

# VOLUME OF TUBES, NON POLYNOMIAL BEHAVIOR

JEAN-FRANCOIS CROUZET<sup>1</sup> AND MARC-OLIVIER CZARNECKI<sup>1</sup>

ABSTRACT. The behavior of the volume of the tube  $B(M, r)$ , around a given compact subset  $M$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , depending on  $r$ , is an old and important question with relations to many fields, like differential geometry, geometric measure theory, integral geometry, and also probability and statistics. Federer (1959) introduces the class of sets with positive reach, for which the volume is given by a polynomial in  $r$ . For applications, in numerical analysis and statistics for example, an “almost” polynomial behavior is of equal interest. We exhibit an example showing how far to a polynomial can be the volume of the tube, for the simplest extension of the class of sets with positive reach, namely the class of (locally finite) union of sets with positive reach -satisfying a tangency condition- introduced by Zähle (1984).

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $M$  be a compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $r$  a non negative real number. Consider the tube (or  $r$ -neighborhood)

$$\overline{B}(M, r) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid d(M, x) \leq r\}$$

an its volume

$$\mathcal{L}_n(\overline{B}(M, r)),$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_n$  denotes the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

The volume  $\mathcal{L}_n(\overline{B}(M, r))$  is polynomial in various useful cases. When the set  $M$  is convex, and the corresponding polynomial is called Steiner formula, named after the seminal work of Jakob Steiner [14, 1840]. When the set  $M$  is a submanifold of class  $C^2$  (and  $r$  smaller than a given  $r_0$ ), it is given by Weyl’s formula, named after the paper of Hermann Weyl [16, 1939]. Hebert Federer [3, 1959] introduced the sets of positive reach, in order to unify both approaches, and it is the widest known class to this day, for which the volume  $\mathcal{L}_n(\overline{B}(M, r))$  is a polynomial -for  $r$  small enough.

The motivation for finding a polynomial formula for  $\mathcal{L}_n(\overline{B}(M, r))$  first comes from the statistics -putting apart the early work of Jakob Steiner. The seminal work of Herbert Hotelling [6, 1939] describes and solves a class of statistical problems

---

<sup>1</sup>Institut de Mathematiques et Modelisation de Montpellier UMR 5149 CNRS, équipe ACIOM (formerly Laboratoire d’Analyse Convexe), Université de Montpellier 2, place Eugène Bataillon, 34095 Montpellier cedex 5, France. E-mail: marco@math.univ-montp2.fr, crouzet@math.univ-montp2.fr

We are indebted to Jacques Lafontaine, who gave us much information through his manuscript from the séminaire Bourbaki [10], and to Luigi Ambrosio and Giovanni Belletini for advises and information, especially for telling us of the work of M. Zähle.

by giving a polynomial formula for (the tube around) curves in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . It apparently motivated the celebrated generalization of H. Weyl, which is published right next to H. Hotelling's paper.

Let us mention the overwhelming interest of the (polynomial) volume of tubes in probability and statistics. It allows for large deviation estimates, approximation of the tail probabilities, simultaneous confidence and prediction bounds, construction of significance tests,... We refer to the papers of Knowles and Siegmund [9], Johansen and Johnstone [8], Naiman [11], Sun [15]... not being exhaustive of course. Also Donnelly [2] related the volume of tubes to the PDEs -the heat equation.

The volume of the tube  $\mathcal{L}_n(\overline{B}(M, r))$  is related to the  $p$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure of the set  $M$  by the Minkowski content<sup>2</sup> (on the right hand side)

$$\mathcal{H}_p(M) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0, r > 0} \frac{\mathcal{L}_n(\overline{B}(M, r))}{\alpha(n-p) r^{n-p}},$$

where  $\alpha(i) = \mathcal{L}_i(B_{\mathbb{R}^i}(0, 1))$ , whenever  $M$  is  $p$ -rectifiable (see for example [4]).

In the various problems involving the volume  $\mathcal{L}_n(\overline{B}(M, r))$ , the fact that it is polynomial is mainly used to obtain a rate of convergence. Our first motivation was to numerically compute the perimeter  $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}(\text{bd } M)$  of an  $n$ -dimensional set  $M$ , and it is quite obvious that a polynomial formula provides a polynomial rate of convergence (when  $r \rightarrow 0$ ).

So, we only need an "almost" polynomial formula for the volume of the tube  $\mathcal{L}_n(\overline{B}(M, r))$ , say something like

$$\mathcal{L}_n(\overline{B}(M, r)) = P(r) + O(r^\lambda),$$

in order to obtain the various estimates usually provided by an exact polynomial formula - $P(r)$  being a polynomial, and the value of  $\lambda$  depending of the problem -for example, with  $\lambda = n - p + 1$  if the set  $M$  is  $p$ -rectifiable, or  $\lambda = 2$  if its boundary  $\text{bd } M$  is  $n - 1$  rectifiable.

D. Hug [7] and J. Rataj [12] show that, for a wide class of compact subsets  $M$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  (locally finite union of sets with positive reach in [12]), having  $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}$ -almost everywhere one unit vector,<sup>3</sup>

$$\mathcal{L}_n(\overline{B}(M, r)) = \mathcal{L}_n(M) + r\mathcal{H}_{n-1}(\text{bd } M) + o(r).$$

Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a class of compact  $n$ -dimensional subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . For the purpose of efficiently (thus with a rate of convergence) compute the perimeter of a set  $M$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , we would need the following result:

**Conjecture ( $\mathcal{M}$ ).** *For every set  $M \in \mathcal{M}$ ,*

$$\mathcal{L}_2(\overline{B}(M, r)) = \mathcal{L}_2(M) + r\mathcal{H}_{n-1}(\text{bd } M) + O(r^2).$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Distinguish upper- and lower Minkowski content in general.

The theory of Federer shows the validity of Conjecture ( $PR_n$ ), where  $PR_n$  is the set of compact sets of positive reach, having  $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}$ -almost everywhere one unit vector.<sup>3</sup>

It is easy to give simple counterexamples for union of convex sets, without any “contact” condition: consider the union of two tangent disks in  $\mathbb{R}^2$

$$M = \overline{B}((1, 0), 1) \cup \overline{B}((-1, 0), 1)$$

Then<sup>4</sup>

$$\mathcal{L}_2(\overline{B}(M, r)) = \mathcal{L}_2(M) + r\mathcal{H}_1(\text{bd } M) + \alpha r^{3/2} + O(r^2).$$

Extensions of Federer’s Theory have been made in various directions. In the Riemannian setting, by the work of Fu [5]. In the Euclidean setting, Zähle [17] considered the finite unions of sets of positive reach satisfying a tangential condition -and gave a polynomial formula for the “volume” of the tube. So did Cheeger, Müller and Schäfer [1] in the case of piecewise linear sets and R. Schneider [13] for unions of convex sets.

But in both cases the corresponding “value” is not the volume  $\mathcal{L}_n(\overline{B}(M, r))$ . It is a modified volume, taking into account the multiplicity of the normal vectors to the set  $M$ . How big is the difference between the volume  $\mathcal{L}_n(\overline{B}(M, r))$  and the modified value. Is it small enough, for example of order 2, to verify the above conjecture?

This is true in dimension 2. The purpose of this paper is to provide a counterexample when the dimension is higher, for which the volume  $\mathcal{L}_n(\overline{B}(M, r))$  is “far” from being a polynom, and which belongs the class  $U_{PR}$  introduced by Zähle [17]. This shows in particular that Conjecture ( $U_{PR_n}$ ) does not holds, for  $n \geq 3$  (taking  $U_{PR_n}$  to be the set of compact sets in  $U_{PR}$ ), having  $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}$ -almost everywhere one unit vector

Our counterexample (Theorem 1) is the union of two convex sets  $M$  and  $M'$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , for which holds the nondegeneracy tangential condition<sup>5</sup> -defining the class  $U_{PR}$  in [17]:

$$T(M \cap M', x) = T(M, x) \cap T(M', x),$$

for every  $x \in M \cap M'$ . Since these are convex sets, the tangent cones are the usual ones, and this removes any hope of replacing the tangent cones (namely Bouligand tangent cones) involved in the definition of the class  $U_{PR}$ , by another tangent cone

---

<sup>3</sup>We only make this restriction to obtain exactly  $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}(\text{bd } M)$  in the expansion, for a smooth reading.

