

# KAKEYA SETS AND DIRECTIONAL MAXIMAL OPERATORS IN THE PLANE

MICHAEL BATEMAN

Indiana University

ABSTRACT. We completely characterize the boundedness of planar directional maximal operators on  $L^p$ . More precisely, if  $\Omega$  is a set of directions, we show that  $M_\Omega$ , the maximal operator associated to line segments in the directions  $\Omega$ , is unbounded on  $L^p$ , for all  $p < \infty$ , precisely when  $\Omega$  admits Keakeya-type sets. In fact, we show that if  $\Omega$  does not admit Keakeya sets, then  $\Omega$  is a generalized lacunary set, and hence  $M_\Omega$  is bounded on  $L^p$ , for  $p > 1$ .

## §0 INTRODUCTION

Given a closed set  $\Omega \subset [0, 1]$  of slopes in the plane, we let  $\mathbf{B}_\Omega$  be the collection of all rectangles so that one of the sides has slope in  $\Omega$ , and we define

$$M_\Omega f(x) = \sup_{x \in R \in \mathbf{B}_\Omega} \frac{1}{|R|} \int_R f.$$

The study of such operators dates at least to Cordoba's paper [C], in which he considered the case  $\Omega = [\frac{1}{N}, \frac{2}{N}, \dots, 1]$ , with the restriction that the rectangles in  $\mathbf{B}_\Omega$  have dimensions  $1 \times N$ . In the case where  $\Omega$  is a lacunary sequence, i.e., when there is a  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\Omega = \{\omega_0, \omega_1, \omega_2, \dots\}$ , and  $\omega_{j+1} \leq \lambda \omega_j$  for  $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , Strömberg [S], and Cordoba and R. Fefferman [CF1] used covering arguments to show that  $M_\Omega$  is bounded on  $L^p$  when  $p \geq 2$ , and Nagel, Stein, and Wainger [NSW] followed with a Fourier analytic proof for boundedness on  $L^p$  when  $p > 1$ . Let us say that a set  $\Omega$  is lacunary of order  $N$  if it is covered by the union of a lacunary sequence  $L$  of order  $N - 1$  with lacunary sequences converging to every point of  $L$ . Sjögren and Sjölin [SS] iterated the proof in [NSW] to improve the result to include lacunary sequences of finite order.

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* primary 42B25 secondary 60K35.  
*email:* mdbatema@indiana.edu

On the other hand, the existence of the Besicovitch set yields unboundedness of  $M_\Omega$  on  $L^p$ ,  $p < \infty$ , when  $\Omega = [0, 1]$ . A further negative result comes when  $\Omega$  is the Cantor set: unboundedness in this case was shown in [K] for  $p \leq 2$ , and in [BK] for  $p < \infty$ .

Now let us say that  $\Omega$  admits *Keakeya sets* if there is a collection  $\mathbf{R}_\Omega$  of rectangles, each pointed in a direction in  $\Omega$  so that  $|\cup_{R \in \mathbf{R}_\Omega} R|$  is small relative to, say,  $|\cup_{R \in \mathbf{R}_\Omega} 3R|$ , where  $3R$  is the rectangle with the same center and width as  $R$  and three times the length. In this paper we will prove

**Theorem 0.1.** *Fix  $1 < p < \infty$ . The following are equivalent:*

*A:  $M_\Omega$  is bounded on  $L^p$*

*B:  $\Omega$  does not admit Keakeya sets*

*C: There exist  $N_1, N_2 < \infty$  such that  $\Omega$  is covered by  $N_1$  lacunary sets of order  $N_2$ .*

To prove this theorem we will view  $\Omega$  as being the boundary of a subtree of the binary tree. Then we will introduce the *splitting number* of a tree, which measures, loosely speaking, to what degree the tree has a subtree that looks like the binary tree. This will allow us to categorize all such  $\Omega$  as looking like either a lacunary-type set or a Cantor-type set.

**Acknowledgements.** *The author thanks Russ Lyons, and especially Nets Katz, for helpful discussions.*

## § $\frac{1}{2}$ OUTLINE

The goal of this paper is to provide a proof of Theorem 0.1. The proof that  $A \Rightarrow B$  is simple. For suppose  $\Omega$  admits Keakeya sets in the sense above: then for any  $N$ , we have sets

$$E_N := \bigcup_t R_t^{(N)} \quad \text{and} \quad E_N^* := \bigcup_t 3R_t^{(N)},$$

where the slopes of the  $R_t^{(N)}$  are in  $\Omega$ , such that

$$\frac{|E_N|}{|E_N^*|} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad N \rightarrow \infty,$$

and such that  $M_\Omega \chi_{E_N}(x) > \frac{1}{2}$  when  $x \in E_N^*$ . Hence

$$\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (M_\Omega \chi_{E_N})^p}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\chi_{E_N})^p} \gtrsim \frac{|E_N|}{|E_N^*|} \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as} \quad N \rightarrow \infty,$$

where, of course, by  $\alpha \lesssim \beta$  we mean  $\alpha \leq c\beta$  for some constant  $c$ .

Our contribution is the proof that  $B \Rightarrow C$ , and the majority of the paper is devoted to this. For completeness, we will review in the final section a proof that  $C \Rightarrow A$ .

## §1 SPLITTING NUMBER AND NOTATION FOR TREES

We begin by constructing the binary tree  $\mathcal{B}$ : fix a vertex,  $v_{origin}$ , called the *origin*, and define

$$\mathcal{B}_0 = \{v_{origin}\}.$$

(Here we will use the word “origin”, since the more commonly used word “root” will be used frequently as a verb.) Then for  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , connect each vertex  $v \in \mathcal{B}_n$  to two new vertices  $c_0(v)$  and  $c_1(v)$ , called the 0th and 1st children of  $v$ , and define

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

Then  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$  is the tree with vertices

$$\mathcal{B} := \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{B}_n$$

and edges connecting a vertex  $v$  with its children  $c_0(v)$  and  $c_1(v)$ . We will refer to the tree  $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$  by its vertex set  $\mathcal{B}$ , and we will do the same for other trees considered in this paper, which will all be subtrees of  $\mathcal{B}$ . If  $v \in \mathcal{B}_n$ , define the height of  $v$ ,  $h(v) = n$ . Further, if  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ , then by  $\mathcal{T}_k$  we mean all vertices  $v \in \mathcal{T}$  such that  $h(v) = k$ .

Now given a vertex  $v \in \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ , 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  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ . Loosely speaking, a ray rooted at  $v$  is a path from  $v$  to infinity that always moves (strictly) away from the origin of the tree. The *boundary* of  $\mathcal{T}$  is the set of all rays in  $\mathcal{T}$  rooted at the origin, and will be denoted  $\partial\mathcal{T}$ . Define the *shadow*,  $U(v)$ , of a vertex  $v$ , to be the set of all rays  $R$  such that  $v \in R$ .

We identify the vertices of the binary tree with the dyadic intervals contained in  $[0, 1]$  as follows:

1. Identify the origin with  $[0, 1]$ .
2. If  $v$  is identified with the dyadic interval  $I$ ,  
then identify  $c_0(v)$  with the left half of  $I$ ,  
and identify  $c_1(v)$  with the right half of  $I$ .

