

**A LOWER BOUND FOR THE A.E. BEHAVIOUR OF  
HAUSDORFF DIMENSION UNDER VERTICAL PROJECTIONS  
IN THE HEISENBERG GROUP**

TERENCE L. J. HARRIS

ABSTRACT. It is shown that for a Borel set  $A$  in the Heisenberg group with  $\dim A > 2$ ,

$$\dim P_{\mathbb{V}_\theta^\perp} A \geq \begin{cases} \frac{\dim A}{2} & \text{if } \dim A \in (2, \frac{5}{2}] \\ \frac{\dim A(\dim A + 2)}{4 \dim A - 1} & \text{if } \dim A \in (\frac{5}{2}, 4], \end{cases}$$

for a.e.  $\theta \in [0, \pi)$ , where  $\dim$  refers to the Hausdorff dimension under the Korányi metric, and  $P_{\mathbb{V}_\theta^\perp}$  is the vertical Heisenberg projection onto the vertical plane at angle  $\theta + \frac{\pi}{2}$ . This improves the known lower bounds in the range  $2 < \dim A < \frac{12 + \sqrt{109}}{7}$ .

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this work is to improve the known lower bounds for the a.e. behaviour of Hausdorff dimension under vertical projections in the Heisenberg group. The average behaviour of Hausdorff dimension under orthogonal projection in Euclidean space was first studied by Marstrand in 1954 [11]; many developments and generalisations in the Euclidean setting have occurred since. An effort towards understanding how Hausdorff dimension changes under possibly nonlinear projections in the Heisenberg group was initiated in [1] by Balogh, Durand-Cartagena, Fässler, Mattila and Tyson. Analogues of these results were obtained for higher dimensional Heisenberg groups in [2]. The main open problem that remains is establishing or refuting the conjectured lower bounds for the a.e. behaviour of Hausdorff dimension under vertical projections.

All definitions relevant to this work will be restated here; more details are also available in [1, 2]. Let  $\mathbb{H}$  be the Heisenberg group, which as a set will be identified with  $\mathbb{R}^3 = \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{R}$ . The assumed convention for the group law on  $\mathbb{H}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} (z, t) * (\zeta, \tau) &= (z + \zeta, t + \tau + 2 \operatorname{Im}(z\bar{\zeta})) \\ &= (z + \zeta, t + \tau - 2z \wedge \zeta), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\wedge : \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the standard wedge product on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , given by

$$(x_1, y_1) \wedge (x_2, y_2) = x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1.$$

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 28A78; 28A80.

*Key words and phrases.* Heisenberg group, Hausdorff dimension, vertical projections.

This material is based upon work partially supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-1501041. I would like to thank Burak Erdoğan for advice, and for financial support. I also thank Jeremy Tyson for suggesting the use of Proposition 1.3, which improved the final result.

Define  $\|(z, t)\|_{\mathbb{H}} := (|z|^4 + t^2)^{1/4}$ . The group  $\mathbb{H}$  is a metric space when equipped with the left invariant metric  $d_{\mathbb{H}}$ , called the Korányi metric, defined by

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{H}}((z, t), (\zeta, \tau)) &= \|(\zeta, \tau)^{-1} * (z, t)\|_{\mathbb{H}} \\ &= (|z - \zeta|^4 + |t - \tau - 2z \wedge \zeta|^2)^{1/4}; \end{aligned}$$

see [6] for a proof of the triangle inequality. This metric is bi-Lipschitz equivalent to the usual Carnot-Carathéodory metric on  $\mathbb{H}$  [1].

For a given metric space the Hausdorff dimension is defined through the underlying distance, which for the Heisenberg group will always be the Korányi metric. The horizontal and vertical projections  $P_{V_{\theta}} : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}_{\theta}$  and  $P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}} : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}_{\theta}^{\perp}$  are defined for each  $\theta \in [0, \pi)$  by

$$P_{V_{\theta}}(z, t) = (\pi_{V_{\theta}}(z), 0), \quad P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(z, t) = (\pi_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(z), t - 2\pi_{V_{\theta}}(z) \wedge \pi_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(z)),$$

where  $\pi_{V_{\theta}} : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  denotes Euclidean projection onto the line

$$V_{\theta} := \{\lambda e^{i\theta} : \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

and  $\pi_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}} : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  denotes Euclidean projection onto the line

$$V_{\theta}^{\perp} = \{\lambda i e^{i\theta} : \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

The horizontal subgroup  $\mathbb{V}_{\theta}$  is defined by

$$\mathbb{V}_{\theta} := \{(\lambda e^{i\theta}, 0) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{R} : \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

and the vertical subgroup  $\mathbb{V}_{\theta}^{\perp}$  is the Euclidean orthogonal complement of  $\mathbb{V}_{\theta}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ :

$$\mathbb{V}_{\theta}^{\perp} = \{(\lambda_1 i e^{i\theta}, \lambda_2) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{R} : \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

The term ‘‘vertical projection’’ and the formula for  $P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}$  come from the unique way of writing an element

$$(z, t) = P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(z, t) * P_{V_{\theta}}(z, t),$$

as a product of an element of  $\mathbb{V}_{\theta}^{\perp}$  on the left, with an element of  $\mathbb{V}_{\theta}$  on the right.

In [1, Theorem 1.4] it was shown that for any Borel (or analytic) set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{H}$ ,

$$(1.2) \quad \dim P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}} A \geq \begin{cases} \dim A & \text{if } 0 \leq \dim A < 1 \\ 1 & \text{if } 1 \leq \dim A < 3 \\ 2 \dim A - 5 & \text{if } 3 \leq \dim A \leq 4, \end{cases}$$

for a.e.  $\theta \in [0, \pi)$ , and it was conjectured that the lower bound  $\dim P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}} A \geq \dim A$  actually holds in the larger range  $0 \leq \dim A \leq 3$ . The upper limit of 3 is necessary since the vertical subgroups  $\mathbb{V}_{\theta}^{\perp}$  have Hausdorff dimension 3. In [8], Fässler and Hovila proved

$$(1.3) \quad \dim P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}} A \geq 1 + \frac{(s-1)(s-2)}{32s^2}, \quad \text{for a.e. } \theta \in [0, \pi), \quad s = \dim A > 2,$$

which improved (1.2) in the range  $2 < \dim A < 3.00348$  (approximately). The main result of this work is the following lower bound.

**Theorem 1.1.** *If  $A \subseteq \mathbb{H}$  is an analytic set with  $\dim A > 2$ , then*

$$\dim P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}} A \geq \begin{cases} \frac{\dim A}{2} & \text{if } \dim A \in (2, \frac{5}{2}] \\ \frac{\dim A(\dim A + 2)}{4 \dim A - 1} & \text{if } \dim A \in (\frac{5}{2}, 4], \end{cases}$$

for a.e.  $\theta \in [0, \pi)$ .

This improves (1.2) and (1.3) in the range  $2 < \dim A < \frac{12+\sqrt{109}}{7}$  (the upper bound is roughly 3.2). The proof employs some of the techniques used by Orponen and Venieri in [13] for restricted families of projections in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ ; the main difficulty in adapting this to the Heisenberg setting lies in finding a substitute for Marstrand's Three Circles Lemma (see [14, Lemma 3.2]).

**1.1. Notation and preliminaries.** Given two measure spaces  $X$  and  $Y$ , a measure  $\nu$  on  $X$  and a measurable function  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ , the pushforward  $f_{\#}\nu$  of  $\nu$  under  $f$  is a measure on  $Y$ , defined by  $f_{\#}\nu(E) = \nu(f^{-1}(E))$  for each measurable set  $E \subseteq Y$ .