<sup>4</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_2(\overline{B}(M, r)) &= 2(1+r)^2 \left( \pi - \arccos \left( \frac{1}{1+r} \right) \right) + 2(2r+r^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= 2\pi + 4\pi r - (8\sqrt{2}/3)r^{3/2} + O(r^2) \\ &= \mathcal{L}_2(M) + r\mathcal{H}_1(\text{bd } M) - (8\sqrt{2}/3)r^{3/2} + O(r^2). \end{aligned}$$

<sup>5</sup>Rataj and Zähle later developed their theory without use of the nondegeneracy tangential condition. However, as we point out thereafter, without this condition and for our problem, the counterexample is obvious.

-in the quest of a quasi-polynomial formula.

## 2. STATEMENT OF THE RESULTS

**2.1. Main result.** Our main result shows that

**Theorem 1.** *For every integer  $N \geq 2$ , there exists two convex compact sets  $M$  and  $M'$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , such that<sup>7</sup>*

$$\forall x \in M \cap M', \quad T(M \cap M', x) = T(M, x) \cap T(M', x),$$

and the volume of the tube  $\overline{B}(M \cup M', r)$  satisfies

$$-\frac{16}{3}r^{1+\frac{1}{N}}+O(r^2) \leq \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cup M', r)) - \mathcal{L}_3(M \cup M') - r\mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}(M \cup M')) \leq -\frac{2}{3N}r^{1+\frac{1}{N}}+O(r^2).$$

Theorem 1 is proved in Section 3. We can provide better asymptotic bounds (Theorem 3 below) but the result is sharp in the sense that the “non polynomial” part has to be negligible in front of  $r$ , as stated in the next result, a special case of [7, Theorem 3.3] and [12, Theorem 3].

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $M$  and  $M'$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  be two convex compact subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , with nonempty interiors. Then*

$$\mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cup M', r)) - \mathcal{L}_3(M \cup M') - r\mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}(M \cup M')) \in o(r)$$

Theorem 2 is proved in Section 4, for the sake of completeness and with a simple self contained proof.

**Theorem 3.** *For every function  $\varepsilon : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  of class  $C^2$  such that*

$$\varepsilon(0) = 0, \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon(r)}{\sqrt{r}} = +\infty, \quad \int_0^1 \frac{\varepsilon(t)}{t} < +\infty,$$

$$\forall r \in (0, 1], \quad r^2\varepsilon''(r) - r\varepsilon'(r) + \varepsilon(r) > 0$$

and the function  $t \mapsto \frac{\varepsilon(t)}{t}$  is strictly convex and decreasing, there exists  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  and two convex compact sets  $M$  and  $M'$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  such that:

$$-2r\varepsilon(r) + O(r^2) \geq \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cup M', r)) - \mathcal{L}_3(M \cup M') - r\mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}(M \cup M'))$$

$$\geq -16r \int_0^r \frac{\varepsilon(t)}{t} dt + \lambda r\varepsilon(r) + O(r^2).$$

<sup>6</sup>We let  $\mathbb{R}_+ = \{x \in \mathbb{R} | x \geq 0\}$  and  $\text{sgn } x = x/|x|$  if  $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ . If  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  and  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$  belong to  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , we denote  $(x|y) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i$ , the scalar product of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\|x\| = \sqrt{(x|x)}$ , the Euclidean norm; we denote  $B(x, r) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n | \|x - y\| < r\}$ ,  $\overline{B}(x, r) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n | \|x - y\| \leq r\}$  and  $S(x, r) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n | \|x - y\| = r\}$ . If  $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we let  $d_X(x) = \inf_{y \in X} \|x - y\|$ ,  $X \setminus Y = \{x \in X | x \notin Y\}$  the set-difference of the sets  $X$  and  $Y$ ,  $X + Y = \{x + y | x \in X, y \in Y\}$ , the sum of the sets  $X$  and  $Y$ ,  $B(X, r) = X + B(0, r)$ ,  $\overline{B}(X, r) = X + \overline{B}(0, r)$ ,  $\text{cl}X$ , the closure of  $X$ ,  $\text{int}X$ , the interior of  $X$ ,  $\text{bd}X = \text{cl}X \setminus \text{int}X$ , the boundary of  $X$ ,  $\text{co}X$ , the convex hull of  $X$ .

<sup>7</sup>In other words, the set  $M \cup M'$  belongs to the class  $U_{PR}$  introduced by M. Zähle [17]. Moreover,

$$M \cup M' \subset \text{co}\{(0, 0, 0), (1, 0, -1), (1, 1, 0), (1, -1, 0)\}$$

$$\text{co}\{(0, 0, 0), (1, 0, -1), (1, 1, 0)\} \cup \text{co}\{(0, 0, 0), (1, 0, -1), (1, -1, 0)\} \subset M \cup M'$$

Theorem 3 is proved in Section 3.4.

**Remark.** As an example take  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $I(r) = \frac{1}{r|\ln(r)|^{1+\varepsilon}}$  for  $r$  small enough. This yields the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} -2\frac{r}{|\ln(r)|^{1+\varepsilon}} + O(r^2) &\geq \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cup M', r)) - \mathcal{L}_3(M \cup M') - r\mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}(M \cup M')) \\ &\geq -\frac{16r}{\varepsilon|\ln(r)|^\varepsilon} + \frac{\lambda r}{|\ln(r)|^{1+\varepsilon}} + O(r^2). \end{aligned}$$

**Remark.** In view of the Steiner formula and of the proof of Theorem 1, one can replace the (Landau) functions  $O(r^2)$  by polynomials  $ar^2 + br^3$  in the statement of Theorem 1, for  $r$  small enough. By contrast, the result in Theorem 3 is only asymptotic, see the end of Section 3.4.

**2.2. Relation to the class  $U_{PR}$ .** In this section, we precisely recall the definitions of sets with positive reach and  $U_{PR}$  sets.

Theorem 1 is a counterexample to a possible extension of a Steiner-Weyl type formula -with “small” error, in the sense of Conjecture ( $U_{PR_n}$ )- for the class of  $U_{PR}$  sets, introduced by [17]. Sets in  $U_{PR}$  are defined as union of sets with positive reach (introduced by [3]), satisfying a (nondegeneracy) tangency condition.

Let  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be nonempty. For  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the projection set of  $x$  on  $M$  is defined by:

$$\text{proj}_M(x) = \{y \in M \mid d(x, M) = \|y - x\|\}.$$

The reach of  $M$  is defined by:

$$\text{reach}(M) = \sup\{r > 0 \mid \forall y \in B(M, r), \text{proj}_M(y) \text{ reduces to a singleton}\}.$$

We let  $\text{reach}(\emptyset) = +\infty$ .

We now recall the definition of sets with positive reach.

**Definition 2.1** (Federer [3]). *A closed set  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is said to be of positive reach if  $\text{reach}(M) > 0$ .*

**Remark.** A closed set  $M$  is of positive reach if it satisfies one of the following conditions (see [3]):

- (i)  $M$  is convex;
- (ii)  $M$  is a compact  $C^2$  submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , with or without a boundary.

In order to generalize the Steiner-Weyl formula to the sets of positive reach, Federer [3] builds a general theory of curvature measures. The curvature measures give indeed the coefficient of the Steiner-Weyl polynomial.

**Theorem 4** (Federer, [3]). *Let  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be compact<sup>8</sup> of positive reach. Then there are  $(c_0, \dots, c_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  such that, for every  $r \in [0, \text{reach}(M)]$ :*

$$\mathcal{L}_n(\overline{B}(M, r)) = \sum_{i=0}^n c_i r^i.$$

---

<sup>8</sup>If one does not assume that  $M$  is bounded, a similar formula holds for  $\mathcal{L}_n(\overline{B}(M, r) \cap \text{proj}_M^{-1}(Q))$  where  $Q$  is a bounded Borel subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

Let  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be nonempty, and  $x \in M$ . Then the Bouligand tangent cone to  $M$  at  $x$ , denoted  $T^B(M, x)$  is defined by:

$$T^B(M, x) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \exists (\lambda_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, \lambda_k > 0, \exists (y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, y_k \in M, y_k \rightarrow x, v = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k (y_k - x)\}.$$

We now recall the definition of the class  $U_{PR}$  in [17].

