

HARMONIC ANALYSIS OF MULTIPLICATIVE CHAOS

PART I: THE PROOF OF GARBAN-VARGAS CONJECTURE FOR 1D GMC

ZHAOFENG LIN, YANQI QIU, AND MINGJIE TAN

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we establish the exact Fourier dimension for all standard sub-critical Gaussian multiplicative chaos on the unit interval, thereby confirming the Garban-Vargas conjecture. The proof relies on a significant improvement of the vector-valued martingale method, initially developed by Chen-Han-Qiu-Wang in the studies of the Fourier dimensions of Mandelbrot cascade random measures.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is the first part of a series of works on the harmonic analysis of general multiplicative chaos measures in the Euclidean space. This series will provide a systematic development of the *vector-valued martingale method*, discovered in [CHQW24], for analyzing the polynomial Fourier decay of general multiplicative chaos measures. This method seems to be fundamental, powerful and straightforward, yielding a crucial *random Fourier decoupling estimate* (see Proposition 5.1 below), which can be naturally integrated with classical Littlewood-Paley type decompositions. As a result, for key models in multiplicative chaos theory, we are able to determine the exact Fourier dimension (i.e., the optimal exponent of polynomial Fourier decay) of the associated multiplicative chaos measures.

The main topics of the three parts in this series are as follows:

- **Part I.** The case study of the key model: the standard log-correlated Gaussian multiplicative chaos on the unit interval (see §1.1 for a brief introduction). We prove the Garban-Vargas conjecture for the standard sub-critical 1D GMC.
- **Part II.** The general theory of Fourier decay of multiplicative chaos. In this part, we develop an axiomatic theory and are able to deal with most well-known multiplicative chaos models, including higher dimensional GMC, Mandelbrot's random covering, generalized Mandelbrot cascades and beyond.
- **Part III.** The general theory of Fourier decay of multiplicative chaos in the more abstract setting, and with abstract background measures.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 60G57, 42A61, 46B09; Secondary 60G46.

Key words and phrases. Gaussian multiplicative chaos; Fourier dimension; Method of vector-valued martingales; Pisier's martingale type inequalities; Littlewood-Paley type decomposition.

The main result of Part I should be considered as a special case of that of Part II. However, we believe that it is reasonable to write a self-contained separate paper on 1D Gaussian multiplicative chaos, for at least the following reasons: 1) The study of this model is the original motivation of the general theory. 2) The part I will provide readers with immediate insight into our work's novel ideas and methods. Indeed, the analysis and main inequalities for this model are more concrete and simpler, the notation is also much easier. 3) There will be extra difficulties in the study of the higher dimensional GMC, for instance, for the planar GMC, we shall need a delicately designed new version of Bacry-Muzy's type white noise decomposition of the log-correlated Gaussian field.

The common framework of this series is Kahane's T -martingale theory for multiplicative chaos measures. More precisely, we will consider the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d or a certain subset $U \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ (for instance, $U = [0, 1]^d$) equipped with a finite Radon measure ν and a sequence of *independent random non-negative functions* $P_n(t)$ with $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\mathbb{E}[P_n(t)] \equiv 1$. For any $n \geq 1$, define a random measure by

$$\mu_n(dt) := \left[\prod_{k=1}^n P_k(t) \right] \nu(dt).$$

Then, Kahane's general T -martingale theory asserts that, almost surely, the sequence of random measures μ_n converges weakly to a random measure

$$\mu_\infty = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n.$$

This limiting random measure μ_∞ will be referred to as the multiplicative chaos measure associated with the random sequence of functions $(P_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and the background measure ν .

1.1. Background on GMC. Gaussian multiplicative chaos (GMC), introduced by Kahane in the 1980s [Kah85a], is a theory of random measures. Informally, GMC measures arise as the exponential of log-correlated Gaussian fields. GMC measures play an essential role in the fields like mathematical physics, Liouville quantum gravity and multifractal analysis.

Because of their foundational significance, the properties of GMC measures from the perspective of harmonic analysis, such as whether they can be classified as Salem measures, have attracted considerable attention. For instance, the Fourier coefficients of GMC have been studied in the construction of the Virasoro algebra in Liouville conformal field theory, number theory and random matrix theory, see [BGK⁺24, CN19] and their references.

Recently, the Fourier decay and the Fourier dimension of GMC have gained considerable attention. Falconer and Jin [FJ19] provided a non-trivial lower bound for the Fourier dimension of 2D GMC for small parameter values $\gamma < \frac{1}{33} \sqrt{858 - 132\sqrt{34}}$. In a remarkable recent work [GV23], Garban and Vargas established the Rajchman property of the standard GMC measure (denoted M_γ there) on the unit circle for all sub-critical cases.

Namely, for all sub-critical parameters $\gamma < \sqrt{2}$, they established the almost sure convergence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{M}_\gamma(n) = 0$. Moreover, for small parameters $\gamma < 1/\sqrt{2}$, they also obtain a lower bound of the Fourier dimension (the definition of Fourier dimension of a measure on $[0, 1]$ is recalled in § 2.1):

$$\frac{1}{2} - \gamma^2 \leq \dim_F(M_\gamma) \leq 1 - \gamma^2 < \dim_H(M_\gamma) = 1 - \frac{\gamma^2}{2},$$

where $\dim_F(M_\gamma)$ and $\dim_H(M_\gamma)$ denote the Fourier and Hausdorff dimension of M_γ respectively. Based on the rescaled fluctuation of $\widehat{M}_\gamma(n)$ (see [GV23, Theorem 1.3]), Garban and Vargas conjectured that for small parameters $\gamma < 1/\sqrt{2}$, the Fourier dimension of M_γ is given by $1 - \gamma^2$. Moreover, they asked that, whether in the whole range of the parameters $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$ for the sub-critical case, the Fourier dimension of M_γ is given by the correlation dimension of M_γ . In this paper, we resolve the Garban-Vargas conjecture in the affirmative.

1.2. Main result. Consider the sub-critical GMC measure $\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}$ with $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$ on the unit interval. Informally, $\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}$ is a random measure on $[0, 1]$ given by

$$\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}(dt) = \exp\left(\gamma\psi(t) - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}\mathbb{E}[\psi^2(t)]\right)dt,$$

where $\{\psi(t)\}_{t \in [0, 1]}$ is a centered Gaussian field with a log-correlated covariance kernel

$$(1.1) \quad \mathbb{E}[\psi(t)\psi(s)] = \log \frac{1}{|t-s|}, \quad t, s \in [0, 1].$$

The precise definition of $\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}$ is recalled in § 3.

For each $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$, define $D_\gamma \in (0, 1)$ by

$$(1.2) \quad D_\gamma := \begin{cases} 1 - \gamma^2 & \text{if } 0 < \gamma < \sqrt{2}/2 \\ (\sqrt{2} - \gamma)^2 & \text{if } \sqrt{2}/2 \leq \gamma < \sqrt{2} \end{cases}.$$

The main result of this paper is the following precise formula for the Fourier dimension $\dim_F(\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}})$ of the random measure $\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}$.

Theorem 1.1. *For each $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$, almost surely, we have $\dim_F(\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}) = D_\gamma$.*

Remark. The methods developed in this paper seem to be applicable, at least in certain case of the complex GMC model of Lacoïn-Rhodes-Vargas [LRV15]. This will be the main topic in a separate paper.

In the classical GMC theory, the exact log-kernel (1.1) can usually be replaced by the following perturbed log-kernel:

$$(1.3) \quad \mathbb{E}[\psi(t)\psi(s)] = \log \frac{1}{|t-s|} + g(s, t),$$

with g being bounded and continuous, and occasionally endowed with greater smoothness (see, for instance, Huang and Saksman [HS23, Theorem 1 and Theorem 2]). This perturbed log-kernel retains many important properties of GMC measures and is important in higher dimension when $d \geq 3$, since for $d = 3$, it remains unresolved whether the exact log-kernel is of σ -positive type, while for $d \geq 4$, the exact log-kernel is not even of positive type. Therefore, in part II of this series of works, we adopt perturbed log-kernels of the form (1.3) to tackle higher dimensional GMC.

However, the mere boundedness and continuity of g is inadequate for analyzing the Fourier decay of the resultant GMC measure. Indeed, multiplication by a continuous density on a measure can profoundly change its Fourier transform's asymptotic behavior. Therefore, to ensure the Fourier dimension of the GMC measure remains invariant under the perturbation, further smoothness constraints on g are indispensable.

1.3. Frostman regularity and Fourier restriction estimate. Recall that a non-negative Borel measure ν on \mathbb{R} is said to be α -upper Frostman regular if

$$\sup \left\{ \frac{\nu(I)}{|I|^\alpha} : I \text{ are finite intervals of } \mathbb{R} \right\} < \infty.$$

Corollary 1.2. *For each $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$, almost surely, $\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}$ is α -upper Frostman regular for any $0 \leq \alpha < D_\gamma/2$.*

The derivation of Corollary 1.2 from Theorem 1.1 is routine and is omitted in this paper. The reader may refer to [CHQW24, Corollary 1.5] for the details of this derivation. It would be interesting to obtain the optimal exponent of α -upper Frostman regularity of $\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}$. Note that, the upper-Frostman regularity $\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}$ has also been previously established by Astala-Jones-Kupiainen-Saksman [AJKS11, Theorem 3.7] in the study of the conformal welding of the random homeomorphism of the unit circle induced by the GMC random measure on the unit circle.

Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2 combined with the Fourier restriction estimate obtained in [Moc00, Theorem 4.1] imply

Corollary 1.3. *For each $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$, almost surely, the measure $\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}$ satisfies the following Fourier restriction estimate: for any $1 \leq r < \frac{4}{4-D_\gamma}$, there exists a constant $C(r, \mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}) > 0$ such that for all $f \in L^r(\mathbb{R})$,*

$$\|\widehat{f}\|_{L^2(\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}})} \leq C(r, \mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}) \|f\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R})}.$$

1.4. Outline of the proof of Theorem 1.1. The main part of the proof of Theorem 1.1 is to establish the almost sure lower bound $\dim_F(\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}) \geq D_\gamma$. The upper bound $\dim_F(\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}) \leq D_\gamma$ in this model, as well as in many other models of multiplicative chaos, is relatively simple and can be obtained in several different manner. We also mention that, to prove the upper bound of the Fourier dimension, one only needs to study

the asymptotic behavior of the Fourier coefficients along a given sequence (say, along the dyadic integers $k = 2^n$), see [CHQW24] for an application of this idea.

1.4.1. *The upper bound.* For the upper bound, we shall use the classical result in potential theory: the Fourier dimension $\dim_F(\nu)$ of a finite Borel measure ν on any bounded domain of \mathbb{R}^d is dominated by its correlation dimension $\dim_2(\nu)$ (see [BSS23, Section 2.6, pp. 70-72] or §2.1 below for the various equivalent definitions of $\dim_2(\nu)$):

$$\dim_F(\nu) \leq \dim_2(\nu).$$

In our situation, for any $0 < \gamma < \sqrt{2}$, the following almost sure equality holds (with D_γ given by the formula (1.2)):

$$(1.4) \quad \dim_2(\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}) = D_\gamma.$$

Indeed, the equality (1.4) follows from the multifractal analysis and especially the L^2 -spectrum or the correlation dimension of GMC, see Bertacco [Ber23, Theorem 3.1] for sub-critical GMC in any domain of \mathbb{R}^d with $d \geq 1$. The equality (1.4) also seems to be known to Lacoïn-Rhodes-Vargas and Garban-Vargas, see [LRV15] and [GV23, Remark 2].

