

Visible Parts and Slices of Ahlfors Regular Sets

Damian Dąbrowski*

Received 27 June 2023; Revised 24 January 2024; Published 20 December 2024

Abstract: We show that for any compact set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ the visible part of E has Hausdorff dimension at most $d - 1/6$ for almost every direction. This improves recent estimates of Orponen and Matheus.

If E is s -Ahlfors regular, where $s > d - 1$, we prove a much better estimate. In that case we have for almost every direction θ

$$\dim_{\text{H}}(\text{Vis}_{\theta}(E)) \leq s - \alpha(s - d + 1),$$

where $\alpha > 0.183$ is absolute. The estimate is new even for self-similar sets satisfying the open set condition. Along the way, we prove a refinement of the Marstrand's slicing theorem for Ahlfors regular sets.

Key words and phrases: visibility conjecture, Hausdorff dimension, Marstrand's slicing theorem

1 Introduction

1.1 Visibility conjecture

Given $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ let $\ell_{\theta} = \{t\theta : t \geq 0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be the closed half-line spanned by θ . The *visible part* of a compact set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ in direction θ is defined as

$$\text{Vis}_{\theta}(E) = \{x \in E : (x + \ell_{\theta}) \cap E = \{x\}\}.$$

*Supported by the Research Council of Finland postdoctoral grant *Quantitative rectifiability and harmonic measure beyond the Ahlfors-David-regular setting*, grant No. 347123.

Let $\pi_\theta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \theta^\perp$ be the orthogonal projection to the $(d-1)$ -dimensional plane θ^\perp . Since $\pi_\theta(\text{Vis}_\theta(E)) = \pi_\theta(E)$, it follows from the Marstrand-Mattila projection theorem (see e.g. [Mat15, Theorem 5.8]) that for \mathcal{H}^{d-1} -a.e. $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$

$$\dim_{\text{H}}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E)) \geq \min\{\dim_{\text{H}}(E), d-1\}, \tag{1.1}$$

where \dim_{H} stands for the Hausdorff dimension. Observe that we also have the trivial upper bound

$$\dim_{\text{H}}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E)) \leq \dim_{\text{H}}(E) \tag{1.2}$$

simply because $\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \subset E$. The two estimates together imply that for sets satisfying $\dim_{\text{H}}(E) \leq d-1$ the inequality (1.1) is in fact an equality. The *visibility conjecture* asserts that the same holds for all compact sets E .

Conjecture. *If $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is compact and $\dim_{\text{H}}(E) > d-1$, then for \mathcal{H}^{d-1} -a.e. $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$*

$$\dim_{\text{H}}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E)) = d-1. \tag{1.3}$$

To the best of our knowledge the conjecture first appeared in [JJMO03]; another early mention is [Mat04, Problem 11].

The visibility conjecture has been confirmed for several special classes of sets. It holds for quasicircles, graphs of continuous functions [JJMO03], fractal percolation [AJJ⁺12], and for self-similar and self-affine sets satisfying various additional hypotheses [JJMO03, FF13, Ros21, JJSW22].

Some progress has also been made towards proving (1.3) for general compact sets. A special case of Theorem 1.1 from [JJN04] gives that if $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies $0 < \mathcal{H}^s(E) < \infty$, then $\mathcal{H}^s(\text{Vis}_\theta(E)) = 0$ for a.e. $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. In a recent breakthrough, Orponen showed that for any compact $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ we have for a.e. $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$

$$\dim_{\text{H}}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E)) \leq d - \frac{1}{50d}, \tag{1.4}$$

so that at least for sets with dimension close enough to d we can beat the trivial bound (1.2). Orponen's proof was optimised by Matheus [Mat21a], but due to typos in equations [Mat21a, (2.9) and (3.17)] the estimates obtained are weaker than stated.

Quite amazingly, in general it is still not known whether for sets satisfying $\dim_{\text{H}}(E) > d-1$ we have $\dim_{\text{H}}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E)) < \dim_{\text{H}}(E)$ for a.e. $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. Until now, this was open even for self-similar sets satisfying the open set condition. If we assume additionally that the rotation group of the associated IFS is finite, and that the projection $\pi_\theta(E)$ has non-empty interior, then this was shown in [JJSW22, Theorem 2.11]. Some estimates for self-similar sets were also shown in [Mat21a], but they were only valid if $\dim_{\text{H}}(E)$ was large enough, and due to the typo in [Mat21a, (3.17)] it is not clear to us what the estimate obtained for $\dim_{\text{H}}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E))$ is.

In the first result of this article we improve on the trivial bound (1.2) for all Ahlfors regular sets with $\dim_{\text{H}}(E) > d-1$. Recall that a compact set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is s -Ahlfors regular, where $0 < s \leq d$, if there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that

$$C^{-1}r^s \leq \mathcal{H}^s(E \cap B(x, r)) \leq Cr^s \quad \text{for all } x \in E, r > 0.$$

Theorem 1.1. *Let $d - 1 < s \leq d$. Suppose that $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a compact s -Ahlfors regular set. Then, for a.e. $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(\text{Vis}_{\theta}(E)) \leq s - \alpha(s - d + 1) = (1 - \alpha)s + \alpha(d - 1), \tag{1.5}$$

where $\alpha = 1 - \sqrt{6}/3 > 0.1835$.

In particular, the result holds for self-similar sets satisfying weak separation condition, see [FHOR15, Theorem 2.1]. Note that proving (1.5) with $\alpha = 1$ would establish the visibility conjecture for Ahlfors-regular sets.

In [Orp22, Remark 1.3] Orponen remarked that while the constant $1/50$ in (1.4) could be improved by optimising the argument (this was done in [Mat21a]), “it seems likely that more ideas will be needed to get an upper bound of the form $n - c$ for some absolute $c > 0$.” In our second main result we obtain such a bound.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is compact. Then, for a.e. $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(\text{Vis}_{\theta}(E)) \leq d - \frac{1}{6}. \tag{1.6}$$

This improves the best known upper bound for $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(\text{Vis}_{\theta}(E))$ for general compact sets.

1.2 Slicing Ahlfors regular sets

When proving Theorem 1.1 we needed an upper bound for the dimension of *line slices* of Ahlfors regular sets, that is, sets of the form $F \cap \ell$, where ℓ is a line. We prove a more general result, valid for slices of arbitrary dimension.

Let $1 \leq n \leq d - 1$ be an integer. The celebrated Marstrand’s slicing theorem [Mar54, Mat75] states that for a set $F \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $0 < \mathcal{H}^s(F) < \infty$ and $n < s \leq d$ we have for $\gamma_{d,n}$ -a.e. $L \in \mathcal{G}(d, n)$

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(F \cap V_{x,L}) = s - n \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^s\text{-a.e. } x \in F. \tag{1.7}$$

Here $\mathcal{G}(d, n)$ denotes the Grassmannian of n -dimensional planes in \mathbb{R}^d , $\gamma_{d,n}$ is the Haar measure on $\mathcal{G}(d, n)$, and $V_{x,L} := x + L^{\perp}$. See [Mat95, Theorem 10.11] or [Mat15, Theorem 6.9] for textbook references.

Refinements and alternative proofs of Marstrand’s slicing theorem have been found in [Mat81, Orp14, MO16], see also [Mat15, Chapter 6] and recent surveys [Mat21b, Mat23]. The properties of slices of certain special classes of fractals have also been extensively studied, see e.g. [Wu19, Shm19, Alg20, BKY21, ABK23].

In [Mat15, p. 97] Mattila asked whether it is possible to get a dimension upper bound on the set

$$F_{u,L} := \{x \in F : \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(F \cap V_{x,L}) > u\},$$

where $0 < \mathcal{H}^s(F) < \infty$, $n < s \leq d$, and $s - n \leq u < d - n$. Note that (1.7) gives only $\mathcal{H}^s(F_{u,L}) = 0$ for a.e. $L \in \mathcal{G}(d, n)$. We prove such estimate for the endpoint $u = s - n$ in the case that F is Ahlfors regular. In this case, we are also able with no extra effort to replace in the definition of $F_{u,L}$ the Hausdorff dimension by the upper box-counting dimension.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $n < s \leq d$. Suppose that $F \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a compact s -Ahlfors regular set. Then, for $\gamma_{d,n}$ -a.e. $L \in \mathcal{G}(d, n)$*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(\{x \in F : \overline{\dim}_{\text{box}}(F \cap V_{x,L}) > s - n\}) \leq n. \tag{1.8}$$

For a more quantitative version of Theorem 1.3, see Proposition 3.1.

Remark 1.4. In fact, we prove that (1.8) holds for every $L \in \mathcal{G}(d, n)$ such that the push-forward of $\mathcal{H}^s|_F$ under the orthogonal projection π_L belongs to the Sobolev space $H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all $0 < \sigma < (s - n)/2$. This is known to be true for $\gamma_{d,n}$ -a.e. $L \in \mathcal{G}(d, n)$ (see Lemma 2.4), and for a general set $F \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $0 < \mathcal{H}^s(F) < \infty$ this is likely to be sharp, in the sense that the set of exceptional planes $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{G}(d, n)$ where the Sobolev bound fails may satisfy $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(\mathcal{E}) = \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(\mathcal{G}(d, n))$. However, it seems plausible that for Ahlfors regular sets F the set of exceptional planes \mathcal{E} is much smaller. Hence, proving any non-trivial upper bounds on $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(\mathcal{E})$ for Ahlfors regular sets would immediately give an estimate on the dimension of exceptional planes where (1.8) fails.

Remark 1.5. The estimate (1.8) is only interesting if $s \leq 2n$, because for $s > 2n$ it is easy to show that for $\gamma_{d,n}$ -a.e. $L \in \mathcal{G}(d, n)$

$$\{x \in F : \overline{\dim}_{\text{box}}(F \cap V_{x,L}) > s - n\} = \emptyset, \tag{1.9}$$

see the argument above (3.11). (1.9) also holds trivially for $s = d$, simply because $\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(V_{x,L}) = d - n$.

Question 1.6. It is not clear to us how sharp (1.8) is. Comparing (1.8) and (1.9), it is tempting to ask whether for $n < s \leq \min(2n, d)$ and sets with $0 < \mathcal{H}^s(F) < \infty$ we have

$$\dim_{\mathbb{H}}(\{x \in F : \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(F \cap V_{x,L}) > s - n\}) \leq 2n - s$$

for a.e. $L \in \mathcal{G}(d, n)$.

Observe that if this estimate was true, then for $s > 3n/2$ it would automatically improve to $\{x \in F : \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(F \cap V_{x,L}) > s - n\} = \emptyset$ for a.e. $L \in \mathcal{G}(d, n)$, simply because $s - n > 2n - s$ in this regime.

1.3 About the proofs

The proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 follow the general strategy invented in [Orp22], which we briefly describe below.

Given a compact set $E \subset [0, 1]^d$ and a fixed direction $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, we seek an estimate for $\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E))$ for some $\tau > 0$. Consider the lines \mathcal{L}_θ parallel to θ that cover $[0, 1]^d$. The lines are divided into two classes, the good lines and the bad lines. Loosely speaking, a line $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_\theta$ is good if the slice $E \cap \ell$ is quite similar to the δ -slice $E \cap \ell(\delta)$, where $\ell(\delta)$ is the δ -neighbourhood of ℓ . Otherwise, ℓ is bad. Let L_B be the union of bad lines, and L_G the union of good lines. We estimate $\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap L_B)$ and $\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap L_G)$ separately.