Let  $|x|$  denote the Euclidean norm of an element  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . The Euclidean distance  $|x - y|$  between  $x$  and  $y$  may also be denoted by  $d_E(x, y)$ . For  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$  and  $r > 0$ , let  $B_E(x, r)$  and  $B_{\mathbb{H}}(x, r)$  be the Euclidean and Korányi balls around  $x$  of radius  $r$ . Throughout, the following local Hölder condition from [3] will be used implicitly.

**Lemma 1.2** ([3, Lemma 2.1]). *For any  $R > 0$ , there exists a positive constant  $c = c(R) > 0$  such that*

$$\frac{|v - w|}{c} \leq d_{\mathbb{H}}(v, w) \leq c|v - w|^{1/2},$$

for all  $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^3$  with  $|v|, |w| \leq R$ .

For high dimensional Hausdorff measures, the following proposition from [3] gives a more efficient covering of a Euclidean ball by Korányi balls, and will be useful later.

**Proposition 1.3** ([3, Proposition 3.4]). *For any  $R > 0$ , there exists a positive integer  $N = N(R) > 0$  such that any Euclidean ball  $B_E(v, r)$  with  $|v| \leq R$  and  $r \in (0, 1)$  can be covered by at most  $\lceil N/r \rceil$  Korányi balls of radius  $r$ .*

The following version of Frostman's Lemma provides a characterisation of Hausdorff dimension for analytic sets (see [9, 12]). A subset  $A$  of a complete separable metric space  $X$  is called analytic if  $A$  is the continuous image of a Borel set  $B \subseteq Y$ , for some complete separable metric space  $Y$ . In particular, every Borel set is analytic.

**Lemma 1.4.** *Let  $X$  be a complete separable metric space, let  $A \subseteq X$  be an analytic subset of  $X$  and let  $s > 0$ . If there exists a nonzero finite Borel measure  $\nu$  on  $A$  such that*

$$(1.4) \quad \nu(B(x, r)) \leq r^s \quad \text{for all } r > 0 \text{ and } x \in A,$$

*then  $\dim A \geq s$ . Conversely, if  $\dim A > s$  then there exists a compactly supported, nonzero, finite Borel measure  $\nu$  on  $A$  such that (1.4) holds.*

## 2. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULT

Most of this section is devoted to proving three lemmas, from which Theorem 1.1 will follow. The first lemma of this section is an abstract version of Lemma 2.5 from [13] (see also [10, Theorem 7.2]); the proof is not too different from the Euclidean case, but is included for completeness. In the statement of the lemma,  $(\theta, x) \mapsto \pi_{\theta}(x)$  is an arbitrary continuous function, but all statements following the proof of the lemma will specialise to the case where  $\pi_{\theta} = P_{\mathbb{V}_{\theta}^{\perp}}$  is a vertical projection on  $\mathbb{H}$ . The lemma essentially says that, given a fractal measure on a set

$A$ , if there is a quantitative restriction on how often the pushforward measure under the projection fails an  $s$ -Frostman condition, then a.e. the dimension of  $\pi_\theta(A)$  is at least  $s$  (where  $s$  may be smaller than  $\dim A$ ).

The proof of the lemma has a few measure theoretic technicalities which may obscure the main idea; the core part of the proof is really the calculation following (2.6).

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $X, Y$  be metric spaces, with  $X$  compact and  $Y$  separable. Suppose that  $\mu$  is a Borel probability measure on  $X$ , that  $\nu$  is a nonzero, finite, compactly supported Borel measure on  $Y$ , and that  $(\theta, y) \mapsto \pi_\theta(y)$  is a continuous function from  $X \times Y$  into  $Y$ . Given  $s > 0$ , if there exist  $\eta, \delta_0 > 0$  such that*

$$(2.1) \quad \nu \{y \in Y : \mu \{\theta \in X : \pi_{\theta\#}\nu(B(\pi_\theta(y), \delta)) \geq \delta^s\} \geq \delta^\eta\} \leq \delta^\eta,$$

for all  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ , then

$$\dim \pi_\theta(\text{supp } \nu) \geq s \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-a.e. } \theta \in X.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mu, \nu, \eta, \delta_0, s$  be given. It is first shown that the sets occurring in (2.1) are measurable. For fixed  $x \in Y$ , and any constant  $c > 0$ , the set

$$S := \{(\theta, y) \in X \times Y : d(\pi_\theta(x), \pi_\theta(y)) < c\},$$

is open in  $X \times Y$  by continuity. Since  $Y$  is separable, the Borel sigma algebra on  $X \times Y$  is equal to the one generated by the products of Borel sets [4, Lemma 6.4.2], and is therefore contained in the class of  $(\mu \times \nu)$ -measurable sets, since  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  are Borel by assumption. Hence  $S$  is  $(\mu \times \nu)$ -measurable. Therefore the function

$$f(\theta, y) = \chi_{\pi_\theta^{-1}(B(\pi_\theta(x), c))}(y),$$

is  $(\mu \times \nu)$ -measurable, and so the function

$$(2.2) \quad \theta \mapsto \int f(\theta, y) d\nu(y) = \pi_{\theta\#}\nu(B(\pi_\theta(x), c))$$

is  $\mu$ -measurable in  $\theta$  by part (iv) of Fubini's Theorem in [7]. This proves  $\mu$ -measurability of the inner part of (2.1).

For the outer part, a similar argument to that for (2.2) shows that for any  $\delta > 0$  the function  $(\theta, y) \mapsto \pi_{\theta\#}\nu(B(\pi_\theta(y), \delta))$  is  $(\mu \times \nu)$ -measurable, and hence the function

$$y \mapsto \mu \{\theta \in X : \pi_{\theta\#}\nu(B(\pi_\theta(y), \delta)) \geq \delta^s\}$$

is a  $\nu$ -measurable function of  $y$ , by part (iii) of Fubini's Theorem in [7]. This proves  $\nu$ -measurability of the outer set in (2.1).

Since  $\nu$  is compactly supported and  $\pi_{(\cdot)}$  is continuous, to prove the lemma it may be assumed that  $Y$  is compact. Let  $\epsilon > 0$  and let  $E \subseteq X$  be a compact set such that

$$(2.3) \quad \dim \pi_\theta(\text{supp } \nu) < s - \epsilon \quad \text{for every } \theta \in E.$$

Since finite Borel measures are inner regular, to prove the lemma it suffices to show that  $\mu(E) = 0$ . Let  $\epsilon' > 0$ , and choose a positive  $\delta_1 < \frac{\delta_0}{4}$  small enough to ensure that  $\delta_1^\eta \leq \epsilon'$ . For each  $\theta \in E$ , using (2.3) let  $\{B(\pi_\theta(z_i(\theta)), \delta_i(\theta))\}_{i=1}^\infty$  be a cover of  $\pi_\theta \text{supp } \nu$  by balls in  $Y$  of radius  $\delta_i(\theta) < \delta_1$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^\infty \delta_i(\theta)^s < \epsilon'$ .

