

BISECTOR ENERGY AND PINNED DISTANCES IN POSITIVE CHARACTERISTIC

BRENDAN MURPHY, MISHA RUDNEV, AND SOPHIE STEVENS

ABSTRACT. We prove a new lower bound for the number of pinned distances over finite fields: if A is a sufficiently small subset of \mathbb{F}_q^2 , then there is an element in A that determines $\gg |A|^{5/8}$ distinct distances to other elements of A . If -1 is not a square in \mathbb{F}_q , we obtain a further improvement of $\gg |A|^{13/20}$ such distances. Combined with results for large subsets $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^2$, these results improve all previously known lower bounds for the number of pinned distinct distances over finite fields.

These improvements are based on the point line incidence bounds of Kollár and of de Zeeuw and the third author. To apply these bounds, we embed the group of rigid motions of \mathbb{F}_q^2 into projective three space and into the group of affine transformations of a quadratic extension of \mathbb{F}_q , respectively.

The proofs of our main theorem and our improvements utilise the “equivariance” of the embedding of the group of rigid motions of the plane into projective space; in fact, $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3$ contains an open subset that is a group. This has long been known in kinematics and geometric algebra; we give a proof for arbitrary fields using Clifford algebras.

We also present a new Fourier-analytic proof of the known result that any set $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^2$ with $|A| \geq q^{4/3}$ yields $\gg q$ pinned distances, with close to optimal values of the implicit constant, in view of a recent counterexample by Petridis and the first author.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	6
3. Proof of Theorem 2	9
4. Proof of Proposition 4	11
5. Proof of Theorem 3	13
Appendix A. Proof of Fourier extension inequality (11)	18
Appendix B. Clifford algebra computations	19
References	21

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1946, Erdős [11] conjectured that any set of N points in the real plane determines at least $\gg \frac{N}{\sqrt{\log N}}$ distinct distances, with a square grid showing this bound

Date: August 14, 2019.

The first and second authors are partially supported by the Leverhulme Trust Grant RPG-2017-371.

is optimal. Guth and Katz [13] nearly resolved this problem 65 years later, proving that N points determine $\gg \frac{N}{\log N}$ distances.

One can also ask this question for non-Euclidean distances over the reals, where some metrics behave similar to the Euclidean one but others do not. For instance, Roche-Newton [32] and Selig and the second author [35] prove positive results, while Matoušek [26] and Valtr [41] prove negative results. For more relatives of the distinct distances problem over the reals we recommend the survey of Sheffer [36].

The distinct distance problem can also be posed over arbitrary fields \mathbb{F} , where much less is known about the tools used and developed by Guth and Katz. Setting up the notation, the distance d between two points $x = (x_1, x_2), y = (y_1, y_2)$ in the plane \mathbb{F}^2 is

$$d(x, y) := (x - y) \cdot (x - y) = \|x - y\|^2 = (x_1 - y_1)^2 + (x_2 - y_2)^2.$$

Typically, \mathbb{F} will be a finite field of order q , where $q = p^r$ is an odd prime power, though some results hold in arbitrary fields \mathbb{F} with constraints in terms of the characteristic of \mathbb{F} .

Distinct distances correspond to equivalence classes of pairs of points in \mathbb{F}^2 modulo the action of rigid motions. We want to find a lower bound on the cardinality $\Delta(A)$ of the set of distances determined by a finite point set $A \subset \mathbb{F}^2$, where we define $\Delta(A) := |\{d(a, b) : a, b \in A\}|$.

A sensible interpretation of the distance problem over a general field \mathbb{F} may be more subtle than over the reals. If \mathbb{F} is finite, then $\Delta(A) \leq |\mathbb{F}|$ for any A , so $\Delta(A) \gg |A|/\log |A|$ cannot hold unconditionally. In fact, if \mathbb{F} has characteristic p , then there are subsets $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}^2$ with $\Delta(A) \leq p$. For this reason we constrain the cardinality of A in terms of the characteristic p of \mathbb{F} if $p > 0$. Another issue is that of *isotropic lines* in the plane: if A contains points exclusively of the form (a, ia) in \mathbb{C}^2 , then the only distance between pairs of points of A is 0. This may happen over finite fields \mathbb{F}_q with $q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$.

Turning our first obstruction on its head, we expect that if $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^2$ is sufficiently large relative to q , then all, or at least a positive proportion of possible distances should be determined. Determining the threshold at which this occurs is often referred to as the Erdős-Falconer problem [19]. Iosevich and the second author [19] initiated this point of view, asking for the corresponding lower bounds on $|A|$. Some obstructions were identified by Hart et al. [15] and Petridis and the first author [30]: when $|A| \leq q^{4/3}$, subfields may preclude $|A| > q/2$. For other recent developments in this direction we refer the reader to Koh, Pham and Vinh [22] and references therein.

The first result on the Erdős distinct distance problem over \mathbb{F}_q was obtained by Bourgain, Katz and Tao [6], who proved a non-quantitative non-trivial bound on $\Delta(A)$, based on a non-trivial Szemerédi-Trotter type theorem, which in turn followed from their sum-product estimate. A strong quantitative variant of this theorem, due to de Zeeuw and the third author [39], implies the bound $\Delta(A) \gg |A|^{8/15}$ under suitable conditions on $|A|$. Iosevich, Koh and Pham [18] strengthen this technique by using bounds on the additive energy of a set lying on a paraboloid, improving the exponent to $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{149}{4215}$. This result is valid for $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_p$ and $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$.

The distinct distance problem has a stronger variant, known as the pinned distance problem. The pinned distance problem asks for the existence of a point $a \in A$, from which many distinct distances are determined. It is open over the reals as well,

the last series of progress having been achieved back in the early 2000s, with the standing record by Katz and Tardos [20].

This note proves new bounds on the pinned distance problem over a general field \mathbb{F} , building on work by Lund and Petridis [25]¹, which further developed the earlier approach [8, 14] of studying perpendicular bisectors to achieve the following result.

Theorem 1 (Lund-Petridis [25]). *Let \mathbb{F} be a field, and $A \subseteq \mathbb{F} \times \mathbb{F}$. If the characteristic of \mathbb{F} is $p > 0$, suppose also that $|A| \leq p^{8/5}$.*

Then there exists $a \in A$ such that $|\{d(a, b) : b \in A\}| \gg |A|^{20/37}$, and in particular, $\Delta(A) \gg |A|^{20/37}$.

We also note that Petridis [31] has proved a stronger result, on the assumption that $A \subseteq \mathbb{F} \times \mathbb{F}$ is a Cartesian product $A = X \times X$, for any $X \subseteq \mathbb{F}$ satisfying $|X| \ll \text{char}(\mathbb{F})^{2/3}$. This result can be proved directly from Rudnev's point-plane incidence bound [34], or by descendents of this bound [1, 29].

1.1. Main Results. We prove a lower bound on the number of pinned distances $\Delta_{\text{pin}}(A)$ determined by A , where

$$\Delta_{\text{pin}}(A) := \max_{a \in A} |\Delta(A, a)|,$$

where $\Delta(A, a) := |\{d(a, b) : b \in A\}|$.

It is clear that $\Delta(A) \geq \Delta_{\text{pin}}(A)$. With this notation, Theorem 1 can be restated as $\Delta_{\text{pin}}(A) \gg |A|^{20/37}$. We now present the main results of this paper.

Theorem 2. *Let $A \subset \mathbb{F}^2$ be a set of points, not all lying on a single isotropic line. If the characteristic of \mathbb{F} is $p > 0$, suppose also that $|A| \leq p^{4/3}$. Then*

$$(1) \quad \Delta_{\text{pin}}(A) \gg |A|^{5/8}.$$

In the special case where $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_p$, $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ and $|A| \leq p^{10/17}$, one has

$$(2) \quad \Delta_{\text{pin}}(A) \gg |A|^{13/20}.$$

We remark that the improvement in the special case $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_p$ is in fact valid for any field \mathbb{F} where -1 is not a square, say \mathbb{F}_q with $q = 4m + 3$ and q a power of the prime p .

Unfortunately, there is still a gap between the estimates of Theorem 2 and what is known for sufficiently large sets A for the Erdős-Falconer problem over finite fields \mathbb{F}_q (p and q are always assumed to be odd and sufficiently large). Chapman et al. [8, Theorem 2.2] used Fourier analysis to show that for any $|A| \gg q^{4/3}$, $\Delta(A) \gg q$. The latter paper claimed the bound for $q \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ only; it was then observed by Bennett et al. [2, Theorem 1.6] that the same proof (which is, in fact, a variant of [40, Proposition 4.29]) works for $q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ as well. Furthermore, Hanson, Lund and Roche-Newton [14] extended the claim to $\Delta_{\text{pin}}(A)$, using spectral graph theory, applied to studying perpendicular bisectors, the initial set-up being similar to that of Theorems 1, 2.

We return to this generally-settled question in view of the recent construction by Petridis and the first author [30], which showed that for infinitely many q , there exists a set A of cardinality $|A| = q^{4/3}$, such that $\Delta(A)$ is close to just $q/2$, rather than q . We present a new Fourier-analytic proof of the bound on

¹We are grateful to Ben Lund and Giorgis Petridis for clarifications of their results and discussions throughout the preparation of this note.

Δ_{pin} , where the implicit constant is the same as that which Chapman et. al. [8] established for $\Delta(A)$, and reasonably close to what it should be, in view of the above counterexample. This also enables us to improve (1) for $q^{8/7} \leq |A| \leq q^{4/3}$.

