

# Sharp stability of the Brunn-Minkowski inequality via optimal mass transportation

Alessio Figalli <sup>\*</sup>, Peter van Hintum <sup>†</sup>, Marius Tiba <sup>‡</sup>

July 16, 2024

## Abstract

The Brunn-Minkowski inequality, applicable to bounded measurable sets  $A$  and  $B$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , states that  $|A + B|^{1/d} \geq |A|^{1/d} + |B|^{1/d}$ . Equality is achieved if and only if  $A$  and  $B$  are convex and homothetic sets in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . The concept of stability in this context concerns how, when approaching equality, sets  $A$  and  $B$  are close to homothetic convex sets. In a recent breakthrough [FvHT23], the authors of this paper proved the following folklore conjectures on the sharp stability for the Brunn-Minkowski inequality:

- (1) A linear stability result concerning the distance from  $A$  and  $B$  to their respective convex hulls.
- (2) A quadratic stability result concerning the distance from  $A$  and  $B$  to their common convex hull.

As announced in [FvHT23], in the present paper, we leverage (1) in conjunction with a novel optimal transportation approach to offer an alternative proof for (2).

## 1 Introduction

Given measurable sets  $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with positive measure, the Brunn-Minkowski inequality says

$$|X + Y|^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq |X|^{\frac{1}{n}} + |Y|^{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

More naturally, for equal sized measurable sets  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and a parameter  $t \in (0, 1)$  this is equivalent to

$$|tA + (1 - t)B| \geq |A|,$$

with equality for equal convex sets  $A$  and  $B$  (less a measure zero set). Here,  $A + B = \{a + b \mid a \in A, \text{ and } b \in B\}$  is the *Minkowski sum*,  $tA := \{ta : a \in A\}$ , and  $|\cdot|$  refers to the outer Lebesgue measure. The Brunn-Minkowski inequality is a fundamental tool in analysis and geometry going back to the 19th century, the importance of which is expertly documented in [Gar02].

The Brunn-Minkowski inequality is part of a vast body of geometric inequalities, such as the isoperimetric inequality, the Sobolev inequality, the Prékopa-Leindler inequality, and the Borell-Brascamb-Lieb inequality (e.g. Figure 1 in [Gar02]). The famous isoperimetric inequality states that, for a given volume, the body minimizing its perimeter is the ball. The isoperimetric inequality follows from Brunn-Minkowski by taking  $A$  a ball and letting  $t$  tend to zero. The Prékopa-Leindler inequality asserts that for  $t \in (0, 1)$  and functions  $f, g, h: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  with the property that  $h(tx + (1 - t)y) \geq f^t(x)g^{1-t}(y)$  for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\int f = \int g$ , we have  $\int h \geq \int f$  with equality if and only if  $f(x) = ag(x - x_0)$  is a log-concave function for some  $a \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Prékopa-Leindler implies Brunn-Minkowski by taking  $f$  and  $g$  to be the indicator functions of  $A$  and  $B$ . The Prékopa-Leindler inequality in turn is subsumed by the Borell-Brascamb-Lieb inequality. Studying these inequalities and their stabilities has sparked a fruitful field of research in recent years.

The stability of Brunn-Minkowski asks for the structure of sets  $A$  and  $B$  which are close to attaining equality in Brunn-Minkowski. This study goes back to the work of for instance Diskant [Dis73] and Ruzsa [Ruz97]. Two folklore conjectures concern the stability of Brunn-Minkowski: if we are within a factor of  $1 + \delta$  from equality, then the distance from the sets  $A$  and  $B$  to a common convex set is  $O_{d,t}(\sqrt{\delta})$ , and furthermore, the distance from to their individual convex hulls is  $O_{d,t}(\delta)$ . These conjectures have received a lot of attention becoming central problems in analysis and convex geometry (see e.g. [FMP09, FMP10, Chr12b, Chr12a, EK14, FJ15, Fig15, FJ17, BJ17, CM17, FJ21, vHST22, vHST23a, vHK23a, vHK23b, vHST23b, FvHT23]). Recently, the present authors resolved these conjectures in [FvHT23] (stated as Theorem 1.5 and Theorem 1.3 below).

<sup>\*</sup>Department of Mathematics, ETH Zurich, Switzerland. email: alessio.figalli@math.ethz.ch

<sup>†</sup>New College, University of Oxford, UK. email: peter.vanhintum@new.ox.ac.uk (corresponding author)

<sup>‡</sup>Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, UK. email: marius.tiba@maths.ox.ac.uk

The stability of the isoperimetric inequality was first explored in 1921 by Bonnesen [Bon21] who settled the planar case. The optimal result in higher dimensions was established only in 2008 by Fusco, Maggi, and Pratelli [FMP08]. In a cornerstone paper, Figalli, Maggi, and Pratelli [FMP09, FMP10] used mass transportation techniques to generalize this to a sharp stability of the anisotropic isoperimetric inequality while simultaneously proving the following sharp stability for the Brunn–Minkowski inequality for convex sets.

**Theorem 1.1** (Figalli, Maggi, and Pratelli [FMP09, FMP10]). *For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t \in (0, 1/2]$ , there are computable constants  $c_n^{1.1} > 0$  such that the following holds. Assume that  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , are convex sets with equal volume so that*

$$|tA + (1-t)B| \leq (1+\delta)|A|.$$

*Then, up to translation<sup>1</sup>,*

$$|A \Delta B| \leq c_n^{1.1} \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{t}} |A|.$$

The aim of this paper is to develop a different mass transportation approach on the stability of the Brunn–Minkowski problem in order to strengthen the above result to non-convex sets.

**Theorem 1.2.** *For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t \in (0, 1/2]$ , there are computable constants  $c_n^{1.2}, d_{n,t}^{1.2}, g_{n,t}^{1.2} > 0$  such that the following holds. Assume  $\delta \in [0, d_{n,t}^{1.2})$ ,  $\gamma \in [0, g_{n,t}^{1.2})$ , and assume that  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , are measurable sets with equal volume so that*

$$|tA + (1-t)B| \leq (1+\delta)|A| \quad \text{and} \quad |\text{co}(A) \setminus A| + |\text{co}(B) \setminus B| \leq \gamma|A|.$$

*Then, up to translation,*

$$|A \Delta B| \leq c_n^{1.2} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|.$$

In recent work of the current authors [FvHT23], the following linear stability result to the convex hull of  $A$  and  $B$  was established, solving one of the aforementioned conjectures.

**Theorem 1.3** ([FvHT23]). *For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t \in (0, 1/2]$ , there are constants  $c_{n,t}^{1.3}, d_{n,t}^{1.3} > 0$  such that the following holds. Assume  $\delta \in [0, d_{n,t}^{1.3})$ , and assume  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  are measurable sets of equal volume so that  $|tA + (1-t)B| \leq (1+\delta)|A|$ , then*

$$|\text{co}(A) \setminus A| + |\text{co}(B) \setminus B| \leq c_{n,t}^{1.3} \delta |A|.$$

A notable application of Theorem 1.2 is that, in combination with Theorem 1.3, it gives the following result.

**Corollary 1.4.** *For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t \in (0, 1/2]$ , there are computable constants  $c_{n,t}^{1.4}, d_{n,t}^{1.4} > 0$  such that the following holds. Assume  $\delta \in [0, d_{n,t}^{1.4})$  and assume that  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , are measurable sets with equal volume so that  $|tA + (1-t)B| \leq (1+\delta)|A|$ . Then, up to translation,*

$$|A \Delta B| \leq c_{n,t}^{1.4} \sqrt{\delta} |A|.$$

This corollary is a weaker instance of the following quadratic stability recently proved by the current authors.

**Theorem 1.5** ([FvHT23]). *For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq 2$  and  $t \in (0, 1/2]$ , there are computable constants  $c_n^{1.5}, d_{n,t}^{1.5} > 0$  such that the following holds. Assume  $\delta \in [0, d_{n,t}^{1.5})$  and let  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be measurable sets with equal volume satisfying*

$$|tA + (1-t)B| = (1+\delta)|A|.$$

*Then, up to translation<sup>2</sup>, there is a convex set  $K \supset A \cup B$  such that*

$$|K \setminus A| = |K \setminus B| \leq c_n^{1.5} \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{t}} |A|.$$

Note that  $\frac{|\text{co}(A \cup B) \setminus A|}{|A \Delta B|} \geq 1/2$ , but a priori we don't have any lower bound in terms of  $n$ . However, as a consequence of [FvHT23, Theorem 1.7] these two measures are actually equivalent for near-convex sets  $A, B$ , i.e., with  $|\text{co}(A) \setminus A| + |\text{co}(B) \setminus B| = O_{n,t}(\delta)|A|$ . Hence, the main difference between Theorem 1.5 and Corollary 1.4 is in the  $t$  dependence of the stability constant. Actually, even combining Theorem 1.2 with the optimal version of Theorem 1.3 (see Conjecture 14.1 in [FvHT23]) would still not obtain the optimal  $t$  dependence provided by Theorem 1.5.

<sup>1</sup>That is, there exists  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  so that  $|(A+x) \Delta B| \leq c_n^{1.1} \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{t}} |A|$ .

<sup>2</sup>That is, there exist  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$  so that  $x+A, y+B \subset K$  and  $|K \setminus (x+A)| + |K \setminus (y+B)| \leq t^{-c^{1.5} n^8} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} |A|$ .

The first contribution to the study of sumset stability was made by Freiman [Fre59] in dimension  $n = 1$ . Freiman's celebrated  $3k - 4$  Theorem [Fre59, LS95, Sta96] from additive combinatorics, implies a strong version of Theorem 1.3 in dimension 1. If  $t \in (0, 1/2]$  and  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}$  are measurable sets with equal volume such that  $|tA + (1-t)B| \leq (1+\delta)|A|$  with  $\delta < t$ , then  $|\text{co}(A) \setminus A| \leq t^{-1}\delta|A|$  and  $|\text{co}(B) \setminus B| \leq (1-t)^{-1}\delta|B|$ , which is optimal.

Stability in higher dimensions is considerably more difficult; in [Chr12b, Chr12a] Christ showed a qualitative result: if  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $t, \varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$  and  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  are measurable sets with equal volume such that  $|tA + (1-t)B| \leq (1+\delta)|A|$  with  $\delta$  sufficiently small in terms of  $t, n, \varepsilon$ , then there exists a convex set  $K$  such that, up to translation,  $K \supset A, B$  and  $|K \setminus A| = |K \setminus B| \leq \varepsilon|A|$ . In a cornerstone result, Figalli and Jerison [FJ17] obtained the first quantitative bounds:  $|K \setminus A| = |K \setminus B| \leq \delta^{(t/|\log(t)|)^{\exp(O(n))}}|A|$ . A similar result for the Prékopa-Leindler inequality was recently established by Böröcky, Figalli, and Ramos [BFRar].

Until recently, the only instance of Theorem 1.5 for arbitrary sets was known in two dimensions due to van Hintum, Spink, and Tiba [vHST23b]. In an independent direction, van Hintum and Keevash [vHK23b] determined the optimal value  $d_{n,t} = t^n$  for all values  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t \in (0, 1/2]$  with the same bound on the distance to a common convex set as in the result of Figalli and Jerison.

Even partial results towards Theorem 1.5 for restricted classes of sets  $A$  and  $B$  have received much attention. Recall that Figalli, Maggi, and Pratelli [FMP09, FMP10] dealt with the case when  $A$  and  $B$  are convex. Figalli, Maggi, and Mooney [FMM18] settled the case when  $A$  is a ball and  $B$  is arbitrary. Barchiesi and Julin [BJ17] extended the previous results to  $A$  convex and  $B$  arbitrary. Despite all these results supporting Theorem 1.5, a conclusive proof remained wide open and outside the scope of the available techniques for a long time.

The particular case of equal sets  $A = B$  in Theorem 1.3 has been thoroughly investigated. Indeed, after establishing in [FJ15] some quantitative bounds for Theorem 1.3 for  $A = B$  in all dimensions, Figalli and Jerison [FJ21] proved Theorem 1.3 for  $A = B$  in dimensions  $n = 1, 2, 3$ . Van Hintum, Spink, and Tiba [vHST22] proved Theorem 1.3 for  $A = B$  in all dimensions. Moreover, they determined the optimal dependency on  $t$ . Furthermore, van Hintum, Spink, and Tiba [vHST23a, Theorem 1.1] established the optimal dependency on  $d$  in dimensions  $d \leq 4$  when  $A = B$  is a hypograph of a function over a convex domain. Another closely related result by van Hintum and Keevash [vHK23a] is that if  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $|\frac{A+A}{2}| \leq (1+\delta)|A|$  with  $\delta < 1$ , then there exists an  $A' \subset A$  with  $|A'| \geq (1-\delta)|A|$  and  $|\text{co}(A')| = O_{n,1-\delta}(|A'|)$ .

For distinct sets  $A$  and  $B$ , showing Theorem 1.3 has proved much more difficult. Van Hintum, Spink, and Tiba in [vHST23a, Theorem 1.5], proved Theorem 1.3, when  $A$  and  $B$  are hypograph of functions over the same convex domain. The only instance of Theorem 1.3 for arbitrary sets was established by van Hintum, Spink and Tiba [vHST23b, Section 12] in two dimensions. In spite of these determined efforts, for arbitrary sets in higher dimensions a proof of Theorem 1.3 was only recently found by the present authors in [FvHT23].

**Acknowledgements.** *AF acknowledges the support of the ERC Grant No.721675 "Regularity and Stability in Partial Differential Equations (RSPDE)" and of the Lagrange Mathematics and Computation Research Center.*

## 1.1 Notation and conventions.

Before starting our proofs, it is convenient to briefly explain the notation that we will use throughout the paper. With  $c > 0$ , we shall denote a universal constant independent of the dimension, while  $c_n > 0$  (and analogous notations) denote dimensional constants. Saying that the quantity  $a$  is controlled by  $O_n(b)$  means that  $|a| \leq c_n b$ , while notation  $a = \Omega_n(b)$  means that  $a \geq c_n |b|$ . When a constant also depends on  $t$ , we write  $c_{n,t}$ . To distinguish the constants that appear in the different statements,  $c^{\ell.m}$  means that the constant  $c$  is the one of Theorem  $\ell.m$ .

Throughout the paper, we fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and either  $t \in (0, 1/2]$ . We use  $|\cdot|$  to denote the outer Lebesgue measure in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

Given  $s \in \mathbb{R}$  and sets  $X$  and  $Y$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , we define  $sX = \{sx : x \in X\}$  and  $X + Y = \{x + y : x \in X, y \in Y\}$ . A set  $X$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is convex if for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  we have  $tX + (1-t)X \subset X$ . The convex hull  $\text{co}(X)$  of a set  $X$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is the intersection of all convex sets containing  $X$ . In particular,  $\text{co}(X)$  is a convex set. Two sets  $X$  and  $Y$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  are homothetic if there exist a point  $z$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and a scalar  $s > 0$  such that  $X = sY + z$ .

Given a bounded convex set  $X$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , we define  $\overline{X}$  as the closure of  $X$ , which is also a convex set. The vertices of  $X$ , denoted by  $V(X)$ , represent the set  $V(X) = \{x \in \overline{X} : \text{co}(\overline{X} \setminus \{x\}) \neq \text{co}(\overline{X})\}$ . It follows that  $\overline{X} = \text{co}(V(X))$ .

Measureable sets  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  are said to form an essential partition of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  if  $|\cap_i X_i^c| = 0$  and for  $j_1 \neq j_2$ , we have  $|X_{j_1} \cap X_{j_2}| = 0$ . By a basis  $e_1, \dots, e_n$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , we mean an orthogonal set of vectors with unit length. In light of Proposition 2.8, we can assume that the sets  $A$  and  $B$  (as well as all parts into which we subdivide  $A$  and  $B$ ) are compact.

