

A MASS TRANSFERENCE PRINCIPLE AND SETS WITH LARGE INTERSECTIONS

TOMAS PERSSON

ABSTRACT. I prove a mass transference principle for general shapes, similar to a recent result by H. Koivusalo and M. Rams. The proof relies on Vitali's covering lemma and manipulations with Riesz energies.

The main novelty is that it is proved that the obtained limsup-set belongs to the classes of sets with large intersections, as defined by K. Falconer. This has previously not been proved for as general shapes as in this paper.

1. THE MASS TRANSFERENCE PRINCIPLE

The mass transference principle is an important tool in the metric theory of numbers, and in other areas, when one is interested in the Hausdorff dimension of the superior limit of a sequence of sets, that is sets of the form

$$E = \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} E_j = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{j=k}^{\infty} E_j.$$

What was first called the mass transference principle was proved by V. Beresnevich and S. Velani [5]. In a simplified form, it is the following statement. Suppose that $B(x_j, r_j)$ is a sequence of balls in \mathbb{R}^d such that the Lebesgue measure λ of $E = \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} B(x_j, r_j)$ is full, i.e. $\lambda(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus E) = 0$. Let $s \leq d$ and consider the set $E_s = \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} B(x_j, r_j^{d/s}) \subset E$, where the original balls $B(x_j, r_j)$ are replaced by shrunken balls of radius $r_j^{d/s}$. Then, for any ball B , the s -dimensional Hausdorff measure of $B \cap E_s$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{H}^s(B \cap E_s) = \mathcal{H}^s(B).$$

In particular, $\dim_{\text{H}} E_s \geq s$.

Actually, the mass transference principle mentioned above is not the first result of this type. S. Jaffard proved a one dimensional mass transference principle a few years earlier [15, Second Theorem 1 on Page 335, not the one on Page 333].

The mass transference principles of S. Jaffard, V. Beresnevich and S. Velani, and other variations are more general than mentioned above, giving information about Hausdorff measures with more general gauge functions

Date: February 5, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 28A78, 28A80.

I thank Henna Koivusalo for interesting discussions, as well as Bao-Wei Wang for his useful comments and kind hospitality. I am also grateful to Demi Allen for her comments, and for telling me about the paper by S. Jaffard [15], which was also communicated to me by Henna Koivusalo. Finally, I thank a referee for putting my attention to the papers by J.-M. Aubry and S. Jaffard [1] and by A. Durand [7, 9].

than $r \mapsto r^t$, $0 < t < d$. The reader is referred to the papers by S. Jaffard, and by V. Beresnevich and S. Velani for more details.

Although it is possible to adjust the methods of this paper to more general gauge functions than $r \mapsto r^t$, we will stay simple and only consider these basic gauge functions.

There has recently been several interesting extensions and variations of the mass transference principle, and this paper shall not be the last. A recent survey article is the paper by D. Allen and S. Troscheit [4].

B.-W. Wang, J. Wu and J. Xu [21] replaced the balls in the mass transference principle by rectangles. A further development in this direction is a recent result by B.-W. Wang and J. Wu [20].

D. Allen and V. Beresnevich [3] proved a mass transference principle for shrinking neighbourhoods of l -dimensional subspaces. This was further developed by D. Allen and S. Baker [2], who proved a mass transference principle for shrinking neighbourhoods of sets of much more general form.

In a recent paper, H. Koivusalo and M. Rams [16], considered a set $E = \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} B(x_j, r_j)$, but instead of shrinking the balls $B(x_j, r_j)$, they replaced them by open subsets $U_j \subset B(x_j, r_j)$, and obtained a lower bound on the Hausdorff dimension of the set $E_U = \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} U_j$. The goal of this paper is to prove a similar result, using different methods. In short, we prove a result of the following form, see Theorem 3.1 for details. Suppose that $\limsup B(x_j, r_j)$ has full Lebesgue measure, and let $U_j \subset B(x_j, r_j)$ be open sets. Then the Hausdorff dimension of $\limsup U_j$ can be estimated from below by an expression involving the Lebesgue measures and Riesz energies with respect to Lebesgue measure of the sets U_j .

