

# DIMENSIONS OF FURSTENBERG SETS AND AN EXTENSION OF BOURGAIN'S PROJECTION THEOREM

PABLO SHMERKIN AND HONG WANG

**ABSTRACT.** We show that the Hausdorff dimension of  $(s, t)$ -Furstenberg sets is at least  $s + t/2 + \epsilon$ , where  $\epsilon > 0$  depends only on  $s$  and  $t$ . This improves the previously best known bound for  $2s < t \leq 1 + \epsilon(s, t)$ , in particular providing the first improvement since 1999 to the dimension of classical  $s$ -Furstenberg sets for  $s < 1/2$ . We deduce this from a corresponding discretized incidence bound under minimal non-concentration assumptions, that simultaneously extends Bourgain's discretized projection and sum-product theorems. The proofs are based on a recent discretized incidence bound of T. Orponen and the first author and a certain duality between  $(s, t)$  and  $(t/2, s + t/2)$ -Furstenberg sets.

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

**1.1. Dimension of Furstenberg sets.** Let  $s \in (0, 1]$ . We say that a set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  is an  $s$ -Furstenberg set if for almost all directions  $\theta \in S^1$  there is a line  $\ell_\theta$  in direction  $\theta$  such that  $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(K \cap \ell_\theta) \geq s$ . Motivated by work of Furstenberg and by the Szemerédi-Trotter Theorem in incidence geometry, T. Wolff [18] posed the problem of estimating the smallest possible dimension  $\gamma(s)$  of an  $s$ -Furstenberg set. Using elementary geometric arguments, Wolff showed that

$$\gamma(s) \geq \max(2s, s + 1/2).$$

Note that both bounds coincide for  $s = 1/2$ . J. Bourgain [1], building up on work of N. Katz and T. Tao [10], proved that  $\gamma(1/2) > 1 + \epsilon$  for some small universal constant  $\epsilon > 0$ ; this is much deeper. Much more recently, T. Orponen and the first author [14] established a similar improvement for  $s \in (1/2, 1)$ :

$$\gamma(s) \geq 2s + \epsilon(s),$$

where  $\epsilon(s) > 0$  for  $s \in (1/2, 1)$ . For the case  $s < 1/2$ , the first author [17] recently obtained a similar improvement, with the significant caveat that it involves only the *packing* dimension of  $s$ -Furstenberg sets (which can be

---

*Date:* November 28, 2022.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 28A80 (Primary) 28A75, 28A78 (Secondary).

*Key words and phrases.* Furstenberg sets, projections, incidences, Hausdorff dimension, sum-product, discretized sets.

P.S. is supported by an NSERC Discovery Grant.

H.W. is supported by NSF Grant DMS-2055544.

larger than Hausdorff dimension). In this paper, as a corollary of our main result we obtain the corresponding Hausdorff dimension improvement:

**Theorem 1.1.** *For every  $s \in (0, 1)$  there is  $\epsilon(s) > 0$  such that every  $s$ -Furstenberg set  $K$  satisfies*

$$\dim_{\text{H}}(K) \geq s + \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon(s).$$

Recently, there has been much interest in the following generalization of Furstenberg sets: we say that  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  is an  $(s, t)$ -Furstenberg set if there is a family of lines  $\mathcal{L}$  with  $\dim_{\text{H}}(\mathcal{L}) \geq t$  such that

$$\dim_{\text{H}}(K \cap \ell) \geq s, \quad \ell \in \mathcal{L}.$$

Since lines are a two-dimensional manifold, the Hausdorff dimension of  $\mathcal{L}$  is well defined. Classical  $s$ -Furstenberg sets are, of course,  $(s, 1)$ -Furstenberg sets. The central problem, initiated by U. Molter and E. Rela [12], is to estimate  $\gamma(s, t)$ , the smallest possible Hausdorff dimension of  $(s, t)$ -Furstenberg sets; this can be seen as a continuous analog of the Szemerédi-Trotter incidence bound. Recent works investigating this problem include [11, 9, 5, 4, 8]. The best currently known bounds are summarized as follows. Suppose first that  $t \leq 1 + \epsilon'(s, t)$  (where  $\epsilon'(s, t)$  is a small positive parameter). Then (see [12, 11, 9, 14])

$$\gamma(s, t) \geq \begin{cases} s + t & \text{if } t \leq s \\ 2s + \epsilon(s, t) & \text{if } s \leq t \leq 2s - \epsilon'(s, t), \\ s + \frac{t}{2} & \text{if } 2s - \epsilon'(s, t) \leq t \end{cases} .$$

Suppose now that  $t \geq 1 + \epsilon'(s, t)$ . Then (see [8])

$$\gamma(s, t) \geq \begin{cases} 2s + t - 1 & \text{if } s + t \leq 2 \\ s + 1 & \text{if } s + t \geq 2 \end{cases} .$$

The bounds  $s + t$ ,  $s + 1$  are sharp in the respective regimes, but the other bounds are not expected to be sharp. In this article we obtain a small improvement upon the  $s + t/2$  bound:

**Theorem 1.2.** *Given  $s \in (0, 1]$ ,  $t \in (0, 2]$ , there is  $\epsilon(s, t) > 0$  such that the following holds. Let  $K$  be an  $(s, t)$ -Furstenberg set. Then*

$$\dim_{\text{H}}(K) \geq s + \frac{t}{2} + \epsilon(s, t).$$

Theorem 1.1 is an immediate corollary, taking  $t = 1$ .

**1.2. Discretized incidence estimates and a strengthening of Bourgain's discretized projection and sum-product theorems.** Theorem 1.2 is a consequence of the following discretized incidence estimate. See §2.2 for the definition of  $(\delta, s, C)$ -sets of points and tubes.

**Proposition 1.3.** *Given  $s \in (0, 1)$  and  $t \in (s, 2]$ , there are  $\epsilon, \eta > 0$  such that the following holds for small enough  $\delta$ .*

Let  $P \subset B^2(0, 1)$  be a  $(\delta, t, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set. For each  $p \in P$ , let  $\mathcal{T}(p)$  be a  $(\delta, s, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set of tubes through  $p$  with  $|\mathcal{T}(p)| \geq M$ . Then the union  $\mathcal{T} = \cup_{p \in P} \mathcal{T}(p)$  satisfies

$$|\mathcal{T}| \geq M\delta^{-(t/2+\eta)}. \quad (1.1)$$

By duality between points and lines (see e.g. [14, Theorem 3.2] and the discussion afterwards) we obtain the following corollary which more closely resembles the Furstenberg set problem. In the statement,  $|P|_\delta$  stands for the  $\delta$ -covering number of  $P$  (see §2.1).

