PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY Volume 141, Number 11, November 2013, Pages 3899–3904 S 0002-9939(2013)11678-3 Article electronically published on July 18, 2013

# HEISENBERG UNIQUENESS PAIRS IN THE PLANE. THREE PARALLEL LINES

#### DANIEL BLASI BABOT

(Communicated by Michael T. Lacey)

ABSTRACT. A Heisenberg uniqueness pair is a pair  $(\Gamma, \Lambda)$ , where  $\Gamma$  is a curve in the plane and  $\Lambda$  is a set in the plane, with the following property: any bounded Borel measure  $\mu$  in the plane supported on  $\Gamma$ , which is absolutely continuous with respect to arc length and whose Fourier transform  $\widehat{\mu}$  vanishes on  $\Lambda$ , must automatically be the zero measure. We characterize the Heisenberg uniqueness pairs for  $\Gamma$  as being three parallel lines  $\Gamma = \mathbb{R} \times \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$  with  $\alpha < \beta < \gamma$ ,  $(\gamma - \alpha)/(\beta - \alpha) \in \mathbb{N}$ .

### 1. Introduction

The Heisenberg uncertainty principle states that both a function and its Fourier transform cannot be too localized at the same time (see [2] and [3]). M. Benedicks in [1] proved that given a nontrivial function  $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , the Lebesgue measure of the set of points where  $f \neq 0$  and the set of points where the Fourier transform  $\hat{f} \neq 0$  cannot be simultaneously finite. In this paper we consider a similar problem for measures supported on a subset of  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

Let  $\Gamma$  be a smooth curve in the plane  $\mathbb{R}^2$  and  $\Lambda$  a subset in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . In [4], Hedenmalm and Montes-Rodríguez posed the problem of deciding when it is true that

$$\widehat{\mu}_{|\Lambda} = 0$$
 implies  $\mu = 0$ 

for any Borel measure  $\mu$  supported on  $\Gamma$  and absolutely continuous with respect to the arc length measure on  $\Gamma$ , where

$$\widehat{\mu}(\xi,\eta) = \int_{\mathbb{P}^2} e^{\pi i \langle (x,y), (\xi,\eta) \rangle} d\mu(x,y).$$

If this is the case, then  $(\Gamma, \Lambda)$  is called a *Heisenberg Uniqueness Pair* (HUP).

When  $\Gamma$  is the circle, Lev [7] and Sjölin [8] independently characterized the HUP for some "small" sets  $\Lambda$ .

In [4] Hedenmalm and Montes-Rodríguez characterized the HUP in the cases:

- $\Gamma$  is the hyperbola xy = 1 and  $\Lambda = (\alpha \mathbb{Z} \times \{0\}) \cup (\{0\} \times \beta \mathbb{Z})$ , for  $\alpha, \beta > 0$ .
- $\Gamma$  two parallel lines in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

Received by the editors March 29, 2011 and, in revised form, October 29, 2011 and January 23, 2012.

<sup>2010</sup> Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 42B10; Secondary 31B35, 81Q05.

Key words and phrases. Heisenberg uniqueness pairs, uncertainty principle.

The author was partially supported by the Göran Gustaffson Foundation, grant No. 2009SGR00420, and the DGICYT grant MTM2008-00145.

In this note we present a result generalizing this last case. We characterize the HUP for  $\Gamma$  as being three parallel lines:

$$\Gamma = \mathbb{R} \times \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\} \text{ with } \alpha < \beta < \gamma, \ (\gamma - \alpha)/(\beta - \alpha) \in \mathbb{N}.$$

# 2. Three parallel lines

Given a set  $E \subset \mathbb{R}$  and a point  $\xi \in E$ , let us define:

- $\mathcal{A}_{loc}^{E,\,\xi} = \{\text{functions } \psi \text{ defined on } E \text{ such that there exist a small interval } I_{\xi} \text{ around } \xi \text{ and a function } \varphi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}) \text{ such that } \psi(\zeta) = \widehat{\varphi}(\zeta), \text{ for } \zeta \in I_{\xi} \cap E\}.$
- $P^{1,p}[\mathcal{A}_{loc}^{E,\xi}] = \{\text{functions } \psi \text{ defined on } E \text{ such that there exist an interval } I_{\xi} \text{ around } \xi \text{ and functions } \varphi_0, \varphi_1 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}) \text{ with } \psi^p(\zeta) + \widehat{\varphi}_1(\zeta)\psi(\zeta) + \widehat{\varphi}_0(\zeta) = 0, \text{ for } \zeta \in I_{\xi} \cap E\}.$