We have a poor understanding of how $\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap L_B$ looks, but luckily we can show that there are very few bad lines, in the sense that $\pi_\theta(L_B)$ has small dimension. This step uses crucially the Sobolev estimate for the projections of high-dimensional Frostman measures, see Lemma 2.4. Then, we can estimate crudely

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap L_B) \leq \mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau-1}(\pi_\theta(L_B)) \lesssim \delta^\varepsilon. \tag{1.10}$$

On the other hand, the good part $\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap L_G$ has a very nice structure, so that for each δ -tube T parallel to θ we have

$$N(T \cap \text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap L_G, \delta) \lesssim \delta^{\tau-1+\varepsilon}, \tag{1.11}$$

where $N(\cdot, \delta)$ stands for δ -covering number, and then

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap L_G) \lesssim \sum_T N(T \cap \text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap L_G, \delta) \cdot \delta^{d-\tau} \lesssim \delta^{1-d} \cdot \delta^{\tau-1+\varepsilon} \cdot \delta^{d-\tau} = \delta^\varepsilon.$$

This is the outline of the proof in [Orp22]. In this paper we make two improvements. Firstly, in [Orp22] one begins by discarding exceptional directions where the Sobolev norm of projections is large (this is important for the estimate of $\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau-1}(\pi_\theta(L_B))$). In the end, this forces $\tau \lesssim 1/d$. In the current paper, we do not discard exceptional directions. Instead, all our estimates depend on the Sobolev norm of the projections, and only at the end we average over all the directions. This removes some annoying terms from the estimates, and allows us to obtain Theorem 1.2, where τ is independent of d .

The second improvement consists of using the slicing estimate from Theorem 1.3 (or rather Proposition 3.1) in the case $n = d - 1$, which corresponds to slicing with lines. In [Orp22] it is hard to do better than (1.10) or (1.11) because a priori each slice might be of dimension 1. Using Theorem 1.3, we know that for an s -Ahlfors regular set E most slices will have dimension at most $s - d + 1$, which allows us to significantly improve (1.10) and (1.11). This is how we get Theorem 1.1.

Finally, the proof of Theorem 1.3 relies on the Sobolev regularity of projections (Lemma 2.4) and the trace formulas for Sobolev functions (Theorem 2.1). It involves proving a weak-type estimate for the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function which is roughly of the form $\mathcal{M} : H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^{2,\infty}(\mathcal{H}_\infty^{n-2\sigma})$ for $0 < \sigma < n/2$, see Lemma 3.2.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notation

Inequalities of the form $f \leq Cg$, where C is some constant, will be abbreviated as $f \lesssim g$. If the constant C depends on an additional parameter ε , we will write $f \lesssim_\varepsilon g$. We will ignore dependence on dimension d and on Ahlfors-regularity constants. If we have $g \lesssim f \lesssim g$, we will write $f \sim g$.

Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, r > 0$ we will denote the open ball centered at x of radius r by $B(x, r)$. If $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, then $B(x, r)$ will stand for the $(d - 1)$ -dimensional open ball in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} . If B is a ball, then $r(B)$ will denote its radius.

If $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\delta > 0$, then $N(A, \delta)$ denotes the δ -covering number of A .

Given an affine line ℓ and $\delta > 0$, $\ell(\delta)$ will denote the δ -neighbourhood of ℓ .

Let \mathbb{D} be the family of standard dyadic cubes on \mathbb{R}^d . Given a dyadic cube Q we will denote its sidelength by $\ell(Q)$.

$\mathcal{G}(d, n)$ stands for the Grassmannian of n -dimensional planes in \mathbb{R}^d . Given $L \in \mathcal{G}(d, n)$, $\pi_L : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow L \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the orthogonal projection to L . Given $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, we set $\pi_\theta := \pi_{\theta^\perp}$, so that $\pi_\theta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$.

2.2 Sobolev spaces

For $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ the fractional Sobolev space $H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the completion of the set of Schwartz functions $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\|f\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 := \int |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2 (1 + |\xi|^2)^\sigma d\xi < \infty.$$

The quantity above is the inhomogeneous Sobolev norm. Its homogeneous counterpart is

$$\|f\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 := \int |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{2\sigma} d\xi.$$

Observe that if ν is a finite Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^d , and $\sigma \geq 0$, then we can estimate the inhomogeneous norm using the homogeneous one:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nu\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 &= \int |\widehat{\nu}(\xi)|^2 (1 + |\xi|^2)^\sigma d\xi \\ &\lesssim \int_{B(0,1)} |\widehat{\nu}(\xi)|^2 d\xi + \int_{B(0,1)^c} |\widehat{\nu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{2\sigma} d\xi \\ &\lesssim \|\widehat{\nu}(\xi)\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\nu\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \leq \nu(\mathbb{R}^d)^2 + \|\nu\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

Another tool we will use in our proof is the theory of traces of Sobolev functions with respect to fractal measures. Results of this type can be found e.g. in the classical monographs [Maz11, Chapter 11], [AH96, Chapter 7], or [Tri06, Chapter 7]. The statement we found particularly convenient was Theorem 7.16 from [Tri06], and in our setting it gives the following.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $0 < t < d$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and $\sigma \geq (d - t + \varepsilon)/2$. Suppose that $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and that η is a Radon probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d satisfying $\eta(B(x, r)) \leq C_0 r^t$. Then,*

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\eta)} \lesssim_\varepsilon (C_0)^{1/2} \|f\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

2.3 Frostman measures

We are going to use two versions of the classical Frostman's lemma. The first one is due to Orponen [Orp22, Lemma A.1], and the difference compared to the usual Frostman's lemma is the lower bound on $\nu(\overline{Q})$.

Lemma 2.2. *If $K \subset [0, 1]^d$ is compact, $0 < t \leq d$, then there exists a Radon measure ν with $\text{supp } \nu \subset K$, satisfying*

$$\nu(B(x, r)) \lesssim r^t \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^d, r > 0$$

and for all dyadic cubes $Q \subset [0, 1]^d$

$$\nu(\overline{Q}) \gtrsim \min(\mathcal{H}_\infty^t(Q \cap K), \mathcal{H}^d(Q)).$$

We remark that the Frostman measure ν above satisfies $\nu(K) \sim \mathcal{H}_\infty^t(K)$, and in particular if $t > \dim_{\mathbb{H}}(K)$, then $\nu \equiv 0$.

The second version of Frostman’s lemma we will use concerns unions of dyadic cubes, and it asserts that at small scales the Frostman measure associated to such sets is just normalized Lebesgue measure. This follows from the usual construction of the Frostman measure using dyadic cubes, as in [Mat95, Theorem 8.8], and we omit the proof.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{D}$ be a collection of disjoint dyadic cubes with $K := \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{K}} Q \subset [0, 1]^d$. For any $0 < t \leq d$ there exists a Radon measure ν with $\text{supp } \nu \subset \bar{K}$, satisfying $\nu(K) \sim \mathcal{H}_\infty^t(K)$,*

$$\nu(B(x, r)) \lesssim r^t \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^d, r > 0,$$

and for all $Q \in \mathcal{K}$

$$\nu|_Q = \frac{\nu(Q)}{\ell(Q)^d} \mathcal{H}^d|_Q. \tag{2.2}$$

Let ν be a compactly supported Radon measure on \mathbb{R}^d . Given $L \in \mathcal{G}(d, n)$ we will write ν_L to denote the push-forward of ν under the orthogonal projection π_L . Whenever $\nu_L \ll \mathcal{H}^n$, which will always be the case in this paper, the expression “ ν_L ” will denote both the measure and its density with respect to \mathcal{H}^n . Similarly, for $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ we will write ν_θ to denote the push-forward of ν under the orthogonal projection $\pi_\theta : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$.

The following estimate is well-known (see e.g. [Mat15, Theorem 5.10]), so we only sketch the proof.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that ν is Radon measure on \mathbb{R}^d with $\text{supp } \nu \subset [0, 1]^d$, and that it satisfies $\nu(B(x, r)) \leq C_0 r^t$ for some $n < t \leq d$. Let $0 < \varepsilon < t - n$, and $\sigma = (t - n - \varepsilon)/2$. Then,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{G}(d, n)} \|\nu_L\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2 d\gamma_{d, n}(L) \lesssim_\varepsilon C_0 \nu(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Proof. Recall that given $0 < s < d$, the Riesz s -energy of a Radon measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d is defined as

$$I_s(\mu) := \iint \frac{1}{|x - y|^s} d\mu(x) d\mu(y).$$

If μ is compactly supported, then we also have the following well-known identity relating Riesz energy with the homogeneous Sobolev norm: for $0 < s < d$

$$I_s(\mu) = C_{d, s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{s-d} d\xi, \tag{2.3}$$

see [Mat15, Theorem 3.10] for the proof.

A simple computation shows that the Frostman condition $\nu(B(x, r)) \leq C_0 r^t$ implies

$$I_{t-\varepsilon}(\nu) \lesssim_\varepsilon C_0 \nu(\mathbb{R}^d). \tag{2.4}$$

Using the fact that $\widehat{v}_L(\xi) = \widehat{v}(\xi)$ for $\xi \in L$, another standard computation (see [Mat15, Theorem 5.10] for details) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{G}(d,n)} \|v_L\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2 d\theta &= \int_{\mathcal{G}(d,n)} \int_L |\widehat{v}_L(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{t-\varepsilon-n} d\mathcal{H}^n(\xi) d\gamma_{d,n}(L) \\ &\sim \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\widehat{v}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{t-\varepsilon-d} d\xi \sim I_{t-\varepsilon}(v) \lesssim_\varepsilon C_0 v(\mathbb{R}^d). \end{aligned}$$

Together with (2.1), this gives the desired estimate. \square

3 Slicing Ahlfors regular sets

In this section we prove Theorem 1.3. We first prove the following more quantitative result, which will be crucial later in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Given a locally integrable function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the centered Hardy-Littlewood maximal function of f is defined as

$$\mathcal{M}f(x) = \sup_{r>0} \frac{1}{r^d} \int_{B(x,r)} |f(y)| dy.$$

Recall that if ν is a Radon measure on \mathbb{R}^d and $L \in \mathcal{G}(d,n)$, then ν_L is the pushforward of ν under the orthogonal projection $\pi_L : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $n < s \leq \min(2n, d)$ and $0 < \varepsilon < (s - n)/2$. Let ν be an s -Ahlfors regular measure on \mathbb{R}^d with $F := \text{supp } \nu \subset B(0, 1)$. Let $M > 3^n \nu(F)$, $L \in \mathcal{G}(d, n)$, and*

$$F_M = \left\{ x \in F : \mathcal{M}\nu_L(\pi_L(x)) \geq M \right\}.$$

Then, for $\sigma = (s - n - \varepsilon)/2$ we have

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{n+2\varepsilon}(F_M) \lesssim_\varepsilon M^{-1} \|v_L\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2.$$

Most of this section is dedicated to proving this result. Fix ν and F as above, and let

$$H' = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathcal{M}\nu_L(x) \geq M\},$$

so that $H' = \pi_L(F_M)$. We would like to get a bound of the form

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{2n-s+2\varepsilon}(H') \lesssim_\varepsilon M^{-2} \|v_L\|_{\dot{H}^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2.$$

We first establish a dyadic variant of this estimate.