## 1.2 Overview of the proof

We now turn to Theorem 1.2. The starting point is the optimal transport approach used in [FMP09] to prove a sharp stability result for the Brunn-Minkowski inequality on convex sets. In our case, the sets  $A$  and  $B$  are only  $L^1$ -close to being convex, and we want to obtain a final estimate where the gap in volume (i.e.,  $\gamma$ ) appears in the stability estimate with the same power as  $\delta$ . Because the optimal transport between arbitrary sets can behave very badly in terms of regularity, we consider the optimal transport map sending  $\text{co}(A)$  to  $\text{co}(B)$ . This makes the first part of our argument (the first three steps in the outline below) very similar to the one in [FMP09], but then we immediately face a series of challenges. The key issue is that the optimal transport proof of Brunn-Minkowski provides a control on the transport map only inside the set  $A$  (although this map is defined in the whole convex hull), while for us it is crucial to obtain some bounds also in the remaining region  $\text{co}(A) \setminus A$ . By a series of delicate arguments exploiting the monotonicity of the optimal map (we recall that the optimal map is the gradient of a convex function) and some interior regularity estimates, we obtain a radial control on the transport map along all rays emanating from the origin and contained inside  $\text{co}(A)$ . This estimate by itself would be too weak. Still, the key observation is that we can repeat our argument by replacing the origin with an arbitrary point  $o'$  inside  $(1 - \varepsilon)C_A$ , and replacing our sets  $A$  and  $B$  with new sets  $Q(A)$  and  $Q(B)$ , where  $Q$  varies among all affine transformations with  $\|Q\|_{op}, \|Q^{-1}\|_{op} \leq \theta$  for some fixed large constant  $\theta$ . Averaging our radial bound over  $o'$  and  $Q$  allows us to find a sharp control on  $|\text{co}(A) \Delta \text{co}(B)|$ , from which the final result follows. We summarize the steps of the proof in the next subsection.

## 1.3 Outline of the proof of Theorem 1.2

The proof of Theorem 1.2 follows the following steps.

0. Reduce to the case that  $A$  and  $B$  are sandwiched between two balls of comparable sizes, and look like cones centered at the same vertex
1. Let  $C_A \supset A$  and  $C_B \supset B$  be convex sets of size  $|C_A| = |C_B| = (1 + \gamma)|A|$ , and let  $T : C_A \rightarrow C_B$  be the optimal transport map between them.
2. Note that if we let  $E := T^{-1}(B) \cap A$ , then

$$(\delta + 2\gamma)|A| \geq |tA + (1 - t)B| - |E| \geq \int_E \left( \det D(tId + (1 - t)T) - 1 \right) dx,$$

where  $D$  is the Jacobian.

3. Analysing the eigenvalues of  $D(T)$  (cf Lemma 3.11 akin to the methods in [FMP09]), we find that this implies

$$\int_E \|D(T - Id)\|_{op} dx \leq O_n \left( \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \right) |A|.$$

4. By an elliptic regularity argument (cf Lemma 3.13) this implies  $\|D(T - Id)(x)\|_{op} \leq O_n \left( \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \right)$  for points  $x \in (1 - \varepsilon)C_A$  and in particular in some small ball around the origin.
5. Next, we note that  $C_A \setminus E$  is small, so when integrating a bounded function, we find

$$\int_{C_A} \frac{x^T}{\|x\|_2} (D(Id - T)(x)) \frac{x}{\|x\|_2} dx \leq O_n(\gamma)|A| + \int_E \|D(Id - T)(x)\|_{op} dx \leq O_n \left( \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \right) |A|.$$

(Here, we crucially use that  $DT$  is nonnegative definite; in particular, we only control the integral on the left-hand side from above.)

6. Combining the two previous steps, we find

$$\int_{C_A} \frac{\frac{x^T}{\|x\|_2} (D(Id - T)(x)) \frac{x}{\|x\|_2}}{\|x\|_2^{n-1}} dx \leq O_n \left( \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \right) |A|.$$

7. This allows us to integrate radially, giving

$$\int_{\partial C_A} \left\langle (x - T(x)) - (o - T(o)), \frac{x}{\|x\|_2} \right\rangle dx \leq O_n \left( \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \right) |A|.$$

8. Up to this point, we only used that  $B(o, \Omega(n)) \in (1 - \varepsilon)C_A$ . So, in fact, for all  $o' \in (1 - 2\varepsilon)C_A$  we get

$$\int_{\partial C_A} \left\langle (x - T(x)) - (o' - T(o')), \frac{x - o'}{\|x - o'\|_2} \right\rangle dx \leq O_n \left( \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \right) |A|.$$

9. Using the fact that  $A$  and  $B$  look like cones at the same vertex, we find that  $|o' - T(o')| = O_n \left( \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \right)$  (see Lemma 3.6).

10. Hence, we find

$$\int_{\partial C_A} \left\langle x - T(x), \frac{x - o'}{\|x - o'\|_2} \right\rangle dx \leq O_n \left( \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \right) |A|.$$

This is the conclusion of Proposition 3.1.

11. We find the same result (cf Corollary 3.2) if we first apply an affine transformation  $Q$

$$\int_{x \in \partial C_A} \left\langle Q(x) - T_Q(Q(x)), \frac{Q(x) - Q(o')}{\|Q(x) - Q(o')\|_2} \right\rangle dx \leq O_n \left( \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \right) |A|,$$

12. Proposition 3.4 shows that, considering an appropriately distributed random affine transformation and random point  $o' \in (1 - \varepsilon)C_A$ , then

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q, o'} \left[ \left\langle Q(x) - T_Q(Q(x)), \frac{Q(x) - Q(o')}{\|Q(x) - Q(o')\|_2} \right\rangle \right] \geq \Omega_n(d(x, C_B)).$$

13. Proposition 3.5 shows that

$$|C_A \triangle C_B| \leq O_n \left( \int_{\partial C_A} d(x, C_B) dx \right).$$

14. Combining the last three steps gives the desired estimate

$$|A \triangle B| \leq |C_A \triangle C_B| + 2\gamma|A| \leq O_n \left( \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \right) |A|.$$

## 2 Initial reduction

We start with a simple reduction (Proposition 2.8) to allow us to assume that  $A$  and  $B$  are sandwiched between two balls of comparable sizes, and look like cones centered at the same vertex (cf Definition 2.7). Much of this section follows the lines of section 2 in [FvHT23].

### 2.1 Setup

**Definition 2.1.** A convex set  $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is called a cone if there exists a hyperplane  $H$  not containing the origin and a bounded convex set  $P \subset H$  such that

$$C = \bigsqcup_{t \geq 0} tP.$$

**Definition 2.2.** We write  $S^{v_0, \dots, v_n}$  for the simplex with vertices  $v_0, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Assuming that  $S^{v_0, \dots, v_n}$  contains the origin in the interior, construct the family of cones  $\mathfrak{C}^{v_0, \dots, v_n} := \{C_i : 0 \leq i \leq n\}$ , where

$$C_i = \bigsqcup_{t \geq 0} t \operatorname{co}(v_0, \dots, v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n).$$

Note that the cones in  $\mathfrak{C}^{v_0, \dots, v_n}$  form an essential partition of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

**Definition 2.3.** Fix vectors  $e_0, \dots, e_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $S^{e_0, \dots, e_n}$  is a regular unit volume simplex centered at the origin. Denote  $S = S^{e_0, \dots, e_n}$  and  $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}^{e_0, \dots, e_n}$ .

**Definition 2.4.** A pair of sets  $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is  $\lambda$ -bounded if there exists an  $r > 0$  so that

$$rS \subset X, Y \subset \lambda rS.$$

**Definition 2.5.** Given a cone  $F \subset C' \in \mathfrak{C}$ , a pair of sets  $X, Y \subset F$  is  $(\lambda, F)$ -bounded if there exists an  $r > 0$  so that

$$r(F \cap S) \subset X, Y \subset \lambda r(F \cap S).$$

**Definition 2.6.** A pair of sets  $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is called a  $\eta$ -sandwich if there exists a convex set  $P$  such that  $o \in P \subset X, Y \subset (1 + \eta)P$ .

Note that given a cone  $F$  and a  $\lambda$ -bounded  $\eta$ -sandwich  $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , the pair  $X \cap F, Y \cap F$  is also a  $(\lambda, F)$ -bounded  $\eta$ -sandwich.

**Definition 2.7.** Say sets  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  are  $(\gamma, \ell, \lambda, \mu)$  conelike if there exist convex sets  $C_A \supset A, C_B \supset B$  with  $|C_A| = |C_B| = (1 + \gamma)|A| = (1 + \gamma)|B|$ , a convex set  $K$ , and a set  $S''$  obtained by intersecting a cone with a half space with the following properties

1.  $B(o, 1/\ell) \subset C_A, C_B \subset B(o, \ell)$ ,
2.  $S'' \subset A - z, C_A - z, B - z, C_B - z \subset \lambda S''$ , for some  $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and
3.  $K \subset A + x, C_A + x, B + y, C_B + y \subset (1 + \mu)K$ , for some  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

## 2.2 Proposition

**Proposition 2.8.** Assume that for sets  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  satisfying the conditions of Theorem 1.2 that are  $(\gamma, \ell, \lambda, \mu)$  conelike (for  $\mu$  sufficiently small in terms of  $n, t, \ell$ , and  $\lambda$ ), we have  $|A \triangle B| \leq c_{n, \ell, \lambda} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|$ . Then Theorem 1.2 is true for all set  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ .

## 2.3 Lemmas

We recall the following result by Michael Christ.

**Theorem 2.9** (Christ 2012, [Chr12a]). For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $t \in (0, 1)$  and  $\eta > 0$ , there exist constants  $d^{2.9} > 0$ , so that for all measurable  $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  of equal volume with the property that  $|tX + (1 - t)Y| < (1 + d^{2.9})|X|$ , then

$$\min_{v \in \mathbb{R}^n} |\text{co}(X \cup (v + Y))| \leq (1 + \eta)|X|.$$

We also use the following three lemmas from [FvHT23]

**Lemma 2.10** (Proposition 5.4 in [FvHT23]). Let  $v_0, \dots, v_n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be vectors not contained in a halfspace and let  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be measurable sets with equal volume. Then there exists a vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that for every cone  $C \in \mathfrak{C}^{v_0, \dots, v_n}$  we have

$$|A \cap C| = |(B + v) \cap C|.$$

Moreover, for every  $\eta, \lambda > 0$ , there is a computable constant  $\eta^{2.10} > 0$  such that the following holds. If  $\{v_0, \dots, v_n\} = \{e_0, \dots, e_n\}$  (as in Definition 2.3) and if  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is a  $\lambda$ -bounded  $\eta^{2.10}$ -sandwich, then  $A, B + v$  is a  $2\lambda$ -bounded  $\eta$ -sandwich.

We won't use Theorem 2.9 directly, but only through Lemma 2.11.

**Lemma 2.11** (Lemma 2.11 in [FvHT23]). For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $t \in (0, 1/2]$  and  $\eta > 0$ , there exist constants  $c^{2.11}$  and  $d_{n, t}^{2.11}(\eta) > 0$  so that the following holds. If  $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  are measurable sets with  $|X| = |Y|$  and  $|tX + (1 - t)Y| = (1 + \delta)|X|$  with  $\delta \in [0, d_{n, t}^{2.11}(\eta))$ , then, up to translation, there exist measurable sets  $X', Y' \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  so that

1.  $X', Y'$  is an  $\eta$ -sandwich,

2.  $|X'| = |Y'| = |X|$ ,
3.  $\text{co}(X') = \text{co}(X)$  and  $\text{co}(Y') = \text{co}(Y)$ ,
4.  $|X' \triangle X| + |Y' \triangle Y| \leq c^{2.11} t^{-1} \delta |X|$ ,
5.  $|tX' + (1-t)Y'| \leq (1+\delta)|X|$ .

Moreover, if  $X \subset Y$ , we additionally find  $X' \subset Y'$ .

**Lemma 2.12** (Lemma 2.12 in [FvHT23]). *For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\eta > 0$  the following holds. If  $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is an  $\eta$ -sandwich, then there exists  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and there exists a linear transformation  $\theta: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $\theta(v+X), \theta(v+Y)$  is a  $(n^2 + n^3\eta)$ -bounded  $n\eta$ -sandwich.*

## 2.4 Proof of Proposition 2.8

*Proof of Proposition 2.8.* First note that we may assume  $|A| = |B| = 1$ . Let  $\lambda = \lambda_n := 16n^6$ . Let  $\ell'_n$  be minimal, so that a translate of  $B(0, 1/\ell'_n)$  is contained in  $\frac{1}{4n^3}S \cap C_0$ , where  $S$  and  $C_0$  are defined in Definition 2.3. Let  $\ell''_n$  be minimal, so that  $4n^3S \cap C_0$  is contained in some translate of  $B(o, \ell''_n)$ . Let  $\ell_n := 2 \max\{\ell'_n, \ell''_n\}$ . Find  $\mu = \mu_{n,t} := \mu_{n,t,\ell_n,\lambda_n}$  sufficiently small as required by the assumption. Let  $\eta = \eta_{n,t} := \mu$  for notational consistency. Choose  $\eta'$  to be sufficiently small in terms of  $\eta$  and  $n$ , so that the second part of Lemma 2.10 applies with parameters  $(\eta'_n)^{2.10} = \eta'$ ,  $\eta_n^{2.10} = \eta$  and  $\lambda_n^{2.10} = 2n^3$ . Choose  $d_{n,t}$  smaller than the constant  $d_{n,t}(\eta'_{n,t})$  in Lemma 2.11. Let  $c_n := (n+1)c_{n,\ell_n,\lambda_n}\sqrt{w_n} + c^{2.11}$ , where  $w_n = (n+1)(4n^3)^n$ ,  $c_{n,\ell_n,\lambda_n}$  is the constant from the assumption and  $c^{2.11}$  is the constant from Lemma 2.11.

First, use Lemma 2.11 with parameter  $\eta'$  to find  $A^1, B^1$  which form an  $\eta'$ -sandwich. Note that

$$|A \triangle B| \leq |A \triangle A^1| + |B \triangle B^1| + |A^1 \triangle B^1| \leq |A^1 \triangle B^1| + c^{2.11} t^{-1} \delta |A|,$$

so it suffices to show

$$|A^1 \triangle B^1| \leq c_n \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A^1|.$$

Now apply Lemma 2.12 to  $A^1, B^1$ , to find  $A^2, B^2$  an  $n^2 + n^3\eta'$ -bounded  $\eta'$  sandwich.  $A^2, B^2$  are just a linear transformation and a translation away from  $A^1, B^1$ . Note that  $n^2 + n^3\eta' \leq 2n^3$ , so, in particular,  $A^2, B^2$  is a  $2n^3$ -bounded  $\eta'$  sandwich.

We then apply Lemma 2.10 with vectors  $e_0, \dots, e_n$  and cones  $\mathfrak{C}$  from Definition 2.3. Let  $A^3 = A^2$  and  $B^3$  be the translation of  $B^2$  given by the lemma. Note that by definition of  $\eta'$ , we find that  $A^3, B^3$  is a  $4n^3$ -bounded  $\eta$ -sandwich with the property that  $|A^3 \cap C| = |B^3 \cap C|$  for all  $C \in \mathfrak{C}$ .

Fix a  $C \in \mathfrak{C}$ , and let

$$A' := A^3 \cap C \text{ and } B' := B^3 \cap C.$$

We will show that  $A'$  and  $B'$  are of the correct form to bound their symmetric difference.

Note that  $t(A^3 \cap C') + (1-t)(B^3 \cap C') \subset (tA^3 + (1-t)B^3) \cap C'$  so that these are disjoint for different  $C' \in \mathfrak{C}$ . Hence, by Brunn-Minkowski we find that

$$(1+\delta)|A| \geq |tA^3 + (1-t)B^3| \geq \sum_{C' \in \mathfrak{C}} |t(A^3 \cap C') + (1-t)(B^3 \cap C')| \geq |tA' + (1-t)B'| + \sum_{C' \neq C \in \mathfrak{C}} |A \cap C'|.$$

In particular, we find  $|tA' + (1-t)B'| \leq |A'| + \delta|A|$ . Since  $A^3, B^3$  is  $4n^3$ -bounded, there exists some  $r > 0$  so that  $rS \subset A^3, B^3 \subset 4n^3rS$ . Given that  $|A^3| = |A| = 1$  and  $|S| = 1$ , this implies  $1/4n^3 \leq r \leq 1$ , and thus  $\frac{1}{4n^3}S \subset A^3, B^3 \subset 4n^3S$ . Since  $A^3, B^3$  is a  $\eta$ -sandwich, there exists a convex set  $K \subset A^3, B^3 \subset (1+\eta)K$ .