The lower bound on the Hausdorff dimension obtained in this paper is not the same as the one obtained by H. Koivusalo and M. Rams. The bound on the dimension obtained in this paper is never better than that obtained by H. Koivusalo and M. Rams, but they coincide in some natural cases, for instance when the open sets U_j are balls or ellipsoids.

The method used in this paper also proves that the set $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} U_j$ has a large intersection property, as introduced by K. Falconer [12, 13]. This implies among other things that the Hausdorff dimension of countable intersections of sets of the form $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} U_j$ is the minimum of the Hausdorff dimensions of the sets intersected. This intersection property has already been proved in the case when U_j are balls by J.-M. Aubry and S. Jaffard [1]. The intersection property has also been proved in a similar setting by A. Durand [7, 8, 9], for so called ubiquitous systems when the sets forming the limsup-set are balls. The results of A. Durand also cover Hausdorff measures with more general gauge functions. However, the result of this paper, that the set $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} U_j$ has a large intersection property for more general shapes than balls, seems new.

The paper is organised as follows. In the next section, we give some background on sets with large intersections, and we state a lemma which, together with Vitali's covering lemma, is the main tool in this paper. In Section 3, we state the mass transference principle obtained in this paper, and give some corollaries. The proof of the mass transference principle is in Section 4, and in the Appendix, the above mentioned lemma is proved.

2. SETS WITH LARGE INTERSECTIONS

The classes of sets with large intersections were defined by K. Falconer [12, 13]. See also the paper by Y. Bugeaud [6].

A dyadic cube D is a set of the form

$$D = [k_1 2^{-n}, (k_1 + 1) 2^{-n}) \times [k_2 2^{-n}, (k_2 + 1) 2^{-n}) \times \dots \times [k_d 2^{-n}, (k_d + 1) 2^{-n})$$

where k_1, k_2, \dots, k_d and n are integers. We define the outer content

$$\mathcal{M}_\infty^s(E) = \inf \left\{ \sum_k |D_k|^s : E \subset \bigcup_k D_k, D_k \text{ are dyadic cubes.} \right\}.$$

The s -dimensional class of sets with large intersections is denoted by \mathcal{G}^s and can be defined as

$$\mathcal{G}^s = \left\{ E \subset \mathbb{R}^d : E \text{ is a } G_\delta\text{-set with } \mathcal{M}_\infty^t(E \cap D) \geq |D|^t \right. \\ \left. \text{for all dyadic cubes } D \text{ and for all } t < s \right\}.$$

For simplicity, we shall work in the d dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}^d = \mathbb{R}^d / \mathbb{Z}^d$ instead of \mathbb{R}^d . We define

$$\mathcal{G}^s(\mathbb{T}^d) = \left\{ E \subset \mathbb{T}^d : E \text{ is a } G_\delta\text{-set with } \mathcal{M}_\infty^t(E \cap D) \geq |D|^t \right. \\ \left. \text{for all dyadic cubes } D \text{ and for all } t < s \right\}.$$

Equivalently we may define $\mathcal{G}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ to be the family of sets E such that $\pi^{-1}(E) \in \mathcal{G}^s$, where $\pi: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^d$ is the projection $\pi(x) = x \pmod{1}$.

There are several other ways to define \mathcal{G}^s , see the papers by K. Falconer [12, 13]. Most properties of \mathcal{G}^s are easily carried over to the corresponding statements for $\mathcal{G}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$, for instance through the projection π mentioned above.

It is immediately clear from the definition of $\mathcal{G}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ above that whenever $E \in \mathcal{G}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$, then $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} E \geq s$. The class $\mathcal{G}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ also has the property that if $E_k \in \mathcal{G}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, then

$$\bigcap_k E_k \in \mathcal{G}^s(\mathbb{T}^d).$$

For this and other properties of $\mathcal{G}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$, the reader is referred again to the papers by K. Falconer [12, 13].

The following lemma will be important for the proof of the main result. It is a slight variation of a lemma in [19]. We give a proof in the Appendix.

Lemma 2.1. *Let E_n be open sets in \mathbb{T}^d and let μ_n be measures with $\mu_n(\mathbb{T}^d \setminus E_n) = 0$ and such that μ_n is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure.*

If there is a constant C such that

$$(1) \quad C^{-1} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu_n(B)}{\lambda(B)} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu_n(B)}{\lambda(B)} \leq C$$

for any ball B , and

$$(2) \quad \iint |x - y|^{-s} d\mu_n(x) d\mu_n(y) < C$$

for all n , then $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n \in \mathcal{G}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$, and in particular $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n \geq s$.

