

A SHARP WEIGHTED FOURIER EXTENSION ESTIMATE FOR THE CONE IN \mathbb{R}^3 BASED ON CIRCLE TANGENCIES

ALEXANDER ORTIZ

ABSTRACT. We apply recent circle tangency estimates due to Pramanik–Yang–Zahl to prove sharp weighted Fourier extension estimates for the cone in \mathbb{R}^3 and 1-dimensional weights. The idea of using circle tangency estimates to study Fourier extension of the cone is originally due to Tom Wolff, who used it in part to prove the first decoupling estimates. We make an improvement to the best known Mizohata–Takeuchi-type estimates for the cone in \mathbb{R}^3 and the 1-dimensional weights as a corollary of our main theorem, where the previously best known bound follows as a corollary of refined decoupling estimates.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Weighted estimates and the Mizohata–Takeuchi conjecture	1
1.2. Decay of Fourier means	4
1.3. Circle tangencies and an overview of the proof of Theorem 1.4	6
Acknowledgments	7
2. Point-circle and rectangle-lightplank duality	8
2.1. Duality constructions	10
2.2. Tangency counting by dual circular maximal estimates	19
2.3. Nearly lightlike separated pairs	25
3. Proof of main theorems	27
3.1. From Theorem 1.2 to Theorem 1.1	29
4. Refined decoupling and the Mizohata–Takeuchi conjecture	31
Appendix A. Lemmas of circle geometry	32
Appendix B. Fourier transform of surface measure on the cone	36
References	38

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Weighted estimates and the Mizohata–Takeuchi conjecture. In \mathbb{R}^n , if $\mathcal{M} \subset B^n(0, 1)$ is a compact manifold with smooth surface measure $d\sigma$, the Fourier extension operator for functions on \mathcal{M} is defined by

$$E_{\mathcal{M}}f(x) = \widetilde{f}d\sigma(x) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} f(\xi)e^{2\pi i x \cdot \xi} d\sigma(\xi), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 42B10.

Key words and phrases. maximal functions, restriction theory.

Since $\mathcal{M} \subset B^n(0, 1)$ is compact, $E_{\mathcal{M}}f$ is approximately constant on unit balls of \mathbb{R}^n . In particular, the level sets

$$U_\alpha = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |E_{\mathcal{M}}f(x)| > \alpha\}$$

are approximately disjoint unions of unit balls. See for example Sections 2–5 of [6] for a standard formalization of this version of the “locally constant” property. If $R > 1$ and $X \subset B_R$ is a disjoint union of unit balls in an arbitrary ball of radius R , we are interested in how much the level sets U_α can concentrate on the “test set” X .

Problem 1 (L^2 sparse restriction problem). *If $X \subset B_R$ is an arbitrary disjoint union of unit balls, what is the best constant $S_2(\mathcal{M}, X)$ so that*

$$\left(\int_X |E_{\mathcal{M}}f|^2 dx\right)^{1/2} \leq S_2(\mathcal{M}, X) \|f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M}, d\sigma)}$$

holds for all $f \in L^2(\mathcal{M}, d\sigma)$?

If \mathcal{M} is a hypersurface and $X \subset B_R$, by the conservation of mass,

$$1 \leq S_2(\mathcal{M}, X) \leq R^{1/2},$$

and examples of particular \mathcal{M} and X show that the the shape of X as well as the shape of \mathcal{M} play a role in determining $S_2(\mathcal{M}, X)$. Weighted Fourier extension estimates for model manifolds such as the paraboloid or the cone have applications to dispersive PDE and to geometric problems such as Falconer’s distance problem. See the influential paper by Du and Zhang [10] for a weighted Fourier extension theorem and its application to pointwise convergence to the initial data for the Schrödinger equation, and the paper [11] for partial progress towards Falconer’s distance set problem as a corollary of weighted Fourier extension estimates for spheres.

Problem 1 can be seen as a special case of the Mizohata–Takeuchi conjecture of Fourier analysis, where the weight is the indicator function of a disjoint union of unit balls. Let \mathcal{M} be a smooth compact hypersurface in \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 2$. If T is a tube in \mathbb{R}^n , let $\nu(T)$ be one of the two unit vectors parallel to the central axis of T . If a vector v is orthogonal to $T_\xi \mathcal{M}$ for some point $\xi \in \mathcal{M}$, we write $v \perp \mathcal{M}$.

Conjecture 1.1 (Local Mizohata–Takeuchi). *For every $\epsilon > 0$, there is a constant C_ϵ such that the following holds for every $R > 1$. If $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a smooth compact hypersurface, $n \geq 2$, let*

$$\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{M}) = \{T \subset \mathbb{R}^n : \nu(T) \perp \mathcal{M}, T \text{ is a } 1 \times \cdots \times 1 \times R\text{-tube}\}$$

be the collection of $1 \times \cdots \times 1 \times R$ -tubes whose direction is orthogonal to a tangent space of \mathcal{M} . If $w: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a measurable weight, let

$$\mathbf{T}_{\mathcal{M}}(w) = \sup\left\{\int_T w : T \in \mathbb{T}(\mathcal{M})\right\}.$$

Then the following estimate holds for all $f \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$ and any R -ball $B_R \subset \mathbb{R}^n$:

$$(1) \quad \int_{B_R} |E_{\mathcal{M}}f|^2 w \leq C_\epsilon R^\epsilon \mathbf{T}_{\mathcal{M}}(w) \|f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}^2.$$

Unlike the Fourier restriction conjecture, Conjecture 1.1 is made without any assumption on the curvature of \mathcal{M} . When the weight is constant on translates of a

fixed hyperplane, and the hypersurface \mathcal{M} is arbitrary, the conjecture is true essentially by Plancherel's theorem. When \mathcal{M} is a sphere in \mathbb{R}^n , the conjecture is open in all dimensions $n \geq 2$. In the case $n = 2$, it is known for radial weights—see [2, 9, 1]. Conjecture 1.1 has its roots in questions about dispersive PDE [19], but it also has a close connection with the endpoint multilinear restriction conjecture, as well as with the Bochner–Riesz problem. See the article [7] for the proof that conditional on Mizohata–Takeuchi for spheres, the endpoint multilinear restriction bound holds as a consequence of the endpoint multilinear Kakeya inequality due to Guth [14]. See the article [4] and the references therein for more discussion on Mizohata–Takeuchi-type estimates for spheres and the connection with the Bochner–Riesz problem on spherical Fourier summation.

In Section 4 we review the state of the art on Conjecture 1.1 for spheres due to Carbery, Iliopoulou, and Wang based on refined decoupling estimates [8]. We compare the strength of our main Theorem 1.1 for the cone and 1-dimensional weights with Theorem 4.2 due to Ciprian Demeter.

As the Mizohata–Takeuchi conjecture is expected to hold regardless of the curvature of the manifold \mathcal{M} , we expect it to be fruitful for our overall understanding to see what we can say about weighted Fourier extension estimates for model manifolds of zero Gaussian curvature. In this paper, we investigate $L^2(w)$ estimates for $E_{\text{Cone}^2}f$, where

$$\text{Cone}^2 = \{(\bar{\xi}, \xi_3) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R} : 1 < |\bar{\xi}| < 2, \xi_3 = |\bar{\xi}|\}$$

is the unit segment of the cone in \mathbb{R}^3 , and w is the indicator function of a 1-dimensional disjoint union of unit balls. To state our main theorem, we make a preliminary definition. Let $\gamma(\theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 1)$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 1.1. *If for some $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$,*

$$P = v + \{a\gamma(\theta) + b\gamma'(\theta) + c(\gamma \times \gamma')(\theta) : |a| \leq \frac{R}{2}, |b| \leq \frac{R^{1/2}}{2}, |c| \leq \frac{1}{2}\},$$

then we say P is a $1 \times R^{1/2} \times R$ -lightplank with center v .

Theorem 1.1. *For each $\epsilon > 0$, there is a constant C_ϵ so the following holds for each $R > 1$. Suppose $X \subset B_R$ is a disjoint union of unit balls in \mathbb{R}^3 that satisfies the 1-dimensional Frostman non-concentration condition*

$$(2) \quad |X \cap B(x, r)| \lesssim r, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3, r > 1.$$

Let $\mathbf{P}(X)$ be the quantity

$$\mathbf{P}(X) = \sup\{|X \cap P| : P \text{ is a } 1 \times R^{1/2} \times R\text{-lightplank}\}.$$

Then the estimate

$$(3) \quad \int_X |E_{\text{Cone}^2}f|^2 \leq C_\epsilon R^\epsilon \mathbf{P}(X)^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(\text{Cone}^2)}^2$$

holds for all $f \in L^2(\text{Cone}^2)$.

When a disjoint union of unit balls X satisfies (2), we will say X is 1-dimensional. The weighted estimate of Theorem 1.1 is sharp in the sense that for each $R > 1$, and for each $1 < T < R$, there is a 1-dimensional disjoint union of unit balls X such that $\mathbf{P}(X) \sim T$, and a nonzero function f such that

$$\int_X |E_{\text{Cone}^2}f|^2 \gtrsim T^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(\text{Cone}^2)}^2.$$

Theorem 1.1 is a corollary of the following weighted L^1 Fourier extension estimate.

Theorem 1.2. *For each $\epsilon > 0$, there is a constant C_ϵ so the following holds for each $R > 1$. Suppose $X \subset B_R$ is a 1-dimensional disjoint union of unit balls.*

Let $\mathbf{P}(X)$ be the quantity

$$\mathbf{P}(X) = \sup\{|X \cap P| : P \text{ is a } 1 \times R^{1/2} \times R\text{-lightplank}\}.$$

Then for any measurable function $w: \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow [0, 1]$, the estimate

$$\int_X |E_{\text{Cone}^2} f| w \leq C_\epsilon R^\epsilon \mathbf{P}(X)^{1/4} \left(\int_X w \right)^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(\text{Cone}^2)}$$

holds for all $f \in L^2(\text{Cone}^2)$.

We give the proof of Theorem 1.2 and the implication that Theorem 1.2 implies Theorem 1.1 in Section 3. As a corollary of Theorem 1.1, we have the following new partial progress on the Mizohata–Takeuchi conjecture for the cone and the 1-dimensional weights.

Corollary 1.1. *For each $\epsilon > 0$, there is a constant C_ϵ so that if X is a 1-dimensional disjoint union of unit balls in $B_R \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, then*

$$\int_X |E_{\text{Cone}^2} f|^2 \leq C_\epsilon R^{1/4+\epsilon} \mathbf{T}_{\text{Cone}^2}(X) \|f\|_{L^2(\text{Cone}^2)}^2.$$

Corollary 1.1 establishes the case of Conjecture 1.1 for the cone and the 1-dimensional weights with a power $R^{1/4}$ -loss. This is an improvement of the $R^{1/3}$ -loss we get by applying Theorem 4.2 directly to 1-dimensional weights.

Instead of using decoupling, our approach to estimating $\int_X |Ef|^2$ is based on a duality argument originally due to Mattila [18] which connects weighted Fourier extension estimates with the decay of Fourier means, and the technique of point-circle duality which was originally used by Wolff in [25] to study $E_{\text{Cone}^2} f$.

1.2. Decay of Fourier means. Weighted Fourier extension estimates are closely related to average Fourier decay rates of measures, and our methods also give new results on average Fourier decay. Given a finite measure μ on \mathbb{R}^n , we define its Fourier transform by

$$\widehat{\mu}(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \xi} d\mu(x), \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

If $d\mu = \phi(x) dx$ for a Schwartz function ϕ , then $\widehat{\mu}(\xi)$ decays rapidly as $|\xi| \rightarrow \infty$. On the other hand, without any assumptions on μ , $\widehat{\mu}(\xi)$ need not decay at all as $|\xi| \rightarrow \infty$ because we allow very singular measures such as $\mu = \delta_0$ where $\widehat{\mu} = 1$ everywhere. An example of a measure which fits in-between these two extremes is the product measure

$$d\mu(x_1, x_2) = \phi(x_1) dx_1 \otimes \delta_0(dx_2),$$

where ϕ is a smooth compactly supported function on \mathbb{R} . The measure $\widehat{\mu}(\xi_1, \xi_2) = \widehat{\phi}(\xi_1)$ decays rapidly in the ξ_1 variable, but is constant in the ξ_2 variable. This motivates the definition of measures with finite α -energy.

Definition 1.2. *If μ is a measure on \mathbb{R}^n , and $0 < \alpha < n$, define the α -energy*

$$I_\alpha(\mu) = \iint \frac{d\mu(x)d\mu(y)}{|x-y|^\alpha}.$$

In 1987, Mattila [18] proposed the problem of identifying the optimal polynomial rate of decay of spherical Fourier averages of compactly supported measures with finite α -energy.

Definition 1.3 (Optimal spherical Fourier average decay rate). *For $n \geq 2$ and $0 < \alpha < n$, $\beta_n(\alpha)$ is the supremum of the numbers $\beta > 0$ such that there exists C with*

$$\int_{S^{n-1}} |\widehat{\mu}(Re)|^2 d\sigma(e) \leq CR^{-\beta} I_\alpha(\mu), \quad \text{for all } R > 1,$$

for all measures μ supported in the unit ball of \mathbb{R}^n .

In [18], Mattila established the sharp exponent $\beta_n(\alpha) = \alpha$ when $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$. For the lower bound $\beta_n(\alpha) \geq \alpha$, Mattila used the stationary phase estimate $|d\sigma(x)| \lesssim |x|^{-(n-1)/2}$, where σ is the surface measure of the sphere, by rewriting the Fourier average as a double integral

$$(4) \quad \int_{S^{n-1}} |\widehat{\mu}|^2 d\sigma = \iint_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n} \widetilde{d\sigma}(x-y) d\mu(x) d\mu(y).$$

Mattila gave examples of measures with finite α -energy to prove the upper bound $\beta_n(\alpha) \leq \alpha$ when $0 < \alpha \leq \frac{n-1}{2}$.

Following partial progress on the decay of spherical Fourier means by Mattila [18], Sjölin [21] in 1993, and Wolff [24] in 1999 who found the optimal values of $\beta_2(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in (1, 2)$, as well as updated progress on the Fourier restriction problem due to Tao [22] in 2003, Erdoğan established the optimal *conical* Fourier average decay rates for α -dimensional measures in \mathbb{R}^3 [12].

Definition 1.4 (Optimal conical Fourier average decay rate). *For $n \geq 3$, let*

$$\text{Cone}^{n-1} = \{(\bar{\xi}, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R} : 1 < |\bar{\xi}| < 2, \xi_n = |\bar{\xi}|\}.$$

For $0 < \alpha < n$, $\gamma_n(\alpha)$ is the supremum of the numbers $\gamma > 0$ such that there exists C with

$$\int_{\text{Cone}^{n-1}} |\widehat{\mu}(Re)|^2 d\sigma(e) \leq CR^{-\gamma} I_\alpha(\mu), \quad \text{for all } R > 1,$$

for all measures μ supported in the unit ball of \mathbb{R}^n .

Theorem 1.3 (Erdoğan, 2004). *For $\alpha \in (0, 3)$, the values of $\gamma_3(\alpha)$ are as follows:*

$$\gamma_3(\alpha) = \begin{cases} \alpha, & \alpha \in (0, 1/2] \\ 1/2, & \alpha \in [1/2, 1] \\ \alpha/2, & \alpha \in [1, 2] \\ \alpha - 1, & \alpha \in [2, 3] \end{cases}.$$

A special case of our main L^1 weighted Fourier extension estimate contains a refinement of the $\alpha = 1$ case of Erdoğan's estimate. In the rest of the introduction, we will focus on this special case whose proof contains most of the key ideas needed to prove Theorem 1.2, and in Section 3 we will elaborate more on the connection between weighted Fourier extension estimates and the decay of Fourier means.

Theorem 1.4 (Refinement of $\gamma_3(1) = 1/2$). *For each $\epsilon > 0$, there is a constant C_ϵ so the following holds for each $R > 1$. Suppose $X \subset B_R$ is a 1-dimensional disjoint union of unit balls, and let $d\mu = 1_X dx$. Let $\mathbf{P}(\mu)$ be the quantity*

$$\mathbf{P}(\mu) = \sup\{\mu(P) : P \text{ is a } 1 \times R^{1/2} \times R\text{-lightplank}\}.$$

Then the estimate

$$\int_{\text{Cone}^2} |\hat{\mu}|^2 d\sigma \leq C_\epsilon R^\epsilon \mathbf{P}(\mu)^{1/2} \mu(B_R)$$

holds.

The assumption $d\mu = 1_X dx$ for a 1-dimensional disjoint union of unit balls in Theorem 1.4 is technically different but closely related to the assumption that μ is supported in the unit ball and has normalized 1-energy in Theorem 1.4. To illustrate the connection between Theorem 1.3 and our Theorem 1.4, the reader can verify that Theorem 1.3 immediately implies the following slightly weaker corollary.