Thus, we find that  $|A'| \geq |\frac{1}{4n^3}S \cap C| = \frac{1}{(n+1)(4n^3)^n} |A|$  for all  $C \in \mathfrak{C}$ . For notational convenience, let  $w_n = (n+1)(4n^3)^n$ , so that

$$|tA' + (1-t)B'| \leq (1+w_n\delta)|A'|.$$

With this bound on  $|A'|$  and  $|B'|$  in hand, we are ready to define  $C_{A'}$  and  $C_{B'}$ . Note that  $\text{co}(A') \setminus A' \subset \text{co}(A^3) \setminus A^3$  and  $|\text{co}(A^3) \setminus A^3| = |\text{co}(A) \setminus A|$ , so that  $|\text{co}(A')| \leq |A'| + |\text{co}(A^3) \setminus A^3| = |A'| + \gamma|A^3| \leq (1+w_n\gamma)|A'|$ , and analogously  $|\text{co}(B')| \leq (1+w_n\gamma)|B'|$ . Find convex sets  $C_{A'} \supset \text{co}(A')$  and  $C_{B'} \supset \text{co}(B')$  so that

$$C_{A'}, C_{B'} \subset C \cap 4n^3S \cap (1+\eta)K \text{ and } |C_{A'}| = |C_{B'}| \leq (1+w_n\gamma)|A'| = (1+w_n\gamma)|B'|.$$

With these in place we check that these sets are conelike (cf Definition 2.7). Recall that  $\frac{1}{4n^3}S \cap C \subset A', B', C_{A'}, C_{B'} \subset 4n^3S \cap C$ . It's easy to see that  $\frac{1}{4n^3}S \cap C$  contains a translate of  $B(o, 1/\ell'_n)$  and  $4n^3S \cap$

$C$  is contained in a translate of  $B(o, \ell_n'')$ . Hence, we find that  $A', B', C_{A'}, C_{B'}$  satisfy the first condition in Definition 2.7.

For the second condition note that  $S'' := \frac{1}{4n^3}S \cap C$  is indeed a set obtained by intersecting a cone with a halfspace. Hence, if we recall that  $\lambda_n = (4n^3)^2$ , and let  $y = o$ , we find that  $A', B', C_{A'}, C_{B'}$  satisfy the second condition in Definition 2.7.

For the third condition, note that  $K \cap C \subset A' \subset C_{A'} \subset (1 + \eta)(K \cap C)$ , and analogously for  $B', C_{B'}$ . Hence, if we let  $\eta_n$  sufficiently small in terms of  $n, t, \ell_n$  and  $\lambda_n$ , set  $x = y = o$ , we find that  $A', B', C_{A'}, C_{B'}$  satisfy the third condition in Definition 2.7.

Hence,  $A', B'$  are  $(w_n\gamma, \ell_n, \lambda_n, \mu_n)$  conelike, with  $\mu_n$  sufficiently small in terms of  $n, t, \ell_n$ , and  $\lambda_n$  so that by the assumption in the proposition, we have

$$|(A^3 \cap C) \Delta (B^3 \cap C)| = |A' \Delta B'| \leq c_{n, \ell_n, \lambda_n} \sqrt{\frac{w_n \delta + w_n \gamma}{t}} |A'| \leq \frac{c_n - c^{2.11}}{n+1} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|,$$

where we recall that  $c_n := (n+1)c_{n, \ell_n, \lambda_n} \sqrt{w_n} + c^{2.11}$ . We conclude by adding up the contributions from the different cones  $C \in \mathfrak{C}$ .

$$|A^1 \Delta B^1| = |A^3 \Delta B^3| = \sum_{C \in \mathfrak{C}} |(A^3 \Delta B^3) \cap C| \leq (c_n - c^{2.11}) \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|.$$

We conclude with the previous note that

$$|A \Delta B| \leq |A^1 \Delta B^1| + c^{2.11} t^{-1} \delta |A| \leq c_n \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|.$$

□

### 3 Intermediate propositions

The proof of Theorem 1.2 relies on optimal transport. For the purpose of this paper, we only need to know the following classical result: given two bounded sets  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  of positive volume, there exists a convex function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  whose gradient sends the normalized indicator function of  $A$  onto that of  $B$ . More precisely, if we define  $T := \nabla \varphi$ , then  $T_{\#} \left( \frac{1}{|A|} \mathbf{1}_A \right) = \frac{1}{|B|} \mathbf{1}_B$ , where  $T_{\#}$  denotes the push-forward through the map  $T$ . Furthermore, this map is unique: If  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  are two convex functions such that  $T_i := \nabla \varphi_i$  sends  $\frac{1}{|A|} \mathbf{1}_A$  to  $\frac{1}{|B|} \mathbf{1}_B$ , then  $T_1 = T_2$  a.e. inside  $A$ .

From now on, whenever we say that  $T$  is the optimal transport from  $A$  to  $B$ , we mean the (unique) gradient of a convex function that sends  $\frac{1}{|A|} \mathbf{1}_A$  to  $\frac{1}{|B|} \mathbf{1}_B$ . We refer to [Fig17, Chapter 4.6] for a quick introduction to this beautiful theory and more references.

#### 3.1 Propositions

**Proposition 3.1.** *For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and all  $t, \varepsilon, \lambda, \ell, \delta, \gamma > 0$  with  $\delta + \gamma \leq t^{2n-1}/2$ , there exists  $c_{n, \varepsilon, \lambda, \ell}^{3.1}, \mu_{n, t, \varepsilon, \ell}^{3.1} > 0$  such that the following holds. Assume that  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  are  $(\gamma, \ell, \lambda, \mu_{n, t, \varepsilon, \ell}^{3.1})$  conelike. Moreover, assume that  $|tA + (1-t)B| \leq (1+\delta)|A|$ . If  $T : C_A \rightarrow C_B$  is the optimal transport map from  $C_A$  to  $C_B$ , then*

$$\int_{x \in \partial C_A} \max \left\{ \left\langle x - T(x), \frac{x - o'}{\|x - o'\|_2} \right\rangle, 0 \right\} dx \leq c_{n, \varepsilon, \lambda, \ell}^{3.1} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|,$$

for any  $o' \in (1 - \varepsilon)C_A$ .

**Corollary 3.2.** *In addition, for all  $\theta > 0$  there exists  $c_{n, \varepsilon, \lambda, \ell, \theta}$  such that the following holds. Let  $Q : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be an affine transformation with  $\|Q\|_{op}, \|Q^{-1}\|_{op} \leq \theta$ . If  $T_Q : Q(C_A) \rightarrow Q(C_B)$  is the optimal transport map from  $Q(C_A)$  to  $Q(C_B)$ , then*

$$\int_{x \in \partial C_A} \max \left\{ \left\langle Q(x) - T_Q(Q(x)), \frac{Q(x) - Q(o')}{\|Q(x) - Q(o')\|_2} \right\rangle, 0 \right\} dx \leq c_{n, \varepsilon, \lambda, \ell, \theta} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |Q(A)|,$$

for all  $o' \in (1 - \varepsilon)C_A$ .

□



**Definition 3.3.** Given a parameter  $\theta$ , let a random scaling be the random affine transformation  $Q \sim \mathcal{Q}_\theta$  generated as follows. Sample a uniformly random orthonormal basis  $e_1, \dots, e_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and sample  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n \in [\theta^{-1}, \theta]$  i.i.d. uniformly. Then, in this basis, let  $Q$  be the random transformation given by the diagonal matrix with entries  $\theta_i$ .

**Proposition 3.4.** For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\ell > 1$ , there exists constants  $\theta = \theta_{n,\ell}, c_{n,\ell} > 0$  such that if

- $B(o, 1/\ell) \subset \frac{1}{2}C_A, \frac{1}{2}C_B \subset B(o, \ell)$  where  $C_A$  and  $C_B$  are convex,
- for every affine transformation  $Q: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $T_Q$  is a map with  $T_Q(Q(C_A)) \subset Q(C_B)$ ,
- $Q \sim \mathcal{Q}_\theta$  is a random scaling, and
- $o'$  is chosen uniformly random from  $B(o, 1/\ell)$ ,

then, for all  $x \in \partial C_A$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q, o'} \left[ \max \left\{ \left\langle Q(x) - T_Q(Q(x)), \frac{Q(x) - Q(o')}{\|Q(x) - Q(o')\|_2} \right\rangle, 0 \right\} \right] \geq c_{n,\ell} d(x, C_B).$$

**Proposition 3.5.** For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}, \ell \geq 1$ , there exists constants  $c_{n,\ell}$ , so that given two convex sets  $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  of equal volume with  $B(o, 1/\ell) \subset X, Y \subset B(o, \ell)$  we have

$$|X \Delta Y| \leq c_{n,\ell} \int_{\partial X} d(x, Y) dx.$$

### 3.2 Auxiliary Lemmas

**Lemma 3.6.** For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lambda, \ell > 0$ , there exists  $\varepsilon_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}, m_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}, r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}, \sigma_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6} > 0$  such that the following holds. Say sets  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  are  $(\gamma, \ell, \lambda, \mu)$  conelike. Then for every non-zero  $y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , there exists  $s \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that for every map  $M: \partial C_A \cap \partial C_B \rightarrow \partial C_A \cup \partial C_B$  the following holds. There exist faces  $F_A$  of  $C_A$  and  $F_B$  of  $C_B$  with the same supporting hyperplane  $H$ , and there exists  $w_0 \in H$ , such that

$$B^n(w_0, 1/r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}) \cap H \subset F_A \cap F_B.$$

Moreover, for every  $w \in B^n(w_0, 1/r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}) \cap H$  there exists a ball  $X_w \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  such that with  $y_1 = M(w) - w$  we have

1.  $X_w \subset (1 - \varepsilon_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6})(C_A \cap C_B)$
2.  $|X_w| \geq m_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}$
3.  $d(w, X_w) \geq 1/(4r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6})$
4.  $\mathbb{P}_{x \in X_w} \left( \frac{\langle y_1, x-w \rangle}{|y_1||x-w|} \geq 0 \right) \geq 1/2$
5.  $\mathbb{P}_{x \in X_w} \left( \frac{\langle sy_2, x-w \rangle}{|y_2||x-w|} \geq \sigma_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6} \right) = 1.$

**Lemma 3.7.** For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lambda, \ell > 0$ , there exists  $r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.7} > \ell$  such that the following holds. Say sets  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  are  $(\gamma, \ell, \lambda, \mu)$  conelike. Construct simplex  $S' = S + z$  with a vertex at  $z$ . Let  $F_0, F_1, \dots, F_n$  be the faces of  $S'$  where  $F_0$  is the face opposite vertex  $z$ . Then

1.  $S' \subset C_A \cap C_B$
2.  $F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_n \subset \partial C_A \cap \partial C_B.$
3.  $B(u, 1/r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.7}) \subset S' \subset B(u, r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.7})$  for some  $u \in \mathbb{R}^n.$

**Lemma 3.8.** For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $r, \sigma > 0$ , there exists  $k_{n,r,\sigma}^{3.8} > 0$  such that the following holds. Let  $H$  be a hyperplane and let  $H^+$  and  $H^-$  be the two half-spaces determined by  $H$ . Let  $w \in H$  with  $|w| \leq r$ . Let  $f$  be the normal vector of  $H$  pointing to  $H^+$ . Let  $y_1, y_2$  be two vectors such that  $\frac{\langle y_1, f \rangle}{|y_1||f|} \geq 0$  and  $\frac{\langle y_2, f \rangle}{|y_2||f|} \geq \sigma$ . Then the ball

$$X = B^n(w + f/(2r), k),$$

has the following properties:

1.  $X \subset (1 - 1/(8r^2))(B^n(w, 1/r) \cap H^+)$
2.  $\mathbb{P}_{x \in X} \left( \frac{\langle y_1, x-w \rangle}{|y_1||x-w|} \geq 0 \right) \geq 1/2$
3. For all  $x \in X$  we have  $\frac{\langle y_2, x-w \rangle}{|y_2||x-w|} \geq \sigma/4$
4. For all  $x \in X$  we have  $|x - w| \geq 1/4r$ .

**Lemma 3.9.** For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $r > 1$ , the following holds. Let  $S'$  be a simplex such that  $B^n(u, 1/r) \subset S' \subset B^n(u, r)$  for some  $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $F$  be a facet of  $S'$  and let  $H$  be the supporting hyperplane of  $F$ . Finally, let  $H^+$  and  $H^-$  be the two half spaces determined by  $H$ , such that  $H^+$  contains  $S'$  and  $H^-$  is disjoint from the interior of  $S'$ . Then there exists  $v \in F$  such that

$$B^n(v, 1/r) \cap H^+ \subset S'$$

and

$$B^n(v, 1/r) \cap H \subset F \subset B^n(v, 2r) \cap H$$

**Lemma 3.10.** For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $r > 0$ , there exists  $\sigma^{3.10} = \sigma_{n,r}^{3.10} > 0$  such that the following holds. Let  $S'$  be a simplex such that  $B^n(u, 1/r) \subset S' \subset B^n(u, r)$  for some  $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $f_0, f_1, \dots, f_n$  be the inward normal vectors to the faces of  $S'$ . Then for every unit vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  there exists  $1 \leq i \leq n$  such that

$$|\langle f_i, v \rangle| \geq \sigma^{3.10}.$$

**Lemma 3.11.** For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists a constant  $c_n^{3.11} > 0$  such that the following holds. If  $0 < t \leq 1/2$  and  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n > 0$  and  $\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_n = 1$ , then

$$\sqrt{\sum_i (\lambda_i - 1)^2} \leq c_n^{3.11} t^{-n} \left( \prod_i (t + (1-t)\lambda_i) - 1 \right) + c_n^{3.11} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\prod_i (t + (1-t)\lambda_i) - 1}.$$

**Lemma 3.12.** For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and for all  $t, \varepsilon, \ell > 0$ , there exists  $\mu = \mu_{n,t,\varepsilon,\ell} > 0$  such that the following holds. Assume that  $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  are  $(\gamma, \ell, \lambda, \mu)$  conelike. Then

$$tA + (1-t)B \supset t(1 - \varepsilon/4)C_A + (1-t)C_B.$$

**Lemma 3.13.** Let  $C_A, C_B$  be two convex sets in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with equal volume 1 and satisfying

$$B^n(o, 1/R) \subset C_A, C_B \subset B^n(o, R) \quad \text{for some constant } R > 1. \quad (3.1)$$

Let  $T = \nabla \varphi$  denote the optimal transport map from  $C_A$  to  $C_B$ . Then, for every  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\|D(T - \text{Id})\|_{L^\infty((1-\varepsilon)C_A)} \leq C_{n,R,\varepsilon} \|D(T - \text{Id})\|_{L^1((1-\varepsilon/2)C_A)}.$$

### 3.3 Proofs of propositions

#### 3.3.1 Proof of Proposition 3.1

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* We first observe that, by Caffarelli's regularity theory [Caf92b, Caf92a], we can write  $T = \nabla \varphi$ , where the function  $\varphi: C_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is a smooth strictly convex solution of  $\det D^2 \varphi = 1$ .

Therefore, for  $x \in C_A$ ,  $DT(x) = D^2 \varphi(x)$  is a positive definite symmetric matrix with determinant 1 and its eigenvalues  $\lambda_1(x), \lambda_2(x), \dots, \lambda_n(x)$  satisfy

$$\lambda_1(x), \lambda_2(x), \dots, \lambda_n(x) > 0 \text{ and } \lambda_1(x)\lambda_2(x) \cdots \lambda_n(x) = 1. \quad (3.2)$$

Note that we can write  $tId + (1-t)T = \nabla(\frac{t}{2}\|x\|_2^2 + (1-t)\varphi)$  and that the function  $\frac{t}{2}\|x\|_2^2 + (1-t)\varphi$  is also strictly convex.