3. NEW (AND OLD) RESULTS

Recall that the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{T}^d is denoted by λ . We define the t -dimensional Riesz energy of a set U by

$$I_t(U) = \int_U \int_U |x - y|^{-t} dx dy,$$

where $0 < t < d$. (As is customary, we write dx instead of $d\lambda(x)$.)

Theorem 3.1. *Let $(B(x_j, r_j))_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of balls in \mathbb{T}^d with $r_j \rightarrow 0$, and let $(U_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of open sets such that $U_j \subset B(x_j, r_j)$. Let*

$$(3) \quad s = \sup \left\{ t > 0 : \sup_j \frac{I_t(U_j) \lambda(B(x_j, r_j))}{\lambda(U_j)^2} < \infty \right\}.$$

Suppose that the set $E = \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} B(x_j, r_j)$ has full Lebesgue measure. Then the set

$$E_U = \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} U_j$$

satisfies $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} E_U \geq s$ and $E_U \in \mathcal{G}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$.

It is now timely to make a comparison between Theorem 3.1 and the result of H. Koivusalo and M. Rams. Let $t > 0$. Consider the set U_j and define a measure η by

$$\eta(A) = \int_{A \cap U_j} \left(\int_{U_j} |x - y|^{-t} dy \right)^{-1} dx.$$

Then by Jensen's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(A) &\leq \int_{A \cap U_j} \left(\int_{A \cap U_j} |x - y|^{-t} \frac{dy}{\lambda(U_j)} \right)^{-1} \frac{dx}{\lambda(U_j)} \\ &\leq \int_{A \cap U_j} \int_{A \cap U_j} |x - y|^t \frac{dy}{\lambda(U_j)} \frac{dx}{\lambda(U_j)} \leq |A|^t, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(U_j) &= \int_{U_j} \left(\int_{U_j} |x - y|^{-t} \frac{dy}{\lambda(U_j)} \right)^{-1} \frac{dx}{\lambda(U_j)} \\ &\geq \left(\int_{U_j} \int_{U_j} |x - y|^{-t} \frac{dx}{\lambda(U_j)} \frac{dy}{\lambda(U_j)} \right)^{-1} = \frac{\lambda(U_j)^2}{I_t(U_j)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, if $(U_{j,k})_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is a cover of U_j , then

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |U_{j,k}|^t \geq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \eta(U_{j,k}) \geq \eta(U_j) \geq \frac{\lambda(U_j)^2}{I_t(U_j)},$$

which shows that $\frac{\lambda(U_j)^2}{I_t(U_j)} \leq \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^t(U_j)$. Hence, the condition

$$\frac{I_t(U_j) \lambda(B(x_j, r_j))}{\lambda(U_j)^2} < K, \quad \text{for all } j$$

implies that

$$\lambda(B(x_j, r_j)) \leq K \mathcal{H}_\infty^t(U_j), \quad \text{for all } j$$

but these two conditions are not equivalent. The condition of H. Koivusalo and M. Rams is that

$$\lambda(B(x_j, r_j)) \leq \phi^s(U_j), \quad \text{for all } j,$$

where the generalised singular value function ϕ^s (defined in [16]) is such that $\phi^s(U_j)/\mathcal{H}_\infty^s(U_j)$ is bounded and bounded away from zero. Hence the dimension bound of Theorem 3.1 is never better than that H. Koivusalo and M. Rams, but they coincide when U_j are for instance balls or ellipsoids, see below.

An immediate corollary of Theorem 3.1 is the following result, following a similar observation in [14]: By replacing each U_j with an open subset $V_j \subset U_j$, we get a smaller limsup-set, but the obtained lower bound on the dimension is nevertheless sometimes larger.

Corollary 3.2. *Let*

$$s = \sup \left\{ \sup \left\{ t : \sup_j \frac{I_t(V_j) \lambda(B(x_j, r_j))}{\lambda(V_j)^2} < \infty \right\} : V_i \subset U_i \right\}.$$

Then with the notation and assumptions of Theorem 3.1 we have $\dim_{\text{H}} E_U \geq s$ and $E_U \in \mathcal{G}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$.

