

# THE MATTILA-SJÖLIN PROBLEM FOR THE $k$ -DISTANCE OVER A FINITE FIELD

DAEWOONG CHEONG, HUNSEOK KANG, AND JINBEOM KIM

ABSTRACT. Let  $\mathbb{F}_q^d$  be a  $d$ -dimensional vector space over a finite field  $\mathbb{F}_q$  with  $q$  elements. For  $x \in \mathbb{F}_q^d$ , let  $\|x\| = x_1^2 + \cdots + x_d^2$ . By abuse of terminology, we shall call  $\|\cdot\|$  a norm on  $\mathbb{F}_q^d$ . For a subset  $E \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$ , let  $\Delta(E)$  be the distance set on  $E$  defined as

$$\Delta(E) := \{\|x - y\| : x, y \in E\}.$$

The Mattila-Sjölin problem seeks the smallest exponent  $\alpha > 0$  such that  $\Delta(E) = \mathbb{F}_q$  for all subsets  $E \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$  with  $|E| \geq Cq^\alpha$ . In this article, we consider this problem for a variant of this norm, which generates a smaller distance set than the norm  $\|\cdot\|$ . Namely, we replace the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  by the so-called  $k$ -norm ( $1 \leq k \leq d$ ), which can be viewed as a kind of deformation of  $\|\cdot\|$ . To derive our result on the Mattila-Sjölin problem for the  $k$ -norm, we use a combinatorial method to analyze various summations arising from the discrete Fourier machinery. Even though our distance set is smaller than the one in the Mattila-Sjölin problem, for some  $k$  we still obtain the same result as that of Iosevich and Rudnev [15], which deals with the Mattila-Sjölin problem. Furthermore, our result is sharp in all odd dimensions.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In geometric measure theory, the Falconer distance problem asks for a minimal Hausdorff dimension  $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E)$  of compact subsets  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  for which the distance set

$$\Delta(E) := \{\|x - y\| : x, y \in E\}$$

has positive Lebesgue measure, where  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the Euclidean norm on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . In 1985, Falconer [11] conjectured that for each compact subset  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  ( $d \geq 2$ ), if  $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E) > d/2$ , then the distance set  $\Delta(E)$  has positive Lebesgue measure. Falconer then proved that this is the case when  $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E) > (d+1)/2$ . While some progress has been made, the question remains open in all dimensions (for example, see references [1, 25, 9, 5, 12, 8, 6, 7]).

Also, Mattila and Sjölin [19] obtained a stronger result that if  $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(E) > (d+1)/2$ , then  $\Delta(E)$  has a non-empty interior as a subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Note that the lower bounds in both results are far from the conjectured dimension threshold  $d/2$ .

The Falconer distance problem can also be considered a continuous version of the Erdős distinct distances problem, which asserts that large finite point sets must have many distinct distances. We refer to references [2], [10], [13], [16], and [23] for a more precise definition of the Erdős distinct distance problem, as well as the known results and conjecture.

On the other hand, Iosevich and Rudnev [15] considered a discrete analogue of the Falconer distance problem over a finite field, which in the literature is referred to as the

Erdős-Falconer distance problem (EF problem). Let us introduce the EF problem. For  $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_q^d$ , a distance between  $x$  and  $y$  is defined by

$$\|x - y\| := (x_1 - y_1)^2 + \cdots + (x_d - y_d)^2.$$

By abuse of terminology, we shall call this a standard distance on  $\mathbb{F}_q^d$ . For a subset  $E \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$ , the distance set  $\Delta(E)$  is given by

$$(1.1) \quad \Delta(E) := \{\|x - y\| : x, y \in E\}.$$

The EF problem asks for the smallest exponent  $\alpha > 0$  for which  $|\Delta(E)| \gtrsim q$  whenever  $|E| \geq Cq^\alpha$  for a sufficiently large constant  $C$ . Here, and throughout this paper,  $A \gtrsim B$  means  $A \geq cB$  where  $0 < c \leq 1$  denotes some constant independent of  $q$ .

There is a stronger version of the EF problem, referred to as the Mattila-Sjölin problem (MS problem), which can be stated as follows:

**Question 1.1** (The MS problem). *Determine the smallest exponent  $\beta > 0$  such that if  $E \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$  with  $|E| \geq Cq^\beta$  for a sufficiently large  $C$ , then  $\Delta(E) = \mathbb{F}_q$ .*

Let us first list some results for the MS problem. Iosevich and Rudnev [15] showed that  $\Delta(E) = \mathbb{F}_q$  whenever  $|E| > 2q^{(d+1)/2}$ . Since then, much effort was made by many researchers to lower the exponent  $\frac{d+1}{2}$ . Hart et al. [14] demonstrated that the exponent  $\frac{d+1}{2}$  due to Iosevich and Rudnev [15] is indeed sharp for the specific odd dimensions  $d$  and under certain assumptions on  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . In addition, they showed that the exponent  $d/2$  for the EF problem cannot be lowered for all even dimensions  $d$ , which implies that the exponent  $\alpha$  should be greater or equal to  $\frac{d}{2}$  in this case. Very recently, Iosevich, Koh and Rakhmonov [22] provided another examples to show that for all  $d \geq 3$ , the exponent  $\alpha$  for EF problem should be greater or equal to  $\frac{d}{2}$  (resp.  $\frac{d+1}{2}$ ) for even (resp. odd)  $d$ .

Let us review some known results for the EF problem. For  $d = 2$ , Chapman et al. [3] obtained the exponent  $4/3$  for the EF problem, whereas it was shown in [20] that the exponent cannot be lowered beyond  $4/3$  for the MS problem. This result was obtained by utilizing a relationship between the EF problem and the Fourier restriction problem, and it is the first result to show that the optimal result  $(d+1)/2$  in odd dimensions can be improved in even dimensions. In the case where  $\mathbb{F}_q$  is a prime field, the result of  $4/3$  has been improved to  $5/4$  by Murphy, Petridis, Pham, Rudnev and Stevens [21]. However, in even higher dimensions  $d \geq 4$ , there is no known result that improves the result of  $(d+1)/2$  for the EF problem.

