

A MATTILA-SJÖLIN THEOREM FOR SIMPLICES IN LOW DIMENSIONS

EYVINDUR ARI PALSSON AND FRANCISCO ROMERO ACOSTA

ABSTRACT. In this paper we show that if a compact set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 3$, has Hausdorff dimension greater than $\frac{(4k-1)}{4k}d + \frac{1}{4}$ when $3 \leq d < \frac{k(k+3)}{(k-1)}$ or $d - \frac{1}{k-1}$ when $\frac{k(k+3)}{(k-1)} \leq d$, then the set of congruence class of simplices with vertices in E has nonempty interior. By set of congruence class of simplices with vertices in E we mean

$$\Delta_k(E) = \{\vec{t} = (t_{ij}) : |x_i - x_j| = t_{ij}; x_i, x_j \in E; 0 \leq i < j \leq k\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\frac{k(k+1)}{2}}$$

where $2 \leq k < d$. This result improves our previous work [30] in the sense that we now can obtain a Hausdorff dimension threshold which allow us to guarantee that the set of congruence class of triangles formed by triples of points of E has nonempty interior when $d = 3$ as well as extending to all simplices. The present work can be thought of as an extension of the Mattila-Sjölin theorem which establishes a non-empty interior for the distance set instead of the set of congruence classes of simplices.

1. INTRODUCTION

Falconer's conjecture states that if the Hausdorff dimension of a compact set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$, is greater than $\frac{d}{2}$, then its distance set $\Delta(E) = \{|x - y|; x, y \in E\}$ has positive Lebesgue measure. Falconer [8] not only stated this conjecture, but also proved that if $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E) > \frac{d+1}{2}$, then $\Delta(E)$ has positive Lebesgue measure. Falconer's conjecture remains open, but much work has been done towards it [1, 6, 23, 32]. For instance, when $d = 2$ Bourgain [1] showed that if $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E) > \frac{13}{9}$, then $\mathcal{L}^1(\Delta(E)) > 0$, later Wolff [32] improved the threshold to $\frac{4}{3}$. In dimension 3 and higher, Erdogan [6] obtained the threshold $\frac{d}{2} + \frac{1}{3}$. Currently, the best known result when $d = 2$ is due to Guth, Iosevich, Ou and Wang [16], who showed that if $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E) > \frac{5}{4}$, then $\Delta(E)$ has positive Lebesgue measure. When $d = 3$, Du, Guth, Ou, Wang, Wilson and Zhang [3] showed that if $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E) > \frac{9}{5}$, then $\mathcal{L}^1(\Delta(E)) > 0$. For higher dimension, that is for $d \geq 4$, Du and Zhang [5] improved the threshold to $\frac{d^2}{2d-1}$. Most recently, when restricting $d \geq 4$ to even integers, Du, Iosevich, Ou, Wang and Zhang [4] showed that $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E) > \frac{d}{2} + \frac{1}{4}$ is enough to guarantee $\mathcal{L}^1(\Delta(E)) > 0$.

A classic result due to H. Steinhaus [31] states that if a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 1$, has positive Lebesgue measure, then the set $E - E = \{x - y : x, y \in E\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ contains a neighborhood of the origin. Likewise, in the context of distance set problem we might wonder the following: For a given compact set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, how large does its Hausdorff dimension need to be to guarantee that its distance set contains an interval. Mattila and Sjölin [26] proved that if $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E) > \frac{d+1}{2}$, then its distance set $\Delta(E)$ has nonempty interior. The proof of this result can be found in [24]. Iosevich, Mourougolou and Taylor [19] showed that if $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E) > \frac{d+1}{2}$, then the set $\Delta(E) = \{\|x - y\|_B : x, y \in E\}$ contains an interval. Where $\|\cdot\|_B$ is a metric induced by the norm defined by a bounded convex body B with non-vanishing

curvature. Koh, Pham and Shen [21] obtain slight improvements to these thresholds in the case of product sets, that is, sets of the form $E = A \times A \times \dots \times A = A^d$, where $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ is compact. Greenleaf, Iosevich and Taylor [13] extend the Mattila-Sjölin theorem to more general 2-point configuration sets, that is, they obtained a Hausdorff dimensional threshold for which they can guarantee that the set $\Delta_\Phi(E) = \{\Phi(x, y) : x, y \in E\}$ of Φ -configurations in E has nonempty interior in \mathbb{R}^m , $m \geq 1$ where $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is a smooth function satisfying some additional conditions. Note that by considering $\Phi(x, y) = |x - y|$, we have that $\Delta_\Phi(E) = \Delta(E)$, in this case the authors in [13] (Corollary 1.2) obtained a Hausdorff dimensional threshold that coincides with the threshold obtained in [26]. Thereafter, Greenleaf, Iosevich and Taylor [15] upgraded their result for an even more general class of k -point configurations. Many results for k -point configurations in the setting of the Falconer problem have previously been obtained, see for example [7, 9, 10, 11, 12] and the references therein.

We are interested in finding a Hausdorff dimensional threshold that guarantees that a particular k -point configuration has nonempty interior. Let's denote by $\vec{t} = (t_{ij})$ the elements of $\mathbb{R}^{\frac{k(k+1)}{2}}$. We define the set of congruence classes of simplices with vertices in E as the set

$$\Delta_k(E) = \{\vec{t} = (t_{ij}) : |x_i - x_j| = t_{ij}; x_i, x_j \in E, 0 \leq i < j \leq k\}.$$

In this paper we wonder how large does the Hausdorff dimension of a compact set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ need to be to guarantee that the set $\Delta_k(E)$ has nonempty interior.

In our previous work [30], given a compact subset $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ we used the classical rule Side-Angle-Side to define a set of congruence classes of triangles formed by triples of points of E , that is,

$$\Delta_{\text{tri}}(E) = \{(t, r, \alpha) : |x - z| = t, |y - z| = r \text{ and } \alpha = \alpha(x, z, y), x, y, z \in E\},$$

where $\alpha(x, z, y)$ denotes the angle formed by x, y and z , centered at z . Moreover, we showed that if a compact set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 4$, has Hausdorff dimension greater than $\frac{2d}{3} + 1$, then the set $\Delta_{\text{tri}}(E)$ has nonempty interior. However, this result yields nothing when $d = 3$. In [15], Greenleaf, Iosevich and Taylor applied their main result to a wide variety of k -point configurations. Some applications to 3-point configurations approached in [15] are area of triangles in \mathbb{R}^2 , volumes of pinned parallelepipeds in \mathbb{R}^3 , ratios of pinned distances in \mathbb{R}^2 and \mathbb{R}^3 . However, their results seem not to be directly applicable to the triangle problem, regardless of how triangles are encoded. In a very recent preprint Greenleaf, Iosevich and Taylor [14] refined their approach and gave an alternative proof of [30]. Despite the sophisticated method developed by the authors in [14] it still provides a trivial threshold for the triangle problem when $d = 3$.