Wiener's lemma [5, p. 57] states that if  $\psi \in \mathcal{A}^{E,\,\xi}_{loc}$  and  $\psi(\xi) \neq 0$ , then  $1/\psi \in \mathcal{A}^{E,\,\xi}_{loc}$ . Observe also that if  $\psi \in \mathcal{A}^{E,\,\xi}_{loc}$ , then  $\psi \in P^{1,p}[\mathcal{A}^{E,\,\xi}_{loc}]$ . This is easy to see only if p is natural.

Due to invariance under translation and rescaling (see [4]) it will be sufficient to study the case when  $\Gamma = \mathbb{R} \times \{0, 1, p\}$  for  $p \in \mathbb{N}, p > 1$ .

Given a set  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ , we say that  $\mu$  is an admissible measure if  $\mu$  is a Borel measure in the plane absolutely continuous with respect to arc length with  $supp \ \mu \subset \Gamma$  and  $\widehat{\mu}_{|\Lambda} = 0$ .

If  $\mu$  is a measure absolutely continuous with respect to arc length on  $\Gamma$ , then there exist functions  $f, g, h \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$  such that

$$\widehat{\mu}(\xi,\eta) = \widehat{f}(\xi) + e^{\pi i \eta} \widehat{g}(\xi) + e^{p\pi i \eta} \widehat{h}(\xi), \quad \text{for any} \quad (\xi,\eta) \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

In particular an admissible measure can be written in this form. Observe also that  $\widehat{\mu}$  is 2-periodic with respect to the second variable. So, for any set  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ , we may consider the periodized set

$$\mathcal{P}(\Lambda) = \{(\xi, \eta) \text{ such that } (\xi, \eta + 2k) \in \Lambda \text{ for some } k \in \mathbb{Z}\},$$

and it follows that  $(\Gamma, \Lambda)$  is a HUP if and only if  $(\Gamma, \overline{\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)})$  is a HUP, where  $\overline{\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)}$  stands for the closure of  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ .

We may think without loss of generality that  $\Lambda$  is a closed set in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , 2-periodic with respect to the second coordinate.

We then have the following result.

**Theorem 1.** Let  $\Gamma = \mathbb{R} \times \{0,1,p\}$ , for some  $p \in \mathbb{N}$ , p > 1 and  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ , closed and 2-periodic with respect to the second variable. Then  $(\Gamma, \Lambda)$  is a Heisenberg uniqueness pair if and only if

$$\mathfrak{F}:=\Pi^3(\Lambda)\cup(\Pi^2(\Lambda)\setminus\Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda))\cup(\Pi^1(\Lambda)\setminus\Pi^{1^*}(\Lambda))$$

is dense in  $\mathbb{R}$ .

 $\Pi(\Lambda)$  means the projection of  $\Lambda$  on the axis  $\mathbb{R} \times \{0\}$  and given a point  $\xi \in \Pi(\Lambda)$ , and  $Img(\xi)$  corresponds to the set of points  $\eta \in [0,2)$  with  $(\xi,\eta) \in \Lambda$ . The sets in  $\mathfrak{F}$  are defined as follows:

- $\Pi^1(\Lambda) = \{ \xi \in \Pi(\Lambda) \text{ such that there is a unique } \eta_0 \in Img(\xi) \}.$
- $\Pi^2(\Lambda) = \{ \xi \in \Pi(\Lambda) \text{ such that there are two different points } \eta_0, \eta_1 \in Img(\xi), \text{ and if there is another point } \eta_2 \in Img(\xi), \text{ then } \frac{e^{p\pi i\eta_1} e^{p\pi i\eta_0}}{e^{\pi i\eta_1} e^{\pi i\eta_0}} = \frac{e^{p\pi i\eta_2} e^{p\pi i\eta_0}}{e^{\pi i\eta_2} e^{\pi i\eta_0}} \}.$