Theorem 3. *Let $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_q$, with q odd, $\lambda > 0$ and $|A| \geq \lambda q^{4/3}$. Then*

$$\Delta_{\text{pin}}(A) \geq (1 + o(q)) \frac{1}{1 + \sqrt{3}\lambda^{-3/2}} q.$$

Moreover, if $|A| = \omega(q)$, then

$$\Delta_{\text{pin}}(A) \geq \frac{(1 + o(q)) |A|^{3/2}}{\sqrt{3} q}.$$

The constant $\sqrt{3}$ in Theorem 3 is the constant that appears in the extension estimate (11), which we show is sharp. The proof of this estimate uses the fact that a circle in \mathbb{F}_q^2 is nearly a Sidon set; if the circle were truly a Sidon set, we could only replace $\sqrt{3}$ by $\sqrt{2}$ [40, Proposition 4.29]. Thus it seems a different (or more direct) approach is needed to show that $\Delta_{\text{pin}}(A) \geq (1 + o(q))q/2$. (Here we have used $X = \omega(q)$ and $Y = o(q)$ to mean $\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} X/q = \infty$ and $\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} Y/q = 0$.)

1.2. Discussion of techniques. To prove Theorem 2, we follow the established technique of studying distances through the perpendicular bisectors of points in A . The perpendicular bisector of points $a, b \in \mathbb{F}^2$ with $d(a, b) \neq 0$ is the line

$$\mathbf{B}(a, b) = \{x : d(a, x) = d(b, x)\}.$$

We consider (a subtle variant of) the *bisector energy* of the set A , which is the number of pairs of points whose perpendicular bisector coincide:

$$|\{(a, b, c, d) \in A^4 : \mathbf{B}(a, b) = \mathbf{B}(c, d)\}|.$$

The variant of the bisector energy that we use — $\sum_{\ell} n_2(\ell)^2$ in Section 3 — allows us to disregard the delicacies that arise from isotropic lines.

The bisector energy controls the number of *isosceles triangles* in A , and upper bounds for the number of isosceles triangles in A yield lower bounds for $\Delta_{\text{pin}}(A)$. Lund and Petridis show quantitatively that if the bisector energy is large, then A contains many collinear points or many co-circular points [25, Theorem 2], thus either the number of isosceles triangles is small, or the set A has structure.

To prove our bound on the modified bisector energy $\sum_{\ell} n_2(\ell)^2$, we use the *kinematic mapping* of Blaschke and Grünwald to embed the space of segments of the same length into projective three-space. The bisector energy in a class of n segments of the same length is then represented by the number of incidences between n points and n planes, which we bound using the point-plane incidence theorem of the second author. We state all incidence bounds we use in Section 2.5.

To be precise, we use $S_r = S_r(A)$ to denote the set of pairs of points of distance r apart:

$$S_r = S_r(A) := \{(a, b) \in A^2 : d(a, b) = r\}.$$

The modified bisector energy $\sum_{\ell} n_2(\ell)^2$ is equal to the sum over $r \neq 0$ of the number of pairs of segments in $S_r(A)$ that are *axially symmetric*. As mentioned above, we count the number of such pairs by representing it as a point-plane incidence count

in projective three-space; see Claim 1 below. From this it follows that

$$\sum_{\ell} n_2(\ell)^2 \ll \sum_{r \neq 0} |S_r|^{3/2} \ll |A| \left(\sum_{r \neq 0} |S_r|^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

unless A has many collinear or co-circular points. (In the proof, we assume without loss of generality that \mathbb{F} is algebraically closed, since we may embed A into the algebraic closure of \mathbb{F} without decreasing the quantities we wish to bound.)

The second moment of $|S_r|$ is the number “distance quadruples”. To obtain the bound (1) in Theorem 2, we use the trivial bound

$$\sum_r |S_r|^2 \ll |A|^{9/2}.$$

Over the real numbers, Guth and Katz proved that $\sum_r |S_r|^2 \ll |A|^3 \log |A|$, which is sharp [9]. Unfortunately, this bound is not currently available in arbitrary fields. For sufficiently small A in positive characteristic, we use point-line incidence estimates in \mathbb{F}^2 to beat the trivial bound, at least when -1 is not a square in \mathbb{F} ; this yields the improvement in equation (2).

Proposition 4. *Suppose $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_p$ and $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$. For $|A| \leq p^{10/17}$ one has*

$$(3) \quad \sum_{r \neq 0} |S_r|^2 \ll |A|^{3+\frac{2}{5}}.$$

The proof of Proposition 4 uses the Elekes-Sharir paradigm [10]: the problem of bounding $\sum_r |S_r|^2$ is tantamount to bounding the number of k -rich rigid motions from A to A , and this can be recast as an incidence problem between $|A|^2$ lines in three dimensions.

Let $G_k(A)$ denote the set of k -rich rigid motions from A to A (see Proposition 10 for details). For relatively small k we use a theorem of Kollár [23], which stems from the “algebraic” incidence bound of Guth and Katz [13, Theorem 4.1]. If used for all k , this bound recovers the trivial estimate, so we require a different bound for large k . We prove such a bound when -1 is not a square in \mathbb{F} by identifying $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}^2$ with its “complexification” in $\mathbb{F}[i]$, where i is a square root of -1 , so that the group of rigid motions in \mathbb{F}^2 corresponds to a subgroup of the group of affine transformations of $\mathbb{F}[i]$. Using the approach of Solymosi and Tardos [38, Theorem 3], we can bound the number of k -rich affine transformations of $\mathbb{F}[i]$ with a point-line incidence theorem in $\mathbb{F}[i] \times \mathbb{F}[i]$ [39, Theorem 4].

We believe that growth in the group of rigid motions can be used to prove a non-trivial estimate for $\sum_r |S_r|^2$, since this only requires a non-trivial bound for k close to $|A|$; such bounds are known for affine transformations [27] and linear fractional transformations [7, 37], and the first author has recently generalised this framework [28]. This would increase the exponent $5/8$ in our claim (1) by some small $\varepsilon > 0$. We hope to pursue this in a future paper.

The proof of Theorem 3 is somewhat different: it relies on Fourier-analytic methods to bound the number of isosceles triangles determined by triples of points of A . This is a straightforward adaptable of a method developed by Liu [24] in the continuous setting. We present its \mathbb{F}_q -analogue, which is followed by an application of a $l^2(\mathbb{F}_q^2) \rightarrow l^4(\mathbb{F}_q^2)$ Fourier extension inequality (11). The latter inequality is due to Chapman et al. [8, Lemma 4.4]. We present a short proof of inequality (11) in the appendix.

Notation. We use standard asymptotic notation: $f(n) \ll g(n)$ or $f = O(g)$ means that there exists a constant $c > 0$ that does not depend on n so that $f(n) \leq c|g(n)|$. The relation $f \gg g$ is equivalent to $g \ll f$. The constant implicit in this notation may freely change from line to line.

We use p to denote an odd prime, and we use \mathbb{F}_q to denote a field of prime power cardinality, with $q = p^r$ for some $r > 0$. We often simply write \mathbb{F} for a field, which is often, but not necessarily \mathbb{F}_q . Most hypotheses involving a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q^2$ include a constraint in terms of the characteristic p ; for instance $|A| \leq p^c$, for some $c > 0$. We always state this constraint as a \leq bound, noting that if it happens to be satisfied up to an absolute constant, the only effect would be a change in the implicit constants in the conclusion.

Also, for results pertaining to finite fields \mathbb{F}_p and \mathbb{F}_q , the prime p is to be sufficiently large to dominate the suppressed universal constants.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. A framework for distance preserving transformations. Let $\text{SO}_2(\mathbb{F}) \subseteq \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{F})$ denote the set of unit determinant linear transformations preserving the distance:

$$\text{SO}_2(\mathbb{F}) := \{g \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{F}) : \forall x, y \in \mathbb{F}^2, d(x, y) = d(gx, gy)\}.$$

As a matrix group,

$$\text{SO}_2(\mathbb{F}) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u & -v \\ v & u \end{pmatrix} : u, v \in \mathbb{F}, u^2 + v^2 = 1 \right\}.$$

We will use the notation $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{F}^2$ for the unit circle, and write $(u, v) \in \mathcal{C}$. As is the case for rotations acting on circles in \mathbb{R}^2 , the group $\text{SO}_2(\mathbb{F})$ acts simply transitively on the level sets $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{F}^2 : d(x, y) = t\}$ for all $t \neq 0$. Thus $d(x, y) = d(x', y')$ if and only if there is a rotation $\theta \in \text{SO}_2(\mathbb{F})$ such that $\theta x - \theta y = x' - y'$.

Let $T_2(\mathbb{F})$ be the group of translations $x \mapsto x + t$ acting on the plane \mathbb{F}^2 . The group $\text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ of positively oriented rigid motions of \mathbb{F}^2 is generated by $\text{SO}_2(\mathbb{F})$ and $T_2(\mathbb{F})$; this is the analogue of the special Euclidean group $\text{SE}_2(\mathbb{R})$.

Explicitly, an element of $\text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ has the form:

$$(4) \quad \begin{pmatrix} u & -v & s \\ v & u & t \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where } u^2 + v^2 = 1.$$

By the above discussion, we see that $d(x, y) = d(x', y')$ if and only if there exists $g \in \text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ such that $g(x, y) = (x', y')$. If such a g exists, an easy calculation shows that it is unique.

2.2. Blaschke-Grünwald Kinematic Mapping. The Blaschke-Grünwald kinematic mapping [4, 12] assigns to each element $g \in \text{SE}_2(\mathbb{R})$ a point in projective space $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{R}^3$. For a detailed exposition concerning this mapping and its properties, see the textbook by Bottema and Roth [5, Chapter 11]. The kinematic mapping was rediscovered some 100 years later by Elekes and Sharir [10] and played an essential role in the resolutions of the Erdős distinct distance problem in \mathbb{R}^2 by Guth and Katz [13].