Therefore, for  $x \in C_A$ ,

$$D(tId + (1-t)T)(x) = D^2 \left( \frac{t}{2}\|x\|_2^2 + (1-t)\varphi \right) (x)$$

is a positive definite symmetric matrix with eigenvalues

$$t + (1-t)\lambda_1(x), t + (1-t)\lambda_2(x), \dots, t + (1-t)\lambda_n(x).$$

In particular, the function  $tId + (1-t)T: C_A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is injective.

The above discussion shows that for every compact subset  $E \subset C_A$  we have

$$\left| \bigcup_{x \in E} tx + (1-t)T(x) \right| = \int_E \det D(tId + (1-t)T) dx = \int_E \left( \prod_i t + (1-t)\lambda_i \right) dx$$

Construct the set  $E := (T^{-1}(B) \cap A) \cup (1 - \varepsilon/4)C_A$ . By Lemma 3.12, it follows that  $tA + (1-t)B \supset \bigcup_{x \in E} tx + (1-t)T(x)$ . By hypothesis, we have  $|tA + (1-t)B| \leq (1 + \delta)|A|$ .

Combining the last three lines, we get

$$\int_E \left( \prod_i t + (1-t)\lambda_i \right) dx \leq (1 + \delta)|A|$$

By hypothesis, we also have

$$|C_A \setminus A| = |C_B \setminus B| = \gamma|A|, \quad (3.3)$$

and because  $T$  is bijective and measure preserving, we get

$$|E| \geq |T^{-1}(B) \cap A| = |A \setminus T^{-1}(C_B \setminus B)| \geq |A| - |C_B \setminus B| \geq (1 - \gamma)|A|. \quad (3.4)$$

Combining the last two inequalities, we get

$$\int_E \left[ \prod_i (t + (1-t)\lambda_i) - 1 \right] dx \leq (\delta + \gamma)|A| \quad (3.5)$$

Also, Lemma 3.11 together with (3.2) imply that

$$\sqrt{\sum_i (\lambda_i - 1)^2} \leq c_n^{3.11} t^{-n} \left( \prod_i (t + (1-t)\lambda_i) - 1 \right) + c_n^{3.11} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\prod_i (t + (1-t)\lambda_i) - 1}. \quad (3.6)$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E \|D(T - Id)\|_{op} dx &\leq \int_E \sqrt{\sum_i (\lambda_i - 1)^2} dx \\ &\leq \int_E \left( c_n^{3.11} t^{-n} \left( \prod_i (t + (1-t)\lambda_i) - 1 \right) + c_n^{3.11} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\prod_i (t + (1-t)\lambda_i) - 1} \right) dx \\ &\leq c_n^{3.11} t^{-n} (\delta + \gamma)|A| + c_n^{3.11} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_E \sqrt{\prod_i (t + (1-t)\lambda_i) - 1} dx \\ &\leq c_n^{3.11} t^{-n} (\delta + \gamma)|A| + c_n^{3.11} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{|E|} \sqrt{\int_E \left( \prod_i (t + (1-t)\lambda_i) - 1 \right) dx} \\ &\leq c_n^{3.11} t^{-n} (\delta + \gamma)|A| + c_n^{3.11} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\delta + \gamma} \sqrt{|E|} \sqrt{|A|} \\ &\leq c_n^{3.11} t^{-n} (\delta + \gamma)|A| + 2c_n^{3.11} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\delta + \gamma} |A| \leq 3c_n^{3.11} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Here, the first inequality follows from the fact that the operator norm is upper bounded by the Hilbert-Schmidt norm. The second inequality follows from (3.6). The third inequality follows from (3.5). The fourth inequality follows from the concavity of the function  $x^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . The fifth inequality follows again from (3.5). The sixth inequality follows from the hypothesis  $|E| \leq |C_A| \leq 2|A|$  and the final inequality follows from the hypothesis  $\delta + \gamma \leq t^{2n-1}/2$ .

Thus, Lemma 3.13, together with (3.7) and the fact that  $E \supset (1 - \varepsilon/4)C_A$ , implies that for  $x \in (1 - \varepsilon/2)C_A$

$$\|D(T - Id)(x)\|_{op} \leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.13} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \quad (3.8)$$

Now, fix  $o' \in (1-\varepsilon)C_A$  and set  $P = B(o', \varepsilon/2\ell)$ . Note that as  $C_A \supset B(o, \ell^{-1})$ , it follows that  $P \subset (1-\varepsilon/2)C_A \subset E$ . Combining (3.7) and (3.8), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_E \frac{\|D(T-Id)\|_{op}}{\|x-o'\|_2^{n-1}} dx &\leq \int_P \frac{\|D(T-Id)\|_{op}}{\|x-o'\|_2^{n-1}} dx + \int_{E \setminus P} \frac{\|D(T-Id)\|_{op}}{\|x-o'\|_2^{n-1}} dx \\
&\leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.13} \sqrt{\frac{\delta+\gamma}{t}} \int_P \frac{1}{\|x-o'\|_2^{n-1}} dx + \int_{E \setminus P} \frac{\|D(T-Id)\|_{op}}{\|x-o'\|_2^{n-1}} dx \\
&\leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.13} \sqrt{\frac{\delta+\gamma}{t}} \int_{B(o,\varepsilon/2\ell)} \frac{1}{\|x\|_2^{n-1}} dx + (2\ell\varepsilon^{-1})^{n-1} \int_{E \setminus P} \|D(T-Id)\|_{op} dx \\
&\leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.13} \sqrt{\frac{\delta+\gamma}{t}} \frac{\varepsilon}{2\ell} |S^{n-1}(o,1)| + (2\ell\varepsilon^{-1})^{n-1} \int_E \|D(T-Id)\|_{op} dx \\
&\leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.13} \sqrt{\frac{\delta+\gamma}{t}} \frac{\varepsilon}{2\ell} |S^{n-1}(o,1)| + (2\ell\varepsilon^{-1})^{n-1} 3c_n^{3.11} \sqrt{\frac{\delta+\gamma}{t}} |A| \leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.9} \sqrt{\frac{\delta+\gamma}{t}} |A|.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Here, the first inequality is immediate. The second inequality follows from (3.8) and the fact that  $P \subset (1-\varepsilon/2)C_A$ . The third inequality follows from the trivial bound that for  $x \notin P$  we have  $\|x-o'\|_2^{-1} \leq 2\ell\varepsilon^{-1}$ . The fourth inequality follows from a simple change of variables. The fifth inequality follows from (3.7). The final inequality follows from the hypothesis  $|A| \geq 2^{-1}|B(o, \ell^{-1})|$ .

In particular, by definition of the operator norm,

$$\int_E \max \left\{ \frac{(x-o')^T (D(Id-T)(x)) \frac{x-o'}{\|x-o'\|_2}}{\|x-o'\|_2^{n-1}}, 0 \right\} dx \leq \int_E \frac{\|D(T-Id)\|_{op}}{\|x-o'\|_2^{n-1}} dx \leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.9} \sqrt{\frac{\delta+\gamma}{t}} |A|.$$

Note now that, for  $x \in C_A$ , as the eigenvalues of  $D(T)(x)$  are all positive by (3.2), it follows that the eigenvalues of  $D(Id-T)(x)$  are at most 1, which implies that

$$\frac{(x-o')^T (D(Id-T)(x)) \frac{x-o'}{\|x-o'\|_2}}{\|x-o'\|_2} \leq 1.$$

As  $P \subset (1-\varepsilon/2)C_A \subset E$ , it follows that for  $x \in C_A \setminus E$  we have  $\|x-o'\|_2 \geq \varepsilon/2\ell$ , which implies that  $\frac{1}{\|x-o'\|_2^{n-1}} \leq (2\ell\varepsilon^{-1})^{n-1}$ .

Combining the last three inequalities with (3.3) and (3.4), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{C_A} \max \left\{ \frac{(x-o')^T (D(Id-T)(x)) \frac{x-o'}{\|x-o'\|_2}}{\|x-o'\|_2^{n-1}}, 0 \right\} dx &\leq (2\ell\varepsilon^{-1})^{n-1} |C_A \setminus E| + c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.9} \sqrt{\frac{\delta+\gamma}{t}} |A| \\
&\leq (2\ell\varepsilon^{-1})^{n-1} 2\gamma |A| + c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.9} \sqrt{\frac{\delta+\gamma}{t}} |A| \leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.10} \sqrt{\frac{\delta+\gamma}{t}} |A|.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Now, for a unit vector  $y \in S^{n-1}(o,1)$  define  $s_y := \max\{s : o' + sy \in C_A\}$ . Define the function  $f_y(s) : [0, s_y] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , by  $f_y(s) := \langle (o' + sy) - T(o' + sy), y \rangle$ . It is easy to check that  $\frac{d}{ds}(f_y)(s) = y^T D(Id-T)(o' + sy) y$ . Thus, by

performing the change of variable  $x(s, y): \mathbb{R} \times S^{n-1}(o, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, x(s, y) = o' + sy$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{C_A} \max \left\{ \frac{\langle (x-o')^T (D(Id-T)(x)) \frac{x-o'}{\|x-o'\|_2} \rangle}{\|x-o'\|_2^{n-1}}, 0 \right\} dx \\
&= \int_{S^{n-1}(o,1)} \int_{0 \leq s \leq s_y} \max \{ y^T D(Id-T)(o' + sy) y, 0 \} ds dy \\
&\geq \int_{S^{n-1}(o,1)} \max \left\{ \int_{0 \leq s \leq s_y} y^T D(Id-T)(o' + sy) y ds, 0 \right\} dy \\
&= \int_{S^{n-1}(o,1)} \max \left\{ \int_{0 \leq s \leq s_y} \frac{d}{ds} (f_y)(s) ds, 0 \right\} dy \\
&= \int_{S^{n-1}(o,1)} \max \{ f_y(s_y) - f_y(0), 0 \} dy \\
&= \int_{S^{n-1}(o,1)} \max \{ \langle (o' + s_y y) - T(o' + s_y y), y \rangle - \langle o' - T(o'), y \rangle, 0 \} dy
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Combining (3.10) and (3.11), it follows that

$$\int_{S^{n-1}(o,1)} \max \{ \langle (o' + s_y y) - T(o' + s_y y), y \rangle - \langle o' - T(o'), y \rangle, 0 \} dy \leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.10} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|. \tag{3.12}$$

Integrating (3.8) between  $o$  and  $o'$ , and using that  $o' \in B(o, 2\ell)$  we find

$$\begin{aligned}
|(T(o) - o) - (T(o') - o')| &= \left| \int_0^{|o-o'|} \left[ D(T-Id) \left( o + t \frac{o' - o}{|o' - o|} \right) \right] \frac{o' - o}{|o' - o|} dt \right| \\
&\leq \int_0^{|o'-o|} \left| D(T-Id) \left( o + t \frac{o' - o}{|o' - o|} \right) \right|_{op} dt \\
&\leq |o - o'| c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.13} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \leq 2\ell c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.13} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Integrating this further over the unit sphere, we find

$$\int_{S^{n-1}(o,1)} \max \{ \langle (T(o) - o) - (T(o') - o'), y \rangle, 0 \} dy \leq |S^{n-1}(o, 1)| 2\ell c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.13} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.14} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|. \tag{3.14}$$

Hence, we can adjust (3.12) to give

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{S^{n-1}(o,1)} \max \{ \langle (o' + s_y y) - T(o' + s_y y), y \rangle - \langle o - T(o), y \rangle, 0 \} dy \\
&\leq \int_{S^{n-1}(o,1)} \max \{ \langle (o' + s_y y) - T(o' + s_y y), y \rangle - \langle o' - T(o'), y \rangle, 0 \} dy \\
&+ \int_{S^{n-1}(o,1)} \max \{ \langle (T(o) - o) - (T(o') - o'), y \rangle, 0 \} dy \\
&\leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.10} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A| + c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.14} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A| = c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.15} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|
\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

We aim to evaluate this as an integral over the boundary  $\partial C_A$  rather than the unit sphere  $S^{n-1}(o, 1)$ . Recall that  $o' \in (1 - \varepsilon)C_A$  so that  $(1 - \varepsilon)o' + \varepsilon C_A \subset C_A$ . In particular, as  $B(o, 1/\ell) \subset C_A \subset B(o, \ell)$ , we have  $B(o', \varepsilon/\ell) \subset C_A \subset B(o', 2\ell)$ . Considering the map  $z: S^{n-1}(o, 1) \rightarrow \partial C_A; y \mapsto o' + s_y y$ , so that  $y = \frac{z-o'}{\|z-o'\|}$ , then we find that the Jacobian of this map has determinant bounded by some constant, say  $k_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.16}$ , depending only

on  $\varepsilon, \ell$ , and  $n$ . Hence, changing variables, we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\partial C_A} \max \left\{ \left\langle z - T(z), \frac{z - o'}{|z - o'|} \right\rangle - \left\langle o - T(o), \frac{z - o'}{|z - o'|} \right\rangle, 0 \right\} dz \\ & \leq k_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.16} \int_{S^{n-1}(o,1)} \max \{ \langle (o' + s_y y) - T(o' + s_y y), y \rangle - \langle o - T(o), y \rangle, 0 \} dy \\ & \leq k_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.16} c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.15} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A| \leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.16} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Note that  $T^{-1}: C_B \rightarrow C_A$  is also an optimal transport map. By repeating the entire argument above, we get that for  $o^* \in (1 - \varepsilon)C_B$

$$\int_{\partial C_B} \max \left\{ \left\langle w - T^{-1}(w), \frac{w - o^*}{|w - o^*|} \right\rangle - \left\langle o - T^{-1}(o), \frac{w - o^*}{|w - o^*|} \right\rangle, 0 \right\} dw \leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.16} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|.$$

We now observe that  $T^{-1}(o)$  belongs to  $(1 - \varepsilon)C_A$ . Indeed, Lemma 3.13 applied to  $T^{-1}$  implies that  $T^{-1}$  is uniformly close to the affine map  $x + T^{-1}(o)$  inside  $(1 - \varepsilon)C_B$ . Since  $T^{-1}((1 - \varepsilon)C_B) \subset C_A$ , this implies that  $T^{-1}(o)$  remains at some uniform positive distance from  $\partial C_A$ .

