

SOLID ANGLE MEASURE OF POLYHEDRAL CONES

ALLISON FITISONE AND YUAN ZHOU

ABSTRACT. This paper addresses the computation of normalized solid angle measure of polyhedral cones. This is well understood in dimensions two and three. For higher dimensions, assuming that a positive-definite criterion is met, the measure can be computed via a multivariable hypergeometric series. We present two decompositions of full-dimensional simplicial cones into finite families of cones satisfying the positive-definite criterion, enabling the use of the hypergeometric series to compute the solid angle measure of any polyhedral cone. Additionally, our second decomposition method yields cones with a special tridiagonal structure, reducing the number of required coordinates for the hypergeometric series formula. Furthermore, we investigate the convergence of the hypergeometric series for this case. Our findings provide a powerful tool for computing solid angle measures in high-dimensional spaces.

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of solid angles has gained a lot of traction in the past several years and has been investigated in several publications (see [20], [5], [6], [9], [17] etc.). Of particular interest is the solid angle measure of a polyhedral cone in higher dimensions. This measure has widespread potential applications, from computing the expected number of simplices in a triangulation of an n -cube [19], to calculating relative pixel purity index (PPI) scores [13], to computing the volume of the feasibility domain of an ecological community [16]. The various ways in which higher-dimensional solid angle measures appear in literature demonstrate the importance of the topic and necessitate a deeper understanding of it.

Recall that a polyhedral cone is the intersection of a finite number of half-spaces passing through the origin. By the well-known Minkowski–Weyl theorem, a polyhedral cone is also the convex conic hull of a finite number of vectors. In \mathbb{R}^2 , the solid (or plane) angle measure can be computed via the standard inner product. In \mathbb{R}^3 , the solid angle measure of a cone generated by three unit vectors is the area of the spherical triangle on the unit sphere formed by the unit vectors. There is a closed formula dating back to Euler and Lagrange which uses the scalar triple product. Assume that $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2$ and \mathbf{v}_3 are unit vectors in \mathbb{R}^3 . The solid angle measure of the cone generated by $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2$ and \mathbf{v}_3 is given by [8]:

$$E := 2 \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{|\mathbf{v}_1 \cdot (\mathbf{v}_2 \times \mathbf{v}_3)|}{1 + \mathbf{v}_2 \cdot \mathbf{v}_3 + \mathbf{v}_2 \cdot \mathbf{v}_1 + \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}_3} \right),$$

and the normalized solid angle measure of the cone, which is the proportion of \mathbb{R}^3 that the cone occupies, is therefore $\frac{E}{4\pi}$.

The authors gratefully acknowledge partial support from the National Science Foundation through grant DMS-2012429, awarded to Y. Zhou.

In higher dimensions, we define the solid angle measure of a polyhedral cone according to [12], and we normalize it in such a way that the whole space has measure 1, according to [20].

Definition 1.1. The *normalized solid angle measure*, of a polyhedral cone $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ with respect to the space \mathbb{R}^n , denoted by $\tilde{\Omega}_n(C)$, is defined as the ratio of the $(n - 1)$ -dimensional volume of the intersection of the cone with the unit sphere S_{n-1} in \mathbb{R}^n centered around the origin to the volume of the unit sphere, i.e.,

$$\tilde{\Omega}_n(C) = \frac{\text{vol}_{n-1}(C \cap S_{n-1})}{\text{vol}_{n-1}(S_{n-1})}. \quad (1)$$

We note that the above definition works for convex non-polyhedral cones as well. It also matches with the definition in lower dimensions $n = 2$ and $n = 3$. When the cone C is of dimension $d < n$, let S_{d-1} denote the unit sphere centered around the origin in the d -dimensional linear space containing C . We define the normalized solid angle measure of C with respect to the linear span of C in a similar manner:

$$\tilde{\Omega}_d(C) = \frac{\text{vol}_{d-1}(C \cap S_{d-1})}{\text{vol}_{d-1}(S_{d-1})}.$$

Remark 1.2. Without loss of generality, in the following, we need only consider *full-dimensional simplicial cones* C . Indeed, if C is not simplicial, then triangulation allows us to decompose C into simplicial cones (i.e. having a linearly independent system of generators), and $\tilde{\Omega}_n(C)$ is the sum of the normalized solid angles of the cones in the decomposition. If C is not full-dimensional, then by our normalization, $\tilde{\Omega}_n(C) = 0$. Note however that $\tilde{\Omega}_d(C) \neq 0$, where d is the dimension of the linear span of C . Other papers normalize with respect to a half space [11] or the affine space [15]. We show the distinction in the following example.

Example 1.3. Consider the polyhedral cone $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ generated by the vectors $\mathbf{v}_1 = (1, 0, 0)$, $\mathbf{v}_2 = (0, 1, 0)$ and $\mathbf{v}_3 = (-1, 0, 0)$. The ambient space has dimension three. However, it is clear that C lies on the plane $z = 0$, and so the dimension of the linear span of C is 2. Thus, $\tilde{\Omega}_3(C) = 0$. However, when the measure is considered with respect to the linear span, we see $\tilde{\Omega}_2(C) \neq 0$. Note that although C is not simplicial, it can be triangulated into two simplicial cones: C_1 generated by the vectors \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_2 , and C_2 generated by the vectors \mathbf{v}_2 and \mathbf{v}_3 . Thus, $\tilde{\Omega}_2(C) = \tilde{\Omega}_2(C_1) + \tilde{\Omega}_2(C_2) = 0.25 + 0.25 = 0.5$.

To the best of our knowledge, there currently does not exist a neat closed formula for the solid angle measure of polyhedral cones in dimensions greater than three. As noted by Seeger and Torki [21], the derivation of an easily computable formula for the solid angle measure is a difficult task and one must use other methods for approximation. These include probabilistic methods, numerical integration methods, and the multi-variate power series method. In regard to the first two methods, see [11]. In regard to the last method, Ribando [20] and Aomoto [3] independently discovered a formula for the normalized solid angle measure of a simplicial cone, in the form of a multi-variate hypergeometric series.

Ribando derived the power series formula by noting that there are many equivalent ways to represent the normalized solid angle measure. It is natural to view the volumes in Definition 1.1 as integrals. Doing so gives the following equivalent

definitions of $\tilde{\Omega}_n$:

$$\tilde{\Omega}_n(C) = \frac{\text{vol}_{n-1}(C \cap S_{n-1})}{\text{vol}_{n-1}(S_{n-1})} = \frac{\int_C f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}}, \quad (2)$$

where $f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is any function that is invariant under rotations around the origin. Ribando determined that the form $f = e^{-\|\mathbf{x}\|^2}$ led to nice computations with the integral

$$\tilde{\Omega}_n(C) = \frac{\int_C e^{-\|\mathbf{x}\|^2} d\mathbf{x}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-\|\mathbf{x}\|^2} d\mathbf{x}} = \frac{\int_C e^{-\|\mathbf{x}\|^2} d\mathbf{x}}{\pi^{\frac{n}{2}}}, \quad (3)$$

which when simplified and expanded gave rise to a convergent hypergeometric series. Furthermore, Ribando showed that the convergence of the power series was dependent on a certain matrix, which we call the *associated matrix*.

Ribando's results are presented in Theorem 1.5 below. Recall that by Remark 1.2, we will only consider full-dimensional simplicial cones.

Definition 1.4. Let C be a simplicial cone in \mathbb{R}^n , whose generators are the linearly independent unit vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, the *associated matrix* of C , denoted by $M_n(C)$, is the $n \times n$ matrix whose (i, j) -th entry is $-|\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_j|$ for $i \neq j$, and whose diagonal (i, i) -th entry is 1.

$$M_n(C) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -|\mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}_2| & \cdots & -|\mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}_n| \\ -|\mathbf{v}_2 \cdot \mathbf{v}_1| & 1 & \cdots & -|\mathbf{v}_2 \cdot \mathbf{v}_n| \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -|\mathbf{v}_n \cdot \mathbf{v}_1| & -|\mathbf{v}_n \cdot \mathbf{v}_2| & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

Theorem 1.5 ([20, Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 3.3], rephrased). *Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be the simplicial cone generated by the unit vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$. Let $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be the matrix whose i^{th} column is \mathbf{v}_i . Let $\alpha_{ij} = \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_j$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. Let*

$$T_{\alpha} = \frac{|\det V|}{(4\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}}} \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{N}^{\binom{n}{2}}} \left[\frac{(-2)^{\sum_{i < j} a_{ij}}}{\prod_{i < j} a_{ij}!} \prod_{i=1}^n \Gamma \left(\frac{1 + \sum_{m \neq i} a_{im}}{2} \right) \right] \alpha^{\mathbf{a}}. \quad (5)$$

Then, T_{α} converges absolutely to the normalized solid angle measure $\tilde{\Omega}_n(C)$ of the cone if and only if its associated matrix $M_n(C)$ is positive definite.

In the above series (5), Γ is the Euler-Gamma function; $\alpha = (\alpha_{12}, \alpha_{13}, \dots, \alpha_{n-1, n})$ is a multivariable in $\binom{n}{2}$ variables; and $\mathbf{a} = (a_{12}, a_{13}, \dots, a_{n-1, n})$ is a multiexponent. We define

$$\alpha^{\mathbf{a}} := \prod_{i < j} \alpha_{ij}^{a_{ij}}.$$

When $i > j$, we set $a_{ij} = a_{ji}$, and we define $\sum_{m \neq i} a_{im}$ to be the sum over all the terms in the multiexponent where i appears as either the first or second index.

Other functionals f have been used in equation (2) to represent high-dimensional solid angle measures as integrals. Hajja and Walker [12, Theorem 1] use $f(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ and consider a standard change of variables, to obtain an integral formula for the solid angle measures, where the integral is taken over the portion of the unit sphere in the positive orthant. Kabluchko and Zaporozhets [15, Proposition 1.1] use a form related to Gaussian distribution to present an equivalent formula for the solid

angle measures of a specific class of cones. For the purposes of this paper, we will focus exclusively on Ribando’s hypergeometric series formula.

As aforementioned, alternative methods exist for estimating solid angle measures. Numerical integration methods often give rise to rough estimates of solid angle measures, or involve integrals that can only be computed under specific conditions [11]. Random estimation techniques require large samples for accurate approximations, as discussed in [11]. Heylen and Scheunders [13] use a multi-dimensional extension of Monte–Carlo sampling to obtain estimates of solid angle measures. Adam and Speciel [1] re-express the solid angle measure as in equation (2), using the Heaviside step function followed by a Monte–Carlo approach for estimation. The multi-variate power series method is arguably the method of choice for computing exact high dimensional solid angle measures [1]. However, the power series method has previously been deemed as too complex and technical [10], [2].