**Definition 2.2.** [Zähle [17]] *A closed set  $M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is said to be  $U_{PR}$  if there is a sequence  $(M_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  of closed sets with positive reach such that:*

- (a)  $M = \cup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} M_k$ ;
- (b) *the sequence  $(M_k)$  is locally finite, precisely, for every  $r > 0$ , the set  $\{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid M_k \cap B(0, r) \neq \emptyset\}$  is finite;*
- (c) *for every finite subset  $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\text{reach}(\cap_{i \in I} M_i) > 0$*
- (d) *for every finite subset  $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ , for every  $x \in \cap_{i \in I} M_i$ ,*  
 $T^B(\cap_{i \in I} M_i, x) = \cap_{i \in I} T^B(M_i, x)$ .

We call  $(M_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  a (not necessarily unique) decomposition of  $M$ .

**Remark.** Note that, if  $M$  is compact, the sequence  $(M_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  clearly reduces to a finite family.

**Remark.** It is easy to notice that the (exact) Steiner-Weyl formula does not hold in general, even in the class  $U_{PR}$  (with no need of the counterexample in Theorem 1!). In  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , consider  $M = \cup_{i=1}^4 M_i$ , where  $M_i = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid (x - x_i)^2 + (y - y_i)^2 = 1, |x| \geq 1, |y| \geq 1\}$  and  $(x_1, y_1) = (1, 0)$ ,  $(x_2, y_2) = (0, 1)$ ,  $(x_3, y_3) = (-1, 0)$ ,  $(x_4, y_4) = (0, -1)$ . Then  $M$  belongs to the class  $U_{PR}$ .<sup>9</sup>

M. Zähle studies [17] the Steiner Weyl formula for  $U_{PR}$  sets, by defining a modified volume of sets which essentially takes into account the multiplicity of normal cones, like Cheeger, Müller, Schrader [1] for piecewise linear spaces, and R. Schneider [13] for unions of convex sets. To make it short, she obtains a polynomial formula for this modified volume of the tube  $\overline{B}(M, r)$ , by adding the volumes of the tubes  $\overline{B}(M_k, r)$  of the decomposition.

It is obvious (above remark) that the (exact) polynomial formula will not hold in general for the true volume  $\mathcal{L}_n(\overline{B}(M, r))$  of the tube, even for  $U_{PR}$  sets. But one may wonder, in the light of the later results of Hug [7] and Rataj [12], how far from a polynomial will the volume behave.

In dimension 2, one obtains a Steiner Weyl type formula, with an extra term  $O(r^2)$ . In dimension greater than 3, Theorem 1 shows the possibly bad behavior of the volume of the tube, thus hindering any hope to extend the (true, without multiplicity) Steiner Weyl formula -with “small” error- for  $U_{PR}$  sets. Since our counterexample

<sup>9</sup>A straightforward computations gives:

$$\mathcal{L}_2(\overline{B}(M, r)) = \begin{cases} \pi(r^2 + 8r) + a(r) & \text{if } r \in [0, 1] \\ 2\pi(r+1)^2 + 4(r^2 - 1)^{1/2} + 2r^2(\arccos(\frac{(r^2-1)^{1/2}}{r}) - \arccos(\frac{1}{r})) + a(r) & \text{if } r \in [1, \sqrt{2}] \\ 2\pi(r+1)^2 + a(r) + 4 & \text{if } r \in [\sqrt{2}, +\infty) \end{cases},$$

$$\text{where } a(r) = -2((r+1)^2 - b(r)) + \sqrt{2}(1+b(r))((r+1)^2 - b(r))^{1/2} - 4(r+1)^2 \arccos(\frac{1+b(r)}{2(r+1)}),$$

$$\text{and } b(r) = (2(r+1)^2 - 1)^{1/2}$$

is the union of two convex sets, it also shows that replacing the Bouligand tangent cone by another tangent cone in the definition of  $U_{PR}$  sets would not make any difference, since all tangent cones coincide in the convex case.

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREMS 1 AND 3, A COUNTEREXAMPLE IN DIMENSION 3

We first prove a more general but more technical result, which also helps to understand the values of the bounds. We deduce Theorem 1 in Section 3.3, and Theorem 3 in Section 3.4.

**Theorem 5.** *Let  $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\psi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  be two strictly convex functions of class  $C^2$  such that  $\psi(0) = \varphi(0) = 0$ ,  $\psi(1) = \varphi(1) = 1$ ,  $\psi'(0) = 0$ ,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varphi(t)}{\psi(t)} = 0$  and  $\frac{\varphi(t)}{\varphi'(t)} < \frac{\psi(t)}{\psi'(t)}$ ,  $\forall t \in (0, 1]$ .*

*We define*

$$M = \text{co} \left( \{(t, 0, -\psi(t)) | t \in [0, 1]\} \cup \{(t, \varphi(t), 0) | t \in [0, 1]\} \right),$$

*and let  $M'$  be the symmetric of  $M$  with respect to the plane  $\{(x_1, x_2, x_3) | x_2 = 0\}$ , precisely,  $M' = \text{co} \left( \{(t, 0, -\psi(t)) | t \in [0, 1]\} \cup \{(t, -\varphi(t), 0) | t \in [0, 1]\} \right)$ . The sets  $M$  and  $M'$  are compact and convex,*

$$\forall x \in M \cap M', \quad T(M \cap M', x) = T(M, x) \cap T(M', x)$$

*and*

$$\begin{aligned} & -2r^2 \int_{\varphi^{-1}(r)}^1 \frac{\psi(t)}{\varphi(t)} dt + O(r^2) \\ & \geq \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cup M', r)) - \mathcal{L}_3(M \cup M') - r\mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}(M \cup M')) \\ & \geq - \left( 2\alpha^{1/2} r^2 \int_{\rho(r)}^1 \frac{\psi'(t)}{\varphi'(\theta(t))} dt + 2r \int_0^{\rho(r)} \psi(t) dt \right) + O(r^2), \end{aligned}$$

*where  $\rho(r) \in [0, 1]$ , and  $\theta(t)$  is the unique solution of*

$$\theta(t) - \frac{\varphi(\theta(t))}{\varphi'(\theta(t))} = t - \frac{\psi(t)}{\psi'(t)}$$

*hence the function  $\theta$  is continuous, and where*

$$\alpha = \max_{t \in [0, 1]} 1 + \frac{\varphi'(\theta(t))^2}{\psi'(t)^2} (1 + \psi(t)^2)$$

**Corollary 1.** *For every integers  $p$  and  $q$  such that  $q > p + 1 \geq 3$ , the functions  $\varphi(t) = t^q$  and  $\psi(t) = t^p$  satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 5, and yield, for the corresponding sets  $M$  and  $M'$*

$$-\frac{2}{q-p-1} r^{1+\frac{p+1}{q}} + O(r^2) \geq \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cup M', r)) - \mathcal{L}_3(M \cup M') - r\mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}(M \cup M')) \geq -c(p, q) r^{1+\frac{p+1}{q}} + O(r^2)$$

*where*

$$c(p, q) = 2 \left( \frac{p^2}{q^2} \left( \frac{q-1}{q} \frac{p}{p-1} \right)^{2q-2} + 2 \right)^{\frac{p+1}{2q}} \left( \frac{1}{q-p-1} + \frac{1}{p+1} \right)$$




FIGURE 1. The set  $M$  with  $\psi(t) = t^2$  and  $\varphi(t) = t^3$

**3.1. Proof of Theorem 5.** The proof of Theorem 5 goes in four steps. First we check the tangency condition, i.e., the set  $M \cup M'$  belongs to the class  $U_{PR}$ . Afterward we introduce the set which provokes the deviation from the polynomial term and we specify its volume. Then we give an upper bound of the volume  $\mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cup M', r))$ , and finally we give a lower bound of this volume.

