arXiv:2208.06896v4 [math.CA] 14 Mar 2023

LENGTH OF SETS UNDER RESTRICTED FAMILIES OF PROJECTIONS ONTO LINES

TERENCE L. J. HARRIS

ABSTRACT. Let $\gamma : I \to S^2$ be a C^2 curve with $\det(\gamma, \gamma', \gamma'')$ nonvanishing, and for each $\theta \in I$ let ρ_θ be orthogonal projection onto the span of $\gamma(\theta)$. It is shown that if $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ is a Borel set of Hausdorff dimension strictly greater than 1, then $\rho_\theta(A)$ has positive length for a.e. $\theta \in I$. This answers a question raised by Käenmäki, Orponen and Venieri.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let S^2 be the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^3$, let $\gamma : I \to S^2$ be a C^2 curve with $\det(\gamma, \gamma', \gamma'')$ nonvanishing on an interval I, and let ρ_θ be orthogonal projection onto the span of $\gamma(\theta)$, given by

$$\rho_\theta(x) = \langle x, \gamma(\theta)\rangle\gamma(\theta), \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

In [2, Conjecture 1.6], Fässler and Orponen conjectured that for any analytic set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$

$$\dim \rho_\theta(A) = \min\{\dim A, 1\}, \qquad \text{a.e. } \theta \in I,$$

where $\dim B$ means the Hausdorff dimension of B. For general C^2 curves this was resolved by Pramanik, Yang and Zahl [11], and independently by Gan, Guth and Maldague [5]. The case where γ is a non-great circle was resolved earlier by Käenmäki, Orponen and Venieri [7], who asked [7, p. 4] whether $\dim A > 1$ implies that $\rho_\theta(A)$ has positive length for a.e. $\theta \in I$. This had been shown previously by Fässler and Orponen [2, Theorem 1.9] in the special case where A is a self-similar set without rotations. The following theorem resolves the general case.

Theorem 1.1. *If $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ is an analytic set with $\dim A > 1$, then*

$$\dim\left\{\theta \in I : \mathcal{H}^1(\rho_\theta(A)) = 0\right\} \leq \frac{4 - \dim A}{3}.$$

Throughout, the symbol $\mathcal{H}^s$ will be used for the s-dimensional Hausdorff measure on Euclidean space. By Frostman's lemma, Theorem 1.1 will follow from Theorem 1.2 below. For the statement, some notation will be defined first. Given a Borel measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^3$ and $\alpha \geq 0$, define

$$c_\alpha(\mu) = \sup_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \\ r > 0}} \frac{\mu(B(x,r))}{r^\alpha}.$$

For each $\theta \in I$, the pushforward measure $\rho_{\theta\#}\mu$ is defined by

$$(\rho_{\theta\#}\mu)(E) = \mu\left(\rho_\theta^{-1}(E)\right),$$

for any Borel set E.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 28A78; 28A80.
Key words and phrases. Hausdorff dimension, orthogonal projection.

Theorem 1.2. *If μ is a Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}^3$ with $c_\alpha(\mu) < \infty$ for some $\alpha > 1$, then*

$$\dim \left\{\theta \in I : \rho_{\theta\#}\mu \not\ll \mathcal{H}^1\right\} \leq \frac{4-\alpha}{3}.$$

The notation $\rho_{\theta\#}\mu \not\ll \mathcal{H}^1$ means that $\rho_{\theta\#}\mu$ is not absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathcal{H}^1$. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is similar to the proof of Theorem 8 in [4], which solved the analogous problem of projections onto planes. It uses a variant of the decomposition of a measure into "good" and "bad" parts, which originated in [6].

Given $s \geq 0$, a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ is called an s-set if A is $\mathcal{H}^s$-measurable with $0 < \mathcal{H}^s(A) < \infty$. Theorem 1.2 implies Theorem 1.1, but it also implies the following slightly stronger version for s-sets.

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose that $s > 1$, and that $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ is an s-set. Let μ be the Borel measure defined by $\mu(F) = \mathcal{H}^s(F \cap A)$ for any Borel set $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$, and let*

$$E = \left\{\theta \in I : \rho_{\theta\#}\mu \not\ll \mathcal{H}^1\right\}.$$

Then

$$\dim E \leq \frac{4-s}{3},$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}^1(\rho_\theta(B)) > 0, \quad \text{for all } \theta \in I \setminus E.$$

for any $\mathcal{H}^s$-measurable set $B \subseteq A$ with $\mathcal{H}^s(B) > 0$.

Theorem 1.3 is related to a lemma of Marstrand (see [9, Lemma 13]), which states that for $s > 1$, for any s-set A in the plane, there is a measure zero set of exceptional directions, such that any s-set $B \subseteq A$ projects onto a set of positive Lebesgue measure outside of this set of exceptional directions.

Theorem 1.3 also implies Theorem 1.1, since any analytic set of infinite $\mathcal{H}^s$ measure contains a closed set of positive finite $\mathcal{H}^s$ measure [1].

2. Proof of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3

Throughout this section, $\gamma : I \to S^2$ will be a fixed C^2 unit speed curve with $\det(\gamma, \gamma', \gamma'')$ nonvanishing on I, where I is a compact interval. For $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$, $m(A)$ will denote the Lebesgue measure of A.

Definition 2.1. *Let*

$$\Lambda = \bigcup_{j \geq 1} \Lambda_j,$$

where each Λ_j is a collection of boxes τ of dimensions $1 \times 2^{j/2} \times 2^j$, forming a finitely overlapping cover of the ~ 1-neighbourhood of the truncated light cone Γ_j in the standard way, where

$$\Gamma_j = \left\{t\gamma(\theta) : 2^{j-1} \leq |t| \leq 2^j, \quad \theta \in I\right\}.$$

Each $\tau \in \Lambda_j$ has an angle θ_τ such that the long axis of τ is parallel to $\gamma(\theta_\tau)$, the medium axis of τ is parallel to $\gamma'(\theta_\tau)$, and the short axis of τ is parallel to $(\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta_\tau)$. Let $\{\psi_\tau\}_{\tau \in \Lambda}$ be a smooth partition of unity subordinate to the cover

$\{1.1\tau : \tau \in \Lambda\}$ *of* $\bigcup_{\tau\in\Lambda}\tau$*, such that for any* $\xi, v \in \mathbb{R}^3$*,* $t \in \mathbb{R}$ *and any positive integer* n*,*

$$\left|\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)^n \psi_\tau(\xi + tv)\right| \lesssim_n \left|2^{-j}\left\langle v, \gamma(\theta_\tau)\right\rangle\right|^n + \left|2^{-j/2}\left\langle v, \gamma'(\theta_\tau)\right\rangle\right|^n + \left|\langle v, (\gamma\times\gamma')(\theta_\tau)\rangle\right|^n. \tag{2.1}$$