We will write  $v_I$  to indicate the vertex identified with the interval  $I$ , and  $I_v$  to indicate the interval identified with the vertex  $v$ . Similarly, we can identify the boundary of the binary tree with the interval  $[0, 1]$  in the following natural way: identify  $.a_1a_2\dots$ , where  $a_j \in \{0, 1\}$ , with the ray  $(v_0 = v_{origin}, v_1, v_2, \dots)$  if  $v_{j+1}$  is the  $a_{j+1}$ th child of  $v_j$ , i.e., if  $v_{j+1} = c_{a_{j+1}}(v_j)$  for every  $j = 1, 2, \dots$

If  $\Omega$  is closed, then  $[0, 1] - \Omega$  is the union of open intervals  $Q_j$ . Each  $Q_j$  is the union of dyadic intervals, so we may write

$$[0, 1] - \Omega = \bigcup_j I_j,$$

where each  $I_j$  is a dyadic interval. We define  $\mathcal{T}_\Omega$  to be the subtree of  $\mathcal{B}$  obtained by removing the subtrees of  $\mathcal{B}$  rooted at  $v_{I_j}$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ . Alternatively,  $\mathcal{T}_\Omega$  is the subtree of  $\mathcal{B}$  with boundary

$$\partial\mathcal{T}_\Omega = \partial\mathcal{B} - \left( \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} U(v_{I_j}) \right).$$

Earlier, we defined what it means for a ray  $R$  to be rooted at a vertex  $v$ . The collection of such rays depends on the tree  $\mathcal{T}$ , and will be denoted by  $\mathfrak{R}_\mathcal{T}(v)$ . If  $u \in R$  for some  $\mathfrak{R}_\mathcal{T}(v)$ , we will write  $u \subseteq v$ , and say that  $u$  is a *descendant* of  $v$ , or that  $v$  is an *ancestor* of  $u$ .

We will say that a vertex  $v$  *splits*, or call  $v$  a *splitting vertex*, if  $v$  has two children, and define the splitting number  $\text{split}(R)$  of a ray  $R$  to be the number of splitting vertices along  $R$ . Then the splitting number of a vertex  $v$  with respect to a tree  $\mathcal{S}$  rooted at  $v$  is defined to be

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

and the splitting number of  $v$  is defined to be

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

where the sup is taken over all subtrees  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  rooted at  $v$ . Finally, for a tree  $\mathcal{T}$ , we define

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

Before we state a theorem using this new language, we give a definition of lacunarity that is more suitable for trees: a subtree  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$  is said to be lacunary of order 0 if  $\mathcal{L}$  consists of a single ray in the boundary of  $\mathcal{T}$ , and  $\mathcal{L}$  is said to be lacunary of order  $N$  if all splitting vertices of  $\mathcal{L}$  lie along a lacunary tree of order  $N - 1$ .

**Remark 1.1.** *If  $\mathcal{L}$  is a lacunary tree of order 1, then, loosely speaking, the directions associated with  $\mathcal{L}$  can be covered by four lacunary sequences in the traditional sense. More precisely, define  $\alpha(R)$  to be the real number in  $[0, 1]$  identified with the ray  $R$ . Note that all*

splitting vertices of  $\mathcal{L}$  lie on a single ray, call it  $\lim \mathcal{L}$ . We claim there exist four lacunary sequences  $\{a_j^{(i)}\}_{j=1}^\infty$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, 4$ , such that

$$a_j^{(i)} \rightarrow \alpha(\lim \mathcal{L}) \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty$$

for each  $i$ , and such that

$$\alpha(R) \in \left( \bigcup_{i,j} a_j^{(i)} \right) \cup \{\alpha(\lim \mathcal{L})\}$$

for every  $R \in \partial \mathcal{L}$ .

*Proof.* For each  $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  there is at most one  $R \in \partial \mathcal{L}$  such that  $d(\alpha(R), \alpha(\lim \mathcal{L})) = 2^{-j}$ , where  $d$  denotes the dyadic distance on real numbers. (That is,  $d(\beta_1, \beta_2)$  is defined to be the size of the smallest dyadic interval containing both  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$ .) Now consider the set

$$A := \{R \in \partial \mathcal{L} : \alpha(R) > \alpha(\lim \mathcal{L})\}.$$

Finally, observe that if  $R_0, R_1, R_2, \dots \in A$  are such that

$$d(\alpha(R_j), \alpha(\lim \mathcal{L})) = 2^{-2j},$$

then

$$0 < \alpha(R_{j+1}) - \alpha(\lim \mathcal{L}) \leq \frac{1}{2} (\alpha(R_j) - \alpha(\lim \mathcal{L})),$$

i.e.,  $\{\alpha(R_j)\}_{j=1}^\infty$  is lacunary in the traditional sense. An identical claim can be made if  $R_0, R_1, R_2, \dots \in A$  are such that  $d(\alpha(R_j), \alpha(\lim \mathcal{L})) = 2^{-2j-1}$ , hence  $A$  is covered by two lacunary sequences in the sense described above. Of course this implies  $\mathcal{L}$  is covered by four lacunary sequences since we could similarly show that the set  $B := \{R \in \partial \mathcal{L} : \alpha(R) < \alpha(\lim \mathcal{L})\}$  is covered by two lacunary sequences.  $\square$

**Theorem 1.2.**

*A: If  $\text{split}(\mathcal{T}_\Omega) = N < \infty$ , then  $\mathcal{T}_\Omega$  is lacunary of order  $N$ , and hence  $M_\Omega$  is bounded on  $L^p$  for  $1 < p < \infty$ .*

*B: Conversely, if  $\text{split}(\mathcal{T}_\Omega) = \infty$ , then  $\Omega$  admits Keakeya sets, and hence  $M_\Omega$  is unbounded on  $L^p$ ,  $p < \infty$ .*

**Remark 1.3.** Let  $\Omega$  be such that  $\text{split}(\mathcal{T}_\Omega) = N$ . In §5 we will see that there exists a constant  $C$  such that

$$\|M_\Omega f\|_p \leq CN \|f\|_p.$$

Theorem 1.2 automatically yields the “ $B \Rightarrow C$ ” part of Theorem 0.1, and we are already able to dispense with part A of Theorem 1.2. The following lemma records an easy observation that will help with the proof.