**Corollary 1.4.** *Given  $0 < s < 1$ ,  $s < t$ , there are  $\epsilon, \eta > 0$  such that the following holds for small enough dyadic  $\delta$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a  $(\delta, t, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set of lines intersecting  $B^2(0, 1)$ . For each  $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ , let  $P(\ell)$  be a  $(\delta, s, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set contained in  $\ell^{(\delta)}$ . Suppose  $|P(\ell)|_\delta \geq M$  for all  $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ . Then the union  $P = \cup_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} P(\ell)$  satisfies*

$$|P|_\delta \geq M\delta^{-(t/2+\eta)}.$$

Note that  $M \geq \delta^{-(t-\epsilon)}$  and hence (up to changing the values of  $\eta, \epsilon$ ) we also have the conclusion  $|\mathcal{T}| \geq \delta^{-(s+t/2+\eta)}$ . In turn, by [9, Lemma 3.3] this yields Theorem 1.2.

The non-concentration assumption on  $\mathcal{T}(p)$  in Proposition 1.3 is quite mild, since  $M$  can potentially be much larger than  $\delta^{-s}$  (and a  $\delta^{-\epsilon}$  factor is also allowed). What about  $P$ ? Some non-concentration is needed, as the following standard example shows: if  $P = B(x, r)$  and  $\mathcal{T}(p)$  is the set of tubes through  $p$  with slopes in a fixed  $(\delta, s, C)$ -set  $\mathcal{S}$ , then

$$|\mathcal{T}| \sim |\mathcal{S}|_\delta \cdot \frac{r}{\delta} \sim |\mathcal{T}(p)| \cdot |P|_\delta^{1/2}.$$

A similar estimate holds if  $P$  is very dense in the union of a small number of  $r$ -balls. The next result asserts that under a minimal single-scale non-concentration assumption on  $P$  that rules out this scenario, there is a gain over the “trivial” estimate of Corollary 2.6:

**Theorem 1.5.** *Given  $s, u \in (0, 1)$ , there are  $\epsilon, \eta > 0$  such that the following holds for small enough dyadic  $\delta$ .*

Let  $P \subset B^2(0, 1)$  be set such that

$$\left| P \cap B\left(x, \delta|P|_\delta^{1/2}\right) \right|_\delta \leq \delta^u |P|_\delta, \quad x \in B^2(0, 1). \quad (1.2)$$

For each  $p \in P$ , let  $\mathcal{T}(p)$  be a  $(\delta, s, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set of dyadic tubes through  $p$  with  $|\mathcal{T}(p)| \geq M$ . Then the union  $\mathcal{T} = \cup_{p \in P} \mathcal{T}(p)$  satisfies

$$|\mathcal{T}| \geq \delta^{-\eta} M |P|_\delta^{1/2}. \quad (1.3)$$

This result extends Proposition 1.3 (however, the proposition is used in the proof) and due to the minimal non-concentration assumption it provides new information even when  $|P|_\delta \gg \delta^{-1}$ . Perhaps more significantly, Theorem 1.5 generalizes Bourgain’s celebrated discretized projection theorem [2, Theorem 3] (or even the refined version with single-scale non-concentration in [16, Theorem 1.7]). Roughly speaking, Bourgain’s Theorem corresponds to the special “product” case in which the slopes of the

tubes in  $\mathcal{T}(p)$  are (nearly) independent of  $p$ ; see Section 5 for the details. This connection between Furstenberg sets and projections is well known, see e.g. [13] or [14, §3.2]. Bourgain’s discretized projection theorem is used in the proof of [14, Theorem 3.2], which is in turn used to prove Theorem 1.5, so this does not provide a new proof of the projection theorem. Using a well-known argument of G. Elekes, Theorem 1.5 (or rather its dual formulation below) also easily recovers Bourgain’s discretized sum-product theorem ([1, Theorem 0.3], [3, Proposition 3.2]). The details are sketched in Section 5. It is worth noting that although Bourgain’s discretized sum-product and projection theorems are closely connected to each other, deducing either from the other takes a substantial amount of work, while they are both rather direct corollaries of Theorem 1.5.

By duality between points and lines (again we refer to [14, Theorem 3.2] for details), we have the following corollary of Theorem 1.5:

**Corollary 1.6.** *Given  $s, u \in (0, 1)$ , there are  $\epsilon, \eta > 0$  such that the following holds for small enough dyadic  $\delta$ .*

*Let  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{T}^\delta$  be a set of dyadic tubes such that*

$$|\{T \in \mathcal{T} : T \subset \mathbf{T}\}| \leq \delta^u |\mathcal{T}|$$

*for all  $(\delta|\mathcal{T}|^{1/2})$ -tubes  $\mathbf{T}$ .*

*For each  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ , let  $P(T) \subset T$  be a  $(\delta, s, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set with  $|P(T)|_\delta \geq M$ . Then  $P = \cup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} P(T)$  satisfies*

$$|P| \geq \delta^{-\eta} M |\mathcal{T}|^{1/2}.$$

**1.3. Sketch of proof.** Many “ $\epsilon$ -improvements” in discretized geometry are obtained by showing that, in the absence of it, the relevant geometric object has a rigid structure that eventually is shown to contradict some previously known bounds (often involving some other “ $\epsilon$ -improvement”). This is also the approach we take here. By the simple elementary bounds in Lemmas 2.4–2.5, one obtains the improved bound in Proposition 1.3 unless

$$\begin{aligned} |P \cap T|_\delta &\approx |P|_\delta^{1/2}, \quad T \in \mathcal{T}, \\ |P|_\delta &\approx \delta^{-t}. \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

(In this section the notation  $\approx$  should be interpreted informally as “up to small powers of  $\delta$ ”). A first ingredient of the proof is showing that (after suitable refinements of  $P$  and  $\mathcal{T}$ ) one also gets the desired conclusion unless

$$|P \cap T \cap Q|_\delta \approx |P \cap Q|_\delta^{1/2}, \tag{1.5}$$

for all  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ , all  $\Delta$ -squares  $Q$  intersecting  $P$  and a “dense” set of scales  $\delta < \Delta < 1$ . To see this, we combine the elementary bounds applied to  $P \cap Q$  (and a sub-system of tubes passing through  $P \cap Q$ ) with an induction-on-scales mechanism from [14], recalled as Proposition 2.7 below.

The relation (1.5) can be shown to imply that either one gets the improved bound we are seeking, or  $P$  intersects each tube  $T$  in a  $(\delta, t/2)$ -set.

By (known) elementary arguments  $\mathcal{T}$  is a  $(\delta, s + t/2)$ -set of tubes. Hence  $P$  is a discretized  $(t/2, s + t/2)$ -Furstenberg set. But it was shown in [14, Theorem 3.2] that this implies that  $|P|_\delta \geq \delta^{-t-\eta}$  for some  $\eta = \eta(t/2, s + t/2) > 0$ . This contradicts (1.4), showing the impossibility of the rigid configuration described by (1.5) and hence establishing Proposition 1.3. To our knowledge this dual relationship between  $(s, t)$  and  $(t/2, s + t/2)$ -Furstenberg sets hadn't been noticed before.