Now, integrating (3.8) between  $o$  and  $T^{-1}(o)$  (both of which are in  $(1 - \varepsilon)C_A$ ), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |(T(o) - o) - (o - T^{-1}(o))| &= |(T(o) - o) - (T(T^{-1}(o)) - T^{-1}(o))| \\ &= \left| \int_0^{|o - T^{-1}(o)|} \left[ D(T - Id) \left( o + s \frac{T^{-1}(o) - o}{|T^{-1}(o) - o|} \right) \right] \frac{T^{-1}(o) - o}{|T^{-1}(o) - o|} ds \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^{|o - T^{-1}(o)|} \left| D(T - Id) \left( o + s \frac{T^{-1}(o) - o}{|T^{-1}(o) - o|} \right) \right|_{op} ds \\ &\leq |o - T^{-1}(o)| c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.13} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \leq 2\ell c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.13} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \end{aligned}$$

Combining the last two equations and using the fact that  $|\partial C_B| \leq |S^{n-1}(o, \ell)|$ , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\partial C_B} \max \left\{ \left\langle w - T^{-1}(w), \frac{w - o^*}{|w - o^*|} \right\rangle - \left\langle T(o) - o, \frac{w - o^*}{|w - o^*|} \right\rangle, 0 \right\} dw \\ & \leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.16} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A| + |S^{n-1}(o, \ell)| 2\ell c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.13} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.17} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

We apply Lemma 3.6 to the  $(\gamma, \ell, \lambda, \mu)$  conelike sets  $A, B$ , together with the vector  $y_2 = o - T(o)$  and the map  $M = T$  in the case  $s = 1$  and the map  $M = T^{-1}$  in the case  $s = -1$  (restricted to  $\partial C_A \cap \partial C_B$ ). Thus, we find faces  $F_A$  of  $C_A$  and  $F_B$  of  $C_B$  with the same supporting hyperplane  $H$ , and we find  $w_0 \in H$  such that  $B^n(w_0, 1/r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}) \cap H \subset F_A \cap F_B$ . Moreover, for every  $w \in B^n(w_0, 1/r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}) \cap H$  there exists a ball  $X_w \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  such that with  $y_1 = M(w) - w$  we have

1.  $X_w \subset (1 - \varepsilon_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6})(C_A \cap C_B)$
2.  $|X_w| \geq m_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}$
3.  $d(w, X_w) \geq 1/(4r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6})$
4.  $\mathbb{P}_{x \in X_w} \left( \frac{\langle y_1, x - w \rangle}{|y_1| |x - w|} \geq 0 \right) \geq 1/2$
5.  $\mathbb{P}_{x \in X_w} \left( \frac{\langle s y_2, x - w \rangle}{|y_2| |x - w|} \geq \sigma_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6} \right) = 1.$

Consider the case  $s = 1$  and  $M = T$  (the other case is analogous). By averaging (3.16) over  $o' \in (1 - \varepsilon)C_A$ , we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{o' \in (1 - \varepsilon)C_A} \int_{\partial C_A} \max \left\{ \left\langle z - T(z), \frac{z - o'}{|z - o'|} \right\rangle - \left\langle o - T(o), \frac{z - o'}{|z - o'|} \right\rangle, 0 \right\} dz \leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.16} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|,$$

which, by interchanging the integration and the average, is equivalent to

$$\int_{\partial C_A} \mathbb{E}_{o' \in (1-\varepsilon)C_A} \max \left\{ \left\langle z - T(z), \frac{z - o'}{|z - o'|} \right\rangle - \left\langle o - T(o), \frac{z - o'}{|z - o'|} \right\rangle, 0 \right\} dz \leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.16} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|.$$

By restricting our attention to a certain part of the boundary, namely  $B^n(w_0, 1/r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}) \cap H \subset \partial C_A$ , we deduce

$$\int_{B^n(w_0, 1/r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}) \cap H} \mathbb{E}_{o' \in (1-\varepsilon)C_A} \max \left\{ \left\langle z - T(z), \frac{z - o'}{|z - o'|} \right\rangle - \left\langle o - T(o), \frac{z - o'}{|z - o'|} \right\rangle, 0 \right\} dz \leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.16} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|.$$

For each  $z \in B^n(w_0, 1/r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}) \cap H$ , by conditioning on the event  $o' \in X_z$  and using the first two properties of  $X_z$ , namely that  $X_z \subset (1 - \varepsilon_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6})C_A \subset (1 - \varepsilon)C_A$ , and that  $|X_z| \geq m_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}$  we get

$$\int_{B^n(w_0, 1/r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}) \cap H} \mathbb{E}_{o' \in X_z} \max \left\{ \left\langle z - T(z), \frac{z - o'}{|z - o'|} \right\rangle - \left\langle o - T(o), \frac{z - o'}{|z - o'|} \right\rangle, 0 \right\} dz \leq (m_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6})^{-1} c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.16} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|.$$

Now for each  $z \in B^n(w_0, 1/r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}) \cap H$ , by conditioning on the event  $o' \in E_z$ , where

$$E_z := \left\{ o' \in X_z : \frac{\langle y_1, o' - z \rangle}{|y_1||o' - z|} \geq 0 \text{ and } \frac{\langle y_2, o' - z \rangle}{|y_2||o' - z|} \geq \sigma_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6} \right\}$$

and using the last two properties of  $X_z$  which imply  $|E_z| \geq \frac{1}{2}|X_z|$ , we get

$$\int_{B^n(w_0, 1/r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}) \cap H} \mathbb{E}_{o' \in E_z} \max \left\{ \left\langle z - T(z), \frac{z - o'}{|z - o'|} \right\rangle - \left\langle o - T(o), \frac{z - o'}{|z - o'|} \right\rangle, 0 \right\} dz \leq 2(m_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6})^{-1} c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.16} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|.$$

For each  $z \in B^n(w_0, 1/r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}) \cap H$  and each  $o' \in E_z$ , by the definition of  $E_z$ ,  $y_1$  and  $y_2$ , we have  $\left\langle z - T(z), \frac{z - o'}{|z - o'|} \right\rangle \geq 0$  and  $-\left\langle o - T(o), \frac{z - o'}{|z - o'|} \right\rangle \geq \sigma_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6} |o - T(o)|$ .

By combining the last three inequalities, we obtain

$$\left| B^n(w_0, 1/r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}) \cap H \right| \sigma_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6} |o - T(o)| \leq 2(m_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6})^{-1} c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.16} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|,$$

hence

$$|T(o) - o| \leq |B^n(w_0, 1/r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}) \cap H|^{-1} (\sigma_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6})^{-1} 2(m_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6})^{-1} c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.16} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A| \leq c_{n,\lambda,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.18} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}}. \quad (3.18)$$

By combining (3.18) with (3.16), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\partial C_A} \max \left\{ \left\langle z - T(z), \frac{z - o'}{|z - o'|} \right\rangle, 0 \right\} dz \\ & \leq \int_{\partial C_A} \max \left\{ \left\langle z - T(z), \frac{z - o'}{|z - o'|} \right\rangle - c_{n,\lambda,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.18} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}}, 0 \right\} + c_{n,\lambda,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.18} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} dz \\ & \leq |\partial C_A| c_{n,\lambda,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.18} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} + \int_{\partial C_A} \max \left\{ \left\langle z - T(z), \frac{z - o'}{|z - o'|} \right\rangle - \left\langle o - T(o), \frac{z - o'}{|z - o'|} \right\rangle, 0 \right\} dz \\ & \leq |\partial C_A| c_{n,\lambda,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.18} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} + c_{n,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.16} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A| \leq c_{n,\lambda,\varepsilon,\ell} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|. \end{aligned}$$

□

### 3.3.2 Proof of Proposition 3.4

*Proof of Proposition 3.4.* First note that if  $x \in C_B$ , then  $d(x, C_B) = 0$ , so the inequality trivially holds. Henceforth assume  $x \notin C_B$ . Define

$$\begin{aligned} \psi &:= 0.1, \quad \phi = \frac{1}{4\ell}, \quad \xi := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{12}\phi\ell^{-1}, \frac{1}{2}\psi\ell^{-1} \right\}, \quad \theta := 2\xi^{-2}\ell^2, \quad \zeta := \frac{1}{24}\psi\theta^{-2}\ell^{-2}, \\ \alpha &:= \min \left\{ \frac{1}{4}\xi^2\theta^{-2}\ell^{-2}(n-1)^{-1}, \frac{1}{48^2}\psi^2n\theta^{-6}\ell^{-6}, \frac{1}{2} \right\}, \quad \text{and } \eta := \min \left\{ \frac{1}{3}\psi\theta^{-1}\ell^{-1}, \frac{1}{2}\phi \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Write  $e_1, \dots, e_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n \in [\theta^{-1}, \theta]$  for the random parameters corresponding to transformation  $Q \sim \mathcal{Q}_\theta$ .

We first restrict our attention to a controlled set of transformations  $Q$ . We condition on the event that  $\theta_1 \leq \theta^{-1} \min_{i>1} \{\theta_i\}$  and the event that  $e_1$  points roughly in the direction  $x$ , viz  $\left\langle \frac{x}{|x|}, e_1 \right\rangle \geq 1 - \alpha$ . As these events are independent, there exists a constant  $c_n^{3.19}$  so that

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \theta_1 \leq \theta^{-1} \min_{i>1} \{\theta_i\} \text{ and } \left\langle \frac{x}{|x|}, e_1 \right\rangle \geq 1 - \alpha \right) \geq c_n^{3.19}. \quad (3.19)$$

Henceforth, we condition on these events. We will show that, for these  $Q$ , the stated inequality holds. For notational convenience, rescale by a factor  $\theta^{-1}/\theta_1$ , so that we may assume that  $\theta_1 = \theta^{-1}$  and  $\theta_2, \dots, \theta_n \in [1, \theta]$ .

First, note that as  $\langle x, e_1 \rangle \geq (1 - \alpha)|x|$ , we have  $\langle x, e_i \rangle \leq \sqrt{1 - (1 - \alpha)^2}|x| \leq \sqrt{2\alpha}\ell$ , which implies that

$$|Q(x)| = \sqrt{\sum_i \langle Q(x), e_i \rangle^2} \leq \sqrt{\theta^{-1} \langle x, e_1 \rangle^2 + \sum_{i>1} \theta^2 \langle x, e_i \rangle^2} \leq \sqrt{\theta^{-1}\ell^2 + (n-1)2\alpha\theta^2\ell^2} \leq \xi, \quad (3.20)$$

$$|Q(x)| \geq \langle Q(x), e_1 \rangle = \theta^{-1} \langle x, e_1 \rangle > 0.9\theta^{-1}\ell^{-1}. \quad (3.21)$$

Let  $u := \frac{Q(x) - T_Q(Q(x))}{|Q(x) - T_Q(Q(x))|}$ . We show that  $\langle u, e_1 \rangle$  is not very negative.

**Claim 3.14.**  $\langle u, e_1 \rangle \geq -\psi$ .

*Proof of claim.* Assume for a contradiction  $\langle u, e_1 \rangle < -\psi$ . Let  $p$  be the point where the line through  $Q(x)$  and  $T_Q(Q(x))$  intersects the plane spanned by  $e_2, \dots, e_n$ . Write  $p - Q(x) = su$  for some  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . Note  $s > 0$  as  $\langle Q(x), e_1 \rangle > 0$  and  $\langle u, e_1 \rangle < 0$ . Since  $\langle Q(x), e_1 \rangle \leq |Q(x)| \leq \xi$  and  $\langle u, e_1 \rangle < -\psi$ , we find that  $s \leq \xi/\psi$ . By the triangle inequality, this implies  $|p| \leq |p - Q(x)| + |Q(x)| \leq \xi + \xi/\psi < 1/\ell$ . Since,  $\theta_i \geq 1$  for all  $i > 1$ , we have  $B^n(o, 1/\ell) \cap \text{span}(e_2, \dots, e_n) \subset Q(B^n(o, 1/\ell)) \cap \text{span}(e_2, \dots, e_n)$ , so that  $|p| \leq 1/\ell$  implies  $p \in Q(B^n(o, 1/\ell))$ . Moreover,  $Q(B^n(o, 1/\ell)) \subset Q(C_B)$ , so  $p \in Q(C_B)$ . However, this implies  $Q(x)$  lies on the line segment between  $p$  and  $T_Q(Q(x))$ , both of which are in  $Q(C_B)$ . Since affine transformations preserve convexity, this implies  $Q(x) \in Q(C_B)$ , i.e.,  $x \in C_B$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

Let us return to the inner product  $\left\langle Q(x) - T_Q(Q(x)), \frac{Q(x) - Q(o')}{\|Q(x) - Q(o')\|_2} \right\rangle = |Q(x) - T_Q(Q(x))| \left\langle u, \frac{Q(x) - o'}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2} \right\rangle$ , for some  $o' \in Q(B(o, 1/\ell))$ . Write

$$\mathcal{O} := \left\{ o' \in Q(B(o, 1/\ell)) : \left\langle u, \frac{Q(x) - o'}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2} \right\rangle \geq \eta \right\}.$$

We shall argue  $|\mathcal{O}| \geq c_n^{3.22}|Q(B(o, 1/\ell))|$ . Write  $\pi$  for the projection onto the plane spanned by  $e_2, \dots, e_n$ , thus

$$\left\langle u, \frac{Q(x) - o'}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2} \right\rangle = \left\langle \pi(u), \pi \left( \frac{Q(x) - o'}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2} \right) \right\rangle + \left( \langle u, e_1 \rangle \cdot \left\langle \frac{Q(x) - o'}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2}, e_1 \right\rangle \right),$$

and distinguish two cases; either  $\langle u, e_1 \rangle \geq \psi$  or  $\langle u, e_1 \rangle \in [-\psi, \psi]$ .

In the former case, consider the set

$$\mathcal{O}' := \{o' \in Q(B(o, 1/\ell)) : \langle o', e_1 \rangle \leq 0, \|o'\| \leq \zeta\}.$$

Note that as  $\zeta < \theta^{-1}\ell^{-1}$ , we have that  $\{o' \in Q(B(o, 1/\ell)) : \|o'\| \leq \zeta\} = B(o, \zeta)$ , so that using symmetry in the plane spanned by  $e_2, \dots, e_n$  we have  $|\mathcal{O}'| = \frac{1}{2}|B(o, \zeta)| \geq \frac{\ell^n \zeta^n}{2\theta^{n-1}}|Q(B(o, 1/\ell))|$ .



For points  $o' \in \mathcal{O}'$ , using Equation (3.21) and a version of Equation (3.20), we get

$$\left| \left\langle \pi(u), \pi \left( \frac{Q(x) - o'}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2} \right) \right\rangle \right| \leq \left| \pi \left( \frac{Q(x) - o'}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2} \right) \right| \leq \frac{|\pi(Q(x))| + |\pi(o')|}{0.9\|Q(x)\|_2} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{(n-1)2\alpha\theta\ell}}{\theta^{-1}\ell^{-1}} + \frac{2\zeta}{\theta^{-1}\ell^{-1}}.$$

On the other hand, because  $\langle o', e_1 \rangle \leq 0$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u, e_1 \rangle \cdot \left\langle \frac{Q(x) - o'}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2}, e_1 \right\rangle &\geq \psi \left\langle \frac{Q(x)}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2}, e_1 \right\rangle \geq \psi \theta^{-1} \left\langle \frac{x}{\|Q(x)\| + \|o'\|}, e_1 \right\rangle \\ &\geq \frac{\psi \theta^{-1}}{\xi + \zeta} \langle x, e_1 \rangle \geq \frac{\psi \theta^{-1}}{\xi + \zeta} (1 - \alpha) \ell^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

Combining these two bounds we find

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle u, \frac{Q(x) - o'}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2} \right\rangle &= \left( \langle u, e_1 \rangle \cdot \left\langle \frac{Q(x) - o'}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2}, e_1 \right\rangle \right) + \left\langle \pi(u), \pi \left( \frac{Q(x) - o'}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2} \right) \right\rangle \\ &\geq \frac{\psi \theta^{-1}}{\xi + \zeta} (1 - \alpha) \ell^{-1} - \frac{2\sqrt{(n-1)2\alpha\theta\ell}}{\theta^{-1}\ell^{-1}} - \frac{2\zeta}{\theta^{-1}\ell^{-1}} \\ &= \theta^{-1}\ell^{-1} \left( \frac{\psi}{2} - 4\sqrt{n\alpha}\theta^3\ell^3 - 2\zeta\theta^2\ell^2 \right) \geq \frac{\psi}{3\theta\ell} \geq \eta. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we find  $\mathcal{O}' \subset \mathcal{O}$ , so that  $|\mathcal{O}| \geq |\mathcal{O}'| \geq \frac{1}{2}|B(o, \zeta)| \geq \frac{\ell^n \zeta^n}{2\theta^{n-1}} |Q(B(o, 1/\ell))|$ .

