

L^2 restriction estimates from the Fourier spectrum

Marc Carnovale, Jonathan M. Fraser, and Ana E. de Orellana

ABSTRACT. The Stein–Tomas restriction theorem is an important result in Fourier restriction theory. It gives a range of q for which $L^q \rightarrow L^2$ restriction estimates hold for a given measure, in terms of the Fourier and Frostman dimensions of the measure. We generalise this result by using the Fourier spectrum; a family of dimensions that interpolate between the Fourier and Sobolev dimensions for measures. This gives us a continuum of Stein–Tomas type estimates, and optimising over this continuum gives a new $L^q \rightarrow L^2$ restriction theorem which often outperforms the Stein–Tomas result. We also provide results in the other direction by giving a range of q in terms of the Fourier spectrum for which $L^q \rightarrow L^2$ restriction estimates fail, generalising an observation of Hambrook and Laba. We illustrate our results with several examples, including the surface measure on the cone, the moment curve, and several fractal measures.

Mathematics Subject Classification: primary: 42B10, 28A80; secondary: 42B20, 28A75, 28A78.
Key words and phrases: restriction problem, Fourier restriction, Fourier transform, Fourier dimension, Fourier spectrum, Frostman dimension.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. The restriction problem	2
1.2. Stein–Tomas restriction	3
1.3. New Stein–Tomas type results using the Fourier spectrum	3
2. Preliminaries	4
2.1. Frostman, Hausdorff and Fourier dimensions	4
2.2. The Fourier spectrum	5
3. Main results	5
3.1. L^2 restriction estimates from the Fourier spectrum	5
3.2. A partial converse from the Fourier spectrum	8
4. Application 1: Improving the Stein–Tomas range	9
5. Application 2: A Stein–Tomas restriction theorem for the Sobolev dimension	9
6. Application 3: Restriction for the cone	11
6.1. Proof of Proposition 6.2	13
7. Application 4: Restriction for the moment curve	17
8. Application 5: Restriction on fractals	19
8.1. Multifractal measures on the 1/3-Cantor set	19
8.2. Measures on a large family of fractals	21

JMF was financially supported by a *Leverhulme Trust Research Project Grant* (RPG-2023-281) and an *EPSRC Standard Grant* (EP/Y029550/1).

AEdO was financially supported by the University of St Andrews.

Acknowledgements	22
References	22

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The restriction problem. Given a non-zero, finite, compactly supported, Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d , the celebrated *restriction problem* asks when is it meaningful to restrict the Fourier transform of a function to the support of μ . More precisely, for which $p, q \in [1, \infty]$ does it hold that

$$\|\widehat{f}\|_{L^{p'}(\mu)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}, \quad (1.1)$$

for a uniform constant $C \geq 1$ for all $f \in L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Here and throughout the paper we write $A \lesssim B$ or $A \gtrsim B$ if there exists a uniform constant $C > 0$ such that $A \leq CB$ or $A \geq CB$ respectively, and $A \approx B$ if both $A \lesssim B$ and $A \gtrsim B$ hold. If we wish to emphasise that C depends on some parameter λ , it will be denoted with a subscript as \lesssim_λ , \gtrsim_λ , or \approx_λ . Also, for $p, q \in [1, \infty]$, we write p' and q' to refer to their conjugate exponents, i.e. they will satisfy $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q'} = 1$.

By duality of L^p spaces, (1.1) is equivalent to

$$\|\widehat{f\mu}\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mu)}$$

with (1.1) referred to as an $L^{q'} \rightarrow L^{p'}$ restriction estimate and the dual form as an $L^p \rightarrow L^q$ extension estimate. What is more, if $p = 2$, both restriction and extension estimates are equivalent to

$$\|\widehat{\mu} * f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \quad (1.2)$$

We suppose from now on that the support of μ is a Lebesgue null set in \mathbb{R}^d (and therefore we are genuinely attempting to restrict). If $q' = 1$ then f is integrable and \widehat{f} is continuous and bounded, and so estimates of the form (1.1) will be possible for all p' . However, since the Fourier transform is an $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ isometry, if $q' = 2$, $\widehat{f} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and is only defined Lebesgue almost everywhere and so (1.1) will not hold for any p' . Thus, the question is only interesting for the range $1 < q' < 2$.

There are many important open problems in restriction theory. For example, for the surface measure on both the sphere and paraboloid, the conjecture is that (1.1) holds if

$$\frac{d-1}{p'} \geq \frac{d+1}{q} \quad \text{and} \quad q > \frac{2d}{d-1}, \quad (1.3)$$

and is still open for $d \geq 3$. We refer the reader to [Mat15], and [Dem20] for a more thorough presentation of its history. The interest on restriction estimates for (surface measures on) manifolds is partially motivated by its connection to PDEs (see [OeS24] for other applications). For example, restriction estimates for the cone (see Section 6) and the parabola, lead to L^p estimates for the solutions of the wave and Schrödinger equations, respectively. It also has deep connections to harmonic analysis and geometric measure theory. For example, the restriction conjecture for the sphere implies the Kakeya maximal function conjecture, which in turn implies the Kakeya set conjecture.

1.2. Stein–Tomas restriction. Stein observed that non-trivial estimates are often possible when μ is the surface measure on a smooth curved manifold, but that nothing can be said when the surface has flat pieces. In general, such curvature features can be captured by Fourier decay and this led to, over many years, the Stein–Tomas restriction theorem. The most general version of this is due to Bak–Seeger [BS11], but builds on work of Stein (see [Ste93]), Tomas [Tom75], Mochenhaupt [Moc00], Mitsis [Mit02], and others (see also [Fef70, CS72]). This theorem considers the case $p = 2$ and gives a non-trivial range of q for which (1.1) holds in terms of the Frostman exponent and Fourier decay of μ . In particular, if $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$ are such that

$$\mu(B(x, r)) \lesssim r^\alpha \quad (1.4)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r > 0$, and

$$|\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 \lesssim |\xi|^{-\beta} \quad (1.5)$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then for all $f \in L^2(\mu)$, the estimate

$$\|f\widehat{\mu}\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\mu)} \quad (1.6)$$

holds for all

$$q \geq 2 + 4\frac{d - \alpha}{\beta}. \quad (1.7)$$

This distinction between Fourier decay (as with curved manifolds) and no Fourier decay (as with flat manifolds) is also fundamental in the fractal geometry literature. Random sets often exhibit Fourier decay (see e.g. [Sal51]), whereas sets with arithmetic structure often do not (see e.g. [LP22]). Thus, the question asked by Stein naturally extends to fractals and suggests a large programme of research investigating restriction problems for fractal measures in various contexts.

1.3. New Stein–Tomas type results using the Fourier spectrum. In this article we obtain a new range of q for which (1.6) holds in terms of the Fourier spectrum; a family of dimensions that continuously interpolate between the Fourier and Sobolev dimensions for measures. These dimensions extract more nuanced information about the measures than the Fourier and Sobolev dimensions alone, and this extra information can be put to use to study restriction problems. In Section 3 we state and prove the main theorem (Theorem 3.1), which follows by an interpolation argument between the $L^2 \rightarrow L^2$ estimate given in [Moc00] using the Frostman dimension and a new $L^{q'} \rightarrow L^q$ estimate obtained directly from the Fourier spectrum, which we state precisely in Corollary 3.3.

Theorem 3.1 provides a continuum of Stein–Tomas type estimates, which are optimised to provide our main result. However, it is worth noting that at one end of this continuum we recover the usual Stein–Tomas theorem and at the other end we obtain a new estimate which can be stated in terms of the Fourier and *Sobolev* dimensions which typically outperforms Stein–Tomas for multifractal measures, see Corollary 5.1. We also provide results in the other direction by giving a range of q in terms of the Fourier spectrum for which the $L^2 \rightarrow L^q$ extension estimate (1.6) fails, generalising an observation of Hambrook and Laba, see Theorem 3.4. We illustrate our results with several examples, including the surface measure on the cone and the moment curve (where we can beat the Stein–Tomas estimate) and several fractal measures; see Sections 6–8.

In order to apply our results to the surface measure on the cone, we first explicitly derive the Fourier spectrum for this measure (see Proposition 6.2); a result which may be of independent interest. We also give the Fourier spectrum of arclength measure on the moment curve (see Proposition 7.1), and this example exhibits multiple phase transitions which has not been previously observed in ‘natural examples’.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Frostman, Hausdorff and Fourier dimensions. We begin with a short summary of the different definitions of fractal dimensions that we will use. For more details we refer the reader to the book [Mat15] and the article [Fra24]. Unless stated otherwise, throughout the article we shall work with non-zero, finite, compactly supported, Borel measures on \mathbb{R}^d .