Note also that, for small parameter values, Garban-Vargas [GV23, Theorem 1.3] proved the following central limit theorem: For $0 < \gamma < \sqrt{2}/2$, we have the following the following convergence in law

$$(1.5) \quad n^{(1-\gamma^2)/2} \widehat{\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}}(n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{(d)} \sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{2}} W_{\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}([0,1])},$$

where W is a complex Brownian motion independent of $\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}$ and $\kappa > 0$ is an explicitly given constant. Note that Garban-Vargas [GV23, Theorem 1.3] proved the central limit theorem (1.5) for the GMC on the circle, but their method works for the GMC on the unit interval. It is then easy to derive from the convergence in law (1.5) that, for small parameters $0 < \gamma < \sqrt{2}/2$, almost surely, one has $\dim_F(\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}) \leq D_\gamma = 1 - \gamma^2$. Therefore, it seems to be of independent interest to study similar convergence in law as (1.5) for $\gamma \in [\sqrt{2}/2, \sqrt{2})$, see [CHQW24, Proposition 1.12] for a related result.

1.4.2. *The lower bound via vector-valued martingale method.* To establish the almost sure lower bound $\dim_F(\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}) \geq D_\gamma$, we shall use an important improvement of the vector-valued martingale method discovered in [CHQW24] in the studies of the Fourier dimensions of Mandelbrot cascade random measures. Compared with the vector-valued martingale method in the setting of Mandelbrot cascades, several key improvements are required in the setting of GMC:

- We will focus on the upper estimate in the *random Fourier decoupling estimate* obtained in Proposition 5.1 below and do not make any effort in proving its sharpness. Therefore, instead of using all the powerful vector-valued martingale inequalities

due to Burkholder-Rosenthal or Bourgain-Stein as in [CHQW24], here we only need the Pisier's martingale type p inequalities.

- The tree structure together with the independence of the random weights in Mandelbrot cascades will be replaced by the so-called Bacry-Muzy's white noise decomposition of the log-correlated Gaussian field and an *odd-even decomposition* (see (5.8) and (5.9) for its precise meaning). Here we shall also mention that, for higher dimensional GMC, in order to obtain greater smoothness of certain stochastic processes (which will be necessary), the Bacry-Muzy's white noise decomposition should be replaced by a delicately-designed new version.
- Compared with that in the setting of Mandelbrot cascades, a key difficulty arises in the GMC setting for obtaining the *separation-of-variable estimate* of the higher-frequency part of the localized Fourier transform (see (1.8) for its definition). We shall resolve this difficulty by applying a dyadic-discrete-time approximation of the Gaussian stochastic processes used in defining the random weights. In particular, the Hölder continuity and the constant of the Hölder continuity of the Gaussian stochastic processes will be crucial for us.
- The Abel's summation method will play an important role. See Step 4 in the proof of Proposition 5.2.
- The discrete version of the product rule for derivatives will be used. See the elementary identity (4.1) and its application in Step 9 in the proof of Proposition 5.2.

In what follows, we briefly outline the vector-valued martingale method for obtaining the optimal Fourier decay in the setting of GMC.

We shall use the construction of GMC via the Bacry-Muzy's white noise decomposition of Gaussian field with the log-correlated covariance kernel (1.1) (this construction will be recalled in § 3, see [BKN⁺15] and [BM03] for more details). In particular, for any $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$, we can define a sequence of independent stochastic processes depending on the parameter γ (see the formula (3.7) below for its precise definition)

$$\{X_m(t) = X_{\gamma,m}(t) : t \in [0, 1]\}_{m \geq 0} \quad \text{with } X_m(t) \geq 0 \text{ and } \mathbb{E}[X_m(t)] \equiv 1.$$

Then the GMC measure $\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}$ is defined as the limit of the following approximating random measures in the sense of weak convergence of measures (see the formula (3.8) below for the details):

$$\mu_{\gamma,m}(dt) = \left[\prod_{j=0}^m X_j(t) \right] dt.$$

Note that $(\mu_{\gamma,m})_{m \geq 0}$ is a measure-valued martingale with respect to the natural increasing filtration.

Now, for each fixed $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$ and any fixed $\tau \in (0, D_\gamma)$, consider the vector-valued martingale $(M_m)_{m \geq 0}$ defined by

$$(1.6) \quad M_m = M_{\gamma, \tau, m} := (n^{\tau/2} \widehat{\mu_{\gamma, m}}(n))_{n \geq 1}.$$

That is, for each $n \geq 1$,

$$M_m(n) = n^{\tau/2} \widehat{\mu_{\gamma, m}}(n) = n^{\tau/2} \int_0^1 e^{-2\pi i n t} \mu_{\gamma, m}(dt).$$

By Lemma 4.1 below, for any integer $m \geq 0$, if $1 < p < 2$ and $q > \frac{4}{1-\tau}$, then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |M_m(n)|^q \right\}^{p/q} \right] < \infty.$$

Therefore, $(M_m)_{m \geq 0}$ is ℓ^q -valued martingale with $\mathbb{E}[\|M_m\|_{\ell^q}^p] < \infty$ for all integers $m \geq 0$.

The key step in proving Theorem 1.1 is the following Theorem 1.4 on the uniform $L^p(\ell^q)$ -boundedness of the ℓ^q -valued martingale $(M_m)_{m \geq 0}$.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$ and $\tau \in (0, D_\gamma)$. Then there exist $p \in (1, 2)$ and $q \in (\frac{4}{1-\tau}, \infty)$ such that*

$$(p-1) \left(1 - \frac{\gamma^2 p}{2} \right) - \frac{\tau p}{2} - \frac{p}{q} > 0.$$

Moreover, for any such exponents p and q , we have

$$(1.7) \quad \sup_{m \geq 0} \mathbb{E}[\|M_m\|_{\ell^q}^p] < \infty.$$

By the standard argument in the theory of vector-valued martingales, the inequality (1.7) is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |n^{\tau/2} \widehat{\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}}(n)|^q \right\}^{p/q} \right] < \infty$$

and hence, almost surely,

$$|\widehat{\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}}(n)|^2 = O(n^{-\tau}) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since $\tau \in (0, D_\gamma)$ is chosen arbitrarily, the above asymptotic relation provides the desired almost sure lower bound of $\dim_F(\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}) \geq D_\gamma$.

Let us briefly explain our strategy in proving Theorem 1.4. The two key ingredients are

- *Localization via twice applications of martingale type p inequalities for ℓ^q :* In Proposition 5.1 below, by applying twice martingale type p inequalities for the Banach space ℓ^q , we shall show that

$$\sup_{m \geq 1} \mathbb{E}[\|M_m\|_{\ell^q}^p] \lesssim \mathbb{E}[\|M_1\|_{\ell^q}^p] + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{O}_{k-1}} \mathbb{E}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p],$$

where \mathcal{D}_{k-1} is the family of dyadic sub-intervals of $[0, 1]$ with length $2^{-(k-1)}$ and for each dyadic interval $I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}$, the localized random vector $Y_I = (Y_I(n))_{n \geq 1}$ is defined by

$$(1.8) \quad Y_I(n) = n^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_I \left[\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} X_j(t) \right] (X_k(t) - 1) e^{-2\pi i n t} dt \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1.$$

- *The separation-of-variable pointwise upper estimate for $|Y_I(n)|$:* In Proposition 5.2 below, by using a certain dyadic-discrete-time approximation and using an appropriate Hölder regularity in the average sense of the stochastic process $[\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} X_j(t)] \cdot (X_k(t) - 1)$, we shall obtain the following separation-of-variable pointwise upper estimate

$$(1.9) \quad |Y_I(n)| \leq v_0(n)R_0 + \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} v_L(n)R_L + \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} w_L(n)Q_L \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1,$$

where R_L, Q_L are non-negative random variables and v_L, w_L are deterministic (without randomness) sequences of non-negative numbers with supports

$$(1.10) \quad \text{supp}(v_0) = [1, 2^k] \cap \mathbb{N} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{supp}(v_L) = \text{supp}(w_L) = (2^{k+L-1}, 2^{k+L}] \cap \mathbb{N}.$$

Moreover, R_L, Q_L and v_L, w_L are all explicitly constructed with rather simple forms. The separation-of-variable pointwise estimate (1.9) combined with the conditions (1.10) turns out to be particularly useful for our purpose. Indeed, it allows us to obtain immediately the upper estimate of $\mathbb{E}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p]$:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p] \lesssim \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} \|v_L\|_{\ell^q}^p \cdot \mathbb{E}[R_L^p] + \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} \|w_L\|_{\ell^q}^p \cdot \mathbb{E}[Q_L^p].$$

Then, by estimating all the quantities $\|v_L\|_{\ell^q}^p, \|w_L\|_{\ell^q}^p$ and $\mathbb{E}[R_L^p], \mathbb{E}[Q_L^p]$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p] \lesssim |I|^{(p - \frac{p(p-1)\gamma^2}{2} - \frac{\tau p}{2} - \frac{p}{q})}.$$

Acknowledgements. YQ is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC No. 12471145) and also partially supported by the grant NSFC No. 12288201.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Fourier dimension and correlation dimension. In this subsection, we always assume that ν is a finite positive Borel measure on the unit interval $[0, 1]$ and we denote its Fourier transform by

$$\widehat{\nu}(\xi) := \int_{[0,1]} e^{-2\pi i \xi t} \nu(dt), \quad \xi \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The Fourier dimension of ν is defined by (see, e.g., [BSS23, Section 8.2])

$$(2.1) \quad \dim_F(\nu) := \sup\{D \in [0, 1) : |\widehat{\nu}(\xi)|^2 = O(|\xi|^{-D}) \text{ as } \xi \rightarrow \infty\}.$$

Following Kahane [Kah85b, Chapter 17, Lemma 1], we may reduce the study of the decay behavior of the Fourier transform of $\widehat{\nu}(\xi)$ as $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ to that of its Fourier coefficients $\widehat{\nu}(n)$ on the positive integers as $n \rightarrow \infty$. More precisely, let ν be a finite positive Borel measure on $[0, 1]$. Then

$$(2.2) \quad \dim_F(\nu) = \sup\{D \in [0, 1) : |\widehat{\nu}(n)|^2 = O(n^{-D}) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty\}.$$

Remark. We note that, usually in the literature, the equality (2.2) is used for measures supported on a small sub-interval within $[\delta, 1 - \delta]$ for some $0 < \delta < 1/2$. However, by Kahane's original work, one can remove this assumption on the support. See [CHQW24, Lemma 1.8] for the details.

The correlation dimension $\dim_2(\nu)$, or sometimes called the lower L^2 -dimension of the measure ν is defined by (see [BSS23, Lemma 2.6.6 and Definition 2.6.7])

$$(2.3) \quad \dim_2(\nu) := \liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \left(\sup \sum_i \nu(B(x_i, \delta))^2 \right)}{\log \delta}$$

where the supremum is taken over all families of disjoint balls. The above definition is equivalent to (see [BSS23, Definition 2.6.1])

$$\dim_2(\nu) = \liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \left(\int \nu(B(x, \delta)) \nu(dx) \right)}{\log \delta}.$$

The above definition is also equivalent to the following one in terms of the Riesz-energy (see Hunt and Kaloshin [HK97, Proposition 2.1]):

$$(2.4) \quad \dim_2(\nu) = \sup \left\{ s \geq 0 : \int \frac{\nu(dx)\nu(dy)}{|x-y|^s} < \infty \right\}.$$

Since the correlation dimension of a measure is always dominated by its Hausdorff dimension (see [FLR02, Theorem 1.4]), in the above definition (2.4), we may always assume that $0 \leq s < 1$. Then by the standard equality for the Riesz energy (see, e.g., [Mat15, Theorem 3.10]), for any $0 \leq s < 1$,

$$\int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{\nu(dx)\nu(dy)}{|x-y|^s} = \pi^{s-1/2} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{1-s}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{s}{2})} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\widehat{\nu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{s-1} d\xi.$$

Hence the definition (2.4) is further equivalent to

$$(2.5) \quad \dim_2(\nu) = \sup \left\{ 0 \leq s < 1 : \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\widehat{\nu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{s-1} d\xi < \infty \right\}.$$

In particular, the above definition (2.5) for the correlation dimension $\dim_2(\nu)$ compared with the definition (2.1) for the Fourier dimension $\dim_F(\nu)$ implies the following classical inequality:

$$(2.6) \quad \dim_F(\nu) \leq \dim_2(\nu).$$

We note that the inequality (2.6) is also used in [CLS24] in the study of Fourier dimension of Mandelbrot cascades.

