

# Unions of lines in $\mathbb{R}^n$

Joshua Zahl\*

August 8, 2022

## Abstract

We prove a conjecture of D. Oberlin on the dimension of unions of lines in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . If  $d \geq 1$  is an integer,  $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$ , and  $L$  is a set of lines in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with Hausdorff dimension at least  $2(d-1) + \beta$ , then the union of the lines in  $L$  has Hausdorff dimension at least  $d + \beta$ . Our proof combines a refined version of the multilinear Kakeya theorem by Carbery and Valdimarsson with the multilinear  $\rightarrow$  linear argument of Bourgain and Guth.

## 1 Introduction

This paper concerns the following conjecture of D. Oberlin. In what follows,  $\dim$  will always refer to Hausdorff dimension.

**Conjecture 1.1.** *Let  $1 \leq d \leq n$  be integers and let  $\beta \in [0, 1]$ . Let  $L$  be a set of lines in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , with  $\dim L \geq 2(d-1) + \beta$ . Then*

$$\dim \bigcup_{\ell \in L} \ell \geq d + \beta. \quad (1.1)$$

The bound (1.1) is best-possible, since  $L$  could be the set of lines contained in a  $\beta$ -dimensional union of (parallel)  $d$ -dimensional affine subspaces of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . In [9], R. Oberlin proved the finite field analogue of Conjecture 1.1, and this is also the first place where the conjecture appeared in print. In [7], Héra, Keleti, and Máthé considered a variant of Conjecture 1.1 where  $d = 0$  and  $L$  is replaced by a set of  $k$ -dimensional affine subspaces of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Finally in [6], Héra posed a generalization of Conjecture 1.1, where lines are replaced by  $k$ -dimensional affine subspaces of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

When  $d = 1$ , Conjecture 1.1 was proved by Héra, Keleti, and Máthé [7] and when  $d = n - 1$ , Conjecture 1.1 was proved by D. Oberlin [8]. In this paper, we will prove Conjecture 1.1 for the remaining values of  $d$ . As is typical for such problems, the conjecture will follow from the corresponding maximal function estimate, which we will state below. In what follows,  $\mathcal{L}_n$  is the set of lines in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , with the following metric: if  $\ell, \ell' \in \mathcal{L}_n$ , then  $d(\ell, \ell') = |x - x'| + |u \wedge u'|$ . Here  $u$  (resp  $u'$ ) is a unit vector parallel to  $\ell$ ;  $x$  (resp.  $x'$ ) is the unique point on  $\ell$  with  $x \perp u$ ; and  $|u \wedge u'|$  is the (unsigned) area of the parallelogram spanned by  $u$  and  $u'$ . A  $\delta$ -tube is the  $\delta$ -neighborhood of a unit line segment in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and if  $T$  is a  $\delta$ -tube, then  $\ell(T)$  is the line coaxial with  $T$ . Finally, if  $p \in [1, \infty]$ , then  $p'$  denotes the conjugate Lebesgue exponent.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $n \geq 2$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then there exists  $C = C(n, \varepsilon)$  so that the following holds. Let  $1 \leq d < n$  be an integer, and let  $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$ . Let  $\mathbb{T}$  be a set of  $\delta$ -tubes in  $B(0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ . Suppose that for all balls  $B \subset \mathcal{L}_n$  of radius  $r$ , we have*

$$\#\{T \in \mathbb{T} : \ell(T) \subset B\} \leq (r/\delta)^{2(d-1)+\beta}. \quad (1.2)$$

---

\*University of British Columbia, Vancouver BC, supported by an NSERC Discovery grant, jzahl@math.ubc.ca.

Then

$$\left\| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} \chi_T \right\|_p \leq C \delta^{\frac{1-d}{p'} - \varepsilon} \left( \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} |T| \right)^{1/p}, \quad p' = d + \beta. \quad (1.3)$$

We prove Theorem 1.2 by combining the multilinear Keakeya theorem [1, 5] with the multilinear to linear arguments developed by Bourgain and Guth in [2]; this is done in Section 2. A secondary goal of this paper is provide a short and self-contained introduction to this type of argument. We prove Conjecture 1.1 by first using a result from [7] to reduce to the case where  $L$  is analytic and hence supports a Frostman measure, and then using a standard discretization argument; this is done in Section 3.

