

THE WEIGHTED L^p MINKOWSKI PROBLEM

DYLAN LANGHARST, JIAQIAN LIU, AND SHENGYU TANG

ABSTRACT. The Minkowski problem in convex geometry concerns showing a given Borel measure on the unit sphere is, up to perhaps a constant, some type of surface area measure of a convex body. Two types of Minkowski problems in particular are an active area of research: L^p Minkowski problems, introduced by Lutwak and (Lutwak, Yang, and Zhang), and weighted Minkowski problems, introduced by Livshyts. For the latter, the Gaussian Minkowski problem, whose primary investigators were (Huang, Xi and Zhao), is the most prevalent. In this work, we consider weighted surface area in the L^p setting. We propose a framework going beyond the Gaussian setting by focusing on rotational invariant measures, mirroring the recent development of the Gardner-Zvavitch inequality for rotational invariant, log-concave measures. Our results include existence for all $p \in \mathbb{R}$ (with symmetry assumptions in certain instances). We also have uniqueness for $p \geq 1$ under a concavity assumption. Finally, we obtain results in the so-called *small mass regime* using degree theory, as instigated in the Gaussian case by (Huang, Xi and Zhao). Most known results for the Gaussian Minkowski problem are then special cases of our main theorems.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Motivation. Given a finite Borel measure μ on the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^{n-1} in the n -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n , one may ask: does there exist a unique (up to translations) convex body K (compact, convex set with non-empty interior) such that $dS_K = d\mu$? Here, S_K is the surface area measure of K , which is obtained by pushing the Hausdorff measure on ∂K , the boundary of K , to \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , i.e. for every Borel $A \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$,

$$S_K(A) = \mathcal{H}^{n-1}(n_K^{-1}(A)),$$

where \mathcal{H}^{n-1} is the $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure and $n_K : \partial K \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ is the Gauss map, which associates an element y of ∂K with its outer unit normal.

Minkowski's existence theorem [94, p. 455] shows that if μ satisfies the following two conditions, then the answer is yes:

- (1) The measure μ is not concentrated on any great hemisphere, that is

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \langle \theta, \xi \rangle_+ d\mu(\xi) > 0 \quad \text{for all } \theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}.$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 52A38, 52A40, Secondary: 52A21, 35J96.

Key words and phrases. Minkowski problem, Gaussian measure, Gaussian Minkowski problem.

The first named author was funded by the Fondation Sciences Mathématiques de Paris Postdoctoral program.

The second named author was funded by the China National Postdoctoral Program for Innovative Talents of CPSF (BX20240102).

(2) The measure is centered, that is

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \xi d\mu(\xi) = 0.$$

The concept of the surface area measure of a convex body has seen many extensions over the past century, which was initiated after a series of papers by Lutwak [78, 79] in the '90s establishing the modern L^p Brunn-Minkowski theory. It will be convenient to denote by \mathcal{K}_o^n the set of all convex bodies containing the origin in their interior, and by \mathcal{K}_e^n the set of all (origin)-symmetric convex bodies. A set K is origin symmetric if $K = -K$. For brevity, we may simply say symmetric.

The question of showing that a given data measure on the sphere is the appropriate surface area measure of a convex body is a *Minkowski problem*. In many instances, one must introduce a constant into the Minkowski problem, in fact this is more standard than not in the weighted setting (also in the Orlicz setting, see [50]). We say a Minkowski problem is *constant free* if there is no constant. In certain instances, one considers only *even* data measures ν on the sphere when solving a Minkowski problem, in which case the convex body whose relevant area measure fits the data will be symmetric.

The L^p Minkowski problem, concerning the L^p surface area measure $S_{K,p}$, is perhaps the most notable example of a Minkowski problem. Setting the support function of a convex body K as $h_K(x) = \sup_{y \in K} \langle x, y \rangle$, then it turned out that $dS_{K,p} = h_K^{1-p} dS_K$ for $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$. Existence in the even case was completely solved [18, 78, 84, 85] for $p \geq 0$ (note that, for $p = n$, one must introduce a constant). In fact, there is uniqueness as well for $p \geq 1, p \neq n$ (uniqueness when $p = 0$ is still an open question, the famed Log-Minkowski problem). For $p > 1, p \neq n$, in the non-even case, existence and uniqueness was settled in [27, 52]. For $p \in (0, 1)$, existence was settled in [25]. The regime $p < 1$, especially uniqueness and non-uniqueness (there are examples of non-uniqueness) is still an active area of research. See e.g. [6, 7, 14–16, 19, 22, 24–26, 45, 46, 54, 55, 57, 69, 87, 95, 96, 101–103]. The reader is recommended the recent survey by Böröczky [13] for a thorough history on the L^p Minkowski problem.