Fix $\widetilde{\delta} > 0$*. For each* $\tau \in \Lambda$*, let* $\mathbb{T}_\tau$ *be a collection of boxes (referred to as "planks") of dimensions* $2^{j\widetilde{\delta}} \times 2^{j\left(\widetilde{\delta}-1/2\right)} \times 2^{j\left(\widetilde{\delta}-1\right)}$*, forming a finitely overlapping cover of* $\mathbb{R}^3$*, such that for each* $T \in \mathbb{T}_\tau$*, the short axis of* T *is parallel to* $\gamma(\theta_\tau)$*, the medium axis is parallel to* $\gamma'(\theta_\tau)$*, and the long axis is parallel to* $(\gamma\times\gamma')(\theta_\tau)$ *(so that* T *is "dual" to* τ*). Let* $\{\eta_T\}_{T\in\mathbb{T}_\tau}$ *be a smooth partition of unity subordinate to the cover* $\mathbb{T}_\tau$ *of* $\mathbb{R}^3$*, such that for any* $x, v \in \mathbb{R}^3$*, any* $t \in \mathbb{R}$ *and any positive integer* n*,*

$$\left|\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)^n \eta_T(x + tv)\right| \lesssim_n \left|2^{j\left(1-\widetilde{\delta}\right)}\left\langle v, \gamma(\theta_\tau)\right\rangle\right|^n + \left|2^{j\left(1/2-\widetilde{\delta}\right)}\left\langle v, \gamma'(\theta_\tau)\right\rangle\right|^n + \left|2^{-j\widetilde{\delta}}\left\langle v, (\gamma\times\gamma')(\theta_\tau)\right\rangle\right|^n. \tag{2.2}$$

Given a finite complex Borel measure μ *on* $\mathbb{R}^3$*, define*

$$M_T\mu = \eta_T\left(\mu * \widetilde{\psi_\tau}\right).$$

For each $\theta \in I$, let π_θ be orthogonal projection onto the orthogonal complement of $(\gamma\times\gamma')(\theta)$. The following lemma is essentially a special case of Lemma 5 from [4], but the proof will be included here for completeness.

Lemma 2.2. *There exists an* $r > 0$*, depending only on* γ*, such that the following holds. Let* $j \geq 1$ *and let* $\tau \in \Lambda_j$*. If* $\theta \in I$ *is such that* $2^{j\left(\widetilde{\delta}-1/2\right)} \leq |\theta_\tau - \theta| \leq r$*, then for any* $T \in \mathbb{T}_\tau$*, for any positive integer* N *and for any* $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$*,*

$$\left\|\pi_{\theta\#}M_T f\right\|_{L^1(\mathcal{H}^2)} \leq C2^{-j\widetilde{\delta}N}\left\|f\right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}, \tag{2.3}$$

where $C = C\left(N, \gamma, \widetilde{\delta}\right)$*.*

Proof. For any $x \in (\gamma\times\gamma')(\theta)^\perp$,

$$(\pi_{\theta\#}M_T f)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\int_\tau f(y)\psi_\tau(\xi)e^{-2\pi i\langle\xi, x-y\rangle}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}}\eta_T(x + t(\gamma\times\gamma')(\theta))e^{-2\pi it\langle\xi,(\gamma\times\gamma')(\theta)\rangle}\,dt\right]d\xi\,dy. \tag{2.4}$$

Let $\xi \in \tau$. By integrating by parts n times, and using (2.2),

$$\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}}\eta_T(x + t(\gamma\times\gamma')(\theta))e^{-2\pi it\langle\xi,(\gamma\times\gamma')(\theta)\rangle}\,dt\right| \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}}\chi_T(x + t(\gamma\times\gamma')(\theta))\,dt\times \frac{2^{j\widetilde{\delta}}}{\left|\langle(\gamma\times\gamma')(\theta), \xi\rangle\right|^n}\Big(2^{j\left(1-\widetilde{\delta}\right)}\left|\langle(\gamma\times\gamma')(\theta), \gamma(\theta_\tau)\rangle\right| + 2^{j\left(1/2-\widetilde{\delta}\right)}\left|\langle(\gamma\times\gamma')(\theta), \gamma'(\theta_\tau)\rangle\right| + 2^{-j\widetilde{\delta}}\left|\langle(\gamma\times\gamma')(\theta), (\gamma\times\gamma')(\theta_\tau)\rangle\right|\Big)^n. \tag{2.5}$$

By the definition of τ,

$$\langle (\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta), \xi \rangle = \\ \xi_1 \langle (\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta), \gamma(\theta_\tau) \rangle + \xi_2 \langle (\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta), \gamma'(\theta_\tau) \rangle + \xi_3 \langle (\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta), (\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta_\tau) \rangle,$$

where $2^{j-2} \leq |\xi_1| \leq 2^{j+2}$, $|\xi_2| \leq 2^{j/2}$ and $|\xi_3| \leq 1$. Let $\varepsilon := |\theta_\tau - \theta|$. By a second order Taylor approximation (using that γ is C^2) and the scalar triple product formula,

$$|\xi_1 \langle (\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta), \gamma(\theta_\tau) \rangle| \sim \varepsilon^2 2^j,$$

provided r is small enough. Moreover

$$|\xi_2 \langle (\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta), \gamma'(\theta_\tau) \rangle| \lesssim 2^{j/2} \varepsilon, \quad |\xi_3 \langle (\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta), (\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta_\tau) \rangle| \leq 1.$$

Since $\varepsilon \geq 2^{j(\widetilde{\delta} - 1/2)}$, it follows that

$$|\langle (\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta), \xi \rangle| \sim \varepsilon^2 2^j,$$

provided that r is sufficiently small and j is sufficiently large. Using second order Taylor approximation in a similar way gives that

$$2^{j(1-\widetilde{\delta})} |\langle (\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta), \gamma(\theta_\tau) \rangle| \\ + 2^{j(1/2-\widetilde{\delta})} |\langle (\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta), \gamma'(\theta_\tau) \rangle| + 2^{-j\widetilde{\delta}} |\langle (\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta), (\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta_\tau) \rangle| \lesssim 2^{j(1-\widetilde{\delta})} \varepsilon^2.$$

It follows that

$$(2.5) \lesssim_n 2^{-j\widetilde{\delta}(n-1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_T(x + t(\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta))\, dt.$$

Substituting this into (2.4) gives that

$$|(\pi_{\theta\#} M_T f)(x)| \lesssim_n 2^{-j\widetilde{\delta}(n-1)} \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}\, m(\tau) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_T(x + t(\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta))\, dt,$$

for any $x \in (\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta)^\perp$. Integrating over $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in (\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta)^\perp$ gives (2.3). $\square$

The following lemma is essentially the same as Lemma 4 from [4], but again the proof is included for completeness.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $j \geq 1$ and let $\tau \in \Lambda_j$. For any finite compactly supported Borel measure μ,*

$$\|M_T \mu\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leq 2^{3j\widetilde{\delta}} \mu(2T) + C_N 2^{-j\widetilde{\delta}N} \mu(\mathbb{R}^3),$$

for any positive integer N.