2.2. Martingale type p inequalities for ℓ^q . We shall use the following well-known fact in the local theory of Banach spaces, also known as the theory of Banach space geometry (see [Pis16, Definition 10.41]):

For any $2 \leq q < \infty$, the Banach space ℓ^q has martingale type p for all $1 < p \leq 2$.

More precisely, for any $1 < p \leq 2 \leq q < \infty$, there exists a constant $C(p, q) > 0$ such that any ℓ^q -valued martingale $(F_m)_{m \geq 0}$ in $L^p(\ell^q; \mathbb{P})$ satisfies

$$(2.7) \quad \mathbb{E}[\|F_m\|_{\ell^q}^p] \leq C(p, q) \sum_{k=0}^m \mathbb{E}[\|F_k - F_{k-1}\|_{\ell^q}^p],$$

with the convention $F_{-1} \equiv 0$.

The inequality (2.7) implies in particular that for any family of independent and centered random variables $(G_k)_{k=0}^m$ in $L^p(\ell^q; \mathbb{P})$,

$$(2.8) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{k=0}^m G_k \right\|_{\ell^q}^p \right] \leq C(p, q) \sum_{k=0}^m \mathbb{E}[\|G_k\|_{\ell^q}^p].$$

3. CONSTRUCTION OF GMC VIA BACRY-MUZY'S WHITE NOISE DECOMPOSITION

We start with recalling the construction of GMC via the Bacry-Muzy's white noise decomposition of Gaussian field with the log-correlated covariance kernel (1.1). See [BKN⁺15] and [BM03] for details.

Let λ be the hyperbolic measure on the upper half-plane, that is, for any Borel set $A \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$(3.1) \quad \lambda(A) := \int_A \frac{dx dy}{y^2}.$$

Let W denote the white noise on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ with control measure λ . In fact, W is considered as a random real function on the Borel sets of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ with finite λ -measure characterized by the following properties: for all disjoint Borel sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying $\lambda(A), \lambda(B) < \infty$, we have

- (1) $W(A)$ is a centered Gaussian random variable with variance $\lambda(A)$;
- (2) $W(A)$ and $W(B)$ are independent;
- (3) $W(A \sqcup B) = W(A) + W(B)$ almost surely.

For any $m \geq 0$ and any $t \in [0, 1]$, denote the Borel set (see the left part in Figure 1)

$$\mathcal{C}_m(t) := \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mid y > \max \{2|x - t|, 2^{-m}\}, |x - t| < \frac{1}{2} \right\}$$

and define

$$(3.2) \quad \psi_m(t) := W(\mathcal{C}_m(t)).$$




FIGURE 1. The sets $\mathcal{C}_m(t)$ (left) and $A_m(t)$ (right).

For any fixed $m \geq 0$ (see [BKN⁺15]), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\psi_m(t)\psi_m(s)] &= \lambda(\mathcal{C}_m(t) \cap \mathcal{C}_m(s)) \\ &= \begin{cases} m \log 2 + 1 - 2^m |t - s| & \text{if } |t - s| < 2^{-m} \\ \log \frac{1}{|t-s|} & \text{if } 2^{-m} \leq |t - s| \leq 1 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Note that from the above covariance kernel, we know that the stochastic process $\{\psi_m(t) : t \in [0, 1]\}$ is translation-invariant.

For any fixed $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$, define the random measure $\mu_{\gamma, m}$ on the unit interval $[0, 1]$ by

$$(3.3) \quad \mu_{\gamma, m}(dt) := \exp \left(\gamma \psi_m(t) - \frac{\gamma^2}{2} \mathbb{E}[\psi_m^2(t)] \right) dt.$$

This construction fits into the framework of Kahane's theory of Gaussian multiplicative chaos [Kah85a], which implies that almost surely, as $m \rightarrow \infty$, the measure $\mu_{\gamma, m}$ tends to the Gaussian multiplicative chaos $\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}$ in the sense of weak convergence of measures:

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{\gamma, m} = \mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}.$$

Now for any $t \in [0, 1]$, consider the Borel set

$$(3.4) \quad A_0(t) := \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mid y > 1, |x - t| < \frac{1}{2} \right\}$$

and for any $m \geq 1$,

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} A_m(t) &:= \mathcal{C}_m(t) \setminus \mathcal{C}_{m-1}(t) \\ &= \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mid \max \{2|x-t|, 2^{-m}\} < y \leq 2^{-(m-1)} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

See the right part in the Figure 1 for the illustration of the sets $A_m(t)$.

For any $m \geq 0$, define the centered Gaussian process φ_m by

$$(3.6) \quad \varphi_m(t) := W(A_m(t)), \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

The family of Borel sets $\{A_m(t) : t \in [0, 1], m \geq 0\}$ satisfy the following elementary properties:

- for any $t \in [0, 1]$, all $A_m(t)$, $m \geq 0$, are mutually disjoint and

$$\mathcal{C}_m(t) = \bigsqcup_{j=0}^m A_j(t);$$

- for any $m \neq k$ and any $t, s \in [0, 1]$, $A_m(t)$ and $A_k(s)$ are disjoint;
- for any $t_1, t_2 \in [0, 1]$ satisfying $|t_1 - t_2| \geq 2^{-(m-1)}$, $A_m(t_1)$ and $A_m(t_2)$ are disjoint. Consequently, for any sub-intervals $T, S \subset [0, 1]$ satisfying

$$\text{dist}(T, S) = \inf \{|t_1 - t_2| : t_1 \in T \text{ and } t_2 \in S\} \geq 2^{-(m-1)},$$

the two subsets $\bigcup_{t_1 \in T} A_m(t_1)$ and $\bigcup_{t_2 \in S} A_m(t_2)$ are disjoint. See Figures 2 and 3 for the illustrations.




FIGURE 2. $|t_1 - t_2| \geq 2^{-(m-1)} \implies A_m(t_1)$ and $A_m(t_2)$ are disjoint.




FIGURE 3. $\text{dist}(S, T) \geq 2^{-(m-1)} \implies \bigcup_{t_1 \in T} A_m(t_1) \cap \bigcup_{t_2 \in S} A_m(t_2) = \emptyset$.

For any fixed $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$ and any $m \geq 0$, define the stochastic process

$$(3.7) \quad X_m(t) = X_{\gamma, m}(t) := \exp\left(\gamma\varphi_m(t) - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}\mathbb{E}[\varphi_m^2(t)]\right), \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

Then the properties on the family $\{A_m(t) : t \in [0, 1], m \geq 0\}$ imply the following elementary properties of ψ_m , φ_m and X_m .

Elementary Properties 3.1. *The stochastic processes ψ_m , φ_m and X_m satisfy the following properties:*

(P1) *The functions ψ_m , φ_m defined in (3.2) and (3.6) satisfy*

$$\psi_m(t) = \sum_{j=0}^m \varphi_j(t)$$

and hence the measure $\mu_{\gamma, m}$ defined in (3.3) can be written as

$$(3.8) \quad \mu_{\gamma, m}(dt) = \exp\left(\sum_{j=0}^m (\gamma\varphi_j(t) - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}\mathbb{E}[\varphi_j^2(t)])\right) dt = \left[\prod_{j=0}^m X_j(t)\right] dt;$$

(P2) *The stochastic processes $\{\varphi_m\}_{m \geq 0}$ are independent and hence so are the processes $\{X_m\}_{m \geq 0}$;*

(P3) *For any sub-intervals $T, S \subset [0, 1]$ satisfying*

$$\text{dist}(T, S) = \inf\{|t_1 - t_2| : t_1 \in T \text{ and } t_2 \in S\} \geq 2^{-(m-1)},$$

the stochastic processes $\{\varphi_m(t) : t \in T\}$ and $\{\varphi_m(t) : t \in S\}$ are independent and hence so are the pairs $\{X_m(t) : t \in T\}$ and $\{X_m(t) : t \in S\}$.

Lemma 3.2. *For any $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$, any $t \in [0, 1]$ and any $p > 0$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[X_j^p(t)] = \begin{cases} e^{\frac{p(p-1)\gamma^2}{2}} & \text{if } j = 0 \\ 2^{\frac{p(p-1)\gamma^2}{2}} & \text{if } j \geq 1 \end{cases}.$$

Proof. Fix any $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$, any $t \in [0, 1]$ and any $p > 0$. By the definitions (3.4), (3.5), (3.6), (3.7) for $A_j(t)$, $\varphi_j(t)$ and $X_j(t)$ respectively, for any $j \geq 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi_j^2(t)] = \lambda(A_j(t)) \quad \text{and} \quad X_j^p(t) = \exp\left(p\gamma\varphi_j(t) - \frac{p\gamma^2}{2}\mathbb{E}[\varphi_j^2(t)]\right).$$

Hence

$$\mathbb{E}[X_j^p(t)] = \exp\left(\frac{p^2\gamma^2}{2}\mathbb{E}[\varphi_j^2(t)] - \frac{p\gamma^2}{2}\mathbb{E}[\varphi_j^2(t)]\right) = \exp\left(\frac{p(p-1)\gamma^2}{2}\lambda(A_j(t))\right).$$

Now by the definition (3.1) of the hyperbolic measure λ on the upper half-plane and the definitions (3.4), (3.5) for the subsets $A_j(t)$,

$$(3.9) \quad \lambda(A_0(t)) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda(A_j(t)) = \log 2 \quad \text{if } j \geq 1.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.3. *For any $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$ and any $p > 0$, we have*

$$\sup_{j \geq 0} \sup_{0 < |t-s| \leq 2^{-j}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\frac{X_j(t) - X_j(s)}{\sqrt{2^j}|t-s|}\right|^p\right] < \infty.$$

Lemma 3.4. *Let g_1, g_2 be i.i.d. standard normal random variables. Then for any $p > 0$, there exists a constant $C_p > 0$ such that for any $\sigma \in [0, \sqrt{2}]$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[|\exp(\sigma g_1) - \exp(\sigma g_2)|^p] \leq C_p \sigma^p.$$

Proof. By Lagrange's mean value theorem for the function $x \mapsto e^x$, for all $\sigma \in [0, \sqrt{2}]$, we have

$$|\exp(\sigma g_1) - \exp(\sigma g_2)| \leq \sigma |g_1 - g_2| \exp(\sqrt{2}|g_1| + \sqrt{2}|g_2|).$$


We complete the proof by taking $C_p = \mathbb{E}[|g_1 - g_2|^p \exp(p\sqrt{2}|g_1| + p\sqrt{2}|g_2|)] < \infty$. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Since the stochastic process X_j is translation-invariant, we only need to deal with $X_j(t) - X_j(0)$. Fix $j \geq 0$ and $0 < t \leq 2^{-j}$. Define three independent centered Gaussian random variables (see Figure 4 for an illustration) as

$$\xi_1(t) = W(A_j(t) \setminus A_j(0)), \quad \xi_2(t) = W(A_j(0) \setminus A_j(t))$$

and

$$\xi_3(t) = W(A_j(t) \cap A_j(0)).$$

FIGURE 4. The regions corresponding to $\xi_1(t)$, $\xi_2(t)$, $\xi_3(t)$.