Corollary 1.2. *For each $\epsilon > 0$, there is a constant C_ϵ so the following holds for each $R > 1$. Suppose $X \subset B_R$ is a 1-dimensional disjoint union of unit balls, and let $d\mu = 1_X dx$. Then the estimate*

$$\int_{\text{Cone}^2} |\hat{\mu}|^2 d\sigma \leq C_\epsilon R^\epsilon R^{3/2}$$

holds.

If $d\mu = 1_X dx$ is a measure satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 1.4, then $\mathbf{P}(\mu) \leq \mu(B_R) \lesssim R$, so Theorem 1.4 also implies Corollary 1.2. However, for measures μ where $\mathbf{P}(\mu)$ is much smaller than R , Theorem 1.4 gives a better estimate than Corollary 1.2.

1.3. Circle tangencies and an overview of the proof of Theorem 1.4. Our approach to conical Fourier average decay is based on Equation (4) with $d\mu = 1_X dx$. We rewrite the conical Fourier mean of μ as a double integral:

$$(5) \quad \int |\hat{\mu}|^2 d\sigma = \iint_{X \times X} \widetilde{d\sigma}(x - y) dx dy$$

and we note the following fact about the cone. If $d\sigma$ is a smooth surface carried measure for Cone^2 , and $\Gamma_0 = \{(a, r) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R} : ||a| - |r|| = 0\}$ is the lightcone with vertex 0, then for every $\epsilon > 0$ and $N > 1$,

$$(6) \quad |\widetilde{d\sigma}(x)| \leq C(\epsilon, N) \frac{1}{(1 + |x|)^{1/2 - \epsilon}} \frac{1}{(1 + d(x, \Gamma_0))^N}.$$

The inequality (6) is not a new estimate—see for instance expression (13) with $n = 3, \nu = 1$ in the proof of Theorem 3 in Guo’s article [13]. To keep this article self-contained, we include the proof by stationary phase considerations in Appendix B.

Heuristically by inequality (6), the only pairs $(x, x') \in X^2$ which contribute to the double integral in Equation (4) are those such that $x - x'$ is close to the lightcone Γ_0 . By the rapid decay in inequality (6), the only pairs $(x, x') \in X^2$ which contribute to the double integral satisfy

$$\Delta(x, x') = ||\bar{x} - \bar{x}'| - |x_3 - x'_3|| < 1.$$

If we interpret the points $x = (\bar{x}, x_3)$ and $x' = (\bar{x}', x'_3)$ of X as circles in the plane with centers \bar{x}, \bar{x}' and radii x_3, x'_3 , respectively, then $\Delta(x, x') < 1$ has the interpretation that the “circles” x and x' are almost internally tangent. We thus need a solution of a discretized variant (see Problem 3 and Theorem 2.4) of the following discrete tangency counting problem introduced by Wolff in [26].

Problem 2 (Tangency counting problem). *If $X \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a finite set of points in $[-\frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{5}]^2 \times [\frac{4}{5}, \frac{6}{5}]$ that we regard as a collection of circles in the plane with given center-radius pairs, estimate the number of internal tangencies of the configuration X :*

$$CT(X) = \#\{(x, x') \in X^2 : \|\bar{x} - \bar{x}'\| - |x_3 - x'_3| = 0\}.$$

Here we write a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ in coordinates as $x = (\bar{x}, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$.

We will apply the following recent circular maximal function estimate of Pramanik–Yang–Zahl [20] which applies to 1-dimensional families of circles as a black box to solve our discretized tangency problem as a key lemma. We use the notation $E(z) = 1_E(z)$ here and elsewhere in the paper.

Theorem 1.5 (Pramanik–Yang–Zahl, 2022). *For each $\epsilon > 0$, there is a constant C_ϵ so the following holds for all $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small. Suppose $X \subset [-\frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{5}]^2 \times [\frac{4}{5}, \frac{6}{5}]$ is a set of δ -separated points regarded as circles in the plane obeying the 1-dimensional Frostman non-concentration condition*

$$|X \cap B(x, r)| \lesssim \frac{r}{\delta}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3, r > \delta.$$

Then the following estimate holds:

$$(7) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\sum_{x \in X} C_{\delta, x}(z) \right)^{3/2} dz \leq C_\epsilon \delta^{-\epsilon} \delta |X|,$$

where $C_{\delta, x} = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \|z - \bar{x}\| - x_3 < \delta\}$ is a δ -thick annulus.

To apply Pramanik–Yang–Zahl’s estimate successfully, we will need to set up an appropriate dictionary translating circle tangency estimates into a bound for the double integral in Equation (5). We take up this work in Section 2.

The idea of applying circle tangencies to study $E_{\text{Cone}^2} f$ is not new. In “Local smoothing type estimates in L^p for large p ” [25], Wolff used the point-circle duality idea to study $E_{\text{Cone}^2} f$. Part of his goal was to understand the large level sets of $E_{\text{Cone}^2} f$, and he used estimates for the number of circle tangencies of configurations of circles as an ingredient to prove the first sharp decoupling estimates for the cone in L^p for large p .

To apply facts about circles to the Fourier extension of the cone successfully, Wolff also needed to partly describe a dictionary of lemmas that relates the geometry of circle tangencies in the plane to the geometry of points in the upper half space. Part of our goal in this paper is to establish the facts from this dictionary we need in order to prove Theorem 1.2. Another goal of this presentation is to clarify and expand on some of the same facts Wolff used in [25].

Acknowledgments. I would like to acknowledge Larry Guth for his constant support and invaluable discussions throughout this project. I would also like to acknowledge Jill Pipher and Tainara Borges for insightful questions about the proof of Theorem 1.2 leading to a cleaner exposition of the implication “Theorem 1.2 \implies Theorem 1.1.” Thanks to Yixuan Pang for drawing my attention to the reference of the Fourier decay estimate (6) from Guo’s paper [13]. I extend my appreciation to Ciprian Demeter who let me include the statement of Theorem 4.2 here and in my doctoral thesis. Finally, thanks to the anonymous referee for their detailed and thoughtful feedback on an earlier version of this paper, and especially for drawing my attention to Wolff’s use of the point-circle duality technique in [25].

2. POINT-CIRCLE AND RECTANGLE-LIGHTPLANK DUALITY

Fix $\delta > 0$ and, for $a \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $r \in [1, 2]$, let $C_{\delta,a,r} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : r - \delta < |x - a| < r + \delta\}$. If $f: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then we define Wolff's circular maximal function $M_\delta f: [1, 2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$M_\delta f(r) = \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{|C_{\delta,a,r}|} \int_{C_{\delta,a,r}} |f(z)| dz.$$

Originally in [23], Wolff proved the following estimate for the maximal function $M_\delta f$.

Theorem 2.1. *If $\epsilon > 0$ then there is a constant A_ϵ such that for all $\delta > 0$ and f ,*

$$(8) \quad \|M_\delta f\|_{L^3([1,2],dr)} \leq A_\epsilon \delta^{-\epsilon} \|f\|_{L^3(\mathbb{R}^2,dz)}.$$

The estimate (8) has an equivalent dual form. Suppose that $a(r)$ is a measurable choice of center for a circle in the plane of radius r , and $w(r)$ is a nonnegative weight function. Define a multiplicity function

$$m[w, a](z) = \int_1^2 w(r) \frac{C_{\delta,a(r),r}(z)}{|C_{\delta,a(r),r}|} dr, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Proposition 2.1 (Multiplicity formulation of the maximal estimate). *If $\epsilon > 0$ then there is a constant A_ϵ such that for all $\delta > 0$, $a(r)$ and $w(r)$,*

$$(9) \quad \|m[w, a]\|_{L^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}^2,dz)} \leq A_\epsilon \delta^{-\epsilon} \|w\|_{L^{3/2}([1,2],dr)}.$$

Proposition 2.2. *Wolff's maximal estimate is equivalent to its dual formulation in terms of multiplicity functions.*

Proof. Suppose that (8) holds. By duality, for an appropriate $f \in L^3(\mathbb{R}^2, dz)$ with $\|f\|_3 = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|m\|_{L^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}^2,dz)} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} m(z) f(z) dz \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\int_1^2 w(r) \frac{C_{\delta,a(r),r}(z)}{|C_{\delta,a(r),r}|} dr \right) f(z) dz \\ &= \int_1^2 w(r) \left(\frac{1}{|C_{\delta,a(r),r}|} \int_{C_{\delta,a(r),r}} f(z) dz \right) dr \\ &\leq \int_1^2 w(r) M_\delta f(r) dr \\ &\leq \|w\|_{L^{3/2}([1,2],dr)} \|M_\delta f\|_{L^3([1,2],dr)} \\ &\leq A_\epsilon \delta^{-\epsilon} \|w\|_{L^{3/2}([1,2],dr)}. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise, if (9) holds, then by linearizing the maximal function, given $f \in L^3(\mathbb{R}^2, dz)$, for an appropriate $a(r)$ we have

$$M_\delta f(r) = \frac{1}{|C_{\delta,a(r),r}|} \int_{C_{\delta,a(r),r}} |f(z)| dz.$$

By duality, for an appropriate $w \in L^{3/2}([1, 2], dr)$ with $\|w\|_{3/2} = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|M_\delta f\|_{L^3([1,2],dr)} &= \int_1^2 M_\delta f(r) w(r) dr \\
 &= \int_1^2 \left(\frac{1}{|C_{\delta,a(r),r}|} \int_{C_{\delta,a(r),r}} |f(z)| dz \right) w(r) dr \\
 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |f(z)| \left(\int_1^2 w(r) \frac{C_{\delta,a(r),r}}{|C_{\delta,a(r),r}|}(z) dr \right) dz \\
 &\leq \|f\|_{L^3(\mathbb{R}^2,dz)} \|m[w,a]\|_{L^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}^2,dz)} \\
 &\leq A_\epsilon \delta^{-\epsilon} \|f\|_{L^3(\mathbb{R}^2,dz)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

The dual form of Wolff's circular maximal function estimate implies the following concrete formulation in terms of the multiplicity of a collection δ -annuli.

Example 2.1. Let $\{r_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset [1, 2]$ be a 10δ -separated set of radii (not necessarily maximal). For real numbers b_i , set

$$w(r) = \sum_i b_i 1_{[r_i, r_i + \delta]}(r),$$

and for each i , let $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$ be an arbitrary point. Set

$$a(r) = \sum_i a_i 1_{[r_i, r_i + \delta]}(r).$$

By definition,

$$m[w,a](z) \approx \sum_i b_i C_{\delta,a_i,r_i}(z),$$

where we remind of the notation $C(z) = 1_C(z)$. Hence Proposition 2.1, the dual form of Wolff's circular maximal estimate, implies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N b_i C_{\delta,a_i,r_i}(z) \right)^{3/2} dz \lesssim \delta^{-\epsilon} \delta \sum_{i=1}^N |b_i|^{3/2}.$$

As a special case, setting each $b_i = 1$ we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N C_{\delta,a_i,r_i}(z) \right)^{3/2} dz \lesssim \delta^{-\epsilon} \delta N.$$

Dual circular maximal function estimates like Wolff's original estimate in the form of Example 2.1 or Pramanik–Yang–Zahl's generalization in Theorem 2.3 can be translated into estimates for the following δ -discretized tangency counting problem.

Problem 3 (Circle tangencies at scale δ). If $X \subset Q$ is a set of N points and $\delta > 0$, estimate the number of “circle tangencies” at scale $\delta > 0$:

$$CT_\delta(X) = \#\{(x, x') \in X^2 : \|\bar{x} - \bar{x}'\| - |x_3 - x'_3| < \delta\}.$$

Here we write a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ in coordinates as $x = (\bar{x}, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$.




FIGURE 1. Point-circle duality

After discussing preliminaries on circle tangencies, tangency rectangles, and point-circle duality, we will sketch how dual circular maximal function estimates can be used to address Problem 3 in Section 2.2. See Theorem 2.4 for the precise version of the circle tangency estimate we will use as a lemma in the proof of Theorem 1.2.

2.1. Duality constructions. We consider circles in the plane parametrized by their center-radius pairs. Given a point $(a, r) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, \infty)$, we will equivalently regard it as the circle

$$C_{a,r} = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^2 : ||z - a| - r| = 0\}.$$

See Figure 1. Likewise, the δ -neighborhood (in \mathbb{R}^3) of the point $(a, r) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ is identified with the δ -thin annulus

$$C_{\delta,a,r} = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^2 : ||z - a| - r| < \delta\}.$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$. We will assume that $\delta < \delta_0(\epsilon)$ is small enough so that $\delta_0^\epsilon < 10^{-3}$ to ensure that approximations such as $\cos \theta \sim 1 - \theta^2/2$ hold up to constant factors if $|\theta| \leq \delta^\epsilon$. We identify points $x = (a, r)$ with their corresponding circles $C_{a,r}$. All the circles we consider will be parametrized by points in $Q = B(e_3, \alpha_0)$ for a small but absolute constant $\alpha_0 > 0$ unless mentioned otherwise.

Remark 2.1 (Notation). *We will make use of the following notation. Throughout, $\epsilon > 0$ is fixed.*

- $A \ll B$: there is a constant $c > 0$ so $A \lesssim \delta^{c\sqrt{\epsilon}} B$.
- $A \lesssim B$: there is a constant $C > 0$ so that $A \lesssim \delta^{-C\epsilon} B$. Note that with this definition, as long as δ is sufficiently small depending on ϵ , $A \ll B \lesssim C$ implies $A \ll C$.
- $A \approx B$: $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$ (with possibly different implied constants).
- e_1, e_2, e_3 will denote the standard basis vectors of \mathbb{R}^3 .
- $\Gamma_0 = \{(a, r) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R} : ||a| - |r|| = 0\}$ is the lightcone with vertex 0.
- $\Gamma_y = \Gamma_0 + y$ is the lightcone with vertex y .
- $Q = B(e_3, \alpha_0)$, the ball of radius α_0 about e_3 , which we take as the parameter space of circles.

- When we are using point-circle duality, we will not necessarily distinguish between circles and the points of Q that parametrize them. For instance, we may say things like “given a set of circles in Q ,” where we mean precisely consider a subset of Q which we think of as a collection of circles.
- If E is a set, we will use $E(x)$ to denote $1_E(x)$, the indicator function of E .
- If $x = (a, r), x' = (a', r') \in Q$, then $\Delta(x, x') = ||a - a'| - |r - r'|$ is (up to an absolute constant) the distance from x to $\Gamma_{x'}$, and vice-versa.
- If $(E_1, o_1), (E_2, o_2)$ are sets with designated “centers” $o_1 \in E_1, o_2 \in E_2$, and $A^{-1}E_1 \subset E_2 \subset AE_1$ for some $A \approx 1$, where the notation AE_1 denotes the dilation of E_1 by A about its center o_1 , then we may write $E_1 \asymp E_2$. We will say that such sets are (A -)comparable.

Given $X \subset Q$ a set of circles, define the multiplicity functions

$$m_{\lambda\delta}(z) = \sum_{x \in X} C_{\lambda\delta, x}(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \delta, \lambda > 0.$$

The number $m_{\lambda\delta}(z)$ counts the number of thin annuli the point z belongs to. We want to understand the shape of the large level sets of $m_{\lambda\delta}$ for some small fixed δ , and $\lambda \gtrsim 1$. We can partition these level sets (which are contained in the union of thin annuli) into curvilinear rectangles of width $\lambda\delta$, and variable length $0 < \tau \lesssim 1$. It turns out that the range $\sqrt{\delta} \leq \tau \ll 1$ is the most important for us to understand.

Definition 2.1 (δ, τ -rectangle, core circle, center). For $\delta^{1/2} \leq \tau \ll 1$, a δ, τ -rectangle is the δ -neighborhood of an arc of length τ on some circle of radius $r \in [1 - \alpha_0, 1 + \alpha_0]$. We will sometimes refer to the implicit circle in this definition as the core circle of Ω , and we may write $\Omega = \Omega^{(v)}$ if v is the core circle of Ω . The midpoint of the core arc of Ω will be referred to as the center of Ω .

Definition 2.2 (Comparable). We say two δ, τ -rectangles Ω_1, Ω_2 are A -comparable if each is contained in the A -dilation of the other about their centers. If Ω_1, Ω_2 are A -comparable for some $A \approx 1$, then we simply say they are comparable. If Ω_1, Ω_2 are not A -comparable, we say they are A -incomparable. A collection \mathcal{R} of δ, τ -rectangles is pairwise A -incomparable if no two members of \mathcal{R} are A -comparable.

If $\tau \lesssim \delta^{1/2}$, then a δ, τ -rectangle is approximately a rectangle in the usual sense, while if τ is much larger than $\delta^{1/2}$, a δ, τ -rectangle is a curvilinear rectangle.