We obtain Theorem 1.5 by applying Proposition 1.3 to each scale in a multiscale decomposition of  $P$  into "non-trivial Frostman pieces" that was established in [16], and is recalled as Theorem 2.10 below. The scales are combined together by another application of Proposition 2.7.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Notation.** The notation  $A \lesssim B$  or  $A = O(B)$  stands for  $A \leq C \cdot B$  for some constant  $C > 0$ ; similarly for  $A \gtrsim B$ ,  $A \sim B$ . The  $\delta$ -covering number of a set  $X$  (in a metric space) is defined as the smallest number of  $\delta$ -balls needed to cover  $X$ , and is denoted  $|X|_\delta$ . The open  $r$ -neighbourhood of a set  $X$  is denoted by  $X^{(r)}$ .

**2.2.  $(\delta, s)$ -sets of points and tubes.** Given  $r \in 2^{-\mathbb{N}}$ , we denote the family of (half-open) dyadic cubes of side-length in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  by  $\mathcal{D}_r$ . The set of cubes in  $\mathcal{D}_r$  intersecting a set  $X$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{D}_r(X)$ .

In this article, we work with the following notion of discretization of sets of dimension  $s$ :

**Definition 2.1** ( $(\delta, s, C)$ -set). Let  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a bounded nonempty set,  $d \geq 1$ . Let  $\delta \in 2^{-\mathbb{N}}$ ,  $0 \leq s \leq d$ , and  $C > 0$ . We say that  $P$  is a  $(\delta, s, C)$ -set if

$$|P \cap Q|_\delta \leq C \cdot |P|_\delta \cdot r^s, \quad Q \in \mathcal{D}_r(\mathbb{R}^d), \delta \leq r \leq 1. \quad (2.1)$$

If  $P \subset \mathcal{D}_\delta$  (so  $P$  is a family of dyadic cubes), we will abuse notation by identifying  $P$  with  $\cup P$ , so it makes sense to speak of  $(\delta, s, C)$ -sets of dyadic cubes.

We also need to work with discretized families of tubes:

**Definition 2.2** (Dyadic  $\delta$ -tubes). Let  $\delta \in 2^{-\mathbb{N}}$ . A *dyadic  $\delta$ -tube* is a set of the form

$$\mathbf{D}(p) := \{(x, y) : y = ax + b \text{ for some } (a, b) \in p\},$$

where  $p \in \mathcal{D}_\delta([-1, 1) \times \mathbb{R})$ . The collection of all dyadic  $\delta$ -tubes is denoted

$$\mathcal{T}^\delta := \{\mathbf{D}(p) : p \in \mathcal{D}_\delta([-1, 1) \times \mathbb{R})\}.$$

A finite collection of dyadic  $\delta$ -tubes  $\{\mathbf{D}(p)\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$  is called a  $(\delta, s, C)$ -set if  $\mathcal{P}$  is a  $(\delta, s, C)$ -set.

We remark that a dyadic  $\delta$ -tube is not exactly a  $\delta$ -neighbourhood of some line, but the intersection of

$$T = \mathbf{D}([a, a + \delta] \times [b, b + \delta])$$

with some fixed bounded set  $B$  satisfies  $\ell_{a,b}^{(c\delta)} \cap B \subset T \cap B \subset \ell_{a,b}^{(C\delta)}$ , where  $\ell_{a,b} = \{y = (a + \delta/2)x + (b + \delta/2)\}$  and  $c, C$  depend only on  $B$ .

An elementary but important observation is that tubes in  $\mathcal{T}^\delta$  that intersect a fixed square  $p \in \mathcal{D}_\delta$  are parametrized by their slope in a bilipschitz way. In particular, if  $\mathcal{T}(p) \subset \mathcal{T}^\delta$  is a family of tubes intersecting  $p \in \mathcal{D}_\delta$ , then  $\mathcal{T}(p)$  is a  $(\delta, s, C)$ -set if and only if the slopes of tubes in  $\mathcal{T}(p)$  form a  $(\delta, s, C')$  set for  $C' \sim C$ ; see [14, Corollary 2.12] for the precise statement.

**2.3. Elementary incidence bounds.** We now collect some elementary incidence bounds; they correspond in various ways to the lower bound  $s + t/2$  for the dimension of  $(s, t)$ -Furstenberg sets. We state our bounds in terms of the following notion:

**Definition 2.3.** Fix  $\delta \in 2^{-\mathbb{N}}$ ,  $s \in [0, 1]$ ,  $C > 0$ ,  $M \in \mathbb{N}$ . We say that a pair  $(P, \mathcal{T}) \subset \mathcal{D}_\delta \times \mathcal{T}^\delta$  is a  $(\delta, s, C, M)$ -nice configuration if for every  $p \in P$  there exists a  $(\delta, s, C)$ -set  $\mathcal{T}(p) \subset \mathcal{T}$  with  $|\mathcal{T}(p)| = M$  and such that  $T \cap p \neq \emptyset$  for all  $T \in \mathcal{T}(p)$ .

**Lemma 2.4.** Let  $(P, \mathcal{T})$  be a  $(\delta, s, C, M)$ -nice configuration. Then for any  $\delta$ -tube  $T$  (not necessarily in  $\mathcal{T}$ ),

$$|\mathcal{T}| \gtrsim C^{-1/s} \cdot |T \cap P|_\delta \cdot M.$$

*Proof.* We may assume  $P$  is  $\delta$ -separated. Fix  $p \in T \cap P$ . Since  $\mathcal{T}(p)$  is a  $(\delta, s, C)$ -set, there is a subset  $\mathcal{T}'(p) \subset \mathcal{T}(p)$  such that  $|\mathcal{T}'(p)| \geq |\mathcal{T}(p)|/2 = M/2$  and each tube  $T' \in \mathcal{T}'(p)$  makes an angle  $\gtrsim C^{-1/s}$  with the direction of  $T$ . In turn, this implies that the sets  $\mathcal{T}'(p)$ ,  $p \in T \cap P$  have overlap  $\lesssim C^{1/s}$ . This gives the claim.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.5.** Let  $(P, \mathcal{T})$  be a  $(\delta, s, C, M)$ -nice configuration. Suppose  $|T \cap P| \leq K$  for all  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ . Then

$$|\mathcal{T}| \geq K^{-1} \cdot |P| \cdot M.$$

*Proof.*

$$|P| \cdot M = \sum_{p \in P} |\mathcal{T}_p| = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} |\{p : T \in \mathcal{T}_p\}| \leq \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} |T \cap P| \leq |\mathcal{T}| \cdot K.$$

$\square$

**Corollary 2.6.** Let  $(P, \mathcal{T})$  be a  $(\delta, s, C, M)$ -nice configuration. Then

$$|\mathcal{T}| \gtrsim C^{-1/s} \cdot |P|^{1/2} \cdot M.$$

Moreover,  $\mathcal{T}$  contains a  $(\delta, s + t/2, \log(1/\delta)^{O(1)} C^{1/s})$ -set of  $\delta$ -tubes.

