

FAILURE OF WEAK-TYPE ENDPOINT RESTRICTION ESTIMATES FOR QUADRATIC MANIFOLDS.

SAM CRAIG

ABSTRACT. A paper of Beckner, Carbery, Semmes, and Soria proved that the Fourier extension operator associated to the sphere cannot be weak-type bounded at the restriction endpoint $q = 2d/(d-1)$. We generalize their approach to prove that the extension operator associated with any n -dimensional quadratic manifold in \mathbb{R}^d cannot be weak-type bounded at $q = 2d/n$. The key step in generalizing the proof of Beckner, Carbery, Semmes, and Soria will be replacing Kakeya sets with what we will call \mathcal{N} -Kakeya sets, where \mathcal{N} denotes a closed subset of the Grassmannian $\text{Gr}(d-n, d)$. We define \mathcal{N} -Kakeya sets to be subsets of \mathbb{R}^d containing a translate of every $d-n$ -plane segment in \mathcal{N} . We will prove that if \mathcal{N} is closed and n -dimensional, then there exists compact, measure zero \mathcal{N} -Kakeya sets, generalizing the same result for standard Kakeya sets.

1. INTRODUCTION

The restriction problem for the sphere is determining the range of p, q for which the Fourier extension operator of the sphere in \mathbb{R}^d extends to a bounded operator $L^p \rightarrow L^q$. A simple example, known since the formulation of the restriction problem, shows that the extension operator cannot be bounded if $q \leq \frac{2d}{d-1}$. This is because the extension operator applied to a bump function has asymptotic decay at least $\langle x \rangle^{-d/2}$. However, this example does not rule out a weak-type bound for the extension operator at $q = \frac{2d}{d-1}$. Generalizing this reasoning, we can rule out a $L^p \rightarrow L^q$ bound when $q \leq \frac{2d}{n}$ for the Fourier extension operator of an n -dimensional quadratic manifold $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, but cannot rule a weak-type bound at $q = \frac{2d}{n}$.

A 1998 paper of Beckner, Carbery, Semmes, and Soria uses the existence of compact measure zero Kakeya sets to prove the extension operator for the sphere cannot be bounded $L^p \rightarrow L^{2d/(d-1), \infty}$ [BCSS89]. Their approach extends to any well-curved quadratic hypersurface in \mathbb{R}^d . The same is not true for extension operators associated with any manifold, since a 2009 paper by Bak, Oberlin, and Seeger proves that the extension operator associated with a monomial curve in $\mathbb{R}^d, d \geq 3$ does satisfy weak-type bounds at the restriction endpoint [BOS09]. We will prove in this paper that the extension operator is not weak-type bounded at $q = \frac{2d}{n}$ for n -dimensional quadratic manifolds in \mathbb{R}^d , generalizing the result of Beckner, Carbery, Semmes, and Soria. To do so, we will prove the existence of compact measure zero \mathcal{N} -Kakeya sets for closed n -dimensional sets \mathcal{N} in the Grassmannian $\text{Gr}(d-n, d)$. We will prove these sets exist by modifying an argument of Körner proving the existence of standard measure zero Kakeya set [Kör03].

1.1. Background. Let $F_1(\xi), \dots, F_{d-n}(\xi)$ be quadratic homogeneous polynomials on \mathbb{R}^n . Their graphs over an open ball $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ define a quadratic manifold $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. For such manifolds, we can define the *Fourier extension operator* $\mathcal{E}^{\mathcal{M}}$ mapping Schwartz functions on

Ω to Schwartz functions on \mathbb{R}^d by

$$\mathcal{E}^{\mathcal{M}} f(x) = \int_{\Omega} e^{2\pi i x \cdot (\xi, F_1(\xi), \dots, F_{d-n}(\xi))} f(\xi) d\xi.$$

The Fourier restriction problem for \mathcal{M} is to determine the range of p and q for which

$$\|\mathcal{E}^{\mathcal{M}} f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.$$

Restriction estimates for quadratic manifolds are most commonly studied in the codimension one case, in particular when \mathcal{M} is a paraboloid or sphere. While the higher codimension case is also an area of active research, it is less well-understood. The current best restriction estimates for quadratic manifolds appear in a recent paper of Gan, Guth, and Oh [GGO23]. In general, the estimates they prove are difficult to compute, but for certain n -dimensional quadratic manifolds of codimension two, they prove $L^p \rightarrow L^p$ restriction estimates when $p \geq \frac{2(n+2)+2}{n} + O(n^{-2})$.

Our result concerns the failure of $L^p \rightarrow L^{2d/n, \infty}$ restriction estimates for an n -dimensional quadratic manifold in \mathbb{R}^d . For many such manifolds, it already known that the extension operator is not bounded $L^p \rightarrow L^q$ for some $q > \frac{2d}{n}$ and any p , in which case the weak-type endpoint bound clearly must fail as well. To clarify when our results may be relevant, we will briefly discuss when we know or expect extension estimates to fail for some $q > \frac{2d}{n}$.

