

PROJECTIONS OF AHLFORS-REGULAR SETS VERSUS THE *ABC* SUM-PRODUCT PROBLEM

TUOMAS ORPONEN

ABSTRACT. A conjecture in projection theory claims that if $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a closed set, then

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}}\{\theta \in S^1 : \dim_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{\theta}(K) < \tau\} \leq \max\{2\tau - \dim_{\mathbb{H}} K, 0\}, \quad 0 \leq \tau \leq \min\{\dim_{\mathbb{H}} K, 1\}.$$

Here π_{θ} is the orthogonal projection to the line spanned by θ . I verify this conjecture for Ahlfors-regular sets K under the assumption that the *ABC sum-product conjecture* is valid. Available progress on the *ABC* problem yields the following partial but unconditional result for closed Ahlfors-regular sets $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$:

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}}\{\theta \in S^1 : \dim_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{\theta}(K) < \tau\} \leq \max\left\{\frac{2\tau - \dim_{\mathbb{H}} K}{1 + \tau - \dim_{\mathbb{H}} K}, 0\right\}, \quad 0 \leq \tau \leq \min\{\dim_{\mathbb{H}} K, 1\}.$$

The proofs proceed via δ -discretised statements which also remain valid for "almost" Ahlfors-regular δ -discretised sets, that is, δ -separated sets which are Ahlfors-regular on scales between δ and 1, up to a multiplicative error of order $\delta^{-\epsilon}$.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Proof outline	4
2. Preliminaries	5
2.1. Notation and terminology	5
2.2. A lemma on Lipschitz functions	5
2.3. Uniform sets and branching numbers	6
2.4. High multiplicity sets	9
3. Proof of Theorem 1.4	10
3.1. A δ -discretised version of Theorem 1.4	10
3.2. An inductive scheme to prove Theorem 3.4	11
4. Proof of Proposition 3.13	13
4.1. Small slices imply sparse slices	13
4.2. Fixing parameters	15
4.3. Finding a branching scale for E	17
4.4. Defining the sets K_{θ}	21
4.5. Projecting the sets K_{θ}	21
4.6. Choosing a good Δ -tube	23
4.7. The sets \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}_{θ}	26
4.8. Violating the <i>ABC</i> sum-product conjecture	27
References	30

Date: January 25, 2023.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 28A80 (primary) 28A78 (secondary).

Key words and phrases. Projections, sum-product problems, Ahlfors-regular sets.

T.O. is supported by the Academy of Finland via the project *Incidences on Fractals*, grant No. 321896.

1. INTRODUCTION

For $\theta \in S^1$, let $\pi_\theta: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \text{span}(\theta)$ be the orthogonal projection to the line spanned by θ . The following theorem is due to Kaufman [4] from 1968, and it sharpens an earlier result of Marstrand [6]:

Theorem 1.1 (Kaufman). *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a Borel set. Then,*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}}\{\theta \in S^1 : \dim_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_\theta(K) < \tau\} \leq \tau, \quad 0 \leq \tau \leq \min\{\dim_{\mathbb{H}} K, 1\}. \quad (1.2)$$

It is conjectured (see for example [7, (1.8)]) that Kaufman's estimate is unsharp for all $0 < \tau < \min\{\dim_{\mathbb{H}} K, 1\}$, and the sharp bound is

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}}\{\theta \in S^1 : \dim_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_\theta(K) < \tau\} \leq \max\{2\tau - \dim_{\mathbb{H}} K, 0\} \quad (1.3)$$

for $0 \leq \tau \leq \min\{\dim_{\mathbb{H}} K, 1\}$. In fact, Oberlin [7] showed that the left hand side of (1.2) equals "0" for $\tau = \frac{1}{2} \dim_{\mathbb{H}} K$. A stronger result is due to Bourgain [1] who proved (as a consequence of his δ -discretised sum-product theorem) that the left hand side of (1.2) tends to 0 as $\tau \searrow \frac{1}{2} \dim_{\mathbb{H}} K$. This behaviour is predicted by the conjectured inequality (1.3), but falls far short from proving it. Notably, Bourgain's proof gave no improvement on (1.2) for parameters τ which are "far away" from $\frac{1}{2} \dim_{\mathbb{H}} K$.

More recently, it was established in [12] that (1.2) admits an ϵ -improvement for all $0 < \tau < \min\{\dim_{\mathbb{H}} K, 1\}$, but the size of " ϵ " (which depends on τ and $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} K$) in [12] is unspecified and very small. For $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} K > 1$, a more quantitative improvement to (1.2) is due to Peres and Schlag [13]. Namely, the upper bound in (1.2) can be replaced by $\max\{\tau + 1 - \dim_{\mathbb{H}} K, 0\}$. However, this bound is weaker than (1.2) for $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} K < 1$.

The ϵ -improvement in [12] was based on the following idea: assuming that an ϵ -improvement to (1.2) is already known for (almost) Ahlfors-regular sets, then such an improvement can also be deduced for general Borel sets via suitable "multi-scale decompositions" – a technique pioneered in the context of Falconer's distance set problem by Keleti and Shmerkin [5]. The required ϵ -improvement for (almost) Ahlfors-regular was also established in [12], building on ideas from [8].

This brief description of the strategy in [12] raises the following question: can the ϵ -improvement for (almost) Ahlfors-regular sets be upgraded to something more quantitative? A positive answer would not solve the conjecture 1.3 (the multi-scale decomposition technique is not "tight" enough at the moment), but it might at least help quantify the " ϵ " in [12]. The main purpose of this paper is to give a positive answer:

Theorem 1.4. *Let $t \in [0, 2]$, and let $\emptyset \neq K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a closed t -Ahlfors regular set. Then, assuming that the ABC sum-product conjecture (Conjecture 1.9 below) holds, we have*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}}\{\theta \in S^1 : \dim_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_\theta(K) < \tau\} \leq 2\tau - t, \quad \tau \in \left[\frac{t}{2}, \min\{t, 1\}\right].$$

Unconditionally, we have

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}}\{\theta \in S^1 : \dim_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_\theta(K) < \tau\} \leq \frac{2\tau - t}{1 + \tau - t}, \quad \tau \in \left[\frac{t}{2}, \min\{t, 1\}\right].$$

Remark 1.5. Note that if $\tau \geq t/2$, then $1 + \tau - t > 0$ for $t \in [0, 2)$. In the special case $t = 2$, the only admissible value is $\tau = 1$, and then we interpret $(2\tau - t)/(1 + \tau - t) := 0$. In fact, for $t = 2$, it is clear that $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_\theta(K) = 1$ for every $\theta \in S^1$.

Remark 1.6. Recall that a Radon measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d is called t -Ahlfors regular if there exist constants $c, C > 0$ such that

$$cr^t \leq \mu(B(x, r)) \leq Cr^t, \quad x \in \text{spt}(\mu), \quad 0 < r < \text{diam}(\text{spt}(\mu)). \quad (1.7)$$

A closed set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is called t -Ahlfors regular if the measure $\mu := \mathcal{H}^t|_K$ is Radon, and t -Ahlfors regular. Theorem 1.4 will be deduced from a δ -discretised version (Theorem 3.4) where a slightly different definition of Ahlfors-regularity is used (see Definition 3.2). This is legitimate, since Radon measures satisfying (1.7) also satisfy Definition 3.2 (the details can be found in [11, Remark 3.4]).

Remark 1.8. While Theorem 1.4 is only stated for Ahlfors-regular sets, a δ -discretised version of it holds for "almost" Ahlfors-regular set, admitting multiplicative errors of size $\delta^{-\epsilon}$. For a more precise statement, see Theorem 3.4. This raises hopes to quantify the " ϵ " in [12], but the question will not be pursued further in this paper.

To make the statement of Theorem 1.4 comprehensible, we next discuss the meaning of the ABC sum-product conjecture, first stated in [9, Conjecture 1.4]. The "continuum version" of the conjecture predicts that if $A, B, C \subset [0, 1]$ are compact sets satisfying $0 < \dim_{\text{H}} B \leq \dim_{\text{H}} A < 1$ and $\dim_{\text{H}} C > \dim_{\text{H}} A - \dim_{\text{H}} B$, then

$$\sup_{c \in C} \dim_{\text{H}}(A + cB) \geq \dim_{\text{H}} A + \epsilon,$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ only depends on $\dim_{\text{H}} A$, $\dim_{\text{H}} B$, and $\dim_{\text{H}} C$. However, the version of the ABC conjecture needed for Theorem 1.4 (and referred to in Theorem 1.4) is the following δ -discretised version:

Conjecture 1.9 (ABC sum-product conjecture). *Let $0 < \beta \leq \alpha < 1$. Then, for every*

$$\gamma \in (\alpha - \beta, 1], \quad (1.10)$$

there exist $\varphi, \eta, \delta_0 \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ such that the following holds. Let $\delta \in 2^{-\mathbb{N}}$ with $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$, and let $A, B \subset [0, 1]$ be δ -separated sets satisfying the following hypotheses:

(A) $|A| \leq \delta^{-\alpha}$.

(B) $B \neq \emptyset$, and $|B \cap B(x, r)| \leq r^\beta |B|$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta \leq r \leq \delta^\eta$.

Further, let ν be a Borel probability measure with $\text{spt}(\nu) \subset [0, 1]$, satisfying the Frostman condition $\nu(B(x, r)) \leq r^\gamma$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta \leq r \leq \delta^\eta$. Then, there exists $c \in \text{spt}(\nu)$ such that

$$|A + cB|_\delta \geq \delta^{-\varphi} |A|. \quad (1.11)$$

Additionally, the constants $\varphi, \eta, \delta_0 \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ stay bounded away from 0 when (α, β, γ) range in a compact subset of $\{(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) : 0 < \beta \leq \alpha < 1 \text{ and } \gamma \in (\alpha - \beta, 1]\}$.

The ABC sum-product conjecture remains open, but it is known that if it were true, it would slightly self-improve into the following corollary:

Corollary 1.12. *Under the same assumptions as in Conjecture 1.9, and assuming that the conjecture holds, then (1.11) can be improved as follows: there exists $c \in \text{spt}(\nu)$ such that*

$$|\pi_c(G)|_\delta \geq \delta^{-\varphi} |A|, \quad G \subset A \times B, \quad |G| \geq \delta^\eta |A| |B|. \quad (1.13)$$

Here $\pi_c(x, y) = x + cy$ for $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

In this paper, we apply the *ABC* sum-product conjecture in the form of Corollary 1.12. The values of the constants " δ_0, η, \wp " in Corollary 1.12 are smaller than those in Conjecture 1.9, but they can be expressed as explicit functions of the constants in Conjecture 1.9. In particular, they enjoy the same "bounded away from zero" property as the constants in Conjecture 1.9. The deduction of Corollary 1.12 from Conjecture 1.9 is conducted in [10], compare [10, Theorem 2.15] to [10, Theorem 1.1], and see [10, Section 1.1].

While Conjecture 1.9 remains open, a weaker version of it is known, where the threshold (1.10) is replaced by a more restrictive condition on γ :

Theorem 1.14. *The conclusions of Conjecture 1.9 and Corollary 1.12 hold if (1.10) is replaced by*

$$\gamma \in ((\alpha - \beta)/(1 - \beta), 1]. \quad (1.15)$$

Remark 1.16. Under the assumption (1.15), the weaker version of Theorem 1.14 (corresponding to Conjecture 1.9) was first established in [9, Theorem 1.5]. Then, it was observed in [10] that the stronger "subset" version of Theorem 1.14 (as in Corollary 1.12) follows as a logical consequence, using standard techniques in additive combinatorics.

To be precise, the details of this deduction in [10] are explicitly recorded under the hypothesis (1.15), but the particular threshold for " γ " makes no difference in the proof (as mentioned in [10, Section 1.1]). Therefore, as we explained, Corollary 1.12 follows logically from Conjecture 1.9, as in [10].

1.1. Proof outline. The connection between Theorem 1.4 and the *ABC* sum-product conjecture is easy to explain, if we are allowed to brush all technicalities under the carpet. Assume that $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a compact set with $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} K = t$, fix $\tau < \min\{t, 1\}$, and let $E \subset S^1$ be a set of directions such that $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{\theta}(K) \leq \tau$ for all $\theta \in E$. For convenience, let us assume instead that $E \subset [0, 1]$, and $\pi_{\theta}(x, y) = x + \theta y$.

Next, let $\theta_0 \in E$ be the direction such that $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{\theta_0}(K) =: \tau_0$ is maximal. Thus $\tau_0 \leq \tau$, and $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{\theta}(K) \leq \tau_0$ for $\theta \in E$. Let us assume that $\theta_0 = 0$, so $\pi_{\theta_0}(x, y) = x$.

If we are incredibly lucky, K now looks like the product of a τ_0 -dimensional set and a $(t - \tau_0)$ -dimensional set, say $K = A \times B$. Write $\alpha := \tau_0$ and $\beta := t - \tau_0$. If it happened that $s > \alpha - \beta = 2\tau_0 - t$, then the *ABC* sum-product conjecture (roughly speaking) would tell us that there exist $\theta \in E$ and $\wp > 0$ such that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{\theta}(K) = \dim_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{\theta}(A \times B) = \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(A + \theta B) \geq \dim_{\mathbb{H}} A + \wp = \tau + \wp.$$

However, this would violate the maximality of " τ_0 ", so we may deduce that

$$s \leq 2\tau_0 - t \leq 2\tau - \dim_{\mathbb{H}} K,$$

as in conjecture (1.3). Needless to say, the "lucky coincidence" that $K = A \times B$ is difficult to arrange. To make this happen, the Ahlfors-regularity of K is very useful. Even under the Ahlfors-regularity assumption, we will not be able to show that $K = A \times B$, but instead that there exists a scale $\delta > 0$ and a $\delta^{1/2}$ -tube $\mathbf{T} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $K \cap \mathbf{T}$ resembles a product set at scale δ . Similar arguments have earlier appeared in [8, 11, 12].

In fact, this difficulty causes the proof to proceed rather differently from the idea above. At the core of the actual argument is Proposition 3.13 which roughly speaking says the following. Assume (inductively) that we have already managed to prove a projection theorem of the following kind. If $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is closed and t -regular, and $E \subset S^1$ is s -dimensional (with $s < 2 - t$), then for a "typical" direction $\theta \in E$ we have $\dim_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_{\theta}(K) \geq \tau$ (the real statement contains a δ -discretised version of such a hypothesis). Then, as long as

$\tau < (s+t)/2$ (and assuming Conjecture 1.9), we can find a small constant $\zeta = \zeta(\tau, s, t) > 0$ such that a similar conclusion holds with $\tau + \zeta$ in place of ζ . Iterating this proposition, we can gradually "lift" τ as close to the value $(s+t)/2$ as we like, see Section 3.2 for the details. This will prove the "conditional" part of Theorem 1.4.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation and terminology.

Definition 2.1 (Dyadic cubes). If $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we denote by $\mathcal{D}_{2^{-n}}$ the family of (standard) dyadic cubes in \mathbb{R}^d of side-length 2^{-n} . If $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a set, we moreover denote

$$\mathcal{D}_{2^{-n}}(P) := \{Q \in \mathcal{D}_{2^{-n}} : Q \cap P \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Definition 2.2 (Covering numbers). For $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $n \in 2^{-\mathbb{N}}$, we write

$$|P|_{2^{-n}} := |\mathcal{D}_{2^{-n}}(P)|.$$

We note that $|P|_{2^{-n}}$ is comparable (up to constants depending on " d ") to the more common definition of covering number $N(P, 2^{-n})$ which encodes the smallest number of open balls of radius " 2^{-n} " required to cover P . The notation $|P|$ (without a subscript) will refer to cardinality in cases where P is a finite set.

Definition 2.3 ((δ, s, C) -set). For $\delta \in 2^{-\mathbb{N}}$, $s \in [0, d]$, and $C > 0$, a bounded set $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is called a (δ, s, C) -set if

$$|P \cap B(x, r)|_r \leq Cr^s |P|_\delta, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d, r \in [\delta, 1].$$

It is useful to note that if P is a non-empty (δ, s, C) -set, then $|P|_\delta \geq \delta^{-s}/C$. This follows by applying the defining inequality with $r := \delta$ and to any ball $B(x, r)$ intersecting P .