Similarly, we can also use the rule Side-Side-Side to define a set of congruence classes of triangles formed by triples of points of E , namely $\Delta_2(E)$. It is clear that there is a bijection between $\Delta_{\text{tri}}(E)$ and $\Delta_2(E)$. Thus, a Hausdorff dimensional threshold that guarantees that $\Delta_2(E)$ has nonempty interior, it also guarantees that $\Delta_{\text{tri}}(E)$ has nonempty interior. In the present work, we improve the result given in [30] in the sense that we now can obtain a nontrivial threshold when $d = 3$ for which we can guarantee that $\Delta_2(E)$ has nonempty interior. Moreover, we provide an analogous result for simplices in higher dimensions. We now state our main result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact set, $d \geq 3$. The set of equivalence classes of k -simplices,*

$$\Delta_k(E) = \{\vec{t} = (t_{ij}) : |x_i - x_j| = t_{ij}; x_i, x_j, \in E, 0 \leq i < j \leq k\},$$

$2 \leq k < d$, has nonempty interior if

$$\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E) > \begin{cases} \frac{(4k-1)}{4k}d + \frac{1}{4} & , \quad 3 \leq d < \frac{k(k+3)}{(k-1)} \\ d - \frac{1}{k-1} & , \quad \frac{k(k+3)}{(k-1)} \leq d \end{cases}.$$

A straightforward consequence of Theorem 1.1 is the following corollary:

Corollary 1.2. *Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact set, $d \geq 3$. The set of congruence classes of triangles formed by triples of points of E ,*

$$\Delta_2(E) = \{(t_{01}, t_{02}, t_{12}) : |x_0 - x_1| = t_{01}, |x_0 - x_2| = t_{02}, |x_1 - x_2| = t_{12}; x_0, x_1, x_2 \in E\},$$

has nonempty interior if

$$\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E) > \begin{cases} \frac{7d}{8} + \frac{1}{4} & , \quad 3 \leq d < 10 \\ d - 1 & , \quad 10 \leq d \end{cases}.$$

As we indicated above, the main result given by Greenleaf, Iosevich and Taylor [15] allows one to obtain a Hausdorff dimensional threshold which guarantees that a general k -point configuration set has nonempty interior. They did not directly approach the problem presented in this work. However, we believe that by using their techniques the best one could possibly obtain would be the following estimates:

- If d is an even integer and $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E) \geq \frac{d}{2} + \frac{k}{2}$, then $\Delta_k(E)$ has nonempty interior.
- If d is an odd integer, k is an even integer and $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E) \geq \frac{(k+2)}{2(k+1)}d + \frac{k}{2}$, then $\Delta_k(E)$ has nonempty interior.

When d is an odd integer and $k = d - 1$ the estimate above provides a trivial threshold. whereas, by Theorem 1.1, we have that if $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E) > d - \frac{1}{4(d-1)}$, then $\Delta_{d-1}(E)$ has nonempty interior. This showcases the strength of Theorem 1.1 in low dimensions, but we also note that no thresholds of the type we hypothesize about above have been published so all our thresholds for all simplices are novel. In their recent work Greenleaf, Iosevich and Taylor [14] suggest that it would be interesting to see if microlocal analysis, the main tool of their paper, could also be used to obtain a non-trivial threshold for the simplex problem when $k = d - 1$.

1.1. Sharpness: For a given set $E \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E) > \frac{d+1}{2}$, Falconer not only showed that its distance set has positive Lebesgue measure, he also provided an example of a set of dimension less than $\frac{d}{2}$ for which its distance set has zero Lebesgue measure. This fact along with the improvements achieved on the Falconer distance problem allow us to think that the exponent $\frac{d}{2}$ would be sharp. Unfortunately, for Mattila-Sjörlin type theorems we do not count with examples as the one given by Falconer. However, since the existence of many triangles (respectively simplices) implies the existences of many distances, we may infer a trivial exponent for sharpness, to see this note that for a given set $E \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E) < \frac{d}{2}$ the set of congruence classes of triangles (respectively simplices) has zero Lebesgue measure, and therefore empty interior. In the triangle case, for dimension 3 and higher there is a gap between the dimensional threshold $\frac{7d}{8} + \frac{1}{4}$ obtained in corollary 1.2 and the trivial exponent. In [30], we obtained a better dimensional threshold for dimension 4 and higher, however the gap with respect

to the trivial exponent still persists.

Unlike the Euclidean setting, in the finite field setting there are results for which the thresholds between analogs of Falconer type results and analogs of Mattila-Sjörlin type results may differ. Murphy, Petridis, Pham, Rudnev and Stevens [28] proved that if $E \subset \mathbb{F}_q^2$, q prime, and $|E| \geq Cq^{\frac{5}{4}}$, for some $C > 0$, then its distance set $\Delta(E)$ contains a positive proportion of \mathbb{F}_q . This result can be thought of as an analogue to a Falconer type result. Murphy and Petridis [27] proved that if $E \subset \mathbb{F}_q^2$ and $|E| \approx q^{\frac{4}{3}}$, then one cannot, in general, expect the distance set to contain all \mathbb{F}_q , which can be thought of as the impossibility of a Mattila-Sjörlin type result. Yet Iosevich and Rudnev [20] proved that if $E \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$, $d \geq 2$, such that $|E| \gtrsim q^{\frac{d+1}{2}}$, then its distance set $\Delta(E)$ contains all of \mathbb{F}_q which establishes a Mattila-Sjörlin type result at a higher threshold.

1.2. Overview of result: Let μ be a Frostman probability measure supported on a compact subset $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 3$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$ let $\psi_\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^{-d} \psi\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \geq 0$, where $\psi \geq 0$ is a smooth function such that its Fourier transform, $\widehat{\psi}$, is a smooth compactly supported cut-off function, satisfying $\widehat{\psi}(0) = 1$ and $0 \leq \widehat{\psi} \leq 1$. Let $\mu_\varepsilon := \mu * \psi_\varepsilon$, and note that $\|\mu_\varepsilon\|_\infty \lesssim \varepsilon^{s-d}$. Furthermore, note that $\mu_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mu$ weakly, as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The proof of our main theorem will proceed as follows:

- **Step 1:** In order to ensure the non-degeneracy of simplices, we will show that it is possible to extract $d + 1$ suitable subsets of E . Each subset of positive μ -measure.
- **Step 2:** We will define the measure $d\delta(\mu)$ on the set $\Delta_k(E)$ as the image of $\mu \times \dots \times \mu$ ($k + 1$ times) under the map $(x_0, \dots, x_k) \mapsto \vec{v}_k(x_0, \dots, x_k)$, and since μ is a probability measure we automatically have that $d\delta(\mu)$ is positive. This definition will also provide an operator $\delta(f)$, where f is a smooth compactly supported function. Furthermore, from the definition of $\delta(\cdot)$ we will immediately have that $\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)$ converges weakly to $d\delta(\mu)$ as long as μ_ε converge weakly to μ .
- **Step 3:** We will show that the density of the measure $d\delta(\mu)$ is continuous. To achieve this, we build on the techniques developed by Iosevich and Magyar [17] to obtain Lemma 2.5. By using Lemma 2.5, we will show that $\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)$ converges uniformly as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Due to $\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)$ is continuous for every $\varepsilon > 0$, then the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ must be a continuous function. Thus, by the uniqueness of the limit we have that the density of $d\delta(\mu)$ is continuous.

1.3. Acknowledgement: The first listed author was supported in part by Simons Foundation Grant no. 360560. We thank Alex Iosevich for suggesting looking at [17] and fruitful discussions about the problem.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

2.1. Step 1: In [30], given a compact subset $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ we had to ensure that the triangles formed by triples of points of E were non-degenerate. This was accomplished by showing that if E is large enough, then it is possible to extract three suitable subsets of E apart from each other. More precisely, we used the following lemma:

Lemma 2.1. ([30], Lemma 2.1). *Let μ be a Frostman probability measure on $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 3$, with Hausdorff dimension greater than $\frac{2}{3}d + 1$, then there are positive constants c_1, c_2 , and E_1, E_2, E_3 subsets of E , such that*

- (i) $\mu(E_i) \geq c_1 > 0$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$.
- (ii) $\max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \{\inf \{|x_k - y_k| : x \in E_i, y \in E_j \text{ and } i \neq j\}\} \geq c_2 > 0$, for $i, j = 1, 2, 3$.

