

ANALYSIS & PDE

Volume 9

No. 5

2016

KEVIN HENRIOT, IZABELLA ŁABA AND MALABIKA PRAMANIK
ON POLYNOMIAL CONFIGURATIONS IN FRACTAL SETS



ON POLYNOMIAL CONFIGURATIONS IN FRACTAL SETS

KEVIN HENRIOT, IZABELLA ŁABA AND MALABIKA PRAMANIK

We show that subsets of \mathbb{R}^n of large enough Hausdorff and Fourier dimension contain polynomial patterns of the form

$$(x, x + A_1 y, \dots, x + A_{k-1} y, x + A_k y + Q(y)e_n), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, y \in \mathbb{R}^m,$$

where A_i are real $n \times m$ matrices, Q is a real polynomial in m variables and $e_n = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$.

1. Introduction

We investigate the presence of point configurations in subsets of \mathbb{R}^n which are large in a certain sense. When E is a subset of \mathbb{R}^n of positive Lebesgue measure, a consequence of the Lebesgue density theorem is that E contains a similar copy of any finite set. A more difficult result of Bourgain [1986] states that sets of positive upper density in \mathbb{R}^n contain, up to isometry, all large enough dilates of the set of vertices of any fixed nondegenerate $(n-1)$ -dimensional simplex. In a different setting, Roth's theorem [1953] in additive combinatorics states that subsets of \mathbb{Z} of positive upper density contain nontrivial 3-term arithmetic progressions.

When a subset $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ is only assumed to have a positive Hausdorff dimension, a direct analogue of Roth's theorem is impossible. Indeed Keleti [1999] has constructed a set of full dimension in $[0, 1]$ not containing the vertices of any nondegenerate parallelogram, and in particular not containing any nontrivial 3-term arithmetic progression. Maga [2011] has since extended this construction to dimensions $n \geq 2$. The work of Łaba and Pramanik [2009] and its multidimensional extension by Chan et al. [2016] circumvent these obstructions under additional assumptions on the set E , which we now describe.

When E is a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^n , Frostman's lemma [Wolff 2003, Chapter 8] essentially states that its Hausdorff dimension is equal to

$$\dim_{\mathcal{H}} E = \sup \left\{ \alpha \in [0, n) : \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n, r > 0} \mu(B(x, r)) r^{-\alpha} < \infty \text{ for some } \mu \in \mathcal{M}(E) \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{M}(E)$ is the space of probability measures supported on E . On the other hand, the Fourier dimension of E is

$$\dim_{\mathcal{F}} E = \sup \left\{ \beta \in [0, n) : \sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n} |\hat{\mu}(\xi)| (1 + |\xi|)^{-\beta/2} < \infty \text{ for some } \mu \in \mathcal{M}(E) \right\}.$$

This work was supported by NSERC Discovery grants 22R80520 and 22R82900.

MSC2010: primary 11B30; secondary 28A80.

Keywords: configurations in fractals, additive combinatorics.

It is well-known that we have $\dim_{\mathcal{F}}(E) \leq \dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E)$ for every compact set E , with strict inequality in many instances, and we call E a Salem set when equality holds. There are various known constructions of Salem sets [Salem 1951; Kaufman 1981; Bluhm 1996; 1998; Kahane 1985; Łaba and Pramanik 2009; Hambrooke 2016], several of which [Körner 2011; Chen 2016] also produce sets with prescribed Hausdorff and Fourier dimensions $0 < \beta \leq \alpha < n$.

In a very abstract setting, one may ask whether it is possible to find translation-invariant patterns of the form

$$\Phi(x, y) = (x, x + \varphi_1(y), \dots, x + \varphi_k(y)) \tag{1-1}$$

in the product set $E \times \dots \times E$, where the $\varphi_j : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ are certain shift functions. When $n + m \geq (k + 1)n$, the map Φ is often a submersion of an open subset of \mathbb{R}^{n+m} onto $\mathbb{R}^{(k+1)n}$, and then one can find a pattern of the desired kind in E via the implicit function theorem. A natural restriction is therefore to assume that $m < kn$ in this multidimensional setting. Chan et al. [2016] studied the case where the maps $\varphi_j(y) = A_j y$ are linear for matrices $A_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, generalizing the study of Łaba and Pramanik for 3-term arithmetic progressions, under the following technical assumption:

Definition 1.1. Let $n, k, m \geq 1$ and suppose that $m = (k - r)n + n'$ with $1 \leq r < k$ and $0 \leq n' < n$. We say that the system of matrices $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is nondegenerate when

$$\text{rk} \begin{bmatrix} A_{j_1}^\top & \dots & A_{j_{k-r+1}}^\top \\ I_{n \times n} & \dots & I_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix} = (k - r + 1)n$$

for every set of indices $\{j_1, \dots, j_{k-r+1}\} \subset \{0, \dots, k\}$, with the convention that $A_0 = 0_{n \times n}$.

Requirements similar to the above arise when analyzing linear patterns by ordinary Fourier analysis in additive combinatorics [Roth 1954], and there is a close link with the modern definition of linear systems of complexity one [Gowers and Wolf 2010]. The main result of [Chan et al. 2016] gives a fractal analogue of the multidimensional Szemerédi theorem [Furstenberg and Katznelson 1978] for nondegenerate linear systems when the Frostman measure has both dimensional and Fourier decay. We only state it in the case where n divides m for simplicity.

Theorem 1.2 (Chan, Łaba and Pramanik). *Let $n, k, m \geq 1, D \geq 1$ and $\alpha, \beta \in (0, n)$. Suppose that E is a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^n and μ is a probability measure supported on E such that¹*

$$\mu(B(x, r)) \leq Dr^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad |\hat{\mu}(\xi)| \leq D(n - \alpha)^{-D}(1 + |\xi|)^{-\beta/2}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n, r > 0$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose that (A_1, \dots, A_k) is a nondegenerate system of $n \times m$ matrices in the sense of Definition 1.1. Assume finally that $m = (k - r)n$ with $1 \leq r < k$ and, for some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\left\lceil \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil n \leq m < kn, \quad \frac{2(kn - m)}{k + 1} + \varepsilon \leq \beta < n, \quad n - c_{n,k,m,\varepsilon,D,(A_i)} \leq \alpha < n$$

¹In fact, this theorem was proved in [Chan et al. 2016] under the more restrictive condition $|\hat{\mu}(\xi)| \leq D(1 + |\xi|)^{-\beta/2}$ for a fixed constant D . However, by examining the proof there, one can see that the constant $D = D_\alpha$ may be allowed to grow polynomially in $n - \alpha$, as was the case in the original argument of [Łaba and Pramanik 2009].

for a sufficiently small constant $c_{n,k,m,\varepsilon,D,(A_i)} > 0$. Then, for every collection of strict subspaces V_1, \dots, V_q of \mathbb{R}^{n+m} , there exists $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \setminus V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_q$ such that

$$(x, x + A_1y, \dots, x + A_ky) \in E^{k+1}.$$

Note that the Hausdorff dimension α is required to be large enough with respect to the constants involved in the dimensional and Fourier decay bounds for the Frostman measure. A construction due to Shmerkin [2015] shows that the dependence of α on the constants cannot be removed.

In practice, Salem set constructions provide a family of fractal sets indexed by α , and it is often possible to verify the conditions of Theorem 1.2 for α close to n ; this was done in a number of cases in [Łaba and Pramanik 2009]. The requirement of Fourier decay of the measure μ serves as an analogue of the notion of pseudorandomness in additive combinatorics [Tao and Vu 2006], under which we expect a set to contain the same density of patterns as a random set of the same size.

In this work we consider a class of polynomial patterns, which generalizes that of Theorem 1.2. We aim to obtain results similar in spirit to the Furstenberg–Sárközy theorem [Sárközy 1978; Furstenberg 1977] in additive combinatorics, which finds patterns of the form $(x, x + y^2)$ in dense subsets of \mathbb{Z} . A deep generalization of this result is the multidimensional polynomial Szemerédi theorem in ergodic theory of [Bergelson and Leibman 1996; Bergelson and McCutcheon 2000] (see also [Bergelson et al. 2008, Section 6.3]), which handles patterns of the form (1-1) where each shift function φ_j is an integer polynomial vector with zero constant term. By contrast, the class of patterns we study includes only one polynomial term, which should satisfy certain nondegeneracy conditions. We are also forced to work with a dimension $n \geq 2$, and all these limitations are due to the inherent difficulty in analyzing polynomial patterns through Fourier analysis. On the other hand, we are able to relax the Fourier decay condition on the fractal measure needed in Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $n, m, k \geq 2, D \geq 1$ and $\alpha, \beta \in (0, n)$. Suppose that E is a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^n and μ is a probability measure supported on E such that*

$$\mu(B(x, r)) \leq Dr^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad |\hat{\mu}(\xi)| \leq D(n - \alpha)^{-D}(1 + |\xi|)^{-\beta/2}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n, r > 0$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose that (A_1, \dots, A_k) is a nondegenerate system of real $n \times m$ matrices in the sense of Definition 1.1. Let Q be a real polynomial in m variables such that $Q(0) = 0$ and the Hessian of Q does not vanish at zero. Assume furthermore that, for a constant $\beta_0 \in (0, n)$,

$$(k - 1)n < m < kn, \quad \beta_0 \leq \beta < n, \quad n - c_{\beta_0,n,k,m,D,(A_i),Q} < \alpha < n$$

for a sufficiently small constant $c_{\beta_0,n,k,m,D,(A_i),Q} > 0$. Then, for every collection V_1, \dots, V_q of strict subspaces of \mathbb{R}^{m+n} , there exists $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+n} \setminus (V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_q)$ such that

$$(x, x + A_1y, \dots, x + A_{k-1}y, x + A_ky + Q(y)e_n) \in E^{k+1}, \tag{1-2}$$

where $e_n = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$.

Our argument broadly follows the transference strategy devised by Łaba and Pramanik [2009] and its extension by Chan and these two authors [Chan et al. 2016]. However, the case of polynomial

configurations requires a more delicate treatment of the singular integrals arising in the analysis. The weaker condition on β is obtained by exploiting restriction estimates for fractal measures due to Mitsis [2002] and Mockenhaupt [2000]. A more detailed outline of our strategy can be found in Section 3. By the method of this paper, one can also obtain an analogue of Theorem 1.2 with the same relaxed condition on the exponent β , and we state this version precisely in Section 9.

For concreteness's sake, we highlight the lowest-dimensional situation handled by Theorem 1.3. When $k = n = 2$ and $m = 3$, this theorem allows us to detect patterns of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} + A_1 \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \\ y_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} + A_2 \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \\ y_3 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ Q(y_1, y_2, y_3) \end{bmatrix}$$

for matrices $A_1, A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 3}$ of full rank such that $A_1 - A_2$ has full rank and for a nondegenerate quadratic form Q in three variables. We may additionally impose that $y_1, y_2, y_3 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ by setting $V_i = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^5 : y_i = 0\}$ in Theorem 1.3. For example, when $A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $Q(y) = |y|^2$, we can detect the configuration

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} x_1 + y_1 \\ x_2 + y_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} x_1 + y_3 \\ x_2 + y_1 + y_1^2 + y_2^2 + y_3^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

with $y_1, y_2, y_3 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. However, we cannot detect the configuration

$$(x, x + y, x + y^2), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\},$$

for then we have $n = m = 1$ and $k = 2$, and the condition $m > (k - 1)n$ is not satisfied.

Note also that, in the statement of Theorem 1.3, one may add a linear term in variables y_1, \dots, y_m to the polynomial Q without affecting the assumptions on it. This allows for some flexibility in satisfying the matrix nondegeneracy conditions of Definition 1.1, since one may alter the last line of A_k at will. For example, the degenerate system of matrices $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and the polynomial $Q(y) = |y|^2$ give rise to the configuration

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} x_1 + y_1 \\ x_2 + y_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} x_1 + y_3 \\ x_2 + |y|^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Rewriting $|y|^2 = y_1 + y_2 + y_3 + Q_1(y)$, we see that Q_1 still has nondegenerate Hessian at zero and the configuration is now associated to the system of matrices $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, which is easily seen to be nondegenerate. One possible explanation for this curious phenomenon is that, by comparison with the setting of Theorem 1.2, we have an extra variable at our disposition, since $m > (k - 1)n \geq \lceil \frac{1}{2}k \rceil n$.

Finally, we note that there is a large body of literature on configurations in fractal sets where Fourier decay assumptions are not required. Here, the focus is often on finding a large variety (in a specified quantitative sense) of certain types of configurations. A well-known conjecture of Falconer [Wolff 2003, Chapter 9] states that when a compact subset E of \mathbb{R}^n has Hausdorff dimension at least $\frac{1}{2}n$, its set of distances $\Delta(E) = \{|x - y| : x, y \in E\}$ must have positive Lebesgue measure. This can be phrased in terms of E containing configurations $\{x, y\}$ with $|x - y| = d$ for all $d \in \Delta(E)$, where $\Delta(E)$ is

“large”. Wolff [1999] and Erdoğan [2005; 2006] proved that the distance set $\Delta(E)$ has positive Lebesgue measure for $\dim_{\mathcal{H}} E > \frac{1}{2}n + \frac{1}{3}$, and Mattila and Sjölin [1999] showed that it contains an open interval for $\dim_{\mathcal{H}} E > \frac{1}{2}(n + 1)$. More recently, Orponen [2015] proved using very different methods that $\Delta(E)$ has upper box dimension 1 if E is s -Ahlfors–David regular with $s \geq 1$. There is a rich literature generalizing these results to other classes of configurations, such as triangles [Greenleaf and Iosevich 2012], simplices [Grafakos et al. 2015; Greenleaf et al. 2014a], and sequences of vectors with prescribed consecutive lengths [Bennett et al. 2015; Greenleaf et al. 2014b].

In a sense, the configurations studied in these references enjoy a greater degree of directional freedom, which ensures that they are not avoided by sets of full Hausdorff dimension. By contrast, a Fourier decay assumption is necessary to locate 3-term progressions in a fractal set of full Hausdorff dimension (as mentioned earlier) and, in light of recent work of Máthé [2012], it is likely that a similar assumption is needed to find polynomial patterns of the form (1-2). It is, however, possible that our nondegeneracy assumptions are not optimal, or that special cases of our results could be proved without Fourier decay assumptions.² Loosely speaking, we would expect that configurations with more degrees of freedom are less likely to require Fourier conditions, but the specifics are far from understood and we do not feel that we have sufficient data to attempt to make a conjecture in this direction.