It is possible to choose the covers in such a way that the functions

$$(2.4) \quad \pi_{\theta\#}\nu(B(\pi_\theta(z_i(\theta)), c)), \quad \pi_{\theta\#}\nu(D_\theta^j), \quad \nu\left(\pi_\theta^{-1}(D_\theta^j) \cap Z_{2^{-(j-1)}}\right),$$

and

$$(2.5) \quad \nu \left( \pi_\theta^{-1} \left( D_\theta^{j,1} \right) \setminus Z_{2^{-(j-1)}} \right), \quad \nu \left( \pi_\theta^{-1} \left( D_\theta^{j,2} \right) \setminus Z_{2^{-(j-1)}} \right),$$

are  $\mu$ -measurable in  $\theta$  on  $E$ , for any  $c > 0$ , for each  $i$  and for any integer  $j$ . Here

$$D_\theta^j := \bigcup_{2^{-(j+1)} < \delta_i(\theta) \leq 2^{-j}} B \left( \pi_\theta(z_i(\theta)), 2^{-j} \right),$$

$D_\theta^{j,1}$  is the subset of  $D_\theta^j$  defined as the union over those balls  $B \left( \pi_\theta(z_i(\theta)), 2^{-j} \right)$  in  $D_\theta^j$  with  $\pi_{\theta\#}\nu \left( B \left( \pi_\theta(z_i(\theta)), 2^{-j} \right) \right) < 2^{-(j-1)s}$ , and the set  $D_\theta^{j,2}$  is the union of the remaining balls in  $D_\theta^j$ , equivalently  $D_\theta^{j,2} = D_\theta^j \setminus D_\theta^{j,1}$ . For any  $\delta > 0$  the set  $Z_\delta$  is defined by

$$Z_\delta := \{y \in Y : \mu \{ \theta \in X : \pi_{\theta\#}\nu(B(\pi_\theta(y), \delta)) \geq \delta^s \} \geq \delta^n \}.$$

To verify the  $\mu$ -measurability of (2.4) and (2.5), for each  $\theta$  the compactness of  $\pi_\theta(\text{supp } \nu)$  ensures that there is a finite subcollection (not relabelled) of balls  $B(\pi_\theta(z_i(\theta)), \delta_i(\theta))$  which cover  $\pi_\theta(\text{supp } \nu)$ . The union  $U_\theta$  of these balls is an open set, and therefore contains an open  $\delta'$ -neighbourhood  $\mathcal{N}_{\delta'}(\pi_\theta(\text{supp } \nu))$  of  $\pi_\theta(\text{supp } \nu)$  for some  $\delta' > 0$ . The compactness of  $Y$  (assumed without loss of generality) ensures that the map  $(\theta, y) \mapsto \pi_\theta(y)$  is uniformly continuous on  $X \times Y$ , which implies that

$$\pi_{\theta'}(\text{supp } \nu) \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{\delta'}(\pi_\theta(\text{supp } \nu)) \subseteq U_\theta,$$

for all  $\theta'$  in a sufficiently small ball  $B_\theta$  around  $\theta$ . Therefore the balls  $B(\pi_\theta(z_i(\theta)), \delta_i(\theta))$  form a finite cover of  $\pi_{\theta'}(\text{supp } \nu)$  for  $\theta' \in B_\theta$ . The balls  $B_\theta$  cover  $E$  as  $\theta$  ranges over  $E$ , so by compactness of  $E$  there is a finite subcollection  $\{B_{\theta_1}, \dots, B_{\theta_N}\}$  covering  $E$ . The functions  $z_i(\theta)$  and  $\delta_i(\theta)$  may then be taken as piecewise constant on a finite partition of  $E$  into Borel sets. By the piecewise constant property and the  $\mu$ -measurability of (2.2), the function  $\pi_{\theta\#}\nu(B(\pi_\theta(z_i(\theta)), c))$  is  $\mu$ -measurable for every  $i$  and any  $c > 0$ . This proves the  $\mu$ -measurability of the first function in (2.4). Measurability of the other functions follows from a similar argument to the measurability of (2.2), the piecewise constant property of the  $\delta_i(\theta)$ 's and the  $\nu$ -measurability of  $Z_{2^{-(j-1)}}$ . This shows that the covers  $\{B(\pi_\theta(z_i(\theta)), \delta_i(\theta))\}_{i=1}^\infty$  may be chosen so that the functions in (2.4), (2.5) are measurable.

For each  $\theta \in X$ ,

$$(2.6) \quad \nu(Y) \leq \sum_{j+1 \geq -\log_2 \delta_1} \pi_{\theta\#}\nu \left( D_\theta^j \right),$$

by the definition of the cover and the sets  $D_\theta^j$ . Dividing both sides by  $\nu(Y)$ , using  $\mu$ -measurability and integrating over  $E$  gives

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.7) \quad \mu(E) &\lesssim \int_E \sum_{j+1 \geq \lceil \log_2 \delta_1 \rceil} \pi_{\theta\#} \nu \left( D_\theta^j \right) d\mu(\theta) \\
&\leq \sum_{j+1 \geq \lceil \log_2 \delta_1 \rceil} \int_E \nu \left( \pi_\theta^{-1} \left( D_\theta^j \right) \cap Z_{2^{-(j-1)}} \right) d\mu(\theta) \\
(2.8) \quad &+ \int_E \sum_{j+1 \geq \lceil \log_2 \delta_1 \rceil} \nu \left( \pi_\theta^{-1} \left( D_\theta^{j,1} \right) \setminus Z_{2^{-(j-1)}} \right) d\mu(\theta) \\
(2.9) \quad &+ \sum_{j+1 \geq \lceil \log_2 \delta_1 \rceil} \int_E \nu \left( \pi_\theta^{-1} \left( D_\theta^{j,2} \right) \setminus Z_{2^{-(j-1)}} \right) d\mu(\theta).
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to bound the integrals in (2.7), (2.8) and (2.9). Up to a constant the first sum, in (2.7), is bounded by  $\delta_1^\eta \leq \epsilon'$  by the assumption on each  $Z_{2^{-(j-1)}}$  in the statement of the lemma, and the choice of  $\delta_1$ . The integral in (2.8) is  $\lesssim \epsilon'$  by the condition  $\sum_{i=1}^\infty \delta_i(\theta)^s \leq \epsilon'$  defining the cover. For each  $j$  the set

$$\left\{ (\theta, y) : \pi_\theta(y) \in D_\theta^{j,2} \right\}$$

is  $(\mu \times \nu)$ -measurable by the piecewise constant property of the defining cover, so an application of Fubini's Theorem to each integral in (2.9) results in

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j+1 \geq \lceil \log_2 \delta_1 \rceil} \int_E \nu \left( \pi_\theta^{-1} \left( D_\theta^{j,2} \right) \setminus Z_{2^{-(j-1)}} \right) d\mu(\theta) \\
&= \sum_{j+1 \geq \lceil \log_2 \delta_1 \rceil} \int_{Y \setminus Z_{2^{-(j-1)}}} \mu \left\{ \theta \in E : \pi_\theta(y) \in D_\theta^{j,2} \right\} d\nu(y) \\
&\leq \sum_{\substack{j+1 \geq \\ \lceil \log_2 \delta_1 \rceil}} \int_{Y \setminus Z_{2^{-(j-1)}}} \mu \left\{ \theta \in E : \pi_{\theta\#} \nu \left( B \left( \pi_\theta(y), 2^{-(j-1)} \right) \right) \geq 2^{-(j-1)s} \right\} d\nu(y) \\
&\lesssim \sum_{j+1 \geq \lceil \log_2 \delta_1 \rceil} 2^{-j\eta} \quad \text{by definition of } Z_{2^{-(j-1)}}, \\
&\lesssim \epsilon',
\end{aligned}$$

by the condition  $\delta_1^\eta \leq \epsilon'$  imposed in the choice of  $\delta_1$ . Therefore  $\mu(E) \lesssim \epsilon'$  with  $\epsilon'$  arbitrary, which implies that  $\mu(E) = 0$ . This proves the lemma.  $\square$

The following lemma is a slightly refined version of Lemma 3.5 from [8], see also [2, Section 4]; the proof has only minor adjustments to those in [2, 8] but a mostly self-contained proof is included for completeness. The lemma is a kind of transversality condition, which means that in a quantitative sense the paths of two fixed, distinct points under the the family of projections pass each other transversally.