Proof. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \|M_T \mu\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} &= \int \eta_T(x) \left| \int \widetilde{\psi_\tau}(x-y)\, d\mu(y) \right| dx \\ &\leq \int_T \int_{2T} \left| \widetilde{\psi_\tau}(x-y) \right| d\mu(y)\, dx \\ &\quad + \int_T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus 2T} \left| \widetilde{\psi_\tau}(x-y) \right| d\mu(y)\, dx. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

The first integral satisfies

$$\int_T \int_{2T} \left| \widetilde{\psi_\tau}(x-y) \right| d\mu(y)\, dx \leq 2^{3j\widetilde{\delta}} \mu(2T). \tag{2.7}$$

The second integral satisfies

$$\int_T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus 2T} \left|\widetilde{\psi_\tau}(x-y)\right| \, d\mu(y)\, dx \leq \mu(\mathbb{R}^3) \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus T_0} \left|\widetilde{\psi_\tau}\right|,$$

where T_0 is the translate of the plank T to the origin, parallel to T. Integrating by parts, and using (2.1), gives that for any $k \geq 0$, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus 2^k T_0$,

$$\left|\widetilde{\psi_\tau}(x)\right| \lesssim_N 2^{-kN - j\widetilde{\delta}N} m(\tau).$$

Summing a geometric series over $k \geq 0$ gives (with relabelled N)

$$\int_T \int_{\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus 2T} \left|\widetilde{\psi_\tau}(x-y)\right| \, d\mu(y)\, dx \leq C_N \mu(\mathbb{R}^3) 2^{-j\widetilde{\delta}N}. \tag{2.8}$$

Putting (2.7) and (2.8) into (2.6) finishes the proof. □

For a function $f : X \to [0, +\infty]$ on a measure space $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$, let $\int_* f \, d\mu$ denote the lower integral of f, defined by

$$\int_* f \, d\mu = \sup \left\{ \int g \, d\mu : g \text{ is simple and } \mathcal{A}\text{-measurable with } 0 \leq g \leq f \right\},$$

where "simple" means that g takes finitely many values. In the application of Lemma 2.4 below, the integrand will be measurable, so the use of the lower integral is not important and is only a technical convenience to avoid measurability issues. The definition of the lower integral is standard; see e.g. [10, p. 13].

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\beta \in [0,1]$, let $\alpha = 4 - 3\beta$, and let λ be a Borel measure supported on I with $c_\beta(\lambda) \leq 1$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$\int_* (\rho_{\theta\#}\mu) \left(\bigcup_{D \in \mathbb{D}_\theta} D \right) d\lambda(\theta) \leq C(\lambda, \delta, \epsilon, \gamma) R^{-\delta} \mu(\mathbb{R}^3), \tag{2.9}$$

for any $R \geq 1$, for any Borel measure μ on $B_3(0,1)$ with $c_\alpha(\mu) \leq 1$, and for any family of sets $\{\mathbb{D}_\theta\}$, where each $\mathbb{D}_\theta$ is a disjoint set of intervals of diameter $2R^{-1}$ in the span of $\gamma(\theta)$, each with cardinality $|\mathbb{D}_\theta| \leq R^{1-\epsilon}\mu(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

Remark 1. *Lemma 2.4 roughly says that the pushforward $\rho_{\theta\#}\mu$ of a $(4-3\beta)$-dimensional measure μ satisfies a 1-dimensional Frostman condition on average. By taking $\beta = 1$ (for example), this is enough to conclude that projections of 1-dimensional sets are a.e. 1-dimensional, but the main application of Lemma 2.4 here will be to bound the L^1 norm of the "bad" part of the measure in the proof of Theorem 1.2. The "bad" part of the measure corresponds to intervals of large $\rho_{\theta\#}\mu$-mass, which will automatically satisfy the cardinality assumption of Lemma 2.4.*

Proof of Lemma 2.4. It may be assumed that $\alpha \leq 3$, since otherwise the lemma is trivial. Since the constant is allowed to depend on γ, it can be assumed that γ is localised to a smaller interval on which Lemma 2.2 holds.

Let ϕ_R be a non-negative bump function supported in $B(0, R^{-1})$ which integrates to 1, defined by

$$\phi_R(x) = R^3 \phi(Rx),$$

for some fixed non-negative bump function ϕ with support in $B(0,1)$ such that $\int \phi = 1$. For any θ and any $D \in \mathbb{D}_\theta$, the 1-Lipschitz property of orthogonal projections implies that

$$\left[\rho_{\theta\#}(\mu * \phi_R)\right](2D) \geq (\rho_{\theta\#}\mu)(D),$$

where $2D$ is the interval with the same centre as D, but twice the radius. Moreover,

$$c_\alpha(\mu * \phi_R) \lesssim c_\alpha(\mu),$$

so it suffices to prove (2.9) with $\mu * \phi_R$ in place of μ. To simplify notation the new measure will not be relabelled, but it will be assumed throughout that μ is a non-negative Schwartz function, and that

$$|\widehat{\mu}(\xi)| \leq C_N(R/\xi)^N, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^3, \tag{2.10}$$

for any positive integer N, where C_N is a constant depending only on N.

Let ϵ_0 be any positive real number which is strictly larger than the the infimum over all positive ϵ for which the conclusion of the lemma is true. It suffices to prove that the lemma holds for any $\epsilon > (2\epsilon_0)/3$, so let such an ϵ be given. Let $R \geq 1$ and choose a non-negative integer J such that $2^J \sim R^{\epsilon/1000}$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be such that $\varepsilon \ll \epsilon - \frac{2\epsilon_0}{3}$. Choose $\widetilde{\delta} > 0$ such that $\widetilde{\delta} \ll \min\{\delta_{\epsilon_0}, \varepsilon\}$, where δ_{ϵ_0} is a δ corresponding to ϵ_0 that satisfies (2.9).

Define the "bad" part of μ by

$$\mu_b = \sum_{j \geq J} \sum_{\tau \in \Lambda_j} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}} M_T \mu, \tag{2.11}$$

where, for each $\tau \in \Lambda_j$, the set of "bad" planks corresponding to τ is defined by

$$\mathbb{T}_{\tau,b} = \left\{ T \in \mathbb{T}_\tau : \mu(4T) \geq 2^{j(\epsilon_0 - 1)} \right\}, \tag{2.12}$$

where $4T$ is a plank with the same centre as T, but scaled by a factor of 4. Define the "good" part of μ by

$$\mu_g = \mu - \mu_b.$$

The Schwartz decay of μ implies that the sum in (2.11) converges in the Schwartz space $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. This implies that μ_b and μ_g are Schwartz functions, and in particular they are finite complex measures. Pushforwards of complex measures are defined just as for positive measures. By[1] Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_* (\rho_{\theta\#}\mu) \left(\bigcup_{D \in \mathbb{D}_\theta} D \right) d\lambda(\theta) \leq & \int \|\rho_{\theta\#}\mu_b\|_{L^1(\mathcal{H}^1)} \, d\lambda(\theta) \\ & + \sup_{\theta \in I} \mathcal{H}^1 \left(\bigcup_{D \in \mathbb{D}_\theta} D \right)^{1/2} \left(\int \|\rho_{\theta\#}\mu_g\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{H}^1)} \, d\lambda(\theta) \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

[1]The particular Cauchy-Schwarz technique used here is from [8].