The main purpose of this paper is to introduce a modified distance, which generates a smaller distance set than the standard distance does, and show that the distance result of  $(d+1)/2$  can still be achieved under this new distance.

Now we present our distance problem and main result. For  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{F}_q^d$ , let  $\mathcal{Z}(x)$  denote the number of zero coordinates of  $x$ . Fix  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ . Define a  $k$ -norm

$\|\cdot\|_k$  on  $\mathbb{F}_q^d$  as

$$(1.2) \quad \|x\|_k = \begin{cases} \|x\| & \text{if } 0 \leq \mathcal{Z}(x) \leq k-1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that if  $k = d$ , two norms coincide with each other;  $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_d$ . Thus the  $k$ -norm  $\|\cdot\|_k$  may be considered a deformation of the standard norm  $\|\cdot\|$  such that it is more deformed as  $k$  gets smaller. The distance induced by  $k$ -norm shall be called a  $k$ -distance. For a subset  $E \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$ , define a  $k$ -distance set

$$D_k(E) = \{\|x - y\|_k : x, y \in E\}.$$

With this newly defined distance set, one can ask the following natural question concerning a distance-related problem.

**Question 1.2** (The MS problem for  $k$ -distance sets). *What is the smallest exponent  $\gamma > 0$  such that whenever  $E \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$  with  $|E| \geq Cq^\gamma$  for a sufficiently large  $C$ , we have  $D_k(E) = \mathbb{F}_q$ ?*

Here, we observe that the MS problem for  $k$ -distance sets in Question 1.2 can be viewed as a significantly stronger version of the original MS problem posed in Question 1.1, in the sense that the equality  $D_k(E) = \mathbb{F}_q$  is less likely to be achieved than the equality  $\Delta(E) = \mathbb{F}_q$  since  $D_k(E) \subset \Delta(E)$  for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots, d$ . This suggests that for odd dimensions  $d$ , the smallest possible exponent  $\gamma$  for Question 1.2 cannot be smaller than the optimal result  $(d+1)/2$  of the MS problem in Question 1.1, and for even dimensions, it cannot be smaller than the conjectured result  $d/2$  of the same problem. Moreover, for each integer  $k = 1, 2, \dots, d$ , if we take  $E = \mathbb{F}_q^{d-k} \times \{\mathbf{0}\} \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$ , then  $|E| = q^{d-k}$ , yet  $D_k(E) = \{0\} \neq \mathbb{F}_q$ . From this example, we can see that the smallest exponent  $\beta$  for Question 1.2 cannot be less than  $d - k$ . Therefore, one can propose the following conjecture on the MS problem for  $k$ -distance sets.

**Conjecture 1.3.** *Let  $E \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$ ,  $d \geq 2$ , and assume that  $C$  is a sufficiently large constant independent of  $q$ . Then for each integer  $k = 1, 2, \dots, d$ , the following statements hold:*

- (i) *If  $d$  is odd and  $|E| \geq Cq^{\max\{(d+1)/2, d-k\}}$ , then  $D_k(E) = \mathbb{F}_q$ .*
- (ii) *If  $d$  is even and  $|E| \geq Cq^{\max\{d/2, d-k\}}$ , then  $D_k(E) = \mathbb{F}_q$ .*

As our main result, for odd dimension case we establish Conjecture 1.3-(i); for the even dimension case we obtain a bit weaker result than in the conjecture. More precisely, our result is stated as follows.

**Theorem 1.4.** *If  $E \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$ ,  $d \geq 2$ , with  $|E| \geq Cq^{\max\{(d+1)/2, d-k\}}$ , then  $D_k(E) = \mathbb{F}_q$ .*

Given the paragraph subsequent to Question 1.2, our result should be compared with that a result for the MS problem, e.g., that of Iosevich and Rudnev [15]. Notice that our exponent in the assumption of Theorem 1.4 can be divided into two cases

$$\max \{(d+1)/2, d-k\} = \begin{cases} (d+1)/2 & \text{if } (d-1)/2 \leq k \leq d, \\ d-k & \text{if } 1 \leq k < (d-1)/2. \end{cases}$$

For  $1 \leq k < (d-1)/2$ , the exponent  $d-k$  in our result is larger than  $(d+1)/2$ , the exponent of Iosevich and Rudnev, as expected from the paragraph subsequent to Question 1.2. However, for  $k \geq (d-1)/2$ , our exponent  $(d+1)/2$  is as small as the exponent of Iosevich and Rudnev [15]. That is, even under the weaker condition  $D_k(E) \subset \Delta(E)$  in our case, we obtain the same result as that of Iosevich and Rudnev.

From the point of view of a deformation of the standard distance, this comparison tells us that the result of the original MS problem remains the same under the “small” deformation, which corresponds to  $k$  with  $(d-1)/2 \leq k \leq d$ .

In the course of proving this, we adopt an analytic approach based on the Fourier analysis machinery, a key tool used in previous studies of the MS problem. However, unlike in the original MS problem, there arises a difficulty in proving Theorem 1.4, namely we encounter many terms in taking sums that are difficult to control. To overcome this difficulty, we introduce a new elimination method based on combinatorial ideas (see, for example, the proof of Lemma 4.2, which constitutes the core of the proof of Theorem 1.4).

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give preliminaries which includes some basics on the Gauss sums, the orthogonality of characters and the discrete Fourier transforms. In Section 3, we introduce the  $k$ -distance and compute the Fourier transform on the sphere with respect to the  $k$ -distance. In Section 4, we give a proof of Theorem 1.4. In Section 5, we carry out a technical computation of Lemma 4.2, which will be used in the proof of the main theorem in Section 4.

**Acknowledgements.** The first named author was supported by a funding for the academic research program of Chungbuk National University in 2025, and the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2021R1I1A3049181).

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we list some basics on the Gauss sum and the Discrete Fourier transform machinery used in [15] (see also [17] and [4]).