1.1.1. *Weighted Surface Area.* In this work, we will focus on a particular type of Minkowski problem. Given a Borel measure μ on a metric measure space (\mathcal{R}, d) , the Minkowski content, or μ -weighted surface area, of a measurable set $A \subset \mathcal{R}$ is given by

$$(1.1) \quad \mu^+(\partial A) = \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(A_\epsilon) - \mu(A)}{\epsilon},$$

where as usual $A_\epsilon = \{x \in \mathcal{R} : d(x, A) \leq \epsilon\}$. In this work, \mathcal{R} will always be \mathbb{R}^n for some n and the metric d will always be the Euclidean distance $|\cdot|$. In this case, $A_\epsilon = A + \epsilon B_2^n$. Here, $K + L = \{x + y : x \in K, y \in L\}$, is the so-called Minkowski sum of Borel sets K and L . A usual step in solving a Minkowski problem is establishing the relevant *isoperimetric inequality*. Given a Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R}^n , its *isoperimetric function* I_μ on $[0, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n)]$ is largest function I such that

$$(1.2) \quad \mu^+(\partial A) \geq I(\mu(A))$$

holds for every Borel set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\mu(A) < \infty$. We reiterate that this means I_μ satisfies the equation

$$\mu^+(\partial A) \geq I_\mu(\mu(A)),$$

and I is another function satisfying (1.2), if and only if I_μ is point-wise larger than I . If B is so that $\mu^+(\partial B) = I_\mu(\mu(B))$, then B is said to be an extremal set. The isoperimetric function, in our setting of Borel measures on \mathbb{R}^n , is essentially only known for the Gaussian and Lebesgue measures. In practice, one usually establishes that a function I satisfies (1.2) (i.e. a *bound* for I_μ is shown).

A natural question is a formula for (1.1). We will follow the terminology by Livshyts [76]: for a convex body K and a Borel measure μ on the boundary of K of the form $d\mu(y) = \phi(y)d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(y)$, the *weighted surface area of K with respect to μ* is defined by

$$(1.3) \quad S_K^\mu(E) = \int_{n_K^{-1}(E)} \phi(y)d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(y)$$

for every Borel set $A \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$.

We briefly mention how to define S_K^μ when μ is a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n . Essentially, the problem boils down to determining a canonical method to select how the measure behaves on the boundary of each convex body. We will always work with measures that have density. We recall a measure μ on \mathbb{R}^n is said to have density if it is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure, i.e. $d\mu(x) = \phi(x)dx$ for a nonnegative, locally integrable function ϕ . Under the minor technical assumption that μ has continuous density, then there is no issue. For a given fixed convex body K , the least assumption needed is that ∂K , up to a set of $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure zero, is included in the Lebesgue set of the density of μ . We can make this precise.

Under the assumption that K is a convex body, μ is a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n with density ϕ containing ∂K in its Lebesgue set, one has that the \liminf in (1.1) is a limit and

$$\mu^+(\partial K) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(K + \epsilon B_2^n) - \mu(A)}{\epsilon} = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} dS_K^\mu(u).$$

If we additionally assume that $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$, its weighted L^p surface area is then, for $E \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ Borel,

$$(1.4) \quad S_{K,p}^\mu(E) = \int_{n_K^{-1}(E)} \langle y, n_K(y) \rangle^{1-p} \phi(y) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(y),$$

i.e. one has $dS_{K,p}^\mu = h_K^{1-p} dS_K^\mu$ and $S_{K,1}^\mu = S_K^\mu$. We outline in Section 2 formulas for more general versions of (1.1) that we will need throughout this work. Before listing our results, it is necessary to contextualize our results with respect to the broader literature.

1.1.2. *Gaussian and Weighted Minkowski Problems.* The Gaussian measure on \mathbb{R}^n is given by

$$d\gamma_n(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}}} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}} dx.$$

Huang, Xi, and Zhao [51] established existence for the even Minkowski problem for the Gaussian measure. Due to the lack of homogeneity, the constant in the problem cannot be removed. This is made precise by the result from K. Ball [4], who showed that $\gamma_n^+(\partial K) \leq 4n^{\frac{1}{4}}$, which illustrates the necessity of the constant. Feng, Liu and Xu [37] later removed the even assumption. Liu [72] first did the L^p Gaussian Minkowski problem, $p > 0$, without any symmetry assumptions. Recently, Feng, Hu and Xu [36] did the existence for the even L^p Gaussian Minkowski problem when $p \leq 0$.

