

A CONTINUUM ERDŐS-BECK THEOREM

PAIGE BRIGHT AND CALEB MARSHALL

ABSTRACT. We prove a version of the Erdős–Beck Theorem from discrete geometry for fractal sets in all dimensions. More precisely, let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ Borel and $k \in [0, n - 1]$ be an integer. Let $\dim(X \setminus H) = \dim X$ for every k -dimensional hyperplane $H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$, and let $\mathcal{L}(X)$ be the set of lines that contain at least two distinct points of X . Then, a recent result of Ren shows

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \min\{2 \dim X, 2k\}.$$

If we instead have that X is not a subset of any k -plane, and

$$0 < \inf_{H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)} \dim(X \setminus H) = t < \dim X,$$

we instead obtain the bound

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \dim X + t.$$

We then strengthen this lower bound by introducing the notion of the “trapping number” of a set, $T(X)$, and obtain

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \max\{\dim X + t, \min\{2 \dim X, 2(T(X) - 1)\}\},$$

as consequence of our main result and of Ren’s result in \mathbb{R}^n . Finally, we introduce a conjectured equality for the dimension of the line set $\mathcal{L}(X)$, which would in particular imply our results if proven to be true.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Examples and a Conjecture	3
1.2. Outline of Paper	7
2. The Planar Theorem	7
2.1. The Dimension of Line Families	7
2.2. Furstenberg Set Estimates	11
2.3. Planar Erdős–Beck Theorems for Fractal Sets	11
3. The Higher Dimensional Theorem	12
3.1. Preliminaries for Higher Dimensions	12
3.2. Higher Dimensional Erdős–Beck Theorems for Fractal Sets	14
References	14

1. INTRODUCTION

In discrete geometry, a classic result of Beck [Bec83] shows that given N points in \mathbb{R}^2 , either $\sim N$ of the points lie on a line, or there are $\sim N^2$ lines spanned by the set, i.e. $\sim N^2$ lines which contain at least two of the points.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 28A75, 28A78.

Remark 1. Here, \sim denotes equality up to some positive multiplicative constant. Similarly, $A \lesssim B$ denotes $A \leq CB$ for some multiplicative constant C .

About two years ago, this result was generalized to the continuum setting by Orponen–Shmerkin–Wang (OSW, [OSW22]), showing that given $X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ Borel, either

- 1) there exists a line ℓ such that $\dim(X \setminus \ell) < \dim X$, or
- 2) $\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \min\{2 \dim X, 2\}$, where $\mathcal{L}(X)$ is the set of all lines containing at least two points of X contained in the metric measure space $\mathcal{A}(2, 1)$, i.e. the space of all lines in \mathbb{R}^2 .

Remark 2. We define the dimension of a subset of the affine Grassmannian subordinate to suitable metrics on $\mathcal{A}(n, 1)$. For the sake of exposition, we postpone any formal definition until Section 2.1.

The proof of the continuum version of Beck’s theorem from Orponen, Shmerkin, and Wang used one of their main results on radial projections proven in the plane, as well as a classical lowerbound on the dimension of a (dual) Furstenberg set (see Section 2.2). Recently, Kevin Ren proved a higher dimensional radial projection theorem strengthening OSW’s result, and as a consequence, Ren was able to derive an analogous continuum version of Beck’s theorem in \mathbb{R}^n ([Ren23], Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.5).

Going back to discrete geometry: there is a more general version of Beck’s theorem, called the Erdős–Beck theorem. This result shows the following: given N points in the plane, P , and a parameter $0 \leq t \leq N$, suppose that

$$\sup_{L \in \mathcal{A}(2, 1)} |P \cap L| \geq N - t.$$

Then P spans $\gtrsim Nt$ many lines. This result was proven by Jozsef Beck in [Bec83] and resolved a conjecture of Erdős—hence, this result is often referred to in the literature as the Erdős–Beck Theorem.

Our main focus of this paper is finding a continuum analogue of the Erdős–Beck theorem in \mathbb{R}^n . In particular, our main result is the following. In what follows, $\mathcal{A}(n, k)$ is the affine Grassmannian of k planes in \mathbb{R}^n .

Theorem 3. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be Borel, and let $k \in [1, n - 1]$ be an integer. Then,*

- 1) *if $\dim(X \setminus H) = \dim X$ for every $H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$, then $\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \min\{2 \dim X, 2k\}$.*
- 2) *if there exists an $H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$ such that $\dim(X \setminus H) < \dim X$, we let $0 < t \leq \dim X$ such that $\dim(X \setminus P) \geq t$ for all $P \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$. Then,*

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \dim X + t.$$

Firstly, note that if we are in the second case of the above theorem, and the only value of t such that $\dim X \setminus P \geq t$ for all $P \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$ is $t = 0$, then one can apply this same theorem with $n = k$ and $X' = X \cap H$. Furthermore, note that, if $\dim X > k$ for some k , then Condition (1) of Theorem 3 necessarily holds. Hence, we always have the bound

$$(1) \quad \dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \max\{2(\lfloor \dim X \rfloor - 1), 0\} \quad \forall X \subset \mathbb{R}^n.$$

However, for sets satisfying Condition (2), we may improve this bound by examining the interaction between the sts $X_1 := X \cap H$ and $X_2 := X \setminus H$, where $H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$ satisfies $\dim(X \setminus H) < \dim X$. We will also further strengthen the lower bound of

Theorem 3 by defining the notion of a “trapping number” of a set—a concept related to the estimate (1) appearing above.