The classical case is that the sets U_n are balls. In this case Theorem 3.1 gives the following corollary. This result has previously been proved by J.-M. Aubry and S. Jaffard [1, Proposition 5.4] when $d = 1$. Closely related are also the results by A. Durand on large intersection properties and ubiquitous systems [7, 8], and the so called large intersection transference principle [9, Theorem 6.10] for ubiquitous systems. The results by A. Durand are valid for Hausdorff measures with more general gauge functions than the basic $r \mapsto r^t$ considered in this paper.

Corollary 3.3. *Let $(x_j)_{j=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of points in \mathbb{T}^d and suppose that the set $E = \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} B(x_j, r_j)$ has full Lebesgue measure. Then the set $E_U = \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} B(x_j, r_j^{d/s})$, where $0 \leq s \leq d$, satisfies $\dim_{\text{H}} E_U \geq s$ and $E_U \in \mathcal{G}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$.*

It is possible to get a similar result when U_j are ellipsoids. Suppose that U is an ellipsoid with semi-axes $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_d$. Define the singular value function by $\phi^s(U) = \lambda_1 \dots \lambda_m \lambda_{m+1}^{s-m}$, where m is such that $m < s \leq m + 1$. It follows from a lemma by Falconer [11, Lemma 2.2] that $I_t(U) \leq K \lambda(U)^2 / \phi^t(U)$. We obtain the following corollary, of which Corollary 3.3 is a special case.

Corollary 3.4. *Suppose $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} B(x_j, r_j)$ has full measure, that the sets $U_j \subset B(x_j, r_j)$ are ellipsoids and let*

$$s = \sup \left\{ t : \sup_j \lambda(B(x_j, r_j)) / \phi^t(U_j) < \infty \right\}.$$

Then $\dim_{\text{H}} \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} U_j \geq s$ and $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} U_j \in \mathcal{G}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$.

Note that instead of ellipses, we can let U_j be rectangles, and Corollary 3.4 holds also in this case. In this case the dimension result has previously been proved by Wang, Wu and Xu [21], but the result on large intersection property is new in this case.

Example 3.5. As an example to Corollary 3.4, consider the set

$$W(\tau) = W(\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_d) = \left\{ (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{T}^d : \max_j \{q^{\tau_j} \|qx_j\|\} < 1 \text{ for infinitely many } q \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

Wang, Wu and Xu showed [21, Corollary 5.1] how to use their mass transference principle to obtain that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}} W(\tau) = D(\tau) := \min \left\{ \frac{d + 1 + j\tau_j - \sum_{i=1}^j \tau_i}{1 + \tau_j} : 1 \leq j \leq d \right\}$$

provided that $\frac{1}{d} \leq \tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq \dots \leq \tau_d$. (The ordering is only important to give the right formula.) With aid of Corollary 3.4 we obtain that $W(\tau) \in \mathcal{G}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ with $s = D(\tau)$. Hence we may conclude that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}} \bigcap_{\tau \in T} W(\tau) = \inf_{\tau \in T} D(\tau),$$

if $T \subset [\frac{1}{d}, \infty)^d$ is an at most countable set.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.1

We shall use Riesz energies of sets and measures to prove the result through Lemma 2.1. The t -dimensional Riesz energy of a measure μ is defined by

$$I_t(\mu) = \iint |x - y|^{-t} d\mu(x) d\mu(y).$$

Recall that we have defined the t -dimensional Riesz energy of a set U by

$$I_t(U) = \int_U \int_U |x - y|^{-t} dx dy.$$

We will also use the number

$$J_t(U, V) = \int_U \int_V |x - y|^{-t} dx dy.$$

There will be an opportunity to use Vitali's covering lemma, see for instance Evans and Gariepy [10] for a proof.