Like many fields of study, such as log-concave functions, PDEs, optimal transport, etc. the Gaussian measure is a core measure in the theory, and the first to be characterized within the

given framework. However, when a field matures, one must inevitably broaden their horizons and consider other classes of measures. A step in this direction was undertaken by Liu and Tang [73]; motivated by [80, 82, 83], they solved the weighted L^p Minkowski problem for $p \in \mathbb{R}$ with weights that were s -concave approximations of a Gaussian, i.e. they considered probability measures μ whose density was proportional to $(1 - s|x|^\alpha)_+^\beta$ for various s, α and β . In this work, we study the weighted L^p Minkowski problem for a large class of measures.

Definition 1.1. A Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R}^n is said to be *rotational invariant* if, for every Borel set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $T \in O(n)$, one has $\mu(TA) = \mu(A)$.

At certain times, we will also impose the requirement of radial decay. We recall a function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is said to be radially decreasing if, for every $t \in [0, 1]$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\phi(tx) \geq \phi(x)$. A measure on \mathbb{R}^n on is said to be Radon if its a locally finite, (inner) regular Borel measure.

Definition 1.2. We say a measure μ on \mathbb{R}^n is *radially decreasing* if it is a Radon measure with radially decreasing density that is continuous on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$.

We remark that a special case of [66, Theorem 1.2] by Kryvonos and Langharst is the even, weighted L^p Minkowski problem (with a constant) for all finite, radially decreasing measures on \mathbb{R}^n . As we will see, the results we present here are more exhaustive. In particular, we will be mirroring the recent development of the Gardner-Zvavitch inequality: as conjectured by Gardner and Zvavitch [43] (with the necessity of symmetry shown in [89]) and resolved by Eskenazis and Moschidis [34] (using the tools established in [62]), γ_n is $(1/n)$ -concave over the class \mathcal{K}_e^n (see Section 1.6 to recall the definition of concavity for measures). Not too long afterwards, this was extended to a larger set of Borel measures. Let \mathcal{M}_n be a class of Borel measures μ on \mathbb{R}^n with the following properties:

$$(1.5) \quad d\mu = e^{-V(|x|)}, \quad V : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty] \text{ and } t \mapsto V(e^t) \text{ is convex.}$$

Cordero-Erausquin and Rotem [30] extended the result by Eskenazis and Moschidis to every measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_n$, i.e. every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_n$ is $(1/n)$ -concave over the class \mathcal{K}_e^n . The class \mathcal{M}_n then contains every rotational invariant, log-concave measure. But it also contains more. For example, the Cauchy-type measures given by $d\mu_{q,b}(x) = (1 + |x|^b)^{-q} dx$ for $q, b \geq 0$. Another group of examples include: if $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{M}_n$, then so too is $d\mu_q(x) = |x|^{-q} d\mu_0(x)$ for $q \geq 0$. Here, μ_0 can even be taken to be the Lebesgue measure.

1.2. Existence Results, positive p . Our existence results concern rotational invariant measures on \mathbb{R}^n . We set

$$S_p^\mu(K) := S_{K,p}^\mu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$$

when $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$. When $p = 1$, this is precisely $\mu^+(\partial K)$.

Theorem 1.3. *Let μ be a finite, rotational invariant Radon measure with density continuous on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. Fix $a \in [\frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n))$ and $p > 0$. Suppose ν is a finite Borel measure on the sphere. If ν is not concentrated on any great hemisphere, then there exists $K = K(a)$ in \mathcal{K}_o^n such that $\mu(K) = a$ and*

$$\nu = \frac{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}{S_p^\mu(K)} S_{K,p}^\mu.$$

If the density of μ is positive on ∂K , then the converse direction hold as well. If ν is even, then K can be taken to be symmetric.

We use in a critical way that μ is finite, i.e. $\mu(\mathbb{R}^n) < \infty$, to prove Theorem 1.3. Thus, Theorem 1.3 says nothing about non-finite, rotational invariant measures (e.g. volume). This is not surprising; we essentially used μ being finite to circumvent any requirement of ν having barycenter at the origin. Note that, for an example, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_n$ such that $\mu(\mathbb{R}^n) < \infty$ is a valid measure in the above theorem. In our next result, we expand the range of a and drop the finite-ness of the measure μ at the cost of symmetry of ν . For a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ for some n , we denote by $C^+(E)$ the set of nonnegative, continuous functions on E . We recall a function $\psi \in L^1_{loc}(E)$ if and only if for every bounded Borel set $A \subset E$, one has $\int_A \psi(x)dx < \infty$.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\psi \in C^+((0, \infty)) \cap L^1_{loc}((0, \infty))$ be such that $\psi(|\cdot|) \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then, define the rotational invariant Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R}^n with density $\psi(|\cdot|)$. Fix $a \in (0, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n))$ and $p > 0$.*

Suppose ν is an even, finite Borel measure on the sphere. If ν is not concentrated on any great hemisphere, then there exists a symmetric convex body $K = K(a)$ such that $\mu(K) = a$ and

$$\nu = \frac{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}{S_p^\mu(K)} S_{K,p}^\mu.$$

If the density of μ is positive on ∂K , then the converse direction hold as well.