The definition of the original Blaschke-Grünwald kinematic mapping extends to all fields that are closed under taking square roots. The reason for this is the

necessity to have well-defined “half-angles”: for all $(u, v) \in \mathcal{C}$ (the unit circle), we may resolve the system of quadratic equations

$$(5) \quad u = \tilde{u}^2 - \tilde{v}^2, \quad v = 2\tilde{u}\tilde{v}$$

to find another point $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}) \in \mathcal{C}$. Since we use projective coordinates, it does not matter which of the two roots of the equation $\tilde{u}^2 = \frac{1+u}{2}$ one chooses for \tilde{u} , and this choice, once made, defines \tilde{v} unambiguously. With these preliminaries in hand, we may define the Blaschke-Grünwald kinematic mapping, which embeds $\mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ in $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3$: an element of $\mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ of the form of (4) becomes the projective point:

$$(6) \quad [X_0 : X_1 : X_2 : X_3] = [2\tilde{u} : 2\tilde{v} : s\tilde{u} + t\tilde{v} : s\tilde{v} - t\tilde{u}].$$

Note that the mapping (6) does not depend on the sign choice in the half-angle formulae (5). Conversely,

$$(7) \quad u = \frac{X_0^2 - X_1^2}{X_0^2 + X_1^2}, \quad v = \frac{2X_0X_1}{X_0^2 + X_1^2}, \quad \frac{s}{2} = \frac{X_1X_3 + X_0X_2}{X_0^2 + X_1^2}, \quad \frac{t}{2} = \frac{X_1X_2 - X_0X_3}{X_0^2 + X_1^2}.$$

If \mathbb{F} is a field where some elements do not have square roots, we can use projectivity to avoid them. If $\tilde{u} \neq 0$, we may multiply the coordinates of the left hand side of (6) to find

$$[X_0 : X_1 : X_2 : X_3] = [2(u+1) : 2v : s(u+1) + tv : sv - t(u+1)].$$

If $\tilde{u} = 0$, then $u = -1$ and $\tilde{v} = \pm 1$, so the formula in the previous equation is still correct.

Observe that the image of the kinematic mapping κ , is $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3 \setminus \{X_0^2 + X_1^2 = 0\}$. That is one removes from $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3$ the exceptional set, which is a line if -1 is not a square and is a union of two planes if -1 is a square.

The kinematic mapping has a number of remarkable properties, however, the easiest way to derive these properties is by studying a certain Clifford algebra. Since we do not have a reference for these computations over arbitrary fields, we carry them out in Appendix B.

The most important property of κ for this paper is that translation in the group $\mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ corresponds to a *projective transformation* of $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3$.

Proposition 5. *For all $g \in \mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ there are projective maps $\phi_g : \mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3$ and $\phi^g : \mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3$ such that for all $x \in \mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$*

$$\kappa(gx) = \phi_g(\kappa(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa(xg) = \phi^g(\kappa(x)).$$

The proof of this proposition is part of Corollary 14 in Appendix B.

As a corollary, we see that the set of all rigid motions mapping one fixed point to another fixed point corresponds to a projective line. For points x and y in \mathbb{F}^2 , let T_{xy} denote the set of $g \in \mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ such that $gx = y$.

Corollary 6. *For all x and y in \mathbb{F}^2 , the image $\kappa(T_{xy})$ is a projective line.*

Proof. The image of the rotation subgroup $\mathrm{SO}_2(\mathbb{F})$ is $X_2 = X_3 = 0$, which is a projective line. By the transformation properties, all conjugate subgroups of $\mathrm{SO}_2(\mathbb{F})$ are projective lines, and all cosets of these groups are lines. But the set T_{xy} is a left coset of the stabiliser of x , which is conjugate to $\mathrm{SO}_2(\mathbb{F})$. \square

2.3. Isotropic lines. Theorem 2 yields different exponents for arbitrary \mathbb{F} and for \mathbb{F} with characteristic $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ because of the existence of isotropic vectors in arbitrary fields \mathbb{F} . A vector $v \neq 0 \in \mathbb{F}^2$ is *isotropic* if $d(v, v) = 0$. If $i := \sqrt{-1} \in \mathbb{F}$, then \mathbb{F} contains isotropic vectors. In particular, we note that when $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, then -1 is not a square so there are no isotropic vectors. Give a finite point set A , an oriented segment is a pair $(a, a') \in A^2$ with length $d(a, a')$. If $d(a, a') = 0$, the segment is called isotropic; when $a \neq a'$ we say that (a, a') is a non-trivial isotropic segment. A non-trivial isotropic segment lies on an isotropic line with slope $\pm i$.

Isotropic line segments should be excluded from counts, for there may be too many of them: a single isotropic line supporting N points contains $\gg N^2$ zero-length segments.

Amongst other facts on isotropic lines, it's easy to see that perpendicular bisectors are not isotropic [25, Corollary 8].

2.4. Axial Symmetries. As in the Euclidean case, $\text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ has index two in the group of all distance-preserving transformations. The other coset of $\text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ consists of compositions of reflection through some (non-isotropic) line, and a translation parallel to this line. We call a reflection through a non-isotropic line an *axial symmetry*. The coset of $\text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ contains, in particular, the set of axial symmetries.

We define axial symmetries relative to non-isotropic lines only, since if ℓ is isotropic, then a being symmetric to a' relative to ℓ means that $a - a'$ is normal to ℓ , and also that for any $b \in \ell$, $d(a, b) = d(a', b)$. However, if ℓ is isotropic, this means that a, a' lie on ℓ .

For $x, y \in \mathbb{F}^2$, we write $x \sim_\ell y$ to mean that x is axially symmetric to y , relative to the (non-isotropic) line ℓ .

The composition of two axial symmetries, relative to distinct lines ℓ and ℓ' , as in the Euclidean case, is generally a rotation around the axes intersection point, by twice the angle between the lines. If the lines are parallel, it is a translation in the normal direction (note that ℓ, ℓ' are non-isotropic lines).

In the sequel, for convenience of working within the group structure of $\text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$, rather than its other coset, we map the set of all axial symmetries into the group $\text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$. We map an axial symmetry to $\text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ by composing it with the fixed axial symmetry ρ relative to a non-isotropic subspace ℓ_τ .

The image of the set of axial symmetries under this mapping is the set of rotations around all points on ℓ_τ , which we denote by R_τ .

If ℓ_τ is the x -axis, then explicitly

$$R_\tau = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u & -v & x_0(1-u) \\ v & u & -x_0v \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} : u^2 + v^2 = 1, u, v, x_0 \in \mathbb{F} \right\}.$$

A short calculation shows that, for this choice of ℓ_τ , the image of R_τ under the kinematic mapping is contained in the plane $X_2 = 0$. By Proposition 5, we see that R_τ is contained in a plane for any choice of ℓ_τ . This transformation motivates the role of incidence geometry.

2.5. Incidence Geometry. We employ several incidence bounds. The first is an incidence bound between points and planes in \mathbb{F}^3 by the second author [33]; for a selection of applications of this bound, see the second author's survey [34].

Theorem 7 (Points-Planes in \mathbb{F}^3). *Let \mathcal{P} be a set of points in \mathbb{F}^3 and let Π be a set of planes in \mathbb{F}^3 , with $|\mathcal{P}| \leq |\Pi|$. If \mathbb{F} has positive characteristic p , suppose that $|\mathcal{P}| \ll p^2$. Let k be the maximum number of collinear points in \mathcal{P} . Then*

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{P}, \Pi) \ll |\mathcal{P}|^{1/2}|\Pi| + k|\Pi|.$$

A consequence of this theorem is a Szemerédi-Trotter type result in arbitrary fields. This is a result of de Zeeuw and the third author [39], stated in the way to fit our purposes.

Theorem 8 (Points-Lines in \mathbb{F}^2). *Let $B \subset \mathbb{F}^*$, consider the set of lines $L(B)$ indexed by the Cartesian product $B \times B$: a line $\ell_{b,c} \in L(B)$ is of the form $x \mapsto bx + c$ for $b, c \in B$.*

Let $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{F}^2$ be a finite set of points where $|B| \leq |\mathcal{P}|$. In positive characteristic suppose, in addition, that $|B||\mathcal{P}| \ll p^2$.

Then there exists an absolute constant C such that

$$(8) \quad \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{P}, L(B)) \leq |L(B)| + C|L(B)|^{5/4}|\mathcal{P}|^{3/4}.$$

It is an unusual feature of Theorem 8 that to be able to apply it, given a set of lines L , to bound the number of, say k -rich points in positive characteristic, we already need to be in possession of a preliminary bound on the number of k -rich points. However, in our application k is large, so we can merely use a trivial estimate $\ll |L|^2/k^2$.

Finally, we will use Theorem 2 of Kollár [23], combined with its extension over \mathbb{F} as stated in [23, Paragraph 39].

Theorem 9 (Points-Lines in \mathbb{F}^3). *Let L be a set of distinct lines in \mathbb{F}^3 and \mathcal{P} a set of distinct points in \mathbb{F}^3 . If the characteristic of \mathbb{F} is $p > 0$, assume that $p^3 > 6|\mathcal{P}|$. Let c be a constant so that no plane contains more than $c\sqrt{|L|}$ of the lines. Then the number of incidences satisfies*

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{P}, L) \ll_c |L||\mathcal{P}|^{1/3} + |\mathcal{P}|.$$

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

In this section we prove Theorem 2, assuming Proposition 4.

Let $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}(A)$ be the number of non-degenerate isosceles triangles with vertices in A . A non-degenerate isosceles triangle means a triple (a, b, b') with $d(a, b) = d(a, b')$ and the base $b - b'$ non-isotropic.

An application of Cauchy-Schwarz [25, Proof of Theorem 1] relates \mathcal{T} to the number of pinned distances:

$$\Delta_{\text{pin}}(A)\mathcal{T} \gg |A|^3.$$

It remains therefore to find an upper bound on \mathcal{T} . We count separately triples of the form (a, a, b) and permutations thereof, and obtain a count for \mathcal{T} in terms of the perpendicular bisectors of pairs of points in A :

$$\mathcal{T} \ll |A|^2 + \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{B}_1(A)} n_1(\ell)n_2(\ell);$$

in the sum above:

- $\mathcal{B}_1(A)$ is the set of (non-isotropic) line-bisectors determined by A containing at least one point of A ,

- $n_1(\ell) > 1$ is the number of points of A lying on ℓ ,
- $n_2(\ell)$ is the number of points of A outside ℓ that have a point in A that is symmetric relative to ℓ , for ℓ non-isotropic:

$$n_2(\ell) := |\{a \in A \setminus (A \cap \ell) : \exists b \in A \text{ such that } a \sim_\ell b\}|.$$

One can assume that n_2 is at least, say, 10, with the notation subsuming the count of lines with $n_2(\ell) < 10$. Given a (non-isotropic) line bisector ℓ , we may also assume that at least, say, half of the pairs of points axially symmetric with respect to ℓ do not lie on a single isotropic line.