**3.1.1.** *The set  $M \cup M'$  belongs to the class  $U_{PR}$ .* The sets  $M$  and  $M'$  are clearly compact and convex. Note that

$$M = \text{co}(C \cup C_1),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \text{co}\{(t, 0, -\psi(t)) \mid t \in [0, 1]\} \\ C_1 &= \text{co}\{(t, \varphi(t), 0) \mid t \in [0, 1]\} \end{aligned}$$

Then  $M \cap M' = C$ . One easily checks the tangency condition

$$\forall x \in M \cap M', T(M \cap M', x) = T(M, x) \cap T(M', x)$$

by using  $\psi'(0) = 0$  for the calculus at the origin, hence the set  $M \cup M'$  belongs to the class  $U_{PR}$ . ■

**3.1.2.** *The set  $A(r)$ .* Define

$$A(r) = \overline{B}(M, r) \cap \overline{B}(M', r) \setminus \overline{B}(M \cap M', r).$$

We specify the volume of the set  $A(r)$ , and thus reduce the proof of Theorem 5 mainly to the estimation of  $\mathcal{L}_3(A(r))$ .

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $M$  and  $M'$  be two compact convex subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , with nonempty interiors. Then*

$$\mathcal{L}_3(A(r)) = -\mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cup M', r)) + \mathcal{L}_3(M \cup M') + r\mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}(M \cup M')) + O(r^2).$$



**Proof of Lemma 1.** From the following partition of  $\overline{B}(M \cup M', r)$

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{B}(M \cup M', r) &= \overline{B}(M, r) \setminus (\overline{B}(M, r) \cap \overline{B}(M', r)) \sqcup \overline{B}(M', r) \setminus (\overline{B}(M, r) \cap \overline{B}(M', r)) \\ &\quad \sqcup (\overline{B}(M, r) \cap \overline{B}(M', r)) \end{aligned}$$

and from the partition

$$\overline{B}(M, r) \cap \overline{B}(M', r) = A(r) \sqcup \overline{B}(M \cap M', r)$$

we deduce

$$\mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cup M', r)) = \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M, r)) + \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M', r)) - \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cap M', r)) - \mathcal{L}_3(A(r))$$

From Steiner's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M, r)) &= \mathcal{L}_3(M) + r\mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd } M) + O(r^2) \\ \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M', r)) &= \mathcal{L}_3(M') + r\mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd } M') + O(r^2) \end{aligned}$$

For the set  $M \cap M'$ , depending on its dimension, Steiner's formula gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cap M', r)) &= \mathcal{L}_3(M \cap M') + r\mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}(M \cap M')) + O(r^2) \text{ if } \dim(M \cap M') = 3 \\ \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cap M', r)) &= 2r\mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}(M \cap M')) + O(r^2) \text{ if } \dim(M \cap M') = 2 \\ \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cap M', r)) &= O(r^2) \text{ if } \dim(M \cap M') \leq 1 \end{aligned}$$

From the partition

$$\begin{aligned} M \cap M' &= M \setminus (M \cap M') \sqcup M' \setminus (M \cap M') \sqcup M \cap M', \\ \mathcal{L}_3(M \cap M') &= \mathcal{L}_3(M) + \mathcal{L}_3(M') - \mathcal{L}_3(M \cap M'). \end{aligned}$$

For the boundaries, we use the following partitions

$$\begin{aligned} \text{bd}(M \cup M') &= \text{bd } M \setminus M' \sqcup \text{bd } M' \setminus M \sqcup (\text{bd } M \cap \text{bd } M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M') \\ \text{bd } M &= \text{bd } M \setminus M' \sqcup (\text{bd } M \cap \text{bd } M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M') \sqcup (\text{bd } M \cap \text{int}(M \cup M')) \\ \text{bd } M' &= \text{bd } M' \setminus M \sqcup (\text{bd } M \cap \text{bd } M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M') \sqcup (\text{bd } M' \cap \text{int}(M \cup M')) \end{aligned}$$

and the decomposition

$$\text{bd}(M \cap M') = (\text{bd } M \cap \text{bd } M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M') \cup (\text{bd } M \cap \text{int}(M \cup M')) \cup (\text{bd } M' \cap \text{int}(M \cup M'))$$

We now consider the different possibilities for  $\dim(M \cap M')$ .

Case  $\dim(M \cap M') = 3$ . A Hahn-Banach separation argument yields  $\text{bd } M \cap \text{bd } M' \cap \text{int}(M \cup M') = \emptyset$ . Hence the above decomposition of  $\text{bd}(M \cup M')$  is a partition hence

$$\mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}(M \cup M')) = \mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd } M) + \mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd } M') - \mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}(M \cap M')).$$

Combined with the above Steiner's formulas, this proves Lemma 1.

Case  $\dim(M \cap M') \leq 2$ . When  $\dim(M \cap M') \leq 2$ , and since  $M$  and  $M'$  are convex with nonempty interiors,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{bd } M \cap \text{int}(M \cup M') &= \text{bd } M' \cap \text{int}(M \cup M') \\ M \cap M' = \text{bd}(M \cap M') &= \text{bd } M \cap \text{bd } M' \end{aligned}$$

Moreover  $\mathcal{H}_2((\text{bd } M \cap \text{bd } M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M')) = 0$  (distinguish the cases  $\dim(M \cap M') \leq 1$  and  $\dim(M \cap M') = 2$ , and use the fact that  $\dim M = \dim M' = 3$ ). Hence

$$\mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}(M \cup M')) = \mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd } M) + \mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd } M') - 2\mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}(M \cap M')).$$

Combined with the above Steiner's formulas, this proves Lemma 1. ■

3.1.3. *Upper bound of the volume  $\mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cup M', r))$ .* In view of Lemma 1, it is sufficient to give a lower bound of the volume of  $A(r)$ .

**Lemma 2.** *For  $r > 0$ , let*

$$\check{A}(r) = \left\{ (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in (0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x_2 \leq 0, x_1 \geq \varphi^{-1}(r), \right. \\ \left. -\frac{\varphi(x_1)}{\psi(x_1)}x_2 - \psi(x_1) \leq x_3 \leq x_2 \frac{\psi(x_1)}{\varphi(x_1)} - \psi(x_1) + r \sqrt{1 + \frac{\psi^2(x_1)}{\varphi^2(x_1)}} \right\}$$

Then

- (1)  $\check{A}(r) \subset \overline{B}(M, r) \cap \overline{B}(M', r) \cap \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \mid x_2 \leq 0\}$ ;
- (2)  $\check{A}(r) \setminus \overline{B}(\{(t, 0, -\psi(t)) \mid t \in [0, 1]\}, r) \subset A(r) \cap \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \mid x_2 \leq 0\}$ .

Let us first admit the lemma. Since  $\mathcal{L}_3(A(r)) = 2\mathcal{L}_3(A(r) \cap \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \mid x_2 \leq 0\})$ , then  $\mathcal{L}_3(A(r)) \geq 2\mathcal{L}_3(\check{A}(r)) - \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(\{(t, 0, -\psi(t)) \mid t \in [0, 1]\}, r))$ . Noting that

$$\mathcal{L}_3(\check{A}(r)) = \int_{\varphi^{-1}(r)}^1 r^2 \frac{\psi(t)}{\varphi(t)} dt$$

and that, for  $r$  small enough,

$$\mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(\{(t, 0, -\psi(t)) \mid t \in [0, 1]\}, r)) = cr^2 + dr^3,$$

where  $c = \mathcal{H}_1(\{(t, 0, -\psi(t)) \mid t \in [0, 1]\})$  and  $d = \frac{4}{3}\pi$ , we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_3(A(r)) \geq 2r^2 \int_{\varphi^{-1}(r)}^1 \frac{\psi(t)}{\varphi(t)} dt - cr^2 - dr^3. \blacksquare$$