## 1.1 Thanks

The author would like to thank Kornélia Héra for comments on an earlier version of this manuscript.

## 2 The Bourgain-Guth multilinear $\rightarrow$ linear argument

In [2], Bourgain and Guth combined the multilinear restriction theorem of Bennett, Carbery, and Tao [1] (see also [5]) with induction on scales to prove new Fourier restriction estimates. In this section, we revisit those arguments and obtain variants that are adapted to the proof of Theorem 1.2.

In the arguments that follow, we adopt the notation  $A \lesssim B$  to mean that there is a constant  $C$  (which may depend on the ambient dimension  $n$ , and possibly also the Lebesgue exponent  $p$ , if this is relevant) so that  $A \leq CB$ .

We will use the following version of the multilinear Keakeya theorem, which is Theorem 1 from [3]. In what follows,  $|u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge u_k|$  is the unsigned volume of the parallelepiped spanned by  $u_1, \dots, u_k$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $2 \leq k \leq n$  and let  $\mathbb{T}_1, \dots, \mathbb{T}_k$  be sets of  $\delta$ -tubes in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Then*

$$\left\| \left( \sum_{T_1 \in \mathbb{T}_1} \dots \sum_{T_k \in \mathbb{T}_k} \chi_{T_1} \dots \chi_{T_k} |u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge u_k| \right)^{\frac{1}{k}} \right\|_{\frac{k}{k-1}} \lesssim \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \right)^{\frac{n}{k}-1} \prod_{i=1}^k \left( \sum_{T_i \in \mathbb{T}_i} |T_i| \right)^{\frac{1}{k}}, \quad (2.1)$$

where in the above expression,  $u_i$  is the direction of the tube  $T_i$ .

When proving Theorem 1.2, Theorem 2.1 is helpful in the special case where, for a typical point  $x$  where  $(\sum \chi_T)^p$  is large, most  $(d+1)$ -tuples of tubes  $T_1, \dots, T_{d+1}$  that contain  $x$  satisfy  $|u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge u_{d+1}| \sim 1$ . Indeed, it is straightforward to verify that our desired bound (1.3) follows from Theorem 2.1 in this case. The Bourgain-Guth multilinear  $\rightarrow$  linear argument establishes a dichotomy between this situation and an opposite extreme, where most of the tubes containing a typical point  $x$  are contained in the thin neighborhood of a  $d$ -dimensional affine subspace.

The lemmas below will help make this dichotomy precise. In what follows, if  $H$  is a  $k$ -dimensional vector subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is a unit vector, we write  $|H \wedge u|$  to mean  $|u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge u_k \wedge u|$ , where  $u_1, \dots, u_k$  are orthonormal vectors that span  $H$ ; the value of  $|H \wedge u|$  is independent of the choice of  $u_1, \dots, u_k$ . In particular,  $|H \wedge u| = 0$  if  $u \in H$ , and  $|H \wedge u| = 1$  if  $u \perp H$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $U \subset S^{n-1}$  be a multiset of unit vectors, let  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , and let  $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$ . Then at least one of the following must hold.*

**A.** 
$$\#\{(u_1, \dots, u_k) \in U^k : |u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge u_k| \geq \rho^{k-1}\} \geq \frac{1}{2}(\#U)^k.$$

**B.** There is a  $(k-1)$ -dimensional vector subspace  $H \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  so that

$$\#\{u \in U : |H \wedge u| \leq \rho\} \geq 2^{-2k}(\#U).$$

In particular, we always have

$$(\#U) \lesssim \rho^{\frac{1-k}{k}} \left( \sum_{u_1 \in U} \dots \sum_{u_k \in U} |u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge u_k| \right)^{1/k} + \sup_{H \in \text{Gr}(k-1, \mathbb{R}^n)} \#\{u \in U : |H \wedge u| \leq \rho\}. \quad (2.2)$$