Lemma 4.1 (Vitali's covering lemma). *Let $\{B(x_j, r_j) : j \in \mathcal{J}\}$ be a collection of balls. Then there is a countable set $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathcal{J}$ such that $\{B(x_j, r_j) : j \in \mathcal{K}\}$ is a disjoint collection and*

$$\bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{J}} B(x_j, r_j) \subset \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{K}} B(x_j, 5r_j).$$

We are now ready to give the proof of Theorem 3.1. For technical reasons in the proof we will assume that there is a number $c \in (0, 1)$ such that $U_j \in B(x_j, cr_j)$. If this is not the case, we can just replace every ball

$B(x_j, r_j)$ by a ball $B(x_j, 2r_j)$ with twice as large diameter, which does not influence any of the assumptions in the theorem.¹

Since E has full Lebesgue measure, for every n there exists a number m_n such that the set

$$E_n = \bigcup_{j=n}^{m_n} B(x_j, r_j)$$

has Lebesgue measure $\lambda(E_n) > 1 - 1/n$.

For each n , we let $\mathcal{I}_n = \{n, n+1, \dots, m_n\}$. By Vitali's covering lemma, Lemma 4.1, there is a set $\mathcal{K}_n \subset \mathcal{I}_n$ such that the balls $B(x_j, r_j)$, $j \in \mathcal{K}_n$, are disjoint and such that

$$E_n \subset \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{K}_n} B(x_j, 5r_j).$$

Note that since the balls are disjoint, we have

$$(4) \quad \sum_{j \in \mathcal{K}_n} \lambda(B(x_j, r_j)) < 1.$$

We put

$$\tilde{E}_n = \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{K}_n} B(x_j, r_j) \subset E_n.$$

Then $\lambda(\tilde{E}_n) < 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(\tilde{E}_n) &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{K}_n} \lambda(B(x_j, r_j)) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{K}_n} 5^{-d} \lambda(B(x_j, 5r_j)) \\ &\geq 5^{-d} \lambda(E_n) > 5^{-d} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Define measures ν_n with support in the closure of \tilde{E}_n by

$$\nu_n = \frac{1}{\lambda(\tilde{E}_n)} \lambda|_{\tilde{E}_n}.$$

Then $\nu_n(\mathbb{T}^d) = 1$ and $\frac{d\nu_n}{d\lambda} \leq (1 - \frac{1}{n})^{-1} \cdot 5^d$ which implies that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nu_n(B)}{\lambda(B)} \leq 5^d$$

for any ball B . Letting $\mathcal{K}_n(B) = \{j \in \mathcal{K}_n : x_j \in B\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nu_n(B)}{\lambda(B)} &\geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda(B \cap \tilde{E}_n)}{\lambda(B)} \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{K}_n(B)} \lambda(B(x_j, r_j))}{\lambda(B)} \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{K}_n(B)} 5^{-d} \lambda(B(x_j, 5r_j))}{\lambda(B)} \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} 5^{-d} \frac{\lambda(B) - \frac{1}{n}}{\lambda(B)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have obtained

$$(5) \quad 5^{-d} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nu_n(B)}{\lambda(B)} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nu_n(B)}{\lambda(B)} \leq 5^d,$$

¹Note that it is therefore not necessary to assume that $U_j \subset B(x_j, r_j)$ in Theorem 3.1; It is enough to assume that $U_j \subset B(x_j, \kappa r_j)$ for some κ that does not depend on j .

for any ball B .

Since $\frac{d\nu_n}{d\lambda} \leq 2 \cdot 5^d$ if $n \geq 2$, we have

$$I_t(\nu_n) \leq 4 \cdot 5^{2d} \iint |x - y|^{-t} dx dy = 4 \cdot 5^{2d} I_t(\lambda).$$

We define the set V_n by

$$V_n = \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{K}_n} U_j.$$

The set V_n is a subset of \tilde{E}_n , since $U_j \subset B(x_j, r_j)$. We define new measures μ_n in the following way. For each $j \in \mathcal{K}_n$, the mass of ν_n in $B(x_j, r_j)$ is moved into U_j and distributed uniformly. More precisely, μ_n is defined by

$$\mu_n = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{K}_n} \nu_n(B(x_j, r_j)) \frac{\lambda|_{U_j}}{\lambda(U_j)} = \frac{1}{\lambda(\tilde{E}_n)} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{K}_n} \frac{\lambda(B(x_j, r_j))}{\lambda(U_j)} \lambda|_{U_j}.$$

By (5), and the fact that $r_j \rightarrow 0$, we immediately obtain that

$$(6) \quad 5^{-d} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu_n(B)}{\lambda(B)} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu_n(B)}{\lambda(B)} \leq 5^d,$$

holds for any ball B . (Replacing $B(x_j, r_j)$ by U_j moves mass and could potentially move mass inside or outside of B . Since $r_j \rightarrow 0$ this could only happen when x_j is close to the boundary, which can only happen for an increasingly small proportion of x_j as $n \rightarrow \infty$, since $r_j \rightarrow 0$.)