The contribution from the "bad" part will be bounded first. By the triangle inequality,

$$\int \|\rho_{\theta\#}\mu_b\|_{L^1(\mathcal{H}^1)}\, d\lambda(\theta) \le \sum_{j\ge J}\int \sum_{\tau\in\Lambda_j}\sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}} \|\rho_{\theta\#}M_T\mu\|_{L^1(\mathcal{H}^1)}\, d\lambda(\theta)$$

$$= \sum_{j\ge J}\int \sum_{\substack{\tau\in\Lambda_j:\\ |\theta_\tau-\theta|\le 2^{j(\widetilde{\delta}-1/2)}}}\sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}} \|\rho_{\theta\#}M_T\mu\|_{L^1(\mathcal{H}^1)}\, d\lambda(\theta) \tag{2.13}$$

$$+ \sum_{j\ge J}\int \sum_{\substack{\tau\in\Lambda_j:\\ |\theta_\tau-\theta|> 2^{j(\widetilde{\delta}-1/2)}}}\sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}} \|\rho_{\theta\#}M_T\mu\|_{L^1(\mathcal{H}^1)}\, d\lambda(\theta). \tag{2.14}$$

Let π_θ be orthogonal projection onto $(\gamma\times\gamma')(\theta)^\perp$. By the inequality

$$\|\rho_{\theta\#}f\|_{L^1(\mathcal{H}^1)} \le \|\pi_{\theta\#}f\|_{L^1(\mathcal{H}^2)},$$

followed by Lemma 2.2,

$$(2.14) \lesssim 2^{-J}\mu(\mathbb{R}^3) \sim R^{-\epsilon/1000}\mu(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

By the inequality

$$\|\rho_{\theta\#}f\|_{L^1(\mathcal{H}^1)} \le \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)},$$

followed by Lemma 2.3,

$$(2.13) \le \sum_{j\ge J}\int \sum_{\substack{\tau\in\Lambda_j:\\ |\theta_\tau-\theta|\le 2^{j(\widetilde{\delta}-1/2)}}}\sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}} \|M_T\mu\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}\, d\lambda(\theta)$$

$$\lesssim 2^{-J}\mu(\mathbb{R}^3) + \sum_{j\ge J} 2^{3j\widetilde{\delta}}\int \sum_{\substack{\tau\in\Lambda_j:\\ |\theta_\tau-\theta|\le 2^{j(\widetilde{\delta}-1/2)}}}\sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}} \mu(2T)\, d\lambda(\theta),$$

The non-tail term satisfies

$$\sum_{j\ge J} 2^{3j\widetilde{\delta}}\int \sum_{\substack{\tau\in\Lambda_j:\\ |\theta_\tau-\theta|\le 2^{j(\widetilde{\delta}-1/2)}}}\sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}} \mu(2T)\, d\lambda(\theta) \lesssim \sum_{j\ge J} 2^{10j\widetilde{\delta}}\int \mu(B_j(\theta))\, d\lambda(\theta), \tag{2.15}$$

where, for each $\theta\in I$ and each j,

$$B_j(\theta) = \bigcup_{\substack{\tau\in\Lambda_j:\\ |\theta_\tau-\theta|\le 2^{j(\widetilde{\delta}-1/2)}}}\ \bigcup_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}} 2T.$$

The inequality (2.15) used that for each j and each $\theta\in I$, there are $\lesssim 2^{j\widetilde{\delta}}$ sets $\tau\in\Lambda_j$ with the property that $|\theta_\tau-\theta|\le 2^{j(\widetilde{\delta}-1/2)}$, which means each of the planks $2T$ in the union defining $B_j(\theta)$ intersects $\lesssim 2^{j\widetilde{\delta}}$ of the others. For each T in the union defining $B_j(\theta)$, the set $(4T)\cap B(0,1)$ is contained in a plank T_θ of dimensions

$$\sim 2^{j(2\widetilde{\delta}-1)}\times 2^{j(\widetilde{\delta}-1/2)}\times 1,$$

with short direction parallel to $\gamma(\theta)$, medium direction parallel to $\gamma'(\theta)$, and long direction parallel to $(\gamma\times\gamma')(\theta)$, where the implicit constant depends only on γ; this

follows from the second order Taylor approximation for γ. Therefore, the intervals in the set

$$\left\{\rho_\theta(T_\theta) : T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}, \quad \tau \in \Lambda_j, \quad |\theta_\tau - \theta| \leq 2^{j\left(\widetilde{\delta}-1/2\right)}\right\},$$

all have length $\sim 2^{j\left(2\widetilde{\delta}-1\right)}$, and form a cover of $\rho_\theta(B_j(\theta) \cap B(0,1))$. By the Vitali covering lemma, there is a disjoint subcollection

$$\{\rho_\theta(T_\theta) : T \in \mathcal{B}_\theta\},$$

indexed by some set $\mathcal{B}_\theta$, such that

$$\{3\rho_\theta(T_\theta) : T \in \mathcal{B}_\theta\},$$

is a cover of $\rho_\theta(B_j(\theta) \cap B(0,1))$. The set $\mathcal{B}_\theta$ has cardinality $|\mathcal{B}_\theta| \leq \mu(\mathbb{R}^3)2^{j(1-\epsilon_0)}$; by disjointness and the definition of the "bad" planks (see (2.12)). Since the conclusion of the lemma holds for ϵ_0, it follows that for each $j \geq J$,

$$\int \mu(B_j(\theta))\, d\lambda(\theta) \leq \int (\rho_{\theta\#}\mu)\left(\bigcup_{T_\theta \in \mathcal{B}_\theta} 3\rho_\theta(T_\theta)\right) d\lambda(\theta) \lesssim 2^{j\left(-\delta_{\epsilon_0}/2+10\widetilde{\delta}\right)}\mu(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

The set $B_j(\theta)$ is piecewise constant in θ over a partition of I into Borel sets, so it may be assumed that the integrands above are Borel measurable. Since $\widetilde{\delta} \ll \delta_{\epsilon_0}$, the inequality above yields

$$(2.13) \lesssim \mu(\mathbb{R}^3)2^{-(J\delta_{\epsilon_0})/100} \sim \mu(\mathbb{R}^3)R^{-(\epsilon\delta_{\epsilon_0})/10^5}.$$

It remains to bound the contribution from μ_g. By the assumptions in the lemma,

$$\sup_{\theta \in I} \mathcal{H}^1\left(\bigcup_{D \in \mathbb{D}_\theta} D\right) \lesssim R^{-\epsilon}\mu(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Since $\varepsilon \ll \epsilon - (2\epsilon_0)/3$, it suffices to prove that

$$\int \|\rho_{\theta\#}\mu_g\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{H}^1)}\, d\lambda(\theta) \lesssim \max\left\{R^{2\epsilon_0/3+1000\varepsilon}, R^{\epsilon/2}\right\}\mu(\mathbb{R}^3),$$

By Plancherel's theorem in 1 dimension,

$$\int \|\rho_{\theta\#}\mu_g\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{H}^1)}\, d\lambda(\theta) = \int \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\widehat{\mu_g}(t\gamma(\theta))|^2\, dt\, d\lambda(\theta).$$

To formally prove this identity, one approach is to rotate $\gamma(\theta)$ to $(1,0,0)$ (using that $\mathcal{H}^1$ is a rotation invariant measure on $\mathbb{R}^3$), and apply Plancherel's theorem on $\mathbb{R}$. By symmetry, by summing a geometric series, and by the rapid decay of $\widehat{\mu}$ outside $B(0,R)$ (see (2.10)), it will suffice to bound

$$\int \int_{2^{j-1}}^{2^j} |\widehat{\mu_g}\,(t\gamma(\theta))|^2\, dt\, d\lambda(\theta),$$

for any $j \geq 2J$ with $2^j \leq R^{1+\widetilde{\delta}}$; the contribution from the small frequencies can be bounded trivially by the definition of J. For each $\tau \in \Lambda$, define the set of "good" planks corresponding to τ by

$$\mathbb{T}_{\tau,g} = \mathbb{T}_\tau \setminus \mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}.$$