It is a well-known conjecture that well-curved manifolds of codimension one or two should satisfy the restriction estimates up to $\frac{2d}{n}$. In the codimension one case, this dates back to the original formulation of the restriction problem. The codimension two conjecture was given by Christ in 1982 [Chr82]. By taking Cartesian products of lower codimensional manifolds, we can find higher codimensional manifolds which should also satisfy restriction estimates up to $\frac{2d}{n}$, but this technique only works to give examples of codimension at most $\frac{d}{2}$. For all manifolds with codimension at most $\frac{d}{2}$, we know curvature is necessary for the restriction estimates up to $\frac{2d}{n}$ to be possible, although we cannot characterize well-curved manifolds except for in the codimension one and two case¹. It was conjectured by Mockenhaupt in 1996 that restriction estimates up to $\frac{2d}{n}$ were only possible for codimension at most $\frac{d}{2}$ and he proved the conjecture when d is odd [Moc96]. The case that d is even is still generally open.

Main Results. The main result in this paper will be that the extension operator does not satisfy weak-type bounds at $q = \frac{2d}{n}$.

Theorem 1.1. If \mathcal{M} is a well-curved n -dimensional quadratic manifold in \mathbb{R}^d , the operator $\mathcal{E}^{\mathcal{M}}$ does not extend to a bounded operator $L^p(\Omega) \rightarrow L^{2d/n, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

To explain the approach in this paper, we will first outline the proof of Beckner, Carbery, Semmes, and Soria. Define a δ -tube to be the δ -neighborhood of a unit line segment. They prove, using the Perron tree construction for Kakeya sets, that there exist collections of congruent δ -tubes T_1, \dots, T_m with δ -separated directions making the ratio $\frac{|\bigcup_{i=1}^m T_i|}{\sum_{i=1}^m |T_i|}$ arbitrarily small. To achieve a contradiction, they prove that if the extension operator is bounded from $L^{2(n+1)/n} \rightarrow L^{2(n+1)/n, \infty}$, then $\frac{|\bigcup_{i=1}^m T_i|}{\sum_{i=1}^m |T_i|}$ is bounded below.

¹A recent paper by Gressman constructed affine-invariant measures on submanifolds of arbitrary codimension [Gre19]. Better understanding these measures could give us more information about when we should expect manifolds to have better or worse restriction estimates.

For the proof of Theorem 1.1, we need some modifications to the approach of Beckner, Carbery, Semmes, and Soria. For a k -dimensional linear space $V \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, take an orthonormal set of vectors $v_1, \dots, v_k \in V$ and extend these to an orthonormal set $v_1, \dots, v_d \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\delta \geq 0$, we will refer to the set

$$\left\{ a + \sum_{i=1}^d t_i v_i : t_1, \dots, t_k \in [0, 1], t_{k+1}, \dots, t_d \in [0, \delta] \right\}$$

as a δ -plate at a in the direction of V . We will call a 0-plate at a in the direction of V a translated plane segment of V . Let $t_{\eta, R, v} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ denote a $1/R$ plate at v in the direction of the normal plane to \mathcal{M} at η .

Proposition 1.1. For any $\delta > 0$, we can find R sufficiently large, η_1, \dots, η_m in a $1/R$ -separated set in Ω and translations $v_1, \dots, v_m \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$(1) \quad \frac{|\bigcup_{i=1}^m t_{\eta_i, R, v_i}|}{\sum_{i=1}^m |t_{\eta_i, R, v_i}|} \lesssim \delta.$$

We will prove this in Section 2. It will follow from the existence of sets of measure zero containing a plane segment for every plane in a restricted set of directions. We will refer to the set of directions as \mathcal{N} and call a set with a plane segment in every direction of \mathcal{N} an \mathcal{N} -Kakeya set.

Theorem 1.2. For any closed $\mathcal{N} \subset \text{Gr}(d-n, d)$ of Hausdorff dimension n , there exists a compact measure zero \mathcal{N} -Kakeya set.

To prove this theorem, we equip the collection \mathcal{P} of all compact sets with a translated plane segment of V for every $V \in \mathcal{N}$ with the Hausdorff metric, forming a complete metric space. We will define a countable collection of open dense sets in \mathcal{P} whose intersection consists only of measure zero sets, then use the Baire category theorem to complete the proof of Theorem 1.2. This approach generalizes a 2003 paper of Körner giving this argument in the case that $n = 1, d = 2$ corresponding to standard measure zero Kakeya sets [Kör03].

Once we have proven Proposition 1.1, the remainder of the proof of Theorem 1.1 closely follows the approach of Beckner, Carbery, Semmes, and Soria. We will reprise this part of their proof in section 3.

Acknowledgements. The author thanks his advisor, Betsy Stovall, for suggesting this problem and for her advice and support. The author also thanks Marianna Csörnyei for introducing him to Körner's paper. The author was supported during this project by the National Science Foundation under grant numbers DMS-2037851 and DMS-2246906.

Notation.

- In the remainder of the paper, the choice of manifold \mathcal{M} is fixed, so we will denote \mathcal{E}^M by \mathcal{E} .
- If there exists a constant C depending only on d, \mathcal{M} such that $A \leq CB$, we will write $A \lesssim B$. If the constant also depends on a collection of parameters p_1, \dots, p_m , we will write $A \lesssim_{p_1, \dots, p_m} B$. If $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$, then we will write $A \approx B$. We may treat approximate equality as exact equality when doing so does not introduce confusion, in particular for the dimensions of plates.
- We will denote the Grassmannian of n -planes in \mathbb{R}^d by $\text{Gr}(n, d)$.