2.2. A lemma on Lipschitz functions.

Lemma 2.4. Let $0 < \kappa \leq d$, $d \geq 1$, $\zeta \in (0, 1]$, and $\epsilon \in (0, \zeta/6]$. Let $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a piecewise linear d -Lipschitz function satisfying $f(0) = 0$ and $f(t) \geq \kappa t - \epsilon$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Then, there exists a point $a \in [c_{d, \zeta}, \frac{1}{3}]$ with the property

$$f(s) - f(a) \geq (\kappa - \zeta)(s - a), \quad s \in [a, 1]. \quad (2.5)$$

Here $c_{d, \zeta} := \zeta/(12d) > 0$.

Proof. Let $a_0 := c_{d, \zeta} \in [c_{d, \zeta}, \frac{1}{3}]$. Assume that (2.5) fails for some $s_1 \in [a_0, 1]$. We claim that $s_1 \leq \frac{1}{3}$. Indeed, if $s_1 > \frac{1}{3}$, recalling the definition of a_0 , and using $f(a_0) \leq da_0$, we have

$$f(s_1) < f(a_0) + (\kappa - \zeta)(s_1 - a_0) < c_{d, \zeta}(d + \zeta) + \kappa s_1 - \zeta/3 < \kappa s_1 - \epsilon, \quad (2.6)$$

by the definition of $c_{d, \zeta}$, and using $\epsilon \leq \zeta/6$. This contradicts our assumption that $f(t) \geq \kappa t - \epsilon$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Now, we set $a_1 := s_1$, and we observe that $a_1 \in [c_{d, \zeta}, \frac{1}{3}]$. Next, assume that (2.5) also fails for some $s_2 \in [a_1, 1]$. In this case, recalling also that $a_1 = s_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(s_2) &< f(a_1) + (\kappa - \zeta)(s_2 - a_1) \\ &\stackrel{(2.6)}{\leq} f(a_0) + (\kappa - \zeta)(s_1 - a_0) + (\kappa - \zeta)(s_2 - s_1) \\ &= f(a_0) + (\kappa - \zeta)(s_2 - a_0). \end{aligned}$$

Now, the estimate on line (2.6) shows that also $s_2 \leq \frac{1}{3}$. Therefore, we may set $a_2 := s_2 \in [c_{d,\zeta}, \frac{1}{3}]$ and keep constructing further points s_j . We make the following addition, however, which will ensure that the points s_{j+1} and s_j have proper separation. Recall that f is piecewise linear. Let $I_1, \dots, I_N \subset [0, 1]$ be the segments on which f is linear. Claim: we may arrange inductively that the points s_j are (distinct) endpoints of the intervals I_i , for $j \geq 1$. Indeed, by definition, each pair s_j, s_{j+1} satisfies

$$f(s_{j+1}) - f(s_j) < (\kappa - \zeta)(s_{j+1} - s_j), \quad j \geq 1. \quad (2.7)$$

This evidently forces $s_{j+1} > s_j$. Now, assume that s_{j+1} lies on some segment I_i , which may be the same segment which contains s_j . There are two cases to consider. First, if the slope of f on I_i happens to be $\geq (\kappa - \zeta)$, then also the left endpoint \bar{s}_{j+1} satisfies (2.7), and in this case s_j cannot be that left endpoint. We then redefine $s_{j+1} := \bar{s}_{j+1}$. In the opposite case, where the slope of f on I_i is $< (\kappa - \zeta)$, then \bar{s}_{j+1} being the right endpoint of I_j still satisfies (2.7), and we redefine $s_{j+1} := \bar{s}_{j+1}$. In this manner all the points s_j (with $j \geq 1$) can be assumed to be distinct endpoints of some intervals I_i .

It remains to check that the process must terminate at some point. Indeed, if it does not, we obtain an increasing sequence $s_1 \leq s_2 \leq \dots$ of points, all contained in $[0, \frac{1}{3}]$. As we just observed above, the separation of the points s_j is $|s_{j+1} - s_j| \gtrsim_f 1$, so in fact there can only be finitely many of the points s_j on $[0, \frac{1}{3}]$. This completes the proof. \square

2.3. Uniform sets and branching numbers. The discussion in this section is virtually copied from [12, Section 7].

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 $\{N_j\}_{j=1}^n$ such that $|P \cap Q|_{\Delta_j} = N_j$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and all $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta_{j-1}}(P)$. As usual, we extend this definition to $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{D}_\delta$ by applying it to $\cup \mathcal{P}$.

Remark 2.9. The key feature of $\{\Delta_j\}_{j=1}^n$ -uniform sets is the following equation which will be used many times below without further remark: if $0 \leq k \leq l < m \leq n$, then

$$|E \cap Q|_{\Delta_m} = |E \cap Q'|_{\Delta_m} |E \cap Q|_{\Delta_l}, \quad Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta_k}(E), Q' \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta_l}(E).$$

Indeed, both sides equal $N_{k+1} \cdots N_m$. As a corollary, if $E \subset [0, 1]^d$, then the above simplifies to $|E|_{\Delta_m} = |E \cap Q|_{\Delta_m} |E|_{\Delta_l}$ for $0 \leq l < m \leq n$ and $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta_l}(E)$.

Lemma 2.10. Let $P \subset [0, 1]^d$, $m, T \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\delta := 2^{mT}$. Let also $\Delta_j := 2^{-jT}$ for $0 \leq j \leq m$, so in particular $\delta = \Delta_m$. Then, there is a $\{\Delta_j\}_{j=1}^m$ -uniform set $P' \subset P$ such that

$$|P'|_\delta \geq (4T)^{-m} |P|_\delta. \quad (2.11)$$

In particular, if $\epsilon > 0$ and $T^{-1} \log(4T) \leq \epsilon$, then $|P'|_\delta \geq \delta^\epsilon |P|_\delta$.

Proof. The inequality (2.11) follows by inspecting the short proof of [12, Lemma 7.3] (that lemma is a general version of Lemma 2.10, allowing for a more general sequence $\{\Delta_j\}$ than the special one $\Delta_j = 2^{-jT}$ relevant here). The "in particular" claim follows by noting that

$$(4T)^{-m} = 2^{-m \log(4T)} = 2^{-mT \cdot (T^{-1} \log(4T))} = \delta^{T^{-1} \log(4T)}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 2.10 will only be used through the following corollary:

Corollary 2.12. *For every $s \in (0, d]$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$, there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that the following holds for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$. Let $P \subset [0, 1]^d$ be a non-empty δ -separated $(\delta, s, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set. Then, there exists $T \sim_{\epsilon} 1$ and a non-empty $\{2^{-jT}\}_{j=1}^m$ -uniform subset $P' \subset P$ so that $|P'| \geq \delta^{\epsilon}|P|$,*

$$2^{-(m+1)T} < \delta \leq 2^{-mT},$$

and P' is also a $(\delta, s, \delta^{-2\epsilon})$ -set.

Proof. Take $T \in \mathbb{N}$ so large that $T^{-1} \log(4T) < \epsilon/2$, and then let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be the largest number such that $\delta' = 2^{-mT} \geq \delta$. Let $\bar{P} \subset P$ be a δ' -net. Since $\delta'/\delta \leq 2^T$, and $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is δ -separated, we have

$$|\bar{P}|_{\delta'} = |\bar{P}| \gtrsim 2^{-dT} |P|.$$

Next, apply Lemma 2.10 to find a $\{2^{-jT}\}_{j=1}^m$ -uniform subset $P' \subset \bar{P}$ with

$$|P'| \geq (\delta')^{\epsilon/2} |\bar{P}| \gtrsim 2^{-dT} \delta^{\epsilon/2} |P|.$$

Now, if $\delta > 0$ is small enough, $|P'| \geq \delta^{\epsilon}|P|$. Then P' is the desired subset of P . \square

A nice feature of every uniform set $P \subset [0, 1]^d$ is that if P happens to be a (δ, s) -set, and if $\delta \leq \Delta \leq 1$, then P is automatically a (Δ, s) -set:

Lemma 2.13. *Let $T \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $P \subset [0, 1]^d$ be a $\{2^{-jT}\}_{j=1}^m$ -uniform set. Write $\delta := 2^{-mT}$, and assume that P is a (δ, s, C) -set for some $s \in [0, d]$ and $C > 0$. Then P is also a $(\Delta, s, O_{d,T}(1)C)$ -set for every $\Delta = 2^{-jT}$, for $1 \leq j \leq m$.*

Proof. Let $\Delta = 2^{-j_0T}$, and let $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{2^{-jT}}$ for $1 \leq j \leq j_0$. Then, if $Q_0 \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta}(P)$ is arbitrary, we have (by the uniformity and (δ, s) -set property of P)

$$|P \cap Q|_{\Delta} = \frac{|P \cap Q|_{\delta}}{|P \cap Q_0|_{\delta}} \leq C \operatorname{diam}(Q)^s \cdot \frac{|P|_{\delta}}{|P \cap Q_0|_{\delta}} = C \operatorname{diam}(Q)^s |P|_{\Delta}. \quad (2.14)$$

This is roughly what we wanted, except that we should get a similar inequality for $|P \cap B(x, r)|_{\Delta}$, where $B(x, r) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is an arbitrary ball with $r \geq \Delta$. The desired estimate is implied by (2.14), at the cost of multiplying the constant " C " by $\lesssim_{d,T} 1$. \square

The lemma will be used via the following corollary:

Corollary 2.15. *Let $T \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $P \subset [0, 1]^d$ be a $\{2^{-jT}\}_{j=1}^m$ -uniform set. Write $\delta := 2^{-mT}$, and assume that P is a (δ, s, C_1) -set for some $s \in [0, d]$ and $C_1 > 0$. Let $P' \subset P$ be a subset satisfying $|P'|_{\delta} \geq |P|_{\delta}/C_2$ for some $C_2 \geq 1$. Then P' is a $(\Delta, s, O_{d,T}(1)C_1C_2)$ -set.*

Proof. Let $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta}(P')$ be the dyadic cube maximising $|P' \cap Q|_{\delta}$ (among all cubes in $\mathcal{D}_{\Delta}(P')$). Then,

$$\frac{|P|_{\delta}}{C_2} \leq |P'|_{\delta} \leq |P' \cap Q|_{\delta} |P'|_{\Delta} \leq |P \cap Q|_{\delta} |P'|_{\Delta}.$$

Consequently,

$$|P'|_{\Delta} \geq \frac{|P|_{\delta}}{C_2 |P \cap Q|_{\delta}} = \frac{|P|_{\Delta}}{C_2}, \quad (2.16)$$

using the uniformity of P in the final equation. By Lemma 2.13, we already know that P is a $(\Delta, s, O_{d,T}(1)C_1)$ -set, so it follows from (2.16) that P' is a $(\Delta, s, O_{d,T}(1)C_1C_2)$ -set. \square

Definition 2.17 (Branching function). Let $T \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $E \subset [0, 1]^d$ be a $\{\Delta_j\}_{j=1}^m$ -uniform set, with $\Delta_j := 2^{-jT}$, and with associated sequence $\{N_j\}_{j=1}^m \subset \{1, \dots, 2^{dT}\}^m$. We define the *branching function* $\beta: [0, m] \rightarrow [0, dm]$ by setting $\beta(0) = 0$, and

$$\beta(j) := \frac{\log |E|_{2^{-jT}}}{T} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^j \log N_i, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, m\},$$

and then interpolating linearly.

Note that since $N_i \in [1, 2^{dT}]$, the branching function β is a d -Lipschitz function. If $E \subset [0, 1]^d$, then its branching function is *superlinear* in the sense of the following lemma:

Lemma 2.18. Let $T \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $E \subset [0, 1]^d$ be $\{2^{-jT}\}_{j=1}^m$ -uniform and non-empty. Write $\delta := 2^{-mT}$, and assume that E is a $(\delta, \kappa, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set for some $\kappa \in [0, d]$. Then the branching function $\beta: [0, m] \rightarrow [0, md]$ of E satisfies

$$\beta(x) \geq \kappa x - \epsilon m - C_d, \quad x \in [0, m],$$

where $C_d > 0$ is a constant depending only on d .

Proof. By the piecewise linear definition of β , it suffices to prove the lower bounds at all integer points $x = j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. By the assumption that E is a $(\delta, \kappa, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set, and noting that $\delta^{-\epsilon} = 2^{\epsilon m T}$, we have $|E \cap Q|_\delta \lesssim_d 2^{\epsilon m T} 2^{-j\kappa T} |E|_\delta$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{2^{-jT}}(E)$. Therefore,

$$|E|_{2^{-jT}} = \frac{|E|_\delta}{|E \cap Q|_\delta} \geq c_d 2^{-\epsilon m T} 2^{j\kappa T}, \quad Q \in \mathcal{D}_{2^{-jT}}(E),$$

where $c_d > 0$ is a constant depending only on d . Consequently,

$$\beta(j) = \frac{\log |E|_{2^{-jT}}}{T} \geq j\kappa - \epsilon m - \log c_d, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, m\},$$

which proves the lemma. \square

Definition 2.19 (Renormalised set). Let $P \subset [0, 1]^d$, let $r \in 2^{-\mathbb{N}}$, and let $Q \in \mathcal{D}_r$. Let $T_Q: Q \rightarrow [0, 1]^d$ be the homothety with $T_Q(Q) = [0, 1]^d$. We write

$$P_Q := T_Q(P).$$

The set P_Q is the Q -renormalisation of P .

The following lemma will be useful in combination with Lemma 2.4.

Lemma 2.20. Let $T \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $E \subset [0, 1]^d$ be a $\{\Delta_j\}_{j=1}^m$ -uniform set with $\Delta_j = 2^{-jT}$. Let $\beta: [0, m] \rightarrow [0, dm]$ be the associated branching function. Assume that there exist $\kappa \in [0, d]$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{N} \cap [0, m]$ with $a < b$ such that

$$\beta(x) - \beta(a) \geq \kappa(x - a), \quad x \in [a, b]. \quad (2.21)$$

Then, for every $Q_0 \in \mathcal{D}_{2^{-aT}}(E)$, the Q_0 -renormalisation E_{Q_0} is a $(\delta, \kappa, C_{d,T})$ -set, where $\delta := 2^{(a-b)T}$, and $C_{d,T} \lesssim_d 2^{dT}$.

Proof. Let $\delta \leq 2^{-jT} \leq 1$, or equivalently $0 \leq j \leq b - a$. We first claim that

$$|E_{Q_0} \cap Q|_\delta \leq 2^{-j\kappa T} |E_{Q_0}|_\delta, \quad Q \in \mathcal{D}_{2^{-jT}}(E_{Q_0}). \quad (2.22)$$

This will prove that $|E_{Q_0} \cap B(z, r)|_\delta \lesssim_d 2^{dT} r^\kappa |E_{Q_0}|_\delta$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\delta \leq r \leq 1$, since $E_{Q_0} \cap B(z, r)$ can be covered by $\lesssim_d 1$ cubes $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{2^{-(j-1)T}}(E_{Q_0})$ with $2^{-jT} \leq r \leq 2^{-(j-1)T}$.

