

# PROBABILISTIC CONSTRUCTION OF KAKEYA-TYPE SETS IN $\mathbb{R}^2$ ASSOCIATED TO SEPARATED SETS OF DIRECTIONS

PAUL HAGELSTEIN, BLANCA RADILLO-MURGUIA, AND ALEXANDER STOKOLOS

ABSTRACT. We provide a condition on a set of directions  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^1$  ensuring that the associated directional maximal operator  $M_\Omega$  is unbounded on  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$  for every  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . The techniques of proof extend ideas of Bateman and Katz involving probabilistic construction of Kakeya-type sets involving sticky maps and Bernoulli percolation.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This paper addresses problems associated to the  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$  boundedness of directional maximal operators acting on measurable functions on  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . In particular we provide a condition on a set of directions so that the associated maximal operator is unbounded on  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$  for every  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . Our research extends the classical work of Nikodym [11] and Busemann and Feller [3] indicating the existence of Kakeya-type sets that prove that the directional maximal operator associated to the set of all directions in  $\mathbb{S}^1$  is unbounded on  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$  for every  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . It more closely relates, however, to the more recent work of Bateman and Katz [2] and Bateman [1] that indicates how probabilistic techniques may be used to show that certain directional maximal operators are unbounded on  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$  for every  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . A particularly noteworthy result in [2] in this regard due to Bateman and Katz is that if  $\Omega$  is the Cantor ternary set in  $[0, 1]$ , then the associated directional maximal operator  $M_\Omega$  acting on measurable functions in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  is unbounded on  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$  for all  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . The goal of this paper is to show that the primary ideas of the paper of Bateman and Katz may, with appropriate modifications, yield similar results for sets that are not lacunary of finite order but satisfy a certain “separation” condition.

The paper [1] contains a theorem asserting that, if  $\Omega$  is a subset of  $\mathbb{S}^1$  that is not the union of finitely many sets of finite lacunary order, then the associated maximal operator  $M_\Omega$  is not bounded on  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$  for any  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . We have recently uncovered a subtle quantitative error in the proof of this theorem that is discussed in Section 4 of this paper. At the present time, to the best of our knowledge, the correctness of the statement of this theorem is unknown. That being said, extension and modification of techniques in [1] do

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 42B25.

*Key words and phrases*. maximal functions, differentiation basis.

P. H. is partially supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation (#521719 to Paul Hagelstein).

enable us to assert for a wide class of sets of directions  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^1$  that the associated directional maximal operators  $M_\Omega$  are unbounded on  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$  for every  $1 \leq p < \infty$ .

In our paper, we will associate to a given set of directions  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^1$  a lacunary value  $\lambda(\Omega)$ . The definition of the lacunary value  $\lambda(\Omega)$  will be very much in the spirit of Bateman's paper [1]. In addition to the lacunary value  $\lambda(\Omega)$  associated to a given set of directions  $\Omega$ , we will introduce the notion that a set of directions is  $\eta$ -separated. Loosely speaking, we would say that the ternary Cantor set is  $\frac{1}{3}$ -separated as the distance between the intervals  $[0, \frac{1}{3}]$  and  $[\frac{2}{3}, 1]$  is  $\frac{1}{3}$  the length of the ambient interval  $[0, 1]$ , with a similar relation holding for subsequent intervals in the natural construction of the ternary Cantor set. This positive ratio is crucial in the Bateman and Katz proof that the directional maximal operator associated to a Cantor set is unbounded on  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$  for all  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . However, as we shall see, this positive ratio does *not* exist for general sets of infinite lacunary value, prohibiting the type of Bernoulli ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) percolation argument used by Bateman and Katz in [2] to also be used in the same manner to show that if  $\Omega$  is a set of directions in  $\mathbb{S}^1$  with  $\lambda(\Omega) = \infty$ , then  $M_\Omega$  is necessarily unbounded on  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$  for every  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . The main result in our paper is that, if  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^1$  is such that, for some  $\eta > 0$ ,  $\Omega$  contains  $\eta$ -separated subsets  $\Omega_N$  with  $\lambda(\Omega_N) = N$  for every natural number  $N$ , then  $M_\Omega$  is unbounded on  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$  for every  $1 \leq p < \infty$ .