- We will define $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ to be the function $F(\xi) = (\xi, F_1(\xi), \dots, F_{d-n}(\xi))$.
- For an open rectangle or ball $\square \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we will use χ_\square to denote a smooth bump function adapted to \square , $\mathbf{1}_\square$ to denote the indicator function for \square , and $\Gamma_\delta(\square)$ to denote a δ -net of \square , that is, a maximal δ -separated set in \square .
- We will denote the ball centered at x with radius r by $B(x, r)$, the d -dimensional unit sphere $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} : |x| = 1\}$ by S^d , and the standard basis for \mathbb{R}^n by e_1, \dots, e_n .

2. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2 AND PROPOSITION 1.1

We will begin with the proof of Theorem 1.2. This proof generalizes that of Körner, which covers the existence standard measure zero Kakeya sets in two dimensions. While there is little mathematical difference between the two-dimensional case and the general case, the two-dimensional case is more easily visualized and is worth keeping in mind while reading this section.

For compact sets K_1, K_2 , we will define the Hausdorff distance

$$d_H(K_1, K_2) = \rho(K_1, K_2) + \rho(K_2, K_1),$$

where ρ is the asymmetric distance

$$\rho(K_1, K_2) = \sup_{x \in K_1} \inf_{y \in K_2} |x - y|.$$

The set of compact sets in $[-2, 2]^d$, equipped with the Hausdorff distance function, becomes a complete metric space. We will equip $\text{Gr}(d-n, d)$ with the metric

$$d_{\text{Gr}(d-n, d)}(V, W) = d_H(V \cap S^{d-1}, W \cap S^{d-1}).$$

Let $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Gr}(d-n, d)}^s$ denote the s -dimensional Hausdorff measure on $\text{Gr}(d-n, d)$ induced by this metric:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{Gr}(d-n, d)}^s(G) = \liminf_{\delta \searrow 0} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} r_i^s \mid \exists \{E_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \text{Gr}(d-n, d) \text{ s.t. } G \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i, \text{diam}(E_i) = r_i < \delta \right\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{N} \subset \text{Gr}(d-n, d)$ be a fixed closed set. By a covering argument, we may assume for the proof of Theorem 1.2 that for every $V \in \mathcal{N}$, $d_{\text{Gr}(d-n, d)}(V, \text{span}(e_1, \dots, e_{d-n})) \lesssim 1$.

Definition. • Define \mathcal{K} to be the set of compact subsets of $[-2, 2]^d$, equipped with the Hausdorff metric.

- Define \mathcal{P} to be the set of $E \in \mathcal{K}$ such that for any $V \in \mathcal{N}$, there exists $x \in [-2, 2]^d$ such that $x + V \cap [-2, 2]^d \subset E$. Note that every element of \mathcal{P} is an \mathcal{N} -Kakeya set.
- For $h = (h_1, \dots, h_{d-n}) \in [-2, 2]^{d-n}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, let $A_h = \left(\prod_{i=1}^{d-n} [h_i - \varepsilon, h_i + \varepsilon] \right) \times [-2, 2]^n$ and let C be a constant depending only on \mathcal{N} . We define

$$\mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon) = \{E \in \mathcal{P} : |E \cap A_h| < C\varepsilon^d\}.$$

We need the inequality $|E \cap A_h| < C\varepsilon^d$ to be strict to ensure that $\mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon)$ is open, so we have foregone the usual asymptotic inequality notation to remove any ambiguity. Körner defined $\mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon)$ to be sets E where $E \cap A_h$ could be covered with axis-parallel rectangles whose total measure is $< C\varepsilon^n$, which is easily seen to be equivalent to the definition given when E is compact.

Elements of $\bigcap_{h \in \Gamma_{1/m}([-2, 2]^{d-n})} \mathcal{P}(h, \frac{1}{m})$ have measure $< Cm^{d-n}m^{-d}$, so elements of $\mathcal{P}_0 = \bigcap_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{h \in \Gamma_{1/m}([-2, 2]^{d-n})} \mathcal{P}(h, \frac{1}{m})$ have measure zero. By construction, $\mathcal{P}_0 \subset \mathcal{P}$, so the proof of Theorem 1.2 would follow from \mathcal{P}_0 being non-empty, which by the Baire category theorem would follow from $\mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon)$ being open and dense.

Proposition 2.1. If $d_{\text{Gr}(d-n, d)}(\mathcal{N}, \text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_{d-n}\}) \lesssim 1$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Gr}(d-n, d)}^n(\mathcal{N}) < \infty$, then for any $h \in [-2, 2]^{d-n}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon)$ is open and dense in \mathcal{P} .

Proof of Proposition 2.1. First, we will prove $\mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon)$ is open. If $E \in \mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon)$ then by the compactness of E , there exist balls B_1, \dots, B_k covering $E \cap A_h$ with total measure $< C\varepsilon^d$. For some small $\delta > 0$, we can increase the radius of each B_i by some δ to \tilde{B}_i , while ensuring that $|\bigcup_{i=1}^k \tilde{B}_i| < C\varepsilon^d$ as well. If $E' \in \mathcal{P}$ and $d_H(E, E') < \delta$, then $E' \cap A_h \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^k \tilde{B}_i$ and hence $|E' \cap A_h| < C\varepsilon^d$. It follows that $\mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon)$ is open.