*Proof.* If  $|T \cap P| \geq |P|^{1/2}$  for some  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ , we apply Lemma 2.4, otherwise we apply Lemma 2.5. In any case we get the first claim.

Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the set of lines corresponding to tubes in  $\mathcal{T}$  (or, equivalently, the  $\delta$ -neighbourhood of the central lines of tubes in  $\mathcal{T}$ ). It follows from the

first claim and two dyadic pigeonholings that the Hausdorff content of  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfies

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{s+t/2}(\mathcal{L}) \gtrsim \log(1/\delta)^{-O(1)} C^{-1/s}.$$

See e.g. the proof of [9, Lemma 3.3] or [15, Lemma 3.5] (in particular, [15, Eq. (3.9)]). The conclusion then follows from the discrete version of Frostman's Lemma, [7, Proposition A.1] (which is stated in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  but works just as well in the space of lines).  $\square$

**2.4. A multiscale incidence bound.** We next recall [14, Proposition 5.2]. Fix two dyadic scales  $0 < \delta < \Delta \leq 1$  and families  $P_0 \subset \mathcal{D}_\delta$  and  $\mathcal{T}_0 \subset \mathcal{T}^\delta$ . For  $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$  and  $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}^\Delta$ , we denote

$$P_0 \cap Q = \{p \in P_0 : p \subset Q\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}_0 \cap \mathbf{T} := \{T \in \mathcal{T}_0 : T \subset \mathbf{T}\}.$$

We also write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_\Delta(P_0) &= \{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta : P_0 \cap Q \neq \emptyset\}, \\ \mathcal{T}^\Delta(\mathcal{T}_0) &= \{\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}^\Delta : \mathcal{T}_0 \cap \mathbf{T} \neq \emptyset\}. \end{aligned}$$

In the next proposition, for  $\Delta \in 2^{-\mathbb{N}}$  and  $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$ , the map  $S_Q: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  is the homothety that maps  $Q$  to the square  $[0, 1]^2$ , and  $S_Q(P_0) = \{S_Q(p) : p \in P_0\}$ . Furthermore, the notation  $A \lesssim_\delta B$  stands for  $A \leq \log(1/\delta)^C B$  for a constant  $C > 0$ , and likewise for  $A \approx_\delta B$ .

**Proposition 2.7** ([14, Proposition 5.2]). *Fix dyadic numbers  $0 < \delta < \Delta \leq 1$ . Let  $(P_0, \mathcal{T}_0)$  be a  $(\delta, s, C, M)$ -nice configuration. Then there exist sets  $P \subset P_0$  and  $\mathcal{T}(p) \subset \mathcal{T}_0(p)$ ,  $p \in P$ , such that denoting  $\mathcal{T} = \bigcup_{p \in P} \mathcal{T}(p)$  the following hold:*

- (i)  $|\mathcal{D}_\Delta(P)| \approx_\delta |\mathcal{D}_\Delta(P_0)|$  and  $|P \cap Q| \approx_\delta |P_0 \cap Q|$  for all  $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta(P)$ .
- (ii)  $|\mathcal{T}(p)| \gtrsim_\delta |\mathcal{T}_0(p)| = M$  for  $p \in P$ .
- (iii)  $(\mathcal{D}_\Delta(P), \mathcal{T}^\Delta(\mathcal{T}))$  is  $(\Delta, s, C_\Delta, M_\Delta)$ -nice for some  $C_\Delta \approx_\delta C$  and  $M_\Delta \geq 1$ .
- (iv) For each  $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta(P)$  there exist  $C_Q \approx_\delta C$ ,  $M_Q \geq 1$ , and a family of tubes  $\mathcal{T}_Q \subset \mathcal{T}^{\delta/\Delta}$  such that  $(S_Q(P \cap Q), \mathcal{T}_Q)$  is  $(\delta/\Delta, s, C_Q, M_Q)$ -nice.

Furthermore, the families  $\mathcal{T}_Q$  can be chosen so that

$$\frac{|\mathcal{T}_0|}{M} \gtrsim_\delta \frac{|\mathcal{T}^\Delta(\mathcal{T})|}{M_\Delta} \cdot \left( \max_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta(P)} \frac{|\mathcal{T}_Q|}{M_Q} \right). \quad (2.2)$$

**2.5. Uniformization.** Next, we recall a basic lemma asserting the existence of large uniform subsets. See e.g. [14, Lemma 7.3] for the proof.

**Definition 2.8.** Let  $N \geq 1$ , and let

$$\delta = \Delta_N < \Delta_{N-1} < \dots < \Delta_1 \leq \Delta_0 = 1$$

be a sequence of dyadic scales. We say that a set  $P \subset [0, 1]^2$  is  $(\Delta_j)_{j=1}^N$ -uniform if there is a sequence  $(K_j)_{j=1}^N$  such that  $|P \cap Q|_{\Delta_j} = K_j$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  and all  $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta_{j-1}}(P)$ .



**Lemma 2.9.** *Given  $P \subset [0, 1]^2$  and a sequence  $\delta = \Delta_N < \Delta_{N-1} < \dots < \Delta_1 \leq \Delta_0 = 1$  of dyadic numbers,  $N \geq 1$ , there is a  $(\Delta_j)_{j=1}^N$ -uniform set  $P' \subset P$  such that*

$$|P'|_\delta \geq (4N^{-1} \log(1/\delta))^{-N} |P|_\delta. \quad (2.3)$$

Note that if the number  $N$  of scales is independent of  $\delta$ , then lower bound on  $|P'|_\delta$  can be simplified as

$$|P'|_\delta \geq C_N^{-1} \cdot \log(1/\delta)^{-C_N} \cdot |P|_\delta,$$

with  $C_N$  independent of  $\delta$ .

**2.6. A multiscale decomposition.** To conclude this section, we recall the multiscale decomposition into ‘‘Frostman pieces’’ of uniform sets that satisfy a single-scale non-concentration assumption provided by [16, Theorem 4.1].