The organization of the paper is as follows. In the second section we will define certain terminology used in the paper, indicating what we mean by the lacunary value  $\lambda(\Omega)$  of a set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^1$  and the directional maximal operator  $M_\Omega$  associated to  $\Omega$ . We will also define the  $\eta$ -separation condition. In this section we will state the main theorem of the paper as well as provide an overview of the structure of the main theorem, indicating, motivated by Bateman's paper, that there exists positive constants  $c_\eta$  and  $C_{\eta,N}$  so that  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} C_{\eta,N} = \infty$  and so that if  $\Omega$  contains an  $\eta$ -separated subset of lacunary value  $N$ , then there exist sets  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  constructed probabilistically such that  $|K_1| \geq C_{\eta,N}|K_2|$  and such that  $M_\Omega \chi_{K_2} > c_\eta$  on  $K_1$ . In this section we will recall lower estimates on the measures of all  $K_1$ -type sets as provided by Bateman. Section 3 will be devoted to the probabilistic construction of a  $K_2$ -type set whose measure satisfies a desired upper estimate. In Section 4 we will provide an example of a set  $\Omega_N \subset \mathbb{S}^1$  that is  $N$ -lacunary but such that, letting  $\mathcal{T}_{\Omega_N}$  be the subset associated to  $\Omega$  of the binary tree and defining for each sticky map  $\sigma : \mathcal{B}^h(\mathcal{T}_\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_\Omega$  the associated set  $K_\sigma$  as in [1], we have  $\sup_{\substack{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \\ x \geq 1}} Pr((x,y) \in K_\sigma) = 1$ , where the probability is taken over all such sticky maps. This provides a counterexample to Claim 7(A) of Theorem 1 of [1]. In Section 5 we will provide an example of a set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^1$  such that, given  $\eta > 0$ ,  $\Omega$  is not contained in an  $\eta$ -separated set of lacunary value  $N$  for any finite value of  $N$ . Additionally we will make concluding remarks and make suggestions for further research in this area.

## 2. TERMINOLOGY AND STATEMENT OF MAIN THEOREM

Let  $\Omega$  be a nonempty subset of  $\mathbb{S}^1$ . We may associate to  $\Omega$  the directional maximal operator  $M_\Omega$  acting on measurable functions on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  by

$$M_\Omega f(x) := \sup_{x \in R} \frac{1}{|R|} \int_R |f|,$$

where the supremum is taken over the set of all rectangles in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  of positive measure containing  $x$  with an edge of longest length being oriented in one of the points (directions) of  $\Omega$ .

For the remainder of the paper we will assume, without loss of generality, that  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^1$  is such that, for every  $\omega \in \Omega$ , the line  $\ell \in \mathbb{R}^2$  passing through the origin and  $\omega$  intersects the line segment

$$\{(1, u) : 0 \leq u \leq 1\}$$

at a point  $\omega_Q$ . For convenience, we will identify  $\Omega$  with the set

$$Q_\Omega := \{u : (1, u) = \omega_Q \text{ for some } \omega \in \Omega\}$$

or more simply identify  $\Omega$  with a subset of  $[0, 1]$ .

We now indicate how we will denote dyadic subintervals of  $[0, 1]$ . Let  $Q_0$  denote the interval  $[0, 1]$ . Let  $Q_{00}, Q_{01}$  denote the two pairwise closed a.e. disjoint dyadic subintervals of  $Q_0$  whose union forms  $Q_0$ , where all members of  $Q_{00}$  are less than or equal to any member of  $Q_{01}$ . Continuing recursively, given  $j_i \in \{0, 1\}$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , we let  $Q_{0j_1 \dots j_k 0}, Q_{0j_1 \dots j_k 1}$  denote the two pairwise a.e. disjoint dyadic intervals of  $Q_{0j_1 \dots j_k}$  whose union forms  $Q_{0j_1 \dots j_k}$ , where all members of  $Q_{0j_1 \dots j_k 0}$  are less than or equal to any member of  $Q_{0j_1 \dots j_k 1}$ . If  $u$  is the binary string  $0j_1j_2 \dots j_k$ , we may abbreviate the interval  $Q_{0j_1j_2 \dots j_k}$  by  $Q_u$ . When convenient, we will also let  $u = 0j_1j_2 \dots j_k$  denote the interval  $[\sum_{i=1}^k 2^{-i} j_i, \sum_{i=1}^k 2^{-i} j_i + 2^{-k}]$ .

We define the binary tree  $\mathcal{B}$  to be the graph whose vertex set consists of 0 and all finite strings of the form  $0a_1a_2 \dots a_k$  where each  $a_i \in \{0, 1\}$ , and whose edge set is the collection of unordered pairs of vertices of the form  $(0, 0a_1)$  or  $(0a_1 \dots a_{k-1}, 0a_1 \dots a_{k-1}a_k)$ .

Given  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ , we define  $\mathcal{T}_\Omega$  to be the smallest subtree of  $\mathcal{B}$  containing 0 and all of the vertices of the form  $0a_1a_2 \dots a_k$  such that  $Q_{0a_1a_2 \dots a_k} \cap Q_\Omega \neq \emptyset$ .

Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a subtree of  $\mathcal{B}$ . Any vertex  $v \in \mathcal{T}$  of the form  $v = 0a_1 \dots a_k$  is said to be of *height*  $k$ , and we may write  $h(v) = k$ .  $0 \in \mathcal{T}$  is considered to be of height 0. If  $u, v \in \mathcal{T}$ , an edge in  $\mathcal{B}$  exists connecting  $u$  and  $v$ , and  $h(v) = 1 + h(u)$ ,  $u$  is considered to be a *parent* of  $v$  and  $v$  is considered to be a *child* of  $u$ . If  $u_j$  is a parent of  $u_{j+1}$  for  $j = 0, \dots, k-1$ , then  $u_j$  is considered to be an *ancestor* of  $u_k$  and  $u_k$  is considered to be a *descendant* of  $u_j$ . If the vertex  $u \in \mathcal{T}$  has two children in  $\mathcal{T}$ , then the vertex  $u$  is considered to *split in*  $\mathcal{T}$ , and we may also refer to  $u$  as a *splitting vertex*.