Remark 2.2. *The threshold given in Lemma 2.1 was stated conveniently to match the threshold given in the main result of [30]. In fact, the best threshold that can be obtained from the proof of Lemma 2.1 is $\frac{d+1}{2}$.*

Likewise to ensure that the simplices under consideration are non-degenerate, we must show that it is possible to extract k suitable subsets of E disjoint from each other. Due to $2 < k \leq d - 1$, it is more than sufficient to show that we can extract $d + 1$ suitable subsets apart from each other. Thus we have the following:

Lemma 2.3. *Let μ be a Frostman probability measure on $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, with Hausdorff dimension greater than $\frac{(d-1)\log_2(3)+\log_2(d)+2}{1+\log_2(3)}$, then there are positive constants $\{c_i\}_{i=1}^{d+1}$ and a collection $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^{d+1}$ of subsets of E , such that*

- (i) $\mu(E_i) \geq c_i > 0$, for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d + 1\}$.
- (ii) $\max_{1 \leq k \leq d} \{\inf \{|x_k - y_k| : x \in E_i, y \in E_j \text{ and } i \neq j\}\} \geq c > 0$, for all i, j and $c > 0$.

The proof of Lemma 2.3 can be found in Section 5.

Note that when $k = 2$ we have that the threshold obtained by Corollary 1.2 is $\frac{7}{8}d + \frac{1}{4}$, which is greater than $\frac{(d-1)\log_2(3)+\log_2(d)+2}{1+\log_2(3)}$. Due to $\frac{(4k-1)d}{4k} + \frac{1}{4}$ is increasing with respect to k , then $\frac{(4k-1)d}{4k} + \frac{1}{4} > \frac{(d-1)\log_2(3)+\log_2(d)+2}{1+\log_2(3)}$ for all $2 \leq k < d < \frac{k(k+3)}{k-1}$, and $d - \frac{1}{k-1} > \frac{(d-1)\log_2(3)+\log_2(d)+2}{1+\log_2(3)}$ for all $d \geq \frac{k(k+3)}{k-1}$. Therefore, we can guarantee the non-degeneracy of the simplices.

Remark 2.4. *Note the following:*

- *The Hausdorff dimensional threshold given in Lemma 2.3 does not depend on k . This is due to the overestimation on the number of subsets that satisfy the conditions given in the Lemma. It is possible to increase the number of subsets, but this will require the set E to be larger.*
- *The proof of Lemma 2.5 is given in terms of E and μ , but it is clear that the proof still holds for E_i and μ_i , $i = 0, \dots, d+1$. Where E_i are the subsets that can be obtained by using Lemma 2.3 and μ_i are the restrictions of μ to the sets E_i respectively.*
- *Note that Lemma 2.3 (respectively Lemma 2.1) ensures that the length of the edges of simplices (respectively side lengths of triangles) under consideration in Theorem 1.1 (respectively Corollary 1.2) can be bounded above and below by positive constants. Moreover, the non-degeneracy of simplices is also guaranteed by the construction given in the proof of Lemma 2.3 (see Figure 3).*

2.2. Step 2: Consider a Frostman probability measure μ supported on E . For any continuous function φ on $\mathbb{R}^{\frac{k(k+1)}{2}}$, we defined a measure on $\Delta_k(E)$ as follows

$$\int \varphi(\vec{t}) d\delta(\mu)(\vec{t}) = \int \dots \int \varphi(\vec{v}_k(x_0, \dots, v_k)) d\mu(x_0) \dots d\mu(x_k).$$

In other words, $\delta(\mu)$ is the image of $\mu \times \dots \times \mu$ ($k+1$ times) under the map $(x_0, \dots, x_k) \rightarrow \vec{v}_k(x_0, \dots, x_k)$. Where $\vec{v}_k(x_0, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{\frac{k(k+1)}{2}}$ denotes the vector with entries $|x_i - x_j|$, $0 \leq i < j \leq k$, listed in a lexicographic order. Furthermore, note that for a smooth compactly supported function f , we have that $\delta(f)$ is also a function given by

$$(1) \quad \delta(f)(\vec{t}) = \left(\prod_{p=1}^k C_{F_p} \right) \int \dots \int f(x) f(x+x_1) \dots f(x+x_k) \\ d\sigma_{r_k}^{d-k} \left(x_k - \sum_{n=1}^{k-1} m_{nk} x_n \right) \dots d\sigma_{r_2}^{d-2}(x_2 - m_{12} x_1) d\sigma_{r_1}^{d-1}(x_1) dx.$$

Where $d\sigma_{r_i}^{d-i}$ denotes the surface area measures over the $d-i$ -dimensional sphere of radius r_i , and m_{ij} are some positive real numbers. Furthermore, $C_{F_p} = 2^{-p} \det(A_p)^{-1/2}$, $A_p = (a_{ij})$ is a $p \times p$ matrix, where $a_{ij} = \langle (x_p - x_{i-1}), (x_p - x_{j-1}) \rangle$, for $1 \leq i, j \leq p$. note that

$$(2) \quad a_{ij} = \begin{cases} 0 & , \text{ if } (x_p - x_{i-1}) \perp (x_p - x_{j-1}) \\ t_{(i-1)p}^2 & , \text{ if } i = j \\ \frac{1}{2} (t_{(i-1)p}^2 + t_{(j-1)p}^2 - t_{(i-1)(j-1)}^2) & , \text{ else} \end{cases}$$

To show (1) note that

$$\int g(\vec{t}) d\delta(f)(\vec{t}) = \int \dots \int g(\vec{v}_k(x_0, \dots, x_k)) f(x_0) f(x_1) \dots f(x_k) dx_0 dx_1 \dots dx_k,$$

for any continuous function g with compact support. By a simple change of variables we obtain

$$\int g(\vec{t}) d\delta(f)(\vec{t}) = \int \dots \int g(|x_1|, \dots, |x_k|, |x_1 - x_2|, |x_1 - x_3|, \dots, |x_{k-1} - x_k|) \\ f(x) f(x+x_1) \dots f(x+x_k) dx dx_1 \dots dx_k.$$

Due to our previous change of variables, lets from now until the end of the proof of our main result denote $x_0 = 0$. Consider the polynomials $P_{ij}(w) = |w - x_i|^2 - t_{ij}^2$, and let $F_j = \{P_{ij}, i < j\}$, for $0 \leq i < j \leq k$, then the right hand side of the latter equation is equal to

$$\int \dots \int g(\vec{t}) \left(\int \dots \int f(x) f(x+x_1) \dots f(x+x_2) d\omega_{F_1}(x_1) \dots d\omega_{F_k}(x_k) dx \right) d\vec{t},$$

where $d\omega_{F_j}$ is the measure supported on the algebraic set $S_{F_j} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : P_{ij}(x) = 0, i < j\}$, $1 \leq j \leq k$. Cook, Lyall and Magyar [2], see also the work written by Iosevich and Magyar [17], suggest that due to our choice of the polynomials P_{ij} we have $d\omega_{F_j}(x_j) = C_{F_j} d\sigma_{r_j}^{d-j}(x_j)$, $r_j > 0$. Thus, we obtain the desired expression for $\delta(f)$.

2.3. Step 3: Given $\varepsilon > 0$ let $\psi_\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^{-d} \psi\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) \geq 0$, where $\psi \geq 0$ is a smooth function such that its Fourier transform, $\widehat{\psi}$, is a smooth compactly supported cut-off function, satisfying $\widehat{\psi}(0) = 1$ and $0 \leq \widehat{\psi} \leq 1$. Let $\mu_\varepsilon := \mu * \psi_\varepsilon$.