To see (2.22), it will be useful to note that $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{2^{-j}T}(E_{Q_0})$ if and only if $T_{Q_0}^{-1}(Q) \in \mathcal{D}_{2^{-(a+j)T}}(E)$. Therefore, by the uniformity of E , we may deduce that

$$|E_{Q_0} \cap Q|_\delta = |T_{Q_0}(E \cap T_{Q_0}^{-1}(Q))|_{2^{(a-b)T}} = |E \cap T_{Q_0}^{-1}(Q)|_{2^{-bT}} = \frac{|E|_{2^{-bT}}}{|E|_{2^{-(a+j)T}}}.$$

The special case $j = 0$ and $Q = [0, 1)^d$ reads

$$|E_{Q_0}|_\delta = \frac{|E|_{2^{-bT}}}{|E|_{2^{-aT}}}.$$

Therefore, (2.22) is equivalent to

$$\frac{|E|_{2^{-(a+j)T}}}{|E|_{2^{-aT}}} = \frac{|E_{Q_0}|_\delta}{|E_{Q_0} \cap Q|_\delta} \geq 2^{j\kappa T},$$

or further

$$\frac{1}{T} (\log |E|_{2^{-(a+j)T}} - \log |E|_{2^{-aT}}) = \beta(a+j) - \beta(a) \geq \kappa j.$$

This is a consequence of (2.21), since $0 \leq j \leq b - a$. We have therefore proven (2.22), and the lemma. \square

2.4. High multiplicity sets. The proof of Theorem 1.4 will be based on studying the "high multiplicity" parts of the t -Ahlfors regular set K in various directions. This terminology is taken verbatim from [11].

Definition 2.23. Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, let $0 < r \leq R \leq \infty$ be dyadic numbers, and let $x \in K$. For $\theta \in S^1$, we define the following *multiplicity number*:

$$\mathfrak{m}_{K,\theta}(x \mid [r, R]) := |B(x, R) \cap K_r \cap \pi_\theta^{-1}\{\pi_\theta(x)\}|_r.$$

Here K_r refers to the r -neighbourhood of K . Thus, $\mathfrak{m}_{K,\theta}(x \mid [r, R])$ keeps track of the (smallest) number of dyadic r -squares needed to cover the intersection between $B(x, R) \cap K_r$ and the line $\pi_\theta^{-1}\{\pi_\theta(x)\}$. Often the set " K " is clear from the context, and we abbreviate $\mathfrak{m}_{K,\theta} =: \mathfrak{m}_\theta$.

Definition 2.24 (High multiplicity sets). Let $0 < r \leq R \leq \infty$, $M > 0$, and let $\theta \in S^1$. For $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, we define the *high multiplicity set*

$$H_\theta(K, M, [r, R]) := \{x \in K : \mathfrak{m}_{K,\theta}(x \mid [r, R]) \geq M\}.$$

The next lemma discusses how the high multiplicity sets are affected by scalings. For $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $r_0 > 0$, we write T_{z_0, r_0} for the homothety which sends $B(z_0, r_0)$ to $B(1)$, namely $T_{z_0, r_0}(z) := (z - z_0)/r_0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

Lemma 2.25. Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be arbitrary, let $0 < r \leq R \leq \infty$, $M > 0$, and $\theta \in [0, 1]$. Then,

$$T_{z_0, r_0}(H_\theta(K, M, [r, R])) = H_\theta(T_{z_0, r_0}(K), M, [\frac{r}{r_0}, \frac{R}{r_0}]), \quad z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2, r_0 > 0.$$

Proof. This is [11, Lemma 2.11]. \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4

3.1. **A δ -discretised version of Theorem 1.4.** In this section we state a δ -discretised version of Theorem 1.4 – Theorem 3.4 below – and then to complete the proof of Theorem 1.4, assuming Theorem 3.4.

Definition 3.1 ((t, C) -Frostman measure). Let $t > 0$ and $C \geq 1$. A Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d is called a (t, C) -Frostman measure if $\mu(B(x, r)) \leq Cr^\tau$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r > 0$.

Definition 3.2 ((t, C) -regular measure). Let $t > 0$ and $C \geq 1$. A Borel measure μ with $K := \text{spt } \mu \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is called (t, C) -regular if

- (1) μ is a (t, C) -Frostman measure, and
- (2) $|K \cap B(x, R)|_r \leq C(R/r)^t$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 < r \leq R < \infty$.

Notation 3.3. If μ is a (t, C) -regular measure on \mathbb{R}^d , and $B = B(z, r) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a disc, we write $\mu_B := r^{-t} \cdot T_B \mu$, where $T_B(x) = (x - z)/r$ is the homothety mapping B to $B(1)$. Then μ_B is also a (t, C) -regular measure on \mathbb{R}^d . More accurate notation would be $\mu_{B,t}$, but the index "t" should always be clear from context.

Here is the δ -discretised version of Theorem 1.4:

Theorem 3.4. *The following true assuming that Conjecture 1.9 holds. Let $t \in (0, 2)$ and $s \in (0, \min\{t, 2 - t\})$. For every $\sigma > (t - s)/2$ there exist $\epsilon, \delta_0 > 0$ such that the following holds for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$. Let μ be $(\delta, t, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -regular measure, and let $E \subset S^1$ be a non-empty $(\delta, s, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set. Then, there exists $\theta \in E$ such that*

$$\mu(B(1) \cap H_\theta(\text{spt}(\mu), \delta^{-\sigma}, [\delta, 1])) \leq \delta^\epsilon. \quad (3.5)$$

Unconditionally, based on Theorem 1.14, the same conclusions hold if $\sigma > (t - s)/(2 - s)$.

Assuming this result, we may complete the proof of Theorem 1.4 immediately:

Proof of Theorem 1.4 assuming Theorem 3.4. The proof involves a fair amount of standard pigeonholing arguments, and it is extremely similar to the proof of [11, Theorem 3.6]. In fact, the main difference is that of numerology. We will skip the pigeonholing arguments.

We first aim to prove that

$$\dim_{\text{H}}\{\theta \in S^1 : \dim_{\text{H}} \pi_\theta(K) < \tau\} \leq 2\tau - t, \quad \tau \in \left[\frac{t}{2}, \min\{t, 1\}\right], \quad (3.6)$$

namely the part of Theorem 1.4 conditional on Conjecture 1.9. We make the following counter assumption. There exists $t \in (0, 2]$, a t -regular closed set $K \subset B(0, 1)$, and a parameter $\tau \in (\frac{t}{2}, \min\{t, 1\})$ with the property

$$\dim_{\text{H}}\{\theta \in S^1 : \dim_{\text{H}} \pi_\theta(K) < \tau\} > 2\tau - t + 4\eta \quad (3.7)$$

for some $\eta > 0$. We may assume that $t < 2$, since for $t = 2$ the set in (3.6) is empty for all $\tau \leq 1$. Since $\frac{t}{2} < \tau < t$, we may assume that $\eta > 0$ is so small that $s := 2\tau - t + 4\eta \in (0, t)$ (evidently also $s < 1$), and

$$\sigma := t - \tau - \eta > t - \tau - 2\eta = \frac{t - s}{2}. \quad (3.8)$$

Since $\tau < 1$, we may also choose $\eta > 0$ so small that $s < 2 - t$. Thus $s \in (0, \min\{t, 2 - t\})$, as required by Theorem 3.4. Let μ be the (t, C) -regular measure $\mu := \mathcal{H}^t|_K$. After some pigeonholing, (3.7) implies that there exist arbitrarily small scales $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and arbitrarily

small numbers $\epsilon > 0$ such that the following holds. There exists a $(\delta, s, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set $E \subset S^1$ such that

$$\mu(H_\theta(K, \delta^{-\sigma}, [\delta, 1])) > \delta^\epsilon, \quad \theta \in E. \quad (3.9)$$

For the details of how to reach (3.9) starting from (3.7), see the proof of [11, Theorem 3.6], and in particular the display formula above [11, (3.16)]. Now, since (3.8) holds, (3.9) contradicts Theorem 3.4 if ϵ, δ are sufficiently small, depending on σ, s, t .

We then establish the unconditional inequality

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}}\{\theta \in S^1 : \dim_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_\theta(K) < \tau\} \leq \frac{2\tau - t}{1 + \tau - t}, \quad \tau \in \left[\frac{t}{2}, \min\{t, 1\}\right]. \quad (3.10)$$

There is a small additional technicality here: we no longer automatically have $(2\tau - t)/(1 + \tau - t) < 2 - t$, as in the first part. However, this can be assumed for the following reason. Falconer [2] has shown that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}}\{\theta \in S^1 : \dim_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_\theta(K) < 1\} \leq 2 - \dim_{\mathbb{H}} K = 2 - t.$$

Thus, we only need to prove (3.10) for $t < 2$, and in the range of parameters $\tau \in [\frac{t}{2}, \min\{t, 1\}]$ for which additionally $(2\tau - t)/(1 + \tau - t) < 2 - t$. With this proviso, we make a counter assumption that (3.10) fails for some t -regular set $K \subset B(1)$, and some $t/2 \leq \tau < \min\{t, 1\}$ satisfying $(2\tau - t)/(1 + \tau - t) < 2 - t$. Then, we set

$$s := \frac{2\tau - t + 3\eta}{1 + \tau - t}$$

for some small constant $\eta > 0$ so small that still $s < 2 - t$, and such that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}}\{\theta \in S^1 : \dim_{\mathbb{H}} \pi_\theta(K) < \tau\} > s.$$

We point out that $(2\tau - t)/(1 + \tau - t) < t$ for $\tau < t$ and $t < 2$ (as we assume), so we may further arrange $s < t$ by taking $\eta > 0$ small enough. Now $s \in (0, \min\{t, 2 - t\})$ as required in Theorem 3.4.

As in the first part of the proof, we set $\sigma := t - \tau - \eta$. With this notation, the same pigeonholing arguments as in the first part of the proof yield (3.9). However, note that $\sigma > (t - s)/(2 - s)$ if and only if

$$s > \frac{(t - \sigma) - \sigma}{1 - \sigma} =: \frac{t - (t - \tau - \eta) - (t - \tau - \eta)}{1 - (t - \tau - \eta)} = \frac{2\tau - t + 2\eta}{1 + \tau - t + \eta},$$

and now this relation is evidently valid by the choice of "s". Therefore (the unconditional version of) Theorem 3.4 is applicable and yields a contradiction to (3.9) (for $\delta, \epsilon > 0$ small enough). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.4. \square

3.2. An inductive scheme to prove Theorem 3.4. The following terminology is useful for the intuition, although a little vague.

Terminology 3.11 (Theorem(s, σ, t)). Let $s, \sigma \in (0, 1]$ and $t \in (0, 2]$. We say that *Theorem*(s, σ, t) holds if the conclusion of Theorem 3.4 holds with the parameters s, σ, t . In other words, there exists $\epsilon, \delta_0 > 0$ such that whenever μ is a $(t, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -regular measure, and $E \subset S^1$ is a non-empty $(\delta, s, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set, then there exists $\theta \in E$ such that (3.5) is valid.

Remark 3.12. It is clear that

$$\text{Theorem}(s, \sigma, t) \implies \text{Theorem}(s, \sigma', t) \text{ for all } \sigma' \geq \sigma,$$

in fact with the same implicit constants " δ, ϵ ". This follows immediately from the inclusion $H_\theta(K, \delta^{-\sigma'}, [\delta, 1]) \subset H_\theta(K, \delta^{-\sigma}, [\delta, 1])$ for $\sigma' \geq \sigma$.

The proof of Theorem 3.4 will be based on iterating the following proposition:

Proposition 3.13. *The following holds if Conjecture 1.9 is valid. Let $t \in (0, 2)$, and $s \in (0, \min\{t, 2 - t\})$, and*

$$\frac{t-s}{2} < \sigma < \frac{t}{2}.$$

Then, there exists $\zeta = \zeta(s, \sigma, t) > 0$, which stays bounded away from 0 as long as σ stays bounded away from $(t - s)/2$ such that

$$\text{Theorem}(s, \sigma, t) \implies \text{Theorem}(s, \sigma - \zeta, t).$$

More precisely, assume that there exist $\epsilon_0, \Delta_0 > 0$ such that whenever μ is a $(t, \Delta^{-\epsilon_0})$ -regular measure, and $E \subset S^1$ is a non-empty δ -separated $(\Delta, s, \Delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set, then there exists $\theta \in E$ such that

$$\mu(B(1) \cap H_\theta(\text{spt}(\mu), \Delta^{-\sigma}, [\Delta, 1])) \leq \Delta^{\epsilon_0}.$$

Then, there exist $\epsilon = \epsilon(\epsilon_0, s, \sigma, t) > 0$ and $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\epsilon, \Delta_0, s, \sigma, t) > 0$ such whenever μ is a $(t, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -regular measure, and $E \subset S^1$ is a non-empty δ -separated $(\delta, s, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set, then there exists $\theta \in E$ such that

$$\mu(B(1) \cap H_\theta(\text{spt}(\mu), \Delta^{-\sigma+\zeta}, [\delta, 1])) \leq \delta^\epsilon.$$

Unconditionally (based on Theorem 1.14), the same conclusions hold for

$$\frac{t-s}{2-s} < \sigma < \frac{t}{2},$$

except that now the constant $\zeta(s, \sigma, t) > 0$ is only claimed to stay bounded away from 0 as long as σ stays bounded away from $(t - s)/(2 - s)$.

To make sense of the final statement, it is good to note that $(t - s)/(2 - s) < t/2$ for $0 < s < t < 2$. We then complete the proof of Theorem 3.4 assuming Proposition 3.13.

Proposition 3.14 (Base case). *Let $t \in (0, 2]$ and $s > 0$. Then, there exists $\eta := \eta(s, t) > 0$ such that Theorem($s, \frac{t}{2} - \eta, t$) holds.*

Proof. We claim that if $\eta > 0$ is small enough (depending on s, t), μ is a $(t, \delta^{-\eta})$ -regular measure, and if $E \subset S^1$ is a non-empty δ -separated $(\delta, s, \delta^{-\eta})$ -set, then

$$\mu(B(1) \cap H_\theta(\text{spt}(\mu), \delta^{-t/2+\eta}, [\delta, 1])) \leq \delta^\eta \tag{3.15}$$

for at least one direction $\theta \in E$. Let $B_\theta := B(1) \cap H_\theta(\text{spt}(\mu), \delta^{-t/2+\eta}, [\delta, 1])$. It is fairly straightforward to check from the definition of $H_\theta(\dots)$ and the $(t, \delta^{-\eta})$ -regularity of μ that

$$|\pi_\theta(B_\theta)|_\delta \lesssim \delta^{-t/2-2\eta}, \quad \theta \in E. \tag{3.16}$$

We leave this to the reader, although virtually the same details in a slightly more advanced context will be recorded in Lemma 4.45. Now, it follows from Bourgain's projection theorem [1, Theorem 3] (although the form stated in [3, Theorem 6] is more direct to apply) that (3.16) is not possible if $\mu(B_\theta) > \delta^\eta$ for all $\theta \in E$, and $\eta = \eta(s, t) > 0$ is small enough. In other words, there exists $\theta \in E$ such that (3.15) holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.4 assuming Proposition 3.13. We assume that Conjecture 1.9 holds. Fix $t \in (0, 2)$ and $s \in (0, \min\{t, 2-t\})$. Let $\Sigma(s, t) \geq (t-s)/2$ be the infimum of the parameters $\sigma > (t-s)/2$ for which $\text{Theorem}(s, \sigma, t)$ holds (for all $\sigma' \geq \sigma$, recall Remark 3.12). In other words, for $\sigma > \Sigma(s, t)$ there exist constants $\Delta_0(s, t, \sigma) > 0$ and $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(s, t, \sigma) > 0$ such that the hypothesis of Proposition 3.13 holds. We already know from the base case recorded above that $\Sigma \leq \sigma_1 := t/2 - \eta(s, t)$ for some $\eta(s, t) > 0$, and we claim that $\Sigma \leq (t-s)/2$.

We make the counter assumption that $\Sigma > (t-s)/2$. Now, fix $\sigma > \Sigma$ so close to Σ that $\sigma - \zeta < \Sigma$, where $\zeta := \zeta(s, \sigma, t) > 0$ is the constant provided by Proposition 3.13. Such a choice of " σ " is possible, since $\zeta(s, \sigma, t)$ stays bounded away from 0 on the interval $[\Sigma, \sigma_1]$ (using the counter assumption that $\Sigma > (t-s)/2$). But now Proposition 3.13 tells us that $\text{Theorem}(s, \sigma - \zeta, t)$ holds, and this contradicts the definition of " Σ ", since $\sigma - \zeta < \Sigma$.