The quantity $\sum_\ell n_1(\ell)^2$ counts pairs of points lying on ℓ : this is at most $|A|^2$.

We bound $\sum n_2^2(\ell)$ by realising it as an incidence problem. Let $\text{Ax}_{(c,d)}$ be the set of elements $(x, y) \in \mathbb{F}^2$ that are axially symmetric to $(c, d) \in \mathbb{F}^2$ (with respect to some non-isotropic line). For a set $X \subseteq A \times A$ containing no isotropic vectors, let $\mathcal{A}(X) := \{\text{Ax}_x : x \in X\}$ be the set of elements attainable from X via axial symmetries.

Then, recalling that $S_r \subset A \times A$ is the set of segments of length r , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_\ell n_2^2(\ell) &= |\{(a, b, c, d, \ell) \in A^4 \times \mathcal{B}_1(A) : (a, b) \sim_\ell (c, d)\}| \\ &= \sum_{r \neq 0} |\{((a, b), (c, d)) \in S_r^2 : (a, b) \in \text{Ax}_{(c,d)}\}| \\ &= \sum_{r \neq 0} \mathcal{I}(S_r, \mathcal{A}(S_r)). \end{aligned}$$

Claim 1. *Let $r \neq 0$, and suppose, if \mathbb{F} has positive characteristic p , that $|A| \leq p^{4/3}$. Suppose that at most M points of A are collinear or co-circular in \mathbb{F}^2 . Then*

$$\mathcal{I}(S_r, \mathcal{A}(S_r)) \ll M|S_r| + |S_r|^{3/2}.$$

Assuming the claim, we now conclude the proof of Theorem 2. We have (after a further application of Cauchy-Schwarz) that:

$$\mathcal{T} \ll |A|^2 + |A| \left(\sum_{r \neq 0} (M|S_r| + |S_r|^{3/2}) \right)^{1/2} \ll \sqrt{M}|A|^2 + |A|^{3/2} \left(\sum_{r \neq 0} |S_r|^2 \right)^{1/4}.$$

If the first term dominates, then we have $\Omega(M) \gg |A|^{3/4}$ pinned distances. Otherwise, the claim of Theorem 2 follows from either Proposition 4 or the trivial count $\sum_r |S_r|^2 \leq |A|^{7/2}$. A single non-zero distance can be realised in at most $|A|^{3/2}$ ways [11], thus $|S_r| \leq |A|^{3/2}$, and so the trivial count follows from the inequality $\sum_r |S_r| \leq |A|^2$.

Proof of Claim 1. Passing to an extension of \mathbb{F} can only increase the quantity we seek to bound, so we assume, without loss of generality, that \mathbb{F} is algebraically closed.

We embed the set S_r in $\text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ by fixing a segment s_r in S_r and identifying an element $(a, a') \in S_r$ with the inverse of the rigid motion that takes s_r to (a, a') . This rigid motion always exists, for one can translate (a, a') to the origin, and then find the corresponding rotation, for $r \neq 0$. Let G_r denote the set of transformations in $\text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ corresponding to segments in A^2 .

Now we will associate a *projective plane* in $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3$ to each segment in S_r . Choose τ so that for all $g, h \in G_r$, the transformation $g^{-1}h$ has no fixed points on ℓ_τ ; this

is possible since \mathbb{F} is algebraically closed, so there are infinitely many choices of ℓ_τ , while there are a finite number of products $g^{-1}h$. Recall that R_τ is the set of axial symmetries composed with a reflection about the non-isotropic subspace ℓ_τ and that $\kappa(R_\tau)$ is contained in a projective plane $\kappa(R_\tau)$. Let g be the element of $\text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ corresponding to (a, a') . By Proposition 5, the transformation ϕ_g is projective, hence the set $\phi_g(\kappa(R_\tau))$ is a projective plane in $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3$. Let $\Pi = \{\phi_g(\kappa(R_\tau)) : g \in G_r\}$. We have $|\Pi| = |G_r| = |S_r|$, since $\phi_g(\kappa(R_\tau)) = \phi_h(\kappa(R_\tau))$ if and only if $g^{-1}h \in R_\tau$, but every element of R_τ fixes a point on ℓ_τ , while no product $g^{-1}h$ with g and h in G_r fixes a point on ℓ_τ .

Let G'_r denote the set of $g \in \text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ such that $g^{-1}s_r \in \tau(A) \times \tau(A)$, and set $P = \kappa(G'_r)$. We will show that

$$\mathcal{I}(S_r, \mathcal{A}(S_r)) = \mathcal{I}(P, \Pi).$$

First note that $|P| = |G'_r| = |S_r|$, since the kinematic mapping is injective. Now, suppose that $\pi = \phi_g(\kappa(R_\tau))$ for some $g \in G_r$ and $p = \kappa(h)$ for some $h \in G'_r$. If $p \in \pi$, then $\kappa(h) \in \phi_g(\pi) = \phi_g(\kappa(R_\tau))$. Thus

$$\kappa(g^{-1}h) = \phi_g^{-1}(\kappa(h)) \in \kappa(R_x),$$

so $h \in gR_x$. Now, let (a, a') correspond to g and (b, b') correspond to h , so that

$$g(a, a') = h(\tau(b), \tau(b')) = s_r.$$

Since $h \in gR_x$, we have

$$(\tau(b), \tau(b')) \in R_x^{-1}(a, a') = R_x(a, a'),$$

thus (b, b') is attainable from (a, a') by an axial symmetry.

To apply Theorem 7 to P and Π , we must bound the maximum number of collinear planes in Π . Lemma 5 of Lund and Petridis [25] shows that the endpoints of the set of segments in S_r that are axially symmetric to a fixed segments in S_r lie on a circle or line in \mathbb{F}^2 . It follows that the quantity M can be used as a bound for the number of collinear planes in the application of the point-plane theorem, thus

$$\mathcal{I}(S_r, \mathcal{A}(S_r)) = \mathcal{I}(P, \Pi) \ll M|S_r| + |S_r|^{3/2},$$

as required. \square

This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.

4. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4

In the notation of the previous sections, the quantity $\sum_{r \neq 0} |S_r|^2$ which we bound in Proposition 4, coincides with the notion of “distance energy”, or “distance quadruples” in the language of Guth and Katz [13]. A key observation of Elekes and Sharir [10] is that we can study distances by looking at the group of transformations preserving the distance between two points.

We say that an element g in $\text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ is a k -rich transformation (from A to A) if $|A \cap gA| \geq k$. Let G_k denote the set of all k -rich transformations from A to A . By a standard calculation [10, Section (H3)],

$$\sum_{r \neq 0} |S_r|^2 = \sum_{g \in \text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})} |A \cap gA|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{|A|} (2k-1)|G_k|.$$

We now bound the quantity $|G_k|$ in two different ways: for small k , we map the rich transformations into rich points within a three dimensional line configuration determined by A ; for large k , we map rich transformations into a two dimensional configuration.

Proposition 10. *Suppose that $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}^2$ and in positive characteristic $|A| \leq p$. Then*

$$|G_k(A)| \ll \frac{|A|^3}{k^{3/2}}.$$

Proposition 11. *Suppose $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_p$ and $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$. If $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^2$ and $|A| \ll p^{10/17}$, then for $k \geq |A|^{4/5}$ we have*

$$(9) \quad |G_k(A)| \ll \frac{|A|^5}{k^4}.$$

These bounds, combined with (4), readily imply Proposition 4.

4.1. Case 1: low multiplicity. Our proof of Proposition 10 uses an embedding of $\text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ into three space. This is essentially the approach of Elekes-Sharir and Guth-Katz, as translated to the finite field setting by Bennett, Iosevich and Pakianathan [3], though in fact, we use the Blaschke-Grünwald kinematic mapping κ .

Proof of Proposition 10. For $a, b \in A$, let $\ell_{ab} = \kappa(T_{ab})$, where T_{ab} is the set of transformations g in $\text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ such that $ga = b$. By Corollary 6, the set ℓ_{ab} is a projective line. An element g of $\text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ is in G_k if and only if there are at least k distinct lines ℓ_{ab} indexed by $a, b \in A$ containing the point $\kappa(g)$ [13, Lemma 2.6]. We conclude that $|G_k|$ is precisely the number of k -rich points in the line configuration $\mathbf{L}(A) = \{\ell_{ab} : a, b \in A\}$. (A point x is k -rich with respect to a line configuration \mathbf{L} if $x \in \ell$ for at least k distinct lines ℓ in \mathbf{L} .) For ease of notation, we will write G_k for the set of k -rich points, as well as for the set of k rich transformations: in light of the previous arguments, the cardinality of these two sets are the same.

If we can apply Theorem 9 to our situation, then we are done. Indeed, we have

$$k|G_k| \leq \mathcal{I}(G_k, \mathbf{L}) \ll |\mathbf{L}||G_k|^{1/3} + |G_k|.$$

Since $|\mathbf{L}(A)| = |A|^2$, rearranging the previous equation yields the desired bound:

$$|G_k| \ll |\mathbf{L}|^{3/2} k^{-3/2} = |A|^3 k^{-3/2}.$$

It remains to check the assumptions of Kollár's theorem. At most $\sqrt{|\mathbf{L}|}$ lines of \mathbf{L} are coplanar, since for distinct elements $a, b, c \in \mathbb{F}^2$, the lines ℓ_{ab} and ℓ_{ac} do not intersect, and so are not coplanar.