**Lemma 2.2.** *There exists a positive constant  $C$  such that for any  $v, w \in \mathbb{H}$ , the set*

$$\left\{ \theta \in [0, \pi) : d_{\mathbb{H}} \left( P_{\mathbb{V}_\theta^\perp}(v), P_{\mathbb{V}_\theta^\perp}(w) \right) \leq \delta \right\},$$

*is contained in at most  $40$  disjoint intervals, each of length less than  $\frac{C\delta}{d_{\mathbb{H}}(v,w)}$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $v, w$  and write  $v = (z, t), w = (\zeta, \tau)$ . If

$$|z - \zeta| \geq |t - \tau - 2z \wedge \zeta|^{1/2},$$

then

$$\left\{ \theta \in [0, \pi) : d_{\mathbb{H}} \left( P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(v), P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(w) \right) \leq \delta \right\} \subseteq \left\{ \theta \in [0, \pi) : |\pi_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(z - \zeta)| \leq \delta \right\}.$$

By writing  $z - \zeta = |z - \zeta|e^{i\phi}$  and rotating so that  $\phi = 0$ , the right hand side is contained in an interval of length  $\lesssim \frac{\delta}{|z - \zeta|} \lesssim \frac{\delta}{d_{\mathbb{H}}(v, w)}$ .

Otherwise,

$$(2.10) \quad |z - \zeta| < |t - \tau - 2z \wedge \zeta|^{1/2}.$$

Suppose that (2.10) holds and that  $z = \pm\zeta$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{H}}(v, w) &= (|z - \zeta|^4 + |t - \tau - 2z \wedge \zeta|^2)^{1/4} \\ &= (|z - \zeta|^4 + |t - \tau|^2)^{1/4} \\ &\leq 2^{1/4}|t - \tau|^{1/2} \\ &= 2^{1/4} \left| t - \tau - 2\pi_{V_{\theta}}(z) \wedge \pi_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(z) + 2\pi_{V_{\theta}}(\zeta) \wedge \pi_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(\zeta) \right|^{1/2} \\ (2.11) \quad &\leq 2^{1/4} d_{\mathbb{H}} \left( P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(v), P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(w) \right), \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\left\{ \theta \in [0, \pi) : d_{\mathbb{H}} \left( P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(v), P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(w) \right) \leq \delta \right\} \subseteq \left\{ \theta \in [0, \pi) : d_{\mathbb{H}}(v, w) \leq 2^{1/4}\delta \right\}.$$

The right hand side is  $[0, \pi)$  if  $d_{\mathbb{H}}(v, w) \leq 2^{1/4}\delta$ , which in this case is an interval of length  $\pi \lesssim \frac{\delta}{d_{\mathbb{H}}(v, w)}$ . Otherwise the right hand side is empty and there is nothing to prove. This proves the lemma in the case of (2.10) with  $z = \pm\zeta$ .

It remains to consider the case for which (2.10) holds but  $z \neq \pm\zeta$ . Let

$$a = \frac{t - \tau - 2z \wedge \zeta}{|z + \zeta||z - \zeta|}, \quad p = \frac{z - \zeta}{|z - \zeta|}, \quad q = \frac{z + \zeta}{|z + \zeta|}.$$

Using  $z \wedge \zeta = \pi_{V_{\theta}}(z) \wedge \pi_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(\zeta) - \pi_{V_{\theta}}(\zeta) \wedge \pi_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(z)$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{H}} \left( P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(v), P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(w) \right) &\geq \left| t - \tau - 2\pi_{V_{\theta}}(z) \wedge \pi_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(z) + 2\pi_{V_{\theta}}(\zeta) \wedge \pi_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(\zeta) \right|^{1/2} \\ &= \left| t - \tau - 2z \wedge \zeta + 2\pi_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(z - \zeta) \wedge \pi_{V_{\theta}}(z + \zeta) \right|^{1/2} \\ &= |t - \tau - 2z \wedge \zeta + 2(z - \zeta) \wedge \pi_{V_{\theta}}(z + \zeta)|^{1/2} \\ (2.12) \quad &= |z + \zeta|^{1/2} |z - \zeta|^{1/2} |a + 2p \wedge \pi_{V_{\theta}}(q)|^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $|a| \geq 4$  then (2.10) implies that (2.12) is  $\gtrsim d_{\mathbb{H}}(v, w)$ , and the argument is similar to the case of (2.11). Hence it remains to consider  $|a| < 4$ . With this assumption, (2.10) gives

$$d_{\mathbb{H}}(v, w) \lesssim |t - \tau - 2z \wedge \zeta|^{1/2} \lesssim |z + \zeta|^{1/2} |z - \zeta|^{1/2},$$

and putting this into (2.12) yields

$$d_{\mathbb{H}} \left( P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(v), P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(w) \right) \gtrsim d_{\mathbb{H}}(v, w) |a + 2p \wedge \pi_{V_{\theta}}(q)|^{1/2}.$$

Therefore

$$(2.13) \quad \left\{ \theta \in [0, \pi) : d_{\mathbb{H}} \left( P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(v), P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(w) \right) \leq \delta \right\} \\ \subseteq \left\{ \theta \in [0, \pi) : |a + 2p \wedge \pi_{V_{\theta}}(q)| \leq \left( \frac{K\delta}{d_{\mathbb{H}}(v, w)} \right)^2 \right\},$$

for a sufficiently large constant  $K$ . Define  $F = F_{p, q}$  by

$$F(\theta) = a + 2p \wedge \pi_{V_{\theta}}(q),$$

so that

$$F'(\theta) = 2p \wedge \partial_{\theta} \pi_{V_{\theta}}(q), \quad F''(\theta) = 2p \wedge \partial_{\theta}^2 \pi_{V_{\theta}}(q).$$

Using  $\pi_{V_{\theta}}(q) = \langle q, e^{i\theta} \rangle e^{i\theta}$  gives

$$\partial_{\theta} \pi_{V_{\theta}}(q) = \langle q, ie^{i\theta} \rangle e^{i\theta} + \langle q, e^{i\theta} \rangle ie^{i\theta}, \quad \partial_{\theta}^2 \pi_{V_{\theta}}(q) = 2(\langle q, ie^{i\theta} \rangle ie^{i\theta} - \langle q, e^{i\theta} \rangle e^{i\theta}).$$

Therefore  $\partial_{\theta} \pi_{V_{\theta}}(q)$  and  $\frac{1}{2} \partial_{\theta}^2 \pi_{V_{\theta}}(q)$  are orthogonal unit vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , for each  $\theta \in [0, \pi)$ , and this implies that

$$(2.14) \quad 1 = |p|^2 = \left| \frac{F'(\theta)}{2} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{F''(\theta)}{4} \right|^2, \quad \theta \in [0, \pi).$$

From this it follows that for any  $b \in \mathbb{R}$ , the equation  $F(\theta) = b$  has at most 2 solutions in any interval of length strictly less than  $1/2$ . To see this, let  $I$  be an interval with  $|I| < 1/2$  and assume for a contradiction that  $F(\theta) = b$  for has three distinct solutions in  $I$ . Then by Rolle's Theorem  $F'$  has two distinct zeroes in  $I$ , and by Rolle's Theorem again  $F''$  has a zero  $\theta''$  in  $I$ . Let  $\theta'$  be one of the zeroes of  $F'$ . Then by (2.14),

$$2 = |F'(\theta'')| = \left| \int_{\theta'}^{\theta''} F''(\theta) d\theta \right| \leq 4|I| < 2,$$

which is a contradiction.