Remark 4. We view our result as a natural continuum analogue of the Erdős-Beck Theorem, with cardinality replaced by Hausdorff dimension. In particular, our estimate gives a lower bound on the dimension of the line set $\mathcal{L}(X)$ as a function of the dimensions of X and its largest dimensional co-planar subset.

Initially, the reader may be surprised that the Erdős-Beck bound of Nt becomes a sum bound of $\dim X + t$ in our result. However, such “logarithmic” phenomenon occur frequently in these kind of discrete-to-continuum Theorems. Some examples in this vein include partial results towards an Erdős-Beck Theorem in the Continuum as in [OSW22] and [Ren23], as well as further afield analogues such as the Kakeya problem in finite fields, where the (conjectured) dimensional estimate of $\dim K = n$ in \mathbb{R}^n becomes a cardinality estimate of $\#K \gtrsim |\mathbb{F}_q|^n$ in the finite field \mathbb{F}_q . See, for example, [Dvi09].

Let us now discuss how Theorem 3 can be strengthened by considering the following definition.

Definition 5. Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be Borel with $\dim(X) > 0$, and define the **trapping number** of X to be

$$T(X) := \begin{cases} \min\{k \in \mathbb{N}_+ : \text{there exists an } H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k) \text{ such that } \dim(X \setminus H) < \dim X\} \\ 1 \text{ if no such } k \text{ exists} \end{cases}$$

One can intuitively think of the trapping number of a set X as a way to recognize if (a large proportion of) X is contained in some lower dimensional k -plane. Notice then that Ren’s continuum Beck’s theorem [Ren23] proves the following:

Theorem 6 ([Ren23], Corollary 1.5). Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be Borel. Then,

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \min\{2 \dim X, 2(T(X) - 1)\}.$$

Remark 7. This was technically proven when $T(X) \geq 2$, though the result is trivial when $T(X) = 1$, so we include it for completeness.

Comparing this to our main result, Theorem 3, we obtain the following:

Corollary 8. Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be Borel and let $k \in [0, n - 1]$ be an integer. Then,

1) if $\dim(X \setminus H) = \dim X$ for every $H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$, then $\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \min\{2 \dim X, 2k\}$.

2) if there exists an $H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$ such that $\dim(X \setminus H) < \dim X$, we let $0 < t \leq \dim X$ such that $\dim(X \setminus P) \geq t$ for all $P \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$. Then,

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \max\{\dim X + t, \min\{2 \dim X, 2(T(X) - 1)\}\}.$$

1.1. Examples and a Conjecture. We illustrate the relationship between the parameters k , t , $T(X)$, and the dimension of the set X through examples.

Firstly, notice that, since $\dim(X \setminus H) \leq \dim X$ for all k -planes H , we always have that

$$\dim X + \inf_{H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)} \dim(X \setminus H) \leq 2 \dim X, \quad \forall 1 \leq k \leq n.$$

Hence, the term $\dim X + t$ appearing in Corollary 8 dominates precisely when $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies the inequality

$$(2) \quad 2(T(X) - 1) \leq \dim X + \inf_{H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)} \dim(X \setminus H) \leq 2 \dim X$$

where $\dim X$ satisfies $\dim X \leq k$. The following example furnishes a set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ which satisfies the inequalities (2) (so Corollary 8 obtains a lower bound of $\dim X + t$).

Example 9. Let $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$ be given and suppose that $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ Borel can be written as $X = X_1 \cup X_2$, where each X_j is contained in some distinct k -plane $H_j \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$ and satisfies $k - 1 < \dim X_1 < \dim X_2 = \dim X \leq k$. Then, since

$$\dim(X \setminus H_2) = \dim(X_1) < \dim(X),$$

we know that $T(X) \leq k$. However, for any $k - 1$ plane $H' \in \mathcal{A}(n, k - 1)$, we know that

$$\dim(X_2 \setminus H') = \dim(X_2) = \dim(X).$$

Hence, $T(X) \geq k$. So, one knows that:

$$\min\{2 \dim X, 2(T(X) - 1)\} \leq 2k - 2.$$

However, since

$$\inf_{H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)} \dim(X \setminus H) = \dim(X \setminus H_2) = \dim(X_1),$$

we have, setting $t = \dim X_1$,

$$\dim X + t > (k - 1) + (k - 1) = 2k - 2$$

Hence, the bound $\dim X + t$ of Corollary 8 dominates in this scenario.

We now provide some intuition for how the parameters t and $T(X)$ come into play for sets with varying geometric structure, and give an example of a set where the term $\min\{2 \dim X, 2(T(X) - 1)\}$ does, in fact, dominate $\dim X + t$.

Example 10. We work in \mathbb{R}^n and suppose we are given some integer $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$ and $0 < \beta \leq 1$. In this example, we construct a set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with dimension $\dim X = k - 1 + \beta$ and trapping dimension $T(X) = k + 1$. We then provide a lower bound for $\dim \mathcal{L}(X)$ from Corollary 8 and determine what happens as $\beta \rightarrow 1$.