Definition 2.3 (Tangency). We say a δ, τ -rectangle Ω is λ -tangent to the circle x if $\Omega \subset C_{\lambda\delta, x}$. We let $\mathbf{D}_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega) = \{x \in Q : \Omega \subset C_{\lambda\delta, x}\}$ be the collection of λ -tangent circles to Ω in Q .

Note that in the definition of tangency, we restrict the “dual set” $\mathbf{D}_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega)$ to be contained in $Q = B(e_3, \alpha_0)$. The terminology “dual set” will be appropriately justified in Theorem 2.2.

We record the following useful and easily proved facts about taking tangency.

Proposition 2.3 (Properties of tangency). For every $\delta > 0$, the following hold.

- (Monotonicity) If $\Omega' \subset \Omega$, then $\mathbf{D}_\delta(\Omega) \subset \mathbf{D}_\delta(\Omega')$.
- (Intersection) If $\Omega = \bigcup_k \Omega_k$, then $\mathbf{D}_\delta(\Omega) = \bigcap_k \mathbf{D}_\delta(\Omega_k)$.
- For every δ, τ -rectangle $\Omega = \Omega^{(v)}$, we have $v \in \mathbf{D}_\delta(\Omega^{(v)})$ and $B(v, \delta) \cap Q \subset \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega)$. In particular, $\mathbf{D}_\delta(\Omega^{(v)}) \neq \emptyset$ for every $v \in Q$.

We will refine property (iii) of Proposition 2.3 substantially in Proposition 2.6. If $\Omega = \Omega^{(v)}$ is a δ, τ -rectangle, then the core circle v is 1-tangent to Ω . Besides v , there are other nearby circles $w \in Q$ which are ≈ 1 -tangent to Ω . The set of all such w takes the shape of an “essentially unique” $\approx \delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ -lightplank centered on v when regarded as a subset of \mathbb{R}^3 . To describe the shape of $\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega)$ more precisely, we introduce the following definition.

Definition 2.4. A lightlike basis for \mathbb{R}^3 is an orthonormal basis $\mathcal{E} = e_m, e_l, e_s$ of \mathbb{R}^3 such that for some $\theta \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2)$, with respect to the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^3 ,

$$e_m = \begin{pmatrix} -\sin \theta \\ \cos \theta \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, e_l = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} -\cos \theta \\ -\sin \theta \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, e_s = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta \\ \sin \theta \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

A lightlike coordinate system (x_m, x_l, x_s) , o is the Cartesian coordinate system with respect to a lightlike basis with the point $o \in \mathbb{R}^3$ as the designated origin, i.e., for any x in \mathbb{R}^3 , $x = o + x_m e_m + x_l e_l + x_s e_s$. If we want to emphasize the angle θ , we will write $x_m(\theta), x_l(\theta), x_s(\theta), e_m(\theta), e_l(\theta), e_s(\theta)$.

Note that with this definition, a lightlike basis is ordered and right-handed, and in particular, it is completely determined by the first basis vector.

Definition 2.5 (Lightplank, comparable, essentially unique). Let $\delta^{1/2} \leq \tau \ll 1$. A rectangular parallelepiped $P \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a $\approx \delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ -lightplank if the edge lengths of P are $A_1\delta \leq A_2\delta\tau^{-1} \leq A_3\delta\tau^{-2}$ for numbers $A_1, A_2, A_3 \approx 1$, and if for some lightlike basis e_m, e_l, e_s of \mathbb{R}^3 , the edges of P are parallel to the vectors e_m, e_l, e_s , in the order “intermediate, long, short.” We will adopt a similar notation as with δ, τ -rectangles where we write $P = P^{(v)}$ if $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the center of P .

Two lightplanks P, P' are comparable if they are both contained in the A -dilation of the other for some $A \approx 1$.

We say a lightplank P satisfying a property π is essentially unique if any other lightplank P' which also satisfies π is comparable to P .

The following calculation of $\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega)$ when Ω is a $\delta, \sqrt{\delta}$ -rectangle will be the basis for the calculation of $\mathbf{D}_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega)$ when Ω is a δ, τ -rectangle, and $\lambda \approx 1, \tau \gg \sqrt{\delta}$.

Proposition 2.4 (Dual of $\delta, \sqrt{\delta}$ -rectangle). Let $o = e_3$ and $\Omega^{(o)} = [1 - \delta, 1 + \delta] \times [-\sqrt{\delta}/2, \sqrt{\delta}/2]$. Let

$$e_m = e_2, \quad e_l = \frac{-e_1 + e_3}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad e_s = \frac{e_1 + e_3}{\sqrt{2}}$$

be a lightlike basis for \mathbb{R}^3 , and let (x_m, x_l, x_s) , o be the associated lightlike coordinate system. Recall that $Q = B(e_3, \alpha_0)$. If C is a sufficiently large absolute constant, then the following hold.

(i) If $x \in P^{(o)} \cap Q$, where

$$P^{(o)} = \{(x_m, x_l, x_s) : |x_m| \leq \sqrt{\delta}, |x_l| \leq 1, |x_s| \leq \delta\}$$

then $x \in C \cdot \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega^{(o)})$, the dilation of $\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega^{(o)})$ about o .

(ii) If $x \in \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega^{(o)})$, then $x \in Q \cap CP^{(o)}$, where CP is the dilation of P by a factor of C about its center o .

Remark 2.2. Proposition 2.4 shows in what precise sense the $\delta, \sqrt{\delta}$ -rectangle $\Omega^{(o)}$ is dual to “the” $\delta \times \sqrt{\delta} \times 1$ -lightplank $P^{(o)}$: any other lightplank P' which satisfies

(i) and (ii) is $O(1)$ -comparable to $P^{(o)}$. Another way to say it is that there is an essentially unique $\approx \delta \times \sqrt{\delta} \times 1$ -lightplank satisfying (i) and (ii) in the sense of Definition 2.5.

Proof of Proposition 2.4. First we prove (i). The reader can verify that

$$(\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega^{(o)}), o) \asymp (\mathbf{D}_{C\delta}(\Omega^{(o)}), o), \quad C > 1,$$

so it suffices to show $P^{(o)} \subset \mathbf{D}_{C\delta}(\Omega^{(o)})$ for absolute C .

By definition of $P^{(o)}$ and the lightlike coordinate system (x_m, x_l, x_s) , o , it is clear that $P^{(o)} \subset Q$. Let $x \in P^{(o)}$, and let (x_1, x_2, x_3) be the usual Euclidean coordinates of x with respect to the standard basis e_1, e_2, e_3 . To verify $x \in \mathbf{D}_{C\delta}(\Omega^{(o)})$, let $(a_1, a_2) \in \Omega^{(o)}$ be arbitrary, and consider the quantity

$$(10) \quad I = |(x_1 - a_1)^2 + (x_2 - a_2)^2 - x_3^2|.$$

We need to show that $I \leq C\delta$ for a constant that does not depend on (a_1, a_2) . Let $x' = (x_1, x_2)$, and $a_1 = 1 + h$ with $|h| \leq \delta$. Expanding Equation (10) and applying the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} I &= |(x_1 - 1)^2 + x_2^2 - x_3^2 + h^2 - 2(x_1 - 1)h - 2x_2a_2| \\ &\leq (||x' - e_1| - x_3| \cdot ||x' - e_1| + x_3|) + \delta^2 + 2\delta|x_1 - 1| + 2\sqrt{\delta}|x_2|. \end{aligned}$$

Now we use that $x \in P^{(o)}$ to make some estimates of this last expression. First, $||x' - e_1| - x_3| = \Delta(x, e_1) \leq C\delta$, because $\Delta(x, e_1)$ is nearly the distance from x to the lightcone with vertex e_1 . The quantity $||x' - e_1| + x_3| < 10$ because $x \in Q$. Similarly, $|x_1 - 1| \leq 2$. Note $|x_2| = |x_m| \leq \sqrt{\delta}$, so $2\sqrt{\delta}|x_2| \leq 2\delta$. Altogether this shows that $I \leq C\delta$, as desired.

Now we prove (ii). Let $\ell = \{e_1 + t(e_3 - e_1) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ be a lightray intersecting e_1 . Consider the infinite $2\delta \times \sqrt{\delta}$ rectangular prism R we get by sliding $\Omega^{(o)}$ along ℓ . (Concretely, R is the Minkowski sum $e_1 + (\ell - e_1) + (\Omega^{(o)} - e_1)$.) If $x \in Q$, but x is not in CR , the dilation of R about its central axis ℓ by a factor of C , and C is sufficiently large, then $\Omega^{(o)} \not\subset C_{10\delta, x}$. This shows that if $x \in \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega^{(o)})$, then $x \in Q \cap CP^{(o)}$ for an appropriate $C > 1$. \square

Remark 2.3 (Our favorite position, coordinates). *The coordinate system and position of $\Omega^{(o)}$ in Proposition 2.4 are so convenient for computations that we will say a δ, τ -rectangle $\Omega^{(o)}$ is in our favorite position if $o = e_3$, and the center of $\Omega^{(o)}$ as defined in Definition 2.5 is e_1 .*

If $P^{(o)}$ is a $\delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ -lightplank, we say $P^{(o)}$ is in our favorite position if $o = e_3$ is the center of $P^{(o)}$, and if the intermediate axis of $P^{(o)}$ is parallel to $e_m := e_2$, the long axis is parallel to $e_l := \frac{-e_1 + e_3}{\sqrt{2}}$, and the short axis is parallel to $e_s := \frac{e_1 + e_3}{\sqrt{2}}$.

We say (x_m, x_l, x_s) , o is our favorite lightlike coordinate system.

By changing coordinates, we can study any $\delta, \sqrt{\delta}$ -rectangle by first changing coordinates so that the transformed rectangle is in our favorite position, applying Proposition 2.4, and then transforming back to the original coordinates. Alternatively, we have the following “coordinate-invariant” description of an essentially unique dual lightplank to a $\delta, \sqrt{\delta}$ -rectangle in the plane.

Construction 1 (Dual of $\delta, \sqrt{\delta}$ -rectangle). *Proposition 2.4 describes how to construct an essentially unique $\delta \times \sqrt{\delta} \times 1$ -lightplank dual to a $\delta, \sqrt{\delta}$ -rectangle in our favorite position. Now we consider more arbitrary $\delta, \sqrt{\delta}$ -rectangles.*

Let $\Omega^{(v)}$ be an arbitrary $\delta, \sqrt{\delta}$ -rectangle in the plane with core circle $v \in Q = B(e_3, \alpha_0)$ and center c_Ω . Let e_m be a unit vector in \mathbb{R}^2 parallel to the long edge of $\Omega^{(v)}$, forming an angle in $[-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ with the standard basis vector e_1 . Consider the lightlike basis e_m, e_l, e_s determined by e_m and the lightrays $\ell_+ = c_\Omega + \mathbb{R}e_l, \ell_- = c_\Omega + \mathbb{R}e_s$ passing through c_Ω .

Define infinite $\delta \times \sqrt{\delta}$ rectangular prisms R_+, R_- by

$$R_+ = \Omega^{(v)} - c_\Omega + \ell_+, \quad R_- = \Omega^{(v)} - c_\Omega + \ell_-.$$

Since $v \in Q$, v lies in exactly one of the sets

$$Q \cap R_+, \quad Q \cap R_-.$$

By relabeling R_+, R_- if necessary, we may assume $v \in Q \cap R_+$. Then $P^{(v)} = R_+ \cap 2Q$ is an essentially unique $\approx \delta \times \sqrt{\delta} \times 1$ -lightplank $P^{(v)}$ satisfying $P^{(v)} \asymp \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega^{(v)})$.

It will be convenient for future computations to describe how different lightlike coordinates are related when o is the same.

Proposition 2.5 (Change of coordinates, fixed o). *If $\theta \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ and $o \in Q$ is fixed, the following relationship between the lightlike coordinates $(x_m(\theta), x_l(\theta), x_s(\theta))$, o and $(x_m(0), x_l(0), x_s(0))$, o holds:*

$$(11) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & \frac{-\sin \theta}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1 + \cos \theta}{2} & \frac{1 - \cos \theta}{2} \\ -\frac{\sin \theta}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1 - \cos \theta}{2} & \frac{1 + \cos \theta}{2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_m(\theta) \\ x_l(\theta) \\ x_s(\theta) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_m(0) \\ x_l(0) \\ x_s(0) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. Since the lightlike bases $e_m(\theta), e_l(\theta), e_s(\theta)$ and $e_m(0), e_l(0), e_s(0)$ are orthonormal, the proof is just the calculation of the nine inner products $\langle e_m(\theta), e_m(0) \rangle, \langle e_l(\theta), e_m(0) \rangle, \dots$, etc. \square

The next Proposition is the first of our dictionary results which does not appear in Wolff's work [25].

Proposition 2.6 (Dual of δ, τ -rectangle). *Let $\delta^{1/2} < \tau \ll 1$, and let $\Omega^{(o)}$ be a δ, τ -rectangle with core circle $o = e_3$ in our favorite position. In our favorite lightlike coordinate system (x_m, x_l, x_s) , o , let*

$$P^{(o)} = \{(x_m, x_l, x_s) : |x_m| \leq \delta\tau^{-1}, |x_l| \leq \delta\tau^{-2}, |x_s| \leq \delta\}.$$

Recall that $Q = B(e_3, \alpha_0)$. If C is a sufficiently large absolute constant, then the following hold.

- (i) If $x \in P^{(o)} \cap Q$, then $x \in C \cdot \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega^{(o)})$.
- (ii) If $x \in \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega^{(o)})$, then $x \in Q \cap CP^{(o)}$, where $CP^{(o)}$ is the dilation of $P^{(o)}$ by a factor of C about its center, o .

Proof snapshot. See Figure 2. Assume $\Omega^{(o)}$ is in our favorite position and take the intersection of lightplanks comparable to $\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega_k^{(o)})$ from Construction 1 for some $\delta, \sqrt{\delta}$ -rectangles $\{\Omega_k^{(o)}\}_k$ which cover $\Omega^{(o)}$ but not $2\Omega^{(o)}$. \square




FIGURE 2. A snapshot of “the” dual $\delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ -lightplank to a δ, τ -rectangle $\Omega^{(v)}$

Proof. First we prove (i). We begin by making a reduction based on taking tangency in Proposition 2.3. Let $\tau < N\sqrt{\delta} < 2\tau$, and for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $|k| \leq N$, consider the $\delta, \sqrt{\delta}$ -rectangle

$$\Omega_k^{(o)} = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^2 : ||z| - 1| < \delta, |z - e^{ik\sqrt{\delta}}| < \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\delta}\}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}, |k| \leq N.$$

and let

$$\bar{\Omega}_N^{(o)} = \bigcup_{|k| \leq N} \Omega_k^{(o)}.$$

It is clear from the definition of N that $\Omega^{(o)} \subset \bar{\Omega}_N^{(o)}$ so by the monotonicity property of Proposition 2.3, we have $\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\bar{\Omega}_N^{(o)}) \subset \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega^{(o)})$. It thus suffices to show

$$(12) \quad P^{(o)} \subset C \cdot \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\bar{\Omega}_N^{(o)})$$

for absolutely large C . By the intersection property of Property 2.3, it is sufficient to show

$$P^{(o)} \subset C \cdot \bigcap_{k=1}^N \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega_k^{(o)}).$$

By Construction 1 or Proposition 2.4, for each $|k| \leq N$, let $P_k^{(o)}$ be an essentially unique $\delta \times \sqrt{\delta} \times 1$ -lightplank $P_k^{(o)}$ such that

$$P_k^{(o)} \subset C \cdot \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega_k^{(o)})$$




FIGURE 3. The four “corner points” of $P_0^{(o)} \cap P_{\frac{\theta}{\sqrt{\delta}}}^{(o)}$

for absolutely large C independent of k . It follows that

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^N P_0^{(o)} \cap P_k^{(o)} \cap P_{-k}^{(o)} \subset C \cdot \bigcap_{|k| \leq N} \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega_k^{(o)})$$

for absolutely large C . Finally, we have reduced (i) to showing

$$P^{(o)} \subset C \cdot \bigcap_{k=1}^N P_0^{(o)} \cap P_k^{(o)} \cap P_{-k}^{(o)}.$$

Claim. For each $1 \leq k \leq N$, in our favorite lightlike coordinate system (x_m, x_l, x_s) , o (see Remark 2.3),

$$P_0^{(o)} \cap P_k^{(o)} \cap P_{-k}^{(o)} \asymp \{|x_m| \leq k^{-1}\sqrt{\delta}, |x_l| \leq k^{-2}, |x_s| \leq \delta\},$$

with an absolute constant of comparability.