Given $0 < \alpha \leq d$, a measure μ satisfies the Frostman condition with exponent α if for all $r > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mu(B(x, r)) \lesssim r^\alpha$. If a measure μ satisfies this condition, its s -energy is finite for all $s < \alpha$, i.e.

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

For an integrable function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, its Fourier transform is defined as

$$\widehat{f}(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-2\pi i \xi \cdot x} f(x) dx,$$

and this operator can be easily extended to functions in L^p for $p \in [1, 2]$. The Fourier transform of a measure μ is

$$\widehat{\mu}(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-2\pi i \xi \cdot x} d\mu(x).$$

Note that for $0 < s < d$, it is a consequence of Parseval's theorem that

$$I_s(\mu) \approx_{d,s} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{s-d} d\xi. \quad (2.1)$$

We define the Frostman and Sobolev dimensions of a measure as

$$\dim_{\text{Fr}} \mu = \sup \{ \alpha \in \mathbb{R} : \mu(B(x, r)) \lesssim r^\alpha, \forall r > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^d \};$$

and

$$\dim_{\text{S}} \mu = \sup \{ s \in \mathbb{R} : \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{s-d} d\xi < \infty \},$$

respectively. Frostman's lemma implies that $\dim_{\text{Fr}} \mu \leq \dim_{\text{S}} \mu$ and when μ is supported on a null set $\dim_{\text{S}} \mu \leq d$, in which case the Sobolev dimension is also called the L^2 -dimension, the energy dimension, or the correlation dimension. Moreover, the Hausdorff dimension of a Borel set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is the supremum of $\min\{d, \dim_{\text{S}} \mu\}$, taken over all measures on X .

The finiteness of $I_s(\mu)$ for $s \in (0, d)$ says that, on average, $|\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|$ decays like $|\xi|^{-\frac{s}{2}}$. The supremum of the polynomial rate of decay of $|\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|$ is its Fourier dimension,

$$\dim_{\text{F}} \mu = \sup \left\{ s \in \mathbb{R} : \sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^s < \infty \right\}.$$

It is easy to see that $\dim_{\text{F}} \mu \leq \dim_{\text{S}} \mu$. What is more, in [Mit02, Section 3] the author shows that

$$\min \left\{ \frac{\dim_{\text{F}} \mu}{2}, d \right\} \leq \dim_{\text{Fr}} \mu,$$

and this bound is sharp; see [LL24+]. We say that a measure μ is Salem if $\dim_{\text{F}} \mu = \dim_{\text{S}} \mu$.

By taking appropriate limits, the Stein–Tomas restriction theorem (1.7) implies that (1.6) holds for all

$$q > 2 + 4 \frac{d - \dim_{\text{Fr}} \mu}{\dim_{\text{F}} \mu}.$$

This version—stated in terms of dimensions—is useful to keep in mind when comparing with our main theorem.

2.2. The Fourier spectrum. The Fourier and Sobolev dimensions quantify the rate of decay of $|\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|$ in a weighted L^∞ and L^2 sense, respectively. If instead we consider a weighted L^p decay, we arrive to the definition of the Fourier spectrum; a family of dimensions first defined in [Fra24] that interpolate between the Fourier and Sobolev dimensions.

For $\theta \in (0, 1]$, define the (s, θ) -energy of a measure μ as

$$\mathcal{J}_{s,\theta}(\mu) := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^{\frac{2}{\theta}} |\xi|^{\frac{s}{\theta}-d} d\xi \right)^\theta$$

and for $\theta = 0$,

$$\mathcal{J}_{s,0}(\mu) = \sup_{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^s.$$

Then the Fourier spectrum of μ at θ is

$$\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^\theta \mu = \sup\{s \in \mathbb{R}^d : \mathcal{J}_{s,\theta}(\mu) < \infty\}.$$

It is immediate from its definition that $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^0 \mu = \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^1 \mu = \dim_{\mathbb{S}} \mu$. Furthermore, [Fra24, Theorem 1.1] states that $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^\theta \mu$ is non-decreasing, concave, and, for compactly supported measures, continuous for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$. In fact, it was proved in [CFdO24+, Proposition 4.2] that for compactly supported μ , $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^\theta \mu \leq \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu + d\theta$ for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$.

The Fourier spectrum has already provided several applications where one uses the additional information provided by the spectrum of dimensions. These applications include contributions to the Falconer distance problem [Fra24, Section 7], sunset type problems [Fra24, Section 6], and the dimension theory of orthogonal projections [FdO24+].

3. MAIN RESULTS

3.1. L^2 restriction estimates from the Fourier spectrum. In the following theorem we give a new range of q for the $L^{q'} \rightarrow L^2$ Fourier restriction estimate to hold. The proof follows that of [Moc00] where instead of using the Fourier dimension of μ , we use its Fourier spectrum, which allows us to interpolate between the known $L^2 \rightarrow L^2$ estimate given by the Frostman condition with a new $L^{q'} \rightarrow L^q$ estimate given by the Fourier spectrum, where we use the information given by the (s, θ) -energies of a discretisation of μ at different scales.

Theorem 3.1. *Let μ be a non-zero, finite, compactly supported, Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^d , with $\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu = \alpha$ for some $0 < \alpha \leq d$. If*

$$q > 2 + 2 \inf_{\substack{\theta \in [0,1] \\ \dim_{\mathbb{F}}^\theta \mu > d\theta}} \frac{(d - \alpha)(2 - \theta)}{\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^\theta \mu - \alpha\theta},$$

then for all $f \in L^2(\mu)$,

$$\|\widehat{f\mu}\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\mu)}.$$

Equivalently, if

$$1 \leq q' < \sup_{\substack{\theta \in [0,1] \\ \dim_{\mathbb{F}}^\theta \mu > d\theta}} \frac{2(d - \alpha)(2 - \theta) + 2(\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^\theta \mu - \alpha\theta)}{2(d - \alpha)(2 - \theta) + \dim_{\mathbb{F}}^\theta \mu - \alpha\theta},$$

then for all $f \in L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\|\widehat{f}\|_{L^2(\mu)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

Proof. We will show that $\|\widehat{\mu} * f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ for every $f \in L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all q sufficiently close to the desired threshold. This is equivalent to both statements in the theorem (see Section 1.1). In particular, establishing (1.6) for some q establishes it for all larger q since μ is compactly supported.

To begin with, let $q \geq 1$ be arbitrary. We start by breaking up $\widehat{\mu}$ dyadically in the standard way. Let $\rho \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that $\rho(\xi) = 0$ for $|\xi| \leq 1/2$ and $\rho(\xi) = 1$ for $|\xi| \geq 1$. Define the function $\varphi(\xi) = \rho(2\xi) - \rho(\xi)$, noting that $\text{spt } \varphi \subset \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d : \frac{1}{4} \leq |\xi| \leq 1\}$ and

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \varphi(2^{-j}\xi) = 1 \quad (\text{for } |\xi| \geq 1).$$

Clearly $\widehat{\mu} = \Phi + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \widehat{\mu}_j$ where

$$\Phi(\xi) = \left(1 - \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \varphi(2^{-j}\xi)\right) \widehat{\mu}(\xi)$$

and $\widehat{\mu}_j(\xi) = \varphi(2^{-j}\xi) \widehat{\mu}(\xi)$. Therefore,

$$\|\widehat{\mu} * f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \|\Phi * f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|\widehat{\mu}_j * f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \quad (3.1)$$

For the first term, since Φ is bounded and has compact support,

$$\|\Phi\|_{L^{q/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim 1.$$

Using this and Young's inequality for convolutions gives,

$$\|\Phi * f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \|\Phi\|_{L^{q/2}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|f\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

For the second term we will obtain the $L^{q'} \rightarrow L^q$ bound by interpolation. Let $\theta \in (0, 1]$ and $s > 0$ be such that $\dim_{\text{F}}^\theta \mu > s > d\theta$. Since $\mathcal{J}_{s,\theta}(\mu) \lesssim 1$,

$$\|\widehat{\mu}_j\|_{L^{2/\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \approx \left(\int_{|\xi| \approx 2^j} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^{\frac{2}{\theta}} |\xi|^{\frac{s}{\theta} - d} 2^{-j(\frac{s}{\theta} - d)} d\xi \right)^{\frac{\theta}{2}} \lesssim 2^{-j\frac{s-d\theta}{2}} \mathcal{J}_{s,\theta}(\mu)^{1/2} \lesssim 2^{-j\frac{s-d\theta}{2}},$$

and so by Young's inequality for convolutions,

$$\|\widehat{\mu}_j * f\|_{L^{4/\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \|\widehat{\mu}_j\|_{L^{2/\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|f\|_{L^{4/(4-\theta)}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim 2^{-j\frac{s-d\theta}{2}} \|f\|_{L^{4/(4-\theta)}(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \quad (3.2)$$

