

REMARKS ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF K_σ SETS ASSOCIATED TO TREES NOT SATISFYING A SEPARATION CONDITION

PAUL HAGELSTEIN, BLANCA RADILLO-MURGUIA, AND ALEX STOKOLOS

ABSTRACT. K_σ sets involving sticky maps σ have been used in the theory of differentiation of integrals to probabilistically construct Keakeya-type sets that imply certain types of directional maximal operators are unbounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for all $1 \leq p < \infty$. We indicate limits to this approach by showing that, given $\epsilon > 0$ and a natural number N , there exists a tree $\mathcal{T}_{N,\epsilon}$ of finite height that is lacunary of order N but such that, for every sticky map $\sigma : \mathcal{B}^h(\mathcal{T}_{N,\epsilon}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{N,\epsilon}$, one has $|K_\sigma \cap ((1, 2) \times \mathbb{R})| \geq 1 - \epsilon$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let Ω be a nonempty subset of $[0, 1]$. Associated to Ω is the *directional maximal operator* M_Ω acting on measurable functions on \mathbb{R}^2 defined by

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

where the supremum is taken over all rectangles in \mathbb{R}^2 containing x with longest side having slope in Ω .

If $\Omega = [0, 1]$, the maximal operator M_Ω is unbounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for all $1 \leq p < \infty$ [3, 7]. If Ω is the lacunary set $\{2^{-j} : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$, then M_Ω is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for $1 < p \leq \infty$ [4, 6, 9]. More generally, if Ω is N -lacunary, then M_Ω is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for $1 < p \leq \infty$ [8].

In [2], Bateman and Katz utilized probabilistic methods involving *sticky maps* to show that the maximal operator $M_\mathcal{C}$ associated to the ternary Cantor set \mathcal{C} is unbounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for $1 \leq p < \infty$. Bateman subsequently announced a result in [1] that the maximal operator M_Ω is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for all $1 < p \leq \infty$ if and only if Ω is a finite union of sets of finite lacunary order. Bateman's clever argument involved using probabilistic methods to show that, if Ω were not of finite lacunary order, then for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$ there would exist a sticky map σ and associated sets $K_\sigma = K_{\sigma,1} \cup K_{\sigma,2}$ (with a structure that we will detail in the next section) such that $|K_{\sigma,1}| \gtrsim (\ln N)|K_{\sigma,2}|$, with $M_\Omega \chi_{K_{\sigma,2}} \gtrsim \frac{1}{2}$ on $K_{\sigma,1}$. Unfortunately, we recently discovered a subtle gap in the proof of this statement in the case that the set Ω , although not of finite lacunary order, fails to satisfy a *separation condition*, although the proof does hold with some minor modification if the separation condition is satisfied [5]. We

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 42B25.

Key words and phrases. maximal functions, differentiation basis.

P. H. is partially supported by Simons Foundation grant MP-TSM-00002046.

now recognize that there exist certain non-separated non-finite lacunary sets Ω for which the desired K_σ sets simply do not exist. The purpose of this paper is to show this is the case.

In Section 2 we will define the appropriate terminology, largely following that of Bateman in [1]. In Section 3 we will construct a set of directions $\Omega \subset [0, 1]$ for which the desired K_σ sets do not exist. In Section 4 we will suggest further directions for research in this area.

2. TERMINOLOGY

In this section we, largely following the terminology and setup of Bateman in [1], define sets K_σ associated to sticky maps σ mapping a truncated binary tree to itself.

We first define the binary tree \mathcal{B} . We fix a vertex v_0 , called the origin, and define $\mathcal{B}_0 = \{v_0\}$. Suppose \mathcal{B}_n has been defined. To each vertex $v \in \mathcal{B}_n$ we associate to new vertices $c_0(v)$ and $c_1(v)$ and define

$$\mathcal{B}_{n+1} = \cup_{v \in \mathcal{B}_n} \{c_0(v), c_1(v)\} .$$

We define the binary tree \mathcal{B} to be the graph with vertices in $\cup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{B}_n$ and edges connecting a vertex v with each of its children $c_0(v)$ and $c_1(v)$. We say the vertices in \mathcal{B}_n are of height n . If the vertex v is of height n , we may write this as $h(v) = n$.

Given a vertex $v \in \mathcal{B}$, we define a ray R rooted at v to be an ordered set of vertices $v_1 = v, v_2, v_3, \dots$ such that v_{j+1} is a child of v_j for $j = 1, 2, \dots$. Given a subtree \mathcal{T} of \mathcal{B} and a vertex $v \in \mathcal{T}$, we set $\mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{T}}(v)$ to be the collection of all rays rooted at v with vertices in \mathcal{T} .

If $u \in R$ for some $R \in \mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{T}}(v)$, we say u is a descendant of v or that v is an ancestor of u .

