

INCIDENCE ESTIMATES FOR α -DIMENSIONAL TUBES AND β -DIMENSIONAL BALLS IN \mathbb{R}^2

YUQIU FU AND KEVIN REN

ABSTRACT. We prove essentially sharp incidence estimates for a collection of δ -tubes and δ -balls in the plane, where the δ -tubes satisfy an α -dimensional spacing condition and the δ -balls satisfy a β -dimensional spacing condition. Our approach combines a combinatorial argument for small α, β and a Fourier analytic argument for large α, β .

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\delta \leq 1$ be a small parameter. We will work with δ -tubes and δ -balls in the plane \mathbb{R}^2 . A δ -ball is a ball of radius δ . A δ -tube is a $\delta \times 1$ rectangle. The direction of a rectangle is the vector pointing in the direction of its longest side. (This vector is only determined up to ± 1 .)

We say two δ -balls p and q are **essentially distinct** if $|p \cap q| \leq \frac{1}{2}|p|$, where $|A|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Likewise, two δ -tubes s and t are essentially distinct if $|s \cap t| \leq \frac{1}{2}|s|$. From now on, we assume all of our sets of δ -balls and δ -tubes are essentially distinct.

Definition 1.1. *Let P be a set of δ -balls and \mathbb{T} be a set of δ -tubes. The number of incidences $I(P, \mathbb{T})$ is the number of pairs (p, t) of δ -balls $p \in P$ and δ -tubes $t \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $|p \cap t| \neq \emptyset$.*

The basic problem we will consider is the following: Given a set of δ -balls P and a set of δ -tubes \mathbb{T} in the square $[0, 1]^2$, what is the maximum number of incidences $I(P, \mathbb{T})$?

We will impose a spacing condition on the set of δ -balls and the set of δ -tubes. The spacing condition on the δ -balls is similar to Definition 1.2 in [KT01].

Definition 1.2. *For $0 \leq \beta \leq 2$, we call a set of essentially distinct δ -balls P in $[0, 1]^2$ a (δ, β) -set of balls if for every $w \in [\delta, 1]$ and every ball B_w of radius w ,*

$$\#\{p \in P \mid p \subset B_w\} \leq 100 \left(\frac{w}{\delta}\right)^\beta.$$

A (δ, β) -set behaves roughly like the δ -neighborhood of a set in \mathbb{R}^2 with no more than β dimension. We will impose an analogous condition on the set of δ -tubes.

Definition 1.3. *For $0 \leq \alpha \leq 2$, we call a set of essentially distinct δ -tubes \mathbb{T} in $[0, 1]^2$ a (δ, α) -set of tubes if for every $w \in [\delta, 1]$ and every $w \times 2$ tube T_w ,*

$$\#\{t \in \mathbb{T} \mid t \subset T_w\} \leq 100 \left(\frac{w}{\delta}\right)^\alpha.$$

Date: November 10, 2021.

The exact values of the constants are not important, and when describing the constructed examples in Section 2, we will replace 100 by appropriate constants.

We can rephrase the problem as follows: given a (δ, β) -set of balls P and a (δ, α) -set of tubes \mathbb{T} , what is the maximum number of incidences $I(P, \mathbb{T})$?

In [GSW19], incidence problems for δ -tubes with some spacing conditions were considered. They fix a parameter $1 \leq W \leq \delta^{-1}$ and choose \mathbb{T} to be a collection of W^2 δ -tubes, such that every $W^{-1} \times 1$ rectangle contains at most one δ -tube in \mathbb{T} . They also consider another spacing condition, where each $W^{-1} \times 1$ rectangle contains $\sim N_1$ many δ -tubes in each direction, for a fixed N_1 . Using a Fourier analytic approach, [GSW19] proved sharp incidence estimates for well-spaced δ -tubes. This Fourier analytic method is also used in [GWZ20, DGW20, GMW20, FGM21a, FGM21b] to derive incidence estimates, decoupling estimates, and square function estimates.

Regarding our question, we will prove the following main theorem:

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose α, β satisfy $0 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq 2$. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $C_\varepsilon = C(\varepsilon, \alpha, \beta)$ with the following property: for every (δ, β) -set of balls P and (δ, α) -set of tubes \mathbb{T} , the following bound holds:*

$$I(P, \mathbb{T}) \leq C_\varepsilon \delta^{-f(\alpha, \beta) - \varepsilon},$$

where $f(\alpha, \beta)$ is defined as in Figure 1. These bounds are sharp up to $C_\varepsilon \delta^\varepsilon$.




FIGURE 1. Values of $f(\alpha, \beta)$

In Section 2, we will show the estimates in Theorem 1.4 are sharp up to $C_\varepsilon \delta^\varepsilon$, by constructing suitable examples.

We will then prove the upper bound of Theorem 1.4 by analyzing different cases for α, β . In Section 3, we will use a combinatorial argument (the L^2 argument as in [Cor77]) to resolve the case where $\alpha \leq 1$ or $\beta \leq 1$. In Section 4, we will use a Fourier analytic argument based on induction to resolve the case where $\alpha, \beta \geq 1$. The starting point of this argument will be Proposition 2.1 from [GSW19], which was inspired by ideas of Orponen [Orp18] and Vinh [Vin11]. In fact, we are able to prove stronger “ L^p -type” estimates in Sections 3 and 4, and we derive Theorem 1.4 in Section 5 as a corollary.

Notation. We will use $A \gtrsim B$ to represent $A \geq CB$ for a constant C , and $A \lesssim B$ to represent $A \leq CB$. The constant C might depend on the dimensions α or β . We will use $A \sim B$ to represent $A \gtrsim B$ and $A \lesssim B$.

The angle between two δ -tubes s and t , or $\angle(s, t)$, is the acute angle between their directions.

Acknowledgements. We wish to thank the MIT SPUR program for making this research possible. We would like to thank Larry Guth for suggesting this problem and helpful discussions, Ankur Moitra and David Jerison for helpful discussions, and Slava Gerovitch for running the SPUR program.

2. CONSTRUCTIONS

We start with the sharpness part of Theorem 1.4. In this section, we construct (δ, α) -sets of tubes and (δ, β) -sets of balls such that the number of incidences is at least $\delta^{-f(\alpha, \beta)}$, where f was defined as in Theorem 1.4. We divide the constructions into four cases. Construction 1 is the main construction that works for most α and β . Constructions 2, 3, 4 can be considered as auxiliary constructions which take care of exceptional values of α, β not covered in Construction 1. The constructions will all take place inside a 1×1 square. In the constructions, some of the δ -tubes may not be fully contained within the 1×1 square, but we will ignore this minor detail. For ease of notation, let $D = \delta^{-1}$.

2.1. Construction 1. In this construction, we assume $\alpha < \beta + 1, \beta < \alpha + 1$, and $\alpha + \beta < 3$. Our goal is to construct a (δ, β) -set of δ -balls and a (δ, α) -set of δ -tubes with at least $\delta^{-\frac{a\alpha+b\beta+ab}{a+b}}$ incidences.




FIGURE 2. Construction 1.

To describe the construction, we will need a few auxiliary variables. Let $a = \min(\alpha, 1), b = \min(\beta, 1)$, and we will eventually choose γ, κ, λ as parameters in $[0, 1]$. Refer to Figure 2. The left picture depicts a single bundle with $\sim D^{(1-\gamma)a}$

δ -tubes and $\sim D^{\gamma b}$ δ -balls. The δ -tubes are rotates of a single central δ -tube t , and the angle spacing between δ -tubes is $\sim \delta^{\gamma+(1-\gamma)a}$, with maximum angle $\sim \delta^\gamma$. The δ -balls are contained in a $\delta \times \delta^{1-\gamma}$ rectangle with the same center and direction as the central δ -tube t , and they are spaced distance $\sim \delta^{1-\gamma+\gamma b}$ apart.