Let $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ be the family of maximal dyadic cubes satisfying

$$\frac{\nu_L(Q)}{\ell(Q)^n} \geq 3^{-n} M. \tag{3.1}$$

Since $3^{-n}M > \nu(F)$ and $\text{supp } \nu_L \subset [0, 1]^n$, we get that all cubes from \mathcal{B} are contained in $[0, 1]^n$. Let $H = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{B}} Q$.

Note that for any $Q \in \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ which is not contained in H we have

$$\frac{\nu_L(Q)}{\ell(Q)^n} < 3^{-n}M. \tag{3.2}$$

Lemma 3.2. *We have*

$$\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{2n-s+2\varepsilon}(H) \lesssim_{\varepsilon} M^{-2} \|\nu_L\|_{H^{\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. Assume that $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{2n-s+2\varepsilon}(H) > 0$, since otherwise there is nothing to prove. Let η be the Radon measure on H given by Frostman's lemma Lemma 2.3, normalized so that $\eta(\mathbb{R}^n) = 1$ (this can be done since $\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{2n-s+2\varepsilon}(H) > 0$), so that it satisfies

$$\eta(B(x, r)) \lesssim (\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{2n-s+2\varepsilon}(H))^{-1} r^{2n-s+2\varepsilon},$$

where the implicit constant depends only on the dimension.

We would like to apply Theorem 2.1 with respect to ν_L and η . However, it is not clear if we can do that, since ν_L might not be a Schwartz function. To overcome this minor issue, we will mollify ν_L .

Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a non-negative radial C^{∞} function with $\varphi(0) > 0$, $\text{supp } \varphi \subset B(0, 1)$ and $\int \varphi = 1$. For $0 < \gamma < 1$ set $\varphi_{\gamma}(x) = \gamma^{-n} \varphi(x/\gamma)$. Let $f_{\gamma} = \nu_L * \varphi_{\gamma}$.

By Theorem 2.1 applied to f_{γ} and η , with $t = 2n - s + 2\varepsilon$ and $\sigma = (s - n - \varepsilon)/2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f_{\gamma}|^2 d\eta &\lesssim_{\varepsilon} (\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{2n-s+2\varepsilon}(H))^{-1} \|f_{\gamma}\|_{H^{\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2 \\ &\lesssim (\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{2n-s+2\varepsilon}(H))^{-1} \|\nu_L\|_{H^{\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2, \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

where in the last estimate we used the fact that convolving with φ_{γ} does not increase the Sobolev norm.

Now we get a lower bound for the left hand side. First, we claim that if $Q \in \mathcal{B}$ and $0 < \gamma \leq \ell(Q)/2$, then

$$\int_Q f_{\gamma}(x) dx \gtrsim M \ell(Q)^n. \tag{3.5}$$

Indeed, let $\tilde{Q} \subset Q$ be a dyadic subcube with $\ell(\tilde{Q}) = \ell(Q)/2$ and $\nu_L(\tilde{Q}) \gtrsim M \ell(Q)^n$ (such subcube exists by (3.1)). It follows from elementary geometry that the set

$$C := \{y \in B(0, \gamma) : y + \tilde{Q} \subset Q\}$$

is a truncated one-sided cone centered at 0 with opening angle ~ 1 . Since φ_{γ} is radial and $\int_{B(0, \gamma)} \varphi_{\gamma} = 1$, we get $\int_C \varphi_{\gamma}(y) dy \gtrsim 1$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_Q f_{\gamma}(x) dx &= \int_Q \nu_L * \varphi_{\gamma}(x) dx = \int_{B(0, \gamma)} \varphi_{\gamma}(y) \int_Q \nu_L(x - y) dx dy \\ &\geq \int_C \varphi_{\gamma}(y) \int_Q \nu_L(x - y) dx dy \geq \int_C \varphi_{\gamma}(y) \int_{\tilde{Q}} \nu_L(z) dz dy \\ &= \nu_L(\tilde{Q}) \int_C \varphi_{\gamma}(y) dy \gtrsim M \ell(Q)^n, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last estimate we used that $v_L(\tilde{Q}) \gtrsim M\ell(Q)^n$, by the definition of \tilde{Q} . This gives (3.5).

It follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the property (2.2) of the Frostman measure η , and (3.5), that if $Q \in \mathcal{B}$ and $0 < \gamma \leq \ell(Q)/2$, then

$$(\eta(Q))^{1/2} \left(\int_Q |f_\gamma|^2 d\eta \right)^{1/2} \geq \int_Q f_\gamma d\eta = \frac{\eta(Q)}{\ell(Q)^n} \int_Q f_\gamma(x) dx \gtrsim M\eta(Q),$$

and so

$$\int_Q |f_\gamma|^2 d\eta \gtrsim M^2 \eta(Q). \tag{3.6}$$

Let $\mathcal{B}_\gamma = \{Q \in \mathcal{B} : \ell(Q)/2 > \gamma\}$, and $H_\gamma = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{B}_\gamma} Q$. Note that $\{H_{1/k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an increasing sequence of sets, with $H = \bigcup_k H_{1/k}$. Hence, by the continuity of measure we have

$$1 = \eta(H) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \eta(H_{1/k}).$$

Let k be so large that $\eta(H_{1/k}) \geq 1/2$. Then, we get from (3.6) and (3.4) that

$$M^2 \lesssim M^2 \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{B}_{1/k}} \eta(Q) \lesssim \int_{H_{1/k}} |f_{1/k}|^2 d\eta \lesssim (\mathcal{H}_\infty^{2n-s+2\varepsilon}(H))^{-1} \|v_L\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2.$$

This gives the desired inequality (3.3). □

In order to pass from (3.3) to an estimate on the size of $H' = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathcal{M}v_L(x) \geq M\}$, we will use the well-known one-third trick. For every $e \in \{0, 1\}^n$ consider the translated dyadic grid on \mathbb{R}^n

$$\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{R}^n}^e = \frac{1}{3}e + \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{R}^n}.$$

The proof of the following lemma can be found e.g. in [Ler03, Section 3].

Lemma 3.3. *For every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $0 < r < 1/3$ there exists $e \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and $Q \in \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{R}^n}^e$ such that $B(x, r) \subset Q$ and $\ell(Q) \leq 3r$.*

Let $\mathcal{B}^e \subset \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{R}^n}^e$ be defined analogously as \mathcal{B} , but using the translated grid $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{R}^n}^e$. Set $H^e = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{B}^e} Q$. By Lemma 3.2, for each $e \in \{0, 1\}^n$ we have $\mathcal{H}_\infty^{2n-s+2\varepsilon}(H^e) \lesssim M^{-2} \|v_L\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2$.

Lemma 3.4. *We have*

$$H' \subset \bigcup_{e \in \{0, 1\}^n} H^e.$$

Proof. Let $x \in H'$. Then, there exists some ball $B(x, r)$ such that

$$\frac{v_L(B(x, r))}{r^n} \geq M.$$

Since $M > 3^n v(F)$, we have $0 < r < 1/3$. By Lemma 3.3, there exists $e \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and $Q \in \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{R}^n}^e$ such that $B(x, r) \subset Q$ and $\ell(Q) \leq 3r$. Thus,

$$\frac{v_L(Q)}{\ell(Q)^n} \geq 3^{-n} \frac{v_L(B(x, r))}{r^n} \geq 3^{-n} M,$$

which gives $x \in H^e$. □

It follows from Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.2 that

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{2n-s+2\varepsilon}(H') \leq \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^n} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{2n-s+2\varepsilon}(H^e) \lesssim_\varepsilon M^{-2} \|\mathbf{v}_L\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2.$$

Let $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ be a family of disjoint dyadic cubes covering H' and such that

$$\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \ell(Q)^{2n-s+2\varepsilon} \lesssim \mathcal{H}_\infty^{2n-s+2\varepsilon}(H') \lesssim_\varepsilon M^{-2} \|\mathbf{v}_L\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2. \quad (3.7)$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that every $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ intersects H' .

For every $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ let $Q' \in \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ be the smallest cube with $Q' \supset Q$ and such that $Q' \cap (H')^c \neq \emptyset$, that is, Q' is not contained in H' . Of course, it may happen that $Q' = Q$. Let $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ be the family of maximal dyadic cubes from $\{Q'\}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}}$. Since \mathcal{Q} is a covering of H' , the family \mathcal{P} is also a covering of H' . Note that the cubes in \mathcal{P} are pairwise disjoint.

Lemma 3.5. *We have*

$$\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \ell(P)^{2n-s+2\varepsilon} \lesssim_\varepsilon M^{-2} \|\mathbf{v}_L\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2. \quad (3.8)$$

Proof. We claim that

$$\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \ell(P)^{2n-s+2\varepsilon} \lesssim \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \ell(Q)^{2n-s+2\varepsilon}.$$

The estimate (3.8) will then follow immediately from (3.7).

The bound above is trivial for $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Q}$, so it suffices to show

$$\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{Q}} \ell(P)^{2n-s+2\varepsilon} \lesssim \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \ell(Q)^{2n-s+2\varepsilon}. \quad (3.9)$$

Fix a cube $P \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{Q}$. It follows that $P = Q'$ for some $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, and $Q \subsetneq Q'$. Since Q' is the smallest ancestor of Q that is not contained in H' , there exists a cube $Q'' \in \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ with $Q \subset Q'' \subsetneq Q'$, $\ell(Q'') = \ell(Q)/2$, and $Q'' \subset H'$. At the same time, \mathcal{Q} covers H' , and in particular, it covers Q'' . Thus, denoting by \mathcal{L}^n the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^n ,

$$\ell(P)^n = \ell(Q')^n = 2^n \ell(Q'')^n = 2^n \mathcal{L}^n(Q'') = 2^n \sum_{R \in \mathcal{Q}, R \subset Q''} \mathcal{L}^n(R) \lesssim \sum_{R \in \mathcal{Q}, R \subset P} \ell(R)^n.$$

Recalling that $0 < 2n - s + 2\varepsilon < n$, we use the elementary inequality $|\sum a_i|^p \leq \sum |a_i|^p$ for $p \in (0, 1)$ to get

$$\ell(P)^{2n-s+2\varepsilon} = \left(\sum_{R \in \mathcal{Q}, R \subset P} \ell(R)^n \right)^{(2n-s+2\varepsilon)/n} \lesssim \sum_{R \in \mathcal{Q}, R \subset P} \ell(R)^{2n-s+2\varepsilon}.$$

Summing over $P \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{Q}$, and recalling that \mathcal{P} is a family of disjoint cubes, gives (3.9). \square

Given a dyadic cube Q and a constant $C \geq 1$, we will write CQ to denote the cube with the same center as Q and with sidelength $C\ell(Q)$.