Ribando notes that there are two significant issues in applying the power series method [20]. The first major issue is that in higher dimensions, computational feasibility is hindered by the large number of coordinates needed to use the formula. To compute the normalized solid angle measure of an n -dimensional simplicial cone, one needs $\binom{n}{2}$ coordinates. Several authors make reference to the power series, but often cite it being computationally untractable for high dimensions. The second issue is that the positive definite-ness of the associated matrix is an essential assumption for applying the power-series formula. When this criterion is not met, α lies outside of the domain of convergence of the series, and the formula cannot be used in a way that is meaningful.

In this paper, we present a method that allows one to compute the normalized solid angle measure of any polyhedral cone via the power series method. Moreover, we address the two major issues standing in the way of widespread use of the power series method as a means to compute solid angle measures.

We address the positive-definite-ness criterion via signed decompositions of cones. In Section 2, we investigate Brion–Vergne decomposition of cones with respect to hyperplanes. We demonstrate in Theorem 2.5 and Corollary 2.6 that Brion–Vergne decomposition of a simplicial cone with respect to a particular hyperplane results in finitely many cones that either have a positive definite associated matrix (and so their solid angle measures can be computed directly via the power series formula), or contain lines (and so by applying Corollary 2.4, the computation of solid angle measures can be simplified to a lower-dimensional problem, which can be addressed using induction on dimension). In Section 3, we consider Brion–Vergne decomposition of cones with respect to lines. We demonstrate in Theorem 3.3 that Brion–Vergne decomposition with respect to a particular line leads to a second decomposition of a simplicial cone into finitely many cones, each of which has a positive definite associated matrix. This theorem gives a method to decompose solid angles lying outside the domain of convergence into solid angles lying within the domain of convergence of the series in Theorem 1.5.

We also address the computational feasibility of the power series method by reducing the number of coordinates needed. In Section 4, we explore the properties of cones resulting from the application of a stronger version of Theorem 3.3. These cones have associated matrices that are not only positive-definite but also tridiagonal, reducing the number of required coordinates for the power series formula from $\binom{n}{2}$ to $n - 1$. Theorem 4.1 shows that under the tridiagonal assumption, the power

series formula always converges to the solid angle measure. In Theorem 4.9, we examine the asymptotic error of the power series formula for cones with tridiagonal associated matrices.

In addition, we have developed software that can compute the normalized solid angle measure of polyhedral cones in any dimension using decomposition methods presented in the current paper. Our software is written in SageMath [22], a comprehensive Python-based open source computer algebra system. It is available at <https://github.com/yuan-zhou/solid-angle-code>, and can be run on a local installation of SageMath or online using SageMath on CoCalc. However, it is important to note that this software is not the focus of the present paper. We will defer all computational questions and experiments to a forthcoming paper.

2. FIRST DECOMPOSITION METHOD

2.1. Brion–Vergne decomposition with respect to a hyperplane. We will make use of Brion–Vergne (B–V) decomposition (see [7], [4]) with respect to a hyperplane. B–V decomposition is a signed decomposition of a simplicial cone into a finite family of full-dimensional simplicial cones. The hyperplane determines a facet for each of the cones in the decomposition. We adopt some of the notation used in [4] and reformulate the decomposition below.

Definition 2.1. Let $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_d$ be vectors in \mathbb{R}^n . We denote by $\langle \mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_d \rangle$ the linear span of $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_d$. We denote by $\mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_d)$ the cone generated by the vectors $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_d$.

Let $L \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a hyperplane, and $\mathbf{w}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus L$. We denote by $\rho_i: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow L$ the projection onto L , parallel to \mathbf{w}_i .

Let C be a cone. We denote by $[C]$ the indicator function of the cone C .

In this paper, we say that a cone C can be decomposed into cones C_1, \dots, C_k , if their indicator functions satisfy the relation

$$[C] \equiv \sum_{i=1}^k s_i [C_i], \text{ where } s_i \in \{\pm 1\},$$

modulo indicator functions of cones containing lines (in section 2) or modulo indicator functions of lower-dimensional cones (in section 3).

Theorem 2.2 (Brion–Vergne decomposition with respect to a hyperplane [4, Proposition 15b]). *Let $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n$ form a basis of \mathbb{R}^n and let cone $C = \mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n)$. Let $L \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a hyperplane. Assume that $\mathbf{w}_i \in L$ if and only if $r+1 \leq i \leq s$ and that \mathbf{w}_i lie on one side of L for $1 \leq i \leq r$, and on the other side for $s+1 \leq i \leq n$. Then, we have the following relation modulo indicator functions of cones containing lines.*

$$[C] \equiv \sum_{i=1}^r [\mathbb{R}_+ \mathbf{w}_i + \rho_i(C)] - \sum_{i=s+1}^n [\mathbb{R}_+(-\mathbf{w}_i) + \rho_i(C)].$$

2.2. Solid angle decomposition that includes cones containing lines. We will first show that the normalized solid angle of an orthogonal sum of convex cones is the product of the normalized solid angles of the cones in the orthogonal sum.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a polyhedral cone (or more generally, a convex cone) of dimension d . Suppose that $C = C_1 \oplus C_2$ is the orthogonal sum of cones C_1 and C_2*

of dimensions d_1 and d_2 , respectively. Then, the normalized solid angle measure of C with respect to the linear span of C satisfies that

$$\tilde{\Omega}_d(C) = \tilde{\Omega}_{d_1}(C_1) \cdot \tilde{\Omega}_{d_2}(C_2).$$

Proof. Since C_1 and C_2 are orthogonal, $d = d_1 + d_2$. Any $\mathbf{u} \in C$ can be uniquely expressed as $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}$ where $\mathbf{v} \in C_1, \mathbf{w} \in C_2$ and $\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 = \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{w}\|^2$. Thus,

$$\int_C e^{-\|\mathbf{u}\|^2} d\mathbf{u} = \int_{C_1 \oplus C_2} e^{-\|\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}\|^2} d(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}) = \int_{C_1} e^{-\|\mathbf{v}\|^2} d\mathbf{v} \int_{C_2} e^{-\|\mathbf{w}\|^2} d\mathbf{w}.$$

It then follows from equation (3) that

$$\tilde{\Omega}_d(C) = \frac{\int_C e^{-\|\mathbf{u}\|^2} d\mathbf{u}}{\pi^{d/2}} = \frac{\int_{C_1} e^{-\|\mathbf{v}\|^2} d\mathbf{v}}{\pi^{d_1/2}} \cdot \frac{\int_{C_2} e^{-\|\mathbf{w}\|^2} d\mathbf{w}}{\pi^{d_2/2}} = \tilde{\Omega}_{d_1}(C_1) \cdot \tilde{\Omega}_{d_2}(C_2). \quad \square$$

In the special case that one of the orthogonal parts is an ℓ -dimensional linear subspace L of \mathbb{R}^n , since $\tilde{\Omega}_\ell(L) = 1$, we enjoy the following corollary.

Corollary 2.4. *Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a polyhedral cone (or more generally, a convex cone) of dimension d , such that $C = C' \oplus L$ is the orthogonal sum of a cone C' of dimension $d' < d$ and a linear subspace L of \mathbb{R}^n . Then, $\tilde{\Omega}_d(C) = \tilde{\Omega}_{d'}(C')$.*

Corollary 2.4 demonstrates how computing solid angles of cones containing lines reduces to computing solid angles of lower dimensional cones.

We now present a signed decomposition of a given full-dimensional simplicial cone whose solid angle measure is of interest (recall the assumption is without loss of generality by Remark 1.2), in a way that the resulting cones either contain lines so that Corollary 2.4 applies, or have positive definite associated matrices so that Theorem 1.5 applies.

Theorem 2.5. *Given linearly independent unit vectors $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the cone $\mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n)$ can be decomposed into a finite family of cones, each of which is either:*

- (I) *a cone containing lines, or*
- (II) *a cone $\mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n)$ of dimension n whose associated matrix*

$$M_n = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -|\mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}_2| & \cdots & -|\mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}_n| \\ -|\mathbf{v}_2 \cdot \mathbf{v}_1| & 1 & \cdots & -|\mathbf{v}_2 \cdot \mathbf{v}_n| \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -|\mathbf{v}_n \cdot \mathbf{v}_1| & -|\mathbf{v}_n \cdot \mathbf{v}_2| & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

is positive definite. In particular,

- (a) $\|\mathbf{v}_i\| = 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$
- (b) $\mathbf{v}_n = \mathbf{w}_n$
- (c) $\langle \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{n-1} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{n-1} \rangle$
- (d) $\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_n = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-2$
- (e) $\mathbf{x}^T M_n \mathbf{x} = \|\left[\varepsilon_1 \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n \mathbf{v}_n \right] \mathbf{x}\|^2$ holds for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\varepsilon_i = \pm 1$.

Before proving the theorem, we point out that the property (IIe) ensures the positive definiteness of the associated matrix M_n given by equation (4). Indeed, for

any nonzero vector $\mathbf{x} := (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, since $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$ are linearly independent,

$$[\varepsilon_1 \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n \mathbf{v}_n] \mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i x_i \mathbf{v}_i \neq \mathbf{0},$$

and hence $\mathbf{x}^T M_n \mathbf{x} = \left\| [\varepsilon_1 \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n \mathbf{v}_n] \mathbf{x} \right\|^2 > 0$. As a consequence, the solid angle formula (5) for a cone in the decomposition, which is of the latter form (II), is a convergent power series.

Proof. We proceed by induction on the dimension.