Then we have

$$(3.10) \quad \text{Var}(\xi_1(t)) = \text{Var}(\xi_2(t)) = \lambda(A_j(0) \setminus A_j(t)) = \begin{cases} t & \text{if } j = 0 \\ 2^{j-1}t & \text{if } j \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

and by (3.9),

$$\text{Var}(\xi_3(t)) = \lambda(A_j(t) \cap A_j(0)) \leq \lambda(A_j(0)) \leq 1.$$

Then, by writing $\varphi_j(t) = \xi_1(t) + \xi_3(t)$, $\varphi_j(0) = \xi_2(t) + \xi_3(t)$ and noting that

$$\mathbb{E}[\varphi_j^2(t)] = \mathbb{E}[\varphi_j^2(0)] = \lambda(A_j(0)),$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} X_j(t) - X_j(0) &= \exp\left(\gamma\varphi_j(t) - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}\mathbb{E}[\varphi_j^2(t)]\right) - \exp\left(\gamma\varphi_j(0) - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}\mathbb{E}[\varphi_j^2(0)]\right) \\ &= \left[\exp(\gamma\xi_1(t)) - \exp(\gamma\xi_2(t))\right] \exp\left(\gamma\xi_3(t) - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}\lambda(A_j(0))\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by the independence of $\xi_1(t)$, $\xi_2(t)$, $\xi_3(t)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[|X_j(t) - X_j(0)|^p] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\exp(\gamma\xi_1(t)) - \exp(\gamma\xi_2(t))\right|^p\right] \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(p\gamma\xi_3(t) - \frac{p\gamma^2}{2}\lambda(A_j(0))\right)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(p\gamma\xi_3(t) - \frac{p\gamma^2}{2}\lambda(A_j(0))\right)\right] &= \exp\left(\frac{p^2\gamma^2\text{Var}(\xi_3(t))}{2} - \frac{p\gamma^2\lambda(A_j(0))}{2}\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{p(p-1)\gamma^2\lambda(A_j(0))}{2}\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{p(p-1)\gamma^2}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, note that $\xi_1(t)$ and $\xi_2(t)$ are i.i.d. centered Gaussian random variables, by Lemma 3.4 and (3.10), for any $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$ and any $0 < t \leq 2^{-j}$, we have

$$\sigma := \gamma \sqrt{\text{Var}(\xi_1(t))} \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot \sqrt{2^j t} = \sqrt{2^{j+1} t} \leq \sqrt{2}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \exp(\gamma \xi_1(t)) - \exp(\gamma \xi_2(t)) \right|^p \right] &\leq C_p \left(\gamma \sqrt{\text{Var}(\xi_1(t))} \right)^p \\ &\leq C_p (\sqrt{2^{j+1} t})^p \\ &= \sqrt{2}^p C_p 2^{jp/2} t^{p/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the desired inequality follows immediately. \square

Corollary 3.5. *For any $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$, any $q > 2$ and any integer $j \geq 0$, there exists a modification \tilde{X}_j of X_j such that*

$$(3.11) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sup_{t \neq s} \frac{|\tilde{X}_j(t) - \tilde{X}_j(s)|}{|t - s|^\alpha} \right)^q \right] < \infty$$

for any

$$0 \leq \alpha < \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{q}.$$

In particular, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \tilde{X}_j(t)^q \right] < \infty.$$

Proof. Fix any $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$, any $q > 2$ and any integer $j \geq 0$. Lemma 3.3 implies that when $|t - s| < 2^{-j}$,

$$(3.12) \quad \mathbb{E}[|X_j(t) - X_j(s)|^q] \leq C 2^{jq/2} |t - s|^{q/2} = C(j, q) \cdot |t - s|^{q/2}.$$

By changing the constant $C(j, q)$ if necessary, the inequality (3.12) holds for all pairs $(t, s) \in [0, 1]^2$. The standard Kolmogorov's continuity theorem (see, e.g., [RY99, Chapter I, Theorem 2.1]) now implies the desired inequality. \square

Corollary 3.6. *For any $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$, any $\alpha \in [0, 1/2)$ and any integer $j \geq 0$, there exists a modification \tilde{X}_j of X_j such that \tilde{X}_j is Hölder continuous of order α and hence*

$$\prod_{j=0}^m \tilde{X}_j(t)$$

is Hölder continuous of order α with respect to $t \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. It follows immediately from Corollary 3.5. \square

Convention 3.7. By Corollary 3.6, in what follows, given any $\varepsilon > 0$, we shall always assume that the stochastic process $X_j(t)$ are Hölder continuous of order $1/2 - \varepsilon$ and satisfies the inequality (3.11).

4. INITIAL STEPS IN THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4

4.1. An elementary identity. The following elementary identity will play a key role in several places of this paper: given any two finite sequences of complex numbers $(a_j)_{j=0}^m$ and $(b_j)_{j=0}^m$, we have

$$(4.1) \quad \prod_{j=0}^m a_j - \prod_{j=0}^m b_j = \sum_{r=0}^m \left(\prod_{j=0}^{r-1} b_j \right) (a_r - b_r) \left(\prod_{j=r+1}^m a_j \right).$$

4.2. A very rough estimate of $\widehat{\mu_{\gamma,m}}$.

Lemma 4.1. For each fixed $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$ and any fixed $\tau \in (0, D_\gamma) \subset (0, 1)$, let $m \geq 0$ be an integer. For any $q > \frac{4}{1-\tau}$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |n^{\tau/2} \widehat{\mu_{\gamma,m}}(n)|^q \right] < \infty.$$

In particular, for any $p \in (1, 2)$ and $q > \frac{4}{1-\tau}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |n^{\tau/2} \widehat{\mu_{\gamma,m}}(n)|^q \right\}^{p/q} \right] < \infty.$$

Proof. We shall use Convention 3.7. In view of the defining formula (3.8) for the random measure $\mu_{\gamma,m}$, we define

$$\rho_m(t) = \prod_{j=0}^m X_j(t), \quad t \in [0, 1].$$

The elementary identity (4.1) implies that

$$|\rho_m(s) - \rho_m(t)| \leq \sum_{r=0}^m \left[\prod_{j=0}^{r-1} X_j(t) \right] |X_r(s) - X_r(t)| \left[\prod_{j=r+1}^m X_j(s) \right].$$

Then by defining the independent random variables

$$K_j = \sup_{t \in [0,1]} X_j(t),$$

we obtain, for any $q > 2$,

$$\mathbb{E}[|\rho_m(s) - \rho_m(t)|^q] \leq (m+1)^q \sum_{r=0}^m \left(\prod_{j=0}^{r-1} \mathbb{E}[K_j^q] \right) \mathbb{E}[|X_r(s) - X_r(t)|^q] \left(\prod_{j=r+1}^m \mathbb{E}[K_j^q] \right).$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.3 and Corollary 3.5, there exists a constant $C(m, q) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[|\rho_m(s) - \rho_m(t)|^q] \leq C(m, q) \cdot |s - t|^{q/2}.$$

Then, again by the standard Kolmogorov's continuity theorem (see, e.g., [RY99, Chapter I, Theorem 2.1]), there exists a modification $\tilde{\rho}_m$ of ρ_m such that

$$(4.2) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sup_{s \neq t} \frac{|\tilde{\rho}_m(s) - \tilde{\rho}_m(t)|}{|s - t|^\alpha} \right)^q \right] < \infty$$

for any $0 \leq \alpha < \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{q}$. Indeed, since both ρ_m and $\tilde{\rho}_m$ are continuous, they are indistinguishable and hence the inequality (4.2) holds for ρ_m itself.

Recall that, by definition, the modulus of continuity of ρ_m is given by

$$\omega(\rho_m, \delta) = \sup_{t, t+\delta \in [0, 1]} |\rho_m(t + \delta) - \rho_m(t)|.$$

For $q > 2$, define a random variable

$$\Lambda_\alpha = \sup_{0 < \delta < 1} \frac{\omega(\rho_m, \delta)}{\delta^\alpha}, \quad \text{with } 0 \leq \alpha < \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{q}.$$

The inequality (4.2) for the function ρ_m implies

$$\mathbb{E}[\Lambda_\alpha^q] < \infty \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq \alpha < \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{q}.$$

Finally, for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\widehat{\mu}_{\gamma, m}(n) = \widehat{\rho}_m(n).$$

Therefore, by the standard fact in harmonic analysis (see, e.g., [Kat04, Chapter I, Section 4.6]), we know that

$$|\widehat{\rho}_m(n)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \omega\left(\rho_m, \frac{\pi}{n}\right) \leq \frac{\pi^\alpha}{2n^\alpha} \Lambda_\alpha.$$

Then, for any $q > \frac{4}{1-\tau}$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that by taking

$$0 < \alpha = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{q} - \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{q},$$

we have

$$\left(\alpha - \frac{\tau}{2}\right)q = 1 + \frac{1-\tau}{2} \left(q - \frac{4}{1-\tau}\right) - q\varepsilon > 1$$

and hence

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |n^{\tau/2} \widehat{\mu}_{\gamma, m}(n)|^q \right] \leq C \mathbb{E}[\Lambda_\alpha^q] \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{(\alpha-\tau/2)q}} < \infty.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

4.3. Existence of suitable exponents for $L^p(\ell^q)$.

Lemma 4.2. *For each fixed $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$ and any fixed $\tau \in (0, D_\gamma) \subset (0, 1)$, there exist $p = p(\gamma, \tau)$ and $q = q(\gamma, \tau)$ satisfying $1 < p < 2 < \frac{4}{1-\tau} < q < \infty$ such that*

$$(p-1)\left(1 - \frac{\gamma^2 p}{2}\right) - \frac{\tau p}{2} - \frac{p}{q} > 0.$$

Proof. Consider the function

$$f_\gamma(p) = -\left(\gamma^2 p + \frac{2}{p}\right) + 2 + \gamma^2, \quad p \in (1, 2].$$

If $0 < \gamma < \sqrt{2}/2$, then f_γ is increasing in $(1, 2]$; while for $\sqrt{2}/2 \leq \gamma < \sqrt{2}$, the function f_γ is increasing in $(1, \sqrt{2}/\gamma]$ and decreasing in $(\sqrt{2}/\gamma, 2]$. Consequently,

$$\sup_{p \in (1, 2]} f_\gamma(p) = \begin{cases} f_\gamma(2) = 1 - \gamma^2 & \text{if } 0 < \gamma < \sqrt{2}/2 \\ f_\gamma(\sqrt{2}/\gamma) = (\sqrt{2} - \gamma)^2 & \text{if } \sqrt{2}/2 \leq \gamma < \sqrt{2} \end{cases}.$$

In other words, by (1.2),

$$\sup_{p \in (1, 2]} f_\gamma(p) = D_\gamma.$$

Hence, for any $\tau \in (0, D_\gamma)$, there exists $p_0 = p_0(\gamma, \tau) \in (1, 2)$ such that $f_\gamma(p_0) > \tau$. It follows that

$$\frac{p_0}{2}[f_\gamma(p_0) - \tau] = (p_0 - 1)\left(1 - \frac{\gamma^2 p_0}{2}\right) - \frac{\tau p_0}{2} > 0.$$

Then for large enough $q_0 = q_0(\gamma, \tau) > \frac{4}{1-\tau} > 2$, we have

$$(p_0 - 1)\left(1 - \frac{\gamma^2 p_0}{2}\right) - \frac{\tau p_0}{2} - \frac{p_0}{q_0} > 0.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

5. THE MAIN PART OF THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.4.

Convention of notation: For simplifying notation, in what follows, we will always fix $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$ and $\tau \in (0, D_\gamma)$, and fix $p \in (1, 2)$, $q \in (\frac{4}{1-\tau}, \infty)$ satisfying

$$(5.1) \quad \Theta(\gamma, \tau, p, q) := (p-1)\left(1 - \frac{\gamma^2 p}{2}\right) - \frac{\tau p}{2} - \frac{p}{q} > 0.$$

The existence of such a pair (p, q) is guaranteed by Lemma 4.2.

Then, for instance, in defining the random vector Y_I in the formula (5.4) below, instead of writing $Y_I^{(\gamma, \tau)}$, we only write Y_I . Similarly, by writing $A \lesssim B$, we mean that there

exists a finite constant $C > 0$ which only depends on the parameters γ, τ, p, q such that $A \leq CB$.