Now consider the other case, i.e.,  $\langle u, e_1 \rangle \in [-\psi, \psi]$ . This implies that  $|\pi(u)| \geq \sqrt{1 - \psi^2} \geq \frac{1}{2}$ . Write  $u' := \pi(u)/|\pi(u)|$ . We consider the set

$$\mathcal{O}'' := \{o' \in Q(B(o, 1/\ell)) : \langle o', e_1 \rangle \geq 0, \|\pi(o')\| \in (1/2\ell, 1/\ell), \langle \pi(o'), u' \rangle < -\phi\}.$$

By symmetry in the plane spanned by  $e_2, \dots, e_n$ , we have that

$$|\mathcal{O}''| = \frac{1}{2} |\{o' \in Q(B(o, 1/\ell)) : \|\pi(o')\| \in (1/2\ell, 1/\ell), \langle \pi(o'), u' \rangle < -\phi\}|$$

Consider the transformation  $Q' \sim \mathcal{Q}_\theta$  with parameters  $e_1, \dots, e_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$  (same as  $Q$ ) and also  $\theta^{-1}, 1, \dots, 1$ . As  $\theta_1 = \theta^{-1}$ ,  $\theta_2, \dots, \theta_n \in [1, \theta]$ , we get  $Q'(B(o, 1/\ell)) \subset Q(B(o, 1/\ell))$  and  $\frac{|Q'(B(o, 1/\ell))|}{|Q(B(o, 1/\ell))|} \geq \theta^{-n+1}$ . From this containment and the rotational symmetry of  $Q'(B(o, 1/\ell))$  around the  $e_1$  axis, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{O}''| &\geq \frac{1}{2} |\{o' \in Q'(B(o, 1/\ell)) : \|\pi(o')\| \in (1/2\ell, 1/\ell), \langle \pi(o'), u' \rangle < -\phi\}| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left| \{o' \in Q'(B(o, 1/\ell)) : \|\pi(o')\| \in (1/2\ell, 1/\ell), \left\langle \frac{\pi(o')}{\|\pi(o')\|}, u' \right\rangle < -2\ell\phi \right\} \right| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\cos^{(-1)}(2\ell\phi)}{2\pi} |\{o' \in Q'(B(o, 1/\ell)) : \|\pi(o')\| \in (1/2\ell, 1/\ell)\}| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{6} |\{o' \in Q'(B(o, 1/\ell)) : \|\pi(o')\| \in (1/2\ell, 1/\ell)\}| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{12} |\{o' \in Q'(B(o, 1/\ell))\}| \geq \frac{1}{12\theta^{n-1}} |\{o' \in Q(B(o, 1/\ell))\}|. \end{aligned}$$

Assume that  $o' \in \mathcal{O}''$ . We have

$$\left| \langle u, e_1 \rangle \cdot \left\langle \frac{Q(x) - o'}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2}, e_1 \right\rangle \right| \leq \psi \left| \left\langle \frac{Q(x)}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2}, e_1 \right\rangle \right| \leq \psi \frac{\|Q(x)\|}{\|o'\| - |Q(x)|} \leq 3\ell\psi\xi,$$

where the first inequality follows from  $\langle o', e_1 \rangle \geq 0$ , the second inequality follows from the triangle inequality and  $|e_1| = 1$  and the final inequality follows from  $|Q(x)| \leq \xi$  and  $\|o'\| - |Q(x)| \geq 1/2\ell - \xi \geq 1/3\ell$ .

For the other term, we use  $|Q(x)| \leq \xi$  and  $|o'| \leq \sqrt{|\pi(o')|^2 + \langle o', e_1 \rangle^2} \leq \sqrt{1/\ell^2 + 1/\ell^2} \leq 2/\ell$  to find that

$$\left\langle \pi(u), \pi \left( \frac{Q(x) - o'}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2} \right) \right\rangle \geq \frac{|\pi(u)|}{\|o'\|_2 + |Q(x)|} (\langle u', \pi(-o') \rangle - |\langle \pi(Q(x)), u' \rangle|) \geq \frac{1/2}{2/\ell + \xi} (\langle u', \pi(-o') \rangle - \xi) \geq \phi - \xi.$$

Combining these two inequalities, we find

$$\left\langle u, \frac{Q(x) - o'}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2} \right\rangle = \left\langle \langle u, e_1 \rangle \cdot \left\langle \frac{Q(x) - o'}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2}, e_1 \right\rangle \right\rangle + \left\langle \pi(u), \pi \left( \frac{Q(x) - o'}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2} \right) \right\rangle \geq \phi - \xi - 3\ell\psi\xi \geq \phi/2 \geq \eta$$

This proves that  $\mathcal{O}'' \subset \mathcal{O}$ , hence  $|\mathcal{O}''| \leq |\mathcal{O}|$ .

Returning to the two cases  $\langle u, e_1 \rangle \geq \psi$  and  $\langle u, e_1 \rangle \in [-\psi, \psi]$ , we now find that in both cases

$$|\mathcal{O}| \geq \min\{|\mathcal{O}'|, |\mathcal{O}''|\} \geq c_n^{3.22} |Q(B(o, 1/\ell))|, \quad (3.22)$$

where  $c_n^{3.22} > 0$  can be found in terms of  $\zeta, \theta, \ell$ , and  $n$ . Note that if  $o' \in \mathcal{O}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle Q(x) - T_Q(Q(x)), \frac{Q(x) - o'}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2} \right\rangle &= |Q(x) - T_Q(Q(x))| \left\langle u, \frac{Q(x) - o'}{\|Q(x) - o'\|_2} \right\rangle \geq \eta |Q(x) - T_Q(Q(x))| \\ &\geq \eta \theta^{-1} |x - Q^{-1}(T_Q(Q(x)))| \geq \eta \theta^{-1} d(x, C_B), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the definition of  $\mathcal{O}$ , the second inequality follows from  $|Q^{-1}|_{op} \leq \theta$  and the last inequality follows from the fact that  $Q^{-1}(T_Q(Q(x))) \in C_B$ .

Now we are ready to conclude using the following Markov bound on the expectation we are trying to control:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{Q, o'} \left[ \max \left\{ \left\langle Q(x) - T_Q(Q(x)), \frac{Q(x) - Q(o')}{\|Q(x) - Q(o')\|_2} \right\rangle, 0 \right\} \right] \\ \geq \mathbb{P} \left( \theta_1 \leq \theta^{-1} \min_{i>1} \{\theta_i\} \text{ and } \left\langle \frac{x}{|x|}, e_1 \right\rangle \geq 1 - \alpha \right) \mathbb{P}(Q(o') \in \mathcal{O} | Q) \eta \theta^{-1} d(x, C_B) \\ \geq c_n^{3.19} c_n^{3.22} \eta \theta^{-1} d(x, C_B) \geq c_n^{3.4} d(x, C_B). \end{aligned}$$

Here we used that if  $o'$  is chosen uniformly from  $B(o, 1/\ell)$ , then  $Q(o')$  is chosen uniformly from  $Q(B(o, 1/\ell))$ . This concludes the lemma.  $\square$

### 3.3.3 Proof of Proposition 3.5

*Proof of Proposition 3.5.* First note that  $|X \Delta Y| = 2|X \setminus Y|$ , so it suffices to bound  $|X \setminus Y|$ .

Given  $x \in (\partial X) \setminus Y$ , let  $y_x$  be the intersection between the line segment  $ox$  and  $\partial Y$ . We'll show that  $|x - y_x| = O_\ell(d(x, Y))$  and integrate  $|x - y_x|$  over  $x$  to find the lemma.

**Claim 3.15.**  $|x - y_x| \leq \ell^2 d(x, Y)$ .

*Proof of claim.* Let  $p_x$  be the projection of  $x$  onto  $\partial Y$ , so that  $d(x, Y) = |x - p_x|$ . Note that as  $x, y_x$ , and  $o$  are colinear,  $x, y_x, p_x$  and  $o$  are coplanar. Restrict attention to this plane, and let  $L$  be the ray (line) through  $p_x$  tangent to  $B(o, 1/\ell)$  so that  $L$  intersects the line segment  $ox$ . Write  $y'_x$  for that intersection. Note that because  $p_x \in Y$  and  $B(o, 1/\ell) \subset Y$ , we have  $|x - y'_x| \geq |x - y_x|$ , so it suffices to upper bound  $|x - y'_x|$ . We show that the angle  $\angle L, ox$  is lower bounded away from 0 in terms of  $\ell$ .

Let  $t$  be the tangent point of  $L$  to  $B(o, 1/\ell)$ , so that  $\angle L, ox = \angle ty'_x o$ . Using the sin rule in the triangle  $ty'_x o$ , we find  $\frac{\sin(\angle ty'_x o)}{|t-o|} = \frac{\sin(\angle y'_x t o)}{|y'_x - o|} = \frac{1}{|y'_x - o|}$ , so that using  $|y'_x - o| \leq \ell$  and  $|t - o| = 1/\ell$ , we find  $\sin(\angle ty'_x o) \geq \ell^{-2}$ . Considering the triangle  $y'_x p_x x$ , we find  $\angle p_x y'_x x = \angle ty'_x o$ , so that applying the sin rule again, we find  $|y'_x - x| = \frac{\sin(\angle x p_x y'_x)}{\sin(\angle p_x y'_x x)} |x - p_x| \leq \ell^2 |x - p_x|$ . We conclude

$$|x - y_x| \leq |y'_x - x| \leq \ell^2 |x - p_x| = \ell^2 d(x, Y).$$

$\square$

Using this claim, we find

$$\int_{\partial X} |x - y_x| dx \leq \ell^2 \int_{\partial X} d(x, Y) dx.$$

Note that  $\bigcup_{x \in \partial X} [x, y_x] = X \setminus Y$ . Let  $z: S^{n-1}(o, \ell) \rightarrow \partial X$  be the map taking a direction  $v \in S^{n-1}(o, \ell)$  to the intersection between  $\mathbb{R}^+v$  and  $\partial X$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bigcup_{x \in \partial X} [x, y_x] \right| &\leq \left| \bigcup_{v \in \partial S^{n-1}(o, \ell)} [v - (z(v) - y_{z(v)}), v] \right| = \int_{0 \leq s \leq \ell} \left| S^{n-1}(o, s) \cap \bigcup_{v \in \partial S^{n-1}(o, \ell)} [v - (z(v) - y_{z(v)}), v] \right| ds \\ &= \int_{0 \leq s \leq \ell} \frac{|S^{n-1}(o, s)|}{|S^{n-1}(o, \ell)|} |\{v \in S^{n-1}(o, \ell) : |z(v) - y_{z(v)}| \geq \ell - s\}| ds \\ &\leq \int_{0 \leq s \leq \ell} |\{v \in S^{n-1}(o, \ell) : |z(v) - y_{z(v)}| \geq \ell - s\}| ds = \int_{v \in \partial S^{n-1}(o, \ell)} |z(v) - y_{z(v)}| dv \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality is immediate from the fact that we compress segments inside  $B^n(o, \ell)$  radially outwards onto the sphere  $S^{n-1}(o, \ell)$ .

As  $B(o, 1/\ell) \subset X \subset B(o, \ell)$ , we find that the Jacobian of the map  $z$  has determinant bounded by some constant, say  $k_{n, \ell}$ , depending only on  $\ell$ , and  $n$ . Hence, we find

$$|X \setminus Y| \leq \int_{v \in \partial S^{n-1}(o, \ell)} |z(v) - y_{z(v)}| dv \leq k_{n, \ell} \int_{\partial X} |x - y_x| dx \leq k_{n, \ell} \ell^2 \int_{\partial X} d(x, Y) dx,$$

which concludes the proof.  $\square$

### 3.4 Proofs of Lemmas

#### 3.4.1 Proof of Lemma 3.6

*Proof of Lemma 3.6.* Fix  $r_{n\lambda, \ell}^{3.6} = 2r_{n\lambda, \ell}^{3.7}$ ,  $\sigma_{n, \lambda, \ell}^{3.6} = \sigma_{n, r_{n\lambda, \ell}^{3.7}}^{3.10}/4$ ,  $m_{n, \lambda, \ell}^{3.6} = \left( k_{n, 2r_{n\lambda, \ell}^{3.7}, \sigma_{n, r_{n\lambda, \ell}^{3.7}}^{3.10}}^{3.8} \right)^n |B^n(o, 1)|$ ,  $\varepsilon_{n, \lambda, \ell}^{3.6} = 1/(32(r_{n\lambda, \ell}^{3.7})^2)$ .

Recall Definition 2.7 and construct simplex  $S' = S'' + z$  with a vertex at  $z$ . Let  $F_0, F_1, \dots, F_n$  be the faces of  $S'$  where  $F_0$  is the face opposite vertex  $z$ . Then, by Lemma 3.7,

1.  $S' \subset C_A \cap C_B$
2.  $F_1 \cup \dots \cup F_n \subset \partial C_A \cap \partial C_B$ .
3.  $B(u, 1/r_{n\lambda, \ell}^{3.7}) \subset S' \subset B(u, r_{n\lambda, \ell}^{3.7})$  for some  $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

Let  $f_0, f_1, \dots, f_n$  be the inward normal vectors to the faces  $F_0, \dots, F_n$ , respectively. By Lemma 3.10 together with (3), there exists  $1 \leq i \leq n$  such that  $\frac{|\langle f_i, y_2 \rangle|}{|f_i| |y_2|} \geq \sigma_{n, r_{n\lambda, \ell}^{3.7}}^{3.10}$ . Hence there exists  $s \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that

$$\frac{\langle f_i, sy_2 \rangle}{|f_i| |sy_2|} \geq \sigma_{n, r_{n\lambda, \ell}^{3.7}}^{3.10}. \quad (3.23)$$

Write  $F = F_i$  and  $f = f_i$ . Let  $H$  be the supporting hyperplane of  $F$  and let  $H^+$  and  $H^-$  be the partition into half-spaces determined by  $H$  with  $H^+$  containing  $S'$  and  $H^-$  disjoint from the interior of  $S'$ .

By Lemma 3.9, together with (3), we deduce there exists  $w_0 \in F$  such that  $B^n(w_0, 1/r_{n\lambda, \ell}^{3.7}) \cap H^+ \subset S'$  and  $B^n(w_0, 1/r_{n\lambda, \ell}^{3.7}) \cap H \subset F$ .

By (1),  $S' \subset C_A, C_B$ . By (2), there exists faces  $F_A$  of  $C_A$  and  $F_B$  of  $C_B$  such that  $F \subset F_A \cap F_B$ . Clearly faces  $F, F_A$  and  $F_B$  share the supporting hyperplane  $H$ ; in particular,  $F, F_A$  and  $F_B$  share the same inward normal vector  $f$ . Therefore, we get  $w_0 \in H$  and  $B^n(w_0, 1/r_{n\lambda, \ell}^{3.7}) \cap H^+ \subset C_A \cap C_B$ . and  $B^n(w_0, 1/r_{n\lambda, \ell}^{3.7}) \cap H \subset F_A \cap F_B$ . It immediately follows that for every  $w \in B^n(w_0, 1/2r_{n\lambda, \ell}^{3.7}) \cap H$ , we also have

$$B^n(w, 1/2r_{n\lambda, \ell}^{3.7}) \cap H^+ \subset C_A \cap C_B. \quad (3.24)$$

Fix  $w \in B^n(w_0, 1/2r_{n\lambda, \ell}^{3.7}) \cap H \subset F_A \cap F_B$ . As  $C_A \cup C_B \subset B^n(o, \ell)$ , it follows that

$$|w| \leq \ell. \quad (3.25)$$

Recall that faces  $F, F_A$  and  $F_B$  share the same inward normal vector  $f$ . Because  $w \in F_A \cap F_B$  and  $M(w) \in \partial C_A \cup \partial C_B$ , by convexity we deduce that  $y_1 = M(w) - w$  satisfies

$$\frac{\langle y_1, f \rangle}{|y_1||f|} \geq 0. \quad (3.26)$$

By Lemma 3.8, together with (3.23), (3.25) and (3.26), applied with parameters  $n, 2r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.7}, \sigma_{n,r_{n,\lambda,\ell}}^{3.10}$  (recall  $r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.7} > \ell$ ), the ball  $X_w = B^n\left(w + f/(4r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.7}), k_{n,2r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.7},\sigma_{n,r_{n,\lambda,\ell}}^{3.10}}^{3.8}\right)$  has the following properties:

1.  $X_w \subset (1 - 1/(32(r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.7})^2))(B(w, 1/2r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.7}) \cap H^+)$ .
2.  $\mathbb{P}_{x \in X_w} \left( \frac{\langle y_1, x-w \rangle}{|y_1||x-w|} \geq 0 \right) \geq 1/2$
3. For all  $x \in X_w$ , we have  $\frac{\langle sy_2, x-w \rangle}{|sy_2||x-w|} \geq \sigma_{n,r_{n,\lambda,\ell}}^{3.10}/4$
4. For all  $x \in X_w$ , we have  $|x - w| \geq 1/8r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.7}$ .