To this end, suppose that $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is an embedding of the k -sphere \mathbb{S}^k in \mathbb{R}^n (which, of course, has dimension k). We then take a subset $X \subset S$ which satisfies $\dim X = k - 1 + \beta$. Now, we know that

$$\dim(S \cap H) \leq k - 1, \quad \forall H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k) \text{ intersecting } S.$$

Hence, for every $H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$, we have $\dim(X \setminus H) = \dim X$. So, the trapping number of X satisfies $T(X) \geq k + 1$. However, the k -sphere S is itself contained in some $k + 1$ hyperplane, which guarantees that $T(X) \leq k + 1$. So, X has trapping number $T(X) = k + 1$. We then have that

$$T(X) - 1 = k \geq k - 1 + \beta = \dim X.$$

This, in turn, implies that $\min\{2 \dim X, 2(T(X) - 1)\} = 2 \dim X$, so that

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \max\{\dim X + t, 2 \dim X\} = 2 \dim X.$$

A similar result is, of course, given by Theorem 3, since we may take $t = \dim X$. However, we note that

$$\dim X = k - 1 + \beta \rightarrow 2k \text{ as } \beta \rightarrow 1.$$

In particular, whenever X is a full-dimensional subset of S , we see that

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq 2 \dim X = 2(T(X) - 1) = 2k.$$

In the special case where $k = n - 1$, this inequality is an equality, since one necessarily has $\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \leq 2(n - 1)$ for any $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

The last example demonstrates a set for which the lower bound of Corollary 8 is, in fact, an equality. However, we do not expect our bound to be sharp for all Borel sets X . Instead, we conjecture the following to be true.

Conjecture 11. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and let $T(X) = T$ be the trapping number of X . Suppose that $H \in \mathcal{A}(n, T)$ is the unique hyperplane such that $\dim(X \setminus H) < \dim X$, and set $X_1 = X \cap H$ and $X_2 = X \setminus H$. Then, one has*

$$(3) \quad \dim \mathcal{L}(X) = \max\{\dim(X_1 \times X_2), \min\{\dim(X_1 \times X_1), 2(T - 1)\}\}$$

The spirit behind Conjecture 11 is the following. For $X = X_1 \sqcup X_2$ in \mathbb{R}^n let $\mathcal{L}(X_1, X_2)$ denote the family of affine lines connecting pairs of points between X_1 and X_2 . Then, we can write

$$\mathcal{L}(X) := \mathcal{L}(X_1) \cup \mathcal{L}(X_1, X_2) \cup \mathcal{L}(X_2).$$

So, if one had the equalities

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(X_1, X_2) = \dim(X_1 \times X_2), \quad \dim \mathcal{L}(X_1) = \dim(X_1 \times X_1),$$

then this would prove Conjecture 11. In particular, since:

$$\dim(X_1 \times X_2) \geq \dim X_1 + \dim X_2 = \dim X + \inf_{H \in \mathcal{A}(n, T)} \dim(X \setminus H),$$

$$\dim(X_1 \times X_1) \geq 2 \dim X_1 = 2 \dim X,$$

we see that Conjecture 11 in fact implies the lower bound of our main result, which is Theorem 3.

Remark 12. We note that *bilinear* line set estimates of the form $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ can be studied in a similar manner, which is a direction we hope to pursue in future work.

To help motivate Conjecture 11 and demonstrate that it supersedes Theorem 3 for certain sets, we recall the following result concerning the dimension of product sets (see [Mat99, Theorem 8.10] for a reference).

Theorem 13. *Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $B \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ be non-empty Borel sets. Then*

$$(4) \quad \dim(A \times B) \geq \dim A + \dim B.$$

Many product sets $K = A \times B$ attain (4) with equality—for example, when A has equal Hausdorff and packing dimensions. Yet, the inequality (4) can also be strict. Such product sets are precisely those which motivate Conjecture 11. We give an example in \mathbb{R}^2 below, where point-line duality arguments allow us to easily calculate the dimension of $\mathcal{L}(X_i, X_j)$ in terms of the dimension of the product set $X_i \times X_j$ for $i, j = 1, 2$.

We now construct a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\dim(E) = 0$ such that $\dim \mathcal{L}(E) = 1$. Moreover, our set E has the property that $E = E_1 \sqcup E_2$ where each E_i is contained in some line ℓ_i and $\mathcal{L}(E) = \dim(E_1 \times E_2) = 1$. In particular, then, this example demonstrates a set E which simultaneously sharpens the conjectured inequality (3) while also departing from the lower bound of Corollary 8.

Example 14. We adapt an example from [BP16, p.90] on \mathbb{R} to lines in \mathbb{R}^2 . For any $S \subset \mathbb{N}$, let

$$A_S := \{x \in [0, 1] : \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} x_k 2^{-k}\}, \text{ where } x_k \in \begin{cases} \{0, 1\}, & k \in S \\ \{0\}, & k \in S^C \end{cases}.$$

Note that $[0, 1] \subset A_S + A_{S^C}$ for any choice of $S \subset \mathbb{N}$. It is shown in [BP16] that

$$\overline{\dim_{\mathcal{M}} A_S} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(S \cap \{1, \dots, N\})}{N},$$

where $\overline{\dim_{\mathcal{M}} A_S}$ denotes the upper Minkowski dimension of A_S . Now, choose S so that

$$S := \mathbb{N} \cap \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} [(2j-1)!, 2j!] \right) \quad S^C := \mathbb{N} \cap \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} [2j!, (2j+1)!] \right),$$

and let $A = A_S$ and $B = A_{S^C}$. We then have that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(S \cap \{1, \dots, N\})}{N} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(S^C \cap \{1, \dots, N\})}{N} = 0,$$

so that $\dim A = \dim B = 0$.

Now, let $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be defined as $E = E_1 \sqcup E_2$ where

$$E_1 := \{(a, 0) : a \in A\} \quad E_2 := \{(0, b) : b \in B\}.$$

Then $\dim(E) = 0$ and each E_i is a subset of the two coordinate axes ℓ_x and ℓ_y . We know, then, that

$$\dim E = T(E) = \dim E + \inf_{H \in \mathcal{A}(2, k)} \dim(E \setminus H) = 0 \quad \forall k = 0, 1, 2,$$

so that Corollary 8 gives the trivial lower bound of $\dim \mathcal{L}(E) \geq 0$.