If the characteristic p of \mathbb{F} is positive, we also need our point set $G_k = G_k(A)$ to have cardinality $|G_k| \ll p^3$. By [23, Corollary 40], if L is a set of lines in \mathbb{F}^3 with $|L| \leq 2p^2$ and at most $\sqrt{|L|}$ lines of L are contained in any plane (and at most $2\sqrt{|L|}$ in any quadric), then the number of points incidence to at least two lines of L is $\leq 30|L|^{3/2}$. Since $|L| \leq p^2$, we have $|G_k| \leq 30p^3$, which suffices. \square

4.2. Case 2: high multiplicity. The idea for the proof of Proposition 11 is illustrated by the following example: we can identify the real plane \mathbb{R}^2 with the complex numbers \mathbb{C} so that rotations of \mathbb{R}^2 correspond to multiplication by complex numbers of norm 1. Thus to bound $|S_r|$ for $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$, we can view our points as complex numbers and our transformations as certain *affine transformations* of \mathbb{C} .

This argument works whenever \mathbb{R} is replaced by a field \mathbb{F} with a non-square element $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}$ and the dot product on \mathbb{R}^2 is replaced by a quadratic form $Q((x_1, x_2)) = x_1^2 - \alpha x_2^2$.

The complexification of \mathbb{F} is formalised by the map $\sigma : \mathbb{F}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}[\sqrt{\alpha}]$ where α is a non-square:

$$\sigma(x, y) = x + \sqrt{\alpha}y.$$

In the case $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_p$, with $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, we take $\alpha = -1$, and write $K = \mathbb{F}[\sqrt{\alpha}]$.

Let $\varphi : \mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Aff}(1, K)$ be defined as:

$$\varphi \left(\begin{pmatrix} u & -v & s \\ v & u & t \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} u + \alpha v & s + \alpha t \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The map φ is an injective homomorphism. Further, σ is equivariant with respect to embedding $\varphi : \mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Aff}(1, K)$; that is, if $g \in \mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$, then $\sigma(gx) = \varphi(g)\sigma(x)$.

Proof of Proposition 11. As in Proposition 10, we bound the size of $G_k = \{g \in \mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F}) : |A \cap gA| \geq k\}$, for a fixed set $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}^2$.

Using the maps σ and φ defined in the above argument, we set $\tilde{A} = \sigma(A) \subseteq K$ and $\tilde{G}_k = \{g \in \mathrm{Aff}(1, K) : |\tilde{A} \cap g\tilde{A}| \geq k\}$. Then, by the equivariance of the map σ , k -rich transformations of A are sent to k -rich transformations of \tilde{A} by the map φ . Hence $|G_k| \leq |\tilde{G}_k|$.

To bound $|\tilde{G}_k|$, we therefore need to bound the number of k -rich lines as to the point set $\tilde{A} \times \tilde{A}$. If $h \in \mathrm{Aff}(1, K)$ is given by the map $x \mapsto mx + b$ with $m \in K^*$, $b \in K$, then we write $h^* = (m, b)$. Let $H_{xy}^* = \{h^* : hx = y, h \in \mathrm{Aff}(1, K)\}$; H^* is contained in the line $\ell_{xy} = \{(m, b) \in K^2 : y = mx + b\}$. If $g \in \tilde{G}_k$, then g^* is incident to at least k lines of the form $\ell_{x,y}$ with $x, y \in \tilde{A}$, so $|\tilde{G}_k|$ is at most the number of k -rich points of the set of lines $\ell_{x,y}$ with $x, y \in \tilde{A}$. There are $|\tilde{A}|^2 = |A|^2$ such lines.

We will bound the number of k -rich points $|\tilde{G}_k|$ by Theorem 8. Note that our line set $L(\tilde{A}) := \{\ell_{x,y} : x, y \in \tilde{A}\}$ is indexed by a Cartesian product $\tilde{A} \times \tilde{A}$. If $|\tilde{G}_k| \leq |\tilde{A}|$, then we are done, so in the subsequent we suppose that $|\tilde{G}_k| > |\tilde{A}|$. If $|\tilde{A}||\tilde{G}_k| \ll p^2$ then Theorem 8 yields

$$|\tilde{G}_k| \ll \frac{|A|^5}{k^4}.$$

It remains therefore to check that $|\tilde{A}||\tilde{G}_k| \ll p^2$. For that we merely use a trivial estimate, for $k \geq |A|^{4/5}$, that

$$|\tilde{G}_k| \ll \frac{|A|^4}{|A|^{8/5}} = |A|^{12/5},$$

which leads to the constraint $|A| \leq p^{10/17}$, as claimed. This concludes the proof of Proposition 11 and hence Theorem 2. \square

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 3

5.1. Fourier transform and extension estimate. In this section let $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{F}_q$, where q is a power of an odd prime p , and let $\mathbb{F}^* = \mathbb{F} \setminus \{0\}$. For $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}^2$, we identify

A with its characteristic function. For functions $f, g: \mathbb{F}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, define the Fourier transform and inverse Fourier transform, respectively, as

$$\hat{f}(\xi) = \mathbf{E}_x f(x) e(-x \cdot \xi) \quad \text{and} \quad \check{g}(x) = \sum_{\xi} g(\xi) e(\xi \cdot x).$$

Here e denotes a principal character of \mathbb{F}_q and \mathbf{E} stands for the expectation

$$\mathbf{E}_x f(x) := q^{-2} \sum_x f(x).$$

With this choice of normalisation, we have $\check{\check{f}}(x) = f(x)$ and the Plancherel identity

$$\mathbf{E}_x f(x) \overline{g(x)} = \sum_{\xi} \hat{f}(\xi) \overline{\hat{g}(\xi)}.$$

Further, defining convolution by

$$(f * g)(x) := \mathbf{E}_y [f(x - y)g(y)],$$

we have

$$\widehat{f * g}(\xi) = \hat{f}(\xi) \hat{g}(\xi).$$

We use the notation, for a real $p > 1$ (not to be confused with the characteristic of \mathbb{F} , which does not appear explicitly in this section) and $S \subset \mathbb{F}^2$

$$\|f\|_{\ell^p(S)} := \left(\sum_{x \in S} |f(x)|^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

Also, we use $f \upharpoonright_S$ to denote the restriction of the function f to the set S .

For $t \in \mathbb{F}$, let C_t denote the ‘‘circle of radius t ’’; i.e. $C_t := \{x \in \mathbb{F}^2 : x \cdot x = t\}$. For a function $g: \mathbb{F}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ supported on C_t , with $t \neq 0$, we have the following *Fourier extension* estimate:

$$(10) \quad \|\hat{g}\|_{\ell^4(\mathbb{F}^2)} \leq \sqrt[4]{3q}^{-3/2} \|g\|_{\ell^2(C_t)},$$

which, unravelling the notation, is exactly the inequality

$$(11) \quad \sum_{\xi \in \mathbb{F}^2} |\hat{g}(\xi)|^4 \leq 3q^{-6} \left(\sum_{x \in C_t} |g(x)|^2 \right)^2.$$

If g is not supported on C_t , we can still apply this result to $g \upharpoonright_{C_t}$.

Inequality (10) is due to Chapman et.al [8, Lemma 4.4] which is a variant of [40, Proposition 4.29]. For a reader uncomfortable with the Fourier extension/restriction jargon we present a short proof in the forthcoming appendix.

5.2. Isosceles triangle estimate. We consider the number of non-degenerate isosceles triangles determined by a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}^2$. As in the proof of Theorem 2, the corresponding quantity is denoted $\mathcal{T}(A)$, but with a small difference concerning isotropy: we exclude from the count any triangles with isotropic sides. Namely

$$\mathcal{T}(A) := \sum_{x \in A} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}^*} |A \cap (x + C_t)|^2.$$

Let us prove the following estimate:

$$(12) \quad \mathcal{T}(A) \leq \frac{(q+1)|A|^3}{q^2} + \sqrt{3q}|A|^{3/2}.$$

To do this we derive the forthcoming formula (13) – a Fourier identity² for $\mathcal{T}(A)$, which is closely related to one established over the reals by Liu [24].

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}^*} |A \cap (x + C_t)|^2 &= \sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}^*} \left(\sum_{y \in C_t} A(x - y) \right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}^*} \sum_{y, z \in C_t} A(x - y) A(x - z) \\
&= \sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}^*} \sum_{y \in C_t} A(x - y) \sum_{\theta \in SO(2)} A(x - \theta \cdot y) \\
&= \sum_{\theta \in SO(2)} \sum_{z \cdot z \neq 0} A(x - z) A(x - \theta \cdot z) \\
&= -\mathcal{E}_1(x) + \sum_{z \in \mathbb{F}^2} \sum_{\theta \in SO(2)} A(x - z) A(x - \theta \cdot z)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}_1(x) := \sum_{\theta \in SO(2)} \sum_{z \cdot z = 0} A(x - z) A(x - \theta \cdot z).$$

Continuing on,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{z \in \mathbb{F}^2} \sum_{\theta \in SO(2)} A(x - z) A(x - \theta \cdot z) &= q^2 \sum_{\xi \in \mathbb{F}^2} \sum_{\theta \in SO(2)} e(-\xi \cdot x) e((\theta \xi) \cdot x) \hat{A}(-\xi) \overline{\hat{A}(-\theta \xi)} \\
&= \mathcal{E}_2(x) + q^2 \sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}^*} \left| \sum_{\xi \in C_t} \hat{A}(\xi) e(\xi \cdot x) \right|^2 \\
&= \mathcal{E}_2(x) + q^6 \sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}^*} \left| \widehat{\hat{A} \upharpoonright_{C_t}}(-x) \right|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}_2(x) := q^2 \sum_{\xi \cdot \xi = 0} \sum_{\theta \in SO(2)} e(-\xi \cdot x) e((\theta \xi) \cdot x) \hat{A}(-\xi) \overline{\hat{A}(-\theta \xi)}.$$

It follows that

$$(13) \quad \mathcal{T}(A) = - \sum_{x \in A} \mathcal{E}_1(x) + \sum_{x \in A} \mathcal{E}_2(x) + q^6 \sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}^*} \sum_{x \in A} \left| \widehat{\hat{A} \upharpoonright_{C_t}}(-x) \right|^2 := I + II + III.$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz and (10),

$$\sum_{x \in A} \left| \widehat{\hat{A} \upharpoonright_{C_t}}(-x) \right|^2 \leq |A|^{1/2} \left\| \widehat{\hat{A} \upharpoonright_{C_t}} \right\|_{\ell^4(\mathbb{F}^2)}^2 \leq \sqrt{3} |A|^{1/2} q^{-3} \sum_{\xi \in C_t} |\hat{A}(\xi)|^2,$$

and so

$$III \leq \sqrt{3} |A|^{1/2} q^3 \sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}^*} \sum_{\xi \in C_t} |\hat{A}(\xi)|^2 \leq \sqrt{3} q |A|^{3/2}.$$

²We present a shorter and more geometric derivation, although one attains the same result directly by using the Plancherel formula, the explicit expression $\hat{C}_t(\xi) = q^{-2} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{F}^*} e\left(\frac{\|\xi\|}{4j} + tj\right)$ for $\|\xi\| \neq 0$ and then somewhat cumbersome algebra.