By covering the interval  $[0, \pi)$  with 7 intervals of length strictly less than  $1/2$ , it follows that the equation  $F(\theta) = b$  has at most 14 solutions in  $[0, \pi)$ , for any  $b$ , and this implies that the second set of (2.13) is the union of at most 14 disjoint subintervals of  $[0, \pi)$ . Equation (2.14) implies that  $F'$  is 4-Lipschitz, so by using  $8\pi < 26$ , these at most 14 intervals can be written as a union of at most  $14 + 26 = 40$  disjoint intervals  $I \subseteq [0, \pi)$ , each of length at most  $1/8$ , such that either  $|F'(\theta)| > 1/2$  for every  $\theta \in I$ , or  $|F''(\theta)| > 3$  for every  $\theta \in I$ . Lemma 3.3 from [5] asserts that each of these intervals has length  $\lesssim \frac{\delta}{d_{\mathbb{H}}(v, w)}$ , so this finishes the proof (the case  $d_{\mathbb{H}}(v, w) \leq \delta$  is trivial and may be treated separately).  $\square$

**Lemma 2.3.** *Fix  $s \in (2, 4]$ , let  $\nu$  be a nonzero finite compactly supported Borel measure on  $\mathbb{H}$  with  $\sup_{\substack{v \in \mathbb{H} \\ r > 0}} \frac{\nu(B_{\mathbb{H}}(v, r))}{r^s} < \infty$ , and fix  $\kappa > \max \left\{ \frac{s}{2}, \frac{3(s-1)}{4-\frac{1}{s}} \right\}$ . Then there exist  $\delta_0, \eta > 0$  such that*

$$\nu \left\{ v \in \mathbb{H} : \mathcal{H}^1 \left\{ \theta \in [0, \pi) : P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}} \# \nu \left( B_{\mathbb{H}} \left( P_{V_{\theta}^{\perp}}(v), \delta \right) \right) \geq \delta^{s-\kappa} \right\} \geq \delta^{\eta} \right\} \leq \delta^{\eta},$$

whenever  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ .



*Proof.* Choose

$$(2.15) \quad \eta = \frac{1}{10^4} \min \left\{ \kappa - \frac{3(s-1)}{4 - \frac{1}{s}}, \kappa - \frac{s}{2} \right\},$$

which is strictly positive by the assumption on  $\kappa$ . The choice of  $\delta_0$  will be made implicitly so that various trivial inequalities, such as  $|\log \delta| \leq \delta^{-\eta}$ , hold for  $\delta < \delta_0$ . Fix  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$  and let

$$Z = Z_\delta = \left\{ v \in \mathbb{H} : \mathcal{H}^1 \left\{ \theta \in [0, \pi) : P_{\mathbb{V}_\theta^\perp} \# \nu \left( B_{\mathbb{H}} \left( P_{\mathbb{V}_\theta^\perp}(v), \delta \right) \right) \geq \delta^{s-\kappa} \right\} \geq \delta^\eta \right\}.$$

By dyadic pigeonholing and the Frostman condition on  $\nu$ , there exists a  $t \geq \delta^{1-100\eta}$  with  $t \lesssim 1$  and a  $\nu$ -measurable subset  $Z' \subseteq Z$  such that

$$\nu(Z') \geq \delta^\eta \nu(Z),$$

and

$$(2.16) \quad \mathcal{H}^1(H'(v)) \geq \delta^{2\eta} \quad \text{for all } v \in Z',$$

where  $H'(v)$  is defined for any  $v \in \mathbb{H}$  by

$$H'(v) = \left\{ \theta \in [0, \pi) : \nu \left( P_{\mathbb{V}_\theta^\perp}^{-1} \left( B_{\mathbb{H}} \left( P_{\mathbb{V}_\theta^\perp}(v), \delta \right) \right) \cap A_{\mathbb{H}}(v, t, 2t) \right) \geq \delta^{s-\kappa+\eta} \right\},$$

and  $A_{\mathbb{H}}(v, r, R)$  is the Korányi annulus in  $\mathbb{H}$  centred at  $v$  with inner radius  $r$  and outer radius  $R$ . By inner regularity of  $\nu$  it may be assumed that  $Z'$  is compact. Let

$$H''(v) = \left\{ \theta \in [0, \pi) : \nu \left( P_{\mathbb{V}_\theta^\perp}^{-1} \left( B_{\mathbb{H}} \left( P_{\mathbb{V}_\theta^\perp}(v), 2\delta \right) \right) \cap A_{\mathbb{H}}(v, t, 2t) \right) \geq \delta^{s-\kappa+\eta} \right\}.$$

Fix  $v \in Z'$ . Using (2.16), choose three subsets  $H'_j(v) \subseteq H'(v)$  separated by a distance of at least  $\delta^{4\eta}$  from each other, each contained in an interval of length  $\delta^{4\eta}$ , and each with 1-dimensional measure at least  $\delta^{8\eta}$ . This can be done by partitioning  $[0, \pi)$  into  $\lesssim \delta^{-4\eta}$  intervals of length  $\delta^{4\eta}$ , choosing the 5 intervals with the largest intersection with  $H'(v)$  (in terms of  $\mathcal{H}^1$ -measure), and then choosing 3 with gaps between them. It may be assumed without loss of generality that all three sets  $H'_j(v)$  lie in  $[\frac{\pi}{8}, \frac{3\pi}{8}]$ , for any  $v$ , and that  $H'_2(v)$  lies between  $H'_1(v)$  and  $H'_3(v)$ .

To avoid a minor measure theoretic issue, the proof will make use of sets  $H''(v)$  and  $H''_j(v)$  rather than  $H'(v)$  and  $H'_j(v)$ ; the present paragraph is mainly a technicality. For each  $v \in Z'$ , continuity ensures that  $H'_j(v') \subseteq H''(v)$  for all  $v' \in Z'$  in a sufficiently small neighbourhood  $U_v$  of  $v$ . The sets  $U_v$  cover the compact set  $Z'$ , so choose a finite subcover  $\{U_{v_1}, \dots, U_{v_N}\}$ . Let  $V_i = U_{v_i} \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{i-1} U_{v_k}$ . For each  $v \in Z'$ , define  $H''_j(v) = H'_j(v_i)$ , with  $i$  uniquely chosen so that  $v \in V_i$ . Then for each fixed  $v \in Z'$ ,  $H''_j(v) \subseteq H''(v)$  for each  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , and the sets  $H''_1(v), H''_2(v), H''_3(v)$  are each contained in a subinterval of  $[\frac{\pi}{8}, \frac{3\pi}{8}]$  of length  $\delta^{4\eta}$ , at distance at least  $\delta^{4\eta}$  from each other, with  $H''_2(v)$  between  $H''_1(v)$  and  $H''_3(v)$ , and each with measure at least  $\delta^{8\eta}$ .