Following [Moc00, Theorem 4.1] we can use the fact that μ is α_0 -Frostman for $\alpha_0 < \alpha$ to prove that

$$\|\widehat{\mu}_j * f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim 2^{-j(\alpha_0 - d)} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \quad (3.3)$$

Let $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and apply the Riesz–Thorin interpolation theorem with parameter λ between (3.2) and (3.3). This gives a $L^{q'} \rightarrow L^q$ estimate, with

$$\frac{1}{q} = \frac{(1-\lambda)\theta}{4} + \frac{\lambda}{2},$$

noting that this forces $2 \leq q \leq 4/\theta$. More precisely, we obtain

$$\|\widehat{\mu}_j * f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq 2^{-j\left((1-\lambda)\frac{s-d\theta}{2} + \lambda(\alpha_0 - d)\right)} \|f\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

Therefore, provided

$$(1-\lambda)\frac{s-d\theta}{2} + \lambda(\alpha_0 - d) > 0, \quad (3.4)$$

we get

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|\widehat{\mu}_j * f\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

Using this in (3.1) establishes the desired $L^{q'} \rightarrow L^q$ bound whenever $q \in [2, 4/\theta]$ satisfies (3.4), that is, whenever

$$\frac{4}{\theta} \geq q > 2 + 2 \frac{(d - \alpha_0)(2 - \theta)}{s - \alpha_0 \theta}.$$

Crucially, using that $s > d\theta$ and $\alpha_0 < d$,

$$\frac{4}{\theta} > 2 + 2 \frac{(d - \alpha_0)(2 - \theta)}{s - \alpha_0 \theta}$$

and so there is a non-empty range of possible q . This proves the desired result upon letting $\alpha_0 \rightarrow \alpha$ and $s \rightarrow \dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu$. \square

The condition $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu > d\theta$ is necessary when taking the infimum in Theorem 3.1. Indeed, the middle third Cantor measure has $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu \leq \theta$ for all θ (see [Fra24, Corollary 4.4]), but if we attempt to apply Theorem 3.1 without the condition we would get a non-trivial restriction range because $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{1/2} \mu > \alpha/2$ (see [Fra24, Corollary 4.4]). However, this is not possible by the following lemma, described to us by Chun-Kit Lai. In particular, the Fourier transform of the middle third Cantor measure does not decay to 0 at ∞ .

Lemma 3.2. *Let μ be a non-zero, finite, compactly supported, Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^d . If for some $q > 1$, $\|\widehat{f\mu}\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \|f\|_{L^2(\mu)}$ for all $f \in L^2(\mu)$, then $|\widehat{\mu}(\xi)| \rightarrow 0$ as $|\xi| \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. Taking $f = 1$, and using that μ has compact support, $f \in L^2(\mu)$ and so $\widehat{\mu} \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$. However, since $\widehat{\mu}$ is uniformly continuous (even uniformly Lipschitz, see [Mat15, (3.19)]) this implies that $\widehat{\mu}$ must decay at infinity. \square

In the proof of Theorem 3.1 we obtained the following restriction estimate directly from the Fourier spectrum, without appealing to the $L^2 \rightarrow L^2$ estimate coming from the Frostman exponent. We record it here for interest.

Corollary 3.3. *Let μ be a non-zero, finite, compactly supported, Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^d . If*

$$q > \inf \left\{ \frac{4}{\theta} : \theta \in [0, 1], \dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu > d\theta \right\},$$

then for all $f \in L^2(\mu)$,

$$\|\widehat{f\mu}\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\mu)}.$$

Equivalently, if

$$1 \leq q' < \sup \left\{ \frac{4}{4 - \theta} : \theta \in [0, 1], \dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu > d\theta \right\},$$

then for all $f \in L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\|\widehat{f}\|_{L^2(\mu)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

L^2 restriction theorems of the type proved in this section have numerous applications. For example, in [Moc00, Theorem 5.1] Mockenhaupt uses the Stein–Tomas theorem to prove that certain convolution operators are L^p -multipliers, with the range of p depending on the established range for L^2 restriction. One can do the same using our Theorem 3.1 and obtain improved ranges, but we leave the details to the reader.

3.2. A partial converse from the Fourier spectrum. Another interesting question is to determine when the restriction estimate (1.1) does not hold. In [HL13] the authors noted that (1.1) will not hold for any $2 \leq q < \frac{2d}{\dim_S \mu}$, which is a non-trivial statement when $\dim_S \mu < d$. We repeat their simple argument here. Let $d > s > \dim_S \mu$, in which case $I_s(\mu) = \infty$. Then, by Hölder's inequality with conjugate exponents $\frac{q}{2}$ and $\frac{q}{q-2}$,

$$\infty = \int_{|\xi| \geq 1} |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 |\xi|^{s-d} d\xi \leq \|\widehat{\mu}\|_q^2 \left(\int_{|\xi| \geq 1} |\xi|^{\frac{q(s-d)}{q-2}} d\xi \right)^{\frac{q-2}{q}},$$

and the last integral is finite if $q < \frac{2d}{s}$. Therefore, for $q < \frac{2d}{\dim_S \mu}$, $\widehat{\mu}$ cannot be in L^q and so (1.1) does not hold for any p . We can generalise this result (which we refer to later as the Hambrook–Laba lower bound) using the Fourier spectrum.

Theorem 3.4. *Let μ be a non-zero, finite, compactly supported, Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^d . If $q = \frac{2}{\theta}$ for some $\theta \in (0, 1]$ such that $\mathcal{J}_{d\theta, \theta}(\mu) = \infty$ and $p \in [1, \infty]$, then for $f = 1$,*

$$\|\widehat{f\mu}\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \infty > \|f\|_{L^p(\mu)} = \mu(\mathbb{R}^d)^{1/p}.$$

Hence, (1.1) does not hold for any $p \in [1, \infty]$.

In particular, (1.1) does not hold for any $p \in [1, \infty]$ if

$$q < \sup \left\{ \frac{2}{\theta} : \dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu < d\theta \right\}.$$

Proof. Let $f = 1$ and $\theta \in (0, 1]$ be such that $\mathcal{J}_{d\theta, \theta}(\mu) = \infty$. Then

$$\infty = \mathcal{J}_{d\theta, \theta}(\mu) = \left(\int |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^{\frac{2}{\theta}} d\xi \right)^{\theta} = \|\widehat{f\mu}\|_{L^{2/\theta}(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2,$$

as required. \square

Note that for all $\theta \in (0, 1]$ such that $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu < d\theta$, $\mathcal{J}_{d\theta, \theta}(\mu) = \infty$. If $\dim_S \mu = \dim_{\mathbb{F}}^1 \mu < d$, then we recover the fact that (1.1) fails for $q < \frac{2d}{\dim_S \mu}$. However, we will often get a stronger result (see Figure 3). Let us consider the smallest possible range provided by the previous theorem. This will happen when the Fourier spectrum stays above $d\theta$ for as large θ as possible. Since the Fourier spectrum is increasing in θ , this will happen when $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu = \dim_S \mu$ for $\theta \geq \dim_S \mu / d$. For non-Salem measures μ this is quite unlikely to happen, and so we will obtain a strictly better (negative) range. On the other hand, the best information we can get from the above result is when the Fourier spectrum is as small as possible. Since the Fourier spectrum is concave this will happen when $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu$ is affine and given by

$$\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu = \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu + \theta(\dim_S \mu - \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu).$$

In this case we get that (1.1) fails for

$$q < 2 + \frac{2(d - \dim_S \mu)}{\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu}.$$

Theorem 3.4 seems to provide useful new information concerning the general restriction problem. For example, for the sphere, it gives that (1.1) fails for

$$q < \frac{2d}{d-1}$$

and this is one of the sharp thresholds from the restriction conjecture. This threshold is also obtained by the Hambrook–Laba bound. However, we will see this behaviour again later when we consider the cone and the moment curve and, in fact, Theorem 3.4 gives a sharp threshold

for the general restriction problem for these examples whereas the Hambrook–Laba bound does not (see Sections 6 and 7).

Another simple consequence of the above is the following mild strengthening of Lemma 3.2.