5.1. The dyadic decomposition and martingale type p inequalities for ℓ^q . For each integer $m \geq 0$, let \mathcal{D}_m denote the family of dyadic sub-intervals of $[0, 1]$ of level/generation m :

$$(5.2) \quad \mathcal{D}_m := \left\{ I \subset [0, 1] : I = \left[\frac{h-1}{2^m}, \frac{h}{2^m} \right) \text{ for some integer } h = 1, \dots, 2^m \right\}.$$

Recall the definition (3.7) of the stochastic processes $\{X_j(t) : t \in [0, 1]\}_{j \geq 0}$ and define

$$(5.3) \quad \mathcal{F}_m := \sigma(X_j : 0 \leq j \leq m), \quad m \geq 0.$$

Recall also the definition (1.6) of the ℓ^q -valued martingale $(M_m)_{m \geq 0}$ with respect to the natural increasing filtration $(\mathcal{F}_m)_{m \geq 0}$ (see Lemma 4.1 for its $L^p(\ell^q)$ -integrability):

$$M_m = (n^{\frac{\tau}{2}} \widehat{\mu_{\gamma, m}}(n))_{n \geq 1}.$$

Now for each $k \geq 2$, and for any dyadic interval $I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}$, we define an \mathcal{F}_k -measurable random vector $Y_I = Y_I^{(\gamma, \tau)} := (Y_I(n))_{n \geq 1}$ by

$$(5.4) \quad Y_I(n) := n^{\frac{\tau}{2}} \int_I \left[\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} X_j(t) \right] \dot{X}_k(t) e^{-2\pi i n t} dt,$$

where

$$\dot{X}_k(t) := X_k(t) - \mathbb{E}[X_k(t)] = X_k(t) - 1.$$

Alarming: One should note that for each $I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}$, the random vector Y_I defined in (5.4) is \mathcal{F}_k -measurable (but is not \mathcal{F}_{k-1} -measurable). It is worthwhile to note that, by the item (P2) of Elementary Properties 3.1, we have

$$(5.5) \quad \mathbb{E}[Y_I | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}] = 0.$$

Proposition 5.1. *There exists a constant $C = C(\gamma, \tau, p, q) > 0$ such that for any $m \geq 2$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|M_m\|_{\ell^q}^p] \leq C \mathbb{E}[\|M_1\|_{\ell^q}^p] + C \sum_{k=2}^m \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}} \mathbb{E}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p].$$

Remark. We already know from Lemma 4.1 that $\mathbb{E}[\|M_1\|_{\ell^q}^p] < \infty$.

We postpone the detailed proof of Proposition 5.1 in § 5.4, but here we explain its main ingredients.

The proof of Proposition 5.1 relies crucially on twice applications of the martingale type p inequalities for the Banach space ℓ^q with $1 < p \leq 2 \leq q < \infty$ and is outlined as follows:

- Firstly, we use the martingale type p inequality (2.7) and obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\|M_m\|_{\ell^q}^p] \lesssim \mathbb{E}[\|M_1\|_{\ell^q}^p] + \sum_{k=2}^m \mathbb{E}[\|M_k - M_{k-1}\|_{\ell^q}^p].$$

- Then, fix an integer k with $2 \leq k \leq m$. We shall use the dyadic decomposition of the martingale difference $M_k - M_{k-1}$ into the summation of the random vectors Y_I introduced in (5.4):

$$M_k - M_{k-1} = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}} Y_I.$$

For using again the martingale type p inequality, we need to consider the *odd-even decomposition* of

$$\mathcal{D}_{k-1} = \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{odd}} \sqcup \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{even}}$$

with $\mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{odd}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{even}}$ being the sub-families of \mathcal{D}_{k-1} defined in (5.8) below. Then we have

$$M_k - M_{k-1} = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{odd}}} Y_I + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{even}}} Y_I.$$

Now a crucial observation is that, by the item (P3) of the Elementary Properties 3.1, conditioned on \mathcal{F}_{k-1} , the random vectors $(Y_I)_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{odd}}}$ are independent (and also conditionally centered by (5.5)) and hence with respect to the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}_{k-1}[\cdot] = \mathbb{E}[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}]$, we may apply the martingale type p inequality (2.8) to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{k-1} \left[\left\| \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{odd}}} Y_I \right\|_{\ell^q}^p \right] \lesssim \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{odd}}} \mathbb{E}_{k-1} [\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p].$$

A similar inequality holds for the summand contributed by $I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{even}}$.

5.2. The localized estimate via separation-of-variable estimate. The next goal is to estimate $\mathbb{E}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p]$.

Recall the definition (5.1) for the quantity $\Theta(\gamma, \tau, p, q)$:

$$\Theta(\gamma, \tau, p, q) = (p-1) \left(1 - \frac{\gamma^2 p}{2} \right) - \frac{\tau p}{2} - \frac{p}{q} > 0.$$

We have the following estimate.

Proposition 5.2. *There exists a constant $C = C(\gamma, \tau, p, q) > 0$ such that for any dyadic sub-interval $I \subset [0, 1]$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p] \leq C |I|^{1+\Theta(\gamma, \tau, p, q)}.$$

In other words, for each $k \geq 2$ and any $I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p] \lesssim 2^{-k \cdot \theta(\gamma, \tau, p, q)}$$

with

$$\theta(\gamma, \tau, p, q) = 1 + \Theta(\gamma, \tau, p, q) = p - \frac{p(p-1)\gamma^2}{2} - \frac{\tau p}{2} - \frac{p}{q}.$$

Remark. Clearly, it is of crucial importance that, in Proposition 5.2, the constant C is uniform for all dyadic sub-intervals $I \subset [0, 1)$.

The proof of Proposition 5.2 is much more involved and is postponed to § 5.5.

The main steps in the proof of Proposition 5.2 are outlined as follows: take any $k \geq 2$ and any dyadic interval $I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}$, recall that

$$\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p = \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |Y_I(n)|^q \right\}^{p/q}.$$

The key in obtaining the desired upper estimate of $\mathbb{E}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p]$ is to establish the following *separation-of-variable* pointwise upper estimate for $|Y_I(n)|$ (which is inspired by the standard Littlewood-Paley decomposition in harmonic analysis):

$$|Y_I(n)| \leq v_0(n)R_0 + \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} v_L(n)R_L + \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} w_L(n)Q_L \quad \text{for all integers } n \geq 1,$$

where R_L, Q_L are non-negative random variables and v_L, w_L are deterministic (without randomness) sequences of non-negative numbers with supports

$$\text{supp}(v_0) = [1, 2^k] \cap \mathbb{N} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{supp}(v_L) = \text{supp}(w_L) = (2^{k+L-1}, 2^{k+L}] \cap \mathbb{N} \quad \text{for all } L \geq 1.$$

In particular, for any $L \geq 1$, the constructions of v_L, w_L and R_L, Q_L rely on a dyadic-discrete-time approximation of the stochastic process

$$\left[\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} X_j(t) \right] \dot{X}_k(t), \quad t \in I.$$

The level of the discrete-time approximation being dependent on each dyadic interval for the integer numbers $2^{L+k-1} < n \leq 2^{L+k}$. It should also be mentioned that, such approximation is reasonable (meaning that the difference can be controlled) by Lemma 3.3.

5.3. Derivation of Theorem 1.4 from Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 5.2. We know from Lemma 4.1 that $\mathbb{E}[\|M_m\|_{\ell^q}^p] < \infty$ for all $m \geq 0$. Therefore, by Proposition 5.1, to prove Theorem 1.4, it suffices to prove the inequality

$$(5.6) \quad \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}} \mathbb{E}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p] < \infty.$$

This inequality follows from Proposition 5.2. Indeed, since $\#\mathcal{D}_{k-1} = 2^{k-1}$ for any $k \geq 2$, by Proposition 5.2, we have

$$\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}} \mathbb{E}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p] \lesssim \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} 2^k \cdot 2^{-k[1+\Theta(\gamma, \tau, p, q)]} = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} 2^{-k \cdot \Theta(\gamma, \tau, p, q)}.$$

Thus, by (5.1), we have $\Theta(\gamma, \tau, p, q) > 0$ and the above geometric series is convergent. Hence we obtain the desired inequality (5.6).

5.4. Proof of Proposition 5.1. Consider the ℓ^q -valued martingale $(M_m)_{m \geq 0}$ defined in (1.6) with respect to the increasing filtration (5.3). For any $m \geq 2$, write M_m as the sum of martingale differences:

$$M_m = M_1 + \sum_{k=2}^m (M_k - M_{k-1}).$$

By the martingale type p inequality (2.7) for the Banach space ℓ^q , we have

$$(5.7) \quad \mathbb{E}[\|M_m\|_{\ell^q}^p] \lesssim \mathbb{E}[\|M_1\|_{\ell^q}^p] + \sum_{k=2}^m \mathbb{E}[\|M_k - M_{k-1}\|_{\ell^q}^p].$$

For each $k \geq 2$ and $n \geq 1$, by the definition (1.6), we have

$$M_k(n) = n^{\frac{\tau}{2}} \widehat{\mu_{\gamma, k}}(n) = n^{\frac{\tau}{2}} \int_0^1 e^{-2\pi i n t} \mu_{\gamma, k}(dt) = n^{\frac{\tau}{2}} \int_0^1 \left[\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} X_j(t) \right] e^{-2\pi i n t} dt.$$

Hence

$$M_k(n) - M_{k-1}(n) = n^{\frac{\tau}{2}} \int_0^1 \left[\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} X_j(t) \right] \dot{X}_k(t) e^{-2\pi i n t} dt,$$

where

$$\dot{X}_k(t) = X_k(t) - 1.$$

Recalling the notation \mathcal{D}_{k-1} introduced in (5.2) for the family of dyadic intervals and the definition (5.4) for the random vector Y_I , we obtain

$$M_k(n) - M_{k-1}(n) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}} Y_I(n) \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1.$$

That is, as random vectors, we have the equality

$$M_k - M_{k-1} = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}} Y_I.$$

Our next step is to introduce the odd-even decomposition of \mathcal{D}_{k-1} :

$$\mathcal{D}_{k-1} = \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{odd}} \sqcup \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{even}}$$

with $\mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{odd}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{even}}$ are two sub-families of \mathcal{D}_{k-1} defined as

$$(5.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{odd}} &= \left\{ I \subset [0, 1) : I = \left[\frac{h-1}{2^{k-1}}, \frac{h}{2^{k-1}} \right) \text{ for some odd integer } 1 \leq h \leq 2^{k-1} \right\}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{even}} &= \left\{ I \subset [0, 1) : I = \left[\frac{h-1}{2^{k-1}}, \frac{h}{2^{k-1}} \right) \text{ for some even integer } 1 \leq h \leq 2^{k-1} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$(5.9) \quad M_k - M_{k-1} = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{odd}}} Y_I + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{even}}} Y_I$$

and hence

$$(5.10) \quad \mathbb{E}[\|M_k - M_{k-1}\|_{\ell^q}^p] \lesssim \mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{odd}}} Y_I \right\|_{\ell^q}^p\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{even}}} Y_I \right\|_{\ell^q}^p\right].$$

Key observation: In the odd-even decomposition (5.9), for any two distinct intervals $I \neq I'$ in the family $\mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{odd}}$, the distance $\text{dist}(I, I')$ satisfies

$$\text{dist}(I, I') \geq 2^{-(k-1)}.$$

Therefore, by the item (P3) of Elementary Properties 3.1, conditioned on \mathcal{F}_{k-1} , the random vectors $(Y_I)_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{odd}}}$ are independent. Moreover, by (5.5), conditioned on \mathcal{F}_{k-1} , the random vectors Y_I are centered. The same holds for the random vectors indexed by $I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{even}}$.