Without assuming Conjecture 1.9, the proof proceeds exactly in the same way, only using the weaker version of Proposition 3.13 in the range $(t-s)/(2-s) < \sigma < t/2$. \square

4. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.13

4.1. Small slices imply sparse slices. This section contains an auxiliary result (Theorem 4.3) which allows us to "upgrade" the hypothesis of Proposition 3.13 into a stronger one. In the sense of Terminology 3.11, $\text{Theorem}(s, \sigma, t)$ tells us something about the "slices" of t -regular measures in directions perpendicular to the directions $\theta \in E$, where E is a (δ, s) -set. Namely, for typical $\theta \in E$, only a δ^ϵ -proportion of $\mu|_{B(1)}$ can lie on "slices" with multiplicity $\geq \delta^{-\sigma}$. More informally still, the typical slices of μ have multiplicity $\leq \delta^{-\sigma}$. How is μ distributed along these typical slices? To answer this question, we define the following "local" variant of the high multiplicity sets:

Definition 4.1 (Local high multiplicity sets). Let $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$, $\rho \in 2^{-\mathbb{N}}$, $\sigma \in (0, 1]$, and let $\theta \in S^1$. For $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, we define the *local high multiplicity set*

$$H_{\theta, \text{loc}}(K, \sigma, \delta, \rho) := \bigcup_{\delta \leq r \leq R \leq 8} H_{\theta}(K, 4(R/r)^{\sigma}, [r, R]), \quad (4.2)$$

where the union ranges over pairs of **dyadic** radii $r, R \in 2^{-\mathbb{N}} \cap [\delta, 8]$ satisfying $r/R \leq \rho$.

Unwrapping the notation, we have $x \in H_{\theta, \text{loc}}(K, \sigma, \delta, \rho)$ if and only if there exist radii $r = r_x, R = R_x \in [\delta, 8]$ satisfying $r \leq \rho R$ and with the property

$$|B(x, R) \cap K_r \cap \pi_{\theta}^{-1}\{\pi_{\theta}(x)\}|_r = \mathfrak{m}_{K, \theta}(x, [r, R]) \geq 4 \left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^{\sigma}.$$

(The constants "4, 8" are a little arbitrary, but they turn out to be useful.) The definition of $H_{\theta, \text{loc}}(K, \sigma, \delta, \rho)$ is mainly useful if ρ is somewhat comparable to " δ ", so the ratio R/r is fairly large for any admissible r, R (without this requirement, the local high multiplicity set can easily be "everything"). Perhaps another helpful observation is that

$$H_{\theta, \text{loc}}(K, \sigma, \delta, \delta) = H_{\theta}(K, \delta^{-\sigma}, [\delta, 1]).$$

Indeed, if $\rho = \delta$, then the only possible radii $\delta \leq r \leq R \leq 1$ satisfying $r \leq \rho R$ are $(r, R) = (\delta, 1)$. On the other hand, if $\rho \gg \delta$, then the set $H_{\theta, \text{loc}}(K, \sigma, \delta, \rho)$ is *a priori* much larger than $H_{\theta}(K, \delta^{-\sigma}, [\delta, 1])$. This motivates the next theorem.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $s, \sigma \in [0, 1]$ and $t \in [0, 2]$, and assume that $\text{Theorem}(s, \sigma, t)$ holds with constants $\Delta_0, \epsilon_0 > 0$. In other words, whenever $\Delta \in (0, \Delta_0]$, μ is a $(t, \Delta^{-\epsilon_0})$ -regular measure, and $E \subset S^1$ is a non-empty $(\delta, s, \Delta^{-\epsilon_0})$ -set, then there exists $\theta \in E$ such that*

$$\mu(B(1) \cap H_\theta(\text{spt}(\mu), \Delta^{-\sigma}, [\Delta, 1])) \leq \Delta^{\epsilon_0}.$$

Then, for every $\eta \in (0, 1]$, there exist $\epsilon = \epsilon(\eta, \epsilon_0) > 0$ and $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\Delta_0, \epsilon, \eta) > 0$, such that the following holds for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$. Let μ be a $(t, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -regular measure, and let $E \subset S^1$ be a non-empty $(\delta, s, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set. Then, there exists $\theta \in E$ such that

$$\mu(B(1) \cap H_{\theta, \text{loc}}(\text{spt}(\mu), \sigma, \delta, \delta^\eta)) \leq \delta^\epsilon. \quad (4.4)$$

Remark 4.5. The proof shows that it is enough to take $\epsilon < \eta\epsilon_0/C$ for a certain absolute constant $C \geq 1$.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. Assume to the contrary that (4.4) fails for every $\theta \in E$. Abbreviate $K := \text{spt}(\mu)$, and

$$K_\theta := B(1) \cap H_{\theta, \text{loc}}(K, \sigma, \delta, \delta^\eta).$$

Thus $\mu(K_\theta) \geq \delta^\epsilon$ for all $\theta \in E$. By definition, for every $x \in K_\theta$, there exist (dyadic!) radii $\delta \leq r \leq \delta^\eta R \leq \delta^\eta 8$, depending on both x and θ , such that

$$x \in H_\theta(K, 4\left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^\sigma, [r, R]) \iff \mathfrak{m}_{K, \theta}(x \mid [r, R]) \geq 4\left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^\sigma.$$

By standard pigeonholing (note that both r, R only have $\lesssim \log(1/\delta)$ possible values), and at the cost of replacing the lower bound $\mu(K_\theta) \geq \delta^\epsilon$ by $\mu(K_\theta) \geq \delta^{2\epsilon}$, we may assume that $r_{x, \theta} = r_\theta$ and $R_{x, \theta} = R_\theta$ for all $x \in K_\theta$. Similarly, by replacing E by a subset which remains a non-empty $(\delta, s, \delta^{-2\epsilon})$ -set, we may assume that $r_\theta = r \in [\delta, 8]$ and $R_\theta = R \in [r, 8]$ for all $\theta \in E$ (we keep the notation "E" for this subset). Applying Corollary 2.12 (replacing E by a further $(\delta, s, \delta^{-2\epsilon})$ -subset), we may assume that E is $\{2^{-jT}\}_{j=1}^m$ -uniform for some $T \sim_\epsilon 1$, and that $\delta = 2^{-mT}$.

Next, let \mathcal{B}_R be a minimal cover of $B(1) \cap K$ by discs of radius R . By the $(t, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -regularity of μ , we have $|\mathcal{B}_R| \leq \delta^{-\epsilon} R^{-t}$. Notice that

$$\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_R} \sum_{\theta \in E} \mu(K_\theta \cap B) = \sum_{\theta \in E} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_R} \mu(K_\theta \cap B) \geq \sum_{\theta \in E} \mu(K_\theta) \geq \delta^\epsilon |E|.$$

Consequently, there exists a disc $B \in \mathcal{B}_R$ with the property

$$\sum_{\theta \in E} \mu(K_\theta \cap B) \geq \frac{\delta^\epsilon |E|}{|\mathcal{B}_R|} \geq \delta^{2\epsilon} |E| R^t.$$

As a further consequence, and using the uniform bound $\mu(K_\theta \cap B) \leq \delta^{-\epsilon} R^t$, there exists a subset $E' \subset E$ of cardinality $|E'| \geq \delta^{4\epsilon} |E|$ such that

$$\mu(K_\theta \cap B) \geq 4 \cdot \delta^{4\epsilon} R^t, \quad \theta \in E'. \quad (4.6)$$

(The "4" is a useful factor, understandable in a moment.) We note that

$$K_\theta \cap B \subset H_\theta(K \cap 2B, 4\left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^\sigma, [r, R]), \quad (4.7)$$

where $2B$ is the disc concentric with B and radius $2R$. This nearly follows from the definition of K_θ (and our pigeonholing), but we added the intersection with the disc $2B$. This is legitimate, since (recalling that B is a disc of radius R)

$$4\left(\frac{R}{r}\right)^\sigma \leq \mathfrak{m}_{K, \theta}(x \mid [r, R]) \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} |B(x, R) \cap K_r \cap \pi_\theta^{-1}\{\pi_\theta(x)\}|_r, \quad x \in B \cap K_\theta,$$

and the right hand side does not change if we replace " K " by " $K \cap 2B$ ". Now, as in Notation 3.3, the measure $\mu_{4B} = (4R)^{-t}T_{4B}(\mu)$ is $(t, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -regular. Since $r/R \leq \delta^\eta$, we see that μ_B is also $(t, (r/R)^{-\epsilon/\eta})$ -regular. Furthermore, by Lemma 2.25, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_{4B}(H_\theta(K \cap 2B, M, [r, R])) &= H_\theta(B(\tfrac{1}{2}) \cap T_{4B}(K), M, [\tfrac{r}{4R}, \tfrac{1}{4}]) \\ &\subset B(1) \cap H_\theta(T_{4B}(K), M, [\tfrac{r}{4R}, 1]), \end{aligned}$$

where we abbreviated $M := 4(R/r)^\sigma \geq (4R/r)^\sigma$ (recall that $\sigma \leq 1$). As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{4B}(B(1) \cap H_\theta(T_{4B}(K), (\tfrac{4R}{r})^\sigma, [\tfrac{r}{4R}, 1])) \\ \geq (4R)^{-t} \mu(H_\theta(K \cap 2B, M, [r, R])) \\ \stackrel{(4.7)}{\geq} \frac{\mu(K_\theta \cap B)}{4R^t} \stackrel{(4.6)}{\geq} \delta^{4\epsilon} \geq (\tfrac{r}{4R})^{4\epsilon/\eta}, \quad \theta \in E'. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

We now claim that (4.8) violates our assumption that Theorem (s, σ, t) holds at scale $\Delta := r/(4R)$. Namely, since E is a $\{2^{-jT}\}_{j=1}^m$ -uniform $(\delta, s, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set (with $T \sim_\epsilon 1$), and $|E'| \geq \delta^{4\epsilon}|E|$, we infer from Corollary 2.15 that E' is a non-empty $(\Delta, s, \delta^{-C\epsilon})$ -set, assuming that $\delta > 0$ is small enough in terms of ϵ . Further, recalling that $\Delta \leq \delta^\eta$, we see that E' is in fact an $(\Delta, s, \Delta^{-C\epsilon/\eta})$ -set.

Finally, recall that μ_{4B} is a $(t, \Delta^{-\epsilon/\eta})$ -regular measure. Now, if $\epsilon = \epsilon(\eta, \epsilon_0) > 0$ is small enough, the inequality (4.8) (for all $\theta \in E'$) violates our assumption that Theorem (s, σ, t) holds at scale Δ . To be precise, recalling the parameters " Δ_0, ϵ_0 " in the statement of the theorem, the contradiction will ensue if we have taken $\delta > 0$ so small that $r/(4R) \leq \delta^\eta \leq \Delta_0$, and $\epsilon > 0$ so small that $C\epsilon/\eta \leq \epsilon_0$. \square

4.2. Fixing parameters. We may now begin the proof of Proposition 3.13 in earnest. The difference between the arguments for the "conditional" part and the "unconditional" part are extremely minor. We give the full details for the "conditional" part, and indicate necessary changes to the "unconditional" proof where necessary.

Fix the triple (s, σ, t) as in Proposition 3.13 (conditional part):

$$t \in (0, 2), \quad s \in (0, \min\{t, 2-t\}) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{t-s}{2} < \sigma_0 \leq \sigma \leq \sigma_1 < \frac{t}{2}.$$

The role of " σ_0, σ_1 " is to quantify that σ stays bounded away from both $(t-s)/2$ and $t/2$. The plan of proof is to make a counter assumption to Proposition 3.13 with these parameters, and eventually find a contradiction to the ABC sum-product conjecture in the stronger form of Corollary 1.12. We now discuss the relevant parameters " α, β, γ " to which Corollary 1.12 will be applied. A good starting point is

$$\alpha' = t - \sigma, \quad \beta' = \sigma, \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma' := s.$$

We make a few remarks about these parameters:

- $0 < \beta'$ since $\sigma > (t-s)/2 > 0$.
- $\beta' < \alpha'$, since $\sigma < t/2$.
- $\alpha' < 1$, since $t - \sigma < t - (t-s)/2 = (s+t)/2 < 1$ by the assumption $s < 2-t$.
- $\gamma' > \alpha' - \beta'$ (as required to apply Corollary 1.12) since $\sigma > (t-s)/2$.

Remark 4.9. In the "unconditional" statement we rather assume $\sigma > (t-s)/(2-s)$. In this range we have $\gamma' > (\alpha' - \beta')/(1 - \beta')$, so Theorem 1.14 will be applicable. It is worth emphasising that the choice of the parameters α', β', γ' is the same in both the "conditional" and "unconditional" parts of the proof of Proposition 3.13.

Evidently, there exists a constant $\zeta_0 = \zeta_0(s, \sigma_0, \sigma_1, t) > 0$ such that all of the inequalities above remain valid if s is replaced by $s - \zeta_0$, and α', β', γ' are replaced by

$$\alpha := \alpha' + \zeta_0, \quad \beta := \beta' - \zeta_0, \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma := \gamma' - \zeta_0 = s - \zeta_0, \quad (4.10)$$

and for all $\sigma \geq \sigma_0$. We now apply Corollary 1.12 with the parameters α, β, γ . The conclusion is that there exist constants $\eta, \wp, \delta_0 > 0$ such that (1.13) holds for all $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$: if A, B, ν satisfy the hypotheses of Corollary 1.12 (in particular $\nu(B(x, r)) \leq r^{s-\zeta_0}$ for $r \leq \delta^\eta$), then there exists $c \in \text{spt}(\nu)$ with

$$|\pi_c(G)|_\delta \geq \delta^{-\wp}|A|, \quad G \subset A \times B, \quad |G| \geq \delta^\eta|A||B|. \quad (4.11)$$

Let us emphasise that

$$\wp = \wp(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = \wp(t - \sigma + \zeta_0, \sigma - \zeta_0, s - \zeta_0) > 0, \quad (4.12)$$

and as long as $\sigma_0 \leq \sigma \leq \sigma_1$, the triple $(t - \sigma + \zeta_0, \sigma - \zeta_0, s)$ ranges in a compact subset of the domain Ω_{ABC} in Conjecture 1.9. Therefore, $\wp \geq \wp_0 > 0$ with $\wp_0 = \wp_0(s, \sigma_0, \sigma_1, t) > 0$. A similar remark applies to the parameter $\eta > 0$ in (4.11), namely as long as $\sigma_0 \leq \sigma \leq \sigma_1$, we have

$$\eta(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = \eta(t - \sigma + \zeta_0, \sigma - \zeta_0, s - \zeta_0) \geq \eta_0 > 0. \quad (4.13)$$

Now, we fix small parameters $\delta_0, \epsilon, \zeta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ (whose values will be discussed in a moment), and then make our main counter assumption: there exists a $(\delta, t, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -regular measure μ , and a non-empty δ -separated $(\delta, s, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set $E \subset S^1$ with the property

$$\mu(B(1) \cap H_\theta(K, \delta^{-\sigma+\zeta}, [\delta, 1])) \geq \delta^\epsilon, \quad \theta \in E. \quad (4.14)$$

Here we have denoted $K := \text{spt}(\mu)$. Whichever is more convenient, we will either view E as a subset of S^1 , or as a subset of $[0, 1)$: the latter interpretation is applied when we ask whether E , or a subset thereof, is $\{\Delta_j\}_{j=1}^m$ -uniform for a suitable sequence of scales $\delta = \Delta_m < \dots < \Delta_1 \leq \Delta_0 = 1$.