Now, let's prove that $\mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon)$ is dense in \mathcal{P} . Fix $E \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\delta > 0$. We need to find $F \in \mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon)$ such that $d_H(E, F) \lesssim \delta$. Recalling the definition of the Hausdorff metric, we need to prove that $\rho(E, F) \lesssim \delta$ and $\rho(F, E) \lesssim \delta$. Suppose we can find sets $E' \subset E, E_{\mathcal{U}} \subset [-2, 2]^d$ with the following properties:

- (a) $|E'| = 0$,
- (b) $\rho(E, E') < \delta$,
- (c) $\rho(E_{\mathcal{U}}, E) \lesssim \delta$, and
- (d) $E_{\mathcal{U}} \in \mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon)$.

If we set $F = E' \cup E_{\mathcal{U}}$, then $F \in \mathcal{P}$ because $E_{\mathcal{U}} \in \mathcal{P}$ and E' is compact. Also, $|F \cap A_h| < C\varepsilon^d$ because E' has measure zero and $|E_{\mathcal{U}} \cap A_h| < C\varepsilon^d$, so $F \in \mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon)$. Since $E' \subset E$, $d_H(F, E) \leq \rho(E_{\mathcal{U}}, E) + \rho(E, E') \lesssim \delta$. Since E and δ are arbitrary, we can conclude that $\mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon)$ is dense in \mathcal{P} .

So it remains to find the sets E' and $E_{\mathcal{U}}$ and prove the four properties we stated about them. We will start with constructing E' and proving it satisfies (a) and (b). Since E is compact, we can find a collection $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}^d, V_1, \dots, V_k \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $V_i + x_i \in E$ for all i and the δ -neighborhood of $V_i + x_i$ covers E . Set $E' = \bigcup_{i=1}^k (V_i + x_i)$. By construction, $E' \subset E$. Since E' is a finite union of measure zero sets, $|E'| = 0$, fulfilling (a). Since the δ -neighborhood of E' covers E , $\rho(E, E') < \delta$, fulfilling (b).

Now we will define $E_{\mathcal{U}}$. Take \mathcal{U} to be a finite collection of balls $B(V_i, \rho_i)$ covering \mathcal{N} such that $\rho_i < \delta$ for all i and $\sum_i \rho_i^n \lesssim_{\mathcal{N}} 1$. Since \mathcal{N} is compact and $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Gr}(d-n, d)}^n(\mathcal{N}) < \infty$, we know we can find such a set \mathcal{U} . For each plane V_i , we can find a point $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $V_i + (h, v_i) \in E$. Each ball $B(V_i, \rho_i)$ induces a set E_i given by

$$E_i = \bigcup \{V' + (h, v_i) : V' \in B_{\rho_i}(V_i)\}.$$

Geometrically, we obtain E_{B_i} from $V_i + (h, v_i)$ by rotating V_i in any direction through an angle of at most ρ_i . Define $E_{\mathcal{U}} = \bigcup_{B(V_i, \rho_i) \in \mathcal{U}} E_i$.

For any $V, V' \in \text{Gr}(d-n, d)$ and any point $x \in [-2, 2]^d$, $\rho(V+x, V'+x) \lesssim d_{\text{Gr}(d-n, d)}(V, V')$, so since \mathcal{U} consists of balls of radius $< \delta$, $\rho(E_{\mathcal{U}}, E) \lesssim \delta$, fulfilling (c).

To prove (d), we need to prove that $E_{\mathcal{U}} \in \mathcal{P}$ and $|E_{\mathcal{U}} \cap A_h| < C\varepsilon^d$. Since $\mathcal{N} \subset \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{U}} B$, we see that $E_{\mathcal{U}} \in \mathcal{P}$. To prove $|E_{\mathcal{U}} \cap A_h| < C\varepsilon^d$, it suffices to prove that $|E_i \cap A_h| \lesssim \varepsilon^d \rho_i^n$, since $\sum_i \rho_i^n \lesssim 1$. By Fubini's theorem, this would follow from proving that $|E_i \cap P_x| \lesssim (\varepsilon \rho_i)^n$, where P_x is the n -dimensional affine space $\{(x, y) : y \in [-2, 2]^n\}$ and $x \in \prod_{i=1}^{d-n} [h_i - \varepsilon, h_i + \varepsilon]$.

For any plane $V \in B(V_i, \rho_i)$, the assumption $d_{\text{Gr}(d-n, d)}(\mathcal{N}, \text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_{d-n}\}) \lesssim 1$ implies that V intersects P_x at a single point $v_{V,x}$. Since $d_{\text{Gr}(d-n, d)}(V_i, V) < \rho_i$, $|v_{V,x} - v_{V_i,x}| \lesssim \varepsilon \rho_i$. Then $E_i \cap P_x \subset B_{C\varepsilon \rho_i}(v_{V_i,x}) \cap P_x$ for some fixed constant C , so $|E_i \cap P_x| \lesssim (\varepsilon \rho_i)^n$, as desired. Hence, **(d)** holds, completing the proof of the proposition. \square

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2. Using this, we will prove Proposition 1.1.