**Lemma 1.4.** *If  $\mathcal{T}$  is a tree, and  $u \neq v$  are vertices of  $\mathcal{T}$  with  $\text{split}(u) \geq N$ , and  $\text{split}(v) \geq N$ , and if  $h(u) \geq h(v)$ , then either  $\text{split}(\mathcal{T}) \geq N + 1$ , or there exists  $R \in \mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{T}}(v)$  such that  $u \in R$ , i.e.,  $u \subseteq v$ .*

*Proof.* First note that  $u$  and  $v$  must have a common ancestor. If there is no  $R \in \mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{T}}(v)$  such that  $u \in R$ , then the common ancestor is some other vertex  $w$ , and  $v \neq w \neq u$ . (Of course  $u$  cannot be the common ancestor since  $h(u) \geq h(v)$ .) But then  $\text{split}(w) \geq N + 1$ : since there are subtrees  $\mathcal{T}_v$  and  $\mathcal{T}_u$  for which  $\text{split}_{\mathcal{T}_v}(v) = N = \text{split}_{\mathcal{T}_u}(u)$ , we define  $\mathcal{T}_w$  to be the tree formed by joining  $\mathcal{T}_u$  with  $\mathcal{T}_v$  through  $w$ , and we have  $\text{split}_{\mathcal{T}_w}(w) = N + 1$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.2 part A.* If  $\text{split}(\mathcal{T}_{\Omega}) = 0$ , then  $\mathcal{T}_{\Omega}$  has only one ray rooted at the origin. Hence  $\mathcal{T}_{\Omega}$  is lacunary of order zero. Now we induct on the splitting number: suppose  $\text{split}(\mathcal{T}_{\Omega}) = N$ . By Lemma 1.4, all vertices  $v$  with  $\text{split}(v) = N$  lie along a single ray. So if  $v^*$  is a child of  $v$  not lying on the ray  $R$ , and if  $\mathcal{T}_{v^*}$  is a subtree of  $\mathcal{T}_{\Omega}$  rooted at  $v^*$ , then  $\text{split}_{\mathcal{T}_{v^*}}(v^*) \leq N - 1$ , and hence is lacunary of order  $N - 1$  by the induction hypothesis. But we can repeat this process, which results in  $\mathcal{T}_{\Omega}$  being lacunary of order  $N$ .  $\square$

Since we suppose now that  $\text{split}(\mathcal{T}_{\Omega}) = \infty$ , to prove Theorem 1.2 part B it suffices to exhibit, when  $\text{split}(\mathcal{T}_{\Omega}) \geq N$ , a collection of parallelograms  $\{P_t\}$ , each of which is pointed in one of the directions in  $\Omega$ , such that

$$(\clubsuit 1) \quad |\cup_t P_t| \lesssim \frac{1}{N}$$

and such that

$$(\clubsuit 2) \quad |\cup_t 3P_t| \gtrsim \frac{\log N}{N},$$

where  $3P_t$  is the parallelogram with the same center and width as  $P_t$ , but three times the length. To do this, we divide the interval  $[0, 1]$  on the  $y$ -axis into small intervals, each of which will serve as a base for one of the parallelograms  $P_t$ . The difficult part of the construction is to specify a slope for each of the parallelograms so that they satisfy the properties  $\clubsuit 1$  and  $\clubsuit 2$ . In fact, we will not give an explicit choice of slopes; instead, we will use the probabilistic method to show that such a choice exists.

## §2 PRUNED TREES AND STICKY MAPS

It will actually be to our advantage to limit the possible slopes to a subset of  $\Omega$ , represented by a *pruned* subtree  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $\mathcal{T}_{\Omega}$ , and to restrict our attention to a certain class of slope functions, called *sticky* maps. We now define these terms. Suppose  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  is a tree such that  $\text{split}(\mathcal{T}) = N$ . Then there is a vertex  $v_0 \in \mathcal{T}$  such that  $\text{split}(v_0) = N$ . Without loss

of generality, suppose  $v_0$  is the origin. We say that  $\mathcal{T}$  is *pruned* if for every  $R \in \mathfrak{R}_{\mathcal{T}}(v_0)$ , and every  $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ,  $R$  contains exactly one vertex  $v_j$  such that  $\text{split}(v_j) = j$ . If  $\mathcal{T}$  is not necessarily pruned, then we can find a pruned subtree  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  that still has splitting number  $N$  by the following recursive procedure:

1. Let  $v_0$  (the origin) be in  $\mathcal{P}$ .
2. Assign  $j := 0$ .
3. While  $0 \leq j < N$ , if  $v \in \mathcal{P}$  has splitting number  $N - j$ , choose a pair  $u, w$  such that  $u \subseteq c_0(v)$ ,  $w \subseteq c_1(v)$ ,  $\text{split}(u) \geq N - j - 1$ , and  $\text{split}(w) \geq N - j - 1$ , and add  $u, w$  to  $\mathcal{P}$ . Also add all vertices and edges connecting  $v$  to  $u$  and  $w$ .
4. Assign  $j := j + 1$ .

We call the vertices added to  $\mathcal{P}$  at the  $j$ th iteration the  $j$ th generation, and denote the collection of vertices in the  $j$ th generation  $G_j(\mathcal{T})$ . If  $\mathcal{T}$  is already pruned, then  $G_j(\mathcal{T})$  still makes sense. We will denote by  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T})$  the subtree of  $\mathcal{T}$  formed by  $\cup_j G_j(\mathcal{T})$  and the edges and vertices connecting  $G_j(\mathcal{T})$  to  $G_{j+1}(\mathcal{T})$ . Note that it is not necessary for any  $v \in G_j$  to have  $h(v) = j$ . (Except for  $j = 0$ , because we have assumed  $h(v_0) = 0$ , and  $G_0 = \{v_0\}$ .) Also note that for a general tree  $\mathcal{T}$  with splitting number  $N$ , there may exist several different subtrees  $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3, \dots$  each with splitting number  $N$ , and each pruned. The method above yields one of them.

We now consider maps  $\sigma : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ . Such a map is said to be *sticky* if whenever  $u \subseteq v \in \mathcal{B}$ , then  $\sigma(u) \subseteq \sigma(v)$  in  $\mathcal{S}$ . In addition, all sticky maps considered here will be assumed to satisfy  $h(\sigma(v)) = h(v)$  for all  $v \in \mathcal{B}$ . Recall that  $I_v$  is the dyadic interval identified with  $v$ , and note that  $|I_v| = 2^{-h(v)}$ , where  $|\cdot|$  denotes the standard Euclidean measure. Note that if  $V$  is a collection of vertices, and if  $v_1, v_2, \dots$  are the disjoint maximal elements in  $V$ , then

$$|\cup_{v \in V} I_v| = \sum |I_{v_j}|.$$

The following lemma gives an elementary fact about sticky maps into pruned trees that will be useful in completing the proof of Theorem 1.2 part B.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Suppose  $\sigma : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  is a sticky map into a pruned tree  $\mathcal{P}$  with generations  $G_k(\mathcal{P})$ . Then for each  $k = 0, 1, \dots, N$ ,*

$$\sum_{v \in G_k(\mathcal{P})} \sum_{u \in \sigma^{-1}(v)} |I_u| = 1.$$

*Proof.* Of course, for  $v_1 \neq v_2 \in G_k(\mathcal{P})$ , the sets  $\sigma^{-1}(v_1)$  and  $\sigma^{-1}(v_2)$  are disjoint. Hence the sum in the statement of the lemma is over a collection of vertices  $u_1, u_2, \dots \in \mathcal{B}$  such

that  $u_i \not\subseteq u_l$  whenever  $i \neq l$ . But then

$$\sum_{v \in G_k(\mathcal{P})} \sum_{u \in \sigma^{-1}(v)} |I_u| = \left| \bigcup_{u \in \sigma^{-1}(G_k(\mathcal{P}))} I_u \right| \leq 1,$$

since  $|[0, 1]| = 1$ . In fact, equality holds, since  $\bigcup_{u \in \sigma^{-1}(G_k(\mathcal{P}))} I_u = [0, 1]$ .