*Proof.* When  $k=1$  there is nothing to prove, so we can assume  $k \geq 2$ . Suppose Option A does not hold. Let  $N = \#U$  and let  $2 \leq j \leq k$  be the smallest index so that

$$\#\{(u_1, \dots, u_j) \in U^j : |u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge u_j| < \rho^{j-1}\} \geq 2^{2j-2k-1}N^j. \quad (2.3)$$

(Such an index must exist, since the failure of Option A implies that (2.3) holds for  $j=k$ ). For notational simplicity, we will suppose that  $j > 2$  (the same argument works when  $j=2$ , though some care must be taken with indices). There are at least  $2^{2j-2k-2}N^{j-1}$  tuples  $(u_1, \dots, u_{j-1})$  for which

$$\#\{u \in U : |u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge u_{j-1} \wedge u| < \rho^{j-1}\} \geq 2^{2j-2k-2}N. \quad (2.4)$$

But by the minimality of  $j$ , at most  $2^{2j-2k-3}N^{j-1}$  of these tuples satisfy  $|u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge u_{j-1}| < \rho^{j-2}$ . We conclude that there exists a tuple  $(u_1, \dots, u_{j-1})$  that satisfies (2.4), with  $|u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge u_{j-1}| \geq \rho^{j-2}$ . Let  $W = \text{span}\{u_1, \dots, u_{j-1}\}$ . Then  $|W \wedge u| \leq \rho$  for each  $u$  in the set (2.4), i.e.

$$\#\{u \in U : |W \wedge u| \leq \rho\} \geq 2^{2j-2k-2}N \geq 2^{-2k}N.$$

The result now follows by selecting a  $(k-1)$ -dimensional vector subspace  $H$  containing  $W$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.3.** Let  $U \subset S^{n-1}$  be a multiset of unit vectors, let  $2 \leq k \leq n$ , and let  $0 < \rho \leq 1$ . Let  $\{\tau\}$  be a covering of  $S^{n-1}$  by spherical caps of diameter  $\rho$ , and suppose each  $u \in S^{n-1}$  is contained in at most  $10^n$  caps. Let  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Then

$$(\#U)^p \lesssim \rho^{\frac{(1-k)p}{k}} \left( \sum_{u_1 \in U} \dots \sum_{u_k \in U} |u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge u_k| \right)^{p/k} + \rho^{(2-k)(p-1)} \sum_{\tau} (\#(U \cap \tau))^p. \quad (2.5)$$

*Proof.* Apply Lemma 2.2. The first term in (2.2) corresponds to the first term in (2.5). For the second term, note that if  $H$  is a  $(k-1)$ -dimensional subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $\lesssim \rho^{2-k}$  of the caps from  $\{\tau\}$  intersect the set  $\{u \in S^{n-1} : |H \wedge u| \leq \rho\}$  (it is not important whether the supremum in (2.2) is realized). Next we use Hölder's inequality, and finally we add the remaining caps to the RHS of (2.5).  $\square$

We record the following consequence of Corollary 2.3.

**Lemma 2.4.** Let  $0 < \delta \leq \rho \leq 1$ , let  $2 \leq k \leq n$ , and let  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Let  $\{\tau\}$  be a covering of  $S^{n-1}$  by spherical caps of diameter  $\rho$  that is at most  $10^n$ -overlapping. Let  $\mathbb{T}$  be a set of  $\delta$ -tubes in  $B(0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ . Then

$$\left\| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} \chi_T \right\|_p \lesssim \rho^{\frac{1-k}{k}} \left\| \left( \sum_{T_1, \dots, T_k \in \mathbb{T}} \chi_{T_1} \cdots \chi_{T_k} |u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge u_k| \right)^{\frac{1}{k}} \right\|_p + \rho^{\frac{2-k}{p}} \left( \sum_{\tau} \left\| \sum_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{T} \\ \text{dir}(T) \in \tau}} \chi_T \right\|_p^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (2.6)$$

*Proof.* For each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we apply Corollary 2.3 to the multiset of unit vectors  $\{\text{dir}(T) : x \in T\}$  and integrate.  $\square$