Corollary 3.5. *Let μ be a non-zero, finite, compactly supported, Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^d . If $\mathcal{J}_{d\theta, \theta}(\mu) = \infty$ for all $\theta \in (0, 1]$, then (1.1) does not hold for any pairs $p, q \in [1, \infty]$ with $q < \infty$. In particular, this is true if $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu < d\theta$ for all $\theta \in (0, 1]$ or if $\widehat{\mu}$ does not decay at infinity.*

4. APPLICATION 1: IMPROVING THE STEIN–TOMAS RANGE

In [HL13, HL16, Che16] the authors proved that there is a large family of measures satisfying (1.4) and (1.5), for which the range given by Stein–Tomas (1.7) is optimal. However, from the constructions of Chen [Che14], Chen–Seeger [CS17], Shmerkin–Suomala [SS18], and Laba–Wang [LW18], we know that there are other measures (some also satisfying (1.4) and (1.5)) for which the range of q such that (1.6) holds can be improved. We now give a condition on the Fourier spectrum of measures for which the range given by Stein–Tomas is not optimal; see Figure 1.

The range of q obtained in Theorem 3.1 will improve on the Stein–Tomas range (1.7) if for some $\theta \in [0, 1]$

$$2 + \frac{2(d - \alpha)(2 - \theta)}{\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu - \alpha\theta} < 2 + \frac{4(d - \alpha)}{\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu}$$

and $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu > d\theta$, where $\alpha = \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu$. Therefore, we need

$$\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu > \max \left\{ \theta \left(\alpha - \frac{\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu}{2} \right) + \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu, d\theta \right\}. \quad (4.1)$$

We note that by concavity $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu \geq (\dim_{\mathbb{S}} \mu - \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu)\theta + \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu$ always holds.

5. APPLICATION 2: A STEIN–TOMAS RESTRICTION THEOREM FOR THE SOBOLEV DIMENSION

If $\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu > 0$, then there is an interval of θ for which $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu > d\theta$ (within which we can apply our estimate from Theorem 3.1). If we fix $\theta = 0$, then we (unsurprisingly) obtain the Stein–Tomas range. However, it is interesting to examine what happens at the other end, that is, Corollary 3.3. If we apply Corollary 3.3 and use only the trivial estimate from the Fourier spectrum coming from concavity, we obtain a restriction theorem in terms of the Sobolev and Fourier dimensions of μ . This result, despite being stated in terms of familiar notions of dimension, has been hidden from view up until now perhaps because it is obtained using the Fourier spectrum for a necessarily intermediate $\theta \in (0, 1)$.

While the Frostman dimension gives information regarding the scaling properties of a measure, the Sobolev dimension quantifies how rough the measure is, where roughness is measured in the Sobolev scale. For surface measures on manifolds such as the sphere or the cone, these two notions are equivalent. However, for fractal measures the Frostman dimension will often be strictly smaller than the Sobolev dimension.

Applying Theorem 3.1 with θ at the right end of the interval of allowable θ and using concavity of the Fourier spectrum, we get the following restriction theorem for the Sobolev dimension. In fact, it follows by applying Corollary 3.3, which we note because its proof is direct from the Fourier spectrum and does not involve the $L^2 \rightarrow L^2$ estimate coming from the Frostman exponent.




FIGURE 1. In order to improve the Stein–Tomas range for the restriction problem, we need the Fourier spectrum of μ to intersect the shaded region, i.e. for some $\theta \in [0, 1]$ we need the point $(\theta, \dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu)$ to lie in the shaded region. Top left: when $\dim_{\mathbb{S}} \mu \geq \dim_{\mathbb{F}\mathbb{R}} \mu + \frac{\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu}{2}$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{F}\mathbb{R}} \mu > \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu$. Top right: when $\dim_{\mathbb{S}} \mu > \dim_{\mathbb{F}\mathbb{R}} \mu + \frac{\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu}{2}$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{F}\mathbb{R}} \mu < \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu$. Bottom left: when $\dim_{\mathbb{S}} \mu < \dim_{\mathbb{F}\mathbb{R}} \mu + \frac{\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu}{2}$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{F}\mathbb{R}} \mu < \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu$. Bottom right: when $\dim_{\mathbb{S}} \mu < \dim_{\mathbb{F}\mathbb{R}} \mu + \frac{\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu}{2}$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{F}\mathbb{R}} \mu > \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu$. The dashed lines are $\theta(\dim_{\mathbb{F}\mathbb{R}} \mu - \frac{\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu}{2}) + \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu$ and $d\theta$, and the solid line is $\theta(\dim_{\mathbb{S}} \mu - \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu) + \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu$, which by concavity is always a lower bound for the Fourier spectrum of μ .

Corollary 5.1. *Let μ be a non-zero, finite, compactly supported, Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^d with $\dim_{\mathbb{S}} \mu < d$. If*

$$q > 4 + \frac{4(d - \dim_{\mathbb{S}} \mu)}{\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu},$$

then for all $f \in L^2(\mu)$,

$$\|\widehat{f\mu}\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\mu)}.$$

Equivalently, if

$$1 \leq q' < \frac{4(d - \dim_{\mathbb{S}} \mu + \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu)}{4(d - \dim_{\mathbb{S}} \mu + \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu) - \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu},$$

then for all $f \in L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\|\widehat{f}\|_{L^2(\mu)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}.$$

Proof. By concavity of the Fourier spectrum for measures, $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu \geq \theta(\dim_{\mathbb{S}} \mu - \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu) + \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu$. Therefore, choosing θ such that $\theta(\dim_{\mathbb{S}} \mu - \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu) + \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu = d\theta$, i.e. $\theta = \frac{\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu}{d - \dim_{\mathbb{S}} \mu + \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu}$, Corollary 3.3 directly gives that the desired restriction estimate holds for

$$q > \frac{4}{\theta} = \frac{4(d - \dim_{\mathbb{S}} \mu + \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu)}{\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu},$$

as required. \square

The previous corollary beats the Stein–Tomas range for measures μ with $\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu + \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu/2 < \dim_{\mathbb{S}} \mu$. For fractal or multifractal measures this is quite typical, since the Fourier dimension is often small and the Frostman dimension is often strictly smaller than the Sobolev dimension (the Frostman dimension can even be as small as $\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu/2$ [LL24+]). On the other hand, if the Frostman and Sobolev dimensions agree, then the previous corollary never beats Stein–Tomas, and this is the case for surface measures. That said, Corollary 3.3 may beat Stein–Tomas, even for surface measures.

6. APPLICATION 3: RESTRICTION FOR THE CONE

In this section we exhibit our main theorem by applying it to an important example in restriction theory. Let $d \geq 3$ and define the truncated cone in \mathbb{R}^d by

$$C^{d-1} = \{(t, |t|) : t \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}, |t| \leq 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d,$$

and let ν_{d-1} be the surface measure on the cone C^{d-1} . This is a well-known and important example in restriction theory.

Conjecture 6.1 (cone restriction conjecture). *The estimate $\|\widehat{f}\|_{L^{p'}(\nu_{d-1})} \lesssim_{p,q} \|f\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ holds for all $f \in L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if and only if*

$$\frac{d-2}{p'} \geq \frac{d}{q} \quad \text{and} \quad q > \frac{2(d-1)}{d-2},$$

and for $p = 2$ if and only if

$$q \geq \frac{2d}{d-2}.$$

The general restriction conjecture for the cone has been proven only in dimensions $d = 3, 4, 5$ by Bacelo [Bar85], Wolff [Wol01], and Ou–Wang [OW22], respectively. The case $p = 2$ was established in unpublished work of Córdoba and Stein in all dimensions, see also [Str77] where Strichartz generalised the result to quadratic surfaces.

In order to apply our results to the surface measure on the cone, we first derive the Fourier spectrum for this measure. This result may be of independent interest.

Proposition 6.2. *Let $d \geq 3$ be an integer, and ν_{d-1} be the surface measure on the cone. Then*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \nu_{d-1} = \min \left\{ 2 + (d-1)\theta, (d-2) + \theta \right\}$$

for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$. This has a phase transition at $\theta = \frac{d-4}{d-2}$ whenever $d \geq 5$, but for $d = 3, 4$ it is affine. Moreover, the Fourier dimension of ν_{d-1} is $\min\{2, d-2\}$ and the Sobolev (and Frostman) dimension of ν_{d-1} is $d-1$.




FIGURE 2. The Fourier spectrum of ν_{d-1} on the cone C^{d-1} for $d = 3, \dots, 6$; see Proposition 6.2.

We defer the proof of the theorem to the end of the section; see Subsection 6.1.