### §3 GEOMETRIC CONSTRUCTION

We can now be more specific about how to construct the collection of parallelograms mentioned above. We define the height of a tree  $\mathcal{T}$  by

$$h(\mathcal{T}) = 1 + \sup_{v \text{ splitting}} h(v)$$

where the sup is only taken over vertices  $v$  that split. Since we suppose  $\text{split}(\mathcal{T}_\Omega) \geq N$ , there exists a pruned subtree  $\mathcal{P} := \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{T}_\Omega)$  such that  $\text{split}(\mathcal{P}) = N$ . We will ignore all vertices  $v \in \mathcal{P}$  such that  $h(v) > h(\mathcal{P})$ . For each  $t = 0, \frac{1}{2^{h(\mathcal{P})}}, \frac{2}{2^{h(\mathcal{P})}}, \dots, \frac{2^{h(\mathcal{P})}-1}{2^{h(\mathcal{P})}}$ , we will have a parallelogram  $P_t = P_{t,\sigma}$  with corners  $(0, t), (0, t + 2^{h(\mathcal{P})}), (2, t + 2\sigma(t)),$  and  $(2, t + 2^{h(\mathcal{P})} + 2\sigma(t))$ , where  $\sigma : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  is a sticky map to be determined. We will write

$$K_\sigma = \bigcup_t P_{t,\sigma}.$$

To finish the proof of Theorem 1.2 part B, it remains to prove the following.

**Claim 3.1.** *A: If  $\sigma : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  is sticky, then*

$$|K_\sigma \cap ([0, 1] \times \mathbb{R})| \gtrsim \frac{\log N}{N}.$$

*B: There exists a sticky map  $\sigma : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  such that*

$$|K_\sigma \cap ([1, 2] \times \mathbb{R})| \lesssim \frac{1}{N}.$$

We begin by proving A. For  $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , define  $X_j$  to be the vertical strip

$$X_j = [2^{-j}, 2^{-j+1}] \times \mathbb{R}.$$

We will show that for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, \log N$ , we have the estimate

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

and Claim 3.1 A will follow. To do this we will control the intersections of the rectangles  $P_{t,\sigma}$  in the strip  $X_j$ . A more precise statement is given below in the setting of a measure space:



**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $(X, \mathcal{M}, |\cdot|)$  be a measure space, and let  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_K$  be sets with  $|A_i| = \alpha$  for every  $i$ . If*

$$\sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^K |A_i \cap A_l| \leq M,$$

then

$$\left| \bigcup_{i=1}^K A_i \right| \geq \frac{\alpha^2 K^2}{16M}.$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.2.* By pigeonholing, we obtain a set  $E \subseteq 1, \dots, K$  such that  $\#(E) \geq \frac{K}{2}$ , and

$$\sum_{l=1}^K |A_i \cap A_l| \leq \frac{2M}{K}$$

for  $i \in E$ . But this implies that

$$\frac{1}{\alpha} \int_{A_i} \sum_{l=1}^K \chi_{A_l} \leq \frac{2M}{\alpha K}$$

for  $i \in E$ , and hence that

$$\sum_{l=1}^K \chi_{A_l}(x) \leq \frac{4M}{\alpha K}$$

for  $x$  in a set  $B_i \subseteq A_i$ , with  $|B_i| \geq \frac{\alpha}{2}$  for  $i \in E$ . But then

$$\left| \bigcup_{i=1}^K A_i \right| \geq \left| \bigcup_{i \in E} B_i \right| \geq \frac{\alpha K}{4M} \sum_{i \in E} |B_i| = \frac{\alpha^2 K^2}{16M}.$$

□

Writing  $P_{t,\sigma,j} := P_{t,\sigma} \cap X_j$ , we have

$$|P_{t,\sigma,j}| = 2^{-h(\mathcal{P})-j}.$$

Then by Lemma 3.2, we only need to show

$$(\heartsuit) \quad \sum_{t_1=1}^{2^{h(\mathcal{P})}} \sum_{t_2=1}^{2^{h(\mathcal{P})}} |P_{t_1,\sigma,j} \cap P_{t_2,\sigma,j}| \lesssim \frac{N}{2^{2j}}.$$

Since the diagonal term is

$$\sum_{t_1=1}^{2^{h(\mathcal{P})}} |P_{t_1, \sigma, j}| = \frac{1}{2^j},$$

we will only be able to show  $(\heartsuit)$  when  $j = 0, 1, \dots, \log N$ . Let us introduce some notation that will be helpful in decomposing the sum in  $(\heartsuit)$ . For any two vertices  $u$  and  $v$  in  $\mathcal{B}_{h(\mathcal{P})}$ , let  $D(u, v)$  be the minimal vertex containing both  $u$  and  $v$ , i.e., let  $D(u, v)$  be the vertex  $w$  with largest height satisfying  $u \subseteq w$  and  $v \subseteq w$ . (Of course this notion could be defined on all pairs of vertices in  $\mathcal{B}$ , but we only need to use the restriction to pairs of vertices in  $\mathcal{B}_{h(\mathcal{P})}$ .) Then of course for a vertex  $w$ , we will write

$$D^{-1}(w) := \{(u, v) \in \mathcal{B}_{h(\mathcal{P})} \times \mathcal{B}_{h(\mathcal{P})} \quad : \quad D(u, v) = w\},$$

and if  $W$  is a collection of vertices, we will write  $D^{-1}(W) := \cup_{w \in W} D^{-1}(w)$ . Now suppose  $t_1 \neq t_2$ , and note that if

$$P_{t_1, \sigma, j} \cap P_{t_2, \sigma, j} \neq \emptyset,$$

then

$$(\diamond) \quad 2^{-j} |I_{D(t_1, t_2)}| \gtrsim 2^{-j} |\sigma(t_1) - \sigma(t_2)| \gtrsim |t_1 - t_2|.$$

(Note that  $|I_{D(t_1, t_2)}|$  is just the usual dyadic distance, except that here it is defined on vertices in  $\mathcal{B}$  identified with  $h(\mathcal{P})$ -digit binary expansions.) In light of this, we introduce for a vertex  $w \in \mathcal{B}$ ,

$$\Gamma^j(w) := \{(t_1, t_2) \in D^{-1}(w) \quad : \quad 2^j |t_1 - t_2| \lesssim |I_w|\}$$

and

$$\Gamma_l^j(w) := \{(t_1, t_2) \in D^{-1}(w) \quad : \quad 2^{j+l} |t_1 - t_2| \sim |I_w|\}$$

so that

$$\Gamma^j(w) = \bigcup_{l \geq 0} \Gamma_l^j(w).$$

Observe that

$$\# \left( \Gamma_l^j(w) \right) \sim 2^{2h(\mathcal{P}) - 2l - 2j - 2h(w)}$$

and

$$\# \left( \Gamma^j(w) \right) \sim 2^{2h(\mathcal{P}) - 2j - 2h(w)}.$$

Now we write the off-diagonal part of  $(\heartsuit)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t_1 \in \mathcal{B}_h(\mathcal{P})} \sum_{t_2 \neq t_1} |P_{t_1, \sigma, j} \cap P_{t_2, \sigma, j}| &= \sum_{v \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{(t_1, t_2) \in D^{-1}(\sigma^{-1}(v))} |P_{t_1, \sigma, j} \cap P_{t_2, \sigma, j}| \\ &= \sum_{v \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{u \in \sigma^{-1}(v)} \sum_{(t_1, t_2) \in D^{-1}(u)} |P_{t_1, \sigma, j} \cap P_{t_2, \sigma, j}| \\ &=: (\star). \end{aligned}$$