If  $\mathcal{T}$  is a subtree of  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $N$  is a natural number, we define  $\mathcal{T}^N$  to be the truncation of  $\mathcal{T}$  to all of its vertices of height less than or equal to  $N$ .

A ray  $R$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  is said to be a (possibly infinite) maximal ordered collection of vertices  $v_1, v_2, v_3, \dots$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  such that  $h(v_{j+1}) = 1 + h(v_j)$ . It is maximal in the sense that the ray does

not terminate at a vertex  $v \in \mathcal{T}$  if  $v$  has any descendants in  $\mathcal{T}$ . If  $v \in \mathcal{T}$ , the set of rays starting at  $v$  of the form  $v, v_2, v_3, \dots$  is labeled by  $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{T}}(v)$ .

Given a tree  $\mathcal{T}$  and a ray  $R$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ , we define the splitting number  $\text{split}(R)$  of  $R$  to be the number (possibly infinite) of vertices that split in  $\mathcal{T}$  that lie on  $R$ . The splitting number of a vertex  $v$  in a tree  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{B}$  is defined by

$$\text{split}_{\mathcal{S}}(v) := \min_{R \in \mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{S}}(v)} \text{split}(R) .$$

The splitting number of a vertex  $v$  in a tree  $\mathcal{T}$  is defined by

$$\text{split}(v) := \sup_{\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{T}} \text{split}_{\mathcal{S}}(v) ,$$

where the supremum is over all subtrees  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  all of whose vertices are of height at least that of  $v$ . We define

$$\text{split}(\mathcal{T}) := \sup_{v \in \mathcal{T}} \text{split}(v) .$$

Given  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ , we define the *lacunary value*  $\lambda(\Omega)$  by

$$\lambda(\Omega) := \text{split}(\mathcal{T}_{\Omega}) .$$

Although this terminology is motivated by that of Sjögren and Sjölin [12] and Bateman [1], a few words of caution are in order here. To begin with, the lacunary value does not agree with what is typically considered the lacunary order of a set. As an example, if  $\Omega = \{1/2\}$ , then  $\lambda(\Omega) = 1$  since  $1/2$  has a binary representation of both  $.100000$  and  $.0111\dots$ . Similarly, multiple binary representations of numbers of the form  $1/2^j$  lead us to have that the lacunary value of the set  $\{1/2, 1/4, 1/8, \dots\}$  is 2 although this set is typically considered to have lacunary order 1. It is for this reason that we refer to a lacunary value of a set as opposed to a lacunary order. We suppose we could get around this issue by associating to any point in  $\Omega$  a single ray, say by choosing a ray that was minimal with respect to a type of dictionary order, but this would create a certain degree of artificiality that we wish to avoid. At any rate, the lacunary value  $\lambda(\Omega)$  that we define agrees with the splitting number  $\text{split}(\mathcal{T}_{\Omega})$  defined by Bateman, so our definition would seem to be reasonable.

Again following terminology in Bateman [1], we state that a tree  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{B}$  is *lacunary of order 0* if  $\mathcal{T}$  consists of a single ray containing 0, and that  $\mathcal{T}$  is lacunary of order  $N$  if all of the splitting vertices of  $\mathcal{T}$  lie on a lacunary tree of order  $N - 1$ .

If  $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{B}$  is lacunary of order  $N$  and of finite height  $h(\mathcal{P})$ , we say that  $\mathcal{P}$  is *pruned* provided every ray in  $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{P}}(0)$  contains exactly one vertex  $v_j$  that splits in  $\mathcal{P}$  such that  $\text{split}_{\mathcal{P}}(v_j) = j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq N$ .

Given  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ , note the lacunary value  $\lambda(\Omega)$  of  $\Omega$  satisfies the equality

$$\lambda(\Omega) = \sup \{N : \mathcal{T}_{\Omega} \text{ contains a lacunary tree of order } N\} .$$

Let  $0 < \eta$ . We say that a tree  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{B}$  is  $\eta$ -*separated* provided for any splitting vertex  $0a_1a_2\dots a_k$  any two descendants  $u$  and  $v$  that are splitting vertices and lying on separate halves of the interval  $Q_{0a_1a_2\dots a_k}$  must be such that the Euclidean distance between the intervals  $Q_u$  and  $Q_v$  is greater than or equal to  $\eta$  times the length of the interval  $Q_{0a_1a_2\dots a_k}$ .

We are now in position to state the main theorem of the paper.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ . Suppose there exists  $\eta > 0$  so that, for every natural number  $N$ , the tree  $\mathcal{T}_\Omega$  contains an  $\eta$ -separated subtree that is lacunary of order  $N$ . Then the maximal operator  $M_\Omega$  is unbounded on  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$  for every  $1 \leq p < \infty$ .*

For any natural number  $N$ , a function  $f : \mathcal{B}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^N$  is called a *sticky map* provided  $h(f(u)) = h(u)$  for every  $u \in \mathcal{B}^N$  and moreover such that  $f(u)$  is an ancestor of  $f(v)$  whenever  $u$  is an ancestor of  $v$ .