**Proof of Lemma 2.** *Proof of (1).* Consider an element  $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$  in the set  $\check{A}(r)$ . The proof consists in checking that its distance to  $M$  is less or equal to  $r$  by considering its projection  $p$  on the line containing  $(x_1, 0, -\psi(x_1))$  and  $(x_1, \varphi(x_1), 0)$ . Let

$$p = \begin{cases} p_1 &= x_1 \\ p_2 &= x_2 - \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\varphi^2(x_1)}{\psi^2(x_1)}} \left( x_2 - \frac{\varphi(x_1)}{\psi(x_1)} x_3 - \varphi(x_1) \right) \\ p_3 &= x_3 + \frac{\frac{\varphi(x_1)}{\psi(x_1)}}{1 + \frac{\varphi^2(x_1)}{\psi^2(x_1)}} \left( x_2 - \frac{\varphi(x_1)}{\psi(x_1)} x_3 - \varphi(x_1) \right) \end{cases}$$

We now check that  $p \in \text{co}\{(x_1, 0, -\psi(x_1)), (x_1, \varphi(x_1), 0)\} \subset M$ . Indeed,

$$p = \theta(x_1, 0, -\psi(x_1)) + (1 - \theta)(x_1, \varphi(x_1), 0),$$

with

$$\theta = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\varphi^2(x_1)}{\psi^2(x_1)}} \left( \frac{\varphi^2(x_1)}{\psi^2(x_1)} - x_2 \frac{\varphi(x_1)}{\psi^2(x_1)} - \frac{x_3}{\psi(x_1)} \right).$$

By assumption,  $-\frac{\varphi(x_1)}{\psi(x_1)}x_2 - \psi(x_1) \leq x_3$ , hence  $\theta \leq 1$ . By assumption,  $r \leq \varphi(x_1)$ <sup>11</sup>,  $x_2 \leq 0$ , and  $x_3 \leq x_2 \frac{\psi(x_1)}{\varphi(x_1)} - \psi(x_1) + r\sqrt{1 + \frac{\psi^2(x_1)}{\varphi^2(x_1)}}$ , hence

$$\begin{aligned} \theta \left( 1 + \frac{\varphi^2(x_1)}{\psi^2(x_1)} \right) &\geq \frac{\varphi^2(x_1)}{\psi^2(x_1)} - x_2 \frac{\varphi(x_1)}{\psi^2(x_1)} - x_2 \frac{1}{\varphi(x_1)} + 1 - \varphi(x_1) \sqrt{\frac{1}{\psi^2(x_1)} + \frac{1}{\varphi^2(x_1)}} \\ &\geq 1 + \frac{\varphi^2(x_1)}{\psi^2(x_1)} - \sqrt{1 + \frac{\varphi^2(x_1)}{\psi^2(x_1)}} \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\|p - x\| = \frac{|x_2 - \frac{\varphi(x_1)}{\psi(x_1)}x_3 - \varphi(x_1)|}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{\varphi^2(x_1)}{\psi^2(x_1)}}}.$$

By assumption, noticing that  $\varphi$  is increasing,  $x_3 \leq x_2 \frac{\psi(x_1)}{\varphi(x_1)} - \psi(x_1) + r\sqrt{1 + \frac{\psi^2(x_1)}{\varphi^2(x_1)}}$ , hence  $\frac{x_2 - \frac{\varphi(x_1)}{\psi(x_1)}x_3 - \varphi(x_1)}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{\varphi^2(x_1)}{\psi^2(x_1)}}} \geq -r$ . By assumption,  $x_2 \leq 0$ , and  $-\frac{\varphi(x_1)}{\psi(x_1)}x_2 - \psi(x_1) \leq x_3$ .

Hence  $x_2 - \frac{\varphi(x_1)}{\psi(x_1)}x_3 - \varphi(x_1) \leq -\frac{\varphi(x_1)}{\psi(x_1)}x_3 - \varphi(x_1) \leq \frac{\varphi^2(x_1)}{\psi^2(x_1)}x_2 \leq 0$ . Finally,

$$d(M, x) \leq \|p - x\| \leq r.$$

Now take

$$p' = \begin{pmatrix} p_1 \\ -p_2 \\ p_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since  $p \in \text{co}\{(x_1, 0, -\psi(x_1)), (x_1, \varphi(x_1), 0)\}$ , then  $p'$  belong to the symmetrical set  $\text{co}\{(x_1, 0, -\psi(x_1)), (x_1, -\varphi(x_1), 0)\}$  hence  $p' \in M'$ . Since  $x_2 \leq 0$  and  $p_2 \geq 0$  (since  $p \in M$ ), we obtain that  $(x_2 - p'_2)^2 = (x_2 + p_2)^2 \leq (x_2 - p_2)^2$ , hence that  $d(M', x) \leq \|p' - x\| \leq \|p - x\| \leq r$ . ■

*Proof of (2).* Consider an element  $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$  in the left-hand side set. We now prove that, if  $x \notin A(r)$ , then  $x \in \overline{B}(\{(t, 0, -\psi(t)) | t \in [0, 1]\}, r)$ . Indeed, since  $x \in (\overline{B}(M, r) \cap \overline{B}(M', r)) \setminus A(r)$  by (1), from the definition of the set  $A(r)$ ,  $x \in \overline{B}(M \cap M', r) = \overline{B}(C, r)$ . Let  $\text{proj}_C(x) = (q_1, 0, q_3)$ . If  $\text{proj}_C(x) \notin \{(t, 0, -\psi(t)) | t \in [0, 1]\}$ , then  $x - \text{proj}_C(x) = (-\lambda, \mu, -\lambda)$  for some  $(\lambda, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\lambda = 0$  if  $q_3 \neq -q_1$ . Noticing that  $q_3 + \psi(q_1) \leq 0$ , the case  $\lambda = 0$  implies that  $q_1 = x_1$  and  $q_3 = x_3$  hence  $x_3 + \psi(x_1) \leq 0$ . Hence, the definition of  $\hat{A}(r)$  yields  $x_2 = 0$  and  $x_3 + \psi(x_1) \geq 0$ , hence  $q_3 + \psi(q_1) \geq 0$ . As  $q_3 + \psi(q_1) \leq 0$ , we deduce  $q_3 = \psi(q_1) = 0$ , hence  $q_1 = 0$  (by the strict convexity of  $\psi$ ) and  $\text{proj}_C(x) = (0, 0, 0)$ , a contradiction. The case  $q_3 = -q_1$  implies that  $x_1 + x_3 = -2\lambda \leq 0$ , a contradiction with the definition of the left-hand side set, which implies that  $-\frac{\varphi(x_1)}{\psi(x_1)}x_2 - \psi(x_1) \leq x_3$ , hence  $x_1 + x_3 \geq \psi(x_1) + x_3 \geq -\frac{\varphi(x_1)}{\psi(x_1)}x_2 \geq 0$  (since  $\psi$  is convex with  $\psi(0) = 0$ ,  $\psi(1) = 1$ , hence  $x_1 \geq \psi(x_1)$ , and since we work in the half space  $\{(x_1, x_2, x_3) | x_2 \leq 0\}$ ). ■

<sup>11</sup>since  $\varphi$  is increasing

3.1.4. *Lower bound of the volume  $\mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cup M', r))$ .* We first verify the definition of the function  $\theta$  and the real number  $\alpha$ .

**Claim 3.1.** *There exists a continuous function  $\theta : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that, for every  $t$ ,  $\theta(t)$  is the unique solution of*

$$\theta(t) - \frac{\varphi(\theta(t))}{\varphi'(\theta(t))} = t - \frac{\psi(t)}{\psi'(t)}.$$

Besides, we can define

$$\alpha = \max_{t \in [0, 1]} 1 + \frac{\varphi'(\theta(t))^2}{\psi'(t)^2} (1 + \psi(t)^2)$$

**Proof of Claim 3.1.** Note that if  $f$  is (as  $\psi$  and  $\varphi$ ) a strictly convex function of class  $C^2$  on  $[0, 1]$  that satisfies  $f(0) = 0$ , we have  $0 < \frac{f(t)}{f'(t)} < t$  on  $(0, 1]$  and  $t \mapsto t - \frac{f(t)}{f'(t)}$  is continuous and strictly increasing on  $[0, 1]$ . Hence the reciprocal function of  $t \mapsto t - \frac{\varphi(t)}{\varphi'(t)}$  is defined on  $\left[0, 1 - \frac{\varphi(1)}{\varphi'(1)}\right]$  and is continuous. Similarly,  $t \mapsto t - \frac{\psi(t)}{\psi'(t)}$  is a continuous strictly increasing function mapping  $[0, 1]$  on  $\left[0, 1 - \frac{\psi(1)}{\psi'(1)}\right] \subset \left[0, 1 - \frac{\varphi(1)}{\varphi'(1)}\right]$ , as by assumption  $\frac{\varphi(1)}{\varphi'(1)} < \frac{\psi(1)}{\psi'(1)}$ . Hence the solution  $\theta(t)$  of the equation  $\theta(t) - \frac{\varphi(\theta(t))}{\varphi'(\theta(t))} = t - \frac{\psi(t)}{\psi'(t)}$  is unique and continuous.