2. Notation

We define the following standard spaces of complex-valued functions and measures:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d) &= \{\text{continuous functions on } \mathbb{R}^d\}, \\ \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d) &= \{\text{Schwartz functions on } \mathbb{R}^d\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) &= \{\text{smooth compactly supported functions on } \mathbb{R}^d\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_{c,+}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) &= \{\text{nonnegative smooth compactly supported functions on } \mathbb{R}^d\}, \\ \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^d) &= \{\text{finite nonnegative Borelian measures on } \mathbb{R}^d\}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar notation is employed for functions on \mathbb{T}^d . We write $e(x) = e^{2i\pi x}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. We let \mathcal{L} denote either the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^d or the normalized Haar measure on \mathbb{T}^d . We let $d\sigma$ denote generically the Euclidean surface measure on a submanifold of \mathbb{R}^d . When f is a function on an abelian group G and t is an element of G , we denote the t -shift of f by $T^t f(x) = f(x + t)$. When A is a matrix we denote its transpose by A^\top . We also write $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ for an integer n and $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

3. Broad scheme

In this section we introduce the basic objects that we will work with in this paper. We also state the intermediate propositions corresponding to the main steps of our argument, and we derive Theorem 1.3 from them at the outset.

²After this article was first submitted for publication, a result of this type was indeed proved by Iosevich and Liu [2016].

We fix a compact set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and a probability measure μ supported on E . For technical reasons, we suppose that $E \subset [-\frac{1}{16}, \frac{1}{16}]^n$. We fix two exponents $0 < \beta \leq \alpha < n$, as well as two constants $D, D_\alpha \geq 1$, where the subscript in the second constant indicates that it is allowed to vary with α . We assume that the measure μ verifies the following dimensional and Fourier decay conditions:

$$\mu(B(x, r)) \leq Dr^\alpha \quad (x \in \mathbb{R}^n, r > 0), \tag{3-1}$$

$$|\hat{\mu}(\xi)| \leq D_\alpha(1 + |\xi|)^{-\beta/2} \quad (\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n). \tag{3-2}$$

We suppose that the second constant involved blows up (if at all) at most polynomially as α tends to n :

$$D_\alpha \lesssim (n - \alpha)^{-O(1)}. \tag{3-3}$$

We also let $k \geq 3$ and we consider smooth functions $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, where Ω is an open neighborhood of zero. We are interested in locating the pattern

$$\Phi(x, y) = (x, x + \varphi_1(y), \dots, x + \varphi_k(y)) \tag{3-4}$$

in E^{k+1} . While this abstract notation is sometimes useful, in practice we work with the maps

$$(\varphi_1(y), \dots, \varphi_k(y)) = (A_1y, \dots, A_{k-1}y, A_ky + Q(y)e_n), \tag{3-5}$$

where (A_1, \dots, A_k) is a nondegenerate system of $n \times m$ matrices in the sense of [Definition 1.1](#) and $Q \in \mathbb{R}[y_1, \dots, y_m]$ is such that $Q(0) = 0$ and the Hessian of Q does not vanish at zero. We also fix a smooth cutoff $\psi \in \mathcal{C}_{c,+}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$ supported on Ω such that $\psi \geq 1$ on a small box $[-c, c]^m$ and the Hessian of Q is bounded away from zero on the support of ψ . This cutoff is used in [Definition 3.2](#) below. We take the opportunity here to state an equivalent form of [Definition 1.1](#) when $m \geq (k - 1)n$.

Definition 3.1. If $m \geq (k - 1)n$, we say that the system of matrices $(A_i)_{1 \leq i \leq k}$ with $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is nondegenerate when, for every $1 \leq j \leq k$, and writing $[k] = \{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}, j\}$, the matrices

$$[A_1^\top \dots \hat{A}_j^\top \dots A_k^\top], \quad [(A_{i_1}^\top - A_j^\top) \dots (A_{i_{k-1}}^\top - A_j^\top)]$$

(where the hat indicates omission) have rank $(k - 1)n$.

We also state a few notational conventions applied throughout the article. When (A_1, \dots, A_k) is a system of $n \times m$ matrices, we define the $kn \times m$ matrix A by $A^\top = [A_1^\top \dots A_k^\top]$. Unless mentioned otherwise, we allow every implicit or explicit constant in the article to depend on the integers n, k, m , the constant D , the matrices A_i and the polynomial Q , and the cutoff function ψ . This convention is already in effect in the propositions stated later in this section.

We start by defining a multilinear form which plays a central role in our argument.

Definition 3.2 (configuration form). For functions $f_0, \dots, f_k \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we let

$$\Lambda(f_0, \dots, f_k) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f_0(x) f_1(x + \varphi_1(y)) \dots f_k(x + \varphi_k(y)) dx \psi(y) dy.$$

In [Section 4](#), we show that the multilinear form has the following convenient Fourier expression:

Proposition 3.3. For measurable functions F_0, \dots, F_k on \mathbb{R}^n and K on \mathbb{R}^{nk} , we let

$$\Lambda^*(F_0, \dots, F_k; K) = \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} F_0(-\xi_1 - \dots - \xi_k) F_1(\xi_1) \cdots F_k(\xi_k) K(\xi) \, d\xi \tag{3-6}$$

whenever the integral is absolutely convergent or the integrand is nonnegative. For all $f_0, \dots, f_k \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have

$$\Lambda(f_0, \dots, f_k) = \Lambda^*(\hat{f}_0, \dots, \hat{f}_k; J),$$

where J is the oscillatory integral of [Definition 4.1](#).

We may extend the configuration operator to measures whenever we have absolute convergence of the dual form:

Definition 3.4. When $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are such that $\Lambda^*(|\hat{\lambda}_0|, \dots, |\hat{\lambda}_k|; |J|) < \infty$, we define

$$\Lambda(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_k) = \Lambda^*(\hat{\lambda}_0, \dots, \hat{\lambda}_k; J).$$

When $\lambda_j \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, this is compatible with [Definition 3.2](#) by [Proposition 3.3](#).

The next step, carried out in [Section 5](#), is to obtain bounds for the dual multilinear form evaluated at the Fourier–Stieltjes transform of the fractal measure μ . Such bounds hold only in certain ranges of α, β and under certain restrictions on n, k, m .

Proposition 3.5. Let $\beta_0 \in (0, n)$ and suppose that, for a constant $c > 0$ small enough with respect to n, k and m ,

$$(k - 1)n < m < kn, \quad \beta_0 \leq \beta < n, \quad n - c\beta_0 \leq \alpha < n. \tag{3-7}$$

Then

$$|\Lambda^*(|\hat{\mu}|, \dots, |\hat{\mu}|; |J|)| \lesssim_{\beta_0} (n - \alpha)^{-O(1)}. \tag{3-8}$$

Recalling [Definition 3.4](#), we see that $\Lambda(\mu, \dots, \mu)$ is well-defined under the conditions [\(3-7\)](#). In practice, we will need slight variants of [Proposition 3.5](#), which are discussed in [Section 5](#). In the same section, we obtain singular integral bounds for bounded functions of compact support.

Proposition 3.6. Suppose that $m > (k - 1)n$. Then there exists $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ depending at most on n, k and m such that the following holds: for functions $f_0, \dots, f_k \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with support in $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^n$,

$$|\Lambda(f_0, \dots, f_k)| \lesssim \prod_{0 \leq j \leq k} \|\hat{f}_j\|_\infty^\varepsilon \cdot \|f_j\|_\infty^{1-\varepsilon}.$$

In [Section 6](#), we construct a measure detecting polynomial configurations, by exploiting the finiteness of the singular integral in [\(3-8\)](#) and the uniform decay of the fractal measure.

Proposition 3.7. Let $\beta_0 \in (0, n)$ and suppose that [\(3-7\)](#) holds. Then there exists a measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ such that

- $\|\nu\| = \Lambda(\mu, \dots, \mu)$,
- ν is supported on the set of $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \Omega$ such that $(x, x + \varphi_1(y), \dots, x + \varphi_k(y)) \in E^{k+1}$,
- $\nu(H) = 0$ for every hyperplane $H < \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$.

In [Section 7](#), we show how to obtain a positive mass of polynomial configurations in sets of positive density, through the singular integral bound of [Proposition 3.6](#) and the arithmetic regularity lemma from additive combinatorics.

Proposition 3.8. *Suppose that $m > (k - 1)n$. Then, uniformly for every function $f \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\text{Supp } f \subset [-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}]^n$, $0 \leq f \leq 1$ and $\int f = \tau \in (0, 1]$, we have*

$$\Lambda(f, \dots, f) \gtrsim_\tau 1.$$

In [Section 8](#), we show how to obtain a positive mass of configurations by a transference argument, by which the fractal measure μ is replaced by a mollified version of itself which is absolutely continuous with bounded density, allowing us to invoke [Proposition 3.8](#).

Proposition 3.9. *Let $\beta_0 \in (0, n)$ and suppose that*

$$(k - 1)n < m < kn, \quad \beta_0 \leq \beta < n, \quad n - c(\beta_0) \leq \alpha < n$$

for a sufficiently small constant $c(\beta_0) > 0$. Then

$$\Lambda(\mu, \dots, \mu) > 0.$$

At this stage we have stated all the necessary ingredients to prove the main theorem.

Proof of [Theorem 1.3](#). We may assume that $E \subset [-\frac{1}{16}, \frac{1}{16}]^n$ after a translation and dilation, which does not affect the assumptions on μ , (A_i) and Q except for the introduction of constant factors in bounds. By [Proposition 3.7](#), there exists a measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ with mass $\Lambda(\mu, \dots, \mu)$ supported on

$$X = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \Omega : (x, x + A_1 y, \dots, x + A_{k-1} y, x + A_k y + Q(y)e_n) \in E^{k+1}\}$$

and such that $\nu(V_i) = 0$ for every collection of hyperplanes V_1, \dots, V_q of \mathbb{R}^{n+m} . We have therefore proven the result if we can show that $\|\nu\| = \Lambda(\mu, \dots, \mu) > 0$, for then $\nu(X \setminus (V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_q)) > 0$ and the set $X \setminus (V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_q)$ cannot be empty. We may apply [Proposition 3.9](#) to obtain precisely this conclusion when α is close enough to n with respect to β_0 (and the other implicit parameters n, k, m, D, A, Q). \square

To conclude this outline, we comment briefly on the role that the Fourier decay hypothesis plays in our argument. Using the restriction theory of fractals, the assumption (3-2) is used together with the ball condition (3-1) in [Appendix B](#) to deduce that $\|\hat{\mu}\|_{2+\varepsilon} < \infty$ for an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$, provided that α is close enough to n (depending on ε). The Hausdorff dimension condition (3-1) alone does yield information on the average Fourier decay of μ , via the energy formula [[Wolff 2003](#), Chapter 8], but this type of estimate seems to be insufficient to establish the boundedness of the singular integrals we encounter. [Section 5](#) on singular integral bounds and [Section 7](#) on absolutely continuous estimates only use the Fourier moment bound above. On the other hand, the estimation of degenerate configurations in [Section 6](#) and the transference argument of [Section 8](#) exploit in an essential way the assumption of uniform Fourier decay.

4. Counting operators and Fourier expressions

In this section we describe the various types of pattern-counting operators and singular integrals that arise in trying to detect translation-invariant patterns in the fractal set of the introduction. First, we define an oscillatory integral which arises naturally in the Fourier expression of the configuration form in [Definition 3.2](#).

Definition 4.1 (oscillatory integral). For $\xi \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^k$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^m$ we define

$$J_\theta(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} e[(\theta + A^T \xi) \cdot y + \xi_{kn} Q(y)] \psi(y) \, dy, \quad J = J_0.$$

We now derive the dual expression of the configuration form announced in [Section 3](#).

Proof of Proposition 3.3. By inserting the Fourier expansions of f_1, \dots, f_k and using Fubini, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(f_0, \dots, f_k) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f_0(x) f_1(x + \varphi_1(y)) \cdots f_k(x + \varphi_k(y)) \, dx \, \psi(y) \, dy \\ &= \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} \hat{f}_1(\xi_1) \cdots \hat{f}_k(\xi_k) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_0(x) e[(\xi_1 + \cdots + \xi_k) \cdot x] \, dx \\ &\quad \times \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} e[\xi_1 \cdot \varphi_1(y) + \cdots + \xi_k \cdot \varphi_k(y)] \psi(y) \, dy \, d\xi_1 \cdots d\xi_k. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling [Definition 4.1](#) and the choice (3-5), we deduce that

$$\Lambda(f_0, \dots, f_k) = \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} \hat{f}_0(-\xi_1 - \cdots - \xi_k) \hat{f}_1(\xi_1) \cdots \hat{f}_k(\xi_k) J(\xi) \, d\xi_1 \cdots d\xi_k. \quad \square$$

We single out a useful bound for the configuration operator, typically used when the λ_i are either the measure μ or a mollified version of it.

Proposition 4.2. For measures $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have

$$|\Lambda(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_k)| \leq \prod_{j=0}^k \|\hat{\lambda}_j\|_\infty^\varepsilon \cdot \Lambda^*(|\hat{\lambda}_0|^{1-\varepsilon}, \dots, |\hat{\lambda}_k|^{1-\varepsilon}; |J|),$$

where the left-hand side is absolutely convergent if the right-hand side is finite.

Proof. This follows from [Definition 3.4](#) and the successive bounds

$$\begin{aligned} |\Lambda^*(\hat{\lambda}_0, \dots, \hat{\lambda}_k; J)| &\leq \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} |\hat{\lambda}_0(\xi_1 + \cdots + \xi_k)| |\hat{\lambda}_1(\xi_1)| \cdots |\hat{\lambda}_k(\xi_k)| |J(\xi)| \, d\xi \\ &\leq \prod_{j=0}^k \|\hat{\lambda}_j\|_\infty^\varepsilon \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} |\hat{\lambda}_0(\xi_1 + \cdots + \xi_k)|^{1-\varepsilon} |\hat{\lambda}_1(\xi_1)|^{1-\varepsilon} \cdots |\hat{\lambda}_k(\xi_k)|^{1-\varepsilon} |J(\xi)| \, d\xi. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

In some instances we will need a slightly more general multilinear form, as follows.