We shall now estimate $I_t(\mu_n)$. From the definition of μ_n follows immediately that

$$I_t(\mu_n) = \sum_{j, k \in \mathcal{K}_n} \int_{U_k} \int_{U_j} |x - y|^{-t} d\mu_n(x) d\mu_n(y).$$

We consider two cases. Below, we write B_j instead of $B(x_j, r_j)$.

If $k = j$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{U_k} \int_{U_j} |x - y|^{-t} d\mu_n(x) d\mu_n(y) &= I_t(U_j) \left(\frac{\mu_n(U_j)}{\lambda(U_j)} \right)^2 \\ &= I_t(U_j) \left(\frac{\nu_n(B_j)}{\lambda(U_j)} \right)^2 \leq 4 \cdot 5^{2d} I_t(U_j) \left(\frac{\lambda(B_j)}{\lambda(U_j)} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

If $k \neq j$, then $B(x_j, r_j)$ and $B(x_k, r_k)$ are disjoint. Hence $B(x_j, cr_j)$ and $B(x_k, cr_k)$ are separated by at least a distance $(1 - c)|x_j - x_k|$, and since $U_k \subset B(x_k, cr_k)$ and $U_j \subset B(x_j, cr_j)$, we have $d(U_k, U_j) \geq (1 - c)|x_j - x_k|$. We get the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{U_k} \int_{U_j} |x - y|^{-t} d\mu_n(x) d\mu_n(y) &\leq d(U_k, U_j)^{-t} \mu_n(U_k) \mu_n(U_j) \\ &\leq (1 - c)^{-t} |x_k - x_j|^{-t} \mu_n(U_k) \mu_n(U_j) \\ &= (1 - c)^{-t} |x_k - x_j|^{-t} \nu_n(B_k) \nu_n(B_j) \\ &\leq 4 \cdot 5^{2d} (1 - c)^{-t} |x_k - x_j|^{-t} \lambda(B_k) \lambda(B_j) \\ &\leq C_{t,d} J_t(B_k, B_j), \end{aligned}$$

where $C_{t,d}$ is a constant which only depends on t and d .

We may now conclude that there is a constant C such that $I_t(\mu_n) < C$ for all n , provided

$$(7) \quad \frac{I_t(U_j)\lambda(B_j)}{\lambda(U_j)^2} < K$$

holds for all j and some constant K . Indeed, it follows from the inequalities above that

$$\begin{aligned} I_t(\mu_n) &= \sum_{j,k \in \mathcal{K}_n} \int_{U_k} \int_{U_j} |x-y|^{-t} d\mu_n(x) d\mu_n(y) \\ &\leq 4 \cdot 5^{2d} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{K}_n} I_t(U_j) \left(\frac{\lambda(B_j)}{\lambda(U_j)} \right)^2 + \sum_{j,k \in \mathcal{K}_n} C_{t,d} J_t(B_k, B_j) \\ &\leq 4 \cdot 5^{2d} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{K}_n} I_t(U_j) \left(\frac{\lambda(B_j)}{\lambda(U_j)} \right)^2 + C_{t,d} I_t(\nu_n) \\ &\leq 4 \cdot 5^{2d} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{K}_n} I_t(U_j) \frac{\lambda(B_j)}{\lambda(U_j)^2} \cdot \lambda(B_j) + 4 \cdot 5^{2d} C_{t,d} I_t(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if (7) holds, we may use (4) to conclude that

$$(8) \quad T_t(\mu_n) \leq 4 \cdot 5^{2d} C_d K + 4 \cdot 5^{2d} C_{t,d} I_t(\lambda),$$

where the constants C_d , K and $C_{t,d}$ do not depend on n .

Finally, by (6) and (8), the assumptions in Lemma 2.1 are satisfied for the measures μ_n provided (7) is satisfied. Lemma 2.1 then implies that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} V_n \in \mathcal{G}^t(\mathbb{T}^d)$ holds for all t which satisfies (7). Since $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} V_n \subset \limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} U_j$, this implies that $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} U_j \in \mathcal{G}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ when s is the supremum of the set of t such that (7) holds for all j .