**2.1. Gauss sum.** An additive (resp. a multiplicative) character of  $\mathbb{F}_q$  is a group homomorphism from the group  $\mathbb{F}_q$  (resp.  $\mathbb{F}_q^*$ ) to the unit circle  $S^1$  on the complex plane. The following two characters are ubiquitous in this paper.

For each  $b \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , let  $\chi_b : \mathbb{F}_q \rightarrow S^1$  be the additive character defined by

$$\chi_b(c) = e^{2\pi i \text{Tr}(bc)/p},$$

where  $p$  is the characteristic of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , and  $\text{Tr}(\alpha) = \text{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}_q/\mathbb{F}_p}(\alpha)$  denotes the absolute trace of  $\alpha$  (see [18, Definition 2.22]).

Let  $\eta : \mathbb{F}_q^* \rightarrow S^1$  be the multiplicative character defined by  $\eta(c) = 1$  if  $c$  is a square and 1 otherwise.

Characters of a finite abelian group  $G$  satisfy the orthogonality property below which will be frequently used for  $G = \mathbb{F}_q$  and  $\mathbb{F}_q^*$  in our computation.

**Proposition 2.1 (Orthogonality of characters).** *Let  $G$  be a finite abelian group and  $\phi$  a character of  $G$ . Then we obtain*

$$\sum_{g \in G} \phi(g) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \phi \text{ is nontrivial,} \\ |G| & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* See [18, Example 5.10].  $\square$

Now we review the basic facts about the Gauss sum, which plays a crucial role in the proof of Theorem 1.4.

**Definition 2.2 (Gauss sum).** *Let  $\psi$  (resp.  $\chi$ ) be a multiplicative (resp. an additive) character on  $\mathbb{F}_q^*$  (resp.  $\mathbb{F}_q$ ). Then, the Gauss sum of  $\psi$  and  $\chi$  is defined by*

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{G}(\psi, \chi) = \sum_{c \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \psi(c) \chi(c).$$

For  $a \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , let  $\mathcal{G}_a$  be the Gauss sum of  $\eta$  and  $\chi_a$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{G}_a = \mathcal{G}(\eta, \chi_a)$ .

**Proposition 2.3** (Theorem 5.15, [18]). *The standard Gauss sum  $\mathcal{G}_1$  can be explicitly computed as follows.*

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{G}_1 = \begin{cases} (-1)^{s-1} q^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}, \\ (-1)^{s-1} \mathbf{i}^s q^{\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}, \end{cases}$$

where  $\mathbf{i} = \sqrt{-1}$ , and  $s$  is the integer with  $p^s = q$ .

Squaring the  $\mathcal{G}_1$ , we can easily see that

$$(2.3) \quad \mathcal{G}_1^2 = \eta(-1)q, \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{G}_1| = \sqrt{q}.$$

The following lemma can be derived from the definition of Gauss sums. For the readers' convenience, we provide its proof.

**Lemma 2.4.** *For  $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$  with  $a \neq 0$ , and  $v \in \mathbb{F}_q^d$ , we have*

- (1)  $\sum_{s \in \mathbb{F}_q} \chi_1(as^2) = \eta(a)\mathcal{G}_1,$
- (2)  $\sum_{s \in \mathbb{F}_q} \chi_1(as^2 + bs) = \eta(a)\mathcal{G}_1\chi_1\left(-\frac{b^2}{4a}\right),$
- (3)  $\sum_{u \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} \chi_1(a\|u\| + v \cdot u) = \eta^d(a)\mathcal{G}_1^d\chi_1\left(\frac{\|v\|}{-4a}\right).$

*Proof.* To demonstrate (1), we observe that

$$\sum_{s \in \mathbb{F}_q} \chi_1(as^2) = 1 + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \chi_1(as^2).$$

As  $(-s)^2 = s^2$  for any  $s \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$  we can perform a change of variables, setting  $s^2 = t$ . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \chi_1(as^2) &= 1 + 2 \sum_{\substack{t \in \mathbb{F}_q^* \\ :t \text{ is a square}}} \chi_1(at) = 1 + \sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \chi_1(at)(\eta(t) + 1) \\ &= 1 + \sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \chi_1(at) + \sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \chi_1(at)\eta(t) = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \chi_1(at)\eta(t). \end{aligned}$$

The last equality arises from the orthogonality of characters for  $\chi_1$ . Now, employing a change of variables  $t = a^{-1}\theta$  and the relation  $\eta(a) = \eta(a^{-1})$ , we obtain

$$\sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \chi_1(at)\eta(t) = \sum_{\theta \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \eta(a)\chi_1(\theta)\eta(\theta) = \eta(a)\mathcal{G}_1.$$

Statements (2) and (3) stem from (1) by completing the square and utilizing a change of variables.  $\square$

**Definition 2.5.** For a nontrivial additive character  $\chi$  and nonzero elements  $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , the Kloosterman sum is defined as

$$K(\chi; a, b) := \sum_{s \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \chi(as + bs^{-1}).$$

A proof of the following result can be found in [24].

**Proposition 2.6.** Let  $\chi, a, b$  be as in the above. Then, we have

$$(2.4) \quad |K(\chi; a, b)| \leq 2\sqrt{q}.$$

**2.2. Discrete Fourier transform.** For a function  $f : \mathbb{F}_q^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , the Fourier transform  $\widehat{f}$  of  $f$  is defined as

$$(2.5) \quad \widehat{f}(m) := q^{-d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} f(x)\chi(-x \cdot m).$$

Here, and throughout the paper, we will use the notation  $\chi$  to denote a fixed non-trivial additive character of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , whose choice will not affect our results.