Definition 4.3 (smoothed configuration form). For functions $f_0, \dots, f_k \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $F \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$, let

$$\Lambda(f_0, \dots, f_k; F) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} F(x, y) f_0(x) f_1(x + \varphi_1(y)) \cdots f_k(x + \varphi_k(y)) dx \psi(y) dy. \tag{4-1}$$

Proposition 4.4. For functions $f_0, \dots, f_k \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $F \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$, we have

$$\Lambda(f_0, \dots, f_k; F) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m} \hat{F}(\kappa, \theta) \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} \hat{f}_0(-\kappa - \xi_1 - \cdots - \xi_k) \prod_{j=1}^k \hat{f}_j(\xi_j) J_\theta(\xi) d\xi d\kappa d\theta.$$

Proof. By inserting the Fourier expansions of F, f_1, \dots, f_k and using Fubini, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(f_0, \dots, f_k; F) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} F(x, y) f_0(x) f_1(x + \varphi_1(y)) \cdots f_k(x + \varphi_k(y)) dx \psi(y) dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m} \hat{F}(\kappa, \theta) \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} \hat{f}_1(\xi_1) \cdots \hat{f}_k(\xi_k) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_0(x) e[(\kappa + \xi_1 + \cdots + \xi_k) \cdot x] dx \\ &\quad \times \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} e[\theta \cdot y + \xi_1 \cdot \varphi_1(y) + \cdots + \xi_k \cdot \varphi_k(y)] \psi(y) dy d\xi_1 \cdots d\xi_k d\kappa d\theta \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m} \hat{F}(\kappa, \theta) \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} \hat{f}_0(-\kappa - \xi_1 - \cdots - \xi_k) \hat{f}_1(\xi_1) \cdots \hat{f}_k(\xi_k) J_\theta(\xi) d\xi d\kappa d\theta. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

5. Bounding the singular integral

This section is devoted to the central task of bounding the singular integral (3-6) when the kernel K involved is the oscillatory integral J_θ from Definition 4.1. We will rely crucially on the following decay estimate:

Proposition 5.1. Assuming that the neighborhood Ω of zero has been chosen small enough, we have

$$|J_\theta(\xi)| \lesssim (1 + |A^T \xi + \theta|)^{-m/2} \quad (\xi \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^k, \theta \in \mathbb{R}^m). \tag{5-1}$$

Proof. By Definition 4.1, we have $J_\theta(\xi) = I(A^T \xi + \theta, \xi_{kn})$, where

$$I(\gamma, \gamma_{m+1}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} e(\gamma \cdot y + \gamma_{m+1} Q(y)) \psi(y) dx.$$

Consider the hypersurface $S = \{(y, Q(y)) : y \in \text{Supp}(\psi)\}$ of \mathbb{R}^{m+1} ; then our assumptions on Q mean that S has nonzero Gaussian curvature. Observe that I is the Fourier transform of $\tilde{\psi} d\sigma_S$, where σ_S is the surface measure on S and $\tilde{\psi}$ is a smooth function with the same support as ψ . Therefore it satisfies the decay estimate [Stein 1993, Chapter VIII]

$$|I(\gamma, \gamma_{m+1})| \lesssim (1 + |\gamma| + |\gamma_{m+1}|)^{-m/2}$$

uniformly in $(\gamma, \gamma_{m+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$, which concludes the proof. □

The main result of this section is a bound on the singular integral for functions in L^s for a range of s depending on n, m, k . In practice we will apply the proposition below when s is close to 2, which requires

the parameter m' to be larger than $(k - 1)n$, and when the functions F_i are powers of $|\hat{\mu}|$ or bounded functions supported on $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^n$.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $1 + \frac{1}{k} < s < k + 1$ and $m' > 0$, and write*

$$K_{\theta, m'}(\xi) = (1 + |A^T \xi + \theta|)^{-m'/2} \quad (\xi \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^k, \theta \in \mathbb{R}^m).$$

Let F_0, \dots, F_k be nonnegative measurable functions on \mathbb{R}^n . Provided that

$$m' > 2kn - \frac{2(k+1)}{s}n, \tag{5-2}$$

we have, uniformly in $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^m$,

$$\Lambda^*(F_0, \dots, F_k; K_{\theta, m'}) \lesssim_{s, m'} \|F_0\|_s \cdots \|F_k\|_s.$$

The first step towards the proof of this proposition is to bound moments of the kernels $K_{\theta, m'}$ on certain subspaces. Consider the $k + 1$ linear maps $(\mathbb{R}^n)^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ given by

$$\xi \mapsto -(\xi_1 + \dots + \xi_k) =: \xi_0, \quad \xi \mapsto \xi_j \quad (1 \leq j \leq k).$$

For every $0 \leq j \leq k$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the set $\{\xi \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^k : \xi_j = \eta\}$ is an affine subspace of $(\mathbb{R}^n)^k$ of dimension $(k - 1)n$. Recall that $A^T : \mathbb{R}^{nk} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, so that in the regime $m \geq (k - 1)n$ we expect $(1 + |A^T \cdot|)^{-1}$ to have bounded moments of order $q > (k - 1)n$ on each of the subspaces $\{\xi_j = \eta\}$, under reasonable nondegeneracy conditions on the matrix A . As the next lemma shows, what is needed is precisely the content of [Definition 3.1](#).

Proposition 5.3. *Let $0 \leq j \leq k$ and suppose that $m \geq (k - 1)n$. Then for $q > (k - 1)n$ we have, uniformly in $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^m$,*

$$\int_{\xi_j = \eta} (1 + |A^T \xi + \theta|)^{-q} d\sigma(\xi) \lesssim_q 1.$$

Proof. First note that the assumptions of [Definition 3.1](#) mean that A^T is injective on $\{\xi : \xi_j = 0\}$ for $0 \leq j \leq k$. To see that, observe that the conditions

$$A^T \xi = 0, \quad \xi_j = 0 \implies \xi = 0 \quad (0 \leq j \leq k)$$

can be put in matrix form

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_1^T & \cdots & A_j^T & \cdots & A_k^T \\ 0 & \cdots & I_{n \times n} & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix} \xi = 0 \implies \xi = 0 \quad (1 \leq j \leq k),$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_1^T & \cdots & A_k^T \\ I_{n \times n} & \cdots & I_{n \times n} \end{bmatrix} \xi = 0 \implies \xi = 0.$$

Since $m + n \geq kn$, the $(m + n) \times kn$ matrices above have empty kernel if and only if they have rank kn , a set of conditions which is easily seen to be equivalent to that of [Definition 3.1](#).

Now let

$$I = \int_{\xi_j = \eta} (1 + |A^T \xi + \theta|)^{-q} d\sigma(\xi).$$

We parametrize the affine subspace $\{\xi_j = \eta\}$ by $\xi = \mathbf{R}\xi' + \xi_\eta$, where ξ' runs over $(\mathbb{R}^n)^k$, $\xi_\eta \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^k$ is picked so that $(\xi_\eta)_j = \eta$, and $\mathbf{R} \in O(\mathbb{R}^{kn})$ is a rotation mapping the subspace $\mathbb{R}^{(k-1)n}$ to $\{\xi_j = 0\}$. We obtain

$$I = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{(k-1)n}} (1 + |A^\top \mathbf{R}\xi' + A^\top \xi_\eta + \theta|)^{-q} d\xi',$$

and we write $\mathbf{B} = A^\top \mathbf{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times kn}$, which is injective on $\mathbb{R}^{(k-1)n}$. Consider the orthogonal decomposition $A^\top \xi_\eta + \theta = \mathbf{B}\xi_{\eta,\theta} + \gamma$ with $\xi_{\eta,\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{(k-1)n}$ and $\gamma \in (\mathbf{B}(\mathbb{R}^{(k-1)n}))^\perp$, and observe that, by Pythagoras and injectivity,

$$|\mathbf{B}\xi' + A^\top \xi_\eta + \theta| = |\mathbf{B}(\xi' + \xi_{\eta,\theta}) + \gamma| \geq |\mathbf{B}(\xi' + \xi_{\eta,\theta})| \gtrsim |\xi' + \xi_{\eta,\theta}|.$$

Via the change of variables $\xi' \leftarrow \xi' + \xi_{\eta,\theta}$,

$$I \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^{(k-1)n}} (1 + |\xi'|)^{-q} d\xi',$$

which is bounded for $q > (k - 1)n$, uniformly in $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$. □

Proposition 5.4. *Let F_0, \dots, F_k be nonnegative measurable functions on \mathbb{R}^n . Let $\tau \in (0, 1)$ and let $p, p' \in (1, +\infty)$ be parameters with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$. Let $H \geq 0$ be a parameter and suppose that K is a nonnegative measurable function on \mathbb{R}^{nk} such that*

$$\int_{\xi_j = \eta} K(\xi)^{p'} d\sigma(\xi) \leq H \quad (\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n, 0 \leq j \leq k).$$

Then

$$\Lambda^*(F_0, \dots, F_k; K) \leq H^{1/p'} \prod_{j=0}^k \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F_j(\eta)^{\tau p(k+1)/k} d\eta \right)^{\frac{k}{k+1} \frac{1}{p}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F_j(\eta)^{(1-\tau)p'(k+1)} d\eta \right)^{\frac{1}{k+1} \frac{1}{p'}}.$$

Proof. We write $I = \Lambda^*(F_0, \dots, F_k; K)$. By a first application of Hölder,

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} \prod_{j=0}^k F_j(\xi_j)^{\tau+(1-\tau)} K(\xi) d\xi \\ &\leq \left(\int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} \left(\prod_{j=0}^k F_j(\xi_j) \right)^{\tau p} d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \times \left(\int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} \left(\prod_{j=0}^k F_j(\xi_j) \right)^{(1-\tau)p'} K(\xi)^{p'} d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\ &=: (I_1)^{1/p} \times (I_2)^{1/p'}. \end{aligned} \tag{5-3}$$

We can rewrite I_1 as follows:

$$I_1 = \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} \prod_{j=0}^k F_j(\xi_j)^{\tau p} d\xi = \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} \prod_{i=0}^k \left(\prod_{\substack{0 \leq j \leq k \\ j \neq i}} F_j(\xi_j)^{\tau p} \right)^{\frac{1}{k}} d\xi.$$

By Hölder, we can then reduce to integrals each involving only k of the ξ_j :

$$I_1 \leq \prod_{i=0}^k \left(\int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} \prod_{\substack{0 \leq j \leq k \\ j \neq i}} F_j(\xi_j)^{\tau p(k+1)/k} d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{k+1}}.$$

Recall that $\xi_0 = \xi_1 + \dots + \xi_k$, so that after appropriate changes of variables each inner integral splits and we have

$$I_1 \leq \prod_{i=0}^k \left(\prod_{\substack{0 \leq j \leq k \\ j \neq i}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F_j(\eta)^{\tau p(k+1)/k} d\eta \right)^{\frac{1}{k+1}} = \prod_{j=0}^k \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F_j(\eta)^{\tau p(k+1)/k} d\eta \right)^{\frac{k}{k+1}}. \tag{5-4}$$

To treat the integral I_2 , we separate variables by Hölder, and then integrate along slices [Nicolaescu 2011]:

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} \prod_{j=0}^k F_j(\xi_j)^{(1-\tau)p'} K(\xi)^{p'} d\xi \\ &\leq \prod_{j=0}^k \left(\int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} F_j(\xi_j)^{(1-\tau)p'(k+1)} K(\xi)^{p'} d\xi \right)^{\frac{1}{k+1}} \\ &= \prod_{j=0}^k \left(\int_{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n} F_j(\eta)^{(1-\tau)p'(k+1)} \left(\int_{\xi_j = \eta} K(\xi)^{p'} d\sigma(\xi) \right) d\eta \right)^{\frac{1}{k+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Inside each inner integral we use the fiber moment condition, so that eventually

$$I_2 \leq H \prod_{j=0}^k \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F_j(\eta)^{(1-\tau)p'(k+1)} d\eta \right)^{\frac{1}{k+1}}. \tag{5-5}$$

The proof is finished upon inserting (5-4) and (5-5) into (5-3). □

It remains to determine the parameters (τ, p) in Proposition 5.4 that lead to a bound involving a single L^s norm.

Corollary 5.5. *Suppose that $1 + \frac{1}{k} < s < k + 1$. Then there exist unique parameters $\tau \in (0, 1)$ and $p \in (1, \infty)$ depending on k and s such that*

$$s = \frac{k+1}{k} p\tau = (k+1)p'(1-\tau), \tag{5-6}$$

where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$, and for such (τ, p) we have

$$\frac{k+1}{s} = \frac{k}{p} + \frac{1}{p'}, \tag{5-7}$$

$$\frac{1}{p'} = \frac{1}{k-1} \left(k - \frac{k+1}{s} \right). \tag{5-8}$$

Proof. Starting from (5-6), and dividing by $\frac{k+1}{k}p$ in the first identity and by $\frac{k+1}{k}pp'$ in the second, we obtain the equivalent identities

$$\tau = \frac{k}{k+1} \frac{s}{p} \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\frac{k}{p} + \frac{1}{p'}\right)\tau = \frac{k}{p}. \tag{5-9}$$

Inserting the left-hand expression of τ in the right-hand identity, we deduce the relation (5-7). This is easily solved in p and p' , and one finds that

$$\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{k-1} \left(\frac{k+1}{s} - 1\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{p'} = \frac{1}{k-1} \left(k - \frac{k+1}{s}\right),$$

which in particular recovers (5-8). It can be checked that $\frac{1}{p} \in (0, 1)$ under the given conditions on s . Inserting this value of $\frac{1}{p}$ in the first identity of (5-9), we find that

$$\tau = \frac{k}{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{s}{k+1}\right),$$

which again lies in $(0, 1)$ for the given range of s . □

Proof of Proposition 5.2. Apply Proposition 5.4 with $K(\xi) = (1 + |A^\top \xi + \theta|)^{-m'/2}$ and the choice of parameters (τ, p) from Corollary 5.5. By (5-7), this gives

$$|\lambda^*(F_0, \dots, F_k; K)| \leq H^{1/p'} \prod_{j=0}^k (\|F_j\|_s^{(k/p+1/p')/(k+1)}) = H^{1/p'} \prod_{j=0}^k \|F_j\|_s,$$

where $H = \max_j \sup_{\eta, \theta} \int_{\xi_j=\eta} (1 + |A^\top \xi + \theta|)^{-p'm'/2} d\sigma(\xi)$. Via Proposition 5.3 and (5-8), we have $H \lesssim_{s,m'} 1$ provided that

$$m' > \frac{2(k-1)n}{p'} = 2\left(k - \frac{k+1}{s}\right)n. \tag{5-10} \quad \square$$

From Proposition 5.2, we now derive useful bounds on the dual form Λ^* , which are needed to develop the results of Sections 6–8. In the course of the proof, we refer to a restriction estimate from Appendix B, which states essentially that $\hat{\mu}$ is in $L^{2+\varepsilon}$ when β remains bounded away from zero and α is close enough to n . Recall the notation $T^\kappa f = f(\kappa + \cdot)$ from Section 2.