5. APPENDIX: PROOF OF LEMMA 2.1

Here we give a proof of Lemma 2.1 following the ideas in the papers [19] and [18].

We start with a lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Let μ_n and C be as in Lemma 2.1, let D be a dyadic cube and $t < s$. Then*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \iint_{D \times D} |x-y|^{-t} d\mu_n(x) d\mu_n(y) \leq C^2 \iint_{D \times D} |x-y|^{-t} dx dy.$$

Proof. Let $M_m = \{(x, y) \in D \times D : |x-y|^{-s} > m\}$. Then

$$\iint_{M_m} |x-y|^{-t} d\mu_n(x) d\mu_n(y) \leq C \frac{s}{s-t} m^{t/s-1}$$

holds for all n with C as in Lemma 2.1 [19, Lemma 2.2]. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and take m so large that

$$\iint_{M_m} |x-y|^{-t} d\mu_n(x) d\mu_n(y) < \varepsilon,$$

holds for all n . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \iint_{D \times D} |x - y|^{-t} d\mu_n(x) d\mu_n(y) \\ \leq \varepsilon + \iint_{D \times D} \min\{|x - y|^{-t}, m^{t/s}\} d\mu_n(x) d\mu_n(y). \end{aligned}$$

Since $(x, y) \mapsto \min\{|x - y|^{-t}, m^{t/s}\}$ is continuous, we have by (1)

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \iint_{D \times D} \min\{|x - y|^{-t}, m^{t/s}\} d\mu_n(x) d\mu_n(y) \\ \leq C^2 \iint_{D \times D} \min\{|x - y|^{-t}, m^{t/s}\} dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

As $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, this proves the lemma. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.1. Let D be a fixed dyadic cube and take $t < s$. Then, if n is sufficiently large $\mu_n(D) > 0$, and the assumptions imply that

$$\nu_n(A) = \int_{A \cap D} \left(\int_D |x - y|^{-t} d\mu_n(x) \right)^{-1} d\mu_n(y)$$

defines a non-zero measure which is absolutely continuous with respect to μ_n . The measure ν_n satisfies $\nu_n(D) = \nu_n(D \cap E_n)$.

By Jensen's inequality, the measure ν_n satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_n(D) &= \int_D \left(\int_D |x - y|^{-t} d\mu_n(x) \right)^{-1} d\mu_n(y) \\ &= \int_D \left(\int_D |x - y|^{-t} \frac{d\mu_n(x)}{\mu_n(D)} \right)^{-1} \frac{d\mu_n(y)}{\mu_n(D)} \\ &\geq \left(\iint_{D \times D} |x - y|^{-t} \frac{d\mu_n(x)}{\mu_n(D)} \frac{d\mu_n(y)}{\mu_n(D)} \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.1, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_n(D) &\geq \frac{C^{-2} \mu_n(D)^2}{2\lambda(D)^2} \left(\iint_{D \times D} |x - y|^{-t} \frac{d\lambda(x)}{\lambda(D)} \frac{d\lambda(y)}{\lambda(D)} \right)^{-1} \\ &= \frac{C^{-2} \mu_n(D)^2 \lambda(D)^2}{\lambda(D)^2 I_t(D)}, \end{aligned}$$

if n is sufficiently large. Hence, for large enough n , we have

$$\nu_n(D) \geq \frac{C^{-2} \mu_n(D)^2 \lambda(D)^2}{2\lambda(D)^2 I_t(D)} \geq \frac{C^{-4} \lambda(D)^2}{4 I_t(D)} \geq C_0 |D|^t,$$

for some constant C_0 which depends only on d and t .