Then

$$\int\int_{2^{j-1}}^{2^j} |\widehat{\mu_g}\,(t\gamma(\theta))|^2\,dt\,d\lambda(\theta)$$
$$\lesssim \int\int_{2^{j-1}}^{2^j} \left|\sum_{\tau\in\bigcup_{|j'-j|\le 2}\Lambda_{j'}}\sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,g}} \widehat{M_T\mu}\,(t\gamma(\theta))\right|^2 dt\,d\lambda(\theta) + 2^{-j}\mu(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Since the τ's are finitely overlapping,

$$\int\int_{2^{j-1}}^{2^j} \left|\sum_{\tau\in\bigcup_{|j'-j|\le 2}\Lambda_{j'}}\sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,g}} \widehat{M_T\mu}\,(t\gamma(\theta))\right|^2 dt\,d\lambda(\theta) \lesssim 2^{-j}\mu(\mathbb{R}^3) \tag{2.16}$$
$$+\sum_{\tau\in\bigcup_{|j'-j|\le 2}\Lambda_{j'}} \int\int_{2^{j-1}}^{2^j} \left|\sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,g}} \widehat{M_T\mu}\,(t\gamma(\theta))\right|^2 dt\,d\lambda(\theta).$$

The uncertainty principle implies that each of the integrals in the right-hand side of (2.16) is bounded by $2^{-j\beta}$ times the integral of the same function over $\mathbb{R}^3$. More precisely, for each $\tau \in \bigcup_{|j'-j|\le 2}\Lambda_{j'}$, the contribution from the planks in the above sum with $T \cap B\left(0, 2^{10j\widetilde{\delta}}\right) = \emptyset$ is negligible since μ is supported in $B(0,1)$. The remaining sum

$$g_\tau = \sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,g}:T\cap B\left(0,2^{10j\widetilde{\delta}}\right)\neq\emptyset} M_T\mu,$$

is equal to $g_\tau\varphi$ where φ is a smooth bump function on $B\left(0, 2^{1+10j\widetilde{\delta}}\right)$ obtained by rescaling a bump function on the unit ball, and therefore by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$|\widehat{g_\tau}|^2 \lesssim |\widehat{g_\tau}|^2 * \zeta, \tag{2.17}$$

where

$$\zeta(\xi) = \frac{2^{30j\delta}}{1+|2^{10j\delta}\xi|^{100}}, \qquad \xi\in\mathbb{R}^3.$$

The function in the right-hand side of (2.17) is essentially constant on balls of radius $2^{-10j\widetilde{\delta}}$ (as it inherits this property from ζ), so by discretising the integral in (2.16) into balls of radius $2^{-10j\widetilde{\delta}}$ and using the condition $c_\beta(\lambda)\le 1$,

$$\int\int_{2^{j-1}}^{2^j} \left|\sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,g}} \widehat{M_T\mu}\,(t\gamma(\theta))\right|^2 dt\,d\lambda(\theta) \lesssim$$
$$2^{j\left(100\widetilde{\delta}-\beta\right)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left|\sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,g}:T\cap B\left(0,2^{10j\widetilde{\delta}}\right)\neq\emptyset} \widehat{M_T\mu}\right|^2 d\xi + 2^{-j}\mu(\mathbb{R}^3),$$

for each $\tau \in \bigcup_{|j'-j|\leq 2} \Lambda_{j'}$. Let

$$\mathbb{T}_{j,g} = \bigcup_{\tau \in \bigcup_{|j'-j|\leq 2} \Lambda_{j'}} \left\{ T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau,g} : T \cap B\left(0, 2^{10j\widetilde{\delta}}\right) \neq \emptyset \right\}.$$

By Plancherel's theorem in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and the finite overlapping property of the T's, it suffices to prove that for any $j \geq 2J$,

$$\sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{j,g}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |M_T \mu|^2 \, dx \lesssim 2^{j\left(\beta + \frac{2\epsilon_0}{3} + 100\varepsilon\right)} \mu(\mathbb{R}^3). \tag{2.18}$$

From the definition $M_T \mu = \eta_T \left(\mu * \widetilde{\psi_{\tau(T)}} \right)$ and by Fubini, the left-hand side of the above is equal to

$$\int \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{j,g}} [\eta_T M_T \mu] * \widetilde{\psi_{\tau(T)}} \, d\mu.$$

If $f_T := [\eta_T M_T \mu] * \widetilde{\psi_{\tau(T)}}$, then by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality with respect to the measure μ, the square of the above is bounded by

$$\int \left| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{j,g}} f_T \right|^2 \, d\mu \cdot \mu(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

By the uncertainty principle,

$$\int \left| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{j,g}} f_T \right|^2 \, d\mu \lesssim \int \left| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{j,g}} f_T \right|^2 \, d\mu_j,$$

where $\mu_j = \mu * \phi_j$ and $\phi_j(x) = \frac{2^{3j}}{1+|2^j x|^N}$, where $N \sim 1000/\widetilde{\delta}^2$. By dyadic pigeonholing, there exists a collection $\mathbb{W}$ of planks $T \in \mathbb{T}_{j,g}$ with $\|f_T\|_p$ constant over $T \in \mathbb{W}$ up to a factor of 2, and a union Y of disjoint 2^{-j}-balls Q such that each Q intersects $\sim M$ planks $2T \in \mathbb{W}$ for some dyadic number M, and such that

$$\int \left| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{j,g}} f_T \right|^2 \, d\mu_j \lesssim j^{10} \int_Y \left| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{W}} f_T \right|^2 \, d\mu_j + 2^{-j} \mu(\mathbb{R}^3)^2,$$

Let $p = 6$. By Hölder's inequality with respect to the Lebesgue measure,

$$\int_Y \left| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{W}} f_T \right|^2 \, d\mu_j \leq \left\| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{W}} f_T \right\|_{L^p(Y)}^2 \left(\int_Y \mu_j^{\frac{p}{p-2}} \right)^{\frac{p-2}{p}}, \tag{2.19}$$

By the dimension condition $c_\alpha(\mu) \leq 1$ on μ, the definition of Y, and the definition of the "good" planks,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_Y \mu_j^{\frac{p}{p-2}} &\lesssim 2^{\frac{2j(3-\alpha)}{p-2}} \int_Y \mu_j \\
&\leq 2^{\frac{2j(3-\alpha)}{p-2}} \sum_{Q \subseteq Y} \int_Q \mu_j \\
&\lesssim \left(\frac{1}{M}\right) \cdot 2^{\frac{2j(3-\alpha)}{p-2}} \sum_{Q \subseteq Y} \sum_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{W} \\ 2T \cap Q \neq \emptyset}} \int_{Q \cap 3T} \mu_j \\
&\lesssim \left(\frac{1}{M}\right) \cdot 2^{\frac{2j(3-\alpha)}{p-2}} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{W}} \int_{3T} \mu_j \\
&\lesssim \left(\frac{1}{M}\right) \cdot 2^{\frac{2j(3-\alpha)}{p-2}} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{W}} \mu(4T) + 2^{-100j} \\
&\lesssim 2^{\frac{2j(3-\alpha)}{p-2} + j(\epsilon_0 - 1)} \left(\frac{|\mathbb{W}|}{M}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

This bounds the second factor in (2.19), so it remains to bound the first factor.