Proof of Proposition 1.1. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Let $\square \subset \Omega$ be a fixed closed ball and denote the normal plane to \mathcal{M} at a point $\eta \in \square$ by \mathcal{N}_η . Define $\mathcal{N}(\square) = \{\mathcal{N}_\eta \mid \eta \in \square\}$. By taking \square small enough, without loss of generality, we can assume that $d_{\text{Gr}(d-n, d)}(\mathcal{N}(\square), \text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_{d-n}\}) \lesssim 1$. Since \square is compact and $\xi \mapsto \mathcal{N}_\xi$ is continuous, $\mathcal{N}(\square)$ is closed. Finally, since \square is n -dimensional, $\mathcal{N}(\square)$ is n -dimensional in $\text{Gr}(d-n, d)$, so $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Gr}(d-n, d)}^n(\mathcal{N}(\square)) < \infty$.

Then we can apply Theorem 1.2 with $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}(\square)$. Let E be the resulting compact measure zero \mathcal{N} -Kakeya set. Denote by $E_{1/R}$ then $1/R$ -neighborhood of E . Taking R sufficiently large, we ensure that $|E_{1/R}| < \delta$. Enumerate $\Gamma_{1/R}(\square)$ as η_1, \dots, η_k . For each j , a translated plane segment of \mathcal{N}_{η_j} is contained in E . Then we can widen it to a plate $t_{\eta_j, R, v_j} \subset E_{1/R}$. It follows that $\left| \bigcup_{j=1}^k t_{\eta_j, R, v_j} \right| < \delta$. Each plate has volume R^{-n} and since \mathcal{N} is n -dimensional and compact, $k \approx R^{-n}$, so $\sum_{j=1}^k |t_{\eta_j, R, v_j}| \approx 1$. Hence, $\frac{|\bigcup_{j=1}^k t_{\eta_j, R, v_j}|}{\sum_{j=1}^k |t_{\eta_j, R, v_j}|} < \delta$, completing the proof of the proposition. \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

For the remainder of the proof of Theorem 1.1, we will assume a weak-type bound holds for the extension operator, which in combination with Proposition 1.1, will lead to a contradiction. First, we will prove that large plates $T_{\eta, R, v} := R^2 t_{\eta, R, v/R^2}$ approximate $\mathcal{E}(\chi_{\eta, R, v})$ from below, where $\chi_{\eta, R, v}$ is a Schwartz function supported on $B(\eta, 1/R)$ which will be defined in the proof of the lemma.

Lemma 3.1. For $R \geq 1$, for any $\eta \in \square, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there exists a large plate $T_{\eta, R, v}$ with of length $\approx R^2$ in the $d-n$ directions of \mathcal{N}_η and $\approx R$ in the n orthogonal directions to \mathcal{N}_η such that $|\mathcal{E}(\chi_{\eta, R, v})|(x) \gtrsim R^{-n}$ for $x \in T_{\eta, R, v}$.

First, we will define the plates using symmetries of the extension operator.

Proposition 3.2. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary function. For an $m \times m$ matrix M , denote $x \mapsto f(Mx)$ by f_M . If $Mx = Rx$ for some scalar R , we will write f_R instead of f_M . For $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^m$, denote $x \mapsto f(x - \eta)$ by f^η . The Fourier extension operator has the following symmetries:

- (a) $\mathcal{E}(f_R)(x) = R^{-n} \mathcal{E}(f)(D_{1/R}x)$, where D_α is the diagonal matrix with α in the first n diagonal entries and α^2 on final $d-n$ entries.
- (b) $\mathcal{E}(f^\eta) = e^{2\pi i x \cdot F(\eta)} \mathcal{E}(f)(A^*(\eta)x)$, where $A(\eta)$ is the lower triangular matrix with ones on the diagonal and entries polynomial in η satisfying $F(\xi + \eta) = F(\eta) + A(\eta)F(\xi)$.
- (c) $\mathcal{E}(e^{-2\pi i v \cdot F(\xi)} f)(x) = \mathcal{E}(f)(x - v)$.

These symmetries are well-known and follow easily from changes of variables, so we will not prove them here.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. For x in a small neighborhood $[-\delta, \delta]^n \subset \square$ of 0, $x \cdot F(\xi) \leq 1/8$ for all $\xi \in B(0, 1)$ and hence if we set $\chi_{0,1} = \chi_{B(0,1)}$, then for $x \in T_{0,1} := [-\delta, \delta]^n$, $\mathcal{E}(\chi_{0,1})(x) \gtrsim 1$. Now set $T_{0,R} = D_R T_{0,1}$ and $\chi_{0,R} = (\chi_{0,1})_R$. Because of the form of the dilation, this plate has the right dimensions. By the first symmetry in Proposition 3.2, we have that for $x \in T_{0,R}$, $\mathcal{E}(\chi_{0,R})(x) = R^{-n} \mathcal{E}(\chi_{0,1})(D_{1/R}x) \gtrsim R^{-n}$.