For each  $v \in Z'$  and  $v_j \in \mathbb{H}$ , define  $v \sim_j v_j$  if

$$v_j \in P_{\mathbb{V}_\theta^\perp}^{-1} \left( B_{\mathbb{H}} \left( P_{\mathbb{V}_\theta^\perp}(v), 2\delta \right) \right) \cap A_{\mathbb{H}}(v, t, 2t)$$

for some  $\theta \in H''_j(v)$  (the definition is not symmetric; there is no assumption that  $\sim_j$  is an equivalence relation). Set

$$(2.17) \quad \alpha = \frac{s - \kappa + 1000\eta}{s}.$$

The lemma will essentially follow from the lower and upper bounds in the following inequality:

$$(2.18) \quad \nu(Z)t^3\delta^{1000\eta+3(s-\kappa-1)} \leq \nu^4 \left\{ (v, v_1, v_2, v_3) \in Z' \times (\mathbb{H}^1)^3 : v \sim_j v_j \text{ for all } j, \right. \\ \left. d_E(\zeta_2, \ell(\zeta_1, \zeta_3)) \geq \delta^\alpha \text{ if } |\zeta - \zeta_1|, |\zeta - \zeta_3| \geq t/2 \right\} \leq t^{s+1}\delta^{(1-\alpha)(s-1)-1000\eta},$$

where  $d_E$  refers to the Euclidean distance,  $\ell(a, b)$  means the infinite line through  $a$  and  $b$  and  $v = (\zeta, \tau) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{R}$ . The piecewise constant property of the sets  $H_j''(v)$  as  $v$  ranges over  $Z'$  guarantees the Borel measurability of the set in (2.18).

To prove the lower bound of (2.18), fix  $v \in Z'$ , fix  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  and cover the unit interval  $[0, \pi)$  with disjoint intervals of diameter  $\delta/t$ . Since  $\mathcal{H}^1(H_j''(v)) \geq \delta^{8\eta}$ , there are at least  $t\delta^{8\eta-1}$  intervals  $I_k = I_{k,j}$  intersecting  $H_j''(v)$ , so pick some  $\theta_k = \theta_{k,j}$  in each intersection. Then

$$(2.19) \quad \nu \left( P_{\mathbb{V}_{\theta_k}^\perp}^{-1} \left( B_{\mathbb{H}} \left( P_{\mathbb{V}_{\theta_k}^\perp}(v), 2\delta \right) \right) \cap A_{\mathbb{H}}(v, t, 2t) \right) \geq \delta^{s-\kappa+\eta},$$

for each  $k$ , which follows from  $H_j''(v) \subseteq H''(v)$  and the definition of  $H''(v)$ .

For fixed  $v, v_1, v_3$  with  $v \sim_1 v_1, v \sim_3 v_3$ , and  $\frac{t}{2} \leq |\zeta - \zeta_1|, |\zeta - \zeta_3| \leq 2t$ ,

$$(2.20) \quad \nu \left\{ v_2 \in P_{\mathbb{V}_{\theta_k}^\perp}^{-1} \left( B_{\mathbb{H}} \left( P_{\mathbb{V}_{\theta_k}^\perp}(v), 2\delta \right) \right) \cap A_{\mathbb{H}}(v, t, 2t) : \right. \\ \left. d_E(\zeta_2, \ell(\zeta_1, \zeta_3)) \geq \delta^\alpha \right\} \geq \delta^{s-\kappa+2\eta}.$$

This will follow from (2.19) combined with the observation that for

$$\frac{t}{2} \leq |\zeta - \zeta_1|, |\zeta - \zeta_3| \leq 2t,$$

the set

$$E := \left\{ v_2 \in P_{\mathbb{V}_{\theta_k}^\perp}^{-1} \left( B_{\mathbb{H}} \left( P_{\mathbb{V}_{\theta_k}^\perp}(v), 2\delta \right) \right) \cap A_{\mathbb{H}}(v, t, 2t) : d_E(\zeta_2, \ell(\zeta_1, \zeta_3)) < \delta^\alpha \right\},$$

is contained in a Korányi ball of radius  $\delta^{\alpha-100\eta}$ , therefore contributing  $\lesssim \delta^{(\alpha-100\eta)s}$  to the measure, which is smaller than  $\delta^{s-\kappa+2\eta}$  by the definition of  $\alpha$ . To prove that the set  $E$  is contained in a Korányi ball, it will first be shown that the set

$$F := \left\{ \zeta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2 : (\zeta_2, \tau_2) \in A_{\mathbb{H}}(v, t, 2t) \text{ for some } \tau_2 \in \mathbb{R} : \right.$$

$$\left. \left| \pi_{\mathbb{V}_{\theta_k}^\perp}(\zeta_2 - \zeta) \right| < 2\delta, \quad d_E(\zeta_2, \ell(\zeta_1, \zeta_3)) < \delta^\alpha \right\},$$

is contained in a Euclidean ball in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  of radius  $\delta^{\alpha-50\eta}$ . Fix  $\zeta_2 \in F$  with  $v_2 = (\zeta_2, \tau_2)$  given and assume that  $t > 100\delta^\alpha$ , since otherwise the claim is trivial. Then the condition  $d_E(\zeta_2, \ell(\zeta_1, \zeta_3)) < \delta^\alpha$ , the inequality  $\frac{t}{2} \leq |\zeta - \zeta_1|, |\zeta - \zeta_3| \leq 2t$  and the conditions  $v \sim_1 v_1, v \sim_3 v_3$  with  $H_1''(v), H_3''(v) \subseteq [\frac{\pi}{8}, \frac{3\pi}{8}]$  either side of  $H_2''(v)$ , imply that  $|\zeta_2 - \zeta| > \frac{t}{100}$ . Therefore  $\zeta_2 = \zeta + re^{i\theta}$  where  $|\theta - \theta_k| \leq \frac{1000\delta}{t}$ . It follows that  $\zeta_2$  is contained in a  $(10^{10}\delta)$ -neighbourhood of the line

$$\ell_k := \{ \zeta + \lambda e^{i\theta_k} : \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \}.$$

The condition  $d_E(H_1''(v), H_3''(v)) \geq \delta^{4\eta}$ , and the property that  $\frac{\delta}{t} \leq \delta^{100\eta}$  is much smaller than  $\delta^{4\eta}$ , together imply that  $|\phi_1 - \phi_3| \gtrsim \delta^{4\eta}$ , where  $\zeta_1 - \zeta = r_1 e^{i\phi_1}$  and  $\zeta_3 - \zeta = r_3 e^{i\phi_3}$  with each  $\phi_i \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$  and  $r_1, r_3 \sim t$ . This implies that the angle

between  $\ell(\zeta_1, \zeta_3)$  and the line  $\ell_k$  is larger than  $\delta^{10\eta}$ . Using  $\alpha < 1$ , it follows that the intersection

$$\mathcal{N}_{\delta^\alpha}(\ell(\zeta_1, \zeta_3)) \cap \mathcal{N}_{10^{10}\delta}(\ell_k),$$

and therefore  $F$ , is contained in a Euclidean ball of radius  $\delta^{\alpha-50\eta}$  inside  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . For the set  $E$ , let  $v_2, v'_2 \in E$ . By the triangle inequality for the Korányi metric,

$$d_{\mathbb{H}}\left(P_{V_{\theta_k}^\perp}(v_2), P_{V_{\theta_k}^\perp}(v'_2)\right) \leq 4\delta.$$

This implies that

$$\left|\pi_{V_{\theta_k}^\perp}(\zeta_2 - \zeta'_2)\right| \leq 4\delta,$$

and

$$\left|\tau_2 - \tau'_2 - 2\pi_{V_{\theta_k}}(\zeta_2) \wedge \pi_{V_{\theta_k}^\perp}(\zeta_2) + 2\pi_{V_{\theta_k}}(\zeta'_2) \wedge \pi_{V_{\theta_k}^\perp}(\zeta'_2)\right| \leq 16\delta^2.$$

Using  $\zeta_2 \wedge \zeta'_2 = \pi_{V_{\theta_k}}(\zeta_2) \wedge \pi_{V_{\theta_k}^\perp}(\zeta'_2) - \pi_{V_{\theta_k}}(\zeta'_2) \wedge \pi_{V_{\theta_k}^\perp}(\zeta_2)$  and putting the two preceding inequalities together yields

$$(2.21) \quad |\tau_2 - \tau'_2 - 2\zeta_2 \wedge \zeta'_2| \lesssim \delta.$$

for any  $v_2, v'_2 \in E$ .