**Theorem 2.10.** *For every  $u > 0$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  there are  $\xi = \xi(u) > 0$  and  $\tau = \tau(\epsilon) > 0$  such that the following holds for all sufficiently small  $\rho \leq \rho_0(\epsilon)$  and  $n \geq n_0(\rho, \epsilon)$ :*

*Let  $P$  be a  $(\rho^j)_{j=1}^n$ -uniform set and write  $\delta = \rho^n$ . Suppose*

$$\left| P \cap B(x, \delta |P|_\delta^{1/2}) \right|_\delta \leq \delta^u |P|_\delta \quad \text{for all } x. \quad (2.4)$$

*Then there exists a collection of dyadic scales*

$$\delta = \Delta_N < \Delta_{N-1} < \dots < \Delta_1 < \Delta_0 = 1, \quad N \leq N_0(\epsilon).$$

*each of which is a power of  $\rho$ , and numbers  $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{N-1} \in [0, 2]$  such that, denoting  $\lambda_j = \Delta_{j+1}/\Delta_j$ , the following hold:*

(i) *For each  $j$  and each  $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta_j}(P)$ ,*

$$|P \cap Q \cap B(x, r\Delta_j)|_{\Delta_{j+1}} \leq \lambda_j^{-\epsilon} \cdot r^{\alpha_j} \cdot |P \cap Q|_{\Delta_{j+1}}$$

*for all  $x \in B^2(0, 1)$  and all  $r \in [\lambda_j, 1]$ .*

(ii)

$$\sum \{ \alpha_j \log(1/\lambda_j) : \lambda_j \leq \delta^\tau \} \geq \log |P|_\delta - 2\epsilon \log(1/\delta).$$

(iii)

$$\sum \{ \log(1/\lambda_j) : \alpha_j \in [\xi, d - \xi] \text{ and } \lambda_j \leq \delta^\tau \} \geq \xi \log(1/\delta).$$

This is just (a slightly weaker version of) [16, Theorem 4.1], although stated using different notation: the measure  $\mu$  there corresponds to normalized Lebesgue measure on  $P(\delta)$  (or the union of  $\delta$ -squares intersecting  $\delta$ );  $\rho$  corresponds to  $2^{-T}$  in [16]; the scales  $\Delta_j$  correspond to both  $2^{-TA_i}$  and  $2^{-TB_i}$ . The last two claims only concern scale intervals  $[\Delta_{j+1}, \Delta_j]$  corresponding to  $[2^{-TB_i}, 2^{-TA_i}]$ , while for  $[\Delta_{j+1}, \Delta_j] = [2^{-TB_{i+1}}, 2^{-TA_i}]$  we simply take  $\alpha_j = 0$ .



## 3. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1.3

In this section we prove Proposition 1.3. Note that there is no loss of generality in assuming that  $P$  is a union of dyadic  $\delta$ -squares and the tubes in  $\mathcal{T}(p)$  are dyadic  $\delta$ -tubes intersecting  $p$ .

The parameter  $\epsilon$  should be thought of being much smaller than  $\eta$  (and will be chosen after  $\eta$ ). Both  $\epsilon, \eta$  will ultimately be chosen in terms of  $s, t$  only. We let  $N = \lceil \eta^{-1} \rceil$ , so that  $N = N(s, t)$ . Let  $\rho = \delta^{1/N}$ ; without loss of generality,  $\rho$  is dyadic.

In the course of this proof,  $A \lesssim B$  stands for  $A \leq C(s, t)\delta^{-C(s, t)\epsilon}B$ . Likewise, a  $(\delta, u)$ -set is a  $(\delta, u, C)$ -set for  $C \lesssim 1$ .

Replacing  $P$  by its  $(\rho^j)_{j=1}^N$ -uniformization (given by Lemma 2.9), we may assume that  $P$  is  $(\rho^j)_{j=1}^N$ -uniform. Note that the uniformization is still a  $(\delta, t)$ -set.

We will construct sequences  $P_j \subset \mathcal{D}_\delta, \mathcal{T}_j \subset \mathcal{T}^\delta, j = 0, 1, \dots, N$  with the following properties:

- (a)  $P_j$  is  $(\rho^j)_{j=1}^N$ -uniform.
- (b)  $P_{j+1} \subset P_j, P_0 \subset P$  and  $|P_{j+1}| \gtrsim |P_j|, |P_0| \gtrsim |P|$ . In particular,  $P_N$  is a  $(\delta, t)$ -set.
- (c)  $\mathcal{T}_0(p) = \mathcal{T}(p), \mathcal{T}_{j+1}(p) \subset \mathcal{T}_j(p)$  and  $M_{j+1} \sim |\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(p)| \gtrsim |\mathcal{T}_j(p)|$  for  $p \in P_{j+1}$  and some  $M_{j+1}$ . In particular, each  $\mathcal{T}(p), p \in P_N$  is a  $(\delta, t)$ -set.
- (d) For each  $j$ , any  $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\rho^j}(P_j)$  and any  $\delta$ -tube  $T$ ,

$$|\mathcal{T}| \gtrsim M \cdot |P_j|_{\rho^j}^{1/2} \cdot |T \cap P_j \cap Q|_\delta.$$

Recall that  $|\mathcal{T}(p)| \geq M$  for each  $p \in P$ . Pigeonhole a dyadic number  $M_0$  such that  $|\mathcal{T}(p)| \sim M_0$  for all  $p \in P'_0 \subset P$  with  $|P'_0| \gtrsim |P|$ . We let  $P_0$  be the  $(\rho^j)_{j=1}^N$ -uniformization of  $P'_0$  given by Lemma 2.9. Then  $P_0$  is a  $(\delta, t)$ -set, and we take  $\mathcal{T}_0(p) = \mathcal{T}(p)$  for  $p \in P_0$ .

Once  $P_j, \mathcal{T}_j$  are defined, we let  $P'_{j+1}, \mathcal{T}'_{j+1}$  be the objects provided by Proposition 2.7 applied to  $(P_j, \mathcal{T}_j)$  at scale  $\Delta = \rho^{j+1}$ . It follows from Proposition 2.7(i) and the regularity of  $P_j$  that  $P'_{j+1} \subset P_j$  and  $|P'_{j+1}| \gtrsim |P_j|$ . Pigeonhole a number  $M_{j+1}$  such that  $|\mathcal{T}'_{j+1}(p)| \sim M_{j+1}$  for all  $p \in P''_{j+1} \subset P'_{j+1}$ , where  $|P''_{j+1}| \gtrsim |P'_{j+1}|$ . Finally, let  $P_{j+1}$  be the  $(\rho^j)_{j=1}^N$ -uniformization of  $P''_{j+1}$  and  $\mathcal{T}_{j+1}(p) = \mathcal{T}'_{j+1}(p)$  for  $p \in P_{j+1}$ .

Properties (a)–(b) hold by construction. Property (c) follows from Proposition 2.7(ii). To see Property (d), let  $C_\Delta, M_\Delta, \mathcal{T}_Q, C_Q, M_Q$  be the objects provided by Proposition 2.7(iii)–(iv). By Corollary 2.6,

$$|\mathcal{T}^\Delta(\mathcal{T}'_{j+1})| \gtrsim M_\Delta \cdot |P_{j+1}|^{1/2},$$

and by Lemma 2.4 and rescaling,

$$|\mathcal{T}_Q| \gtrsim M_Q \cdot |T \cap P_j \cap Q|_\delta.$$

Putting these facts together with (2.2), we see that Property (d) holds.

We pause to observe that  $(P_N, \mathcal{T}_N)$  is a  $(\delta, s, C_N, M_N)$ -nice configuration where  $C_N \lesssim 1$  and  $M_N \gtrsim M$ .