Lemma 3.6. *For any $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and $C \geq 1$ we have*

$$v_L(CP) \lesssim_C M \ell(P)^n. \tag{3.10}$$

Proof. Let $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Then, by the definition of \mathcal{P} , the cube P is not contained in H' . Let $x \in P \setminus H'$, and let $C' \sim C$ be such that $B(x, C'\ell(P)) \supset CP$. Then,

$$\frac{v_L(CP)}{\ell(P)^n} \leq (C')^n \frac{v_L(B(x, C'\ell(P)))}{(C'\ell(P))^n} \leq (C')^n M,$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $\mathcal{M}v_L(x) \leq M$. □

We are ready to conclude the proof of Proposition 3.1. We remark that until this point we never used lower Ahlfors regularity of measure v , but now it will be crucial.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. For every $P \in \mathcal{P}$ let $\mathcal{D}_P \subset \mathbb{D}$ be the family of dyadic cubes $Q \subset [0, 1]^d$ with $\ell(Q) = \ell(P)$, $\pi_L(Q) \cap P \neq \emptyset$, and $F \cap Q \neq \emptyset$. Since $F_M = F \cap \pi_L^{-1}(H')$, and $H' \subset \bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P$, we get that

$$F_M \subset \bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_P} Q.$$

Note that, since v is s -Ahlfors regular, we have $v(3Q) \sim \ell(Q)^s$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{D}_P$, the cubes $\{3Q\}_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_P}$ have bounded intersections, and they satisfy $\pi_L(3Q) \subset CP$ for some dimensional constant $C \geq 1$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{n+2\varepsilon}(F_M) &\lesssim \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_P} \ell(Q)^{n+2\varepsilon} \sim \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \ell(P)^{n+2\varepsilon-s} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_P} \ell(Q)^s \\ &\sim \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \ell(P)^{n+2\varepsilon-s} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_P} v(3Q) \lesssim \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \ell(P)^{n+2\varepsilon-s} v_L(CP) \\ &\stackrel{(3.10)}{\lesssim} M \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \ell(P)^{2n+2\varepsilon-s} \stackrel{(3.8)}{\lesssim_\varepsilon} M^{-1} \|v_\theta\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 1.3 follows easily from Proposition 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Set $v = \mathcal{I}^s|_F$, let $M > 3^n v(F)$ be a large integer. Given $L \in \mathcal{G}(d, n)$ define

$$F_M = \{x \in F : \mathcal{M}v_L(\pi_L(x)) \geq M\}.$$

Let $x \in F$ be such that the $(d-n)$ -plane $V = V_{x,L} = x + L^\perp$ satisfies $\overline{\dim}_{\text{box}}(V \cap F) > s - n$. We claim that $V \cap F \subset F_M$. Indeed, since $\overline{\dim}_{\text{box}}(V \cap F) > s - n$, there exists $\beta > 0$ and a sequence $\delta_m \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$N(F \cap V, \delta_m) \geq \delta_m^{-s+n-\beta}.$$

Since v is s -Ahlfors regular, it follows that

$$v(V(2\delta_m)) \gtrsim \delta_m^{-s+n-\beta} \cdot \delta_m^s = \delta_m^{n-\beta},$$

where $V(2\delta_m)$ is the $2\delta_m$ -neighbourhood of V . Hence, for $x \in V$ we have

$$\mathcal{M}v_L(\pi_L(x)) \geq \frac{v_L(B(\pi_L(x), 2\delta_m))}{(2\delta_m)^n} \gtrsim \delta_m^{-\beta}.$$

If δ_m is chosen small enough, we get $x \in F_M$.

The argument above implies that $\{x \in F : \overline{\dim}_{\text{box}}(F \cap V_{x,L}) > s - n\} \subset F_M$. In the case $s > 2n$, it follows from Lemma 2.4 and the Sobolev embedding that $v_L \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for $\gamma_{d,n}$ -a.e. $L \in \mathcal{G}(d, n)$, so that $\mathcal{M}v_L$ is a bounded function. Hence, taking M large enough, we get

$$\{x \in F : \overline{\dim}_{\text{box}}(F \cap V_{x,L}) > s - n\} \subset F_M = \emptyset. \tag{3.11}$$

This gives (1.9).

On the other hand, if $n < s \leq 2n$, then by Proposition 3.1

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{n+2\varepsilon}(\{x \in F : \overline{\dim}_{\text{box}}(F \cap V_{x,L}) > s - n\}) \lesssim_\varepsilon M^{-1} \|v_L\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2.$$

Taking $M \rightarrow \infty$ gives for all $L \in \mathcal{G}(d, n)$ such that $\|v_L\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^n)}^2 < \infty$ (which is true for a.e. $L \in \mathcal{G}(d, n)$)

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{n+2\varepsilon}(\{x \in F : \overline{\dim}_{\text{box}}(F \cap V_{x,L}) > s - n\}) = 0.$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ finishes the proof. □

4 Decomposition of the visible part

We begin the proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be an s -Ahlfors regular set, with $s \in (d - 1, d]$. We set $\mu = \mathcal{H}^s|_E$. By rescaling and translating, we may assume that $\text{diam}(E) \sim 1 \sim \mu(E)$ and $E \subset [0, 1]^d$.

4.1 Parameters, cubes, and tubes

Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ (in the end we will take $\alpha = 1 - \sqrt{6}/3$), let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a small constant, and set

$$\tau := \alpha(s - d + 1) - 5\varepsilon. \tag{4.1}$$

Our goal is to prove that

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E)) = 0 \quad \text{for a.e. } \theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}. \tag{4.2}$$

Taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the estimate (1.5) will follow.

Fix a small dyadic scale $\delta \in 2^{-\mathbb{N}}$. In the proof we will often assume without further mention that δ is small enough depending on ε .

We are going to show the following.

Proposition 4.1. *For $\alpha = 1 - \sqrt{6}/3$ we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E)) d\theta \lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^\varepsilon.$$

Taking $\delta \rightarrow 0$, this will give (4.2).

Let $\Delta \in 2^{-\mathbb{N}}$ be the dyadic number satisfying

$$\delta^\kappa < \Delta \leq 2\delta^\kappa,$$

where $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ is a constant to be fixed later. In the end we will choose $\kappa = \alpha/(1 - \alpha)$. Note that $\Delta \gg \delta$.

Recall that \mathbb{D} stands for the dyadic cubes in \mathbb{R}^d . We set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} &:= \{Q \in \mathbb{D} : Q \cap E \neq \emptyset\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_\delta &:= \{Q \in \mathcal{D} : \ell(Q) = \delta\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_\Delta &:= \{Q \in \mathcal{D} : \ell(Q) = \Delta\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since E is s -Ahlfors regular, we have $\#\mathcal{D}_\delta \sim \delta^{-s}$ and $\#\mathcal{D}_\Delta \sim \delta^{-\kappa s}$.

For every $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$ we define also

$$\mu_Q = \mu|_{3Q}.$$

Note that $\mu_Q(\mathbb{R}^d) = \mu(3Q) \sim \ell(Q)^s \sim \delta^{\kappa s}$.

Recall that μ_θ denotes the push-forward of μ by the orthogonal projection π_θ , so that it is a measure on $\theta^\perp \simeq \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$.

Let $\sigma = (s - d + 1 - \varepsilon)/2$. By Lemma 2.4 we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \|\mu_\theta\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2 d\theta \lesssim_\varepsilon 1, \tag{4.3}$$

and for every $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2 d\theta \lesssim_\varepsilon \mu(3Q) \sim \delta^{\kappa s}. \tag{4.4}$$

Given $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and a dyadic parameter $\gamma \in 2^{-\mathbb{N}}$, let $\mathcal{T}_{\gamma,\theta}$ be a family of (approximate) tubes given by

$$\mathcal{T}_{\gamma,\theta} := \{T : T = \pi_\theta^{-1}(Q), Q \in \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}}, \ell(Q) = \gamma, T \cap [0, 1]^d \neq \emptyset\},$$

where $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}}$ denotes the standard dyadic cubes on \mathbb{R}^{d-1} . When the direction θ is clear from context, we will simply write \mathcal{T}_γ .

Note that the tubes from $\mathcal{T}_{\gamma,\theta}$ have width $\sim \gamma$, they are parallel to θ , they cover $[0, 1]^d$, and $\#\mathcal{T}_{\gamma,\theta} \sim \gamma^{1-d}$.

We set $\mathcal{T}_\theta = \bigcup_\gamma \mathcal{T}_{\gamma,\theta}$, and for $T \in \mathcal{T}_\theta$ we denote by $w(T)$ the width of T , i.e. the unique γ such that $T \in \mathcal{T}_\gamma$.

Given a tube $T = \pi_\theta^{-1}(Q) \in \mathcal{T}_{\gamma,\theta}$ and a constant $C > 1$, we will write CT to denote $\pi_\theta^{-1}(CQ)$.

Let $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. We will divide $\text{Vis}_\theta(E)$ into four parts. The Hausdorff content of each will be estimated separately.

4.2 Heavy tubes

Since E is an s -Ahlfors regular set, we expect that for a typical tube $T \in \mathcal{T}_\gamma = \mathcal{T}_{\gamma,\theta}$

$$N(T \cap E, \gamma) \lesssim \gamma^{-(s-d+1)}.$$

We are going to bound the number of exceptional tubes where the estimate above fails badly.

We say that $T \in \mathcal{T}_\theta$ is *heavy*, denoted by \mathcal{T}_H , if

$$N(T \cap E, \gamma) \geq \delta^{-2\varepsilon} \gamma^{-s+d-1}, \tag{4.5}$$

where $\gamma = w(T)$.

Let $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$. We will say that $T \in \mathcal{T}_\delta$ is *heavy inside* Q , denoted by $\mathcal{T}_{H,Q}$, if

$$N(T \cap E \cap Q, \delta) \geq \delta^{(\kappa-1)(s-d+1)-\kappa\tau-4\varepsilon}. \tag{4.6}$$

Remark that the definition of \mathcal{T}_H includes tubes of varying widths, whereas the tubes in $\mathcal{T}_{H,Q}$ are all δ -tubes.

We define

$$E'_H := E \cap \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_H} T,$$

and for each $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$ we define

$$Q_H := 3Q \cap E \cap \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_{H,Q}} T.$$

Finally, we set

$$E_H := E'_H \cup \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta} Q_H.$$

Remark 4.2. Note that the definitions above depend on the direction θ . To simplify notation we usually suppress this dependence, but at times we will write $E_{H,\theta}$ instead of E_H . The same applies to other sets defined in this section.