Consider the base case $n = 2$. Let $\mathbf{w}_1 = (w_{11}, w_{12})$ and $\mathbf{w}_2 = (w_{21}, w_{22})$ be linearly independent unit vectors. We show that the cone $\mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2)$ is already of the form (II). The cone satisfies the properties (IIa) through (IIc) trivially. Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. The equation in property (Iie) has the left-hand-side

$$\mathbf{x}^T M_n \mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -|\mathbf{w}_1 \cdot \mathbf{w}_2| \\ -|\mathbf{w}_1 \cdot \mathbf{w}_2| & 1 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} = x_1^2 + x_2^2 - 2x_1 x_2 |\mathbf{w}_1 \cdot \mathbf{w}_2|,$$

and the right-hand side

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| [\varepsilon_1 \mathbf{w}_1, \varepsilon_2 \mathbf{w}_2] \mathbf{x} \right\|^2 &= \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_1 w_{11} & \varepsilon_2 w_{21} \\ \varepsilon_1 w_{12} & \varepsilon_2 w_{22} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2 \\ &= (\varepsilon_1 x_1 w_{11} + \varepsilon_2 x_2 w_{21})^2 + (\varepsilon_1 x_1 w_{12} + \varepsilon_2 x_2 w_{22})^2 \\ &= x_1^2 (w_{11}^2 + w_{12}^2) + x_2^2 (w_{21}^2 + w_{22}^2) + 2\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 x_1 x_2 (w_{11} w_{21} + w_{12} w_{22}) \\ &= x_1^2 + x_2^2 + 2\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 x_1 x_2 (\mathbf{w}_1 \cdot \mathbf{w}_2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for appropriate choices of ε_1 and ε_2 , we see that property (Iie) is satisfied.

Suppose the statement is true for dimension $n - 1$. Now consider the cone $\mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n)$ in dimension n which is not already of the form (I) or (II). We distinguish two cases depending on the orthogonality.

Case 1: Suppose that \mathbf{w}_n is orthogonal to all \mathbf{w}_i for $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$. Set $\mathbf{v}_n = \mathbf{w}_n$. By the inductive hypothesis, there is a (signed) decomposition of the cone $\mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{n-1})$ into finitely many cones $\mathfrak{k}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{k}_N$ that either contain lines or are of the second form and satisfy the desired properties. Then, it is clear that the cones

$$C_1 := \mathfrak{k}_1 + \mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{v}_n), C_2 := \mathfrak{k}_2 + \mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{v}_n), \dots, C_N := \mathfrak{k}_N + \mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{v}_n)$$

obtained by the Minkowski sums give a decomposition of $\mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n)$.

If \mathfrak{k}_i is a cone containing lines in the decomposition of $\mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{n-1})$, then C_i also contains lines, and hence is of form (I). Otherwise, \mathfrak{k}_i must be of the form $\mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{n-1})$ that satisfies the properties (IIa)–(Iie) of dimension $n - 1$. It is clear that $C_i = \mathfrak{c}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{n-1}, \mathbf{v}_n)$ satisfies properties (IIa), (IIb) and (IId) of dimension n . By the inductive hypothesis, $\langle \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{n-2} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{n-2} \rangle$ and $\mathbf{v}_{n-1} = \mathbf{w}_{n-1}$. Thus, we have that $\langle \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{n-2}, \mathbf{v}_{n-1} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{n-2}, \mathbf{w}_{n-1} \rangle$ and so property (IIc) is satisfied. It remains to verify property (Iie). We note that since $\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_n = 0$, the associated matrix of C_i according to Definition 1.4 satisfies

$$M_n(C_i) = \begin{bmatrix} & & 0 \\ & M_{n-1}(\mathfrak{k}_i) & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

By the inductive hypothesis, there exist $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{n-1} \in \{\pm 1\}$ such that the left-hand-side of the equation in property (IIe) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^T M_n(C_i) \mathbf{x} &= [x_1 \cdots x_{n-1}] M_{n-1}(\mathbf{t}_i) \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_{n-1} \end{bmatrix} + x_n^2 \\ &= \|\varepsilon_1 x_1 \mathbf{v}_1 + \cdots + \varepsilon_{n-1} x_{n-1} \mathbf{v}_{n-1}\|^2 + x_n^2 \\ &= \left\| [\varepsilon_1 \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{n-1} \mathbf{v}_{n-1}, \varepsilon_n \mathbf{v}_n] \mathbf{x} \right\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which is equal to its right-hand side, where we set $\varepsilon_n = 1$. Thus, property (IIe) holds.

Case 2: Suppose that \mathbf{w}_n is not orthogonal to all $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{n-1}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\mathbf{w}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{w}_n \neq 0$.

We construct a hyperplane L in order to apply Brion–Vergne decomposition Theorem 2.2 as follows. For $1 \leq i \leq n-2$, we define

$$\ell_i := \mathbf{w}_i - \frac{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \mathbf{w}_{n-1}. \quad (6)$$

We remark that $\ell_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n = 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-2$. Let

$$L := \langle \ell_1, \dots, \ell_{n-2}, \mathbf{w}_n \rangle.$$

This L is a hyperplane of \mathbb{R}^n , since if there are scalars λ_i 's making

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \lambda_i \ell_i + \lambda_n \mathbf{w}_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \lambda_i \mathbf{w}_i - \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \lambda_i \frac{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \mathbf{w}_{n-1} + \lambda_n \mathbf{w}_n,$$

then the linear independence of the \mathbf{w}_i 's implies each $\lambda_i = 0$.

Next, we decide for each i whether $\mathbf{w}_i \in L$, and we use $s_i = -1$ or 1 to indicate which open half-space that \mathbf{w}_i belongs to. It is clear that $\mathbf{w}_n \in L$. We also know that $\mathbf{w}_{n-1} \notin L$, because otherwise L would contain all $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n$, a contradiction. We set $s_{n-1} = 1$. For $1 \leq i \leq n-2$, if $\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n = 0$, then it follows from equation (6) that $\mathbf{w}_i = \ell_i \in L$; otherwise, $\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n \neq 0$, then we have $\mathbf{w}_i \notin L$ since

$$\mathbf{w}_i = \ell_i + \left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \right) \mathbf{w}_{n-1} \quad (7)$$

again by equation (6). We let accordingly

$$s_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \mathbf{w}_i \text{ and } \mathbf{w}_{n-1} \text{ are on the same side of } L \\ -1, & \text{if } \mathbf{w}_i \text{ and } \mathbf{w}_{n-1} \text{ are on the opposite sides of } L. \end{cases}$$

Denote

$$I^+ = \{1 \leq i \leq n-1 \mid s_i = 1\} \text{ and } I^- = \{1 \leq i \leq n-1 \mid s_i = -1\}.$$

We remark that $I^- \cup I^+$ is the set of i such that $\mathbf{w}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus L$, or equivalently, the set of $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ such that $\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n \neq 0$.

By Theorem 2.2, modulo indicator functions of cones containing lines, we can decompose the cone $C = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n)$ as

$$[C] \equiv \sum_{i \in I^+} [\mathbb{R}_+ \mathbf{w}_i + \rho_i(C)] - \sum_{i \in I^-} [\mathbb{R}_+ (-\mathbf{w}_i) + \rho_i(C)],$$

which can be rewritten as

$$[C] \equiv \sum_{i \in I^+ \cup I^-} s_i [\mathbb{R}_+(s_i \mathbf{w}_i) + \rho_i(C)]. \quad (8)$$

Therefore, it suffices to show that every cone on the right-hand side of (8) can be decomposed into a finite family of cones of form (I) or (II).

To this end, we let $i \in I^+ \cup I^-$ and we consider the cone

$$\mathbf{c}_i := \mathbb{R}_+(s_i \mathbf{w}_i) + \rho_i(C).$$

According to Definition 2.1,

$$\rho_i(C) = \mathbf{c}(\rho_i(\mathbf{w}_1), \dots, \rho_i(\mathbf{w}_{i-1}), \rho_i(\mathbf{w}_{i+1}), \dots, \rho_i(\mathbf{w}_n)).$$

Since $\mathbf{w}_n \in L$, we have $\rho_i(\mathbf{w}_n) = \mathbf{w}_n$. Thus,

$$\mathbf{c}_i = \mathbf{c}(s_i \mathbf{w}_i, \rho_i(\mathbf{w}_1), \dots, \rho_i(\mathbf{w}_{i-1}), \rho_i(\mathbf{w}_{i+1}), \dots, \rho_i(\mathbf{w}_{n-1}), \mathbf{w}_n). \quad (9)$$

Next, we determine the projections that arise on the right-hand side of equation (9), by distinguishing the cases $i = n-1$ and $i \neq n-1$. In the former case where $i = n-1$, it follows from equation (7) that $\rho_i(\mathbf{w}_k) = \ell_k$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n-2$. Therefore, equation (9) simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c}_{n-1} &= \mathbf{c}(s_{n-1} \mathbf{w}_{n-1}, \ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_{n-2}, \mathbf{w}_n) \\ &= \mathbf{c}(s_{n-1} \mathbf{w}_{n-1}, \mathbf{w}_1 - \frac{\mathbf{w}_1 \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \mathbf{w}_{n-1}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{n-2} - \frac{\mathbf{w}_{n-2} \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \mathbf{w}_{n-1}, \mathbf{w}_n). \end{aligned}$$

In the latter case where $i \leq n-2$ and $\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n \neq 0$, we have by equation (7)

$$\mathbf{w}_{n-1} = \frac{\mathbf{w}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} (\mathbf{w}_i - \ell_i),$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_i(\mathbf{w}_{n-1}) &= - \left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \right) \ell_i = - \left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \right) \left(\mathbf{w}_i - \frac{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \mathbf{w}_{n-1} \right) \\ &= \mathbf{w}_{n-1} - \left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \right) \mathbf{w}_i. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

For $1 \leq k \leq n-2$ such that $k \neq i$, we have

$$\mathbf{w}_k = \ell_k + \frac{\mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \mathbf{w}_{n-1} = \ell_k + \frac{\mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{w}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} (\mathbf{w}_i - \ell_i).$$

It follows from (6) that

$$\rho_i(\mathbf{w}_k) = \ell_k - \frac{\mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \ell_i = \mathbf{w}_k - \frac{\mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \mathbf{w}_i. \quad (11)$$

Using (10) and (11), equation (9) simplifies to

$$\mathbf{c}_i = \mathbf{c} \left(s_i \mathbf{w}_i, \left\{ \mathbf{w}_k - \frac{\mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \mathbf{w}_i \mid 1 \leq k \leq n-1, k \neq i \right\}, \mathbf{w}_n \right).$$

We observe that the generators of \mathbf{c}_i in the latter case agree with those of \mathbf{c}_{n-1} in the former case, by setting $i = n-1$.