We have moreover by assumption  $-\frac{\varphi(t)}{\varphi'(t)} + \frac{\psi(t)}{\psi'(t)} > 0$ , and we recall that  $-t + \frac{\psi(t)}{\psi'(t)} < 0$ . As  $\theta(t)$  is the unique point annullating the continuous function  $x \mapsto x - \frac{\varphi(x)}{\varphi'(x)} - t + \frac{\psi(t)}{\psi'(t)}$ , we have  $0 < \theta(t) < t$  by the mean value theorem. Thus, as  $\psi'$  and  $\varphi'$  are clearly non negative functions, and  $\varphi'$  is increasing, we have  $0 \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varphi'(\theta(t))}{\psi'(t)} \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varphi'(t)}{\psi'(t)} = 0$ , given that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varphi'(t)}{\psi'(t)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varphi(t)}{\psi(t)} = 0$  by l'Hôpital's rule. Hence  $t \mapsto 1 + \frac{\varphi'(\theta(t))^2}{\psi'(t)^2} (1 + \psi(t)^2)$  is continuous on  $[0, 1]$  and attains its supremum  $\alpha$ . ■

Back to the lower bound of the volume  $\mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cup M', r))$ , it is now sufficient to give an upper bound of the volume of  $A(r)$  in view of Lemma 1,

**Lemma 3.** *Let*

$$\widehat{A}(r) = \left\{ (x_1, x_2, x_3) \mid x_2 \leq 0, -\psi(x_1) \leq x_3, -x_2 + \frac{\varphi'(\theta(x_1))}{\psi'(x_1)}(x_3 + \psi(x_1)) \leq \alpha^{1/2} r \right\}.$$

Then

$$A(r) \cap \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \mid x_1 \in [0, 1], x_2 \leq 0\} \subset \widehat{A}(r).$$

Admitting the lemma, we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_3(A(r) \cap [\rho(r), 1] \times \mathbf{R}^2) \leq 2\mathcal{L}_3(\widehat{A}(r) \cap [\rho(r), 1] \times \mathbf{R}^2) = 2\alpha^{1/2} r^2 \int_{\rho(r)}^1 \frac{\psi'(t)}{\varphi'(\theta(t))} dt.$$

In view of Lemma 3, we notice that

$$A(r) \cap [0, \rho(r)] \times \mathbf{R}^2 \subset \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \mid 0 \leq x_1 \leq \rho(r), -r \leq x_2 \leq r, -\psi(x_1) \leq x_3 \leq r\}.$$

If  $x_1 \leq 0$  and  $x_2 \leq 0$  (if  $x_2 \geq 0$ , consider  $d(M', x)$ ) we deduce by a direct computation that

$$d(M, x) \geq d(\text{co}\{(0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0), (1, 0, -1)\}, x) \geq d(\text{co}\{(0, 0, 0), (1, 0, -1)\}, x) \geq d(M \cap M', x)$$

which contradicts the definition of the set  $A(r)$ . Hence

$$A(r) \cap (-\infty, 0] \times \mathbb{R}^2 = \emptyset$$

Finally,

$$A(r) \cap [1, +\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^2 \subset [1, 1+r] \times [-r, r] \times [-1-r, 1].$$

and we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_3(A(r)) \leq 2\alpha^{1/2}r^2 \int_{\rho(r)}^1 \frac{\psi'(t)}{\varphi'(\theta(t))} dt + 2r \int_0^{\rho(r)} \psi(t) dt + 2r^2\rho(r) + 2r^2(1+2r). \blacksquare$$

**Proof of Lemma 3.** Consider an element  $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$  in the set  $A(r) \cap \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) | x_2 \leq 0\}$ . First note that  $-r \leq x_2$ . Indeed, since  $M \subset \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) | x_2 \geq 0\}$ , we have  $r \geq d(M, x) \geq d(\{(x_1, x_2, x_3) | x_2 \geq 0\}, x) = \|x - (x_1, 0, x_3)\| = -x_2$ .

We first prove that  $-\psi(x_1) \leq x_3$ . Assume that it is not true. If  $-x_1 \leq x_3$ , then

$$(x_1, 0, x_3) \in \text{co}\{(x_1, 0, -\psi(x_1)), (x_1, 0, -x_1)\} \subset C = M \cap M'.$$

Hence  $d(M \cap M', x) \leq |x_2| \leq r$ , which contradicts the fact that  $x \in A(r)$ . Now assume that  $x_3 < -x_1$ . Note that  $n = (-1, 0, -1)$  strictly separates  $x$  and  $M$ . Indeed,  $(n|x) = -x_1 - x_3 > 0$ , and, for every  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ ,  $(n|(\lambda, 0, -\psi(\lambda))) = -\lambda + \psi(\lambda) \leq 0$ ,  $(n|(\lambda, \varphi(\lambda), 0)) = -\lambda \leq 0$ , hence  $(n|\Lambda) \leq 0$  for every  $\Lambda \in M$ . In particular,  $(n|\text{proj}_M(x)) \leq 0$ , which implies that  $(n|x - \text{proj}_M(x)) > 0$  hence that  $n \notin T(M, \text{proj}_M(x))$ . Note also that  $n' = (-1, -2, -1)$  strictly separates  $x$  and  $M$ ,  $(n'|x) = -x_1 - 2x_2 - x_3 > 0$ , hence that  $n' \notin T(M, \text{proj}_M(x))$ . We now show that this implies that  $\text{proj}_M(x) \in C = M \cap M'$ , which contradicts the fact that  $x \in A(r)$ . Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \text{co}\{(t, 0, -\psi(t)) | t \in [0, 1]\} = \{(y_1, 0, y_3) | -y_1 \leq y_3 \leq -\psi(y_1)\} \\ C_1 &= \text{co}\{(t, \varphi(t), 0) | t \in [0, 1]\} = \{(z_1, z_2, 0) | \varphi(z_1) \leq z_2 \leq z_1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\text{proj}_M(x) \in M = \text{co}(C \cup C_1)$ , there are  $y \in C$ ,  $z \in C_1$  and  $\theta \in [0, 1]$  such that  $\text{proj}_M(x) = \theta y + (1-\theta)z$ . If  $\theta = 1$  or  $z = (0, 0, 0)$ , then clearly  $\text{proj}_M(x) \in C$ . Now assume that  $\theta < 1$  and  $z \neq (0, 0, 0)$ . If  $z \notin \text{co}\{(0, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0)\}$ , for  $\varepsilon$  small enough,  $z + \varepsilon n \in M$  (for example,  $z + \frac{z_1 - z_2}{2}n = z_2(1, 1, 0) + \frac{z_1 - z_2}{2}(1, 0, -1) \in \text{co}\{(0, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0), (1, 0, -1)\}$ ), hence  $\text{proj}_M(x) + \varepsilon(1-\theta)n \in M$ , which implies that  $n \in T(M, \text{proj}_M(x))$ , a contradiction. If  $z \in \text{co}\{(0, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0)\} \setminus \{(0, 0, 0)\}$ , then  $z + \varepsilon n' \in M$  (for example,  $z + \frac{z_1}{2}n' = \frac{z_1}{2}(1, 0, -1) \in \text{co}\{(0, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0), (1, 0, -1)\}$ ), hence  $\text{proj}_M(x) + \varepsilon(1-\theta)n' \in M$ , which implies that  $n' \in T(M, \text{proj}_M(x))$ , a contradiction.