Here we will show that the continuous functions $\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)$ converges strongly (uniformly) as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The rest of the proof of Theorem 1.1 relies on the following:

Lemma 2.5. *There is a function $M(\vec{t}) = \left(\prod_{p=1}^k C_{F_p} \right)$ such that*

$$|\delta(\mu_{2\varepsilon}) - \delta(\mu_\varepsilon)| \lesssim |M(\vec{t})| \varepsilon^\gamma$$

$$\text{Where } \gamma = \begin{cases} (k-1)s - \frac{(k-1)(4k-1)d}{4k} - \frac{(k-1)}{4} & , \quad 3 \leq d < \frac{k(k+3)}{k-1} \\ (k-1)s - (k-1)d + 1 & , \quad \frac{k(k+3)}{k-1} \leq d \end{cases}.$$

Remark 2.6. *We remind to the reader that $C_{F_p} := C_{F_p}(\vec{t})$ are functions of \vec{t} , more precisely, $C_{F_p} = 2^{-p} \det(A_p)^{-1/2}$. Where $A_p = (a_{ij})$ is a $p \times p$ matrix, and a_{ij} are described as in (2).*

For the proof of Lemma 2.5 we build on the techniques developed by Iosevich and Magyar [17]. Details can be found in Section 4. To have a better understanding of the proof of Lemma 2.5 the reader can go over Section 3 in which we provide a proof for the case $k = 2$.

Consider the sequence $\{\delta(\mu_{\varepsilon_n})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Where $\varepsilon_j = \frac{\varepsilon}{2^j}$. Consider $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, with $m > n$, then by Lemma 2.5

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta(\mu_{\varepsilon_m}) - \delta(\mu_{\varepsilon_n})| &\leq \sum_{j=n+1}^m |\delta(\mu_{2\varepsilon_j}) - \delta(\mu_{\varepsilon_j})| \\ &\lesssim |M(\vec{t})| \varepsilon^\gamma \sum_{j=n}^{m-1} 2^{-j\gamma} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon^\gamma \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{-j\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the geometric series in the right hand side is convergent as long as $\gamma > 0$. From which we have

$$\begin{aligned} s &> \frac{(4k-1)d}{4k} + \frac{1}{4} & \text{if } 3 \leq d < \frac{k(k+3)}{k-1} \\ s &> d - \frac{1}{k-1} & \text{if } \frac{k(k+3)}{k-1} \leq d \end{aligned}.$$

Thus, the sequence $\{\delta(\mu_{\varepsilon_n})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence with respect to the supremum norm. Therefore, $\{\delta(\mu_{\varepsilon_n})\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges uniformly to a continuous function, say $\delta(\mu)^*$. Due to the functions $\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)$ converge weakly to $\delta(\mu)$, then by uniqueness of the limit we have $d\delta(\mu) = \delta(\mu)^* d\vec{t}$. Finally we note that $\delta(\mu)$, as a pushforward of probability measures is positive, and therefore the density $\delta(\mu)^*$ is non-zero. \square

3. PROOF OF LEMMA 2.5 FOR THE CASE $k = 2$.

From (1) we have

$$\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)(t_{01}, t_{02}, t_{12}) = \iiint C_{F_1} C_{F_2} \mu_\varepsilon(x) \mu_\varepsilon(x+x_1) \mu_\varepsilon(x+x_2) d\sigma_{r_2}^{d-2}(mx_1-x_2) d\sigma_{r_1}^{d-1}(x_1) dx.$$

Where $r_1 = t_{01}$, $m_{01} = \frac{t_{01}^2 + t_{01}^2 - t_{12}^2}{2t_{01}}$, and $r_2 = t_{02}^2 - m_{01}^2$ (see Figure 1). Write $\Delta\mu_\varepsilon := \mu_{2\varepsilon} - \mu_\varepsilon$, and $\Delta\delta(\mu_\varepsilon) := \delta(\mu_{2\varepsilon}) - \delta(\mu_\varepsilon)$. Then

$$\prod_{j=0}^2 \mu_{2\varepsilon}(x+x_j) - \prod_{j=0}^2 \mu_\varepsilon(x+x_j) = \sum_{j=0}^2 \Delta_j(\mu_\varepsilon),$$




FIGURE 1. Here $C_{F_1} = \frac{t_{01}^2}{2}$, $C_{F_2} = \frac{1}{4} \left[t_{02}^2 t_{12}^2 - \frac{1}{4} (t_{02}^2 + t_{12}^2 - t_{01}^2)^2 \right]$.

where $\Delta_j(\mu_\varepsilon) = \prod_{i=0, i \neq j}^2 \mu_{\varepsilon_{ij}}(x + x_i) \Delta \mu_\varepsilon(x + x_j)$, with $\varepsilon_{ij} = \begin{cases} 2\varepsilon & , i < j \\ \varepsilon & , i > j \end{cases}$, and $x_0 = 0$. Therefore,

$$(3) \quad |\Delta \delta(\mu_\varepsilon)| = |C_{F_1} C_{F_2}| \left| \sum_{j=0}^2 \iiint \Delta_j(\mu_\varepsilon) d\sigma_{r_2}^{d-2}(m_{01}x_1 - x_2) d\sigma_{r_1}^{d-1}(x_1) dx \right|$$

Note that by a simple change of variables or by considering the points in a different order, all the terms of the sum in the right hand side of equation (3) are equivalent (See Figure 2). Therefore, we just study the case $j = 2$.




FIGURE 2. A triangle can be measured in different ways. In (A) we use the measure $d\sigma_{t_{01}}^{d-1}(x_1) d\sigma_{r_2}^{d-2}(m_{01}x_1 - x_2)$, but in (B) we use $d\sigma_{t_{02}}^{d-1}(x_2) d\sigma_{\tilde{r}_2}^{d-2}(\tilde{m}_{02}x_2 - x_1)$. Thus, we can use either of these measures in the second term of the sum given in the right hand side of equation (3). A similar analysis can be done in each of the other terms.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \iiint \mu_{2\varepsilon}(x) \mu_{2\varepsilon}(x+x_1) \Delta \mu_\varepsilon(x+x_2) d\sigma_{r_2}^{d-2}(x_2 - m_{01}x_1) d\sigma_{r_1}^{d-1}(x_1) dx \right| \\
& \lesssim \varepsilon^{s-d} \int \left| \iint \mu_{2\varepsilon}(x) \Delta \mu_\varepsilon(x+x_2) d\sigma_{r_2}^{d-2}(x_2 - m_{01}x_1) dx \right| d\sigma_{r_1}^{d-1}(x_1) \\
& = \varepsilon^{s-d} \int \left| \int \mu_{2\varepsilon}(x) [(\Delta \mu_\varepsilon * \sigma_{r_2}^{d-2}) \circ \tau_{m_{01}x_1}](x) dx \right| d\sigma_{r_1}^{d-1}(x_1)
\end{aligned}$$

by Plancherel

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lesssim \varepsilon^{s-d} \int \int |\widehat{\mu_{2\varepsilon}}(\xi)| |\widehat{\Delta \mu_\varepsilon}(\xi)| |\widehat{\sigma_{r_2}^{d-2}}(\xi)| d\xi d\sigma_{r_1}^{d-1}(x_1) \\
& = \varepsilon^{s-d} \int \int |\widehat{\mu_{2\varepsilon}}(\xi)| |\xi|^{\frac{1}{8}-\frac{d}{16}} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{8}+\frac{d}{16}} |\widehat{\Delta \mu_\varepsilon}(\xi)| |\widehat{\sigma_{r_2}^{d-2}}(\xi)| d\xi d\sigma_{r_1}^{d-1}(x_1)
\end{aligned}$$

and by applying Cauchy-Schwarz twice we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \leq \varepsilon^{s-d} \int \left(\int |\widehat{\mu_{2\varepsilon}}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{d}{8}} d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4}+\frac{d}{8}} |\widehat{\Delta \mu_\varepsilon}(\xi)|^2 |\widehat{\sigma_{r_2}^{d-2}}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} d\sigma_{r_1}^{d-1}(x_1) \\
& \lesssim \varepsilon^{s-d} \left(\int |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4}+\frac{d}{8}} |\widehat{\Delta \mu_\varepsilon}(\xi)|^2 \left(\int |\widehat{\sigma_{r_2}^{d-2}}(\xi)|^2 d\sigma_{r_1}^{d-1}(x_1) \right) d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$|\Delta \delta(\mu_\varepsilon)|^2 \lesssim |C_{F_1} C_{F_2}|^2 \varepsilon^{2(s-d)} \left(\int |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4}+\frac{d}{8}} |\widehat{\Delta \mu_\varepsilon}(\xi)|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \right).$$