4.3 Light tubes

We will say that a tube $T \in \mathcal{T}_\delta$ is *light* if

$$N(T \cap E, \delta) \leq \delta^{-(s-d+1)+\tau+\varepsilon}.$$

We denote the family of light tubes by \mathcal{T}_L , and we set

$$E_L = E \cap \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_L} T.$$

Lemma 4.3. *We have*

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(E_L) \lesssim \delta^\varepsilon.$$

Proof. Observe that

$$N(E_L, \delta) \leq \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_L} N(T \cap E, \delta) \lesssim \delta^{1-d} \cdot \delta^{-s+d-1+\tau+\varepsilon} = \delta^{-s+\tau+\varepsilon},$$

which gives

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(E_L) \leq N(E_L, \delta) \cdot \delta^{s-\tau} \lesssim \delta^\varepsilon.$$

□

4.4 Good and bad parts

Let $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$. We will say that a tube $T \in \mathcal{T}_\delta$ *substantially intersects* Q , denoted by $T \in \mathcal{T}(Q)$, if

$$N(T \cap E \cap Q, \delta) \geq \delta^{(\kappa-1)(s-d+1)+\tau+4\varepsilon}. \quad (4.7)$$

The following lemma explains where the exponent $(\kappa-1)(s-d+1)+\tau+4\varepsilon$ came from.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_\delta$ be a tube which is not contained in any tube from $\mathcal{T}_L \cup \mathcal{T}_H$. Then, there exists $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$ such that $T \in \mathcal{T}(Q)$.*

Proof. Let $T' \in \mathcal{T}_\Delta$ be such that $T \subset T'$. By our assumption, $T' \notin \mathcal{T}_H$, which gives

$$N(T \cap E, \Delta) \leq N(T' \cap E, \Delta) \leq \delta^{-2\varepsilon} \Delta^{-s+d-1} \sim \delta^{-\kappa(s-d+1)-2\varepsilon}.$$

At the same time, since $T \notin \mathcal{T}_L$, we have $N(T \cap E, \delta) > \delta^{-(s-d+1)+\tau+\varepsilon}$. The two inequalities imply that for some $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$ we have

$$N(T \cap E \cap Q, \delta) \gtrsim \frac{N(T \cap E, \delta)}{N(T \cap E, \Delta)} \gtrsim \delta^{(\kappa-1)(s-d+1)+\tau+3\varepsilon}.$$

□

Let \mathcal{L} denote the set of affine lines parallel to θ . We say that a line $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ is *bad with respect to* $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$ if the δ -tube $T \in \mathcal{T}_\delta$ with $\ell \subset T$ satisfies $T \in \mathcal{T}(Q)$, and at the same time

$$\ell \cap E \cap \overline{3Q} = \emptyset. \quad (4.8)$$

We denote the collection of bad lines with respect to Q by $\mathcal{L}_{Q,B}$, and set

$$L_{Q,B} = \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_{Q,B}} \ell, \quad L_B = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta} L_{Q,B}.$$

We define the bad part of E as

$$E_B := E \cap L_B \setminus E_H,$$

and the good part of E as

$$E_G := E \setminus (E_B \cup E_H \cup E_L).$$

It is clear that

$$\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \subset E_H \cup E_L \cup E_B \cup (E_G \cap \text{Vis}_\theta(E)).$$

In order to estimate the Hausdorff content of $\text{Vis}_\theta(E)$, we will estimate the contents of the four sets on the right hand side separately. We have already estimated $\mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(E_L)$ in Lemma 4.3. The estimates for $\mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(E_H)$, $\mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(E_B)$, and $\mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(E_G \cap \text{Vis}_\theta(E))$ are obtained in the next three sections.

5 Heavy part

Recall that \mathcal{M} denotes the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function. We define

$$\tilde{E}'_H := \{x \in E : \mathcal{M}\mu_\theta(\pi_\theta(x)) \geq \delta^{-\varepsilon}\},$$

and for each $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$ we define

$$\tilde{Q}_H := \{x \in 3Q \cap E : \mathcal{M}\mu_{Q,\theta}(\pi_\theta(x)) \geq \delta^{\kappa(s-d+1)-\kappa\tau-3\varepsilon}\}.$$

Lemma 5.1. *We have $E'_H \subset \tilde{E}'_H$ and $Q_H \subset \tilde{Q}_H$.*

Proof. Let $x \in E'_H$, so that $x \in T \cap E$ for some $T \in \mathcal{T}$ satisfying (4.5). It follows that for some absolute $C > 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}\mu_\theta(\pi_\theta(x)) &\geq \frac{\mu_\theta(B(\pi_\theta(x), Cw(T)))}{(Cw(T))^{d-1}} \gtrsim w(T)^{-d+1} \mu(2T) \\ &\gtrsim w(T)^{-d+1} N(T \cap E, w(T)) \cdot w(T)^s \stackrel{(4.5)}{\geq} \delta^{-2\varepsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the third inequality we used s -Ahlfors regularity of E . Hence, $x \in \tilde{E}'_H$.

Similarly, if $T \in \mathcal{T}_\delta$ satisfies (4.6), then for $x \in T \cap Q \cap E$

$$\mathcal{M}\mu_{Q,\theta}(\pi_\theta(x)) \gtrsim \delta^{-d+1} \mu_Q(2T) \gtrsim \delta^{-d+1} N(T \cap Q \cap E, \delta) \cdot \delta^s \geq \delta^{\kappa(s-d+1)-\kappa\tau-4\varepsilon},$$

which gives $x \in \tilde{Q}_H$. □

We use Proposition 3.1 to estimate the size of E_H .

Lemma 5.2. *We have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(E_{H,\theta}) d\theta \lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^\varepsilon. \quad (5.1)$$

Proof. Recall that

$$E_{H,\theta} = E'_{H,\theta} \cup \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta} Q_{H,\theta}.$$

By Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 3.1 applied with $n = d - 1$, $\nu = \mu$, $F = E$ and $M = \delta^{-\varepsilon}$, we have

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1+2\varepsilon}(E'_{H,\theta}) \leq \mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1+2\varepsilon}(\tilde{E}'_{H,\theta}) \lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^\varepsilon \|\mu_\theta\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2,$$

so that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1+2\varepsilon}(E'_{H,\theta}) \, d\theta \lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^\varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \|\mu_\theta\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2 \, d\theta \stackrel{(4.3)}{\lesssim_\varepsilon} \delta^\varepsilon. \quad (5.2)$$

Since $d-1+2\varepsilon < s-\tau$, this is even better than the estimate for $\mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(E'_{H,\theta})$ that we need thanks to the simple inequality

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^a(A) \leq \text{diam}(A)^{a-b} \cdot \mathcal{H}_\infty^b(A) \quad \text{if } a > b. \quad (5.3)$$

We move on to estimating $\mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(Q_{H,\theta})$. We apply again Proposition 3.1 with $n = d-1$, $\nu = \mu_Q$, $F = 3\bar{Q} \cap E$ and $M = \delta^{\kappa(s-d+1)-\kappa\tau-3\varepsilon}$ to get

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1+2\varepsilon}(Q_{H,\theta}) \leq \mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1+2\varepsilon}(\tilde{Q}_{H,\theta}) \lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^{\kappa\tau+3\varepsilon-\kappa(s-d+1)} \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2.$$

We use (5.3) to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(Q_{H,\theta}) &\lesssim \ell(Q)^{s-\tau-(d-1+2\varepsilon)} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1+2\varepsilon}(Q_{H,\theta}) \\ &\lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^{\kappa(s-d+1-\tau-2\varepsilon)-\kappa(s-d+1-\tau)+3\varepsilon} \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2 \\ &= \delta^{(3-2\kappa)\varepsilon} \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2 \leq \delta^\varepsilon \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Summing over $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$ and integrating over $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(Q_{H,\theta}) \, d\theta &\lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^\varepsilon \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2 \, d\theta \\ &\stackrel{(4.4)}{\lesssim_\varepsilon} \delta^\varepsilon \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta} \mu(3Q) \sim \delta^\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Together with (5.2), this finishes the proof of (5.1). □

6 Bad part

Fix $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. Recall that the collection of bad lines with respect to Q parallel to θ is denoted by $\mathcal{L}_{Q,B}$, $L_{Q,B} = \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_{Q,B}} \ell$, $L_B = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta} L_{Q,B}$, and that the bad part was defined as $E_B = E \cap L_B \setminus E_H$. In this section we estimate $\mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(E_B)$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\sigma = (s-d+1-\varepsilon)/2$. For every $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$ we have*

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_\theta(L_{Q,B})) \lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^{(1-3\alpha-2\kappa)(s-d+1)+5\varepsilon} \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2.$$

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_\theta(L_{Q,B})) > 0$, otherwise there is nothing to prove. It is easy to see that $\pi_\theta(L_{Q,B}) \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ is a Borel set, and so we can use the usual Frostman's lemma ([Mat95, Theorem 8.8]) to get a Borel probability measure ν with $\text{supp } \nu \subset \pi_\theta(L_{Q,B})$ and

$$\nu(B(x,r)) \lesssim \mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_\theta(L_{Q,B}))^{-1} r^{d-1-\tau}. \quad (6.1)$$

By the definition of bad lines in $\mathcal{L}_{Q,B}$ (4.8), we have

$$\pi_\theta(L_{Q,B}) \cap \pi_\theta(\overline{3Q} \cap E) = \emptyset.$$

This means that $\text{supp } \nu \cap \text{supp } \mu_{Q,\theta} = \emptyset$. Since the supports are compact, we get that for $\eta > 0$ small enough

$$\int \mu_{Q,\theta} * \varphi_\eta \, d\nu = 0, \quad (6.2)$$

where φ_η is a smooth mollifier, as in the proof of Lemma 3.2. At the same time, using Plancherel's identity

$$\begin{aligned} \int \mu_{Q,\theta} * \varphi_\eta \, d\nu &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \hat{\varphi}(\eta\xi) \widehat{\mu_{Q,\theta}}(\xi) \overline{\hat{\nu}(\xi)} \, d\xi \\ &\geq \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \hat{\varphi}(C\delta\xi) \hat{\varphi}(\eta\xi) \widehat{\mu_{Q,\theta}}(\xi) \overline{\hat{\nu}(\xi)} \, d\xi \right| \\ &\quad - \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} (1 - \hat{\varphi}(C\delta\xi)) \hat{\varphi}(\eta\xi) \widehat{\mu_{Q,\theta}}(\xi) \overline{\hat{\nu}(\xi)} \, d\xi \right| = I_1 - I_2, \end{aligned}$$

where $C \geq 1$ is an absolute constant to be fixed below. Note that by (6.2) we have $I_1 = I_2$.