We now prove that  $-x_2 + \frac{\varphi'(\theta(x_1))}{\psi'(x_1)}(x_3 + \psi(x_1)) \leq \alpha^{1/2}r$ . This a consequence of the following claim.

**Claim 3.2.**

$$n'' = \left( \varphi'(\theta(x_1)), -1, \frac{\varphi'(\theta(x_1))}{\psi'(x_1)} \right) \in N\left(M, (x_1, 0, -\psi(x_1))\right).$$

Admitting the claim, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} (x - (x_1, 0, -\psi(x_1)) | n'') &= (x - \text{proj}_M(x) + \text{proj}_M(x) - (x_1, 0, -\psi(x_1)) | n'') \\ &\leq \|x - \text{proj}_M(x)\| \|n''\| \leq r \|n''\| \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$-x_2 + \frac{\varphi'(\theta(x_1))}{\psi'(x_1)}(x_3 + \psi(x_1)) \leq \sup_{t \in [0,1]} \left( 1 + \frac{\varphi'(\theta(t))^2}{\psi'(t)^2} (1 + \psi(t)^2) \right)^{1/2} r = \alpha^{1/2} r. \blacksquare$$

**Proof of Claim 3.2.** Consider  $y = (y_1, 0, y_3) \in C$ . Then, in view of the definition of  $C$ ,

$$(n''|y - (x_1, 0, -\psi(x_1))) = n_1''(y_1 - x_1) + n_3''(y_3 + \psi(x_1)) \leq n_1''(y_1 - x_1) + n_3''(-\psi(y_1) + \psi(x_1))$$

Since  $n_1'' = \psi'(x_1)n_3''$ , and since  $\psi$  is convex,

$$(n''|y - (x_1, 0, -\psi(x_1))) \leq n_3''(-\psi(y_1) + \psi(x_1) + (y_1 - x_1)\psi'(x_1)) \leq 0.$$

Now consider  $z = (z_1, z_2, 0) \in C_1$ . From the definition of  $C_1$ ,  $z_2 \geq \varphi(z_1)$ , hence

$$(n''|z - (x_1, 0, -\psi(x_1))) \leq (z_1 - x_1)\varphi'(\theta(x_1)) - \varphi(z_1) + \psi(x_1)\frac{\varphi'(\theta(x_1))}{\psi'(x_1)}.$$

The study of the concave function,  $\lambda \mapsto (\lambda - x_1)\varphi'(\theta(x_1)) - \varphi(\lambda) + \psi(x_1)\frac{\varphi'(\theta(x_1))}{\psi'(x_1)}$  shows that it attains its maximum on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  at the point  $\theta(x_1)$  where its value is zero. Hence  $(n''|z - (x_1, 0, -\psi(x_1))) \leq 0$ . Since  $M = \text{co}(C \cup C_1)$ , it ends the proof of the claim.  $\blacksquare$

**3.2. Proof of Corollary 1.** It is immediate to check that the functions  $\varphi(t) = t^q$  and  $\psi(t) = t^p$  satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 5, and provide the explicit value  $\theta(t) = \frac{q}{q-1} \frac{p-1}{p} t$ . Hence, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\rho(r)}^1 \frac{\psi'(t)}{\varphi'(\theta(t))} dt &= \frac{p}{q} \left( \frac{q-1}{q} \frac{p}{p-1} \right)^{q-1} \frac{\rho(r)^{p+1-q} - 1}{q-p-1} \\ \int_0^{\rho(r)} \psi(t) dt &= \frac{\rho(r)^{p+1}}{p+1} \\ \alpha &= 1 + 2 \frac{q^2}{p^2} \left( \frac{q}{q-1} \frac{p-1}{p} \right)^{2q-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Take

$$\rho(r) = \left( \frac{p^2}{q^2} \left( \frac{q-1}{q} \frac{p}{p-1} \right)^{2q-2} + 2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2q}} r^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

which belongs to  $[0, 1]$  for  $r$  small enough and which yields the lower bound:

$$\mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cup M', r)) - \mathcal{L}_3(M \cup M') - r\mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}(M \cup M')) \geq -c(p, q)r^{1+\frac{p+1}{q}} + O(r^2)$$

For the upper bound,

$$\int_{\varphi^{-1}(r)}^1 \frac{\psi(t)}{\varphi(t)} dt = \frac{r^{\frac{p+1}{q}-1} - 1}{q-p-1}$$

leads to

$$-\frac{2}{q-p-1} r^{1+\frac{p+1}{q}} + O(r^2) \geq \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cup M', r)) - \mathcal{L}_3(M \cup M') - r\mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}(M \cup M'))$$

which ends the proof of the corollary.  $\blacksquare$

**3.3. Proof of Theorem 1 .** Take  $p = 2$  and  $q = 3N$  in Corollary 1.  $\blacksquare$

**3.4. Proof of Theorem 3.** Take  $\psi(t) = t^2$ ,  $\rho(r) = 2\varphi^{-1}(r)$  and  $I(r) = \int_{\varphi^{-1}(r)}^1 \frac{\psi(t)}{\varphi(t)} dt$  in Theorem 5. The definition of  $\theta(t)$  and the convexity of  $\psi$  imply  $\frac{\psi'(t)}{\varphi'(\theta(t))} \leq \frac{\psi}{\varphi}(\theta(t))$ . Since  $\theta(t) \geq t - \frac{\psi(t)}{\psi'(t)}$ , and since  $\frac{\psi}{\varphi}$  is decreasing, we get  $\int_{2\varphi^{-1}(r)}^1 \frac{\psi'(t)}{\varphi'(\theta(t))} dt \leq \int_{2\varphi^{-1}(r)}^1 \frac{\psi}{\varphi} \left( t - \frac{\psi(t)}{\psi'(t)} \right) dt$ . The choice of  $\psi(t) = t^2$  yields

$$\int_{2\varphi^{-1}(r)}^1 \frac{\psi'(t)}{\varphi'(\theta(t))} dt \leq \int_{2\varphi^{-1}(r)}^1 \frac{\psi}{\varphi} \left( \frac{t}{2} \right) dt \leq 2I(r).$$

We have moreover  $\int_0^{2\varphi^{-1}(r)} \psi(t) dt = 8 \int_0^{\varphi^{-1}(r)} \psi(t) dt$ . From the definition of  $I(r)$  a simple derivation and integration by parts gives  $\int_0^{\varphi^{-1}(r)} \psi(t) dt = \int_0^r I(t) dt - rI(r)$  (as by assumption  $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} rI(r) = 0$ ). The estimation proved in Theorem 5 reads now as expected (with  $\lambda = 16 - 4\alpha$ ).

$$\begin{aligned} -2r^2 I(r) + O(r^2) &\geq \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cup M', r)) - \mathcal{L}_3(M \cup M') - r\mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}(M \cup M')) \\ &\geq - \left( 4\alpha r^2 I(r) + 16r \left( \int_0^r I(t) dt - rI(r) \right) \right) + O(r^2). \end{aligned}$$

We now have to check that  $\varphi$  given by the relation  $I(r) = \int_{\varphi^{-1}(r)}^1 \frac{\psi(t)}{\varphi(t)} dt = \frac{\varepsilon(r)}{r}$  satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 5. The relation  $\int_0^{\varphi^{-1}(r)} \psi(t) dt = \int_0^r \frac{\varepsilon(t)}{t} dt - \varepsilon(r)$  and the choice of  $\psi(t) = t^2$  yields

$$\varphi^{-1}(r) = 3 \left( \int_0^r \frac{\varepsilon(t)}{t} dt - \varepsilon(r) \right)^{1/3}.$$