Given the claim, the proof of (i) follows because $N\sqrt{\delta} \sim \tau$, so

$$\begin{aligned} P^{(o)} &= \{|x_m| \leq \delta\tau^{-1}, |x_l| \leq \delta\tau^{-2}, |x_s| \leq \delta\} \\ &\asymp \{|x_m| \leq N^{-1}\sqrt{\delta}, |x_l| \leq N^{-2}, |x_s| \leq \delta\} \\ &\asymp P_0^{(o)} \cap P_N^{(o)} \cap P_{-N}^{(o)} \\ &\asymp \bigcap_{k=1}^N P_0^{(o)} \cap P_k^{(o)} \cap P_{-k}^{(o)} \subset C \cdot \bigcap_{|k| \leq N} \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega_k^{(o)}). \end{aligned}$$

The third \asymp in the chain above holds because the sets $\{|x_m| \leq k^{-1}\sqrt{\delta}, |x_l| \leq k^{-2}, |x_s| \leq \delta\} \asymp P_0^{(o)} \cap P_k^{(o)} \cap P_{-k}^{(o)}$ are decreasing as k increases.

To prove the claim, let $\theta \in \{\pm k\sqrt{\delta}\}$ and consider the lightlike coordinate system $(x_m(\theta), x_l(\theta), x_s(\theta))$, o . The lightplank $P_{\frac{\theta}{\sqrt{\delta}}}^{(o)}$ is contained in the δ -neighborhood of the affine plane

$$\Pi_{\frac{\theta}{\sqrt{\delta}}} = o + \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \langle x, e_s(\theta) \rangle = 0\}.$$

To see how $P_{\frac{\theta}{\sqrt{\delta}}}^{(o)}$ intersects $P_0^{(o)}$, we just need to determine the (x_m, x_l, x_s) , o -coordinates of the four “corner points” $x \in \Pi_{\frac{\theta}{\sqrt{\delta}}} \cap \partial P_0^{(o)}$ (see Figure 3). The




FIGURE 4. The dimensions of the intersection $P_0^{(o)} \cap P_k^{(o)} \cap P_{-k}^{(o)}$

calculation to determine the coordinates shown in Figure 3 is not difficult, but it is lengthy, so we just describe the method we use to obtain the coordinates here. The four marked points in Figure 3 are the “corner points” where the plane $\Pi_{\frac{\theta}{\sqrt{\delta}}}$ intersects $P_0^{(o)}$ on its faces $x_m = \pm \frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{2}$ and $x_s = \pm \frac{\delta}{2}$. We use Equation (11) to solve for $x_m(\theta), x_l(\theta)$ (we know $x_s(\theta) = 0$ by definition of the plane $\Pi_{\frac{\theta}{\sqrt{\delta}}}$) in terms of the known values for x_m, x_s , and then use Equation (11) again with $x_m = \pm \frac{\sqrt{\delta}}{2}, x_s = \pm \frac{\delta}{2}$ to determine the value of x_l for each of these four points.

By computing these points for each $\theta \in \{\pm k\sqrt{\delta}\}$, we can find the region of overlap $P_0^{(o)} \cap P_k^{(o)} \cap P_{-k}^{(o)}$ in the (x_m, x_l, x_s) , o -coordinates—see Figure 4.

The upshot is that for each $1 \leq k \leq N$ we have

$$P_0^{(o)} \cap P_k^{(o)} \cap P_{-k}^{(o)} \asymp \{|x_m| \leq k^{-1}\sqrt{\delta}, |x_l| \leq k^{-2}, |x_s| \leq \delta\},$$

which finishes the proof of the claim, and the proof of (i) that $P^{(o)} \cap Q \subset C \cdot \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega^{(o)})$ provided C is sufficiently large.

The proof of (ii) now follows partly by the work we did to prove (i), so we avoid repeating some of the same details. We choose N so that $\tau/2 < N\sqrt{\delta} < \tau$, and let $\Omega_k^{(o)}$ for $|k| \leq N$ be $\delta, \sqrt{\delta}$ -rectangles as in the proof of (i). Let $\underline{\Omega}_N^{(o)} = \bigcup_{|k| \leq N} \Omega_k^{(o)}$ so $\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega^{(o)}) \subset \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\underline{\Omega}_N^{(o)})$ by monotonicity. By the intersection property of taking tangency, it suffices to prove

$$(13) \quad \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega^{(o)}) \subset \bigcap_{|k| \leq N} \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega_k^{(o)}).$$

By the calculation we established in the claim from the proof of (i), in our favorite coordinate system, the intersection on the right-hand side of Equation (13) is comparable to the $\delta \times N^{-1}\sqrt{\delta} \times N^{-2}$ -lightplank

$$\{|x_m| \leq N^{-1}\sqrt{\delta}, |x_l| \leq N^{-2}, |x_s| \leq \delta\},$$

which is itself $O(1)$ -comparable to $P^{(o)}$ by the definition $N\sqrt{\delta} \sim \tau$. This finishes the proof of (ii), and the proposition. \square

We can compute $\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega^{(v)})$ for any particular δ, τ -rectangle $\Omega^{(v)}$ by translating our coordinates so that the transformed rectangle is in our favorite position, applying Proposition 2.6, and then undoing the coordinate transformation. Alternatively, we record the following “coordinate-invariant” description of the dual lightplank to a δ, τ -rectangle analogous to Construction 1.

Construction 2 (Dual to δ, τ -rectangle, $\sqrt{\delta} \leq \tau \ll 1$). *Given an arbitrary δ, τ -rectangle $\Omega^{(v)}$ with $v \in Q$, take the intersection of essentially unique $\delta \times \sqrt{\delta} \times 1$ -lightplanks dual to sub- $\delta, \sqrt{\delta}$ -rectangles contained in $\Omega^{(v)}$. The result is an essentially unique $\delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ -lightplank with long edge parallel to the lightray connecting v and the center of $\Omega^{(v)}$.*

Remark 2.4. *Construction 2 is “continuous” in the sense that if $\Omega^{(v)}$ and $\Omega^{(w)}$ are comparable δ, τ -rectangles for some $v, w \in Q$, then $\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega^{(v)})$, $\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega^{(w)})$ are comparable $\approx \delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ -lightplanks. A precise version of this remark appears later in Proposition 2.8.*

Like the sets $\mathbf{D}_\delta(\Omega) \subset Q$ for $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, there is an appropriate “dual” for subsets $E \subset Q = B(e_3, \alpha_0)$.

Definition 2.6. *If $E \subset Q$, and $\delta > 0$, $\lambda \lesssim 1$, let*

$$\mathbf{D}_{\lambda\delta}^*(E) = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^2 : E \subset \Gamma_{\delta,z}\}$$

where $\Gamma_{\delta,z}$ is the δ -neighborhood of $\Gamma_z = z + \Gamma_0$, and we remind that $\Gamma_0 = \{(a, r) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R} : ||a| - |r|| = 0\}$ is the lightcone with vertex 0.

Like \mathbf{D}_δ , the map \mathbf{D}_δ^* obeys a few simple properties.

Proposition 2.7. *For every $\delta > 0$, the following hold.*

- (i) *(Monotonicity) If $E' \subset E$, then $\mathbf{D}_\delta^*(E) \subset \mathbf{D}_\delta^*(E')$.*
- (ii) *(Intersection) If $E = \bigcup_k E_k$, then $\mathbf{D}_\delta^*(E) = \bigcap_k \mathbf{D}_\delta^*(E_k)$.*
- (iii) *For every $\sqrt{\delta} \leq \tau \ll 1$, and every $\delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ -rectangle P , $\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}^*(P) \neq \emptyset$.
If $P = P^{(o)}$ is a $\delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ lightplank in our favorite position, and $\Omega^{(o)}$ is a δ, τ -rectangle in our favorite position, then*

$$\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}^*(P^{(o)}) \asymp \Omega^{(o)}.$$

- (iv) *(Continuity) For $v, w \in Q$, if $P^{(v)} \asymp P^{(w)}$ then $\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}^*(P^{(v)}) \asymp \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}^*(P^{(w)})$.*

Proof. Points (i) and (ii) are immediate from the definition.

Points (iii) and (iv) follow from Proposition 2.6. \square

To summarize the results of this Section, we record the following Theorem and accompanying Figure 5, which justifies our use of the terms “dual lightplank” and “dual rectangle.”




FIGURE 5. Rectangle-lightplank duality

Theorem 2.2 (Rectangle-lightplank duality). *If $\Omega^{(v)}$ is a δ, τ -rectangle with $v \in Q$, then for appropriate $C \approx 1$,*

$$\mathbf{D}_{C\delta}^*(\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega^{(v)})) \asymp \Omega^{(v)}.$$

Likewise, if $v \in Q$ and $P^{(v)}$ is a $\delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ -lightplank, then

$$\mathbf{D}_{C\delta}(\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}^*(P^{(v)})) \asymp P^{(v)}.$$

Until now, we have considered one rectangle $\Omega^{(v)}$ and a corresponding dual lightplank $P^{(v)} \asymp \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega^{(v)})$. To address the δ -discretized version of Problem 3, we will also have to consider how multiple rectangles and corresponding lightplanks relate to one another.

2.2. Tangency counting by dual circular maximal estimates. With the fundamentals of point-circle duality established, we will sketch how we count circle tangencies using dual circular maximal function estimates as a black box. We assume the family of circles X we consider satisfies the 1-dimensional Frostman non-concentration condition

$$(14) \quad |X \cap B_r| \lesssim \frac{r}{\delta}, \quad \text{for all } r\text{-balls } B_r \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ and } r \geq \delta.$$

Recall Pramanik, Yang, and Zahl's estimate from the introduction:

Theorem 2.3 (Pramanik–Yang–Zahl [20], 2022). *For each $\epsilon > 0$, there is a constant C_ϵ so the following holds. Suppose $X \subset Q$ is a set of δ -separated circles obeying the 1-dimensional Frostman non-concentration condition (14). Then the following estimate holds:*

$$(15) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\sum_{x \in X} C_{\delta,x}(z) \right)^{3/2} dz \leq C_\epsilon \delta^{-\epsilon} \delta |X|.$$

First we will sketch how we plan to use Theorem 2.3 to address Problem 3. It will take some justification (see Proposition 2.14), but the integral appearing on the left-hand side of (15) controls the cardinality of any maximal pairwise incomparable collection \mathcal{R} of δ, τ -rectangles Ω contained in $\bigcup_{x \in X} C_{\delta,x}$ satisfying

$$(16) \quad |X \cap \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega)| \approx \mu, \quad \text{for all } \Omega \in \mathcal{R}$$

to the effect of

$$(17) \quad \int_{\bigcup \mathcal{R}} \left(\sum_{x \in X} C_{10\delta, x}(z) \right)^{3/2} dz \geq \mu^{3/2} \int_{\bigcup \mathcal{R}} \sum_{\Omega \in \mathcal{R}} \Omega(z) dz = \mu^{3/2} \delta \tau |\mathcal{R}|.$$

If $v, w \in X$ is a pair of points that is D -separated, and nearly lightlike separated, meaning $\Delta(v, w) < \delta$, then v, w belong to a common $\approx \delta \times \sqrt{D\delta} \times D$ -lightplank P . Therefore, if

$$\mathcal{L}_{D, < \delta}(X) = \{(v, w) \in X \times X : d(v, w) \sim D, \Delta(v, w) < \delta\},$$

then we have $CT_\delta(X) = \sum_{\delta < D \lesssim 1} |\mathcal{L}_{D, < \delta}|$, and

$$|\mathcal{L}_{D, < \delta}(X)| \leq \sum_{\substack{P: \text{incomparable} \\ \delta \times \sqrt{D\delta} \times D \text{ lightplanks}}} |X \cap P|^2.$$

For each $\delta < D \lesssim 1$, write $D = \delta \tau^{-2}$ for some $\sqrt{\delta} \leq \tau \leq 1$. For τ fixed, pigeonhole a value μ and a maximal pairwise incomparable collection \mathcal{P}_μ of $\delta \times \delta \tau^{-1} \times \delta \tau^{-2}$ lightplanks P with $|X \cap P| \approx \mu$ such that

$$\sum_{\substack{P: \text{incomparable} \\ \delta \times \delta \tau^{-1} \times \delta \tau^{-2} \text{ lightplanks}}} |X \cap P|^2 \approx \mu^2 |\mathcal{P}_\mu|.$$

Using rectangle-lightplank duality, the set

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{P}_\mu) := \{\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}^*(P) : P \in \mathcal{P}_\mu\}$$

of dual $\approx \delta, \tau$ -rectangles $\Omega = \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}^*(P)$ as P ranges in \mathcal{P}_μ is a maximal pairwise incomparable collection of $\approx \delta, \tau$ -rectangles satisfying (16). Therefore, applying rectangle-lightplank duality and Equation (16),

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}_{\delta\tau^{-2}, < \delta}(X)| &\lesssim \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_\mu} |X \cap P|^2 \\ &\leq \sup\{|X \cap P| : P \text{ is a } \delta \times \delta \tau^{-1} \times \delta \tau^{-2}\text{-lightplank}\}^{1/2} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_\mu} |X \cap P|^{3/2} \\ &\approx \mathbf{P}_\tau(X)^{1/2} \cdot \mu^{3/2} |\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{P}_\mu)|, \end{aligned}$$

where we introduce the shorthand notation

$$\mathbf{P}_\tau(X) = \sup\{|X \cap P| : P \text{ is a } \delta \times \delta \tau^{-1} \times \delta \tau^{-2}\text{-lightplank}\}.$$


Now, combining Equations (15) and (17),

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}_{\delta\tau^{-2}, < \delta}(X)| &\lesssim \mathbf{P}_\tau(X)^{1/2} \cdot (\delta\tau)^{-1} \cdot \delta |X| \\ &= \mathbf{P}_\tau(X)^{1/2} \tau^{-1} |X|, \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tau \geq \sqrt{\delta}$, and there are ≈ 1 -many dyadic values of τ ,

$$(18) \quad CT_\delta(X) = \sum_{\sqrt{\delta} \leq \tau \leq 1} |\mathcal{L}_{\delta\tau^{-2}, < \delta}(X)| \lesssim \mathbf{P}_{\sqrt{\delta}}(X)^{1/2} \delta^{-1/2} |X|.$$

Inequality (18) is our answer to Problem 3 when X is 1-dimensional (see Theorem 2.4 for the precise statement). The quantity $\mathbf{P}_{\sqrt{\delta}}(X)$ depends on the shape of X . For example, if X manages to avoid lightplanks, so $\mathbf{P}_{\sqrt{\delta}}(X) = 1$, our bound for $CT_\delta(X)$ is a significant gain over the trivial bound of $|X|^2$. See Figure 6 for three different 1-dimensional configurations X with different values of $\mathbf{P}_{\sqrt{\delta}}(X)$.

FIGURE 6. Three sets X_1, X_2, X_3 with $\mathbf{P}(X_1) \gg \mathbf{P}(X_2) \gg \mathbf{P}(X_3)$

The rest of this section will be devoted to making the proof sketch of inequality (18) we have just presented rigorous in Theorem 2.4. To keep the exposition in this section clean, we will keep a few geometric lemmas regarding circles satisfying $\Delta(x, x') < \delta$ within Appendix A.

Our first minor goal is to count the number of A -incomparable δ, τ -rectangles contained within a slightly larger rectangle in Proposition 2.9. To do so, we first give a rigorous proof of Remark 2.4, which says that the tangency map $\Omega \mapsto \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega)$ is “continuous” when Ω is a δ, τ -rectangle.

Proposition 2.8 (Continuity of $\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}$). *Suppose $\Omega^{(v)} \subset \bar{\Omega}^{(w)}$, where $\Omega^{(v)}$ is a δ, τ -rectangle, and $\bar{\Omega}^{(w)}$ is an $A\delta, A\tau$ -rectangle. Let $P^{(v)} = \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega^{(v)})$ and $\bar{P}^{(w)} = \mathbf{D}_{10A\delta}(\bar{\Omega}^{(w)})$. Then for an absolute constant $C > 1$, $P^{(v)} \subset CA^C \bar{P}^{(w)}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{E} = e_m, e_l, e_s$ and $\bar{\mathcal{E}} = \bar{e}_m, \bar{e}_l, \bar{e}_s$ be the lightlike bases associated with the lightplanks $P^{(v)}$ and $\bar{P}^{(w)}$, respectively. Let $\theta = \angle e_m, \bar{e}_m$. Because $\Omega^{(v)} \subset C_{A\delta, w}$, we have $w \in \mathbf{D}_{A\delta}(\Omega^{(v)})$ by Definition 2.3 of taking tangency. By Proposition 2.6, $\mathbf{D}_{A\delta}(\Omega^{(v)}) \subset CA^C P^{(v)}$ for an appropriate large constant C .