Let us discuss the parameters ζ, ϵ, δ further. The parameter " ζ " is the most important one. We will see that (4.14) implies a contradiction against (4.11) if $\zeta > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small in terms of both the constant $\zeta_0 > 0$ in (4.11) and the constants $\wp_0, \eta_0 > 0$ introduced around (4.12)-(4.13). Thus, the contradiction will ensue if

$$\zeta = o_{\zeta_0, \wp_0, \eta_0}(1) = o_{s, \sigma_0, \sigma_1, t}(1). \quad (4.15)$$

Here $o_{p_1, \dots, p_n}(1)$ refers – and will refer – to a function of the parameters p_1, \dots, p_n which is continuous at 0 and vanishes at 0. This will show that Proposition 3.13 actually holds with some (maximal) constant " ζ " satisfying (4.15). The constant $\epsilon > 0$ in Proposition 3.13 is allowed to depend on both ζ , and also the constants ϵ_0 for which the "inductive hypothesis" in Proposition 3.13 holds. The constant $\delta_0 > 0$ is additionally allowed to depend on ϵ and Δ_0 . Thus, to reach a contradiction, we will need that

$$\epsilon = o_{\zeta, \epsilon_0}(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_0 = o_{\Delta_0, \epsilon, \zeta}(1). \quad (4.16)$$

When in the sequel we write "...by choosing $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small" we in fact mean "...by choosing the upper bound δ_0 for δ sufficiently small". Also, we may write *Note that $\epsilon \leq \zeta^{10}\epsilon_0$ by (4.16)*, or something similar. This simply means that the requirement " $\epsilon \leq \zeta^{10}\epsilon_0$ " should – at that moment – be added to the list of restrictions for the function $o_{\zeta, \epsilon_0}(1)$. Finally, we will often use the following abbreviation: an upper bound of the form $C_{\epsilon, \zeta}\delta^{-C\epsilon}$ will be abbreviated to $\delta^{-O(\epsilon)}$. Indeed, if $\delta = o_{\zeta, \epsilon}(1)$ is sufficiently small, then $C_{\epsilon, \zeta} \leq \delta^{-\epsilon}$, and hence $C_{\epsilon, \zeta}\delta^{-C\epsilon} \leq \delta^{-(C+1)\epsilon}$.

4.3. Finding a branching scale for E . We need to discuss the "branching numbers" of the set E from the counter assumption (4.14), so we need to know that E is uniform. Given the constant $\epsilon > 0$ as in (4.16), we fix $T \sim_\epsilon 1$ as in Corollary 2.12. Then, we may find a $\{2^{-jT}\}_{j=1}^m$ -uniform subset $E' \subset E$ with $|E'| \geq \delta^\epsilon |E|$, which is automatically a $(\delta, s, \delta^{-2\epsilon})$ -set. We replace E by this subset without changing notation: thus, we assume that E is $\{2^{-jT}\}_{j=1}^m$ -uniform with $2^{-(m+1)T} < \delta \leq 2^{-mT}$, and $T \sim_\epsilon 1$. It is easy to reduce matters to the case $\delta = 2^{-mT}$, and we will make this assumption in the sequel.

What now follows would be unnecessary if the set E happened to be s -regular. More precisely, to skip this section, we would need to know that if $I \in \mathcal{D}_{\delta^{1/2}}(E)$, then the renormalisation E_I is a $(\delta^{1/2}, s)$ -set. This may not be the case. The problem will be solved by "replacing" δ by a larger scale $\bar{\delta} \in [\delta, \delta^{\sqrt{\zeta}/12}]$. The scale $\bar{\delta}$ will be chosen in such a way that if $I \in \mathcal{D}_{\bar{\delta}^{1/2}}(E)$, then the renormalisation E_I is a $(\bar{\delta}^{1/2}, s)$ -set. Lemma 2.18 plays a central role. The main technicality caused by the "replacement" action is that our main counter assumption (4.14) concerns the scale " δ ", not " $\bar{\delta}$ ". However, by virtue of the regularity of μ , it turns out that a sufficiently strong version of (4.14) will remain valid at scale $\bar{\delta}$. After these observations have been consolidated, we may assume "without loss of generality" that $\delta = \bar{\delta}$, and thus $E_I, I \in \mathcal{D}_{\delta^{1/2}}(E)$, is a $(\delta^{1/2}, s)$ -set, as initially desired.

Here is precisely what we claim:

Proposition 4.17. *There exists a scale $\bar{\delta} \in [\delta, \delta^{\sqrt{\zeta}/12}]$ and a non-empty $\bar{\delta}$ -separated $(\bar{\delta}, s, \bar{\delta}^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)})$ -subset $E_{\bar{\delta}} \subset E$ which is $\{2^{-jT}\}_{j=1}^m$ -uniform ($\bar{\delta} = 2^{-mT}$) and has the following properties.*

- (a) For $\bar{\Delta} := \bar{\delta}^{1/2}$ and $I \in \mathcal{D}_{\bar{\Delta}}(E_{\bar{\delta}})$, the renormalisation $(E_{\bar{\delta}})_I$ is a $(\bar{\Delta}, s - \sqrt{\zeta}, \bar{\Delta}^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)})$ -set.
- (b) We have

$$\mu(B(1) \cap H_\theta(K, \bar{\delta}^{-\sigma+\zeta}, [\bar{\delta}, 5])) \geq \bar{\delta}^{O_\zeta(\epsilon)}, \quad \theta \in E_{\bar{\delta}}. \quad (4.18)$$

Here in fact $O_\zeta(\epsilon) = 12\epsilon/\sqrt{\zeta}$, and $\bar{\zeta} = 7\sqrt{\zeta}$.

Remark 4.19. In the sequel, the notation " $O_\zeta(\epsilon)$ " will stand for a constant of the form $C_\zeta\epsilon$. Note that (4.18) is an analogue of our initial counter assumption (4.14), except that the scale δ has been replaced by $\bar{\delta}$, and we have gained the property (a). Since $\zeta > 0$ is a constant depending only on s, σ_0, σ_1, t , the constant $O_\zeta(\epsilon)$ can still be made arbitrarily small compared to ϵ_0 by choosing ϵ small enough, in terms of $\epsilon_0, s, \sigma, \zeta$.

We then prove Proposition 4.17. Since E is $\{\Delta_j\}_{j=1}^m$ -uniform, and a subset of $[0, 1]$, we may associate to it the 1-Lipschitz branching function $\beta: [0, m] \rightarrow [0, m]$ as in Definition 2.17. Recall that β is the linear interpolation between the conditions $\beta(0) = 0$, and

$$\beta(j) := \frac{\log |E|_{2^{-jT}}}{T}, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, m\}.$$

Since E is a $(\delta, s, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set, it follows from Lemma 2.18 that

$$\beta(x) \geq sx - \epsilon m - C, \quad x \in [0, m].$$

Therefore the renormalised function $f(x) := \frac{1}{m}\beta(mx)$, defined on $[0, 1]$, is also 1-Lipschitz and satisfies

$$f(x) \geq \frac{1}{m}(smx - \epsilon m - C) \geq sx - \epsilon - C/m, \quad x \in [0, 1].$$

Since $\delta = 2^{-mT}$ with $T \sim_\epsilon 1$, we may assume that $C/m \leq \epsilon$ by choosing $\delta = o_\epsilon(1)$. Therefore $f(x) \geq sx - 2\epsilon$ for $x \in [0, 1]$. Since $2\epsilon \in (0, \sqrt{\zeta}/6]$ by (4.16), Lemma 2.4 allows us to find a point $a \in [\sqrt{\zeta}/12, \frac{1}{3}]$ with the property

$$f(x) - f(a) \geq (s - \sqrt{\zeta})(x - a), \quad x \in [a, 1].$$

In terms of the original branching function β , this means that there exists a point $\bar{m} := am \in [\sqrt{\zeta}m/12, m/3]$ with the property

$$\beta(x) - \beta(\bar{m}) \geq (s - \sqrt{\zeta})(x - \bar{m}), \quad x \in [\bar{m}, 2\bar{m}]. \quad (4.20)$$

The inequality would even hold for $x \in [\bar{m}, m]$, but we only need it for $x \in [\bar{m}, 2\bar{m}]$.

Set

$$\bar{\delta} := 2^{-2\bar{m}T} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\Delta} := \bar{\delta}^{1/2} = 2^{-\bar{m}T}.$$

It now follows from (4.20) and Lemma 2.20 that if $I \in \mathcal{D}_{\bar{\Delta}}(E)$, then E_I is a $(\bar{\Delta}, s - \sqrt{\zeta}, C_\epsilon)$ -set, where $C_\epsilon \lesssim 2^T \lesssim_\epsilon 1$. Since $\bar{m} \geq \sqrt{\zeta}m/12$, we notice that

$$\delta = 2^{-mT} \geq (2^{-2\bar{m}T})^{6/\sqrt{\zeta}} = \bar{\delta}^{6/\sqrt{\zeta}}, \quad (4.21)$$

as desired in Proposition 4.17. On the other hand, since $\bar{m} \leq m/3$, we have $2\bar{m} \leq 2m/3$, and therefore $\bar{\delta}$ is also substantially larger than δ :

$$\delta/\bar{\delta} = 2^{(2\bar{m}-m)T} \leq 2^{-mT/3} = \delta^{1/3}. \quad (4.22)$$

The ratio $\delta/\bar{\delta}$ will appear our calculations in a moment, and (4.22) will allow us to assume that it is "as small as needed" by choosing $\delta > 0$ small enough.

The scale $\bar{\delta} \in [\delta, \delta^{\sqrt{\zeta}/12}]$ has now been fixed, and simply the choice $E_{\bar{\delta}} := E$ (or at least a $\bar{\delta}$ -net inside E) would satisfy Proposition 4.17(a). To reach (b), we need to work a little more, and eventually replace E by the final subset $E_{\bar{\delta}}$. The following auxiliary result is [11, Proposition 5.1].

Proposition 4.23. *Let $\theta \in S^1$, $1 \leq M \leq N < \infty$, let $0 < r \leq R \leq 1$, and let μ be a (t, C_{reg}) -regular measure with $t \in [0, 2]$, $C_{\text{reg}} > 0$, and $K := \text{spt } \mu \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Abbreviate $\mu_\rho := \mu|_{B(\rho)}$ for $\rho > 0$. Then, there exist absolute constants $c, C > 0$ such that*

$$\mu_1(H_\theta(cN, [r, 1])) \leq \mu_1(H_\theta(cM, [4R, 5])) + CC_{\text{reg}}^2 \cdot \mu_4(H_\theta(c\frac{N}{M}, [4r, 7R])). \quad (4.24)$$

Here we have omitted the set " K " from the H_θ -notation, but it should appear in all three instances of H_θ . We will apply the proposition to the $(t, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -regular measure μ with the parameters $M \leq N$ satisfying

$$cN = \delta^{-\sigma+\zeta} \quad \text{and} \quad c \cdot \frac{N}{M} = (\delta/\bar{\delta})^{-\sigma},$$

from which we may solve that

$$cM = c^2 \left(\frac{\delta}{\bar{\delta}}\right)^\sigma \cdot N = \frac{c^2}{C} \left(\frac{\delta}{\bar{\delta}}\right)^\sigma \cdot \delta^{-\sigma+\zeta} = \frac{c^2}{C} \cdot \bar{\delta}^{-\sigma} \cdot \delta^\zeta \stackrel{(4.21)}{\geq} \bar{\delta}^{-\sigma+7\sqrt{\zeta}}. \quad (4.25)$$

In the final inequality, we also took δ so small that $(c^2/C) \geq \delta^{\sqrt{\zeta}}$. In the sequel we abbreviate $\bar{\zeta} := 7\sqrt{\zeta}$.

We have now defined the parameters M, N relevant for the application of Proposition 4.23, but we still need to specify the radii $0 < r \leq R \leq 1$. We set $r := \delta$, and $R := \bar{\delta}/4$. (We have $R > r$ by (4.22).) Let us then rewrite the conclusion (4.24) with these parameters.

Before doing this, notice that the left hand side is lower bounded by δ^ϵ by our counter assumption (4.14), for $\theta \in E$. Therefore, for $\theta \in E$ fixed, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^\epsilon &\leq \mu(B(1) \cap H_\theta(K, \delta^{-\sigma+\zeta}, [\delta, 1])) \\ &\leq \mu(B(1) \cap H_\theta(K, \bar{\delta}^{-\sigma+\bar{\zeta}}, [\bar{\delta}, 5])) \\ &\quad + C\delta^{-2\epsilon} \mu(B(4) \cap H_\theta(K, (\delta/\bar{\delta})^{-\sigma}, [4\delta, 4\bar{\delta}])). \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

The plan is, next, to use the hypothesis of Proposition 3.13 (validity of Theorem(s, σ, t)) to show that for typical $\theta \in E$, the first term must dominate, or in other words the term (4.26) is substantially smaller than δ^ϵ . More precisely, we claim that if $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small relative to ϵ_0 , then

$$\sum_{\theta \in E} C\delta^{-2\epsilon} \mu(B(4) \cap H_\theta(K, (\delta/\bar{\delta})^{-\sigma}, [4\delta, 4\bar{\delta}])) \leq \delta^{2\epsilon} |E|. \quad (4.27)$$

To prove (4.27), let \mathcal{K} be a minimal cover of $K \cap B(4)$ by discs of radius $4\bar{\delta}$. By the $(t, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -regularity of μ , we have

$$|\mathcal{K}| \leq \delta^{-\epsilon} \cdot \bar{\delta}^{-t}. \quad (4.28)$$

Then, we decompose

$$(4.26) \leq C\delta^{-2\epsilon} \cdot \sum_{B \in \mathcal{K}} \mu \left(B \cap H_\theta \left(K, \left(\frac{\delta}{\bar{\delta}} \right)^{-\sigma}, [4\delta, 4\bar{\delta}] \right) \right), \quad \theta \in E. \quad (4.29)$$

To treat the individual terms on the right hand side, we consider the rescaled and renormalised measures $\mu_B = (4\bar{\delta})^{-t} \cdot T_B \mu$ familiar from Notation 3.3, and we write

$$\mu \left(B \cap H_\theta \left(K, \left(\frac{\delta}{\bar{\delta}} \right)^{-\sigma}, [4\delta, 4\bar{\delta}] \right) \right) = (4\bar{\delta})^t \mu_B (B(1) \cap H_\theta (T_B(K), \Delta^{-\sigma}, [\Delta, 1])), \quad (4.30)$$

for any $\theta \in [0, 1]$, where $\Delta := \delta/\bar{\delta}$. This equation is easily deduced from Lemma 2.25 with $r_0 = 4\bar{\delta}$. In (4.30), the measure μ_B is $(t, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -regular, where

$$\delta^{-\epsilon} \leq (\delta/\bar{\delta})^{-3\epsilon} = \Delta^{-3\epsilon}$$

by (4.22). In particular, μ_B is $(t, \Delta^{-\epsilon_0})$ -regular, assuming $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0/3$. Therefore, since we may assume that $\Delta = \delta/\bar{\delta} \leq \delta^{1/3} \leq \Delta_0$, the hypothesis of Proposition 3.13 is applicable to the measure μ_B . We claim, as a corollary of this hypothesis applied to μ_B , that

$$\sum_{\theta \in E} \mu_B (B(1) \cap H_\theta (T_B(K), \Delta^{-\sigma}, [\Delta, 1])) \leq \delta^{10\epsilon} |E|, \quad (4.31)$$

Assume for a moment that (4.31) fails. Then, since $\mu_B(B(1)) \leq \delta^{-\epsilon}$, there exists a subset $E' \subset E$ with the properties $|E'| \geq \delta^{20\epsilon} |E|$ and

$$\mu_B (B(1) \cap H_\theta (T_B(K), \Delta^{-\sigma}, [\Delta, 1])) \geq \delta^{20\epsilon}, \quad \theta \in E'. \quad (4.32)$$

