

**Theorem 78.** For every positive integer \( k \) there are constants \( C_k, D_k \geq 1 \) such that the following statement holds. Let \( \mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}([k]) \) be a down-set and let \( \mathcal{G}' \) be the down-set obtained by removing the maximal elements from \( \mathcal{G} \). Suppose that we are given multilinear forms \( \alpha_i : G_{I_i} \to \mathbb{F}_p \), where \( I_i \in \mathcal{G} \), for \( i \in [r] \). Let \( \nu \in \mathbb{F}_p^r \) and let \( V = \{ x_{\lbrack k\rbrack} \in G_{[k]} : (\forall i \in [r]) \alpha_i(x_{I_i}) = \nu_i \} \). Let \( \xi > 0 \). Suppose that \( I_1 \) is a maximal element of \( \mathcal{G} \) and that

\[
\text{bias}(\alpha_1 - \lambda \cdot \alpha) \leq p^{-C_k(r + \log r)^{1/2}}
\]

for every \( \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^{[r]} \) such that \( \lambda_i = 0 \) whenever \( I_i \neq I_1 \). Let \( X \subset V \) be a set of size at least \( (1 - \varepsilon)|V| \) and let \( \phi : X \to H \) be a multiaffine map. Write \( I_1 = \{ c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_m \} \). Let \( h_0 : G_{[k]} \setminus I_1 \to H \) be an arbitrary multiaffine map. Then there is a \( \mathcal{G}' \)-supported multiaffine variety \( W \) of codimension
\( O \left( r + \log_p \varepsilon^{-1} + \log_p \xi^{-1} \right)^{O(1)} \) such that \( V' = \{ x_{[k]} \in G_{[k]} : (\forall i \in [2, r]) \alpha_i(x_{I_i}) = \nu_i \} \cap W \neq \emptyset \), a set \( X' \subset V' \) of size \((1 - O(\varepsilon^{\Omega(1)}) - O(\xi^{\Omega(1)})))|V'|\), a multiaffine map \( \psi : X' \to H \), a point \( a_{[k]} \in G_{[k]} \), and \( \mu_0 \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{ \nu_1 \} \) such that for each \( x_{[k]} \in X' \),

- when \( x_{[k]} \in V \), then \( x_{[k]} \in X \) and \( \psi(x_{[k]}) = \phi(x_{[k]}) \), and

- when \( x_{[k]} \in V' \) and \( \alpha_1(x_{I_i}) = \mu \) for some \( \mu \neq \nu_1 \), for \( \Omega \left( p^{-O((r + \log_p \xi^{-1})^{O(1)})} \right) \) choices of \( u_{I_i} \in G_{I_i} \), we have

\[
\psi(x_{[k]}) = \phi \left( x_{[k]} \setminus \{ c_m \}, x_{c_m} - \frac{\mu - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} (a_{c_m} - u_{c_m}) \right) + \frac{\mu - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \left( h_0(x_{[k]} \setminus I_1) - \phi(x_{[k]} \setminus c_m), u_{c_m} \right) + \sum_{i \in [m-1]} \phi(x_{[k]} \setminus \{ c_i, \ldots, c_m \}, u_{c_i} + x_{c_i} - a_{c_i}, a_{\{c_{i+1}, \ldots, c_m\}}) - \sum_{i \in [m-1]} \phi(x_{[k]} \setminus \{ c_i, \ldots, c_m \}, u_{c_i}, a_{\{c_{i+1}, \ldots, c_m\}}),
\]

and additionally all points in the arguments of \( \phi \) belong to \( X \).

**Remark.** By modifying \( \xi \) appropriately, we may strengthen the conclusion slightly to

\[
|X'| \geq \left( 1 - O(\varepsilon^{\Omega(1)}) - \xi \right)|V'|.
\]

**Proof.** Suppose that \( I_i = I_1 \) if and only if \( i \in [r_0] \). Begin by applying Theorem \( \ref{thm:main} \). Misusing the notation by still writing \( X \) and \( V \) for the smaller set and variety produced by that theorem, we may assume that a set \( X \subset V \) of size at least \((1 - \varepsilon')|V|\) is given, where \( \varepsilon' = O(\varepsilon^{\Omega(1)}) + \xi \), \( \phi : X \to H \) is multiaffine and extends on each axis-aligned plane to a global biaffine map, and \( V \) is defined by \( s \leq C_k (r + \log_p \xi^{-1})^D_k \) multilinear forms, where the first \( r \) are the given ones, and the others are \( G' \)-supported, where \( C_k \) and \( D_k \) are the implicit constants appearing in the theorem. Write \( V^{[2, s]} = \{ x_{[k]} \in G_{[k]} : \alpha_2(x_{[k]}) = \nu_2, \ldots \} \) for the variety where \( \alpha_1 \) is not used.

Let \( \eta > 0 \). For simplicity of notation assume without loss of generality that \( I_1 = [d_0 + 1, k] \). For each \( d \in [d_0 + 1, k] \), let \( Y_d \) be the set of all \( x_{[k]} \in V^{[2, s]} \setminus V \) such that \(|X_{x_{[k]} \setminus \{d\}}| \geq (1 - \eta)|V_{x_{[k]} \setminus \{d\}}| > 0\).

**Claim A.** If \( \text{bias}(\alpha_1 - \lambda \cdot \alpha) \leq \frac{\xi}{2p^{-D_k(k+1)s}} \) for every \( \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^{[2, r_0]} \), then

\[
|Y_d| \geq (1 - 2p\eta^{-1}\varepsilon' - 2\xi)|V^{[2, s]} \setminus V|
\]

for each \( d \in [d_0 + 1, k] \).

**Proof of Claim A.** Without loss of generality \( d \in I_i \) if and only if \( i \in [s_0] \). Write \( \alpha_i(x_{I_i}) = A_i(x_{I_i \setminus \{d\}}) \cdot x_d \). Note that \( A_1(x_{I_1 \setminus \{d\}}) \) is independent of \( A_2(x_{I_2 \setminus \{d\}}), \ldots, A_{s_0}(x_{I_{s_0} \setminus \{d\}}) \) for most values of \( x_{[k] \setminus \{d\}} \).
Indeed, for any \( \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^{[2,r_0]} \), we have

\[
|G[k] \setminus \{d\}|^{-1} \left\{ x[k] \in G[k] \setminus \{d\} : A_1(x_I \setminus \{d\}) = \sum_{i \in [2,r_0]} \lambda_i A_i(x_I \setminus \{d\}) \right\} \\
\leq \mathbb{E} \omega^{A_1(x_I \setminus \{d\}) - \sum_{i \in [2,r_0]} \lambda_i A_i(x_I \setminus \{d\})} x_d \\
\leq \mathbb{E} \omega^{A_1(x_I \setminus \{d\}) - \sum_{i \in [2,r_0]} \lambda_i A_i(x_I \setminus \{d\})} \\
\leq \text{bias} \left( A_1 - \sum_{i \in [2,r_0]} \lambda_i A_i \right) \\
\leq \frac{\xi}{2} p^{-(k+1)s},
\]

where the second inequality follows from Lemma \([\text{H}]\) and the third is true by hypothesis.

Thus, \( |V_{x[k] \setminus \{d\}}| = \frac{1}{p} |V_{x[k] \setminus \{d\}}| \) for all but \( \frac{\xi}{2} p^{-k_s} |G[k] \setminus \{d\}| \) elements \( x[k] \setminus \{d\} \in G[k] \setminus \{d\} \). Let \( Z \) be the set of such \( x[k] \setminus \{d\} \). Then

\[
\left| (V^{[2,s]} \setminus V) \setminus Y_d \right| \leq \sum_{x[k] \setminus \{d\} \in Z} \left| (V^{[2,s]} \setminus V)_{x[k] \setminus \{d\}} \right| \cdot \mathbb{I} \left( |X_{x[k] \setminus \{d\}}| < (1 - \eta)|V_{x[k] \setminus \{d\}}| \right) + |G[k] \setminus \{d\} \setminus Z| \cdot |G_d|
\]

\[
= \sum_{x[k] \setminus \{d\} \in Z} (p - 1)|V_{x[k] \setminus \{d\}}| \cdot \mathbb{I} \left( |X_{x[k] \setminus \{d\}}| < (1 - \eta)|V_{x[k] \setminus \{d\}}| \right) + |G[k] \setminus \{d\} \setminus Z| \cdot |G_d|
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{x[k] \setminus \{d\} \in Z} (p - 1)\eta^{-1}|V_{x[k] \setminus \{d\}} \setminus X_{x[k] \setminus \{d\}}| + |G[k] \setminus \{d\} \setminus Z| \cdot |G_d|
\]

\[
\leq (p - 1)\eta^{-1}|V \setminus X| + \xi p^{-k_s} |G[k]|
\]

\[
\leq (p - 1)\eta^{-1} \varepsilon' + \xi |V|
\]

\[
\leq (2(p - 1)\eta^{-1} \varepsilon' + 2\xi)|V^{[2,s]} \setminus V|,
\]

which proves the claim. \( \square \)

Let \( \mu_0 \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{\nu_1\} \) be arbitrary. Write \( V^{\mu_0} = \{ x[k] \in V^{[2,s]} : \alpha_1(x[k]) = \mu_0 \} \). Let \( Y = \bigcap_{d \in I_1} Y_d \). Applying the claim to each \( Y_d \), we have that \( |Y| \geq (1 - 2kpn^{-1} \varepsilon' - 2k\xi)|V^{[2,s]} \setminus V| \). Let

\[
\tilde{Y} = \left\{ x[k] \in Y : \alpha_1(x[k]) = \mu_0, |Y_{x[k-1]}| \geq (1 - \eta)|V^{[2,s]} \setminus V_{x[k-1]}| \right\}.
\]

Using the quasirandomness of \( \alpha_1 \) with respect to the other forms as in the proof of the claim, one has that \( |V_{x[k-1]}^{\mu_0}| = \frac{1}{p}|V_{x[k-1]}^{[2,s]}| \) for all but \( \frac{\xi}{2} p^{-k_s} |G[k-1]| \) elements \( x[k-1] \in G[k-1] \). Let \( Q \) be the set of such \( x[k-1] \). We deduce that

\[
|V^{\mu_0} \setminus \tilde{Y}| \leq \sum_{x[k-1] \in Q} \left| V_{x[k-1]}^{\mu_0} \right| \cdot \mathbb{I} \left( |Y_{x[k-1]}| < (1 - \eta)|V^{[2,s]} \setminus V_{x[k-1]}| \right) + \sum_{x[k-1] \in G[k-1] \setminus Q} |G[k]|
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{x[k-1] \in Q} \frac{1}{p - 1} \left| V^{[2,s]} \setminus V \right|_{x[k-1]} \cdot \mathbb{I} \left( |Y_{x[k-1]}| < (1 - \eta)|V^{[2,s]} \setminus V_{x[k-1]}| \right) + \sum_{x[k-1] \in G[k-1] \setminus Q} |G[k]|
\]
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and for every \( x_{[k-1]} \in Q \) we may use the same equation for \( x_{[k-1]} \) such that \( \tilde{Y} \) belongs to \( \tilde{Y} \cap (U \times G_k) \), and an element \( a_{[k]} \in Z \) such that \( (\tilde{x}, \tilde{a}_{[i+1,k]}) \) might not belong to \( Z \) for each \( i \in [k] \). Let \( h_0 : G_{[k]} \setminus I \) → \( H \) be an arbitrary multiaffine map. We now define \( \phi^{ext} \) on a very dense subset of \( V^{[2,\omega]} \cap (U \times G_k) \) as follows.

When \( x_{[k]} \in X \), we set \( \phi^{ext}(x_{[k]}) = \phi(x_{[k]}) \). After that, let \( \phi^{ext}(x_{[d_0]}, a_{[d_0+1,k]}) = h_0(x_{[d_0]}) \) for each \( x_{[d_0]} \) such that \( (x_{[d_0]}, a_{[d_0+1,k]}) \in Z \). Next, once we have defined \( \phi^{ext}(x_{[i]}, a_{[i+1,k]}) \) for some \( i \in [d_0, k-1] \) such that \( (x_{[i]}, a_{[i+1,k]}) \in Z \), if \( (x_{[i+1]}, a_{[i+2,k]}) \in Z \), then set

\[
\phi^{ext}(x_{[i+1]}, a_{[i+2,k]}) = \phi^{ext}(x_{[i]}, a_{[i+1,k]}) + \phi(x_{[i]}, a_{[i+1,k]}, u_{i+1} + x_{i+1} - a_{[i+1,k]}, a_{[i+2,k]}) - \phi(x_{[i]}, u_{i+1} + a_{[i+1,k]}, a_{[i+2,k]}),
\]

where \( u_{i+1} \) is chosen so that the last two points in the argument of \( \phi \) lie in \( X \). Since \( (x_{[i+1]}, a_{[i+2,k]}) \in Z \subset \tilde{Y} \subset Y_{i+1} \), we know that \( |X_{[i+1]}| \geq (1-\eta)|V_{[i+1]}| \), so we may do this as long as \( \eta < \frac{1}{10} \).

Note also that this is well-defined since \( \phi \) is a multiaffine map.

Finally, when \( x_{[k]} \in Y \) is such that \( \alpha_1(x_{[k]}) = \mu \neq \mu_0, \nu_1 \) and \( (x_{[k-1]}, a_{k}) \in Z \), we put

\[
\phi^{ext}(x_{[k]}) = \frac{\mu - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1}(\phi^{ext}(x_{[k-1]}, a_{k}) - \phi(x_{[k-1]}, u_{k})) + \phi(x_{[k-1]}, x_{k} - \frac{\mu - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1}(a_{k} - u_{k})),
\]

where again we choose \( u_{k} \) so that \( (x_{[k-1]}, u_{k}, x_{[k-1]} - \frac{\mu - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1}(a_{k} - u_{k})) \in X \) (which we may do by the same argument as above). Again, this is well-defined. Note that, allowing a misuse of notation, we may use the same equation for \( x_{[k]} \in V \), since the right-hand-side reduces to \( \phi(x_{[k]}) \) (even though \( (x_{[k-1]}, a_{k}) \) might not belong to \( Z \) in this case). Furthermore, when \( \mu = \mu_0 \), this definition coincides with the definition from the previous step. We now prove that this extension is a multi-homomorphism. Later we shall strengthen this new map to a multiaffine one.

Let \( \tilde{Z} \) be the set of all points in \( V^{[2,\omega]} \cap (U \times G_k) \) where \( \phi^{ext} \) has been defined. That is, \( \tilde{Z} \cap \alpha_1^{-1}(\nu_1) = X \cap (U \times G_k), \tilde{Z} \cap \alpha_1^{-1}(\mu_0) = Z \) and \( \tilde{Z} \cap \alpha_1^{-1}(p \setminus \{\nu_1, \mu_0\}) \) is the set of all points \( x_{[k]} \in Y \cap (U \times G_k) \) such that \( \alpha_1 \neq \nu_1, \mu_0 \) and \( (x_{[k-1]}, a_{k}) \in Z \). Observe that when \( x_{[k]} \in Z \), then we have \( x_{[k]} \in \tilde{Y} \subset Y_k \), so \( |Y_{[k]}| \geq (1-\eta)|V^{[2,\omega]} \cap (U \times G_k)| \) and \( |X_{[k]}| \geq (1-\eta)|V_{[k]}| \). Using this, we conclude from (63) that

\[
|\tilde{Z}| \geq \left(1 - O(\eta) - O(\eta^{-2} \xi^{O(1)}) - O(\eta^{-1} \xi^{O(1)})\right)|V^{[2,\omega]} \cap (U \times G_k)|.
\]
Let \( d \in [k] \), and for \( i \in [4] \) let \((x_{[k] \setminus \{d\}}, y_d^i) \in \tilde{Z}\) be points such that \( y_1^d + y_2^d = y_3^d + y_4^d \). Write \( \text{sgn} : [4] \rightarrow \{-1, 1\} \) for the function defined by \( \text{sgn}(1) = \text{sgn}(2) = 1, \text{sgn}(3) = \text{sgn}(4) = -1 \), so that \( \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i)y_d^i = 0 \). Let \( \mu_i \) be the value of \( \alpha_1 \) at the \( i \)-th point. That is,

\[
\alpha_1((x_{[k] \setminus \{d\}}, y_d^i)|_1) = \begin{cases} 
\alpha_1(x_{I_1 \setminus \{d\}}, y_d^i), & \text{when } d \geq d_0 + 1 \\
\alpha_1(x_{I_1}), & \text{when } d \leq d_0.
\end{cases}
\]

Assume first that \( d = k \). By definition of \( \phi^\text{ext} \), there are \( u_k^{[d]} \) in \( G_k \) (if \( \mu_i = \nu_1 \) for some \( i \) we continue with the misuse of notation mentioned earlier) such that

\[
\sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i)\phi^\text{ext}(x_{[k-1]}, y_k^i) = \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i)\frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1}\phi^\text{ext}(x_{[k-1]}, a_k) - \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i)\frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1}\phi(x_{[k-1]}, u_k^i) + \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i)\phi(x_{[k-1]}, y_k^i - \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1}(a_k - u_k^i)).
\]

Since the map \( z_k \mapsto \phi(x_{[k-1]}, z_k) \) is a restriction of an affine map, and \( \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i)\frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} = 0 \), the whole expression is zero, as desired.

Next, assume that \( d \in [d_0 + 1, k - 1] \). By downwards induction on \( d' \in [d, k - 1] \) we show the following claim.

\textbf{Claim B.} Let \( d' \in [d, k - 1] \). There are elements \( t_d, u_d^{[4]}, v_d^{[4]} \) in \( G_d \) such that \((x_{[d'] \setminus \{d\}}, u_d^i, a_{[d'+1,k]})\), \((x_{[d'] \setminus \{d\}}, v_d^i, a_{[d'+1,k]})\), \((x_{[d'] \setminus \{d\}}, u_d^i + v_d^i + t_d - y_d^i, a_{[d'+1,k]}) \in X \) (or if \( \mu_i = \nu_1 \) we continue with the misuse of notation and write formal expressions that are multiplied by a zero scalar) for each \( i \in [4] \) and

\[
\sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i)\phi^\text{ext}(x_{[k] \setminus \{d\}}, y_d^i) = \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i)\frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1}\phi^\text{ext}(x_{[d'] \setminus \{d\}}, y_d^i, a_{[d'+1,k]})
\]

\[
- \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i)\frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1}\phi(x_{[d'] \setminus \{d\}}, u_d^i, a_{[d'+1,k]}) + \phi(x_{[d'] \setminus \{d\}}, v_d^i, a_{[d'+1,k]})
\]

\[
- \phi(x_{[d'] \setminus \{d\}}, u_d^i + v_d^i + t_d - y_d^i, a_{[d'+1,k]}),
\]

where \((x_{[d'] \setminus \{d\}}, y_d^i, a_{[d'+1,k]}) \in Z \) for each \( i \in [4] \) (again, unless \( \mu_i = \nu_1 \)).

\textbf{Proof of Claim B.} We begin the proof by dealing with the base case \( d' = k - 1 \). By definition, there are \( u_k^{[d]} \) in \( G_k \) such that

\[
\sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i)\phi^\text{ext}(x_{[k] \setminus \{d\}}, y_d^i) = \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i)\frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1}\phi^\text{ext}(x_{[k-1] \setminus \{d\}}, y_d^i, a_k)
\]
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\[-\sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \phi(x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d^i, u_k^i) + \sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi\left(x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d^i, x_k - \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} (a_k - u_k^i)\right),\]

where \((x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d^i, a_k) \in Z \subset V^{\mu_0}\) (unless \(\mu_i = \nu_1\), but then we have cancellation), so in particular \(\alpha_1(x_{[d_0+1,k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d^i, a_k) = \mu_0\). Note also that \(V_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, a_k}^{\mu_0} \neq \emptyset\). Moreover, since \((x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d^i, a_k) \in Z \subset Y_d\), we also have \(V_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, a_k}^{\mu_0} \neq \emptyset\). Thus, these are cosets of the same subspace and there exists some element \(t_d \in G_d\) such that \(V_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, a_k}^{\mu_0} = V_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, a_k}^{\mu_0} - t_d\). In particular, \((x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d^i - t_d, a_k) \in V\) for each \(i \in [d]\).

For fixed \(x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}\), there is a global biaffine map \(\phi_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}}^{\text{glob}}\) that extends \(\phi\) from \(X_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}}\) to \(G_d \times G_k\). Thus, we get

\[
\sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}}^{\text{ext}}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d^i)
= \sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \phi_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}}^{\text{ext}}(x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d^i, a_k)
- \sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \phi_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}}^{\text{glob}}(y_d^i, u_k^i) + \sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}}^{\text{glob}}(y_d^i, x_k - \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} (a_k - u_k^i))
= \sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \phi_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}}^{\text{ext}}(x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d^i, a_k)
- \sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \phi_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}}^{\text{glob}}(y_d^i, a_k)
= \sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \phi_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}}^{\text{ext}}(x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d^i, a_k)
- \sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \phi_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}}^{\text{glob}}(y_d^i - t_d, a_k)
= \sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \phi_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}}^{\text{ext}}(x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d^i, a_k)
- \sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \phi_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}}^{\text{glob}}(y_d^i, a_k)
- \sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \left(\phi(x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, \bar{v}_d^i, a_k) + \phi(x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, \bar{v}_d^i, a_k) - \phi(x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, \bar{v}_d^i + \bar{v}_k^i + t_d - y_d^i, a_k)\right),
\]

where in the last line we found elements \(\bar{v}_d^i, \bar{v}_k^i \in X_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, a_k}\) such that \(\bar{v}_d^i + \bar{v}_k^i + t_d - y_d^i \in X_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, a_k}\), using the facts that \((x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d^i - t_d, a_k) \in V\), \((x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, y_d^i, a_k) \in Y_d\), and \(\eta < 1/10\).

Now assume that the claim holds for some \(d' \in [d+1, k-1]\). Then there are elements \(u_d^{[d]}, v_d^{[d]}\) in \(G_d\) with the properties claimed. By definition of \(\phi_{x_{[d']}\setminus\{d'\}}^{\text{ext}}\) and the fact that \((x_{[d']}\setminus\{d'\}), y_d^{[d]}, a_{[d'+1,k]}\) \(\in Z\), there are \(w_d^{[d']}\) in \(G_{d'}\) such that

\[
\sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi_{x_{[k]}\setminus\{d\}}^{\text{ext}}(x_{[k]}\setminus\{d\}, y_d^i) = \sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \left(\phi_{x_{[d'-1]}\setminus\{d'\}}^{\text{ext}}(x_{[d'-1]}\setminus\{d'\}, y_d^{[d]}, a_{[d'+1,k]}))
+ \phi(x_{[d'-1]}\setminus\{d'\}, y_d^{[d]}, x_d^{[d']} + w_d^{[d']} - a_{[d'+1,k]} - \phi(x_{[d'-1]}\setminus\{d'\}, y_d^{[d]}))\right).
\]
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\[-\sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \left( \phi(x[d'] \setminus \{d\}, u_d, a[d+1,k]) + \phi(x[d'] \setminus \{d\}, v_d, a[d+1,k]) \right) + \phi(x[d'] \setminus \{d\}, v_d + t_d - y_d, a[d+1,k]) \),

where arguments of \( \phi^{\text{ext}} \) on the right hand side lie in \( Z \), and arguments of \( \phi \) lie in \( X \).