Next, we will define the frequency translated plates. For $\eta \in \square$, set $\tilde{T}_{\eta,R} = (A^*(\eta))^{-1}T_{0,R}$. The transformation $A^*(\eta)^{-1}$ sends the long directions of $T_{0,R}$ to span \mathcal{N}_η , as desired. However, since $(A^*(\eta))^{-1}$ is not an orthogonal matrix, $\tilde{T}_{\eta,R}$ is an oblique rectangular prism, while by our definition, a plate must be a right rectangular prism. Let V denote the plane segment formed by the long directions of \mathcal{N}_η and let $T_{\eta,R}$ be the R neighborhood of V . By rescaling $T_{\eta,R}$ by the ≈ 1 factor, we have $T_{\eta,R} \subset \tilde{T}_{\eta,R}$. Set $\chi_{\eta,R} = \chi_{0,R}^\eta$. Then by the translational symmetry of the extension operator, for $x \in T_{\eta,R}$, $|\mathcal{E}(\chi_{\eta,R})(x)| = |e^{2\pi i x \cdot F(\eta)} \mathcal{E}(f)(A^*(\eta)x)| \gtrsim R^{-n}$.

Finally, we extend this to spatially translated plates. For $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$, set $T_{\eta,R,v} = T_{\eta,R} + v$. These are clearly plates of the right dimensions and if we set $\chi_{\eta,R,v} = e^{-2\pi i v \cdot F(\xi)} \chi_{\eta,R}$, then $\mathcal{E}(\chi_{\eta,R,v})(x) = \mathcal{E}(\chi_{\eta,R})(x - v)$. Both desired conditions follow immediately. \square

The following lemma follows through a well-known randomization argument essentially identical to the argument given in [BCSS89, Lemma 1].

Lemma 3.3. If \mathcal{E} is bounded $L^p(\Omega) \rightarrow L^{2d/n,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then for any collection of maps $f_1, \dots, f_m : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with disjoint support,

$$(2) \quad \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^m |\mathcal{E}(f_i)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^{2d/n,\infty}} \lesssim \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m f_i \right\|_{L^p}.$$

Finally, we are ready to prove the main theorem. For concision, and keeping with the exposition of [BCSS89], we will prove this without reference to the Kakeya maximal function, although the proof could easily be formulated in terms of bounds for the Kakeya maximal function.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We will contradict the conclusion of Lemma 3.3, so assume (2) holds. For any choice of centers $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_m \in \square$, modulations v_1, \dots, v_m , and radius $R > 0$ sufficiently large, by construction

$$(3) \quad \sum_{i=1}^m |\mathcal{E}(\chi_{\eta_i,R,v_i})|^2(x) \gtrsim R^{-2n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{T_{\eta_i,R,v_i}}(x) \right).$$

By Hölder's inequality, for $q = d/n$,

$$(4) \quad \int \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{T_{\eta_i,R,v_i}}(x) dx \lesssim \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{T_{\eta_i,R,v_i}}(x) \right\|_{L^{q,\infty}} \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^m T_{\eta_i,R,v_i} \right|^{1/q'}.$$

Combining (2), (3), (4) and Lemma 3.1, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^m |T_{\eta_i, R, v_i}| &\lesssim \int \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{T_{\eta_i, R, v_i}}(x) dx \\
&\lesssim \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{T_{\eta_i, R, v_i}}(x) \right\|_{L^{q, \infty}} \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^m T_{\eta_i, R, v_i} \right|^{1/q'} \\
&= \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{1}_{T_{\eta_i, R, v_i}}(x) \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^{2q, \infty}}^2 \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^m T_{\eta_i, R, v_i} \right|^{1/q'} \\
&\lesssim R^{2n} \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^m |\mathcal{E}(\chi_{\eta_i, R, v_i})|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^{2q}}^2 \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^m T_{\eta_i, R, v_i} \right|^{1/q'}
\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 1.1, for any $\delta > 0$, R sufficiently large, and $2/R$ -separated collection of centers η_1, \dots, η_m and modulations v_1, \dots, v_m , we have

$$\left| \bigcup_{i=1}^m t_{\eta_i, R, v_i/R^2} \right|^{1/q'} \leq \delta \left(\sum_{i=1}^m |t_{\eta_i, R, v_i/R^2}| \right)^{1/q'}.$$

Rescaling, this implies

$$\left| \bigcup_{i=1}^m T_{\eta_i, R, v_i} \right|^{1/q'} \leq \delta \left(\sum_{i=1}^m |T_{\eta_i, R, v_i}| \right)^{1/q'}.$$

Then rearranging the previous inequality and applying Lemma 3.3, we have

$$(5) \quad \left(\sum_{i=1}^m |T_{\eta_i, R, v_i}| \right)^{1/q} \lesssim \delta R^{2n} \left\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^m |\chi_{\eta_i, R, v_i}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^{2q, \infty}}^2.$$

The left hand side of (5) is then $(mR^{2d-n})^{n/d}$, while since $\chi_{\eta_1, R, v_1}, \dots, \chi_{\eta_m, R, v_m}$ have disjoint support, the right hand side of (5) is $\lesssim \delta R^{2n} (mR^{-n})^{n/d} = \delta (mR^{2d-n})^{n/d}$. Since $\delta > 0$ was arbitrary, we arrive at the desired contradiction. \square

4. REMARKS

- (1) The proof of Theorem 1.2 only depends on the Hausdorff dimension of \mathcal{N} and that it is closed, which ensures \mathcal{P} is closed in \mathcal{K} and hence complete. We can generalize Theorem 1.2 to $\mathcal{N} \subset \text{Gr}(d-n, d)$ with $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Gr}(d-n, d)}^s(\mathcal{N}) < \infty$ for some $s \in (0, n]$ and replacing the Lebesgue measure of the \mathcal{N} -Kakeya sets with the Hausdorff $s + d - n$ dimensional measure.