Therefore, we can rewrite the cone \mathbf{c}_i for any $i \in I^+ \cup I^-$ in the form of

$$\mathbf{c}_i = \mathbf{c} \left(\frac{\mathbf{u}_1}{\|\mathbf{u}_1\|}, \dots, \frac{\mathbf{u}_{n-2}}{\|\mathbf{u}_{n-2}\|}, \mathbf{u}_{n-1}, \mathbf{w}_n \right),$$

where

$$\{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{n-2}\} = \left\{ \mathbf{w}_k - \frac{\mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \mathbf{w}_i \mid 1 \leq k \leq n-1, k \neq i \right\} \quad (12)$$

$$\mathbf{u}_{n-1} = s_i \mathbf{w}_i \quad (13)$$

If the cone \mathbf{c}_i is already of the form (I) or (II), then no further decomposition is needed. Otherwise, we apply the inductive hypothesis on the $(n-1)$ -dimensional cone

$$\mathbf{c} \left(\frac{\mathbf{u}_1}{\|\mathbf{u}_1\|}, \dots, \frac{\mathbf{u}_{n-2}}{\|\mathbf{u}_{n-2}\|}, \mathbf{u}_{n-1} \right)$$

to get its (signed) decomposition into cones $\mathfrak{k}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{k}_M$ that are of the form (I) or (II). That is, each cone $\mathfrak{k}_m := \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{n-1})$ from $\{\mathfrak{k}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{k}_M\}$ either (I) contains lines, or (II) satisfies

- (i) $\|\mathbf{v}_j\| = 1$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$
- (ii) $\mathbf{v}_{n-1} = \mathbf{u}_{n-1}$
- (iii) $\langle \mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{n-2} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{n-2} \rangle$
- (iv) $\mathbf{v}_j \cdot \mathbf{v}_{n-1} = 0$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-3$
- (v) $\mathbf{x}^T M_{n-1}(\mathfrak{k}_m) \mathbf{x} = \|\left[\varepsilon_1 \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{n-1} \mathbf{v}_{n-1} \right] \mathbf{x}\|^2$ holds for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, where $\varepsilon_j = \pm 1$.

Let

$$C_m = \mathfrak{k}_m + \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_n) = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{n-1}, \mathbf{w}_n)$$

be the n -dimensional cone obtained by appending \mathbf{w}_n to the generators of \mathfrak{k}_m . Then, the cones C_1, C_2, \dots, C_M give a decomposition of the cone \mathbf{c}_i on the right-hand side of (8). It is clear that if \mathfrak{k}_m contain lines, then C_m also contains lines, so it is of the form (I). It remains to show that $C_m = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{n-1}, \mathbf{w}_n)$ is of the form (II), given that $\mathfrak{k}_m = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{n-1})$ satisfies properties (i)–(v).

We set $\mathbf{v}_n = \mathbf{w}_n$. Then, $C_m = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{n-1}, \mathbf{v}_n)$ clearly satisfies property (IIa) because of (i), and property (IIb). Property (IIc) holds because

$$\langle \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{n-2}, \mathbf{v}_{n-1} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{n-2}, \mathbf{u}_{n-1} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{n-2}, \mathbf{w}_{n-1} \rangle,$$

where the first equality follows from properties (ii) and (iii), and the second equality follows from equations (12) and (13). For any $1 \leq k \leq n-1, k \neq i$, we have

$$\left(\mathbf{w}_k - \frac{\mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \mathbf{w}_i \right) \cdot \mathbf{w}_n = \mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_n - \frac{\mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n = 0.$$

Thus, \mathbf{w}_n is orthogonal to all $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{n-2}$ by (12). Property (IId) holds because $\mathbf{v}_n = \mathbf{w}_n$ is also orthogonal to all $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{n-2}$ by property (iii). Using property (IId), the associated matrix of C_m can be written in relation to the associated matrix of \mathfrak{k}_m , as

$$M_n(C_m) = \begin{bmatrix} & & & & 0 \\ & & & & \vdots \\ & & M_{n-1}(\mathfrak{k}_m) & & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & -|\mathbf{v}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{v}_n| & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then,

$$\mathbf{x}^T M_n(C_m) \mathbf{x} = [x_1 \cdots x_{n-1}] M_{n-1}(\mathfrak{k}_m) \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_{n-1} \end{bmatrix} - 2|\mathbf{v}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{v}_n| x_{n-1} x_n + x_n^2.$$

By property (v), for the appropriate choice of $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{n-1} \in \{\pm 1\}$, the first term on the right-hand side of the above equation is equal to

$$\|\varepsilon_1 x_1 \mathbf{v}_1 + \cdots + \varepsilon_{n-1} x_{n-1} \mathbf{v}_{n-1}\|^2.$$

By setting

$$\varepsilon_n = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if } \mathbf{v}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{v}_n \text{ and } \varepsilon_{n-1} \text{ have the same sign} \\ 1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

we have that $-|\mathbf{v}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{v}_n| = \varepsilon_{n-1} \varepsilon_n (\mathbf{v}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{v}_n)$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^T M_n(C_m) \mathbf{x} &= \|\varepsilon_1 x_1 \mathbf{v}_1 + \cdots + \varepsilon_{n-1} x_{n-1} \mathbf{v}_{n-1}\|^2 + 2\varepsilon_{n-1} \varepsilon_n (\mathbf{v}_{n-1} \cdot \mathbf{v}_n) x_{n-1} x_n + \varepsilon_n^2 x_n^2 \\ &= \|\left[\varepsilon_1 \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{n-1} \mathbf{v}_{n-1}, \varepsilon_n \mathbf{v}_n\right] \mathbf{x}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that property (IIe) holds as well. We showed that in Case 2, every cone obtained via B–V decomposition can be further decomposed into a finite family of cones, each of which either contains lines or has an associated matrix that is positive definite. This concludes the proof of the theorem. \square

Corollary 2.6. *The decomposition in Theorem 2.5 allows for the computation of the normalized solid angle of a simplicial cone $C \in \mathbb{R}^n$ via the power series (5).*

Proof. Suppose Theorem 2.5 yields the decomposition C_1, \dots, C_N of C such that $[C] = \sum_{i=1}^N s_i [C_i]$, where $s_i = \pm 1$. Then

$$\tilde{\Omega}_n(C) = \sum_{i=1}^N s_i \tilde{\Omega}_n(C_i).$$

For each C_i in the decomposition, if it is of the form (I), then we can apply Corollary 2.4 to reduce it to a lower-dimensional problem; if it is of the form (II), then Theorem 1.5 applies. By induction on the dimension, each $\tilde{\Omega}_n(C_i)$ can be computed. \square

We note that in order to compute the solid angle measure using Theorem 2.5, one must determine the cones that contain lines and take orthogonal projections to reduce dimension, which is not immediately obvious. As such, we present another decomposition method in the following section.

3. SECOND DECOMPOSITION METHOD

The decomposition Theorem 3.3 in this section gives a more direct way to compute the normalized solid angle measure of a simplicial cone. The resulting cones are either lower-dimensional cones or full-dimensional simplicial cones. In the former case, the cones have normalized solid angle measure 0. In the latter, the generators of the cones are explicitly given. This allows us to determine the normalized solid angle measure of the original cone, according to Corollary 3.4.

3.1. Brion–Vergne decomposition with respect to a line. We will make use another variant of Brion–Vergne (B–V) decomposition (see [7], [4]), which is with respect to a one-dimensional subspace. Each cone in the decomposition will contain a generator along the given one-dimensional subspace. This B–V decomposition is reformulated below.

Theorem 3.1 (Brion–Vergne decomposition with respect to a line [4, Proposition 15a], rephrased). *Let $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n$ form a basis of \mathbb{R}^n and let cone $C = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n)$. Given a non-zero vector $\mathbf{r} = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \mathbf{w}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $\delta_i \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ denote the sign of λ_i for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then, the following relation holds, modulo indicator functions of cones containing lines.*

$$[C] \equiv \sum_{i:\delta_i \neq 0} s_i [\mathbf{c}(\varepsilon_{i,1} \mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \varepsilon_{i,i-1} \mathbf{w}_{i-1}, \varepsilon_{i,i+1} \mathbf{w}_{i+1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{i,n} \mathbf{w}_n, \delta_i \mathbf{r})],$$

where $s_i, \varepsilon_{i,k} \in \{\pm 1\}$ for $1 \leq k \leq n, k \neq i$ are given by

$$s_i = \begin{cases} (-1)^{\text{card}(\{1 \leq j < i \mid \delta_j = 1\})}, & \text{if } \delta_i = 1 \\ (-1)^{\text{card}(\{i < j \leq n \mid \delta_j = -1\})}, & \text{if } \delta_i = -1 \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

$$\varepsilon_{i,k} = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if } \delta_i = \delta_k = 1 \text{ and } k < i, \text{ or if } \delta_i = \delta_k = -1 \text{ and } k > i \\ 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (15)$$

Recall that if $C = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n)$ is a simplicial cone in \mathbb{R}^n generated by some basis $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then its dual cone

$$C^* := \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{x} \geq 0 \forall \mathbf{x} \in C\}$$

is also simplicial. The dual cone $C^* = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n^*)$ is generated by some dual basis $\mathbf{w}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that for every $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ and $j \neq i$,

$$\mathbf{w}_i^* \cdot \mathbf{w}_i > 0 \text{ and } \mathbf{w}_i^* \cdot \mathbf{w}_j = 0. \quad (16)$$

Furthermore, the dual of the dual is the cone itself, i.e., $(C^*)^* = C$. The dual of a cone containing lines is a lower dimensional cone (i.e., a cone whose affine dimension is less than n).

By first passing to the dual cone, then applying Brion–Vergne decomposition Theorem 3.1 with respect to a particular line, and finally taking the dual again, we obtain the following decomposition which is modulo lower dimensional cones. Furthermore, each cone in the decomposition shares at least two generators \mathbf{w}_i and \mathbf{w}_n of the original cone.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n$ form a basis of \mathbb{R}^n and let cone $C = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n)$. Let $\delta_i \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ denote the sign of $\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and set $\delta_n = 0$. Suppose that the δ_i 's are not all zero. Then, the following relation holds, modulo indicator functions of lower dimensional cones.*

$$[C] \equiv \sum_{i:\delta_i \neq 0} s_i [\mathbf{c}_i],$$

where each cone \mathbf{c}_i is generated by $\mathbf{u}_{i,k}$ ($1 \leq k \leq n$) defined as

$$\mathbf{u}_{i,k} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{w}_k, & \text{if } \delta_k = 0 \text{ or } k = i \\ \varepsilon_{i,k} \left(\mathbf{w}_k - \frac{\mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \mathbf{w}_i \right), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

and the signs $s_i, \varepsilon_{i,k} \in \{\pm 1\}$ are given by equations (14) and (15), respectively.