By  $(\diamond)$ , we have that if  $(t_1, t_2) \in D^{-1}(u)$  is to contribute to the sum, then

$$(\diamond\diamond) \quad |I_u| \gtrsim 2^j |t_1 - t_2|,$$

i.e.,  $(t_1, t_2) \in \Gamma^j(u)$ . Further, if  $(t_1, t_2) \in \Gamma_l^j(u)$  contributes, then

$$|\sigma(t_1) - \sigma(t_2)| \gtrsim 2^j |t_1 - t_2|,$$

so that in this case,

$$|P_{t_1, \sigma, j} \cap P_{t_2, \sigma, j}| \lesssim \frac{1}{2^{2h(\mathcal{P})} 2^j |t_1 - t_2|} \sim \frac{1}{2^{2h(\mathcal{P})} 2^{-l} |I_u|}.$$

Then because of  $(\diamond\diamond)$ , we may compute the innermost sum in  $(\star)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(t_1, t_2) \in D^{-1}(u)} |P_{t_1, \sigma, j} \cap P_{t_2, \sigma, j}| &= \sum_{(t_1, t_2) \in \Gamma^j(u)} |P_{t_1, \sigma, j} \cap P_{t_2, \sigma, j}| \\ &= \sum_{l \geq 0} \sum_{(t_1, t_2) \in \Gamma_l^j(u)} |P_{t_1, \sigma, j} \cap P_{t_2, \sigma, j}| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{l \geq 0} \frac{\#(\Gamma_l^j(u))}{2^{2h(\mathcal{P})-l} |I_u|} \\ &\lesssim \frac{|I_u|}{2^{2j}}. \end{aligned}$$

To finish estimating  $(\star)$ , we state and prove a technical-looking proposition, whose proof requires little more than counting exponents.

**Proposition 3.4.** *Fix  $w \in \mathcal{B}$ . Then for any  $l^* \geq 1$ ,*

$$\sum_{l=0}^{l^*-1} \sum_{\{u \subseteq w: h(u)=h(w)+l\}} \#(\Gamma_{l^*-l}^j(u)) \leq 2 \sum_{\{u \subseteq w: h(u)=h(w)+l^*\}} \#(\Gamma^j(u)).$$

*Proof.* There are  $2^l$  vertices  $u \subseteq w$  such that  $h(u) = h(w) + l$ , so the estimates on  $\Gamma_l^j(w)$  and  $\Gamma^j(w)$  allow us to control the left hand side in the statement of the proposition by

$$\sum_{l=0}^{l^*-1} 2^l 2^{2h(\mathcal{P})-2(l^*-l)-2j-2(h(w)+l)} \lesssim 2^{l^*} 2^{2h(\mathcal{P})-2j-2h(w)},$$

which is controlled by the right hand side.  $\square$

This Proposition allows us to restrict attention in the outer sum in  $(\star)$  to splitting vertices  $v \in \mathcal{P}$ , i.e., to vertices  $v \in G_k(\mathcal{P})$  for some  $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . For if  $v_1, v_2, \dots \in \mathcal{P}$  are such that  $v_{j+1}$  is a child of  $v_j$ , with  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{n-1}$  not splitting and  $v_n$  splitting, then by Proposition 3.4,

$$\sum_{l=1}^{n-1} \sum_{u \in \sigma^{-1}(v_l)} \sum_{(t_1, t_2) \in D^{-1}(u)} |P_{t_1, \sigma, j} \cap P_{t_2, \sigma, j}| \lesssim \sum_{u \in \sigma^{-1}(v_n)} \frac{|I_u|}{2^{2j}}.$$

Using the computation above with Proposition 3.4 and Lemma 2.1 yields

$$\begin{aligned} (\star) &\lesssim \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{v \in G_k(\mathcal{P})} \sum_{u \in \sigma^{-1}(v)} \frac{|I_u|}{2^{2j}} \\ &\lesssim \frac{N}{2^{2j}}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of Claim 3.1 A.

#### §4 THE PROBABILISTIC ARGUMENT AND PERCOLATION ON TREES

Now we prove probabilistically that there is some sticky map  $\sigma : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  such that  $|K_\sigma \cap ([1, 2] \times \mathbb{R})| \lesssim \frac{1}{N}$ . In fact, if we denote by  $Pr(x, y)$  the probability (over sticky  $\sigma$ ) that  $(x, y) \in P_{t, \sigma}$  for some  $t$ , it is enough to show that given  $(x, y) \in [1, 2] \times [0, 3]$ , we have  $Pr(x, y) \lesssim \frac{1}{N}$ . (Of course, if  $x \in [1, 2]$ , and  $y \notin [0, 3]$ , then  $(x, y)$  cannot possibly be covered by  $K_\sigma$ .) Then by the linearity of expectations, we would have

$$\begin{aligned} \int \left( \int_1^2 \int_0^3 \chi_{K_\sigma}(x, y) dy dx \right) d\sigma &= \int_1^2 \int_0^3 \left( \int \chi_{K_\sigma}(x, y) d\sigma \right) dy dx \\ &= \int_1^2 \int_0^3 Pr(x, y) dy dx \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{N}. \end{aligned}$$

This, of course, would imply the existence of a sticky map  $\sigma$  satisfying Claim 3.1 B.

Recall that there will be one parallelogram for each vertex  $t \in \mathcal{B}_h(\mathcal{P})$ . Since  $x > 1$ , for each  $t$ , there is at most one possible value for  $\sigma(t)$  in  $\mathcal{P}_h(\mathcal{P})$  such that  $(x, y) \in P_{t,\sigma}$ . If such a slope exists, call it  $S_{(x,y)}(t)$ ; if it does not exist, we will say  $S_{(x,y)}(t) = \infty$ . The set of  $t \in \mathcal{B}_h(\mathcal{P})$  for which  $S_{(x,y)}(t) < \infty$ , call it the *possible set* of  $(x, y)$ ,  $\text{Poss}(x, y)$ , will have at most  $2^N$  elements. Given a set of vertices  $V \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ , we denote by  $\langle V \rangle$  the tree generated by  $V$ , i.e., the subtree of  $\mathcal{B}$  consisting of  $V$  and all the ancestors of elements in  $V$  (and all the edges connecting these vertices). Now consider the subtree  $\langle \text{Poss}(x, y) \rangle \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ . Given  $t \in \text{Poss}(x, y)$ , there are at least  $N$  ancestors of  $t$ , say  $t_1, \dots, t_N \supseteq t$  such that  $t_j$  is an ancestor of  $t_{j+1}$  and such that  $\sigma(t_j)$  is a splitting vertex in  $\mathcal{P}$ . Call such vertices *choosing vertices*.