By rescaling by 2^j, applying the refined decoupling inequality (see Theorem A.1 of the appendix), and then rescaling back,

$$\left\| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{W}} f_T \right\|_{L^p(Y)} \lesssim 2^{j\varepsilon} \left(\frac{M}{|\mathbb{W}|}\right)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} \left(\sum_{T \in \mathbb{W}} \|f_T\|_p^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Recall that $f_T = [\eta_T M_T \mu] * \widetilde{\psi_{\tau(T)}}$. By applying the Hausdorff-Young inequality, then Hölder's inequality, and then Plancherel's theorem,

$$\|f_T\|_p \lesssim \|M_T \mu\|_2 \, 2^{\frac{3j}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}\right)}.$$

Hence

$$\left\| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{W}} f_T \right\|_{L^p(Y)} \lesssim 2^{\frac{3j}{2}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p} + \varepsilon\right)} \left(\frac{M}{|\mathbb{W}|}\right)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} \left(\sum_{T \in \mathbb{W}} \|M_T \mu\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2}. \tag{2.21}$$

Putting (2.21) and (2.20) into (2.19) gives

$$\sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{j,g}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |M_T \mu|^2 \lesssim 2^{j\left[\frac{5-2\alpha}{2p} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{\epsilon_0(p-2)}{2p} + \frac{3\varepsilon}{2}\right]} \left(\sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{j,g}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |M_T \mu|^2 \right)^{1/2} \mu(\mathbb{R}^3)^{1/2}.$$

By cancelling the common factor, this gives

$$\sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{j,g}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |M_T \mu|^2 \lesssim 2^{j\left[\frac{5-2\alpha}{p} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon_0(p-2)}{p} + 3\varepsilon\right]} \mu(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Since $p = 6$ and $\alpha = 4 - 3\beta$, this simplifies to

$$\sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{j,g}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |M_T \mu|^2 \lesssim 2^{j\left(\beta + \frac{2\epsilon_0}{3} + 3\varepsilon\right)} \mu(\mathbb{R}^3),$$

which verifies (2.18), and as explained above, this proves the lemma. □

The proof of Theorem 1.2 will be similar to the proof of the lemma.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. It will first be shown that the set

$$\left\{\theta \in I : \rho_{\theta\#}\mu \not\ll \mathcal{H}^1\right\}$$

is Borel measurable. It may be assumed that μ is compactly supported, since if μ_k is the restriction of μ to $B(0,k)$, then

$$\left\{\theta \in I : \rho_{\theta\#}\mu \not\ll \mathcal{H}^1\right\} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \left\{\theta \in I : \rho_{\theta\#}\mu_k \not\ll \mathcal{H}^1\right\}.$$

For any positive integer n, the function

$$(\theta, t) \mapsto (\rho_{\theta\#}\mu)\left(B(t\gamma(\theta), 1/n)\right),$$

is lower semicontinuous on $I \times \mathbb{R}$, and is therefore Borel measurable from $I \times \mathbb{R}$ to $[0, +\infty]$ (here $B(x,r)$ denotes the *open* ball or interval of radius r around x). It follows that the function

$$(\theta, t) \mapsto \limsup_{n\to\infty} n\,(\rho_{\theta\#}\mu)\left(B(t\gamma(\theta), 1/n)\right)$$

is Borel measurable from $I \times \mathbb{R}$ to $[0, +\infty]$. By Tonelli's theorem (see e.g. [12, Theorem 1.7.15]), the function

$$\theta \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}} \limsup_{n\to\infty} n\,(\rho_{\theta\#}\mu)\left(B(t\gamma(\theta), 1/n)\right) dt$$

is Borel measurable from I to $[0, +\infty]$. It follows that the set

$$\left\{\theta \in I : \int_{\mathbb{R}} \limsup_{n\to\infty} n\,(\rho_{\theta\#}\mu)\left(B(t\gamma(\theta), 1/n)\right) dt < \mu(\mathbb{R}^3)\right\},$$

is a Borel measurable subset of I, and this set is equal to $\left\{\theta \in I : \rho_{\theta\#}\mu \not\ll \mathcal{H}^1\right\}$ by the Lebesgue differentiation theorem (see e.g. [3, Theorem 3.22]).

As in the proof of the lemma, it may be assumed that γ is localised to a small interval on which Lemma 2.2 holds. It may also be assumed that $\alpha \leq 3$, $c_\alpha(\mu) \leq 1$ and (by countable stability of the Hausdorff dimension) that μ has support in the unit ball. Let β be such that $0 \leq \beta < (4-\alpha)/3$. Let λ be a Borel measure supported on I with $c_\beta(\lambda) \leq 1$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be such that $\epsilon \ll \frac{4-\alpha}{3} - \beta$. Choose $\widetilde{\delta} > 0$ such that $\widetilde{\delta} \ll \min\{\epsilon, \delta_\epsilon\}$, where δ_ϵ is an exponent corresponding to ϵ from Lemma 2.4. Using Definition 2.1, define μ_b by

$$\mu_b = \sum_{j\geq 1} \sum_{\tau\in\Lambda_j} \sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}} M_T\mu, \tag{2.22}$$

where, for each $j \geq 1$ and $\tau \in \Lambda_j$, the set of "bad" planks corresponding to τ is defined by

$$\mathbb{T}_{\tau,b} = \left\{T \in \mathbb{T}_\tau : \mu(4T) \geq 2^{j(\epsilon-1)}\right\}.$$

Since the frequencies are no longer localised, the sum in (2.22) only converges a priori in the space of tempered distributions, but the individual functions $M_T\mu$ are smooth and compactly supported. For λ-a.e. $\theta \in I$,

$$\rho_{\theta\#}\mu_b := \sum_{j\geq 1} \sum_{\tau\in\Lambda_j} \sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}} \rho_{\theta\#}M_T\mu, \tag{2.23}$$

where, for λ-a.e. $\theta \in I$, the series will be shown to be absolutely convergent in $L^1(\mathcal{H}^1)$. Since L^1 is always a Banach space, any absolutely convergent series of L^1 functions is convergent in L^1, so the λ-a.e. absolute convergence of (2.23) in $L^1(\mathcal{H}^1)$ will imply that $\rho_{\theta\#}\mu_b \in L^1(\mathcal{H}^1)$ for λ-a.e. $\theta \in I$, and will imply that the series is well-defined as an $L^1(\mathcal{H}^1)$ limit. Define

$$\rho_{\theta\#}\mu_g = \rho_{\theta\#}\mu - \rho_{\theta\#}\mu_b,$$

for each $\lambda \in I$ such that the sum defining $\rho_{\theta\#}\mu_b$ converges in $L^1(\mathcal{H}^1)$ (which will include λ-a.e. $\theta \in I$). It will be shown that

$$\rho_{\theta\#}\mu_g \in L^2(\mathcal{H}^1),$$

for λ-a.e. $\theta \in I$. Together with $\rho_{\theta\#}\mu_b \in L^1(\mathcal{H}^1)$, this will imply that $\rho_{\theta\#}\mu \in L^1(\mathcal{H}^1)$ (or equivalently $\rho_{\theta\#}\mu \ll \mathcal{H}^1$) for λ-a.e. $\theta \in I$.