It might be helpful to observe that the configuration of δ -balls is “dual” to the configuration of δ -tubes in a bundle, in the sense that the δ -balls in a bundle are evenly spaced along the central axis, while the δ -tubes are evenly spaced in direction.

We make some geometric observations in the left picture.

- The maximum angle separation between two δ -tubes is $\sim \delta^\gamma$. Thus, the entire bundle fits inside a $\delta^\gamma \times 1$ rectangle.
- Let O be the center of the central δ -tube t . The maximum distance of a δ -ball p from O is $\sim \delta^{1-\gamma}$. For any δ -tube s in the bundle, we have $\angle(s, t) \lesssim \delta^\gamma$ (where t is the central δ -tube). Thus, a trigonometric argument shows that s intersects p . In other words, each δ -tube of the bundle contains all of the $\sim D^{\gamma b}$ δ -balls of the bundle.

In the right picture, there are $\sim D^\kappa$ bundles in the $\sim 1 \times 1$ square. The bundles are arranged in a $D^{(1-\lambda)\kappa} \times D^{\lambda\kappa}$ grid, with the horizontal spacing $\delta^{(1-\lambda)\kappa}$ and the vertical spacing $\delta^{\lambda\kappa}$. The bundles in the same row are translates of each other; two adjacent bundles in the same column are $\frac{1}{100}\delta^{\lambda\kappa}$ rotates of each other.

If \mathbb{T} is the set of δ -tubes and P is the set of δ -balls in the configuration, then we see that $|\mathbb{T}| \sim D^{(1-\gamma)a+\kappa}$ and $|P| \sim D^{\gamma b+\kappa}$.

Intuitively, we can regard λ as controlling the “aspect ratio” of the bundle configuration. If $\lambda = 1$, then all the bundles are rotated copies of each other, arranged vertically; if $\lambda = 0$, then all the bundles are translated copies of each other, arranged horizontally. For the right values of λ , we will get a (δ, α) -set of δ -tubes and a (δ, β) -set of δ -balls.

Now, we choose suitable values for our parameters γ, κ, λ . We first choose $\gamma = \frac{a-\alpha+\beta}{a+b}$ and $\kappa = \alpha - (1-\gamma)a = \frac{a\beta+b\alpha-ab}{a+b}$. Then, we apply the following Lemma to choose λ and also check that $\gamma, \kappa \in [0, 1]$.

Lemma 2.1. (a) We have $0 \leq \gamma, \kappa \leq 1$.

(b) There exists $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ such that \mathbb{T} is a (δ, α) -set of δ -tubes and P is a (δ, β) -set of δ -balls.

The proof is computational, and we defer it to the Appendix. Now with this choice of parameters, we find $|\mathbb{T}| \sim D^{(1-\gamma)a+\kappa} = D^\alpha$ and $|P| \sim D^{\gamma b+\kappa} = D^\beta$. Finally, since $|\mathbb{T}| \sim D^\alpha$ δ -tubes, and each δ -tube contains $\sim D^{\gamma b}$ δ -balls, we get $I(P, \mathbb{T}) \gtrsim D^\alpha D^{\gamma b} = D^{\frac{a\alpha+b\beta+ab}{a+b}}$.

The prototypical example is $\alpha = 1, \beta = 1$, in which $\gamma = \kappa = 0.5$. In this case, the possible values for λ are $0 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{1}{2}$. If we choose $\lambda = 0$, then we get a series of $D^{0.5}$ horizontally spaced, parallel bundles, as in Figure 3.

2.2. Construction 2. For this construction, we will assume $\alpha \geq \beta + 1$. Our goal is to obtain $\delta^{-(\beta+1)}$ incidences.

Refer to Figure 4. In each bundle, there are $\sim D$ δ -tubes, each separated by angle δ . Thus, we can fit the bundle inside a $\frac{1}{4} \times 1$ rectangle. We arrange $\sim D^{\alpha-1}$ bundles as in the right figure, separated by distance $\sim \delta^{\alpha-1}$, such that the centers of the bundles lie within a segment of length $\frac{1}{2}$ centered at the unit square’s center. Then,




 FIGURE 3. The special case $\alpha = \beta = 1$.


FIGURE 4. Construction 2.

we place D^β δ -balls at some of the centers of the bundles, such that the δ -balls are δ^β -separated. Thus, there are D^α δ -tubes and D^β δ -balls in the configuration.

Let \mathbb{T} be the set of δ -tubes and P be the set of δ -balls. We will show that \mathbb{T} is a (δ, α) -set of tubes and P is a (δ, β) -set of balls.

Fix $w \in [\delta, 1]$ and a $w \times 2$ rectangle R_w ; we will count how many δ -tubes in \mathbb{T} are in R_w . There are two main contributions.

- R_w can intersect $\lesssim \lceil \frac{w}{\delta^{\alpha-1}} \rceil$ bundles of $|\mathbb{T}|$.
- For each bundle, R_w can contain $\lesssim \frac{w}{\delta}$ δ -tubes.

Thus, R_w contains at most n δ -tubes in \mathbb{T} , where

$$n \lesssim \left(\frac{w}{\delta^{\alpha-1}} + 1 \right) \cdot \frac{w}{\delta} \leq \left(\frac{w}{\delta} \right)^\alpha + \left(\frac{w}{\delta} \right)^\alpha = 2 \cdot \left(\frac{w}{\delta} \right)^\alpha.$$

The δ -tubes in \mathbb{T} are essentially distinct because non-parallel δ -tubes are δ -angle separated and parallel-tubes are δ -distance separated. Thus, \mathbb{T} is a (δ, α) -set of tubes.

Now, we verify that P is a (δ, β) -set of balls. Fix $w \in [\delta, 1]$ and a ball B_w of radius w ; we will count how many δ -balls in P are in B_w . Note that B_w can

intersect at most n δ -balls, where (using $\beta \leq \alpha - 1 \leq 1$):

$$n \lesssim \lceil \frac{w}{\delta^\beta} \rceil \leq \frac{w}{\delta^\beta} + 1 \leq 2 \left(\frac{w}{\delta} \right)^\beta.$$

The δ -balls in P are essentially distinct, so P is a (δ, β) -set. Finally, each δ -ball in P lies in $\sim D$ δ -tubes of \mathbb{T} , so $I(P, \mathbb{T}) \sim D^\beta \cdot D = D^{\beta+1}$.

2.3. Construction 3. For this construction, we will assume $\beta \geq \alpha + 1$. Our goal is to obtain $\delta^{-(\alpha+1)}$ incidences.




FIGURE 5. Construction 3.

Refer to Figure 5. There are $D^{\beta-1}$ columns of D δ -balls each. On D^α of the columns, there is a δ -tube. The δ -tube-containing columns are separated by distance δ^α . Thus, there are D^β δ -balls and D^α δ -tubes. Note that Construction 3 is “dual” to Construction 2, in the sense that a bundle of direction-separated δ -tubes is replaced by a bundle of evenly-spaced δ -balls.

The δ -tubes are a (δ, α) -set of tubes and the δ -balls are a (δ, β) -set of balls by a similar argument to Construction 2. Finally, each δ -tube contains D δ -balls, so $I(P, \mathbb{T}) = D^\alpha \cdot D = D^{\alpha+1}$.

2.4. Construction 4. For this construction, we will assume $\alpha + \beta \geq 3$. Our goal is to obtain $\delta^{-(\alpha+\beta-1)}$ incidences.