Let  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{B}$  be a tree of finite height whose vertices consist of a collection of vertices  $\{v_j\}$ , all of height  $h(\mathcal{T})$ , together with all of the ancestors of these vertices. To every sticky map  $\sigma : \mathcal{B}^{h(\mathcal{T})} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$  we may associate a set  $K_\sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  as follows.

Let  $d_{\sigma, 0j_1 \dots j_{h(\mathcal{T})}} \in [0, 1]$  be the left hand endpoint of the interval  $Q_{0k_1 \dots k_{h(\mathcal{T})}}$ , where

$$\sigma(0j_1 j_2 \dots j_{h(\mathcal{T})}) = 0k_1 k_2 \dots k_{h(\mathcal{T})}.$$

We let  $\rho_{\sigma, 0j_1 \dots j_{h(\mathcal{T})}}$  denote the union of all lines in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  passing through the interval  $0 \times Q_{0j_1 \dots j_{h(\mathcal{T})}}$  oriented in the direction  $(1, d_{\sigma, 0j_1 \dots j_{h(\mathcal{T})}})$ . We define

$$K_\sigma = \bigcup_{\substack{j_1, \dots, j_{h(\mathcal{T})} \\ j_i \in \{0, 1\}}} \rho_{\sigma, 0j_1 \dots j_{h(\mathcal{T})}}.$$

We set

$$K_{\sigma, 1} = K_\sigma \cap \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 \leq x_1 \leq 1\}$$

and

$$K_{\sigma, 2, \eta} = K_\sigma \cap \left\{ (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \frac{1}{\eta} \leq x_1 \leq \frac{1}{\eta} + 1 \right\}.$$

**Lemma 1** (Bateman [1]). *Suppose  $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{B}$  is a pruned tree that is lacunary of order  $N$  and of finite height  $h(\mathcal{P})$ . Moreover suppose  $\mathcal{P}$  contains  $2^N$  vertices of height  $h(\mathcal{P})$ . Then*

$$|K_{\sigma, 1}| \gtrsim \frac{\log N}{N}$$

holds for every sticky map  $\sigma : \mathcal{B}^{h(\mathcal{P})} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ .

**Lemma 2.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{B}$  is an  $\eta$ -separated pruned tree that is lacunary of order  $N$  and of finite height  $h(\mathcal{P})$ . Moreover suppose  $\mathcal{P}$  contains  $2^N$  vertices of height  $h(\mathcal{P})$ . Then there exists a sticky map  $\sigma : \mathcal{B}^{h(\mathcal{P})} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  such that*

$$|K_{\sigma, 2, \eta}| \lesssim_\eta \frac{1}{N}.$$

Note Lemma 1 is essentially Claim 7A of [1]. To prove Theorem 1 it suffices to prove Lemma 2. To see this, suppose the hypotheses of Theorem 1 are satisfied. Then, given  $N > 0$ , there exists an  $\eta$ -separated pruned tree  $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{T}_\Omega$  of finite height  $h(\mathcal{P})$  with  $2^N$  vertices of height  $h(\mathcal{P})$  that is lacunary of order  $N$  and a sticky map  $\sigma : \mathcal{B}^{h(\mathcal{P})} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  such that the associated sets  $K_{\sigma,1}$  and  $K_{\sigma,2,\eta}$  satisfy  $|K_{\sigma,1}| \gtrsim \frac{\log N}{N}$  and  $|K_{\sigma,2,\eta}| \lesssim_\eta \frac{1}{N}$ . Since  $M_\Omega \chi_{K_{\sigma,2,\eta}} \gtrsim \eta$  on  $K_{\sigma,1}$ , we have the desired result.

### 3. PROOF OF LEMMA 2

*Proof of Lemma 2.* We may assume without loss of generality that  $\eta = 2^{-j}$  for some natural number  $j$ .

Let  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  with  $\frac{1}{\eta} < x \leq \frac{1}{\eta} + 1$ . It suffices to show that  $Pr((x, y) \in K_\sigma) \lesssim_\eta \frac{1}{N}$ , where the probability is taken over all sticky maps  $\sigma : \mathcal{B}^{h(\mathcal{P})} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ .

Let  $q_1, \dots, q_k, \dots, q_{2^N}$  denote the  $2^N$  vertices in  $\mathcal{P}$  of height  $h(\mathcal{P})$ . For each  $1 \leq k \leq 2^N$ , we let  $0q_{k1} \dots q_{kh(\mathcal{P})}$  denote the binary string of  $q_k$ . Let  $b_1, \dots, b_l$  denote all of the vertices in  $\mathcal{B}$  of height  $h(\mathcal{P})$  such that, if  $b_k$  is the string  $0b_{k1} \dots b_{kh(\mathcal{P})}$ , then for some  $q_n$  there exists a parallelogram  $\rho_k$  that contains  $(x, y)$  with longest sides of slope  $\sum_{j=1}^{h(\mathcal{P})} 2^{-j} q_{nj}$  and with corners at  $(0, \sum_{j=1}^{h(\mathcal{P})} 2^{-j} b_{kj})$  and  $(0, \sum_{j=1}^{h(\mathcal{P})} 2^{-j} b_{kj} + 2^{-h(\mathcal{P})})$  and with a right vertical side on the line  $x = \frac{1}{\eta} + 1$ . Note  $0 \leq l = l(\mathcal{P}, x, y) \leq 2^N$ . We assume without loss of generality that  $(x, y)$  does not lie on the boundary of this parallelogram and there is at most one parallelogram  $\rho_k$  satisfying this property. (The set of points lying on the boundaries of all parallelograms of this form is of measure 0.)