Using the above Key observation, with respect to the conditional expectation

$$\mathbb{E}_{k-1}[\cdot] = \mathbb{E}[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}],$$

we may apply the martingale type p inequality (2.8) for the Banach space ℓ^q and obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{k-1}\left[\left\| \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{odd}}} Y_I \right\|_{\ell^q}^p\right] \lesssim \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{odd}}} \mathbb{E}_{k-1}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p]$$

and hence, by taking expectation on both side, we get

$$(5.11) \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{odd}}} Y_I \right\|_{\ell^q}^p\right] \lesssim \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{odd}}} \mathbb{E}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p].$$

By exactly the same argument, we have

$$(5.12) \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\left\| \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{even}}} Y_I \right\|_{\ell^q}^p\right] \lesssim \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}^{\text{even}}} \mathbb{E}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p].$$

Finally, by combining the inequalities (5.7), (5.10), (5.11) and (5.12), we get the desired inequality

$$\mathbb{E}[\|M_m\|_{\ell^q}^p] \lesssim \mathbb{E}[\|M_1\|_{\ell^q}^p] + \sum_{k=2}^m \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}} \mathbb{E}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p].$$

5.5. Proof of Proposition 5.2. The proof of Proposition 5.2 is divided into the following twelve steps.

Fix any $k \geq 2$ and any dyadic interval $I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}$. As explained before in § 5.2, our first goal is to establish a *separation-of-variable* pointwise upper estimate for $|Y_I(n)|$ introduced in (5.4).

Step 1. The lower-frequency part $1 \leq n \leq 2^k$.

For the lower-frequency part $1 \leq n \leq 2^k$, the quantities $Y_I(n)$ are controlled by the total mass of $\mu_{\gamma,k}$ on the interval I . More precisely, here we use a very rough upper estimate of $Y_I(n)$:

$$|Y_I(n)| = \left| n^{\frac{\tau}{2}} \int_I \left[\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} X_j(t) \right] \dot{X}_k(t) e^{-2\pi i n t} dt \right| \leq n^{\frac{\tau}{2}} \int_I \left[\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} X_j(t) \right] |\dot{X}_k(t)| dt.$$

Hence by defining

$$(5.13) \quad v_0(n) := n^{\frac{\tau}{2}} \cdot \mathbf{1}(1 \leq n \leq 2^k)$$

and

$$(5.14) \quad R_0 := \int_I \left[\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} X_j(t) \right] |\dot{X}_k(t)| dt,$$

we obtain

$$(5.15) \quad |Y_I(n)| \leq v_0(n) R_0 \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq n \leq 2^k.$$

Step 2. Dyadic-discrete-time approximation for the higher-frequency part.

For the higher-frequency part $Y_I(n)$ with $n > 2^k$, we shall use a finer estimate by applying a dyadic-discrete-time approximation of the stochastic process

$$(5.16) \quad D_k(t) := \left[\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} X_j(t) \right] \dot{X}_k(t), \quad t \in I.$$

Namely, we shall approximate $D_k(n)$ by the value of D_k at some dyadic t . It is important for our purpose to use a finer approximation of $D_k(t)$. That is, to control $Y_I(n)$, the level of the dyadic-discrete-time approximation depends on each dyadic interval of integers $(2^{L+k-1}, 2^{L+k}] \cap \mathbb{N}$ containing n .

More precisely, given any integer $L \geq 1$, by using the same dyadic decomposition of I , we shall decompose $Y_I(n)$ in the same manner for all integers $2^{L+k-1} < n \leq 2^{L+k}$. That is, we divide the dyadic interval $I \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}$ into 2^L equal pieces (hence each sub-interval has length $2^{-(L+k-1)}$). In other words, denote by $\mathcal{D}_{L+k-1}(I)$ the family of sub-intervals $J \subset I$ in \mathcal{D}_{L+k-1} :

$$(5.17) \quad \mathcal{D}_{L+k-1}(I) := \left\{ J \subset I : J \in \mathcal{D}_{L+k-1} \right\}.$$

By using the decomposition

$$I = \bigsqcup_{J \in \mathcal{D}_{L+k-1}(I)} J,$$

we can decompose $Y_I(n)$ as

$$Y_I(n) = n^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_I D_k(t) e^{-2\pi i n t} dt = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_{L+k-1}(I)} n^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_J D_k(t) e^{-2\pi i n t} dt.$$

Then on each interval $J \in \mathcal{D}_{L+k-1}(I)$, we approximate $D_k(t)$ with D_k evaluated on the left end-point of J . That is, by writing ℓ_J the left end-point of the interval J and using the decomposition

$$D_k(t) = [D_k(t) - D_k(\ell_J)] + D_k(\ell_J),$$

we obtain

$$(5.18) \quad \begin{aligned} Y_I(n) &= \underbrace{\sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_{L+k-1}(I)} n^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_J [D_k(t) - D_k(\ell_J)] e^{-2\pi i n t} dt}_{\text{denoted } V_I(n)} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_{L+k-1}(I)} n^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \int_J D_k(\ell_J) e^{-2\pi i n t} dt}_{\text{denoted } U_I(n)}. \end{aligned}$$

The two terms $V_I(n)$ and $U_I(n)$ will be controlled by different methods.

Step 3. The simple control of $V_I(n)$.

The term $V_I(n)$ is controlled directly by using the triangle inequality:

$$|V_I(n)| \leq n^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_{L+k-1}(I)} \int_J |D_k(t) - D_k(\ell_J)| dt.$$

Hence by defining

$$(5.19) \quad v_L(n) := n^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \cdot \mathbb{1}(2^{L+k-1} < n \leq 2^{L+k})$$

and

$$(5.20) \quad R_L := \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_{L+k-1}(I)} \int_J |D_k(t) - D_k(\ell_J)| dt,$$

we obtain

$$(5.21) \quad |V_I(n)| \leq v_L(n) R_L \quad \text{for all } 2^{L+k-1} < n \leq 2^{L+k}.$$

Remark. It should be emphasized that the random variable R_L defined as above depends on L (and of course it depends on k , which is determined by I), but does not depend on n . In other words, all integers $2^{L+k-1} < n \leq 2^{L+k}$ share the same R_L .

Step 4. The Abel's summation method for controlling $U_I(n)$.

We shall apply the Abel's summation method to the term $U_I(n)$. Indeed, ordering the dyadic sub-intervals $J \in \mathcal{D}_{L+k-1}(I)$ from left to right according to their natural ordering on the real line, we get

$$J_l = [t_{l-1}, t_l), \quad 1 \leq l \leq 2^L,$$

with $t_0 = \ell_I$, $t_{2^L} = r_I$, the left and right end points of I respectively and

$$t_l - t_{l-1} = |J_l| = \frac{|I|}{2^L} = 2^{-(L+k-1)}, \quad \text{i.e. } t_l = \ell_I + l \cdot 2^{-(L+k-1)} \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq l \leq 2^L.$$

Under the above notation, by using the elementary equality

$$\int_a^b e^{-2\pi i n t} dt = \frac{e^{-2\pi i n t}}{-2\pi i n} \Big|_{t=a}^b = \frac{e^{-2\pi i n b} - e^{-2\pi i n a}}{-2\pi i n},$$

we obtain

$$U_I(n) = \sum_{l=1}^{2^L} n^{\frac{\tau}{2}} \int_{J_l} D_k(t_{l-1}) e^{-2\pi i n t} dt = \frac{n^{\frac{\tau}{2}}}{-2\pi i n} \sum_{l=1}^{2^L} D_k(t_{l-1}) [e^{-2\pi i n t_l} - e^{-2\pi i n t_{l-1}}].$$

An application of Abel's summation method then yields

$$U_I(n) = \frac{n^{\frac{\tau}{2}}}{-2\pi i n} \left(D_k(t_{2^L-1}) e^{-2\pi i n t_{2^L}} - D_k(t_0) e^{-2\pi i n t_0} + \sum_{l=1}^{2^L-1} [D_k(t_{l-1}) - D_k(t_l)] e^{-2\pi i n t_l} \right).$$

It follows that

$$|U_I(n)| \leq \frac{n^{\frac{\tau}{2}-1}}{2\pi} \left(|D_k(t_{2^L-1})| + |D_k(t_0)| + \sum_{l=1}^{2^L-1} |D_k(t_{l-1}) - D_k(t_l)| \right).$$

Hence by defining

$$(5.22) \quad w_L(n) := n^{\frac{\tau}{2}-1} \cdot \mathbb{1}(2^{L+k-1} < n \leq 2^{L+k})$$

and

$$(5.23) \quad Q_L := \frac{1}{2\pi} \left(|D_k(t_{2^{L-1}})| + |D_k(t_0)| + \sum_{l=1}^{2^{L-1}} |D_k(t_{l-1}) - D_k(t_l)| \right),$$

we obtain

$$(5.24) \quad |U_I(n)| \leq w_L(n)Q_L \quad \text{for all } 2^{L+k-1} < n \leq 2^{L+k}.$$

Step 5. Separation-of-variable estimate of $Y_I(n)$.

Combining (5.15), (5.18), (5.21) and (5.24), we obtain the desired separation-of-variable estimate

$$(5.25) \quad |Y_I(n)| \leq \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} v_L(n)R_L + \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} w_L(n)Q_L \quad \text{for all integers } n \geq 1,$$

where R_L, Q_L are non-negative random variables and v_L, w_L are deterministic sequences of non-negative numbers with supports

$$\text{supp}(v_0) = [1, 2^k] \cap \mathbb{N} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{supp}(v_L) = \text{supp}(w_L) = (2^{k+L-1}, 2^{k+L}] \cap \mathbb{N} \quad \text{for all } L \geq 1.$$

Step 6. Upper estimate of $\mathbb{E}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p]$ via separation-of-variable.

We are going to use the following elementary inequality (since $0 < p/q < 1$):

$$(5.26) \quad \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x_i \right)^{p/q} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x_i^{p/q} \quad \text{for any non-negative numbers } x_i \geq 0.$$

Since v_L 's in the separation-of-variable estimate (5.25) have disjoint supports (and so do w_L 's), by using the elementary inequality $(x+y)^q \leq 2^q x^q + 2^q y^q$ for all non-negative real numbers x, y , we obtain that for any $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |Y_I(n)|^q &\leq 2^q \left(\sum_{L=0}^{\infty} v_L(n)R_L \right)^q + 2^q \left(\sum_{L=1}^{\infty} w_L(n)Q_L \right)^q \\ &= 2^q \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} v_L(n)^q R_L^q + 2^q \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} w_L(n)^q Q_L^q. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^q &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |Y_I(n)|^q \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(2^q \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} v_L(n)^q R_L^q + 2^q \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} w_L(n)^q Q_L^q \right) \\ &= 2^q \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} \|v_L\|_{\ell^q}^q R_L^q + 2^q \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} \|w_L\|_{\ell^q}^q Q_L^q. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by applying the inequality (5.26), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p &\leq \left\{ 2^q \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} \|v_L\|_{\ell^q}^q R_L^q + 2^q \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} \|w_L\|_{\ell^q}^q Q_L^q \right\}^{p/q} \\ &\leq 2^p \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} \|v_L\|_{\ell^q}^p R_L^p + 2^p \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} \|w_L\|_{\ell^q}^p Q_L^p \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$(5.27) \quad \mathbb{E}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p] \leq 2^p \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} \|v_L\|_{\ell^q}^p \cdot \mathbb{E}[R_L^p] + 2^p \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} \|w_L\|_{\ell^q}^p \cdot \mathbb{E}[Q_L^p].$$

Step 7. Simple estimates of the quantities $\|v_L\|_{\ell^q}^p$ and $\|w_L\|_{\ell^q}^p$.