The discrete analogue of the Fourier inversion theorem and the Plancherel theorem is as follows.

$$(2.6) \quad f(x) := \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} \chi(m \cdot x)\widehat{f}(m),$$

$$(2.7) \quad \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |\widehat{f}(m)|^2 = q^{-d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |f(x)|^2.$$

For a given set  $E$ , let  $I_E(x)$  be the characteristic function:

$$I_E(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & x \in E, \\ 0 & x \notin E. \end{cases}$$

For simplicity, we write  $E(x)$  for  $I_E(x)$  if there is no confusion. For  $E \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$ , using the Plancherel theorem, we can easily see that

$$(2.8) \quad \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 = q^{-d}|E|,$$

and it is clear by the definition of the Fourier transform that

$$(2.9) \quad \widehat{E}(0, \dots, 0) = q^{-d}|E|.$$

### 3. THE FOURIER TRANSFORM ON THE SPHERE W.R.T. THE $k$ -NORM

Let  $k$  be an integer with  $1 \leq k \leq d$ . For each  $t \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , we define the sphere of radius  $t$  with respect to the  $k$ -norm as follows:

$$S_k^t := \{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^d : \|x\|_k = t\}.$$

Simply,  $S_k^t$  shall be referred to as a sphere (of radius  $t$ ), without reference to the  $k$ -norm, if there is no confusion. In this section, we mostly compute  $\widehat{S_k^t}$ , the Fourier transform on the sphere  $S_k^t$ , which will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.4. To this end, we shall first carry out preliminary computation. Let us begin by giving notations.

**3.1. Notation.** For each non-negative integer  $d \geq 1$ , let  $[d] := \{1, \dots, d\}$ . For a subset  $I \subset [d]$ , we define  $\mathcal{F}_I := \{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^d : x_i \neq 0 \iff i \in I\}$ . By convention we set  $\mathcal{F}_\emptyset = \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$ . Then  $\mathbb{F}_q^d$  is a disjoint union of all the ‘slices’  $\mathcal{F}_I$ , i.e.,

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbb{F}_q^d = \bigsqcup_{I \subset [d]} \mathcal{F}_I.$$

For a non-empty subset  $I = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_e\} \subset [d]$  with  $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_e \leq d$  and  $x \in \mathbb{F}_q^d$ , we define  $x_I = (x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_e}) \in \mathbb{F}_q^e$ . In particular, we adopt the convention that  $x_\emptyset = (0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{F}_q^d$ .

Recall that for  $y \in \mathbb{F}_q^d$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}(y)$  denotes the number of zero coordinates of  $y$ . For example if  $x \in \mathcal{F}_I$ , then  $\mathcal{Z}(x) = d - |I|$ . For  $\alpha \in [d] \cup \{0\}$ , we define  $N_\alpha := \{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^d : \mathcal{Z}(x) = \alpha\}$ . Thus,  $N_\alpha$  can be written as

$$(3.2) \quad N_\alpha = \bigsqcup_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} \mathcal{F}_I.$$

**3.2. Preliminary computation.** The following lemma will be used to compute  $\widehat{S_k^t}(m)$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $m = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_d) \in \mathbb{F}_q^d$ . For each  $\alpha \in [d] \cup \{0\}$ , we have*

$$\sum_{x \in N_\alpha} \chi(s \|x\| - m \cdot x) = \begin{cases} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} \prod_{i \in I} \left( \eta(s) \mathcal{G}_1 \chi \left( -\frac{m_i^2}{4s} \right) - 1 \right) & \text{if } s \neq 0, \\ \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} (q-1)^{\mathcal{Z}(m_I)} (-1)^{d-\alpha-\mathcal{Z}(m_I)} & \text{if } s = 0. \end{cases}$$

Here, if  $\alpha = d$ , then  $|I| = d - \alpha = 0$  and so  $I = \emptyset$ , in which case the summation on the right-hand side for  $s \neq 0$  is set to be 1.

*Proof.* Fix an element  $\alpha \in [d] \cup \{0\}$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{x \in N_\alpha} \chi(s\|x\| - m \cdot x) &= \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{F}_I} \chi(s\|x_I\| - m_I \cdot x_I) \\
 (3.3) \quad &= \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} \prod_{i \in I} \left[ \left( \sum_{u \in \mathbb{F}_q} \chi(su^2 - m_i u) \right) - 1 \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

The first equality follows from (3.2), and the second equality just unravels the notation of  $\mathcal{F}_I$ . We consider two cases:  $s \neq 0$ , and  $s = 0$ . For the case where  $s \neq 0$ , applying Definition 2.2 and Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} \prod_{i \in I} \left[ \left( \sum_{u \in \mathbb{F}_q} \chi(su^2 - m_i u) \right) - 1 \right] = \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} \prod_{i \in I} \left( \eta(s) \mathcal{G}_1 \chi \left( -\frac{m_i^2}{4s} \right) - 1 \right).$$

For the case where  $s = 0$ , (3.3) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} \prod_{\substack{i \in I \\ :m_i \neq 0}} \left[ \left( \sum_{u \in \mathbb{F}_q} \chi(-m_i u) \right) - 1 \right] \prod_{\substack{j \in I \\ :m_j=0}} \left[ \left( \sum_{u \in \mathbb{F}_q} \chi(-m_j u) \right) - 1 \right] \\
 &= \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} (q-1)^{\mathcal{Z}(m_I)} (-1)^{d-\alpha-\mathcal{Z}(m_I)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**3.3. Computation of  $\widehat{S}_k^t(m)$ .** We are ready to compute the following Fourier transform on the sphere  $\widehat{S}_k^t(m)$ .

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $t \in \mathbb{F}_q$ . Then, for any  $m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d$ , the Fourier transform  $\widehat{S}_k^t(m)$  of the sphere can be written*