Let  $g_0$  denote the splitting vertex of  $\mathcal{P}$  of lowest height. Let  $g_{00}$  denote the splitting vertex of  $\mathcal{P}$  of lowest height that is or is a descendant of one child of  $g_0$  and we let  $g_{01}$  denote the splitting vertex of  $\mathcal{P}$  of lowest height that is or is a descendant of the other child. More generally suppose  $g_{0a_1 \dots a_j}$  has been defined for  $j \leq N - 2$ . We let  $g_{0a_1 \dots a_j 0}$  denote the splitting vertex of  $\mathcal{P}$  of lowest height that is or is a descendant of one child of  $g_{0a_1 \dots a_j}$  and we let  $g_{0a_1 \dots a_j 1}$  denote the splitting vertex of  $\mathcal{P}$  of lowest height that is or is a descendant of the second child. Note the heights of both  $g_{0a_1 \dots a_j 0}$  and  $g_{0a_1 \dots a_j 1}$  are greater than or equal to  $j + 1$  and they do not have to be equal to each other.

We now consider a splitting vertex  $g_{0r_1 \dots r_k}$  of  $\mathcal{P}$ . The set of real numbers  $t$  such that there exists a line passing through  $(x, y)$  and  $(0, t)$  with slope lying in the interval  $g_{0r_1 \dots r_k}$  forms an interval  $I_{g_{0r_1 \dots r_k}}$  of length less than or equal to  $\frac{2}{\eta}$  times the length of the interval  $g_{0r_1 \dots r_k}$ . This interval is in turn contained in a union of at most  $\frac{2}{\eta} + 1$  dyadic intervals of length that of  $g_{0r_1 \dots r_k}$  all of which intersecting  $I_{g_{0r_1 \dots r_k}}$ . We label those intervals in  $[0, 1]$  that happen to contain any of the intervals  $b_1, \dots, b_l$  of length  $2^{-h(\mathcal{P})}$  as  $G_{g_{0r_1 \dots r_k}}^m$  where  $m$  is an index over a set that is possibly empty but could have integer values from 1 to as large as  $\frac{2}{\eta} + 1 \leq \frac{4}{\eta}$ . Since  $\mathcal{P}$  satisfies an  $\eta$ -separability condition, if  $0s_1 \dots s_j \neq 0t_1 \dots t_j$  no interval  $G_{g_{0s_1 \dots s_j}}^m$  for  $1 \leq j \leq N - 1$  can be an interval  $G_{g_{0t_1 \dots t_j}}^n$ .

Note that if  $g_{0a_1\dots a_j a_{j+1}}$  is a descendant of  $g_{0a_1\dots a_j}$ , then any interval  $G_{g_{0a_1\dots a_j a_{j+1}}}^m$  must be contained in an interval  $G_{g_{0a_1\dots a_j}}^n$  for some  $n$ . Moreover, the interval  $G_{g_{0a_1\dots a_j}}^k$  can contain at most  $\frac{4}{\eta}$  intervals  $G_{g_{0a_1\dots a_j 0}}^m$  for some  $m$  and at most  $\frac{4}{\eta}$  intervals  $G_{g_{0a_1\dots a_j 1}}^m$  for some  $m$ .

This enables us to define an  $\frac{8}{\eta}$ -tree  $\mathcal{G}$  described as follows. We assume without loss of generality that  $G_{g_0}^k$  exists for at least one value of  $k$ , as otherwise  $(x, y) \notin K_\sigma$  for every sticky map  $\sigma : \mathcal{B}^{h(\mathcal{P})} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  automatically holds. The root of  $\mathcal{G}$  is the interval  $[0, 1]$ . Vertices of  $\mathcal{G}$  of height  $h$  are the intervals  $G_{g_{0a_1\dots a_h}}^k$ , and edges are placed between  $[0, 1]$  and the intervals  $G_{g_0}^k$  and also between any  $G_{g_{0a_1\dots a_j}}^m$  and any  $G_{g_{0a_1\dots a_j a_{j+1}}}^n$ .  $\mathcal{G}$  has height  $N - 1$ .

Note that the number of vertices in  $\mathcal{G}$  of height  $j$  is bounded by  $\frac{4}{\eta} 2^j$ .