Like before, since \((x[d'-1] \setminus \{d\}, y_d, a[d', k]) \in Z \subset V^{10} \cap Y_d \), we may pick \( \tilde{t}_d \in G_d \) such that \((x[d'-1] \setminus \{d\}, y_d - \tilde{t}_d, a[d', k]) \in V \) for each \( i \in [4] \). Using the global biaffine map \( \phi^{\text{glob}} = \phi^{\text{glob}}_{x[d'-1] \setminus \{d\}, a[d'+1,k]} \) on \( G_d \times G_{d'} \), we get

\[
\sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi^{\text{ext}}(x[k] \setminus \{d\}, y_d^{\prime}) \\
= \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \phi^{\text{ext}}(x[d'-1] \setminus \{d\}, y_d^{\prime}, a[d', k]) + \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \left( \phi^{\text{glob}}(y_d^{\prime}, x_d' + u_d' - a_d') - \phi^{\text{glob}}(y_d^{\prime}, x_d') \right) - \phi^{\text{glob}}(u_d', x_d') - \phi^{\text{glob}}(v_d', x_d') + \phi^{\text{glob}}(u_d' + v_d' + t_d - y_d', x_d') \\
= \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \phi^{\text{ext}}(x[d'-1] \setminus \{d\}, y_d^{\prime}, a[d', k]) - \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \phi^{\text{glob}}(y_d^{\prime}, a[d']) \\
= \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \phi^{\text{ext}}(x[d'-1] \setminus \{d\}, y_d^{\prime}, a[d', k]) - \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \phi^{\text{glob}}(y_d^{\prime} - \tilde{t}_d, a[d']) \\
= \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \phi^{\text{ext}}(x[d'-1] \setminus \{d\}, y_d^{\prime}, a[d', k]) - \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \left( \phi(x[d'-1] \setminus \{d\}, \tilde{u}_d', a[d', k]) + \phi(x[d'-1] \setminus \{d\}, \tilde{v}_d', a[d', k]) \right) - \phi(x[d'-1] \setminus \{d\}, \tilde{u}_d' + \tilde{v}_d' + \tilde{t}_d - y_d', a[d', k]) \),

where in the last line we again found elements \( \tilde{u}_d', \tilde{v}_d' \in X_{x[d'-1] \setminus \{d\}, a[d', k]} \) such that \( \tilde{u}_d' + \tilde{v}_d' + \tilde{t}_d - y_d' \in X_{x[d'-1] \setminus \{d\}, a[d', k]} \), using the facts that \((x[k] \setminus \{d\}, y_d', a_k) \in Y_d \) and \( \eta < 1/10 \).}

Now that the claim has been proved, apply it with \( d' = d \) to get

\[
\sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi^{\text{ext}}(x[k] \setminus \{d\}, y_d^{\prime}) \\
= \sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \phi^{\text{ext}}(x[d-1], y_d, a[d+1,k])
\]
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Recall that for fixed $X_i \in i \sum d \in d \phi(x_{d-1}, v_d, a_{d+1, k})$

$$- \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_i}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \left( \phi(x_{d-1}, u_d, a_{d+1, k}) + \phi(x_{d-1}, v_d, a_{d+1, k}) \right)$$

$$- \phi(x_{d-1}, u_d^i + v_d, a_{d+1, k})$$

$$= \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_i}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \left( \phi^\text{ext}(x_{d-1}, a_{d,k}) + \phi(x_{d-1}, y_d^i + w_d^i - a_d, a_{d+1, k}) - \phi(x_{d-1}, w_d^i, a_{d+1, k}) \right)$$

$$- \sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_i}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \left( \phi(x_{d-1}, u_d^i, a_{d+1, k}) + \phi(x_{d-1}, v_d^i, a_{d+1, k}) \right)$$

$$- \phi(x_{d-1}, u_d^i + v_d, a_{d+1, k})$$

$$= \left( \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_i}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \right) \phi^\text{ext}(x_{d-1}, a_{d,k})$$

$$- \sum_{i \in [d]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_i}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \left( \phi(x_{d-1}, u_d^i, a_{d+1, k}) + \phi(x_{d-1}, v_d^i, a_{d+1, k}) \right)$$

$$+ \phi(x_{d-1}, u_d^i, a_{d+1, k}) + \phi(x_{d-1}, v_d^i, a_{d+1, k}) - \phi(x_{d-1}, u_d^i + v_d, a_{d+1, k})$$

$$= 0$$

since $\sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu_i - \nu_i}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} = 0$ and $\phi$ is the restriction of a global affine map in each direction. (The second equality above uses the definition of $\phi^\text{ext}(x_{d-1}, y_d^i, a_{d+1, k})$, where $(x_{d-1}, y_d^i, a_{d+1, k}) \in Z$, with an auxiliary element $w_d^i \in G_d$.)

Finally, suppose that $d \in [d_0]$. By induction on $d' \in [d_0, k]$ we show the following claim.

**Claim C.** For $d' \in [d_0, k]$, we have $\sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi^\text{ext}(x_{d'} \setminus \{d\}, y_d^i, a_{d'+1, k}) = 0$.

Note that $(x_{d'} \setminus \{d\}, y_d^i, a_{d'+1, k}) \in Z$ for $d' \leq k - 1$.

**Proof of Claim C.** The base case is the case $d = d_0$, when $\phi^\text{ext}$ becomes $h_0$, which is multiaffine. Assume now that the claim holds for some $d' \in [d_0, k - 2]$: we shall treat the case $d' = k - 1$ separately. Recall that for fixed $x_{|\{d\} \setminus \{d,d'+1\}, x_{[k]} \setminus \{d,d'+1\}$, there is a global biaffine map $\phi^\text{glob} = \phi^\text{glob}_{x_{[k]} \setminus \{d,d'+1\}}$ that extends $\phi$ from $X_{x_{[k]} \setminus \{d,d'+1\}}$ to $G_d \times G_{d'+1}$. Then, by definition of $\phi^\text{ext}$, we have, for some elements $v_d^i \in d_{d+1}$, that

$$\sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi^\text{ext}(x_{d'+1} \setminus \{d\}, y_d^i, a_{d'+2, k}) = \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi^\text{ext}(x_{d'} \setminus \{d\}, y_d^i, a_{d'+1, k})$$

$$+ \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi(x_{d'} \setminus \{d\}, y_d^i, u^i_{d'+1} + x_{d'+1} - a_{d'+1}, a_{d'+2, k})$$

$$- \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi(x_{d'} \setminus \{d\}, y_d^i, u^i_{d'+1}, a_{d'+2, k}),$$

which by the inductive hypothesis is equal to

$$\sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi(x_{d'} \setminus \{d\}, y_d^i, u^i_{d'+1} + x_{d'+1} - a_{d'+1}, a_{d'+2, k}) - \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi(x_{d'} \setminus \{d\}, y_d^i, u^i_{d'+1}, a_{d'+2, k}),$$
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\[
\sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi_{\text{glob}}^\varepsilon_{x(d') \setminus \{d\}}, \alpha_{d'+2,k} (y^i_d, u^i_{d'+1} + x_{d'+1} - a_{d'+1}) - \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi_{x(d') \setminus \{d\}}, \alpha_{d'+2,k} (y^i_d, u^i_{d'+1}) = 0.
\]

We now prove the induction step when \(d' = k - 1\). Recall that \(\mu_i\) was defined as the value of \(\alpha_i\) at \(i\)th point. Since \(d \leq d_0\), we have \(\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 = \mu_4\) and we write \(\mu\) for this value instead. Note that if \(\mu = \nu_1\), the points lie in \(X\), and \(\phi^{\text{ext}} = \phi\) is already a multi-homomorphism. Assume therefore that \(\mu \neq \nu_1\). By definition of \(\phi^{\text{ext}}\), we have for some \(u_k^{[4]}\)

\[
\sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi^{\text{ext}}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, y^i_d) = \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \left( \phi^{\text{ext}}(x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, y^i_d, a_k) - \phi(x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, y^i_d, u_k^{[4]}) \right) + \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi(x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, y^i_d, x_k - \frac{\mu - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} (a_k - u_k^{[4]}),
\]

which by the inductive hypothesis is equal to

\[
- \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \phi(x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, y^i_d, u_k^{[4]}) + \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi(x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}, y^i_d, x_k - \frac{\mu - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} (a_k - u_k^{[4]}))
\]

\[
= - \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \frac{\mu - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} \phi_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}} (y^i_d, u_k^{[4]}) + \sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi_{x_{[k-1]\setminus\{d\}}} (y^i_d, x_k - \frac{\mu - \nu_1}{\mu_0 - \nu_1} (a_k - u_k^{[4]}))
\]

\[
= 0,
\]

completing the proof of the claim. \(\square\)

When \(d' = k\), we get \(\sum_{i \in [4]} \text{sgn}(i) \phi^{\text{ext}}(x_{[k]\setminus\{d\}}, y^i_d) = 0\), which completes the proof that \(\phi^{\text{ext}}\) is a multi-homomorphism on \(\tilde{Z}\).

Recall from (B6) that \(|\tilde{Z}| = (1 - O(\eta)) - O(\eta^{-2} \varepsilon^{\Omega(1)}) - O(\eta^{-1} \chi^{\Omega(1)})|V^{[2,s]} \cap (U \times G_k)|\) and that \(V^{[2,s]} \cap (U \times G_k) \neq \emptyset\). We may pick \(\eta \geq c \left( \varepsilon^C + \chi^C \right)\) so that that requirement is satisfied and the bound above becomes

\[|\tilde{Z}| \geq (1 - O(\varepsilon^{\Omega(1)}) - O(\chi^{\Omega(1)}))|V^{[2,s]} \cap (U \times G_k)|.\]

(Note that the necessary bounds involving \(\eta\) were \(\eta < 1/10\), so the choice of \(\eta\) made here will satisfy those requirements provided \(\varepsilon\) and \(\chi\) are smaller than some positive absolute constant \(c\). Of course if \(\chi > c\) or \(\varepsilon > c\) then the claim is vacuous.)

Apply Proposition [3] to make multi-homomorphism become a multiaffine map and to finish the proof. \(\square\)
10.2. Generating structure by convolving

In a similar way to the way we defined arrangements when we stated Theorem 51, we now define a closely related structure we call a tri-arrangement. We say that a singleton sequence \( x_{[k]} \in G_{[k]} \) is an \( \emptyset \)-tri-arrangement of lengths \( x_{[k]} \). For \( i \in [k] \), a \((k, k-1, \ldots, i)\)-tri-arrangement \( q \) of lengths \( x_{[k]} \) is any concatenation \((q_1, q_2, q_3)\) where \( q_1, q_2 \) and \( q_3 \) are \((k, k-1, \ldots, i+1)\)-tri-arrangements of lengths \((x_{[k]\{i\}}, u_i), (x_{[k]\{i\}}, v_i)\) and \((x_{[k]\{i\}}, w_i)\), respectively, such that \( u_i + v_i - w_i = x_i \). When \( \phi \) is a map defined at points of the tri-arrangement above, we recursively define its \( \phi \) value by \( \phi(q) = \phi(q_1) + \phi(q_2) - \phi(q_3) \).

The next theorem tells us that if \( \phi \) is a multi-\( D \)-homomorphism defined on \( 1 - o(1) \) of a variety \( V \) and if \( \xi > 0 \), then, by convolving, we may extend \( \phi \) to \( 1 - \xi \) of \( V \cap W \), for a lower-order variety \( W \) of bounded codimension. The additional price we pay is that this extension is a multi-\( D' \)-homomorphism, where \( D' \) is slightly smaller than \( D \). (This short description is the case \( i = 0 \), for \( i \) in the statement of the theorem.)

**Theorem 79.** Let \( D \) be a positive integer and let \( G \subset \mathcal{P}[k] \) be a down-set. Write \( G' \) for the down-set obtained by removing maximal subsets from \( G \). Let \( \alpha : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}_p^\mathbb{F}_P \) be a multiaffine map such that each form \( \alpha_i \) is multilinear on some \( G_i \), for a maximal set \( I_i \in G \). Let \( V = \alpha^{-1}(\nu(0)) \cap V' \) be a non-empty variety of codimension \( r \geq r_0 \), where \( V' \) is some \( G' \)-supported variety. Given a subset \( I \subset [k] \), write \( V_I \) for the set \( \{ x_I \in G_I : (\forall j \in [r_0] : I_j \subset I) \alpha_j(x_I) = \nu_j(0) \} \). Let \( X \subset V \) be a set of size at least \((1 - \varepsilon)|V| \). Let \( \phi : X \to H \) be a multi-(\( D \cdot 20^k \))-homomorphism, let \( i \in [0, k] \), and let \( \xi > 0 \). Then there exist

- a \((G' \cap \mathcal{P}[i])\)-supported variety \( W \subset G_{[i]} \) of codimension \( O((r + \log p \xi^{-1})O(1)) \),
- a subset \( Y \subset W \cap V[i] \),
- a \( G' \)-supported variety \( U \subset G_{[k]} \) of codimension \( O((r + \log p \xi^{-1})O(1)) \),
- a subset \( Z \subset (Y \times G_{[i+1,k]}) \cap V \cap U \), and
- a multi-(\( D \cdot 20^i \))-homomorphism \( \psi : Z \to H \)

such that

(i) the variety \((W \cap V[i]) \times G_{[i+1,k]} \) \( \cap V \cap U \) is non-empty,

(ii) \(|((W \cap V[i]) \times G_{[i+1,k]} \) \( \cap V \cap U| = (O(\varepsilon O(1)) + \xi)|((W \cap V[i]) \times G_{[i+1,k]} \) \( \cap V \cap U|,

(iii) \(|((Y \times G_{[i+1,k]} \cap V \cap U) \setminus Z| \leq \xi|((W \cap V[i]) \times G_{[i+1,k]} \cap V \cap U|,

(iv) for each \( x_{[k]} \in Z \), there are at least \( \Omega\left(p_{O((r + \log p \xi^{-1})^O(1)|G_{i+1}^2|G_{i+2}^2|G_{i+3}^2|G_k^2|3^{\delta-1+i}}\right) (k, k - 1, \ldots, i + 1)\)-tri-arrangements \( q \) with points in \( X \) of lengths \( x_{[k]} \) such that \( \phi(q) = \psi(x_{[k]}) \).
**Remark.** The implicit constants in bounds in the theorem depend on $D$. However, we shall apply it with $D = O_{k,p}(1)$, so we opt not to stress dependence on $D$ for the sake of readability.

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, $V'$ is mixed-linear, thus making $V$ mixed-linear as well. We prove the claim by downwards induction on $i$. For the base case $i = k$, simply take $W = V'$, $Y = X$, $U = G_{[k]}$, $Z = X$ and $\psi = \phi$.

Assume now that the claim holds for some $i+1 \in [1,k]$. Let $\xi_0 > 0$ be a parameter to be chosen later. Then if we use $\xi_0$ instead of $\xi$, there exist a $(G' \cap \mathcal{P}[i+1])$-supported variety $W^{\text{ind}} \subset G_{[i+1]}$, a subset $Y^{\text{ind}} \subset W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]}$, a $G'$-supported variety $U^{\text{ind}} \subset G_{[k]}$, a subset $Z^{\text{ind}} \subset V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \cap (Y^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]})$, and a multi-$(D \cdot 20^{i+1})$-homomorphism $\psi^{\text{ind}} : Z^{\text{ind}} \to H$ with the properties described. Let $r^{\text{ind}} = \text{codim } V + \text{codim } W^{\text{ind}} + \text{codim } U^{\text{ind}} = O((r + \log_{cp} \xi_0^{-1})O(1))$.

We now show that without loss of generality $W^{\text{ind}}$ and $U^{\text{ind}}$ can be taken to be mixed-linear. By looking at the multilinear parts of the maps that define these two varieties, we find $r_1 \leq 2^k \text{codim } W^{\text{ind}}$, $r_2 \leq 2^k \text{codim } U^{\text{ind}}$, a $(G' \cap \mathcal{P}[i+1])$-supported mixed-linear map $\gamma^1 : G_{[i+1]} \to F_p^r$, a $G'$-supported mixed-linear map $\gamma^2 : G_{[k]} \to F_p^r$, and collections of values $M_1 \subset F_p^r$, $M_2 \subset F_p^r$ such that $W^{\text{ind}} = (\gamma^1)^{-1}(M_1)$ and $U^{\text{ind}} = (\gamma^2)^{-1}(M_2)$. We may also assume that $(\gamma^1)^{-1}(1) \neq \emptyset$ for each $\mu_1 \in M_1$ and $(\gamma^2)^{-1}(1) \neq \emptyset$ for each $\mu_2 \in M_2$. Let $0 < \tilde{\varepsilon} = O(\varepsilon h(1)) + \xi_0$ be such that

$$||(W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \setminus Y^{\text{ind}}) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}}|| \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}||(W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \times G_{[i+2,k]} \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}}||.$$

Let $P_1$ be the set of all $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in M_1 \times M_2$ such that

$$\left((\gamma^1)^{-1}(1) \cap V^{[i+1]} \times G_{[i+2,k]} \cap V \cap (\gamma^2)^{-1}(1) \setminus \emptyset, \right.$$

let $P_2$ be the set of all $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in M_1 \times M_2$ such that

$$\left|\left((\gamma^1)^{-1}(1) \cap V^{[i+1]} \times G_{[i+2,k]} \cap V \cap (\gamma^2)^{-1}(1) \setminus \emptyset\right) - \tilde{\varepsilon}\left|\left((\gamma^1)^{-1}(1) \cap V^{[i+1]} \times G_{[i+2,k]} \cap V \cap (\gamma^2)^{-1}(1) \setminus \emptyset\right)\right|\right| \leq 3\tilde{\varepsilon}\left|\left((\gamma^1)^{-1}(1) \cap V^{[i+1]} \times G_{[i+2,k]} \cap V \cap (\gamma^2)^{-1}(1) \setminus \emptyset\right)\right|,$$

and let $P_3$ be the set of all $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in M_1 \times M_2$ such that

$$\left|\left((\gamma^1)^{-1}(1) \cap V^{[i+1]} \times G_{[i+2,k]} \cap V \cap (\gamma^2)^{-1}(1) \setminus \emptyset\right) - \tilde{\varepsilon}\left|\left((\gamma^1)^{-1}(1) \cap V^{[i+1]} \times G_{[i+2,k]} \cap V \cap (\gamma^2)^{-1}(1) \setminus \emptyset\right)\right|\right| \leq 3\tilde{\varepsilon}\left|\left((\gamma^1)^{-1}(1) \cap V^{[i+1]} \times G_{[i+2,k]} \cap V \cap (\gamma^2)^{-1}(1) \setminus \emptyset\right)\right|.$$

Then, by averaging,

$$\sum_{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in (M_1 \times M_2) \setminus P_1} \left|\left((\gamma^1)^{-1}(1) \cap V^{[i+1]} \times G_{[i+2,k]} \cap V \cap (\gamma^2)^{-1}(1) \setminus \emptyset\right)\right| = 0,$$

$$\sum_{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in (M_1 \times M_2) \setminus P_2} \left|\left((\gamma^1)^{-1}(1) \cap V^{[i+1]} \times G_{[i+2,k]} \cap V \cap (\gamma^2)^{-1}(1) \setminus \emptyset\right)\right| \leq \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{3}\sum_{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in (M_1 \times M_2) \setminus P_2} \left|\left((\gamma^1)^{-1}(1) \cap V^{[i+1]} \times G_{[i+2,k]} \cap V \cap (\gamma^2)^{-1}(1) \setminus \emptyset\right)\right| \leq \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{3}\left|\left((W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \times Y^{\text{ind}}) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}}\right)\right|.$$
\[
\frac{1}{3} \left| (W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]}) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right|,
\]
and
\[
\sum_{(\mu^1, \mu^2) \in (M_1 \times M_2) \setminus P_3} \left| \left( (\gamma^1)^{-1}(\mu^1) \cap V^{[i+1]} \right) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \cap V \cap (\gamma^2)^{-1}(\mu^2) \right| \leq \frac{\xi_0^{-1}}{3} \sum_{(\mu^1, \mu^2) \in (M_1 \times M_2) \setminus P_3} \left| \left( (Y^{\text{ind}} \cap (\gamma^1)^{-1}(\mu^1)) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \cap V \cap (\gamma^2)^{-1}(\mu^2) \right) \setminus Z^{\text{ind}} \right|
\]
\[
\leq \frac{\xi_0^{-1}}{3} \left| (Y^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]} \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}}) \setminus Z^{\text{ind}} \right|
\]
\[
\leq \frac{1}{3} \left| (W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]}) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right|.
\]

Hence, there exists a pair \((\mu^1, \mu^2) \in P_1 \cap P_2 \cap P_3\). Misuse the notation and write \(W^{\text{ind}}\) for \((\gamma^1)^{-1}(\mu^1)\), \(U^{\text{ind}}\) for \((\gamma^2)^{-1}(\mu^2)\), \(Y^{\text{ind}}\) for \(Y^{\text{ind}} \cap (\gamma^1)^{-1}(\mu^1)\), \(Z^{\text{ind}}\) for \(Z^{\text{ind}} \cap ((\gamma^1)^{-1}(\mu^1) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \cap (\gamma^2)^{-1}(\mu^2))\) and \(\xi_0\) instead of \(3\xi_0\) (this will not affect the bounds in the statement that depend on \(\xi\)).