Observe that if  $\delta < \rho/2$ , then the final term in (2.6) can be further decomposed. For each cap  $\tau$  with center  $u \in S^{n-1}$ , we can cover  $B(0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  by boundedly overlapping  $\rho$ -tubes that point in direction  $u$ . If  $T \in \mathbb{T}$  and  $\text{dir}(T) \in \tau$ , then  $T$  will be contained in at least 1, and at most  $\lesssim 1$  tubes  $T_\rho$  of this type. Let  $\mathbb{T}_\rho$  denote the set of all such tubes, for all caps  $\tau$ . Then each  $T \in \mathbb{T}$  is contained in at least 1, and at most  $\lesssim 1$  tubes from  $\mathbb{T}_\rho$ . Thus we have

$$\sum_{\tau} \left\| \sum_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{T} \\ \text{dir}(T) \in \tau}} \chi_T \right\|_p^p \lesssim \sum_{T_\rho \in \mathbb{T}_\rho} \left\| \sum_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{T} \\ T \subset T_\rho}} \chi_T \right\|_p^p, \quad 1 \leq p < \infty. \quad (2.7)$$

The advantage is that each term on the RHS of (2.7) has been localized to a  $\rho$ -tube.

We will use Theorem 2.1 to control the first term on the RHS of (2.6). We record the following computation.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $1 \leq d < n$  be integers, let  $\beta \in [0, 1]$ , and let  $\mathbb{T}$  be a set of  $\delta$ -tubes in  $B(0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , with  $\#\mathbb{T} \leq \delta^{2(1-d)-\beta}$ . Then*

$$\left\| \left( \sum_{T_1, \dots, T_{d+1} \in \mathbb{T}} \chi_{T_1} \cdots \chi_{T_{d+1}} |u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge u_{d+1}| \right)^{\frac{1}{d+1}} \right\|_p \lesssim \delta^{\frac{1-d}{p'}} \left( \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} |T| \right)^{1/p}, \quad p' = d + \beta. \quad (2.8)$$

*Proof.* Note that  $p - \frac{d+1}{d} \geq 0$ , with equality if  $\beta = 1$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \left( \sum_{T_1, \dots, T_{d+1} \in \mathbb{T}} \chi_{T_1} \cdots \chi_{T_{d+1}} |u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge u_{d+1}| \right)^{\frac{p}{d+1}} \\ & \leq (\#\mathbb{T})^{p - \frac{d+1}{d}} \int \left( \sum_{T_1, \dots, T_{d+1} \in \mathbb{T}} \chi_{T_1} \cdots \chi_{T_{d+1}} |u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge u_{d+1}| \right)^{\frac{1}{d}} \\ & \lesssim \left( \delta^{1-n} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} |T| \right)^{p - \frac{d+1}{d}} \left[ \delta^{\frac{d+1-n}{d}} \left( \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} |T| \right)^{\frac{d+1}{d}} \right] \\ & = \delta^{1+(1-n)(p-1)} \left( \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} |T| \right)^{p-1} \left( \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} |T| \right) \\ & \leq \delta^{1+(1-n)(p-1)} \left( \delta^{n-1} \delta^{2(1-d)-\beta} \right)^{p-1} \left( \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} |T| \right) \\ & = \delta^{\frac{p(1-d)}{p'}} \left( \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} |T| \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

For the first inequality, we used the observation that the integrand is bounded by  $(\#\mathbb{T})^{d+1}$ . The second inequality used Theorem 2.1. The next equality re-groups terms. The fifth line used the hypothesis on the cardinality of  $\mathbb{T}$ , while the final line simplifies the expression.  $\square$

Combining (2.7) and Lemma 2.5, we obtain the following; recall that  $\mathbb{T}_\rho$  is a maximal collection of boundedly overlapping  $\rho$ -tubes.

**Corollary 2.6.** *Let  $1 \leq d < n$  be integers and let  $\beta \in [0, 1]$ . Let  $0 < \delta \leq \rho/2 \leq 1$ , and let  $\mathbb{T}$  be a set of  $\delta$ -tubes in  $B(0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , with  $\#\mathbb{T} \leq \delta^{2(1-d)-\beta}$ . Then*

$$\left\| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} \chi_T \right\|_p \lesssim \rho^{\frac{-d}{d+1}} \delta^{\frac{1-d}{p'}} \left( \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} |T| \right)^{1/p} + \rho^{\frac{1-d}{p'}} \left( \sum_{T_\rho \in \mathbb{T}_\rho} \left\| \sum_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{T} \\ T \subset T_\rho}} \chi_T \right\|_p^p \right)^{1/p}, \quad p' = d + \beta. \quad (2.10)$$

Using Inequality 2.10, we can prove Theorem 1.2 using induction on scales.