By the definitions (5.13), (5.19) and (5.22) for v_L and w_L , we have

$$(5.28) \quad \|v_0\|_{\ell^q}^p = \left(\sum_{n=1}^{2^k} n^{\frac{\tau q}{2}} \right)^{p/q} \lesssim 2^{(\frac{\tau p}{2} + \frac{p}{q})k}$$

and for all $L \geq 1$,

$$(5.29) \quad \|v_L\|_{\ell^q}^p = \left(\sum_{2^{L+k-1} < n \leq 2^{L+k}} n^{\frac{\tau q}{2}} \right)^{p/q} \lesssim 2^{(\frac{\tau p}{2} + \frac{p}{q})(L+k)},$$

$$(5.30) \quad \|w_L\|_{\ell^q}^p = \left(\sum_{2^{L+k-1} < n \leq 2^{L+k}} n^{\frac{\tau q}{2} - q} \right)^{p/q} \lesssim 2^{(\frac{\tau p}{2} - p + \frac{p}{q})(L+k)}.$$

Step 8. Estimate of $\mathbb{E}[R_0^p]$.

Recall the definition (5.14) for R_0 . By the triangle inequality, we have

$$(\mathbb{E}[R_0^p])^{1/p} = \left\| \int_I \left[\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} X_j(t) \right] |\dot{X}_k(t)| dt \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P})} \leq \int_I \left\| \left[\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} X_j(t) \right] |\dot{X}_k(t)| \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P})} dt.$$

Since the stochastic processes $\{X_j\}_{0 \leq j \leq k}$ are independent, by Lemma 3.2, we have

$$(5.31) \quad \left\| \left[\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} X_j(t) \right] |\dot{X}_k(t)| \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P})} = \left(\left[\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{E}[X_j^p(t)] \right] \cdot \mathbb{E}[|\dot{X}_k(t)|^p] \right)^{1/p} \lesssim 2^{\frac{(p-1)\gamma^2}{2}k}.$$

Therefore, by recalling $|I| = 2^{-(k-1)}$, we obtain

$$(5.32) \quad (\mathbb{E}[R_0^p])^{1/p} \lesssim 2^{[\frac{(p-1)\gamma^2}{2} - 1]k}.$$

Step 9. Control of the difference $D_k(t) - D_k(s)$.

From the expressions (5.20) and (5.23), we are led to study the difference $D_k(t) - D_k(s)$. Then the elementary identity (4.1) will be used again. To ease the notation, we rewrite D_k introduced in (5.16) as

$$D_k(t) = \prod_{j=0}^k Z_j(t) \quad \text{with} \quad Z_j(t) = \begin{cases} X_j(t) & \text{if } 0 \leq j \leq k-1 \\ \mathring{X}_k(t) & \text{if } j = k \end{cases}.$$

Note that since $\mathring{X}_k(t) = X_k(t) - 1$, we have

$$\mathring{X}_k(t) - \mathring{X}_k(s) = X_k(t) - X_k(s)$$

and thus

$$|Z_j(t) - Z_j(s)| = |X_j(t) - X_j(s)| \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq j \leq k.$$

Then by (4.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |D_k(t) - D_k(s)| &\leq \sum_{r=0}^k \left(\prod_{j=0}^{r-1} |Z_j(s)| \right) |Z_r(t) - Z_r(s)| \left(\prod_{j=r+1}^k |Z_j(t)| \right) \\ &= \sum_{r=0}^k \left(\prod_{j=0}^{r-1} X_j(s) \right) |X_r(t) - X_r(s)| \left(\prod_{j=r+1}^k |Z_j(t)| \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any $t, s \in [0, 1]$ such that $|t - s| \leq 2^{-k}$, by applying the triangle inequality, the independence of $\{X_j\}_{0 \leq j \leq k}$ and then Lemma 3.2, Lemma 3.3, we obtain

(5.33)

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_k(t) - D_k(s)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P})} &\leq \sum_{r=0}^k \left\| \left(\prod_{j=0}^{r-1} X_j(s) \right) |X_r(t) - X_r(s)| \left(\prod_{j=r+1}^k |Z_j(t)| \right) \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P})} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{r=0}^k 2^{\frac{(p-1)\gamma^2}{2}k} \cdot 2^{\frac{r}{2}} \sqrt{|t-s|} \\ &\lesssim 2^{\frac{(p-1)\gamma^2+1}{2}k} \sqrt{|t-s|}. \end{aligned}$$

Step 10. Estimate of $\mathbb{E}[R_L^p]$ for $L \geq 1$.

Recall the definition (5.20) of R_L for $L \geq 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_L\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P})} &= \left\| \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_{L+k-1}(I)} \int_J |D_k(t) - D_k(\ell_J)| dt \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P})} \\ &\leq \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_{L+k-1}(I)} \int_J \|D_k(t) - D_k(\ell_J)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P})} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Now by (5.33) and the fact that $|t - \ell_J| \leq |J| = 2^{-(L+k-1)} \leq 2^{-k}$ for all $t \in J \in \mathcal{D}_{L+k-1}(I)$, we obtain

$$(\mathbb{E}[R_L^p])^{1/p} \lesssim \sum_{J \in \mathcal{D}_{L+k-1}(I)} 2^{\frac{(p-1)\gamma^2+1}{2}k} \cdot 2^{-\frac{3}{2}(L+k)}.$$

Note that by the definition (5.17) of $\mathcal{D}_{L+k-1}(I)$ (recall that the interval I is divided into 2^L equal pieces), we have

$$\#\mathcal{D}_{L+k-1}(I) = 2^L.$$

Hence

$$(5.34) \quad (\mathbb{E}[R_L^p])^{1/p} \lesssim 2^L \cdot 2^{\frac{(p-1)\gamma^2+1}{2}k} \cdot 2^{-\frac{3}{2}(L+k)} = 2^{-\frac{L}{2}} \cdot 2^{[\frac{(p-1)\gamma^2}{2}-1]k}.$$

Step 11. Estimate of $\mathbb{E}[Q_L^p]$ for $L \geq 1$.

Recall the definition (5.23) of Q_L for $L \geq 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}[Q_L^p])^{1/p} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \left\| |D_k(t_{2^L-1})| + |D_k(t_0)| + \sum_{l=1}^{2^L-1} |D_k(t_{l-1}) - D_k(t_l)| \right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P})} \\ &\lesssim \|D_k(t_{2^L-1})\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P})} + \|D_k(t_0)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P})} + \sum_{l=1}^{2^L-1} \|D_k(t_{l-1}) - D_k(t_l)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P})}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, by the same calculation as in (5.31) (or by directly using the translation-invariance), we have

$$\|D_k(t_{2^L-1})\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P})} = \|D_k(t_0)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P})} \lesssim 2^{\frac{(p-1)\gamma^2}{2}k}.$$

On the other hand, by (5.33) and by using $|t_l - t_{l-1}| = 2^{-(L+k-1)} \leq 2^{-k}$, we obtain

$$\|D_k(t_{l-1}) - D_k(t_l)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P})} \lesssim 2^{\frac{(p-1)\gamma^2+1}{2}k} \cdot 2^{-\frac{1}{2}(L+k)}.$$

It follows that

$$(5.35) \quad (\mathbb{E}[Q_L^p])^{1/p} \lesssim 2^{\frac{(p-1)\gamma^2}{2}k} + 2^L \cdot 2^{\frac{(p-1)\gamma^2+1}{2}k} \cdot 2^{-\frac{1}{2}(L+k)} \lesssim 2^{\frac{L}{2}} \cdot 2^{\frac{(p-1)\gamma^2}{2}k}.$$

Remark. Note that here $(\mathbb{E}[Q_L^p])^{1/p}$ is large when k or L is large. However, the product $\|w_L\|_{\ell^q}^p \cdot \mathbb{E}[Q_L^p]$ becomes very small.

Step 12. Conclusion of the estimate of $\mathbb{E}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p]$.

Combining the inequalities (5.28) and (5.32), we obtain

$$\|v_0\|_{\ell^q}^p \cdot \mathbb{E}[R_0^p] \lesssim 2^{(\frac{\tau p}{2} + \frac{p}{q})k} \cdot (2^{[\frac{(p-1)\gamma^2}{2} - 1]k})^p = 2^{-k(p - \frac{p(p-1)\gamma^2}{2} - \frac{\tau p}{2} - \frac{p}{q})}.$$

For all integers $L \geq 1$, by (5.29), (5.34),

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_L\|_{\ell^q}^p \cdot \mathbb{E}[R_L^p] &\lesssim 2^{(\frac{\tau p}{2} + \frac{p}{q})(L+k)} \cdot (2^{-\frac{L}{2}} \cdot 2^{[\frac{(p-1)\gamma^2}{2} - 1]k})^p \\ &= 2^{-k(p - \frac{p(p-1)\gamma^2}{2} - \frac{\tau p}{2} - \frac{p}{q})} \cdot 2^{-pL(\frac{1-\tau}{2} - \frac{1}{q})} \end{aligned}$$

and by (5.30), (5.35),

$$\begin{aligned} \|w_L\|_{\ell^q}^p \cdot \mathbb{E}[Q_L^p] &\lesssim 2^{(\frac{\tau p}{2} - p + \frac{p}{q})(L+k)} \cdot (2^{\frac{L}{2}} \cdot 2^{\frac{(p-1)\gamma^2}{2}k})^p \\ &= 2^{-k(p - \frac{p(p-1)\gamma^2}{2} - \frac{\tau p}{2} - \frac{p}{q})} \cdot 2^{-pL(\frac{1-\tau}{2} - \frac{1}{q})}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (5.27), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p] \lesssim 2^{-k(p - \frac{p(p-1)\gamma^2}{2} - \frac{\tau p}{2} - \frac{p}{q})} \left[1 + \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} 2^{-pL(\frac{1-\tau}{2} - \frac{1}{q})} + \sum_{L=1}^{\infty} 2^{-pL(\frac{1-\tau}{2} - \frac{1}{q})} \right].$$

Since $q > \frac{4}{1-\tau}$, we have

$$\frac{1-\tau}{2} - \frac{1}{q} > \frac{1-\tau}{2} - \frac{1-\tau}{4} = \frac{1-\tau}{4} > 0.$$

Hence

$$\sum_{L=1}^{\infty} 2^{-pL(\frac{1-\tau}{2} - \frac{1}{q})} < \infty.$$

Consequently, we get the desired inequality

$$\mathbb{E}[\|Y_I\|_{\ell^q}^p] \lesssim 2^{-k(p - \frac{p(p-1)\gamma^2}{2} - \frac{\tau p}{2} - \frac{p}{q})}.$$

This completes the whole proof of Proposition 5.2.

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

Theorem 1.1 follows immediately from Lemma 6.1 and Lemma 6.2 below.

6.1. Lower bound of Fourier dimension for GMC.

Lemma 6.1. *For each $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$, almost surely, we have $\dim_F(\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}) \geq D_\gamma$.*

Proof. Fix any $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$. For any $\tau \in (0, D_\gamma)$, take $p = p(\gamma, \tau)$ and $q = q(\gamma, \tau)$ as in Theorem 1.4. Then Theorem 1.4 combined with the standard fact for vector-valued martingales implies that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\frac{\tau q}{2}} |\widehat{\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}}(n)|^q \right\}^{p/q} \right] = \sup_{m \geq 1} \mathbb{E}[\|M_m\|_{\ell^q}^p] < \infty$$

and hence

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\frac{\tau q}{2}} |\widehat{\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}}(n)|^q < \infty \quad a.s.$$

Consequently, almost surely,

$$|\widehat{\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}}(n)|^2 = O(n^{-\tau}) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

and hence $\dim_F(\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}) \geq \tau$. Finally, by taking a sequence $\{\tau_N\}_{N \geq 1} \subset (0, D_\gamma)$ with $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tau_N = D_\gamma$, we conclude that, almost surely, $\dim_F(\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}) \geq D_\gamma$. \square

6.2. Upper bound of Fourier dimension for GMC.

Lemma 6.2. *For each $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{2})$, almost surely, we have $\dim_F(\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}) \leq D_\gamma$.*

6.2.1. *The proof of Lemma 6.2 via L^2 -spectrum of GMC.* In [Ber23], Bertacco introduced the L^q -spectrum of a measure ν by

$$\tau_\nu(q) := \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \left(\sup_i \sum \nu(B(x_i, r))^q \right)}{-\log r}, \quad q \in \mathbb{R},$$

where the supremum is taken over all families of disjoint balls. From Bertacco's definition, we have (the lim sup becomes lim inf after multiplication by -1)

$$(6.1) \quad -\tau_\nu(q) = \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \left(\sup_i \sum \nu(B(x_i, r))^q \right)}{\log r}.$$

Remark. One may note that the right hand side of (6.1) is the definition of the L^q -spectrum of ν in [BSS23, Definition 2.6.7, formula (2.30) in p. 72].