From Theorem 3.1 we know that $\|\widehat{f\nu_{d-1}}\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\nu_{d-1})}$ if

$$q > 2 + 2 \inf_{\substack{\theta \in [0,1] \\ \dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu > d\theta}} \frac{(d - \alpha)(2 - \theta)}{\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu - \alpha\theta},$$

For $d = 3, 4$ the spectrum is affine, and we can do nothing more than recover Stein–Tomas (respectively, $q > 6, 4$), but this range is sharp in both of these cases. For $d \geq 5$ we can do better than Stein–Tomas. Here the infimum above is realised at the phase transition $\theta = \frac{d-4}{d-2}$ and, therefore, for any $f \in L^2(\nu_{d-1})$, the estimate $\|\widehat{f\nu_{d-1}}\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^2(\nu_{d-1})}$ holds if

$$q > \frac{3d - 4}{d - 2}.$$

The Stein–Tomas range for all $d \geq 5$ is $q > 4$. We also get a converse result from Theorem 3.4. For all $d \geq 3$, the Fourier spectrum crosses the diagonal $d\theta$ at $\theta = \frac{d-2}{d-1}$ and so Theorem 3.4 implies that the general restriction estimate (1.1) fails for

$$q < \frac{2(d - 1)}{d - 2}.$$

This outperforms the estimate $q < \frac{2d}{\dim_{\mathbb{S}} \nu_{d-1}} = \frac{2d}{d-1}$ for all $d \geq 3$ and, moreover, recovers the second condition in the cone restriction conjecture 6.1.




FIGURE 3. Bounds for the range of q for the restriction estimate (1.2) to hold for the cone in \mathbb{R}^d . The dashed lines are the Stein–Tomas upper bound and the Hambrook–Laba lower bound, the dotted line is the sharp result, and the solid lines are our upper and lower bounds for the threshold. These plots should be understood as only applying to integer points in the domain, but we included the full curve for aesthetic reasons.

6.1. **Proof of Proposition 6.2.** Throughout the proof we write $z = (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $u \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}$. We also write $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$ and $a \wedge b = \min\{a, b\}$ for real numbers a, b . First observe that, up to normalisation constant, ν_{d-1} disintegrates as

$$\int f(u, v) d\nu_{d-1}(u, v) = \int_0^1 v^{d-2} \int_{S^{d-2}} f(uv, v) d\sigma_{d-2}(u) dv$$

for $f \in L^1(\nu_{d-1})$ where σ_{d-2} is the surface measure on the $(d - 2)$ -dimensional sphere S^{d-2} in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\nu_{d-1}}(z) &= \int_0^1 v^{d-2} \int_{S^{d-2}} e^{-2\pi i(uv \cdot x + v \cdot y)} d\sigma_{d-2}(u) dv \\ &= \int_0^1 v^{d-2} \widehat{\sigma_{d-2}}(vx) e^{-2\pi i y v} dv \\ &= c(d-1)|x|^{\frac{3-d}{2}} \int_0^1 v^{\frac{d-1}{2}} J_{\frac{d-3}{2}}(2\pi v|x|) e^{-2\pi i y v} dv \quad (\text{by [Mat15, (3.41)]}) \end{aligned}$$

where $c(d - 1)$ is a constant depending on the ambient dimension $d - 1$ and $J_{\frac{d-3}{2}}$ is a Bessel function. We use the above expression to derive estimates for $|\widehat{\nu_{d-1}}(z)|$ in different situations depending on x, y .

Recall the standard asymptotic for Bessel functions (e.g. [Mat15, (3.37)]) which gives

$$J_m(t) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{\pi t}} \cos(t - \pi m/2 - \pi/4) + R_m(t) \tag{6.1}$$

where R_m is a smooth error function satisfying

$$|R_m(t)| \lesssim t^{-3/2}.$$

Inserting this above gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{\nu}_{d-1}(z)| &\lesssim |x|^{\frac{2-d}{2}} \left| \int_0^1 v^{\frac{d-2}{2}} \cos(2\pi v|x| - \frac{\pi}{4}(d-2)) e^{-2\pi i y v} dv \right| \\ &\quad + |x|^{\frac{3-d}{2}} \left| \int_0^1 v^{\frac{d-1}{2}} R_{\frac{d-3}{2}}(2\pi v|x|) e^{-2\pi i y v} dv \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

We estimate these integrals separately, starting with the first one. Both estimates use the method of stationary phase. Using Euler's identity,

$$\begin{aligned} &2 \left| \int_0^1 v^{\frac{d-2}{2}} \cos(2\pi v|x| - \frac{\pi}{4}(d-2)) e^{-2\pi i y v} dv \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_0^1 v^{\frac{d-2}{2}} e^{-2\pi i y v + i(2\pi v|x| - \frac{\pi}{4}(d-2))} dv \right| + \left| \int_0^1 v^{\frac{d-2}{2}} e^{-2\pi i y v - i(2\pi v|x| - \frac{\pi}{4}(d-2))} dv \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

Both of these integrals can be expressed as

$$\int_0^1 \psi(v) e^{i|y|\phi(v)} dv$$

for

$$\psi(v) = v^{\frac{d-2}{2}} e^{\pm i \frac{\pi}{4}(d-2)}$$

and

$$\phi(v) = -2\pi v \left(\operatorname{sgn}(y) \pm \frac{|x|}{|y|} \right).$$

Then

$$\phi'(v) \equiv -2\pi \left(\operatorname{sgn}(y) \pm \frac{|x|}{|y|} \right)$$

and, by the stationary phase estimate given in [Mat15, Corollary 14.3],

$$\left| \int_0^1 \psi(v) e^{i|y|\phi(v)} dv \right| \lesssim |y|^{-1} \left(|\psi(1)| + \int_0^1 |\psi'(v)| dv \right) \lesssim |y|^{-1}$$

whenever $\frac{|x|}{|y|}$ is bounded away from 1. This gives the following bound for the first term in (6.2):

$$|x|^{\frac{2-d}{2}} \left| \int_0^1 v^{\frac{d-2}{2}} \cos(2\pi v|x| - \frac{\pi}{4}(d-2)) e^{-2\pi i y v} dv \right| \lesssim |x|^{\frac{2-d}{2}} |y|^{-1} \quad (6.4)$$

whenever $\frac{|x|}{|y|}$ is bounded away from 1.

Now we consider the second term from (6.2). By the stationary phase estimate given in [Mat15, Corollary 14.3], we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^1 v^{\frac{d-1}{2}} R_{\frac{d-3}{2}}(2\pi v|x|) e^{-2\pi i y v} dv \right| &\lesssim |y|^{-1} \left(|R_{\frac{d-3}{2}}(2\pi|x|)| + \int_0^1 \left| \frac{d}{dv} v^{\frac{d-1}{2}} R_{\frac{d-3}{2}}(2\pi v|x|) \right| dv \right) \\ &\lesssim |y|^{-1} \left(|x|^{-3/2} + |x|^{-1/2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used basic properties of Bessel functions (see [Mat15, (3.36), (3.37), and (3.38)]) to obtain the final estimate. This gives the following bound for the second term in (6.2):

$$|x|^{\frac{3-d}{2}} \left| \int_0^1 v^{\frac{d-1}{2}} R_{\frac{d-3}{2}}(2\pi v|x|) e^{-2\pi i y v} dv \right| \lesssim |x|^{\frac{2-d}{2}} |y|^{-1}. \quad (6.5)$$

Combining (6.4), (6.5) and (6.2) we get

$$|\widehat{\nu}_{d-1}(z)| \lesssim |x|^{\frac{2-d}{2}} |y|^{-1} \quad (6.6)$$

whenever $\frac{|x|}{|y|}$ is bounded away from 1. Note that the above calculation in fact gives

$$|\widehat{\nu_{d-1}}(z)| \lesssim (|x|^{\frac{2-d}{2}} \wedge 1)(|y|^{-1} \wedge 1), \quad (6.7)$$

whenever $\frac{|x|}{|y|}$ is bounded away from 1. This aesthetically less pleasing but sharper estimate will be used in some cases below.

For $\frac{|x|}{|y|}$ close to 1 we need a different approach. By (6.2), we always have the bound

$$|\widehat{\nu_{d-1}}(z)| \lesssim |x|^{\frac{2-d}{2}} \quad (6.8)$$

but can beat this estimate even when $\frac{|x|}{|y|}$ is quite close to 1. For $\frac{|x|}{|y|} \neq 1$ we re-express the integrals from (6.3) as

$$\int_0^1 \psi(v) e^{i|y \pm |x||\phi(v)} dv$$

for

$$\psi(v) = v^{\frac{d-2}{2}} e^{\pm i\frac{\pi}{4}(d-2)}$$

and

$$\phi(v) = -2\pi v \operatorname{sgn}(y \pm |x|).$$

Then [Mat15, Corollary 14.3] gives

$$\int_0^1 \psi(v) e^{i|y \pm |x||\phi(v)} dv \lesssim |y \pm |x||^{-1}$$

and, using (6.2),

$$|\widehat{\nu_{d-1}}(z)| \lesssim |x|^{\frac{2-d}{2}} |y \pm |x||^{-1} \quad (6.9)$$

which beats (6.8) whenever $|y \pm |x|| \geq 1$. These estimates are enough for our purposes.