Since E was a $\{2^{-jT}\}_{j=1}^m$ -uniform $(\delta, s, \delta^{-\epsilon})$ -set, it now follows from Corollary 2.15 that E' is a $(\Delta, s, \delta^{-O(\epsilon)})$ -set, and since $\Delta = \delta/\bar{\delta} \leq \delta^{1/3}$ by (4.22), in fact E' is a $(\Delta, s, \Delta^{-O(\epsilon)})$ -set. Therefore, if we take $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_0/C$ for an absolute constant $C > 0$, our hypothesis implies that

$$\mu_B (B(1) \cap H_\theta (T_B(K), \Delta^{-\sigma}, [\Delta, 1])) \leq \Delta^{\epsilon_0} = (\delta/\bar{\delta})^{\epsilon_0} \leq \delta^{\epsilon_0/3}$$

for some $\theta \in E'$. This violates (4.32) if $20\epsilon < \epsilon_0/3$, and the ensuing contradiction shows that (4.31) must be valid. Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\theta \in E} C\delta^{-2\epsilon} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{K}} \mu \left(B \cap H_\theta \left(K, \left(\frac{\delta}{\bar{\delta}} \right)^{-\sigma}, [4\delta, 4\bar{\delta}] \right) \right) \\ & \stackrel{(4.30)}{=} (4\bar{\delta})^t \sum_{B \in \mathcal{K}} C\delta^{-2\epsilon} \sum_{\theta \in E} \mu_B (B(1) \cap H_\theta (T_B(K), \Delta^{-\sigma}, [\Delta, 1])) \\ & \stackrel{(4.31)}{\leq} (4\bar{\delta})^t \sum_{B \in \mathcal{K}} C\delta^{-2\epsilon} \delta^{10\epsilon} |E| \stackrel{(4.28)}{\lesssim} \delta^{7\epsilon} |E|. \end{aligned}$$

The left hand side of this chain is an upper bound for the left hand side of (4.27), so we have now established (4.27). Now, inspecting (4.26), and plugging in (4.27), we have

$$\delta^\epsilon |E| \leq \sum_{\theta \in E} \mu(B(1) \cap H_\theta(K, \delta^{-\sigma+\zeta}, [\delta, 1])) \leq \sum_{\theta \in E} \mu(B(1) \cap H_\theta(K, \bar{\delta}^{-\sigma+\bar{\zeta}}, [\bar{\delta}, 5])) + \delta^{2\epsilon} |E|,$$

and consequently

$$\sum_{\theta \in E} \mu(B(1) \cap H_\theta(K, \bar{\delta}^{-\sigma+\bar{\zeta}}, [\bar{\delta}, 5])) \geq \frac{1}{2} \delta^\epsilon |E|.$$

It follows that there exists a subset $E' \subset E$ with $|E'| \geq \delta^{2\epsilon} |E| \geq \bar{\delta}^{12\epsilon/\sqrt{\zeta}} |E|$ with the property

$$\mu(B(1) \cap H_\theta(K, \bar{\delta}^{-\sigma+\bar{\zeta}}, [\bar{\delta}, 5])) \geq \delta^{2\epsilon} \geq \bar{\delta}^{12\epsilon/\sqrt{\zeta}}, \quad \theta \in E'. \quad (4.33)$$

This verifies (4.18), and therefore Proposition 4.17(b). A small technicality remains: the scale $\bar{\delta}$ was chosen so that E_I is a $(\bar{\Delta}, s - \sqrt{\zeta}, C(\epsilon))$ -set for all $I \in \mathcal{D}_{\bar{\Delta}}(E)$ (with $\bar{\Delta} = \bar{\delta}^{1/2}$), but since $E' \subset E$ is only a subset with $|E'| \geq \delta^{2\epsilon}$, this property may now be violated. To fix this, apply Corollary 2.12 to find a further $\{2^{-jT}\}_{j=1}^m$ -uniform subset $E'' \subset E'$ with $|E''| \geq \delta^\epsilon |E'|$. Now, let $I \in \mathcal{D}_{\bar{\Delta}}(E'')$. Then $|E'' \cap I| \geq \delta^{3\epsilon} |E \cap I|$, since otherwise

$$|E''| = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{\bar{\Delta}}(E'')} |E'' \cap I| < \delta^{3\epsilon} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{\bar{\Delta}}(E)} |E \cap I| = \delta^{3\epsilon} |E| \leq \delta^\epsilon |E'|.$$

Now it follows easily from a combination of the $(\bar{\Delta}, s - \sqrt{\zeta}, C(\epsilon))$ -set property of E_I , and $|E'' \cap I| \geq \delta^{3\epsilon} |E \cap I|$, that E''_I is a $(\bar{\Delta}, s - \sqrt{\zeta}, \delta^{-O(\epsilon)})$ -set for all $I \in \mathcal{D}_{\bar{\Delta}}(E'')$. Finally, since $\delta^{O(\epsilon)} \leq \bar{\Delta}^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)}$, we see that E''_I is a $(\bar{\Delta}, s - \sqrt{\zeta}, \bar{\Delta}^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)})$ -set for all $I \in \mathcal{D}_{\bar{\Delta}}(E'')$.

In Proposition 4.17, we desired the set $E_{\bar{\delta}}$ to be $\bar{\delta}$ -separated. This is finally achieved by choosing one point from each interval $J \in \mathcal{D}_{\bar{\delta}}(E'')$, and calling the result $E_{\bar{\delta}}$. This does not violate the property of the blow-ups E''_I established just above, since the $(\bar{\Delta}, s - \sqrt{\zeta})$ -set property of E''_I only cares about the behaviour of E'' between the scales $\bar{\delta}$ and $\bar{\Delta}$. The proof of Proposition 4.17 is complete.

Notation 4.34. Now that Proposition 4.17 has been established, we remove the "bars" from the notation. We assume that $\bar{\delta} = \delta$ (thus $\bar{\Delta} = \sqrt{\delta}$) and $E_{\bar{\delta}} = E$. We also rename $\bar{\zeta} =: \zeta$. The only difference to our starting position is, then, that some constants of the form δ^ϵ have to be replaced by $\delta^{O_\zeta(\epsilon)}$. Notably, E is a $(\delta, s, \delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)})$ -set, and μ is $(t, \delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)})$ -regular. We are seeking a contradiction if $\zeta > 0$ is small enough in terms of (s, σ, t) , and ϵ is small enough in terms of $(\epsilon_0, s, \sigma, t, \zeta)$, so this difference will be completely irrelevant. Additionally, E_I is a $(\Delta, s - \zeta, \Delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)})$ -set for all $I \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta(E)$.

4.4. Defining the sets K_θ . We start again with a brief heuristic discussion. Recall that by assumption (4.14), or more precisely (4.18), we have

$$\mu(B(1) \cap H_\theta(K, \delta^{-\sigma+\zeta}, [\delta, 1])) \geq \delta^{C_\zeta \epsilon}, \quad \theta \in E, \quad (4.35)$$

where $C_\zeta \geq 1$ is a constant depending only on ζ . On the other hand, by the hypothesis that Theorem(4.3, σ, t) is valid, we have the (nearly) opposite inequality

$$\mu(B(1) \cap H_\theta(K, \delta^{-\sigma}, [\delta, 1])) \leq \delta^{\epsilon_0} \ll \delta^{C_\zeta \epsilon}$$

for at least $\frac{1}{2}$ of the points in E , assuming that $\epsilon < \epsilon_0/C_\zeta$, simply because any such half is a $(\delta, s, \delta^{-\epsilon_0})$ -set. In particular, for $\frac{1}{2}$ of the points in E , the difference set

$$B(1) \cap H_\theta(K, \delta^{-\sigma+\zeta}, [\delta, 1]) \setminus H_\theta(K, \delta^{-\sigma}, [\delta, 1]) \quad (4.36)$$

has μ measure at least $\frac{1}{2}\delta^{C_\zeta \epsilon}$. In this section, we apply the same idea to remove from $H_\theta(K, \delta^{-\sigma+\zeta}, [\delta, 1])$ a more complicated set of high multiplicity.

In fact, we apply Theorem 4.3 with parameter $\eta := \sqrt{\epsilon}$. Recall also Remark 4.5, and note that with our notation $\eta = \sqrt{\epsilon}$, we have $2C_\zeta \epsilon < \eta \epsilon_0/C$ as soon as $\epsilon < (\epsilon_0/C'_\zeta)^2$ – as we may assume. Now, Theorem 4.3 yields the following conclusion for at least $\frac{1}{2}$ of the points in E :

$$\mu(B(1) \cap H_{\theta, \text{loc}}(K, \sigma, \delta, \delta^{\sqrt{\epsilon}})) \leq \delta^{2C_\zeta \epsilon}. \quad (4.37)$$

We then replace E by the acquired subset without changing notation. At this point, the $(\Delta, s - \zeta, \Delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)})$ -property of the renormalisations E_I might have failed, but this property can be restored by replacing the "new" E by a further $\{2^{-jT}\}_{j=1}^m$ -regular subset, just like we did in the argument after (4.33).

For the remaining $\theta \in E$, we now define the set

$$K_\theta := B(1) \cap H_\theta(K, \delta^{-\sigma+\zeta}, [\delta, 1]) \setminus H_{\theta, \text{loc}}(K, \sigma, \delta, \delta^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}). \quad (4.38)$$

Comparing (4.35) and (4.37), we obtain

$$\mu(K_\theta) \geq \delta^{C_\zeta \epsilon} - \delta^{2C_\zeta \epsilon} = \delta^{O_\zeta(\epsilon)}, \quad \theta \in E. \quad (4.39)$$

It is easy to check from the definitions that $K_\theta \cap H_\theta(K, 4\delta^{-\sigma}, [\delta, 1]) = \emptyset$, so removing $H_{\theta, \text{loc}}(\dots)$ is a strictly more powerful manoeuvre than what we initially discussed at (4.36) (up to the irrelevant constant "4").

4.5. Projecting the sets K_θ . We record the following useful lemma whose proof is a good exercise in applying the definition of $H_{\theta, \text{loc}}$:

Lemma 4.40. *Let $B \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a disc of radius $\Delta \in [\delta^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}, 1]$. Then,*

$$|\pi_\theta(B \cap K_\theta)|_\delta \gtrsim \delta^{O_\zeta(\epsilon)-t} \cdot \left(\frac{\delta}{\Delta}\right)^\sigma \mu(B \cap K_\theta), \quad \theta \in E. \quad (4.41)$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{T}_δ be a minimal cover of $B \cap K_\theta$ by δ -tubes perpendicular to the projection π_θ , i.e. parallel to $\pi_\theta^{-1}\{0\}$. Then evidently

$$|\pi_\theta(B \cap K_\theta)|_\delta \gtrsim |\mathcal{T}_\delta|. \quad (4.42)$$

We now claim that

$$|(B \cap K) \cap T|_\delta \lesssim \left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right)^\sigma, \quad T \in \mathcal{T}_\delta. \quad (4.43)$$

To see this, fix $T \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta$. Note that since T is a minimal cover of $B \cap K_\theta$, the tube T contains at least one point $x_0 \in B \cap K_\theta$, and by the definition of " K_θ " we have

$$x_0 \notin H_{\theta, \text{loc}}(K, \sigma, \delta, \delta^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}) \implies x \notin H_\theta(K, 4 \left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right)^\sigma, [8\delta, 8\Delta]).$$

Unwrapping the definitions even further,

$$|B(x_0, 8\Delta) \cap K_{8\delta} \cap \pi_\theta^{-1}\{\pi_\theta(x_0)\}|_{8\delta} \leq 4 \left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right)^\sigma. \quad (4.44)$$

Now, notice that since B is a disc of radius Δ containing x_0 , we have $B \subset B(x_0, 3\Delta)$. If the intersection $(B \cap K) \cap T$ contained $\gg (\Delta/\delta)^\sigma$ points which are at least δ -separated (i.e. (4.43) failed), then a little argument using the triangle inequality would show that the line $\pi_\theta^{-1}\{\pi_\theta(x_0)\} \subset T$ would intersect $B(x_0, 8\Delta) \cap K_{8\delta}$ in many more than $(\Delta/\delta)^\sigma$ points which are 8δ -separated. In other words, a failure of (4.43) lead to the failure of (4.44). Thus (4.43) holds.

We have now shown that each intersection $(B \cap K) \cap T$, $T \in \mathcal{T}_\delta$, can be covered by $\lesssim (\Delta/\delta)^\sigma$ discs of radius δ . It follows from the $(t, \delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)})$ -regularity of μ that

$$\mu(B \cap K_\theta) \leq \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_\delta} \mu((B \cap K) \cap T) \lesssim |\mathcal{T}_\delta| \cdot \delta^{t - O_\zeta(\epsilon)} \left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right)^\sigma,$$

and finally,

$$|\pi_\theta(K_\theta \cap B)|_\delta \stackrel{(4.42)}{\gtrsim} |\mathcal{T}_\delta| \gtrsim \delta^{O_\zeta(\epsilon) - t} \cdot \left(\frac{\delta}{\Delta}\right)^\sigma \mu(K_\theta \cap B).$$

This completes the proof of (4.41). \square

The lower bound in Lemma 4.40 was based on the fact that K_θ is disjoint from the set $H_{\theta, \text{loc}}(\dots)$. In similar spirit, the fact that K_θ is a subset of $H_\theta(K, \delta^{-\sigma+\zeta}, [\delta, 1])$ yields an upper bound the δ -covering number of $\pi_\theta(K_\theta)$, as follows:

Lemma 4.45. *Let $\theta \in E$, let $\Delta \in [\delta^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}, 1]$, and let \mathbf{T} be a tube of width Δ parallel to $\pi_\theta^{-1}\{0\}$. Then,*

$$|\pi_\theta(K_\theta \cap \mathbf{T})|_\delta \lesssim \delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon) - \zeta} \cdot \left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right)^{t - \sigma}. \quad (4.46)$$

In particular, $|\pi_\theta(K_\theta)|_\delta \lesssim \delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon) - \zeta} \cdot \delta^{\sigma - t}$.

Proof. We may assume that $K_\theta \cap \mathbf{T} \neq \emptyset$, otherwise there is nothing to prove. Let \mathcal{T}_δ be a minimal cover of $K_\theta \cap \mathbf{T}$ by δ -tubes $T \subset \mathbf{T}$ parallel to $\pi_\theta^{-1}\{0\}$. It suffices to show that

$$|\mathcal{T}_\delta| \lesssim \delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon) - \zeta} \cdot \left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right)^{t - \sigma}. \quad (4.47)$$

To see this, fix $T \in \mathcal{T}_\delta$ and $x \in K_\theta \cap T$. Thus $x \in H_\theta(K, \delta^{-\sigma+\zeta}, [\delta, 1])$, so

$$|B(2) \cap K_\delta \cap \pi_\theta^{-1}\{\pi_\theta(x)\}|_\delta \geq \mathbf{m}_{K, \theta}(x | [\delta, 1]) \geq \delta^{-\sigma+\zeta}.$$

Summing over the tubes $T \in \mathcal{T}_\delta$, we infer that

$$|B(2) \cap K_\delta \cap \mathbf{T}|_\delta \gtrsim |\mathcal{T}_\delta| \cdot \delta^{-\sigma+\zeta}. \quad (4.48)$$

To find a useful upper bound for the left hand side, fix $x_0 \in K_\theta$ arbitrary, and recall that

$$x_0 \notin H_{\theta, \text{loc}}(K, \sigma, \delta, \delta^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}) \implies x_0 \notin H_\theta(K, 4\Delta^{-\sigma}, [8\Delta, 8]),$$

or in other words

$$|B(x_0, 8) \cap K_{8\Delta} \cap \pi_\theta^{-1}\{\pi_\theta(x_0)\}|_{8\Delta} \leq 4\Delta^{-\sigma}.$$

This easily implies that $B(2) \cap K \cap \mathbf{T}$ can be covered by $\lesssim \Delta^{-\sigma}$ discs "B" of radius Δ . Since $|B \cap K|_\delta \leq \delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)} (\Delta/\delta)^t$ for each "B" by the $(t, \delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)})$ -regularity of μ , we obtain

$$|\mathcal{T}_\delta| \cdot \delta^{-\sigma+\zeta} \stackrel{(4.48)}{\lesssim} |B(2) \cap K_\delta \cap \mathbf{T}|_\delta \lesssim \delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)} \Delta^{-\sigma} \cdot \left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right)^t.$$

Dividing by $\delta^{-\sigma+\zeta}$ implies (4.47) and therefore (4.46). \square