By comparing (2.3) and (6.1), we get

$$\dim_2(\nu) = -\tau_\nu(2).$$

Note that the above equality is a particular case of [BSS23, Lemma 2.6.6].

Bertacco [Ber23, Theorem 3.1, formula (3.2)] obtained the precise value of the L^q -spectrum $\tau_{\mu_{\gamma,\text{GMC}}}(q)$ of the GMC measure for all $q \in \mathbb{R}$ and all dimension $d \geq 1$, where he used the more general perturbed log-kernel of the form (1.3). In particular, for our purpose of GMC with dimension $d = 1$, Bertacco's result says that, for any $0 \leq \gamma < \sqrt{2}$, almost surely,

$$\dim_2(\mu_{\gamma,\text{GMC}}) = -\tau_{\mu_{\gamma,\text{GMC}}}(2) = \begin{cases} \xi_{\mu_{\gamma,\text{GMC}}}(2) - 1 & \text{if } 2 \leq \sqrt{2}/\gamma \\ 2\xi'_{\mu_{\gamma,\text{GMC}}}(\sqrt{2}/\gamma) & \text{if } 2 \geq \sqrt{2}/\gamma \end{cases},$$

where $\xi_{\mu_{\gamma,\text{GMC}}}(q)$ is the power law spectrum of $\mu_{\gamma,\text{GMC}}$ given by

$$\xi_{\mu_{\gamma,\text{GMC}}}(q) = \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\gamma^2\right)q - \frac{1}{2}\gamma^2q^2, \quad q \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Therefore, by an elementary computation, we obtain that for $0 \leq \gamma < \sqrt{2}$, almost surely,

$$\dim_2(\mu_{\gamma,\text{GMC}}) = \begin{cases} 1 - \gamma^2 & \text{if } 0 \leq \gamma \leq \sqrt{2}/2 \\ 2 + \gamma^2 - 2\sqrt{2}\gamma & \text{if } \sqrt{2}/2 \leq \gamma < \sqrt{2} \end{cases}.$$

In other words, for any $0 \leq \gamma < \sqrt{2}$, almost surely,

$$\dim_2(\mu_{\gamma,\text{GMC}}) = D_\gamma,$$

with D_γ given by (1.2).

Finally, we complete the proof of Lemma 6.2 by applying the standard inequality (2.6) in potential theory: $\dim_F(\nu) \leq \dim_2(\nu)$ for any finite Borel measure ν supported on a compact subset.

6.2.2. An alternative proof of Lemma 6.2. The almost sure upper bound

$$(6.2) \quad \dim_F(\mu_{\gamma,\text{GMC}}) \leq D_\gamma \quad a.s.$$

is also known to Lacoïn-Rhodes-Vargas and Garban-Vargas, see [LRV15] and also [GV23, Remark 2]. Here we provide an alternative proof of (6.2).

For proving (6.2), we need to use the result in [LRV15] and a simple application of the Kolmogorov's zero-one law. Let us fix any $0 < \gamma < \sqrt{2}$. For any $\beta > 0$, consider event A_β defined by

$$A_\beta := \left\{ \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{\mu_{\gamma,\text{GMC}}(dt)\mu_{\gamma,\text{GMC}}(ds)}{|t-s|^\beta} < \infty \right\}.$$

Lemma 6.3. *For any $\beta > 0$, we have $\mathbb{P}(A_\beta) \in \{0, 1\}$.*

Proof. Recall the definitions (3.2), (3.6) for the stochastic processes ψ_m and φ_m respectively. For any $m \geq 1$, set

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\gamma, > m}(dt) &:= \prod_{k=m+1}^{\infty} \exp\left(\gamma\varphi_k(t) - \frac{\gamma^2\mathbb{E}[\varphi_k^2(t)]}{2}\right)dt \\ &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{k=m+1}^N \exp\left(\gamma\varphi_k(t) - \frac{\gamma^2\mathbb{E}[\varphi_k^2(t)]}{2}\right)dt. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to the random measure $\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}(dt)$, the existence of $\mu_{\gamma, > m}(dt)$ is also guaranteed by [Kah85a].

Clearly, we have

$$\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}(dt) = \underbrace{\exp\left(\gamma\psi_m(t) - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}(m \log 2 + 1)\right)}_{\text{denoted } R_{\gamma, m}(t)} \mu_{> m}^{\gamma}(dt).$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}(dt)\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}(ds)}{|t-s|^\beta} = \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{R_{\gamma, m}(t)R_{\gamma, m}(s)}{|t-s|^\beta} \mu_{\gamma, > m}(dt)\mu_{\gamma, > m}(ds).$$

By Corollary 3.6 and Convention 3.7, almost surely, $R_{\gamma, m}(t)$ is continuous in t and non-vanishing. Thus, by setting

$$B_\beta(m) := \left\{ \int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{\mu_{\gamma, > m}(dt)\mu_{\gamma, > m}(ds)}{|t-s|^\beta} < \infty \right\} \in \sigma(\varphi_k : k > m),$$

we have $A_\beta = B_\beta(m)$ up to a probability measure zero set. Since m is arbitrary, the result follows by applying Kolmogorov's zero-one law. \square

Proof of the upper bound (6.2). Assume by contradiction that $\dim_F(\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}) > D_\gamma$ with positive probability. That is, there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ with $D_\gamma + \varepsilon < 1$ such that

$$(6.3) \quad |\widehat{\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}}(\xi)|^2 = O(|\xi|^{-(D_\gamma+2\varepsilon)}) \quad \text{with positive probability.}$$

By the standard equality for the Riesz energy (see, e.g., [Mat15, Theorem 3.10]),

$$\int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}(dt)\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}(ds)}{|t-s|^{D_\gamma+\varepsilon}} = \pi^{D_\gamma+\varepsilon-1/2} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1-D_\gamma-\varepsilon}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{D_\gamma+\varepsilon}{2}\right)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\widehat{\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{D_\gamma+\varepsilon-1} d\xi.$$

Therefore, by (6.3),

$$\int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}(dt)\mu_{\gamma, \text{GMC}}(ds)}{|t-s|^{D_\gamma+\varepsilon}} < \infty \quad \text{with positive probability.}$$

Hence, by Lemma 6.3,

$$\int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{\mu_{\gamma,\text{GMC}}(dt)\mu_{\gamma,\text{GMC}}(ds)}{|t-s|^{D_\gamma+\varepsilon}} < \infty \quad a.s.$$

However, this contradicts to the following result from [LRV15] (see also [GV23, Remark 2]):

$$\int_{[0,1]^2} \frac{\mu_{\gamma,\text{GMC}}(dt)\mu_{\gamma,\text{GMC}}(ds)}{|t-s|^\beta} < \infty \quad a.s. \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \beta < D_\gamma.$$

This completes the proof of the almost sure upper bound (6.2). \square

REFERENCES

- [AJKS11] Kari Astala, Peter Jones, Antti Kupiainen, and Eero Saksman. Random conformal weldings. *Acta Math.* 207 (2011), no. 2, 203-254.
- [BM03] Emmanuel Bacry and Jean-Francois Muzy. Log-infinitely divisible multifractal processes. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 236 (2003), no. 3, 449-475.
- [BSS23] Balázs Bárány, Károly Simon, and Boris Solomyak. Self-similar and self-affine sets and measures. *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, 276. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2023.
- [BKN⁺15] Julien Barral, Antti Kupiainen, Miika Nikula, Eero Saksman, and Christian Webb. Basic properties of critical lognormal multiplicative chaos. *Ann. Probab.* 43 (2015), no. 5, 2205-2249.
- [BGK⁺24] Guillaume Baverez, Colin Guillarmou, Antti Kupiainen, Rémi Rhodes, and Vincent Vargas. The Virasoro structure and the scattering matrix for Liouville conformal field theory. *Probab. Math. Phys.* 5 (2024), no. 2, 269-320.
- [Ber23] Federico Bertacco. Multifractal analysis of Gaussian multiplicative chaos and applications. *Electron. J. Probab.* 28 (2023), Paper No. 2, 36 pp.
- [CLS24] Changhao Chen, Bing Li, and Ville Suomala. Fourier dimension of Mandelbrot multiplicative cascades. *arXiv preprint. arXiv: 2409.13455*, 2024.
- [CHQW24] Xinxin Chen, Yong Han, Yanqi Qiu, and Zipeng Wang. Harmonic analysis of mandelbrot cascades – in the context of vector-valued martingales. *arXiv preprint. arXiv: 2409.13164*, 2024.
- [CN19] Reda Chhaibi and Joseph Najnudel. On the circle, $\text{GMC}^\gamma = \varprojlim C^\beta E_n$ for $\gamma = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\beta}}$ ($\gamma \leq 1$). *arXiv preprint. arXiv: 1904.00578*, 2019.
- [FJ19] Kenneth Falconer and Xiong Jin. Exact dimensionality and projection properties of Gaussian multiplicative chaos measures. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 372 (2019), no. 4, 2921-2957.
- [FLR02] Ai-Hua Fan, Ka-Sing Lau, and Hui Rao. Relationships between different dimensions of a measure. *Monatsh. Math.*, 135 (2002), no. 3, 191-201.
- [GV23] Christophe Garban and Vincent Vargas. Harmonic analysis of Gaussian multiplicative chaos on the circle. *arXiv preprint. arXiv: 2311.04027*, 2023.
- [HS23] Yichao Huang and Eero Saksman. Random analytic functions via Gaussian multiplicative chaos. *arXiv preprint. arXiv:2306.07732*, 2023.
- [HK97] Brian R. Hunt and Vadim Yu. Kaloshin. How projections affect the dimension spectrum of fractal measures. *Nonlinearity* 10 (1997), no. 5, 1031-1046.
- [Kah85a] Jean-Pierre Kahane. Sur le chaos multiplicatif. *Ann. Sci. Math. Québec* 9 (1985), no. 2, 105-150.

- [Kah85b] Jean-Pierre Kahane. Some random series of functions. Second edition. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 5. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985.
- [Kat04] Yitzhak Katznelson. An introduction to harmonic analysis. Third edition. Cambridge Mathematical Library. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [LRV15] Hubert Lacoïn, Rémi Rhodes, and Vincent Vargas. Complex gaussian multiplicative chaos. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 337 (2015), no. 2, 569-632.
- [Mat15] Pertti Mattila. Fourier analysis and Hausdorff dimension. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 150. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015.
- [Moc00] Gerd Mockenhaupt. Salem sets and restriction properties of Fourier transforms. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 10 (2000), no. 6, 1579-1587.
- [Pis16] Gilles Pisier. Martingales in Banach spaces. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 155. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2016.
- [RY99] Daniel Revuz and Marc Yor. Continuous martingales and Brownian motion. Third edition. *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*, 293. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.

ZHAOFENG LIN: SCHOOL OF FUNDAMENTAL PHYSICS AND MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, HIAS,
UNIVERSITY OF CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, HANGZHOU 310024, CHINA

Email address: linzhaofeng@ucas.ac.cn

YANQI QIU: SCHOOL OF FUNDAMENTAL PHYSICS AND MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, HIAS, UNI-
VERSITY OF CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, HANGZHOU 310024, CHINA

Email address: yanqi.qiu@hotmail.com, yanqiqiu@ucas.ac.cn

MINGJIE TAN: SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, WUHAN UNIVERSITY, WUHAN 430072,
CHINA

Email address: mingjie1tan1wuhan@gmail.com