Refer to Figure 6. The bundles of δ -tubes are the same as Construction 2. We then arrange $\sim D^\beta$ δ -balls in a $D^{\beta/2} \times D^{\beta/2}$ grid, such that adjacent δ -balls are separated by distance $\sim \delta^{\beta/2}$. We confine the δ -balls to a $\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2}$ square \mathcal{S} concentric with the large 1×1 square. Let \mathbb{T} be the set of δ -tubes and P be the set of δ -balls in this configuration.

From Construction 2, \mathbb{T} is a (δ, α) -set of tubes. We now show that P is a (δ, β) -set of balls.

Fix $w \in [\delta, 1]$ and a ball B_w of radius w ; we will count how many δ -balls in P are in B_w . Note that B_w can intersect at most n δ -balls in P , where

$$n \lesssim \left(\lceil \frac{w}{\delta^{\beta/2}} \rceil \right)^2 \leq \left(\frac{w}{\delta^{\beta/2}} + 1 \right)^2 \leq 2 \left(\frac{w^2}{\delta^\beta} + 1 \right) \leq 4 \left(\frac{w}{\delta} \right)^\beta.$$

Also, the δ -balls in P are essentially distinct, so P is a (δ, β) -set of balls.

Finally, we will count the number of incidences. For a bundle centered at some point $O \in \mathcal{S}$, the δ -tubes in the bundle cover a double cone with apex O and




FIGURE 6. Construction 4.

angle $\frac{1}{4}$. This double cone intersects square \mathcal{S} in a polygonal region with positive area, so it contains a positive fraction of the balls in P . Hence, the number of incidences between a given bundle and P is $\gtrsim D^\beta$. There are $D^{\alpha-1}$ bundles in \mathbb{T} , so $I(P, \mathbb{T}) \gtrsim D^\beta D^{\alpha-1} = D^{\alpha+\beta-1}$.

3. COMBINATORIAL UPPER BOUND

We will first prove the upper bound for $\alpha \leq 1$ or $\beta \leq 1$. We will further casework on whether $\alpha \leq \beta$ or $\alpha \geq \beta$, which we call the balls-dominated and tubes-dominated case, respectively.

Notation. For a δ -tube t and δ -ball p , we use $p \sim t$ to denote $p \cap t \neq \emptyset$.

3.1. Geometric Observations. We will need a few basic geometric observations involving intersection patterns of δ -tubes. Specifically, we show that if two δ -tubes intersect in a large angle, then their intersection is small.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\delta \leq w \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$.*

- (a) *The intersection of two δ -tubes separated by angle w is contained in a rhombus with side length $\sim \frac{\delta}{w}$ and angle w .*
- (b) *Let t be a δ -tube. The set of all δ -tubes s such that $s \cap t \neq \emptyset$ and $\angle(s, t) \leq w$ is contained in a δ -tube with dimensions $\sim w \times 3$.*
- (c) *Let \mathbb{T} be a (δ, α) -set of tubes, and let $t \in \mathbb{T}$. The number of δ -tubes $s \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $s \cap t \neq \emptyset$ and $\angle(s, t) \leq w$ is $\lesssim \left(\frac{w}{\delta}\right)^\alpha$.*
- (d) *Let p and q be two δ -balls whose centers are distance w apart, and let \mathbb{T} be a (δ, α) -set of tubes. If s and t are any two δ -tubes that intersect both p and q , then $\angle(s, t) \leq \frac{\delta}{w}$. The number of δ -tubes in \mathbb{T} that intersect both p and q is $\lesssim \left(\frac{1}{w}\right)^{\min(\alpha, 1)}$.*

The proof of (a) relies on basic trigonometry and the approximation $\sin \alpha \sim \alpha$, which holds if $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$. Part (b) follows from trigonometry.

For part (c), we invoke part (b) and cover the $\sim w \times 3$ tube with two $\sim w \times 2$ tubes, spaced 1 apart. Each δ -tube must be contained in one of the $\sim w \times 1$ δ -tubes. Now use dimension.

The first claim of part (d) follows from part (a). The second claim follows from part (c) if $\alpha \leq 1$.

Suppose $\alpha > 1$, and let A be the set of δ -tubes in \mathbb{T} that intersect both p and q . Then the set of directions of the δ -tubes in A is contained inside an arc of length $\sim \frac{\delta}{w}$. We can split this arc into $\sim \frac{1}{w}$ sub-arcs of length δ . Within each δ -arc, we can fit $\lesssim 1$ essentially distinct δ -tubes that intersect p . Thus, A can contain $\lesssim \frac{1}{w}$ essentially distinct δ -tubes.

3.2. Balls dominated case. We will first assume $\beta \geq \alpha$ and $1 \geq \alpha$. This case is resolved by the following theorem:

Theorem 3.2. *Let P be a (δ, β) -set of balls and \mathbb{T} be a (δ, α) -set of tubes. Let $D = \delta^{-1}$. Let $b = \min(\beta, 1)$, and assume $b \geq \alpha$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists C_ε such that*

$$I(P, \mathbb{T})^{\alpha+b} \leq C_\varepsilon D^{\alpha b(1+\varepsilon)} |P|^b |\mathbb{T}|^\alpha.$$

If $\alpha = 0$ then the result is trivial, so we assume $\alpha > 0$. Recall that $I(P, \mathbb{T})$ is the number of pairs $(t, p) \in \mathbb{T} \times P$ such that $p \sim t$ (i.e. $p \cap t \neq \emptyset$). Let $d(p)$ be the number of δ -tubes containing p . Define

$$J(P, \mathbb{T}) = \sum_{p \in P} d(p)^{(b+\alpha)/\alpha}.$$

We first relate J to I . By Hölder's inequality, we have

$$J^\alpha \geq \frac{1}{|P|^b} \left(\sum_{p \in P} d(p) \right)^{b+\alpha} = \frac{I(P, \mathbb{T})^{b+\alpha}}{|P|^b}.$$

Next, we estimate $J(P, \mathbb{T})$. For a given δ -tube $t \in \mathbb{T}$, let

$$j(t) = \sum_{p \sim t} d(p)^{b/\alpha}.$$

Clearly, we have

$$J(P, \mathbb{T}) = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{T}} j(t).$$

Now we will show $j(t) \leq D^{b(1+\varepsilon)}$ for any $t \in \mathbb{T}$. Let $T(\delta) = \{s \in \mathbb{T} \mid s \cap t \neq \emptyset, \angle(s, t) \leq 2\delta\}$ and for $w \geq 2\delta$,

$$T(w) = \{s \in \mathbb{T} \mid s \cap t \neq \emptyset, w \leq \angle(s, t) \leq 2w\}.$$

From the Intersection Lemma 3.1, $|T(w)| \lesssim \left(\frac{w}{\delta}\right)^\alpha$. For a δ -ball p , let $N(p)$ be the δ -tubes containing p . We now employ a double counting argument.