Nevertheless, one has $\dim \mathcal{L}(E) = 1$. To verify this, first write

$$\mathcal{L}(E) = \mathcal{L}(E_1) \sqcup \mathcal{L}(E_2) \sqcup \mathcal{L}(E_1, E_2),$$

and notice that $\dim \mathcal{L}(E_1) = \dim \mathcal{L}(E_2) = 0$. Now, since ℓ_x and ℓ_y are perpendicular, no lines in $\mathcal{L}(E_1, E_2)$ are vertical. So, we may use the point-line duality dimension bound (see, for example, [OS23] for a discussion) to obtain

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(E_1, E_2) = \dim(E_1 \times E_2) = \dim(A \times B) = 1.$$

In particular, this shows the *equality*–not inequality–conjectured in (3).

Remark 15. Example 14 demonstrates the improvement of Conjecture 11 over Corollary 8 by first finding two sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $\dim(A \times B) > \dim A + \dim B$ and then embedding these sets in perpendicular lines in \mathbb{R}^2 . It is likely that a similar method could give further examples relevant to Conjecture 11 in \mathbb{R}^n for $n \geq 3$. That is, taking sets $A \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ and $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\dim(A \times B) > \dim A + \dim B$. Such sets are constructed in [Hat71], with parameters $\alpha = \dim A$, $\beta = \dim B$ and $\gamma = \dim(A \times B)$ satisfying $\alpha \leq m$ and

$$\alpha + \beta < \gamma < \min\{\alpha + m, \beta + n\}.$$

We plan to study such generalizations at a later time.

1.2. Outline of Paper. We begin by proving Theorem 3, and thus Corollary 8, in the plane in Section 2. This is done to outline the approach we will take in higher dimensions. We also take this time to develop useful lemmata regarding the affine Grassmannian and the relation to radial projections. Then, in Section 3, we discuss and prove the higher dimensional results. In this section, we generalize the planar lemmata and utilize results of Ren [Ren23] and the first author, Fu, and Ren [BFR24].

Acknowledgements. A number of ideas for this paper were conceived while the authors were working on the Study Guide Writing Workshop 2023 at UPenn. We would like to thank our collaborators on the study guide: Ryan Bushling and Alex Ortiz. We would also like to thank Hong Wang for words of insight and encouragement when first attempting this problem at the Study Guide Workshop. Finally, we also must thank Josh Zahl for insightful discussions, especially for helping us formalize Corollary 8 and Conjecture 11.

2. THE PLANAR THEOREM

2.1. The Dimension of Line Families. For each $n \geq 2$, we work with $\mathcal{G}(n, 1)$, the set of linear subspaces of \mathbb{R}^n and $\mathcal{A}(n, 1)$, the family of affine lines in \mathbb{R}^n .

Before beginning our work on line families, we make a small note of the following notation. Whenever $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the map $\pi_x : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{x\} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ will denote radial projection onto the sphere centered at x ; however, if whenever $L \in \mathcal{A}(n, 1)$, we let $\pi_L : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow L$ denote the orthogonal projection map onto L .

We will view both $\mathcal{G}(n, 1)$ and $\mathcal{A}(n, 1)$ as a topological metric spaces. For $\mathcal{G}(n, 1)$, we need only use the standard metric,

$$d_{\mathcal{G}(n,1)}(L, L') := \|\pi_L - \pi_{L'}\|.$$

where π_L denotes orthogonal projection onto L .

This metric induces a natural notion of *measure* and *dimension* on $\mathcal{G}(n, 1)$, which is defined to the (normalized) \mathcal{H}^s measures on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} and radial projection about the origin. Since we often employ radial projection through the origin, we define it below.

Definition 16. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, we let $\pi_O(x)$ denote the radial projection of x onto \mathbb{S}^{n-1} centered at the origin. That is

$$\pi_O(x) := \frac{x}{|x|}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}.$$

In particular, if $L \in \mathcal{G}(n, 1)$ is any line through the origin, $\pi_O(L)$ consists of two antipodal points. Moreover, whenever $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{G}(n, 1)$ is (viewed as) a collection of lines in \mathbb{R}^n , we let

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{L}} := \pi_O\left(\bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} L\right) = \bigcup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} (L \cap \mathbb{S}^{n-1}),$$

In words, $\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the set of directions determined by \mathcal{L} . We then use a notion of measure and dimension on $\mathcal{G}(n, 1)$, which is discussed, for example, in [Mat99].

Definition 17. For each $0 \leq s \leq n-1$, the *s-Hausdorff measure* γ_s on $\mathcal{G}(n, 1)$ is defined as,

$$\gamma_s(\mathcal{L}) := \mathcal{H}^s|_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}(\Theta_{\mathcal{L}}), \quad \forall \mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{G}(n, 1),$$

The **Hausdorff dimension** of \mathcal{L} is then defined in the usual way but relative to the measures γ_s .

For the affine Grassmanian $\mathcal{A}(n, 1)$, we use a family of metrics parametrized by $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Definition 18. For each $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define a metric $d^w := d_{\mathcal{A}(n,1)}^w(\cdot, \cdot)$ on $\mathcal{A}(n, 1)$ by setting,

$$d_{\mathcal{A}(n,1)}^w(\ell, \ell') = \|\pi_{L_w} - \pi_{L'_w}\| + |a_w - a'_w|, \quad \forall \ell, \ell' \in \mathcal{A}(n, 1).$$

where π_{L_w} denotes projection onto the line L_w , which is parallel to ℓ and passes through w , and a_w is the point of intersection of the lines ℓ and the $n-1$ -dimensional hyperplane through w which is perpendicular to L_w .