Proposition 5.6. *Let $\beta_0 \in (0, n)$ and suppose that, for a constant $c > 0$ small enough with respect to n, k and m ,*

$$(k-1)n < m < kn, \quad \beta_0 \leq \beta < n, \quad n - c\beta_0 \leq \alpha < n.$$

Then there exists $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ depending at most on n, k and m such that

$$\sup_{(\kappa, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m} \Lambda^*(T^\kappa |\hat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon}, |\hat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon}, \dots, |\hat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon}; |J_\theta|^{1-\varepsilon}) < \infty,$$

$$\Lambda^*(|\hat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon}, \dots, |\hat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon}; |J|) \lesssim_{\beta_0} (n - \alpha)^{-O(1)}.$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$ be parameters. Recalling the majoration (5-1), we apply Proposition 5.2 to $F_0 = T^\kappa |\hat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon}$ and $F_i = |\hat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon}$ for $i \geq 1$, with parameters $m' = (1 - \varepsilon)m$ and $s = (2 + \delta)/(1 - \varepsilon)$. The

condition (5-2) is fulfilled when $m > (k - 1)n$ and ε, δ are small enough with respect to n, k, m . We obtain, uniformly in $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^m$,

$$\Lambda^*(T^\kappa |\hat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon}, |\hat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon}, \dots, |\hat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon}; |J_\theta|^{1-\varepsilon}) \lesssim_{\varepsilon, s} \| |\hat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon} \|_s^{k+1} = \| \hat{\mu} \|_{2+\delta}^{(1-\varepsilon)(k+1)}.$$

By Proposition B.3 and (3-3), we conclude that

$$\Lambda^*(T^\kappa |\hat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon}, |\hat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon}, \dots, |\hat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon}; |J_\theta|^{1-\varepsilon}) \lesssim_{\varepsilon, \delta, \beta_0} (n - \alpha)^{-O(1)},$$

and the second bound follows since $|J| \lesssim |J|^{1-\varepsilon}$. □

Proof of Proposition 3.6. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ be a parameter. By Proposition 4.2 and (5-1), we have

$$|\Lambda(f_0, \dots, f_k)| \leq \prod_{0 \leq j \leq k} \| \hat{f}_j \|_\infty^\varepsilon \cdot \Lambda^*(|\hat{f}_0|^{1-\varepsilon}, \dots, |\hat{f}_k|^{1-\varepsilon}; (1 + |A^\top \cdot|)^{-m/2}). \tag{5-10}$$

For ε small enough with respect to n, k, m , we may apply Proposition 5.2 with $s = 2/(1 - \varepsilon)$ and $m' = m$, together with Plancherel:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^*(|\hat{f}_0|^{1-\varepsilon}, \dots, |\hat{f}_k|^{1-\varepsilon}; (1 + |A^\top \cdot|)^{-m/2}) &\lesssim \prod_{j=0}^k \| |\hat{f}_j|^{1-\varepsilon} \|_{2/(1-\varepsilon)} \\ &= \prod_{j=0}^k \| \hat{f}_j \|_2^{1-\varepsilon} \\ &= \prod_{j=0}^k \| f_j \|_2^{1-\varepsilon} \\ &\leq \prod_{j=0}^k \| f_j \|_\infty^{1-\varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the assumption $\text{Supp}(f_j) \subset [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^n$ in the last line. Inserting this bound in (5-10) finishes the proof. □

6. The configuration measure

In this section, we aim to construct the measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ specified in Proposition 3.7. We make extensive use of the singular integral bounds derived in the previous section. Our treatment is similar to that of [Chan et al. 2016], but we work in a more abstract setting. We assume throughout this section that the dimensionality conditions (3-7) are met, so that singular integral bounds are available.

We start with the proper definition of ν , which is the content of the next proposition (recall Definition 3.2 and Proposition 3.3). We define an extra shift function $\varphi_0 = 0$ for notational convenience.

Proposition 6.1. *Define the functional ν at $F \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ by*

$$\langle \nu, F \rangle = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \Lambda(\mu_\varepsilon, \dots, \mu_\varepsilon; F),$$

where $\mu_\varepsilon = \mu * \phi_\varepsilon$ for an approximate identity ϕ_ε with $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_{c,+}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then ν is well-defined and we have, for every $F \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$,

$$\langle \nu, F \rangle = \Lambda^*(\hat{\mu}, \dots, \hat{\mu}; \hat{F}) \quad \text{and} \quad |\langle \nu, F \rangle| \leq \|F\|_\infty \Lambda(\mu, \dots, \mu),$$

where the integrals defined by the right-hand sides converge absolutely. Therefore ν extends by density to a positive bounded linear operator on $\mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$.

Proof. By Proposition 4.4, we have

$$\Lambda(\mu_\varepsilon, \dots, \mu_\varepsilon; F) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+m}} \widehat{F}(\kappa, \theta) \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} \widehat{\mu}(-\kappa - \xi_1 - \dots - \xi_k) \prod_{j=1}^k \widehat{\mu}(\xi_j) J_\theta(\xi) h_\varepsilon(\xi, \kappa) \, d\xi \, d\kappa \, d\theta,$$

where $h_\varepsilon(\xi, \kappa) = \widehat{\phi}(-\varepsilon(\kappa + \xi_1 + \dots + \xi_k)) \prod_{j=1}^k \widehat{\phi}(\varepsilon \xi_j)$. Since h_ε is bounded by 1 in absolute value and tends to 1 pointwise as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the limit of $\Lambda(\mu_\varepsilon, \dots, \mu_\varepsilon; F)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ exists and equals $\Lambda^*(\widehat{\mu}, \dots, \widehat{\mu}; \widehat{F})$ by dominated convergence, since we have uniform boundedness of

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+m}} |\widehat{F}(\kappa, \theta)| \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} |\widehat{\mu}(\kappa + \xi_1 + \dots + \xi_k)| \prod_{j=1}^k |\widehat{\mu}(\xi_j)| |J_\theta(\xi)| \, d\xi \, d\kappa \, d\theta \\ \leq \sup_{(\kappa, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m} \Lambda^*(|T^\kappa \widehat{\mu}|, |\widehat{\mu}|, \dots, |\widehat{\mu}|; |J_\theta|) \times \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+m}} |\widehat{F}(\kappa, \theta)| \, d\kappa \, d\theta < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

via Proposition 5.6 and the majorations $|J_\theta| \lesssim |J_\theta|^{1-\varepsilon}$ and $|\widehat{\mu}| \leq |\widehat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon}$. Recalling Definitions 3.2 and 4.3 and using the positivity of μ_ε , we also have

$$|\langle \nu, F \rangle| = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} |\Lambda(\mu_\varepsilon, \dots, \mu_\varepsilon; F)| \leq \|F\|_\infty \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \Lambda(\mu_\varepsilon, \dots, \mu_\varepsilon).$$

By Fourier inversion (Proposition 3.3) and another instance of the dominated convergence theorem, exploiting the finiteness of $\Lambda^*(|\widehat{\mu}|, \dots, |\widehat{\mu}|; |J|)$ provided by Proposition 5.6, we obtain

$$|\langle \nu, F \rangle| \leq \|F\|_\infty \overline{\lim}_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \Lambda^*(\widehat{\mu}_\varepsilon, \dots, \widehat{\mu}_\varepsilon; J) = \|F\|_\infty \Lambda^*(\widehat{\mu}, \dots, \widehat{\mu}; J).$$

This last quantity equals $\|F\|_\infty \Lambda(\mu, \dots, \mu)$ by Definition 3.4. □

Proposition 6.2. *When defined, the measure ν of Proposition 6.1 is supported on the compact set*

$$X = \{(x, y) \in E \times \text{Supp } \psi : (x, x + \varphi_1(y), \dots, x + \varphi_k(y)) \in E^{k+1}\}.$$

Proof. We can rewrite $X = (E \times \text{Supp } \psi) \cap \Phi^{-1}(E^{k+1})$, where Φ is the smooth map defined by (3-4), so that X is closed and bounded, and therefore compact. Since its complement X^c is open, it is enough to show that $\langle \nu, F \rangle = 0$ for every $F \in \mathcal{C}_{c,+}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ such that $\text{Supp } F \subset X^c$. By compactness we know that there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\max_{0 \leq j \leq k} d(x + \varphi_j(y), E) \geq c > 0 \quad \text{for all } (x, y) \in \text{Supp } F \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \times \text{Supp } \psi).$$

On the other hand,

$$\langle \nu, F \rangle = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\text{Supp } F \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \times \text{Supp } \psi)} F(x, y) \prod_{j=0}^k \mu_\varepsilon(x + \varphi_j(y)) \, dx \, \psi(y) \, dy.$$

For ε small enough, since μ_ε is supported on $E + B(0, C\varepsilon)$ for a certain $C > 0$, the integrand above is always zero. □

Proposition 6.3. *We have $\|\nu\| = \Lambda(\mu, \dots, \mu)$.*

Proof. Consider the compact set X from Proposition 6.2, and the larger compact set

$$Y = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \text{Supp } \psi : d(x + \varphi_j(y), E) \leq 1 \text{ for } 0 \leq j \leq k\}.$$

Pick a smoothed ball indicator $F \in \mathcal{C}_{c,+}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ such that $F = 1$ on Y . Since ν is supported on $X \subset Y$, we have

$$\nu(\mathbb{R}^{n+m}) = \langle \nu, F \rangle = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \times \text{Supp } \psi} F(x, y) \prod_{j=0}^k \mu_\varepsilon(x + \varphi_j(y)) \, dx \, \psi(y) \, dy.$$

Since $(x, y) \mapsto \prod_{j=0}^k \mu_\varepsilon(x + \varphi_j(y))$ is supported on Y for ε small enough, we therefore have

$$\nu(\mathbb{R}^{n+m}) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \Lambda(\mu_\varepsilon, \dots, \mu_\varepsilon).$$

By the same reasoning as in the end of the proof of Proposition 6.1, again using $\Lambda^*(|\hat{\mu}|, \dots, |\hat{\mu}|; |J|) < \infty$ provided by Proposition 5.6, we find eventually that $\|\nu\| = \Lambda(\mu, \dots, \mu)$. \square

We now turn to the last expected feature of the configuration measure ν , which is that it has zero mass on any hyperplane.

Proposition 6.4. *We have $\nu(H) = 0$ for every hyperplane H of \mathbb{R}^{n+m} .*

Proof. Consider a hyperplane $H < \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ and a rotation $R \in O_{n+m}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $H = R(\mathbb{R}^{n+m-1} \times \{0\})$. Consider parameters $L \geq 1$ and $\delta \in (0, 1]$. We consider a Schwartz function F_δ of the form

$$F_\delta \circ R = \chi\left(\frac{\cdot}{L}\right) \Xi\left(\frac{\cdot}{\delta}\right), \tag{6-1}$$

where $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m-1})$ and $\Xi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ are nonnegative with $\chi \geq 1$ on $[-1, 1]^{n+m-1}$ and $\Xi(0) \geq 1$. Writing $H_L = R([-L, L]^{n+m-1} \times \{0\})$, we therefore have $\nu(H_L) \leq \langle \nu, F_\delta \rangle$, and it is enough to show that $\langle \nu, F_\delta \rangle$ tends to 0 as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ for every fixed $L \geq 1$. By Proposition 6.1, writing $\gamma = (\kappa, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$, we have

$$\langle \nu, F_\delta \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+m}} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} \hat{F}_\delta(\gamma) \hat{\mu}(-\kappa - \xi_1 - \dots - \xi_k) \prod_{j=1}^k \hat{\mu}(\xi_j) J_\theta(\xi) \, d\xi \, d\gamma. \tag{6-2}$$

We assume that χ and Ξ have been chosen so that their Fourier transforms are supported on centered balls of radius 1, which is certainly possible. Recalling (6-1), we therefore have, for every $(u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m-1} \times \mathbb{R}$,

$$|\widehat{F}_\delta \circ R(u, v)| = |\widehat{F}_\delta \circ R(u, v)| \lesssim L^{n+m-1} \cdot 1_{|u| \leq L^{-1}} \cdot \delta \cdot 1_{|v| \leq \delta^{-1}}. \tag{6-3}$$

We next show how to obtain some uniform γ -decay from the other factor in the integrand of (6-2). By (3-2) and (5-1), since $\beta \leq n \leq m$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\mu}(\kappa + \xi_1 + \dots + \xi_k)| \prod_{j=1}^k |\hat{\mu}(\xi_j)| |J_\theta(\xi)| &\lesssim_\alpha (1 + |\kappa + \xi_1 + \dots + \xi_k|)^{-\beta/2} \prod_{j=1}^k (1 + |\xi_j|)^{-\beta/2} (1 + |\mathbf{A}^\top \xi + \theta|)^{-m/2} \\ &\lesssim_\alpha (1 + |\kappa + \xi_1 + \dots + \xi_k| + |\xi_1| + \dots + |\xi_k| + |\mathbf{A}^\top \xi + \theta|)^{-\beta/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using this in conjunction with the triangle inequality and the decompositions $\theta = (A^\top \xi + \theta) - \sum_{j=1}^k A_j^\top \xi_j$ and $\kappa = (\kappa + \xi_1 + \dots + \xi_k) - \sum_{j=1}^k \xi_j$, we deduce that

$$|\hat{\mu}(\kappa + \xi_1 + \dots + \xi_k)| \prod_{j=1}^k |\hat{\mu}(\xi_j)| |J_\theta(\xi)| \lesssim_\alpha (1 + |\kappa| + |\theta|)^{-\beta/2} \asymp (1 + |\gamma|)^{-\beta/2}. \tag{6-4}$$

Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ be the small parameter in the statement of the proposition. At this point we have two parametrizations $\gamma = (\kappa, \theta) = R(u, v)$ with $(\kappa, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$ and $(u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m-1} \times \mathbb{R}$. By integrating in (u, v) coordinates in (6-2) and bounding $\hat{F}_\delta(\gamma)$ via (6-3), we obtain

$$|\langle v, F_\delta \rangle| \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+m-1} \times \mathbb{R}} 1_{|u| \leq L^{-1}} \cdot L^{n+m-1} \cdot \delta \cdot 1_{|v| \leq \delta^{-1}} \left(\int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} |\hat{\mu}(\kappa + \xi_1 + \dots + \xi_k)| \prod_{j=1}^k |\hat{\mu}(\xi_j)| |J_\theta(\xi)| d\xi \right) du dv.$$

By pulling out an ε -th power of the inner integrand and using (6-4), we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle v, F_\delta \rangle| &\lesssim_\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+m-1}} L^{n+m-1} \cdot 1_{|u| \leq L^{-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \delta \cdot 1_{|v| \leq \delta^{-1}} \cdot (1 + |(u, v)|)^{-\varepsilon\beta/2} \\ &\quad \left(\int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} |\hat{\mu}(\kappa + \xi_1 + \dots + \xi_k)|^{1-\varepsilon} \prod_{j=1}^k |\hat{\mu}(\xi_j)|^{1-\varepsilon} |J_\theta(\xi)|^{1-\varepsilon} d\xi \right) du dv \\ &\lesssim \sup_{(\kappa, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m} \Lambda^*(|T^\kappa \hat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon}, |\hat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon}, \dots, |\hat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon}; |J_\theta|^{1-\varepsilon}) \times \delta \int_{|v| \leq \delta^{-1}} (1 + |v|)^{-\varepsilon\beta/2} dv. \end{aligned}$$

The supremum above is finite by Proposition 5.6 and for ε small enough the last factor is bounded by $\delta^{\varepsilon\beta/2}$. Therefore $\langle v, F_\delta \rangle \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, as was to be shown. □

Proof of Proposition 3.7. It suffices to combine Propositions 6.1–6.4, recalling that we assumed (3-7) in this section. □

7. Absolutely continuous estimates

In this section we verify that absolutely continuous estimates are available when the shifts in (3-4) are given by polynomial vectors and the singular integral converges. We work with the notation of abstract shift functions.