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* In the arguments that follow, we will choose the (small, positive) quantities  $\rho$  and  $\delta_0$ , and then the (large) quantity  $C$ , in that order;  $C$  is the quantity appearing in (1.3).

We will prove the theorem by induction on  $\delta$ . By choosing  $C$  appropriately, we can suppose that (1.3) holds whenever  $\delta \geq \delta_0$ . Suppose now that  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ , and suppose furthermore that for all  $\tilde{\delta} \in (\delta, 1]$ , we have that (1.3) has been established for all collections  $\mathbb{T}$  of  $\tilde{\delta}$ -tubes in  $B(0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  that satisfy the analogue of (1.2) with  $\tilde{\delta}$  in place of  $\delta$ . Let  $\mathbb{T}$  be a set of  $\delta$ -tubes in  $B(0, 1)$  that satisfy (1.2). Our goal is to establish (1.3) for this collection of tubes.

By Corollary 2.6, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} \chi_T \right\|_p^p \lesssim \rho^{\frac{-dp}{d+1}} \delta^{\frac{(1-d)p}{p'}} \left( \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} |T| \right) + \rho^{\frac{(1-d)p}{p'}} \sum_{T_\rho \in \mathbb{T}_\rho} \left\| \sum_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{T} \\ T \subset T_\rho}} \chi_T \right\|_p^p. \quad (2.11)$$

If  $C = C(n, \varepsilon)$  is chosen sufficiently large depending on  $\rho$  (which in turn, will ultimately only depend on  $n$  and  $\varepsilon$ ) and the implicit constant in (2.11), then (2.11) may be re-written as

$$\left\| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} \chi_T \right\|_p^p - \frac{1}{2} C^p \delta^{\frac{(1-d)p}{p'}} \left( \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} |T| \right) \lesssim \rho^{\frac{(1-d)p}{p'}} \sum_{T_\rho \in \mathbb{T}_\rho} \left\| \sum_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{T} \\ T \subset T_\rho}} \chi_T \right\|_p^p. \quad (2.12)$$

We must now bound the RHS of (2.12). Let  $T_\rho \in \mathbb{T}_\rho$ . Let  $A$  be the affine map that sends the coaxial line of  $T_\rho$  to the  $e_1$ -axis, and dilates  $T_\rho$  by a factor of  $1/\rho$  in each of the directions  $e_2, \dots, e_n$ . We can verify that the image of each of the tubes  $\{T \in \mathbb{T} : T \subset T_\rho\}$  under this transformation is comparable to a  $\delta/\rho$ -tube contained in  $B(0, 1)$ , and that this set of  $\delta/\rho$ -tubes satisfies the analogue of (1.2) with  $\delta/\rho$  in place of  $\delta$  (the inequality (1.2) might be weakened by a constant factor, but this is harmless and can be remedied, for example, by partitioning the set of  $\delta/\rho$ -tubes into  $\sim 1$  families, applying the arguments below to each family in turn, and using the triangle inequality).

Since  $\delta/\rho > \delta$ , we can apply the induction hypothesis to conclude that (after undoing the re-scaling)

$$\left\| \sum_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{T} \\ T \subset T_\rho}} \chi_T \right\|_p^p \lesssim C^p (\delta/\rho)^{\frac{(1-d)p}{p'} - \varepsilon p} \left( \sum_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{T} \\ T \subset T_\rho}} |T| \right).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{\frac{(1-d)p}{p'}} \sum_{T_\rho \in \mathbb{T}_\rho} \left\| \sum_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{T} \\ T \subset T_\rho}} \chi_T \right\|_p^p &\lesssim C^p \rho^{\frac{(1-d)p}{p'}} (\delta/\rho)^{\frac{(1-d)p}{p'} - \varepsilon p} \sum_{T_\rho \in \mathbb{T}_\rho} \left( \sum_{\substack{T \in \mathbb{T} \\ T \subset T_\rho}} |T| \right) \\ &\lesssim C^p \rho^{\varepsilon p} \delta^{\frac{(1-d)p}{p'} - \varepsilon p} \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} |T|. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