$$\widehat{S}_k^t(m) = q^{-d-1} \left( A(m, t) + B(m) \right),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 A(m, t) &= \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k-1} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \chi(-st) \prod_{i \in I} \left( \eta(s) \mathcal{G}_1 \chi \left( -\frac{m_i^2}{4s} \right) - 1 \right), \\
 B(m) &= \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k-1} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} (q-1)^{\mathcal{Z}(m_I)} (-1)^{d-\alpha-\mathcal{Z}(m_I)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* From the definition of the Fourier transform and the orthogonality of the additive characters (Proposition 2.1), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \widehat{S_k^t}(m) &= q^{-d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} \chi(-m \cdot x) S_k^t(x) \\
 (3.4) \quad &= q^{-d} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} \chi(-m \cdot x) \left( q^{-1} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{F}_q} \chi(s(\|x\|_k - t)) \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Now, recall from (3.2) that  $\mathbb{F}_q^d = \bigsqcup_{\alpha \in [d] \cup \{0\}} N_\alpha$ . By the definition of the  $k$ -norm, (3.4) can be rewritten:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.5) \quad \widehat{S_k^t}(m) &= q^{-d} \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k-1} \sum_{x \in N_\alpha} \chi(-m \cdot x) \left( q^{-1} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{F}_q} \chi(s(\|x\| - t)) \right) \\
 (3.6) \quad &+ q^{-d} \sum_{\alpha=k}^d \sum_{x \in N_\alpha} \chi(-m \cdot x) \left( q^{-1} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{F}_q} \chi(-st) \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $t \neq 0$ , (3.6) vanishes by the orthogonality of  $\chi$ . Hence, by rewriting the (3.5), we obtain

$$(3.7) \quad \widehat{S_k^t}(m) = q^{-d-1} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{F}_q} \chi(-st) \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k-1} \sum_{x \in N_\alpha} \chi(s \|x\| - m \cdot x).$$

Using Lemma 3.1 to calculate the summation over  $x \in N_\alpha$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \widehat{S_k^t}(m) &= q^{-d-1} \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k-1} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{F}_q^*} \chi(-st) \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} \prod_{i \in I} \left( \eta(s) \mathcal{G}_1 \chi \left( -\frac{m_i^2}{4s} \right) - 1 \right) \\
 &+ q^{-d-1} \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k-1} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} (q-1)^{\mathcal{Z}(m_I)} (-1)^{d-\alpha-\mathcal{Z}(m_I)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of  $A(m, t)$  and  $B(m)$ , the proof is complete.  $\square$

#### 4. PROOF OF MAIN THEOREM

In this section, we provide the proof of our main result (Theorem 1.4) that can be restated as follows.

**Theorem 4.1.** *If  $E \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$  with  $d \geq 2$ , and  $|E| \geq Cq^{\max\{\frac{d+1}{2}, d-k\}}$ , then  $D_k(E) = \mathbb{F}_q$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $d_E : E \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$  denote the  $k$ -distance on  $E$  defined by  $d_E(x, y) = \|x - y\|_k$  for  $x, y \in E$ .

Note that  $d_E$  is surjective if and only if for each  $t \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , the set  $d_E^{-1}(t)$  is nonempty, or equivalently, the collection  $\{d_E^{-1}(t)\}_{t \in \mathbb{F}_q}$  forms a partition of  $E \times E$ .

For  $E \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$  and  $t \in \mathbb{F}_q$ , let  $\nu_E(t)$  be the cardinality of the set  $d_E^{-1}(t)$ , i.e.,  $\nu_E(t) = |d_E^{-1}(t)|$ . Then, to prove Theorem 4.1, it suffices to show that  $\nu_E(t) > 0$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{F}_q$ . It is obvious that  $\nu_E(0) > 0$  since  $E$  is nonempty. Now it remains to show  $\nu_E(t) > 0$  for all nonzero  $t \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$ . By definition,  $\nu_E(t)$  can be written

$$(4.1) \quad \nu_E(t) = \sum_{\substack{x,y \in E \\ : \|x-y\|_k = t}} 1 = \sum_{x,y \in E} S_k^t(x-y).$$

Then we use the Fourier inversion formula and the definition of the Fourier transform to obtain

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \nu_E(t) &= \sum_{x,y \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} E(x)E(y) \left( \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} \chi(m \cdot (x-y)) \widehat{S_k^t}(m) \right) \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} \widehat{S_k^t}(m) \sum_{x,y \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} \overline{\chi(-m \cdot x) E(x)} \chi(-m \cdot y) E(y) \\ &= q^{2d} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} \widehat{S_k^t}(m) |\widehat{E}(m)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Invoking Proposition 3.2, we see that

$$(4.3) \quad \nu_E(t) = q^{d-1} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 \left( A(m, t) + B(m) \right).$$

Now we require the following lemma, a key ingredient in deriving our main result, contains technically challenging terms that do not appear in the original MS problem.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $A(m, t)$ , and  $B(m)$  be defined as in Proposition 3.2. Then for every  $E \subset \mathbb{F}_q^d$ , the following inequalities hold.*

- (i)  $\left| \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 A(m, t) \right| \lesssim q^{-\frac{d-1}{2}} |E|,$
- (ii)  $\sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 B(m) \gtrsim q^{-d} |E|^2 - q^{-k} |E|.$

With Lemma 4.2 in hand, let us complete the proof of Theorem 4.1. A proof of Lemma 4.2 will be given in the next section. The combination of (4.3) and Lemma 4.2 yields

$$\nu_E(t) \gtrsim q^{-1} |E|^2 - q^{d-k-1} |E| - q^{\frac{d-1}{2}} |E|.$$

Observe that if  $|E| \gtrsim q^{d-k}$ , then the term  $q^{-1} |E|^2$  dominates  $q^{d-k-1} |E|$ ; similarly, if  $|E| \gtrsim q^{(d+1)/2}$ , then  $q^{-1} |E|^2$  dominates  $q^{(d-1)/2} |E|$ . Thus, we obtain the desired conclusion that if  $|E| \geq C q^{\max\{\frac{d+1}{2}, d-k\}}$ , then  $\nu_E(t) > 0$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5. PROOF OF LEMMA 4.2