The Euclidean projection of  $E$  down to  $\mathbb{R}^2$  is contained in  $F$ , and therefore in a ball of radius  $\delta^{\alpha-50\eta}$ . Combining this with (2.21) gives

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathbb{H}}(v_2, v'_2) &= (|\zeta_2 - \zeta'_2|^4 + |\tau_2 - \tau'_2 - 2\zeta_2 \wedge \zeta'_2|^2)^{1/4} \\ &\lesssim \delta^{\alpha-50\eta} + \delta^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \delta^{\alpha-50\eta}, \end{aligned}$$

for any  $v_2, v'_2 \in E$ , by the definition (2.17) of  $\alpha$  and the choice (2.15) of  $\eta$ . This shows that the Korányi diameter of  $E$  is  $\lesssim \delta^{\alpha-50\eta}$ , and thus  $E$  is contained in a Korányi ball of radius  $\delta^{\alpha-100\eta}$ . This implies (2.20) by (2.19), the Frostman condition on  $\nu$  and the definition of  $\alpha$ .

For each  $j$  and each  $v \in Z'$ , the sets in (2.19) are finitely overlapping over  $k$  by Lemma 2.2, and therefore summing (2.19) over  $k$  gives

$$\nu\{v_j \in \mathbb{H} : v \sim_j v_j\} \gtrsim t\delta^{100\eta+s-\kappa-1}.$$

Similarly, for fixed  $v \in Z'$  and  $v_1, v_3$  with  $v \sim_1 v_1$  and  $v \sim_3 v_3$ , summing (2.20) over  $k$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \nu\{v_2 \in \mathbb{H} : v \sim_2 v_2 \text{ and } d_E(\zeta_2, \ell(\zeta_1, \zeta_3)) \geq \delta^\alpha \text{ if } |\zeta - \zeta_1|, |\zeta - \zeta_3| \geq t/2\} \\ \gtrsim t\delta^{100\eta+s-\kappa-1}. \end{aligned}$$

By Fubini's Theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu^4\left\{(v, v_1, v_2, v_3) \in Z' \times (\mathbb{H}^1)^3 : v \sim_j v_j \text{ for all } j, \right. \\ &\quad \left. d_E(\zeta_2, \ell(\zeta_1, \zeta_3)) \geq \delta^\alpha \text{ if } |\zeta - \zeta_1|, |\zeta - \zeta_3| \geq t/2\right\} \\ &= \int_{Z'} \int_{\{v_1: v \sim_1 v_1\}} \int_{\{v_3: v \sim_3 v_3\}} \int_{\substack{\{v_2: v \sim_2 v_2 \text{ and} \\ d_E(\zeta_2, \ell(\zeta_1, \zeta_3)) \geq \delta^\alpha \text{ if} \\ |\zeta - \zeta_1|, |\zeta - \zeta_3| \geq t/2\}} d\nu^4(v_2, v_3, v_1, v) \\ &\gtrsim \nu(Z') (t\delta^{100\eta+s-\kappa-1})^3 \\ &\geq \nu(Z) t^3 \delta^{302\eta+3(s-\kappa-1)}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies the lower bound of (2.18).

For the upper bound, fix  $v_j = (\zeta_j, \tau_j)$  for  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned} A &= A(v_1, v_2, v_3) \\ &:= \{v \in Z' : v \sim_j v_j \text{ for all } j, d_E(\zeta_2, \ell(\zeta_1, \zeta_3)) \geq \delta^\alpha \text{ if } |\zeta - \zeta_1|, |\zeta - \zeta_3| \geq t/2\}. \end{aligned}$$

The upper bound of (2.18) will be obtained by bounding  $\nu(A)$  and then integrating over  $v_1, v_2, v_3$ .

Fix  $v \in A$ . For each  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , the inequality

$$d_{\mathbb{H}}\left(P_{V_\theta^\perp}(v), P_{V_\theta^\perp}(v_j)\right) \leq 2\delta, \quad \theta \in H_j''(v),$$

implies

$$(2.22) \quad |\tau - \tau_j - 2\zeta \wedge \zeta_j| \lesssim \delta,$$

by the same calculation as in the derivation of (2.21).

Hence if  $|\tau - \tau_j - 2\zeta \wedge \zeta_j|^{1/2} \geq |\zeta - \zeta_j|$  for some  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , then  $d_{\mathbb{H}}(v, v_j) \lesssim \delta^{1/2}$  since (2.22) corresponds to the second component of the Korányi distance, see (1.1). Therefore

$$(2.23) \quad \nu\{v \in A : |\tau - \tau_j - 2\zeta \wedge \zeta_j|^{1/2} \geq |\zeta - \zeta_j| \text{ for some } j \in \{1, 2, 3\}\} \lesssim \delta^{s/2}.$$

It remains to bound  $\nu(A')$ , where

$$A' = \{v \in A : |\tau - \tau_j - 2\zeta \wedge \zeta_j|^{1/2} < |\zeta - \zeta_j| \text{ for all } j \in \{1, 2, 3\}\}.$$

In this set,  $\frac{t}{2} \leq |\zeta - \zeta_j| \leq 2t$  for each  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  by the definition of the Korányi metric. Define  $G : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  by

$$G(\zeta, \tau) = \begin{pmatrix} \tau - \tau_1 - 2\zeta \wedge \zeta_1 \\ \tau - \tau_2 - 2\zeta \wedge \zeta_2 \\ \tau - \tau_3 - 2\zeta \wedge \zeta_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{so that} \quad DG = \begin{pmatrix} -2y_1 & 2x_1 & 1 \\ -2y_2 & 2x_2 & 1 \\ -2y_3 & 2x_3 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\zeta_j = x_j + iy_j$ . Then  $A' \subseteq G^{-1}(B_E(0, C\delta))$  for some sufficiently large constant  $C$ , by (2.22). If  $A'$  is nonempty and there exists  $v_0 \in A'$ , then by the condition  $d_E(\zeta_2, \ell(\zeta_1, \zeta_3)) \geq \delta^\alpha$  in the definition of  $A$ ,

$$\zeta_2 = \zeta_3 + \lambda_1(\zeta_1 - \zeta_3) + \lambda_2 i(\zeta_1 - \zeta_3), \quad \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R},$$

with  $|\lambda_2||\zeta_1 - \zeta_3| \geq \delta^\alpha$ . Using  $d_E(H_1''(v_0), H_3''(v_0)) \geq \delta^{4\eta}$  gives  $|\zeta_1 - \zeta_3| \gtrsim t\delta^{100\eta}$ , and so