Where $T(\xi) = \int |\widehat{\sigma_{r_2}^{d-2}}(\xi)|^2 d\sigma_{r_1}^{d-1}(x_1)$. Due to $\sigma_{r_2}^{d-2}$ is $d-2$ dimensional sphere of radius $r_2 > 0$ is contained in an affine subspace orthogonal to the subspace $M = \{mx_1; m \in \mathbb{R}\}$, then

$$|\widehat{\sigma_{r_2}^{d-2}}(\xi)| \lesssim (1 + r_2 \text{dist}(\xi, M))^{-\frac{(d-2)}{2}}.$$

Note that the measure $\sigma_{r_1}^{d-1}(x_1)$ is invariant with respect to the change of variables $(x_1, x_2) \rightarrow (R(x_1), R(x_2))$ for any rotation $R \in SO(d)$, thus

$$\begin{aligned}
T(\xi) & \lesssim \iint (1 + r_2 \text{dist}(\xi, M))^{-\frac{(d-2)}{2}} d\sigma_{r_1}^{d-1}(x_1) dR \\
& = \iint (1 + r_2 \text{dist}(R(\xi), M))^{-\frac{(d-2)}{2}} d\sigma_{r_1}^{d-1}(x_1) dR \\
& = \iint (1 + r_2 |\xi| \text{dist}(\eta, M))^{-\frac{(d-2)}{2}} d\sigma_{r_1}^{d-1}(x_1) d\sigma^{d-2}(\eta) \\
& \lesssim (1 + r_2 |\xi|)^{-\frac{(d-2)}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Where $\eta := |\xi|^{-1}R(\xi)$. Then $|T(\xi)| \lesssim |\xi|^{-\frac{(d-2)}{2}}$. Note that $\widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) = \widehat{\mu}(\xi) \left(\widehat{\psi}(2\varepsilon\xi) - \widehat{\psi}(\varepsilon\xi) \right)$ is supported on $|\xi| \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \int |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4}+\frac{d}{8}} \left| \widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) \right|^2 T(\xi) d\xi &= \int_{|\xi| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4}+\frac{d}{8}} \left| \widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) \right|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \\ &= \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\lfloor \log_2(\varepsilon^{-1}) \rfloor} \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4}+\frac{d}{8}} \left| \widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) \right|^2 T(\xi) d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\left| \widehat{\psi}(2\varepsilon\xi) - \widehat{\psi}(\varepsilon\xi) \right| \lesssim \varepsilon|\xi|$. Thus the summation above is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=-\infty}^0 \varepsilon^2 \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{d}{4}} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{d}{8}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \\ + \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \log_2(\varepsilon^{-1}) \rfloor} \varepsilon^2 \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{d}{4}} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{d}{8}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^2 T(\xi) d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

Note

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=-\infty}^0 \varepsilon^2 \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{d}{4}} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{d}{8}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \\ \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=-\infty}^0 (2^j)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{d}{4}+2} \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{d}{8}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (4) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \log_2(\varepsilon^{-1}) \rfloor} \varepsilon^2 \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{d}{4}} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{d}{8}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \\ \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \log_2(\varepsilon^{-1}) \rfloor} (2^j)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{d}{4}+2-\frac{(d-2)}{2}} \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{d}{8}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \end{aligned}$$

Observe that there are two ways in which we can bound the right-hand side of inequality (4). We can add the terms to infinity, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \log_2(\varepsilon^{-1}) \rfloor} \varepsilon^2 \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{d}{4}} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{d}{8}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \\ \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(2^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{d}{4}+2-\frac{(d-2)}{2}} \right)^j \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{d}{8}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \lesssim \varepsilon^2, \end{aligned}$$

which requires $d > 10$. We can also add the terms of the finite sum, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \log_2(\varepsilon^{-1}) \rfloor} \varepsilon^2 \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{d}{4}} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{d}{8}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \\ & \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \log_2(\varepsilon^{-1}) \rfloor} \left(2^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{d}{4} + 2 - \frac{(d-2)}{2}} \right)^j \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{d}{8}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \\ & \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \left[\frac{\varepsilon^{-(\frac{5}{2} - \frac{d}{4})} - 1}{\left(2^{\frac{5}{2} - \frac{d}{4}} - 1 \right)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In the first case we then have $|\Delta\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)|^2 \lesssim |C_{F_1} C_{F_2}|^2 \varepsilon^{2(s-d)} (2\varepsilon^2)$, and thus

$$|\Delta\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)| \lesssim |C_{F_1} C_{F_2}| \varepsilon^{s-d+1},$$

if $d > 10$. In the second case we have

$$|\Delta\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)|^2 \lesssim |C_{F_1} C_{F_2}|^2 \varepsilon^{2(s-d)} \left(\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^2 \left[\frac{\varepsilon^{-(\frac{5}{2} - \frac{d}{4})} - 1}{\left(2^{\frac{5}{2} - \frac{d}{4}} - 1 \right)} \right] \right)$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)| & \lesssim |C_{F_1} C_{F_2}| \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}(2(s-d)+2 - (\frac{5}{2} - \frac{d}{4}))} \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2} - \frac{d}{4}} + \left[\frac{1 - \varepsilon^{\frac{5}{2} - \frac{d}{4}}}{\left(2^{\frac{5}{2} - \frac{d}{4}} - 1 \right)} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \lesssim |C_{F_1} C_{F_2}| \varepsilon^{s - \frac{7d}{8} - \frac{1}{4}}, \end{aligned}$$

if $d < 10$. When $d = 10$, we use the following equation

$$\begin{aligned} \int |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4} + \frac{10}{8}} \left| \widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) \right|^2 T(\xi) d\xi & = \int_{|\xi| \leq \varepsilon} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4} + \frac{10}{8}} \left| \widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) \right|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \\ & \quad + \int_{\varepsilon < |\xi| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4} + \frac{10}{8}} \left| \widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) \right|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \end{aligned}$$

from which we have

$$\int |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4} + \frac{10}{8}} \left| \widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) \right|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \lesssim \varepsilon^2 (\varepsilon^4 + 1),$$

thus $|\Delta\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)|^2 \lesssim |C_{F_1} C_{F_2}|^2 \varepsilon^{2(s-10)} \varepsilon^2 (\varepsilon^4 + 1)$, and therefore

$$|\Delta\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)| \lesssim |C_{F_1} C_{F_2}| \varepsilon^{s-9}.$$

In other words we have

$$|\Delta\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)| \lesssim |C_{F_1} C_{F_2}| \varepsilon^\gamma.$$

Where $\gamma = \begin{cases} s - \frac{7d}{8} - \frac{1}{4} & , \quad 3 \leq d < 10 \\ s - d + 1 & , \quad 10 \leq d \end{cases}$.