The strategy, as in the regularity proof of Roth’s theorem [Tao 2014], is to use the U^2 arithmetic regularity lemma to decompose a nonnegative bounded function into an almost-periodic component, an L^2 error, and a part which is Fourier-small. The precise version of the regularity lemma that we need is found in Appendix A. To neglect the contribution of Fourier-small functions, we use the fact that the counting operator is controlled by the Fourier L^∞ norm for bounded functions, in the sense of Proposition 3.6. To show that the pattern count for almost-periodic functions is high, we need uniform lower bounds for certain Bohr sets of almost-periods, the proof of which will occupy subsequent parts

of this section. We define a Bohr set of \mathbb{T}^n of a frequency set $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$, radius $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and dimension $d = |\Gamma| < \infty$ by

$$B = B(\Gamma, \delta) = \{x \in \mathbb{T}^n : \|\xi \cdot x\| \leq \delta \text{ for all } \xi \in \Gamma\}. \tag{7-1}$$

We first prove the following conditional version of [Proposition 3.8](#):

Proposition 7.1. *Suppose that $m > (k - 1)n$ and, uniformly for every Bohr set B of \mathbb{T}^n of dimension d and radius $\delta > 0$,*

$$\mathcal{L}\{y \in [-c, c]^m : \varphi_1(y), \dots, \varphi_k(y) \in B\} \gtrsim_{d,\delta} 1.$$

Then, for every function $f \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ supported on $[-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}]^n$ such that $0 \leq f \leq 1$ and $\int f = \tau \in (0, 1]$, we have

$$\Lambda(f, \dots, f) \gtrsim_\tau 1.$$

Proof. We let $\kappa : (0, 1]^3 \rightarrow (0, 1]$ be a decay function and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ be a parameter, both to be determined later. Write the decomposition of [Proposition A.2](#) with respect to ε and κ as $f = f_1 + f_2 + f_3 = g + f_3$. Note that $f_1, g \geq 0$ and f_1, f_2, f_3, g are supported in $[-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}]^n$ and uniformly bounded by 2 in absolute value. Expanding $f = g + f_3$ by multilinearity and using [Proposition 3.6](#) together with the Fourier bound on f_3 in [\(A-5\)](#), we obtain

$$\Lambda(f, \dots, f) = \Lambda(g, \dots, g) + O\left(\sum \Lambda(*, \dots, f_3, \dots, *)\right) = \Lambda(g, \dots, g) + O(\kappa(\varepsilon, d^{-1}, \delta)^{\varepsilon'}) \tag{7-2}$$

for an $\varepsilon' \in (0, 1)$ depending at most on n, k, m . Recall that we assumed that ψ is at least 1 on a box $[-c, c]^m$ in [Section 3](#), and let

$$E = \{y \in [-c, c]^m : \varphi_1(y), \dots, \varphi_k(y) \in B\}, \tag{7-3}$$

where B is the Bohr set of [Proposition A.2](#). For reasons that shall be clear later, we first restrict integration to the set E , using the nonnegativity of g :

$$\Lambda(g, \dots, g) \geq \int_E \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g \cdot T^{\varphi_1(y)} g \dots T^{\varphi_k(y)} g \, d\mathcal{L} \right) dy.$$

Next, we focus on the decomposition $g = f_1 + f_2$ and exploit the L^2 bound on f_2 in [\(A-5\)](#) by Cauchy–Schwarz in the inner integral:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(g, \dots, g) &\geq \int_E \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g \cdot T^{\varphi_1(y)} g \dots T^{\varphi_k(y)} g \, d\mathcal{L} \right) dy \\ &\geq \int_E \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_1 \cdot T^{\varphi_1(y)} f_1 \dots T^{\varphi_k(y)} f_1 \, d\mathcal{L} - \sum \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} * \dots T^{\varphi_j(y)} f_2 \dots * \, d\mathcal{L} \right) dy \\ &\geq \int_E \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_1 \cdot T^{\varphi_1(y)} f_1 \dots T^{\varphi_k(y)} f_1 \, d\mathcal{L} - O(\varepsilon) \right) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we use the almost-periodicity estimate for f_1 in [\(A-5\)](#) and the definition [\(7-3\)](#) of E to replace the shifts of f_1 by itself:

$$\Lambda(g, \dots, g) \geq \int_E \left(\int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^n} f_1^{k+1} \, d\mathcal{L} - O(\varepsilon) \right) dy.$$

By nesting of $L^p([-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^n)$ norms and the nonnegativity of f_1 , we infer that

$$\Lambda(g, \dots, g) \geq \int_E \left(\left(\int_{[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^n} f_1 \, d\mathcal{L} \right)^{k+1} - O(\varepsilon) \right) dy = \mathcal{L}(E) \cdot (\tau^{k+1} - O(\varepsilon)).$$

Choosing $\varepsilon = c\tau^{k+1}$ with a small $c > 0$, and recalling (7-2) and the assumption on E , we obtain

$$\Lambda(f, \dots, f) \geq c(\delta, d^{-1})\tau^{k+1} - O(\kappa(c\tau^{k+1}, d^{-1}, \delta)^{\varepsilon'}).$$

Choosing $\kappa(\varepsilon, d^{-1}, \delta) = c' \cdot (c(\delta, d^{-1})\varepsilon)^{1/\varepsilon'}$, recalling that $d, \delta^{-1} \lesssim_{\varepsilon, \kappa} 1 \lesssim_{\tau} 1$, we obtain

$$\Lambda(f, \dots, f) \geq \frac{1}{2}c(\delta, d^{-1})\tau^{k+1} \gtrsim_{\tau} 1. \quad \square$$

It remains to determine a lower bound on the measure of the intersection of preimages of a Bohr set by the shift functions. This can be done when the shift functions are polynomial vectors, by reduction to a known diophantine approximation problem, and in fact there will be a series of intermediate reductions. We let d denote the L^∞ metric on \mathbb{R}^n or \mathbb{R} and we define

$$\|x\|_{\mathbb{T}^n} = d(x, \mathbb{Z}^n) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} d(x_i, \mathbb{Z})$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. In all subsequent propositions in this section we also liberate the letters n, k, m from their usual meaning, and we indicate the dependencies of implicit constants on all parameters. Our objective is to prove the following statement:

Proposition 7.2. *Let $t, m, n, l, d \geq 1$. Let $Q_1, \dots, Q_t : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be polynomial vectors with components of degree at most l and such that $Q_i(0) = 0$ for all $i \in [t]$. For $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_d \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have*

$$\mathcal{L}\{y \in [-c, c]^m : \|Q_i(y) \cdot \xi_j\|_{\mathbb{T}} < \varepsilon \text{ for all } (i, j) \in [t] \times [d]\} \gtrsim_{\varepsilon, l, m, t, d, n} 1.$$

Our first reduction is to a finite system of conditions on monomials modulo 1.

Proposition 7.3. *Let $l, m \geq 1$ and $X = \{0, \dots, l\}^m \setminus \{0\}$. For every $I \in X$, let $d_I \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\xi_I \in \mathbb{R}^{d_I}$. Then³*

$$\mathcal{L}\{y \in [-c, c]^m : \|y^I \xi_I\|_{\mathbb{T}^{d_I}} \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } I \in X\} \gtrsim_{\varepsilon, l, m, (d_I)} 1.$$

Proof that Proposition 7.3 implies Proposition 7.2. Let $X = \{0, \dots, l\}^m \setminus \{0\}$ and write $Q_i = \sum_{k \in [n]} Q_{ik} e_k$ with $Q_{ik} = \sum_{I \in X} a_I^{(ik)} y^I$. For every $I \in X$ we define $d_I = t + d + n$ and $\xi_I = (a_I^{(ik)} \xi_{jk})_{(i,j,k)} \in \mathbb{T}^{t+d+n}$, to make the following observation:

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_i(y) \cdot \xi_j\|_{\mathbb{T}} \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } (i, j) \in [t] \times [d] \\ \iff \left\| \sum_{k \in [n]} \sum_{I \in X} a_I^{(ik)} y^I \xi_{jk} \right\|_{\mathbb{T}} \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } (i, j) \in [t] \times [d] \\ \iff \|y^I a_I^{(ik)} \xi_{jk}\|_{\mathbb{T}} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{nl^m} \quad \text{for all } (i, j, k) \in [t] \times [d] \times [n], I \in X \\ \iff \|y^I \xi_I\|_{\mathbb{T}^{d_I}} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{nl^m} \quad \text{for all } I \in X. \end{aligned}$$

³Here and in the sequel we set $\mathbb{R}^0 = \{0\}$ and $\|0\|_{\mathbb{T}^0} = 0$, so that the conditions involving a space \mathbb{R}^0 are void.

Applying [Proposition 7.3](#) with $\varepsilon \leftarrow \varepsilon/nl^m$ and (d_I, ξ_I) as above, we find a lower bound on the quantity under study which depends only on $\varepsilon, l, m, t, d, n$. \square

Our second reduction consists in a straightforward induction, which reduces the dimension of the problem to 1.

Proposition 7.4. *Let $l \geq 1, d_1, \dots, d_l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\xi_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}, \dots, \xi_l \in \mathbb{R}^{d_l}$. We have*

$$\mathcal{L}\{y \in [-c, c] : \|y^j \xi_j\|_{\mathbb{T}^{d_j}} \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } j \in [l]\} \gtrsim_{\varepsilon, l, (d_i)} 1.$$

Proof that [Proposition 7.4](#) implies [Proposition 7.3](#). We induct on $m \geq 1$, the case $m = 1$ being precisely [Proposition 7.4](#). Assume that we have proven the estimate for dimensions less than or equal to m , and write a tuple $I \in \{0, \dots, l\}^{m+1} \setminus \{0\}$ as $I = (J, i_{m+1})$ with $J \in \{0, \dots, l\}^m$ and $i_{m+1} \geq 0$. We distinguish the conditions involving y_{m+1} or not by Fubini:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{L}\{y \in [-c, c]^{m+1} : \|y^I \xi_I\|_{\mathbb{T}^{d_I}} \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } I \in X\} \\ &= \int_{[-c, c]^{m+1}} 1[\|y^J y_{m+1}^{i_{m+1}} \xi_I\|_{\mathbb{T}^{d_I}} \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } (J, i_{m+1}) = I \in X] dy_1 \cdots dy_m dy_{m+1} \\ &= \int_{[-c, c]^m} 1[\|y^J \xi_I\|_{\mathbb{T}^{d_I}} \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } (J, 0) = I \in X] \\ &\quad \int_{[-c, c]} 1[\|y_{m+1}^{i_{m+1}} \cdot y^J \xi_I\|_{\mathbb{T}^{d_I}} \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } (J, i_{m+1}) = I \in X : i_{m+1} \geq 1] dy_{m+1} dy_1 \cdots dy_m. \end{aligned}$$

By first applying the induction hypothesis with $m = 1$ at fixed y_1, \dots, y_m , and then by applying another instance of the induction hypothesis, we find that this quantity is indeed bounded from below by a positive constant depending only on ε, l, m and (d_I) . \square

Our final reduction is a simple discretization argument, which reduces the problem to the following known diophantine approximation estimate (see also [[Green and Tao 2009](#), Proposition A.2; [Baker 1986](#), Chapter 7]).

Proposition 7.5 [[Lyall and Magyar 2011](#), Proposition B.2]. *Let $l \geq 1$ and $d_1, \dots, d_l \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, l$ and $N \geq 1$. We have*

$$N^{-1} \#\{|n| \leq N : \|n^j \alpha_j\|_{\mathbb{T}^{d_j}} \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } j \in [l]\} \gtrsim_{\varepsilon, l, (d_j)} 1.$$

Proof that [Proposition 7.5](#) implies [Proposition 7.4](#). Consider a scale $N \geq 1$ going to infinity. Write each $|y| \leq c$ as $y = (n + u)/N$ with $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $u \in (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$, so that $y^j = n^j/N^j + O_l(1/N)$ for every $j \in [l]$. For N large enough with respect to $(\xi_j), \varepsilon$ and l , we therefore have

$$\|y^j \xi_j\|_{\mathbb{T}} \leq \varepsilon \iff \left\| n^j \frac{\xi_j}{N^j} \right\|_{\mathbb{T}} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}\{y \in [-c, c] : \|y^j \xi_j\|_{\mathbb{T}^{d_j}} \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } j \in [l]\} \\ \geq \sum_{|n| \leq cN/2} \mathcal{L}\left\{y = \frac{n+u}{N} : |u| \leq \frac{1}{2}, \left\|n^j \frac{\xi_j}{N^j}\right\|_{\mathbb{T}^{d_j}} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \text{ for all } j \in [l]\right\} \\ \geq N^{-1} \#\left\{|n| \leq \frac{cN}{2} : \left\|n^j \frac{\xi_j}{N^j}\right\|_{\mathbb{T}^{d_j}} \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } j \in [l]\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition 7.5 concludes the proof. □

To conclude this section we may now derive the absolutely continuous estimates stated in Section 3.

Proof of Proposition 3.8. It suffices to combine Propositions 7.1 and 7.2, recalling the shape (3-5) of our shift functions. □

8. The transference argument

This section is concerned with proving that $\Lambda(\mu, \dots, \mu) > 0$, by the transference argument of [Łaba and Pramanik 2009] exploiting the pseudorandomness of the fractal measure μ as $\alpha \rightarrow n$. We start by recalling the decomposition of [Chan et al. 2016, Section 6] of the fractal measure μ into a bounded smooth part (a mollified version of μ) and a Fourier-small part (the difference with the first part). This is the part of the argument where one lets α tend to n in a certain sense, and then the Fourier tail exhibits very strong, exponential-type decay in $n - \alpha$.

Proposition 8.1. *There exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ depending at most on n and D , and a decomposition $\mu = \mu_1 + \mu_2$, where $\mu_1 = f \, d\mathcal{L}$, $f \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $0 \leq f \leq C_1$, $\int f = 1$, $\text{Supp } f \subset [-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}]^n$, $|\hat{\mu}_i| \leq 2|\hat{\mu}|$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and*

$$\|\hat{\mu}_2\|_\infty \lesssim (n - \alpha)^{-O(1)} e^{-\beta/(2+\beta)(n-\alpha)}.$$

Proof. Let $L \geq 1$ be a parameter. Consider a cutoff $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\int \phi = 1$, $\text{Supp } \phi \subset B(0, \frac{1}{16})$ and $0 \leq \phi \leq C_0$ for a certain $C_0 = C_0(n) > 0$, and define $\phi_L = L^n \phi(L \cdot)$. Let $f = \mu * \phi_L$ and consider the decomposition $\mu = \mu_1 + \mu_2$ with $\mu_1 = f \, d\mathcal{L}$ and $\mu_2 = \mu - \mu_1$. We can already infer that $f \geq 0$, $\int f = 1$, $|\hat{\mu}_i| \leq 2|\hat{\mu}|$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $\text{Supp } \mu_1 \subset [-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}]^n$, since we assumed that $E \subset [-\frac{1}{16}, \frac{1}{16}]^n$ in Section 3.