From now on fix $\theta \in (0, 1]$. We begin with the lower bound. Write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{s,\theta}(\nu_{d-1})^{1/\theta} &= \int_{\substack{z=(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}: \\ \frac{|x|}{|y|} \notin (1/2,2)}} |\widehat{\nu_{d-1}}(z)|^{\frac{2}{\theta}} |z|^{\frac{s}{\theta}-d} dz \\ &\quad + \int_{\substack{z=(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}: \\ \frac{|x|}{|y|} \in (1/2,2) \text{ and } |y \pm |x|| \geq 1}} |\widehat{\nu_{d-1}}(z)|^{\frac{2}{\theta}} |z|^{\frac{s}{\theta}-d} dz \\ &\quad + \int_{\substack{z=(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}: \\ \frac{|x|}{|y|} \in (1/2,2) \text{ and } |y \pm |x|| < 1}} |\widehat{\nu_{d-1}}(z)|^{\frac{2}{\theta}} |z|^{\frac{s}{\theta}-d} dz \\ &=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

We estimate these three integrals separately. Let $B_k(0, r)$ denote the open r -ball in \mathbb{R}^k centred at the origin. First, using (6.6) and (6.7),

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\lesssim \int_{\substack{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}: \\ |x| \geq |y| \geq 1}} \left(|x|^{\frac{2-d}{2}} |y|^{-1} \right)^{\frac{2}{\theta}} |x|^{\frac{s}{\theta}-d} dx dy \\ &\quad + \int_{\substack{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}: \\ 1 \leq |x| \leq |y|}} \left(|x|^{\frac{2-d}{2}} |y|^{-1} \right)^{\frac{2}{\theta}} |y|^{\frac{s}{\theta}-d} dx dy \\ &= \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \setminus B_{d-1}(0,1)} |x|^{\frac{s}{\theta}-d + \frac{2-d}{\theta}} \int_{\substack{y \in \mathbb{R}: \\ 1 \leq |y| \leq |x|}} |y|^{-\frac{2}{\theta}} dy dx \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \int_{y \in \mathbb{R} \setminus B_1(0,1)} |y|^{\frac{s}{\theta} - d - \frac{2}{\theta}} \int_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}: \\ 1 \leq |x| \leq |y|}} |x|^{\frac{2-d}{\theta}} dx dy \\
& \lesssim \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \setminus B_{d-1}(0,1)} |x|^{\frac{s}{\theta} - d + \frac{2-d}{\theta}} dx + \int_{y \in \mathbb{R} \setminus B_1(0,1)} |y|^{\frac{s}{\theta} - d - \frac{2}{\theta} + (d-1 + \frac{2-d}{\theta}) \vee 0} dy \\
& < \infty
\end{aligned}$$

provided

$$\frac{s}{\theta} - d + \frac{2-d}{\theta} < 1 - d$$

and

$$\frac{s}{\theta} - d - \frac{2}{\theta} + (d-1 + \frac{2-d}{\theta}) \vee 0 < -1,$$

that is, provided

$$s < \min \left\{ 2 + (d-1)\theta, (d-2) + \theta \right\}$$

which is consistent with the desired lower bound.

Turning to the second integral, using (6.9)

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 & \lesssim \int_{\substack{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}: \\ \frac{|x|}{|y|} \in (1/2,2) \text{ and } |y \pm |x|| \geq 1}} \left(|x|^{\frac{2-d}{2}} |y \pm |x||^{-1} \right)^{\frac{2}{\theta}} |x|^{\frac{s}{\theta} - d} dx dy \\
& \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \setminus B_{d-1}(0,1)} |x|^{\frac{2+s-d}{\theta} - d} \int_{\substack{y \in \mathbb{R}: \\ \frac{|x|}{|y|} \in (1/2,2) \text{ and } |y \pm |x|| \geq 1}} |y \pm |x||^{-\frac{2}{\theta}} dy dx \\
& \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \setminus B_{d-1}(0,1)} |x|^{\frac{2+s-d}{\theta} - d} \int_1^{|x|} \alpha^{-\frac{2}{\theta}} d\alpha dx \\
& \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \setminus B_{d-1}(0,1)} |x|^{\frac{2+s-d}{\theta} - d} dx \\
& < \infty
\end{aligned}$$

provided

$$\frac{2+s-d}{\theta} - d < 1 - d,$$

that is, provided

$$s < (d-2) + \theta$$

which is consistent with the desired lower bound.

Finally, for the third integral, using (6.8),

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3 & \lesssim \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \setminus B_{d-1}(0,1)} \int_{\substack{y \in \mathbb{R}: \\ |y \pm |x|| < 1}} |x|^{\frac{2-d}{\theta}} |x|^{\frac{s}{\theta} - d} dy dx \\
& \lesssim \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \setminus B_{d-1}(0,1)} |x|^{\frac{2+s-d}{\theta} - d} dx \\
& < \infty
\end{aligned}$$

provided

$$\frac{2+s-d}{\theta} - d < 1 - d,$$

that is, provided

$$s < (d-2) + \theta$$

which is consistent with the desired lower bound. Combining our estimates for I_1 , I_2 and I_3 , gives the desired lower bound.

We turn our attention to the upper bound. Fix $\varepsilon \in (0, 0.01)$ small. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}_{s,\theta}(\nu_{d-1})^{1/\theta} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\widehat{\nu_{d-1}}(x, y)|^{\frac{2}{\theta}} (|x| \vee |y|)^{\frac{s}{\theta}-d} dy dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \int_0^1 v^{d-2} \widehat{\sigma_{d-2}}(xv) e^{-2\pi i y \cdot v} dv \right|^{\frac{2}{\theta}} (|x| \vee |y|)^{\frac{s}{\theta}-d} dy dx \\
&\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \setminus B_{d-1}(0,1)} \int_{B_1(0,\varepsilon)} \left| \int_0^1 v^{d-2} \widehat{\sigma_{d-2}}(xv) e^{-2\pi i y \cdot v} dv \right|^{\frac{2}{\theta}} |x|^{\frac{s}{\theta}-d} dy dx \\
&\gtrsim_{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \setminus B_{d-1}(0,1)} \left| \int_0^1 v^{d-2} \widehat{\sigma_{d-2}}(xv) dv \right|^{\frac{2}{\theta}} |x|^{\frac{s}{\theta}-d} dx \\
&\approx \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \setminus B_{d-1}(0,1)} |x|^{-\frac{d-2}{\theta}} |x|^{\frac{s}{\theta}-d} dx \\
&= \infty
\end{aligned}$$

whenever $-\frac{d-2}{\theta} + \frac{s}{\theta} - d \geq -(d-1)$, proving $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \nu_{d-1} \leq (d-2) + \theta$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}_{s,\theta}(\nu_{d-1})^{1/\theta} &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus B_1(0,1)} \int_{B_{d-1}(0,\varepsilon)} \left| \int_0^1 v^{d-2} \widehat{\sigma_{d-2}}(xv) e^{-2\pi i y \cdot v} dv \right|^{\frac{2}{\theta}} |y|^{\frac{s}{\theta}-d} dx dy \\
&\gtrsim_{\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus B_1(0,1)} |y|^{-\frac{2}{\theta}} |y|^{\frac{s}{\theta}-d} dy \\
&= \infty
\end{aligned}$$

whenever $-\frac{2}{\theta} + \frac{s}{\theta} - d \geq -1$, proving $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \nu_{d-1} \leq 2 + (d-1)\theta$. This completes the proof.

7. APPLICATION 4: RESTRICTION FOR THE MOMENT CURVE

In this section we consider another important example in restriction theory and consider how our results compare with the Stein–Tomas range. For $d \geq 2$, let the moment curve (or Veronese curve) be defined by

$$V^d \{(t, t^2/2, \dots, t^d/d!) : t \in [0, 1]\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$$

and let ν denote the pushforward of Lebesgue measure onto the curve. Thus, ν is—up to a bi-Lipschitz density—the arclength measure on V^d . Despite being a 1-dimensional curve embedded in high ambient dimension, one can still get good estimates for Fourier decay and restriction due to the curvature. It is known that the extension estimate

$$\|\widehat{f\mu}\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^p(\mu)} \tag{7.1}$$

holds if and only if

$$q \geq \frac{d(d+1)p'}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad q > \frac{d^2+d+2}{2}, \tag{7.2}$$

and for $p = 2$ if and only if $q \geq d^2 + d$; see [Dru85]. We are most grateful to Jonathan Hickman for both suggesting the moment curve as an example to consider and completely solving it for us by pointing out that an explicit formula for the Fourier spectrum follows from estimates in [BGGIST07] for the averages

$$G_{\rho}(R) := \left(\int_{S^{d-1}} |\widehat{\nu}(R\omega)|^{\rho} d\sigma_{d-1}(\omega) \right)^{1/\rho}.$$

In particular, setting $\rho = \frac{2}{\theta}$ and using polar coordinates,

$$\mathcal{J}_{s,\theta}(\nu)^{1/\theta} = \int_0^\infty R^{\frac{s}{\theta}-1} G_{\frac{s}{\theta}}(R)^{\frac{2}{\theta}} dR$$

and applying [BGGIST07, Theorems 1.2–1.3, for $K = d$], we get the following. This example is noteworthy because we have not yet seen a natural example exhibiting multiple phase transitions.