□

4. PROOF OF LEMMA 2.5 GENERAL CASE

In this section we will show that the proof given above can be easily extended. From (1) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\mu_\varepsilon)(\vec{t}) &= \left(\prod_{p=1}^k C_{F_p} \right) \int \dots \int \mu_\varepsilon(x) \mu_\varepsilon(x+x_1) \dots \mu_\varepsilon(x+x_k) \\ &\quad d\sigma_{r_k}^{d-k} \left(x_k - \sum_{n=1}^{k-1} m_{nk} x_n \right) \dots d\sigma_{r_2}^{d-2}(x_2 - m_{12}x_1) d\sigma_{r_1}^{d-1}(x_1) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Write $\Delta\mu_\varepsilon := \mu_{2\varepsilon} - \mu_\varepsilon$, and $\Delta\delta(\mu_\varepsilon) := \delta(\mu_{2\varepsilon}) - \delta(\mu_\varepsilon)$. Then

$$\prod_{j=0}^k \mu_{2\varepsilon}(x+x_j) - \prod_{j=0}^k \mu_\varepsilon(x+x_j) = \sum_{j=0}^k \Delta_j(\mu_\varepsilon)$$

where $\Delta_j(\mu_\varepsilon) = \prod_{i=0, i \neq j}^k \mu_{\varepsilon_{ij}}(x+x_i) \Delta \mu_\varepsilon(x+x_j)$, with $\varepsilon_{ij} = \begin{cases} 2\varepsilon & , i < j \\ \varepsilon & , i > j \end{cases}$, and $x_0 = 0$. Therefore,

$$(5) \quad |\Delta\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)| = \left| \prod_{p=1}^k C_{F_p} \right| \left| \sum_{j=0}^k \int \dots \int \Delta_j(\mu_\varepsilon) \prod_{i=1}^k d\sigma_{r_i}^{d-i} \left(x_i - \sum_{n=0}^{i-1} m_{ni} x_n \right) dx \right|$$

By a similar reasoning as in the proof of Lemma 2.5 for the case $k=2$, we can conclude that all the terms of the sum in the right hand side of equation (5) are equivalent, therefore we just study the case $j=k$. Note

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int \dots \int \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \mu_{\varepsilon_{ij}}(x+x_i) \Delta \mu_\varepsilon(x+x_k) d\sigma_{r_k}^{d-k}(x_k - m x_1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \prod_{i=1}^k d\sigma_{r_i}^{d-i} \left(x_i - \sum_{n=0}^{i-1} m_{ni} x_n \right) dx \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim \varepsilon^{(k-1)(s-d)} \int \left| \iint \mu_{2\varepsilon}(x) \Delta \mu_\varepsilon(x+x_k) d\sigma_{r_k}^{d-k} \left(x_k - \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} m_{nk} x_n \right) dx \right| d\bar{\omega}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1})$$

$$= \varepsilon^{(k-1)(s-d)} \int \left| \int \mu_{2\varepsilon}(x) [(\Delta\mu_\varepsilon * \sigma_{r_k}^{d-k}) \circ \tau_{\bar{x}}](x) dx \right| d\bar{\omega}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}).$$

Where $\bar{x} = \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} m_{nk} x_n$, and $d\bar{\omega}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}) = \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} d\sigma_{r_i}^{d-i} \left(x_i - \sum_{n=0}^{i-1} m_{ni} x_n \right)$.

By Plancherel

$$\begin{aligned} & \varepsilon^{(k-1)(s-d)} \int \left| \int \mu_{2\varepsilon}(x) [(\Delta\mu_\varepsilon * \sigma_{r_k}^{d-k}) \circ \tau_{\bar{x}}](x) dx \right| d\bar{\omega}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}) \\ & \leq \varepsilon^{(k-1)(s-d)} \int \int |\widehat{\mu_{2\varepsilon}}(\xi)| \left| \widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) \right| \left| \widehat{\sigma_{r_k}^{d-k}}(\xi) \right| d\xi d\bar{\omega}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}) \\ & = \varepsilon^{(k-1)(s-d)} \int \int |\widehat{\mu_{2\varepsilon}}(\xi)| |\xi|^{\frac{1}{8} - \frac{d}{8k}} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{8} + \frac{d}{8k}} \left| \widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) \right| \left| \widehat{\sigma_{r_k}^{d-k}}(\xi) \right| d\xi d\bar{\omega}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}) \end{aligned}$$

and by applying Cauchy-Schwarz twice we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq \varepsilon^{(k-1)(s-d)} \int \left(\int |\widehat{\mu_{2\varepsilon}}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{d}{4k}} d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4} + \frac{d}{4k}} \left| \widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) \right|^2 \left| \widehat{\sigma_{r_k}^{d-k}}(\xi) \right|^2 d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad d\bar{\omega}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}) \\ & \lesssim \varepsilon^{(k-1)(s-d)} \left(\int |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4} + \frac{d}{4k}} \left| \widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) \right|^2 \left(\int \left| \widehat{\sigma_{r_k}^{d-k}}(\xi) \right|^2 d\bar{\omega}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}) \right) d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$|\Delta\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)|^2 \lesssim \left| \prod_{p=1}^k C_{F_p} \right|^2 \varepsilon^{2(k-1)(s-d)} \left(\int |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4} + \frac{d}{4k}} \left| \widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) \right|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \right).$$

Where $T(\xi) = \int \left| \widehat{\sigma_{r_k}^{d-k}}(\xi) \right|^2 d\bar{\omega}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1})$. Let $r = \min \{r_n, 1 \leq n \leq k\}$.

Due to $\sigma_{r_k}^{d-k}$ is a $d-k$ dimensional sphere of radius $r_k \geq r > 0$ is contained in an affine subspace orthogonal to the subspace $M(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}) = \text{Span} \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}\}$, then

$$\left| \widehat{\sigma_{r_k}^{d-k}}(\xi) \right| \lesssim (1 + r \text{dist}(\xi, M(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1})))^{-\frac{(d-k)}{2}}.$$

Note that the measure $d\bar{\omega}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1})$ is invariant with respect to the change of variables $(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}) \rightarrow (R(x_1), \dots, R(x_{k-1}))$ for any rotation $R \in SO(d)$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} T(\xi) & \lesssim \iint (1 + r \text{dist}(\xi, M(R(x_1), \dots, R(x_{k-1}))))^{-\frac{(d-k)}{2}} d\bar{\omega}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}) dR \\ & = \iint (1 + r \text{dist}(R(\xi), M(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1})))^{-\frac{(d-k)}{2}} d\bar{\omega}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}) dR \\ & = \iint (1 + r|\xi| \text{dist}(\eta, M(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1})))^{-\frac{(d-k)}{2}} d\bar{\omega}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k-1}) d\sigma^{k-1}(\eta) \\ & \lesssim (1 + r|\xi|)^{-\frac{(d-k)}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Where $\eta := |\xi|^{-1}R(\xi)$. Then $|T(\xi)| \lesssim |\xi|^{-\frac{(d-k)}{2}}$. Note that $\widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) = \widehat{\mu}(\xi) \left(\widehat{\psi}(2\varepsilon\xi) - \widehat{\psi}(\varepsilon\xi) \right)$ is supported on $|\xi| \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \int |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4}+\frac{d}{4k}} \left| \widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) \right|^2 T(\xi) d\xi &= \int_{|\xi| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4}+\frac{d}{4k}} \left| \widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) \right|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \\ &= \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\lfloor \log_2(\varepsilon^{-1}) \rfloor} \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4}+\frac{d}{4k}} \left| \widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) \right|^2 T(\xi) d\xi. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\left| \widehat{\psi}(2\varepsilon\xi) - \widehat{\psi}(\varepsilon\xi) \right| \lesssim \varepsilon|\xi|$. Thus the summation above is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=-\infty}^0 \varepsilon^2 \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{d}{2k}} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{d}{4k}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \\ + \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \log_2(\varepsilon^{-1}) \rfloor} \varepsilon^2 \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{d}{2k}} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{d}{4k}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \end{aligned}$$