Next, we show that f is bounded. Since ϕ_L has support in $B(0, 1/(16L))$, by (3-1) we have

$$f(x) = \int_{B(x, 1/(16L))} \phi_L(x - y) \, d\mu(y) \leq \|\phi_L\|_\infty \cdot \mu\left[B\left(x, \frac{1}{16L}\right)\right] \leq C_0 D L^{n-\alpha}.$$

Choosing $L = e^{1/(n-\alpha)}$, we deduce that

$$\|f\|_\infty \leq C_0 D e =: C_1.$$

Finally, we bound the Fourier transform of $\hat{\mu}_2$. Observe that, for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\hat{\mu}_2(\xi) = \hat{\mu}(\xi) \left(1 - \hat{\phi}\left(\frac{\xi}{L}\right)\right). \tag{8-1}$$

Since $\int \phi = 1$, we always have $|1 - \hat{\phi}(\xi/L)| \leq 2$. On the other hand, since ϕ has support in $B(0, \frac{1}{16})$, we have

$$\left| 1 - \hat{\phi}\left(\frac{\xi}{L}\right) \right| = \left| \int_{B(0, 1/16)} \phi(x) \left(1 - e\left(\frac{\xi \cdot x}{L}\right) \right) dx \right| \lesssim \frac{|\xi|}{L}.$$

By inserting these two last bounds in (8-1), we obtain

$$|\hat{\mu}_2(\xi)| \lesssim \min\left(1, \frac{|\xi|}{L}\right) |\hat{\mu}(\xi)|.$$

Consequently, by (3-2) and (3-3) we have

$$|\hat{\mu}_2(\xi)| \lesssim (n - \alpha)^{-O(1)} \min\left(1, \frac{|\xi|}{L}\right) \min(1, |\xi|^{-\beta/2}).$$

By considering separately the ranges $|\xi| \geq L^{2/(2+\beta)}$ and $|\xi| \leq L^{2/(2+\beta)}$, we find that

$$|\hat{\mu}_2(\xi)| \lesssim (n - \alpha)^{-O(1)} L^{-\beta/(2+\beta)}.$$

Recalling our choice of L , we have

$$|\hat{\mu}_2(\xi)| \lesssim (n - \alpha)^{-O(1)} e^{-\beta/(2+\beta)(n-\alpha)}. \quad \square$$

We now establish the positivity of $\Lambda(\mu, \dots, \mu)$, using the previous decomposition, with the main contribution from the absolutely continuous part estimated by Proposition 3.8, and the other contributions bounded away by Proposition 5.6.

Proof of Proposition 3.9. We consider the decomposition $\mu = \mu_1 + \mu_2$ from Proposition 8.1, and expand by multilinearity in

$$\Lambda(\mu, \dots, \mu) = C_1^{-(k+1)} \Lambda(\mu_1/C_1, \dots, \mu_1/C_1) + O\left(\sum \Lambda(*, \dots, \mu_2, \dots, *)\right),$$

where the sum is over $2^{k+1} - 1$ terms and the stars denote measures equal to either μ_1 or μ_2 . By Proposition 3.8, we deduce that, for a certain constant $c > 0$, we have

$$\Lambda(\mu, \dots, \mu) \geq c - O\left(\sum \Lambda(*, \dots, \mu_2, \dots, *)\right).$$

By Proposition 4.2, we have, furthermore, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\Lambda(\mu, \dots, \mu) \geq c - O\left(\|\hat{\mu}_2\|_\infty^\varepsilon \Lambda^*(|\hat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon}, \dots, |\hat{\mu}|^{1-\varepsilon}; |J|)\right).$$

By taking ε to be that appearing in Proposition 5.6, and inserting the Fourier bound on μ_2 from Proposition 8.1, we find that

$$\Lambda(\mu, \dots, \mu) \geq c - O_{\beta_0}\left((n - \alpha)^{-O(1)} e^{-\varepsilon \cdot \beta_0 / (2+\beta_0)(n-\alpha)}\right),$$

where we used the monotonicity of $x/(2+x)$. This can be made positive for $\alpha \geq n - c(\beta_0, \varepsilon)$ with $c(\beta_0, \varepsilon) > 0$ small enough. □

9. Revisiting the linear case

In this section we indicate how the method of this article may be modified to obtain the following extension of [Theorem 1.2](#), which allows for any positive exponent of Fourier decay for the fractal measure. For simplicity we only treat the case where n divides m , which already covers all the geometric applications discussed in [\[Chan et al. 2016\]](#).

Theorem 9.1. *Let $n, k, m \geq 1, D \geq 1$ and $\alpha, \beta \in (0, n)$. Suppose that E is a compact subset of \mathbb{R}^n and μ is a probability measure supported on E such that*

$$\mu(B(x, r)) \leq Dr^\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad |\hat{\mu}(\xi)| \leq D(n - \alpha)^{-D}(1 + |\xi|)^{-\beta/2}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n, r > 0$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose that (A_1, \dots, A_k) is a nondegenerate system of $n \times m$ matrices in the sense of [Definition 1.1](#). Assume finally that $m = (k - r)n$ with $1 \leq r < k$ and, for some $\beta_0 \in (0, n)$,

$$\frac{1}{2}(k - 1)n < m < kn, \quad \beta_0 \leq \beta < n, \quad n - c_{n,k,m,\beta_0,D,(A_i)} \leq \alpha < n$$

for a sufficiently small constant $c_{n,k,m,\beta_0,D,(A_i)} > 0$. Then, for every collection of strict subspaces V_1, \dots, V_q of \mathbb{R}^{n+m} , there exists $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \setminus V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_q$ such that

$$(x, x + A_1y, \dots, x + A_ky) \in E^{k+1}.$$

Note that the condition on m is equivalent to that of [Theorem 1.2](#). We only sketch the proof of [Theorem 9.1](#), since it follows by a straightforward adaption of the methods of this paper, with the only difference lying in the treatment of the singular integral.

We start by stating a slight generalization of Hölder’s inequality that was already used (for $l = k + 1, r = k$) in the proof of [Proposition 5.4](#). We write $\binom{[l]}{r}$ for the set of subsets of $[l]$ of size r .

Proposition 9.2. *Let $(X, \mathfrak{M}, \lambda)$ be a measure space and let $1 \leq r \leq l$. For measurable functions $F_1, \dots, F_l : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we have*

$$\int_X \prod_{j \in [l]} |F_j| \, d\lambda \leq \prod_{S \in \binom{[l]}{r}} \left[\int_X \prod_{j \in S} |F_j|^{l/r} \, d\lambda \right]^{1/\binom{[l]}{r}}.$$

Proof. First observe that, for arbitrary real numbers $a_1, \dots, a_l \geq 0$, we have

$$\prod_{j \in [l]} a_j = \prod_{S \in \binom{[l]}{r}} \left(\prod_{j \in S} a_j \right)^{1/\binom{[l]-1}{r-1}}.$$

Next, let $I = \int_X \prod_{j \in [l]} |F_j| \, d\lambda$ and apply Hölder’s inequality in

$$I = \int_X \prod_{S \in \binom{[l]}{r}} \left(\prod_{j \in S} |F_j| \right)^{1/\binom{[l]-1}{r-1}} \, d\lambda \leq \prod_{S \in \binom{[l]}{r}} \left[\int_X \left(\prod_{j \in S} |F_j| \right)^{\binom{[l]}{r}/\binom{[l]-1}{r-1}} \, d\lambda \right]^{1/\binom{[l]}{r}}.$$

A quick computation shows that $\binom{[l]}{r}/\binom{[l]-1}{r-1} = l/r$, which concludes the proof. □

We now place ourselves under the assumptions of [Theorem 9.1](#), and in particular we assume that the matrices A_1, \dots, A_k are nondegenerate in the sense of [Definition 1.1](#). We also write $A_0 = 0_{n \times n}$ throughout. This matches the framework of this paper except that now $Q = 0$.

We fix a smooth cutoff $\psi \in \mathcal{C}_{c,+}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ which is at least 1 on a box $[-c, c]^n$. We define the oscillatory integral

$$J(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e(A^\top \xi \cdot y) \psi(y) dy = \hat{\psi}(-A^\top \xi). \tag{9-1}$$

The counting operators are now defined by⁴

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(f_0, \dots, f_k) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f_0(x) f_1(x + A_1 y) \cdots f_k(x + A_k y) dx \psi(y) dy, \\ \Lambda^*(F_0, \dots, F_k; J) &= \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} F_0(-\xi_1 - \cdots - \xi_k) F_1(\xi_1) \cdots F_k(\xi_k) J(\xi) d\xi, \end{aligned}$$

for functions $f_i, F_i \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and we have $\Lambda(f_0, \dots, f_k) = \Lambda^*(\hat{f}_0, \dots, \hat{f}_k; J)$ as before.

Since we assumed that $\psi \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^m)$, it follows from [\(9-1\)](#) that

$$|J(\xi)| \lesssim_N (1 + |A^\top \xi|)^{-N} \tag{9-2}$$

for every $N > 0$. Via some matricial considerations (as in [\[Chan et al. 2016, Lemma 3.2\]](#)), it can be checked that [Definition 1.1](#) is equivalent to the requirement that $A^\top : \mathbb{R}^{kn} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{kn-rn}$ is injective on each subspace of the form

$$\{\xi \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^k : (\xi_j)_{j \in S} = \eta\},$$

where S is a subset of $\{0, \dots, k\}$ of size r and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{rn}$, and we write $\xi_0 = -(\xi_1 + \cdots + \xi_k)$ as before. Now consider an arbitrary subset S of $\{0, \dots, k\}$ of size r . By [\(9-2\)](#) one quickly deduces that

$$\int_{(\xi_j)_{j \in S} = \eta} |J(\xi)|^q d\sigma(\xi) \lesssim_q 1 \quad (q > 0, \eta \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^r), \tag{9-3}$$

in the same manner as in the proof of [Proposition 5.3](#).

In our linear setting one may naturally obtain a better range of m for which the multilinear form Λ^* is controlled by L^s norms. The next proposition demonstrates this, and it is applicable to our problem only when $(k + 1)/r > 2$, or equivalently $m = (k - r)n > \frac{1}{2}(k - 1)n$.

Proposition 9.3. *We have*

$$|\Lambda^*(F_0, \dots, F_k; J)| \lesssim \|F_0\|_{(k+1)/r} \cdots \|F_k\|_{(k+1)/r}.$$

⁴In fact, one could work without cutoff functions in the y variable, as was done in [\[Chan et al. 2016\]](#), which simplifies the estimates somewhat. Here we keep smooth cutoffs to stay closer to the framework of the article.

Proof. Write $I = \Lambda^*(F_0, \dots, F_k; J)$ and $[0, k] = \{0, \dots, k\}$ for the purpose of this proof. By [Proposition 9.2](#), we have

$$I \leq \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} \prod_{j=0}^k (F_j(\xi_j) \cdot |J(\xi)|^{1/(k+1)}) \, d\xi \leq \prod_{S \in \binom{[0,k]}{r}} \left(\int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^k} \prod_{j \in S} F_j(\xi_j)^{(k+1)/r} |J(\xi)|^{1/r} \, d\xi \right)^{1/\binom{k+1}{r}}.$$

Integrating along slices, and invoking [\(9-3\)](#), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I &\leq \prod_{S \in \binom{[0,k]}{r}} \left(\int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^r} \prod_{j \in S} F_j(\eta_j)^{(k+1)/r} \left(\int_{(\xi_j)_{j \in S} = \eta} |J(\xi)|^{1/r} \, d\sigma(\xi) \right) \, d\eta \right)^{1/\binom{k+1}{r}} \\ &\lesssim \prod_{S \in \binom{[0,k]}{r}} \left(\int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^r} \prod_{j \in S} F_j(\eta_j)^{(k+1)/r} \, d\eta \right)^{1/\binom{k+1}{r}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore each inner integral splits and we have

$$I \lesssim \prod_{S \in \binom{[0,k]}{r}} \left(\prod_{j \in S} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F_j(\eta)^{(k+1)/r} \, d\eta \right)^{1/\binom{k+1}{r}} = \prod_{j \in [0,k]} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F_j(\eta)^{(k+1)/r} \, d\eta \right)^{\binom{k}{r-1}/\binom{k+1}{r}}.$$

Since $\binom{k+1}{r}/\binom{k}{r-1} = (k+1)/r$, it follows that $I \leq \prod_{j \in [0,k]} \|F_j\|_{(k+1)/r}$, as was to be shown. □

With [Proposition 9.3](#) in hand, it is a simple matter to adapt the rest of the argument in this paper. In fact, one would need a slight variant of that proposition involving a shift θ , as in the case of [Proposition 5.2](#). From such a proposition one may deduce the natural analogues of [Propositions 5.6](#) and [3.6](#), which will impose the same conditions on α and β , and a distinct condition $m > \frac{1}{2}(k-1)n$ on m . With these singular integral bounds in hand, the arguments of [Sections 6–8](#) go through essentially unchanged, and one obtains [Theorem 9.1](#) by the process described at the end of [Section 3](#).

Appendix A: The arithmetic regularity lemma

In this section, we derive a version of the U^2 arithmetic regularity lemma, following Tao’s argument [\[2014\]](#), with minor twists to accommodate functions defined over \mathbb{R}^n instead of \mathbb{T}^n . This set of ideas itself originates in [\[Bourgain 1986\]](#), albeit in a rather different language. We include the complete proof since the exact result we need is not stated in a convenient form in the literature.