•  $\Pi^3(\Lambda) = \{ \xi \in \Pi(\Lambda) \text{ such that there are at least three different points } \eta_0, \eta_1, \eta_2 \in Img(\xi) \text{ with } \frac{e^{p\pi i\eta_1} - e^{p\pi i\eta_0}}{e^{\pi i\eta_1} - e^{\pi i\eta_0}} \neq \frac{e^{p\pi i\eta_2} - e^{p\pi i\eta_0}}{e^{\pi i\eta_2} - e^{\pi i\eta_0}} \}.$ 

The following technical lemma is easy to prove and shows that the functions  $\tau$  and  $\Phi$  are well defined for  $\xi \in \Pi^2(\Lambda)$ .

**Lemma 2.** Let  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{C}$  be different with

$$\tau = \frac{y^p - x^p}{y - x} = \frac{z^p - x^p}{z - x};$$

then

$$\frac{z^p - y^p}{z - y} = \tau \quad and \quad \Phi = x\tau - x^p = y\tau - y^p = z\tau - z^p.$$

Let  $\chi$  be a function defined on  $\Pi^1(\Lambda)$  as  $\chi(\zeta) = e^{\pi i \eta}$ , where  $\eta \in Img(\zeta)$ . We define the set  $\Pi^{1*}(\Lambda)$  as

•  $\Pi^{1^*}(\Lambda) = \{ \xi \in \Pi^1(\Lambda) \text{ such that } \chi \in P^{1,p}[\mathcal{A}_{loc}^{\Pi^1(\Lambda),\xi}] \}.$ 

Let  $\tau, \Phi$  be functions defined on  $\Pi^2(\Lambda)$  as

$$\tau(\xi) = \frac{e^{p\pi i\eta_1} - e^{p\pi i\eta_0}}{e^{\pi i\eta_1} - e^{\pi i\eta_0}} \quad \text{ and } \quad \Phi(\xi) = e^{\pi i\eta_0} \frac{e^{p\pi i\eta_1} - e^{p\pi i\eta_0}}{e^{\pi i\eta_1} - e^{\pi i\eta_0}} - e^{p\pi i\eta_0},$$

where  $\eta_0, \ \eta_1 \in Img(\xi)$ . We define the set  $\Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)$  as

•  $\Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda) = \{ \xi \in \Pi^2(\Lambda) \text{ such that } \tau, \Phi \in \mathcal{A}^{\Pi^2(\Lambda), \, \xi}_{loc} \}.$ 

The next lemma will be needed for the proof of the necessity of condition (2.1) in Theorem 1.

**Lemma 3.** Let I be an interval in  $\mathbb{R}$  with  $\Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)$  dense in I. Then there exists a subinterval  $I' \subset I$  with  $I' \subset \Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda) \cup \Pi^3(\Lambda)$ .

*Proof.* Pick an arbitrary point  $\widetilde{\xi} \in I \cap \Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)$ . Since  $\tau, \Phi \in \mathcal{A}^{\Pi^2(\Lambda), \widetilde{\xi}}_{loc}$  and  $\Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)$  is dense in I, we can extend the functions  $\tau, \Phi$  continuously on a neighborhood of  $\widetilde{\xi}$ . Let  $\widetilde{\eta} \neq \widetilde{\varrho} \in Img(\widetilde{\xi})$ . Then

$$|\tau(\widetilde{\xi})| = \left|\frac{e^{p\pi i \widetilde{\eta}} - e^{p\pi i \widetilde{\varrho}}}{e^{\pi i \widetilde{\eta}} - e^{\pi i \widetilde{\varrho}}}\right| < p,$$

and since  $\tau$  is continuous around  $\widetilde{\xi}$ , there exists a small interval I' around  $\widetilde{\xi}$  with  $|\tau(\xi)| < p$  for  $\xi \in I'$ . We will see that  $I' \subset \Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda) \cup \Pi^3(\Lambda)$ .