We estimate I_1 from below. Note that, by Plancherel,

$$I_1 = \int \mu_{Q,\theta} * \varphi_{C\delta} * \varphi_\eta \, d\nu.$$

Observe that, by the definition of bad lines, and (4.7), for any $x \in \text{supp } \nu \subset \pi_\theta(L_{Q,B})$ the line $\ell = \pi_\theta^{-1}(x) \in \mathcal{L}_{Q,B}$ satisfies $N(\ell(C\delta) \cap E \cap Q, \delta) \gtrsim \delta^{(\kappa-1)(s-d+1)+\tau+4\epsilon}$. Recalling that for $y \in E \cap Q$ we have $\mu_Q(B(y, \delta)) \sim \delta^s$, it follows that

$$\mu_Q(\ell(C\delta)) \gtrsim \delta^{(\kappa-1)(s-d+1)+\tau+4\epsilon} \cdot \delta^s,$$

which means that, assuming $C \sim 1$ large enough and $\eta > 0$ small enough,

$$\mu_{Q,\theta} * \varphi_{C\delta} * \varphi_\eta(x) \gtrsim \delta^{\kappa(s-d+1)+\tau+4\epsilon}.$$

Since ν is a probability measure, we get that

$$I_1 \gtrsim \delta^{\kappa(s-d+1)+\tau+4\epsilon}. \quad (6.3)$$

Now we estimate I_2 from above. Since $\hat{\varphi}$ is a bounded Lipschitz function, and $\hat{\varphi}(0) = 1$, we have for any $0 \leq a \leq 1$

$$|1 - \hat{\varphi}(C\delta\xi)| = |\hat{\varphi}(0) - \hat{\varphi}(C\delta\xi)| \lesssim \min(|\delta\xi|, 1) \leq \delta^a |\xi|^a.$$

Thus, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\lesssim \delta^a \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} |\xi|^a |\widehat{\mu_{Q,\theta}}(\xi)| |\hat{\nu}(\xi)| \, d\xi \\ &\leq \delta^a \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} |\widehat{\mu_{Q,\theta}}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{s-d+1-\epsilon} \, d\xi \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} |\hat{\nu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{(2a-s+2(d-1)+\epsilon)-(d-1)} \, d\xi \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since ν satisfies the Frostman condition (6.1), it follows from the Riesz energy estimate (2.4) and the identity (2.3) that if $2a - s + 2(d - 1) + \varepsilon \leq d - 1 - \tau - \varepsilon$, then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} |\widehat{\nu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{(2a-s+2(d-1)+\varepsilon)-(d-1)} d\xi \lesssim_{\varepsilon} \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_{\theta}(L_{Q,B}))^{-1}.$$

Together with the preceding estimate, we arrive at

$$I_2 \lesssim_{\varepsilon} \delta^a \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^{\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})} \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_{\theta}(L_{Q,B}))^{-1/2},$$

as long as

$$0 \leq a \leq \frac{(s-d+1) - \tau}{2} - \varepsilon.$$

Recalling that $I_1 = I_2$, we compare the estimate of I_2 with (6.3) and obtain

$$\delta^a \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^{\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})} \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_{\theta}(L_{Q,B}))^{-1/2} \gtrsim_{\varepsilon} \delta^{\kappa(s-d+1)+\tau+4\varepsilon},$$

which is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_{\theta}(L_{Q,B})) \lesssim_{\varepsilon} \delta^{2a-2\kappa(s-d+1)-2\tau-8\varepsilon} \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^{\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2.$$

Choosing $a = \frac{(s-d+1) - \tau}{2} - \varepsilon$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_{\theta}(L_{Q,B})) &\lesssim_{\varepsilon} \delta^{(1-2\kappa)(s-d+1)-3\tau-10\varepsilon} \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^{\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2 \\ &= \delta^{(1-2\kappa-3\alpha)(s-d+1)+5\varepsilon} \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^{\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\tau = \alpha(s-d+1) - 5\varepsilon$. □

Lemma 6.2. *If $2\kappa + 3\alpha \leq 1$, then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{s-\tau}(E_{B,\theta}) d\theta \lesssim_{\varepsilon} \delta^{\varepsilon}. \tag{6.4}$$

Proof. Note that if κ and α satisfy $2\kappa + 3\alpha \leq 1$, then Lemma 6.1 gives

$$\mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_{\theta}(L_{Q,B})) \lesssim_{\varepsilon} \delta^{5\varepsilon} \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^{\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2. \tag{6.5}$$

Let \mathcal{P} be a family of dyadic cubes in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} that covers $\pi_{\theta}(L_B) = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta}} \pi_{\theta}(L_{Q,B})$ and such that

$$\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \ell(P)^{d-1-\tau} \lesssim \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta}} \mathcal{H}_{\infty}^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_{\theta}(L_{Q,B})).$$

Clearly, \mathcal{P} is a covering of $\pi_{\theta}(E_{B,\theta})$, and without loss of generality we may assume that each $P \in \mathcal{P}$ intersects $\pi_{\theta}(E_{B,\theta})$.

For each $P \in \mathcal{P}$ let $T_P \in \mathcal{T}$ be the tube parallel to θ such that $\pi_{\theta}(T_P) = P$. Clearly,

$$E_{B,\theta} \subset \bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} T_P \cap E.$$

Since $P \cap \pi_\theta(E_{B,\theta}) \neq \emptyset$, we have $T_P \cap E_{B,\theta} \neq \emptyset$. Recalling that $E_{B,\theta} \cap E_{H,\theta} = \emptyset$, we see that $T_P \cap E \not\subset E_{H,\theta}$. This means that $T_P \notin \mathcal{T}_H$, and so by the definition of heavy tubes (4.5),

$$N(T_P \cap E, \ell(P)) \leq \delta^{-2\varepsilon} \ell(P)^{-s+d-1}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(E_{B,\theta}) &\lesssim \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} N(T_P \cap E, \ell(P)) \cdot \ell(P)^{s-\tau} \\ &\lesssim \delta^{-2\varepsilon} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \ell(P)^{d-1-\tau} \lesssim \delta^{-2\varepsilon} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_\theta(L_{Q,B})). \end{aligned}$$

Together with (6.5) this gives

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(E_{B,\theta}) \lesssim \delta^\varepsilon \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta} \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2.$$

Integrating the above over $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and using (4.4) we get the desired estimate:

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(E_{B,\theta}) \, d\theta \lesssim \delta^\varepsilon \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2 \, d\theta \lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^\varepsilon \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta} \mu(3Q) \sim \delta^\varepsilon. \quad (6.6)$$

□

7 Good part

In this section we estimate $\mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap E_G)$. Recall that \mathcal{T}_δ denotes a collection of $\sim \delta^{1-d}$ tubes of width δ , parallel to θ , which cover $[0, 1]^d$.

Lemma 7.1. *For each $T \in \mathcal{T}_\delta$ we have*

$$N(\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap E_G \cap T, \delta) \lesssim \delta^{(\alpha-1)(s-d+1)-3\varepsilon} + \delta^{(\kappa-1-\kappa\alpha)(s-d+1)-4\varepsilon}.$$

Proof. If $T \cap E_G = \emptyset$, then there is nothing to prove, so assume that $T \cap E_G \neq \emptyset$. Since $E_L \cap E_G = \emptyset$ and $E_H \cap E_G = \emptyset$, it follows that T is not contained in any tube from $\mathcal{T}_L \cup \mathcal{T}_H$. Hence, Lemma 4.4 implies that there exists at least one $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$ such that $T \in \mathcal{T}(Q)$, which means that

$$N(T \cap E \cap Q, \delta) \geq \delta^{(\kappa-1)(s-d+1)+\tau+4\varepsilon}. \quad (7.1)$$

Furthermore, since T is not contained in any tube from \mathcal{T}_H , we have that the family $\mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T} := \{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta : Q \cap T \neq \emptyset\}$ satisfies

$$\#\mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T} \lesssim \delta^{-\kappa(s-d+1)-2\varepsilon}. \quad (7.2)$$

Let $Q_T \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}$ be the “ θ -highest” of all cubes $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$ satisfying (7.1), in the sense that it maximizes $\inf\{x \cdot \theta : x \in 3Q\}$ among all such cubes.

We partition the family $\mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}$ into 3 subfamilies:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^{\leq} &:= \left\{ Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T} : \sup_{x \in 3Q} x \cdot \theta < \inf_{x \in 3Q_T} x \cdot \theta \right\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^{\bar{=}} &:= \left\{ Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T} : \sup_{x \in 3Q} x \cdot \theta \geq \inf_{x \in 3Q_T} x \cdot \theta \geq \inf_{x \in 3Q} x \cdot \theta \right\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^{\geq} &:= \left\{ Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T} : \inf_{x \in 3Q} x \cdot \theta > \inf_{x \in 3Q_T} x \cdot \theta \right\}.\end{aligned}\tag{7.3}$$

Roughly speaking, the cubes in $\mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^{\leq}$ lie “ θ -below” Q_T , the cubes in $\mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^{\geq}$ are “ θ -above” Q_T , and the cubes in $\mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^{\bar{=}}$ are “ θ -on-the-same-height” as Q_T . Observe that

$$\#\mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^{\bar{=}} \lesssim 1,\tag{7.4}$$

$$\#\mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^{\geq} \leq \#\mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T} \stackrel{(7.2)}{\lesssim} \delta^{-\kappa(s-d+1)-2\varepsilon}.\tag{7.5}$$

We will estimate $N(\text{Vis}_{\theta}(E) \cap E_G \cap T \cap Q, \delta)$ for cubes Q in different families separately.

Cubes from $\mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^{\leq}$. We claim that for $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^{\leq}$ we have $\text{Vis}_{\theta}(E) \cap E_G \cap T \cap Q = \emptyset$, so that

$$N(\text{Vis}_{\theta}(E) \cap E_G \cap T \cap Q, \delta) = 0 \quad \text{for } Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^{\leq}.\tag{7.6}$$

Indeed, suppose that there is some $x \in \text{Vis}_{\theta}(E) \cap E_G \cap T \cap Q$. Let $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$ be the affine line such that $x \in \ell \subset T$. Since $x \in E_G$, we have $x \notin L_B$, and in particular $\ell \notin \mathcal{L}_{Q_T,B}$, i.e. ℓ is not bad with respect to Q_T . Recalling that $T \in \mathcal{T}(Q_T)$, it follows from the definition of bad lines (4.8) that $\ell \cap E \cap \overline{3Q_T} \neq \emptyset$.

Let $y \in \ell \cap E \cap \overline{3Q_T}$. Then, by the definition of $\mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^{\leq}$ we have $x \cdot \theta < y \cdot \theta$. But the assumption $x \in \text{Vis}_{\theta}(E)$ implies that for all $z \in \ell \cap E$ we have $x \cdot \theta > z \cdot \theta$, by the definition of $\text{Vis}_{\theta}(E)$. We have reached a contradiction.