We now consider several cases. Suppose first that there are  $T \in \mathcal{T}_N$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  and  $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\rho^j}(P_N)$  such that

$$|T \cap P_N \cap Q|_\delta \geq \delta^{-2\eta} \cdot |P_N \cap Q|_\delta^{1/2}.$$

Then, by **(d)**, the uniformity of  $P_N$ , and the fact that  $P_j \supset P_N$  is a  $(\delta, t)$ -set, we see that **(1.3)** holds if  $\epsilon$  is small enough in terms of  $s, t, \eta$ .

Hence, we assume from now on that

$$|T \cap P_N \cap Q|_\delta \leq \delta^{-2\eta} \cdot |P_N \cap Q|_\delta^{1/2}, \quad (3.1)$$

for  $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ ,  $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\rho^j}(P_N)$ , and  $T \in \mathcal{T}_N$ .

We consider two further sub-cases. Suppose first that for at least half of the squares  $p$  in  $P_N$ , at least half of the tubes  $T \in \mathcal{T}_N(p)$  satisfy

$$|T \cap P_N|_\delta \leq \delta^{2\eta} \cdot |P_N|_\delta^{1/2}.$$

Then Lemma 2.5 (applied to suitable restrictions of  $P_N$  and  $\mathcal{T}_N$ ) yields **(1.3)**.

We can then assume that

$$|T \cap P_N|_\delta \geq \delta^{2\eta} \cdot |P_N|_\delta^{1/2} \quad \text{for all } T \in \mathcal{T}'_N, \quad (3.2)$$

where  $\mathcal{T}'_N = \cup_{p \in P'_N} \mathcal{T}'(p)$ , with  $|P'_N| \geq |P_N|/2$  and  $|\mathcal{T}'_N(p)| \geq |\mathcal{T}_N(p)|/2$ . It then follows from **(3.1)** that, for any  $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\rho^j}(P_N)$  and  $T \in \mathcal{T}'_N$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |T \cap P_N \cap Q|_\delta &\leq \delta^{-4\eta} \left( |P_N|_\delta^{-1/2} |P_N \cap Q|_\delta^{1/2} \right) |T \cap P_N|_\delta \\ &\leq \delta^{-5\eta} (\rho^j)^{t/2} |T \cap P_N|_\delta, \end{aligned}$$

using that  $P_N$  is a  $(\delta, t)$ -set and taking  $\epsilon$  sufficiently small in terms of  $\eta, s, t$ .

Recalling that  $N = \lceil \eta^{-1} \rceil$ , we deduce that for any  $r$ -ball  $B_r$  with  $\rho^{j+1} \leq r < \rho^j$ ,

$$|T \cap P_N \cap B_r|_\delta \lesssim \delta^{-5\eta} (\rho^j)^{t/2} |T \cap P_N|_\delta \leq \delta^{-6\eta} r^{t/2} |T \cap P_N|_\delta,$$

so that  $T \cap P_N$  is a  $(\delta, t/2, \delta^{-7\eta})$ -set for each  $T \in \mathcal{T}'$ .

Now, taking  $\epsilon$  small enough in terms of  $s, t, \eta$ , we deduce from Corollary 2.6 that  $\mathcal{T}'$  contains a  $(\delta, s+t/2, \delta^{-\eta})$ -set  $\mathcal{T}''$ . Then  $\{T \cap P_N : T \in \mathcal{T}''\}$  satisfies the assumptions of [14, Theorem 3.2] (with  $t/2$  in place of  $s$  and  $s+t/2$  in place of  $t$ ), provided that  $\eta$  and  $\delta$  are taken small enough in terms of  $s, t$  only. Applying [14, Theorem 3.2], we conclude that  $|P_N|_\delta > \delta^{-t-3\eta}$  (again assuming  $\eta = \eta(s, t)$  is small enough). The first claim of Corollary 2.6 then yields **(1.3)**.

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.5

By iterating Proposition 2.7, we obtain the follow multiscale version.

**Corollary 4.1.** *Fix  $N \geq 2$  and dyadic numbers*

$$0 < \delta = \Delta_N < \Delta_{N-1} < \dots < \Delta_1 < \Delta_0 = 1.$$

*Let  $(P_0, \mathcal{T}_0)$  be a  $(\delta, s, C, M)$ -nice configuration. Then there exists a set  $P \subset P_0$  such that the following hold:*

- (i)  $|\mathcal{D}_{\Delta_j}(P)| \approx_\delta |\mathcal{D}_{\Delta_j}(P_0)|$  and  $|P \cap Q| \approx_\delta |P_0 \cap Q|$  for all  $j \in [1, N]$  and all  $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta_j}(P)$ .
- (ii) For each  $j \in [0, N-1]$  and each  $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta_j}(P)$  there exist  $C_Q \approx_\delta C$ ,  $M_Q \geq 1$ , and a family of tubes  $\mathcal{T}_Q \subset \mathcal{T}^{\Delta_{j+1}/\Delta_j}$  such that  $(S_Q(P \cap Q), \mathcal{T}_Q)$  is  $(\Delta_{j+1}/\Delta_j, s, C_Q, M_Q)$ -nice.

*Furthermore, the families  $\mathcal{T}_Q$  can be chosen so that if  $Q_j \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta_j}(P)$ , then*

$$\frac{|\mathcal{T}_0|}{M} \gtrsim_\delta \prod_{j=0}^{N-1} \frac{|\mathcal{T}_{Q_j}|}{M_{Q_j}}. \quad (4.1)$$

*All the constants implicit in the  $\approx_\delta$  notation are allowed to depend on  $N$ .*

*Proof.* We proceed by induction in  $N$ . The case  $N = 2$  follows from Proposition 2.7. Suppose the claim holds for  $N$  and let us verify it for  $N + 1$ . First apply Proposition 2.7 with  $\delta = \Delta_{N+1}$  and  $\Delta = \Delta_N$ . Let  $P', \mathcal{T}$  be the resulting objects. Property (ii) holds (at the moment for  $P'$ ) for  $j = N$  thanks to Proposition 2.7(iv). We then apply the inductive assumption to  $(\mathcal{D}_{\Delta_N}(P'), \mathcal{T}^{\Delta_N}(\mathcal{T}))$ , which is legitimate by Proposition 2.7(iii). This yields a set  $P'' \subset \mathcal{D}_{\Delta_N}$ ; we define

$$P = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta_N}(P'')} P' \cap Q.$$

This ensures that  $S_Q(P \cap Q)$ , when viewed at scale  $\Delta_{j+1}/\Delta_j$ , equals  $P''$  for  $j < N$  and  $P'$  for  $j = N$ , and so Property (ii) holds for all  $j \in [0, N]$ . Finally, (4.1) holds thanks to (2.2) and the inductive assumption.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.5.* We will eventually take  $\eta = \eta(s, u)$  and  $\epsilon = \epsilon(\eta, s, u) \ll \eta$ . Fix  $\rho = \rho(\epsilon) \in (0, 1)$  small enough that the conclusion of Theorem 2.10 holds, and

$$\frac{\log(4 \log(1/\rho))}{\log(1/\rho)} < \epsilon.$$

Then, for  $\delta = \rho^n$ , the  $(\rho^j)_{j=1}^n$ -uniformization  $P'$  of  $P$  given by Lemma 2.9 satisfies  $|P'| \geq \delta^\epsilon |P|$ . We assume from now on that  $\delta = \rho^n$ , where  $n$  is taken sufficiently large in terms of all other parameters. Take  $\epsilon < \min(u/2, \eta/2)$ . Then  $P'$  satisfies (1.2) with  $u/2$  in place of  $u$ , and the conclusion (1.3) for  $P'$  implies it for  $P$  with  $\eta/2$  in place of  $\eta$ . Hence we assume from now on that  $P$  is  $(\rho^j)_{j=1}^n$ -uniform.