Proposition 7.1. *Let $d \geq 2$ be an integer and ν be the arclength measure on the moment curve. Then*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^\theta \nu = \min_{k=2,\dots,d} \frac{2}{k} + \frac{k^2 - k - 2}{2k} \theta.$$

In particular, $\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \nu = 2/d$, the Fourier spectrum coincides with the Hausdorff dimension of the curve for $\theta \geq 1/2$ and the Fourier spectrum has $d - 2$ phase transitions occurring at

$$\theta = \frac{4}{k^2 - k + 2} \quad (k = 3, \dots, d).$$

Finally, $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^\theta \nu > d\theta$ holds for all

$$0 \leq \theta < \frac{4}{d^2 + d + 2}.$$

In fact [BGGIST07] treats much more general curves, in particular, allowing less curvature than the moment curve. By carefully examining their results, one can derive the Fourier spectrum more generally, but we leave this to the interested reader.




FIGURE 4. The Fourier spectrum of the arclength measure on the moment curve in \mathbb{R}^8 ; see Proposition 7.1. There are 6 phase transitions and the Fourier dimension is $1/4$.

Let us now examine extension estimates coming from Proposition 7.1. For $p = 2$, the Stein–Tomas range is

$$q \geq 2d^2 - 2d + 2$$

and Theorem 3.1 obtains the range

$$q > d^2 + d + 2,$$

which is the sharp bound plus 2. Moreover, for $d \geq 4$ the range in Theorem 3.1 is optimised (uniquely) at $\theta = \frac{4}{d^2+d+2}$. On the other hand, Theorem 3.4 shows that the general extension estimate (7.1) fails for

$$q < \frac{d^2 + d + 2}{2},$$

whereas applying the Hambrook–Laba bound only gives failure for $q < d$. It is perhaps interesting to note that the bound coming from Theorem 3.4 is sharp and provides the right-hand side estimate in (7.2). This was also the case for the cone, recall Conjecture 6.1, and the sphere, recall the discussion after Theorem 3.4.




FIGURE 5. Bounds for the range of q for the extension estimate (1.2) to hold for the moment curve in \mathbb{R}^d . The dashed lines are the Stein–Tomas upper bound and the Hambrook–Laba lower bound, the dotted line is the sharp result, and the solid lines are our upper and lower bounds for the threshold. These plots should be understood as only applying to integer points in the domain, but we included the full curve for aesthetic reasons.

8. APPLICATION 5: RESTRICTION ON FRACTALS

8.1. Multifractal measures on the 1/3-Cantor set. We saw in Lemma 3.2 that it does not make sense to restrict the Fourier transform to measures that do not have Fourier decay. That said, examples of multifractal measures with positive Fourier dimension abound. Indeed, in [Sol21] Solomyak proved that outside of a set of parameters of Hausdorff dimension zero, all self-similar measures supported on the line have positive Fourier dimension. However, finding explicit examples of such measures can be very difficult, and since we do not know of any, we will add a small amount of ‘noise’ to a concrete family of multifractal measures, which will result in a new family that will exhibit both multifractal behaviour and polynomial Fourier decay.

Let $p > 1/2$ and μ_p be the (self-similar) measure on the 1/3 Cantor set associated to probabilities p and $(1 - p)$. Then, by direct calculation or appealing to the extensive literature e.g. [Fal14],

$$\dim_{\text{F}} \mu_p = 0; \quad \dim_{\text{Fr}} \mu_p = \frac{\log p}{-\log 3}; \quad \dim_{\text{S}} \mu_p = \frac{\log(p^2 + (1 - p)^2)}{-\log 3}.$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and ν_ε be a Salem measure of dimension ε .

Consider the measure $m = \mu_p * \nu_\varepsilon$. By [Fra24, Theorem 6.1], for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$, $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^\theta m \geq \dim_{\mathbb{F}}^\theta \mu_p + \varepsilon$.

If $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{1/2} m > 1/2$, we may fix $\theta = 1/2$ in Theorem 3.1, which gives the range

$$q > 2 + \frac{2(1-\alpha)(2-\frac{1}{2})}{\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{1/2} m - \frac{\alpha}{2}} = 2 + \frac{6(1-\alpha)}{2 \dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{1/2} m - \alpha} \quad (8.1)$$

for the restriction estimate to hold, where $\alpha = \dim_{\mathbb{F}} m$.

Since $\mu_p * \mu_p$ is a self-similar measure satisfying the open set condition with a system of 3 maps and weights p^2 , $(1-p)^2$ and $2p(1-p)$, then the Fourier spectrum of μ_p at $\theta = 1/2$ is, by [Fra24, Lemma 6.2],

$$\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{1/2} \mu_p = \frac{\dim_{\mathbb{S}}(\mu_p * \mu_p)}{2} = \frac{\log(p^4 + (2p(1-p))^2 + (1-p)^4)}{-2 \log 3}.$$

Therefore,

$$\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{1/2} m \geq \frac{\log(p^4 + (2p(1-p))^2 + (1-p)^4)}{-2 \log 3} + \varepsilon,$$

where we choose ε small, but large enough so that $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{1/2} m > 1/2$.

To bound $\alpha = \dim_{\mathbb{F}} m$ from below let $\beta < \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu$, $\delta < \varepsilon = \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \nu_\varepsilon$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $r > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} m(B(x, r)) &= \iint 1_{B(x, r)}(u+v) d\mu(u) d\nu_\varepsilon(v) \\ &= \int_{B(x, r)} \int_{B(x, r)-v} d\mu(u) d\nu_\varepsilon(v) \\ &= \int_{B(x, r)} \mu(B(x-v, r)) d\nu_\varepsilon(v) \\ &\lesssim r^{\beta+\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

and letting $\beta \rightarrow \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu$ and $\delta \rightarrow \varepsilon$ shows that $\alpha \geq \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu_p + \varepsilon$.

Since $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{1/2} m > 1/2$, as a function of α , $\frac{6(1-\alpha)}{2 \dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{1/2} m - \alpha}$ is decreasing. Replacing the obtained bounds on the right-hand side of (8.1) we get that restriction is possible if

$$q > 2 + \frac{6(\log 3 + \log p - \varepsilon \log 3)}{\log p + \varepsilon \log 3 - \log(p^4 + (2p(1-p))^2 + (1-p)^4)}. \quad (8.2)$$

On the other hand, Stein–Tomas gives the range

$$q > 2 + \frac{4(\log 3 + \log p - \varepsilon \log 3)}{\varepsilon \log 3}. \quad (8.3)$$

For example, if $p = 0.6$, to have $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{1/2} m > 1/2$ we need $\varepsilon \geq 0.067$. Our results would still apply for smaller ε (and always give a non-trivial range for restriction, see Subsection 8.2) but we would need to use a smaller value of θ . The problem is then that we do not know the Fourier spectrum of μ_p explicitly other than at $\theta = 1/2$. For this threshold value of $\varepsilon = 0.067$, the range of (8.2) is $q > 7.99$ and the Stein–Tomas range (8.3) is $q > 29.95$.




FIGURE 6. Lower bound on the range of q for the restriction estimate (1.2) to hold for the measure $\mu_{0.6} * \nu_\varepsilon$, as a function of ε . Note that the bound obtained from Theorem 3.1 is only valid for values of ε greater than 0.067.

Curiously, if in the previous example we set $\varepsilon = 0.7$, then from Figure 6 or by direct calculation, we can see that the Stein–Tomas range (8.3) is better than the one given by Theorem 3.1 with $\theta = 1/2$, (8.2). This implies that for such values of ε , the improvement on the Stein–Tomas result will come from another value $\theta < 1/2$; see previous discussion and subsequent section.

8.2. Measures on a large family of fractals. Here we consider a variant on the family of examples from the previous section where we replace the concrete family of self-similar measures μ_p with a large family of measures satisfying a mild non-concentration condition (certainly the measures μ_p are in this family as well as many other examples). As in the previous example, these measures do not have polynomial Fourier decay, and so in order to make sense of restriction we will convolve them with a Salem measure of small dimension. If we make this ‘noise’ small, we get better restriction estimates than those provided by Stein–Tomas’.