This family of metrics $d_{\mathcal{A}(n,1)}^w$ allows us to perform the following important “change-of-coordinates” for a family of lines passing through a common point. Indeed, notice that if \mathcal{L}_w is a family of lines passing through $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then $a_w = a'_w = w$ for each $\ell, \ell' \in \mathcal{L}_w$. Consequently

$$\sup_{\ell, \ell' \in \mathcal{L}_w} d^w(\ell, \ell') = \sup_{L_w, L'_w} \|\pi_{L_w} - \pi_{L'_w}\| = \sup_{L, L'} \|\pi_L - \pi_{L'}\|,$$

where $L \sim L_w$ and $L' \sim L'_w$ are the linear subspaces parallel to L_w and L'_w . So, relative to the metric d^w , the diameter of a collection of lines \mathcal{L}_w passing through $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is computable in terms of $d_{\mathcal{G}(n,1)}$ —the standard metric on the Grassmanian of linear subspaces.

For us, the most important property of the metrics d^w s are their equivalence.

Proposition 19. Suppose that w_1 and w_2 are points in \mathbb{R}^n . Then, the associated metrics d^{w_1} and d^{w_2} are bilipschitz equivalent. That is, there exist constants C_1, C_2 —which are allowed to depend on w_1 and w_2 —such that:

$$(5) \quad C_1 d^{w_1}(\ell, \ell') \leq d^{w_2}(\ell, \ell') \leq C_2 d^{w_1}(\ell, \ell')$$

for all lines $\ell, \ell' \in \mathcal{A}(n, 1)$.

Proof. The ideas behind this Proposition are discussed in [Mat99]. However, we give a proof of the following restricted special case, as it is essentially the situation we encounter in the following key result (Lemma 20). Specifically: we will be studying line families that intersect in a common point—so, the following special case considers the transformation from the origin to this point of intersection.

Suppose $\ell, \ell' \in \mathcal{A}(n, 1)$ are non-parallel lines, and set $w := \ell \cap \ell'$. Let us show that there exist constants C_1 and C_2 such that

$$C_1 d^w(\ell, \ell') \leq d^O(\ell, \ell') \leq C_2 d^w(\ell, \ell')$$

where O is the origin. Importantly, our constants C_1 and C_2 will depend upon the distance $W := |O - w| = |w|$, which is valid since our choice of w fixes the metric, but not the lines in question.

It is clear that the projection operators satisfy,

$$\|\pi_{L_w} - \pi_{L'_w}\| = \|\pi_L - \pi_{L'}\|.$$

which follows directly from the definition of the operator norm. So, call this value $\delta > 0$. Then, we have that

$$d^w(\ell, \ell') = \delta$$




FIGURE 1. We work with the change-of-coordinates which takes us from the origin to the point of intersection of the lines ℓ and ℓ' . This change-of-coordinates is highly important for what comes later.

$$d^O(\ell, \ell') = \delta + |a - a'|$$

It is obvious that the left-hand inequality of (5) holds with constant $C_1 = 1$. It remains to show the right-hand side of the inequality is valid.

Consider the two triangles T and T' formed by connecting the points w , a and O and w , a' and O , respectively. Notice that, the assumption that $a \in L^\perp$ and $a' \in L'^\perp$ implies that both T and T' are right-triangles, and both have hypotenuse along the segment connecting w and O . Moreover, if θ and θ' denote the the angles of triangles T and T' (resp.) at vertex w , then we have

$$\theta + \theta' \lesssim \delta.$$

This is just another way of asserting that both θ and θ' are proportionally bounded above by the separation-in-direction of ℓ and ℓ' .



(A) The right triangle formed by the origin, a and w . (B) The right-triangle formed by the origin, a' and w .

FIGURE 2. Both of these right-triangles are contained in two separate two-dimensional hyperplanes. Hence, we can apply elementary trigonometry and the triangle inequality to estimate their dimensions.

Combining our previous observations, we have

$$|a - a'| \leq |a - O| + |a' - O| = \sin \theta |W| + \sin \theta' |W| \lesssim (\theta + \theta') |W|.$$

Since $\theta + \theta' \lesssim \delta$, this gives:

$$d^O(\ell, \ell') = \delta + |a - a'| \lesssim \delta |W| = |W| \cdot d^w(\ell, \ell').$$

Hence, it suffices to take $C_2 \gtrsim |W|$. The proof is finished for this special case. \square

Proposition 19 guarantees that any s -dimensional measures we generate from the metrics d^w are guaranteed to be absolutely continuous. In particular, then, we can define our notion of s -dimensional Hausdorff measure on $\mathcal{A}(n, 1)$ relative to the metric $d_{\mathcal{A}(n, 1)}^O$ (so w is chosen to be the origin). This is the metric given in [Mat99]. This brings us to the following Lemma—which we think of as an identity for calculating the dimension of line families which happen to have common intersection at a point.