Lemma 3.3 (Double Counting).

$$\sum_{p \sim t} |N(p) \cap T(w)| \lesssim |T(w)| \cdot \frac{1}{w^b}.$$

Proof. The left-hand side counts the number of pairs (p, s) with $p \sim t$, $s \in T(w)$ such that $p \sim s$. For each $s \in T(w)$, $s \cap t$ is contained in a $\delta \times \frac{\delta}{w}$ rectangle R_w . If $\alpha \geq 1$, R_w intersects $\lesssim \frac{1}{w}$ essentially distinct δ -balls. If $\alpha < 1$, then R_w is contained in a ball of radius $\frac{\delta}{w}$, so a dimension argument shows $s \cap t$ intersects $\lesssim \left(\frac{1}{w}\right)^b$ many δ -balls. \square

Now let $\mathcal{K} = \{\delta, 2\delta, 4\delta, \dots, 1\}$, $C_1 = |\mathcal{K}|^{b/\alpha-1}$, and $C = C_1|\mathcal{K}|$. Since $|\mathcal{K}| = \log D$, we have $C \lesssim D^{\varepsilon/\alpha}$. Recall that $b \geq \alpha$. By Holder's inequality, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} j(t) &= \sum_{p \sim t} \left(\sum_{w \in \mathcal{K}} |N(p) \cap T(w)| \right)^{b/\alpha} \\ &\leq \sum_{p \sim t} C_1 \sum_{w \in \mathcal{K}} |N(p) \cap T(w)|^{b/\alpha} \\ &\leq C_1 \sum_{w \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{p \sim t} |N(p) \cap T(w)| \cdot |T(w)|^{b/\alpha-1} \\ &\lesssim C_1 \sum_{w \in \mathcal{K}} |T(w)|^{b/\alpha} \cdot \frac{1}{w^b} \\ &\lesssim C \cdot D^b \lesssim D^{b+\varepsilon/\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$I(P, \mathbb{T})^{b+\alpha} \leq |P|^b J^\alpha \lesssim |P|^b \left(\sum_{t \in \mathbb{T}} D^{b+\varepsilon/\alpha} \right)^\alpha = |P|^b |\mathbb{T}|^\alpha D^{b\alpha+\varepsilon}.$$

This is the desired result.

3.3. Tubes-dominated case. Now, we will assume $\alpha \geq \beta$ and $1 \geq \beta$. This case is exactly dual to the balls-dominated case, if we interchange δ -balls and δ -tubes. We provide explicit details in the following theorem:

Theorem 3.4. *Let P be a (δ, β) -set of balls and \mathbb{T} be a (δ, α) -set of tubes. Let $D = \delta^{-1}$. Let $a = \min(\alpha, 1)$ and assume $a \geq \beta$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists C_ε such that*

$$I(P, \mathbb{T})^{a+\beta} \leq C_\varepsilon D^{a\beta(1+\varepsilon)} |P|^\beta |\mathbb{T}|^a.$$

If $\beta = 0$ then the result is trivial, so we assume $\beta > 0$. Recall that $I(P, \mathbb{T})$ is the number of pairs $(t, p) \in \mathbb{T} \times P$ such that $p \sim t$ (i.e. $p \cap t \neq \emptyset$). Let $d(t)$ be the number of δ -balls inside t . Define

$$J(P, \mathbb{T}) = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{T}} d(t)^{(a+\beta)/\beta}.$$

We first relate J to I . By Hölder's inequality, we have

$$J^\beta \geq \frac{1}{|\mathbb{T}|^a} \left(\sum_{t \in \mathbb{T}} d(t) \right)^{a+\beta} = \frac{I(P, \mathbb{T})^{a+\beta}}{|\mathbb{T}|^a}.$$

Next, we estimate $J(P, \mathbb{T})$. For a given δ -ball $p \in P$, let

$$j(p) = \sum_{t \sim p} d(t)^{a/\beta}.$$

Clearly, we have

$$J(P, \mathbb{T}) = \sum_{p \in P} j(p).$$

Now we will show $j(p) \leq D^{a(1+\varepsilon)}$ for any $t \in \mathbb{T}$. If $d(p, q)$ is the distance between the centers of p and q , let

$$P(w) = \{q \in P \mid w \leq d(p, q) \leq 2w\}.$$

By dimension, we have $|P(w)| \lesssim \left(\frac{w}{\delta}\right)^\beta$. For a δ -tube t , let $N(t)$ be the δ -balls contained in t . Similar to the balls-dominated case, we use another double counting argument.

Lemma 3.5 (Double Counting).

$$\sum_{t \sim p} |N(t) \cap P(w)| \lesssim |P(w)| \cdot \frac{1}{w^a}.$$

Proof. The left-hand side counts the number of pairs (t, q) with $t \sim p$, $q \in P(w)$ such that $t \sim q$. For each $q \in P(w)$, p and q are contained in at most $\frac{1}{w^a}$ many δ -tubes (Intersection Lemma 3.1, part (d)). \square

Now let $\mathcal{K} = \{\delta, 2\delta, 4\delta, \dots, 1\}$, $C_1 = |\mathcal{K}|^{a/\beta-1}$, and $C = C_1|\mathcal{K}|$. Since $|\mathcal{K}| = \log D$, we have $C \lesssim D^{\varepsilon/\beta}$. Recall that $a \geq \beta$. By Holder's inequality, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} j(t) &= \sum_{t \sim p} \left(\sum_{w \in \mathcal{K}} |N(t) \cap P(w)| \right)^{a/\beta} \\ &\leq \sum_{t \sim p} C_1 \sum_{w \in \mathcal{K}} |N(t) \cap P(w)|^{a/\beta} \\ &\leq C_1 \sum_{w \in \mathcal{K}} \sum_{t \sim p} |N(t) \cap P(w)| \cdot |P(w)|^{a/\beta-1} \\ &\lesssim C_1 \sum_{w \in \mathcal{K}} |P(w)|^{a/\beta} \cdot \frac{1}{w^a} \\ &\lesssim C \cdot D^a \lesssim D^{a+\varepsilon/\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$I(P, \mathbb{T})^{a+\beta} \leq |\mathbb{T}|^a J^\beta \lesssim |\mathbb{T}|^a \left(\sum_{p \in P} D^{a+\varepsilon/\beta} \right)^\beta = |\mathbb{T}|^a |P|^\beta D^{a\beta+\varepsilon}.$$

This is the desired result.

4. FOURIER ANALYTIC UPPER BOUND

We will now prove the upper bound for $\alpha \geq 1$ and $\beta \geq 1$. First, we observe a reduction. Define $I'(P, \mathbb{T})$ to be number of pairs (p, t) with $p \in P, t \in \mathbb{T}$, and $|p \cap t| \geq \frac{|p|}{2}$. Note that $I'(P, \mathbb{T}) \leq I(P, \mathbb{T})$, but I' can be much less than I , e.g. $I' = 0$ while I is large. However, a standard rescaling argument shows that an upper bound for I' translates into an upper bound for I , possibly with a worse implied constant.

4.1. A Fourier Analytic result. We will need a variant of Proposition 2.1 from [GSW19]. First, we state the original version for $n = 2$.

Proposition 4.1 ([GSW19]). *Fix a small $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists a constant C_ε with the following property: Suppose that P is a set of unit balls in $[0, D]^2$ and \mathbb{T} is a set of essentially distinct tubes of length D and radius 1 in $[0, D]^2$. Suppose that each ball of P lies in about E tubes of \mathbb{T} . Let $S = D^{\varepsilon/20}$. Then either:*

***Thin case.** $|P| \lesssim S^2 E^{-2} |\mathbb{T}| D$, or*

Thick case. *There is a set of finitely overlapping $2S$ -balls Q_j (heavy balls) such that:*

- (1) $\bigcup_j Q_j$ contains a fraction $\gtrsim 1$ of the balls of P ;
- (2) Each Q_j intersects $\gtrsim SE$ tubes of \mathbb{T} .

Here, \lesssim means $\leq C_\varepsilon D^{20\varepsilon^3}$.

From this, we deduce the following corollary:

Corollary 4.2. *Fix a small $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists a constant C_ε with the following property: Suppose that P is a set of unit balls in $[0, D]^2$ and \mathbb{T} is a set of essentially distinct $1 \times D$ rectangles in $[0, D]^2$. Let $S = 4D^{\varepsilon/20}$, and for $q \in P$, define $B_S(q)$ to be the ball of radius S concentric with q , and $W_S(q) = \#\{T \in \mathbb{T} \mid T \cap B_S(q) \neq \emptyset\}$. Then*

$$(1) \quad I'(P, \mathbb{T}) \lesssim S \cdot D^{1/2} |P|^{1/2} |\mathbb{T}|^{1/2} + S^{-1} \sum_{q \in P} W_S(q).$$

Here, \lesssim means $\leq C_\varepsilon D^{21\varepsilon^3}$.