For $U \subset D$ we have again by Jensen's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_n(U) &= \int_U \left(\int_D |x - y|^{-t} d\mu_n(x) \right)^{-1} d\mu_n(y) \\ &\leq \int_U \left(\int_U |x - y|^{-t} \frac{d\mu_n(x)}{\mu_n(U)} \right)^{-1} \frac{d\mu_n(y)}{\mu_n(U)} \\ &\leq \int_U \int_U |x - y|^t \frac{d\mu_n(x)}{\mu_n(U)} \frac{d\mu_n(y)}{\mu_n(U)} \leq |U|^t. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose now that $\{D_k\}$ is a disjoint cover of $E_n \cap D$ by dyadic cubes. Then if n is large, we have by the estimates above that

$$\sum_k |D_k|^t \geq \sum_k \nu_n(D_k) = \nu_n(D \cap E_n) = \nu_n(D) \geq C_0 |D|^t.$$

This proves that $\mathcal{M}_t^\infty(E_n \cap D) \geq C_0 |D|^t$ when n is large and hence

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}_t^\infty(E_n \cap D) \geq C_0 |D|^t.$$

By [13], this implies that $\limsup E_n \in \mathcal{G}^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] J.-M. Aubry, S. Jaffard, *Random wavelet series*, Communications in Mathematics Physics 227 (2002), no. 3, 483–514.
- [2] D. Allen, S. Baker, *A general mass transference principle*, Selecta Mathematica 25 (2019), no. 3, Art. 39, 38 pp.
- [3] D. Allen, V. Beresnevich, *A mass transference principle for systems of linear forms and its applications*, Compositio Mathematica 154 (2018), no. 5, 1014–1047.
- [4] D. Allen, S. Troscheit, *The mass transference principle: ten years on*, Horizons of fractal geometry and complex dimensions, 1–33, Contemporary Mathematics 731, American Mathematical Society, 2019.
- [5] V. Beresnevich, S. Velani, *A mass transference principle and the Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture for Hausdorff measures*, Annals of Mathematics 164 (2006), 971–992.
- [6] Y. Bugeaud, *Intersective sets and Diophantine approximation*, The Michigan Mathematical Journal 52 (2004), no. 3, 667–682.
- [7] A. Durand, *Sets with large intersection and ubiquity*, Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society 144 (2008), no. 1, 119–144.
- [8] A. Durand, *Large intersection properties in Diophantine approximation and dynamical systems*, Journal of the London Mathematical Society 79 (2009), no. 2, 377–398.
- [9] A. Durand, *Describability via ubiquity and eutaxy in Diophantine approximation*, Annales Mathématiques Blaise Pascal, Tome 22 (2015) no. S2, 1–149.
- [10] L. C. Evans, R. F. Gariépy, *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*, Studies in Advanced Mathematics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 1992, ISBN: 0-8493-7157-0.
- [11] K. Falconer, *The Hausdorff dimension of self-affine fractals*, Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society 103 (1988), 339–350.
- [12] K. Falconer, *Classes of sets with large intersection*, Mathematika 32 (1985), 191–205.
- [13] K. Falconer, *Sets with large intersection properties*, Journal of the London mathematical society 49 (1994), 267–280.
- [14] D.-J. Feng, E. Järvenpää, M. Järvenpää, V. Suomala, *Dimensions of random covering sets in Riemann manifolds*, Annals of Probability 46 (2018), no. 3, 1542–1596.
- [15] S. Jaffard, *Construction of functions with prescribed Hölder and chirp exponents*, Revista Matemática Iberoamericana 16 (2000), no. 2, 331–349.
- [16] H. Koivusalo, M. Rams, *Mass transference principle: from balls to arbitrary shapes*, accepted for publication in International Mathematics Research Notices, arXiv:1812.08557

- [17] T. Persson, *A Note on Random Coverings of Tori*, Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society, 2015, 47 (1), 7–12.
- [18] T. Persson, *Inhomogeneous potentials, Hausdorff dimension and shrinking targets*, Annales Henri Lebesgue, volume 2 (2019), 1–37.
- [19] T. Persson, H. Reeve, *A Frostman type lemma for sets with large intersections, and an application to Diophantine approximation*, Proceedings of the Edinburgh Mathematical Society, Volume 58, Issue 02, June 2015, 521–542.
- [20] B.-W. Wang, J. Wu, *Mass transference principle from rectangles to rectangles in Diophantine approximation*, arXiv:1909.00924.
- [21] B.-W. Wang, J. Wu, J. Xu, *Mass transference principle for limsup sets generated by rectangles*, Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society 158 (2015), no. 3, 419–437.

T. PERSSON, CENTRE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, LUND UNIVERSITY, BOX 118,
221 00 LUND, SWEDEN

Email address: `tomasp@maths.lth.se`