Lemma 20. *Let \mathcal{L}_x be a family of lines in \mathbb{R}^n , and suppose there exists a common point $x \in \ell$ for each $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_x$. Then,*

$$\dim \mathcal{L}_x = \dim \pi_x \left(\bigcup_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \ell \setminus \{x\} \right).$$

Proof. The proof is a summation of what we have already discussed. Namely, since our notion of dimension is stable under translation, we can freely choose $x = O$ to be the origin. This is critical, because in this special situation, \mathcal{L}_O can be taken as a subset of $\mathcal{G}(n, 1)$. In particular, we can define the dimension of our line family \mathcal{L}_x relative to the measure γ_s defined in Definition 17. The details—again, freely assuming now that $x = O$ due to Proposition 19—are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \mathcal{L}_x &:= \sup \{s : \gamma_s(\mathcal{L}_O) = 0\} \\ &= \sup \{s : \mathcal{H}^s(\Theta_{\mathcal{L}_O}) = 0\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ s : \mathcal{H}^s \left(\bigcup_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}_O} (\ell \cap \mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \right) = 0 \right\} \\ &= \dim \pi_O \left(\bigcup_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} (\ell \setminus \{O\}) \right) \end{aligned}$$

\square

Remark 21. In the special case of $\mathcal{A}(2, 1)$, one may leverage the duality of points and lines to greatly simplify the notion of dimension (at least in certain special cases). A discussion of this idea is given in [OS23] and [OSW22]. However, when working in $\mathcal{A}(n, 1)$ for $n \geq 3$, this duality is not available to us. For this reason, we think of Lemma 20 as a substitute for this duality—at least in the special case where our line family has common intersection in a point.

These lemmata on dimension of line sets, as well as classic lower bounds on the dimension of Furstenberg sets, are utilized in the proof of Theorem 3.

2.2. Furstenberg Set Estimates. We now go into some background regarding Furstenberg set estimates, which has been a rapidly developing topic over the past few years and one that we will utilize in this paper. An (s, t) -Furstenberg set in \mathbb{R}^n is a set of points F such that there exists a (non-empty) family of lines $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{A}(n, 1)$ such that $\dim \mathcal{L} \geq t > 0$, and such that $\dim(F \cap \ell) \geq s > 0$ for all $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$.

The Furstenberg set problem strives to find a lower bound on the dimension of all (s, t) -Furstenberg sets—a problem that was recently solved by Kevin Ren and Hong Wang in the plane [RW23]. Before this result was proven, there were a number of partial results towards the full conjecture which prove useful for this paper. One such result is the the following:

$$\dim F \geq s + \min\{s, t\}$$

where F is an (s, t) -Furstenberg set. The case when $t \leq s$ was proven by Lutz and Stull using information theory [LS20] and the case $s \leq t$ is essentially due to Wolff [Wol99]. Both cases were also proven by Héra–Shmerkin–Yavicoli in [[HSY20], Theorem A.1].

However, studying (generalized) dual Furstenberg sets has been proving fruitful in the past few years. A (generalized) *dual (s, t) -Furstenberg set of lines* in \mathbb{R}^n is a set of lines \mathcal{L} such that there exists a non-empty set of pins $F^* \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\dim F^* \geq t > 0$, and for all $x \in F^*$, there exists a set of lines $\mathcal{L}_x \subset \mathcal{L}$ through x such that $\dim \mathcal{L}_x \geq s \geq 0$. The (generalized) dual Furstenberg set problem then asks for a lower bound on $\dim \mathcal{L}$. As it happens, in two dimensions, the notion of a dual Furstenberg set is precisely dual to a Furstenberg set using point-line duality (see [OSW22] Section 3.1 for more details). In particular, via point-line duality in two dimensions, one obtains

$$\dim \mathcal{L} \geq s + \min\{s, t\}$$

where \mathcal{L} is a dual (s, t) -Furstenberg set. This lower bound is the one we shall utilize in the proof of the continuum Erdős–Beck Theorem.

Remark 22. While in higher dimensions, generalized dual Furstenberg sets are *not* dual to a Furstenberg set, the notion still generalizes the lower dimensional case, and are thusly referred to as generalized dual Furstenberg sets. See Section 3.1 for an analogous lower bound.

2.3. Planar Erdős–Beck Theorems for Fractal Sets. We now prove our main result in the plane, which we restate here for convenience.

Theorem 23. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be Borel. Then,*

- 1) *if $\dim(X \setminus \ell) = \dim X$ for every $\ell \in \mathcal{A}(2, 1)$, then $\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \min\{2 \dim X, 2\}$.*
- 2) *if there exists an $\ell \in \mathcal{A}(2, 1)$ such that $\dim(X \setminus \ell) < \dim X$, we let $0 < t \leq \dim X$ such that $\dim(X \setminus \ell) \geq t$ for all $\ell \in \mathcal{A}(2, 1)$. Then,*

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \dim X + t.$$

Proof. If it is the case that for all lines ℓ we have $\dim(X \setminus \ell) = \dim X$, then we may apply the continuum version of Beck’s theorem and obtain

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \min\{2 \dim X, 2\}.$$

Otherwise, there exists an $\ell \in \mathcal{A}(2, 1)$ such that $\dim X \setminus \ell < \dim X$. Fix $0 < t \leq \dim X$ such that $\dim(X \setminus \ell') \geq t$ for all lines ℓ' . Given there exists a line ℓ such

that $\dim(X \setminus \ell) < \dim X$, we have that $\dim(X \cap \ell) = \dim X := s$. Therefore, by Lemma 25, we have that

$$\dim \pi_x(X \setminus \{x\}) \geq s, \quad \forall x \in X \setminus \ell.$$

Hence, by Lemma 20, the set of lines through x , $\mathcal{L}_x \subset \mathcal{L}(X)$, satisfies

$$\dim \mathcal{L}_x = \dim \pi_x(X \setminus \{x\}) \geq s$$

for all $x \in X \setminus \ell$.