Proof. Let $P(E)$ be the subset of balls of P that lie in $\sim E$ tubes of \mathbb{T} . By dyadic pigeonholing, there exists E such that

$$(2) \quad I(P, \mathbb{T}) \lesssim \log D \cdot I'(P(E), \mathbb{T}) \lesssim D^{\varepsilon^3} I'(P(E), \mathbb{T})$$

Let $P' = P(E)$, and apply Proposition 4.1, using $\frac{S}{4}$ for S . If we are in the thin case, then we immediately get

$$(3) \quad I'(P', \mathbb{T}) \lesssim E |P'| \leq C_\varepsilon D^{20\varepsilon^3} \cdot \frac{S}{4} \cdot D^{1/2} |P|^{1/2} |\mathbb{T}|^{1/2}.$$

If we are in the thick case, then let P'' be the set of balls in $\bigcup_j Q_j$. We are given $|P'| \leq C_\varepsilon D^{20\varepsilon^3} |P''|$. A ball $q \in P''$ is contained in some Q_j with radius $\frac{S}{2}$, so $Q_j \subset B_S(q)$. Thus, $W_S(q) \gtrsim SE$ for all $q \in P''$, which means

$$(4) \quad I'(P', \mathbb{T}) \lesssim E |P'| \leq C_\varepsilon D^{20\varepsilon^3} E |P''| \lesssim C_\varepsilon D^{20\varepsilon^3} S^{-1} \sum_{q \in P''} W_S(q).$$

Combining (2), (3), and (4) give the desired result. \square

Remark. By rescaling, the bound for I' still holds if we replace P by a set of δ -balls and \mathbb{T} by a set of δ -tubes in $[0, 1]^2$. We also change $B_S(q)$ to be a $S\delta$ -ball concentric with q .

4.2. A Partitioning Argument. Proposition 4.2 hints at an inductive approach to upper bound I' . If the first term in (1) dominates, we get our desired upper bound. If the second term dominates, we get a sum of $W_S(q)$, which encourages us to thicken the δ -balls in P to $S\delta$ -balls. (Here, $S = 4D^{\varepsilon/20}$.) We would then thicken the δ -tubes in \mathbb{T} to $S\delta$ -tubes. We thus change the scale from δ to $S\delta$, and we can apply induction. The problem with this approach is that by thickening the δ -balls and δ -tubes, we may violate the essentially distinct and the dimension property, which in the scale $\delta' = S\delta$ reads for δ -balls,

$$(5) \quad \#\{q \in P \mid q \subset B_w\} < 100 \cdot \left(\frac{w}{S\delta}\right)^\beta.$$

If we just naively thicken all the δ -balls, then we can still have up to $100 \cdot \left(\frac{w}{\delta}\right)^\beta$ of the $S\delta$ -balls inside B_w , which would violate (5) by a factor of S^β . To resolve this

issue, we partition the $S\delta$ -balls into about S^β groups, each of which can satisfy (5). We do a similar process with δ -tubes, and we may now apply induction.

The partitioning argument will work with a modified dimension condition. Instead of satisfying (5) for all w and all balls B_w , our modified dimension condition only satisfies (5) for a certain set of w and B_w .

Recall that the δ -tubes and δ -balls are located in a 1×1 square, $[0, 1]^2$.

Definition 4.3. Fix $\delta \leq w \leq 1$. The *canonical w -ball tiling* is the covering of the 1×1 square by w -balls whose centers are spaced in a $w\mathbb{Z}$ -lattice $(w\mathbb{Z})^2$. The *canonical w -tube tiling* is a covering of the 1×1 square by $w \times 2$ tubes, defined as follows. For each direction $d \in \{e^{i0}, e^{i\frac{w}{2}}, e^{iw}, e^{i\frac{3w}{2}}, \dots, e^{i\pi}\} \subset S^1$, let L_d be the lattice generated by $\frac{w}{2}\widehat{e}_1$ and \widehat{e}_2 , where $\widehat{e}_1 = d$ and \widehat{e}_2 is a unit normal to d . Place a $w \times 2$ tube with direction d and centered at each point in L_d , and keep only those tubes that intersect $[0, 1]^2$.

From now on, we will refer to $w \times 2$ tubes as w -tubes.

We observe that for the canonical w -ball tiling,

- for every δ -ball q , at most 50 w -balls of the tiling contain q ;
- every w -ball p is strongly contained in the union of at most 50 w -balls q_1, \dots, q_{50} of the tiling, in the sense that if a δ -ball is contained inside p , then it must be contained inside some q_i , $1 \leq i \leq 50$.

Likewise for the canonical w -tube tiling (although this is less obvious to see):

- for every δ -tube t , at most 50 w -tubes of the tiling contain t ;
- every w -tube t is strongly contained in the union of at most 50 w -tubes v_1, \dots, v_{50} of the tiling, in the sense that if a δ -tube is contained inside t , then it must be contained inside some v_i , $1 \leq i \leq 50$.

The constant 50 is not optimal, but the important thing is that it's a constant. For purely technical reasons, we now define a weaker notion of a (δ, β) -set of balls using the canonical tiling.

Definition 4.4. For $0 \leq \beta \leq 2$, call a set of essentially distinct δ -balls P a weak (δ, β) -set of balls if for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $w = 2^{-n}$, $\delta \leq w \leq 1$, every ball B_w in the canonical w -ball tiling satisfies

$$\#\{q \in P \mid q \subset B_w\} < 100 \cdot \left(\frac{w}{\delta}\right)^\beta.$$

Likewise, call a set of essentially distinct δ -tubes \mathbb{T} a weak (δ, α) -set of tubes if for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $w = 2^{-n}$, $\delta \leq w \leq 1$, every w -tube T_w in the canonical w -tube tiling satisfies

$$\#\{T \in \mathbb{T} \mid T \subset T_w\} < 100 \cdot \left(\frac{w}{\delta}\right)^\alpha.$$

A few remarks are helpful. First, there are $\sim \log \delta^{-1}$ choices for n to satisfy $\delta \leq w \leq 1$. Second, despite its name, a weak (δ, β) -set of balls is also a (non-weak) (δ, β) -set of balls with a different constant (say, 5000 instead of 100). We are ready to state our main partitioning results.

Proposition 4.5. Let $S > 1$. Given a weak (δ, β) -set of balls P , form Q by changing all δ -balls in P to $S\delta$ -balls with the same center. Then we can partition Q into $\lesssim S^\beta \log \delta^{-1}$ weak $(S\delta, \beta)$ -sets of balls.

Proposition 4.6. *Let $S > 1$. Given a weak (δ, α) -set of tubes \mathbb{T} , form \mathbb{V} by changing all δ -tubes in \mathbb{T} to $S\delta$ -tubes with the same center and direction. Then we can partition \mathbb{V} into $\lesssim S^\alpha \log \delta^{-1}$ weak $(S\delta, \alpha)$ -sets of tubes.*

Proof. We will only prove Proposition 4.5. The proof of Proposition 4.6 is essentially the same, except change all δ -balls to δ -tubes, and use the properties for the canonical w -tube tiling instead of the canonical w -ball tiling.