The  $\eta$ -separation condition on  $\mathcal{P}$  manifests itself at this stage of the argument in a very important way. Namely, *there do not exist two intervals  $G_{g_{0a_1\dots a_j 0}}^m, G_{g_{0a_1\dots a_j 1}}^n$  that lie in the same half of an interval  $G_{g_{0a_1\dots a_j}}^k$* . The reason for this is that, letting  $H$  denote a half of the interval  $G_{g_{0a_1\dots a_j}}^k$ , the sets

$$\left\{ (u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \frac{1}{\eta} < u, v = mu + b, b \in H, m \in g_{0a_1\dots a_j 0} \right\}$$

and

$$\left\{ (u, v) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \frac{1}{\eta} < u, v = mu + b, b \in H, m \in g_{0a_1\dots a_j 1} \right\}$$

are disjoint, and hence both cannot simultaneously contain the point  $(x, y)$ .

Accordingly, if  $\sigma : \mathcal{B}^{h(\mathcal{P})} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  is a randomly chosen sticky map, the probability that  $(x, y) \in K_\sigma$  is bounded by the probability of a Bernoulli ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) percolation on  $\mathcal{G}$ , which is a subtree of an  $\frac{8}{\eta}$ -tree of height  $N - 1$  with at most  $\frac{4}{\eta} 2^j$  vertices of height  $j$ . As calculations similar to those found in [2, 9] indicate (see also Exercise 5.52 (a) of [10]) this probability is bounded by  $\frac{C}{\eta} \frac{1}{N}$ , and so the lemma holds.  $\square$

#### 4. AN EXAMPLE

Fix a natural number  $N$  and  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a pruned tree of bounded height  $h(\mathcal{T})$  with lacunary order  $N$ . We set  $\text{Pr}_{\mathcal{T}}(x, y)$  to be the probability over all sticky maps  $\sigma : \mathcal{B}^{h(\mathcal{T})} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$  that  $(x, y) \in K_\sigma$ . In [1] it is asserted that  $\text{Pr}_{\mathcal{T}}(x, y) \lesssim \frac{1}{N}$  provided  $(x, y) \in [1, 2] \times [0, 3]$ , although this is not necessarily the case. An example is provided by the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.** *Given a natural number  $N$ , there exists a pruned tree  $\mathcal{P}$  of lacunary order  $N$  and a point  $(1, y)$  with  $1 \leq y \leq 3/2$  such that  $\text{Pr}_{\mathcal{P}}(1, y) = 1$ .*

*Proof.* We define the *interval maps*  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  on the set of closed intervals in  $\mathbb{R}$  of positive finite measure by the following:



$$\rho_1([a, b]) = \left[ \frac{a+b}{2} - \frac{b-a}{8}, \frac{a+b}{2} \right];$$

$$\rho_2([a, b]) = \left[ \frac{a+b}{2}, \frac{a+b}{2} + \frac{b-a}{8} \right].$$

Let  $\mathcal{I}_0 = [0, 1]$ . We set  $\mathcal{I}_{01} = \rho_1 \mathcal{I}_0$  and  $\mathcal{I}_{02} = \rho_2 \mathcal{I}_0$ . Similarly, for any sequence  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k$  of 1's and 2's, we let

$$\mathcal{I}_{0a_1 a_2 \dots a_k} = \rho_{a_k} \rho_{a_{k-1}} \dots \rho_{a_1} \mathcal{I}_0.$$

We let  $m_{0a_1 a_2 \dots a_k} \in [0, 1]$  denote the left hand endpoint of  $\mathcal{I}_{0a_1 a_2 \dots a_k}$ . Given  $N$ , let  $\Omega_N$  consist of the left hand endpoints of any interval of the form  $\mathcal{I}_{0a_1 a_2 \dots a_N}$ . Note that  $\mathcal{T}_{\Omega_N}^{3N}$  (the tree  $\mathcal{T}_{\Omega_N}$  truncated at height  $3N$ ) is lacunary of order  $N$ , with the vertices corresponding  $\mathcal{I}_0$  and to each  $\mathcal{I}_{0a_1 a_2 \dots a_k}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq N-1$  being splitting vertices.

Let now  $y = 1 + \frac{1}{8} + (\frac{1}{8})^2 + \dots + (\frac{1}{8})^N - (\frac{1}{8})^{N+1}$ . We will show that for *every* sticky map  $\sigma : \mathcal{B}^{3N} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\Omega_N}^{3N}$  we have  $(1, y) \in K_\sigma$ , proving the desired result. In particular, we will see that the probability of  $(1, y)$  lying in  $K_\sigma$  does not correspond to the survivor probability of  $(1/2)$  Bernoulli-percolation of a binary tree of height  $N$ , as rather for this particular value of  $y$  each sticky map  $\sigma$  provides a ‘‘tournament’’ for which exactly one slope in  $\Omega_N$  is associated to a parallelogram in  $K_{\sigma,1}$  that contains  $(1, y)$ . This is because, for every natural number  $j$  and sequence  $a_1 a_2 \dots a_j$ , the translates of both  $\mathcal{I}_{0a_1 a_2 \dots a_{j1}}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_{0a_1 a_2 \dots a_{j2}}$  by  $\frac{1}{8} + \dots + (\frac{1}{8})^{j+1}$  lie in the *same half* of a dyadic interval in  $[0, 1]$  whose length is the same as that of the interval  $\mathcal{I}_{0a_1 a_2 \dots a_j}$ .