Cubes from $\mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^{\bar{=}}$. Recall that $E_G \cap E_H = \emptyset$. In particular, for any $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^{\bar{=}}$ we have $E_G \cap Q_H = \emptyset$. There are two possibilities: either $T \in \mathcal{T}_{H,Q}$, or $T \notin \mathcal{T}_{H,Q}$. In the first case, we get $Q \cap E \cap T \subset Q_H \subset E_H$, so that $Q \cap E_G \cap T = \emptyset$. In the latter case, the definition of $\mathcal{T}_{H,Q}$ (4.6) gives

$$N(Q \cap E_G \cap T, \delta) \lesssim \delta^{(\kappa-1)(s-d+1)-\kappa\tau-4\varepsilon} \leq \delta^{(\kappa-1-\kappa\alpha)(s-d+1)-4\varepsilon}.\tag{7.7}$$

Cubes from $\mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^{\geq}$. Recall that Q_T was defined as the “ θ -highest” cube in $\mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}$ satisfying (7.1). This means that all the cubes in $\mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^{\geq}$ do not satisfy (7.1), and so for $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^{\geq}$

$$N(T \cap E \cap Q, \delta) \lesssim \delta^{(\alpha+\kappa-1)(s-d+1)-\varepsilon}.\tag{7.8}$$

We use the three estimates above to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
 N(T \cap E_G \cap \text{Vis}_\theta(E), \delta) &\leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta, T}} N(Q \cap T \cap E_G \cap \text{Vis}_\theta(E), \delta) \\
 &\lesssim \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta, T}^-} \delta^{(\kappa-1-\kappa\alpha)(s-d+1)-4\varepsilon} + \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta, T}^>} \delta^{(\alpha+\kappa-1)(s-d+1)-\varepsilon} \\
 &\stackrel{(7.4), (7.5)}{\lesssim} \delta^{(\kappa-1-\kappa\alpha)(s-d+1)-4\varepsilon} + \delta^{-\kappa(s-d+1)-2\varepsilon} \cdot \delta^{(\alpha+\kappa-1)(s-d+1)-\varepsilon} \\
 &= \delta^{(\kappa-1-\kappa\alpha)(s-d+1)-4\varepsilon} + \delta^{(\alpha-1)(s-d+1)-3\varepsilon}
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 7.2. *If $\kappa = \alpha/(1-\alpha)$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, then*

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap E_G) \lesssim \delta^\varepsilon.$$

Proof. Using the estimate from Lemma 7.1 we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap E_G) &\leq \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_\delta} N(\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap E_G \cap T, \delta) \cdot \delta^{s-\tau} \\
 &\lesssim \delta^{-d+1} \cdot (\delta^{(\kappa-1-\kappa\alpha)(s-d+1)-4\varepsilon} + \delta^{(\alpha-1)(s-d+1)-3\varepsilon}) \cdot \delta^{s-\tau} \\
 &= \delta^{(\kappa-\kappa\alpha-\alpha)(s-d+1)+\varepsilon} + \delta^{2\varepsilon}
 \end{aligned}$$

Taking $\kappa = \alpha/(1-\alpha)$, which satisfies $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$, we obtain the desired inequality. □

7.1 Conclusion of the proof of Theorem 1.1

Putting together the estimates from Lemma 4.3, Lemma 5.2, Lemma 6.2, and Lemma 7.2, we get that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{s-\tau}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E)) d\theta \lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^\varepsilon$$

as long as $2\kappa + 3\alpha \leq 1$, $\kappa = \alpha/(1-\alpha)$, and $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$.

Plugging $\kappa = \alpha/(1-\alpha)$ into $2\kappa + 3\alpha \leq 1$ we arrive at

$$-3\alpha^2 + 6\alpha - 1 \leq 0,$$

and the largest $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ which satisfies this inequality is $\alpha = 1 - \sqrt{6}/3$. This gives Proposition 4.1. Taking $\delta \rightarrow 0$, and then $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, Theorem 1.1 follows.

8 General compact sets

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2. Since the proof follows quite closely that of [Orp22], with the major changes already present in our proof of Theorem 1.1, we will be brief.

Let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be compact. By rescaling, we may assume that $E \subset [0, 1]^d$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a small constant, and set

$$\tau := \frac{1}{6} - 5\varepsilon.$$

Our goal is to prove that

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E)) = 0 \quad \text{for a.e. } \theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}.$$

By taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, (1.6) will follow.

8.1 Preliminaries

Fix a small dyadic scale $\delta \in 2^{-\mathbb{N}}$, and let $\Delta \in 2^{-\mathbb{N}}$ with $\Delta \sim \delta^\kappa$, where $\kappa = 1/6$, so that $\Delta \gg \delta$. We will show that

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E)) d\theta \lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^\varepsilon.$$

As before, we set $\mathcal{D} = \{Q \in \mathbb{D} : Q \cap E \neq \emptyset\}$, $\mathcal{D}_\delta = \{Q \in \mathcal{D} : \ell(Q) = \delta\}$, and $\mathcal{D}_\Delta = \{Q \in \mathcal{D} : \ell(Q) = \Delta\}$.

Let μ be the Frostman measure on E given by Lemma 2.2, with exponent $t = d - \tau$, so that

$$\mu(B(x, r)) \lesssim r^{d-\tau} \tag{8.1}$$

and for all $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\delta$

$$\mu(\overline{Q}) \gtrsim \min(\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau}(E \cap Q), \ell(Q)^d). \tag{8.2}$$

For every $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$ we define $\mu_Q = \mu|_Q$. Let $\sigma = (1 - \tau - \varepsilon)/2$. By Lemma 2.4 we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \|\mu_\theta\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2 d\theta \lesssim_\varepsilon 1, \tag{8.3}$$

and for every $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2 d\theta \lesssim_\varepsilon \mu(Q). \tag{8.4}$$

8.2 Light part

We say that a cube $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\delta$ is light, denoted by $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\delta,L}$, if

$$\mu(Q) \leq \ell(Q)^{d+\varepsilon} = \delta^{d+\varepsilon}.$$

Note that, by (8.2), this implies that

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau}(E \cap Q) \leq \mu(\overline{Q}) = \mu(Q) \leq \delta^{d+\varepsilon}, \tag{8.5}$$

where the equality in the middle holds because by (8.1) μ does not charge ∂Q , which is $(d - 1)$ -dimensional. We set

$$E_0 = E \setminus \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\delta,L}} Q,$$

and

$$\mathcal{Q}_\delta := \mathcal{D}_\delta \setminus \mathcal{D}_{\delta,L},$$

so that \mathcal{Q}_δ is the collection of all dyadic δ -cubes intersecting E_0 . Given $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$, we set $\mathcal{Q}_\delta(Q) = \{P \in \mathcal{Q}_\delta : P \subset Q\}$.

Consider families of tubes $\mathcal{T}_{\delta,\theta}$ as in Subsection 4.1. We will say that a tube $T \in \mathcal{T}_{\delta,\theta}$ is light if

$$\#\{P \in \mathcal{Q}_\delta : P \cap T \neq \emptyset\} \leq \delta^{-1+\tau+\varepsilon}.$$

We denote the family of light tubes by $\mathcal{T}_{L,\theta}$. When the direction θ is clear from context, we will just write \mathcal{T}_L .

We set

$$E_{L,\theta} = \left(E_0 \cap \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_{L,\theta}} T \right) \cup \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\delta,L}} Q \cap E.$$

Lemma 8.1. *We have*

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau}(E_{L,\theta}) \lesssim \delta^\varepsilon.$$

Proof. We estimate the content of light cubes and light tubes separately. Regarding the light cubes, we have

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau} \left(\bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\delta,L}} Q \cap E \right) \leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\delta,L}} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau}(Q \cap E) \stackrel{(8.5)}{\leq} \delta^{-d} \cdot \delta^{d+\varepsilon} = \delta^\varepsilon.$$

Concerning tubes, observe that

$$N \left(E_0 \cap \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_L} T, \delta \right) \leq \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_L} N(T \cap E_0, \delta) \lesssim \delta^{1-d} \cdot \delta^{-1+\tau+\varepsilon} = \delta^{-d+\tau+\varepsilon},$$

which gives

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau} \left(E_0 \cap \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_L} T \right) \leq N \left(E_0 \cap \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_L} T, \delta \right) \cdot \delta^{d-\tau} \lesssim \delta^\varepsilon.$$

□

8.3 Bad part

Fix a direction $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. Let $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$. If a tube $T \in \mathcal{T}_\delta$ satisfies

$$\#\{P \in \mathcal{Q}_\delta(Q) : P \cap T \neq \emptyset\} \geq \delta^{\tau+\kappa-1+2\varepsilon}, \quad (8.6)$$

we will write $T \in \mathcal{T}(Q)$.

Lemma 8.2. *Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_\delta \setminus \mathcal{T}_L$. Then, there exists $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$ such that $T \in \mathcal{T}(Q)$.*

Proof. Observe that, trivially,

$$\#\{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta : Q \cap T \neq \emptyset\} \lesssim \Delta^{-1} \sim \delta^{-\kappa}.$$

At the same time, since $T \notin \mathcal{T}_L$, we have $\#\{P \in \mathcal{Q}_\delta : P \cap T \neq \emptyset\} > \delta^{-1+\tau+\varepsilon}$. By pigeonholing, we get that for some $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$

$$\#\{P \in \mathcal{Q}_\delta(Q) : P \cap T \neq \emptyset\} \gtrsim \frac{\#\{P \in \mathcal{Q}_\delta : P \cap T \neq \emptyset\}}{\#\{Q' \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta : Q' \cap T \neq \emptyset\}} \gtrsim \delta^{\kappa+\tau-1+\varepsilon}.$$

□

Let \mathcal{L} denote the set of affine lines parallel to θ . We will write $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_{Q,B}$ if the δ -tube $T \in \mathcal{T}_\delta$ with $\ell \subset T$ satisfies $T \in \mathcal{J}(Q)$, and at the same time

$$\ell \cap E \cap \overline{Q} = \emptyset. \quad (8.7)$$

We set

$$L_{Q,B} = \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_{Q,B}} \ell, \quad L_B = \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta} L_{Q,B}.$$

We define the bad part of E as

$$E_B := E \cap L_B.$$

Lemma 8.3. *For every $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$ we have*

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_\theta(L_{Q,B})) \lesssim \delta^\varepsilon \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2.$$

Proof. Arguing exactly the same as in the beginning of the proof of Lemma 6.1, we arrive at the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int \mu_{Q,\theta} * \varphi_{C\delta} * \varphi_\eta \, d\nu = I_2 \\ &\lesssim \delta^a \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} |\widehat{\mu_{Q,\theta}}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{1-\tau-\varepsilon} \, d\xi \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} |\widehat{\nu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{(2a-1+\tau+(d-1)+\varepsilon)-(d-1)} \, d\xi \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.8)$$

Recalling that $\sigma = (1 - \tau - \varepsilon)/2$, and noting that for $a = 1/2 - \tau - \varepsilon$ we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} |\widehat{\nu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{(2a-1+\tau+(d-1)+\varepsilon)-(d-1)} \, d\xi \lesssim_\varepsilon \mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_\theta(L_{Q,B}))^{-1},$$

we get that

$$I_2 \lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^{1/2-\tau-\varepsilon} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_\theta(L_{Q,B}))^{-1/2} \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}.$$

On the other hand, it follows from the definition of bad lines $\mathcal{L}_{Q,B}$ that for each $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_{Q,B}$

$$\mu_Q(\ell(C\delta)) \gtrsim \delta^{\tau+\kappa-1+2\varepsilon} \cdot \delta^{d+\varepsilon},$$

where we also used that $\mu_Q(P) \geq \delta^{d+\varepsilon}$ for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}_\delta(Q)$. Hence, for each $x \in \pi_\theta(L_{Q,B})$

$$\mu_{Q,\theta} * \varphi_{C\delta} * \varphi_\eta(x) \gtrsim \delta^{\tau+\kappa+3\varepsilon}.$$

Since ν is a probability measure, we get $I_1 \gtrsim \delta^{\tau+\kappa+3\varepsilon}$. Comparing this with the estimate for I_2 , we arrive at

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_\theta(L_{Q,B})) \lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^{1-2\tau-2\varepsilon} \cdot \delta^{-2\tau-2\kappa-6\varepsilon} \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2.$$

Recalling that $\kappa = 1/6$ and $\tau = 1/6 - 5\varepsilon$, we get

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_\theta(L_{Q,B})) \lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^{12\varepsilon} \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2.$$

□

Lemma 8.4. *We have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau}(E_{B,\theta}) \, d\theta \lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^\varepsilon. \quad (8.9)$$