**Convolutional extension.** Apply Theorem \([30]\) to variety \([\square]\)

\[
V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \cap (W^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]}) = \alpha^{-1}(\mu^{(0)}) \cap \beta^{-1}(0).
\]

in direction \(G_{i+1}\) and with parameter \(\eta > 0\), to find a positive integer \(s = O\left((r^{\text{ind}} + \log f \eta^{-1})^{O(1)}\right)\), a \(G'\)-supported multiaffine map \(\gamma : G_{[k]\{i+1}\} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^s_p\) (which without loss of generality is mixed-linear), a collection of values \(M \subset \mathbb{F}_p^s\) such that \(|\gamma^{-1}(M)| \geq (1 - \eta)|G_{[k]\{i+1}\}|\), and a map \(c : M \rightarrow [0, 1]\) such that

\[
\left| \left( V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \cap (W^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]})) \right)_{x^{[k]\{i+1}\}} \right| = c(\mu)|G_{i+1}|. \tag{67}
\]

for every \(\mu \in M\) and every \(x^{[k]\{i+1}\} \in \gamma^{-1}(\mu) \cap V^{[k]\{i+1}\}\). Let \(\varepsilon' > 0\) be a parameter to be chosen later and let \(M'\) be the set of all \(\mu \in M\) such that

\[
\left| \left( (W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \setminus Y^{\text{ind}}) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \right) \cap \left( \gamma^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{i+1} \right) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right| \leq \varepsilon' \left| \left( (W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \setminus Y^{\text{ind}}) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \right) \cap \left( \gamma^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{i+1} \right) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right| \neq 0 \tag{68}
\]

\(17\)More precisely, since \(V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \cap (W^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]})\) is a mixed-linear variety, we may see it as defined to be \((\beta^1)^{-1}(\mu^1) \cap (\beta^2)^{-1}(\mu^2)\), where \(\beta^1\) is a mixed-linear map all of whose components depend linearly on \(G_{i+1}\) and \(\beta^2\) is a mixed-linear map that does not depend on \(G_{i+1}\). Then apply the theorem to the variety \((\beta^3)^{-1}(\mu^1)\) to obtain the relevant layers \(L_1, \ldots, L_m \subset G_{[k]\{i+1}\})\) of some other lower-order multiaffine map \(\gamma\). For the initial variety, we are then interested in layers of \((\gamma, \beta^2)\) which are of the form \((\beta^2)^{-1}(\mu^2) \cap L_i\). In our case, \((\beta^2)^{-1}(\mu^2)\) is of the form \(V^{[k]\{i+1}\})\) intersected with a mixed-linear lower-order variety. (We have put these details in a footnote so as not to interrupt the flow of the argument.)
and let $M''$ be the set of all $\mu \in M$ such that
\[
\left| \left( \left( Y^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]} \right) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \cap \left( \gamma^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{i+1} \right) \right) \setminus Z^{\text{ind}} \right| \\
\leq \sqrt{\eta_0} \left| \left( \left( W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \right) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \right) \cap \left( \gamma^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{i+1} \right) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right| \neq 0.
\]
(69)

Then
\[
\sum_{\mu \in M' \setminus M''} \left| \left( \left( W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \right) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \right) \cap \left( \gamma^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{i+1} \right) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right| \\
\leq \varepsilon^{-1} \sum_{\mu \in M' \setminus M''} \left| \left( \left( W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \setminus Y^{\text{ind}} \right) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \right) \cap \left( \gamma^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{i+1} \right) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right| \\
\leq \varepsilon^{-1} \left| \left( (W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \setminus Y^{\text{ind}}) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \right) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right| \\
= O(\varepsilon^{-1}(\varepsilon^{\Omega(1)} + \xi_0)) \left| \left( W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \right) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \right) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right|.
\]
We may take $\varepsilon' = O(\varepsilon^{\Omega(1)} + \xi_0)$ so that the $O(\varepsilon^{-1}(\varepsilon^{\Omega(1)} + \xi_0))$ term becomes less than $1/3$.

Similarly,
\[
\sum_{\mu \in M' \setminus M''} \left| \left( \left( W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \right) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \right) \cap \left( \gamma^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{i+1} \right) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right| \\
\leq \xi_0^{-1/2} \sum_{\mu \in M' \setminus M''} \left| \left( Y^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]} \right) \cap \left( \gamma^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{i+1} \right) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \setminus Z^{\text{ind}} \right| \\
\leq \xi_0^{-1/2} \left| \left( Y^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]} \right) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \setminus Z^{\text{ind}} \right| \\
\leq \xi_0^{1/2} \left| \left( W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \right) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \right) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right|.
\]

Finally,
\[
\sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}_p \setminus M''} \left| \left( \left( W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \right) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \right) \cap \left( \gamma^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{i+1} \right) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right| \leq \eta |G_k| \\
\leq \eta p^{(\text{codim } W^{\text{ind}} + 2 \text{codim } V + \text{codim } U^{\text{ind}})} \left| \left( W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \right) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \right) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right|.
\]

Thus, provided we take $\eta = \frac{1}{3} p^{-2k^{\text{ind}}}$ and $\varepsilon$ and $\xi_0$ are smaller than some sufficiently small positive absolute constant (otherwise the claim of the proposition is vacuous, as we may take $Y = Z = \emptyset$), there exists $\mu \in M' \cap M''$. Let $\delta = e(\mu) > 0$.

Let $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(D \cdot 20^{i+1}, k)$ be the constant from Theorem 76. Set
\[
T = \{ x_{[k]\{i+1\}} \in V^{[k]\{i+1\}} : \gamma(x_{[k]\{i+1\}}) = \mu \},
\]
which is mixed-linear. By (77), we have for every $x_{[k]\{i+1\}} \in T$, that
\[
\left| \left( V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \cap \left( W^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]} \right) \right)_{x_{[k]\{i+1\}}} \right| = \delta |G_{i+1}|.
\]
Define also

\[ A = \left\{ x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \} \in T : \left\| \left( W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \setminus Y^{\text{ind}} \right)_{x[i]} \cap (V \cap U^{\text{ind}})_{x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \}} \right\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4} \left\| W^{\text{ind}}_{x[i]} \cap (V \cap U^{\text{ind}})_{x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \}} \right\| \right\} \]

and

\[ F = \left\{ x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \} \in T : \left| \left( Y^{\text{ind}}_{x[i]} \cap \left( V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \setminus Z^{\text{ind}} \right)_{x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \}} \right) \right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4} \left| W^{\text{ind}}_{x[i]} \cap (V \cap U^{\text{ind}})_{x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \}} \right| \right\} . \]

Then from (65), (68) and (70)

\[ |T \setminus A| \leq \frac{1}{\delta[G_{i+1}]} \sum_{x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \} \in T \setminus A} \left| \left( V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \cap (W^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]}) \right)_{x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \}} \right| \quad (\text{by (70)}) \]

\[ \leq \frac{4\varepsilon_0^{-1}}{\delta[G_{i+1}]} \sum_{x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \} \in T \setminus A} \left| \left( W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \setminus Y^{\text{ind}} \right)_{x[i]} \cap (V \cap U^{\text{ind}})_{x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \}} \right| \]

\[ \leq \frac{4\varepsilon_0^{-1}}{\delta[G_{i+1}]} \sum_{x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \} \in T} \left| \left( W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \setminus Y^{\text{ind}} \right)_{x[i]} \cap (V \cap U^{\text{ind}})_{x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \}} \right| \]

\[ = \frac{4\varepsilon_0^{-1}}{\delta[G_{i+1}]} \left| \left( (W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \setminus Y^{\text{ind}}) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \right) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \cap (T \times G_{i+1}) \right| \]

\[ \leq \frac{4\varepsilon_0^{-1}}{\delta[G_{i+1}]} O(\varepsilon^{(1)} + \xi_0) \left| \left( (W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \times G_{[i+2,k]}) \cap (T \times G_{i+1}) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right) \right| \quad (\text{by (65)}) \]

\[ = O(\varepsilon_0^{-1}(\varepsilon^{(1)} + \xi_0)) \sum_{x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \} \in T \setminus A} \left| \left( V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \cap (W^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]}) \right)_{x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \}} \right| \quad (\text{by (70)}) \]

and

\[ |F| = \frac{1}{\delta[G_{i+1}]} \sum_{x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \} \in F} \left| \left( V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \cap (W^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]}) \right)_{x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \}} \right| \quad (\text{by (71)}) \]

\[ \leq \frac{4\varepsilon_0^{-1}}{\delta[G_{i+1}]} \sum_{x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \} \in F} \left| Y^{\text{ind}}_{x[i]} \cap \left( V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \setminus Z^{\text{ind}} \right)_{x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \}} \right| \]

\[ \leq \frac{4\varepsilon_0^{-1}}{\delta[G_{i+1}]} \sum_{x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \} \in T} \left| Y^{\text{ind}}_{x[i]} \cap \left( V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \setminus Z^{\text{ind}} \right)_{x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \}} \right| \]

\[ = \frac{4\varepsilon_0^{-1}}{\delta[G_{i+1}]} \sum_{x[k] \setminus \{ i + 1 \} \in T} \left| \left( Y^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]} \right) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \cap (T \times G_{i+1}) \setminus Z^{\text{ind}} \right| \]

\[ \leq \frac{4\varepsilon_0^{-1}}{\delta[G_{i+1}]} O(\varepsilon^{(1)} + \xi_0) \left| \left( (W^{\text{ind}} \cap V^{[i+1]} \times G_{[i+2,k]}) \cap (T \times G_{i+1}) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right) \right| \quad (\text{by (68)}) \]

\[ = O(\varepsilon_0^{-1} \sqrt{\xi_0}) |T|. \quad (\text{by (71)}) \]
Note that
\[ |Z_{x[k]\setminus\{i+1\}}^{\text{ind}}| \geq \left( 1 - \varepsilon_0 \right) |W_{x[i]}^{\text{ind}} \cap (V \cap U^{\text{ind}})_{x[k]\setminus\{i+1\}}| \]
holds for each \( x[k]\setminus\{i+1\} \in A \setminus F \).

Apply Theorem \( \ref{thm:main} \) to the subset \( A \setminus F \) of \( T \) (which is the set of \( (1 - \varepsilon_0) \)-dense columns), the subset \( Z_{x[k]}^{\text{ind}} \) of \( (W_{x[i]}^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]}) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \), the map \( \phi \) and the parameter \( \rho > 0 \). Let \( \gamma^{\text{conv}} \) be the \( G' \)-supported multi-affine map (which without loss of generality is mixed-linear) given by the theorem and let \( R \subset (A \setminus F) \) be the set of points removed from \( A \setminus F \), which is such that \( |R| \leq \rho |G_{[k]\setminus\{i+1\}}| \).

We may take \( \rho \geq \Omega(\varepsilon_0^{-k} \cdot \text{codim} T) \), and average over the permitted layers of \( \gamma^{\text{conv}} \) to find a layer \( (\gamma^{\text{conv}})^{-1}(\mu^{\text{conv}}) \) such that \( |A \cap (\gamma^{\text{conv}})^{-1}(\mu^{\text{conv}})| = (1 - O(\varepsilon_0^{-1} \cdot \varepsilon_{01}(1) + \xi_0)) |T \cap (\gamma^{\text{conv}})^{-1}(\mu^{\text{conv}})| \) and
\[ |(R \cup F) \cap (\gamma^{\text{conv}})^{-1}(\mu^{\text{conv}})| = O(\varepsilon_0^{-1} \sqrt{\xi_0}) |T \cap (\gamma^{\text{conv}})^{-1}(\mu^{\text{conv}})|. \]

We shall abuse notation and keep writing \( T \) for \( T \cap (\gamma^{\text{conv}})^{-1}(\mu^{\text{conv}}) \) (which remains mixed-linear), \( A \) for \( A \cap (\gamma^{\text{conv}})^{-1}(\mu^{\text{conv}}) \) and \( F \) for \( (F \cap R) \cap (\gamma^{\text{conv}})^{-1}(\mu^{\text{conv}}) \). In the new notation we again have
\[ A = \left\{ x[k]\setminus\{i+1\} \in T : \left| Y_{x[i]}^{\text{ind}} \cap (V \cap U^{\text{ind}})_{x[k]\setminus\{i+1\}} \right| \geq \left( 1 - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{4} \right) |W_{x[i]}^{\text{ind}} \cap (V \cap U^{\text{ind}})_{x[k]\setminus\{i+1\}}| \right\}, \]
(since \( T \) has shrunk as well; the elements removed from initial version of \( A \) are also removed from the initial version of \( T \))
\[ |A| = (1 - O(\varepsilon_0^{-1}(\varepsilon_{01}(1) + \xi_0))) |T| \quad (71) \]
and
\[ |F| = O(\varepsilon_0^{-1} \sqrt{\xi_0}) |T|. \quad (72) \]

Additionally, convolving in direction \( i+1 \) turns \( \phi \) into a well-defined multi-\( (D \cdot 20^i) \)-homomorphism on
\[ \left( (W_{x[i]}^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]}) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right) \cap \left( (A \setminus F) \times G_{i+1} \right). \]
Property \( \text{(iv)} \) will follow directly from the inductive hypothesis and property \( \text{(iii)} \) of Theorem \( \ref{thm:main} \). It remains to show that convolving in direction \( i+1 \) of \( Z_{x[k]}^{\text{ind}} \) gives a set with the desired structure, that is, we need to find the desired structure in the set
\[
\left( (W_{x[i]}^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]}) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right) \cap \left( (A \setminus F) \times G_{i+1} \right)
= \left( (W_{x[i]}^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]}) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right) \cap \left( (A \times G_{i+1}) \setminus \left( (W_{x[i]}^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]}) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right) \right) \setminus \left( (W_{x[i]}^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]}) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \right) \cap (F \times G_{i+1}).
\]

**Densification.** Let \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) be a parameter to be specified later. Choose elements \( a, y_1, \ldots, y_m \in G_{i+1} \) independently and uniformly at random. For a set \( S \subset G_{i+1} \), we write
\[ L(S) = \{ \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^m : a + \lambda \cdot y \in S \} \]
and we write \( l(S) \) for the cardinality of \( L(S) \).

Let
\[ C = \left\{ (x[i], z[i+2,k]) \in T : l(Y_{x[i]}^{\text{ind}} \cap (V \cap U^{\text{ind}})_{x[i], z[i+2,k]}) \geq \left( 1 - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{3} \right) \delta p^m \right\}. \]
By Lemma \( \ref{lem:induction} \).
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• if $(x[i], z[i+2, k])$ is such that $|Y_{x[i]}^{\text{ind}} \cap (V \cup U^{\text{ind}})_{x[i], z[i+2, k]}| \geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}\right)\delta|G_{i+1}|$, then

$$P_{a,y[m]} \left((x[i], z[i+2, k]) \in C\right) = 1 - O(\varepsilon_0^{-2}p^{-m}\delta^{-1}). \quad (73)$$

• if $(x[i], z[i+2, k])$ is such that $|Y_{x[i]}^{\text{ind}} \cap (V \cup U^{\text{ind}})_{x[i], z[i+2, k]}| \leq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}\right)\delta|G_{i+1}|$, then

$$P_{a,y[m]} \left((x[i], z[i+2, k]) \in C\right) = O(\varepsilon_0^{-2}p^{-m}\delta^{-1}). \quad (74)$$

By (73), the first case holds for $(1 - O(\varepsilon_0^{-1}(\varepsilon_0^2 + \xi_0)))|T|$ elements $(x[i], z[i+2, k]) \in T$. Thus $E_{a,y[m]}[T \setminus C] \leq O(\varepsilon_0^{-1}(\varepsilon_0^2 + \xi_0) + \varepsilon_0^{-2}p^{-m}\delta^{-1})|T|$. Let

$$C_{\text{sparse}} = \left\{(x[i], z[i+2, k]) \in C : |Y_{x[i]}^{\text{ind}} \cap (V \cup U^{\text{ind}})_{x[i], z[i+2, k]}| \leq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}\right)\delta|G_{i+1}|\right\}.$$ 

By the calculation in the second case, $E_{a,y[m]}[C_{\text{sparse}}] = O(\varepsilon_0^{-2}p^{-m}\delta^{-1})|T|$. Therefore

$$E_{a,y[m]}[T \setminus C] + p^{-m/2}|C_{\text{sparse}}| = O(\varepsilon_0^{-1}(\varepsilon_0^2 + \xi_0) + \varepsilon_0^{-2}p^{-m/2}\delta^{-1})|T|,$$

so there exists a choice of $a, y[m]$ such that $|C| \geq (1 - O(\varepsilon_0^{-1}(\varepsilon_0^2 + \xi_0)))|T|$ and $|C_{\text{sparse}}| \leq p^{-m/3}|T|$, provided $p^{-m} \leq c\delta^C\varepsilon_0^C(\varepsilon_0^C + \xi_0^C)$ and $\varepsilon, \xi_0$ are smaller than some sufficiently small absolute constant. Let $C_{\text{bad}} = C \cap F$, which by (72) has size at most $|F| = O(\varepsilon_0^{-1}\sqrt{\varepsilon_0})|T|$. Note also that when $x[k] \setminus \{i+1\} \in C \setminus (C_{\text{sparse}} \cup C_{\text{bad}})$, then

$$|Z_{x[k] \setminus \{i+1\}}^{\text{ind}}| \geq \left(1 - \varepsilon_0\right)|\left(V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \cap (W^{\text{ind}} \times G_{i+2, k})\right)_{x[k] \setminus \{i+1\}}|.$$ 

**Finding algebraic structure.** Observe that we may rewrite $C$ in a different form. Let $\tau_1 : G[k] \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^d$ be a $G$-supported multiaffine map, linear in direction $i + 1$, and let $\nu_1 \in \mathbb{F}^d$ be such that

$$(T \times G_{i+1}) \cap (W^{\text{ind}} \times G_{i+2, k}) \cap V \cap U^{\text{ind}} = (T \times G_{i+1}) \cap (\tau_1)^{-1}(\nu_1).$$

Fix an element $x[i] \in G[i]$ and let $\{\lambda^1, \ldots, \lambda^e\} = L(Y_{x[i]}^{\text{ind}})$. Then

$$C_{x[i]} = \left\{z[i, j, x[i]] \in T_{x[i]} : \left|\left\{j \in [e] : a + \lambda^j \cdot y \in (V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \cap (W^{\text{ind}} \times G_{i+2, k}))_{x[i], z[i+2, k]}\right\}\right| \geq \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{3}\right)\delta p^m \right\} = \bigcup_{M \subset \{1, \ldots, e\} \text{ such that } |M| \geq (1 - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{3})\delta p^m} \left\{z[i, j, x[i]] \in T_{x[i]} : (\forall \mu \in M)a + \mu \cdot y \in (V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \cap (W^{\text{ind}} \times G_{i+2, k}))_{x[i], z[i+2, k]}\right\}$$

$$= \bigcup_{M \subset \{1, \ldots, e\} \text{ such that } |M| \geq (1 - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{3})\delta p^m} T_{x[i]} \cap \left(\bigcap_{\mu \in M} (V \cap U^{\text{ind}} \cap (W^{\text{ind}} \times G_{i+2, k}))_{x[i], i+1: a+\mu \cdot y}\right).$$
Define a map
\[ \theta(x[i], z[i+2,k]) = \left( \tau_1(x[i], a, z[i+2,k]), \tau_1(x[i], y1, z[i+2,k]), \ldots, \tau_1(x[i], y_m, z[i+2,k]) \right). \]
Then \( \text{codim } \theta \leq (m+1)(\text{codim } V + \text{codim } U^{\text{ind}} + \text{codim } W^{\text{ind}}) \) and \( \theta \) is \( G' \)-supported. Notice that when \( (x[i], i+1 : a + \mu \cdot y) \in W^{\text{ind}} \) (which is the case above since \( Y^{\text{ind}} \subset W^{\text{ind}} \)), we have
\[
T_{x[i]} \cap (V \cap U^{\text{ind}})_{x[i], i+1 : a + \mu \cdot y} = T_{x[i]} \cap \{ z[i+2,k] \in G[i+2,k] : \tau_1(x[i], a + \mu \cdot y, z[i+2,k]) = \nu_1 \}
= T_{x[i]} \cap \left\{ z[i+2,k] \in G[i+2,k] : \tau_1(x[i], a, z[i+2,k]) + \mu_1 \tau_1(x[i], y1, z[i+2,k]) + \ldots + \mu_m \tau_1(x[i], y_m, z[i+2,k]) = \nu_1 \right\}
= T_{x[i]} \cap \{ z[i+2,k] \in G[i+2,k] : \left( 1, \mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m \right) \cdot \theta(x[i], z[i+2,k]) = \nu_1 \}.
\]
Thus, for each \( x[i] \), we have a collection \( R_{x[i]} \subset \mathbb{F}_p^{(m+1)} \) of values of \( \theta \), such that
\[
C_{x[i]} = \bigcup_{u \in R_{x[i]}} T_{x[i]} \cap \{ z[i+2,k] \in G[i+2,k] : \theta(x[i], z[i+2,k]) = u \}.
\]

**Regularization.** Let \( \eta_2 > 0 \). Apply Theorem \( \text{[37]} \) to \( T \) and \( \theta \) in directions \( G[i+2,k] \) with error parameter \( \eta_2 \). We get a positive integer \( s_2 = O\left( \log_p \eta_2^{-1} + \text{codim } T + \text{codim } \theta^{O(1)} \right) \), a \( G' \)-supported multi-affine map \( \gamma_2 : G[i] \to \mathbb{F}_p^{s_2} \), a collection of values \( M_2 \subset \mathbb{F}_p^{s_2} \), and maps \( c_\mu : \mathbb{F}_p^{\text{codim } \theta} \to [0,1] \) for \( \mu \in M_2 \), such that
\[ |\gamma_2^{-1}(M_2)| \geq (1 - \eta_2)|G[i]| \]
and
\[
|T_{x[i]} \cap \{ z[i+2,k] \in G[i+2,k] : \theta(x[i], z[i+2,k]) = u \}| \in [c_\mu(u), c_\mu(u) + \eta_2] : |G[i+2,k]|
\]
for every \( \mu \in M_2 \), every \( x[i] \in \gamma_2^{-1}(\mu) \cap T[i] \) and every \( u \in \mathbb{F}_p^{\text{codim } \theta} \). Moreover, provided \( \eta_2 < p^{-k(\text{codim } T + \text{codim } \theta)} \), we may assume that if \( c_\mu(u) = 0 \), then actually
\[ |T_{x[i]} \cap \{ z[i+2,k] \in G[i+2,k] : \theta(x[i], z[i+2,k]) = u \}| = 0. \]
Without loss of generality, when \( c_\mu(u) > 0 \), then in fact \( c_\mu(u) \geq p^{-k(\text{codim } T + \text{codim } \theta)} \).

Let \( 0 < \varepsilon'' = O(\varepsilon_0^{-1}(\varepsilon^{O(1)} + \xi_0)) \) be a quantity such that \( |C| \geq (1 - \varepsilon'')|T| \). Let \( M'_2 \) be the set of all \( \mu \in M_2 \) such that
\[ |C \cap (\gamma_2^{-1}(\mu) \times G[i+2,k])| \geq (1 - 3\varepsilon'')|T \cap (\gamma_2^{-1}(\mu) \times G[i+2,k])| > 0. \]
\(^{18}\) As with a previous step in this proof, we are actually applying the theorem to the map \((\rho, \theta)\), where \( \rho \) is a mixed-linear map, each component of which depends on at least one coordinate in \( G[i+2,k] \), such that \( T = (T[i] \times G[i+2,k]) \cap \{ \rho = \lambda \} \) for some \( \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^{\text{codim } \rho} \). Here, \( T[i] \subset G[i] \) is the variety given by multilinear forms defining \( T \) and are \( (G \cap \mathcal{P}[i]) \)-supported. Hence, each \( \rho_i \) depends on a set of coordinates that lies in \( G \setminus \mathcal{P}[i] \). Therefore, the multi-affine map given by Theorem \( \text{[33]} \) is \( G' \)-supported. We put these details in a footnote to keep the main line of the argument clearer.
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Let $0 < \eta''_0 = p^{-m/3} + O(\varepsilon_0^{-1} \sqrt{\varepsilon_0})$ be a quantity such that $|C^{\text{spars}} \cup C^{\text{bad}}| \leq \eta''_0 |T|$ and let $M_2''$ be the set of all $\mu \in M_2$ such that

$$
|(C^{\text{spars}} \cup C^{\text{bad}}) \cap (\gamma_2^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{[i+2,k]})| \leq 3\eta''_0 |T \cap (\gamma_2^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{[i+2,k]})|.
$$

We then have

\[
\sum_{\mu \in M_2 \setminus M_2''} |T \cap (\gamma_2^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{[i+2,k]})| \leq \frac{\eta''_0}{3} \sum_{\mu \in M_2 \setminus M_2''} |(T \setminus C) \cap (\gamma_2^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{[i+2,k]})|
\leq \frac{\eta''_0}{3} |T \setminus C|
\leq \frac{1}{3} |T|.
\]

Also,

\[
\sum_{\mu \in M_2 \setminus M_2''} |T \cap (\gamma_2^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{[i+2,k]})| \leq \frac{\eta''_0}{3} \sum_{\mu \in M_2 \setminus M_2''} |(C^{\text{spars}} \cup C^{\text{bad}}) \cap (\gamma_2^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{[i+2,k]})|
\leq \frac{\eta''_0}{3} |C^{\text{spars}} \cup C^{\text{bad}}|
\leq \frac{1}{3} |T|.
\]

Finally,

\[
\sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{P}_0 \cap M_2} |T \cap (\gamma_2^{-1}(\mu) \times G_{[i+2,k]})| \leq |\gamma_2^{-1}(\mathbb{P}_0 \setminus M_2)| \cdot |G_{[i+2,k]}| \leq \eta_2 p^{-k \cdot \text{codim} T} |T|.
\]

Hence, provided $\eta_2 \leq \frac{1}{3} p^{-k \cdot \text{codim} T}$, we may select $\mu_2 \in M_2' \cap M_2''$.