We now discuss the above remarks in detail. It will be helpful to associate to any set  $\mathcal{S}$  in  $[0, 1]$  its reflection across  $\frac{1}{2}$  that we denote by  $rf(\mathcal{S})$ ; in particular

$$rf(\mathcal{S}) = \{1 - x : x \in \mathcal{S}\}.$$

We will associate to each  $\mathcal{I}_{0a_1 a_2 \dots a_k}$  its reflection  $\mathcal{J}_{0a_1 a_2 \dots a_k}$  given by

$$\mathcal{J}_{0a_1 a_2 \dots a_k} = rf(\mathcal{I}_{0a_1 a_2 \dots a_k}).$$

If  $h \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}$ , we define the translate  $\tau_h \mathcal{S}$  by  $\chi_{\tau_h \mathcal{S}}(x) = \chi_{\mathcal{S}}(x - h)$ .

If a line with slope lying in  $\mathcal{S} \subset [0, 1]$  intersects the point  $(1, 1)$ , then the  $y$ -intercept of that line must lie in  $rf(\mathcal{S})$ . If a line with slope lying in  $\mathcal{S} \subset [0, 1]$  intersects the point  $(1, 1 + h)$ , then the  $y$ -intercept of that line must lie in the set  $h + rf(\mathcal{S}) = \tau_h rf(\mathcal{S})$ . Note that for each interval  $\mathcal{I}_{0a_1 \dots a_N}$  there exists a parallelogram with slope  $m_{0a_1 \dots a_N}$  whose left hand side is the set  $\{(0, t) : t \in \mathcal{J}_{0a_1 \dots a_N}\}$  and such that  $(1, 1)$  is on the upper edge. Note that consequently there exists a parallelogram with slope  $m_{0a_1 \dots a_N}$  whose left hand side is the vertically oriented interval  $\{(0, t) : t \in \tau_{-1+y+(\frac{1}{8})^{N+1}} \mathcal{J}_{0a_1 \dots a_N}\}$  that contains the point  $(1, y)$  a distance  $(\frac{1}{8})^{N+1}$  vertically below its top edge. In Bateman's terminology in [1], it is these  $2^N$  intervals that



are associated to the possible set  $\text{Poss}(1, y)$  and the associated tree  $\langle(1, y)\rangle$ . These intervals are important enough to us to give them a name, namely, we let

$$\mathcal{K}_{0a_1\dots a_N} = \tau_{-1+y+(\frac{1}{8})^{N+1}} \mathcal{J}_{0a_1\dots a_N} .$$

We also define for any string  $a_1 \dots a_j$  of 1's and 2's for  $1 \leq j \leq N$  the set

$$\mathcal{K}_{0a_1a_2\dots a_j} = \tau_{\sum_{k=1}^j 2^{-3k}} \mathcal{J}_{0a_1a_2\dots a_j} .$$

Note that, as may be seen by induction, for  $1 \leq j \leq N - 1$  both  $\mathcal{K}_{0a_1a_2\dots a_{j1}}$  and  $\mathcal{K}_{0a_1a_2\dots a_{j2}}$  lie on the right half of  $\mathcal{K}_{0a_1a_2\dots a_j}$ .

Our choice of  $\Omega_N$  and  $y$  gives the possible set  $\text{Poss}(1, y)$  a particular structure that we now wish to exploit.

Let us now fix  $\sigma : \mathcal{B}^{3N} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\Omega_N}^{3N}$ . We need to show that  $(1, y)$  must lie in  $K_\sigma$ . Readers familiar with Bateman's terminology might at this point observe that since  $[0, 1]$  and all intervals of the form  $\mathcal{I}_{0a_1a_2\dots a_j}$  for  $1 \leq j \leq N - 1$  correspond to splitting vertices of the tree  $\mathcal{T}_{\Omega_N}$ , we have that  $[0, 1]$  and intervals of the form  $\mathcal{K}_{0a_1a_2\dots a_j}$  for  $1 \leq j \leq N - 1$  are associated to choosing vertices of  $\langle(1, y)\rangle$ .

Associated to  $\sigma$  will be the string of 1's and 2's that are defined recursively as follows.

Let  $k_1$  be such that  $\sigma[\frac{1}{2}, 1] \supset \mathcal{I}_{0k_1}$ . Note that  $\sigma(\mathcal{K}_{0k_1}) = \mathcal{I}_{0k_1}$  because  $\mathcal{T}_{\Omega_N}^{3N}$  has no splitting vertices between  $\mathcal{I}_0$  and  $\mathcal{I}_{0k_1}$ .

Assuming  $k_1, \dots, k_j$  are determined, let  $k_{j+1}$  be the value such that

$$\sigma(\text{right half } (\mathcal{K}_{0k_1k_2\dots k_j})) \supset \mathcal{I}_{0k_1k_2\dots k_{j+1}} .$$

Note that  $\sigma(\mathcal{K}_{0k_1k_2\dots k_{j+1}}) = \mathcal{I}_{0k_1k_2\dots k_{j+1}}$  since there are no splitting vertices in  $\mathcal{T}_{\Omega_N}^{3N}$  between  $\mathcal{I}_{0k_1k_2\dots k_j}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_{0k_1k_2\dots k_{j+1}}$ .