For the first part (i) of Lemma 4.2, we write

$$\begin{aligned} A(m, t) &= \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k-1} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} \sum_{s \neq 0} \chi(-st) \prod_{i \in I} \left( \eta(s) \mathcal{G}_1 \chi \left( -\frac{m_i^2}{4s} \right) - 1 \right) \\ &= \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k-1} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} \sum_{s \neq 0} \chi(-st) \left( \sum_{\beta=0}^{d-\alpha} \sum_{\substack{J \subset I \\ :|J|=d-\alpha-\beta}} \eta^{d-\alpha-\beta}(s) \mathcal{G}_1^{d-\alpha-\beta} \chi \left( -\frac{\|m_J\|}{4s} \right) (-1)^\beta \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we express the product over  $i \in I$  in terms of the summation over  $\beta$ . It follows by the triangle inequality that

$$|A(m, t)| \leq \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k-1} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} \sum_{\beta=0}^{d-\alpha} \sum_{\substack{J \subset I \\ :|J|=d-\alpha-\beta}} |\mathcal{G}_1|^{d-\alpha-\beta} \left| \sum_{s \neq 0} \eta^{d-\alpha-\beta}(s) \chi \left( -st - \frac{\|m_J\|}{4s} \right) \right|.$$

Recall from (2.3) that  $|\mathcal{G}_1| = \sqrt{q}$ , and note that the sum over  $s \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$  is a generalized Kloosterman sum, which is dominated by  $2\sqrt{q}$  as shown in (2.4). Hence, for every  $m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d$  and  $t \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$ , we have

$$|A(m, t)| \leq \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k-1} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} \sum_{\beta=0}^{d-\alpha} \sum_{\substack{J \subset I \\ :|J|=d-\alpha-\beta}} 2q^{\frac{d-\alpha-\beta+1}{2}} \lesssim q^{\frac{d+1}{2}},$$

where the last inequality follows from the simple observation that  $q^{\frac{d+1}{2}}$  dominates  $q^{\frac{d-\alpha-\beta+1}{2}}$  for all  $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$ . Using this upper bound of  $|A(m, t)|$  and the Plancherel theorem, the part (i) of Lemma 4.2 is proven as follows:

$$\left| \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 A(m, t) \right| \leq \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 |A(m, t)| \lesssim q^{\frac{d+1}{2}} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 = q^{-\frac{d-1}{2}} |E|.$$

Now, we prove the part (ii) of Lemma 4.2. Recall that

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 B(m) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k-1} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} (q-1)^{\mathcal{Z}(m_I)} (-1)^{d-\alpha-\mathcal{Z}(m_I)}.$$

We observe that the summation over  $\alpha$  can be rewritten:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k-1} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} (q-1)^{\mathcal{Z}(m_I)} (-1)^{d-\alpha-\mathcal{Z}(m_I)} \\ &= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 \left( \sum_{\alpha=0}^d - \sum_{\alpha=k}^d \right) \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} (q-1)^{\mathcal{Z}(m_I)} (-1)^{d-\alpha-\mathcal{Z}(m_I)} \\ &=: B_{\text{main}} + B_{\text{auxiliary}}. \end{aligned}$$

This decomposition allows us to analyze the summation over  $\alpha$  in terms of the full summation over  $0 \leq \alpha \leq d$  and the summation over  $k \leq \alpha \leq d$ . It is obvious that

$$(5.1) \quad \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 B(m) \geq B_{\text{main}} - |B_{\text{auxiliary}}|.$$

We can simply bound the auxiliary term as follows:

$$(5.2) \quad |B_{\text{auxiliary}}| \lesssim q^{-d} |E| q^{d-k} = q^{-k} |E|.$$

Next, let us estimate a lower bound of the term  $B_{\text{main}}$ . For each  $I \subset [d]$  and  $m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d$ , let  $\beta := \mathcal{Z}(m_I)$ . Then  $0 \leq \beta \leq |I|$ . Using a new variable  $\beta$  we can write

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\text{main}} &= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 \sum_{\alpha=0}^d \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} (q-1)^{\mathcal{Z}(m_I)} (-1)^{d-\alpha-\mathcal{Z}(m_I)} \\ &= \sum_{\alpha=0}^d \sum_{\beta=0}^{d-\alpha} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d \\ :Z(m_I)=\beta}} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 (q-1)^\beta (-1)^{d-\alpha-\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of the indicator function  $\mathbb{1}_{\{0,1,\dots,d-\alpha\}}(\beta)$ , the above term  $B_{\text{main}}$  can be rewritten as follows:

$$B_{\text{main}} = \sum_{\beta=0}^d \sum_{\alpha=0}^{d-\beta} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=d-\alpha}} \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d \\ :Z(m_I)=\beta}} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 (q-1)^\beta (-1)^{d-\alpha-\beta} \mathbb{1}_{\{0,1,\dots,d-\alpha\}}(\beta).$$

Fixing the variable  $\beta$ , we perform a change of variables from  $\alpha$  to  $r$  using the relation  $\alpha = d - \beta - r$ . Then we obtain the expression

$$B_{\text{main}} = \sum_{\beta=0}^d \sum_{r=0}^{d-\beta} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=\beta+r}} \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d \\ :Z(m_I)=\beta}} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 (q-1)^\beta (-1)^r.$$

Note that for each  $\beta$  and  $I \subset [d]$ , the set  $\{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d \mid Z(m_I) = \beta\}$  is a union of subsets  $\{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d \mid Z(m_I) = \beta, Z(m) = w\}$  for  $0 \leq w \leq d$ , and that  $r := |I| - \beta \leq d - w$ . Thus,

using a variable  $w$ ,  $B_{\text{main}}$  can be written

$$B_{\text{main}} = \sum_{w=0}^d \sum_{\beta=0}^w \sum_{r=0}^{d-w} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=\beta+r \\ :\mathcal{Z}(m_I)=\beta \\ :\mathcal{Z}(m)=w}} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 (q-1)^\beta (-1)^r.$$

By distinguishing between the cases  $\mathcal{Z}(m) = d$  (that is,  $m = (0, \dots, 0)$ ) and  $\mathcal{Z}(m) < d$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\text{main}} &= \sum_{w=0}^{d-1} \sum_{\beta=0}^w \sum_{r=0}^{d-w} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=\beta+r \\ :\mathcal{Z}(m_I)=\beta \\ :\mathcal{Z}(m)=w}} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 (q-1)^\beta (-1)^r \\ &\quad + \sum_{\beta=0}^d \sum_{I \subset [d]} \sum_{\substack{m=(0, \dots, 0) \\ :|I|=\beta \\ :\mathcal{Z}(m_I)=\beta}} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 (q-1)^\beta. \end{aligned}$$