Hence, we have that

$$\mathcal{L}(X) \supset \bigcup_{x \in X \setminus \ell} \mathcal{L}_x,$$

where $\dim(X \setminus \ell) \geq t$ (by assumption) and $\dim \mathcal{L}_x \geq s$ for all $x \in X \setminus \ell$. This is an dual (s, t) -Furstenberg set (note that here we used $X \setminus \ell$ as our non-empty set of pins with dimension at least $t > 0$ by assumption). Thus, using point-line duality, we see that

$$\dim \left(\bigcup_{x \in X \setminus \ell} \mathcal{L}_x \right) \geq \dim F,$$

where F is an (s, t) -Furstenberg set. Note that by assumption, $0 < t \leq s = \dim X$. Thus, the result of Lutz–Stull gives that $\dim F \geq s + t$. In total, we have that

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \dim \left(\bigcup_{x \in X \setminus \ell} \mathcal{L}_x \right) \geq \dim F \geq s + t.$$

This gives the desired result. \square

Corollary 24. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be Borel. Then,*

- 1) *if $\dim(X \setminus \ell) = \dim X$ for every $\ell \in \mathcal{A}(2, 1)$, then $\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \min\{2 \dim X, 2\}$.*
- 2) *if there exists an $\ell \in \mathcal{A}(2, 1)$ such that $\dim(X \setminus \ell) < \dim X$, we let $0 < t \leq \dim X$ such that $\dim(X \setminus \ell) \geq t$ for all $\ell \in \mathcal{A}(2, 1)$. Then,*

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \max\{\dim X + t, \min\{2 \dim X, 2(T(X) - 1)\}\}.$$

Proof. Compare Theorem 23 with Theorem 6 (due to Ren) to obtain the result. \square

3. THE HIGHER DIMENSIONAL THEOREM

3.1. Preliminaries for Higher Dimensions. In the course of proving Theorem 3, we will use the following two lemmata.

Lemma 25. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\dim X = s \in [k, k+1)$ for some integer $1 \leq k \leq n-1$. Assume that there exists a k -plane $H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$ so that $\dim(X \cap H) = s$. Then,*

$$(6) \quad \dim \pi_x(X \setminus \{x\}) \geq s, \quad \forall x \in X \setminus H.$$

Proof of Lemma 25. Firstly, note that if $X \setminus H = \emptyset$, this is vacuously true, so we may assume that $X \setminus H \neq \emptyset$.

Call $X_1 := X \cap H$ and $X_2 := X \setminus H$. We show that,

$$\dim \pi_{x_2}(X_1) = s, \quad \forall x_2 \in X_2.$$

which clearly implies (6). Indeed, this follows because the mapping $\pi_{x_2} : H \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ is locally bi-Lipschitz for each fixed $x_2 \in X_2$. However, since locally bi-Lipschitz mappings preserve dimension, we have

$$\dim \pi_{x_2}(X_1) = \dim X_1 = s.$$

Hence, to finish the proof, we show that the mapping $\pi_{x_2} : X_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ is locally bi-Lipschitz.

We will assume (without loss of generality) that

$$H := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_{k+1} = \cdots = x_{n-1} = 0; x_n = 1\}$$

and that $x_2 = 0$. Note that, for an arbitrary k -dimensional hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and point $x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we can always perform an affine transformation to arrive at this special case. Since affine transformations preserve Hausdorff dimension, we are fine making this reduction. In this special case, notice that

$$\pi_{x_2}(H) = \{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} : \theta_{k+1} = \cdots = \theta_{n-1} = 0\} = \Theta.$$

So, the mapping $\pi_{x_2}|_H$ admits an inverse function $\psi : \Theta \rightarrow H$, defined via:

$$\psi(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k, \theta_{k+1}, \dots, \theta_n) := \left(\frac{\theta_1}{\theta_n}, \dots, \frac{\theta_k}{\theta_n}, 0, \dots, 0, 1 \right).$$

Now, for each $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, let

$$X_n := \{x \in X_1 : |x - e_n| \leq n\},$$

where e_n is the n -th standard normal vector in \mathbb{R}^n . Similarly, let $\Theta_n := \pi_{x_2}(X_n)$, which is a subset of Θ . The mapping $\pi_{x_2}|_{X_n}$ is Lipschitz with constant ~ 1 . Moreover, this mapping admits an inverse $\psi_n : \Theta_n \rightarrow X_n$, which is also Lipschitz with constant $\sim n$. Therefore,

$$\dim \pi_{x_2}(X_n) := \dim \Theta_n = \dim X_n.$$

In particular,

$$\dim \pi_{x_2}(X_1) \geq \sup_{1 \leq n < \infty} (\dim X_n) = \dim X.$$

Since $X_1 \subset X$, this concludes the proof. \square

In addition to the previous two lemmata, we will require some recent results—the first of which is a continuum higher dimensional Beck’s theorem by Ren, and the second of which is a dual Furstenberg set estimate from the first author, Fu, and Ren—both of which we state without proof.

Theorem 26 ([Ren23], Corollary 1.5). *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a Borel set with $\dim(X \setminus H) = \dim X$ for all k -planes H . Then, the line set $\mathcal{L}(X)$ spanned by pairs of distinct points in X satisfies*

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \min\{2 \dim X, 2k\}.$$

Theorem 27 ([BFR24], Theorem 4). *Let $0 \leq s \leq n - 1$ and let $0 < t \leq n$. Given \mathcal{L} is a dual (s, t) -Furstenberg set of lines in \mathbb{R}^n , we have,*

$$\dim \mathcal{L} \geq s + \min\{s, t\}.$$

3.2. Higher Dimensional Erdős-Beck Theorems for Fractal Sets. We now prove the higher-dimensional Erdős-Beck Theorem, Theorem 3, restated here.