Theorem 4.1. For any $\mathcal{N} \subset \text{Gr}(d-n, d)$ with $\dim_H(\mathcal{N}) := s \in (0, n]$, there exists a compact \mathcal{N} -Kakeya set E with $\mathcal{H}^{s+d-n}(E) = 0$.

This proof follows the same general structure as the proof of Theorem 1.2, but needs technical modification due to the fact that \mathcal{H}^s is not a Radon measure for $s < n$, so we need to be more careful to ensure the sets $\mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon)$ are open. Our proof will more closely follow Körner's original proof, with his original formulation of the sets $\mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon)$.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Define $\mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon)$ to consist of sets $E \in \mathcal{P}$ such that there exists a finite collection of balls B_1, \dots, B_k covering $E \cap A_h$ such that $\text{radius}(B_i) < \varepsilon$ and $\sum_{i=1}^k \text{radius}(B_i)^{s+d-n} < C\varepsilon^{s+d-n}$ for a fixed constant C . We will call this the *area condition*.

As in the proof of Theorem 1.2, we will prove $\mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon)$ is open and dense. Before doing so, we will note why this suffices to complete the proof of Theorem 4.1. We apply the Baire category theorem to prove that $\mathcal{P}_0 = \bigcap_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{h \in \Gamma_{1/m}([-2, 2]^{d-n})} \mathcal{P}(h, 1/m)$ is nonempty. Take $E \in \mathcal{P}_0$. For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $E \in \bigcap_{h \in \Gamma_{1/m}([-2, 2]^{d-n})} \mathcal{P}(h, 1/m)$, so for each $h \in \Gamma_{1/m}([-2, 2]^{d-n})$, we can cover $E \cap A_h$ with balls B_1^h, \dots, B_k^h such that $\text{radius}(B_i^h) < 1/m$ and $\sum_{i=1}^k \text{radius}(B_i^h)^{s+d-n} < m^{-(s+d-n)}$. Then we can cover all of E with balls $\{B_i^h : h \in \Gamma_{1/m}, 1 \leq i \leq k\}$, all of which have $\text{radius}(B_i^h) < 1/m$ and satisfy

$$\sum_{h \in \Gamma_{1/m}} \sum_{i=1}^k \text{radius}(B_i^h)^{s+d-n} < m^{-(s+d-n)} m^{d-n} = m^{-s}.$$

Since this holds for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we see that $\mathcal{H}^{s+d-n}(E) = 0$.

It remains to prove that $\mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon)$ is open and dense. The proof that it is open is identical to the proof given in Theorem 1.2.

For density, fix $\delta > 0$ and take the set \mathcal{U} to consist of balls $B_i = B(V_i, \rho_i)$ such that $\sum_i \rho_i^s \lesssim 1$ and $\rho_i < \delta$ for all i . Construct $E', E_{\mathcal{U}}$, and F as in Theorem 1.2. Clearly, $F \in \mathcal{P}$ and as seen previously, $d_H(E, F) < \delta$. Since E' is a $d-n$ dimensional set, we can cover it with balls B_1, \dots, B_k of arbitrarily small radius and which make $\sum_{i=1}^k \text{radius}(B_k)^{s+d-n}$ arbitrarily small. Then if we can prove $E_{\mathcal{U}}$ satisfies the area condition, then F will as well. To do so, note that $E_{\mathcal{U}}$ is the union of sets $E_{\tilde{B}_i}$ such that $|E_{\tilde{B}_i} \cap A_h| < C\rho_i^n \varepsilon^d$. We can cover $E_{\tilde{B}_i} \cap A_h$ with $k < C\rho_i^{n-d}$ balls B_1^i, \dots, B_k^i of radius $\varepsilon\rho_i < \varepsilon$. These balls satisfy

$$\sum_{\tilde{B}_i \in \mathcal{U}} \sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \text{radius}(B_j^i) \leq \sum_{\tilde{B}_i \in \mathcal{U}} C\rho_i^{n-d} (\varepsilon\rho_i)^{s+d-n} = C\varepsilon^{s+d-n} \sum_i \rho_i^s \lesssim C\varepsilon^{s+d-n}.$$

Hence, $F \in \mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon)$. It follows that $\mathcal{P}(h, \varepsilon)$ is dense, as desired. \square

- (2) Theorem 4.1 suggests an analog to the standard Kakeya set conjecture: that if $\mathcal{N} \subset \text{Gr}(k, d)$ has Hausdorff dimension s , then any \mathcal{N} -Kakeya set E has Hausdorff dimension at least $\min(s+k, d)$. This Kakeya-esque lower bound cannot be true in general, as observed by Rogers in a paper on the $k=2$ variant of this problem, since if every element of \mathcal{N} is contained a lower dimensional space, then \mathcal{N} -Kakeya sets can have smaller dimension than $\min(s+k, d)$ [Rog05]. If \mathcal{N} is all or almost all of $\text{Gr}(k, d)$ or if it satisfies some curvature condition, then we can still hope to find non-trivial lower bounds on \mathcal{N} -Kakeya sets. We will mention a few results in the literature relevant to this problem:

- Mitsis proved that if $\mathcal{N} = \text{Gr}(2, d)$, then any \mathcal{N} -Kakeya set has Hausdorff dimension at least $\frac{2n+3}{3}$ [Mit04; Mit05].
- The best restriction estimates found in [GGO23] for a subset of well-curved manifolds the authors called "good manifolds". The L^p bounds they found for such manifolds combined with standard reductions from restriction estimates to

Takeya dimension estimates imply a lower bound for the related Takeya sets. Specifically, if \mathcal{M} is a good manifold and \mathcal{N} is the set of normal planes to \mathcal{M} , for any \mathcal{N} -Takeya set E , then $\dim_H(E) > \frac{n+2}{3} + O(n^{-1})$.