Now we divide the summation over  $\beta$  in the first series of summations into two cases:  $\beta < w$  and  $w = \beta$ . Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\text{main}} &= \sum_{w=0}^{d-1} \sum_{\beta=0}^{w-1} \sum_{r=0}^{d-w} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=\beta+r \\ :\mathcal{Z}(m_I)=\beta \\ :\mathcal{Z}(m)=w}} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 (q-1)^\beta (-1)^r \\ &\quad + \sum_{w=0}^{d-1} \sum_{r=0}^{d-w} \sum_{I \subset [d]} \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d \\ :\mathcal{Z}(m_I)=w \\ :\mathcal{Z}(m)=w}} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 (q-1)^w (-1)^r \\ &\quad + \sum_{\beta=0}^d \sum_{I \subset [d]} \sum_{\substack{m=(0, \dots, 0) \\ :|I|=\beta \\ :\mathcal{Z}(m_I)=\beta}} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 (q-1)^\beta \\ &=: B_{m1} + B_{m2} + B_{m3}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, a lower bound of  $B_{\text{main}}$  can be expressed as follows:

$$(5.3) \quad B_{\text{main}} \geq -|B_{m1}| + B_{m2} + B_{m3}.$$

Notice that  $|N_{d-\alpha}| = (q-1)^\alpha \sim q^\alpha$  and by (2.9) that  $\sum_{m \in N_{d-\alpha}} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 \lesssim q^{-2d+\alpha} |E|^2$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |B_{m1}| &= \sum_{w=0}^{d-1} \sum_{\beta=0}^{w-1} \sum_{r=0}^{d-w} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=\beta+r \\ :\mathcal{Z}(m_I)=\beta \\ :\mathcal{Z}(m)=w}} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 (q-1)^\beta \\ &\lesssim q^{-2d+(d-w)} |E|^2 q^{w-1} = q^{-d-1} |E|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

Recall that

$$B_{m2} = \sum_{w=0}^{d-1} \sum_{r=0}^{d-w} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=w+r \\ :\mathcal{Z}(m_I)=w \\ :\mathcal{Z}(m)=w}} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 (q-1)^w (-1)^r.$$

Now we show that  $B_{m2} = 0$ . The main idea for this is that for each  $1 \leq w \leq d-1$ ,  $J \subset [d]$ ,  $m \in \mathcal{F}_{[d] \setminus J}$ ,  $B_{m2}$  will be manipulated to involve the summations

$$(5.5) \quad \sum_{r=0}^{d-w} \sum_{\substack{T \subset [d] \setminus J \\ :|T|=r}} (-1)^r,$$

which will be turned into

$$\sum_{r=0}^{d-w} (-1)^r (1)^{d-w-r} \binom{d-w}{r} = 0.$$

To be precise, first changing the order of summations, we write

$$B_{m2} = \sum_{w=0}^{d-1} \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d \\ :\mathcal{Z}(m)=w}} \sum_{r=0}^{d-w} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=w+r \\ :\mathcal{Z}(m_I)=w}} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 (q-1)^w (-1)^r.$$

Recall from (3.1) that

$$(5.6) \quad \mathbb{F}_q^d = \bigsqcup_{J \subset [d]} \mathcal{F}_{[d] \setminus J}.$$

Thus using a variable  $J$ ,  $B_{m2}$  can be rewritten

$$B_{m2} = \sum_{w=0}^{d-1} \sum_{J \subset [d]} \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d \\ :\mathcal{Z}(m)=w \\ :m \in \mathcal{F}_{[d] \setminus J}}} \sum_{r=0}^{d-w} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=w+r \\ :\mathcal{Z}(m_I)=w}} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 (q-1)^w (-1)^r.$$

For a fixed  $m \in \mathcal{F}_{[d] \setminus J}$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}(m) = w$  if and only if  $|J| = w$ . Consequently, we obtain

$$(5.7) \quad B_{m2} = \sum_{w=0}^{d-1} \sum_{J \subset [d]} \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d \\ :|J|=w \\ :m \in \mathcal{F}_{[d] \setminus J}}} \sum_{r=0}^{d-w} \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=w+r \\ :\mathcal{Z}(m_I)=w}} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 (q-1)^w (-1)^r.$$

For each  $J \subset [d]$ , choose  $m \in \mathcal{F}_{[d] \setminus J}$ . Then there is an  $I$  with  $|I| \geq |J|$  such that  $\mathcal{Z}(m_I) = |J|$ , and for any such  $I$  (independent of the choice of  $m \in \mathcal{F}_{[d] \setminus J}$ ), we have  $J \subset I$ . Let  $T := I \setminus J$ . Changing the fifth summation over  $I$  in (5.7) into the summation over  $T$ , we obtain

$$(5.8) \quad B_{m2} = \sum_{w=0}^{d-1} \sum_{J \subset [d]} \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d \\ :|J|=w \\ :m \in \mathcal{F}_{[d] \setminus J}}} |\widehat{E}(m)|^2 (q-1)^w \sum_{r=0}^{d-w} \sum_{\substack{T \subset [d] \setminus J \\ :|T|=r}} (-1)^r.$$

The last double summation of (5.8) can be turned into

$$\sum_{r=0}^{d-w} \sum_{\substack{T \subset [d] \setminus J \\ :|T|=r}} (-1)^r = \sum_{r=0}^{d-w} (-1)^r \left( \sum_{\substack{T \subset [d] \setminus J \\ :|T|=r}} 1 \right) = \sum_{r=0}^{d-w} (-1)^r (1)^{d-w-r} \binom{d-w}{r}.$$

By the binomial theorem, we have

$$\sum_{r=0}^{d-w} (-1)^r (1)^{d-w-r} \binom{d-w}{r} = (1 + (-1))^{d-w} = 0.$$

Therefore, we obtain the desired result:

$$(5.9) \quad B_{m_2} = 0.$$

Finally, we estimate the term  $B_{m3}$ . Recall that

$$B_{m3} = \sum_{\beta=0}^d \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=\beta}} \sum_{\substack{m=(0, \dots, 0) \\ :Z(m_I)=\beta}} |\hat{E}(m)|^2 (q-1)^\beta.$$