4.6. Choosing a good Δ -tube. Recall the sets K_θ defined at (4.38), which had measure $\mu(K_\theta) \geq \delta^{O_\zeta(\epsilon)}$ for all $\theta \in E$ by (4.39). Further, recall that if $I \subset \mathcal{D}_\Delta(E)$ is arbitrary, then E_I is a $(\Delta, s - \zeta, \Delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)})$ -set (Proposition 4.17(a)). From $\mu(B(1)) \leq \delta^{-\epsilon}$ and Cauchy-Schwarz, it easily follows that

$$\sum_{\theta, \theta' \in E \cap I} \mu(K_\theta \cap K_{\theta'}) \geq \delta^{O_\zeta(\epsilon)} |E \cap I|^2,$$

and in particular there exists $\theta_0 \in E \cap I$ with the property

$$\sum_{\theta \in E \cap I} \mu(K_{\theta_0} \cap K_\theta) \geq \delta^{O_\zeta(\epsilon)} |E \cap I|.$$

Further, from this inequality it follows that there exists a subset of the form $E' \cap I \subset E \cap I$ with $|E' \cap I| \geq \delta^{O_\zeta(\epsilon)} |E \cap I|$ such that $\mu(K_\theta \cap K_{\theta_0}) \geq \delta^{O_\zeta(\epsilon)}$ for all $\theta \in E' \cap I$. Since the renormalisation E'_I remains a non-empty $(\Delta, s - \zeta, \Delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)})$ -set, the difference between $E \cap I$ and $E' \cap I$ will be irrelevant to us, and we simplify notation by assuming that

$$\mu(K_{\theta_0} \cap K_\theta) \geq \delta^{O_\zeta(\epsilon)}, \quad \theta \in E \cap I. \quad (4.49)$$

The interval $I \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta(E)$ and the point $\theta_0 \in E \cap I$ will remain fixed for the remainder of the proof. Since our problem is rotation-invariant, we may assume that $\theta_0 = (1, 0)$, so the projection $\pi_{\theta_0}(x, y) = x$ is the projection to the x -axis, and I is an arc of length Δ around $(1, 0)$. For technical convenience, it will be useful to re-parametrise the projections π_θ , $\theta \in I$, in the following standard way:

$$\pi_\theta(x, y) = x + \theta y, \quad \theta \in I = [0, \Delta] = [0, \delta^{1/2}]. \quad (4.50)$$

So, when we apply the definition of K_θ in the near future and write " $\pi_\theta^{-1}\{\pi_\theta(x)\}$ " we refer precisely to the maps in (4.50). We abbreviate

$$K_0 := K_{\theta_0} \quad \text{and} \quad \pi := \pi_{\theta_0},$$

so the lines $\pi^{-1}\{\pi(x)\}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, are parallel to the y -axis. For $\theta \in I$, the lines $\pi_\theta^{-1}\{\pi_\theta(x)\}$ make an angle $\leq \Delta$ with the y -axis.

The plan is, next, to investigate the intersection of K_0 with a "typical" vertical tube \mathbf{T} of width Δ . Roughly speaking, it turns out that the minimal cover of $K_0 \cap \mathbf{T}$ with Δ -discs consists of $\approx \Delta^{-\sigma}$ discs satisfying a σ -dimensional non-concentration condition. Once this has been verified, we (still roughly speaking) restrict attention to one of these "typical" tubes \mathbf{T}_0 for the remainder of the argument.

Let \mathcal{B}_Δ be a cover of $B(1) \cap K$ with discs of radius Δ , satisfying $|\mathcal{B}_\Delta| \leq \Delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)-t}$. We note that

$$\sum_{\theta \in E \cap I} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_\Delta} \mu(K_0 \cap K_\theta \cap B) \geq \sum_{\theta \in E \cap I} \mu(K_0 \cap K_\theta) \geq \delta^{O_\zeta(\epsilon)} |E \cap I|. \quad (4.51)$$

A disc $B \in \mathcal{B}_\Delta$ is called *light* (denoted $B \in \mathcal{B}_\Delta^{\text{light}}$) if

$$\frac{1}{|E \cap I|} \sum_{\theta \in E \cap I} \mu(K_0 \cap K_\theta \cap B) \leq \Delta^{t+C_\zeta \epsilon},$$

where $C_\zeta \geq 1$ is a constant to be determined momentarily. Observe that

$$\sum_{\theta \in E \cap I} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_\Delta^{\text{light}}} \mu(K_0 \cap K_\theta \cap B) \leq |\mathcal{B}_\Delta| |E \cap I| \Delta^{t+C_\zeta \epsilon} \leq \Delta^{C_\zeta \epsilon - O_\zeta(\epsilon)} |E \cap I|,$$

so in particular if $\mathcal{B}_\Delta^{\text{heavy}} := \mathcal{B}_\Delta \setminus \mathcal{B}_\Delta^{\text{light}}$, then

$$\sum_{\theta \in E \cap I} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}_\Delta^{\text{heavy}}} \mu(K_0 \cap K_\theta \cap B) \stackrel{(4.51)}{\geq} (\delta^{O_\zeta(\epsilon)} - \Delta^{C_\zeta \epsilon - O_\zeta(\epsilon)}) |E \cap I| \geq \delta^{O_\zeta(\epsilon)} |E \cap I|, \quad (4.52)$$

assuming that the constant " C_ζ " in the definition of "lightness" was chosen five times larger than the " $O_\zeta(\epsilon)$ " constants.

We make the following simple observation about the heavy discs:

$$\mu(K_0 \cap B) \geq \frac{1}{|E \cap I|} \sum_{\theta \in E \cap I} \mu(K_0 \cap K_\theta \cap B) \geq \delta^{O_\zeta(\epsilon)} \Delta^t, \quad B \in \mathcal{B}_\Delta^{\text{heavy}}. \quad (4.53)$$

Consequently, it follows from Lemma 4.40 (and $\delta/\Delta = \Delta$) that

$$|\pi(B \cap K_0)|_\delta \geq \delta^{O_\zeta(\epsilon)} \Delta^{\sigma-t}, \quad B \in \mathcal{B}_\Delta^{\text{heavy}}. \quad (4.54)$$

Next, let \mathcal{T}_Δ be a minimal cover of the heavy discs by disjoint Δ -tubes perpendicular to θ_0 . In particular, every tube in \mathcal{T}_Δ meets at least one disc in $\mathcal{B}_\Delta^{\text{heavy}}$. We claim that

$$|\mathcal{T}_\Delta| \leq \Delta^{\sigma-t-3\zeta}. \quad (4.55)$$

Since each of the tubes $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta$ meets at least one disc $B \in \mathcal{B}_\Delta^{\text{heavy}}$ (and each of these discs can meet at most 3 tubes), we deduce that

$$|\pi(K_0)|_\delta \stackrel{(4.54)}{\gtrsim} \delta^{O_\zeta(\epsilon)} |\mathcal{T}_\Delta| \Delta^{\sigma-t}.$$

On the other hand, a special case of Lemma 4.45 states that $|\pi(K_0)|_\delta \lesssim \delta^{-\epsilon-\zeta} \cdot \delta^{\sigma-t}$. The upper bound (4.55) follows by combining these two inequalities (note that $\delta/\Delta = \Delta$), and choosing $\epsilon = o_\zeta(1)$ so small that $O_\zeta(\epsilon) \leq \zeta$.

Next, for every $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta$, write

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}) := \{B \in \mathcal{B}_\Delta^{\text{heavy}} : B \cap \mathbf{T} \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Since the union of the tubes in \mathcal{T}_Δ cover all the heavy discs, we have

$$\sum_{\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta} \sum_{\theta \in E \cap I} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T})} \mu(K_0 \cap K_\theta \cap B) \stackrel{(4.52)}{\geq} \delta^{O_\zeta(\epsilon)} |E \cap I|. \quad (4.56)$$

A tube $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta$ is called *heavy* if

$$\sum_{\theta \in E \cap I} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T})} \mu(K_0 \cap K_\theta \cap B) \geq \Delta^{t-\sigma+4\zeta} |E \cap I|, \quad (4.57)$$

where $O_\zeta(\epsilon)$ stands for a suitable constant of the form $C_\zeta\epsilon$. The heavy tubes are denoted $\mathcal{T}_\Delta^{\text{heavy}}$. With this notation,

$$\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta \setminus \mathcal{T}_\Delta^{\text{heavy}}} \sum_{\theta \in E \cap I} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T})} \mu(K_0 \cap K_\theta \cap B) \leq |\mathcal{T}_\Delta| \cdot \Delta^{t-\sigma+4\zeta} |E \cap I|$$

Combining this estimate with the upper bound $|\mathcal{T}_\Delta| \leq \Delta^{\sigma-t-3\zeta}$ established in (4.55), and inspecting (4.56), we see that the sum over the light tubes is less than half the total value of the sum in (4.56). As a consequence, the set of heavy tubes is non-empty. For the remainder of the whole proof, we fix one heavy tube

$$\mathbf{T}_0 \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta^{\text{heavy}}. \quad (4.58)$$

We record that

We record the following consequence of Lemma 4.45:

$$|\pi_\theta(K_\theta \cap \mathbf{T}_0)|_\delta \leq \delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)-\zeta} \Delta^{\sigma-t} \leq \Delta^{\sigma-t-2\zeta}, \quad \theta \in E \cap I. \quad (4.59)$$

For the second inequality we took $\epsilon > 0$ so small depending on ζ that $O_\zeta(\epsilon) \leq \zeta$. Inequality (4.59) looks like an immediate consequence of (4.46) with $\Delta = \delta^{1/2}$, but the tube \mathbf{T}_0 is not exactly parallel to $\pi_\theta^{-1}\{0\}$. However, \mathbf{T}_0 is parallel to $\pi^{-1}\{0\} = \pi_{\theta_0}^{-1}\{0\}$, and since $|\theta - \theta_0| \leq \Delta$, we have $K_\theta \cap \mathbf{T}_0 \subset K_\theta \cap 2\mathbf{T}_\theta$, where \mathbf{T}_θ is a Δ -tube parallel to $\pi_\theta^{-1}\{0\}$. Thus, (4.59) follows from Lemma 4.45 applied to $2\mathbf{T}_\theta$.

We record a σ -dimensional non-concentration condition for $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0)$:

Lemma 4.60. *We have*

$$|\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0) \cap B(x, R)| \lesssim \left(\frac{R}{\Delta}\right)^\sigma, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2, R \in [\delta^{-\sqrt{\epsilon}}\Delta, 1]. \quad (4.61)$$

Here $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0) \cap B(x, R) := \{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0) : B \cap B(x, R) \neq \emptyset\}$. In particular, $|\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0)| \lesssim \Delta^{-\sigma}$.

Proof. To prove (4.61), fix $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $R \in [\delta^{-\sqrt{\epsilon}}\Delta, 1]$, and let $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0) \cap B(x, R)$. Then in particular $B \in \mathcal{B}_\Delta^{\text{heavy}}$, so $B \cap K_0 \neq \emptyset$ according to (4.53). Fix $x_0 \in B \cap K_0$, and recall that

$$x_0 \notin H_{\theta_0, \text{loc}}(K, \sigma, \delta, \delta^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}) \implies x_0 \notin H_{\theta_0}(K, 4\left(\frac{R}{\Delta}\right)^\sigma, [8\Delta, 8R]).$$

The implication is valid since $\Delta/R \leq \delta^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}$, and $8R \leq 8$. Now, by the definition of $H_{\theta_0}(\dots)$, we deduce that

$$|B(x_0, 8R) \cap K_{8\Delta} \cap \pi^{-1}\{\pi(x)\}|_{8\Delta} = \mathfrak{m}_{\theta_0}(x \mid [8\Delta, 8R]) \leq 4\left(\frac{R}{\Delta}\right)^\sigma.$$

Note that $B(x, R) \subset B(x_0, 8R)$ since $x_0 \in B$ and $B \cap B(x, R) \neq \emptyset$. Recalling that \mathcal{B}_Δ is a minimal cover of $B(1) \cap K$, the previous inequality even shows that

$$|\{B \in \mathcal{B}_\Delta : B \cap \mathbf{T}_0 \cap B(x, R) \neq \emptyset\}| \lesssim \left(\frac{R}{\Delta}\right)^\sigma, \quad (4.62)$$

and this implies (4.61). \square

By definition, the tube \mathbf{T}_0 satisfies the lower bound (4.57). We claim that, as a consequence, there exists a subset $E' \cap I \subset E \cap I$ of cardinality $|E' \cap I| \geq \Delta^{5\zeta} |E \cap I|$ and such that

$$\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T})} \mu(B \cap K_0 \cap K_\theta) \geq \Delta^{t-\sigma+5\zeta}, \quad \theta \in E' \cap I. \quad (4.63)$$

This is a straightforward consequence of (4.57), and the following inequality which is based on Lemma 4.60 and the $(t, \delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)})$ -regularity of μ :

$$\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T})} \mu(B \cap K_0 \cap K_\theta) \leq |\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0)| \cdot \Delta^{t-O_\zeta(\epsilon)} \lesssim \Delta^{t-\sigma-O_\zeta(\epsilon)} \quad \theta \in E \cap I.$$

This shows that in order for (4.57) to be true, the inequality (4.63) must hold for all $\theta \in E' \cap I$ with $|E' \cap I| \geq \Delta^{5\zeta} |E \cap I|$. Now, as we have done many times before, we replace $E \cap I$ by $E' \cap I$ without changing notation: the only property of $E' \cap I$ we will need eventually is that E'_I is a $(\Delta, s - \zeta, \Delta^{-O(\zeta)})$ -set.¹ Thus, we assume in the sequel that

$$\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T})} \mu(B \cap K_0 \cap K_\theta) \geq \Delta^{t-\sigma+5\zeta}, \quad \theta \in E \cap I. \quad (4.64)$$

4.7. **The sets \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}_θ .** Let

$$\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{D}_\delta(\pi(K_0 \cap \mathbf{T}_0)).$$

We record that

$$|\mathcal{A}| = |\pi(K_0 \cap \mathbf{T}_0)|_\delta \stackrel{(4.59)}{\leq} \Delta^{\sigma-t-2\zeta}. \quad (4.65)$$

Fix $\theta \in E \cap I$, and define the following subset $\mathcal{A}_\theta \subset \mathcal{A}$. We declare that $I \in \mathcal{A}_\theta$ if $I \in \mathcal{A}$, and

$$|\{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0) : \pi^{-1}(I) \cap (B \cap K_0 \cap K_\theta) \neq \emptyset\}| \geq \Delta^{-\sigma+9\zeta}. \quad (4.66)$$

We claim that

$$|\mathcal{A}_\theta| \geq \Delta^{\sigma-t+6\zeta}. \quad (4.67)$$

The proof is, once again, based on the fact that K_0 lies in the complement of $H_{\theta_0, \text{loc}}(\dots)$. This is used via the following lemma:

Lemma 4.68. *Let $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0)$. Then,*

$$\mu(\pi^{-1}(I) \cap (B \cap K_0)) \lesssim \Delta^{-\sigma} \cdot \delta^{t-O_\zeta(\epsilon)}, \quad I \in \mathcal{D}_\delta(\mathbb{R}). \quad (4.69)$$

Proof. Fix $I \in \mathcal{D}_\delta(\mathbb{R})$ and write $T := \pi^{-1}(I)$. If $T \cap (B \cap K_0) = \emptyset$, there is nothing to prove, so assume that there exists at least one point $x_0 \in T \cap (B \cap K_0)$. In particular,

$$x \notin H_{\theta_0, \text{loc}}(K, \sigma, \delta, \delta^{\sqrt{\epsilon}}) \implies x_0 \notin H_{\theta_0}(K, 4(\frac{\Delta}{\delta})^\sigma, [8\delta, 8\Delta]),$$

or in other words

$$|B(x_0, 8\Delta) \cap K_{4\delta} \cap \pi^{-1}\{\pi(x_0)\}|_{8\delta} \leq 4(\frac{\Delta}{\delta})^\sigma \sim \Delta^{-\sigma},$$

using $\Delta = \delta^{1/2}$. Since $\pi^{-1}\{\pi(x_0)\} \subset T$ and $B \subset B(x_0, 8\Delta)$, this easily implies that the intersection $T \cap (B \cap K_0)$ can be covered by $\lesssim \Delta^{-\sigma}$ discs of radius δ , and now the inequality (4.69) follows from the $(t, \delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)})$ -regularity of μ . \square