Now let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the tree formed by all the choosing vertices of  $\langle \text{Poss}(x, y) \rangle$ , and edges connecting any pair of choosing vertices  $u, v \in \langle \text{Poss}(x, y) \rangle$  such that  $u \subseteq v$  with no choosing vertex  $w$  such that  $u \subsetneq w \subsetneq v$ . Similarly, let  $\mathcal{B}_N^*$  be the tree formed by all the splitting vertices of  $\mathcal{P}$ , with edges connecting all the splitting vertices  $u, v \in \mathcal{P}$  such that  $u \subseteq v$  and there is no splitting vertex  $w$  such that  $u \subsetneq w \subsetneq v$ . Now  $\mathcal{B}_N^*$  is the binary tree of height  $N$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{B}_N^* = \mathcal{B} \cap \left( \bigcup_{k=1}^N \mathcal{B}_k \right),$$

and  $\mathcal{C}$  is a subtree of  $\mathcal{B}_N^*$ .

So now we construct the sticky maps  $\sigma : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  randomly as follows: to each edge  $e$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , assign a random variable  $r = r(e)$  that takes on the values 0 and 1 with probabilities  $\frac{1}{2}$ . We will write  $e_{v,u}$  to denote the edge connecting  $v$  to one of its children  $u$ . If  $r(e_{v,u}) = l$ , we set

$$\sigma(u) = c_l(\sigma(v)),$$

where, again, we use  $c_l(w)$  to denote the  $l$ th child of a vertex  $w$ .

Let  $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$ . Given  $v \in \mathcal{B}_k$ , for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, k$ , define  $A_j(v)$  to be the ancestor of  $v$  at height  $j$ . So if  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{P}_{t,\sigma}$ , and if

$$A_{j+1}(S_{(x,y)}(t)) = c_{b_j(t)}(A_j(S_{(x,y)}(t))),$$

for some sequence  $b_j$  of zeros and ones depending on  $t$ , then we must have

$$r(e_{A_j(t), A_j(t+1)}) = b_j(t).$$

Similarly, if we are to have  $(x, y) \in K_\sigma$ , then we must find a  $t \in \text{Poss}(x, y)$  such that  $r(e_{A_j(t), A_j(t+1)}) = b_j(t)$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, N$ . Since  $r$  takes on each value 0 or 1 with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$ , this requirement is equivalent to the following: if we remove each edge of  $\mathcal{C}$

with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$ , we require that a path remains from the root to  $\mathcal{C}_N$ . In the probability literature, the probability of this outcome is called the survival probability of Bernoulli( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) percolation on  $\mathcal{C}$ , which we discuss below.

Given a tree  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  of height  $N$ , remove each edge with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Denote by  $P(\mathcal{T})$  the probability that a path remains from the origin to  $\mathcal{T}_N$ . A convenient way to compute this quantity is to view  $\mathcal{T}$  as an electrical circuit. Accordingly, we define the resistance of the tree  $\mathcal{T}$  as follows: place the positive node of a battery at the root of  $\mathcal{T}$ , then identify all vertices in  $\mathcal{T}_N$ , and place the negative node of the battery at this new vertex. For each edge at distance  $k$  from the root, place a resistor of strength  $2^k$ . The resistance of the tree  $\mathcal{T}$ , call it  $R(\mathcal{T})$ , is defined to be the resistance of this circuit. The following result of R. Lyons relates the resistance of  $\mathcal{T}$  to the survival probability of Bernoulli ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) percolation on  $\mathcal{T}$ . We state and prove a special case to keep the paper self-contained. For a more general result, see [L]. For more about probability on trees, see [LP]. The proof given here is from [BK] and actually holds when  $\mathcal{T}$  is a subset of the ternary tree, but it works for our purposes since the binary tree is a subtree of the ternary tree.

**Theorem 4.1 (Lyons).** *We have that*

$$P(\mathcal{T}) \lesssim \frac{1}{2 + R(\mathcal{T})}.$$

*Proof of Claim 3.1 B.* Assuming Theorem 4.1, it remains to show that the resistance of the tree  $\mathcal{C}$  is  $\gtrsim \frac{1}{N}$ . First recall that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a subtree of the truncated binary tree  $\mathcal{B}_N^*$ , so  $R(\mathcal{C}) \geq R(\mathcal{B}_N^*)$ . Now to compute a lower bound for  $R(\mathcal{B}_N^*)$ , connect all vertices at height  $k$  by an ideal conductor to make one node  $V_k$ . (This only decreases the resistance of the circuit.) Now there are  $2^k$  connections between  $V_k^*$  and  $V_{k+1}^*$ , each with resistance  $2^k$ . If  $R_k$  is the resistance between  $V_k^*$  and  $V_{k+1}^*$ , then

$$\frac{1}{R_k} = \sum_1^{2^k} \frac{1}{2^k} = 1,$$

so  $R_k = 1$  for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Summing over  $k$  results in  $R(\mathcal{B}_N^*) \geq N$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* We prove this by induction on  $n$ . Clearly it is true for constant 2, when  $n = 0$ . We assume up to  $n - 1$ , we have

$$P(\mathcal{T}) \leq \frac{12}{2 + R(\mathcal{T})}.$$

We observe that we may view  $\mathcal{T}$  as the root together with up to 3 edges connected to 3 trees  $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2$ , and  $\mathcal{T}_3$ . (If some of these trees are empty, we assign them probability zero and infinite resistance.) We denote

$$P(\mathcal{T}) = P_j,$$

and

$$R(\mathcal{T}) = R_j.$$

Then we have the recursive formulae

$$(4.1) \quad P(\mathcal{T}) = \frac{1}{2}(P_1 + P_2 + P_3) - \frac{1}{4}(P_1P_2 + P_1P_3 + P_2P_3) + \frac{1}{8}P_1P_2P_3$$

and

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{1}{R(\mathcal{T})} = \frac{1}{2 + 2R_1} + \frac{1}{2 + 2R_2} + \frac{1}{2 + 2R_3}.$$

Now we break into two cases. In the first case, we have  $\frac{12}{2+R_j} > 2$  for some  $j$ . Then we have  $R_j < 4$ . This implies  $R(\mathcal{T}) < 10$  which implies  $\frac{12}{2+R(\mathcal{T})} > 1$ , so that we certainly have

$$P(\mathcal{T}) \leq \frac{12}{2 + R(\mathcal{T})}.$$

We define

$$Q_j = \frac{12}{2 + R_j}.$$

We may assume each  $Q_j \leq 2$ . Observe that if we define

$$F(x, y, z) = 1 - (1 - \frac{1}{2}x)(1 - \frac{1}{2}y)(1 - \frac{1}{2}z),$$

on the domain  $[0, 2] \times [0, 2] \times [0, 2]$  then  $F$  is monotone increasing in each variable. Therefore we have that

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} P(\mathcal{T}) &= F(P_1, P_2, P_3) \\ &\leq F(Q_1, Q_2, Q_3) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}(Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3) - \frac{1}{6}(Q_1Q_2 + Q_1Q_3 + Q_2Q_3) \end{aligned}$$

Note that the equality is (4.1), while for the two inequalities we have used that the  $Q$ 's are  $\leq 2$ .