Since  $|\hat{E}(m)|^2 = q^{-2d} |E|^2$  for  $m = (0, \dots, 0)$ , we get

$$(5.10) \quad B_{m3} = \sum_{\beta=0}^d \sum_{\substack{I \subset [d] \\ :|I|=\beta}} q^{-2d} |E|^2 (q-1)^\beta \sim q^{-d} |E|^2.$$

Combining the estimates in (5.1), (5.2), (5.3), (5.4), (5.9), and (5.10), we conclude that

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbb{F}_q^d} |\hat{E}(m)|^2 B(m) \gtrsim q^{-d} |E|^2 - q^{-d-1} |E|^2 - q^{-k} |E| \gtrsim q^{-d} |E|^2 - q^{-k} |E|,$$

which proves the second part (ii) of Lemma 4.2.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bourgain. *J. Hausdorff dimension and distance sets* Israel J. Math. **87** (1994). 193–201.
- [2] J. Bourgain, N. Katz, and T. Tao, *A sum-product estimate in finite fields, and applications*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **14** (2004), no. 1, 27–57.
- [3] J. Chapman, M. B. Erdogan, D. Hart, A. Iosevich, and D. Koh, *Pinned distance sets,  $k$ -simplices, Wolff’s exponent in finite fields and sum-product estimates*, Math Z. **271** (2012), 63–93.
- [4] D. Cheong, D. Koh, T. Pham, and C.Y. Chen, *Mattila-Sjölin type functions: A finite field model*, Vietnam J. Math. **51** (2023), no. 2, 421–434.
- [5] X. Du, L. Guth, Y. Ou, H. Wang, B. Wilson, and R. Zhang, *Weighted restriction estimates and application to Falconer distance set problem*, Amer. J. Math. **143** (2021), no. 1, 175–211.
- [6] X. Du, A. Iosevich, Y. Ou, H. Wang, and R. Zhang, *An improved result for Falconer’s distance set problem in even dimensions*, Math. Ann. **380** (2021), no. 3–4, 1215–1231.
- [7] X. Du, Y. Ou, K. Ren, and R. Zhang, *New improvement to Falconer distance set problem in higher dimensions*, arXiv: 2309.04103 (2023)
- [8] X. Du, and R. Zhang, *Sharp  $L^2$  estimate of Schrödinger maximal function in higher dimensions*, Ann. of Math. (2) **189** (2019), no. 3, 837–861.

- [9] M. Erdogan, *A bilinear Fourier extension theorem and applications to the distance set problem*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **23** (2005), no. 23, 1411–1425.
- [10] P. Erdős, *On sets of distances of  $n$  points*, Amer. Math. Monthly **53** (1946), 248–250.
- [11] K. Falconer, *On the Hausdorff dimensions of distance sets*, Mathematika **32** (1985), 206–212.
- [12] L. Guth, A. Iosevich, Y. Ou, and H. Wang, *On Falconer's distance set problem in the plane*, Invent. Math. **219** (2020), no. 3, 779–830.
- [13] L. Guth, and N. Katz, *On the Erdős distinct distances problem in the plane*, Ann. of Math. (2) **181** (2015), no. 1, 155–190.
- [14] D. Hart, A. Iosevich, D. Koh, and M. Rudnev, *Averages over hyperplanes, sum-product theory in vector spaces over finite fields and the Erdős-Falconer distance conjecture*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **363** (2011), no. 6, 3255–3275.
- [15] A. Iosevich, and M. Rudnev, *Erdős distance problem in vector spaces over finite fields*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **359** (2007), no. 12, 6127–6142.
- [16] N. Katz, and G. Tardos, *A new entropy inequality for the Erdős distance problem*, in “Towards a Theory of Geometric Graphs”, pp. 119–126, Contemp. Math., 2004. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, **342**.
- [17] D. Koh and H. Sun, *Distance sets of two subsets of vector spaces over finite fields*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **143** (2015), no. 4, 1679–1692.
- [18] R. Lidl, and H. Niederreiter, *Finite Fields*, Cambridge University Press, (1997).
- [19] P. Mattila, and P. Sjö, *Regularity of distance measures and sets*, Math. Nachr. **204** (1999), 157–162.
- [20] B. Murphy, and G. Petridis, *An example related to the Erdős-Falconer question over arbitrary finite fields*, Bull. Hellenic Math. Soc. **63** (2019), 38–39.
- [21] B. Murphy, G. Petridis, T. Pham, M. Rudnev, and S. Stevens, *On the Pinned Distances Problem in Positive Characteristic*, J. Lond. Math. Soc.(2) **105** (2022), no. 1, 469–499.
- [22] F. Rakhmonov, A. Iosevich, and D. Koh, *The quotient set of the quadratic distance set over finite fields*, Forum Mathematicum **36**, no. 5 (2024), 1341–1358. <https://doi.org/10.1515/forum-2023-0313>
- [23] J. Solymosi, and V. Vu, *Near optimal bounds for the Erdős distinct distances problem in high dimensions*, Combinatorica **28** (2008), no. 1, 113–125.
- [24] A. Weil, *On some exponential sums*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. **34** (1948), 204–207.
- [25] T. Wolff, *Decay of circular means of Fourier transforms of measures*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices (1999), no. 10, 547–567.

CHUNGBUK NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CHUNGDAE-RO 1, SEOWON-GU, CHEONGJU CITY, CHUNGBUK 28644, KOREA

*Email address:* daewoongc@chungbuk.ac.kr

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY, AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF THE MIDDLE EAST, KUWAIT  
*Email address:* hunseok.kang@auem.edu.kw

CHUNGBUK NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CHUNGDAE-RO 1, SEOWON-GU, CHEONGJU CITY, CHUNGBUK 28644, KOREA

*Email address:* jinbeom337@chungbuk.ac.kr