We apply Theorem 2.10 to  $P$ . Let  $\xi = \xi(u)$ ,  $\tau = \tau(\epsilon)$  be the numbers provided by the theorem, and let  $(\Delta_j)_{j=0}^N$  and  $(\alpha_j)_{j=1}^N$  be the scales and exponents corresponding to  $P$ .

Let  $\lambda_j = \Delta_{j+1}/\Delta_j$ . We apply Corollary 4.1 to  $(P, \mathcal{T})$  and the scales  $(\Delta_j)$ . Let  $P' \subset P$  be the resulting set. Since  $N \leq N_0(\epsilon)$ , the notation  $A \lesssim_\delta B$  in the statement of Corollary 4.1 translates to  $A \leq \log(1/\delta)^{C(\epsilon)} B$ ; in particular,  $A \leq \delta^{\epsilon\tau/2} B$  if  $\delta$  is small enough in terms of  $\epsilon$ . With these remarks, the  $(\Delta_j)_{j=1}^N$ -uniformity of  $P$ , Corollary 4.1(i) and Theorem 2.10(i) show that if  $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta_j}(P')$ , then  $S_Q(P' \cap Q)$  is a  $(\lambda_j, \alpha_j, \lambda_j^{-\epsilon})$ -set whenever  $\lambda_j \leq \delta^\tau$ .

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N} &= \{j : \lambda_j \leq \delta^\tau, \alpha_j \notin [\xi, 2 - \xi]\}, \\ \mathcal{G} &= \{j : \lambda_j \leq \delta^\tau, \alpha_j \in [\xi, 2 - \xi]\}. \end{aligned}$$

(Here  $\mathcal{N}$  stands for “normal” and  $\mathcal{G}$  for “good” scales.) It follows from Corollary 4.1(ii) combined with Corollary 2.6 and Proposition 1.3 that, for  $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta_j}(P')$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} j \in \mathcal{N} &\implies |\mathcal{T}_Q| \geq (1/\log \delta)^{C(\epsilon, s)} \cdot M_Q \cdot |S_Q(P \cap Q)|_{\lambda_j}^{1/2}, \\ j \in \mathcal{G} &\implies |\mathcal{T}_Q| \geq (1/\log \delta)^{C(\epsilon, s)} \cdot M_Q \cdot \lambda_j^{-(\alpha_j/2 - \eta)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\eta = \eta(\xi, s) = \eta(u, s) > 0$ . It is indeed possible to take a value of  $\eta$  uniformly over  $t \in [\xi, 2 - \xi]$  because the value of  $\eta$  in Proposition 1.3 is robust under perturbations of  $t$ . Note that since  $\tau = \tau(\epsilon)$ , if  $\delta$  is small enough in terms of  $\epsilon$ , and  $j \in \mathcal{G}$ , then  $\lambda_j \leq \delta^\tau$  is small enough that Proposition 1.3 is indeed applicable. It follows from Theorem 2.10(i) that

$$|S_Q(P \cap Q)|_{\lambda_j} \geq \lambda_j^{\epsilon - \alpha_j}.$$

Combining these facts with the conclusion (4.1) and the trivial bound  $|\mathcal{T}_Q| \geq M_Q$  (applied at scales outside  $\mathcal{N} \cup \mathcal{G}$ ), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\mathcal{T}|}{M} &\geq \left( \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \lambda_j^{\epsilon/2} \lambda_j^{-\alpha_j/2} \right) \left( \prod_{j \in \mathcal{G}} \lambda_j^{-\eta} \lambda_j^{-\alpha_j/2} \right) \\ &\geq \delta^\epsilon \left( \prod_{j \in \mathcal{N} \cup \mathcal{G}} \lambda_j^{-\alpha_j/2} \right) \left( \prod_{j \in \mathcal{G}} \lambda_j^{-\eta} \right) \\ &\geq \delta^{3\epsilon} \cdot |P|_\delta^{1/2} \cdot \delta^{-\xi\eta}, \end{aligned}$$

using Theorem 2.10(ii)–(iii) for the last inequality. Taking  $\epsilon < \xi\eta/6$ , this gives the claim with  $\xi\eta/2$  in place of  $\eta$ .  $\square$

## 5. CONNECTION WITH BOURGAIN’S PROJECTION THEOREM

We conclude by showing how Theorem 1.5 has as corollaries both Bourgain’s discretized projection and sum-product theorems. We start with the former. Let  $\Pi_s(x, y) = x - sy$ .

**Theorem 5.1** (Bourgain's discretized projection theorem ([2, 16])). *Given  $s, u \in (0, 1)$  there are  $\epsilon, \eta > 0$  such that the following hold.*

*Let  $P \subset B^2(0, 1)$  satisfy*

$$\left| P \cap B \left( x, \delta |P|_\delta^{1/2} \right) \right|_\delta \leq \delta^u |P|_\delta, \quad x \in B^2(0, 1).$$

*Let  $S \subset [1, 2]$  be a  $(\delta, s, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set. Then there is  $s \in S$  such that*

$$|\Pi_s(P')|_\delta \geq \delta^{-\eta} \cdot |P|_\delta^{1/2} \quad \text{for all } P' \subset P, |P'|_\delta \geq \delta^\epsilon |P|_\delta.$$

*Proof.* The argument is standard. Suppose the claim does not hold. Hence, for each  $s \in S$  there is a set  $P_s \subset P$  with  $|P_s|_\delta \geq \delta^\epsilon |P|_\delta$  such that

$$|\Pi_s(P_s)|_\delta \leq \delta^{-\eta} \cdot |P|_\delta^{1/2}.$$

The set  $X = \{(p, s) : p \in P_s\}$  has size  $\geq \delta^\epsilon |P| |S|$ , hence there is a set  $P' \subset P$  with  $|P'|_\delta \gtrsim \delta^\epsilon |P|_\delta$  such that  $|S_p| \gtrsim \delta^\epsilon |S|$ , where  $S_p = \{s : p \in P_s\}$ .