Given a subtree \mathcal{T} of \mathcal{B} and $h \in \mathbb{N}$, by \mathcal{T}^h we denote the induced subtree of \mathcal{T} associated to its vertices of height less than or equal to h .

Given a subtree \mathcal{T} of \mathcal{B} , we say a vertex $v \in \mathcal{T}$ splits, or we say v is a splitting vertex, if v has two children in \mathcal{T} . We define the splitting number $\text{split}(R)$ of a ray R in \mathcal{T} to be the number of splitting vertices in \mathcal{T} on R . The splitting number of a vertex v with respect to a tree \mathcal{S} rooted at v is defined as

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

and the splitting number of v is defined as

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

where the supremum is taken over all subtrees \mathcal{S} of \mathcal{T} rooted at v . For a tree \mathcal{T} , we set

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

where the supremum is taken over all the vertices v in \mathcal{T} .

A tree $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{B}$ is said to be lacunary of order 0 if it consists of a single ray (possibly truncated to be of finite height) rooted at the origin of \mathcal{B} . For $N \geq 1$, \mathcal{T} is said to be lacunary of order N if all of the splitting vertices of \mathcal{T} lie on a lacunary tree of order $N - 1$ and moreover that \mathcal{T} is not lacunary of order $N - 1$.

Let $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{B}$ be lacunary of order N . We say \mathcal{T} is pruned provided, for every ray $R \in \mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{T}}(v_0)$ and every $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$, R contains exactly one vertex v_j such that $\text{split } v_j = j$.

Let v be a vertex in \mathcal{B} of height k . Let (j_1, \dots, j_k) be a sequence of 0's and 1's such that, letting v_0 denote the origin, v lies on the ray $v_0, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k = v, \dots$ in \mathcal{B} such that $v_i = c_{j_i}(v_{i-1})$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. For notational convenience, we will on occasion denote v by the $(k+1)$ -string $0j_1 \cdots j_k$, with v_0 itself being denoted simply by the 1-string 0.

Let $\sigma : \mathcal{B}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^N$. σ is said to be a *sticky map* if $h(\sigma(v)) = h(v)$ for all $v \in \mathcal{B}^N$ and $h(u)$ is an ancestor of $h(v)$ whenever $u, v \in \mathcal{B}^N$ and u is an ancestor of v .

To each $\sigma : \mathcal{B}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^N$ we may construct a set $K_\sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ as follows.

For every $(N+1)$ -string $v = 0j_1 \cdots j_N$ consisting of 0's and 1's, let (k_1, \dots, k_N) be such that $\sigma(v) = 0k_1 \cdots k_N$. Let ρ_v denote the parallelogram with vertices at the points $(0, \sum_{i=1}^N 2^{-i} j_i)$, $(0, 2^{-N} + \sum_{i=1}^N 2^{-i} j_i)$, $(2, \sum_{i=1}^N 2^{-i} j_i + 2 \sum_{i=1}^N 2^{-i} k_i)$, $(2, 2^{-N} + \sum_{i=1}^N 2^{-i} j_i + 2 \sum_{i=1}^N 2^{-i} k_i)$. Define the set $K_\sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ by

$$K_\sigma = \bigcup_{v \in \mathcal{B}^N : h(v) = N} \rho_v .$$

The primary result of this paper is the following.

Theorem 1. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$. There exists a pruned tree \mathcal{P} of finite height that is lacunary of order N such that, for every sticky map $\sigma : \mathcal{B}^{h(\mathcal{P})} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$, we have*

$$|K_\sigma \cap ([1, 2] \times \mathbb{R})| \geq 1 - \epsilon .$$

In contrasting this result with Claim 7(B) of [1], it is helpful to recognize that, as indicated in [5], the proof of Claim 7(B) implicitly relies on an assumption that \mathcal{P} satisfies a separation condition. Theorem 1 indicates what can happen if such a separation condition is not satisfied.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Proof of Theorem 1. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Let j_1, \dots, j_N be a sequence of natural numbers, all greater than 2, such that

$$8[2^{-j_1} + \dots + 2^{-j_N}] < \epsilon .$$

For $1 \leq i \leq N$, let a_i denote the j_i -string $0111 \cdots 1$ and b_i denote the j_i -string $1000 \cdots 0$. Let \mathcal{P} be the pruned tree consisting of all of the vertices of the form $0x_1 \cdots x_n$, where each x_i is either a_i or b_i , together with their ancestors. Note that \mathcal{P} is lacunary of order N , and \mathcal{P} is a tree of height $j_1 + \dots + j_N$.

Let $\sigma : \mathcal{B}^{h(\mathcal{P})} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$. Note K_σ is the union of $2^{h(\mathcal{P})}$ parallelograms of the form ρ_v indicated above, where v is an element of \mathcal{B} of height $h(\mathcal{P})$.