Given  $\xi \in I'$ , consider a sequence  $\{\xi_k\} \subset \Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda) \cap I'$  with  $\xi_k \to \xi$ , and for each  $\xi_k$  let  $\eta_k \neq \varrho_k \in Img(\xi_k)$ . There exist subsequences  $\{\eta_k^*\}$  and  $\{\varrho_k^*\}$  such that  $\eta_k^* \to \eta^*$  and  $\varrho_k^* \to \varrho^*$  for some  $\eta^*, \varrho^* \in [0, 2]$ . Since the set  $\Lambda$  is closed and 2-periodic with respect to the second coordinate, we may assume WLOG that  $\xi \in \Pi(\Lambda)$  with  $\eta^* \neq \varrho^* \in Img(\xi)$ . Otherwise,

$$\begin{split} |\tau(\xi)| & \longleftarrow |\tau(\xi_k^*)| = \left| e^{(p-1)\pi i \eta_k^*} + e^{(p-2)\pi i \eta_k^*} e^{\pi i \varrho_k^*} + \dots + e^{(p-1)\pi i \varrho_k^*} \right| \\ & \longrightarrow \left| e^{(p-1)\pi i \eta^*} + e^{(p-1)\pi i \eta^*} + \dots + e^{(p-1)\pi i \eta^*} \right| = p, \end{split}$$

which is a contradiction with the fact that  $\xi \in I'$ .

So  $I' \subset \Pi^2(\Lambda) \cup \Pi^3(\Lambda)$ , and since the extended functions  $\tau, \Phi$  are continuous on I', we also have that  $\xi \in \Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)$  for any  $\xi \in \Pi^2(\Lambda) \cap I'$ . Also, we can conclude that  $I' \subset \Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda) \cup \Pi^3(\Lambda)$ .

## 3. Proof of the main result

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1. The proof of the sufficiency of condition (2.1) is rather easy. Let  $\mu$  be an admissible measure. Then there exist functions  $f, g, h \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$  such that

$$\widehat{\mu}(\xi,\eta) = \widehat{f}(\xi) + e^{\pi i \eta} \widehat{g}(\xi) + e^{p\pi i \eta} \widehat{h}(\xi), \quad \text{for any} \quad (\xi,\eta) \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Since  $\mathfrak{F}$  is dense in  $\mathbb{R}$  we will be done if we show that  $\widehat{f}(\xi) = \widehat{g}(\xi) = \widehat{h}(\xi) = 0$  for any  $\xi \in \mathfrak{F} = \Pi^3(\Lambda) \cup (\Pi^2(\Lambda) \setminus \Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)) \cup (\Pi^1(\Lambda) \setminus \Pi^{1^*}(\Lambda))$ .

If  $\xi \in \Pi^3(\Lambda)$ , let  $\eta_0, \eta_1, \eta_2 \in Img(\xi)$  be different. Since  $\widehat{\mu}_{|\Lambda} = 0$  and  $\frac{e^{p\pi i\eta_1} - e^{p\pi i\eta_0}}{e^{\pi i\eta_1} - e^{\pi i\eta_0}}$ , it follows that  $\widehat{f}(\xi) = \widehat{g}(\xi) = \widehat{h}(\xi) = 0$ .

If  $\xi \in \Pi^2(\Lambda)$ , let  $\eta_0 \neq \eta_1 \in Img(\xi)$ . Since  $\widehat{\mu}_{|\Lambda} = 0$ , then  $\widehat{g}(\xi) = -\tau(\xi)\widehat{h}(\xi)$  and  $\widehat{f}(\xi) = \Phi(\xi)\widehat{h}(\xi)$ . Suppose  $\widehat{h}(\xi) \neq 0$ . Then by Wiener's lemma and Fubini's theorem,  $\tau, \Phi \in \mathcal{A}^{\Pi^2(\Lambda), \xi}_{loc}$ , which implies that  $\xi \in \Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)$ . So if  $\xi \in \Pi^2(\Lambda) \setminus \Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)$ , then  $\widehat{f}(\xi) = \widehat{g}(\xi) = \widehat{h}(\xi) = 0$ .