Given a tube  $T = \mathbf{D}([a, a + \delta] \times [b, b + \delta])$  (recall Definition 2.2), we let  $\sigma(T) = [a, a + \delta]$  be the corresponding slope interval. For each  $p \in P'$  let  $\mathcal{T}_p$  be the set of dyadic tubes through  $p$  such that  $\sigma(T) \cap S_p \neq \emptyset$ .

If  $\epsilon < u/2$ , then  $P'$  still satisfies the single-scale non-concentration assumption (with  $u/2$  in place of  $u$ ). Since  $S_p$  is a  $(\delta, s, O(\delta^{-2\epsilon}))$ -set, so is  $\mathcal{T}_p$ . Also,  $|\mathcal{T}_p| \gtrsim \delta^\epsilon |S|$ . Hence if  $\epsilon > 0$  is small enough in terms of  $s, u$ , we can apply Theorem 1.5 to obtain (for  $\mathcal{T} = \cup_{p \in P'} \mathcal{T}_p$ )

$$|\mathcal{T}| \gtrsim \delta^{-\eta'} \cdot \delta^\epsilon |S| \cdot |P'|_\delta^{1/2} \geq \delta^{2\epsilon - \eta'} \cdot |S| \cdot |P|_\delta^{1/2},$$

where  $\eta' > 0$  depends on  $s, u$  only. Taking  $\eta' > 4\epsilon$ , this implies that there is  $s \in S$  such that there are  $\gtrsim \delta^{-\eta'/2} \cdot |P|_\delta^{1/2}$  tubes  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  with  $s \in \sigma(T)$ . All of these tubes intersect  $P_s$  by construction. We conclude that

$$|\Pi_s P_s|_\delta \gtrsim \delta^{-\eta'/2} |P|_\delta^{1/2}$$

which is a contradiction if we take  $\eta = \eta'/3$ .  $\square$

We turn to the discretized sum-product problem. We have the following corollary of Theorem 1.5:

**Corollary 5.2.** *Given  $s, u \in (0, 1)$ , there are  $\epsilon, \eta > 0$  such that the following holds for all small enough  $\delta$ .*

*Let  $A, B_1, B_2 \subset [1, 2]$  satisfy the following:  $A$  is a  $(\delta, s, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set, and  $B_1, B_2$  satisfy the single-scale non-concentration bound*

$$|B_i \cap [a, a + \delta |B_i|_\delta]|_\delta \leq \delta^u |B_i|, \quad a \in [1, 2].$$

*Then*

$$|A + B_1|_\delta |A \cdot B_2|_\delta \geq \delta^{-\eta} |A|_\delta |B_1|_\delta^{1/2} |B_2|_\delta^{1/2}. \quad (5.1)$$

Taking  $A = B_1 = B_2$ , one immediately recovers Bourgain's discretized sum-product theorem, even under the weak non-concentration assumption of Bourgain-Gamburd [3, Proposition 3.2].

To prove the corollary, consider (as in [6]) the set  $P = (A + B_1) \times (A \cdot B_2)$ . For each  $(b_1, b_2) \in B_1 \times B_2$ , the set  $P$  intersects the line  $\ell_{b_1, b_2} = \{x + b_1, b_2 x : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$  in an affine copy of  $A$ . Using that  $(b_1, b_2) \rightarrow \ell_{b_1, b_2}$  is bilipschitz, it is routine to verify that this configuration satisfies the assumptions of Corollary 1.6, with  $2u$  in place of  $u$  (considering for each  $(b_1, b_2)$  the  $\delta$ -dyadic tube that contains  $\ell_{b_1, b_2} \cap [0, 2]^2$ ). See e.g. [4, §6.3] for details of adapting Elekes' argument to the discretized setting. The conclusion of Corollary 1.6 is then precisely (5.1).

## REFERENCES

- [1] Jean Bourgain. On the Erdős-Volkmann and Katz-Tao ring conjectures. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 13(2):334–365, 2003.
- [2] Jean Bourgain. The discretized sum-product and projection theorems. *J. Anal. Math.*, 112:193–236, 2010.
- [3] Jean Bourgain and Alex Gamburd. On the spectral gap for finitely-generated subgroups of  $SU(2)$ . *Invent. Math.*, 171(1):83–121, 2008.
- [4] Damian Dąbrowski, Tuomas Orponen, and Michele Villa. Integrability of orthogonal projections, and applications to Furstenberg sets. *Adv. Math.*, 407:Paper No. 108567, 34, 2022.
- [5] Daniel Di Benedetto and Joshua Zahl. New estimates on the size of  $(\alpha, 2\alpha)$ -Furstenberg sets. Preprint, arXiv:2112.08249, 2021.
- [6] György Elekes. On the number of sums and products. *Acta Arith.*, 81(4):365–367, 1997.
- [7] Katrin Fässler and Tuomas Orponen. On restricted families of projections in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 109(2):353–381, 2014.
- [8] Yuqiu Fu and Kevin Ren. Incidence estimates for  $\alpha$ -dimensional tubes and  $\beta$ -dimensional balls in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Preprint, arXiv:2111.05093, 2022.
- [9] Kornélia Héra, Pablo Shmerkin, and Alexia Yavicoli. An improved bound for the dimension of  $(\alpha, 2\alpha)$ -Furstenberg sets. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 38(1):295–322, 2022.
- [10] 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.
- [11] Neil Lutz and Donald M. Stull. Bounding the dimension of points on a line. *Inform. and Comput.*, 275:104601, 15, 2020.
- [12] Ursula Molter and Ezequiel Rela. Furstenberg sets for a fractal set of directions. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 140(8):2753–2765, 2012.
- [13] Daniel M. Oberlin. Some toy Furstenberg sets and projections of the four-corner Cantor set. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 142(4):1209–1215, 2014.
- [14] Tuomas Orponen and Pablo Shmerkin. On the Hausdorff dimension of Furstenberg sets and orthogonal projections in the plane. Preprint, arXiv:2106.03338, 2021.
- [15] Tuomas Orponen, Pablo Shmerkin, and Hong Wang. Kaufman and Falconer estimates for radial projections and a continuum version of Beck's theorem. Preprint, arXiv:2209.00348, 2022.
- [16] Pablo Shmerkin. A nonlinear version of Bourgain's projection theorem. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, online first, 2022.
- [17] Pablo Shmerkin. On the packing dimension of Furstenberg sets. *J. Anal. Math.*, 146(1):351–364, 2022.
- [18] Thomas Wolff. Recent work connected with the Kakeya problem. In *Prospects in mathematics (Princeton, NJ, 1996)*, pages 129–162. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, 1984 MATHEMATICS ROAD, VANCOUVER, BC, V6T 1Z2, CANADA  
 Email address: pshmerkin@math.ubc.ca

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UCLA, LOS ANGELES, CA 90095, USA  
*Email address:* hongwang@math.ucla.edu