Proof. Suppose that the dual cone C^* is generated by $\mathbf{w}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let

$$\mathbf{r} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_i^*} \right) \mathbf{w}_i^*.$$

We note that the signs δ_i agree with those defined in Theorem 3.1, since $\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_i^* > 0$. We apply Theorem 3.1 to the dual cone $C^* = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n^*)$, with respect to the non-zero vector \mathbf{r} , and obtain that

$$[C^*] \equiv \sum_{i:\delta_i \neq 0} s_i \left[\mathbf{c}(\varepsilon_{i,1} \mathbf{w}_1^*, \dots, \varepsilon_{i,i-1} \mathbf{w}_{i-1}^*, \varepsilon_{i,i+1} \mathbf{w}_{i+1}^*, \dots, \varepsilon_{i,n} \mathbf{w}_n^*, \delta_i \mathbf{r}) \right],$$

modulo indicator functions of cones containing lines.

Since linear identities that hold for indicator functions of cones also hold for their duals, we have

$$[C] \equiv \sum_{i:\delta_i \neq 0} s_i \left[\mathbf{c}(\varepsilon_{i,1} \mathbf{w}_1^*, \dots, \varepsilon_{i,i-1} \mathbf{w}_{i-1}^*, \varepsilon_{i,i+1} \mathbf{w}_{i+1}^*, \dots, \varepsilon_{i,n} \mathbf{w}_n^*, \delta_i \mathbf{r})^* \right],$$

modulo indicator functions of lower dimensional cones.

We now show that each dual cone on the right-hand side of the above relation is generated by the $\mathbf{u}_{i,k}$'s that are defined in (17). To this end, we verify that

$$\mathbf{w}_i \cdot (\delta_i \mathbf{r}) > 0 \text{ and } \mathbf{w}_i \cdot (\varepsilon_{i,j} \mathbf{w}_j^*) = 0 \quad \forall j \neq i, \quad (18)$$

and that for any $k \neq i$,

$$\mathbf{u}_{i,k} \cdot (\delta_i \mathbf{r}) = 0, \quad \mathbf{u}_{i,k} \cdot (\varepsilon_{i,k} \mathbf{w}_k^*) > 0 \text{ and } \mathbf{u}_{i,k} \cdot (\varepsilon_{i,j} \mathbf{w}_j^*) = 0 \quad \forall j \neq i \text{ or } k. \quad (19)$$

The conditions in (18) trivially hold because of (16). To show (19) for $k \neq i$, we first consider the case where $\delta_k = 0$, which implies that $\mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_n = 0$ and $\mathbf{u}_{i,k} = \mathbf{w}_k$ by (17). We have

$$\mathbf{w}_k \cdot (\varepsilon_{i,k} \mathbf{w}_k^*) > 0, \quad \mathbf{w}_k \cdot (\varepsilon_{i,j} \mathbf{w}_j^*) = 0 \quad \forall j \neq i \text{ or } k, \text{ and}$$

$$\mathbf{w}_k \cdot (\delta_i \mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{w}_k \cdot \left(\delta_i \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_j \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_j \cdot \mathbf{w}_j^*} \right) \mathbf{w}_j^* \right)$$

which is equal to 0 when $k = n$, or equal to $\delta_i (\mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_n) = 0$ when $k \neq n$. Now consider $k \neq i$ such that $\delta_k \neq 0$, which implies $k \neq n$. Since $\delta_i \neq 0$, we also know that $i \neq n$ and $\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n \neq 0$. Using (17), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}_{i,k} \cdot (\delta_i \mathbf{r}) &= \varepsilon_{i,k} \delta_i \left(\mathbf{w}_k - \frac{\mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \mathbf{w}_i \right) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left(\frac{\mathbf{w}_j \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_j \cdot \mathbf{w}_j^*} \right) \mathbf{w}_j^* \\ &= \varepsilon_{i,k} \delta_i \left[\frac{\mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_k^*} (\mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_k^*) - \frac{\mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_i^*} (\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_i^*) \right] = 0 \\ \mathbf{u}_{i,k} \cdot (\varepsilon_{i,k} \mathbf{w}_k^*) &= \varepsilon_{i,k}^2 \left(\mathbf{w}_k - \frac{\mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \mathbf{w}_i \right) \cdot \mathbf{w}_k^* = \mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_k^* > 0 \\ \mathbf{u}_{i,k} \cdot (\varepsilon_{i,j} \mathbf{w}_j^*) &= \varepsilon_{i,k} \varepsilon_{i,j} \left(\mathbf{w}_k - \frac{\mathbf{w}_k \cdot \mathbf{w}_n}{\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n} \mathbf{w}_i \right) \cdot \mathbf{w}_j^* = 0 \quad \forall j \neq i \text{ or } k. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the conditions in (19) are all satisfied. The theorem holds. \square

3.2. Solid angle decomposition that includes lower dimensional cones. We present another decomposition theorem for a given full-dimensional simplicial cone whose solid angle measure is of interest. The theorem is analogue to Theorem 2.5. The resulting cones from Theorem 3.3 are either lower dimensional and hence have 0 as normalized solid angle measures, or have positive definite associated matrices so that Theorem 1.5 applies.

Theorem 3.3. *Given linearly independent unit vectors $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the cone $\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n)$ can be decomposed into a finite family of cones, each of which is either*

- (I) *a cone of affine dimension less than n , or*
- (II) *a full-dimensional cone generated by some vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$ that satisfy the properties (IIa)–(IIe) in Theorem 2.5 so that its associated matrix is positive definite.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 2.5. We proceed by induction on the dimension. The base case $n = 2$ is trivial (same proof as in Theorem 2.5). Suppose that the theorem holds for dimension $n - 1$. Now consider the cone $\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots, \mathbf{w}_n)$ in dimension n which is not already of the form (I) or (II).

If \mathbf{w}_n is orthogonal to all \mathbf{w}_i for $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$, then the arguments in **Case 1** of the proof of Theorem 2.5 (where we replace “contain lines” by “of affine dimension less than n ”) verbatim apply, so the statement is true for dimension n .

Next, we assume that \mathbf{w}_n is not orthogonal to all $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{n-1}$. Let $\delta_n = 0$ and $\delta_i \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be the sign of $\mathbf{w}_i \cdot \mathbf{w}_n$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then, the δ_i 's are not all zero. We apply Theorem 3.2, and obtain the (signed) decomposition

$$[C] \equiv \sum_{i: \delta_i \neq 0} s_i [\mathbf{c}_i] \text{ modulo indicator functions of lower dimensional cones,} \quad (20)$$

where each cone $\mathbf{c}_i = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{u}_{i,1}, \mathbf{u}_{i,2}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{i,n})$ is generated by the $\mathbf{u}_{i,k}$'s according to equation (17). In particular, $\mathbf{u}_{i,i} = \mathbf{w}_i$ and $\mathbf{u}_{i,n} = \mathbf{w}_n$. Thus, we can rewrite the cone \mathbf{c}_i for any $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$ such that $\delta_i \neq 0$ in the form of

$$\mathbf{c}_i = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{n-2}, \mathbf{u}_{n-1}, \mathbf{w}_n)$$

with $\{\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{n-2}\} = \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{u}_{i,k}}{\|\mathbf{u}_{i,k}\|} \mid 1 \leq k \leq n - 1, k \neq i \right\}$ and $\mathbf{u}_{n-1} = \mathbf{w}_i$.

If the cone \mathbf{c}_i is already of the form (I) or (II), then no further decomposition is needed. Otherwise, by the inductive hypothesis, the $(n - 1)$ -dimensional cone $\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{n-2}, \mathbf{u}_{n-1})$ can be decomposed into cones $\mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_M$, such that each cone $\mathbf{k}_m := \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{n-1})$ from $\{\mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_M\}$ is either (I) a cone of affine dimension less than $n - 1$, or (II) a cone with positive associated matrix satisfying the properties (i)–(v). Let

$$C_m = \mathbf{k}_m + \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{w}_n) = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{n-1}, \mathbf{w}_n)$$

be the n -dimensional cone obtained by appending \mathbf{w}_n to the generators of \mathbf{k}_m . Then, the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 2.5 show that C_m has the desired properties, and that the cones C_1, \dots, C_M give a (signed) decomposition of the cone \mathbf{c}_i in the relation (20). This concludes the inductive step, and therefore, the theorem holds. \square

Corollary 3.4. *Let C be a simplicial cone in \mathbb{R}^n . Theorem 3.3 gives explicitly the cones C_i whose normalized solid angle measures $\tilde{\Omega}_n(C_i)$ can be computed via the*

power series formula (5) and the signs $s_i \in \{\pm 1\}$, such that the normalized solid angle measure of C satisfies

$$\tilde{\Omega}_n(C) = \sum_{i=1}^N s_i \tilde{\Omega}_n(C_i). \quad (21)$$

Furthermore, the number of cones in the decomposition is $N \leq (n-1)!$.

Proof. Suppose that Theorem 3.3 yields a signed decomposition of the cone C :

$$[C] \equiv \sum_{i=1}^N s_i [C_i] \text{ modulo indicator functions of lower dimensional cones.}$$

Since the normalized solid angle measure of a lower dimensional cone with respect to \mathbb{R}^n is zero, equation (21) holds.

Since each full-dimensional cone C_i resulting from the decomposition has a positive-definite matrix, Theorem 1.5 applies, and so $\tilde{\Omega}_n(C_i)$ can be computed via the power series (5).