**Obtaining the desired structure.** Let $\tilde{Y}_1$ be the set of $x[i] \in T[i] \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2)$ such that $|C_{x[i]}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon''_0)|T_{x[i]}|$. Then

\[
\sum_{x[i] \in T[i] \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2) \setminus \tilde{Y}_1} |T_{x[i]}| \leq \varepsilon''_0^{-1/2} \sum_{x[i] \in T[i] \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2) \setminus \tilde{Y}_1} |T_{x[i]} \setminus C_{x[i]}|
\leq \varepsilon''_0^{-1/2} |T \cap ((\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2) \times G_{[i+2,k]} \setminus C)|
\leq 3\varepsilon''_0^{-1/2} |T \cap ((\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2) \times G_{[i+2,k]})|.
\]

Let $\tilde{Y}_2$ be the set of $x[i] \in T[i] \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2)$ such that $|(C^{\text{spars}} \cup C^{\text{bad}})_{x[i]}| \leq \sqrt{\eta''_0^2 |T_{x[i]}|}$. Then

\[
\sum_{x[i] \in T[i] \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2) \setminus \tilde{Y}_2} |T_{x[i]}| \leq \varepsilon''_0^{-1/2} \sum_{x[i] \in T[i] \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2) \setminus \tilde{Y}_2} |(C^{\text{spars}} \cup C^{\text{bad}})_{x[i]}|
\leq \varepsilon''_0^{-1/2} |(C^{\text{spars}} \cup C^{\text{bad}}) \cap ((\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2) \times G_{[i+2,k]})|
\leq 3 \sqrt{\eta''_0^2 |T \cap ((\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2) \times G_{[i+2,k]})|}.
\]
Let $\tilde{Y} = \tilde{Y}_1 \cap \tilde{Y}_2$. Write $\sigma$ for $\sum_{u \in \mathbb{P}^{-\text{codim}\theta}} c_{\mu_2}(u)$. Using (75) twice, we have
\[
|\tilde{Y}|(\sigma + p^{-\text{codim}\theta})|G_{[i+2,k]}| \geq \sum_{x[i] \in \tilde{Y}} |T_{x[i]}|
\]
\[
\geq (1 - 3\sqrt{\epsilon''} - 3\sqrt{\epsilon_0''})T \cap ((\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2) \times G_{[i+2,k]})
\]
\[
= (1 - 3\sqrt{\epsilon''} - 3\sqrt{\epsilon_0''}) \sum_{x[i] \in T[i] \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2)} |T_{x[i]}|
\]
\[
\geq (1 - 3\sqrt{\epsilon''} - 3\sqrt{\epsilon_0''}) \sum_{x[i] \in T[i] \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2)} \sigma|G_{[i+2,k]}|.
\]
It follows that
\[
|\tilde{Y}| \geq (1 - 3\sqrt{\epsilon''} - 3\sqrt{\epsilon_0''}) \frac{\sigma}{\sigma + p^{-\text{codim}\theta}} |T[i] \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2)|
\]
\[
= (1 - O(\sqrt{\epsilon''} + \sqrt{\epsilon_0''}))|T[i] \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2)|,
\]
provided that $\eta_2 \leq (\sqrt{\epsilon''} + \sqrt{\epsilon_0''})p^{-k\text{codim}T-(k+1)\text{codim}\theta}$. (Note that $\sigma \geq p^{-k(\text{codim}T+\text{codim}\theta)}$.)

For each $x[i] \in \tilde{Y}$ let $R_{x[i]}$ be the set of all $u \in R_{x[i]}$ such that
\[
\left|\left(C^\text{sparse} \cup C^\text{bad}\right)_{x[i]} \cap \left\{ z_{[i+2,k]} \in G_{[i+2,k]} : \theta(x[i], z_{[i+2,k]}) = u \right\} \right| \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_0''}|T_{x[i]} \cap \left\{ z_{[i+2,k]} \in G_{[i+2,k]} : \theta(x[i], z_{[i+2,k]}) = u \right\} |.
\]
Then by averaging,
\[
\left| \bigcup_{u \in \bar{R}_{x[i]}} T_{x[i]} \cap \left\{ z_{[i+2,k]} \in G_{[i+2,k]} : \theta(x[i], z_{[i+2,k]}) = u \right\} \right| = (1 - O(\sqrt{\epsilon''} + \sqrt{\epsilon_0''}))|T_{x[i]}|.
\]
Pick a random value $u \in \mathbb{P}^{1_{(m+1)}}_p$, according to the probability distribution $p_u = \sigma^{-1}c_{\mu_2}(u)$. Define $Y = \{ x[i] \in \tilde{Y} : u \in \bar{R}_{x[i]} \}$. Then
\[
\sigma \mathbb{E}[Y] = \sigma \sum_{x[i] \in \tilde{Y}} \mathbb{P}(u \in \bar{R}_{x[i]})
\]
\[
= \sum_{x[i] \in \tilde{Y}} \sum_{u \in \mathbb{P}^{1_{(m+1)}}_p} \sigma p_u \mathbb{1}(u \in \bar{R}_{x[i]})
\]
\[
= \sum_{x[i] \in \tilde{Y}} \sum_{u \in \mathbb{P}^{1_{(m+1)}}_p} c_{\mu_2}(u) \mathbb{1}(u \in \bar{R}_{x[i]})
\]
\[
\geq \sum_{x[i] \in \tilde{Y}} \sum_{u \in \mathbb{P}^{1_{(m+1)}}_p} \frac{c_{\mu_2}(u)}{c_{\mu_2}(u) + \eta_2} |G_{[i+2,k]}|^{-1}|T_{x[i]} \cap \left\{ z_{[i+2,k]} \in G_{[i+2,k]} : \theta(x[i], z_{[i+2,k]}) = u \right\} | \mathbb{1}(u \in \bar{R}_{x[i]})
\]
\[
\geq \sum_{x[i] \in \tilde{Y}} \sum_{u \in \mathbb{P}^{1_{(m+1)}}_p} \frac{c_{\mu_2}(u)}{c_{\mu_2}(u) + \eta_2} |G_{[i+2,k]}|^{-1}|T_{x[i]} \cap \left\{ z_{[i+2,k]} \in G_{[i+2,k]} : \theta(x[i], z_{[i+2,k]}) = u \right\} | \mathbb{1}(u \in \bar{R}_{x[i]})
\]
Hence, there is a choice of

$$\eta_2 p^k(\text{codim} T + \text{codim} \theta) \sum_{x[i] \in Y} \sum_{u \in R_{x[i]}} |G_{[i+2,k]}|^{-1} |T_{x[i]} \cap \{ z_{[i+2,k]} \in G_{[i+2,k]} : \theta(x[i], z_{[i+2,k]}) = u \}|$$

$$\geq (1 - O(\sqrt{e^p} + \sqrt[4]{\xi_p})) \sum_{x[i] \in Y} |G_{[i+2,k]}|^{-1} |T_{x[i]}|$$

$$\geq (1 - O(\sqrt{e^p} + \sqrt[4]{\xi_p}))(\bar{Y} | \sigma,$$

where the first and the last inequality both use (75), while in the second inequality we use the fact that either $c_{\mu_2}(u) \geq p^{-k(\text{codim} T + \text{codim} \theta)}$, or $c_{\mu_2}(u) = 0$, in which case

$$T_{x[i]} \cap \{ z_{[i+2,k]} \in G_{[i+2,k]} : \theta(x[i], z_{[i+2,k]}) = u \} = \emptyset.$$

Hence, there is a choice of $u$ such that

$$|Y| = (1 - O(\sqrt{e^p} + \sqrt[4]{\xi_p}))(T[i] \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2)).$$

(76)

Recall that $T = V[i] \setminus \{ i + 1 \} \cap \gamma^{-1}(\mu)$ and that $\gamma$ is a mixed-linear $G'$-supported multi-affine map. Let $\bar{T}$ be the variety defined by $\{ x[i] \in G[i] : (\forall j \in J) \gamma_j(x[i]) = \mu_j \}$, where $J$ is the set of all $j$ such that $\gamma_j$ does not depend on any coordinate among $G_{[i+2,k]}$. Note that the variety $T[i]$ satisfies $T[i] = \bar{T} \cap V[i]$. Let

$$U = ((\gamma^{-1}(\mu) \cap \theta^{-1}(u)) \times G_{i+1}) \cap U^{\text{ind}} \cap (W^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]}) \subset G[k]$$

and

$$W = \bar{T} \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2) \subset G[i],$$

both of which are $G'$-supported. Then we have

$$Y \subset T[i] \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2) = \bar{T} \cap V[i] \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2) = W \cap V[i].$$

We also have

$$|Y \times G_{[i+1,k]}| \cap V \cup U|$$

$$= |(Y \times G_{[i+1,k]}) \cap ((\gamma^{-1}(\mu) \cap \theta^{-1}(u)) \times G_{i+1}) \cap V \cup U^{\text{ind}} \cap (W^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]})|$$

$$= |(Y \times G_{[i+1,k]}) \cap ((T \cap \theta^{-1}(u)) \times G_{i+1}) \cap V \cup U^{\text{ind}} \cap (W^{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]})|$$

$$= \sum_{x[i] \in Y} |T_{x[i]} | T \cap \theta^{-1}(u)| \delta|G_{i+1}|$$

(by (77))

$$= \sum_{x[i] \in Y} |T_{x[i]} \cap \{ z_{[i+2,k]} \in G_{[i+2,k]} : \theta(x[i], z_{[i+2,k]}) = u \}| \delta|G_{i+1}|$$

(by (75))

$$\geq \frac{|Y| \delta c_{\mu_2}(u) |G_{[i+1,k]}|}{c_{\mu_2}(u)} = \left(1 - O(\sqrt{e^p} + \sqrt[4]{\xi_p})\right)|T[i] \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2)||G_{[i+1,k]}|$$

(by (76))

$$= \frac{c_{\mu_2}(u)}{c_{\mu_2}(u)} (1 - O(\sqrt{e^p} + \sqrt[4]{\xi_p}))$$
\[
\sum_{x_{[i]} \in T^{[i]} \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2)} |T_{x_{[i]}} \cap \{ z_{[i+2,k]} \in G_{[i+2,k]} : \theta(x_{[i]}, z_{[i+2,k]}) = u \}| \cdot |G_{i+1}| \quad \text{(by (26))}
\]

\[
= (1 - O(\sqrt{ep} + \frac{4}{\sqrt{\xi_0'}})) |(T^{[i]} \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2)) \times G_{[i+2,k]} ) \cap T \cap \theta^{-1}(u) | \cdot |G_{i+1}|
\]

\[
= (1 - O(\sqrt{ep} + \frac{4}{\sqrt{\xi_0'}})) \sum_{x_{[i]} \in \{ x_{[i]} \in (T^{[i]} \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2)) \times G_{[i+2,k]} ) \cap T \cap \theta^{-1}(u) \} |(V \cap U_{\text{ind}} \cap (W_{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]}))_{x_{[i]}}| \quad \text{(by (74))}
\]

\[
= (1 - O(\sqrt{ep} + \frac{4}{\sqrt{\xi_0'}})) \left| \left( (T^{[i]} \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2)) \times G_{[i+1,k]} \right) \cap \left( (T \cap \theta^{-1}(u)) \times G_{i+1} \right) \cap V \cap U_{\text{ind}} \cap (W_{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]}) \right|
\]

\[
= (1 - O(\sqrt{ep} + \frac{4}{\sqrt{\xi_0'}})) \left| \left( (T \cap (\gamma_2)^{-1}(\mu_2)) \times G_{[i+1,k]} \right) \cap \left( (\gamma^{-1}(\mu) \cap \theta^{-1}(u)) \times G_{i+1} \right) \cap V \cap U_{\text{ind}} \cap (W_{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]}) \right|
\]

Finally, set
\[
Z = \left( (Y \times G_{[i+1,k]}) \cap (T \cap \theta^{-1}(u)) \times G_{i+1} \right) \cap V \cap U_{\text{ind}} \cap (W_{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]}) \cap \left( (C_{\text{sp}} \cup C_{\text{bad}}) \times G_{i+1} \right).
\]

Note that \( Z \) satisfies
\[
Z = \left( (Y \times G_{[i+1,k]}) \cap (\gamma^{-1}(\mu) \cap \theta^{-1}(u)) \times G_{i+1} \right) \cap V \cap U_{\text{ind}} \cap (W_{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]}) \cap \left( (C_{\text{sp}} \cup C_{\text{bad}}) \times G_{i+1} \right)
\]

\[
= (Y \times G_{[i+1,k]}) \cap V \cap U \cap \left( (C_{\text{sp}} \cup C_{\text{bad}}) \times G_{i+1} \right)
\]

\[
\subset (Y \times G_{[i+1,k]}) \cap V \cap U.
\]

Then
\[
\left| \left( (Y \times G_{[i+1,k]}) \cap V \cap U \right) \setminus Z \right|
\]

\[
= \left| \left( (Y \times G_{[i+1,k]}) \cap (T \cap \theta^{-1}(u)) \times G_{i+1} \right) \cap V \cap U_{\text{ind}} \cap (W_{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]}) \right) \cap \left( (C_{\text{sp}} \cup C_{\text{bad}}) \times G_{i+1} \right) | \quad \text{(by (70))}
\]

\[
= \sum_{x_{[i]} \in Y} \left| (T \cap \theta^{-1}(u))_{x_{[i]}} \cap (C_{\text{sp}} \cup C_{\text{bad}})_{x_{[i]}} \right| \cdot |G_{i+1}|
\]

\[
\leq \frac{4}{\sqrt{\xi_0'}} \sum_{x_{[i]} \in Y} \left| (T \cap \theta^{-1}(u))_{x_{[i]}} \right| \cdot |G_{i+1}| \quad \text{(since } u \in \tilde{R}_{x_{[i]}} \text{ for all } x_{[i]} \in Y \text{)}
\]

\[
= \frac{4}{\sqrt{\xi_0'}} \left| (Y \times G_{[i+2,k]}) \cap T \cap \theta^{-1}(u) \right| \cdot |G_{i+1}|
\]

\[
= \frac{4}{\sqrt{\xi_0'}} \left| (Y \times G_{[i+1,k]}) \cap (T \cap \theta^{-1}(u)) \times G_{i+1} \right) \cap V \cap U_{\text{ind}} \cap (W_{\text{ind}} \times G_{[i+2,k]}) | \quad \text{(by (26))}
\]

132
\[ \begin{align*}
&= \sqrt{\epsilon_0''(Y \times G_{i_{i+1,k}}) \cap ((\gamma^{-1}(\mu) \cap \theta^{-1}(u)) \times G_{i_{i+1}})} \cap V \cap U^{\ind} \cap (W^{\ind} \times G_{i_{i+2,k}}) \\
&= \sqrt{\epsilon_0''(Y \times G_{i_{i+1,k}}) \cap U \cap V} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\epsilon_0''((W \cap V^{[i]}) \times G_{i_{i+1,k}}) \cap V \cap U}. 
\end{align*} \]

It remains to choose parameters \( \xi_0, m \) and \( \eta_2 \). To satisfy the required bounds involving \( \eta_2 \), we set \( \eta_2 = (\sqrt{\epsilon''} + \sqrt{\xi_0''})p^{-k\codim T-(k+1)\codim \theta} \), where \( \epsilon'' \) and \( \xi_0'' \) were previously defined and satisfy \( \epsilon'' = O(\epsilon_0^{-1}(\xi^{\Omega(1)} + \xi_0)) = O(\epsilon^{\Omega(1)} + \xi_0) \) and \( \xi_0'' = p^{-m/3} + O(\xi_0^{-1}) = O(\xi_0) \).

Finally, we may choose \( m = O(\log \delta^{-1} + \log \xi_0^{-1}) \) and \( \xi_0 = \Omega(\xi^{\Omega(1)}) \) so that all the other required bounds hold. This completes the proof. \( \square \)

### 10.3. Obtaining a Global Multiaffine Map

Let \( \phi \) be a multiaffine map defined on \( 1-o(1) \) of \( G \)-supported variety \( V \). The next proposition tells us that we can use \( \phi \) to define a multiaffine map \( \psi \) on \( 1-o(1) \) of \( (G \setminus \{I_0\}) \)-supported variety, where \( I_0 \in G \) is a maximal member. The value of \( \psi \) is obtained by evaluation of \( \phi \) on an arrangement of points. However, we allow more than one a single shape of arrangement, which leads to decomposition of the domain of \( \psi \) according to which kind of arrangement was used.

**Proposition 80.** There exists \( \varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(k) > 0 \) with the following property.

Let \( G \subset P \) be a down-set and let \( G' \) be a down-set obtained by removing a maximal element \( I_0 \) from \( G \). Let \( V \subset G_{[k]} \) be a \( G' \)-supported mixed-linear variety of codimension \( r \) given by \( V = \{ x_{[k]} \in G_{[k]} : (\forall i \in [r])\alpha_i(x_i) = \tau_i \} \) for some multilinear forms \( \alpha_i : G_i \to \mathbb{F}_p \), where \( I_i \in G \) for each \( i \). Define \( V_{\lower} \) to be the variety \( \{ (\forall i \in [r]) : I_i \neq I_0 \alpha_i(x_i) = \tau_i \} \). Let \( X \subset V \) be a set of size at least \( (1 - \varepsilon_0)|V| \). Let \( \phi : X \to H \) be a multiaffine map and let \( \eta > 0 \). Then there exist

- a positive integer \( s \leq p^{(2k)^{r+1}} - 1 \),
- a mixed-linear \( G' \)-supported variety \( V' \) of codimension \( (2 + \log \eta^{-1})^{2O(r)} \),
- a set \( X' \subset V_{\lower} \cap V' \),
- a multiaffine map \( \psi : X' \to H \), and
- a partition \( X' = X'_1 \cup \ldots \cup X'_s \),

such that

1. \( V_{\lower} \cap V' \not= \emptyset \),
2. \( |X'| \geq (1 - \eta)|V_{\lower} \cap V'| \).
(iii) for each $i \in [s]$, there exist $m = m^{(i)} \leq 3^k \cdot (2k + 1)^r$, a collection of $\nu_{j,l} = \nu_{j,l}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{[0,m]}$ for $j \in [m], l \in [k]$, $a_{j,l} = a_{j,l}^{(i)} \in G_t$, coefficients $\lambda_l = \lambda_l^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0\}$, $l \in [k]$, such that:

(iii.a) for each $x_{[k]} \in X'_i$

$$
\psi(x_{[k]}) = \sum_{j \in [m]} \lambda_j \phi(\nu_{j,1} \cdot (x_1, u_{1}^1, \ldots, u_{m}^1) + a_{j,1}, \ldots, \nu_{j,k} \cdot (x_k, u_{1}^k, \ldots, u_{m}^k) + a_{j,k}),
$$

where $\nu_{j,l} \cdot (x_l, u_{1}^l, \ldots, u_{m}^l) = \nu_{j,l,0} x_l + \sum_{l' \in [m]} \nu_{j,l,l'} u_{l'}^l$, holds for at least

$$p^{-(2 + \log_p \eta^{-1})^2 \Omega(r)} |G|^{m+1}$$

choices of $u_{1}^1, \ldots, u_{m}^1 \in G_1, \ldots, u_{1}^k, \ldots, u_{m}^k \in G_k$.

(iii.b) there is exactly one $j \in [m]$ such that $\nu_{j,l,0} \neq 0$ for all $l \in [k]$.

Proof. For fixed $k$ and $p$, let $D_0, c_0 > 0$ be constants such that the term $O(\varepsilon^{\Omega(1)})$ replaces $D_0\varepsilon^{c_0}$ that appears in (P3) in the statement of Theorem (8). Let $d_0 = (2D_0)^{-1}$ and $C_0 = c_0^{-1}$. Likewise, let $D_1, c_1 > 0$ be the implicit constants from (P3) in Proposition (8). Let $d_1 = (2D_1)^{-1}$ and $C_1 = c_1^{-1}$.

Since $\phi$ is multi-affine, it is also a multi-2 · $20^k$-homomorphism. Apply Theorem (8) for $i = 0$ and error parameter $\xi_0 = \left(\frac{d_1}{2}\right)^C_1 \cdot d_0^{C_0^{-1} + C_0^{-2} + \cdots + 1} \eta C_1 - C_0$. (This is the reason why $\xi_0$ has to be smaller than some positive constant—the term $(O(\varepsilon^{\Omega(1)}) + \xi)$ in the bound in property (ii) of that theorem has to be less than 1.) We obtain

- a $G'$-supported variety $U \subset G_k$ of codimension $O((r + \log_p \xi_0^{-1})^{O(1)}) = O(C_0^{O(r)} \log_p^{O(1)} \eta^{-1})$, which is mixed-linear, without loss of generality,
- a subset $Z \subset V \cap U$, and
- a multi-homomorphism $\psi : Z \to H$,

such that

(i) the variety $V \cap U$ is non-empty,

(ii) $|(V \cap U) \setminus Z| \leq \xi_0 |V \cap U|$, 

(iii) for each $x_{[k]} \in Z$, there are $p^{O((r + \log_p \xi_0^{-1})^{O(1)})} |G_k|^{2 \cdot 3^k - 1} |G_{k-1}|^{2 \cdot 3^{k-2} - 1} \cdots |G_1|^{2} (k, k-1, \ldots, 1)$-triarrangements $q$ with points in $X$ of lengths $x_{[k]}$ such that $\phi(q) = \psi(x_{[k]})$.