Now plugging into (4.3), the definition of the  $Q$ 's, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathcal{T}) &\leq \frac{12}{2} \left[ \frac{(R_1 + 2)(R_2 + 2) + (R_1 + 2)(R_3 + 2) + (R_2 + 2)(R_3 + 2) - \frac{12}{6}(R_1 + R_2 + R_3 + 6)}{(R_1 + 2)(R_2 + 2)(R_3 + 2)} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{12}{2} \left[ \frac{(R_1 + 2)(R_2 + 2) + (R_1 + 2)(R_3 + 2) + (R_2 + 2)(R_3 + 2) - \frac{12}{6}(R_1 + R_2 + R_3 + 6)}{(R_1 + 2)(R_2 + 2)(R_3 + 2) - 4R_1 - 4R_2 - 4R_3 - 13} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{12}{2} \left[ \frac{(R_1 + 1)(R_2 + 1) + (R_1 + 1)(R_3 + 1) + (R_2 + 1)(R_3 + 1)}{(R_1 + 2)(R_2 + 2)(R_3 + 2) - 4R_1 - 4R_2 - 4R_3 - 13} \right] \\ &= \frac{12}{R(\mathcal{T}) + 2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here the second inequality is by decreasing the denominator and the third inequality is by increasing the numerator.

□

### §5 THE LACUNARY CASE

To complete the proof of Theorem 0.1, it remains to show the following proposition:

**Proposition 5.1.** *If  $\mathcal{T}_\Omega$  is lacunary of order  $N$ , then there exists a constant  $C$  such that*

$$\|M_\Omega f\|_p \leq CN \|f\|_p.$$

**Remark 5.2.** *As noted earlier, if  $\mathcal{T}_\Omega$  has splitting number  $N$ , then  $\mathcal{T}_\Omega$  is lacunary of order  $N$ , and hence*

$$\|M_\Omega f\|_p \leq CN \|f\|_p.$$

As mentioned earlier, the result in Proposition 5.1 was published in [SS]. The proof given here extends ideas present in [NSW], and follows Alfonseca [A].

Recall that each ray  $R \in \mathcal{T}_\Omega$  is identified with a real number  $\alpha(R) \in [0, 1]$ . If  $\mathcal{T}$  is a tree, we will define

$$\alpha(\mathcal{T}) = \{\alpha(R) : R \in \partial\mathcal{T}\}.$$

Now write  $v_\theta$  to denote the unit vector with slope  $\theta$ , and define

$$M_\theta f(x) = \sup_{h>0} \frac{1}{2h} \int_{-h}^h f(x + v_\theta t) dt.$$

If a tree  $\mathcal{L}$  is lacunary of order 1, then there is a ray, called  $\lim \mathcal{L}$  as in Remark 1.1, such that every splitting vertex in  $\mathcal{L}$  lies along  $\lim \mathcal{L}$ . Also define  $\beta_j(\mathcal{L})$  to be the (unique, if it exists) element of  $\alpha(\mathcal{L})$  such that  $d(\alpha(\lim \mathcal{L}), \beta_j) = 2^{-j}$ , where again  $d$  denotes the dyadic distance on real numbers, and let

$$\Omega_j(\mathcal{L}) := \{\beta \in \alpha(\mathcal{L}) : d(\alpha(\lim \mathcal{L}), \beta) = 2^{-j}\}.$$

**Proposition 5.3.** *Fix  $1 < p \leq \infty$ . Let  $\Omega^* \subseteq \Omega$ . If there exists a lacunary tree  $\mathcal{L}$  of order 1 such that  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{T}_{\Omega^*}$ , then there exists a constant  $C$ , depending only on  $p$ , such that*

$$\|M_\Omega f\|_p \leq C \|f\|_p \left( 1 + \sup_j \|M_{\Omega_j}\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \right).$$

A simple iteration of Proposition 5.3 will give us Proposition 5.1: For if  $\mathcal{T}_\Omega$  is lacunary of order  $N$ , then there exists  $\Omega^* \subseteq \Omega$  and a lacunary tree  $\mathcal{L}$  of order 1 such that  $\mathcal{T}_{\Omega^*} = \mathcal{L}$ .



Since  $\mathcal{T}_\Omega$  is lacunary of order  $N$ , we may actually choose such an  $\mathcal{L}$  so that  $\mathcal{T}_{\Omega_j(\mathcal{L})}$  is lacunary of order  $N - 1$  for all  $j$ . But then we may apply the proposition again to the sets  $\Omega_j$  and repeat to get  $\|M_\Omega f\|_p \leq CN\|f\|_p$ . It remains to prove Proposition 5.3.

*Proof of Proposition 5.3.* For convenience, we will rotate the plane so that  $\alpha(\lim \mathcal{L}) = 0$ . Let  $\delta_j = \frac{12}{20}2^{-j}$ . Let  $A_j$  be an interval centered around the dyadic interval containing the sets  $\Omega_j$  such that  $|A_j| = \delta_j$  and  $\text{dist}(A_j^c, \Omega_j) \geq \frac{1}{50}2^{-j}$ . Also let  $\widetilde{A}_j = \frac{13}{11}A_j$  and  $\widetilde{\widetilde{A}}_j = \frac{14}{11}A_j$ . Then define

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_j &= \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2: \frac{y}{x} \in A_j\} \\ \widetilde{\Delta}_j &= \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2: \frac{y}{x} \in \widetilde{A}_j\} \\ \widetilde{\widetilde{\Delta}}_j &= \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2: \frac{y}{x} \in \widetilde{\widetilde{A}}_j\}, \end{aligned}$$

and let  $\omega_j$  be a  $C^\infty$  function away from the origin, homogeneous of degree zero, such that  $\omega_j \equiv 1$  on  $\Delta_j$  and  $\omega_j \equiv 0$  outside  $\widetilde{\Delta}_j$ . Similarly, define  $\widetilde{\omega}_j$  with respect to the sectors  $\widetilde{\Delta}_j$  and  $\widetilde{\widetilde{\Delta}}_j$ . Define

$$\widehat{S}_j f = \omega_j \widehat{f}, \quad \widetilde{\widehat{S}}_j f = \widetilde{\omega}_j \widehat{f}.$$

Now let  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\psi \in C^\infty$ ,  $\psi \geq 0$ , be such that  $\psi \equiv 1$  on  $[-1, 1]$  and  $\psi \equiv 0$  outside  $[-2, 2]$ . For  $j \geq 1$  and  $\theta \in \Omega_j$ , define

$$N_{h,j,\theta} f(x) = \frac{1}{2h} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \psi\left(\frac{t}{h}\right) f(x + v_\theta t) dt.$$

We will only consider nonnegative  $f$ , and for such  $f$ ,  $\sup_{h>0} N_{h,j,\theta} f(x) \sim M_\theta f(x)$ . Let  $m = \widehat{\psi}$  and let  $\phi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be  $C_c^\infty$  with  $\phi(\xi) = 1$  when  $|\xi| \leq 1$ . Now we write