Hence  $\varphi(0) = 0$ . A simple derivation proves that  $\varphi$  is a strictly increasing function. Moreover, the condition  $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varepsilon(r)}{\sqrt{r}} = +\infty$  and the convexity of  $t \mapsto \frac{\varepsilon(t)}{t}$  prove that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varphi(t)}{t^2} = 0$  (by a Taylor expansion and using the above expression of  $\varphi^{-1}(r)$ ). The condition  $r^2 \varepsilon''(r) - r\varepsilon'(r) + \varepsilon(r) > 0$  is sufficient to verify that  $\frac{\varphi(t)}{\psi(t)} = \frac{\varepsilon(t)}{t^2}$  is strictly increasing on  $[0, 1]$ , that is  $\frac{\varphi(t)}{\varphi'(t)} < \frac{\psi(t)}{\psi'(t)}$ ,  $\forall t \in (0, 1]$ . As by assumption  $t \mapsto \frac{\varepsilon(t)}{t}$  is a strictly convex function of class  $C^2$  on  $(0, 1]$  and  $\frac{\varphi}{\psi}$  is strictly increasing, a double derivation of  $I(r) = \int_{\varphi^{-1}(r)}^1 \frac{\psi(t)}{\varphi(t)} dt$  proves that  $\varphi^{-1}$  is strictly concave, and hence that  $\varphi$  is strictly convex. Finally, the condition  $\varphi(1) = 1$  is obtained by modifying the function  $\varphi$  on the interval  $[\beta, 1]$  for a sufficiently small  $\beta$ , keeping the properties of  $\varphi$  (strict convexity,  $\frac{\varphi}{\psi}$  strictly increasing)<sup>12</sup>, noticing that the asymptotic behavior when  $r \rightarrow 0$  remains unchanged. ■

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

In view of Lemma 1, it is sufficient to prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $M$  and  $M'$  be two compact convex subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{L}_3(A(r)) \in o(r)$$

<sup>12</sup>An easy way is to take  $\beta$ , such that  $\varphi(\beta) < 1$  replace  $\varphi$  with  $t \mapsto \frac{\varphi(\beta)-1}{\beta^2-1}t^2 + \frac{\beta^2-\varphi(\beta)}{\beta^2-1}$  on  $[\beta, 1]$ , and carefully smoothing the new function around  $\beta$ .

**Proof of Lemma 4.** From the following partition of the set  $\text{bd}(M \cup M')$

$$\text{bd}(M \cup M') = \text{bd}M \setminus M' \sqcup \text{bd}M' \setminus M \sqcup (\text{bd}M \cap \text{bd}M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M')$$

we write, using the elementary fact  $\overline{B}(A \cup B, r) = \overline{B}(A, r) \cup \overline{B}(B, r)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{B}(\text{bd}(M \cup M'), r) &= \overline{B}(\text{bd}M \setminus M', r) \cup \overline{B}(\text{bd}M' \setminus M, r) \\ &\quad \cup \overline{B}((\text{bd}M \cap \text{bd}M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M'), r) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using the elementary formula  $\mathcal{L}_3(A \cup B \cup C) = \mathcal{L}_3(A \cup C) + \mathcal{L}_3(B \cup C) - \mathcal{L}_3(C) - \mathcal{L}_3(A \cap B \setminus A \cap B \cap C)$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cup M', r)) &= \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(\text{bd}M \setminus M' \cup (\text{bd}M \cap \text{bd}M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M'), r)) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(\text{bd}M' \setminus M \cup (\text{bd}M \cap \text{bd}M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M'), r)) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}((\text{bd}M \cap \text{bd}M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M'), r)) \\ &- \mathcal{L}_3((\overline{B}(\text{bd}M \setminus M', r) \cap \overline{B}(\text{bd}M' \setminus M, r)) \setminus \overline{B}((\text{bd}M \cap \text{bd}M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M'), r)) \end{aligned}$$

Now notice that each set in the above decomposition of the set  $\text{bd}(M \cup M')$  is 2-rectifiable, as part of the boundary of a convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , or union of two such sets. Hence by [4, Theorem 3.2.39] their Minkowski content equals the 2-dimensional Hausdorff measure of their closure. Noticing additionally that the set  $\text{bd}M \setminus M' \sqcup (\text{bd}M \cap \text{bd}M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M')$  is closed, we deduce

$$\mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}(M \cup M')) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2r} \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(M \cup M', r))$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}M \setminus M' \sqcup (\text{bd}M \cap \text{bd}M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M')) &= \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2r} \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(\text{bd}M \setminus M' \sqcup (\text{bd}M \cap \text{bd}M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M'), r)) & \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}M' \setminus M \sqcup (\text{bd}M \cap \text{bd}M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M')) &= \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2r} \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}(\text{bd}M' \setminus M \sqcup (\text{bd}M \cap \text{bd}M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M'), r)) & \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_2((\text{bd}M \cap \text{bd}M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M')) &= \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{2r} \mathcal{L}_3(\overline{B}((\text{bd}M \cap \text{bd}M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M'), r)) & \end{aligned}$$

Remark that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_3(\text{bd}(M \cup M')) &= \mathcal{L}_3(\text{bd}M \setminus M' \cup (\text{bd}M \cap \text{bd}M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M')) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{L}_3(\text{bd}M' \setminus M \cup (\text{bd}M \cap \text{bd}M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M')) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{L}_3((\text{bd}M \cap \text{bd}M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M')) \end{aligned}$$

and that

$$A(r) \subset \overline{B}(\text{bd}M \setminus M', r) \cap \overline{B}(\text{bd}M' \setminus M, r) \setminus \overline{B}((\text{bd}M \cap \text{bd}M') \setminus \text{int}(M \cup M'), r)$$

and deduce

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{L}_3(A(r))}{2r} = 0. \blacksquare$$



Let us just point out that we may not have  $\mathcal{H}_2(\text{cl}(\text{bd}M \setminus M')) = \mathcal{H}_2(\text{bd}M \setminus M')$  without additional assumptions, which prevents us to use a more straightforward decomposition and a rough bound.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Cheeger, J., Müller, W., Schrader, R., 1986, *Kinematic and tube formulas for piecewise linear spaces*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., 35, p. 737-754.
- [2] Donnelly, H., 1975, Heat Equation and the volume of tubes, *Inventiones Math.* p. 239-243.
- [3] Federer, H., 1959, *Curvature measures*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 93, pp 418-491.
- [4] Federer, H., 1969, *Geometric Measure Theory*, Springer, Band 153.
- [5] Fu, J. H. G., 1989, *Curvature measures and generalized Morse theory*, J. Differential Geom. 30, p. 619-642.
- [6] Hotelling, H., Tubes and spheres in  $n$ -spaces, and a class of statistical problems. Amer. J. Math. 61, 440-460. (1939)
- [7] Hug, Daniel Contact distributions of Boolean models. III International Conference in "Stochastic Geometry, Convex Bodies and Empirical Measures", Part I (Mazara del Vallo, 1999). Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo (2) Suppl. No. 65, part I (2000), 137-181
- [8] Johansen, Sren; Johnstone, Iain M. Hotelling's theorem on the volume of tubes: some illustrations in simultaneous inference and data analysis. Ann. Statist. 18 (1990), no. 2, 652-684.
- [9] Knowles, Mark; Siegmund, David On Hotelling's approach to testing for a nonlinear parameter in regression. Int. Stat. Rev. 57, No.3, 205-220 (1989)
- [10] Lafontaine, J., 1986 *Mesures de courbure des variétés lisses et des polyèdres*, Sémin. Bourbaki, n° 664.
- [11] Naiman, Daniel Q.(1-JHOP) Volumes of tubular neighborhoods of spherical polyhedra and statistical inference. Ann. Statist. 18 (1990), no. 2, 685-716.
- [12] Rataj, J. On boundaries of unions of sets with positive reach. Beitrge Algebra Geom. 46 (2005), no. 2, 397-404.
- [13] Schneider, R., Parallelmengen mit Vielfachheit und Steiner-Formeln. (German) Geom. Dedicata 9 (1980), no. 1, 111-127.
- [14] Steiner J. Ueber parallele Flächen, Monatsbericht der Akademie des Wissenschaften zu Berlin (1840) p. 114-118; also *Jakob Steiner's Gesammelte Werke* band. 2 (1882) pp 171-176, Berlin.
- [15] Sun, Jiayang Tail probabilities of the maxima of Gaussian random fields. Ann. Probab. 21 (1993), no. 1, 34-71.
- [16] Weyl, H., 1939, *On the volume of tubes*, Amer. J. Math., 61, p. 461-472.
- [17] Zähle, M., 1984, *Curvature measures and random sets, I*, Math. Nachr. 119, p. 327-339.