If \mathbb{F}^2 has no isotropic subspaces, then the “zero radius circle” satisfies $|C_0| = 1$ and

$$I = -(q+1) \sum_{x \in A} A(x) = -(q+1)|A|,$$

and

$$II = q^2(q+1)|\hat{A}(0)|^2 \sum_{x \in A} 1 = \frac{(q+1)|A|^3}{q^2},$$

thus

$$\mathcal{T}(A) \leq \frac{(q+1)|A|^3}{q^2} - (q+1)|A| + \sqrt{3}q|A|^{3/2}.$$

Now, suppose that \mathbb{F}^2 has two isotropic subspaces L_1 and L_2 . Let L_i^* denote $L_i \setminus \{0\}$. The group $SO(2)$ acts transitively on C_t for $t \neq 0$ and on L_i^* , $i = 1, 2$.

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_1(x) &= (q-1)A(x) + \sum_{i=1,2} \left(\sum_{z \in L_i^*} A(x-z) \right)^2 \\ &= (q-1)A(x) + \sum_{i=1,2} |A \cap (x - L_i^*)|^2 \\ &= (q-1)A(x) + \sum_{i=1,2} (|A \cap (x - L_i)| - A(x))^2 \\ &= (q-1)A(x) + \sum_{i=1,2} (|A \cap (x - L_i)|^2 - 2A(x)|A \cap (x - L_i)| + A(x)) \\ &= (q+1)A(x) + \sum_{i=1,2} (|A \cap (x - L_i)|^2 - 2A(x)|A \cap (x - L_i)|). \end{aligned}$$

So

$$I = - \sum_{x \in A} \mathcal{E}_1(x) = (q+1)|A| - 2 \sum_{x \in A} \sum_{i=1,2} |A \cap (x - L_i)| + \sum_{x \in A} \sum_{i=1,2} |A \cap (x - L_i)|^2.$$

We have

$$\mathcal{E}_2(x) = q^2(q-1)|\hat{A}(0)|^2 + q^2 \sum_{i=1,2} \left| \sum_{\xi \in L_i^*} \hat{A}(\xi)e(\xi \cdot x) \right|^2.$$

Now,

$$\sum_{\xi \in L_i^*} \hat{A}(\xi)e(\xi \cdot x) = (A * \check{L}_i^*)(x)$$

is the inverse Fourier transform of \hat{A} times the indicator function on L_i^* , which is equal to the convolution of A and the inverse Fourier transform of L_i^* . To compute \check{L}_i^* , fix $\xi_0 \in L_i^*$. Then

$$\check{L}_i^*(x) = \sum_{\xi \in L_i^*} e(x \cdot \xi) = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}^*} e(x \cdot t\xi_0) = qL_i(x) - 1,$$

since $x \cdot \xi_0 = 0$ if and only if $x \in L_i$. Thus

$$(A * \check{L}_i^*)(x) = \frac{|A \cap (x - L_i)|}{q} - \frac{|A|}{q^2}.$$

It follows that

$$II = \frac{(q-1)|A|^3}{q^2} + \sum_{i=1,2} \sum_{x \in A} \left| |A \cap (x - L_i)| - \frac{|A|}{q} \right|^2.$$

Combining I and II yields

$$\begin{aligned} I + II &= \frac{(q-1)|A|^3}{q^2} - (q+1)|A| \\ &+ \sum_{i=1,2} \sum_{x \in A} \left(\left| |A \cap (x - L_i)| - \frac{|A|}{q} \right|^2 - |A \cap (x - L_i)|^2 + 2|A \cap (x - L_i)| \right) \\ &= \frac{(q-1)|A|^3}{q^2} - (q+1)|A| + \sum_{i=1,2} \sum_{x \in A} \left(\frac{|A|^2}{q^2} - \frac{2(|A| - q)}{q} |A \cap (x - L_i)| \right) \\ &= \frac{(q-1)|A|^3}{q^2} - (q+1)|A| + \frac{2|A|^3}{q^2} - \frac{2(|A| - q)}{q} \sum_{i=1,2} \sum_{x \in A} |A \cap (x - L_i)| \\ &= \frac{(q+1)|A|^3}{q^2} - (q+1)|A| - \frac{2(|A| - q)}{q} \sum_{i=1,2} \sum_{x \in A} |A \cap (x - L_i)|. \end{aligned}$$

Estimate (12) follows.

5.3. Pinned distances. We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3. Since

$$\sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}^*} |A \cap (x + C_t)| = |A| - |A \cap (x + C_0)|$$

and $|A \cap (x + C_t)| > 0$ only if there is a point in A that is at a distance t from x , we have

$$\frac{|A \setminus (x + C_0)|^2}{\Delta(A, x)} \leq \sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}^*} |A \cap (x + C_t)|^2.$$

Since

$$\mathcal{T}(A) \leq \frac{(q+1)|A|^3}{q^2} + \sqrt{3}q|A|^{3/2},$$

there is an $x \in A$ such that

$$\frac{|A \setminus (x + C_0)|^2}{\Delta(A, x)} \leq \frac{(q+1)|A|^2}{q^2} + \sqrt{3}q|A|^{1/2}.$$

If $|A| = \lambda q^{4/3}$, we have

$$\Delta(A, x) \sim \frac{\lambda^{3/2}}{\lambda^{3/2} + \sqrt{3}} q.$$

If $\lambda = q^{-\delta}$, then

$$\Delta(A, x) \sim \frac{q^{1-3\delta/2}}{\sqrt{3}} = \frac{|A|^{3/2}}{\sqrt{3}q}.$$

This is better than $|A|^{5/8}$ for $\delta < 4/21$; that is, $|A| > q^{8/7}$. \square

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF FOURIER EXTENSION INEQUALITY (11)

Though the estimate (11) is not new, existing arguments require notation that is not necessary for our purpose. We give a proof with minimal notation, following an argument in the book by Tao and Vu [40, Proposition 4.29], which is closely related to the arguments used to prove (11) in previous work [17, 16, 8].

Proposition 12. *A non-empty subset $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}^2$ satisfies $S = -S$ and $r_{S-S}(x) \leq 2$ for $x \neq 0$ if and only if*

$$(14) \quad \mathbb{E}_x \left| \sum_{x \in S} f(x) e(x \cdot \xi) \right|^4 \leq \left(3 - \frac{2}{|S|} \right) \left(\sum_{\xi \in S} |f(\xi)|^2 \right)^2.$$

In particular, the estimate (14) holds whenever $S = C_t$ is a circle of non-zero radius. We may write equation (14) as

$$\|(f \upharpoonright_S)\|_{L^4(\mathbb{F}^2)} \leq \left(3 - \frac{2}{|S|} \right)^{1/4} \|f\|_{\ell^2(S)},$$

and by changing normalisation, we have equation (10):

$$\|\widehat{f \upharpoonright_S}\|_{\ell^4(\mathbb{F}^2)} = q^{-3/2} \|(f \upharpoonright_S)\|_{L^4(\mathbb{F}^2)} \leq \left(3 - \frac{2}{|S|} \right)^{1/4} q^{-3/2} \|f\|_{\ell^2(S)},$$

Proof. The left hand side of (14) is

$$\sum_{\xi, \xi', \eta, \eta' \in S: \xi - \eta = \xi' - \eta'} f(\xi) f(\xi') \overline{f(\eta) f(\eta')} = \sum_{\zeta} \left| \sum_{\xi - \eta = \zeta} f(\xi) \overline{f(\eta)} S(\xi) S(\eta) \right|^2.$$

For $\zeta = 0$, we have

$$\left| \sum_{\xi - \eta = 0} f(\xi) \overline{f(\eta)} S(\xi) S(\eta) \right|^2 = \left(\sum_{\xi \in S} |f(\xi)|^2 \right)^2.$$

For $\zeta \neq 0$, Cauchy-Schwarz implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\zeta \neq 0} \left| \sum_{\xi - \eta = \zeta} f(\xi) \overline{f(\eta)} S(\xi) S(\eta) \right|^2 &\leq \sum_{\zeta \neq 0} \left(\sum_{\xi - \eta = \zeta} S(\xi) S(\eta) \right) \sum_{\xi - \eta = \zeta} |f(\xi)|^2 |f(\eta)|^2 S(\xi) S(\eta) \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{\zeta \neq 0} \sum_{\xi - \eta = \zeta} |f(\xi)|^2 |f(\eta)|^2 S(\xi) S(\eta) \\ &= 2 \sum_{\xi, \eta \in S: \xi \neq \eta} |f(\xi)|^2 |f(\eta)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the left hand side of (14) is bounded by

$$\left(\sum_{\xi \in S} |f(\xi)|^2 \right)^2 + 2 \sum_{\xi, \eta \in S: \xi \neq \eta} |f(\xi)|^2 |f(\eta)|^2,$$

which is equal to

$$\left(\sum_{\xi \in S} |f(\xi)|^2 \right)^2 + 2 \left(\left(\sum_{\xi \in S} |f(\xi)|^2 \right)^2 - \sum_{\xi \in S} |f(\xi)|^4 \right).$$

Since

$$\sum_{\xi \in S} |f(\xi)|^4 \geq \frac{1}{|S|} \left(\sum_{\xi \in S} |f(\xi)|^2 \right)^2,$$

the desired bound holds.