By construction,  $|X_w| = \left(k_{n,2r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.7},\sigma_{n,r_{n,\lambda,\ell}}^{3.10}}^{3.8}\right)^n |B^n(o, 1)| = m_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}$ . By the first property of  $X_w$ , together with (3.24), we get  $X_w \subset (1 - 1/(32(r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.7})^2))(C_A \cap C_B) = (1 - \varepsilon_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6})(C_A \cap C_B)$ . The second and third property of  $X_w$  exactly give  $\mathbb{P}_{x \in X_w} \left( \frac{\langle y_1, x-w \rangle}{|y_1||x-w|} \geq 0 \right) \geq 1/2$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{x \in X_w} \left( \frac{\langle sy_2, x-w \rangle}{|sy_2||x-w|} \geq \sigma_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6} \right) = 1$ . The last property of  $X_w$  is exactly  $d(w, X_w) \geq 1/(4r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6})$ . Finally, note that all of these hold for all  $w \in B^n(w_0, 1/r_{n,\lambda,\ell}^{3.6}) \cap H$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

### 3.4.2 Proof of Lemma 3.7

*Proof of Lemma 3.7.* Set  $r^{3.7} = 2\ell\lambda$ . The first two parts follow immediately from Definition 2.7 (2). For the third part, note that by Definition 2.7 (1) and (2) we have  $B(o, 1/\ell) \subset C_A \subset \lambda S'' + z = \lambda S' + (1 - \lambda)z$ . After rearranging, we conclude  $B\left(\frac{\lambda-1}{\lambda}z, \frac{1}{\ell\lambda}\right) \subset S'$ . In addition,  $z \in S' \subset C_A \subset B(o, \ell)$ . After rearranging, we conclude

$$S' \subset B(o, \ell) \subset B\left(\frac{\lambda-1}{\lambda}z, \ell + \frac{\lambda-1}{\lambda}|z|\right) \subset B\left(\frac{\lambda-1}{\lambda}z, 2\ell\right).$$

$\square$

### 3.4.3 Proof of Lemma 3.8

*Proof of Lemma 3.8.* Set  $k = (4r)^{-1}\sigma$  and  $\varepsilon = 1/(8r)^2$ . As everything is normalized, without loss of generality we can assume  $|y_1| = |y_2| = 1$ .

For the second part, consider the half-space  $Y = \{x : \langle y_1, x - w \rangle \geq 0\}$ . We need to show that  $|X \cap Y|/|X| \geq 1/2$ . Because  $X$  is a ball and  $Y$  is a half-space, it is enough to show that the center of the ball belongs to the half space. In other words, we need to check  $\langle y_1, w + f/(2r) - w \rangle \geq 0$ , which follows from the hypothesis  $\langle y_1, f \rangle \geq 0$ .

For the rest of the proof fix  $x \in X = B^n(w + f/(2r), k)$ . For the third part, note that we can write  $x = w + f/(2r) + \alpha g$  where  $g$  is a unit vector and  $k \geq \alpha \geq 0$ . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\langle y_2, x - w \rangle}{|y_2||x - w|} &= \frac{\langle y_2, f/(2r) + \alpha g \rangle}{|y_2||f/(2r) + \alpha g|} = \frac{(2r)^{-1}\langle y_2, f \rangle + \alpha \langle y_2, g \rangle}{|y_2||f/(2r) + \alpha g|} \geq \frac{(2r)^{-1}\sigma + \alpha \langle y_2, g \rangle}{|y_2||f/(2r) + \alpha g|} \\ &\geq \frac{(2r)^{-1}\sigma - \alpha}{|y_2||f/(2r) + \alpha g|} \geq \frac{(4r)^{-1}\sigma}{|y_2||f/(2r) + \alpha g|} \geq \frac{(4r)^{-1}\sigma}{|y_2|(|f/(2r)| + |\alpha g|)} \\ &\geq \frac{(4r)^{-1}\sigma}{1/(2r) + \alpha} \geq \frac{(4r)^{-1}\sigma}{3/(4r)} \geq \sigma/4. \end{aligned}$$

Here the first inequality follows from the hypothesis  $\langle y_2, f \rangle \geq \sigma$ . The second inequality follows from the simple fact that for unit vectors  $y_2, g$   $\langle y_2, g \rangle \geq -1$ . The third inequality follows from the fact that  $\alpha \leq k \leq (4r)^{-1}\sigma$ . The fourth inequality is the triangle inequality. The fifth inequality follows from the fact that  $y_2, f, g$  have norm 1. The sixth inequality follows from the fact that  $\alpha \leq k \leq (4r)^{-1}$ .

For the forth and first parts, we recall that  $|x - (w + (f/2r))| \leq k$ ,  $|w| \leq r$  and  $|f| = 1$  and apply the triangle inequality.

$$|x - w| \geq |w + f/(2r) - w| - |x - (w + f/(2r))| \geq 1/(2r) - k \geq 1/(4r).$$

Here we used the hypothesis  $k \leq 1/(4r)$ .

$$|x - (1 - \varepsilon)w| \leq |w + f/(2r) - w| + |\varepsilon w| + |x - (w + f/(2r))| \leq 1/(2r) + \varepsilon r + k \geq 7/(8r) \leq (1 - \varepsilon)r.$$

Here we used the hypothesis  $k \leq 1/(4r)$  and  $\varepsilon \leq 1/(8r^2) \leq 1/8$ . Finally, we can again write  $x = w + f/(2r) + \alpha g$  with  $g$  a unit vector and  $0 \leq \alpha \leq k$ , so that we have

$$\langle f, x \rangle = \langle f, w \rangle + \langle f, f/(2r) \rangle + \langle f, \alpha g \rangle = 0 + 1/(2r) + \alpha \langle f, g \rangle \geq 0.$$

Here we used that  $0 \leq \alpha \leq k \leq 1/(2r)$  and  $\langle f, g \rangle \geq -1$ . Hence, we find that  $X \subset H^+$ .  $\square$

### 3.4.4 Proof of Lemma 3.9

*Proof of Lemma 3.9.* Let  $x$  be the vertex of  $S'$  opposite to  $F$ . Let  $v = xu \cap F$  be the intersection of the ray  $xu$  with the face  $F$ . Set  $\lambda = |xu|/|xv| \leq 1$ . Then it is easy to see that  $(1 - \lambda)x + \lambda B^n(v, 1/r) = B^n(u, \lambda/r) \subset B^n(u, 1/r)$ .

Let  $F, F_1, \dots, F_n$  be the faces of  $F$  and let  $H, H_1, \dots, H_n$  be the supporting hyperplanes, respectively. For each  $1 \leq i \leq n$  let  $H_i^+$  and  $H_i^-$  be the two half spaces determined by  $H_i$ , such that  $H_i^+$  contains  $S'$  and  $H_i^-$  is disjoint from the interior of  $S'$ . Then  $S' = H^+ \cap_{i=1}^n H_i^+$ .

For the first part, as  $B^n(v, 1/r) \cap H^+ \subset H^+$ , it is enough to show that for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , we have  $B^n(v, 1/r) \subset H_i^+$ . Assume for the sake of contradiction that there exists  $y \in B^n(v, 1/r) \cap H_i^-$ . As vertex  $x$  belongs to all faces except  $F$ , we have  $x \in F_i \subset H_i \subset H_i^-$ . Hence, as  $H_i^-$  is convex, we have  $(1 - \lambda)x + \lambda y \in H_i^-$ . However, by the above discussion, we have  $(1 - \lambda)x + \lambda y \in B^n(u, 1/r) \subset S' \subset H_i^+$ . As  $H_i^+$  and  $H_i^-$  are disjoint, this gives the desired contradiction. Thus, we conclude the first part.

For the second part, on the one hand we have  $B^n(v, 1/r) \cap H = B^n(v, 1/r) \cap H^+ \cap H \subset S' \cap H = F$ . On the other hand,  $F \subset H$  by definition and  $F \subset S' \subset B^n(u, r) \subset B^n(v, 2r)$  by hypothesis. For the last inclusion we just used the fact that  $v \in F \subset S' \subset B^n(u, r)$ . Thus, we conclude the second part.  $\square$

### 3.4.5 Proof of Lemma 3.10

*Proof of Lemma 3.10.* For a contradiction assume there is a sequence of simplices  $S^i$  and unit vectors  $v^i$  so that  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |\langle f_j^i, v^i \rangle| \leq \sigma_i$ , where  $\sigma_i \rightarrow 0$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . By compactness there exists a converging subsequence so that  $v^i \rightarrow v$  and  $S^i \rightarrow S'$  (each of the vertices of  $S_i$  converging to the corresponding vertices of  $S'$ ).  $S'$  has the property that  $B(u, 1/r) \subset S' \subset B(u, r)$  and letting  $f_i$  be the inward normal vectors to the faces of  $S'$ , we have  $\langle f_i, v \rangle = 0$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

Consider the line  $u + \mathbb{R}v$  through  $u$ . As  $B(u, 1/r) \subset S'$ , this line goes through the interior of  $S'$ , so intersects the boundary  $\partial S'$  exactly twice, in two distinct faces. In particular, this line intersects some face  $i$  with normal  $f_i$  with  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . However, as  $\langle f_i, v \rangle = 0$  it follows that this line is contained inside face  $i$ . However, this line goes through the interior of  $S'$ , contradiction.  $\square$

### 3.4.6 Proof of Lemma 3.11

*Proof of Lemma 3.11.* The statement is equivalent to the following statement. There exists  $0 < \alpha_n < 1$  such that the following holds. If  $0 < t \leq 1/2$  and  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n > 0$  and  $\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_n = 1$ , then

$$\alpha_n (\lambda_1 - 1)^2 \leq t^{-1} \left( \prod_i (t + (1 - t)\lambda_i) - 1 \right) + t^{-2n} \left( \prod_i (t + (1 - t)\lambda_i) - 1 \right)^2.$$

It is easy to check that for fixed  $\lambda_1 > 0$ , and conditioned on  $\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_n = 1$ , the right hand side is minimised when  $\lambda_2 = \dots = \lambda_n = \lambda_1^{\frac{1}{1-n}}$ . This is because for  $a, b > 0$  we have  $(t + (1 - t)a)(t + (1 - t)b) \geq (t + (1 - t)\sqrt{ab})^2$ . Write  $\lambda_1 = \lambda^{1-n}$  and  $\lambda_2 = \dots = \lambda_n = \lambda$  for some  $\lambda > 0$ . Then the inequality becomes

$$\alpha_n (\lambda^{1-n} - 1)^2 \leq t^{-1} \left( (t + (1 - t)\lambda^{1-n})(t + (1 - t)\lambda)^{n-1} - 1 \right) + t^{-2n} \left( (t + (1 - t)\lambda^{1-n})(t + (1 - t)\lambda)^{n-1} - 1 \right)^2$$

We first assume that  $0 < \lambda \leq 1$  and note that

$$\begin{aligned} (t+(1-t)\lambda^{1-n})(t+(1-t)\lambda)^{n-1} - 1 &\geq \lambda^{(1-t)(1-n)}(t+(1-t)\lambda)^{n-1} - 1 = (t\lambda^{t-1} + (1-t)\lambda^t)^{n-1} - 1 \\ &\geq t\lambda^{t-1} + (1-t)\lambda^t - 1 = t \exp(-\log(\lambda)(1-t)) + (1-t) \exp(t \log(\lambda)) - 1 \\ &\geq t(1 - \log(\lambda)(1-t)) + \frac{1}{2} \log^2(\lambda)(1-t)^2 + (1-t)(1 + t \log(\lambda)) - 1 = \frac{t}{2} \log^2(\lambda)(1-t)^2 \geq \frac{t}{8} \log^2(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

We now assume that  $\lambda \geq 1$  and note that

$$\begin{aligned} (t+(1-t)\lambda^{1-n})(t+(1-t)\lambda)^{n-1} - 1 &\geq (t+(1-t)\lambda^{1-n})\lambda^{(1-t)(n-1)} - 1 = t\lambda^{(1-t)(n-1)} + (1-t)\lambda^{-t(n-1)} - 1 \\ &= t \exp(\log(\lambda)(1-t)(n-1)) + (1-t) \exp(-t \log(\lambda)(n-1)) - 1 \\ &\geq t \left( 1 + \log(\lambda)(1-t)(n-1) + \frac{1}{2} \log^2(\lambda)(1-t)^2(n-1)^2 \right) + (1-t) \left( 1 - t \log(\lambda)(n-1) \right) - 1 \\ &= \frac{t}{2} \log^2(\lambda)(1-t)^2(n-1)^2 \geq \frac{t}{8} \log^2(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

In both cases ( $0 < \lambda \leq 1$  and  $\lambda > 1$ ), the first inequality follows from the AM-GM inequality:  $px + (1-p)y \geq x^p y^{1-p}$  for  $0 < p < 1$  and  $0 < x, y$ . Also, the penultimate inequality follows from the inequalities  $\exp(x) \geq 1 + x + \frac{x^2}{2}$  and  $\exp(-x) \geq 1 - x$ , for  $x \geq 0$ . Combining the two cases, for  $\lambda > 0$  we get that

$$(t+(1-t)\lambda^{1-n})(t+(1-t)\lambda)^{n-1} - 1 \geq \frac{t}{8} \log^2(\lambda).$$

Therefore, for  $|\lambda - 1| \leq 0.25$ , using the simple inequality  $|\log(\lambda)| \geq \frac{|\lambda-1|}{2}$ , we deduce that

$$(t+(1-t)\lambda^{1-n})(t+(1-t)\lambda)^{n-1} - 1 \geq \frac{t}{2^5} |\lambda - 1|^2. \quad (3.27)$$

Moreover, for  $|\lambda - 1| \geq 0.25$ , using the inequality  $|\log(\lambda)| \geq 1/8$ , we deduce that  $(t+(1-t)\lambda^{1-n})(t+(1-t)\lambda)^{n-1} - 1 \geq \frac{t}{2^9}$ . The last inequality implies that for  $t/2 < \lambda \leq 0.75$ , we have

$$t^{-2n} \left( (t+(1-t)\lambda^{1-n})(t+(1-t)\lambda)^{n-1} - 1 \right)^2 \geq \frac{t^{2-2n}}{2^{18}} \geq \frac{\lambda^{2-2n}}{2^{16+2n}} \geq \frac{(\lambda^{1-n} - 1)^2}{2^{16+2n}}. \quad (3.28)$$

It also implies that for  $1.25 \leq \lambda$ , we have

$$t^{-2n} \left( (t+(1-t)\lambda^{1-n})(t+(1-t)\lambda)^{n-1} - 1 \right)^2 \geq \frac{t^{2-2n}}{2^{18}} \geq \frac{1}{2^{18}} \geq \frac{(\lambda^{1-n} - 1)^2}{2^{18}}. \quad (3.29)$$

For  $0 < \lambda \leq t/2$ , we have the simple bound

$$(t+(1-t)\lambda^{1-n})(t+(1-t)\lambda)^{n-1} - 1 \geq (1-t)\lambda^{1-n}t^{n-1} - 1 \geq 3^{-1}\lambda^{1-n}t^{n-1},$$

where the last inequality follows from  $\lambda^{1-n}t^{n-1} \geq 2^{n-1}$  and  $0 < t \leq 1/2$ . Therefore, for  $0 < \lambda \leq t/2$  we infer

$$t^{-2n} \left( (t+(1-t)\lambda^{1-n})(t+(1-t)\lambda)^{n-1} - 1 \right)^2 \geq t^{-2n} 3^{-2} \lambda^{2-2n} t^{2n-2} \geq 3^{-2} \lambda^{2-2n} \geq 3^{-2} (\lambda^{1-n} - 1)^2. \quad (3.30)$$

where the last inequality follows from  $\lambda \leq 1$ .

Combining (3.27), (3.28), (3.29) and (3.30), we conclude

$$\frac{(\lambda^{1-n} - 1)^2}{2^{18+2n}} \leq t^{-1} \left( (t+(1-t)\lambda^{1-n})(t+(1-t)\lambda)^{n-1} - 1 \right) + t^{-2n} \left( (t+(1-t)\lambda^{1-n})(t+(1-t)\lambda)^{n-1} - 1 \right)^2.$$

□

### 3.4.7 Proof of Lemma 3.12

*Proof of Lemma 3.12.* Choose maximal  $1 \geq \mu > 0$  such that  $(\ell^{-2} + 1)^{-1}(1 + \mu) \leq (t\varepsilon/4)^{-1}(t(1 + \mu)\varepsilon/4 - \mu)$ . By hypothesis, we have  $K - x \subset A \subset C_A \subset (1 + \mu)K - x$  and  $K - y \subset B \subset C_B \subset (1 + \mu)K - y$ .