Hence, by Proposition 2.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle v - w, \bar{e}_s \rangle| &\leq |\langle v - w, e_s \rangle| + O(\theta) |\langle v - w, e_m \rangle| + O(\theta^2) |\langle v - w, e_l \rangle| \\ &\lesssim A^C \delta + O(\theta) A^C \delta \tau^{-1} + O(\theta^2) A^C \delta \tau^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition A.2, $|\theta| \lesssim A^C \tau$, so $|\langle v - w, \bar{e}_s \rangle| \lesssim A^C \delta$. Analogous considerations using Proposition 2.5 and $|\theta| \lesssim A^C \tau$ show $|\langle v - w, \bar{e}_m \rangle| \lesssim A^C \delta \tau^{-1}$ and $|\langle v - w, \bar{e}_l \rangle| \lesssim A^C \delta \tau^{-2}$. Since $\bar{P}^{(w)}$ is an $\approx \delta \times \delta \tau^{-1} \times \delta \tau^{-2}$ -lightplank, this shows $v \in CA^C \bar{P}^{(w)}$. Now that we have shown $v \in CA^C \bar{P}^{(w)}$, it suffices to prove that for any $x \in P^{(v)}$, the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle x - v, \bar{e}_s \rangle| &\lesssim A^C \delta \\ |\langle x - v, \bar{e}_m \rangle| &\lesssim A^C \delta \tau^{-1} \\ |\langle x - v, \bar{e}_l \rangle| &\lesssim A^C \delta \tau^{-2} \end{aligned}$$

all hold. We provide the details to estimate $|\langle x - v, \bar{e}_s \rangle|$ since the proofs of the remaining inequalities are entirely analogous. By Proposition 2.5 again, we have

$$(19) \quad |\langle x - v, \bar{e}_s \rangle| \lesssim O(1)|\langle x - v, e_s \rangle| + O(\theta)|\langle x - v, e_m \rangle| + O(\theta^2)|\langle x - v, e_l \rangle|.$$

Since $x \in P^{(v)}$, $a \approx \delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ -lightplank, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle x - v, e_s \rangle| &\lesssim \delta \\ |\langle x - v, e_m \rangle| &\lesssim \delta\tau^{-1} \\ |\langle x - v, e_l \rangle| &\lesssim \delta\tau^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting these bounds into (19) with $|\theta| \lesssim A^C\tau$, we obtain

$$|\langle x - v, \bar{e}_s \rangle| \lesssim A^C\delta.$$

Finally, we use Proposition 2.5 and $|\theta| \lesssim A^C\tau$ again to bound $|\langle x - v, \bar{e}_m \rangle| \lesssim A^C\delta\tau^{-1}$ and $|\langle x - v, \bar{e}_l \rangle| \lesssim A^C\delta\tau^{-2}$, and this finishes the proof. \square

The next proposition is a refinement of Lemma 1.2 in Wolff's paper [25]. Since we need to be precise about the size of the final answer, and because Wolff does not include the proof, we include the proof here.

Proposition 2.9 (Packing incomparable rectangles). *For any $A_0 \geq 1$, the number of pairwise A -incomparable δ, τ -rectangles contained in an $A_0A\delta, A_0A\tau$ -rectangle is $\lesssim (A_0A)^C$.*

Proof. Let $\bar{\Omega}^{(o)}$ be an $A_0A\delta, A_0A\tau$ -rectangle, and let $\{\Omega^{(v_i)}\}_{i=1}^M$ be a maximal pairwise A -incomparable collection of δ, τ -rectangles contained in $\bar{\Omega}^{(o)}$. Let $\bar{P}^{(o)} \asymp \mathbf{D}_{10A_0A\delta}(\bar{\Omega}^{(o)})$ be the essentially unique $\approx \delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ -lightplank dual to $\bar{\Omega}^{(o)}$.

Let $\bar{\mathcal{E}} = \bar{e}_m, \bar{e}_l, \bar{e}_s$ be the lightlike basis associated to the lightplank $\bar{P}^{(o)}$. Since $\Omega^{(v_i)} \subset \bar{\Omega}^{(o)}$ for each i , by Proposition 2.8, we have $v_i \in (A_0A)^C\bar{P}^{(o)}$, so each of the following inequalities holds for every $i, j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$:

- $|\langle v_i - v_j, \bar{e}_s \rangle| \lesssim (A_0A)^C\delta$
- $|\langle v_i - v_j, \bar{e}_m \rangle| \lesssim (A_0A)^C\delta\tau^{-1}$
- $|\langle v_i - v_j, \bar{e}_l \rangle| \lesssim (A_0A)^C\delta\tau^{-2}$.

As the rectangles $\Omega^{(v_1)}, \dots, \Omega^{(v_M)}$ are pairwise A -incomparable, for each $i \neq j$, at least one of the following inequalities must hold:

- $|\langle v_i - v_j, \bar{e}_s \rangle| \gtrsim A^C\delta$
- $|\langle v_i - v_j, \bar{e}_m \rangle| \gtrsim A^C\delta\tau^{-1}$
- $|\langle v_i - v_j, \bar{e}_l \rangle| \gtrsim A^C\delta\tau^{-2}$.

Therefore, $M \lesssim (A_0A)^C$, and the claim is proved. \square

For $\delta > 0$ fixed, and each $\lambda \approx 1$, we recall the multiplicity function

$$m_{\lambda\delta}(z) = \sum_{x \in X} C_{\lambda\delta, x}(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

If $v \in Q$ and $\Omega^{(v)}$ is a δ, τ -rectangle, recall that v is by Definition 2.3 1-tangent to Ω , and that by Proposition 2.6 if $\lambda \approx 1$, the collection $\mathbf{D}_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega^{(v)})$ is comparable to an essentially unique $\approx \delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ -lightplank $P^{(v)}$.

Proposition 2.10. *There is an absolute constant $C \geq 1$ such that the following holds. Let \mathcal{R} be an A -incomparable collection of δ, τ -rectangles contained in $\bigcup_{x \in X} C_{\delta, x}$. For each $x \in X$, and each $\lambda \geq A$, let*

$$\mathcal{R}_{\lambda\delta}(x) = \{\Omega \in \mathcal{R} : x \in \mathbf{D}_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega)\}$$

be the rectangles in \mathcal{R} which are λ -tangent to x (see Definition 2.3). Then for every $z \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we have

$$\sum_{\Omega \in \mathcal{R}_{\lambda\delta}(x)} \Omega(z) \lesssim \lambda^C C_{\lambda\delta, x}(z).$$

Proof. The δ, τ -rectangles $\Omega \in \mathcal{R}$ satisfying

$$x \in \Omega \subset C_{\lambda\delta, x}$$

are all contained in a $\lambda\delta, C\tau$ -rectangle. The $\Omega \in \mathcal{R}$ are pairwise A -incomparable, so by Proposition 2.9 on packing rectangles, the number of such Ω is at most λ^C for some absolute constant C . \square

Definition 2.7 (Multiplicity of a rectangle). *For $\lambda \approx 1$, and a δ, τ -rectangle Ω , let*

$$\mu_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega) = |X \cap \mathbf{D}_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega)|$$

be the number of points in X that are λ -tangent to Ω . We refer to $\mu_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega)$ as the multiplicity of Ω (or the X -multiplicity if we want to emphasize the set X of circles).

We recall the notation that if $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a set, we may use $E(z)$ as shorthand for the indicator function $1_E(z)$. Recall the following notation we used in Proposition 2.10: if \mathcal{R} is any set of δ, τ -rectangles, then

$$\mathcal{R}_{\lambda\delta}(x) = \{\Omega \in \mathcal{R} : x \in \mathbf{D}_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega)\}$$

is the set of rectangles of \mathcal{R} that are λ -tangent to x . If $a(x, \Omega)$ is any quantity that depends on $x \in X$ and $\Omega \in \mathcal{R}$, then we have the following double-counting/Fubini relationship:

$$\sum_{\Omega \in \mathcal{R}} \sum_{x \in X \cap \mathbf{D}_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega)} a(x, \Omega) = \sum_{x \in X} \sum_{\Omega \in \mathcal{R}_{\lambda\delta}(x)} a(x, \Omega).$$

Proposition 2.11. *If \mathcal{R} is a pairwise A -incomparable collection of δ, τ -rectangles contained in $\bigcup_{x \in X} C_{\delta, x}$ and $\lambda \geq A$, then*

$$\sum_{\Omega \in \mathcal{R}} \mu_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega) \Omega(z) \lesssim \lambda^C m_{\lambda\delta}(z) = \lambda^C \sum_{x \in X} C_{\lambda\delta, x}(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Proof. By Definition 2.7 of $\mu_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega)$ and double-counting,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\Omega \in \mathcal{R}} \mu_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega) \Omega(z) &= \sum_{\Omega \in \mathcal{R}} \left(\sum_{x \in X \cap \mathbf{D}_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega)} C_{\lambda\delta, x}(z) \right) \Omega(z) \\ &= \sum_{x \in X} C_{\lambda\delta, x}(z) \sum_{\Omega \in \mathcal{R}_{\lambda\delta}(x)} \Omega(z). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 2.10, for each fixed $x \in X$ and $\lambda \geq A$, the inner sum over $\Omega \in \mathcal{R}_{\lambda\delta}(x)$ is bounded by $\lambda^C C_{\lambda\delta, x}(z)$. This finishes the proof by the definition of $m_{\lambda\delta}(z)$. \square

For $\delta^{1/2} \leq \tau \ll 1$, let

$$T(\tau) = \sup\{\mu_{10\delta}(\Omega) : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ is a } \delta, \tau\text{-rectangle}\}$$

be the maximal number of circles of X that are 10-tangent to a δ, τ -rectangle.

Proposition 2.12 (Maximal tangency number and lightplank occupancy). *For $\delta^{1/2} \leq \tau \ll 1$, we have*

$$T(\tau) \approx \sup\{|X \cap P| : P \text{ is a } \delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}\text{-lightplank}\}.$$

Proof. For this proof, let $\mathbf{P}(\tau)$ denote the maximal $\delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ -lightplank occupancy of X :

$$\mathbf{P}(\tau) = \sup\{|X \cap P| : P \text{ is a } \delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}\text{-lightplank}\}.$$

Let Ω be a δ, τ -rectangle such that $\mu_{10\delta}(\Omega) = T(\tau)$. By Proposition 2.6 $\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega)$ can be covered by ≈ 1 -many $\delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ -lightplanks. By the pigeonhole principle, there exists a $\delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ -lightplank P_0 such that

$$|X \cap P_0| \gtrsim |X \cap \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega)| = \mu_{10\delta}(\Omega) = T(\tau).$$

This shows that $\mathbf{P}(\tau) \gtrsim T(\tau)$. Conversely, let P be a $\delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ -lightplank such that $|X \cap P| = \mathbf{P}(\tau)$. By Proposition 2.6, there are ≈ 1 -many δ, τ -rectangles Ω which cover $\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}^*(P)$. By the pigeonhole principle, there exists a δ, τ -rectangle Ω_0 such that

$$|X \cap \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega_0)| \gtrsim |X \cap P| = \mathbf{P}(\tau).$$

This finishes the proof that $T(\tau) \approx \mathbf{P}(\tau)$. \square

Proposition 2.13. *If Ω is a δ, τ -rectangle, then for each $\lambda \approx 1$,*

$$\mu_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega) \lesssim T(\tau).$$

Proof. This would follow immediately from the definition of $\mu_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega)$ (with “ \leq ” in place of “ \lesssim ”) if $T(\tau)$ were defined with $\mathbf{D}_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega)$ instead of $\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega)$. By Proposition 2.6, $\mathbf{D}_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega)$ is comparable to a $\approx \delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ -lightplank, which can be covered by ≈ 1 -many translates $\{\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega) + v_i\}_i$, at least one of which must satisfy by the pigeonhole principle,

$$|X \cap (\mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega) + v_i)| \gtrsim \mu_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega).$$

Therefore, $T(\tau) \gtrsim \mu_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega)$. \square

For a dyadic number $1 \leq M \leq T(\tau)$, a number $\lambda \approx 1$, and a collection \mathcal{R} of δ, τ -rectangles, let

$$\mathcal{R}_{M,\lambda} = \{\Omega \in \mathcal{R} : \mu_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega) \sim M\}.$$

We are now ready to rigorously justify the proof sketch we presented at the beginning of this Section.

Proposition 2.14 (Counting tangency rectangles). *Suppose $X \subset Q$ is a set of δ -separated circles obeying the 1-dimensional Frostman non-concentration condition*

$$|X \cap B_r| \lesssim \frac{r}{\delta}, \quad \text{for all } r\text{-balls } B_r \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ and } r \geq \delta.$$

If \mathcal{R} is any pairwise A -incomparable collection of δ, τ -rectangles contained in $\bigcup_{x \in X} C_{\delta,x}$, then for each $M \in [1, T(\tau)]$ and $A \leq \lambda \lesssim 1$,

$$M^{3/2} |\mathcal{R}_{M,\lambda}| \lesssim \tau^{-1} |X|.$$

Proof. By Proposition 2.11, if $\lambda \geq A$, we have

$$\lambda^C m_{\lambda\delta}(z) \gtrsim \sum_{\Omega \in \mathcal{R}} \mu_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega) \Omega(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

We organize the sum on the right-hand side by the dyadic level sets of $\mu_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega)$, keeping in mind Proposition 2.13:

$$\lambda^C m_{\lambda\delta}(z) \gtrsim \sum_{\substack{1 < M < T(\tau) \\ M \text{ dyadic}}} M \sum_{\Omega \in \mathcal{R}_{M,\lambda}} \Omega(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

By Pramanik–Yang–Zahl’s Theorem 2.3, and the embedding $\ell^1 \hookrightarrow \ell^{3/2}$,

$$\delta |X| \gtrsim \lambda^C \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} m_{\lambda\delta}(z)^{3/2} dz \gtrsim M^{3/2} |\mathcal{R}_{M,\lambda}| \cdot |\Omega|.$$

Dividing by $|\Omega| \sim \delta\tau$ finishes the proof. \square

2.3. Nearly lightlike separated pairs. For dyadic numbers $0 < \Delta \leq D < 1$, define the collection

$$\mathcal{L}_{D,\Delta}(X) = \{(v, w) \in X \times X : d(v, w) \sim D, \Delta(v, w) \sim \Delta\}.$$

We will refer to a pair $(v, w) \in \mathcal{L}_{D,\Delta}(X)$ as *nearly lightlike separated* when $\Delta \lesssim \delta$. A pair of nearly lightlike separated points is the same as a pair of nearly internally tangent circles in terms of point-circle duality. Let $\tau_D = \delta^{1/2} D^{-1/2}$, and recall

$$T(\tau_D) = \sup\{|X \cap \mathbf{D}_{10\delta}(\Omega)| : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ is a } \delta, \tau_D\text{-rectangle}\}$$

is the maximal number of circles of X that are 10-tangent to any δ, τ_D -rectangle. The reason for the definition $\tau_D = \delta^{1/2} D^{-1/2}$ is that if $d(v, w) \approx D$, then both v and w belong to an $\approx \delta \times \sqrt{\delta D} \times D$ -lightplank, and the circles v, w are $\gtrsim \delta, \tau_D$ -tangent, in the following sense.

Definition 2.8. *We say two circles v, w are $\gtrsim \delta, \tau$ -tangent if there are ≈ 1 -comparable δ, τ -rectangles $\Omega^{(v)} \subset C_{\delta,v}$, $\Omega^{(w)} \subset C_{\delta,w}$.*

Proposition 2.15. *If $(v, w) \in \mathcal{L}_{D,\Delta}(X)$ for $D \gg \delta$ and $\Delta \lesssim \delta$, then v, w are $\gtrsim \delta, \tau_D$ -tangent.*

Proof. Suppose $D \gg \delta$, $\Delta \lesssim \delta$, and $(v, w) \in \mathcal{L}_{D,\Delta}(X)$. We will find a $\approx \delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ -lightplank P such that both $v, w \in P$. By duality, for appropriate $\lambda \approx 1$,

$$\mathbf{D}_{\lambda\delta}^*(P) \cap C_{\delta,v} \text{ and } \mathbf{D}_{\lambda\delta}^*(P) \cap C_{\delta,w}$$

are ≈ 1 -comparable $\approx \delta, \tau_D$ -rectangles contained in $C_{\delta,v}$ and $C_{\delta,w}$, respectively, so this will finish the proof.

Recall Γ_v is the lightcone with vertex v . Let $w_0 \in \Gamma_v$ be the nearest point to w . By definition, $v - w_0$ is a lightlike vector, and since $\delta \ll D$, we have $|v - w_0| \sim |v - w| \sim D$ and $|w_0 - w| \sim \Delta(v, w) \lesssim \delta$. Choose a unit vector e_l parallel to $v - w_0$, another unit vector $e_m \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \{0\}$ orthogonal to $\pi_{\mathbb{R}^2}(v - w_0)$ (the projection of $v - w_0$ to \mathbb{R}^2), and a third unit vector e_s so that e_m, e_l, e_s is a lightlike basis for \mathbb{R}^3 . It suffices to check

- (i) $|\langle v - w, e_l \rangle| \lesssim \delta\tau_D^{-2}$,
- (ii) $|\langle v - w, e_m \rangle| \lesssim \delta\tau_D^{-1}$, and
- (iii) $|\langle v - w, e_s \rangle| \lesssim \delta$.