Apply Proposition (8) to $Z \subset V \cap U$ and the map $\phi$. Abusing notation, we may assume that all the properties above hold, with $\phi$ now being multi-affine, and $|(V \cap U) \setminus Z| \leq \xi_0 |V \cap U|$ changed to $|(V \cap U) \setminus Z| \leq \xi_1 |V \cap U|$, for

$$\xi_1 = d_0^{C_0^{-1} + C_0^{-2} + \cdots + 1} \eta C_0.$$

Without loss of generality the forms that define $V$ are organized in such a way that $I_i = I_0$ if and only if $i \in [r_0]$ for some $r_0 \leq r$. By induction on $s \in [0, r_0]$ we show that there exist
• a \( G' \)-supported variety \( U^{\text{lower}} \subset G[k] \) of codimension \( (C_0^{O(r)} \log_p O(1) \eta^{-1})^{2^{O(s)}} \),

• a subset \( Z^{\text{dom}} \subset \{ x[k] \in G[k] : (\forall i \in [s, r_0]) \alpha_i(x_{I_0}) = \tau_i \} \cap U^{\text{lower}} \), and

• a multiaffine map \( \psi : Z^{\text{dom}} \to H \),

such that

(i) the variety \( \{ x[k] \in G[k] : (\forall i \in [s, r_0]) \alpha_i(x_{I_0}) = \tau_i \} \cap U^{\text{lower}} \) is non-empty,

(ii)

\[
|\{ x[k] \in G[k] : (\forall i \in [s, r_0]) \alpha_i(x_{I_0}) = \tau_i \} \cap U^{\text{lower}} \setminus Z^{\text{dom}} |
\leq d_0^{c_{s_1}^{r_0-1} + c_{s_2}^{r_0-2} + \cdots + 1} \eta^{\cdot s} |\{ x[k] \in G[k] : (\forall i \in [s, r_0]) \alpha_i(x_{I_0}) = \tau_i \} \cap U^{\text{lower}} |,
\]

(iii) we have a partition of \( Z^{\text{dom}} \) into \( p^{(2k)^s-1} \) pieces such that properties (iii.a) and (iii.b) from the statement hold with \( m^{(i)} \leq 3^k(2k)^s \) and a proportion \( p^{-(C_0^{O(r)} \log_p O(1) \eta^{-1})^{2^{O(s)}}} \) of the parameters satisfying the relevant expression.

For the base case \( s = 0 \), we use \( U^{\text{lower}} = U \cap \{ x[k] \in G[k] : (\forall i \in [r_0 + 1, r]) \alpha_i(x_{I_0}) = \tau_i \}, Z^{\text{dom}} = Z \) with the trivial partition \( Z = Z \) and with \( \phi \) as above. We just need to identify the scalars to show that (iii) holds. We can parametrize \((k, k - 1, \ldots, 1)\)-tri-arrangements of lengths \( x[k] \) using \( u^d_\varepsilon \in G_d \) for \( \varepsilon \in \{ 1, 2 \}^d \times \{ 1, 2, 3 \}^{d-1, 1} \) as follows. When \( \varepsilon \in \{ 1, 2, 3 \}^{[k, 1]} \) is given, we define \( y[k] = y[k](\varepsilon) \), by setting

\[
y_d = \begin{cases} 
  u^d_\varepsilon, & \text{if } \varepsilon_d = 1, 2, \\
  u^d_{(1, \varepsilon_{[d-1, 1])}} + u^d_{(2, \varepsilon_{[d-1, 1])}} - x_d, & \text{if } \varepsilon_d = 3,
\end{cases}
\]

and define its corresponding weight \( \lambda_\varepsilon = (-1)^{|\{ d \in [k] : \varepsilon_d = 3 \}|} \). Hence, for each \( x[k] \in Z \) there are many choices of \( u^d_\varepsilon \) such that

\[
\psi(x[k]) = \sum_{\varepsilon \in \{ 1, 2, 3 \}^{[k, 1]}} \lambda_\varepsilon \phi(y[k](\varepsilon)).
\]

Note that the only time all \( x_1, \ldots, x_k \) are present in the coordinates of \( y[k] \) is when \( \varepsilon = (3, \ldots, 3) \). The properties in (iii) are easily seen to hold (note that we formally need to add auxiliary variables \( u^d_\varepsilon \) for \( \varepsilon \notin \{ 1, 2 \}^d \times \{ 1, 2, 3 \}^{d-1, 1} \) which are not used in the expression above, to make the sequences of parameters \( u^d_\varepsilon \) of same length for each \( d \)).

Assume now that the claim holds for some \( s \in [0, r_0 - 1] \). Let \( U^{\text{lower}} \), without loss of generality, \( Z^{\text{dom}} = Z_1^{\text{dom}} \cup \ldots \cup Z_N^{\text{dom}} \), where \( N \leq p^{(2k)^s-1} \), and \( \psi \) be the objects with the properties

\[\text{This is the set of sequences indexed from } d \text{ down to 1, whose elements lie in } \{1, 2, 3\} \text{ except the element indexed by } d \text{ which can only be 1 or 2.}\]
described. Let \( C_k, D_k \) be the constants from Theorem 78 and let \( \xi_s = \frac{1}{2} d_0^{r-s-2} + d_0^{r-s-3} + ... + 1 \eta d_0^{s-1} \).

If \( \alpha_s \) satisfies

\[
\text{bias} \left( \alpha_s - \mu \cdot \alpha_{[s+1,r_0]} \right) \geq p^{-c_k(r_0 + \text{codim } U^{\text{lower}} + \log_p \eta_s^{-1}) D_k}
\]

for some \( \mu \in \mathbb{F}_p^{[s+1,r_0]} \), apply Theorem 74. We are then immediately done as we may replace \( \alpha_s \) by fewer lower-order forms. Thus, we may assume the opposite. Apply Theorem 78 to \( Z_{\text{dom}}^p \subset \{ x[k] \in G[k] : (\forall i \in [s,r_0]) \alpha_i(x_{I_0}) = \tau_i \} \cap U^{\text{lower}} \) and to the map \( \psi \). We obtain a further \( G' \)-supported variety \( W \subset G[k] \) of codimension \( (r + \text{codim } U^{\text{lower}})^{O(1)} + c_0^{O(r)} \log_p^{O(1)} \eta^{-1} \), a subset \( Z' \subset \{ x[k] \in G[k] : (\forall i \in [s+1,r_0]) \alpha_i(x_{I_0}) = \tau_i \} \cap W \) of size at least

\[
(1 - D_0(d_0^{r-s-2} + d_0^{r-s-3} + ... + 1 \eta d_0^{s-1} \xi_s))\{ x[k] \in G[k] : (\forall i \in [s+1,r_0]) \alpha_i(x_{I_0}) = \tau_i \} \cap W
\]

\[
= (1 - d_0^{r-s-2} + d_0^{r-s-3} + ... + 1 \eta d_0^{s-1} \xi_s)\{ x[k] \in G[k] : (\forall i \in [s+1,r_0]) \alpha_i(x_{I_0}) = \tau_i \} \cap W > 0,
\]

a multiaffine map \( \psi' : Z' \to H \), a point \( a_{[k]} \in G[k] \), and \( \mu_0 \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{ \tau_s \} \), such that for each \( x[k] \in Z' \),

- if \( \alpha_s(x_{I_0}) = \tau_s \), then \( \psi'(x[k]) = \psi(x[k]) \), and

- if \( \alpha_s(x_{I_0}) = \mu \neq \tau_s \), for \( \Omega(p^{-O((r + \text{codim } U^{\text{lower}} + \log_p \eta^{-1})^{O(1)}) |G_{I_0}|) \) choices of \( u_{I_0} \in G_{I_0} \), we have

\[
\psi'(x[k]) = \psi(x[k]|_{c_I}, x_{c_I} - \frac{\mu - \tau_s}{\mu_0 - \tau_s} (a_{c_I} - u_{c_I})) + \frac{\mu - \tau_s}{\mu_0 - \tau_s} (\psi(x[k]|_{c_I}, u_{c_I})
\]

\[
= \sum_{i \in [t-1]} \psi(x[k]|_{c_{i_1}...c_I}, u_{c_i} + x_{c_i} - a_{c_i}, a_{c_{i+1}...c_I})
\]

\[
- \sum_{i \in [t-1]} \psi(x[k]|_{c_{i_1}...c_I}, u_{c_i}, a_{c_{i+1}...c_I})
\]

where \( I_0 = \{ c_1, \ldots, c_t \} \).

We first partition \( Z' \) into sets of the form \( Z' \cap \{ x[k] \in G[k] : \alpha_s(x_{I_0}) = \mu \} \). Thus, for each set in the current partition, we have that one of the formulas above holds for all points \( x[k] \) in the set. Refine each such set by looking, for each \( x[k] \), at most frequent choice of indices \( (i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{2^k}) \) such that the arguments of \( \psi \) belong to \( Z_1^{\text{dom}}, Z_2^{\text{dom}}, \ldots, Z_{2^k}^{\text{dom}} \) (in order they appear in the expression). Then the number of sets in the new partition is at most \( p \cdot (p^{2k^r} - 1)^{2^k} \). The only time we get an argument of \( \phi \) that depends on all \( x_1, \ldots, x_k \) comes from the only such argument of \( \psi \) in the expressions above (namely the first one).

We now arrive to the culmination of the work on extensions of multiaffine maps. Using Proposition 84 several times, we are able to prove that a multiaffine map defined on \( 1 - o(1) \) of a variety necessarily agrees on a large portion of points with a global multiaffine map.
Theorem 81. There exists $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(k) > 0$ with the following property.

Let $V \subset G_{[k]}$ be a multiaffine variety of codimension $r$ and let $X \subset V$ be a set of size at least $(1 - \varepsilon_0)|V|$. Let $\phi : X \to H$ be a multiaffine map. Then there exist a subset $X' \subset X$ of size $(\exp^{(2k+1)}(O(r)))^{-1}|X|$, a global multiaffine map $\Phi : G_{[k]} \to H$, a positive integer $m = \exp^{(2k+1)}(O(r))$, a collection of $\nu_{j,l} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{[0,m]}$ for $j \in [m], l \in [k], a_{j,l} \in G_l$, and coefficients $\lambda_l \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0\}, l \in [m]$, such that

(a) for each $x_{[k]} \in X'$

$$\Phi(x_{[k]}) = \sum_{j \in [m]} \lambda_j \phi(\nu_{j,1} \cdot (x_1, u_1^1, \ldots, u_m^1) + a_{j,1}, \ldots, \nu_{j,k} \cdot (x_k, u_1^k, \ldots, u_m^k) + a_{j,k}),$$

where $\nu_{j,l} \cdot (x_1, u_1, \ldots, u_m) = \nu_{j,l,0} x_l + \sum s \in [m] \nu_{j,l,s} u_l s$, holds for at least

$$2^{-\exp^{(2k+1+3)}(O(r))}|G_{[k]}|^m + 1$$

choices of $u_1^1, \ldots, u_m^1 \in G_1, \ldots, u_1^k, \ldots, u_m^k \in G_k$.

(b) there is exactly one $j \in [m]$ such that $\nu_{j,l,0} \neq 0$ for all $l \in [k]$.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ be the value in Proposition 80. Decreasing $\varepsilon_0$ further, we may assume that the expression $1 - O(\varepsilon_0^{1/2})$ in Proposition 80 is at least $1/2$. Note that $\varepsilon_0$ is still a positive quantity depending on $k$ and $p$ only. List all subsets of $[k]$ as $I_1, \ldots, I_{2^k}$ so that larger sets come first – that is, if $I_i \supset I_j$ then $i \leq j$. Let $G_i = \{I_i, \ldots, I_{2^k}\}$, which is a down-set for each $i \in [2^k]$. By induction on $i \in [2^k]$, we shall show that there exist

(i) a non-empty $G_i$-supported variety $V'$ of codimension $\exp^{(2i)}(O(r))$, (this is a tower of exponentials of height $2i$)

(ii) a subset $X' \subset V'$ of size at least $(1 - \varepsilon_0)|V'|$,

(iii) a multiaffine map $\phi' : X' \to H$,

(iv) a partition $X' = X_1' \cup \ldots \cup X_s'$, where $s = \exp^{(2i+1)}(O(r))$, such that for each $i_0 \in [s]$, there exist $m = m^{(i_0)} = \exp^{(2i+1)}(O(r))$, a collection of $\nu_{j,l}^{(i_0)} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{[0,m]}$ for $j \in [m], l \in [k], a_{j,l}^{(i_0)} \in G_l$, coefficients $\lambda_l^{(i_0)} \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0\}, l \in [m]$, such that:

(iv.a) for each $x_{[k]} \in X_{i_0}^{(i_0)}$

$$\phi'(x_{[k]}) = \sum_{j \in [m]} \lambda_j \phi(\nu_{j,1}^{(i_0)} \cdot (x_1, u_1^1, \ldots, u_m^1) + a_{j,1}^{(i_0)}, \ldots, \nu_{j,k}^{(i_0)} \cdot (x_k, u_1^k, \ldots, u_m^k) + a_{j,k}^{(i_0)})$$

for $2^{-\exp^{(2i+2)}(O(r))}|G_{[k]}|^m + 1$ choices of $u_1^1, \ldots, u_m^1 \in G_1, \ldots, u_1^k, \ldots, u_m^k \in G_k$,

(iv.b) there is exactly one $j \in [m]$ such that $\nu_{j,l,0}^{(i_0)} \neq 0$ for all $l \in [k]$.
For \( i = 1 \), the claim is trivial. Assume now that the claim has been proved for some \( i \in [2^k - 1] \), and let \( V', X' = X'_1 \cup \ldots \cup X'_s \) and \( \phi' \) be the relevant variety, set and map. By averaging over the layers of the multilinear parts of the multiaffine map that defines \( V' \) we may without loss of generality assume that \( V' \) is mixed-linear. Recall that \( I_i \) is a maximal set in \( \mathcal{G}_i \). Write \( V' = V^\text{max} \cap V^\text{lower} \), where \( V^\text{max} \) and \( V^\text{lower} \) are mixed-linear, \( V^\text{max} \) is defined by multilinear forms that depend exactly on \( G_i \) and \( V^\text{lower} \) is \( G_{i+1} \)-supported. Apply Proposition 32 to \( X' \subset V' \), the map \( \phi' \) and the parameter \( \eta = \varepsilon_0 \) to get a further \( G_{i+1} \)-supported variety \( U^\text{lower} \) of codimension \( 2^{O(\text{codim } V')} \), a subset \( X'' \subset X' \cap U^\text{lower} \) of size at least \( (1 - \varepsilon_0)|V^\text{lower} \cap U^\text{lower}| \), a multiaffine map \( \phi' : X'' \to H \), and a partition of \( X'' \) into \( 2^{O(\text{codim } V')} \) pieces \( X''_n \), such that for each piece there exist \( m = m_1^{\varepsilon_0} = 2^{O(\text{codim } V')} \), a collection of \( \nu_{j,l} = \nu_{j,l}^{(e)} \in \mathbb{F}_p^{[0,m]} \) for \( j \in [m], l \in [k], a_{j,l} = a_{j,l}^{(e)} \in G_i \), and coefficients \( \lambda_l = \lambda_l^{(e)} \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0\}, l \in [m] \), such that:

- for each \( x[j] \in X''_e \)

\[
\phi'(x[j]) = \sum_{j \in [m]} \lambda_j \phi'(\nu_{j,1} \cdot (x_1, u_1^1, \ldots, u_m^1) + a_{j,1}, \ldots, \nu_{j,k} \cdot (x_k, u_1^k, \ldots, u_m^k) + a_{j,k}),
\]

for \( 2 - 2^{O(\text{codim } V')} |G_i|^{m+1} \) choices of \( u_1^1, \ldots, u_m^1 \in G_1, \ldots, u_1^k, \ldots, u_m^k \in G_k \),

- there is exactly one \( j \in [m] \) such that \( \nu_{j,l,0} \neq 0 \) for all \( l \in [k] \).

The claim follows after using (iv.a) and (iv.b) in the inductive hypothesis to express \( \phi' \) in terms of \( \phi \) in the newly obtained expressions.

Once the claim has been proved, we use it for \( i = 2^k \). We obtain a multiaffine map from a subset \( X' \subset G_i \) of size at least \( (1 - \varepsilon_0)|G_i| \), where \( X' = X'_1 \cup \ldots \cup X'_s \) with property (iv). Take the largest set \( X'_1 \) and apply Proposition 40 to it to finish the proof.

\[ \Box \]

\section*{§11 Putting everything together}

**Proposition 82.** Let \( D \subset G_i \) be a set of density \( \delta > 0 \), let \( \phi : D \to H \) be a multi-homomorphism and let \( \Phi : G_i \to H \) be a global multiaffine map. Let \( m, n \in \mathbb{N}, \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0\}, \nu_{i,j,l} \in \mathbb{F}_p \) for \( i \in [n], j \in [k], l \in [0, m] \) and \( a_{i,j}, i \in [m], j \in [k], \) be such that

\[
\Phi(x[i]) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \lambda_i \phi(\nu_{i,1} \cdot (x_1, u_1^1, \ldots, u_m^1) + a_{i,1}, \ldots, \nu_{i,k} \cdot (x_k, u_1^k, \ldots, u_m^k) + a_{i,k}), \tag{77}
\]

for at least \( \delta|G_1|^{m+1} \) choices of \( x, u_j^1 \in G_i, i \in [k], j \in [m] \). Assume also that \( \prod_{j \in [k]} \nu_{i,j,0} \neq 0 \) for exactly one \( i \in [n] \). Then \( \phi \) coincides with some global multiaffine map on a set of size \( \delta' G_i \), where \( \delta' = \left( \exp((k-D_{m+1}^{-1})O(\delta^{-1})) \right)^{-1} \).

**Proof.** Without loss of generality \( \prod_{j \in [k]} \nu_{i,j,0} \neq 0 \) and \( \prod_{j \in [k]} \nu_{i,j,0} = 0 \) for \( i \in [n-1] \). We may therefore partition \( [n-1] = I_1 \cup \ldots \cup I_k \) so that when \( i \in I_j \), then \( \nu_{i,j,0} = 0 \).
By averaging, we may find $u^{[k]}_m$ such that (77) holds for at least $\delta |G[k]|$ elements $x[k] \in G[k]$. Let $X_0$ be the set of such $x[k]$. We may rewrite that expression as

$$\Phi(x[k]) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \lambda_i \phi(\nu_{1,1,0}x_1 + a'_{i,1}, \ldots, \nu_{i,k,0}x_k + a'_{i,k})$$

for some $a'_{i,j} \in G_j$, $i \in [n], j \in [k]$. Reorganizing this further, we obtain

$$\Phi(x[k]) = \lambda_n \phi(\nu_{1,1,0}x_1 + a'_{1,1}, \ldots, \nu_{n,k,0}x_k + a'_{n,k}) + \sum_{j \in [k]} \left( \sum_{i \in I_j} \lambda_i \phi(\nu_{1,1,0}x_1 + a'_{i,1}, \ldots, \nu_{i,k,0}x_k + a'_{i,k}) \right).$$

(78)

We now find sets $X_0 \supset X_1 \supset \ldots \supset X_k$ of sizes $|X_i| = \delta_i |G[k]|$, $\delta_i = \left( \frac{\exp(\frac{1}{2}D_{k-1}^{\min})(O(\delta^{-1}))}{\delta} \right)^{-1}$, such that for each $d \in [k]$, there is a global multi-affine map $\Psi_d : G[k] \rightarrow H$ such that

$$\left( \forall x[k] \in X_d \right) \sum_{i \in I_d} \lambda_i \phi(\nu_{1,1,0}x_1 + a'_{i,1}, \ldots, \nu_{i,k,0}x_k + a'_{i,k}) = \Psi_d(x[k]).$$

We have already defined $X_0$. Assume now that we have defined $X_0, X_1, \ldots, X_{d-1}$. Let $Y \subset G[k] \setminus \{d\}$ be the set of $x[k] \setminus \{d\}$ such that $|(x_{d-1} \setminus \{d\})_x| \geq \frac{\delta_{d-1}}{2} |G[d]|$. By averaging, $|Y| \geq \frac{\delta_{d-1}}{4} |G[k] \setminus \{d\}|$. Hence, we may define a map $\psi : Y \rightarrow H$ by

$$\psi(x[k] \setminus \{d\}) = \sum_{i \in I_d} \lambda_i \phi(\nu_{1,1,0}x_1 + a'_{i,1}, \ldots, \nu_{i,k,0}x_k + a'_{i,k}),$$

noting that $\eta_{i,0} = 0$ for all $i \in I_d$ so $x_d$ does not appear. Since $\phi$ is a multi-homomorphism, so is $\psi$. We may now apply Theorem 3 for the space $G[k] \setminus \{d\}$ (recall that at the beginning of the proof we assume Theorem 1 for smaller numbers of variables). This gives us a subset $Y' \subset Y$ of size

$$\left( \frac{\exp(D_{k-1}^{\min})(O(\delta^{-1}_d))}{\delta} \right)^{-1} |G[k] \setminus \{d\}|$$

and a global multi-affine map $\Psi_d : G[k] \setminus \{d\} \rightarrow H$ such that $\psi = \Psi_d$ on $Y'$. Let $X_d = (Y' \times G[d]) \cap X_{d-1} = \bigcup_{x[k] \setminus \{d\} \in Y'} \{x[k] \setminus \{d\} \times (X_{d-1} \setminus \{x[k] \setminus \{d\}\})$, which has size at least $\delta_d |G[k]|$, where

$$\delta_d \geq \frac{\delta_{d-1}}{2} \left( \frac{\exp(D_{k-1}^{\min})(O(\delta^{-1}_d))}{\delta} \right)^{-1}.$$

Thus, when $x[k] \in X_k$, from (78), we obtain

$$\phi(\nu_{1,1,0}x_1 + a'_{1,1}, \ldots, \nu_{n,k,0}x_k + a'_{n,k}) = \lambda_n^{-1} \Phi(x[k]) - \lambda_n^{-1} \sum_{j \in [k]} \Psi_j(x[k] \setminus \{j\}).$$

The result follows after a change of variables.

**Proof of Theorem 4** Suppose that $\phi : A \rightarrow H$ is a multi-homomorphism, where $A \subset G[k]$ has density $\delta$. First, we find subsets $A_k \subset A_{k-1} \subset \ldots \subset A_1 \subset A_0 = A$ of densities $\delta_i = |A_i|/|G[k]|$, such that on each $A_d$, $\phi$ is actually affine in the directions $G[d]$. We obtain $A_{d+1}$ from $A_d$ by applying Theorem 2 to $(\delta_d/2)$-dense columns of $A_d$ in direction $G_{d+1}$. Thus, we may take $\delta_k = \exp(-\log^{|O(1)|} \delta)$.
Let $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ be as in Theorem $\text{[1]}$. By Theorems $\text{[2]}$ and $\text{[3]}$ there exist a subset $A' \subset A_k$, a non-empty variety $V$ of codimension $r = \exp((2k+1)(D^{m_b}_{m_b}+2)) \left(O(\delta_k^{-O(1)})\right)$, a subset $B \subset V$ of size at least $(1 - \varepsilon_0)|V|$, and a multiaffine map $\psi : B \to H$ such that for each $x_{[k]} \in B$ there is at least a $\Omega(\delta_k^{O(1)})$-proportion of $(k,1],[k,1],[k,1])$-arrangements $q$ with $l(q) = x_{[k]}$ whose points lie in $A'$, such that $\phi(q) = \psi(x_{[k]})$, where $l(q)$ are the lengths of $q$.