Note

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=-\infty}^0 \varepsilon^2 \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{d}{2k}} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{d}{4k}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \\ \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=-\infty}^0 (2^j)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{d}{2k}+2} \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{d}{4k}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (6) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \log_2(\varepsilon^{-1}) \rfloor} \varepsilon^2 \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{d}{2k}} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{d}{4k}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \\ \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \log_2(\varepsilon^{-1}) \rfloor} (2^j)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{d}{2k}+2-\frac{(d-k)}{2}} \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{d}{4k}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the case $k = 2$, there are two ways in which we can bound the right-hand side of inequality (6). We can add the terms to infinity, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \log_2(\varepsilon^{-1}) \rfloor} \varepsilon^2 \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{d}{2k}} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{d}{4k}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \\ \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(2^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{d}{2k}+2-\frac{(d-2)}{2}} \right)^j \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4}-\frac{d}{4k}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \lesssim \varepsilon^2, \end{aligned}$$

which requires $d > \frac{k(k+3)}{k-1}$. We can also add the terms of the finite sum, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \log_2(\varepsilon^{-1}) \rfloor} \varepsilon^2 \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{d}{2k}} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{d}{4k}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \\ & \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor \log_2(\varepsilon^{-1}) \rfloor} \left(2^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{d}{2k} + 2 - \frac{(d-k)}{2}} \right)^j \int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{d}{4k}} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \\ & \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \left[\frac{\varepsilon^{-\left(\frac{(1-k)d}{2k} + \frac{k+3}{2}\right)} - 1}{\left(2^{\frac{(1-k)d}{2k} + \frac{k+3}{2}}\right) - 1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

In the first case we then have $|\Delta\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)|^2 \lesssim \left| \prod_{p=1}^k C_{F_p} \right|^2 \varepsilon^{2(k-1)(s-d)} (2\varepsilon^2)$, and thus

$$|\Delta\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)| \lesssim \left| \prod_{p=1}^k C_{F_p} \right| \varepsilon^{(k-1)s - (k-1)d + 1},$$

if $d > \frac{k(k+3)}{k-1}$. In the second case we have

$$|\Delta\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)|^2 \lesssim \left| \prod_{p=1}^k C_{F_p} \right|^2 \varepsilon^{2(k-1)(s-d)} \left(\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^2 \left[\frac{\varepsilon^{-\left(\frac{(1-k)d}{2k} + \frac{k+3}{2}\right)} - 1}{\left(2^{\frac{(1-k)d}{2k} + \frac{k+3}{2}}\right) - 1} \right] \right)$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)| & \lesssim \left| \prod_{p=1}^k C_{F_p} \right| \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}(2(k-1)(s-d) + 2 - \left(\frac{(1-k)d}{2k} + \frac{k+3}{2}\right))} \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{(1-k)d}{2k} + \frac{k+3}{2}} + \left[\frac{1 - \varepsilon^{\frac{(1-k)d}{2k} + \frac{k+3}{2}}}{\left(2^{\frac{(1-k)d}{2k} + \frac{k+3}{2}}\right) - 1} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \lesssim \left| \prod_{p=1}^k C_{F_p} \right| \varepsilon^{(k-1)s - \frac{(k-1)(4k-1)d}{4k} - \frac{(k-1)}{4}}, \end{aligned}$$

if $d < \frac{k(k+3)}{k-1}$. When $d = \frac{k(k+3)}{k-1}$, we use the following equation

$$\begin{aligned} \int |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4k} \left(\frac{k(k+3)}{k-1}\right)} \left| \widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) \right|^2 T(\xi) d\xi & = \int_{|\xi| \leq \varepsilon} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4k} \left(\frac{k(k+3)}{k-1}\right)} \left| \widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) \right|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \\ & + \int_{\varepsilon < |\xi| \leq \varepsilon^{-1}} |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4k} \left(\frac{k(k+3)}{k-1}\right)} \left| \widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) \right|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \end{aligned}$$

from which we have

$$\int |\xi|^{-\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4k} \left(\frac{k(k+3)}{k-1}\right)} \left| \widehat{\Delta\mu_\varepsilon}(\xi) \right|^2 T(\xi) d\xi \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \left(\varepsilon^{2 + \frac{2}{k-1}} + 1 \right),$$

thus $|\Delta\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)|^2 \lesssim \left| \prod_{p=1}^k C_{F_p} \right|^2 \varepsilon^{2(k-1)(s - (\frac{k(k+3)}{k-1}))} \varepsilon^2 \left(\varepsilon^{2 + \frac{2}{k-1}} + 1 \right)$, and therefore

$$|\Delta\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)| \lesssim \left| \prod_{p=1}^k C_{F_p} \right| \varepsilon^{(k-1)s - k(k+3) + 1}.$$

In other words we have

$$|\Delta\delta(\mu_\varepsilon)| \lesssim \left| \prod_{p=1}^k C_{F_p} \right| \varepsilon^\gamma.$$

Where $\gamma = \begin{cases} (k-1)s - \frac{(k-1)(4k-1)d}{4k} - \frac{(k-1)}{4} & , \quad 3 \leq d < \frac{k(k+3)}{k-1} \\ (k-1)s - (k-1)d + 1 & , \quad \frac{k(k+3)}{k-1} \leq d \end{cases}$.

□

5. PROOF OF LEMMA 2.3

Similar to the proof of Lemma 2.1 given in [30] (and Lemma 2.1 in [18]) we will use a stopping time argument to show that it is possible to find at least $d + 1$ cubes with positive measure.

Without lost of generality assume that $E \subset [0, 1]^d$ such that $\mu(E) = 1$. Where $[0, 1]^d$ is the unit cube in \mathbb{R}^d and μ is a Frostman probability measure. Let $C_\mu > 0$ be the constant in the Frostman condition $\mu(B(x, r)) \leq C_\mu r^s$, for some $s > 0$ and for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r > 0$. For the proof of this Lemma we may assume that C_μ is big enough.

Lets divide the unit cube $[0, 1]^d$ into 6^d smaller cubes with edge-length $\frac{1}{6}$. Let Ω_k , $1 \leq k \leq 3^{d-1}2^2$, be a collection of 32^{d-2} sub-cubes such that no two cubes of the same collection touch each other. By pigeon hole principle at least one of the collections Ω_k has measure greater or equal to $\frac{1}{3^{d-1}2^2}$, that is,

$$\mu \left(\bigcup_{Q \in \Omega_k} Q \right) \geq \frac{1}{3^{d-1}2^2} \text{ for some } k.$$

We have the following cases:

- (1) There is a collection that contains $d + 1$ cubes with positive measure. If this is the case then we conclude the proof.
- (2) For each $1 \leq l \leq d$, there is a collection that contains l cubes with positive measure. In other words, for some $1 \leq k \leq 3^{d-1}2^2$ there are cubes $Q_{ik} \in \Omega_k$ such that $\mu(Q_{ik}) > \frac{c}{3^{d-1}2^2}$, for $1 \leq i \leq l$ and some $c > 0$. Then we have the following sub-cases
 - (a) If $c \geq 1$, then we have $\mu(Q_{ik}) \geq \frac{1}{3^{d-1}2^2}$, for $1 \leq i \leq l$. Thus we pick one of these cubes, say Q_{1k} , and we repeat the procedure, that is, we subdivide Q_{1k} into $3^{d-1}2^2$ collections of 32^{d-2} smaller cubes each.
 - (b) If $c < 1$, then there is a cube, say Q_{1k} , such that $\mu(Q_{1k}) \geq \frac{1}{l3^{d-1}2^2}$, and thus we repeat the procedure on Q_{1k} . If such cube does not exists, then $0 < \mu(Q_{ik}) < \frac{1}{l3^{d-1}2^2}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq l$, therefore

$$\mu \left(\bigcup_{Q \in \Omega_k \setminus \{Q_{ik}\}} Q \right) > 0.$$

Thus, there must be a cube in $\Omega_k \setminus \{Q_{ik}\}$ with positive μ measure, and we have $l + 1$ cubes with positive μ measure.