- Rogers considered n -dimension manifolds $\mathcal{N} \subset \text{Gr}(2, n+2)$ satisfying a certain curvature condition. He proved that if $n = 1$, then \mathcal{N} -Takeya sets have full Hausdorff dimension, and if $n = 2$, then \mathcal{N} -Takeya have Hausdorff dimension $7/2$ [Rog05].
 - A paper by Fraser, Harris, and Kroon proved lower bounds for the Fourier dimension \dim_F of \mathcal{N} -Takeya for sets $\mathcal{N} \subset \text{Gr}(k, d)$ [FHK22]. Specifically, they prove that if $\mathcal{N} \subset \text{Gr}(k, d)$ has Hausdorff dimension n and $2(n - k(d - k - 1)) \leq d$, then for any compact \mathcal{N} -Takeya set E , $\dim_F(E) \geq 2(n - k(d - k - 1))$. Since the Fourier dimension is less than the Hausdorff dimension, this implies the same lower bound for the Hausdorff dimension.
- (3) We prove in this paper that the Fourier extension operator for n -dimensional quadratic manifolds in \mathbb{R}^d does not satisfy $L^p \rightarrow L^{2d/n, \infty}$ bounds. As discussed previously, this rules out a weak-type endpoint bound for well-curved quadratic manifolds. One could ask if the same could be said for other classes of manifolds. Our approach does not seem to rule an weak-type endpoint bound for n -dimensional quadratic manifolds in \mathbb{R}^d where the restriction endpoint is greater than $2d/n$. If we could find an \mathcal{N} -Takeya set in \mathbb{R}^d with Minkowski dimension $< d$ when \mathcal{N} is the normal space for \mathcal{M} , we could use the approach of this paper to disprove weak-type restriction estimates above $2d/n$, but the existence of such sets seems unlikely.

There are some manifolds, for example, the moment curve, where the extension operator does satisfy weak-type bounds at the restriction endpoint. For most manifolds, however, the problem of proving weak-type endpoint bounds remains open. We are not sure when to expect weak-type endpoint bounds to hold, but our proof requires certain geometric properties unique to quadratic manifolds, so it would need significant modification to apply to other manifolds. Specifically, it is important for our proof that the dimensions of the large plates $T_{\eta, R, v}$ grow at only two different rates: R in the tangent directions to \mathcal{M} at η and R^2 in the normal directions, which does not hold for general manifolds. This property allows us to expand an \mathcal{N} -Takeya set E to contain the plates $t_{\eta, R, v}$ while controlling the increase in the measure of E .

REFERENCES

- [BOS09] Jong-Guk Bak, Daniel M. Oberlin, and Andreas Seeger. “Restriction of Fourier Transforms to Curves and Related Oscillatory Integrals”. In: *American Journal of Mathematics* 131.2 (2009), pp. 277–311.
- [BCSS89] W. Beckner et al. “A note on restriction of the Fourier transform to spheres”. In: *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society* 21.4 (July 1989), pp. 394–398.
- [Chr82] F. M. Christ. *Restriction of the Fourier transform to submanifolds of low codimension*. 1982.
- [FHK22] Jonathan M. Fraser, Terence L. J. Harris, and Nicholas G. Kroon. “On the Fourier dimension of (d, k) -sets and Takeya sets with restricted directions”. In: *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 301.3 (July 2022), pp. 2497–2508.

- [GGO23] S. Gan, L. Guth, and C. Oh. *Restriction estimates for quadratic manifolds of arbitrary codimensions*. 2023. arXiv: 2308.06427 [math.CA].
- [Gre19] Philip T. Gressman. “On the Oberlin affine curvature condition”. In: *Duke Mathematical Journal* 168.11 (2019), pp. 2075–2126.
- [Kör03] T. W. Körner. “Besicovitch via Baire”. In: *Studia Mathematica* 158.1 (2003), pp. 65–78.
- [Mit04] Themis Mitsis. “ $(n, 2)$ -sets have full Hausdorff dimension.” In: *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana* 20.2 (2004), pp. 381–393.
- [Mit05] Themis Mitsis. “Corrigenda: $(n, 2)$ -sets have full Hausdorff dimension (Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana 20 (2004), no. 2, 381-393)”. In: *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana* 21.2 (2005), pp. 689–692.
- [Moc96] G. Mockenhaupt. *Bounds in Lebesgue spaces of oscillatory integrals*. 1996.
- [Rog05] Keith Rogers. “On a planar variant of the Kakeya problem”. In: *Mathematical Research Letters* 13 (Mar. 2005).