Since $\delta\tau_D^{-2} = D \sim |\langle v - w, e_l \rangle|$, and $\Delta(v, w) = |w - w_0| \sim |\langle v - w, e_s \rangle| \lesssim \delta$, only point (ii) needs elaboration. But by elementary geometry considerations, this is a simple consequence of the assumption $d(v, w) \sim D$ and $\Delta(v, w) \lesssim \delta$. \square

Proposition 2.16 (Covering by lightplanks). *There is an absolute constant $C > 1$ so that the following holds. If $(v, w) \in \mathcal{L}_{D, \Delta}(X)$ and \mathcal{R} is a maximal pairwise A -incomparable collection of δ, τ_D -rectangles contained in $\bigcup_{x \in X} C_{\delta, x}$, then there exists $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{R}$ so that $v, w \in \mathbf{D}_{CA^C\delta}(\Omega_0)$.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.15, there are ≈ 1 -comparable δ, τ_D -rectangles $\Omega^{(v)}, \Omega^{(w)}$ in $C_{\delta, v}, C_{\delta, w}$ respectively. By maximality of \mathcal{R} with respect to A -incomparability, there is some $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $\Omega^{(v)}$ is comparable to Ω_0 , hence $v \in \mathbf{D}_{CA^C\delta}(\Omega_0)$. Since $\Omega^{(v)}$ and $\Omega^{(w)}$ are comparable, by almost-transitivity (Proposition A.4), Ω_0 and $\Omega^{(w)}$ are CA^C -comparable. Hence $w \in \mathbf{D}_{CA^C\delta}(\Omega_0)$ for a large enough absolute constant C , and the claim is proved. \square

Theorem 2.4 (Nearly lightlike separated pairs for a 1-dimensional family of circles). *Suppose $X \subset Q = B(e_3, \alpha_0)$ is a set of δ -separated circles obeying the 1-dimensional Frostman non-concentration condition*

$$|X \cap B_r| \lesssim \frac{r}{\delta}, \quad \text{for all } r\text{-balls } B_r \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ and } r \geq \delta.$$

If $\Delta \lesssim \delta$ and $D \gg \delta$, then $|\mathcal{L}_{D, \Delta}(X)| \lesssim T(\tau_D)^{1/2}(\delta^{-1}D)^{1/2}|X|$, where $\tau_D = \delta^{1/2}D^{-1/2}$.

Proof. Let $A \approx 1$ be a parameter (take $A = \delta^{-\epsilon}$ for definiteness), and fix an arbitrary maximal pairwise A -incomparable collection \mathcal{R} of δ, τ_D -rectangles contained in $\bigcup_{x \in X} C_{\delta, x}$.

By Proposition 2.16, for a given $(v, w) \in \mathcal{L}_{D, \Delta}(X)$, we can find a rectangle $\Omega \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $v, w \in \mathbf{D}_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega)$ for some $\lambda = A^{O(1)}$, and we can write

$$\mathcal{L}_{D, \Delta}(X) \subset \bigcup_{\Omega \in \mathcal{R}} \{(v, w) \in X \times X : v, w \in \mathbf{D}_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega)\}.$$

By the union bound,

$$(20) \quad |\mathcal{L}_{D, \Delta}(X)| \leq \sum_{\Omega \in \mathcal{R}} |X \cap \mathbf{D}_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega)|^2 = \sum_{\Omega \in \mathcal{R}} \mu_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega)^2.$$

Recall that by Proposition 2.13, $\mu_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega) \lesssim T(\tau_D)$. We organize the last sum on the right-hand side of (20) by the dyadic value of $\mu_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega)$, up to $T(\tau_D)$. Letting $\mathcal{R}_{M, \lambda} = \{\Omega \in \mathcal{R} : \mu_{\lambda\delta}(\Omega) \sim M\}$, we estimate (20) by

$$\sum_{\substack{1 < M < T(\tau_D) \\ M \text{ dyadic}}} M^2 |\mathcal{R}_{M, \lambda}| \leq T(\tau_D)^{1/2} \sum_{1 < M < T(\tau_D)} M^{3/2} |\mathcal{R}_{M, \lambda}|.$$

By Proposition 2.14, for each M , $M^{3/2} |\mathcal{R}_{M, \lambda}| \lesssim \tau_D^{-1} |X| = (\delta^{-1}D)^{\frac{1}{2}} |X|$. As $T(\tau_D) \leq |X \cap Q| \lesssim \delta^{-1}$ for any 1-dimensional set of δ -separated circles in $Q = B(e_3, \alpha_0)$, there are ≈ 1 -many values of M in the sum, so we have shown $|\mathcal{L}_{D, \Delta}(X)| \lesssim T(\tau_D)^{1/2}(\delta^{-1}D)^{1/2}|X|$. This finishes the proof. \square

3. PROOF OF MAIN THEOREMS

In addition to the estimate of circle tangencies for a 1-dimensional set of circles, we need a pointwise bound for the Fourier transform of σ , a smooth surface carried measure on the cone segment. We state the version of the estimate we will use in the proof of Theorem 1.2 here. The proof of this lemma is contained in Appendix B.

Lemma 3.1. *Let σ be a smooth surface measure supported in Cone^2 . For any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a constant C_ϵ so that*

$$|\widetilde{d\sigma}(x)| \leq C_\epsilon \frac{1}{(1+|x|)^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}} \frac{1}{(1+d(x, \Gamma_0))^{100\epsilon-1}}$$

holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, where $\Gamma_0 = \{(a, r) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R} : |a| - |r| = 0\}$ is the lightcone with vertex 0.

Now we are ready to give the proof of Theorem 1.2, whose statement we recall here.

Theorem 3.1. *For each $\epsilon > 0$, there is a constant C_ϵ so the following holds for each $R > 1$. Suppose $X \subset B_R$ is a disjoint union of unit balls that satisfies the 1-dimensional Frostman non-concentration condition*

$$|X \cap B(x, r)| \lesssim r, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3, r > 1.$$

Let $\mathbf{P}(X)$ be the quantity

$$\mathbf{P}(X) = \sup\{|X \cap P| : P \text{ is a lightplank of dimensions } 1 \times R^{1/2} \times R\}.$$

Then for any measurable function $w : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and any $f \in L^2(\text{Cone}^2)$, the estimate

$$\int_X |E_{\text{Cone}^2} f| w \leq C_\epsilon R^\epsilon \mathbf{P}(X)^{1/4} \left(\int_X w \right)^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(d\sigma)}$$

holds.

Proof. For each dyadic $\eta \leq 1$, let X_η be the union of unit balls $Q \subset X$ satisfying $\int_Q w \sim \eta$. The sets X_η are pairwise disjoint, and we can write

$$\int_X |Ef| w = \sum_\eta \int_{X_\eta} |Ef| w.$$

Moreover,

$$\int_X w = \sum_\eta \int_{X_\eta} w = \sum_\eta \sum_{Q \subset X_\eta} \int_Q w \sim \sum_\eta \eta |X_\eta|.$$

Set $d\mu_\eta = w 1_{X_\eta} dx$. By duality, for an appropriate $|g| \leq 1$,

$$\int |Ef| d\mu_\eta = \int Ef \cdot g d\mu_\eta.$$

By Plancherel and Cauchy-Schwarz, this is bounded by

$$\left(\int_{\text{Cone}^2} |\widehat{g\mu_\eta}|^2 d\sigma \right)^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(d\sigma)}.$$

Next, we use Fourier transform properties, $|g| \leq 1$, and the triangle inequality to bound this by

$$\left(\iint_{X_\eta \times X_\eta} |\widetilde{d\sigma}(x-y)| w(x)w(y) dx dy \right)^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(d\sigma)}.$$

By dyadic pigeonholing and Lemma 3.1, up to a rapidly decaying tail, for some $1 < \rho < R$ this is bounded by

$$\left(\frac{1}{\rho^{1/2}} \sum_{\substack{Q_1, Q_2 \subset X_\eta \\ d(Q_1, Q_2) \sim \rho \\ \Delta(Q_1, Q_2) < R^\epsilon}} \iint_{Q_1 \times Q_2} w(x)w(y) dx dy \right)^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(d\sigma)}.$$

By the definition of X_η , $\iint_{Q_1 \times Q_2} w(x)w(y) dx dy \sim \eta^2$, so this is equal to

$$\left(\frac{\eta^2}{\rho^{1/2}} \#\{(Q_1, Q_2) \subset X_\eta \times X_\eta : d(Q_1, Q_2) \sim \rho, \Delta(Q_1, Q_2) < R^\epsilon\} \right)^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(d\sigma)}$$

Since X_η is a disjoint union of unit balls satisfying $|X_\eta \cap B_r| \leq |X \cap B_r| \lesssim r$ for all r -balls and $r \geq 1$, we use Pramanik–Yang–Zahl’s maximal estimate in the form of Theorem 2.4 (after rescaling the ball of radius R to a ball of radius 1) to bound this by

$$\left(\frac{\eta^2}{\rho^{1/2}} \cdot \rho^{1/2} \mathbf{P}(X_\eta)^{1/2} |X_\eta| \right)^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(d\sigma)}.$$

Simplifying and using $\mathbf{P}(X_\eta) \leq \mathbf{P}(X)$, we arrive at

$$\int_{X_\eta} |Ef|w \lesssim \mathbf{P}(X)^{1/4} \cdot \eta |X_\eta|^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(d\sigma)}.$$

Summing over $\eta > R^{-500}$ gives

$$\int_X |Ef|w \lesssim \mathbf{P}(X)^{1/4} \left(\sum_{\substack{\eta > R^{-500} \\ \eta \text{ dyadic}}} \eta |X_\eta|^{1/2} \right) \|f\|_{L^2(d\sigma)} + O(R^{-100}) \|f\|_{L^2(d\sigma)}.$$

There are ≈ 1 summands, so using Cauchy–Schwarz and neglecting the error term gives

$$\int_X |Ef|w \lesssim \mathbf{P}(X)^{1/4} \left(\sum_{\substack{\eta > R^{-500} \\ \eta \text{ dyadic}}} \eta^2 |X_\eta| \right)^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(d\sigma)}.$$

Finally, $\eta \leq 1$, and since $\sum_\eta \eta |X_\eta| \sim \int_X w$, we have arrived at the desired bound

$$\int_X |Ef|w \lesssim \mathbf{P}(X)^{1/4} \left(\int_X w \right)^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(d\sigma)}.$$

□

By taking w identically equal to 1 in Theorem 1.2, we have the following refinement of $\gamma_3(1) = 1/2$ we mentioned in the introduction (recall Definition 1.4):

Corollary 3.1 (Refinement of $\gamma_3(1) = 1/2$). *For each $\epsilon > 0$, there is a constant C_ϵ so the following holds for each $R > 1$. Suppose $X \subset B_R$ is a 1-dimensional disjoint union of unit balls, and let $d\mu = 1_X dx$. Let $\mathbf{P}(\mu)$ be the quantity*

$$\mathbf{P}(\mu) = \sup\{\mu(P) : P \text{ is a } 1 \times R^{1/2} \times R\text{-lightplank}\}.$$

Then the estimate

$$\int_{\text{Cone}^2} |\widehat{\mu}|^2 d\sigma \leq C_\epsilon R^\epsilon \mathbf{P}(\mu)^{1/2} \mu(B_R)$$

holds.

3.1. From Theorem 1.2 to Theorem 1.1. For each $1 \leq q < \infty$ and measurable $w: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, let $S_q(\mathcal{M}, w)$ be the smallest constant so that

$$\left(\int |E_{\mathcal{M}} f|^q w \right)^{1/q} \leq S_q(\mathcal{M}, w) \|f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}$$

holds for all $f \in L^2(\mathcal{M})$. If $w = 1_X$, the indicator function of a set X , then we write $S_q(\mathcal{M}, X)$ instead of $S_q(\mathcal{M}, 1_X)$. When $q = 1$, we have the following Proposition:

Proposition 3.1 (From Fourier averages to weighted Fourier extension estimates). *We have*

$$S_1(\mathcal{M}, X) \leq \sup_{\|h\|_{L^\infty(X)}=1} \left(\int_{\mathcal{M}} |\widehat{h}|^2 d\sigma \right)^{1/2}.$$

Proof. By duality, $\int_X |Ef| = \sup_{\|h\|_{L^\infty(X)}=1} \int_X Ef \cdot h$. By Plancherel and Cauchy–Schwarz, the claim follows. \square

At first glance, the estimate of $S_1(\mathcal{M}, X)$ in terms of Fourier averages in Proposition 3.1 may not seem so useful since we are interested in $S_2(\mathcal{M}, X)$, and by Hölder’s inequality, we have $S_1(\mathcal{M}, X) \leq |X|^{1/2} S_2(\mathcal{M}, X)$. However, the inequality $S_1(\mathcal{M}, X) \leq |X|^{1/2} S_2(\mathcal{M}, X)$ can essentially be reversed:

Theorem 3.2. *Let X be a disjoint union of N unit balls, and let $1 < q < \infty$. Let $q' = \frac{q}{q-1}$ be the Hölder conjugate exponent of q . Suppose that for some $A > 1$ (which is allowed to depend on X) and for every measurable function $w: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$, we know*

$$\int_X |Ef| w \leq A \left(\int_X w \right)^{\frac{1}{q'}} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})}.$$

Then for every f with $\|f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} = 1$,

$$\left(\int_X |Ef|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim A (\log N)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

In other words, if $S_1(\mathcal{M}, w1_X) \leq A (\int w1_X)^{1/q'}$ for every $w: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, 1]$, then $S_q(\mathcal{M}, X) \lesssim A (\log N)^{1/q}$.

Remark 3.1. *Theorem 3.2 is closely related to Lemma C.1 in Barceló–Bennett–Carbery–Rogers’ work on the dimension of divergence sets for dispersive equations [3].*

Proof. Let $\|f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} = 1$, and let $c > 0$ be very small to be determined. Note $|Ef| \leq \|f\|_{L^1(\mathcal{M})} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\mathcal{M})} = 1$, so we can write

$$\int_X |Ef|^q = \int_{X \cap \{|Ef| < c\}} |Ef|^q + \sum_{c < \lambda \lesssim 1} \int_{X \cap \{|Ef| \sim \lambda\}} |Ef|^q$$

where the sum is over dyadic values of λ . For the first term we can bound it by

$$\int_{X \cap \{|Ef| < c\}} |Ef|^q \leq c^q N < 1,$$

if $c < N^{-1/q}$. If this term dominates, we are done, so we assume the second term dominates. We write out the second term as

$$\sum_{c < \lambda \lesssim 1} \int_{X \cap \{|Ef| \sim \lambda\}} |Ef|^q \sim \sum_{c < \lambda < 1} \lambda^{q-1} \int_X |Ef| 1_{\{|Ef| \sim \lambda\}}.$$

By assumption, since $0 \leq 1_{\{|Ef| \sim \lambda\}} \leq 1$ and $\|f\|_{L^2} = 1$, this is bounded by

$$A \sum_{c < \lambda \lesssim 1} \lambda^{q-1} |X \cap \{|Ef| \sim \lambda\}|^{\frac{q-1}{q}}.$$

By Hölder's inequality, this is bounded by

$$A(\log N)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\sum_{c < \lambda \lesssim 1} \lambda^q |X \cap \{|Ef| \sim \lambda\}| \right)^{\frac{q-1}{q}} \lesssim A(\log N)^{\frac{1}{q}} \left(\int_X |Ef|^q \right)^{\frac{q-1}{q}}.$$

Finally, we cancel $(\int_X |Ef|^q)^{\frac{q-1}{q}}$ from both sides to obtain

$$\left(\int_X |Ef|^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \lesssim A(\log N)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

□

By Theorem 3.2, Theorem 1.1 holds as a corollary of Theorem 1.2.

Corollary 3.2. *Theorem 1.1 holds.*

Lastly, we describe examples that establish the sharpness of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 3.3. *For each $R > 1$, and each $T \in [1, R]$, there is a nonzero function $f \in L^2(\text{Cone}^2)$ and disjoint union of unit balls $X \subset B(0, R)$ satisfying the 1-dimensional Frostman condition*

$$|X \cap B(x, r)| \lesssim r, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3, r > 1,$$

such that $\mathbf{P}(X) \sim T$, and

$$\int_X |E_{\text{Cone}^2} f|^2 \gtrsim T^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(d\sigma)}.$$

Proof. We give one example with a small variation.