Form a graph where the vertices are δ -balls in P . We will add edges to represent two δ -balls being in different partitions. We form the edge set following these two steps:

Step A. For each $w = 2^{-n}$, $S\delta \leq w \leq 1$, and for each w -ball B_w in the canonical w -ball tiling, let \mathcal{A} be the set of δ -balls in P that lie in B_w . Divide the δ -balls in \mathcal{A} into groups of size $2S^\beta$, with the remaining group of size at most $2S^\beta$. In each group, draw all edges between members of the group, forming a complete graph. (The way we partition \mathcal{A} is not unique, and we pick one such partition.)

Step B. For each $S\delta$ -ball $q \in Q$, let \mathcal{A} be the set of δ -balls in P that lie in q . Draw an edge between every δ -ball in \mathcal{A} .

Now we will calculate the maximum degree of the graph. Fix $p \in P$. For any w , p will lie in $\lesssim 1$ balls B_w of the canonical w -ball tiling. For each B_w , p is connected to at most $\lesssim S^\beta$ neighbors. Finally, there are $\sim \log \delta^{-1}$ choices for n , and thus w , to satisfy $S\delta \leq w \leq 1$. Thus, the maximum degree of p in Step A is $d \lesssim S^\beta \log \delta^{-1}$. For Step B, we get $\lesssim S^\beta$ more edges connected to p , since the $(S\delta)$ -ball containing p is strongly contained in the union of 50 $(S\delta)$ -balls of the canonical $S\delta$ -tiling, and each $(S\delta)$ -ball contains $\lesssim S^\beta$ of the δ -balls. We will now employ the following well-known lemma from graph theory.

Lemma 4.7. *Any graph with maximum degree n admits a coloring of the vertices with $n + 1$ colors such that no two adjacent vertices share the same color.*

Thus, we may color the graph with $d + 1$ colors. The coloring induces a partition of P into $d + 1$ sets, P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{d+1} . For each i , we thicken each δ -ball in P_i to a $S\delta$ -ball, forming Q_i . Now, we will show each set is a weak $(S\delta, \beta)$ -set of balls. It suffices to check $i = 1$.

First, Q_1 is essentially distinct by Step B. Now consider a ball B_w of the canonical w -ball tiling. Since P is a weak (δ, β) -set of balls, B_w contains at most $b \lesssim \left(\frac{w}{\delta}\right)^\beta$ δ -balls in P . There are $\lceil \frac{b}{2S^\beta} \rceil \leq \max(1, \frac{b}{S^\beta})$ groups, and each group contains at most one member of P_1 by construction. Thus, B_w contains at most

$$\max(1, \frac{b}{S^\beta}) \leq 100 \cdot \left(\frac{w}{S\delta}\right)^\beta$$

elements of P_1 . This bound still holds for Q_1 . Thus, Q_1 is a weak $(S\delta, \beta)$ -set of balls, as desired. \square

4.3. The upper bound for I' . Using the δ -balls and δ -tube partitioning results, we can now prove an upper bound on I' using the inductive argument mentioned at the start of Section 4.2.

Theorem 4.8. *Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, and let $c^{-1} = \max(\alpha + \beta - 1, 2)$, $D = \delta^{-1}$. There exists a $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that the following holds: for any weak (δ, β) -set of balls P and weak (δ, α) -set of tubes \mathbb{T} , we have the following incidence estimate,*

$$I'(P, \mathbb{T}) \leq C_\varepsilon D^{c+\varepsilon} |P|^{1-c} |\mathbb{T}|^{1-c}.$$

Remark. If $\alpha = \beta = 2$, which corresponds to the case where there are no constraints on the distribution of δ -tubes or δ -balls in $[0, 1]^2$, the result becomes $I'(P, \mathbb{T}) \leq C_\varepsilon D^{1/3+\varepsilon} |P|^{2/3} |\mathbb{T}|^{2/3}$, which is similar to the Szemerédi-Trotter bound with an additional $D^{1/3}$ factor.

Proof. First, we can assume $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{40}$. The proof will be by induction on δ . Base case is $\delta > \delta_0$, which is true if we choose $C_\varepsilon > C_0$ for a sufficiently large $C_0(\delta_0)$. We will choose the exact value of δ_0 at the end of the proof. For the inductive step, assume the result is true for $\tilde{\delta} > \delta$.

We first take care of the case when $|P||\mathbb{T}|$ is small. If $|P||\mathbb{T}| \leq D$, then $I'(P, \mathbb{T}) \leq |P||\mathbb{T}| \leq D^c |P|^{1-c} |D|^{1-c}$.

Thus, we may assume $|P||\mathbb{T}| \geq D$. We apply Corollary 4.2 to obtain, for some constant $C_1 = C_1(\varepsilon)$,

$$(6) \quad I'(P, \mathbb{T}) \leq C_1 D^{21\varepsilon^3} S \cdot D^{1/2} |P|^{1/2} |\mathbb{T}|^{1/2} + C_1 S^{-1} D^{21\varepsilon^3} \sum_{q \in P} W_S(q).$$

It suffices to show each term is bounded above by $\frac{1}{2} C_\varepsilon D^{c+\varepsilon} |P|^{1-c} |\mathbb{T}|^{1-c}$.

This is clear for the first term, since $c \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $|P||\mathbb{T}| \geq D$, and $\varepsilon \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{20} + 21\varepsilon^3$. We can choose $C_\varepsilon \geq 2C_1$.

For the second term, we can thicken the δ -tubes to $S\delta$ -tubes and thicken the δ -balls to $S\delta$ -balls. Let the set of tubes \mathbb{V} and set of balls Q be the results of this thickening. By Proposition 4.5 and 4.6, we can partition \mathbb{V} into weak $(S\delta, \alpha)$ -sets of tubes $\mathbb{V}_1, \mathbb{V}_2, \dots, \mathbb{V}_{K_2}$ and P into weak $(S\delta, \beta)$ -sets of balls P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{K_1} , where $K_1 \leq C_2 S^\alpha \log D$ and $K_2 \leq C_3 S^\beta \log D$ for constants $C_2, C_3 \geq 1$. Note that by partition property, $\sum_{i=1}^{K_1} |Q_i| = |P|$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{K_2} |\mathbb{V}_i| = |\mathbb{T}|$. Thus, using the inductive hypothesis and Cauchy-Schwarz, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{q \in P} W_S(q) &\leq I(Q, \mathbb{V}) = \sum_{i=1}^{K_1} \sum_{j=1}^{K_2} I(Q_i, \mathbb{V}_j) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{K_1} \sum_{j=1}^{K_2} 2C_\varepsilon (S^{-1}D)^{c+\varepsilon} |Q_i|^{1-c} |\mathbb{V}_j|^{1-c} \\ &= 2C_\varepsilon (S^{-1}D)^{c+\varepsilon} \sum_{i=1}^{K_1} |Q_i|^{1-c} \sum_{j=1}^{K_2} |\mathbb{V}_j|^{1-c} \\ &\leq 2C_\varepsilon (S^{-1}D)^{c+\varepsilon} (K_1^c |P|^{1-c} K_2^c |\mathbb{T}|^{1-c}) \\ &\leq 2C_\varepsilon (S^{-1}D)^{c+\varepsilon} S^{(\alpha+\beta)c} C_2^c C_3^c (\log D)^{2c} \cdot |P|^{1-c} |\mathbb{T}|^{1-c} \\ &= \left(2C_\varepsilon C_2^c C_3^c S^{(\alpha+\beta-1)c-\varepsilon} (\log D)^{2c} \right) D^{c+\varepsilon} |P|^{1-c} |\mathbb{T}|^{1-c}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $(\alpha + \beta - 1)c \leq 1$. If we let $C_4 = 2C_1 C_2^c C_3^c$, we get

$$C_1 S^{-1} D^{21\varepsilon^3} \sum_{q \in P} W_S(q) \leq \left(C_4 S^{-\varepsilon} D^{21\varepsilon^3} (\log D)^{2c} \right) C_\varepsilon D^{c+\varepsilon} |P|^{1/2} |\mathbb{T}|^{1/2}.$$