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{N_{h,j,\theta} f}(\xi) &= m(h\xi_1 + h\xi_2\theta) \widehat{f}(\xi) \\ &= \phi(h\delta_j\xi) m(h\xi_1 + h\xi_2\theta) \widehat{f}(\xi) \\ &\quad + (1 - \phi(h\delta_j\xi))(1 - \omega_j(h\xi)) m(h\xi_1 + h\xi_2\theta) \widehat{f}(\xi) \\ &\quad + (1 - \phi(h\delta_j\xi)) \omega_j(h\xi) m(h\xi_1 + h\xi_2\theta) \widehat{f}(\xi) \\ &=: I_{h,j,\theta} + II_{h,j,\theta} + III_{h,j,\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

To control  $I_{h,j,\theta}$ , we note that  $\phi$  is Schwartz, and hence  $I_{h,j,\theta}$  is controlled by the strong maximal function  $M_{\beta_j}^S$  with respect to the axes with slopes  $\beta_j$  and  $\beta_j + \pi$ , with constants independent of  $j$ . The term  $II_{h,j,\theta}$  can be estimated in the same way, giving us

$$(*) \quad \sup_h \sup_{\theta \in \Omega_j} I_{h,j,\theta} f(x) + II_{h,j,\theta} f(x) \leq CM_{\beta_j}^S f(x).$$

Hence

$$(**) \quad \left\| \sup_{j,h,\theta \in \Omega_j} (I_{h,j,\theta} + II_{h,j,\theta})f \right\|_p \leq C \|M_{\Omega^*} f\|_p \leq C \|f\|_p,$$

by the result in [NSW], since  $T_{\Omega^*}$  is lacunary of order 1. It remains to control  $III_{h,j,\theta}$ .

We will assume, for now, that  $\Omega$  is a finite set, and obtain a bound independent of the size of  $\Omega$ . Since  $\Omega$  is finite, there is some minimal constant  $C(\Omega)$  such that for  $f \in L^p$ ,

$$\left\| \sup_{j,h,\theta \in \Omega_j} |III_{h,j,\theta} f| \right\|_p \leq C(\Omega) \|f\|_p.$$

Note that  $N_{h,j,\theta}(g) \leq N_{h,j,\theta}(|g|)$  for any  $g, h, j, \theta$ , and let  $\{g_j\}$  be a sequence of functions. Then by (\*), (\*\*) and the decomposition of  $N_{h,j,\theta}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sup_{j,h,\theta \in \Omega_j} |III_{h,j,\theta}(g_j)| \right\|_p &\leq \left\| \sup_{j,h,\theta \in \Omega_j} |III_{h,j,\theta}(\sup_j |g_j|)| \right\|_p + c_0 \left\| \sup_j |g_j| \right\|_p \\ &\leq (C(\Omega) + c_0) \left\| \sup_j |g_j| \right\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

In fact, if  $C(\Omega) \leq c_0$  independent of  $\Omega$ , we are already finished with Proposition 5.3, so we can assume otherwise and estimate the quantity above by  $2C(\Omega)\|f\|_p$ . In addition, it is clear that

$$\left\| \left( \sum_j \sup_{h,\theta \in \Omega_j} |III_{h,j,\theta}(g_j)|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_p \leq \left( \sup_j \left\| \sup_{h,\theta \in \Omega_j} III_{h,j,\theta} \right\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \right) \left\| \left( \sum_j |g_j|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\|_p.$$

Interpolating yields

$$\left\| \left( \sum_j \sup_{h,\theta \in \Omega_j} |III_{h,j,\theta}(g_j)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p \lesssim C(\Omega)^{1-\frac{p}{2}} \left( \sup_j \left\| \sup_{h,\theta \in \Omega_j} III_{h,j,\theta} \right\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left\| \left( \sum_j |g_j|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p.$$

Recall that  $III_{h,j,\theta}f$  has frequency support in  $\widetilde{\Delta}_j$  so

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sup_{j,h,\theta \in \Omega_j} |III_{h,j,\theta}f| \right\|_p &\leq \left\| \left( \sum_j \sup_{h,\theta \in \Omega_j} |III_{h,j,\theta}(\widetilde{S}_j f)|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p \\ &\lesssim C(\Omega)^{1-\frac{p}{2}} \left( \sup_j \left\| \sup_{h,\theta \in \Omega_j} III_{h,j,\theta} \right\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left\| \left( \sum_j |\widetilde{S}_j f|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

But  $C(\Omega)$  is minimal, and one can show  $\left\| \left( \sum_j |\widetilde{S}_j f|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_p \leq C \|f\|_p$  by using Rademacher functions and the Marcinkiewicz multiplier theorem, as in [NSW], so

$$C(\Omega) \lesssim C(\Omega)^{1-\frac{p}{2}} \left( \sup_j \left\| \sup_{h, \theta \in \Omega_j} III_{h,j,\theta} \right\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}},$$

and hence

$$C(\Omega) \lesssim \sup_j \left\| \sup_{h, \theta \in \Omega_j} III_{h,j,\theta} \right\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p}.$$

However,

$$\begin{aligned} III_{h,j,\theta}(f) &\lesssim N_{h,j,\theta}(|\check{\omega}_j * f|) \\ &\lesssim M_{\Omega_j}(|\check{\omega}_j * f|) \\ &\lesssim M_{\Omega_j} \left( \left( \sum_j |\widetilde{S}_j f|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\sup_j \left\| \left\| \sup_{h, \theta \in \Omega_j} III_{h,j,\theta} \right\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p} \right\| \lesssim \sup_j \|M_{\Omega_j}\|_{L^p \rightarrow L^p},$$

and this proves Proposition 5.2.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [A] Alfonseca, A., *Strong type inequalities and an almost-orthogonality principle for families of maximal operators along directions in  $R^2$* , J. London Math. Soc. **67 no. 2** (2003), 208-218.
- [BK] Bateman, M., and Katz, N.H., *Keakeya sets in Cantor directions, available online at <http://lanl.arxiv.org/pdf/math.CA/0609187>*.
- [C] Cordoba, A., *The Keakeya Maximal Function and the Spherical Summation Multipliers*, Am. J. Math. **99 no. 1** (1977), 1-22.
- [CF1] Cordoba, A. and Fefferman, R., *On differentiation of Integrals*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. **74 no. 6** (1977), 2211-2213.
- [CF2] Cordoba, A. and Fefferman, R., *On the Equivalence between the Boundedness of Certain Classes of Maximal and Multiplier Operators in Fourier Analysis*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. **74 no. 2** (1977), 423-425.
- [L] Lyons, R., *Random walks, Capacity, and Percolation on trees*, Ann. Probab. **20** (1992), 2043-2088.
- [LP] Lyons, R. and Peres, Y., *Probability on Trees and Networks, in preparation, <http://mypage.iu.edu/~rdlyons/#book>*.
- [K] Katz, N.H., *A counterexample for maximal operators over a Cantor set of directions*, Math. Res. Let. **3** (1996), 527-536.
- [NSW] Nagel, A., Stein, E.M., and Wainger, S., *Differentiation in Lacunary Directions*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **75** (1978), 1060-1062.

- [SS] Sjögren, P. and Sjölin, P., *Littlewood-Paley decompositions and Fourier multipliers with singularities on certain sets*, Annales de l'institut Fourier **31 no. 1** (1981), 157-175.
- [S] Strömberg, J.-O., *Maximal functions for rectangles with given directions*, Thesis, Mittag-Leffler Inst., Djursholm, Sweden.