Finally, if  $\xi \in \Pi^1(\Lambda)$  and  $\eta_0 \in Img(\xi)$ , since  $\widehat{\mu}_{|\Lambda} = 0$ , then  $\widehat{f}(\xi) + \chi(\xi)\widehat{g}(\xi) + \chi^p(\xi)\widehat{h}(\xi) = 0$ , where  $\chi(\xi) = e^{\pi i \eta_0}$ . Suppose  $\widehat{h}(\xi) \neq 0$ ; then  $\chi \in P^{1,p}[\mathcal{A}^{\Pi^1(\Lambda), \xi}_{loc}]$  and  $\xi \in \Pi^{1^*}(\Lambda)$ . Otherwise, if  $\widehat{h}(\xi) = 0$  and  $\widehat{g}(\xi) \neq 0$ , then by Wiener's lemma and Fubini's theorem,  $\chi \in \mathcal{A}^{\Pi^1(\Lambda), \xi}_{loc}$  and also  $\chi^p \in \mathcal{A}^{\Pi^1(\Lambda), \xi}_{loc}$ , so  $\chi \in P^{1,p}[\mathcal{A}^{\Pi^1(\Lambda), \xi}_{loc}]$  and  $\xi \in \Pi^{1^*}(\Lambda)$ . This means that if  $\xi \in \Pi^1(\Lambda) \setminus \Pi^{1^*}(\Lambda)$ , then  $\widehat{f}(\xi) = \widehat{g}(\xi) = \widehat{h}(\xi) = 0$ .

For the proof of the necessity of condition (2.1), suppose that the set  $\mathfrak{F}$  is not dense in  $\mathbb{R}$  and let us pick an open interval I that has empty intersection with  $\mathfrak{F}$ , i.e.,

$$\Pi(\Lambda) \cap I = (\Pi^{1^*}(\Lambda) \cup \Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)) \cap I.$$

We consider three cases:

• There exists a small interval  $I_{\xi} \subset I$  around  $\xi \in \Pi^{1^*}(\Lambda)$  such that all the points in  $I_{\xi} \cap \Pi(\Lambda)$  belong to  $\Pi^{1^*}(\Lambda)$ . Since  $\chi \in P^{1,p}[\mathcal{A}^{\Pi^1(\Lambda),\,\xi}_{loc}]$ , there exist an interval  $I' \subset I_{\xi}$  around  $\xi$  and functions  $\varphi_0, \varphi_1 \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$  such that

$$\chi^p(\xi^*) + \widehat{\varphi}_1(\xi^*)\chi(\xi^*) + \widehat{\varphi}_0(\xi^*) = 0$$

for any  $\xi^* \in I' \cap \Pi(\Lambda)$ . Let  $h \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$  with  $\widehat{h}(\xi) \neq 0$  and  $supp \widehat{h} \subseteq I'$ , and define  $f, g \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$  via  $\widehat{f} = \widehat{h}\widehat{\varphi_0}$ , and  $\widehat{g} = \widehat{h}\widehat{\varphi_1}$ . Now,

$$\widehat{\mu}(\xi^*, \eta^*) = \widehat{f}(\xi^*) + \widehat{g}(\xi^*)\chi(\xi^*) + \widehat{h}(\xi^*)\chi^p(\xi^*) = 0$$

for  $\xi^* \in I' \cap \Pi^{1^*}(\Lambda)$ ,  $\eta^* \in Img(\xi^*)$ . Finally, since  $supp \ \widehat{h} \subseteq I'$  and  $I' \cap \Pi(\Lambda) = I' \cap \Pi^{1^*}(\Lambda)$ , we can conclude that  $\widehat{\mu}_{|\Lambda} \equiv 0$ , and we have that  $\mu$  is a nontrivial admissible measure. So  $(\Gamma, \Lambda)$  is not a Heisenberg uniqueness pair.

• There exists a small interval  $I_{\xi} \subset I$  around  $\xi \in \Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)$  such that all the points in  $I_{\xi} \cap \Pi(\Lambda)$  belong to  $\Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)$ . Now there exists a small interval  $I' \subset I_{\xi}$  around  $\xi$  and functions  $\Phi_1, \tau_1 \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$  such that  $\widehat{\tau_1} = \tau$  and  $\widehat{\Phi_1} = \Phi$  on  $I' \cap \Pi(\Lambda)$ . Consider a function  $h \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$  with  $supp \widehat{h} \subset I'$  and  $\widehat{h}(\xi) \neq 0$ , and define  $f, g \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$  as

$$g = -h * \tau_1$$
 and  $f = h * \Phi_1$ .