We have that  $(1, y)$  lies in the parallelogram in  $K_\sigma$  with slope  $m_{0k_1\dots k_N}$  whose left hand side is the vertically oriented interval  $\{(0, t) : t \in \mathcal{K}_{0k_1\dots k_N}\}$ .  $\square$

## 5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Even though Theorem 2 provides a counterexample to a step in the proof of Theorem 1 of [1], it does not provide a counterexample to Theorem 1 of [1] itself as the union of all of the trees  $\mathcal{T}_{\Omega_N}$  of Theorem 2 contains, for every natural number  $N$ , a subtree that is  $\frac{1}{8}$ -separated and lacunary of order  $N$ .

Theorem 1 of [1] has been used as a key step in the proofs of several interesting results, including Theorems 5 and 6 of [4]; Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 of [5]; Theorems 2,3, and 4 of [6]; Theorem 4 of [7]; and Theorem 1 of [8]. Researchers in the area should consider these results at the moment to be at best provisional.

It is important to recognize that a set  $\Omega \subset [0, 1]$  may have infinite lacunary value yet be such that for no  $\eta > 0$  does  $\mathcal{T}_\Omega$  contain an  $N$ -lacunary  $\eta$ -separated subtree for every  $N$ . Such a set may be defined as follows.

Let  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . We define the interval maps  $\rho_{j,1}, \rho_{j,2}$  respectively on the set of closed intervals in  $\mathbb{R}$  of finite length by

$$\rho_{j,1}([a, b]) = \left[ \frac{a+b}{2} - 2^{-j}(b-a), \frac{a+b}{2} \right],$$

$$\rho_{j,2}([a, b]) = \left[ \frac{a+b}{2}, \frac{a+b}{2} + 2^{-j}(b-a) \right].$$

Let  $\Omega \subset [0, 1]$  be the set of all  $x$  contained any infinitely many intervals of the form

$$\rho_{1,i_1} \rho_{2,i_2} \cdots \rho_{k,i_k} [0, 1].$$

One can check that  $\lambda(\Omega) = \infty$ . However, there is no  $\eta > 0$  for which  $\mathcal{T}_\Omega$  contains an  $N$ -lacunary  $\eta$ -separated subtree for every  $N$ .

This set  $\Omega$  constructed here poses a model problem for the theory of geometric maximal operators. Is the geometric maximal operator  $M_\Omega$  bounded on  $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$  for every  $1 < p \leq \infty$ ?

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Bateman, *Keakeya sets and directional maximal operators in the plane*, Duke Math. J. **147** (2009), 55–77. [1](#), [2](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#)
- [2] M. Bateman and N. Katz, *Keakeya sets in Cantor directions*, Math. Res. Lett. **15** (2008), 73–81. [1](#), [2](#), [7](#)
- [3] H. Busemann and W. Feller, *Differentiation der  $L$ -Integrale*, Fund. Math. **22** (1934), 226–256. [1](#)
- [4] A. Gauvan, *Application of Perron trees to geometric maximal operators*, Colloq. Math. **172** (2023), 1–13. [9](#)
- [5] A. Gauvan, *Keakeya-type sets for geometric maximal operators*, New York J. Math. **30** (2024), 295–306. [9](#)
- [6] P. A. Hagelstein, *Maximal operators associated to sets of directions of Hausdorff and Minkowski dimension zero*, Recent Advances in Harmonic Analysis and Applications, Springer Proceedings in Mathematics and Statistics **25** (2012), 269–283. [9](#)
- [7] P. A. Hagelstein and A. Stokolos, *An extension of the Córdoba-Fefferman theorem on the equivalence between the boundedness of certain classes of maximal and multiplier operators*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I **346** (2008), 1063–1065. [9](#)
- [8] P. A. Hagelstein and A. Stokolos,  *$L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$  bounds for geometric maximal operators associated to homothety invariant convex bases*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. (to appear) [9](#)
- [9] R. Lyons, *Random walks, capacity and percolation on trees*, Ann. Probab. **20** (1992), 2043–2088. [7](#)
- [10] R. Lyons and Y. Peres, *Probability on trees and networks*, Camb. Ser. Stat. Probab. Math. **42**, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2016. [7](#)
- [11] O. Nikodym, *Sur les ensembles accessibles*, Fund. Math. **10** (1927), 116–168. [1](#)
- [12] P. Sjögren, P. Sjölin, *Littlewood-Paley decompositions and Fourier multipliers with singularities on certain sets*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **31** (1981), 157–175. [4](#)

P. H.: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BAYLOR UNIVERSITY, WACO, TEXAS 76798

*Email address:* [paul.hagelstein@baylor.edu](mailto:paul.hagelstein@baylor.edu)

B. R.-M.: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BAYLOR UNIVERSITY, WACO, TEXAS 76798

*Email address:* [blanca.radillo1@baylor.edu](mailto:blanca.radillo1@baylor.edu)

A. S.: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY, STATESBORO,  
GEORGIA 30460

*Email address:* [astokolos@GeorgiaSouthern.edu](mailto:astokolos@GeorgiaSouthern.edu)