To show that the bound (14) is sharp, let f be the indicator function on S . Then the left hand side of (14) is

$$E(S) = \sum_{\xi} r_{S-S}^2(\xi) = |S|^2 + \sum_{\xi \neq 0} r_{S-S}^2(\xi) \geq |S|^2 + 2|S|(|S| - 1) = 3|S|^2 - 2|S|,$$

since if $x - y = \xi$, then $(-y) - (-x) = \xi$ is a solution as well, since $S = -S$. \square

APPENDIX B. CLIFFORD ALGEBRA COMPUTATIONS

This section is a short digest of Clifford algebras over finite fields. We follow Klawitter and Hagemann [21], who give a similar exposition for Clifford algebras over \mathbb{R} . We are indebted to Jon Selig, who told us about the connection between Clifford algebras and the Blaschke-Grünwald kinematic mapping.

For a vector space V with a quadratic form Q , the Clifford algebra $\mathcal{Cl}(V, Q)$ is largest algebra containing V and satisfying the relation that $x^2 = Q(x)$ for all $x \in V$, where x^2 is the square of x in the algebra. If V is an n -dimensional vector space over a finite field \mathbb{F} of odd characteristic, then there is a basis e_1, \dots, e_n of V such that $Q(e_i) = \lambda_i$, where λ_i is 0, 1, or a non-square. This basis is orthogonal with respect to the bilinear form associated to Q . The Clifford algebra is a 2^n -dimensional \mathbb{F} vector space with basis $e_{i_1 \dots i_k}$ where $i_1 < \dots < i_k$ and $0 \leq k \leq n$ (with the understanding that the empty index is e_0) defined by

$$e_{i_1 \dots i_k} = e_{i_1} \cdots e_{i_k}.$$

The rules for multiplication in $\mathcal{Cl}(V, Q)$ are given by $e_i e_j = e_j e_i$ for $i \neq j$ and $e_i^2 = \lambda_i$.

The Clifford algebra $\mathcal{Cl}(V, Q)$ splits as a direct sum of exterior products

$$\mathcal{Cl}(V, Q) = \bigoplus_{i=0}^n \bigwedge^i V$$

and is $\mathbb{Z}/2$ -graded:

$$\mathcal{Cl}(V, Q) = \mathcal{Cl}(V, Q)^+ \oplus \mathcal{Cl}(V, Q)^-,$$

where

$$\mathcal{Cl}(V, Q)^+ := \bigoplus_{\substack{i=0 \\ i \equiv 0 \pmod{2}}}^n \bigwedge^i V \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Cl}(V, Q)^- := \bigoplus_{\substack{i=0 \\ i \equiv 1 \pmod{2}}}^n \bigwedge^i V.$$

The dimension of the even subalgebra $\mathcal{Cl}(V, Q)^+$ is 2^{n-1} . We identify $\bigwedge^0 V$ with \mathbb{F} and $\bigwedge^1 V$ with V .

We define two automorphisms of $\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)$. The first, called *conjugation*, is denoted by an asterisk. For the basis elements of V we define conjugation by $e_i^* = -e_i$. We extend conjugation to other basis elements by declaring insisting that it changes the order of multiplication

$$(e_{i_1} e_{i_2} \cdots e_{i_k})^* = (-1)^k e_{i_k} \cdots e_{i_2} e_{i_1} \quad 0 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_k \leq n.$$

Finally, we extend conjugation to $\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)$ by linearity. One can check that $(\mathbf{ab})^* = \mathbf{b}^* \mathbf{a}^*$ for an elements $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)$. (Notice that if $\mathbf{a} \in \bigwedge^k V$, then $\mathbf{a}^* = (-1)^{k(k+1)/2} \mathbf{a}$.) We define the norm of an element \mathbf{a} by $N(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{a} \mathbf{a}^*$.

The second automorphism of $\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)$, called the *main involution*, is denoted by α and defined by $\alpha(e_i) = -e_i$ and extended to $\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)$ by linearity and the rules for multiplication. Clearly α fixes the even subalgebra $\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)^+$ and acts by multiplication by -1 on the odd subalgebra $\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)^-$.

Let $\mathcal{C}\ell^\times(V, Q)$ denote the set of invertible elements of $\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)$, which we call *units*. If $N(\mathbf{a}) = 1$, then $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{C}\ell^\times(V, Q)$. If $\mathbf{a} \in V$ and $N(\mathbf{a}) \neq 0$, then $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{C}\ell^\times(V, Q)$, and $\mathbf{a}^{-1} = \mathbf{a}^*/N(\mathbf{a})$. The *Clifford group* associated to $\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)$ is defined by

$$\Gamma(\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)) := \{ \mathfrak{g} \in \mathcal{C}\ell^\times(V, Q) : \alpha(\mathfrak{g}) V \mathfrak{g}^{-1} \subseteq V \}.$$

We say that the map $\mathfrak{v} \mapsto \alpha(\mathfrak{g}) \mathfrak{v} \mathfrak{g}^{-1}$ is the *sandwich operator* associated to an element $\mathfrak{g} \in \Gamma(\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q))$. Two important subgroups of the Clifford group are the Pin group and the Spin group, however, we will not need them for our exposition.

Given a quadratic form Q_0 on \mathbb{F}^2 with $Q_0(e_1) = 1$ and $Q_0(e_2) = -\lambda$, let $\text{SO}_2(\mathbb{F})$ denote the group of rotations preserving Q_0 :

$$\text{SO}_2(\mathbb{F}) := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} u & v \\ \lambda v & u \end{pmatrix} : u^2 - \lambda v^2 = 1 \right\},$$

and let $\text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ denote the group of rigid motions of \mathbb{F}^2 generated by $\text{SO}_2(\mathbb{F})$ and the group of translations.

Proposition 13. *Let $V = \mathbb{F}^3$ and define Q on V by $Q(x, y, z) = Q_0(x, y)$, let $G = (\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)^+)^{\times}$ be the group of units of the even subalgebra, and let Z be its center. Then G/Z is isomorphic to $\text{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$.*

Proof. By our definition of Q , $e_1^2 = 1, e_2^2 = -\lambda, e_3^2 = 0$, $\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)$ is spanned by

$$e_0, e_1, e_2, e_3, e_{12}, e_{13}, e_{23}, e_{123},$$

and $\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)^+$ is spanned by $e_0, e_{12}, e_{13}, e_{23}$.

If $\mathfrak{g} = g_0 e_0 + g_{12} e_{12} + g_{13} e_{13} + g_{23} e_{23}$, then

$$N(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathfrak{g} \mathfrak{g}^* = g_0^2 - \lambda g_{12}^2,$$

thus if $g_0^2 - \lambda g_{12}^2 \neq 0$, the inverse of \mathfrak{g} is

$$\mathfrak{g}^{-1} = \frac{1}{g_0^2 - \lambda g_{12}^2} \mathfrak{g}^*.$$

This determines the group of units explicitly.

One can show by a computation that G acts on V by the sandwich product $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{v}) \mapsto \mathfrak{g} \mathfrak{v} \mathfrak{g}^{-1}$ (that is $G = \Gamma(\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)^+)$). In fact, the action of general element

$\mathfrak{g} = g_0e_0 + g_{12}e_{12} + g_{13}e_{13} + g_{23}e_{23}$ in G is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{g}e_1\mathfrak{g}^{-1} &= \frac{g_0^2 + \lambda g_{12}^2}{g_0^2 - \lambda g_{12}^2}e_1 + \frac{-2g_0g_{12}}{g_0^2 - \lambda g_{12}^2}e_2 + \frac{-2(g_0g_{13} + \lambda g_{12}g_{23})}{g_0^2 - \lambda g_{12}^2}e_3, \\ \mathfrak{g}e_2\mathfrak{g}^{-1} &= \frac{-2\lambda g_0g_{12}}{g_0^2 - \lambda g_{12}^2}e_1 + \frac{g_0^2 + \lambda g_{12}^2}{g_0^2 - \lambda g_{12}^2}e_2 + \frac{2\lambda(g_0g_{23} + g_{12}g_{13})}{g_0^2 - \lambda g_{12}^2}e_3, \\ \mathfrak{g}e_3\mathfrak{g}^{-1} &= e_3. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\rho: G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(V)$ denote this representation. The contragredient representation $\rho^*(\mathfrak{g}) := \rho(\mathfrak{g}^{-1})^T$, where T denotes the transpose, acts on the dual space V^* , and in the standard basis $\{f_1, f_2, f_3\}$ on V^* defined by $f_i(e_j) = \delta_{ij}$, we have

$$(15) \quad \rho^*(\mathfrak{g}^{-1}) = \frac{1}{g_0^2 - \lambda g_{12}^2} \begin{pmatrix} g_0^2 + \lambda g_{12}^2 & -2g_0g_{12} & -2(g_0g_{13} + \lambda g_{12}g_{23}) \\ -2\lambda g_0g_{12} & g_0^2 + \lambda g_{12}^2 & 2\lambda(g_0g_{23} + g_{12}g_{13}) \\ 0 & 0 & g_0^2 - \lambda g_{12}^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The kernels of ρ and ρ^* are both equal to the subgroup $Z := \{g_0e_0 : g_0 \neq 0\}$. We wish to show that G/Z is isomorphic to $\mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$. Let R be the subgroup defined by $g_{13} = g_{23} = 0$; the rational parameterisation of the circle shows that $\rho^*(R)$ is bijective with the subgroup $\mathrm{SO}_2(\mathbb{F}) \subseteq \mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$. On the other hand, it is clear that the subgroup T defined by $g_0 = 1, g_{12} = 0$ is bijective with the translation subgroup of $\mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$. Since these subgroups generate $\mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$, we see that ρ^* is surjective. \square

We have shown more: $\mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ is naturally identified with an (open) subset of $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3$, and the nature of this identification yields some desirable features. In particular, the set of transformations in $\mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ that map a point $x \in \mathbb{F}^2$ to a point $y \in \mathbb{F}^2$ is a line.