We defined a Bohr set of \mathbb{T}^n of a frequency set $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$, radius $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and dimension $d = |\Gamma| < \infty$ in [\(7-1\)](#). We define the dilate of a Bohr set B of a frequency set Γ and radius δ by a factor $\rho \in (0, 1]$ as $B(\Gamma, \delta)_\rho = B(\Gamma, \rho\delta)$. Note that $B(\Gamma, \delta) = \phi^{-1}(2\delta \cdot Q)$ for the cube $Q = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^n$ and the morphism $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^d, x \mapsto (\xi \cdot x)_{\xi \in \Gamma}$. We can find a cube covering of the form $Q \subset \bigcup_{t \in T} (t + \delta \cdot Q)$ with $|T| = \lceil 1/\delta \rceil^d \leq (2/\delta)^d$, and therefore

$$1 = |\phi^{-1}(Q)| \leq \sum_{t \in T} |\phi^{-1}(t + \delta \cdot Q)|.$$

By the pigeonhole principle, there exists $t \in T$ such that $|\phi^{-1}(t + \delta \cdot Q)| \geq (\frac{1}{2}\delta)^d$ and, since $\phi^{-1}(t + \delta \cdot Q) - \phi^{-1}(t + \delta \cdot Q) \subset B$, we deduce that

$$|B| = |B(\Gamma, \delta)| \geq (\frac{1}{2}\delta)^d \quad \text{for all } \delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]. \tag{A-1}$$

Now consider the tent function $\Delta(x) = (1 - |x|)^+$ on \mathbb{R} , which is 1-Lipschitz, bounded by 1 everywhere, and bounded from below by $\frac{1}{2}$ on $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$. For any Bohr set B , we define functions $\phi_B, \nu_B : \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\phi_B(x) = \Delta\left(\frac{1}{\delta} \sup_{\xi \in \Gamma} \|\xi \cdot x\|\right), \quad \nu_B = \frac{\phi_B}{\int \phi_B},$$

so that $\int \nu_B = 1$ and $\frac{1}{2}1_{B_{1/2}} \leq \nu_B \leq 1_B$. The function ν_B is essentially a smoothed normalized indicator function of the Bohr set B , and its most important properties are summarized in the following proposition:

Proposition A.1. *For any Bohr set B of frequency set $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ and radius $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$, we have*

$$\|\nu_B\|_\infty \lesssim (\frac{1}{4}\delta)^{-d}, \tag{A-2}$$

$$\|T^t \nu_B - \nu_B\|_\infty \lesssim (\frac{1}{4}\delta)^{-d} \rho \quad \text{for } t \in B_\rho, \rho \in (0, 1], \tag{A-3}$$

$$\hat{\nu}_B(\xi) = 1 + O(\delta) \quad \text{for } \xi \in \Gamma. \tag{A-4}$$

Proof. Note that $\int \phi_B \geq \frac{1}{2}|B_{1/2}| \geq \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{4}\delta)^d$ by (A-1), which implies the first estimate. For every $x, t \in \mathbb{T}^n$, we also have

$$|\nu_B(x+t) - \nu_B(x)| \leq 2(\frac{1}{4}\delta)^{-d} \left| \Delta\left(\frac{1}{\delta} \sup_{\xi \in \Gamma} \|\xi \cdot (x+t)\|\right) - \Delta\left(\frac{1}{\delta} \sup_{\xi \in \Gamma} \|\xi \cdot x\|\right) \right|.$$

When $t \in B_\rho$, we have $\|\xi \cdot t\| \leq \rho\delta$ for every $\xi \in \Gamma$, and therefore $|\nu_B(x+t) - \nu_B(x)| \lesssim (\frac{1}{4}\delta)^{-d} \rho$ since Δ is 1-Lipschitz, and we have established the second estimate. To obtain the third, consider $\xi \in \Gamma$ and observe that, since ν_B is supported on B and $\|\xi \cdot x\| \leq \delta$ for $x \in B$, we have

$$\hat{\nu}_B(\xi) = \int_B \nu_B(x) e^{-\xi \cdot x} dx = (1 + O(\delta)) \int \nu_B = 1 + O(\delta). \quad \square$$

Proposition A.2. *Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ be a parameter and let $\kappa : (0, 1]^3 \rightarrow (0, 1]$ be a decay function. Suppose that $f \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is such that $0 \leq f \leq 1$ and $\text{Supp } f \subset [-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}]^n$. Then there exists a decomposition $f = f_1 + f_2 + f_3$ with $f_i \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\text{Supp } f_i \subset [-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}]^n$, $\|f_i\|_\infty \leq 1$, $f_1 \geq 0$, $f_1 + f_2 \geq 0$, $\int f_1 = \int f$ as well as a Bohr set B of dimension $d \lesssim_{\varepsilon, \kappa} 1$ and radius $\delta \gtrsim_{\varepsilon, \kappa} 1$ such that*

$$\|T^t f_1 - f_1\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } t \in B, \quad \|f_2\|_2 \leq \varepsilon, \quad \|\hat{f}_3\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq \kappa(\varepsilon, d^{-1}, \delta). \tag{A-5}$$

Proof. We initially consider f as defined on the torus \mathbb{T}^n , by identification with its 1-periodization from the cube $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^n$. Consider sequences of positive real numbers

$$\frac{1}{2} \geq \delta_0 \geq \delta_1 \geq \dots \geq \delta_i \geq \dots \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \geq \eta_1 \geq \dots \geq \eta_i \geq \dots$$

to be determined later. We define sequences of frequency sets Γ_i and Bohr sets B_i of dimension d_i , and measures ν_i , inductively for $i \geq 0$ by

$$\Gamma_{i+1} = \Gamma_i \cup \{|\hat{f}| \geq \eta_{i+1}\} \cup \bigcup_{j=0}^i \{|\hat{\nu}_j| \geq \eta_{i+1}\}, \quad B_{i+1} = B(\Gamma_{i+1}, \delta_{i+1}), \quad \nu_{i+1} = \nu_{B_{i+1}}. \tag{A-6}$$

We initialize with $\Gamma_0 = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$, $\delta_0 \leq \frac{1}{8}$, $B_0 = B(\Gamma_0, \delta_0)$ and $\nu_0 = \nu_{B_0}$, so that $d_0 = n$ and, by the definition (7-1) of Bohr sets, we have $B_i \subset [-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}]^n$ for all i . Note that, by Chebyshev, we also have a dimension bound

$$d_{i+1} \leq d_i + \frac{\|\hat{f}\|_2^2}{\eta_{i+1}^2} + \sum_{j=0}^i \frac{\|\hat{\nu}_j\|_2^2}{\eta_{i+1}^2}.$$

By Plancherel and the bound (A-2), it follows that

$$d_i \lesssim_{\delta_0, \dots, \delta_{i-1}, d_{i-1}, \eta_i} 1 \quad (i \geq 1). \tag{A-7}$$

We start by finding a piece of the Fourier expansion of f which is small in L^2 . To this end observe that

$$\sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{\Gamma_{i+2} \setminus \Gamma_i} |\hat{f}|^2 \leq 2\|\hat{f}\|_2^2 = 2\|f\|_2^2 \leq 2.$$

By Chebyshev’s bound, it follows that

$$\#\left\{0 \leq i \leq k : \sum_{\Gamma_{i+2} \setminus \Gamma_i} |\hat{f}|^2 \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\right\} \leq \frac{4}{\varepsilon^2}.$$

Choosing $k = \lceil 4/\varepsilon^2 \rceil$, we obtain the existence of an index $0 \leq i \leq k$ such that

$$\sum_{\Gamma_{i+2} \setminus \Gamma_i} |\hat{f}|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2. \tag{A-8}$$

We now decompose f into three pieces $f_1, f_2, f_3 : \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$f = f * \nu_i + (f * \nu_{i+1} - f * \nu_i) + (f - f * \nu_{i+1}) = f_1 + f_2 + f_3.$$

Since f takes values in $[0, 1]$ and $\int \nu_i = 1$, the functions f_1, f_2, f_3 take values in $[-1, 1]$ by simple convolution bounds. It is also clear that f_1 and $f_1 + f_2$ are nonnegative and $\int f_1 = \int f$.

Let us first analyze the L^2 -small piece. By Plancherel and (A-8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f * \nu_{i+1} - f * \nu_i\|_2^2 &= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^n} |\hat{f}(m)|^2 |\hat{\nu}_{i+1}(m) - \hat{\nu}_i(m)|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} + \sum_{m \in \Gamma_i \cup (\mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \Gamma_{i+2})} |\hat{f}(m)|^2 |\hat{\nu}_{i+1}(m) - \hat{\nu}_i(m)|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{A-9}$$

For $m \in \Gamma_i \subset \Gamma_{i+1}$, by (A-4) we have $|\hat{\nu}_{i+1}(m) - \hat{\nu}_i(m)| \lesssim \delta_{i+1} + \delta_i$. For $m \notin \Gamma_{i+2}$, the definition (A-6) of Γ_{i+2} implies that $|\hat{\nu}_i(m)| \leq \eta_{i+2}$ and $|\hat{\nu}_{i+1}(m)| \leq \eta_{i+2}$. Inserting these bounds into (A-9), we obtain

$$\|f * \nu_{i+1} - f * \nu_i\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 + O(\delta_i + \delta_{i+1} + \eta_{i+2}) \leq \varepsilon^2, \tag{A-10}$$

provided that $\delta_j, \eta_j \leq c\varepsilon^2$ for all j .

Next, let us focus on the almost-periodic piece. Introducing a parameter $\rho_i \in (0, 1]$, we deduce from (A-3) that, for $t \in B_{\rho_i}$, we have

$$\|T^t f * v_i - f * v_i\|_\infty \leq \|f\|_1 \|T^t v_i - v_i\|_\infty \lesssim_n \delta_i^{-d_i} \rho_i \leq \varepsilon, \tag{A-11}$$

choosing $\rho_i = c_n \varepsilon \delta_i^{d_i}$. We write $\tilde{\delta}_i = \rho_i \delta_i$, and from (A-7) we see that $\tilde{\delta}_i$ depends at most on $n, \varepsilon, \delta_0, \dots, \delta_i$ and η_1, \dots, η_i .

Finally, we consider the Fourier-small piece. By Fourier inversion,

$$\|(f - f * v_{i+1})^\wedge\|_{l^\infty(\mathbb{Z}^n)} = \sup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}^n} |\hat{f}(m)| |1 - \hat{v}_{i+1}(m)|.$$

For $m \in \Gamma_{i+1}$, we have $|1 - \hat{v}_{i+1}(m)| \lesssim \delta_{i+1}$ by (A-4), while for $m \notin \Gamma_{i+1}$, the definition (A-6) of Γ_{i+1} shows that $|\hat{f}(m)| \leq \eta_{i+1}$. Therefore

$$\|(f - f * v_{i+1})^\wedge\|_{l^\infty(\mathbb{Z}^n)} \lesssim \delta_{i+1} + \eta_{i+1} \leq c\kappa(\varepsilon, d_i^{-1}, \tilde{\delta}_i) \tag{A-12}$$

for a small constant $c > 0$ provided that we choose the δ_j and η_j recursively satisfying

$$\max(\delta_{i+1}, \eta_{i+1}) = c \min(\kappa(\varepsilon, d_i^{-1}, \tilde{\delta}_i), \varepsilon^2).$$

At this stage we have obtained the desired bounds (A-5) over \mathbb{T}^n and for a Bohr set $\tilde{B}_i = B_i(\Gamma_i, \tilde{\delta}_i)$, and from (A-7) and the construction of the δ_i it follows that $d_i \lesssim_{\varepsilon, \kappa} 1$ and $\delta_i \gtrsim_{\varepsilon, \kappa} 1$.

To finish the proof we now consider the functions f_1, f_2, f_3 as functions on \mathbb{R}^n supported on $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^n$. Since f and the Bohr sets measures v_i are supported on $[-\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{8}]^n$, the convolutions $f * v_i$ over \mathbb{T}^n may be readily interpreted as convolutions over \mathbb{R}^n , and the functions f_i are supported on $[-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}]^n$. The properties (A-10) and (A-11) are readily viewed as holding over \mathbb{R}^n , thus we only need to verify that f_3 has the appropriate Fourier decay at real frequencies. We claim that, since f_3 has support in $[-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}]^n$, we have $\|\hat{f}_3\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \lesssim \|\hat{f}_3\|_{l^\infty(\mathbb{Z}^n)}$ and, by taking the constant c in (A-12) small enough, we obtain the desired Fourier decay estimate. To prove this claim, consider a smooth bump function χ equal to 1 on $[-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}]^n$. For $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, expanding f as a Fourier series yields

$$\hat{f}_3(\xi) = \int_{[-1/4, 1/4]^n} f_3(x) \chi(x) e(-\xi \cdot x) dx = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \hat{f}_3(k) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \chi(x) e((k - \xi) \cdot x) dx = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \hat{f}_3(k) \hat{\chi}(\xi - k).$$

Using the smoothness of χ , it follows that, uniformly in $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$|\hat{f}_3(\xi)| \lesssim \|\hat{f}_3\|_{l^\infty(\mathbb{Z}^n)} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^n} (1 + |\xi - k|)^{-(n+1)} \lesssim \|\hat{f}_3\|_{l^\infty(\mathbb{Z}^n)}. \quad \square$$

Appendix B: Uniform restriction estimates for fractal measures

In this section we obtain restriction estimates for fractal measures satisfying dimensionality and Fourier decay conditions, with uniformity in all the parameters involved. We liberate μ, α and β from their usual meaning and track dependencies on all parameters, such as the dimension n . To facilitate our quoting of the literature, we first recall the functional equivalences in Tomas’s T^*T argument [Wolff 2003, Chapter 7].

Fact B.1. *Suppose that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $p \in (1, +\infty]$, and that p' is given by $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$. Let $R > 0$. The following statements are equivalent:*

$$\|\widehat{f}\|_{L^2(d\mu)} \leq R \|f\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n), \tag{B-1}$$

$$\|\widehat{g d\mu}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq R \|g\|_{L^2(d\mu)} \quad \text{for all } g \in L^2(d\mu). \tag{B-2}$$

We now fix two exponents $0 < \beta \leq \alpha \leq n$ and two constants $A, B \geq 1$, and we restrict our attention to probability measures μ on \mathbb{R}^n satisfying

$$\mu(B(x, r)) \leq Ar^\alpha \quad (x \in \mathbb{R}^n, r > 0), \tag{B-3}$$

$$|\widehat{\mu}(\xi)| \leq B(1 + |\xi|)^{-\beta/2} \quad (\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n). \tag{B-4}$$

We define the critical exponent

$$p_0 = 2 + \frac{4(n - \alpha)}{\beta}, \tag{B-5}$$

so that the Mitsis–Mockenhaupt restriction theorem [Mitsis 2002; Mockenhaupt 2000] states that each of the inequalities in Fact B.1 holds for $p > p_0$ for a certain constant $R = R(A, B, \alpha, \beta, p, n)$. We wish to use (B-2) with $g \equiv 1$ and $p = 2 + \delta$ with a fixed small $\delta > 0$, which is possible when α is close enough to n by (B-5), but to be useful this requires some uniformity in α . The constants in [Mitsis 2002; Mockenhaupt 2000] can be given explicit expressions in terms of the parameters involved, and in fact one could likely adapt the version of Mockenhaupt’s argument in [Łaba and Pramanik 2009, Proposition 4.1], to relax the condition $\beta > \frac{2}{3}$ there to $\beta > 0$. We provide instead a direct derivation from the estimate of [Bak and Seeger 2011], which includes explicit constants.