Now, given a point  $\xi^* \in I' \cap \Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)$ , let  $\eta^* \neq \varrho^* \in Img(\xi^*)$ . Since  $\tau(\xi^*) = \frac{e^{p\pi i\eta^*} - e^{p\pi i\varrho^*}}{e^{\pi i\eta^*} - e^{\pi i\varrho^*}}$  and  $\Phi(\xi) = e^{\pi i\eta^*} \frac{e^{p\pi i\eta^*} - e^{p\pi i\varrho^*}}{e^{\pi i\eta^*} - e^{\pi i\varrho^*}} - e^{p\pi i\varrho^*}$ , we have that

$$\widehat{\mu}(\xi^*,\eta^*) = \quad \widehat{f}(\xi^*) + \widehat{g}(\xi^*) e^{\pi i \eta^*} + \widehat{h}(\xi^*) e^{p\pi i \eta^*} = 0$$

and also that  $\widehat{\mu}(\xi^*, \varrho^*) = 0$ . So, the corresponding measure  $\mu$  is a nontrivial admissible measure and  $(\Gamma, \Lambda)$  is not a Heisenberg uniqueness pair.

• All the intervals  $I_{\xi} \subset I$  contain points in  $\Pi^{1^*}(\Lambda)$  and points in  $\Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)$ . That is, the sets  $\Pi^{1^*}(\Lambda)$  and  $\Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)$  are dense in  $I \cap (\Pi^{1^*}(\Lambda) \cup \Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)) = I \cap \Pi(\Lambda)$ . But this is not possible. In fact, if  $\Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)$  is dense in I, by Lemma 3, there exists a subinterval  $I' \subset I$  such that  $I' \subset \Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda) \cup \Pi^3(\Lambda)$ .

This finishes the proof of the theorem.

#### 4. Examples and further results

Given a point  $\xi \in \Pi(\Lambda)$  such that  $\sharp \{ \eta \in Img(\xi) \} \geq 3$ , we will state a criteria to decide whether the point  $\xi$  belongs to  $\Pi^3(\Lambda)$  or to  $\Pi^2(\Lambda)$ . But before this we prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.** Given  $C \in \mathbb{C}$ , there exist at most p different points  $\rho^{(k)} \in [0,2)$  such that for any  $j \neq k$ ,

(4.1) 
$$\frac{x^p - y^p}{x - y} = C, \quad \text{where} \quad x = e^{\pi i \rho^{(k)}}, \ y = e^{\pi i \rho^{(j)}}.$$

*Proof.* Observe that for fixed C, there exists a constant  $C^* \in \mathbb{C}$  such that

$$(4.2) xC - x^p = C^*$$

for any  $x = e^{\pi i \rho^{(k)}}$  solution of (4.1). Now it is obvious that there are at most p different solutions  $\rho^{(k)} \in [0,2)$  of the equation (4.2).

Corollary 5. Given a point  $\xi \in \Pi(\Lambda)$ , if  $\sharp \{ \eta \in Img(\xi) \} > p$ , then  $\xi \in \Pi^3(\Lambda)$ .

In particular, if  $\Gamma$  consists of three parallel equidistant lines in the plane (p=2), we have

$$\Pi^{3}(\Lambda) = \{ \xi \in \Lambda \text{ such that } \sharp \{ \eta \in Img(\xi) \} \ge 3 \},$$
  
$$\Pi^{2}(\Lambda) = \{ \xi \in \Lambda \text{ such that } \sharp \{ \eta \in Img(\xi) \} = 2 \}.$$

**Example 6.** The following example shows that Corollary 5 is sharp:

• Let  $\Lambda = \mathbb{R} \times \{2k/p\}_{k=0,\dots,p-1}$ . Then for any  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\sharp \{\eta \in Img(\xi)\} = p$$

and  $\xi \in \Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)$ . Observe that in this case,  $(\Gamma, \Lambda)$  is not an HUP.

This lemma will be useful for another example.

**Lemma 7.** For any  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  with |z| < 1, there exist  $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{C}$  unimodular with  $z = w_1 + w_2$ .