Proof. First, observe that

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau}(E_{B,\theta}) \lesssim \mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_\theta(E_{B,\theta})).$$

Indeed, if \mathcal{B} is a nearly optimal covering of $\pi_\theta(E_{B,\theta})$ by cubes, then we can cover $E_{B,\theta}$ by a family of tubes $\mathbf{T} = \{T_Q : T_Q := \pi_\theta^{-1}(Q) \cap [0, 1]^d, Q \in \mathcal{B}\}$ (recall that $E \subset [0, 1]^d$). At the same time, each T_Q can be covered by $\lesssim \ell(Q)^{-1}$ many cubes of sidelength $\ell(Q)$. Hence,

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau}(E_{B,\theta}) \lesssim \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{B}} \ell(Q)^{-1} \cdot \ell(Q)^{d-\tau} \lesssim \mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_\theta(E_{B,\theta})).$$

Since $\pi_\theta(E_{B,\theta}) \subset \bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta} \pi_\theta(L_{Q,B})$, we have

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_\theta(E_{B,\theta})) \leq \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_\theta(L_{Q,B})),$$

and so by Lemma 8.3

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau}(E_{B,\theta}) \, d\theta &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-1-\tau}(\pi_\theta(E_{B,\theta})) \, d\theta \\ &\lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^\varepsilon \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \|\mu_{Q,\theta}\|_{H^\sigma(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})}^2 \, d\theta \stackrel{(8.4)}{\lesssim_\varepsilon} \delta^\varepsilon \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta} \mu(Q) \sim \delta^\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

□

8.4 Good part

Fix $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$. We define the good part of E as

$$E_G := E \setminus (E_B \cup E_L).$$

Recall that \mathcal{T}_δ is a family of δ -tubes parallel to θ .

Lemma 8.5. *For any $T \in \mathcal{T}_\delta$ we have*

$$N(\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap E_G \cap T, \delta) \lesssim \delta^{\tau-1+2\varepsilon} + \delta^{\kappa-1}.$$

Proof. Assume that $T \cap E_G \neq \emptyset$, otherwise there is nothing to prove. Since $E_G \cap E_L = \emptyset$, we get that $T \notin \mathcal{T}_L$. Hence, by Lemma 8.2, there exists $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$ such that $T \in \mathcal{T}(Q)$, so that

$$\#\{P \in \mathcal{Q}_\delta(Q) : P \cap T \neq \emptyset\} \geq \delta^{\tau+\kappa-1+2\varepsilon}. \quad (8.10)$$

Let $Q_T \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}$ be the “ θ -highest” of all cubes $Q \in \mathcal{D}_\Delta$ satisfying (8.10), in the sense that it maximizes $\inf\{x \cdot \theta : x \in Q\}$ among all such cubes. Consider families $\mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^<, \mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^=, \mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^>$ defined as in (7.3), except with $3Q, 3Q_T$ replaced by Q, Q_T .

For cubes $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^<$, we argue in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 7.1 that $N(\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap E_G \cap T \cap Q, \delta) = 0$.

For cubes $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^=$ we use the trivial bound

$$N(\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap E_G \cap T \cap Q, \delta) \leq N(T \cap Q, \delta) \lesssim \delta^{\kappa-1}$$

Finally, for cubes $Q \in \mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^>$ the inequality (8.10) fails (this follows from the definition of Q_T), so that

$$N(\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap E_G \cap T \cap Q, \delta) \leq N(E_0 \cap T \cap Q, \delta) \lesssim \delta^{\tau+\kappa-1+2\varepsilon},$$

where we used the fact that $E_G \subset E_0$, since $E_G \cap E_L = \emptyset$.

Putting the three estimates together, and noting that $\#\mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^= \lesssim 1$ and $\#\mathcal{D}_{\Delta,T}^< \lesssim \Delta^{-1} \sim \delta^{-\kappa}$, we get

$$N(\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap E_G \cap T, \delta) \lesssim \delta^{\kappa-1} + \delta^{\tau-1+2\varepsilon}.$$

□

Lemma 8.6. *We have*

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap E_G) \lesssim \delta^\varepsilon. \quad (8.11)$$

Proof. Using Lemma 8.5 we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap E_G) &\leq \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_\delta} N(\text{Vis}_\theta(E) \cap E_G \cap T, \delta) \cdot \delta^{d-\tau} \\ &\lesssim \delta^{-d+1} \cdot (\delta^{\tau-1+2\varepsilon} + \delta^{\kappa-1}) \cdot \delta^{d-\tau} = \delta^{2\varepsilon} + \delta^{\kappa-\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $\tau = 1/6 - 5\varepsilon = \kappa - 5\varepsilon$, we get (8.11). □

Putting together estimates from Lemma 8.1, Lemma 8.4, and Lemma 8.6, we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \mathcal{H}_\infty^{d-\tau}(\text{Vis}_\theta(E)) d\theta \lesssim_\varepsilon \delta^\varepsilon.$$

Taking $\delta \rightarrow 0$, and then $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, Theorem 1.2 follows.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Tuomas Orponen for many helpful discussions, and to Esa Järvenpää for reading a draft of this paper and giving useful comments.

References

- [ABK23] R. Anttila, B. Bárány, and A. Käenmäki. Slices of the Takagi function. *Ergod. Theory Dyn. Syst.*, pages 1–38, 2023. doi:10.1017/etds.2023.117. 3
- [AH96] D. R. Adams and L. I. Hedberg. *Function Spaces and Potential Theory*, volume 314 of *Grundlehren Math. Wiss.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 1996. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-03282-4. 6
- [AJJ⁺12] I. Arhosalo, E. Järvenpää, M. Järvenpää, M. Rams, and P. Shmerkin. Visible parts of fractal percolation. *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc.*, 55(2):311–331, 2012. doi:10.1017/S0013091509001680. 2
- [Alg20] A. Algom. Slicing theorems and rigidity phenomena for self-affine carpets. *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 121(2):312–353, 2020. doi:10.1112/plms.12325. 3
- [BKY21] B. Bárány, A. Käenmäki, and H. Yu. Finer geometry of planar self-affine sets. *Preprint*, 2021. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2107.00983. 3
- [FF13] K. Falconer and J. Fraser. The visible part of plane self-similar sets. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 141(1):269–278, 2013. doi:10.1090/S0002-9939-2012-11312-7. 2
- [FHOR15] J. M. Fraser, A. M. Henderson, E. J. Olson, and J. C. Robinson. On the Assouad dimension of self-similar sets with overlaps. *Adv. Math.*, 273:188–214, Mar. 2015. doi:10.1016/j.aim.2014.12.026. 3
- [JJMO03] E. Järvenpää, M. Järvenpää, P. MacManus, and T. C. O’Neil. Visible parts and dimensions. *Nonlinearity*, 16(3):803, 2003. doi:10.1088/0951-7715/16/3/302. 2
- [JJN04] E. Järvenpää, M. Järvenpää, and J. Niemelä. Transversal mappings between manifolds and non-trivial measures on visible parts. *Real Anal. Exchange*, 30(2):675–688, 2004. 2
- [JJSW22] E. Järvenpää, M. Järvenpää, V. Suomala, and M. Wu. On dimensions of visible parts of self-similar sets with finite rotation groups. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 150(7):2983–2995, 2022. doi:10.1090/proc/15843. 2
- [Ler03] G. Lerman. Quantifying curvelike structures of measures by using L^2 Jones quantities. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 56(9):1294–1365, 2003. doi:10.1002/cpa.10096. 10
- [Mar54] J. M. Marstrand. Some Fundamental Geometrical Properties of Plane Sets of Fractional Dimensions. *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, s3-4(1):257–302, 1954. doi:10.1112/plms/s3-4.1.257. 3
- [Mat75] P. Mattila. Hausdorff dimension, orthogonal projections and intersections with planes. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.*, 1:227–244, 1975. 3
- [Mat81] P. Mattila. Integralgeometric properties of capacities. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 266(2):539–554, 1981. doi:10.1090/S0002-9947-1981-0617550-8. 3

- [Mat95] P. Mattila. *Geometry of sets and measures in Euclidean spaces: fractals and rectifiability*, volume 44 of *Cambridge Stud. Adv. Math.* Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, 1995. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511623813. 3, 7, 18
- [Mat04] P. Mattila. Hausdorff dimension, projections, and the Fourier transform. *Publ. Mat.*, 48(1):3–48, 2004. doi:10.5565/PUBLMAT_48104_01. 2
- [Mat15] P. Mattila. *Fourier Analysis and Hausdorff Dimension*, volume 150 of *Cambridge Stud. Adv. Math.* Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, 2015. doi:10.1017/CBO9781316227619. 2, 3, 7, 8
- [Mat21a] C. Matheus. Some Variants of Orponen’s Theorem on Visible Parts of Fractal Sets. In M. Pollicott and S. Vaienti, editors, *Thermodynamic Formalism*, volume 2290 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 517–533. Springer, Cham, Switzerland, 2021. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-74863-0_16. 2, 3
- [Mat21b] P. Mattila. Hausdorff dimension of intersections with planes and general sets. *J. Fractal Geom.*, 8(4):389–401, 2021. doi:10.4171/jfg/110. 3
- [Mat23] P. Mattila. A Survey on the Hausdorff Dimension of Intersections. *Math. Comput. Appl.*, 28(2):49, 2023. doi:10.3390/mca28020049. 3
- [Maz11] V. Maz’ya. *Sobolev Spaces*, volume 342 of *Grundlehren Math. Wiss.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 2nd edition, 2011. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-15564-2. 6
- [MO16] P. Mattila and T. Orponen. Hausdorff dimension, intersections of projections and exceptional plane sections. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 144(8):3419–3430, 2016. doi:10.1090/proc/12985. 3
- [Orp14] T. Orponen. Slicing Sets and Measures, and the Dimension of Exceptional Parameters. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 24(1):47–80, 2014. doi:10.1007/s12220-012-9326-0. 3
- [Orp22] T. Orponen. On the dimension of visible parts. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 2022. doi:10.4171/jems/1230. 3, 4, 5, 6, 23
- [Ros21] E. Rossi. Visible part of dominated self-affine sets in the plane. *Ann. Fenn. Math.*, 46(2):1089–1103, Sept. 2021. doi:0.5186/aasfm.2021.4668. 2
- [Shm19] P. Shmerkin. On Furstenberg’s intersection conjecture, self-similar measures, and the L^q norms of convolutions. *Ann. Of Math.*, 189(2):319–391, 2019. doi:10.4007/annals.2019.189.2.1. 3
- [Tri06] H. Triebel. *Theory of Function Spaces III*, volume 100 of *Monogr. Math.* Birkhäuser, Basel, Switzerland, 2006. doi:10.1007/3-7643-7582-5. 6
- [Wu19] M. Wu. A proof of Furstenberg’s conjecture on the intersections of $\times p$ - and $\times q$ -invariant sets. *Ann. Of Math.*, 189(3):707–751, 2019. doi:10.4007/annals.2019.189.3.2. 3

AUTHOR

Damian Dąbrowski
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Jyväskylä
Jyväskylä, Finland
damian.m.dabrowski@jyu.fi
<https://www.damiandabrowski.eu/>