Finally, we show that $N \leq (n-1)!$ by induction on n . If $n = 2$, then the base case in the proof of Theorem 2.5 shows that the cone C is already of the form (II), so no further decomposition is needed. Suppose that an $(n-1)$ -dimensional cone can be decomposed into at most $(n-2)!$ cones. For an n -dimensional cone C whose associated matrix is not yet positive-definite, Theorem 3.3 first decomposes it into the cones c_i for i such that $\delta_i \neq 0$, according to (20). Since $\delta_n = 0$, there are at most $n-1$ such cones $c_i = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{u}_{i,1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{i,n})$. Subsequently, for each c_i whose associated matrix is not yet positive-definite, we omit its generator $\mathbf{u}_{i,n} = \mathbf{w}_n$ in order to obtain the $(n-1)$ -dimensional cone $\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{u}_{i,1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{i,n-1})$, and we further decompose it into at most $(n-2)!$ cones that satisfy the desired properties by the inductive hypothesis. Therefore, the total number of cones resulting from Theorem 3.3 is at most $(n-1)(n-2)! = (n-1)!$. \square

4. ASYMPTOTIC BOUND ON THE TRUNCATION ERROR

4.1. Tridiagonal associated matrices. As aforementioned, the large number of coordinates needed creates issues with computational feasibility of the power series formula (5) in Theorem 1.5. Ribando [20, p. 487] states that “[...] *accurate series approximations will require theorems allowing us to reduce the number of terms that need computing.*” Note that when $\alpha_{ij} = 0$, the only terms of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\mathbf{a}}$ in the series (5) that are non-zero must have multiexponent \mathbf{a} whose $a_{ij} = 0$. Thus, one possibility for reducing the number of terms needed for computing is by decomposing into cones with as many pairwise orthogonal generators as possible. One particular interesting case is when $(\alpha_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ is a tridiagonal matrix (i.e., $a_{ij} = \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_j = 0$ whenever $i \neq j$ and $i+1 \neq j$), as we will discuss in this section.

Given linearly independent unit vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ denote the matrix whose i -th column vector is \mathbf{v}_i . Suppose that $V^T V$ is the following

symmetric and tridiagonal matrix, where $\beta_i = \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_{i+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$.

$$V^T V = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \beta_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \beta_1 & 1 & \beta_2 & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \beta_{n-2} & 1 & \beta_{n-1} \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & \beta_{n-1} & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (22)$$

Then, the formula (5) simplifies to the following multivariate power series T_β in $(n-1)$ -variables.

$$T_\beta = \frac{|\det V|}{(4\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}}} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}} \left[\frac{(-2)^{\sum b_i}}{\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} b_i!} \Gamma\left(\frac{1+b_1}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{1+b_1+b_2}{2}\right) \dots \right. \\ \left. \Gamma\left(\frac{1+b_{n-2}+b_{n-1}}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{1+b_{n-1}}{2}\right) \right] \beta^{\mathbf{b}}. \quad (23)$$

Theorem 4.1. *Let $C = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n)$ be a cone in \mathbb{R}^n generated by the linearly independent unit vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$. Let V be the matrix whose column vectors are $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$. Suppose that $V^T V$ is a tridiagonal matrix as in (22). Then, the associated matrix $M_n(C)$ has the same eigenvalues as $V^T V$.*

In particular, if $V^T V$ is tridiagonal, then $M_n(C)$ is positive definite, and the power series (23) converges absolutely to the normalized solid angle measure $\tilde{\Omega}_n(C)$ of the cone C .

Proof. When $V^T V$ is the symmetric and tridiagonal matrix given by equation (22), the associated matrix of C is

$$M_n(C) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -|\beta_1| & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ -|\beta_1| & 1 & -|\beta_2| & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & & -|\beta_{n-2}| & 1 & -|\beta_{n-1}| \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & -|\beta_{n-1}| & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (24)$$

which is also symmetric and tridiagonal.

Let $P_j(\lambda)$ be the characteristic polynomial of the j -th leading principal minor of $V^T V$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$. Set $\beta_0 = 0$. We have $P_0(\lambda) = 1$, $P_1(\lambda) = 1 - \lambda$ and

$$P_j(\lambda) = (1 - \lambda)P_{j-1}(\lambda) - \beta_{j-1}^2 P_{j-2}(\lambda) \quad \text{for } 2 \leq j \leq n,$$

where the last recurrence relation is a well-known result for symmetric tridiagonal matrix (e.g., see [18]). Since relation depends only on $\beta_{j-1}^2 = (-|\beta_{j-1}|)^2$, it is clear that the characteristic polynomial of the associated matrix is the same as that of $V^T V$. Therefore, $V^T V$ and $M_n(C)$ have the same eigenvalues.

Since the columns of V are linearly independent, for any $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$, we have $\mathbf{x}^T (V^T V) \mathbf{x} = \|V\mathbf{x}\|^2 > 0$, showing that $V^T V$ is positive definite. Thus, $M_n(C)$ is also positive definite. It follows from Theorem 1.5 that the power series (23) converges absolutely to the normalized solid angle measure $\tilde{\Omega}_n(C)$ of the cone C . \square

Remark 4.2. We can strengthen property (IId) from “ $\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_n = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-2$ ” in Theorem 2.5 and Theorem 3.3 to

$$\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_j = 0 \text{ for all } 1 \leq i, j \leq n \text{ such that } j \neq i \text{ or } i \pm 1. \quad (\text{IId}')$$

The proofs of the two theorems hold verbatim. The new property (IId') ensures that $V^T V$ is a tridiagonal matrix for any cone from the decomposition, so that Theorem 4.1 applies. Therefore, we have the following variant of Corollary 3.4, which takes advantage of the tridiagonal structure. We note that the number of cones resulting from the new decomposition can be larger than that of Corollary 3.4, but it is still upper bounded by $(n-1)!$.

Corollary 4.3. *Let C be a simplicial cone in \mathbb{R}^n . Theorem 3.3 (with property (IId) replaced by (IId')) gives explicitly the cones C_i and the signs $s_i \in \{\pm 1\}$, such that the normalized solid angle measure of C satisfies*

$$\tilde{\Omega}_n(C) = \sum_{i=1}^N s_i \tilde{\Omega}_n(C_i).$$

The cones C_i have positive-definite and tridiagonal associated matrices, so their normalized solid angle measures $\tilde{\Omega}_n(C_i)$ can be computed via the simplified power series formula (23). Furthermore, the number of cones in the decomposition is $N \leq (n-1)!$.

4.2. Eigenvalues and series truncation errors. In their study [11], Gourion and Seeger observed that a particular power series exhibited slow convergence when the associated matrix was close to being singular. Considering this observation alongside the previous Theorem 4.1, it is reasonable to investigate the impact of eigenvalues on the convergence of the power series.

We notice that if the linearly independent unit vectors \mathbf{v}_i 's are all pairwise orthogonal, then the normalized solid angle measure of the cone $C = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n)$ is trivial:

$$\tilde{\Omega}_n(C) = \frac{1}{2^n}.$$

Therefore, in the following, we further assume that $n \geq 2$ and that $\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_j \neq 0$ for some $1 \leq i < j \leq n$. Let V denote the matrix whose i^{th} column is \mathbf{v}_i . Let λ_{\min} be the smallest eigenvalue of $V^T V$.

Lemma 4.4. *The smallest eigenvalue λ_{\min} of $V^T V$ satisfies $0 < \lambda_{\min} < 1$.*

Proof. The matrix $V^T V$ is positive definite, since for any $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$, we have that $\mathbf{x}^T (V^T V) \mathbf{x} = \|V\mathbf{x}\|^2 > 0$, where the last strict inequality follows from the linear independence of the columns of V . Thus, $\lambda_{\min} > 0$.

By Cauchy interlacing theorem, λ_{\min} is less than or equal to the minimum eigenvalue of a principal submatrix of $V^T V$. In particular, by taking the principal submatrix $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_j \\ \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_j & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ where $\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_j \neq 0$, we have $\lambda_{\min} \leq 1 - \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \mathbf{v}_j < 1$. \square

For the rest of this section, we focus on the case where $V^T V$ is the tridiagonal matrix as defined in equation (22). Theorem 4.1 implies that the power series T_{β} in $n-1$ variables as defined in equation (23) converges absolutely to the solid angle

measure. For simplicity, we consider only the series part

$$\frac{(4\pi)^{n/2}}{|\det V|} T_{\beta} = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}} A_{\mathbf{b}} \beta^{\mathbf{b}},$$

where, for any multiexponent $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_{n-1})$ in \mathbb{N}^{n-1} ,

$$A_{\mathbf{b}} := \frac{(-2)^{\sum b_i}}{\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} b_i!} \Gamma\left(\frac{1+b_1}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{1+b_1+b_2}{2}\right) \cdots \Gamma\left(\frac{1+b_{n-2}+b_{n-1}}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{1+b_{n-1}}{2}\right). \quad (25)$$

We regard

$$T(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}} A_{\mathbf{b}} x_1^{b_1} x_2^{b_2} \cdots x_{n-1}^{b_{n-1}}$$

as a hypergeometric series of $(n-1)$ variables $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ in Horn's sense [14].

Remark 4.5. We recall some standard notations and results from [14, 20] regarding the convergence of a hypergeometric series. We rephrase them below for the triadiagonal case to describe the domain of convergence of $T(\mathbf{x})$.

Let \mathbf{e}_i denote the i -th standard basis vector. For $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, we define the ratio of the neighboring coefficients

$$f_i(\mathbf{b}) := \frac{A_{\mathbf{b}+\mathbf{e}_i}}{A_{\mathbf{b}}}, \quad (26)$$

and introduce the limit

$$\Psi_i(\mathbf{b}) := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f_i(t\mathbf{b}).$$

We can view $A_{\mathbf{b}}$, $f_i(\mathbf{b})$ and $\Psi_i(\mathbf{b})$ as functions of $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n-1}$ instead of $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}$. Then, for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, f_i is a rational function of the variables $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n-1}$. Set $b_0 = b_n = 0$. The function Ψ_i satisfies

$$\Psi_i(\mathbf{b}) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{A_{t\mathbf{b}+\mathbf{e}_i}}{A_{t\mathbf{b}}} = -\frac{\sqrt{(b_{i-1}+b_i)(b_i+b_{i+1})}}{b_i}, \quad (27)$$

and it is a rational and homogeneous function of degree zero.

The parameterized curve $\left(\frac{1}{|\Psi_1(\mathbf{b})|}, \dots, \frac{1}{|\Psi_{n-1}(\mathbf{b})|}\right)$ describes an hypersurface that bounds the convergence domain of the hypergeometric series $T(\mathbf{x})$. That is, if a point \mathbf{x} lies on the boundary of the convergence domain, then for some $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n-1}$,

$$|x_i| = \frac{1}{|\Psi_i(\mathbf{b})|} \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n-1. \quad (28)$$

In addition, [20, Theorem 3.2] states that \mathbf{x} lies on the boundary of the convergence domain, if

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -|x_1| & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -|x_1| & 1 & -|x_2| & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & & -|x_{n-2}| & 1 & -|x_{n-1}| \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & -|x_{n-1}| & 1 \end{bmatrix} = 0. \quad (29)$$

It follows from Theorem 4.1 that in the tridiagonal case, the minimum eigenvalue of the associated matrix $M(C)$ given in (24) is also λ_{\min} , where $0 < \lambda_{\min} < 1$ by Lemma 4.4, and that $\mathbf{x} = \boldsymbol{\beta}$ lies in the convergence domain of $T(\mathbf{x})$. The following lemma suggests that $1 - \lambda_{\min}$ plays a role in the convergence of $T(\mathbf{x})$.