It will first be shown that

$$\int \sum_{j\geq 1} \sum_{\tau\in\Lambda_j} \sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}} \|\rho_{\theta\#}M_T\mu\|_{L^1(\mathcal{H}^1)}\, d\lambda(\theta) < \infty. \tag{2.24}$$

The proof of this is similar to the proof of Lemma 2.4, but some of the details will be included for readability. The left-hand side of (2.24) can be written as

$$\sum_{j\geq 1}\int \sum_{\tau\in\Lambda_j} \sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}} \|\rho_{\theta\#}M_T\mu\|_{L^1(\mathcal{H}^1)}\, d\lambda(\theta)$$

$$= \sum_{j\geq 1}\int \sum_{\substack{\tau\in\Lambda_j:\\ |\theta_\tau-\theta|\leq 2^{j(\widetilde{\delta}-1/2)}}} \sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}} \|\rho_{\theta\#}M_T\mu\|_{L^1(\mathcal{H}^1)}\, d\lambda(\theta) \tag{2.25}$$

$$+ \sum_{j\geq 1}\int \sum_{\substack{\tau\in\Lambda_j:\\ |\theta_\tau-\theta|> 2^{j(\widetilde{\delta}-1/2)}}} \sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}} \|\rho_{\theta\#}M_T\mu\|_{L^1(\mathcal{H}^1)}\, d\lambda(\theta). \tag{2.26}$$

By Lemma 2.2,

$$(2.26) \lesssim \mu(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

By Lemma 2.3,

$$(2.25) \leq \sum_{j\geq 1}\int \sum_{\substack{\tau\in\Lambda_j:\\ |\theta_\tau-\theta|\leq 2^{j(\widetilde{\delta}-1/2)}}} \sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}} \|M_T\mu\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}\, d\lambda(\theta)$$

$$\lesssim \mu(\mathbb{R}^3) + \sum_{j\geq 1} 2^{3j\widetilde{\delta}} \int \sum_{\substack{\tau\in\Lambda_j:\\ |\theta_\tau-\theta|\leq 2^{j(\widetilde{\delta}-1/2)}}} \sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}} \mu(2T)\, d\lambda(\theta).$$

As in the proof of Lemma 2.4, the non-tail term satisfies

$$\sum_{j\geq 1} 2^{3j\widetilde{\delta}} \int \sum_{\substack{\tau\in\Lambda_j:\\ |\theta_\tau-\theta|\leq 2^{j(\widetilde{\delta}-1/2)}}} \sum_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}} \mu(2T)\, d\lambda(\theta) \lesssim \sum_{j\geq 1} 2^{10j\widetilde{\delta}} \int \mu(B_j(\theta))\, d\lambda(\theta),$$

where, for each $\theta \in I$ and each j,

$$B_j(\theta) = \bigcup_{\substack{\tau\in\Lambda_j:\\ |\theta_\tau-\theta|\leq 2^{j(\widetilde{\delta}-1/2)}}} \bigcup_{T\in\mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}} 2T.$$

For each T in the union defining $B_j(\theta)$, the set $(4T) \cap B(0,1)$ is contained in a plank T_θ of dimensions

$$\sim 2^{j\left(2\widetilde{\delta}-1\right)} \times 2^{j\left(\widetilde{\delta}-1/2\right)} \times 1,$$

with short direction parallel to $\gamma(\theta)$, medium direction parallel to $\gamma'(\theta)$, and long direction parallel to $(\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta)$. The intervals in the set

$$\left\{\rho_\theta(T_\theta) : T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau,b}, \quad \tau \in \Lambda_j, \quad |\theta_\tau - \theta| \leq 2^{j\left(\widetilde{\delta}-1/2\right)}\right\},$$

all have length $\sim 2^{j\left(2\widetilde{\delta}-1\right)}$, and cover $\rho_\theta(B_j(\theta) \cap B(0,1))$. By the Vitali covering lemma, there is a disjoint subcollection

$$\{\rho_\theta(T_\theta) : T \in \mathcal{B}_\theta\},$$

indexed by some set $\mathcal{B}_\theta$, such that

$$\{3\rho_\theta(T_\theta) : T \in \mathcal{B}_\theta\},$$

is a cover of $\rho_\theta(B_j(\theta) \cap B(0,1))$. The set $\mathcal{B}_\theta$ has cardinality $|\mathcal{B}_\theta| \leq \mu(\mathbb{R}^3) 2^{j(1-\epsilon)}$; by disjointness and the definition of the "bad" planks. By Lemma 2.4, for each $j \geq 1$,

$$\int \mu(B_j(\theta))\, d\lambda(\theta) \leq \int (\rho_{\theta\#}\mu) \left(\bigcup_{T_\theta \in \mathcal{B}_\theta} 3\rho_\theta(T_\theta) \right) d\lambda(\theta) \lesssim 2^{j\left(-\delta_\epsilon/2+10\widetilde{\delta}\right)} \mu(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Since $\widetilde{\delta} \ll \delta_\epsilon$, summing the above inequality over j gives

$$(2.25) \lesssim \mu(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

It remains to show that $\rho_{\theta\#}\mu_g \in L^2(\mathcal{H}^1)$ for λ-a.e. $\theta \in I$. To prove this, by Plancherel's theorem in 1 dimension it suffices to show that

$$\int \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left|\widehat{\mu_g}\left(t\gamma(\theta)\right)\right|^2 \, dt\, d\lambda(\theta) < \infty.$$

By symmetry and by summing a geometric series, it is enough to show that for any $j \geq 1$,

$$\int \int_{2^{j-1}}^{2^j} \left|\widehat{\mu_g}\left(t\gamma(\theta)\right)\right|^2 \, dt\, d\lambda(\theta) \lesssim 2^{-j\epsilon}.$$

By similar reasoning to the proof of Lemma 2.4, it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{j,g}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |M_T \mu|^2 \lesssim 2^{j(\beta-10\epsilon)},$$

where

$$\mathbb{T}_{j,g} = \bigcup_{\tau \in \bigcup_{|j'-j|\leq 2} \Lambda_{j'}} \left\{T \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau,g} : T \cap B\left(0, 2^{10j\widetilde{\delta}}\right) \neq \emptyset\right\}.$$

By a similar argument to the proof of Lemma 2.4,

$$\sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{j,g}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |M_T \mu|^2 \lesssim 2^{j\left[\frac{5-2\alpha}{p}+\frac{1}{2}+100\epsilon\right]}.$$

Since $\alpha > 4 - 3\beta$, $p = 6$ and $\epsilon \ll \frac{4-\alpha}{3} - \beta$, this implies that

$$\sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}_{j,g}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |M_T \mu|^2 \lesssim 2^{j(\beta-10\epsilon)},$$

which finishes the proof of the theorem. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3. By the density theorem for Hausdorff measures ([10, Theorem 6.2]),

$$\limsup_{r\to 0^+} \frac{\mathcal{H}^s(A\cap B(x,r))}{r^s} \le 2^s \qquad \mathcal{H}^s\text{-a.e. } x\in A.$$