Selecting  $\rho$  sufficiently small compared to  $\varepsilon$ ,  $p$ , and the implicit constants in (2.12) and (2.13) (recall that these constants depend only on  $n$  and  $p$ ; crucially, they do not depend on  $\rho$  or  $C$ ), we obtain (1.3), which closes the induction and completes the proof.  $\square$

### 3 Proof of Conjecture 1.1

We are now ready to prove Conjecture 1.1. First, we will reduce the situation where  $L$  is analytic, and in particular supports a Frostman measure of the appropriate dimension. A reduction of this type first appeared in [7]; we briefly summarize those arguments here.

For convenience, we will suppose that  $\beta > 0$  (so in particular  $d < n$ ). This is harmless, since if  $\beta = 0$  then we can replace  $d$  by  $d - 1$  and  $\beta$  by 1. Next, note that it suffices to establish a variant of (1.1), where the RHS has been replaced by  $d + \beta - \varepsilon$  for arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

Fix such an  $\varepsilon$ . Let  $X = \bigcup_{\ell \in L} \ell$ , and let  $X_1 \supset X$  be a  $G_\delta$  set with  $\dim X_1 = \dim X$ ; the construction of such a set is explained, for example, in [4]. Since  $\ell \subset X_1$  for each  $\ell \in L$ , if we select  $R$  sufficiently large then the set  $L_1 = \{\ell \in L: |\ell \cap X_1 \cap B(0, R)| > 1\}$  satisfies  $\dim L_1 \geq \dim L - \varepsilon/2$ .

Abusing notation, we will replace the set  $X_1$  and the lines in  $L_1$  and  $L$  with their images under the re-scaling  $x \mapsto x/R$ . We still have  $\dim L_1 \geq 2(d - 1) + \beta - \varepsilon/2$ , but now

$$L_1 = \{\ell \in L: |\ell \cap B(0, 1)| > R^{-1}\}. \quad (3.1)$$

The set  $X_2 = X_1 \cap B(0, 1)$  is  $G_\delta$  and bounded, and  $\ell \cap X_2$  contains an interval of length  $\geq 1/R$  for each  $\ell \in L_1$ .

Next, we recall the following special case of Lemma 3.1 from [7]. In the statement below,  $A(n, 1)$  is the set of lines in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and if  $Z \subset \ell$ , then  $\mathcal{H}_\infty^1(Z) = \inf \sum |J|$ , where the infimum is taken over all coverings of  $Z$  by countable collections of open intervals  $\{J\}$ . Note that the analyticity of a set  $M \subset A(1, n)$  depends on the metric (or more generally, the topology), and the authors in [7] discuss their choice of metric in Remark 2.2. The metric on  $\mathcal{L}_n \subset A(n, 1)$  described in Section 1 is compatible with that from [7].

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be  $G_\delta$  and bounded, and let  $c > 0$ . Then the set of lines*

$$\{\ell \in A(n, 1): \mathcal{H}_\infty^1(\ell \cap Y) > c\}$$

*is analytic.*

Let  $L_2 = \{\ell \in A(n, 1): \mathcal{H}_\infty^1(\ell \cap X_2) \geq 1/R\}$ . Then  $L_2$  is analytic, and  $L_2 \supset L_1$  (indeed,  $\mathcal{H}_\infty^1(\ell \cap X_2) \geq 1/R$  for each  $\ell \in L_1$ , since  $\ell \cap X_2$  contains an interval of length  $\geq 1/R$ ), so  $\dim L_2 \geq 2(d - 1) + \beta - \varepsilon/2$ . At this point, we have replaced our original set  $X = \bigcup_{\ell \in L} \ell$  by a new set  $X_2$  whose Hausdorff dimension is no larger than that of  $X$ , and we have replaced the original set of lines  $L$  by a set  $L_2$  that is analytic (in the metric space  $\mathcal{L}_n$ ), with  $\dim L_2 \geq 2(d - 1) + \beta - \varepsilon/2$ . In particular,  $L_2$  supports a Frostman probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$  that satisfies the following ball condition: There is a constant  $C_0$  so that for all  $r > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(B) \leq C_0 r^{2(d-1)+\beta-\varepsilon} \quad \text{for all balls } B \subset \mathcal{L}_n \text{ of radius } r. \quad (3.2)$$

To prove Conjecture 1.1, it suffices to establish the estimate

$$\dim X_2 \geq d + \beta - C_1 \varepsilon, \quad (3.3)$$

for some constant  $C_1 = C_1(n) > 0$ ; we will prove (3.3) with  $C_1 = 7n$ .