Proposition B.2. *Let $\beta_0 \in (0, n)$. There exists $C_{n,\beta_0} > 0$ such that, when $\beta \geq \beta_0$, the estimate (B-1) holds for $p \geq p_0$ with $R = C_{n,\beta_0} \max(A, B)^{p_0/2p}$.*

Proof. Apply [Bak and Seeger 2011, Equation (1.5)], replacing $a \leftarrow \alpha$, $b \leftarrow \frac{1}{2}\beta$, $d \leftarrow n$, $p \leftarrow p'$, so that $q = 2p/p_0$; and note that α and β belong to the compact interval $[\beta_0, n]$. Since $q \geq 2$ for $p \geq p_0$, by nesting of $L^s(d\mu)$ norms this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L^2(d\mu)} &\leq \|\widehat{f}\|_{L^q(d\mu)} \leq (C_{n,\beta_0})^{2/q} A^{1/q \cdot 2/p_0} B^{1/q \cdot (1-2/p_0)} \|f\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\leq C_{n,\beta_0} \max(A, B)^{p_0/(2p)} \|f\|_{L^{p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Alternatively, one may choose to track down the dependencies on constants in Mitsis’s simpler argument [2002], which would lead to a similar estimate for the constant R in (B-1), up to a harmless (for our argument) factor $(p - p_0)^{-1}$. Via Proposition B.2, it is now possible to bound the moments of $\widehat{\mu}$ of order slightly larger than 2 when α is close enough to n , with only a moderate dependency of constants on α .

Proposition B.3. *Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $\beta_0 \in (0, n)$. Suppose that μ is a probability measure satisfying (3-1) and (3-2). Then, uniformly for $n - \frac{1}{4}\delta\beta_0 \leq \alpha < n$ and $\beta_0 \leq \beta < n$, we have*

$$\|\widehat{\mu}\|_{2+\delta} \lesssim_{\beta_0,n} D_\alpha^{1/2}.$$

Proof. We consider the exponent $p = 2 + \delta$. Recalling (B-5), we have $p \geq p_0$ in the stated range of α . We can therefore invoke Proposition B.2 with $A = D \asymp 1$ and $B = D_\alpha$, so that the extension inequality (B-2) holds for $g \equiv 1$ with $R \lesssim_{\beta_0,n} D_\alpha^{1/2}$. □

References

- [Bak and Seeger 2011] J.-G. Bak and A. Seeger, “Extensions of the Stein–Tomas theorem”, *Math. Res. Lett.* **18**:4 (2011), 767–781. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Baker 1986] R. C. Baker, *Diophantine inequalities*, London Mathematical Society Monographs. New Series **1**, Clarendon, New York, 1986. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Bennett et al. 2015] M. Bennett, A. Iosevich, and K. Taylor, “Finite chains inside thin subsets of \mathbb{R}^d ”, 2015. To appear in *Anal. PDE*. [arXiv](#)
- [Bergelson and Leibman 1996] V. Bergelson and A. Leibman, “Polynomial extensions of van der Waerden’s and Szemerédi’s theorems”, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **9**:3 (1996), 725–753. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Bergelson and McCutcheon 2000] V. Bergelson and R. McCutcheon, *An ergodic IP polynomial Szemerédi theorem*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **695**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Bergelson et al. 2008] V. Bergelson, A. Leibman, and E. Lesigne, “Intersective polynomials and the polynomial Szemerédi theorem”, *Adv. Math.* **219**:1 (2008), 369–388. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Bluhm 1996] C. Bluhm, “Random recursive construction of Salem sets”, *Ark. Mat.* **34**:1 (1996), 51–63. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Bluhm 1998] C. Bluhm, “On a theorem of Kaufman: Cantor-type construction of linear fractal Salem sets”, *Ark. Mat.* **36**:2 (1998), 307–316. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Bourgain 1986] J. Bourgain, “A Szemerédi type theorem for sets of positive density in \mathbf{R}^k ”, *Israel J. Math.* **54**:3 (1986), 307–316. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Chan et al. 2016] V. Chan, I. Łaba, and M. Pramanik, “Finite configurations in sparse sets”, *J. Anal. Math.* **128** (2016), 289–335. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Chen 2016] X. Chen, “Sets of Salem type and sharpness of the L^2 -Fourier restriction theorem”, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **368**:3 (2016), 1959–1977. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Erdoğan 2005] M. B. Erdoğan, “A bilinear Fourier extension theorem and applications to the distance set problem”, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **2005**:23 (2005), 1411–1425. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Erdoğan 2006] M. B. Erdoğan, “On Falconer’s distance set conjecture”, *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* **22**:2 (2006), 649–662. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Furstenberg 1977] H. Furstenberg, “Ergodic behavior of diagonal measures and a theorem of Szemerédi on arithmetic progressions”, *J. Analyse Math.* **31** (1977), 204–256. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Furstenberg and Katznelson 1978] H. Furstenberg and Y. Katznelson, “An ergodic Szemerédi theorem for commuting transformations”, *J. Analyse Math.* **34** (1978), 275–291. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Gowers and Wolf 2010] W. T. Gowers and J. Wolf, “The true complexity of a system of linear equations”, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* (3) **100**:1 (2010), 155–176. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Grafakos et al. 2015] L. Grafakos, A. Greenleaf, A. Iosevich, and E. Palsson, “Multilinear generalized Radon transforms and point configurations”, *Forum Math.* **27**:4 (2015), 2323–2360. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Green and Tao 2009] B. Green and T. Tao, “New bounds for Szemerédi’s theorem, II: A new bound for $r_4(N)$ ”, pp. 180–204 in *Analytic number theory*, edited by W. W. L. Chen et al., Cambridge Univ. Press, 2009. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Greenleaf and Iosevich 2012] A. Greenleaf and A. Iosevich, “On triangles determined by subsets of the Euclidean plane, the associated bilinear operators and applications to discrete geometry”, *Anal. PDE* **5**:2 (2012), 397–409. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Greenleaf et al. 2014a] A. Greenleaf, A. Iosevich, B. Liu, and E. Palsson, “A group-theoretic viewpoint on Erdős–Falconer problems and the Mattila integral”, 2014. [arXiv](#)
- [Greenleaf et al. 2014b] A. Greenleaf, A. Iosevich, and M. Pramanik, “On necklaces inside thin subsets of \mathbb{R}^d ”, 2014. To appear in *Math. Res. Lett.* [arXiv](#)
- [Hambrooke 2016] K. Hambrooke, “Explicit Salem sets and applications to metrical Diophantine approximation”, 2016. [arXiv](#)
- [Iosevich and Liu 2016] A. Iosevich and B. Liu, “Equilateral triangles in subsets of \mathbb{R}^d of large Hausdorff dimension”, 2016. [arXiv](#)
- [Kahane 1985] J.-P. Kahane, *Some random series of functions*, 2nd ed., Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics **5**, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)

- [Kaufman 1981] R. Kaufman, “On the theorem of Jarník and Besicovitch”, *Acta Arith.* **39**:3 (1981), 265–267. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Keleti 1999] T. Keleti, “A 1-dimensional subset of the reals that intersects each of its translates in at most a single point”, *Real Anal. Exchange* **24**:2 (1999), 843–844. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Körner 2011] T. W. Körner, “Hausdorff and Fourier dimension”, *Studia Math.* **206**:1 (2011), 37–50. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Łaba and Pramanik 2009] I. Łaba and M. Pramanik, “Arithmetic progressions in sets of fractional dimension”, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **19**:2 (2009), 429–456. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Lyll and Magyar 2011] N. Lyall and A. Magyar, “Simultaneous polynomial recurrence”, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **43**:4 (2011), 765–785. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Maga 2011] P. Maga, “Full dimensional sets without given patterns”, *Real Anal. Exchange* **36**:1 (2011), 79–90. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Máthé 2012] A. Máthé, “Sets of large dimension not containing polynomial configurations”, 2012. [arXiv](#)
- [Mattila and Sjölin 1999] P. Mattila and P. Sjölin, “Regularity of distance measures and sets”, *Math. Nachr.* **204** (1999), 157–162. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Mitsis 2002] T. Mitsis, “A Stein–Tomas restriction theorem for general measures”, *Publ. Math. Debrecen* **60**:1-2 (2002), 89–99. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Mockenhaupt 2000] G. Mockenhaupt, “Salem sets and restriction properties of Fourier transforms”, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **10**:6 (2000), 1579–1587. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Nicolaescu 2011] L. Nicolaescu, “The coarea formula”, seminar notes, 2011, <http://www3.nd.edu/~lnicolae/Coarea.pdf>.
- [Orponen 2015] T. Orponen, “On the distance sets of AD-regular sets”, 2015. [arXiv](#)
- [Roth 1953] K. F. Roth, “On certain sets of integers”, *J. London Math. Soc.* **28** (1953), 104–109. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Roth 1954] K. F. Roth, “On certain sets of integers, II”, *J. London Math. Soc.* **29** (1954), 20–26. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Salem 1951] R. Salem, “On singular monotonic functions whose spectrum has a given Hausdorff dimension”, *Ark. Mat.* **1** (1951), 353–365. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Sárközy 1978] A. Sárközy, “On difference sets of sequences of integers, I”, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.* **31**:1–2 (1978), 125–149. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Shmerkin 2015] P. Shmerkin, “Salem sets with no arithmetic progressions”, 2015. [arXiv](#)
- [Stein 1993] E. M. Stein, *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*, Princeton Mathematical Series **43**, Princeton University Press, 1993. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Tao 2014] T. Tao, “A proof of Roth’s theorem”, 2014, <https://terrytao.wordpress.com/2014/04/24/a-proof-of-roths-theorem/>.
- [Tao and Vu 2006] T. Tao and V. Vu, *Additive combinatorics*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics **105**, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2006. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Wolff 1999] T. Wolff, “Decay of circular means of Fourier transforms of measures”, *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* **1999**:10 (1999), 547–567. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)
- [Wolff 2003] T. H. Wolff, *Lectures on harmonic analysis*, University Lecture Series **29**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003. [MR](#) [Zbl](#)

Received 25 Nov 2015. Revised 29 Mar 2016. Accepted 29 Apr 2016.

KEVIN HENRIOT: khenriot@math.ubc.ca

Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia, 1984 Mathematics Road, Vancouver BC V6T 1Z2, Canada

IZABELLA ŁABA: ilaba@math.ubc.ca

Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia, 1984 Mathematics Road, Vancouver BC V6T 1Z2, Canada

MALABIKA PRAMANIK: malabika@math.ubc.ca

Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia, 1984 Mathematics Road, Vancouver BC V6T 1Z2, Canada

Analysis & PDE

msp.org/apde

EDITORS

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Patrick Gérard

patrick.gerard@math.u-psud.fr

Université Paris Sud XI

Orsay, France

BOARD OF EDITORS

Nicolas Burq	Université Paris-Sud 11, France nicolas.burq@math.u-psud.fr	Werner Müller	Universität Bonn, Germany mueller@math.uni-bonn.de
Massimiliano Berti	Scuola Intern. Sup. di Studi Avanzati, Italy berti@sissa.it	Yuval Peres	University of California, Berkeley, USA peres@stat.berkeley.edu
Sun-Yung Alice Chang	Princeton University, USA chang@math.princeton.edu	Gilles Pisier	Texas A&M University, and Paris 6 pisier@math.tamu.edu
Michael Christ	University of California, Berkeley, USA mchrist@math.berkeley.edu	Tristan Rivière	ETH, Switzerland riviere@math.ethz.ch
Charles Fefferman	Princeton University, USA cf@math.princeton.edu	Igor Rodnianski	Princeton University, USA irod@math.princeton.edu
Ursula Hamenstaedt	Universität Bonn, Germany ursula@math.uni-bonn.de	Wilhelm Schlag	University of Chicago, USA schlag@math.uchicago.edu
Vaughan Jones	U.C. Berkeley & Vanderbilt University vaughan.f.jones@vanderbilt.edu	Sylvia Serfaty	New York University, USA serfaty@cims.nyu.edu
Vadim Kaloshin	University of Maryland, USA vadim.kaloshin@gmail.com	Yum-Tong Siu	Harvard University, USA siu@math.harvard.edu
Herbert Koch	Universität Bonn, Germany koch@math.uni-bonn.de	Terence Tao	University of California, Los Angeles, USA tao@math.ucla.edu
Izabella Laba	University of British Columbia, Canada ilaba@math.ubc.ca	Michael E. Taylor	Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, USA met@math.unc.edu
Gilles Lebeau	Université de Nice Sophia Antipolis, France lebeau@unice.fr	Gunther Uhlmann	University of Washington, USA gunther@math.washington.edu
László Lempert	Purdue University, USA lempert@math.purdue.edu	András Vasy	Stanford University, USA andras@math.stanford.edu
Richard B. Melrose	Massachusetts Inst. of Tech., USA rbb@math.mit.edu	Dan Virgil Voiculescu	University of California, Berkeley, USA dvv@math.berkeley.edu
Frank Merle	Université de Cergy-Pontoise, France Frank.Merle@u-cergy.fr	Steven Zelditch	Northwestern University, USA zelditch@math.northwestern.edu
William Minicozzi II	Johns Hopkins University, USA minicozz@math.jhu.edu	Maciej Zworski	University of California, Berkeley, USA zworski@math.berkeley.edu
Clément Mouhot	Cambridge University, UK c.mouhot@dpms.cam.ac.uk		

PRODUCTION

production@msp.org

Silvio Levy, Scientific Editor

See inside back cover or msp.org/apde for submission instructions.

The subscription price for 2016 is US \$235/year for the electronic version, and \$430/year (+\$55, if shipping outside the US) for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues from the last three years and changes of subscribers address should be sent to MSP.

Analysis & PDE (ISSN 1948-206X electronic, 2157-5045 printed) at Mathematical Sciences Publishers, 798 Evans Hall #3840, c/o University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840, is published continuously online. Periodical rate postage paid at Berkeley, CA 94704, and additional mailing offices.

APDE peer review and production are managed by EditFlow® from MSP.

PUBLISHED BY

 **mathematical sciences publishers**
nonprofit scientific publishing

<http://msp.org/>

© 2016 Mathematical Sciences Publishers

ANALYSIS & PDE

Volume 9 No. 5 2016

Multidimensional entire solutions for an elliptic system modelling phase separation NICOLA SOAVE and ALESSANDRO ZILIO	1019
Time-periodic approximations of the Euler–Poisson system near Lane–Emden stars JUHI JANG	1043
Sharp weighted norm estimates beyond Calderón–Zygmund theory FRÉDÉRIC BERNICOT, DOROTHEE FREY and STEFANIE PETERMICHL	1079
Existence, uniqueness and optimal regularity results for very weak solutions to nonlinear elliptic systems MIROSLAV BULÍČEK, LARS DIENING and SEBASTIAN SCHWARZACHER	1115
On polynomial configurations in fractal sets KEVIN HENRIOT, IZABELLA ŁABA and MALABIKA PRAMANIK	1153
Free pluriharmonic functions on noncommutative polyballs GELU POPESCU	1185
Bohnenblust–Hille inequalities for Lorentz spaces via interpolation ANDREAS DEFANT and MIECZYŚLAW MASTYŁO	1235
On the negative spectrum of the Robin Laplacian in corner domains VINCENT BRUNEAU and NICOLAS POPOFF	1259