(1) Let $f = 1_\theta$, where

$$\theta = \left[1, \frac{3}{2}\right] \times \left[0, \frac{T^{-1/2}}{1000}\right] \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 1 < |\xi| < 2\}.$$

Let e_m, e_l, e_s be our favorite lightlike basis (see Remark 2.3), and set

$$P = \{x_m e_m + x_l e_l + x_s e_s : |x_m| \leq T^{1/2}, |x_l| \leq T, |x_s| \leq 1\}.$$

By definition of f , $E_{\text{Cone}^2} f(x) \gtrsim |\theta| \sim T^{-1/2}$ for $x \in P$.

Let X be any $1 \times 1 \times T$ -tube contained in the lightplank P . By construction, X is 1-dimensional and $\mathbf{P}(X) \gtrsim |X \cap P| \sim T$. Also, $\|f\|_{L^2(d\sigma)}^2 = |\theta| \sim T^{-1/2}$, and

$$\int_X |Ef|^2 \gtrsim T^{-1} |X \cap P| \sim T^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(d\sigma)}^2,$$

as desired.

- (2) As a small variation on the last example, we can also normalize $|X| = R$, with $\mathbf{P}(X) \sim T$. Let f and P be the same as in the first example, let X_P be any $1 \times 1 \times T$ tube contained in the lightplank P , and let X_V be a $1 \times 1 \times (R-T)$ -tube with direction e_3 . Let $X = X_P \cup X_V$. By construction, $|X| \sim R$ and X is 1-dimensional. Moreover, $\mathbf{P}(X) \sim T$ as any lightplank intersects X_V in a ball of radius $O(1)$. By the same calculation as in the first example, $\int_X |Ef|^2 \gtrsim T^{1/2} \|f\|_{L^2(d\sigma)}^2$.

□

4. REFINED DECOUPLING AND THE MIZOHATA–TAKEUCHI CONJECTURE

The current best progress on Conjecture 1.1 for spheres is based on an application of refined decoupling estimates (see Theorem 4.4 of [15]), and is due to Carbery, Iliopoulou, and Wang [8]. The special case of Carbery, Iliopoulou, and Wang’s main estimate for spheres when w is the indicator function of a disjoint union of unit balls is the following:

Theorem 4.1 (Carbery–Iliopoulou–Wang). *Let S be the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^n . For each $\epsilon > 0$, there is a constant C_ϵ so the following holds for each $R > 1$. Suppose $X \subset B_R$ is an arbitrary disjoint union of unit balls, and let $\mathbf{P}(X)$ be the quantity $\mathbf{P}(X) = \sup\{|X \cap P| : P \text{ is a } R^{1/2} \times \cdots \times R^{1/2} \times R\text{-tube (with any orientation)}\}$.*

Then for all $f \in L^2(S)$, the estimate

$$(21) \quad \int_X |E_S f|^2 \leq C_\epsilon R^\epsilon \mathbf{P}(X)^{\frac{2}{n+1}} \|f\|_{L^2(S)}^2$$

holds.

Theorem 4.1 is sharp by letting X be a set P as in the definition of $\mathbf{P}(X)$, and letting f be an appropriate Knapp example.

The sets P that are $R^{1/2} \times \cdots \times R^{1/2} \times R$ -tubes with directions orthogonal to S in the definition of $\mathbf{P}(X)$ have the same shape as the supports of wave packets in the wave packet decomposition of $E_S f$. As a consequence of Theorem 4.1, by covering one of the sets P with about $R^{\frac{n-1}{2}}$ -many $1 \times \cdots \times 1 \times R$ -tubes, Conjecture 1.1 holds with an $R^{\frac{n-1}{n+1}}$ -loss. Carbery–Iliopoulou–Wang show that it is impossible to improve on the $R^{\frac{n-1}{n+1}}$ -loss using decoupling in a precise sense. They prove their partial progress on Conjecture 1.1 for spheres is sharp given the decoupling axioms of Guth [16], which are an axiomatization of the two key ingredients used to prove Bourgain–Demeter’s celebrated decoupling theorem [5], namely local constancy, and local L^2 orthogonality.

Theorem 1.1 is a sharp weighted Fourier extension estimate for the cone in \mathbb{R}^3 and the 1-dimensional weights. By covering a $1 \times R^{1/2} \times R$ -lightplank with about $R^{1/2}$ -many $1 \times 1 \times R$ -tubes whose directions are orthogonal to Cone^2 , we deduce Corollary 1.1: the Mizohata–Takeuchi conjecture for the cone and the 1-dimensional weights holds with a power $R^{1/4}$ -loss. I would like to compare this with what we can achieve for Cone^2 and general sets using refined decoupling.

By applying refined decoupling estimates for Cone^2 (see Theorem A.1 of [17] for a precise statement of one version of refined decoupling theorem for the cone), we have the following sharp weighted Fourier extension theorem for Cone^2 and arbitrary disjoint unions of unit balls. I thank Ciprian Demeter for allowing me to include the statement of the following theorem.

Theorem 4.2 (Ciprian Demeter, 2023—private communication). *For each $\epsilon > 0$ there is a constant C_ϵ so the following holds for every $R > 1$. Let $X \subset B_R$ be an arbitrary disjoint union of unit balls.*

Let $\mathbf{P}(X)$ be the quantity

$$\mathbf{P}(X) = \sup\{|X \cap P| : P \text{ is a } 1 \times R^{1/2} \times R\text{-lightplank}\}.$$

Then for every $f \in L^2(\text{Cone}^2)$,

$$(22) \quad \int_X |E_{\text{Cone}^2} f|^2 \leq C_\epsilon R^\epsilon \mathbf{P}(X)^{2/3} \|f\|_{L^2(\text{Cone}^2)}^2.$$

A sharp example for the estimate (22) is to let X be a $1 \times R^{1/2} \times R$ -lightplank, and let f be a similar Knapp-type example as in Theorem 3.3. By covering a lightplank with $R^{1/2}$ -many $1 \times 1 \times R$ -tubes, Theorem 4.2 implies the Mizohata–Takeuchi conjecture for Cone^2 and general sets X with a $R^{1/3}$ -loss, which is slightly worse than the $R^{1/4}$ -loss we manage to prove holds for 1-dimensional sets in Corollary 1.1.

In Carbery–Iliopoulou–Wang’s work [8], the authors show how the $R^{1/3}$ -loss they get in their Mizohata–Takeuchi-type estimate for the unit circle S in the plane cannot be improved using Guth’s decoupling axioms alone because of an enemy scenario which obeys the decoupling axioms, but is not of the form $E_S f$ [16]. It would be very interesting to know whether a similar enemy scenario exists for the cone, and which would imply that it is impossible to improve the $R^{1/3}$ -loss in the Mizohata–Takeuchi conjecture for the cone in \mathbb{R}^3 and general sets X without using properties of the extension operator E_{Cone} beyond decoupling axioms.

APPENDIX A. LEMMAS OF CIRCLE GEOMETRY

In this Appendix we record a few facts about the geometry of overlapping circles and their corresponding dual lightplanks for use in Section 2. The first Lemma describes the region of intersection of two δ -annuli: generally two δ -annuli intersect in two δ, τ -rectangles for some τ depending on the distance and degree of internal tangency.

We recall our notation from Remark 2.1 that $Q = B(e_3, \alpha_0)$ for a small absolute constant ($\alpha_0 = 1/100$ will do).

Lemma A.1 (Wolff [26], Lemma 3.1 (a)). *Assume that v, w are two circles in Q . Let $d = d(v, w)$, and $\Delta = \Delta(v, w)$. Then*

$$|C_{\delta, v} \cap C_{\delta, w}| \lesssim \delta \cdot \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{(d + \delta)(\Delta + \delta)}}.$$

Corollary A.1. *If $\Omega \subset C_{\delta, v} \cap C_{\delta, w}$ is a δ, τ -rectangle, then*

$$\tau \lesssim \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{(d(v, w) + \delta)(\Delta(v, w) + \delta)}}$$

Proof. Let $d = d(v, w)$, $\Delta = \Delta(v, w)$. By Lemma A.1,

$$\delta \tau \sim |\Omega| \leq |C_{\delta, v} \cap C_{\delta, w}| \lesssim \delta \cdot \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{(d + \delta)(\Delta + \delta)}}.$$

Canceling δ from both sides of the inequality gives the desired result. \square

The next Proposition calculates the angle of intersection of two circles in terms of their distance and degree of internal tangency. The angle of intersection of two circles is a useful quantity when comparing lightlike coordinates. See Proposition 2.8 for our use of it in the proof of continuity of the tangency map.

Proposition A.1. *Suppose C_1, C_2 are two circles in Q (i.e., two points in Q) which intersect at a point $a \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Let u_1, u_2 be the positively oriented unit tangent vectors to C_1, C_2 , respectively at the point a . Then $\angle u_1, u_2 \sim \sqrt{d(C_1, C_2)\Delta(C_1, C_2)}$*

Proof. Without loss of generality, suppose $C_1 = (0, 0, r)$ and $C_2 = (b, 0, s)$ with $1 - \alpha_0 \leq s \leq r \leq 1 + \alpha_0$ and $b > 0$. With these choices, we have $d(C_1, C_2) = b + (r - s)$ and $\Delta(C_1, C_2) = |b - (r - s)|$. Consider the triangle T in the plane whose vertices are a , $(0, 0)$ and $(b, 0)$. By elementary geometry, the angle ϕ at the vertex a of T is the same as $\angle u_1, u_2$. By the law of cosines,

$$b^2 = r^2 + s^2 - 2rs \cos \phi.$$

Adding and subtracting $2rs$ and completing the square yields

$$b^2 = (r - s)^2 + 2rs(1 - \cos \phi).$$

Note that by definition, $d(C_1, C_2)\Delta(C_1, C_2) = |b^2 - (r - s)^2|$. Suppose $b > r - s$ (with a similar conclusion in the case $b \leq r - s$), so rearranging, we have

$$\frac{d(C_1, C_2)\Delta(C_1, C_2)}{rs} = 2(1 - \cos \phi).$$

Using the approximations $r, s \sim 1$ and $\cos \phi \sim 1 - \frac{\phi^2}{2}$, we obtain

$$d(C_1, C_2)\Delta(C_1, C_2) \sim \phi^2.$$

Taking square roots yields the claim. \square

Proposition A.2. *Suppose $\Omega^{(v)} \subset \bar{\Omega}^{(w)}$, where $\Omega^{(v)}$ is a δ, τ -rectangle, and $\bar{\Omega}^{(w)}$ is an $A\delta, A\tau$ -rectangle. Let a, \bar{a} be the center points of $\Omega^{(v)}$ and $\bar{\Omega}^{(w)}$, respectively, and let e_m, \bar{e}_m be the positively oriented unit tangent vectors to v, w at the points a, \bar{a} , respectively. Then $\angle e_m, \bar{e}_m \lesssim A^2\tau$.*

Proof. Let $d = d(v, w)$, $\Delta = \Delta(v, w)$, and let $\gamma, \bar{\gamma}$ denote the core arcs of $\Omega, \bar{\Omega}$. We make the same simplifying technical assumption that there exists a point $x \in \gamma \cap \bar{\gamma}$ to make use of Proposition A.1. To remove this assumption, we note by replacing v with a concentric circle of a slightly smaller or larger radius, we can arrange for $\gamma \cap \bar{\gamma} \neq \emptyset$, while keeping $\angle e_m, \bar{e}_m$ the same and $\Omega^{(v)} \subset \bar{\Omega}^{(w)}$. By Proposition A.1, the angle between the tangent lines to v and w at x , respectively, is $\sim \sqrt{d\Delta}$.

By the assumption $\Omega^{(v)} \subset \bar{\Omega}^{(w)}$, we have

$$(23) \quad |C_{A\delta, v} \cap C_{A\delta, w}| \geq |\Omega| \sim \delta\tau.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma A.1,

$$(24) \quad |C_{A\delta, v} \cap C_{A\delta, w}| \lesssim \frac{(A\delta)^2}{\sqrt{(d + A\delta)(\Delta + A\delta)}}.$$

Combining inequalities (23) and (24) and using $\delta^{1/2} \leq \tau$ gives

$$\sqrt{d\Delta} \lesssim (\delta\tau)^{-1}(A\delta)^2 \leq A^2\tau.$$

Finally, because $\text{dist}(a, x) + \text{dist}(x, \bar{a}) \lesssim A\tau$, by comparing angles at a and \bar{a} , we conclude $\angle e_m, \bar{e}_m = O(A^2)\tau + O(A)\tau = O(A^2)\tau$. \square

The following Proposition about engulfing rectangles is reminiscent of, but not the same as, Lemma 1.2 of Wolff's paper [25], so we include the proof here for completion.

Proposition A.3 (Engulfing). *Let $1 < A, B \lesssim 1$ and $\Omega^{(v)}$ be a δ, τ -rectangle contained in $C_{\delta, v} \cap C_{A\delta, w}$ for $v, w \in Q$. Suppose $\overline{\Omega}^{(w)}$ is an $A\delta, B\tau$ -rectangle contained in $C_{A\delta, w}$ which contains $\Omega^{(v)}$. Then there exists $A_1 \approx 1$ such that $\overline{\Omega}^{(w)} \subset C_{A_1 AB^2 \delta, v} \cap C_{A\delta, w}$.*

Remark A.1. *In terms of taking tangency in the sense of Definition 2.3, Proposition A.3 can be summarized succinctly as*

$$\Omega^{(v)} \subset \overline{\Omega}^{(w)} \implies v \in \mathbf{D}_{CAB^2\delta}(\overline{\Omega}^{(w)}),$$

provided C is sufficiently large. The threshold CAB^2 is probably not optimal, but the fact it is a polynomial in A and B is important.

Proof. Let $d = d(v, w)$, $\Delta = \Delta(v, w)$, and let $\gamma, \overline{\gamma}$ denote the core arcs of $\Omega^{(v)}, \overline{\Omega}^{(w)}$. We make the simplifying technical assumption that there exists a point $x \in \gamma \cap \overline{\gamma} \subset \Omega^{(v)}$. To remove this assumption, we note by replacing v with a concentric circle of a slightly smaller or larger radius, we can arrange for $\gamma \cap \overline{\gamma} \neq \emptyset$, while keeping $\Omega^{(v)} \subset \overline{\Omega}^{(w)}$.

By translating, scaling by a factor ~ 1 , and rotating our coordinate system if necessary, assume that $w = (0, 0, 1)$, $v = (a_1, a_2, s) =: (a, s)$, and that $x = 1$ is on the positive real axis (see Figure 7). In particular, we may assume that $\Omega^{(v)}$ is in our favorite position (see Remark 2.3), and its center is e_1 .

With this choice of coordinate system, it suffices to show (using complex notation) that for $|r - 1| < A\delta$ and $|\theta| \lesssim B\tau$, we have

$$|re^{i\theta} - a| = s + O(AB^2)\delta,$$

since in our chosen coordinate system, $\overline{\Omega}^{(w)} \subset \{re^{i\theta} : |r - 1| < A\delta, |\theta| \lesssim B\tau\}$.

So assume $|r - 1| < A\delta$ and $|\theta| \lesssim B\tau$. It follows by the triangle inequality we can replace $re^{i\theta}$ with $e^{i\theta}$ at the cost of $A\delta$. Next, because we assume $1 \in \gamma \cap \overline{\gamma}$, we have $s = |1 - a|$, so we can substitute $|1 - a|$ for s , and we are left with estimating

$$\|e^{i\theta} - a| - |1 - a|\|.$$

Because our circles lie in $Q = B(e_3, \alpha_0)$, we have the estimate $|e^{i\theta} - a| + |1 - a| \sim 1$. Therefore multiplying $\|e^{i\theta} - a| - |1 - a|\|$ by $|e^{i\theta} - a| + |1 - a|$, we only have to show

$$|e^{i\theta} - a|^2 - |1 - a|^2 = O(AB^2)\delta.$$

The upshot is we can use the trigonometric identity

$$\begin{aligned} |e^{i\theta} - a|^2 - |1 - a|^2 &= 2 \operatorname{Re}(a)(1 - \cos \theta) - 2 \operatorname{Im}(a) \sin \theta \\ &= O(\operatorname{Re}(a))\theta^2 + O(\operatorname{Im}(a))|\theta| \\ &\lesssim O(\operatorname{Re}(a))B^2\tau^2 + O(\operatorname{Im}(a))B\tau, \end{aligned}$$

and it suffices to estimate the components $a_1 = \operatorname{Re}(a)$ and $a_2 = \operatorname{Im}(a)$. We can use rectangle-lightplank duality to estimate both components simultaneously. We note $\Omega^{(v)} \subset C_{A\delta, w}$, so we have $w \in \mathbf{D}_{A\delta}(\Omega^{(v)})$, which is contained in an $\approx \delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ -lightplank, by Proposition 2.6. By projecting this lightplank down to the plane $\mathbb{R}^2 \times \{0\}$, we see that $|\operatorname{Re}(a)| \lesssim \delta\tau^{-2}$, and $|\operatorname{Im}(a)| \lesssim \delta\tau^{-1}$. Here we are using




FIGURE 7. Engulfing rectangles

that $\Omega^{(v)}$ is in our favorite position (see Remark 2.3) so $\mathbf{D}_{A\delta}(\Omega^{(v)}) \asymp P^{(o)}$, for a $\approx \delta \times \delta\tau^{-1} \times \delta\tau^{-2}$ -lightplank containing $o = e_3$.