Lemma 4.6. *The point $\left(\frac{\beta_1}{1-\lambda_{\min}}, \dots, \frac{\beta_{n-1}}{1-\lambda_{\min}}\right)$ lies on the boundary of the domain of convergence of the series $T(\mathbf{x})$.*

Proof. By Remark 4.5, it suffices to show that equation (29) holds for $\mathbf{x} = \frac{\boldsymbol{\beta}}{1-\lambda_{\min}}$, which is clearly satisfied since λ_{\min} is an eigenvalue of $M(C)$. \square

We show a lemma regarding the monotonicity of the functions f_i in (26), which will become useful later in analysing the series truncation errors.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n-1}$ and let $1 \leq i, j \leq n-1$ such that $i \neq j$. Then, $|f_i(\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{e}_j)| \geq |f_i(\mathbf{b})|$.*

Proof. If $j \neq i \pm 1$, then it follows from equations (26) and (25) that $|f_i(\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{e}_j)| = |f_i(\mathbf{b})|$. If $j = i \pm 1$, then the desired inequality is equivalent to

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{3+b_i+b_j}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{2+b_i+b_j}{2}\right)} \geq \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{2+b_i+b_j}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1+b_i+b_j}{2}\right)},$$

which holds because the Γ function is log-convex on the positive real axis. \square

We are interested in an asymptotic analysis on the truncation error of the series $T(\boldsymbol{\beta})$. Truncating the series in partial degrees (N_1, \dots, N_{n-1}) , the error term is bounded by $E(N_1, \dots, N_{n-1})$ defined below.

Definition 4.8. For partial degrees $(N_1, \dots, N_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}$, define the series $T(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ truncation error as

$$E(N_1, \dots, N_{n-1}) = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in B} |A_{\mathbf{b}} \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\mathbf{b}}|,$$

where $B = \{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1} \mid b_i \geq N_i \text{ for at least one } i\}$.

We investigate the asymptotic decay of $E(N_1, \dots, N_{n-1})$, in relation to $1 - \lambda_{\min}$.

Theorem 4.9. *For any ρ such that $1 - \lambda_{\min} < \rho < 1$, there exist partial degrees N_1, \dots, N_{n-1} such that for any integer $\ell \geq 1$, we have*

$$E(N_1 + \ell, \dots, N_{n-1} + \ell) \leq \rho^\ell E(N_1, \dots, N_{n-1}).$$

To simplify the notation, we will prove Theorem 4.9 specifically for $n = 3$, which we restate as Proposition 4.10 below. Note that the proof for general n follows in the exact same manner.

Proposition 4.10. *For any ρ such that $1 - \lambda_{\min} < \rho < 1$, there exist partial degrees N_1 and N_2 such that for any integer $\ell \geq 1$, we have*

$$E(N_1 + \ell, N_2 + \ell) \leq \rho^\ell E(N_1, N_2).$$

Proof. For the multiexponent (b_1, b_2) , the coefficient $A_{\mathbf{b}}$ in equation (25) writes

$$A_{b_1, b_2} = \frac{(-2)^{b_1+b_2}}{b_1! b_2!} \Gamma\left(\frac{1+b_1}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{1+b_2}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{1+b_1+b_2}{2}\right).$$




FIGURE 1. The (b_1, b_2) -plane corresponding to the proof of Proposition 4.10. The purple sector region shows where the ratio bounds in (34) hold; The red region and the blue region correspond to Claim 4.11 (1) and (2), respectively.

By Lemma 4.6 and (28), there exist $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$\frac{|\beta_1|}{1 - \lambda_{\min}} = \frac{1}{|\Psi_1(x_1, x_2)|} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{|\beta_2|}{1 - \lambda_{\min}} = \frac{1}{|\Psi_2(x_1, x_2)|}$$

Thus,

$$|\beta_1 \Psi_1(x_1, x_2)| = 1 - \lambda_{\min} \quad \text{and} \quad |\beta_2 \Psi_2(x_1, x_2)| = 1 - \lambda_{\min} \quad (30)$$

Since Ψ_1, Ψ_2 are rational and homogeneous functions of degree zero by (27), their values only depend on the ratio between x_1 and x_2 . (We note that for general $n > 3$, each Ψ_i only depends on at most two consecutive pairwise ratios.) We express (x_1, x_2) in polar coordinates (r_0, θ_0) with $r_0 = \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}$ and $\theta_0 = \arctan(x_2/x_1)$. It follows from (27) that $|\Psi_1(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta)| = \sqrt{1 + \tan \theta}$, which is increasing on $\theta \in [0, \pi/2)$, and $|\Psi_2(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta)| = \sqrt{1 + \cot \theta}$, which is decreasing on $\theta \in (0, \pi/2]$. We obtain from (30) that

$$\left| \beta_1 \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} f_1(r \cos \theta_0, r \sin \theta_0) \right| = \left| \beta_2 \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} f_2(r \cos \theta_0, r \sin \theta_0) \right| = 1 - \lambda_{\min}. \quad (31)$$

Let ε be a small positive number. Specifically, we set

$$\varepsilon := \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{1 - \lambda_{\min}}} - 1 > 0. \quad (32)$$

It follows from (31) that there exists $r_0 > 0$ such that

$$\forall r \geq r_0, \quad |\beta_i f_i(r \cos \theta_0, r \sin \theta_0)| \leq (1 - \lambda_{\min})(1 + \varepsilon/2) \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.$$

Since f_1, f_2 are rational functions, there exist θ_1, θ_2 with $\theta_2 < \theta_0 < \theta_1$ such that

$$\forall r \geq r_0 \text{ and } \theta \in [\theta_2, \theta_1], \quad |\beta_i f_i(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta)| \leq (1 - \lambda_{\min})(1 + \varepsilon) \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.$$

Let S be the sector whose polar coordinates r, θ satisfy

$$r > r_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \theta \in [\theta_2, \theta_1].$$

Denote

$$\mu := (1 - \lambda_{\min})(1 + \varepsilon) = \sqrt{(1 - \lambda_{\min})\rho} < 1. \quad (33)$$

We note that for $(b_1, b_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1 f_1(b_1, b_2) &= \left(A_{b_1+1, b_2} \beta_1^{b_1+1} \beta_2^{b_2} \right) / \left(A_{b_1, b_2} \beta_1^{b_1} \beta_2^{b_2} \right); \\ \beta_2 f_2(b_1, b_2) &= \left(A_{b_1, b_2+1} \beta_1^{b_1} \beta_2^{b_2+1} \right) / \left(A_{b_1, b_2} \beta_1^{b_1} \beta_2^{b_2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any $(b_1, b_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ that lies in the sector S ,

$$\frac{\left| A_{b_1+1, b_2} \beta_1^{b_1+1} \beta_2^{b_2} \right|}{\left| A_{b_1, b_2} \beta_1^{b_1} \beta_2^{b_2} \right|} \leq \mu \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\left| A_{b_1, b_2+1} \beta_1^{b_1} \beta_2^{b_2+1} \right|}{\left| A_{b_1, b_2} \beta_1^{b_1} \beta_2^{b_2} \right|} \leq \mu. \quad (34)$$

Let (N_1, N_2) be an integer point in the interior of S such that $(N_1 \pm 1, N_2)$ and $(N_1, N_2 \pm 1)$ are also inside the sector S . Such point (N_1, N_2) exists because the conditions below can always be met by scaling.

$$\begin{aligned} N_2 \cot \theta_1 + 1 &\leq N_1 \leq N_2 \cot \theta_2 - 1 \quad \text{and} \\ N_1 \tan \theta_2 + 1 &\leq N_2 \leq N_1 \tan \theta_1 - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

We illustrate the parameters and the regions in Figure 1.

Using (34)–(35) together with Lemma 4.7, we obtain the following claim.

Claim 4.11. *Let $(b_1, b_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2$.*

- (1) *If $b_1 \geq N_1$ and $b_2 \leq b_1 \tan \theta_1$, then $\frac{\left| A_{b_1+1, b_2} \beta_1^{b_1+1} \beta_2^{b_2} \right|}{\left| A_{b_1, b_2} \beta_1^{b_1} \beta_2^{b_2} \right|} \leq \mu$.*
- (2) *If $b_2 \geq N_2$ and $b_2 \geq b_1 \tan \theta_2$, then $\frac{\left| A_{b_1, b_2+1} \beta_1^{b_1} \beta_2^{b_2+1} \right|}{\left| A_{b_1, b_2} \beta_1^{b_1} \beta_2^{b_2} \right|} \leq \mu$.*

In order to study the truncation errors $E(N_1, N_2)$ and $E(N_1 + \ell, N_2 + \ell)$, we rewrite them as

$$E(N_1, N_2) = S_1 + S_2 + S_3 \quad (36)$$

and

$$E(N_1 + \ell, N_2 + \ell) \leq S'_1 + S'_2 + S'_3 + S'_4, \quad (37)$$

respectively, where

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \sum_{\substack{b_1 \geq N_1 \\ 0 \leq b_2 < N_2}} \left| A_{b_1, b_2} \beta_1^{b_1} \beta_2^{b_2} \right|; & S_2 &= \sum_{\substack{b_2 \geq N_2 \\ 0 \leq b_1 < N_1}} \left| A_{b_1, b_2} \beta_1^{b_1} \beta_2^{b_2} \right|; \\ S_3 &= \sum_{\substack{b_1 \geq N_1 \\ b_2 \geq N_2}} \left| A_{b_1, b_2} \beta_1^{b_1} \beta_2^{b_2} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} S'_1 &= \sum_{\substack{b_1 \geq N_1 + \ell \\ 0 \leq b_2 < N_2}} \left| A_{b_1, b_2} \beta_1^{b_1} \beta_2^{b_2} \right|; & S'_2 &= \sum_{\substack{b_2 \geq N_2 + \ell \\ 0 \leq b_1 < N_1}} \left| A_{b_1, b_2} \beta_1^{b_1} \beta_2^{b_2} \right|; \\ S'_3 &= \sum_{\substack{b_1 \geq N_1 \\ b_2 \geq N_2 + \ell}} \left| A_{b_1, b_2} \beta_1^{b_1} \beta_2^{b_2} \right|; & S'_4 &= \sum_{\substack{b_1 \geq N_1 + \ell \\ b_2 \geq N_2}} \left| A_{b_1, b_2} \beta_1^{b_1} \beta_2^{b_2} \right|. \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 2. Planes of multiexponents $(b_1, b_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ for analysing the series truncation errors $E(N_1, N_2)$ (left) and $E(N_1 + \ell, N_2 + \ell)$ (right). The color of a point (b_1, b_2) indicates which series S_k the term $|A_{b_1, b_2} \beta_1^{b_1} \beta_2^{b_2}|$ belongs to in equations (36) and (37).