Therefore, it is enough to show that  $t(K - x) + (1-t)(K - y) \supset t(1 - \varepsilon/4)((1 + \mu)K - x) + (1-t)((1 + \mu)K - y)$ . After rearranging, this is equivalent to  $K - tx - (1-t)y \supset (1 - t\varepsilon/4)(1 + \mu)K - t(1 - \varepsilon/4)x - (1-t)y$ . After further rearranging, this is equivalent to  $K \supset (1 + \mu - t(1 + \mu)\varepsilon/4)K + (t\varepsilon/4)x$ . Therefore, it is enough to show

$$x \in (t\varepsilon/4)^{-1}(t(1 + \mu)\varepsilon/4 - \mu)K$$

By hypothesis, we know  $K \subset (1 + \mu)K$  which implies that  $o \in K$  (assuming wlog  $K$  is compact). By hypothesis, we also know  $K - x \subset B(o, \ell)$ . Combining the last two inclusions, we get  $-x \in B(o, \ell)$  i.e.,  $x \in B(o, \ell)$ . Finally, by hypothesis we have  $(1 + \mu)K - x \supset B(o, \ell^{-1})$ .

Combining the last two inclusions and rearranging, we get

$$x \in (\ell^{-2} + 1)^{-1}(1 + \mu)K.$$

By the choice of parameters, we have  $(\ell^{-2} + 1)^{-1}(1 + \mu) \leq (t\varepsilon/4)^{-1}(t(1 + \mu)\varepsilon/4 - \mu)$ , from which the conclusion follows.  $\square$

### 3.4.8 Proof of Lemma 3.13

*Proof of Lemma 3.13.* We first observe that, by Caffarelli's regularity theory [Caf92b, Caf92a], the function  $\varphi$  is a strictly convex Alexandrov solution of  $\det D^2\varphi = 1$ . Also, thanks to (3.1), the modulus of strict convexity depends only on  $R$  and the dimension. Hence, we can apply the interior regularity theory for Alexandrov solutions (see for instance [Fig17, Theorem 4.42]) to deduce that, for every  $\theta, \alpha \in (0, 1)$ ,  $D^2\varphi$  is uniformly  $\alpha$ -Hölder continuous inside  $(1 - \theta)C_A$ . More precisely, there exists a constant  $\hat{C}_{n,R,\theta,\alpha} > 0$  such that

$$\|D^2\varphi\|_{C^{0,\alpha}((1-\theta)C_A)} := \|D^2\varphi\|_{L^\infty((1-\theta)C_A)} + \sup_{x,y \in (1-\theta)C_A} \frac{|D^2\varphi(x) - D^2\varphi(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha} \leq \hat{C}_{n,R,\theta,\alpha} \quad (3.31)$$

(here the choice of the norm for  $D^2\varphi(x)$  is irrelevant, since all norms are equivalent up to dimensional constants).

Now, given any affine function  $\ell(x) := b \cdot x + c$  ( $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ ), consider the second-order polynomial  $p_\ell(x) := \frac{|x|^2}{2} + \ell(x)$ . Since  $\det D^2p_\ell = 1$ , applying [Fig17, Lemma A.1] we write

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \det D^2\varphi - \det D^2p_\ell = \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt} \det(tD^2\varphi + (1-t)D^2p_\ell) dt \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^n \left( \int_0^1 \operatorname{cof}(tD^2\varphi + (1-t)\operatorname{Id}) dt \right)_{ij} \partial_{ij}(\varphi - p_\ell), \end{aligned}$$

where, given a symmetric matrix  $A$ ,  $\operatorname{cof}(A)$  denotes its cofactor matrix. In other words, if we define the functions

$$a_{ij}(x) := \left( \int_0^1 \operatorname{cof}(tD^2\varphi(x) + (1-t)\operatorname{Id}) dt \right)_{ij} \quad i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$$

and  $\psi_\ell := \varphi - p_\ell$ , then  $\psi_\ell$  solves the equation

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij} \partial_{ij} \psi_\ell = 0.$$

Note that, thanks to (3.31), the matrices  $(a_{ij}(x))_{i,j=1}^n$  are uniformly positive definite and Hölder continuous. Hence, recalling (3.1), it follows from classical elliptic regularity (see for instance [GT98, Corollary 6.3 and Theorem 9.20]) and a covering argument that

$$\|D^2\psi_\ell\|_{L^\infty((1-2\theta)C_A)} \leq C'_{n,R,\theta} \|\psi_\ell\|_{L^1((1-\theta)C_A)}, \quad (3.32)$$

where  $C'_{n,R,\theta}$  depends on  $n$ ,  $R$ , and  $\theta$  only.

Now, set  $\psi(x) := \varphi(x) - \frac{|x|^2}{2}$  and fix  $\bar{\ell}(x) = \bar{b} \cdot x + \bar{c}$  with

$$\bar{b} := \frac{1}{|(1-\theta)C_A|} \int_{(1-\theta)C_A} \nabla\psi(x) dx, \quad \bar{c} := \frac{1}{|(1-\theta)C_A|} \int_{(1-\theta)C_A} (\psi(x) - \bar{b} \cdot x) dx.$$

Then, by applying twice the 1-Poincaré inequality (see [GT98, Equation (7.45)] with  $p = 1$ ) and recalling (3.1), we have

$$\|\psi_{\bar{\ell}}\|_{L^1((1-\theta)C_A)} \leq 2^n R^{2n-1} \|\nabla\psi_{\bar{\ell}}\|_{L^1((1-\theta)C_A)} \leq 4^n R^{4n-2} \|D^2\psi_{\bar{\ell}}\|_{L^1((1-\theta)C_A)}. \quad (3.33)$$

Noticing that  $D^2\psi_{\bar{\ell}} = D^2\psi$ , combining (3.32) (with  $\ell = \bar{\ell}$ ) and (3.33) we conclude that

$$\|D^2\psi\|_{L^\infty((1-2\theta)C_A)} \leq 4^n R^{4n-2} C'_{n,R,\theta} \|D^2\psi\|_{L^1((1-\theta)C_A)}.$$

Choosing  $\theta = \varepsilon/2$ , this proves the desired estimate with  $C_{n,R,\varepsilon} = 4^n R^{4n-2} C'_{n,R,\varepsilon/2}$ .  $\square$

## 4 Putting it all together: Proof of Theorem 1.2

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.* Consider any  $n, t, \ell$ , and  $\lambda$ . Choose  $g_{n,t} = d_{n,t} := t^{2n-1}/4$ . Choose  $\theta = \theta_{n,\ell/2}^{3.4}$  as given by Proposition 3.4. Choose  $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ . Choose  $\mu := \mu_{n,t,\varepsilon,\ell}^{3.1}$  as given by Proposition 3.1. Choose  $c_{n,\ell,\lambda} := \frac{c_{n,\ell}^{3.5} c_{n,\varepsilon,\lambda,\ell,\theta}^{3.2}}{c_{n,\ell}^{3.4}} \theta^{-n} + 2$ , where  $c_{n,\ell}^{3.5}$ ,  $c_{n,\varepsilon,\lambda,\ell,\theta}^{3.2}$ , and  $c_{n,\ell}^{3.4}$  are the constants from Proposition 3.5, Corollary 3.2 and Proposition 3.4 respectively.

By Proposition 2.8, we may assume that  $A, B$  are  $(\gamma, \ell, \lambda, \mu)$  conelike with  $\mu$  sufficiently small in terms of  $n, t, \ell$  and  $\lambda$ .

By Corollary 3.2, we find that for any affine transformation  $Q : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ , if  $\|Q\|_{op}, \|Q^{-1}\|_{op} \leq \theta$  and if  $T_Q : Q(C_A) \rightarrow Q(C_B)$  is the optimal transport map from  $Q(C_A)$  to  $Q(C_B)$ , then

$$\int_{x \in \partial C_A} \max \left\{ \left\langle Q(x) - T_Q(Q(x)), \frac{Q(x) - Q(o')}{\|Q(x) - Q(o')\|_2} \right\rangle, 0 \right\} dx \leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\lambda,\ell,\theta}^{3.2} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |Q(A)|,$$

for all  $o' \in (1 - \varepsilon)C_A$ .

Let  $Q \sim \mathcal{Q}_\theta$  be random scaling, choose  $o'$  uniformly random from  $B(o, 1/2\ell)$ . Note that  $T_Q(Q(C_A)) \subset Q(C_B)$  and  $B(o, 1/2\ell) \subset \frac{1}{2}C_A, \frac{1}{2}C_B \subset B(o, 2\ell)$ . Hence, by Proposition 3.4, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q,o'} \left[ \max \left\{ \left\langle Q(x) - T_Q(Q(x)), \frac{Q(x) - Q(o')}{\|Q(x) - Q(o')\|_2} \right\rangle, 0 \right\} \right] \geq c_{n,2\ell}^{3.4} d(x, C_B).$$

Since we have  $\|Q\|_{op}, \|Q^{-1}\|_{op} \leq \theta$  for every random scaling  $Q \sim \mathcal{Q}_\theta$ , and  $B(o, 1/2\ell) \subset (1 - \varepsilon)C_A, (1 - \varepsilon)C_B$ , we can combine these two to find:

$$\begin{aligned} c_{n,2\ell}^{3.4} \int_{x \in \partial C_A} d(x, C_B) dx &\leq \int_{x \in \partial C_A} \mathbb{E}_{Q,o'} \left[ \max \left\{ \left\langle Q(x) - T_Q(Q(x)), \frac{Q(x) - Q(o')}{\|Q(x) - Q(o')\|_2} \right\rangle, 0 \right\} \right] dx \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q,o'} \left[ \int_{x \in \partial C_A} \max \left\{ \left\langle Q(x) - T_Q(Q(x)), \frac{Q(x) - Q(o')}{\|Q(x) - Q(o')\|_2} \right\rangle, 0 \right\} dx \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{Q,o'} \left[ c_{n,\varepsilon,\lambda,\ell,\theta}^{3.2} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |Q(A)| \right] \leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\lambda,\ell,\theta}^{3.2} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \mathbb{E}_Q [|Q(A)|] \leq c_{n,\varepsilon,\lambda,\ell,\theta}^{3.2} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \theta^n |A|, \end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality follows as every  $Q \sim \mathcal{Q}_\theta$  has determinant at most  $\theta^n$ . Applying Proposition 3.5 we find

$$|C_A \Delta C_B| \leq c_{n,\ell}^{3.5} \int_{x \in \partial C_A} d(x, C_B) dx \leq \frac{c_{n,\ell}^{3.5} c_{n,\varepsilon,\lambda,\ell,\theta}^{3.2}}{c_{n,2\ell}^{3.4}} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \theta^n |A|.$$

We conclude recalling the definition of  $C_A, C_B$ :

$$|A \Delta B| \leq |C_A \Delta C_B| + |C_A \setminus A| + |C_B \setminus B| \leq \frac{c_{n,\ell}^{3.5} c_{n,\varepsilon,\lambda,\ell,\theta}^{3.2}}{c_{n,2\ell}^{3.4}} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} \theta^n |A| + 2\gamma |A| \leq c_{n,\ell,\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{\delta + \gamma}{t}} |A|.$$

This concludes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

## References

- [BFRar] Károly J Böröczky, Alessio Figalli, and João PG Ramos. A quantitative stability result for the Prékopa-Leindler inequality for arbitrary measurable functions. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, to appear.
- [BJ17] Marco Barchiesi and Vesa Julin. Robustness of the Gaussian concentration inequality and the Brunn-Minkowski inequality. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 56, 05 2017.
- [Bon21] Tommy Bonnesen. Sur une amélioration de l'inégalité isopérimétrique du cercle et la démonstration d'une inégalité de minkowski. *CR Acad. Sci. Paris*, 172:1087–1089, 1921.
- [Caf92a] Luis Caffarelli. Boundary regularity of maps with convex potentials. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 45(9):1141–1151, 1992.



- [Caf92b] Luis Caffarelli. The regularity of mappings with a convex potential. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 5(1):99–104, 1992.
- [Chr12a] Michael Christ. Near equality in the Brunn–Minkowski inequality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1207.5062*, 2012.
- [Chr12b] Michael Christ. Near equality in the two-dimensional Brunn–Minkowski inequality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1206.1965*, 2012.
- [CM17] Eric Carlen and Francesco Maggi. Stability for the Brunn–Minkowski and Riesz rearrangement inequalities, with applications to Gaussian concentration and finite range non-local isoperimetry. *Canad. J. Math.*, 69(5):1036–1063, 2017.
- [Dis73] Valentin Ivanovich Diskant. Stability of the solution of the Minkowski equation. *Siberian Mathematical Journal*, 14(3):466–469, 1973.
- [EK14] Ronen Eldan and Bo’az Klartag. Dimensionality and the stability of the Brunn–Minkowski inequality. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Classe di scienze*, 13(4):975–1007, 2014.
- [Fig15] Alessio Figalli. Stability results for the Brunn–Minkowski inequality. In *Colloquium De Giorgi 2013 and 2014*, pages 119–127. Springer, 2015.
- [Fig17] Alessio Figalli. The Monge–Ampère equation and its applications. *Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich*, pages x+200, 2017.
- [FJ15] Alessio Figalli and David Jerison. Quantitative stability for sumsets in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 17(5):1079–1106, 2015.
- [FJ17] Alessio Figalli and David Jerison. Quantitative stability for the Brunn–Minkowski inequality. *Adv. Math.*, 314:1–47, 2017.
- [FJ21] Alessio Figalli and David Jerison. A sharp Freiman type estimate for semisums in two and three dimensional Euclidean spaces. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér.*, 54(4):235–257, 2021.
- [FMM18] Alessio Figalli, Francesco Maggi, and Connor Mooney. The sharp quantitative Euclidean concentration inequality. *Camb. J. Math.*, 6:59–87, 3 2018.
- [FMP08] Nicolo Fusco, Francesco Maggi, and Aldo Pratelli. The sharp quantitative isoperimetric inequality. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 168(3):941–980, 2008.
- [FMP09] Alessio Figalli, Francesco Maggi, and Aldo Pratelli. A refined Brunn–Minkowski inequality for convex sets. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 26:2511–2519, 11 2009.
- [FMP10] Alessio Figalli, Francesco Maggi, and Aldo Pratelli. A mass transportation approach to quantitative isoperimetric inequalities. *Invent. Math.*, pages 167–211, 2010.
- [Fre59] Gregory A Freiman. The addition of finite sets. I. *Izv. Vysš. Učebn. Zaved. Matematika*, (6):202–213, 1959.
- [FvHT23] Alessio Figalli, Peter van Hintum, and Marius Tiba. Sharp quantitative stability of the Brunn–Minkowski inequality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.20643*, 2023.
- [Gar02] Richard Gardner. The Brunn–Minkowski inequality. *Bulletin of the American mathematical society*, 39(3):355–405, 2002.
- [GT98] David Gilbarg and Neil Sidney Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.
- [vHK23a] Peter van Hintum and Peter Keevash. Locality in sumsets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.01189*, 2023.
- [vHK23b] Peter van Hintum and Peter Keevash. The sharp doubling threshold for approximate convexity. *Forthcoming in the Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, 2023.
- [vHST22] Peter van Hintum, Hunter Spink, and Marius Tiba. Sharp stability of Brunn–Minkowski for homothetic regions. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 24(12):4207–4223, 2022.

- [vHST23a] Peter van Hintum, Hunter Spink, and Marius Tiba. Sharp  $L^1$  Inequalities for Sup-Convolution. *Discrete Anal.*, 7:16pp, 2023.
- [vHST23b] Peter van Hintum, Hunter Spink, and Marius Tiba. Sharp quantitative stability of the planar Brunn–Minkowski inequality. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 26(2):695–730, 2023.
- [LS95] Vsevolod F Lev and Pavel Y Smeliansky. On addition of two distinct sets of integers. *Acta Arith.*, 70(1):85–91, 1995.
- [Ruz97] Imre Z Ruzsa. The Brunn–Minkowski inequality and nonconvex sets. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 67:337–348, 1997.
- [Sta96] Yonutz Stanchescu. On addition of two distinct sets of integers. *Acta Arith.*, 75(2):191–194, 1996.