Collecting the estimates we have made so far, we have shown for arbitrary $|r - 1| < A\delta$ and $|\theta| \lesssim B\tau$,

$$\|re^{i\theta} - a\| - s \lesssim A\delta + \delta\tau^{-2} \cdot B^2\tau^2 + A\delta\tau^{-1} \cdot B\tau \lesssim AB^2\delta.$$

This finishes the proof. \square

A useful fact about comparability is that that “being comparable” is almost a transitive relation. For the purpose of stating the next Proposition succinctly, if Ω, Ω' are A -comparable, we write $\Omega \asymp_A \Omega'$. See Proposition 2.16 on covering nearly lightlike separated pairs by lightplanks for our main application of this fact.

Proposition A.4 (Being comparable is almost transitive). *There is an absolute constant $C > 1$ such that if $\Omega^{(u)} \asymp_A \Omega^{(v)}$ and $\Omega^{(v)} \asymp_A \Omega^{(w)}$, then $\Omega^{(u)} \asymp_{C^A C} \Omega^{(w)}$.*

Proof. Recall the notation $u = (\bar{u}, u_3)$, $v = (\bar{v}, v_3)$, $w = (\bar{w}, w_3)$ for the points $u, v, w \in Q$, which we identify with circles $C_u, C_v, C_w \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ in the usual way. Consider the radial projection

$$\pi: \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{\bar{v}\} \rightarrow C_v, \quad z \mapsto \frac{z - \bar{v}}{|z - \bar{v}|}, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{\bar{v}\}$$

onto C_v . By assumption, $\pi(\Omega^{(u)} \cup \Omega^{(w)})$ is contained in an arc of length $\sim A\tau$ containing the core arc of $\Omega^{(v)}$. Therefore, by Proposition A.3, $\Omega^{(u)} \cup \Omega^{(w)} \subset C_{A^{O(1)}\delta, v}$, which finishes the proof. \square

APPENDIX B. FOURIER TRANSFORM OF SURFACE MEASURE ON THE CONE

Here we record Lemma 3.1 and its proof.

Lemma B.1 (Fourier transform estimate). *Let σ be a smooth surface measure supported in Cone^2 . For any $\epsilon > 0$ and any $N > 1$, there is a constant $C(\epsilon, N)$ so that*

$$|\check{\sigma}(x)| \leq C(\epsilon, N) \frac{1}{(1 + |x|)^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}} \frac{1}{(1 + d(x, \Gamma_0))^N}$$

holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, where Γ_0 is the lightcone $\{(a, r) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R} : ||a| - |r|| = 0\}$ with vertex 0.

Proof. We will prove this by combining two estimates for $|\check{\sigma}(x)|$:

- (i) $|\check{\sigma}(x)| \lesssim (1 + |x|)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}$
- (ii) For every N , $|\check{\sigma}(x)| \lesssim_N (1 + d(x, \Gamma_0))^{-N}$.

The conclusion follows by taking an appropriate geometric average of these two estimates. We may assume that $|x| \geq C$ for an appropriately large constant since $|\check{\sigma}(x)| \lesssim 1$ for $|x| \lesssim 1$.

We will start with (i). Suppose $|x| \sim r \gg 1$; our aim is to show $|\check{\sigma}(x)| \lesssim r^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}$. We divide Cone^2 into $\sim r^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon}$ -many strips θ of angular width $r^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}$ and let $\{\eta_\theta\}$ be a smooth partition of unity subordinate to $\{\theta\}$. Then with $\sigma_\theta = \sigma \eta_\theta$,

$$\check{\sigma}(x) = \sum_{\theta} \check{\sigma}_\theta(x).$$

For each θ , we let θ^* be the lightplank containing the origin of dimensions $1 \times r^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon} \times r^{1-2\epsilon}$ dual to the $r^{-1+2\epsilon}$ -neighborhood of θ . By the Schwartz decay of $\check{\sigma}_\theta(x)$, we have

$$|\check{\sigma}_\theta(x)| \lesssim_N |\theta| \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{-jN} 1_{2^j \theta^*}(x).$$

Since we assume $|x| \sim r \gg r^{1-2\epsilon}$, and the directions of θ^* are $r^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}$ -separated, x lies in at most $\lesssim 1$ of the θ^* . Therefore,

$$|\check{\sigma}_\theta(x)| \lesssim |\theta| \sim r^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}.$$

Now we prove (ii), but instead of using wave packets, we give a proof based on stationary phase considerations. For this proof, we use the notation $(x', x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}$ for points in \mathbb{R}^3 instead of the notation (\bar{x}, x_3) we used earlier. Let $x = (x', x_3)$ with $|x| \gg 1$. By the symmetry $(x', x_3) \mapsto (x', -x_3)$, we may assume that $x_3 > 0$. We also assume that $|x'| > x_3 > 0$; the case $|x'| < x_3$ is similar. For an appropriate smooth and compactly supported function $a(\xi)$ in $\{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 1 < |\xi| < 2\}$, we write

$$\check{\sigma}(x) = Ea(x) = \int a(\xi) e^{2\pi i(x' \cdot \xi + x_3 |\xi|)} d\xi.$$

Here E is the Fourier extension operator for the cone.

Let w be the nearest point on the cone Γ_0 to x . By elementary geometry, $x - w$ is orthogonal to the lightcone at w , and from this, we can compute the coordinates of w in terms of x :

$$w = w(x) = \left(\frac{|x'| + x_3}{2} \frac{x'}{|x'|}, \frac{|x'| + x_3}{2} \right).$$

Note from this formula for w that

$$d(x, \Gamma_0) = |x - w| \leq |x'| - x_3 \lesssim |x - w| = d(x, \Gamma_0),$$

so $d(x, \Gamma_0) \sim ||x'| - x_3|$. Write

$$\begin{aligned} Ea(x) &= Ea(w + (x - w)) = \int a(\xi) e^{2\pi i(w' \cdot \xi + w_3 |\xi|)} e^{2\pi i[(x' - w') \cdot \xi + (x_3 - w_3) |\xi|]} d\xi \\ &= \int a(\xi) e^{2\pi i(w' \cdot \xi + w_3 |\xi|)} e^{2\pi i \frac{|x'| - x_3}{2} (\frac{x'}{|x'|} \cdot \xi - |\xi|)} \\ &= \int a(\xi) e^{2\pi i \phi_1(\xi)} e^{2\pi i \lambda \phi_2(\xi)} d\xi, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1(\xi) &= w' \cdot \xi + w_3 |\xi| \\ \phi_2(\xi) &= \frac{x'}{|x'|} \cdot \xi - |\xi| \\ \lambda &= \lambda(x) = \frac{|x'| - x_3}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\Sigma_1 = \{1 < |\xi| < 2 : \nabla \phi_1(\xi) = 0\}$, and similarly denote $\Sigma_2 = \{1 < |\xi| < 2 : \nabla \phi_2(\xi) = 0\}$. Since w is the nearest point to x lying in Γ_0 , the critical points of $\phi_1(\xi)$ in $\{1 < |\xi| < 2\}$ are contained in the line segment

$$\Sigma_1 = \{1 < |\xi| < 2 : \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} = -\frac{x'}{|x'|}\}.$$

Likewise, Σ_2 is contained in the line segment

$$\Sigma_2 = \{1 < |\xi| < 2 : \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} = \frac{x'}{|x'|}\}.$$

Consider the open sets

$$U_1 = \{1 < |\xi| < 2 : \angle(\xi, -x') > \frac{1}{5}\}, \quad U_2 = \{1 < |\xi| < 2 : \angle(\xi, -x') < \frac{2}{5}\},$$

and a smooth partition of unity $\{\eta_1, \eta_2\}$ subordinate to $\{U_1, U_2\}$. By linearity, $Ea = E(a\eta_1) + E(a\eta_2)$. Since the phase $x' \cdot \xi + x_3 |\xi|$ has no critical points in U_1 , we have $|E(a\eta_1)(x)| \lesssim_N (1 + |x|)^{-N} \leq d(x, \Gamma_0)^{-N}$ by integrating by parts. Therefore, it suffices to show that $|E(a\eta_2)(x)| \lesssim_N d(x, \Gamma_0)^{-N}$.

Since we only work with $a\eta_2$ from now on, to reduce clutter, we let a_0 denote $a\eta_2$. By definition of Σ_2 ,

$$(25) \quad \text{dist}(\text{supp } a_0, \Sigma_2) \geq \frac{1}{100}.$$

Lastly, we note that the phase ϕ_2 satisfies

$$(26) \quad \sup\{|\partial^\alpha \phi_2(\xi)| : 1 < |\xi| < 2, |\alpha| \leq N\} \leq C_N$$

for each $N \geq 1$. Consider the following vector field and its transpose

$$L = \frac{1}{2\pi i \lambda} \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla, \quad L^t f = -\frac{1}{2\pi i \lambda} \nabla \cdot (f \mathbf{v})$$

where $\mathbf{v}(\xi) = \nabla\phi_2(\xi)/|\nabla\phi_2(\xi)|$, which is well defined and smooth throughout $\text{supp } a_0$ by Equation (25). By definition $Le^{2\pi i\lambda\phi_2} = e^{2\pi i\lambda\phi_2}$, and consequently integrating by parts one time,

$$\begin{aligned} Ea_0(x) &= \int L^t(a_0 e^{2\pi i\phi_1}) e^{2\pi i\lambda\phi_2} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi i\lambda} \int \nabla \cdot (a_0 e^{2\pi i\phi_1} \mathbf{v}) e^{2\pi i\lambda\phi_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the vector calculus identity

$$\nabla \cdot (fg\mathbf{v}) = f\nabla g \cdot \mathbf{v} + g\nabla f \cdot \mathbf{v} + fg\nabla \cdot \mathbf{v},$$

applied with $f = a_0$ and $g = e^{2\pi i\phi_1}$, we get

$$Ea_0(x) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i\lambda} \left(\int a_0 [2\pi i e^{2\pi i\phi_1} \nabla\phi_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}] e^{2\pi i\lambda\phi_2} + \int e^{2\pi i\phi_1} \underbrace{(\nabla a_0 \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} + a_0 \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v})}_{\equiv a_1} e^{2\pi i\lambda\phi_2} \right).$$

Note that

$$\nabla\phi_1(\xi) = w' + w_3 \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} = \left(\frac{|x'| + x_3}{2} \right) \left(\frac{x'}{|x'|} + \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} \right)$$

and

$$\mathbf{v} = \frac{1}{|\nabla\phi_2|} \left(\frac{x'}{|x'|} - \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} \right).$$

Therefore, $\nabla\phi_1 \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0$, so $Ea_0(x)$ simplifies to

$$Ea_0(x) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i\lambda} \int a_1 e^{2\pi i\phi_1} e^{2\pi i\lambda\phi_2}.$$

Repeating the same integration-by-parts argument N times with a_1 in place of a_0 , and then a_2 in place of a_1 , and so on, where

$$a_{j+1} = \nabla a_j \cdot \nabla \mathbf{v} + a_j \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v}, \quad j \geq 1,$$

we get

$$|Ea_0(x)| \leq \frac{C_N}{\lambda^N} \int |a_N|.$$

By Equations (25), (26) and the definition of \mathbf{v} , this is bounded by $C'_N/\lambda^N \sim_N \frac{1}{(|x'|-x_3)^N}$. Finally, since $|x'|-x_3 \sim d(x, \Gamma_0)$, we have proved

$$|Ea(x)| \lesssim_N \frac{1}{d(x, \Gamma_0)^N}.$$

Together with the proof of (i), this finishes the proof of the lemma. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] JA Barceló, JM Bennett, and Anthony Carbery. “A note on localised weighted inequalities for the extension operator”. In: *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society* 84.3 (2008), pp. 289–299.
- [2] Juan Antonio Barceló, Alberto Ruiz, and Luis Vega. “Weighted estimates for the Helmholtz equation and some applications”. In: *journal of functional analysis* 150.2 (1997), pp. 356–382.
- [3] Juan Antonio Barceló et al. “On the dimension of divergence sets of dispersive equations”. In: *Mathematische Annalen* 349.3 (2011), pp. 599–622.
- [4] Jonathan Bennett et al. “A Stein conjecture for the circle”. In: *Mathematische Annalen* 336 (2006), pp. 671–695.

- [5] Jean Bourgain and Ciprian Demeter. “The proof of the ℓ^2 decoupling conjecture”. In: *Annals of mathematics* (2015), pp. 351–389.
- [6] Jean Bourgain and Larry Guth. “Bounds on oscillatory integral operators based on multilinear estimates”. In: *Geometric and Functional Analysis* 21 (2011), pp. 1239–1295.
- [7] Anthony Carbery, Timo S Hänninen, and Stefán Ingi Valdimarsson. “Disentanglement, multilinear duality and factorisation for nonpositive operators”. In: *Analysis & PDE* 16.2 (2023), pp. 511–543.
- [8] Anthony Carbery, Marina Iliopoulou, and Hong Wang. “Some sharp inequalities of Mizohata–Takeuchi-type”. In: *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana* 40.4 (2024).
- [9] Anthony Carbery and Fernando Soria. “Pointwise Fourier inversion and localisation in \mathbb{R}^n ”. In: *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications* 3 (1997), pp. 847–858.
- [10] Xiumin Du and Ruixiang Zhang. “Sharp L^2 estimates of the Schrödinger maximal function in higher dimensions”. In: *Ann. of Math.(2)* 189.3 (2019), pp. 837–861.
- [11] Xiumin Du et al. “Weighted restriction estimates and application to Falconer distance set problem”. In: *American Journal of Mathematics* 143.1 (2021), pp. 175–211.
- [12] M Burak Erdoğan. “A note on the Fourier transform of fractal measures”. In: *Mathematical Research Letters* 11.3 (2004), pp. 299–313.
- [13] Kanghui Guo. “On the p -thin problem for hypersurfaces of \mathbb{R}^n with zero Gaussian curvature”. In: *Canadian Mathematical Bulletin* 36.1 (1993), pp. 64–73.
- [14] Larry Guth. “The endpoint case of the Bennett–Carbery–Tao multilinear Kakeya conjecture”. In: *Acta Mathematica* 205.2 (2010), pp. 263–286.
- [15] Larry Guth et al. “On Falconer’s distance set problem in the plane”. In: *Inventiones mathematicae* 219.3 (2020), pp. 779–830.
- [16] HAPPY. *Prof. Larry Guth (MIT) 2022 - An enemy scenario in restriction theory*. YouTube. 2022. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x-DET83UjFg>.
- [17] Terence LJ Harris. “Length of sets under restricted families of projections onto lines”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.06896* (2022).
- [18] Pertti Mattila. “Spherical averages of Fourier transforms of measures with finite energy; dimensions of intersections and distance sets”. In: *Mathematika* 34.2 (1987), pp. 207–228.
- [19] Sigeru Mizohata. *On the Cauchy problem*. Vol. 3. Academic Press, 2014.
- [20] Malabika Pramanik, Tongou Yang, and Joshua Zahl. “A Furstenberg-type problem for circles, and a Kaufman-type restricted projection theorem in \mathbb{R}^3 ”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.02259* (2022).
- [21] Per Sjölin. “Estimates of spherical averages of Fourier transforms and dimensions of sets”. In: *Mathematika* 40.2 (1993), pp. 322–330.
- [22] Terence Tao. “A sharp bilinear restriction estimate for paraboloids”. In: *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA* 13 (2003), pp. 1359–1384.
- [23] Thomas Wolff. “A Kakeya-type problem for circles”. In: *American Journal of Mathematics* 119.5 (1997), pp. 985–1026.

- [24] Thomas Wolff. “Decay of circular means of Fourier transforms of measures.” In: *IMRN: International Mathematics Research Notices* 1999.10 (1999).
- [25] Thomas Wolff. “Local smoothing type estimates on L^p for large p ”. In: *Geometric and functional analysis* 10.5 (2000), pp. 1237–1288.
- [26] Thomas Wolff. “Recent work connected with the Keakeya problem”. In: *Prospects in mathematics (Princeton, NJ, 1996)* 2.129-162 (1999), p. 4.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, 77 MASSACHUSETTS AVE, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139

Email address: `aeortiz@mit.edu`