Our goal is thus to bound the term $C_4 S^{-\varepsilon} D^{21\varepsilon^3} (\log D)^{2c}$ above by $\frac{1}{2}$. Assume that $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{40}$. Since $S = 4D^{\varepsilon/20}$, there exists $D_0 = D_0(\varepsilon)$ such that for $D > D_0$, we have $C_4 S^{-\varepsilon} D^{21\varepsilon^3} (\log D)^{2c} < \frac{1}{2}$. Now choose $\tilde{\delta}_0 = D_0^{-1}$. This $\tilde{\delta}_0$ allows us to choose $C_0(\tilde{\delta}_0)$, and lastly we can choose $C_\varepsilon = \max(C_0, C_4)$. Thus, for $\delta < \tilde{\delta}_0$, we obtain

the desired bound for the second term of (6). This completes the inductive step and thus the proof of the theorem. \square

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4

We restate Theorem 1.4 here:

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose α, β satisfy $0 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq 2$. For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $C_\varepsilon = C(\varepsilon, \alpha, \beta)$ with the following property: for every (δ, β) -set of balls P and (δ, α) -set of tubes \mathbb{T} , the following bound holds:*

$$I(P, \mathbb{T}) \leq C_\varepsilon \delta^{-f(\alpha, \beta) - \varepsilon},$$

where $f(\alpha, \beta)$ is defined as in Figure 1. These bounds are sharp up to δ^ε .

Proof. The sharpness of these bounds was proved in Section 2, with the constructed examples.

First, we have $|P| \lesssim D^\beta$ and $|\mathbb{T}| \lesssim D^\alpha$ by dimension property (take $w = 2$). We will split into cases.

- If $1 \geq \alpha \geq \beta$ or $\alpha \geq 1 \geq \beta \geq \alpha - 1$, then we use Theorem 3.4 to get

$$I(P, \mathbb{T})^{\alpha+\beta} \lesssim D^{\alpha\beta+\varepsilon} D^{\beta^2} D^{\alpha\alpha}.$$

- If $1 \geq \beta \geq \alpha$ or $\beta \geq 1 \geq \alpha \geq \beta - 1$, then we use Theorem 3.2 to get

$$I(P, \mathbb{T})^{\alpha+b} \lesssim D^{\alpha b + \varepsilon} D^{b\beta} D^{\alpha^2}.$$

- If $\alpha \geq 1$ and $\beta \geq 1$, then we use Theorem 4.8 to get

$$I(P, \mathbb{T}) \lesssim I'(P, \mathbb{T}) \lesssim D^{c+\varepsilon} D^{\alpha(1-c)} D^{\beta(1-c)},$$

where $c^{-1} = \max(\alpha + \beta - 1, 2)$.

- If $\alpha \geq \beta + 1$, then since each δ -ball intersects $\lesssim D$ δ -tubes, we get $I(P, \mathbb{T}) \lesssim D^\beta \cdot D$.
- If $\beta \geq \alpha + 1$, then since each δ -tube intersects $\lesssim D$ δ -balls, we get $I(P, \mathbb{T}) \lesssim D^\alpha \cdot D$.

Combining these results proves Theorem 1.4. \square

6. APPENDIX

In this Appendix, we will verify Lemma 2.1 for Construction 1, which is the case

$$(7) \quad \alpha + \beta < 3, \alpha < \beta + 1, \text{ and } \beta < \alpha + 1.$$

Recall $a = \min(\alpha, 1)$, $b = \min(\beta, 1)$, $\gamma = \frac{a - \alpha + \beta}{a + b}$, $\kappa = \alpha - (1 - \gamma)a = \frac{a\beta + b\alpha - ab}{a + b}$.

Lemma 6.1. (a) *We have $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$ and $0 \leq \kappa \leq 1$.*

(b) *Suppose λ is a parameter satisfying the defining condition*

- $(1 - \gamma)a(a + 1 - \alpha) + \max(\lambda, 1 - \lambda)\kappa \leq a$;
- $(1 - \gamma)b(b + 1 - \beta) + \max(\lambda, 1 - \lambda)\kappa \leq b$;
- $\gamma + (1 - \gamma)\min(a, b) \geq \max(\lambda, 1 - \lambda)$;
- $0 \leq \lambda \leq \min(\gamma, 1 - \gamma) \leq 1$.

Then \mathbb{T} is a (δ, α) -set of tubes and P is a (δ, β) -set of balls.

(c) $\lambda = \min(\gamma, 1 - \gamma)$ *satisfies the defining condition.*

Proof. We will show four facts:

- (1) $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$.

- (2) $0 \leq \kappa \leq \min(a, b)$.
- (3) The δ -tubes are a (δ, α) -set of tubes.
- (4) The δ -balls are a (δ, β) -set of balls.

These facts allow us to verify $\lambda = \min(\gamma, 1 - \gamma)$ satisfies the defining condition. We perform the following computation using Facts 1-2 and $(a - 1)(a - \alpha) = 0$:

$$(1 - \gamma)a(a + 1 - \alpha) + \gamma\kappa \leq a(1 - \gamma) + \gamma a = a,$$

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \gamma)a(a + 1 - \alpha) + (1 - \gamma)\kappa &= (1 - \gamma)(a(a + 1 - \alpha) + (\alpha - (1 - \gamma)a)) \\ &= (1 - \gamma)(a(a - \alpha) + \alpha + \gamma a) \\ &= (1 - \gamma)(a - \alpha + \alpha + \gamma a) \\ &= (1 - \gamma)(1 + \gamma)a \leq a. \end{aligned}$$

$$\gamma + (1 - \gamma) \min(a, b) \geq \gamma \geq \gamma\kappa,$$

$$\gamma + (1 - \gamma) \min(a, b) \geq (1 - \gamma) \min(a, b) \geq (1 - \gamma)\kappa,$$

To show Facts 1-2, we look at the following table.

α	β	γ	κ
≤ 1	≤ 1	$\frac{\beta}{\alpha + \beta}$	$\frac{\alpha\beta}{\alpha + \beta}$
≤ 1	≥ 1	$\frac{\beta}{\alpha + 1}$	$\frac{\alpha\beta}{\alpha + 1}$
≥ 1	≤ 1	$\frac{1 - \alpha + \beta}{1 + \beta}$	$\frac{\alpha\beta}{1 + \beta}$
≥ 1	≥ 1	$\frac{1 - \alpha + \beta}{2}$	$\frac{\alpha + \beta - 1}{2}$

From the table and the conditions in equation (7), we can easily show Facts 1 and 2. Now, we will verify the δ -tubes are a (δ, α) -set of tubes. Fix $w \in [\delta, 1]$ and a $w \times 2$ rectangle R_w ; we will count how many δ -tubes are in R_w . Recall that the bundles in the construction are arranged in a rectangular grid, with bundles in the same row being translates of each other, and bundles in the same column being rotates of each other. We find three main contributions to our count:

- R_w can intersect bundles of $\lesssim \lceil \frac{w}{\delta^{\lambda\kappa}} \rceil$ different rows. This is because the angle between bundles of adjacent rows is $\delta^{\lambda\kappa}$, which is at least the angle δ^γ of a single bundle (since $\gamma \geq \lambda \geq \lambda\kappa$).
- R_w can intersect bundles of $\lesssim \lceil \frac{w}{\delta^{(1-\lambda)\kappa}} \rceil$ different columns.
- For each bundle, R_w can contain $\lesssim \min(\lceil \frac{w}{\delta^{\gamma+(1-\gamma)a}} \rceil, D^{(1-\gamma)a})$ δ -tubes. This is because the angle separation between adjacent δ -tubes of the same bundle is $\delta^{\gamma+(1-\gamma)a}$.