By Theorem $\text{[4]}$, there exist a subset $B' \subset B$ of size at least $\left(\exp(2k+1+1)(O(r))\right)^{-1}|B|$, a global multiaffine map $\Phi : G[k] \to H$, $m \leq \exp(2k+1+1)(O(r))$, a collection of $\nu_{j,l} = \nu_{j,l}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_p[0,m]$ for $j \in [m], l \in [k]$, $a_{j,l} = a_{j,l}^{(i)} \in G_l$, and coefficients $\lambda_l = \lambda_l^{(i)} \in \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0\}$, $l \in [m]$ such that

(a) for each $x_{[k]} \in B'$

$$\Phi(x_{[k]}) = \sum_{j \in [m]} \lambda_j \psi(\nu_{j,1} \cdot (x_1, u_{11}, \ldots, u_{1m}) + a_{j,1}, \ldots, \nu_{j,k} \cdot (x_k, u_{k1}, \ldots, u_{km}) + a_{j,k}),$$

for

$$2^{-\exp(2k+1+3)(O(r))}|G[k]|^m$$

choices of $u_{11}, \ldots, u_{1m} \in G_1$, $\ldots$, $u_{k1}, \ldots, u_{km} \in G_k$,

(b) there is exactly one $j \in [m]$ such that $\nu_{j,l,0} \neq 0$ for all $l \in [k]$.

Replace $\psi$ in the expression above using $(k,1],[k,1],[k,1])$-arrangements $q$ such that $\phi(q) = \psi(l(q))$. Apply Proposition $\text{[5]}$ where the proportion of parameters that obey the relevant equation is at least

$$\left(\exp(2k+1+4+(2k+1)(D^{m_b}_{m_b}+2)) (\log O(1) \delta^{-1})\right)^{-1}.$$

This completes the proof, as we obtain a global multiaffine map $\Psi$ which coincides with $\phi$ for a proportion

$$\left(\exp(k,D^{m_{k-1}}_{m_{k-1}}) \exp(2k+1+4+(2k+1)(D^{m_{k-1}+2}_{m_{k-1}+2})) (\log O(1) \delta^{-1})\right)^{-1} \geq \left( \exp((3k+1)D^{m_{k-1}+2k+1+6}_{k-1}) (O(\delta^{-1})) \right)^{-1}$$

of the points in $G_{[k]}$.

\section*{12 Applications}

\subsection*{12.1. An Inverse Theorem for Multiaffine Maps over General Finite Fields}

In this subsection, we fix a finite field $\mathbb{F}$ of characteristic $p$, and we view $\mathbb{F}_p$ as a subfield of $\mathbb{F}$. The next result tells us that a map defined on a dense subset of $G_{[k]}$ that is $\mathbb{F}$-affine in each direction separately agrees on a further dense subset with a global $\mathbb{F}$-multiaffine map.
**Theorem 83.** Let $G_1, \ldots, G_k$ be finite-dimensional vector spaces over $\mathbb{F}$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a constant $D_k$ such that the following holds. Let $A \subset G_{[k]}$ be a set of density $\delta$, and let $\phi : A \to H$ be a $\mathbb{F}$-multiaffine map, which means that for each direction $d \in [k]$, and every $x_{[k]\setminus \{d\}} \in G_{[k]\setminus \{d\}}$, there is an $\mathbb{F}$-affine map $\alpha : G_d \to H$ such that for each $y_d \in A_{x_{[k]\setminus \{d\}}}$, $\phi(x_{[k]\setminus \{d\}}, y_d) = \alpha(y_d)$. Then, there is a global $\mathbb{F}$-multiaffine map $\Phi : G_{[k]} \to H$ such that $\phi(x_{[k]}) = \Phi(x_{[k]})$ for at least \( \left( \exp(D_k)(O(\delta^{-1})) \right)^{-1} |G_{[k]}| \) of $x_{[k]} \in A$.

The theorem will follow from Theorem 4 and Proposition 85. For the proposition, we need the following lemma.

**Lemma 84.** Let $\alpha : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}$ be a $\mathbb{F}_p$-multilinear map, which is $\mathbb{F}$-linear in first $d - 1$ coordinates. Suppose that for every $i \in [r]$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$,

\[
\text{prank}_{\mathbb{F}_p}(x_{[k]} \mapsto \alpha_i(x_{[k]\setminus \{d\}}, \lambda x_d) - (\lambda \cdot \alpha)_i(x_{[k]\setminus \{d\}}, \lambda x_d)) \leq s.
\]

Then there is an $\mathbb{F}_p$-multilinear form $\sigma : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}$, linear in the first $d$ coordinates, such that $\text{prank}_{\mathbb{F}_p} \alpha_i - \sigma_i \leq s \cdot r^2$ for each $i \in [r]$.

**Proof.** Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the $\mathbb{F}_p$-vector space of all $\mathbb{F}_p$-multilinear forms on $G_{[k]}$ that are additionally $\mathbb{F}$-linear in coordinates $1, \ldots, d - 1$. Consider the $\mathbb{F}^\times$-action on $\mathcal{M}$ given by

\[
\lambda \circ \mu := \left( x_{[k]} \mapsto \lambda^{-1}\mu(x_{[k]\setminus \{d\}}, \lambda x_d) \right),
\]

for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^\times$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$. This can be viewed as a representation of the multiplicative group $\mathbb{F}^\times$. Let $V \leq \mathcal{M}$ be the $\mathbb{F}_p$-subspace $V = ( \lambda \circ \alpha - \lambda' \circ \alpha : \lambda, \lambda' \in \mathbb{F}^\times )_{\mathbb{F}_p}$. Then $V$ is invariant under the above action, i.e. it is a subrepresentation. Since $p = \text{char} \mathbb{F}_p$ does not divide $|\mathbb{F}^\times|$, we may apply Maschke’s theorem to find another subspace $W \leq \mathcal{M}$, also invariant under the action above, such that $\mathcal{M} = V \oplus W$. Write $\alpha = v + w$ for $v \in V$ and $w \in W$. Then for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^\times$,

\[
\alpha - \lambda \circ \alpha = (v - \lambda \circ v) + (w - \lambda \circ w).
\]

Since $V$ and $W$ are invariant under the action, we have $v - \lambda \circ v \in V$ and $w - \lambda \circ w \in W$. However, $\alpha - \lambda \circ \alpha \in V$, so we in fact get $w - \lambda \circ w \in V_1 \cap V_2 = \{0\}$, and therefore $w = \lambda \circ w$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^\times$. Hence, $w$ is actually $\mathbb{F}$-linear in coordinate $d$ as well.

On the other hand, $V$ is spanned by elements of the form $e_i \circ \alpha - e_j \circ \alpha$, so there are $\nu_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}_p$, $i, j \in [r]$, such that

\[
\alpha - w = \sum_{i, j \in [r]} \nu_{ij}(e_i \circ \alpha - e_j \circ \alpha).
\]

Hence, for each $l \in [r]$,

\[
\text{prank}(\alpha_l - w_l) \leq r^2 s,
\]

as required. \( \square \)
Proposition 85. Let $G \subset \mathcal{P}([k])$ be a down-set with a maximal element $I_0$. Write $G' = G \setminus \{I_0\}$. Let $\Phi : G_{[k]} \to H$ be a $\mathbb{F}_p$-multiaffine $G$-supported map and let $A \subset G_{[k]}$ be a set of density $\delta > 0$ on which $\Phi$ is $\mathbb{F}$-multiaffine. Then there exist a $\mathbb{F}$-multiaffine map $\Theta : G_{[k]} \to H$ and a $\mathbb{F}_p$-multiaffine map $\alpha : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}_p^r$, where $r = O((\log p)^{-1})^{O(1)}$, such that on each layer of $\alpha$, $\Phi - \Theta$ is a $G'$-supported $\mathbb{F}_p$-multiaffine map.

Proof. Since $\Phi$ is $G$-supported, we may write it as $\Phi(x_{[k]}) = \Phi^{ml}(x_{I_0}) + \Phi'(x_{[k]})$ for a $\mathbb{F}_p$-multilinear map $\Phi^{ml} : G_{I_0} \to H$ and a $G'$-supported $\mathbb{F}_p$-multiaffine map $\Phi' : G_{[k]} \to H$. Thus, whenever $a_{I_0}, b_{I_0} \in G_{I_0}$ and $z_{[k]\setminus I_0} \in G_{[k]\setminus I_0}$ are such that $(a_{I_0}, b_{I_0}\setminus J, z_{[k]\setminus I_0}) \in A$ for each choice of $J \subset I_0$, then in fact

$$\sum_{J \subset I_0} (-1)^{|I_0| - |J|} \Phi(a_{I_0}, b_{I_0}\setminus J, z_{[k]\setminus I_0}) = \Phi^{ml}(a) - b : i \in I_0).$$

By averaging, there are $z_{[k]\setminus I_0} \in G_{[k]\setminus I_0}$ and a $\delta^{O(1)}$-dense collection of $b_{I_0} \in G_{I_0}$ such that for each $x_{I_0} \in X$, there is a $\delta^{O(1)}$-dense collection of $b_{I_0} \in G_{I_0}$ such that $(b + x_{I_0})_{I_0}, b_{I_0\setminus J}, z_{[k]\setminus I_0}) \in A$ for each $J \subset I_0$.

Claim. For each $d \in I_0$, there is a subset $X' \subset X$ of size at least $(|\mathbb{F}|^{-1}\delta^{O(1)})|G_{I_0}|$ such that for each $x_{I_0\setminus\{d\}} \in G_{I_0\setminus\{d\}}$, there is an $\mathbb{F}$-linear map $\theta : \theta_{x_{I_0\setminus\{d\}}} : G_d \to H$ such that $\Phi_{\text{ml}}(x_{I_0\setminus\{d\}}, y_d) = \theta(y_d)$ for all $y_d \in X'_{x_{I_0\setminus\{d\}}}.$

Proof of claim. Let $x_{I_0\setminus\{d\}}$ be such that $X'_{x_{I_0}}$ is $\delta^{O(1)}$-dense. Then there exists $b_{I_0} \in G_{I_0}$ such that $(b + x_{I_0})_{I_0}, b_{I_0\setminus J}, z_{[k]\setminus I_0}) \in A$ for each $J \subset I_0$ for a $\delta^{O(1)}$-proportion of $x_{I_0} \in X_{x_{I_0\setminus\{d\}}}$. Let $\tilde{X}_{x_{I_0\setminus\{d\}}}$ be the set of such $x_{I_0}$. Then for each $x_{I_0} \in \tilde{X}_{x_{I_0\setminus\{d\}}}$,

$$\sum_{I \subset I_0} (-1)^{|I_0| - |I|} \Phi((b + x_{I_0})_{I}, b_{I_0\setminus J}, z_{[k]\setminus I_0}) = \Phi_{\text{ml}}(x_{I_0}).$$

But by the properties of $\Phi$, for fixed $x_{I_0\setminus\{d\}}$ there is an $\mathbb{F}$-affine map $\theta : G_d \to H$ such that $\Phi_{\text{ml}}(x_{I_0}) = \theta(x_{d})$ for $x_{d} \in \tilde{X}_{x_{I_0\setminus\{d\}}}$. We now modify $\theta$ to make it an $\mathbb{F}$-linear map.

Fix an $\mathbb{F}$ dot product $\cdot$ on $G_d$. Take a random element $u \in G_d$. Define a map $\theta'$ by $\theta'(x) = \theta(x) - \theta(0) + \theta(0)u \cdot x$. View $\mathbb{F}_p$ as a subset of $\mathbb{F}$. Then for each $x_{I_0} \in \tilde{X}_{x_{I_0\setminus\{d\}}}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\Phi_{\text{ml}}(x_{I_0}) = \theta'(x_{d})) = |\mathbb{F}|^{-1}.$$ 

There is therefore a choice of $u$ such that $\Phi_{\text{ml}}(x_{I_0}) = \theta'(x_{d})$ on a set $X_{x_{I_0\setminus\{d\}}} \subset \tilde{X}_{x_{I_0\setminus\{d\}}}$ of size at least $|\mathbb{F}|^{-1} |\tilde{X}_{x_{I_0\setminus\{d\}}}|$, as desired. This proves the claim. □

Now define a map $\psi : G_{I_0} \times H \to \mathbb{F}$ by $\psi(x_{I_0}, h) = \Phi_{\text{ml}}(x_{I_0}) \cdot h$, where $\cdot$ is an $\mathbb{F}$ dot product on $H$. Then $\psi$ is an $\mathbb{F}_p$-multilinear map. Fix an $\mathbb{F}_p$-basis $e_1, \ldots, e_r$ of $\mathbb{F}$ and for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$ let $\lambda_i$ be the $i$th coordinate with respect to this basis. We now claim that for each $i \in [r]$, $d \in I_0$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$, the $\mathbb{F}_p$-form

$$(x_{I_0}, h) \mapsto \psi_i(x_{I_0\setminus\{d\}}, \lambda x_{d}, h) - (\lambda \psi)_i(x_{I_0}, h)$$
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has large bias.

Let \( X' \) be the set provided by the claim. This set has size \( \delta_2 |G_b| \), where \( \delta_2 = \Omega(\delta^{O(1)}) \). Let \( Y \) be the set of all \( x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\} \in G_{I_0} \setminus \{d\} \) such that \( |X'_{x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\}}| \geq \frac{\delta_2}{2} |G_d| \). Then \( |Y| \geq \frac{\delta_2}{2} |G_{I_0} \setminus \{d\}| \). Observe that we may in fact assume that \( X'_{x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\}} \) is an \( \mathbb{F}_p \)-subspace of \( G_d \), for each \( x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\} \in Y \). Indeed, the set of all \( y_d \in G_d \) such that \( \theta_{x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\}}(y_d) = \Phi^{ml}(x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\}, y_d) \) is an \( \mathbb{F}_p \)-subspace. Let \( X''_{x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\}} = \bigcap_{\mu \in \mathbb{F}_p} \mu \cdot X'_{x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\}} \). This is then an \( \mathbb{F} \)-subspace of density at least \( 2^{1-|\mathbb{F}|} \delta_2^{-1} \).

For each \( x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\} \in Y \) we obtain

\[
E_{y_d, h} \chi \left( \psi_i(x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\}, \lambda y_d, h) - (\lambda \psi)_i(x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\}, y_d, h) \right)
= E_{y_d, h} \chi \left( \Phi(x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\}, \lambda y_d) \cdot h - \lambda \Phi(x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\}, h) \cdot h \right)
= E_{y_d} E_h \chi \left( (\Phi(x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\}, \lambda y_d) \cdot h - \lambda \Phi(x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\}, y_d) \cdot h) \right).
\]

Since the expression in brackets is in \([0, 1]\), this is at least

\[
E_{y_d} 1(y_d \in X''_{x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\}}) E_h \chi \left( (\Phi(x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\}, \lambda y_d) \cdot h - \lambda \Phi(x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\}, y_d) \cdot h) \right)
= |X''_{x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\}}| / |G_d|
\geq 2^{1-|\mathbb{F}|} \delta_2^{-1}.
\]

After averaging over \( x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\} \), the bias we considered is at least \( 2^{1-|\mathbb{F}|} \delta_2^{-1} \).

By Theorem [3], \( p_i, \lambda, d(x_{I_0}, h) = \psi_i(x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\}, \lambda x_d, h) - (\lambda \psi)_i(x_{I_0}, h) \) has partition-rank \( s = O(\log |\mathbb{F}| \delta_2^{-1})^{O(1)} \).

On the other hand, \( \psi_i(x_{I_0} \setminus \{d\}, \lambda x_d, h) - (\lambda \psi)_i(x_{I_0}, h) \) is always zero.

We now apply Lemma [3] on \( |I_0| \) times to get an \( \mathbb{F} \)-multilinear form \( \sigma : G_{I_0} \times H \to \mathbb{F} \) such that \( \text{prank}(\psi_1 - \sigma) \leq kr^2 s \). Given an \( \mathbb{F} \)-multilinear map \( S : G_{I_0} \to H \), write \( \sigma(x_{I_0}, h) = S(x_{I_0}) \cdot h \). For each \( i \in [r] \), we get that \( \{ x_{I_0} \in G_{I_0} : (\forall h \in H) \psi_i(x_{I_0}, h) = \sigma_i(x_{I_0}, h) \} \) contains a multilinear variety \( W_i \) of codimension \( O(\log p \delta_2^{-1})^{O(1)} \). Thus, \( \{ x_{I_0} \in G_{I_0} : (\forall h \in H) (\forall i \in [r]) \psi_i(x_{I_0}, h) = \sigma_i(x_{I_0}, h) \} \) contains an \( \mathbb{F}_p \)-variety of codimension \( s' = O(\log p \delta_2^{-1})^{O(1)} \), and in particular has density at least \( p^{-ks'} \). Hence, \( S = \Phi^{ml} \) on a set of density at least \( p^{-ks'} \). Now consider \( \mathbb{F}_p \)-multilinear forms \( \psi^{\mathbb{F}_p} \), \( \sigma^{\mathbb{F}_p} \) defined by \( \psi^{\mathbb{F}_p}(x_{I_0}, h) = \Phi^{ml}(x_{I_0}) \cdot h \) and \( \sigma^{\mathbb{F}_p}(x_{I_0}, h) = S(x_{I_0}) \cdot h \) (where \( \cdot \) is the \( \mathbb{F}_p \) dot product on \( H \)). Apply Theorem [3] to the form \( \psi^{\mathbb{F}_p} - \sigma^{\mathbb{F}_p} \) to complete the proof of the proposition.

**Proof of Theorem [3].** From the assumptions, we deduce that \( \phi \) is a Freiman homomorphism in each direction, so Theorem [3] applies and gives an \( \mathbb{F}_p \)-multiaffine map \( \Phi : G_k \to H \) such that \( \phi = \Phi \) on a set \( B \subset A \) of size \( |B| = \delta_1 |G_k| \), where \( \delta_1 = \left( \exp(D_k^{mh}) (O(\delta^{-1})) \right)^{-1} \). We now use \( \Phi \) to find the desired
Theorem 86. Let $G$ and $H$ be $\mathbb{F}_p$-vector spaces, with $p > k$. Suppose that $\phi : G \rightarrow H$ is a function with the property that $\Delta_{a_1} \ldots \Delta_{a_{k+1}} \phi(x) = 0$ for at least $c|G|^{k+2}$ choices of $(x, a_1, \ldots, a_{k+1}) \in G^{k+2}$. Then there is a polynomial $\Phi : G \rightarrow H$ of degree at most $k$ such that $\phi(x) = \Phi(x)$ for every $x$ in a subset of $G$ of density $\Omega\left(\exp(O(1))(c^{-1})\right)$.

Proof. The proof will proceed by induction on $k$ and will take several steps. For $k = 0$, the result is straightforward to prove. For the rest of this subsection we shall assume that the result has been proved for $k - 1$.

Step 1. Finding a multiaffine map. We may rewrite the condition as the statement that

$$\Delta_{a_1} \ldots \Delta_{a_{k+1}} \phi(x) = \Delta_{a_1} \ldots \Delta_{a_{k+1}} \phi(y)$$

for at least $c|G|^{k+2}$ $(k + 2)$-tuples $(x, y, a_1, \ldots, a_{k+1}) \in G^{k+2}$. By averaging, we may find a set $S \subset G^k$ and a map $\psi : S \rightarrow H$ such that $|S| = c^{O(1)}|G^k|$ and such that for each $a_{[k]} \in S$ we may find $c^{O(1)}|G|
elements \( x \in G \) for which

\[
\Delta_{a_1} \ldots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(x) = \psi(a_{[k]}).
\]

We now prove that \( \psi \) coincides with a global multiaffine map on a dense set.

**Claim 87.** Let \( A \subset G^k \) be a set of density \( \delta \) such that for each \( a_{[k]} \in A \), there are at least \( \delta |G| \) elements \( x \in G \) such that \( \Delta_{a_1} \ldots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(x) = \psi(a_{[k]}) \). Then for each \( d \in [k] \), \( \psi \) respects \( \Omega(\delta^2 \delta^4) |G|^{k+2} \) \( d \)-additive quadruples.

**Proof.** Without loss of generality \( d = k \). Take any \( a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1} \) such that \( |A_{a_{[k-1]}}| \geq \frac{\delta}{2} |G| \). Then there are at least \( \frac{\delta}{2} |G|^{k-1} \) such \( a_{[k-1]} \). Define \( \alpha : G \to H \) by

\[
\alpha(x) = \Delta_{a_1} \ldots \Delta_{a_{k-1}} \phi(x).
\]

Then there are at least \( \frac{\delta^2}{2} |G|^2 \) pairs \((b, x) \in A_{a_{[k-1]}} \times G \) such that

\[
\alpha(x + b) - \alpha(x) = \psi(a_{[k-1]}, b).
\]

That is, there are at least \( \frac{\delta^2}{2} |G|^2 \) of \((x, y) \in G^2 \) such that \((a_{[k-1]}, x - y) \in A \) and

\[
\alpha(x) - \alpha(y) = \psi(a_{[k-1]}, x - y).
\]

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, there are at least \( \left( \frac{\delta^2}{2} \right)^2 |G|^3 \) triples \((x_1, x_2, y) \in G^3 \) such that \((a_{[k-1]}, x_1 - y), (a_{[k-1]}, x_2 - y) \in A \), \( \alpha(x_1) - \alpha(y) = \psi(a_{[k-1]}, x_1 - y) \), and \( \alpha(x_2) - \alpha(y) = \psi(a_{[k-1]}, x_2 - y) \). The last two conditions imply that

\[
\alpha(x_1) - \alpha(x_2) = \psi(a_{[k-1]}, x_1 - y) - \psi(a_{[k-1]}, x_2 - y).
\]

Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality once more, we get at least \( \left( \frac{\delta^2}{2} \right)^4 |G|^4 \) quadruples \((x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) \in G^4 \) such that \((a_{[k-1]}, x_1 - y_1), (a_{[k-1]}, x_2 - y_1), (a_{[k-1]}, x_1 - y_2), (a_{[k-1]}, x_2 - y_2) \in A \),

\[
\alpha(x_1) - \alpha(x_2) = \psi(a_{[k-1]}, x_1 - y_1) - \psi(a_{[k-1]}, x_2 - y_1),
\]

and

\[
\alpha(x_1) - \alpha(x_2) = \psi(a_{[k-1]}, x_1 - y_2) - \psi(a_{[k-1]}, x_2 - y_2),
\]

The last two conditions imply that

\[
\psi(a_{[k-1]}, x_1 - y_1) - \psi(a_{[k-1]}, x_2 - y_1) - \psi(a_{[k-1]}, x_1 - y_2) + \psi(a_{[k-1]}, x_2 - y_2) = 0,
\]

which completes the proof. \( \square \)

Combining this claim with Theorem 27 for each direction, we find a set \( B \subset G^k \) of size \( c_1 |G^k| \), where \( c_1 = \exp(-O(\log c^{-1})^{O(1)}) \), such that for each \( x_{[k]} \in B \) and \( d \in [k] \), \( \psi_{x_{[k]} \setminus \{a_d\}} \) coincides with an affine map \( G \to H \). Thus, by Theorem 4, there is a global multiaffine map \( \Psi : G^k \to H \) such that

\[
\Delta_{a_1} \ldots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(x) = \Psi(a_{[k]})
\]
for \( c_2 |G|^{k+1} \) choices of \((a_{[k]}, x)\), where 
\[ c_2 = \left( \exp^{O(1)}(O(c^{-1})) \right)^{-1}. \]

**Step 2. We may take \( \Psi \) to be multilinear.** This follows from the following proposition.

**Proposition 88.** Suppose that \( \Delta_{a_1} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(x) = \Theta(a_{[k]}) \) holds for \( c_0 |G|^{k+1} \) choices of \((a_{[k]}, x)\) in \( G^{k+1} \), where \( \Theta(a_{[k]}) \) is a global multiaffine map. Then \( \Delta_{a_1} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(x) = \Theta^{ml}(a_{[k]}) \) for \( c_0^{O(1)} |G|^{k+1} \) choices of \((a_{[k]}, x)\) in \( G^{k+1} \).