Theorem 28. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be Borel, and let $k \in [1, n-1]$ be an integer. Then,*

- 1) *if $\dim(X \setminus H) = \dim X$ for every $H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$, then $\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \min\{2 \dim X, 2k\}$.*
- 2) *if there exists an $H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$ such that $\dim(X \setminus H) < \dim X$, we let $0 < t \leq \dim X$ such that $\dim(X \setminus P) \geq t$ for all $P \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$. Then,*

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \dim X + t.$$

Proof. Fix an integer $k \in [1, n-1]$. If it is the case that for all k -planes $H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$, we have $\dim(X \setminus H) = \dim X$, then by Theorem 26 from [Ren23], we have that

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \min\{2 \dim X, 2k\}.$$

Otherwise, there exists an H such that $\dim(X \setminus H) < \dim X$. Then, fix $0 < t \leq \dim X$ such that $\dim(X \setminus P) \geq t$ for all k -planes $P \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$. We now go into case work. Given there exists a k -plane $H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$ such that $\dim(X \setminus H) < \dim X$, we have that $\dim(X \cap H) = \dim X := s$. Therefore, by Lemma 25, we have that

$$\dim \pi_x(X \setminus \{x\}) \geq s, \quad \forall x \in X \setminus H.$$

Hence, by Lemma 20, for all $x \in X \setminus H$, the set of lines through x , $\mathcal{L}_x \subset \mathcal{L}(X)$, satisfies

$$\dim \mathcal{L}_x = \dim \pi_x(X \setminus \{x\}) \geq s$$

for all $x \in X \setminus H$.

In total, we have that

$$\mathcal{L}(X) \supset \bigcup_{x \in X \setminus H} \mathcal{L}_x,$$

where $X \setminus H$ is non-empty, $\dim X \setminus H \geq t$, and $\dim \mathcal{L}_x \geq s$ for all $x \in X \setminus H$. By Theorem 27, this implies that

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \dim \left(\bigcup_{x \in X \setminus H} \mathcal{L}_x \right) \geq s + \min\{t, s\} = s + t := \dim X + t.$$

□

Corollary 29. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be Borel and let $k \in [1, n-1]$ be an integer. Then,*

- 1) *if $\dim(X \setminus H) = \dim X$ for every $H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$, then $\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \min\{2 \dim X, 2k\}$.*
- 2) *if there exists an $H \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$ such that $\dim(X \setminus H) < \dim X$, we let $0 < t \leq \dim X$ such that $\dim(X \setminus P) \geq t$ for all $P \in \mathcal{A}(n, k)$. Then,*

$$\dim \mathcal{L}(X) \geq \max\{\dim X + t, \min\{2 \dim X, 2(T(X) - 1)\}\}.$$

Proof. Compare Theorem 28 with Theorem 6 (due to Ren) to obtain the result. □

REFERENCES

- [Bec83] József Beck. “On the lattice property of the plane and some problems of Dirac, Motzkin and Erdős in combinatorial geometry”. In: *Combinatorica* 22 (1983), pp. 281–297.
- [BFR24] Paige Bright, Yuqiu Fu, and Kevin Ren. *Radial projections in \mathbb{R}^n revisited*. 2024.

- [BP16] Christopher J. Bishop and Yuval Peres. *Fractals in Probability and Analysis*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2016. DOI: 10.1017/9781316460238.
- [Dvi09] Zeev Dvir. “On the size of Kakeya sets in finite fields”. In: *Journal of the American Mathematics Society* 22 (2009), pp. 1093–1097.
- [Hat71] Kaoru Hatano. “Notes on Hausdorff dimensions of Cartesian product sets”. In: *Hiroshima Mathematical Journal* 1 (1971), pp. 17–25. DOI: 10.32917/hmj/1206138139.
- [HSY20] Kornélia Héra, Pablo Shmerkin, and Alexia Yavicoli. “An improved bound for the dimension of $(\alpha, 2\alpha)$ -Furstenberg sets”. In: *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* 38 (2020), pp. 295–322. DOI: 10.4171/rmi/1281.
- [LS20] Neil Lutz and D.M. Stull. “Bounding the dimension of points on a line”. In: *Information and Computation* 275 (2020). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2020.104601>.
- [Mat99] Pertti Mattila. *Geometry of sets and measures in Euclidean spaces. Fractals and rectifiability. 1st paperback ed.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [OS23] Tuomas Orponen and Pablo Shmerkin. *Projections, Furstenberg sets, and the ABC sum-product problem*. 2023. arXiv: 2301.10199 [math.CA].
- [OSW22] Tuomas Orponen, Pablo Shmerkin, and Hong Wang. *Kaufman and Falconer estimates for radial projections and a continuum version of Beck’s Theorem*. 2022.
- [Ren23] Kevin Ren. *Discretized Radial Projections in \mathbb{R}^d* . 2023. arXiv: 2309.04097 [math.CA].
- [RW23] Kevin Ren and Hong Wang. *Furstenberg sets estimate in the plane*. 2023. arXiv: 2308.08819 [math.CA].
- [Wol99] Thomas Wolff. “Recent work connected with the Kakeya problem”. In: *Prospects in Mathematics* (1999), pp. 129–162.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02142-4307, USA

Email address: `paigeb@mit.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA, 1984 MATHEMATICS ROAD, VANCOUVER, BC, CANADA V6T 1Z2

Email address: `cmarshall@math.ubc.ca`