Thus, R_w contains at most n δ -tubes, for

$$n \lesssim \min\left(\lceil \frac{w}{\delta^{\gamma+(1-\gamma)a}} \rceil, D^{(1-\gamma)a}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{w}{\delta^{(1-\lambda)\kappa}} + 1\right) \left(\frac{w}{\delta^{\lambda\kappa}} + 1\right).$$

Suppose $w < \delta^{\gamma+(1-\gamma)a}$. From property of λ , we get $w < \delta^{\lambda\kappa}$ and $w < \delta^{(1-\lambda)\kappa}$. Hence,

$$n \lesssim 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 2 = 8 < 8 \left(\frac{w}{\delta}\right)^\alpha.$$

Thus we may assume $w > \delta^{\gamma+(1-\gamma)a}$. In this case, we can use $\lceil x \rceil \leq x + 1 \leq 2x$ to write

$$n \lesssim \min\left(\frac{w}{\delta^{\gamma+(1-\gamma)a}}, D^{(1-\gamma)a}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{w}{\delta^{(1-\lambda)\kappa}} + 1\right) \left(\frac{w}{\delta^{\lambda\kappa}} + 1\right).$$

Let $m = \min\left(\frac{w}{\delta^{\gamma+(1-\gamma)a}}, D^{(1-\gamma)a}\right)$. We expand the product and bound each term separately. We will use the fact $\min(x, y) \leq x^c y^{1-c}$ for any $0 \leq c \leq 1$, as well as $a \leq \min(\alpha, 1)$, $\delta \leq w \leq 1$, $\kappa = \alpha - (1 - \gamma)a$, and the defining relation of λ .

$$(8) \quad m \leq \left(\frac{w}{\delta^{\gamma+(1-\gamma)a}}\right)^a \left(D^{(1-\gamma)a}\right)^{1-a} = \left(\frac{w}{\delta}\right)^a \leq \left(\frac{w}{\delta}\right)^\alpha.$$

$$(9) \quad m \cdot \frac{w}{\delta^{(1-\lambda)\kappa}} \leq \left(\frac{w}{\delta}\right)^{\alpha-a} \left(D^{(1-\gamma)a}\right)^{a+1-\alpha} \cdot \frac{w}{\delta^{(1-\lambda)\kappa}} \leq \frac{w^{\alpha-a+1}}{\delta^\alpha} \leq \left(\frac{w}{\delta}\right)^\alpha,$$

$$(10) \quad m \cdot \frac{w}{\delta^{\lambda\kappa}} \leq \left(\frac{w}{\delta}\right)^{\alpha-a} \left(D^{(1-\gamma)a}\right)^{a+1-\alpha} \cdot \frac{w}{\delta^{\lambda\kappa}} \leq \frac{w^{\alpha-a+1}}{\delta^\alpha} \leq \left(\frac{w}{\delta}\right)^\alpha,$$

$$(11) \quad m \cdot \frac{w}{\delta^{\lambda\kappa}} \cdot \frac{w}{\delta^{(1-\lambda)\kappa}} \leq D^{(1-\gamma)a} \cdot \frac{w}{\delta^{\lambda\kappa}} \cdot \frac{w}{\delta^{(1-\lambda)\kappa}} = \frac{w^2}{\delta^\alpha} \leq \left(\frac{w}{\delta}\right)^\alpha.$$

Hence, we get the desired bound $n \lesssim \left(\frac{w}{\delta}\right)^\alpha$. Finally, to verify the δ -tubes are essentially distinct, we observe that:

- two δ -tubes in bundles in different rows are separated by a translation of $\geq \delta^{(1-\lambda)\kappa} \geq \delta$;
- two δ -tubes in bundles in different columns are separated by a rotation of $\geq \delta^{\lambda\kappa} \geq \delta$;
- two δ -tubes in the same bundle are separated by a rotation of $\geq \delta^{\gamma+(1-\gamma)a} \geq \delta$.

Thus, \mathbb{T} is a (δ, α) -set of tubes, proving Fact 3.

Now, we verify the δ -balls are a (δ, β) -set of balls. Fix $w \in [\delta, 1]$ and a ball B_w of radius w ; we will count how many δ -balls are in B_w . There are three main contributions.

- B_w can intersect bundles of $\lesssim \lceil \frac{w}{\delta^{\lambda\kappa}} \rceil$ different rows.
- B_w can intersect bundles of $\lesssim \lceil \frac{w}{\delta^{(1-\lambda)\kappa}} \rceil$ different columns.
- For each bundle, B_w can contain $\lesssim \min(\lceil \frac{w}{\delta^{1-\gamma+\gamma b}} \rceil, D^{\gamma b})$ δ -balls.

Thus, B_w contains at most n δ -balls, for

$$n \lesssim \min\left(\lceil \frac{w}{\delta^{1-\gamma+\gamma b}} \rceil, D^{\gamma b}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{w}{\delta^{(1-\lambda)\kappa}} + 1\right) \left(\frac{w}{\delta^{\lambda\kappa}} + 1\right).$$

Using a similar method to the δ -tubes case, we get the desired bound $n \lesssim \left(\frac{w}{\delta}\right)^\beta$. Finally, to verify the δ -balls are essentially distinct, we look at bundles. Each bundle contains a set of balls, which we call a stick.

- Since $\lambda\kappa \leq \lambda \leq 1 - \gamma$, sticks in different rows cannot overlap;
- Two sticks in the same row but different columns are horizontal $\delta^{(1-\lambda)\kappa} \geq \delta$ translates of each other. Since the angle from vertical of a given stick is $\leq \frac{1}{100}$, these two sticks cannot overlap;
- Two δ -balls in the same stick are separated by a translation of $\geq \delta^{1-\gamma+\gamma b} \geq \delta$.

Thus, P is a (δ, β) -set of balls, proving Fact 4. The Lemma is proved. \square

REFERENCES

- [Cor77] Antonio Cordoba. The Kakeya maximal function and the spherical summation multipliers. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 99(1):1–22, 1977.
- [DGW20] Ciprian Demeter, Larry Guth, and Hong Wang. Small cap decouplings. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 30(4):989–1062, 2020.
- [FGM21a] Yuqiu Fu, Larry Guth, and Dominique Maldague. A decoupling inequality for short generalized Dirichlet sequences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.00856*, 2021.
- [FGM21b] Yuqiu Fu, Larry Guth, and Dominique Maldague. Sharp superlevel set estimates for small cap decouplings of the parabola. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.13139*, 2021.
- [GMW20] Larry Guth, Dominique Maldague, and Hong Wang. Improved decoupling for the parabola. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.07953*, 2020.
- [GSW19] Larry Guth, Noam Solomon, and Hong Wang. Incidence estimates for well spaced tubes. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 29(6):1844–1863, 2019.
- [GWZ20] Larry Guth, Hong Wang, and Ruixiang Zhang. A sharp square function estimate for the cone in \mathbb{R}^3 . *Annals of Mathematics*, 192(2):551–581, 2020.
- [KT01] Nets Hawk Katz and Terence Tao. Some connections between Falconer’s distance set conjecture and sets of Furstenberg type. *New York J. Math*, 7:149–187, 2001.
- [Orp18] Tuomas Orponen. On the dimension and smoothness of radial projections. *Analysis & PDE*, 12(5):1273–1294, 2018.
- [Vin11] Le Anh Vinh. The Szemerédi–Trotter type theorem and the sum-product estimate in finite fields. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 32(8):1177–1181, 2011.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MIT, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139
Email address: `yuqiufu@mit.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MIT, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139
Email address: `kevinren@mit.edu`