**Proof.** Write \( \Theta_0 = \Theta \), and define \( \Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_k \) iteratively as \( \Theta_{i-1}(a_{[k]}) = \Theta_i(a_{[k]}) + \theta_i(a_{[k]\{i\}}) \), where \( \Theta_i \) is linear in coordinate \( i \) and \( \theta_i \) is multiaffine. Actually, we obtain that \( \Theta_i \) is linear in first \( i \) coordinates, and in particular, \( \Theta_k = \Theta^{ml} \). Let \( T^0 \) be the set of \((x, a_{[k]}) \in G^{k+1} \) such that 
\[ \Delta_{a_1} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(x) = \Theta(a_{[k]}). \]

Thus, \(|T^0| \geq c_0 |G|^{k+1}\).

We claim now that for each \( i \in [0, k] \), there is a set \( T^i \subset G^{k+1} \) such that \(|T^i| \geq c_0^{O(1)} |G|^{k+1} \) and for each \((x, a_{[k]}) \in T^i\)
\[ \Delta_{a_1} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(x) = \Theta_i(a_{[k]}), \tag{80} \]
which will imply the proposition.

We prove this claim by induction on \( i \). The base case is the case \( i = 0 \), where the claim holds trivially. Assume now that it holds for some \( i \in [0, k-1] \), and fix \( x_0 \in G \). Observe that if \( b_{i+1}, c_{i+1} \in T^i_{a_{[k]\{i+1\}}} \), then
\[
\Theta_{i+1}(a_{[k]\{i+1\}}, b_{i+1} - c_{i+1}) = \Theta_{i}(a_{[k]\{i+1\}}, b_{i+1}) - \Theta_{i}(a_{[k]\{i+1\}}, c_{i+1}) \\
= \Delta_{a_k} \cdots \Delta_{a_{i+1}} \Delta_{a_{i+1}} \cdots \Delta_{a_1} \phi(x_0 + b_{i+1}) \\
- \Delta_{a_k} \cdots \Delta_{a_{i+1}} \Delta_{a_{i+1}} \cdots \Delta_{a_1} \phi(x_0 + c_{i+1}) \\
= \Delta_{a_k} \cdots \Delta_{a_{i+1}} \Delta_{b_{i+1} - c_{i+1}} \Delta_{a_{i+1}} \cdots \Delta_{a_1} \phi(x_0 + c_{i+1}).
\]

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, there are \( c_0^{O(1)} |G|^{k+2} \) choices of \((x_0, a_{[k]\{i\}}, b_{i+1}, c_{i+1})\) such that the above equality holds. The result follows after a change of variables. \( \square \)

We shall abuse notation and keep writing \( \Psi \) for the modified multilinear map \( \Psi^{ml} \). We end up with
\[ \Delta_{a_1} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(x) = \Psi(a_{[k]}) \tag{81} \]
which holds for a \( c_3 \)-dense collection of \((a_{[k]}, x)\), where \( c_3 = c_2^{O(1)} \).

**Step 3. A symmetry argument.** What we would like to do at this point is use a polarization identity to obtain a polynomial from \( \Psi \), but we cannot do that because \( \Psi \) is not symmetric. In this
section we show how to obtain a symmetric multilinear map from \( \Psi \). The argument will have a similar flavour to an argument introduced in a slightly different context by Green and Tao in [13].

We begin by showing that, for each \( i \in [k-1] \), the variety

\[
\left\{ a_{[k]} \in G^k : \Psi(a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1}, a_{i+2}, \ldots, a_k) = \Psi(a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_k) \right\}
\]

is dense.

Let us focus on the first two coordinates. Write \( T \subset G^{k+1} \) for the set of all \( (x, a_{[k]}) \) such that [3] holds. Fix \( x \in G \) and \( a_{[2,k]} \in G^{k-1} \). Then, for \( u_1, v_1 \in T_{x,a_{[2,k]}} \), we have

\[
\psi(u_1 - v_1, a_{[2,k]}) = \Delta_{a_1} \Delta_{a_2} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(x) - \Delta_{v_1} \Delta_{a_2} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(x) \\
= \Delta_{a_2} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(x + u_1) - \Delta_{a_2} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(x + v_1) \\
= \Delta_{a_3} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(x + u_1 + a_1) - \Delta_{a_3} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(x + u_1) - \Delta_{a_3} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(x + v_1) \\
- \Delta_{a_3} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(x + v_1 + a_1) + \Delta_{a_3} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(x + v_1).
\]

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, this holds for \( c_3^{O(1)} |G|^{k+2} \) choices of \( (x, u_1, v_1, a_{[2,k]}) \).

Let \( z = x + a_2 + u_1 + v_1 \). Then

\[
\psi(u_1 - v_1, z - u_1 - v_1 - x, a_{[3,k]}) = \Delta_{a_2} \cdots \Delta_{a_3} \phi(z - v_1) + \Delta_{a_3} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(z - u_1) \\
- \Delta_{a_3} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(z + u_1) - \Delta_{a_3} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(z - u_1).
\]

Hence, there is a set \( T' \subset G^{k+2} \) of size \( c_3^{O(1)} |G|^{k+2} \) whose elements \( (x, u_1, v_1, z, a_{[3,k]}) \) satisfy

\[
\psi(u_1, u_1, a_{[3,k]}) - \psi(u_1, v_1, a_{[3,k]}) = \Delta_{a_3} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(z - v_1) + \Delta_{a_3} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(z - u_1) \\
+ \psi(v_1, z - v_1 - x, a_{[3,k]}) \\
- \Delta_{a_3} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(z - v_1) - \Delta_{a_3} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(z - u_1) \\
- \psi(u_1, z - u_1 - x, a_{[3,k]}).
\]

Fix \( x, u_1, z, a_{[3,k]} \). For any \( v_1, v_1' \in T'_{(x,u_1,z,a_{[3,k]})} \) we get, after subtracting, that

\[
\psi(v_1 - v_1', u_1, a_{[3,k]}) - \psi(u_1, v_1 - v_1', a_{[3,k]}) = \Delta_{a_2} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(z - v_1') + \Delta_{a_3} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(z - v_1) \\
+ \psi(v_1, z - v_1 - x, a_{[3,k]}) - \Delta_{a_3} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(z - v_1') \\
- \Delta_{a_3} \cdots \Delta_{a_k} \phi(z - v_1) - \psi(v_1', z - v_1' - x, a_{[3,k]}).
\]

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain a set \( T'' \subset G^{k+3} \) of size \( c_3^{O(1)} |G|^{k+3} \) such that each \( (x, u_1, v_1, v_1', z, a_{[3,k]}) \) \( \in T'' \) satisfies the equality above. Now fix \( (x, v_1, v_1', z, a_{[3,k]}) \). For each \( u_1, u_1' \in T''_{(x,v_1,v_1',z,a_{[3,k]})} \) we get, after subtracting, that

\[
\psi(v_1 - v_1', u_1 - u_1', a_{[3,k]}) - \psi(u_1 - u_1', v_1 - v_1', a_{[3,k]}) = \psi(v_1 - v_1', u_1 - u_1', a_{[3,k]}) - \psi(v_1 - v_1', u_1 - u_1', a_{[3,k]}) + \psi(u_1 - u_1', v_1 - v_1', a_{[3,k]}) = 0.
\]
Hence, by Cauchy-Schwarz,
\[ \Psi(v_1 - v'_1, u_1 - u'_1, a_{[3,k]}) - \Psi(u_1 - u'_1, v_1 - v'_1, a_{[3,k]}) = 0 \]
for \( c^O(1)|G|^{k+2} \) choices of \( u_1, u'_1, v_1, v'_1, a_{[3,k]} \). We are done after a change of variables.

By Claim 1.6 in [23], it follows that the variety
\[ V_{\text{sym}} = \left\{ a_{[k]} \in G^k : (\forall i \in [k-1])\Psi(a_1, \ldots, a_i, a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_k) = \Psi(a_1, \ldots, a_{i+1}, a_i, \ldots, a_k) \right\} \]
has density \( c_3O(1) \).

Let \( \psi : G^k \times H \to F_p \) be the multilinear form given by \( \psi(x[k], y) = \Psi(x[k]) \cdot y \). For a permutation \( \pi \in \text{Sym}_k \), let \( \pi \circ \psi(x[k], h) = \psi(x_{\pi(1)}, \ldots, x_{\pi(k)}, h) \). Then for each \( \pi \), bias \( \left( \pi \circ \psi - \psi \right) = c_3O(1) \). By Theorem [30] we have \( \text{prank}(\pi \circ \psi - \psi) \leq O(\log_p c_3^{-1})O(1) \).

Define a multilinear form \( \theta : G^k \times H \to F_p \) by
\[ \theta(x[k], y) = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\pi \in \text{Sym}_k} \pi \circ \psi(x[k], h). \]

Then \( s = \text{prank}(\psi - \theta) = O(\log_p c_3^{-1})O(1) \), which means that for each \( i \in [s] \) there exist non-empty sets \( I_i \subset [k] \), and multilinear forms \( \alpha_i : G^{I_i} \to F_p \) and \( \beta_i : G^{[k] \setminus I_i} \times H \to F_p \), such that for each \( (x[k], h) \in G^k \times H \) we have
\[ \psi(x[k], h) - \theta(x[k], h) = \sum_{i \in [s]} \alpha_i(x_{I_i}) \beta_i(x_{[k] \setminus I_i}, h). \]

Write \( \theta(x[k], y) = \Theta(x[k]) \cdot y \) and \( \beta_i(x_{[k] \setminus I_i}, y) = B_i(x_{[k] \setminus I_i}) \cdot y \) for multilinear maps \( \Theta \) and \( B_i \). Then, \( \Theta = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\pi \in \text{Sym}_k} \pi \circ \Psi \), so it is symmetric, and \( \Psi = \Theta + \sum_{i \in [s]} \alpha_i(x_{I_i}) B_i(x_{[k] \setminus I_i}) \). By averaging over layers of \( \alpha \), we obtain \( \mu \in F_p^s \) and a \( c_3p^{-s} \)-dense set of \( (a_{[k]}, x) \) such that \( \alpha_i(a_{I_i}) = \mu_i \) and
\[ \Delta_{a_1} \ldots \Delta_{a_s} \phi(x) = \Theta(a_{[k]}) + \sum_{i \in [s]} \mu_i B_i(x_{[k] \setminus I_i}). \]

Applying Proposition [88], we may without loss of generality assume that the \( B_i \) do not appear in the expression above, which now holds for a \( c_3O(1)p^{-O(s)} \)-dense set of \( (a_{[k]}, x) \). Define \( \phi'(x) = \phi(x) - \frac{1}{k!} \Theta(x, x, \ldots, x) \). By the polarization identity,
\[ \Delta_{a_1} \ldots \Delta_{a_s} \phi'(x) = 0 \]
on a set of parameters of density \( c_3p^{-s} \). We may now apply the inductive hypothesis to finish the proof of Theorem [88].
12.3. A Quantitative Inverse Theorem for the $U^k$ Norm.

For our next application, we show that a bounded function defined on $G = \mathbb{F}_p^n$ with large $U^k$ norm must correlate well with a polynomial phase function of degree at most $k - 1$. For each fixed $k$, the dependence on the $U^k$ norm is given by a bounded number of exponentials, but this number increases with $k$, so the dependence on $k$ is given by a tower-type function.

For a map $f : G \to \mathbb{C}$, and $a \in G$, we write $\partial_a f : G \to H$ for the map $\partial_a f(x) = f(x)f(x-a)$.

**Theorem 89.** Let $f : G \to \mathbb{D}$ be a function such that $\|f\|_{U^k} \geq \delta$. Assume that $p \geq k$. Write $\omega = \exp \left( \frac{2\pi i}{p} \right)$. Then there is a polynomial $g : G \to \mathbb{F}_p$ of degree at most $k - 1$ such that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_x f(x) \omega^g(x) \right| = \left( \exp(O(1))(O(\delta^{-1})) \right)^{-1}.$$

The proof of the inverse theorem will be based on the following lemma and proposition. The lemma is a straightforward generalization of lemmas that have played similar roles in proofs of earlier $U^k$ inverse theorems; it is the proposition that forms the heart of the proof.

**Lemma 90.** Let $S \subset G^{k-2}$ be a set of density $\delta'$ such that for each $a_{[k-2]} \in S$

$$\left| \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-2}} f(\phi(a_{[k-2]})) \right| \geq \delta'',$$

Then, for each $d \in [k]$, $\phi$ respects at least $\delta'^4 \delta''^8 |G|^k$ $d$-additive quadruples.

**Proof.** Since $\partial_a \partial_b = \partial_b \partial_a$, we may assume without loss of generality that $d = 1$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-2]}} S(a_{[k-2]}) \left| \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-2}} f(\phi(a_{[k-2]})) \right|^2$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-2]}} S(a_{[k-2]}) \mathbb{E}_{x,y} \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-2}} f(x) \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-2}} f(y) \omega^{-\phi(a_{[k-2]})(x-y)}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-2]}} S(a_{[k-2]}) \mathbb{E}_{x,u} \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-2}} f(x) \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-2}} f(x-u) \omega^{-\phi(a_{[k-2]})u}$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-2]}} \mathbb{E}_{x,u} \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-2}} f(x) \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-2}} f(x-u)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-2]}} \mathbb{E}_{x,u} \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-2}} f(x-a_1) \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-2}} f(x-a_1-u) \omega^{-\phi(a_{[k-2]})u}.$$
By Lemma \[\text{Lemma 95}\], we get
\[
\left( \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathbb{F}_{p}} \left( \mathbb{E}_{a_1, a_2} g(a_2, a_1)(a_1 - x)h(a_2, a_1, u(a_1)) \right)^2 \right)^2 \leq \sum_r \left| h(a_2, a_1, u)^r (r) \right|^4.
\]

Returning to the inequalities above, we deduce that
\[
\delta^k \delta^{np^8} \leq \left( \mathbb{E}_{a_1, a_2} S(a_1, a_2) \left| \partial_{a_1, \ldots, \partial_{a_2}} f^\phi(a_1, a_2) \right| \right)^4
\]
\[
\leq \mathbb{E}_{a_1, a_2} \sum_r \mathbb{E}_{v} S(v, a_1, a_2) \omega^{-\phi(v, a_1, a_2)} \omega^{-r v} \right|^4.
\]

Some easy algebraic manipulation shows that the right-hand side expands to give \(|G|^{-k}\) times the number of \(d\)-additive quadruples, which implies the lemma.

\[\square\]

**Proposition 91.** Let \(\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{P}([k - 1])\) be a down-set, let \(f : G \to \mathbb{D}\), and let \(V\) be an \(\mathcal{F}\)-supported mixed-linear variety in \(G^{k-1}\) of codimension \(r\). Suppose that
\[
\left| \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} V(a_{[k-1]}) \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f(x) \right| \geq c.
\]

Let \(I_0\) be a maximal element of \(\mathcal{F}\). Then there exist a polynomial \(g : G \to \mathbb{F}_p\) of degree at most \(k - 1\) and a further \(\mathcal{F} \setminus \{I_0\}\)-supported variety \(V'\) such that \(\text{codim} V' = r + O(\log p^{-1})\) and the map \(f'(x) = f(x) \omega^g(x)\) satisfies the inequality
\[
\left| \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} V'(a_{[k-1]}) \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f'(x) \right| \geq p^{-O(\log p^{-1})}.\]

In order to prove the proposition, we need another symmetry argument (closer to that of Green and Tao), which we present as a separate lemma.

**Lemma 92 (Symmetry argument).** Let \(I_0 \subset [k - 1]\) be a non-empty subset, let \(i_1, i_2 \in I_0\) be distinct elements, let \(V_i \subset G_{[k-1]\setminus\{i\}}\) be varieties and let \(\psi : G_{I_0} \to \mathbb{F}_p\) be a multilinear form. Suppose that
\[
\left| \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} \left( \prod_{i \in I_0} V_i(a_{[k-1]\setminus\{i\}}) \right) \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f(x) \omega^{\psi(a_{I_0})} \right| \geq c\]  
(82)

for some \(c > 0\). Then the multilinear map \(\psi\), defined by \(\psi(x_{I_0}) = \psi(x_{I_0}\setminus\{i_1, i_2\}, x_{i_1}, x_{i_2})\), that is by swapping coordinates \(i_1\) and \(i_2\), satisfies
\[
\text{bias}(\psi - \psi') \geq c^{O(1)}.
\]

**Proof of Lemma 92.** For simplicity, we argue in the case \(i_1 = k - 2, i_2 = k - 1\); the general case is analogous. By averaging, there is some \(x_0 \in G\) such that
\[
c \leq \left| \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \left( \prod_{i \in I_0} V_i(a_{[k-1]\setminus\{i\}}) \right) \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f(x_0) \omega^{\psi(a_{I_0})} \right|.\]
(83)
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We first use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality a few times to remove \( V_i \) terms from the expression. Let \( i_0 \in I_0 \). By Cauchy-Schwarz, we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\epsilon^2 \leq & \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \setminus \{i_0\}} \left( \mathbb{E}_{a_{i_0}} \left( \prod_{i \in I_0 \setminus \{i_0\}} V_i(a_{[k-1]} \setminus \{i_0\}) \right) \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f(x_0) | \omega^{\psi(a_{i_0})} \right)^2 \\
\leq & \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \setminus \{i_0\}} \left( \mathbb{E}_{a_{i_0}} \left( \prod_{i \in I_0 \setminus \{i_0\}} V_i(a_{[k-1]} \setminus \{i_0\}) \right) \omega^{\psi(a_{i_0})} \right)^2 \\
= & \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \setminus \{i_0\}} \left( \mathbb{E}_{a_{i_0}} \left( \prod_{i \in I_0 \setminus \{i_0\}} V_i(a_{[k-1]} \setminus \{i_0\}) \right) \omega^{\psi(a_{i_0})} \right)^2
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore, there is a choice of \( v_{i_0} \in G \) such that

\[
\epsilon^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]}} \left( \prod_{i \in I_0 \setminus \{i_0\}} V_i(a_{[k-1]} \setminus \{i_0\}; i_0 : v_{i_0} + a_{i_0}) V_i(a_{[k-1]} \setminus \{i_0\}; i_0 : v_{i_0})) \partial_{a_{[k-1]}} f(x_0 - v_{i_0}) \omega^{\psi(a_{i_0})} \bigg| \right.
\]

By modifying \( V_i \) for \( i \in I_0 \setminus \{i_0\} \) suitably, we may apply the same argument \( |I_0| \) times to get

\[
\epsilon^{2^k} \leq \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]}} \left( \prod_{i \in I_0 \setminus \{i_0\}} V_i(a_{[k-1]} \setminus \{i_0\}; i_0 : v_{i_0} + a_{i_0}) V_i(a_{[k-1]} \setminus \{i_0\}; i_0 : v_{i_0})) \partial_{a_{[k-1]}} f(x_0 - v_{i_0}) \omega^{\psi(a_{i_0})} \bigg| \right.
\]

for a suitable \( x_0 \) (after a minor abuse of notation).