It follows that if, for each positive integer n,

$$A_n := \left\{ x\in A : \sup_{0<r<1/n} \frac{\mathcal{H}^s(A\cap B(x,r))}{r^s} < 2^{s+1} \right\},$$

and μ_n is the Borel measure defined by

$$\mu_n(F) = \mathcal{H}^s\left(F\cap A_n \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{n-1} A_k \right),$$

for any Borel set F, then

$$\mu = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_n, \tag{2.27}$$

and for any $n\ge 1$

$$c_s(\mu_n) \le \max\left\{ 2^{2s+1}, (2n)^s \mathcal{H}^s(A) \right\}.$$

By Theorem 1.2, for any $n\ge 1$,

$$\dim\left\{ \theta\in I : \rho_{\theta\#}\mu_n \not\ll \mathcal{H}^1 \right\} \le \frac{4-s}{3},$$

By (2.27),

$$\left\{ \theta\in I : \rho_{\theta\#}\mu \not\ll \mathcal{H}^1 \right\} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \theta\in I : \rho_{\theta\#}\mu_n \not\ll \mathcal{H}^1 \right\}.$$

By countable stability of the Hausdorff dimension, it follows that

$$\dim\left\{ \theta\in I : \rho_{\theta\#}\mu \not\ll \mathcal{H}^1 \right\} \le \frac{4-s}{3}.$$

This proves the first half of the theorem. For the second half, let $B\subseteq A$ be an $\mathcal{H}^s$-measurable set with $\mathcal{H}^s(B)>0$. Let ν be the Borel measure

$$\nu(F) = \mathcal{H}^s(F\cap B) \qquad (=\mu(F\cap B)),$$

for any Borel set F. It will be shown that

$$\left\{ \theta\in I : \rho_{\theta\#}\nu \ll \mathcal{H}^1 \right\} \subseteq \left\{ \theta\in I : \mathcal{H}^1(\rho_\theta(B))>0 \right\}. \tag{2.28}$$

Let $\theta\in I$ be such that $\rho_{\theta\#}\nu \ll \mathcal{H}^1$. Suppose for a contradiction that $\mathcal{H}^1(\rho_\theta(B))=0$. Let $\delta>0$ be such that

$$(\rho_{\theta\#}\nu)(F) < \mathcal{H}^s(B),$$

for any Borel set F with $\mathcal{H}^1(F)<\delta$. Since $\mathcal{H}^1(\rho_\theta(B))=0$, there exists a Borel set F containing $\rho_\theta(B)$ with $\mathcal{H}^1(F)<\delta$. Hence

$$\mathcal{H}^s(B) = \mathcal{H}^s(\rho_\theta^{-1}(F)\cap B) = (\rho_{\theta\#}\nu)(F) < \mathcal{H}^s(B),$$

and this contradiction proves (2.28). Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\left\{ \theta\in I : \mathcal{H}^1(\rho_\theta(B))=0 \right\} &\subseteq \left\{ \theta\in I : \rho_{\theta\#}\nu \not\ll \mathcal{H}^1 \right\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{ \theta\in I : \rho_{\theta\#}\mu \not\ll \mathcal{H}^1 \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Appendix A. Refined decoupling

The following inequality is Theorem 9 from [4]; it is a refined version of the decoupling theorem for generalised cones.

Theorem A.1 ([4, Theorem 9])**.** *Let I be a compact interval, and let $\gamma : I \to S^2$ be a C^2 unit speed curve with $\det(\gamma, \gamma', \gamma'')$ nonvanishing on I. Then if $c > 0$ is sufficiently small (depending only on γ), then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that the following holds for all $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, and any $R \geq 1$. Let Θ_R be a maximal $cR^{-1/2}$-separated subset of I, and for each $\theta \in \Theta_R$, let*

$$\tau(\theta) := \left\{\lambda_1\gamma(\theta) + \lambda_2\gamma'(\theta) + \lambda_3(\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta) : 1/2 \leq \lambda_1 \leq 1, |\lambda_2| \leq R^{-1/2}, |\lambda_3| \leq R^{-1}\right\}.$$

For each $\tau = \tau(\theta)$, let $\mathbb{T}_\tau$ be a ~ 1-overlapping cover of $\mathbb{R}^3$ by translates of

$$\left\{\lambda_1\gamma(\theta) + \lambda_2\gamma'(\theta) + \lambda_3(\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta) : |\lambda_1| \leq R^{\delta}, |\lambda_2| \leq R^{1/2+\delta}, |\lambda_3| \leq R^{1+\delta}\right\}.$$

If $2 \leq p \leq 6$, and

$$\mathbb{W} \subseteq \bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta_R} \mathbb{T}_{\tau(\theta)},$$

and

$$\sum_{T \in \mathbb{W}} f_T$$

is such that $\|f_T\|_p$ is constant over $T \in \mathbb{W}$ up to a factor of 2, with $\operatorname{supp} \widehat{f_T} \subseteq \tau(T)$ and

$$\|f_T\|_{L^\infty(B(0,R)\setminus T)} \leq AR^{-10000}\|f_T\|_p,$$

and Y is a disjoint union of balls in $B_3(0,R)$ of radius 1, such that each ball $Q \subseteq Y$ intersects at most M planks $2T$ with $T \in \mathbb{W}$, then

$$\left\|\sum_{T\in\mathbb{W}} f_T\right\|_{L^p(Y)} \leq C_{A,\gamma,c,\epsilon,\delta} R^\epsilon \left(\frac{M}{|\mathbb{W}|}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}} \left(\sum_{T\in\mathbb{W}} \|f_T\|_p^2\right)^{1/2}.$$

References

[1] Davies, R. O.: Subsets of finite measure in analytic sets. Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A. **55** = Indagationes Math. **14**, 488–489 (1952)

[2] Fässler, K., Orponen, T.: On restricted families of projections in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **109**, 353–381 (2014)

[3] Folland, G. B.: Real analysis. Modern techniques and their applications. Second edition. Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York). A Wiley-Interscience Publication. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, (1999)

[4] Gan, S., Guo, S., Guth, L., Harris, T. L. J., Maldague, D., Wang, H.: On restricted projections to planes in $\mathbb{R}^3$. arXiv:2207.13844v1 (2022)

[5] Gan, S., Guth, L., Maldague, D.: An exceptional set estimate for restricted projections to lines in $\mathbb{R}^3$. arXiv:2209.15152v2 (2022)

[6] Guth, L., Iosevich, A., Ou, Y, Wang, H.: On Falconer's distance set problem in the plane. Invent. Math. **219**, 779–830 (2020)

[7] Käenmäki, A., Orponen, T., Venieri, L.: A Marstrand-type restricted projection theorem in $\mathbb{R}^3$. To appear in *Amer. J. Math.* arXiv:1708.04859v2 (2017)

[8] Liu, B.: Hausdorff dimension of pinned distance sets and the L^2-method. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **148** 333–341 (2020)

[9] Marstrand, J.: Some fundamental geometrical properties of plane sets of fractional dimensions. Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **4**, 257–302 (1954)

[10] Mattila, P.: Geometry of sets and measures in Euclidean spaces. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom (1995)
[11] Pramanik, M., Yang, T., Zahl, J.: A Furstenberg-type problem for circles, and a Kaufman-type restricted projection theorem in $\mathbb{R}^3$. arXiv:2207.02259v2 (2022)
[12] Tao, T.: An introduction to measure theory. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, **126**. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, (2011)

Department of Mathematics, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853, USA
Email address: tlh236@cornell.edu