Let $\kappa: \mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F}) \rightarrow G/Z$ denote the inverse of $\rho^*: G/Z \rightarrow \mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$. This is the *kinematic mapping* of Blaschke and Grunwald, who both sought to embed the group of rigid motions in projective space. Let $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3$ denote projective three space; we write $[X_0 : X_1 : X_2 : X_3]$ for a typical point of $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3$.

Corollary 14. *There is a bijection $\kappa: \mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3 \setminus \{X_0^2 - \lambda X_1^2 = 0\}$ such that the image of the rotation subgroup and translation subgroups are projective lines.*

Further, for all $g \in \mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$ there are projective maps $\phi_g: \mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3$ and $\phi^g: \mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3$ such that for all $x \in \mathrm{SF}_2(\mathbb{F})$

$$\kappa(gx) = \phi_g(\kappa(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa(xg) = \phi^g(\kappa(x)).$$

Proof. The even subalgebra $\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)^+$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{F}^4 as a vector space, so the projective space $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)^+)$ is $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3$. On the other hand, $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)^+)$ is just $\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)^+$ modulo the action of the multiplicative subgroup Z , so we have $G/Z \subseteq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)^+)$. In fact, G/Z consists of all points $[g_0 : g_{12} : g_{13} : g_{23}]$ such that $g_0^2 - \lambda g_{12}^2 \neq 0$.

Since $\mathcal{C}\ell(V, Q)^+$ is an \mathbb{F} -algebra, left and right multiplication are \mathbb{F} -linear transformations. That is, if $\tilde{\phi}_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{v}) := \mathfrak{g}\mathbf{v}$ and $\tilde{\phi}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{v}) := \mathbf{v}\mathfrak{g}$, then $\tilde{\phi}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ and $\tilde{\phi}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ are linear transformations. It follows that left and right translation in G/Z are *projective transformations* of $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{F}^3$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] E. AKSOY-YAZICI, B. MURPHY, M. RUDNEV, AND I. SHKREDOV, *Growth Estimates in Positive Characteristic via Collisions*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN, 2017 (2017), pp. 7148–7189.

- [2] M. BENNETT, D. HART, A. IOSEVICH, J. PAKIANATHAN, AND M. RUDNEV, *Group actions and geometric combinatorics in \mathbb{F}_q^d* , Forum Math., 29 (2017), pp. 91–110.
- [3] M. BENNETT, A. IOSEVICH, AND J. PAKIANATHAN, *Three-point configurations determined by subsets of \mathbb{F}_q^2 via the Elekes-Sharir paradigm*, Combinatorica, 34 (2014), pp. 689–706.
- [4] W. BLASCHKE, *Kinematik und quaternionen*, vol. 4, VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1960.
- [5] O. BOTTEMA AND B. ROTH, *Theoretical kinematics*, vol. 24, Courier Corporation, 1990.
- [6] J. BOURGAIN, *More on the sum-product phenomenon in prime fields and its applications*, Int. J. Number Theory, 1 (2005), pp. 1–32.
- [7] J. BOURGAIN, *A modular Szemerédi-Trotter theorem for hyperbolas*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris, 350 (2012), pp. 793–796.
- [8] J. CHAPMAN, M. B. ERDOĞAN, 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), pp. 63–93.
- [9] J. CILLERUELO, M. SHARIR, AND A. SHEFFER, *A note on distinct distances in rectangular lattices*, Discrete Mathematics, 336 (2014), pp. 37 – 40.
- [10] G. ELEKES AND M. SHARIR, *Incidences in three dimensions and distinct distances in the plane*, Combin. Probab. Comput., 20 (2011), pp. 571–608.
- [11] P. ERDŐS, *On sets of distances of n points*, Amer. Math. Monthly, 53 (1946), pp. 248–250.
- [12] J. GRÜNWARD, *Ein abbildungsprinzip, welches die ebene geometrie und kinematik mit der räumlichen geometrie verknüpft*, Sitzber. Ak. Wiss. Wien, 120 (1911), pp. 677–741.
- [13] L. GUTH AND N. H. KATZ, *On the Erdős distinct distances problem in the plane*, Ann. of Math. (2), 181 (2015), pp. 155–190.
- [14] B. HANSON, B. LUND, AND O. ROCHE-NEWTON, *On distinct perpendicular bisectors and pinned distances in finite fields*, Finite Fields Appl., 37 (2016), pp. 240–264.
- [15] 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), pp. 3255–3275.
- [16] A. IOSEVICH AND D. KOH, *Extension theorems for the Fourier transform associated with nondegenerate quadratic surfaces in vector spaces over finite fields*, Illinois J. Math., 52 (2008), pp. 611–628.
- [17] ———, *Extension theorems for spheres in the finite field setting*, Forum Math., 22 (2010), pp. 457–483.
- [18] A. IOSEVICH, D. KOH, AND T. PHAM, *A new perspective on the distance problem over prime fields*, arXiv e-prints, (2019), p. arXiv:1905.04179.
- [19] A. IOSEVICH AND M. RUDNEV, *Erdős distance problem in vector spaces over finite fields*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 359 (2007), pp. 6127–6142.
- [20] N. H. KATZ AND G. TARDOS, *A new entropy inequality for the erdős distance problem*, in Towards a theory of geometric graphs, Contemporary Mathematics, J. Pach, ed., vol. 342, Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society, 2004, pp. 119–126.
- [21] D. KLAWITTER AND M. HAGEMANN, *Kinematic mappings for cayley–klein geometries via clifford algebras*, Beiträge zur Algebra und Geometrie/Contributions to Algebra and Geometry, 54 (2013), pp. 737–761.
- [22] D. KOH, T. PHAM, AND L. A. VINH, *Distance problems and extension theorems over finite fields*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.08699, (2018).
- [23] J. KOLLÁR, *Szemerédi-Trotter-type theorems in dimension 3*, Adv. Math., 271 (2015), pp. 30–61.
- [24] B. LIU, *An L^2 -identity and pinned distance problem*, Geom. Funct. Anal., 29 (2019), pp. 283–294.
- [25] B. LUND AND G. PETRIDIS, *Bisectors and pinned distances*, arXiv e-prints, (2018), p. arXiv:1810.00765.
- [26] J. MATOUŠEK, *The number of unit distances is almost linear for most norms*, Advances in Mathematics, 226 (2011), pp. 2618–2628.
- [27] B. MURPHY, *Upper and lower bounds for rich lines in grids*, 2017. Accepted for publication in Amer. J. Math.
- [28] B. MURPHY, *Group Action Combinatorics*, arXiv e-prints, (2019).

- [29] B. MURPHY AND G. PETRIDIS, *A Second Wave of Expanders over Finite Fields*, in Combinatorial and Additive Number Theory II: CANT, New York, NY, USA, 2015 and 2016, M. B. Nathanson, ed., vol. 220, 2017.
- [30] ———, *An example related to the Erdős-Falconer question over arbitrary finite fields*, Bull. Hellenic Math. Soc., 63 (2019), pp. 38–39.
- [31] G. PETRIDIS, *Pinned algebraic distances determined by Cartesian products in \mathbb{F}_p^2* , Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 145 (2017), pp. 4639–4645.
- [32] O. ROCHE-NEWTON AND M. RUDNEV, *On the Minkowski distances and products of sum sets*, Israel J. Math., 209 (2015), pp. 507–526.
- [33] M. RUDNEV, *On the number of incidences between planes and points in three dimensions*, Combinatorica, 38 (2018), pp. 219–254.
- [34] ———, *Point-plane incidences and some applications in positive characteristic*, in Combinatorics and Finite Fields Difference Sets, Polynomials, Pseudorandomness and Applications Difference Sets, Polynomials, Pseudorandomness and Applications, K.-U. Schmidt and A. Winterhof, eds., vol. 23 of Radon Series on Computational and Applied Mathematics, De Gruyter, Berlin, Boston, 2019.
- [35] M. RUDNEV AND J. M. SELIG, *On the Use of the Klein Quadric for Geometric Incidence Problems in Two Dimensions*, SIAM J. Discrete Math., 30 (2016), pp. 934–954.
- [36] A. SHEFFER, *Distinct distances: open problems and current bounds*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.1949, (2014).
- [37] I. D. SHKREDOV, *On asymptotic formulae in some sum-product questions*, Trans. Moscow Math. Soc., accepted, (2018).
- [38] J. SOLYMOSI AND G. TARDOS, *On the number of k -rich transformations*, in Computational geometry (SCG'07), ACM, New York, 2007, pp. 227–231.
- [39] S. STEVENS AND F. DE ZEEUW, *An improved point-line incidence bound over arbitrary fields*, Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society, 49 (2017), pp. 842–858.
- [40] T. TAO AND V. H. VU, *Additive combinatorics*, vol. 105 of Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010. Paperback edition [of MR2289012].
- [41] P. VALTR, *Strictly convex norms allowing many unit distances and related touching questions*, 2005.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL, BRISTOL BS8 1TW, UNITED KINGDOM

E-mail address: `brendan.murphy@bristol.ac.uk`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL, BRISTOL BS8 1TW, UNITED KINGDOM

E-mail address: `misha.rudnev@bristol.ac.uk`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL, BRISTOL BS8 1TW, UNITED KINGDOM

E-mail address: `sophie.stevens@bristol.ac.uk`