Armed with Theorem 1.2, the proof of (3.3) is a straightforward discretization argument. Let  $k_0$  be a large integer that will be chosen below. Cover  $X_2$  by a union  $\bigcup_{k=k_0}^\infty \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}_k} B$ , where  $\mathcal{B}_k$  is a collection of balls of radius  $2^{-k}$ , and  $\sum_k 2^{-k(\dim X_2 + \varepsilon)} \#\mathcal{B}_k < \infty$ .

For each line  $\ell \in L_2$ , there is an index  $k = k(\ell) \geq k_0$  so that

$$\left| \ell \cap \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}_k} B \right| \geq \frac{1}{100Rk^2},$$

where  $R$  is the constant from (3.1). For each index  $k$ , define  $L^{(k)} = \{\ell \in L_2: k(\ell) = k\}$ . Then  $\sum_{k \geq k_0} \mathbb{P}(L^{(k)}) \geq 1$ , so there is an index  $k_1 \geq k_0$  with  $\mathbb{P}(L^{(k_1)}) \geq \frac{1}{100k_1^2}$ . Define  $L_3 = L^{(k_1)}$ , define  $\delta = 2^{-k_1}$ , and define  $E_\delta = \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}_{k_1}} B$ .

In what follows, we will write  $A \lesssim B$  to mean  $A \lesssim |\log \delta|^C B$ , where  $C$  is an absolute constant (in practice we can take  $C \leq 10$ ). In particular, we have  $\mathbb{P}(L_3) \gtrsim 1$ , and  $|\ell \cap E_\delta| \gtrsim 1$  for each  $\ell \in L_3$ .

By dyadic pigeonholing, we can select a  $2\delta$ -separated set  $L_3^\delta \subset L_3$  and a number  $A \geq C_0^{-1} \delta^\varepsilon$  so that  $(A^{-1} \delta^{2(1-d)-\beta})(\#L_3^\delta) \gtrsim 1$ , and for each  $\ell \in L_3^\delta$  we have

$$A^{-1} \delta^{2(d-1)+\beta} \leq \mathbb{P}(B(\ell, \delta)) < 2A^{-1} \delta^{2(d-1)+\beta}. \quad (3.4)$$

Comparing (3.2) and (3.4), we see that if  $B \subset \mathcal{L}_n$  is a ball of radius  $r \geq \delta$ , then

$$\#(L_3^\delta \cap B) \leq C_0 \delta^{-\varepsilon} A (r/\delta)^{2(d-1)+\beta}. \quad (3.5)$$

Let  $L_4^\delta \subset L_3^\delta$  be obtained by randomly and independently selecting each  $\ell \in L_3^\delta$  with probability  $C_0^{-1} \delta^{2\varepsilon} A^{-1}$ . We claim that if  $\delta > 0$  is sufficiently small (depending on  $\varepsilon$ ), then there exists such a random selection  $L_4^\delta$  with

$$\#L_4^\delta \geq \frac{1}{2} C_0^{-1} \delta^{2\varepsilon} A^{-1} \#L_3^\delta \geq \delta^{2(1-d)-\beta+4\varepsilon}, \quad (3.6)$$

which satisfies the ball condition

$$\#(L_4^\delta \cap B) \leq (r/\delta)^{2(d-1)+\beta} \quad \text{for all balls } B \subset \mathcal{L}_n. \quad (3.7)$$

This is a standard random sampling argument. The key insight is that it suffices to establish (3.7) (with  $(r/\delta)^{2(d-1)+\beta}$  strengthened to  $\frac{1}{2}(r/\delta)^{2(d-1)+\beta}$ ) for a boundedly-overlapping family of balls of radius  $r$ , for each dyadic  $\delta \leq r \leq 1$ . There are only about  $\delta^{-n}$  such balls, and the probability that (3.7) fails for any particular ball is exponentially small in  $\delta$ . The existence of an appropriate random sample then follows from the union bound. See e.g. [10, Section 2] for details.