Let μ be a non-negative, finite, compactly supported, Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^d which satisfies: $\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu = 0$, $\dim_{\mathbb{S}} \mu < d$, and that the upper right semi-derivative of $\theta \mapsto \dim_{\mathbb{F}}^\theta \mu$ at $\theta = 0$ is d . In particular, since $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^\theta \mu \leq \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu + d\theta$ this derivative condition says that the Fourier spectrum has the largest possible growth at $\theta = 0$. This seemingly artificial condition turns out to be satisfied very generally due to work of Khalil [Kha23+]. We say that a Borel measure μ' on \mathbb{R}^d is uniformly affinely non-concentrated if there exist $s > 0$, $C \geq 1$ such that for every $\delta > 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $0 < r \leq 1$ and hyperplane $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mu'(W^{(\delta r)} \cap B(x, r)) \leq C\delta^s \mu(B(x, r))$$

where $W^{(\delta r)}$ is the δr neighbourhood of W . In particular, many families of dynamically defined measures satisfy this condition. It turns out that if such a measure μ' has Fourier dimension zero, then it satisfies our derivative condition. Indeed, by [Fra24, Lemma 6.2] and [Kha23+, Theorem 1.6],

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^\theta \mu'}{\theta} = d.$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be small and ν_ε be a Salem measure on \mathbb{R}^d of dimension ε . We consider the measure $m = \mu * \nu_\varepsilon$ and our goal is to establish a restriction estimate for m with an optimal range as

$\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Since we assume $\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mu = 0$, we cannot do any better in general than the estimate $\dim_{\mathbb{F}} m \geq \varepsilon$ and therefore the Stein–Tomas range for restriction (1.6) to hold is

$$q > 2 + \frac{4(d - \dim_{\mathbb{F}} m)}{\varepsilon} = \Omega(\varepsilon^{-1}).$$

Similarly, considering the Fourier spectrum, the best estimate we can get in general is $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} m \geq \dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu + \varepsilon$. Let $\theta_0 \in (0, 1)$ be chosen such that $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta_0} \mu + \varepsilon = d\theta_0$, noting that this choice is unique. Then Corollary 3.3 gives that restriction (1.6) holds for

$$q > \frac{4}{\theta_0} = o(\varepsilon^{-1}).$$

In particular, we obtain an asymptotically better range for restriction as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The fact that $\theta_0^{-1} = o(\varepsilon^{-1})$ follows since the upper right semi-derivative of $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu$ at $\theta = 0$ is d . That is, for every $\eta > 0$, there will exist $\theta > 0$ such that $(d - \eta)\theta < \dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu$ and thus $\theta_0 > \varepsilon/\eta$ for ε small enough.

In certain situations we can say more. For example, if $\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu$ is twice (right) continuously differentiable at $\theta = 0$ (and still assuming that the first right derivative is d) then, by Taylor's theorem,

$$\dim_{\mathbb{F}}^{\theta} \mu = d\theta - |O(\theta^2)|$$

and so Corollary 3.3 gives that restriction (1.6) holds for

$$q > \frac{4}{\theta_0} = O(\varepsilon^{-1/2}).$$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Jonathan Hickman, Chun-Kit Lai, and Bochen Liu for helpful discussions and suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [Bar85] B. Barcelo. On the Restriction of the Fourier Transform to a Conical Surface. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **292**, pp. 321–333 (1985).
- [BS11] J.-G. Bak and A. Seeger. Extensions of the Stein–Tomas Theorem. *Math. Res. Lett.*, **18**(4), pp. 767–781 (2011).
- [BGGIST07] L. Brandolini, G. Gigante, A. Greenleaf, A. Iosevich, A. Seeger, and G. Travaglini. Average decay estimates for Fourier transforms of measures supported on curves. *J. Geom. Anal.*, **17**(1), pp. 15–40, (2007).
- [CFdO24+] M. Carnovale, J. M. Fraser and A. E. de Orellana. Obtaining the Fourier spectrum via Fourier coefficients. preprint: [arXiv:2403.12603](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.12603) (2024).
- [Che14] X. Chen. A Fourier restriction theorem based on convolution powers. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **142**(11), pp. 3897–3901 (2014).
- [Che16] X. Chen. Sets of Salem type and sharpness of the L^2 -Fourier restriction theorem. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **368**(3), pp. 1959–1977 (2016).
- [CS72] L. Carleson and P. Sjölin. Oscillatory integrals and multiplier problem for the disc. *Studia Math.*, **44**, pp. 287–299 (1972).
- [CS17] X. Chen and A. Seeger. Convolution Powers of Salem Measures With Applications. *Canad. J. Math.*, **69**(2), pp. 284–320 (2017).
- [Dem20] C. Demeter. *Fourier Restriction, Decoupling, and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, (2020).

- [Dru85] S. W. Drury. Restrictions of Fourier transforms to curves, *Annales de l'institut Fourier*, **35**(1), 117–123, (1985).
- [Fal14] K. J. Falconer. *Fractal Geometry: Mathematical Foundations and Applications*, John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ, 3rd. ed., (2014).
- [Fef70] C. Fefferman. Inequalities for strongly singular convolution operators. *Acta Math.*, **124**, pp. 9–36 (1970).
- [Fra24] J. M. Fraser. The Fourier spectrum and sunset type problems, *Math. Ann.*, **390**, pp. 3891–3930 (2024).
- [FdO24+] J. M. Fraser and A. E. de Orellana. A Fourier analytic approach to exceptional set estimates for orthogonal projections. *Indiana U. Math. J.* (to appear), preprint: [arXiv:2404.11179](https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.11179) (2024).
- [Kha23+] O. Khalil. Exponential Mixing Via Additive Combinatorics. Preprint, available at: [arXiv:2305.00527](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.00527), (2023).
- [HL13] K. Hambrook and I. Laba. On the Sharpness of Mockenhaupt's Restriction Theorem. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, **23**, pp. 1262–1277 (2013).
- [HL16] K. Hambrook and I. Laba. On the Sharpness of Mockenhaupt–Mitsis–Bak–Seeger Restriction Theorem in Higher Dimensions. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, **48**, pp. 757–770 (2016).
- [LL24+] L. Li and B. Liu. Dimension of Diophantine approximation and applications. preprint: [arXiv:2409.12826](https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.12826) (2024).
- [LP22] Y. Liang and M. Pramanik. Fourier dimension and avoidance of linear patterns. *Adv. Math.*, **399**(108252), (2022).
- [LW18] I. Laba and H. Wang. Decoupling and Near-optimal Restriction Estimates for Cantor Sets. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, **2018**(9), pp. 2944–2966 (2018).
- [Mat15] P. Mattila. *Fourier analysis and Hausdorff dimension*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, **150**, Cambridge, (2015).
- [Mit02] T. Mitsis. A Stein–Tomas restriction theorem for general measures. *Publ. Math. Debrecen*, **60**, pp. 89–99 (2002).
- [Moc00] G. Mockenhaupt. Salem sets and restriction properties of Fourier transforms. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, **10**, pp. 1579–1587 (2000).
- [OeS24] D. Oliveira e Silva. Correction to: The endpoint Stein–Tomas inequality: old and new. *São Paulo J. Math. Sci.* (2024).
- [OW22] Y. Ou and H. Wang. A cone restriction estimate using polynomial partitioning. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, **24**, pp. 3557–3595 (2022).
- [Sal51] K. Salem. On singular monotonic functions whose spectrum has a given Hausdorff dimension. *Ark. Mat.*, **1**, pp. 353–365 (1951).
- [SS18] P. Shmerkin and V. Suomala. *Spatially independent martingales, intersections, and applications*. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society. **251**(1195), Cambridge, (2018).
- [Sol21] B. Solomyak. Fourier decay of self-similar measures. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **149**, pp. 3277–3291 (2021).
- [Ste93] E. M. Stein. *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ. With the assistance of T. S. Murphy, (1993).
- [Str77] R. Strichartz. Restrictions of Fourier transforms to quadratic surfaces and decay of solutions of wave equations. *Duke Math. J.*, **44**, pp. 477–478 (1977).
- [Tom75] P. A. Tomas. A restriction theorem for the Fourier transform. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **81**, pp. 705–714 (1975).

[Wol01] T. Wolff. A Sharp Bilinear Cone Restriction Estimate. *Ann Of Math.*, **153**, pp. 661-698 (2001).

Marc Carnovale

Email address: carnom2@nationwide.com

Jonathan M. Fraser, University of St Andrews, Scotland

Email address: jmf32@st-andrews.ac.uk

A. E. de Orellana, University of St Andrews, Scotland

Email address: aedo1@st-andrews.ac.uk