$$\begin{aligned} |\det DG| &= 4|\zeta_1 \wedge \zeta_2 + \zeta_2 \wedge \zeta_3 + \zeta_3 \wedge \zeta_1| \\ &= 4|(\zeta_1 - \zeta_3) \wedge (\zeta_2 - \zeta_3)| \\ &= 4|\lambda_2||\zeta_1 - \zeta_3|^2 \\ &\gtrsim t\delta^{\alpha+100\eta}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the formula  $(DG)^{-1} = (\det DG)^{-1} \text{adj } DG$  for the inverse, the operator norm satisfies  $\|(DG)^{-1}\| \lesssim t^{-1}\delta^{-\alpha-100\eta}$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} A' &\subseteq G^{-1}(B_E(0, C\delta)) \\ &\subseteq B_E(v_0, C't^{-1}\delta^{1-\alpha-100\eta}). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 1.3,  $A'$  can be covered by at  $\lesssim t\delta^{-(1-\alpha-100\eta)}$  balls of radius  $\lesssim t^{-1}\delta^{1-\alpha-100\eta}$ , so by the Frostman condition on  $\nu$ ,

$$(2.24) \quad \nu(A') \lesssim t^{1-s}\delta^{(1-\alpha-100\eta)(s-1)}.$$

The inequality  $\delta^{s/2} \leq \delta^{(1-\alpha-100\eta)(s-1)}$  follows from the definition of  $\alpha$  in (2.17) and the definition of  $\kappa$ ; if  $\kappa = s/2$  this is trivial, and if  $\kappa = \frac{3(s-1)}{4-\frac{1}{s}}$  it follows from the inequality

$$2s^2 - 11s + 6 < 0 \quad \text{for } s \in [1, 4].$$

Combining (2.24) with (2.23) therefore yields

$$\nu(A) \lesssim t^{1-s}\delta^{(1-\alpha-100\eta)(s-1)}.$$

Using the triangle inequality for  $d_{\mathbb{H}}$ , and part (iii) of Fubini's Theorem in [7], gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \nu^4 \left\{ (v, v_1, v_2, v_3) \in Z' \times (\mathbb{H}^1)^3 : v \sim_j v_j \text{ for all } j, \right. \\ & \quad \left. d_E(\zeta_2, \ell(\zeta_1, \zeta_3)) \geq \delta^\alpha \text{ if } |\zeta - \zeta_1|, |\zeta - \zeta_3| \geq t/2 \right\} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{H}} \int_{B_{\mathbb{H}}(v_3, 4t)} \int_{B_{\mathbb{H}}(v_3, 4t)} \nu(A(v_1, v_2, v_3)) d\nu(v_1) d\nu(v_2) d\nu(v_3) \\ &\lesssim t^{s+1}\delta^{(1-\alpha-100\eta)(s-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies the upper bound in (2.18).

Combining the lower and upper bounds in (2.18) gives

$$\nu(Z)t^3\delta^{1000\eta+3(s-\kappa-1)} \leq t^{s+1}\delta^{(1-\alpha)(s-1)-1000\eta}.$$

Since  $s > 2$  and  $t \lesssim 1$ , this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(Z) &\leq \delta^{(1-\alpha)(s-1)-3(s-\kappa-1)-2001\eta} \\ &= \delta^\eta \delta^{\left(4-\frac{1}{s}\right)\left(\kappa - \frac{3(s-1)}{4-\frac{1}{s}}\right) - 3002\eta} \quad \text{using } \alpha = \frac{s-\kappa+1000\eta}{s}, \\ &\leq \delta^\eta, \end{aligned}$$

by the definition of  $\eta$  in (2.15). This finishes the proof.  $\square$

Combining Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.3 with Lemma 1.4 (Frostman) results in the following proof of the main theorem.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Let  $A \subseteq \mathbb{H}$  be an analytic set with  $s = \dim A > 2$  and let  $\epsilon \in (0, s-2)$ . By Lemma 1.4 (Frostman), there is a nonzero, finite, compactly supported Borel measure  $\nu$  on  $A$  such that  $\nu(B_{\mathbb{H}}(v, r)) \leq r^{s-\epsilon}$  for every  $v \in \mathbb{H}$  and  $r > 0$ . By Lemma 2.3 with  $\kappa = \max\left\{\frac{s}{2}, \frac{3(s-1)}{4-\frac{1}{s}}\right\} > \max\left\{\frac{s-\epsilon}{2}, \frac{3(s-\epsilon-1)}{4-\frac{1}{s-\epsilon}}\right\}$ , there exist  $\delta_0, \eta > 0$  such that

$$\nu \left\{ v \in \mathbb{H} : \mathcal{H}^1 \left\{ \theta \in [0, \pi) : P_{\mathbb{V}_\theta^\perp} \# \nu \left( B_{\mathbb{H}} \left( P_{\mathbb{V}_\theta^\perp}(v), \delta \right) \right) \geq \delta^{s-\kappa-\epsilon} \right\} \geq \delta^\eta \right\} \leq \delta^\eta,$$

whenever  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ . Applying Lemma 2.1 gives

$$\dim P_{\mathbb{V}_\theta^\perp} A \geq \dim P_{\mathbb{V}_\theta^\perp}(\text{supp } \nu) \geq s - \kappa - \epsilon \quad \text{for a.e. } \theta \in [0, \pi).$$

Since a countable union of measure zero sets has measure zero, letting  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  along a countable sequence results in

$$\dim P_{V_\theta^\perp} A \geq s - \kappa = \begin{cases} \frac{s}{2} & \text{if } s \in (2, \frac{5}{2}] \\ \frac{s(s+2)}{4s-1} & \text{if } s \in (\frac{5}{2}, 4], \end{cases}$$

for a.e.  $\theta \in [0, \pi)$ . □

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Balogh, Z. M., Durand-Cartagena, E., Fässler, K., Mattila, P., Tyson, J. T.: The effect of projections on dimension in the Heisenberg group. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* **29**, 381–432 (2013)
- [2] Balogh, Z. M., Fässler, K., Mattila, P., Tyson, J. T.: Projection and slicing theorems in Heisenberg groups. *Adv. Math.* **231**, 569–604 (2012)
- [3] Balogh, Z. M., Rickly, M., Cassano, F. S.: Comparison of Hausdorff measures with respect to the Euclidean and the Heisenberg metric. *Publ. Mat.* **47**, 237–259 (2003)
- [4] Bogachev, V. I.: *Measure Theory, Volume II*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany (2007)
- [5] Christ, M.: Hilbert transforms along curves: I. Nilpotent groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **122**, 575–596 (1985)
- [6] Cygan, J.: Subadditivity of homogeneous norms on certain nilpotent Lie groups. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **83**, 69–70 (1981)
- [7] Evans, L. C., Gariepy, R. F.: *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL (2014)
- [8] Fässler, K., Hovila, R.: Improved Hausdorff dimension estimate for vertical projections in the Heisenberg group. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.* **15**, 459–483 (2016)
- [9] Howroyd, J. D.: On dimension and on the existence of sets of finite positive Hausdorff measure. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)* **70**, 581–604 (1995)
- [10] Käenmäki, A., Orponen, T., Venieri, L.: A Marstrand-type restricted projection theorem in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . [arXiv:1708.04859v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.04859v1) (2017)
- [11] Marstrand, J.: Some fundamental geometrical properties of plane sets of fractional dimensions. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)* **4**, 257–302 (1954)
- [12] Mattila, P.: *Geometry of Sets and Measures in Euclidean Spaces*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom (1995)
- [13] Orponen, T., Venieri, L.: Improved bounds for restricted families of projections to planes in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* doi:10.1093/imrn/rny193 (2018)
- [14] Wolff, T.: Recent work connected with the Kakeya problem. In: *Prospects in Mathematics*, 129–162. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (1999)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, URBANA, IL 61801, U.S.A.  
*E-mail address:* `terence2@illinois.edu`