Finally, for each  $\ell \in L_4^\delta$ , let  $\tilde{\ell} \subset \ell$  be a unit line segment in  $B(0, 1)$  with  $|\tilde{\ell} \cap E_\delta| \gtrsim 1$ , and let  $T(\ell)$  be the  $\delta$ -neighborhood of  $\tilde{\ell}$ . Let  $\mathbb{T} = \{T(\ell) : \ell \in L_4^\delta\}$ . Then  $\mathbb{T}$  is a collection of  $\delta$ -tubes in  $B(0, 1)$  that satisfies (1.2), and  $|T \cap E_\delta| \gtrsim |T|$  for each  $T \in \mathbb{T}$ . By (3.6) and Hölder's inequality, have that for  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,

$$\delta^{n-1} \delta^{2(1-d)-\beta+4\varepsilon} \lesssim \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} |T| \lesssim \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} |T \cap E_\delta| \leq |E_\delta|^{1/p'} \left\| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} \chi_T \right\|_p \lesssim \delta^{(n-\dim X_2-\varepsilon)/p'} \left\| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} \chi_T \right\|_p,$$

i.e.

$$\left\| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} \chi_T \right\|_p \gtrsim \delta^{5\varepsilon} \delta^{n-2d+1-\beta} \delta^{-(n-\dim X_2)/p'}. \quad (3.8)$$

On the other hand, by Theorem 1.2, if  $p = \frac{d+\beta}{d+\beta-1}$  then

$$\left\| \sum_{T \in \mathbb{T}} \chi_T \right\|_p \leq C \delta^{\frac{1-d}{p'} + \frac{n+1-2d-\beta}{p} - \varepsilon}. \quad (3.9)$$

Comparing (3.8) and (3.9) and simplifying, we conclude that  $\delta^{\frac{\dim X_2 - d - \beta}{p'}} \lesssim \delta^{-6\varepsilon}$ . Thus if  $k_0$  is selected sufficiently large (which forces  $\delta$  to be sufficiently small), we conclude that  $\dim X_2 \geq d + \beta - 7(d+1)\varepsilon$ , which is (3.3).

## References

- [1] Jonathan Bennett, Anthony Carbery, and Terence Tao. On the multilinear restriction and Kakeya conjectures. *Acta Math.*, 196:261–302, 2006.
- [2] Jean Bourgain and Larry Guth. Bounds on oscillatory integral operators based on multilinear estimates. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 21:1239–1295, 2011.
- [3] Anthony Carbery and Stefán Ingi Valdimarsson. The endpoint multilinear Kakeya theorem via the Borsuk-Ulam theorem. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 264:1643–1663, 2012.
- [4] D.H. Fremlin. *Measure Theory: Topological Measure Spaces (Vol. 4)*. Torres Fremlin, 2003.
- [5] Larry Guth. The endpoint case of the Bennett-Carbery-Tao multilinear Kakeya conjecture. *Acta Math.*, 205:263–286, 2010.
- [6] K. Héra. Hausdorff dimension of Furstenberg-type sets associated to families of affine subspaces. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn.*, 44:903–923, 2019.
- [7] K. Héra, T. Keleti, and A. Máthé. Hausdorff dimension of unions of affine subspaces and of Furstenberg-type sets. *J. Fractal Geom.*, 6:263–284, 2019.
- [8] D. Oberlin. Exceptional sets of projections, unions of  $k$ -planes, and associated transforms. *Israel J. Math.*, 202:331–342, 2014.
- [9] R. Oberlin. Unions of lines in  $F^n$ . *Mathematika*, 62:738–752, 2016.
- [10] M. Pramanik, T. Yang, and J. Zahl. A Furstenberg-type problem for circles, and a Kaufman-type restricted projection theorem in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . arXiv:2207.02259, 2022.