We will show that if there is a collection that contains l cubes with positive μ measure, then the same collection also contains $l+1$ cubes with positive μ measure. Due to Lemma 2.1 we know that case (2) is proved for $l = 1, 2, 3$. Assume that case (2) holds for l , such that $l \geq 3$.

Claim 5.1. *There is a collection in which there are at least $l+1$ cubes with positive measure.*

Suppose that at every iteration we cannot find $l+1$ cubes with positive measure. If we fail to find an $l + 1$ -th cube at the n -th iteration, we obtain a cube, say $Q_{1k}^{(n)}$, of side-length $\frac{1}{6^n}$ for which $\mu(Q_{1k}^{(n)}) \geq \frac{1}{l^n 3^{n(d-1)} 2^{2n}}$. By the Frostman measure condition we have $\frac{1}{l^n 3^{n(d-1)} 2^{2n}} \leq \mu(Q_{1k}^{(n)}) \leq C_\mu \frac{1}{6^{ns}}$, from which we obtain $n \leq \frac{\log_2(C_\mu)}{(1+\log_2(3))s - (d-1)\log_2(3) - \log_2(l) - 2}$ for every n which is a contradiction. \square




FIGURE 3. Due to the number of collections is greater than the number of cubes in each collection, it is simple to subdivide the unit cube into collections in a way that no more than three cubes in the same collection are 'co-planar'. For instance, when $d = 3$ we have 36 collections of 6 cubes each. By Lemma 2.3 we can guarantee the existence of a collection with 4 cubes with positive measure. The picture above shows a way in which we can subdivided the unit cube.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bourgain, "Hausdorff dimensions and distance sets", *Israel J. Math.* 87 (1994), no. 1-3, 193–201.
- [2] B. Cook, N. Lyall and A. Magyar, "Multilinear Maximal Operators Associated to Simplices", *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)* 104 (2021), no. 4, 1491–1514.
- [3] X. Du, L. Guth, Y. Ou, H. Wang, B. Wilson and R. Zhang, "Weighted restriction estimates and application to Falconer distance set problem", *Amer. J. Math.* 143 (2021), no. 1, 175–211.
- [4] X. Du, A. Iosevich, Y. Ou, H. Wang and R. Zhang, "An improved Result for Falconer's distance set problem in even dimensions", *Math. Ann.* 380 (2021), no. 3-4, 1215–1231.
- [5] X. Du and R. Zhang, "Sharp L^2 estimates of the Schrödinger maximal function in higher dimensions", *Ann. of Math.* 189 (2019), no 3, 837–861.
- [6] B. Erdogan, "A bilinear Fourier extension theorem and applications to the distance set problem", *Int. Math. Res. Not.* (2005), no. 23, 1411–1425.

- [7] B. Erdogan, D. Hart and A. Iosevich, "Multiparameter projection theorems with applications to sums-products and finite point configurations in the Euclidean setting, Recent advances in harmonic analysis and applications", *Springer Proc. Math. Stat.*, 25, Springer, New York (2013), 3, 93–103.
- [8] K. J. Falconer, "On the Hausdorff dimensions of distance sets", *Mathematika* 32 (1986), 206–212.
- [9] L. Grafakos, A. Greenleaf, A. Iosevich and E. Palsson, "Multilinear generalized Radon transforms and point configurations", *Forum Mathematicum* 27 (2015), no. 4, 2323–2360.
- [10] A. Greenleaf and A. Iosevich, "On triangles determined by subsets of the Euclidean plane, the associated bilinear operators and applications to discrete geometry", *Anal. PDE* 5 (2012), no. 2, 397–409.
- [11] A. Greenleaf, A. Iosevich, B. Liu and E. Palsson, "An elementary approach to simplices in thin subsets of Euclidean space", *arxiv:1608.04777* (2016).
- [12] A. Greenleaf, A. Iosevich, B. Liu and E. Palsson, "A group-theoretic viewpoint on Erdős-Falconer problems and the Mattila integral", *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* 31 (2015), no. 3, 799–810.
- [13] A. Greenleaf, A. Iosevich and K. Taylor, "Configuration sets with nonempty interior", *J. Geom. Anal.* 31 (2021), no. 7, 6662–6680.
- [14] A. Greenleaf, A. Iosevich and K. Taylor, "Nonempty interior of configuration sets via microlocal partition obtimization", *arXiv:2209.02084* (2022).
- [15] A. Greenleaf, A. Iosevich and K. Taylor, "On k -point configurations sets with nonempty interior", *Mathematika* 68 (2020), no. 1, 163–190.
- [16] L. Guth, A. Iosevich, Y. Ou and H. Wang, "On Falconer's distance set problem in the plane", *invent math.* 219 (2020), no. 3, 779–830.
- [17] A. Iosevich and A. Magyar, "Simplices in thin subsets of Euclidean spaces", *arxiv:2009.04902* (2020).
- [18] A. Iosevich, M. Mourgoglou and S. Senger, "On sets of directions determined by subsets of \mathbb{R}^d ", *J. Anal. Math.* 116 (2012), 355–369.
- [19] A. Iosevich, M. Mourgoglou and K. Taylor, "On the Mattila-Sjölin theorem for distance sets", *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.* 37 (2012), no.2, 557–562.
- [20] A. Iosevich and M. Rudnev, "Erdős distance problem in vector spaces over finite fields", *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 359 (2007), no. 12, 6127–6142.
- [21] D. Koh, T. Pham and C. Shen, "On the Mattila-Sjölin distance theorem for product sets", *accepted at Mathematika*.
- [22] W. Littman, "Fourier transforms of surface-carried measures and differentiability of surface averages", *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* 69 (1963), 766–770.
- [23] B. Liu, "An L^2 -identity and pinned distance problem", *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 29 (2019), no.1, 283–294.
- [24] P. Mattila, "Fourier Analysis and Hausdorff dimension", *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics* 150 (2015).
- [25] P. Mattila, "Geometry of sets and measures in Euclidean spaces", *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics* 44 (1995).
- [26] P. Mattila and P. Sjölin, "Regularity of distance measures and sets", *Math. Nachr.* 204 (1999), 157–162.
- [27] B. Murphy and G. Petridis, "An example related to the Erdős-Falconer question over arbitrary finite fields", *Bull. Hellenic Math. Soc.* 63 (2019), 38–39.
- [28] B. Murphy, G. Petridis, T. Pham, M. Rudnev and S. Stevens, "On the pinned distances problem in positive characteristic", *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)* 105 (2022), no. 1, 469–499.
- [29] C. Muscalu and W. Schlag, "Classical and Multilinear Harmonic Analysis: Volume 1", *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics* 138 (2013).
- [30] E.A. Palsson and F. Romero Acosta, "A Mattila-Sjölin Theorem for Triangles", *arxiv:2109.13429* (2021).
- [31] H. Steinhaus, "Sur les distances des points dans les esembles de mesure positive", *Fund. Math.* 1 (1920), 93–94.
- [32] T. Wolff, "Decay of circular means of Fourier transforms of measures", *Int. Math. Res. Notices* (1999), no. 10, 547–567.

Email address: palsson@vt.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, VIRGINIA TECH, BLACKSBURG, VA 24061

Email address: jfromero@vt.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, VIRGINIA TECH, BLACKSBURG, VA 24061