To make the expressions that follow clearer, we shall write \( \chi \) for the one-dimensional character \( \chi(\lambda) = \omega^\lambda \). Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality again, and making the change of variables \( z = x_0 - u_{k-1} - v_{k-1} - a_{k-2} \) for the third equality below, we obtain that

\[
\begin{align*}
\epsilon^{2^{k+1}} \leq & \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-2]}} \left( \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]}} \partial_{a_{[k-2]}} f(x_0) f(x_0 - u_{k-1}) \chi(\psi(a_{i_0}) \bigg|}
\end{align*}
\]
Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality once again, we get

\[ c^{2k+2} \leq \mathbb{E}_{a_{\{k\}}} \mathbb{E}_{z, u_{k-1}} \partial_{a_{\{k\}}} f(z + v_{k-1}) \partial_{a_{\{k\}}} f(x_0 - u_{k-1}) \partial_{a_{\{k\}}} f(z + u_{k-1}) \partial_{a_{\{k\}}} f(x_0 - v_{k-1}) \]

\[ \chi \left( \psi(a_{f_0} \{k-2,k-1\}, x_0 - z, u_{k-1}) \right) \chi \left( \psi(a_{f_0} \{k-2,k-1\}, x_0 - z, v_{k-1}) \right) \]

\[ \chi \left( \psi(a_{f_0} \{k-2,k-1\}, v_{k-1}, u_{k-1}) \right) \chi \left( \psi(a_{f_0} \{k-2,k-1\}, v_{k-1}, u_{k-1}) \right) \]

\[ \chi \left( \psi(a_{f_0} \{k-2,k-1\}, u_{k-1}, u_{k-1} - v_{k-1}, u_{k-1}) \right) \cdot \]

Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality one last time,

\[ c^{2k+3} \leq \mathbb{E}_{a_{\{k\}}} \mathbb{E}_{z, u_{k-1}, v_{k-1}} \partial_{a_{\{k\}}} f(z + v_{k-1}) \partial_{a_{\{k\}}} f(x_0 - u_{k-1}) \partial_{a_{\{k\}}} f(z + v'_{k-1}) \partial_{a_{\{k\}}} f(x_0 - v'_{k-1}) \]

\[ \chi \left( \psi(a_{f_0} \{k-2,k-1\}, x_0 - z, v_{k-1}' - u_{k-1}) \right) \]

\[ \chi \left( \psi(a_{f_0} \{k-2,k-1\}, u_{k-1}, v_{k-1}' - u_{k-1}) \right) \chi \left( \psi(a_{f_0} \{k-2,k-1\}, v_{k-1}' - u_{k-1}, v_{k-1}' - u_{k-1}) \right) \]

\[ \chi \left( \psi(a_{f_0} \{k-2,k-1\}, u_{k-1}, u_{k-1} - v_{k-1}' - u_{k-1}, u_{k-1}) \right) \cdot \]
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Proof of Proposition 91. Out of the multilinear maps that define \( V \), let \( \phi_1, \ldots, \phi_s \) be those with coordinate set \( I_0 \). Then there exists \( \lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p^s \) such that
\[
\lambda = \left( \prod_{i \in I_0} V_i \times G \right) \cap \left( \bigcap_{i \in [s]} \{ a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1} : \phi_i(a_{I_0}) = \lambda \} \right),
\]
where for each \( i \in I_0 \), \( V_i \) is a variety that does not depend on the coordinate \( i \). Hence,
\[
c \leq \left| \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} V(a_{[k-1]}) \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f(x) \right|
\]
\[
= \left| \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} \left( \prod_{i \in I_0} V_i(a_{[k-1]\setminus\{i\}}) \right) \mathbb{I}\left( \phi(a_{I_0}) = \lambda \right) \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f(x) \right|
\]
\[
= \left| \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} \left( \prod_{i \in I_0} V_i(a_{[k-1]\setminus\{i\}}) \right) p^{-s} \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{F}_p^s} \omega^{\mu \cdot (\phi(a_{I_0}) - \lambda)} \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f(x) \right|
\]
\[
\leq p^{-s} \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{F}_p^s} \left| \omega^{-\lambda \mu} \right| \left| \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} \left( \prod_{i \in I_0} V_i(a_{[k-1]\setminus\{i\}}) \right) \omega^{\mu \cdot \phi(a_{I_0})} \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f(x) \right|
\]
\[
\leq p^{-s} \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{F}_p^s} \left| \omega^{-\lambda \mu} \right| \left| \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} \left( \prod_{i \in I_0} V_i(a_{[k-1]\setminus\{i\}}) \right) \omega^{\mu \cdot \phi(a_{I_0})} \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f(x) \right|.
\]
In particular, there is some \( \mu_0 \) such that
\[
c \leq \left| \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} \left( \prod_{i \in I_0} V_i(a_{[k-1]\setminus\{i\}}) \right) \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f(x) \omega^{\mu_0 \cdot \phi(a_{I_0})} \right|.
\]
Write \( \psi = \mu_0 \cdot \phi \). For \( \pi \in \text{Sym}_{I_0} \), write \( \psi_{\pi}(a_{I_0}) \) for \( \psi(a_{\pi(d)}) \), where \( a_{\pi(d)}^\pi = a_{\pi(d)} \) for each \( d \in I_0 \). Observe that \( \psi_{\pi} \) satisfies the assumption (24) of Lemma 24. Hence, for any permutation \( \pi \in \text{Sym}_{I_0} \) and any inversion \( \tau \in \text{Sym}_{I_0} \), Lemma 24 implies
\[
\text{bias}(\psi_{\pi} - \psi_{\tau \pi}) \geq c^O(1).
\]
Using the fact that every permutation is a composition of a bounded number of inversions and that the analytic rank is subadditive (Theorem 1.5 of [24]), we get that
\[
\text{bias}(\psi_{\pi} - \psi) \geq c^O(1)
\]
for all \( \pi \in \text{Sym}_{I_0} \).
Define \( \sigma: G^J_0 \to \mathbb{F} \) by

\[
\sigma(x_{I_0}) = \frac{1}{|I_0|!} \sum_{\pi \in \text{Sym}_{I_0}} \psi_\pi(x_{I_0}),
\]

which is a symmetric multilinear form such that \( \text{bias}(\psi - \sigma) \geq c^{O(1)} \), again using subadditivity of the analytic rank. Hence, by Theorem \( \mathbf{3.2} \), \( \psi - \sigma \) has partition rank \( m' \leq O\left( \frac{1}{\log_p \text{c}^{-1}} c^{O(1)} \right) \). Then there are proper non-empty subsets \( J_i \subseteq I_0 \), and multilinear forms \( \alpha_i: G^{J_i} \to \mathbb{F}_p \) and \( \beta_i: G^{|J_i|} \to \mathbb{F}_p \) for each \( i \in [m'] \), such that

\[
\psi(x_{I_0}) = \sigma(x_{I_0}) + \sum_{i \in [m']} \alpha_i(x_{J_i})\beta_i(x_{I_0 \setminus J_i}).
\]

Returning to (82), we have that

\[
\sum_{i \in [m']} \alpha_i(x_{J_i})\beta_i(x_{I_0 \setminus J_i}) = O(1).
\]

Since \( p \geq k \), we may use the polarization identity to find a polynomial \( g: G \to \mathbb{F}_p \) of degree at most \( k-1 \) such that \( \sigma(x_{[k-1]}) = \Delta x_1 \ldots \Delta x_{k-1} g(y) \) (namely \( g(x) = \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \sigma(x, \ldots, x) \)). Set \( f'(x) = f(x)\chi(g(x)) \) to obtain the identity

\[
\partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f(x)\chi(\sigma(a_{I_0})) = \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f'(x).
\]

Then

\[
c \leq \left| \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} \left( \prod_{i \in I_0} V_i(a_{[k-1] \setminus \{i\}}) \right) \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f'(x) \chi\left( \sum_{i \in [m']} \alpha_i(a_{J_i})\beta_i(x_{I_0 \setminus J_i}) \right) \right|
\]

\[
\leq \left| \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} \left( \prod_{i \in I_0} V_i(a_{[k-1] \setminus \{i\}}) \right) \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f'(x) \right|
\]

\[
\sum_{\nu, \tau \in \mathbb{F}_p} \chi(\nu \cdot \tau) \mathbbm{1} \left( \forall i \in [m] \alpha_i(a_{J_i}) = \nu_i, \beta_i(x_{I_0 \setminus J_i}) = \tau_i \right)
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{\nu, \tau \in \mathbb{F}_p} \left| \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} \left( \prod_{i \in I_0} V_i(a_{[k-1] \setminus \{i\}}) \right) \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f'(x) \right|
\]

Therefore, there is a choice of \( \nu, \tau \in \mathbb{F}_p^m \) such that

\[
c p^{-2m} \leq \left| \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} \left( \prod_{i \in [m]} \alpha_i(a_{J_i}) = \nu_i, \beta_i(x_{I_0 \setminus J_i}) = \tau_i \right) \left( \prod_{i \in I_0} V_i(a_{[k-1] \setminus \{i\}}) \right) \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f'(x) \right|
\]

Define

\[
V' = \left( \bigcap_{i \in I_0} V_i \right) \cap \left\{ a_{[k-1]} : (\forall i \in [m]) \alpha_i(a_{J_i}) = \nu_i, \beta_i(x_{I_0 \setminus J_i}) = \tau_i \right\}.
\]

The variety \( V' \) has codimension at most \( r + 2m = r + O(\log_p c^{-1}) \), so we have the bound

\[
\left| \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} V'(a_{[k-1]}) \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f'(x) \right| \geq p^{-2m} c,
\]

which completes the proof. \( \square \)
Proof of Theorem 89. We prove the result by induction on $k$. Recall that for any map $h : G \to \mathbb{D}$, we have the bound

$$
\|h\|_{U^2}^2 = \sum_r |\hat{h}(r)|^4 \leq \left( \sum_r |\hat{h}(r)|^2 \right) \max_r |\hat{h}(r)|^2 \leq \max_r |\hat{h}(r)|^2.
$$

It follows that

$$
\delta^2 \leq \|f\|_{U}^2 = \mathbb{E}_{a_1, \ldots, a_{k-2}} \left\| \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-2}} f \right\|_{U^2}^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_{a_1, \ldots, a_{k-2}} \max_r |[\partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-2}} f](r)|^2.
$$

Let $\phi : G^{k-2} \to G$ be a map defined by taking $\phi(a_{[k-2]})$ to be any $r \in G$ such that $|[\partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-2}} f](r)|$ is maximal. This gives us a set $A \subset G_{[k-2]}$ of size at least $\frac{\delta^2}{2} |G_{k-2}|$ such that

$$
|\partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-2}} f|^{\wedge}(\phi(a_{[k-2]})) \geq \delta^{k-1}/2
$$

for every $a_{[k-2]} \in A$.

Applying Lemmas 27 and 31 in each direction, and then Theorem 3, we obtain a global multiaffine map $\Phi : G^{k-2} \to G$ and a set $A' \subset G_{[k-2]}$ of size $\delta_1 |G_{k-2}|$, where

$$
\delta_1 = \left( \exp(O(1))(O(\delta^{-1})) \right)^{-1}
$$

such that for every $a_{[k-2]} \in A'$ we have the bound

$$
|\partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-2}} f|^{\wedge}(\Phi(a_{[k-2]})) \geq \delta^{k-1}/2.
$$

Therefore,

$$
\mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f(x) \omega^{-\Phi(a_{[k-2]})} a_{k-1} = \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-2]} \in G_{[k-2]}} \left| \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-2}} f \right|^{\wedge}(\Phi(a_{[k-2]}))^2 = \Omega(\delta_1^{O(1)})
$$

Write $\phi(a_{[k-1]}) = -\Phi(a_{[k-2]}) \cdot a_{k-1}$ to rewrite the left-hand side as

$$
\mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f(x) \chi(\phi(a_{[k-1]})) = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{F}} \chi(\lambda) \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} \mathbb{1}(\phi(a_{[k-1]}) = \lambda) \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f(x).
$$

Let $\phi_I, I \subseteq [k-1]$ be the multilinear parts of $\phi$. Then there are values $\lambda_I \in \mathbb{F}$ for each $I$ such that if $V$ is the multilinear variety $\{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1} : (\forall I)\phi_I(a_I) = \lambda_I\}$, then

$$
\mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} V(a_{[k-1]}) \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f(x) = \mathbb{E}_{a_{[k-1]} \in G^{k-1}} \mathbb{1}(\forall I)\phi_I(a_I) = \lambda_I \mathbb{E}_{x \in G} \partial_{a_1} \ldots \partial_{a_{k-1}} f(x)
$$

$$
= \Omega(\delta_1^{O(1)}).
$$

Let $I_1, \ldots, I_{2k-2-1}$ be the non-empty subsets of $\mathcal{P}([k-2])$, listed in such a way that $I_i \supset I_j$ implies $i \leq j$. Apply Proposition 32 $2^{k-2} - 1$ times, with $\mathcal{F} = \{I_1, \ldots, I_{2k-2-1}\}$ at the $i^{th}$ step. This gives us a new map $f' : G \to \mathbb{D}$ of the form $f'(x) = f(x) \chi(g(x))$, where $g$ is a polynomial of degree at most $k-1$, such that

$$
\|f'\|_{U^{k-1}} = \left( \exp(O(1))(O(\delta^{-1})) \right)^{-1}.
$$

Applying the induction hypothesis completes the proof. \qed
12.4. A multiaffine Bogolyubov argument

We now strengthen Theorem 93. The main theorem of this subsection tells us, roughly speaking, that if we apply enough convolutions in each direction to a bounded function $f$, then the resulting function will be approximately constant (in an $L_\infty$ sense) on almost all the level sets of a multiaffine map to $F_p^l$, where $l$ is bounded. (In the case $k = 1$, the “almost all” makes this statement weaker than Bogolyubov’s lemma, but as we remarked in [10], one cannot obtain uniform approximations on all level sets when $k \geq 2$.)

**Theorem 93.** Let $f : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{D}$, let $d_1, \ldots, d_r \in [k]$ directions such that $\{d_1, \ldots, d_r\} = [k]$, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exist

- a positive integer $l = \exp(O(1)) (2^{O(r)} \varepsilon^{-O(1)})$,
- a multiaffine map $\phi : G_{[k]} \to F_p^l$,
- a set of values $M \subset F_p^l$, such that $|\phi^{-1}(M)| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|G_{[k]}|$,
- a map $c : M \to \mathbb{D}$

such that

$$\left| C_{d_r} \cdots C_{d_1} C_k \cdots C_1 f(x_{[k]}) - c(\phi(x_{[k]})) \right| \leq \varepsilon$$

for every $x_{[k]} \in \phi^{-1}(M)$.

We will be almost done once we have proved a closely related statement in the case where $f$ is already of the desired form. The next lemma shows that this property is approximately preserved if we convolve in several directions.

**Lemma 94.** Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\alpha : G_{[k]} \to F_p^l$ be a multiaffine map, let $c : F_p^l \to \mathbb{D}$ and let $f = c \circ \alpha$. Let $d_1, \ldots, d_r \in [k]$ be directions and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exist positive integers $l', s \in \mathbb{N}$, $l', s = O(l + \log_2 \varepsilon^{-1})^{O(1)}$, multiaffine maps $\beta : G_{[k]} \to F_p^s$, $\alpha' : G_{[k]} \to F_p^{l'}$, a map $c' : F_p^{l'} \to \mathbb{D}$, and a collection of values $B \subset F_p^s$ such that

$$|\beta^{-1}(B)| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|G_{[k]}|$$

and

$$\left| C_{d_r} \cdots C_{d_1} f(x_{[k]}) - c'(\alpha'(x_{[k]})) \right| \leq \varepsilon$$

for every $x_{[k]} \in \beta^{-1}(B)$.

**Proof.** We prove the statement by induction on $r$ and include the trivial $r = 0$ case as the base case. Suppose that the statement has been proved for some $r$. Apply it with parameter $\varepsilon' > 0$, and let $m', s, \alpha', \beta', c', B$ be the relevant objects. Let $g : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{D}$ be given by $g(x_{[k]}) = c'(\alpha'(x_{[k]}))$.  
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Apply Theorem 3 to $\beta'$ in direction $G_{d_{r+1}}$ with parameter $\eta_1$. We obtain a positive integer $t = O(s + \log_p \eta_1^{-1})O(1)$, a multiaffine map $\rho : G_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}} \to F_p^t$, a collection of values $R \subset F_p^t$ and a map $v : R \times F_p^t \to \mathbb{D}$ such that

$$|\rho^{-1}(R)| \geq (1 - \eta_1)|G_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}}|$$

and

$$\{|y_{d_{r+1}} \in G_{d_{r+1}} : \beta(x_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}}, y_{d_{r+1}}) = \lambda\| = v(\rho(x_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}}, \lambda)$$

for every $x_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}} \in \rho^{-1}(R)$ and every $\lambda \in F_p^t$.

Note that for each $\lambda \in R$, the size $|\{y_{d_{r+1}} \in G_{d_{r+1}} : \beta(x_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}}, y_{d_{r+1}}) \neq B\}|$ is the same for every $x_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}} \in \rho^{-1}(\lambda)$. Let $R'$ be the set of all $\lambda \in R$ for which this size is at most $\frac{1}{2}|G_{d_{r+1}}|$. By averaging, we have

$$|\rho^{-1}(R')| \geq (1 - \eta_1 - 2\varepsilon^{-1})|G_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}}|.$$  

Thus, whenever $\rho(x_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}}) \in R'$, we have

$$|\mathbf{C}_{d_{r+1}} \cdots \mathbf{C}_{d_{1}} f(x_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}}, y_{d_{r+1}}) - \mathbf{C}_{d_{r+1}} g(x_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}}, y_{d_{r+1}})| \leq \varepsilon \frac{1}{2}.$$  

It remains to approximate $\mathbf{C}_{d_{r+1}} g$. To this end, let $\alpha' : G_{[k]} \to F_p^t$ and $\gamma : G_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}} \to F_p^t$, where $\alpha'$ is additionally linear in coordinate $d_{r+1}$. Then, for each $x_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}}$, the map $y_{d_{r+1}} \mapsto \mathbf{C}_{d_{r+1}} \gamma(x_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}}, y_{d_{r+1}})$ is constant on cosets of $\{y_{d_{r+1}} \in G_{d_{r+1}} : \alpha''(x_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}}, y_{d_{r+1}}) = 0\}$. Apply Theorem 3 to $\alpha''$ in direction $G_{d_{r+1}}$ with parameter $\eta_2$. We obtain a positive integer $t' = O(t' + \log_p \eta_2^{-1})O(1)$, a multiaffine map $\rho' : G_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}} \to F_p^{t'}$, a collection of values $T \subset F_p^{t'}$, and a map $u : T \times F_p^{t'} \to \mathbb{D}$, such that

$$|(\rho')^{-1}(T)| \geq (1 - \eta_2)|G_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}}|$$

and

$$\{|y_{d_{r+1}} \in G_{d_{r+1}} : \alpha''(x_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}}, y_{d_{r+1}}) = \lambda\| = u(\rho'(x_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}}, \lambda)$$

for every $x_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}} \in (\rho')^{-1}(T)$ and every $\lambda \in F_p^{t'}$.

Combining everything above, for each choice of $\lambda \in R', \lambda' \in T, \mu, \mu' \in F_p^{t'}$, we obtain a single value $w \in \mathbb{D}$ such that for each $x_{[k]} \in G_{[k]}$ such that $\rho(x_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}}) = \lambda, \rho'(x_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}}) = \lambda', \alpha''(x_{[k]}) = \mu$, and $\gamma(x_{[k]\{d_{r+1}\}}) = \mu'$,

$$|\mathbf{C}_{d_{r+1}} \cdots \mathbf{C}_{d_{1}} f(x_{[k]}) - w| \leq \varepsilon .$$

Pick $\varepsilon' = \frac{\varepsilon}{\eta_2}, \eta_1 = \frac{\eta_1}{\eta_2}, \eta_2 = \frac{\eta_2}{\eta_2}$ to finish the proof. 

**Proof of Theorem 7.** To reduce the theorem to Lemma 8, we first apply Theorem 1 for the $L^1$ norm with approximation parameter $2^{-\tau-1}\varepsilon$. That yields

- a positive integer $l(1) = \exp((2k+1)(D_{\eta_1^{-1}}^n+2)) \left(O(\varepsilon^{-O(1)})\right)$,

- constants $c_{1}^{(1)}, \ldots, c_{l(1)}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{D}$, and
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• multiaffine forms $\phi_1^{(1)} \ldots, \phi_1^{(r)} : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}_p$ such that

$$C_k \ldots C_1 C_k \ldots C_1 f \overset{2^{-r-1}\varepsilon}{\approx} L^1 \sum_{i \in [l]} c_i^{(1)} \chi \circ \phi_i^{(1)}.$$ 

Define $g : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{C}$ as follows. For given $x_{[k]}$, let $\sigma = \sum_{i \in [l]} c_i^{(1)} \chi(\phi_i(x_{[k]}))$. Set

$$g(x_{[k]}) = \begin{cases} \sigma, & \text{when } |\sigma| \leq 1 \\ \frac{\sigma}{|\sigma|}, & \text{when } |\sigma| > 1. \end{cases}$$

Notice that $g$ is constant on layers of $\phi$ and that $C_k \ldots C_1 C_k \ldots C_1 f \overset{2^{-r-1}\varepsilon}{\approx} L^1 g$.

Now apply Lemma [8] to obtain approximation in the $L^\infty$ norm, though with slightly larger approximation parameter:

$$\left\| C_{d_r} \ldots C_{d_1} C_k \ldots C_1 C_k \ldots C_1 f - C_{d_r} \ldots C_{d_1} g \right\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$ 

Finally, we may apply Lemma [9] to approximate $C_{d_r} \ldots C_{d_1} g$ with error parameter $\varepsilon/2$. We obtain positive integers $l, s \in \mathbb{N}$, $t = O(l^{1/2} \log p, \varepsilon^{-1})O(1)$, multiaffine maps $\beta : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}_p^l$, $\alpha : G_{[k]} \to \mathbb{F}_p^l$, a map $c : \mathbb{F}_p^l \to \mathbb{D}$, and a collection of values $B \subset \mathbb{F}_p^s$ such that

$$|\beta^{-1}(B)| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|G_{[k]}|$$

and

$$\left| C_{d_r} \ldots C_{d_1} g(x_{[k]}) - c(\alpha(x_{[k]})) \right| \leq \varepsilon/2$$

for every $x_{[k]} \in \beta^{-1}(B)$.

It follows that

$$\left| C_{d_r} \ldots C_{d_1} C_k \ldots C_1 C_k \ldots C_1 f(x_{[k]}) - c(\alpha(x_{[k]})) \right|$$

$$\leq \left| C_{d_r} \ldots C_{d_1} C_k \ldots C_1 C_k \ldots C_1 f(x_{[k]}) - C_{d_r} \ldots C_{d_1} g(x_{[k]}) \right| + \left| C_{d_r} \ldots C_{d_1} g(x_{[k]}) - c(\alpha(x_{[k]})) \right|$$

$$\leq \varepsilon$$

for each $x_{[k]} \in \beta^{-1}(B)$, which completes the proof.

**Corollary 95.** Let $G_{[k]}$ be $\mathbb{F}_p$-vector spaces. Suppose that $X \subset G_{[k]}$ is a set of density $\delta > 0$ such that for each $d \in [k]$, $x_{[k]\{d\}}$ is a (possibly empty) subspace. Then $X$ contains a multilinear variety of codimension $\exp(O(1))(O(\delta^{-1}))$.

**Proof.** Apply Theorem [8] with $\varepsilon = \delta/2$. Then $X$ contains a non-empty variety $V$ of codimension $r = \exp(O(1))(O(\delta^{-1}))$. Apply Lemma [8] to get a multilinear non-empty variety $\tilde{V}$ of codimension $O(r)$ inside $X$. Since

$$\tilde{V} \subset \text{supp} C_k \ldots C_1 V \subset \text{supp} C_k \ldots C_1 X \subset X,$$

we are done.
Corollary 96 (General finite fields version). Let $G[k]$ be $\mathbb{F}$-vector spaces and let $X \subset G[k]$ be a set of density $\delta > 0$ such that for each $d \in [k]$ and each $x[k \setminus \{d\}]$, the slice $X_{x[k \setminus \{d\}]}$ is a (possibly empty) $\mathbb{F}$-subspace. Then, there exist a positive integer $r = \exp(O(1))(O(\delta^{-1}))$ and a $\mathbb{F}_p$-mixed-linear map $\theta : G[k] \to \mathbb{F}_p^r$ such that

$$\bigcap_{d \in [k], \lambda \in \mathbb{F}(\setminus \{0\})} \{x[k] \in G[k] : \theta(x[d-1], \lambda x_d, x[d+1,k]) = 0\} \subset X.$$

This is best possible – it is easy to check that the set on the left-hand-side of the expression in the conclusion of the corollary is indeed an $\mathbb{F}$-subspace in each direction. It is naturally dense, since it is a non-empty $\mathbb{F}_p$-variety of bounded codimension.

Proof. Apply the previous corollary and let $\theta$ be a $\mathbb{F}_p$-mixed-linear map $\theta : G[k] \to \mathbb{F}_p^r$ such that $\theta^{-1}(0) \subset X$, where $r = \exp(O(1))(O(\delta^{-1}))$. Then $X$ contains the variety

$$\bigcap_{d \in [k], \lambda \in \mathbb{F}(\setminus \{0\})} \{x[k] \in G[k] : \theta(x[d-1], \lambda x_d, x[d+1,k]) = 0\}$$

as well. \qed
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