*Proof.* Let  $z = re^{i\sigma}$  and let  $v \in [0, \pi/2]$  with  $\cos v = r/2$ . Let's take

$$w_1 = e^{i(v+\sigma)}, \quad w_2 = e^{i(-v+\sigma)}.$$

Then,

$$w_1 + w_2 = e^{i(v+\sigma)} + e^{i(-v+\sigma)} = e^{i\sigma}2\cos(v) = re^{i\sigma} = z,$$

and this finishes the proof.

**Example 8.** Let p=2. Let g be a bounded, continuous function with |g|<1 that is nowhere locally the Fourier transform of an  $L^1$  function. There exists a set  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R} \times [0,2)$  such that  $\Pi(\Lambda) = \Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)$  is dense in  $\mathbb{R}$  and the function  $\Phi \equiv g$  on  $\Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)$ . So,  $(\Gamma, \Lambda)$  is not an HUP.

Let's first prove the existence of the function g. Let E be a dense set of measure zero on the circle  $\mathbb{T}$ . By [6] there exists a continuous function f such that the Fourier series of f fails to converge on any point of E. Now let  $g: \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$  be the 2-periodic function defined as  $g(t) = f(e^{\pi it})$ . It is easy to see that this function g is continuous but it is not a Fourier transform of an  $L^1$  function locally at any point. By a standard argument we can think that g is bounded with |g| < 1.

Now we will define the set  $\Lambda$ . By Lemma 7, for any  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$  there exist  $w_1(\xi) = e^{\pi i \eta_0}$ ,  $w_2(\xi) = e^{\pi i \eta_1}$  with  $w_1(\xi) + w_2(\xi) = g(\xi)$ . Observe also that there is a dense set  $\Psi$  of  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $\eta_0 \neq \eta_1$  for any  $\xi \in \Psi$ . Otherwise the function g is constant on an interval, and we get a contradiction with the fact that g is not locally the Fourier transform of an  $L^1$  function.

We define 
$$\Lambda = \{(\xi, \eta_0) \cup (\xi, \eta_1)\}_{\xi \in \Psi}$$
. Now  $\Pi(\Lambda) = \Pi^2(\Lambda)$  and  $\Phi(\xi) = e^{\pi i \eta_0} + e^{\pi i \eta_1} = g(\xi)$ , for any  $\xi \in \Psi$ .

Since  $\Phi \notin \mathcal{A}_{loc}^{\Pi^2(\Lambda),\,\xi}$  for any  $\xi \in \Pi^2(\Lambda)$ , we have that  $\Pi(\Lambda) = \Pi^{2^*}(\Lambda)$ , and so  $(\Gamma, \Lambda)$  is not an HUP.

#### Acknowledgements

The author thanks Håkan Hedenmalm for proposing the problem and Ioannis Parissis and Joaquim Ortega-Cerdà for helpful comments.

# References

- M. Benedicks, On Fourier transforms of functions supported on sets of finite Lebesgue measure, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 106 (1985), no. 1, 180-183. MR780328 (86f:43006)
- [2] W. Heisenberg, Uber den anschaulichen Inhalt der quantentheoretischen Kinematik und Mechanik, Physik 43 (1927), 172-198.
- [3] V. Havin; B. Jöricke, The uncertainty principle in harmonic analysis, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)], 28. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994. MR1303780 (96c:42001)
- [4] H. Hedenmalm; A. Montes-Rodríguez, Heisenberg uniqueness pairs and the Klein-Gordon equation, Ann. of Math. (2) 173 (2011), no. 3, 1507-1527. MR2800719
- [5] J.P. Kahane, Séries de Fourier absolument convergentes, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Band 50, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York (1970). MR0275043 (43:801)
- [6] J.P. Kahane; Y. Katznelson, Sur les ensembles de divergence des séries trigonométriques, Studia Math. 26 (1966), 305-306. MR0199633 (33:7776)
- [7] N. Lev, Uniqueness theorems for Fourier transforms, Bull. Sci. Math. 135 (2011), no. 2, 134-140. MR2773393
- [8] P. Sjölin, Heisenberg uniqueness pairs and a theorem of Beurling and Malliavin, Bull. Sci. Math. 135 (2011), no. 2, 125-133. MR2773392 (2012c:42026)

Departament de Matemàtiques, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193 Cerdanyola del Vallès, Catalunya, Spain

E-mail address: dblasi@gmail.com