To proceed with the proof of (4.67), let $\mathcal{T}_\theta := \{\pi^{-1}(I) : I \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_\theta\}$. Thus, the tubes $\pi^{-1}(I)$, $I \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_\theta$, can intersect $B \cap K_0 \cap K_\theta$ for at most $\leq \Delta^{-\sigma+9\zeta}$ different discs $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0)$. Applying (4.69) for each of those discs individually leads to

$$\sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0)} \mu(\pi^{-1}(I) \cap (B \cap K_0 \cap K_\theta)) \leq \Delta^{8\zeta} \delta^{t-\sigma}, \quad I \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_\theta,$$

¹This is weaker than the information so far that E'_I is a $(\Delta, s - \zeta, \Delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)})$ -set, but still good enough.

assuming that $O_\zeta(\epsilon) < \zeta$. Summing over $I \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_\theta$, it follows that

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_\theta} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0)} \mu(\pi^{-1}(I) \cap (B \cap K_0 \cap K_\theta)) \leq |\mathcal{A}| \cdot \Delta^{8\zeta} \delta^{t-\sigma} \stackrel{(4.65)}{\leq} \Delta^{t-\sigma+6\zeta}. \quad (4.70)$$

On the other hand, the "full sum" over $I \in \mathcal{A}$ has the lower bound

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0)} \mu(\pi^{-1}(I) \cap (B \cap K_0 \cap K_\theta)) \geq \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0)} \mu(B \cap K_0 \cap K_\theta) \stackrel{(4.64)}{\geq} \Delta^{t-\sigma+5\zeta},$$

so by (4.70) the full sum cannot be dominated by part over $I \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_\theta$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{t-\sigma+5\zeta} &\leq 2 \sum_{I \in \mathcal{A}_\theta} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0)} \mu(\pi^{-1}(I) \cap (B \cap K_0 \cap K_\theta)) \\ &\stackrel{(4.69)}{\lesssim} |\mathcal{A}_\theta| \cdot |\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0)| \cdot \Delta^{-\sigma} \cdot \delta^{t-O_\zeta(\epsilon)} \stackrel{(4.61)}{\lesssim} |\mathcal{A}_\theta| \cdot \Delta^{-2\sigma} \cdot \delta^{t-O_\zeta(\epsilon)}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore $|\mathcal{A}_\theta| \geq \Delta^{\sigma-t+6\zeta}$, as claimed in (4.67).

4.8. Violating the ABC sum-product conjecture. Let A be the right end-points of the intervals in the collection $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{D}_\delta(\pi(K_0 \cap \mathbf{T}_0))$. Therefore A is a δ -separated subset of the interval $\pi(\mathbf{T}_0)$. This interval has length Δ , and there is no loss of generality in assuming that

$$A \subset \pi(\mathbf{T}_0) = [0, \Delta].$$

Next, we define the set " B " to consist of the y -coordinates of the centres of the discs in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0)$. Since \mathbf{T}_0 is a vertical tube of width Δ , and the discs in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0)$ all intersect $B(1)$, there is no loss of generality in assuming that B is a Δ -separated subset of $[0, 1]$. Moreover, the "non-concentration" of the discs in $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0)$ recorded in Lemma 4.60 is inherited by the set B . We claim the following corollary:

Corollary 4.71. *The set B satisfies the following non-concentration condition if $\delta, \zeta > 0$ are sufficiently small:*

$$|B \cap B(x, r)|_\Delta \leq r^{\sigma-6\sqrt{\zeta}} |B|, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2, r \in [\Delta, \Delta^{\sqrt{\zeta}}], \quad (4.72)$$

Proof. To begin with, we observe that

$$|B| = |\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0)| \geq \Delta^{-\sigma+6\zeta} \quad (4.73)$$

by (4.63) and the $(t, \delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)})$ -regularity of μ . Therefore, the non-concentration condition recorded in Lemma 4.60 implies that

$$|B \cap B(x, r)|_\Delta \lesssim \left(\frac{r}{\Delta}\right)^\sigma \leq \Delta^{-6\zeta} r^\sigma |B|, \quad r \in [\delta^{-\sqrt{\epsilon}} \Delta, 1].$$

For $r \leq \Delta^{\sqrt{\zeta}}$, we have $\Delta^{-6\zeta} \leq r^{-6\sqrt{\zeta}}$. Thus, the inequality (4.72) holds at least for $r \in [\delta^{-\sqrt{\epsilon}} \Delta, \Delta^{\sqrt{\zeta}}]$. For $r \in [\Delta, \delta^{-\sqrt{\epsilon}} \Delta]$, we can simply use the trivial estimate

$$|B \cap B(x, r)|_\Delta \lesssim r/\Delta \leq \delta^{-\sqrt{\epsilon}} \leq (\delta^{-\sqrt{\epsilon}} \Delta)^{-\zeta} \leq r^{-\zeta} \stackrel{(4.73)}{\leq} r^{\sigma-7\zeta} |B|.$$

Since $7\zeta \leq 6\sqrt{\zeta}$ for $\zeta > 0$ small (as we assume), this proves (4.72). \square

In summary, $A \times B$ is a $(\delta \times \Delta)$ -separated product subset of $[0, \Delta] \times [0, 1]$ with the properties

$$\Delta^{\sigma-t+6\zeta} \stackrel{(4.67)}{\leq} |A| = |\mathcal{A}| \stackrel{(4.65)}{\leq} \Delta^{\sigma-t-2\zeta} \quad \text{and} \quad |B| \stackrel{(4.73)}{\geq} \Delta^{-\sigma+6\zeta}, \quad (4.74)$$

and such that B satisfies the $(\sigma - o_\zeta(1))$ -dimensional non-concentration condition recorded in (4.72). For each $\theta \in E$, we next proceed to define a substantial subset $G_\theta \subset A \times B$ with a small π_θ -projection at scale δ . The starting point is the interval collection $\mathcal{A}_\theta \subset \mathcal{A}$ defined at (4.66). Let $A_\theta \subset A$ be the left end-points of the intervals in \mathcal{A}_θ . Then, for each $I \in \mathcal{A}_\theta$, consider the subset $B_{I,\theta} \subset B$ defined by

$$B_{I,\theta} := \{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0) : \pi^{-1}(I) \cap (B \cap K_\theta \cap K_\theta) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

There is a 1-to-1 correspondence between the points $x \in A_\theta$ and $I \in \mathcal{A}_\theta$, so we may denote $B_{I,\theta} =: B_{x,\theta}$ for $x \in A_\theta$, and define

$$G_\theta := \{(x, y) : x \in A_\theta \text{ and } y \in B_{x,\theta}\}. \quad (4.75)$$

By the defining property (4.66) of the family \mathcal{A}_θ , we have $|B_{x,\theta}| \geq \Delta^{-\sigma+9\zeta}$ for all $x \in A_\theta$, and therefore

$$|G_\theta| = \sum_{x \in A_\theta} |B_{x,\theta}| \stackrel{(4.67)}{\geq} \Delta^{-t+15\zeta} \geq \Delta^{20\zeta} |A \times B|, \quad \theta \in E \cap I. \quad (4.76)$$

On the other hand, it turns out that the π_θ -projection of G_θ is controlled by the π_θ -projection of $K_\theta \cap \mathbf{T}_0$:

Lemma 4.77. *We have*

$$|\pi_\theta(G_\theta)|_\delta \lesssim |\pi_\theta(K_\theta \cap \mathbf{T}_0)|_\delta \stackrel{(4.59)}{\leq} \Delta^{\sigma-t-2\zeta} \stackrel{(4.74)}{\leq} \Delta^{-8\zeta} |A|, \quad \theta \in E \cap I. \quad (4.78)$$

Proof. Let $(x, y) \in G_\theta$. This implies, by definition, that $x \in I \in \mathcal{A}_\theta$ and $\pi^{-1}(I) \cap (B \cap K_\theta) \neq \emptyset$ for some Δ -disc $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{T}_0)$ whose centre has second coordinate "y". In particular, there exists a point $(x', y') \in \pi^{-1}(I) \cap K_\theta$ with the properties

$$|x' - x| \leq \delta \quad \text{and} \quad |y' - y| \leq \Delta.$$

Now, observe that

$$|\pi_\theta(x, y) - \pi_\theta(x', y')| \leq |x' - x| + |\theta||y' - y| \leq 2\delta, \quad \theta \in E \cap I = E \cap [0, \Delta].$$

In other words $\pi_\theta(G_\theta)$ is contained in the (2δ) -neighbourhood of $\pi_\theta(K_\theta \cap \mathbf{T}_0)$, for every $\theta \in E \cap I$. This proves the lemma. \square

This is nearly what we need in order to apply – or rather violate – the *ABC* sum-product conjecture, Corollary 1.12. To make the conclusion of the argument precise, we apply the dilation $(x, y) \mapsto D(x, y) := (\Delta^{-1}x, y)$ to the set $A \times B$, and also to the subsets G_θ . Then, writing $A' := \Delta^{-1}A$, we find that $A' \times B = D(A \times B)$ is a Δ -separated product set, and $G'_\theta := D(G_\theta) \subset A' \times B$ is a subset satisfying $|A'| = |A|$, and

$$|G'_\theta| = |D(G_\theta)| \stackrel{(4.76)}{\geq} \Delta^{20\zeta} |A' \times B|, \quad \theta \in E \cap I. \quad (4.79)$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{\Delta^{-1}\theta}(G'_\theta) &= \{x + (\Delta^{-1}\theta)y : (x, y) \in G'_\theta\} \\ &= \Delta^{-1}\{\Delta x + \theta y : (x, y) \in G'_\theta\} = \Delta^{-1}\pi_\theta(G_\theta), \quad \theta \in E \cap I. \end{aligned}$$

Since the renormalisation E_I consists exactly of the points $\Delta^{-1}\theta$ with $\theta \in E \cap I$, the previous equation yields

$$|\pi_\theta(G'_\theta)|_\Delta = |\pi_{\Delta\theta}(G_\theta)|_\delta \stackrel{(4.78)}{\leq} \Delta^{-9\zeta}|A'|, \quad \theta \in E_I. \quad (4.80)$$

Proposition 4.17(a) suggests that the renormalisation E_I is a $(\Delta, s - \zeta, \Delta^{-O_\zeta(\epsilon)})$ -set, but keeping in mind the various refinements to $E \cap I$, and in particular the latest one above (4.64), the correct conclusion is that E_I is a $(\Delta, s - \zeta, \Delta^{-O(\zeta)})$ -set.

It is time to apply the ABC sum-product conjecture (Corollary 1.9) to the values

$$\alpha := t - \sigma + \zeta_0, \quad \text{and} \quad \beta := \sigma - \zeta_0,$$

as announced at (4.11). We will apply the conjecture at the scale Δ . According to (4.74), the sets A' and B are Δ -separated sets satisfying $|A'| \leq \Delta^{-\alpha}$ and $|B| \geq \Delta^{-\beta}$, assuming that $\zeta > 0$ was taken sufficiently smaller than $\zeta_0 = \zeta_0(s, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, t) > 0$. Also, according to (4.72), the set B satisfies a β -dimensional non-concentration condition if $6\sqrt{\zeta} < \zeta_0$.² We already noted above (4.11) that with this notation,

$$\gamma = s - \zeta_0 > \alpha - \beta.$$

Moreover, the set E_I is a $(\Delta, s - \zeta, \Delta^{-O(\zeta)})$ -set, or in other words the normalised counting measure $\nu = |E_I|^{-1}\mathcal{H}^0|_{E_I}$ satisfies the Frostman condition

$$\nu(B(x, r)) \leq \Delta^{-O(\zeta)}r^{s-\zeta}, \quad x \in S^1, \Delta \leq r \leq 1.$$

Consequently, if $\zeta > 0$ is small enough depending on ζ_0 and $\eta_0 = \eta_0(s, \sigma_0, \sigma_1, t) > 0$, namely the constant from (4.13), then ν also satisfies

$$\nu(B(x, r)) \leq r^{s-O(\sqrt{\zeta})} \leq r^{s-\zeta_0}, \quad x \in S^1, \Delta \leq r \leq \Delta^{\eta_0} \leq \Delta^{\sqrt{\zeta}}.$$

In other words, ν satisfies the hypothesis of Corollary 1.12, in the notation of (4.11). As a final piece of information, recall that the sets $G'_\theta \subset A' \times B$ defined above (4.79) (see also (4.75)) satisfy $|G'_\theta| \geq \Delta^{\eta_0}|A'||B|$, assuming that $20\zeta < \eta_0$.

Therefore, by Corollary 1.12, or more precisely (4.11), if $\delta > 0$ (hence $\Delta > 0$) is sufficiently small, there exists $\theta \in \text{spt}(\nu) = E_I$ with the property

$$|\pi_\theta(G_\theta)|_\Delta \geq \Delta^{-\wp_0}|A'|.$$

However, this lower bound contradicts (4.80) if $9\zeta < \wp_0 = \wp_0(s, \sigma_0, \sigma_1, t)$. This completes the proof of Proposition 3.13 – or at least the "conditional" part of it where $\sigma > (t - s)/2$.

We leave the details of the "unconditional" part to the reader. As we discussed in Remark 4.9, the parameters α, β, γ in the application of Theorem 1.14 (in place of Corollary 1.12) are exactly the same as above. The hypothesis $\sigma > (t - s)/(2 - s)$ guarantees that the relation $\gamma > (\alpha - \beta)/(1 - \beta)$, necessary for the application of Theorem 1.14, is valid with these choices.

²Since the current " ζ " actually stands for $\sqrt{\zeta}$ in the original notation of (4.14), recall Notation 4.34, it would be more accurate to require here that $C\zeta^{1/4} < \zeta_0$.

REFERENCES

- [1] Jean Bourgain. The discretized sum-product and projection theorems. *J. Anal. Math.*, 112:193–236, 2010.
- [2] K. J. Falconer. Hausdorff dimension and the exceptional set of projections. *Mathematika*, 29(1):109–115, 1982.
- [3] Weikun He. Orthogonal projections of discretized sets. *J. Fractal Geom.*, 7(3):271–317, 2020.
- [4] Robert Kaufman. On Hausdorff dimension of projections. *Mathematika*, 15:153–155, 1968.
- [5] Tamás Keleti and Pablo Shmerkin. New bounds on the dimensions of planar distance sets. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 29(6):1886–1948, 2019.
- [6] John M. Marstrand. Some fundamental geometrical properties of plane sets of fractional dimensions. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 4:257–302, 1954.
- [7] Daniel M. Oberlin. Restricted Radon transforms and projections of planar sets. *Canad. Math. Bull.*, 55(4):815–820, 2012.
- [8] Tuomas Orponen. An improved bound on the packing dimension of Furstenberg sets in the plane. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 22(3):797–831, 2020.
- [9] Tuomas Orponen. On the discretised ABC sum-product problem. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2110.02779, October 2021.
- [10] Tuomas Orponen. Hausdorff dimension bounds for the ABC sum-product problem. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2201.00564, January 2022.
- [11] Tuomas Orponen. On arithmetic sums of Ahlfors-regular sets. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 32(1):81–134, 2022.
- [12] Tuomas Orponen and Pablo Shmerkin. On the Hausdorff dimension of Furstenberg sets and orthogonal projections in the plane. *Duke Math. J. (to appear)*, 2023+.
- [13] Yuval Peres and Wilhelm Schlag. Smoothness of projections, Bernoulli convolutions, and the dimension of exceptions. *Duke Math. J.*, 102(2):193–251, 2000.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ, P.O. BOX 35 (MAD),
FI-40014 UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ, FINLAND
Email address: tuomas.t.orponen@jyu.fi