Let M denote the number of parallelograms ρ_v for which there is a $w \neq v$ such that $|\rho_v \cap \rho_w| > 0$. Since σ is a sticky map and by the structure of \mathcal{P} , we have that if ρ_u and ρ_v are parallelograms whose left hand sides lie in a dyadic interval of length $2^{-j_1 - j_2 - \dots - j_k}$ on the y -axis, their slopes are within $2^{-j_1 - j_2 - \dots - j_k} \cdot 2 \cdot 2^{-j_{k+1}}$ of each other. Accordingly we have the bound

$$M \leq 2^{h(\mathcal{P})} 8[2^{-j_1} + 2^{j_1} 2^{-j_1 - j_2} + 2^{j_1 + j_2} 2^{-j_1 - j_2 - j_3} + \dots + 2^{j_1 + \dots + j_{N-1}} 2^{-j_1 - \dots - j_N}]$$

$$\leq 2^{h(\mathcal{P})} 8[2^{-j_1} + \dots + 2^{-j_N}] .$$

Since for each parallelogram ρ_v we have $|\rho_v \cap ([1, 2] \times \mathbb{R})| = 2^{-h(\mathcal{P})}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & |K_\sigma \cap ([1, 2] \times \mathbb{R})| \\ & \geq 1 - M2^{-h(\mathcal{P})} \\ & \geq 1 - 8[2^{-j_1} + \dots + 2^{-j_N}] \\ & > 1 - \epsilon , \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

4. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

It is highly desirable to ascertain whether the maximal operator M_Ω is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for all $1 < p \leq \infty$ if and only if Ω is a union of finitely many sets each of finite lacunary order. The proof of the above theorem suggests the following model case of consideration:

Let j_1, j_2, \dots be an infinite sequence of natural numbers greater than or equal to 2 such that

$$2^{-j_1} + 2^{-j_2} + 2^{-j_3} + \dots < \infty$$

and let, as before, a_i denote the j_i -string $0111 \dots 1$ and b_i denote the j_i -string $1000 \dots 0$. Let $\Omega \subset [0, 1]$ be the set of points with binary expansions corresponding to sequences of the form $0x_1x_2x_3 \dots x_N$, where N is arbitrary in \mathbb{N} and each x_i is either of the form a_i or b_i . Ω is not finite lacunary, and hence one can not use the Sjögren-Sjölin result in [8] to prove that M_Ω is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$. However, Ω also does not satisfy the separation condition found in [5] that would imply that M_Ω is unbounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for all $1 \leq p < \infty$. Ω having a rather straightforward structure, however, suggests that determining whether M_Ω is bounded on $L^p(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for all $1 < p \leq \infty$ provides a good starting point for investigating the above problem.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Bateman, *Kekeya sets and directional maximal operators in the plane*, Duke Math. J. **147** (2009), 55–77. MR2494456 ↑1, 2, 3
- [2] M. Bateman and N. H. Katz, *Kekeya sets in Cantor directions*, Math. Res. Lett. **15** (2008), 73–81. MR2367175 ↑1
- [3] H. Busemann and W. Feller, *Zur Differentiation der Lebesguesche Integrale*, Fund. Math. **22** (1934), 226–256. 1
- [4] A. Córdoba and R. Fefferman, *On differentiation of integrals*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **74** (1977), 2211–2213. 1
- [5] P. Hagelstein, B. Radillo-Murguia, and A. Stokolos, *Probabilistic construction of Kekeya-type sets in \mathbb{R}^2 associated to separated sets of directions*, (submitted for publication), arXiv:2405.17674 1, 3, 4
- [6] A. Nagel, E. M. Stein, and S. Wainger, *Differentiation in lacunary directions*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. **75** (1978), 1060–1062. MR0466470 ↑1
- [7] O. Nikodym, *Sur les ensembles accessibles*, Fund. Math. **10** (1927), 116–168. 1

- [8] P. Sjögren and P. Sjölin, *Littlewood-Paley decompositions and Fourier multipliers with singularities on certain sets*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **31** (1981), 157–175. MR0613033 ↑1, 4
- [9] J.-O. Strömberg, *Weak estimates on maximal functions with rectangles in certain directions*, Ark. Math. **15** (1977), 229–240. 1

P. H.: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BAYLOR UNIVERSITY, WACO, TEXAS 76798
Email address: paul_hagelstein@baylor.edu

B. R.-M.: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BAYLOR UNIVERSITY, WACO, TEXAS 76798
Email address: blanca_radillo1@baylor.edu

A. S.: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY, STATESBORO,
GEORGIA 30460
Email address: astokolos@GeorgiaSouthern.edu