We view each term $|A_{b_1, b_2} \beta_1^{b_1} \beta_2^{b_2}|$ in a series S_k as corresponding to the point (b_1, b_2) in the first quadrant. See Figure 2.

We first consider S_1 and S'_1 . Let $(b_1, b_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ such that $b_1 = N_1 + i$ for some $i \geq 0$ and $b_2 \leq N_2$. We compare the term corresponding to (b_1, b_2) with the term corresponding to (N_1, b_2) . Using Claim 4.11–(1), we have that

$$\left| \frac{A_{N_1+i, b_2} \beta_1^{N_1+i} \beta_2^{b_2}}{A_{N_1, b_2} \beta_1^{N_1} \beta_2^{b_2}} \right| = \prod_{j=0}^{i-1} \left| \frac{A_{N_1+j+1, b_2} \beta_1^{N_1+j+1} \beta_2^{b_2}}{A_{N_1+j, b_2} \beta_1^{N_1+j} \beta_2^{b_2}} \right| \leq \mu^i.$$

In particular, the above inequality holds for $i = \ell$ and any $0 \leq b_2 \leq N_2 - 1$. This implies that

$$S'_1 \leq \mu^\ell S_1. \quad (38)$$

Similarly, using Claim 4.11–(2), we obtain that

$$S'_2 \leq \mu^\ell S_2. \quad (39)$$

Next, we compare a term corresponding to (b_1, b_2) in S_3 to the term s corresponding to (N_1, N_2) , which is defined by

$$s := \left| A_{N_1, N_2} \beta_1^{N_1} \beta_2^{N_2} \right|.$$

Claim 4.12. *Let $b_1 = N_1 + i$ and $b_2 = N_2 + j$, where i, j are non-negative integers. Then*

$$\frac{\left| A_{b_1, b_2} \beta_1^{b_1} \beta_2^{b_2} \right|}{s} \leq \mu^{i+j}.$$

Proof. Depending on whether the point (b_1, b_2) lies below or above the ray from the origin through the point (N_1, N_2) , we reduce either b_1 or b_2 by 1, as follows. By the geometric conditions in (35), if (b_1, b_2) is below the ray, then $b_1 - 1$ lies in the sector S , and if (b_1, b_2) is above the ray, then $b_2 - 1$ lies in the sector S . In either case, we can apply Claim 4.11 to obtain that the ratio between the terms corresponding to (b_1, b_2) and $(b'_1, b'_2) = (b_1, b_2 - 1)$ or $(b_1 - 1, b_2)$ is at most μ . Repeat this process until $(b'_1, b'_2) = (N_1, N_2)$. By multiplying the sequences of ratios obtained in the process, we have the desired inequality. \square

In particular, Claim 4.12 provides upper bounds of S'_3 and S'_4 in terms of s .

$$\begin{aligned} S'_3 &\leq s \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=\ell}^{\infty} \mu^{i+j} = \frac{\mu^\ell s}{(1-\mu)^2}, \\ S'_4 &\leq s \sum_{i=\ell}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mu^{i+j} = \frac{\mu^\ell s}{(1-\mu)^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Claim 4.13. *For very large N_1, N_2 , we may assume that s/S_1 is sufficiently small.*

Proof. Let $(N_1^*, N_2^*) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ be a point in the sector S such that $N_1^* \geq N_1, N_2^* = N_2 + k$ and $k := \lfloor N_2^* - N_1^* \tan \theta_2 \rfloor$ is a large integer. Define s^* to be the term corresponding to the integer point (N_1^*, N_2^*) , and define the series S_1^* accordingly. Notice that we can lower bound S_1^* by the single term t inside it, where $t := \left| A_{N_1^*, N_2^*} \beta_1^{N_1^*} \beta_2^{N_2^*} \right|$ corresponding to the point (N_1^*, N_2^*) . Since this point lies in S and $N_2 = N_2^* - k$, Claim 4.11–(2) implies that $s^*/t \leq \mu^k$. Therefore, $s^*/S_1^* \leq \mu^k$, which is sufficiently small for k large enough. \square

In particular, we take large N_1, N_2 such that $s/S_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon(1-\mu)^2$, or equivalently,

$$\frac{2s}{(1-\mu)^2} \leq \varepsilon S_1. \tag{41}$$

By combining (36)–(41), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} E(N_1 + \ell, N_2 + \ell) &\leq S'_1 + S'_2 + S'_3 + S'_4 \leq \mu^\ell \left(S_1 + S_2 + \frac{2s}{(1-\mu)^2} \right) \\ &\leq \mu^\ell (S_1 + S_2 + \varepsilon S_1) \leq \mu^\ell (1 + \varepsilon)(S_1 + S_2 + S_3) \\ &\leq \mu^\ell (1 + \varepsilon)^\ell (S_1 + S_2 + S_3) \\ &= (\mu(1 + \varepsilon))^\ell E(N_1, N_2). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, according to the definitions (32) and (33),

$$\mu(1 + \varepsilon) = \sqrt{(1 - \lambda_{\min})\rho} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{1 - \lambda_{\min}}} = \rho.$$

Therefore, the desired inequality $E(N_1 + \ell, N_2 + \ell) \leq \rho^\ell E(N_1, N_2)$ holds. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Adam and R. Speciel, *Evaluating ensemble robustness against adversarial attacks*, 2020, [arXiv:2005.05750](https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.05750).
- [2] R. Aljundi, M. Lin, B. Goujaud, and Y. Bengio, *Gradient based sample selection for online continual learning*, 2019, [arXiv:1903.08671](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.08671).
- [3] K. Aomoto, *Analytic structure of Schläfli function*, Nagoya Math. J. **68** (1977), 1–16, available from <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.nmj/1118796538>, MR 569685.
- [4] V. Baldoni, N. Berline, M. Köppe, and M. Vergne, *Intermediate sums on polyhedra: computation and real Ehrhart theory*, Mathematika **59** (2013), no. 1, 1–22, <https://doi.org/10.1112/S0025579312000101>, MR 3028168.
- [5] M. Beck and S. Robins, *Solid angles*, Computing the Continuous Discretely: Integer-Point Enumeration in Polyhedra, Springer New York, New York, NY, 2007, pp. 179–190, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-46112-0_11, ISBN 978-0-387-46112-0.
- [6] M. Beck, S. Robins, and S. V. Sam, *Positivity theorems for solid-angle polynomials*, Beiträge Algebra Geom. **51** (2010), no. 2, 493–507, MR 2663951.
- [7] M. Brion and M. Vergne, *Residue formulae, vector partition functions and lattice points in rational polytopes*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **10** (1997), no. 4, 797–833, <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0894-0347-97-00242-7>, MR 1446364.
- [8] F. Eriksson, *On the measure of solid angles*, Math. Mag. **63** (1990), no. 3, 184–187, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2691141>, MR 1058149.
- [9] L. Fukshansky and S. Robins, *Bounds for solid angles of lattices of rank three*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **118** (2011), no. 2, 690–701, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcta.2010.06.001>, MR 2739513.
- [10] L. Fukshansky and S. Wang, *Positive semigroups in lattices and totally real number fields*, 2021, [arXiv:2105.10458](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.10458).
- [11] D. Gourion and A. Seeger, *Deterministic and stochastic methods for computing volumetric moduli of convex cones*, Comput. Appl. Math. **29** (2010), no. 2, 215–246, <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1807-03022010000200007>, MR 2672258.
- [12] M. Hajja and P. Walker, *The measure of solid angles in n -dimensional Euclidean space*, Internat. J. Math. Ed. Sci. Tech. **33** (2002), no. 5, 725–729, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207390210144025>, MR 1939582.
- [13] R. Heylen and P. Scheunders, *Multidimensional pixel purity index for convex hull estimation and endmember extraction*, IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing **51** (2013), no. 7, 4059–4069, <https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2012.2226734>.
- [14] J. Horn, *Ueber die Convergenz der hypergeometrischen Reihen zweier und dreier Veränderlichen*, Math. Ann. **34** (1889), no. 4, 544–600, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01443681>, MR 1510591.
- [15] Z. Kabluchko and D. Zaporozhets, *Absorption probabilities for Gaussian polytopes and regular spherical simplices*, Adv. in Appl. Probab. **52** (2020), no. 2, 588–616, <https://doi.org/10.1017/apr.2020.7>, MR 4123647.
- [16] M. S. Mariani, Z.-M. Ren, J. Bascompte, and C. J. Tessone, *Nestedness in complex networks: observation, emergence, and implications*, Phys. Rep. **813** (2019), 1–90, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2019.04.001>, MR 3961158.

- [17] O. Mazonka, *Solid angle of conical surfaces, polyhedral cones, and intersecting spherical caps*, 2012, [arXiv:1205.1396](https://arxiv.org/abs/1205.1396).
- [18] B. N. Parlett, *The symmetric eigenvalue problem*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1998.
- [19] J. M. Ribando, *Probabilistic methods for efficient triangulations of the n -cube*, Ph.D. thesis, University of California, San Diego, 2000.
- [20] ———, *Measuring solid angles beyond dimension three*, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **36** (2006), no. 3, 479–487, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00454-006-1253-4>, MR 2255515.
- [21] A. Seeger and M. Tori, *Centers and partial volumes of convex cones I. Basic theory*, *Beitr. Algebra Geom.* **56** (2015), no. 1, 227–248, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13366-014-0220-8>, MR 3305445.
- [22] The Sage Developers, *Sagemath, the Sage Mathematics Software System (Version 9.6)*, 2022, <https://www.sagemath.org>.

ALLISON FITISONE: DEPT. OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
Email address: allison.fitisone@uky.edu

YUAN ZHOU: DEPT. OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
Email address: yuan.zhou@uky.edu