We are able to remove the constant in the even weighted L^p Minkowski problems when $p > n$, which generalizes the result by Wang [99] for the Gaussian measure. We will need the following property.

Definition 1.5. Fix $p \neq 0$. We say $\phi \in C^+(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\})$ has fast enough radial decay, or has property $(\mathbf{D})_p$, if $\phi \neq 0$ and, for every $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, one has

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{n-p} \phi(t\theta) = 0.$$

Theorem 1.6. *Fix $p > n$. Let μ be an even Radon measure on \mathbb{R}^n with density ϕ satisfying Property $(\mathbf{D})_p$ such that $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow 0} \phi(x) \in (0, \infty]$. Suppose ν is an even, finite Borel measure on the sphere. If ν is not concentrated on any great hemisphere, then there exists an origin symmetric convex body K such that*

$$\nu = S_{K,p}^\mu.$$

If ϕ is positive on ∂K , then the converse direction holds as well.

Actually in Theorem 1.6, we require the slightly weaker assumption of

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_2^n} \frac{\phi(rx)}{r^{p-n}} dx = 0.$$

We note that any finite measure on \mathbb{R}^n with continuous density, that is strictly positive at o , satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 1.6. Here is another example, where $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow 0} \phi(x) = +\infty$: let $\phi(x) = |x|^{-q}$ for some $q > 0$ to be determined. To satisfy condition $(\mathbf{D})_p$, we need $n - p \leq q$. But, to be integrable near the origin, we need $q < n$. Thus, as long as p and q satisfy $p \geq n - q > 0$, the measure μ with density ϕ is valid for Theorem 1.6.

1.3. Existence results, p equals 0. We recall that Böröczky, Lutwak, Yang, and Zhang [18] defined the subspace concentration condition.

Definition 1.7. Let ν be a finite Borel measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . The measure ν is said to satisfy *the subspace concentration inequality* if for every subspace ξ of \mathbb{R}^n such that $0 < \dim \xi < n$,

$$(1.6) \quad \mu(\xi \cap \mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \leq \frac{1}{n} \mu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \dim \xi.$$

- (1) If (1.6) is always strict, then ν is said to satisfy the *strict subspace concentration inequality*.
- (2) If equality occurring in (1.6) for a subspace ξ implies there exists a subspace ξ' complementary to ξ so that equality occurs in (1.6) for ξ' , then ν is said to satisfy the *subspace concentration condition*.

The phenomenon of subspace concentration also appeared in the work of Klartag [61]. In this work, we will use the strict subspace concentration inequality. The first result is the analogue of Theorem 1.3 for $p = 0$.

Theorem 1.8. Let μ be a finite, rotational invariant Radon measure with density continuous on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. Fix $a \in [\frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Suppose ν is a finite Borel measure on the sphere satisfying the strict subspace inequality. Then there exists $K = K(a)$ in \mathcal{K}_o^n such that $\mu(K) = a$ and

$$\nu = \frac{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}{S_0^\mu(K)} S_{K,0}^\mu.$$

If ν is even, then K can be taken to be symmetric.

The second result is the analogue of Theorem 1.4. However, we need to add an integrability assumption on the density of μ .

Theorem 1.9. Let $\psi \in C^+((0, \infty)) \cap L_{loc}^1((0, \infty))$ be such that $\psi(|\cdot|) \in L^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $s \in [1, \infty)$. Then, define the rotational invariant Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R}^n with density $\psi(|\cdot|)$. Fix $a \in (0, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Suppose ν is an even, finite Borel measure on the sphere satisfying the strict subspace inequality. If ν is not concentrated on any great hemisphere, then there exists a symmetric convex body $K = K(a)$ such that $\mu(K) = a$ and

$$\nu = \frac{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}{S_0^\mu(K)} S_{K,0}^\mu.$$

Actually, Theorem 1.9 holds for volume as well; at a key step, we use Hölder's inequality to control μ -measures of convex bodies by their volumes. Clearly, if μ is Lebesgue, this step is unnecessary. The reader may be surprised by these results, in so far as, when considering the case μ is volume and ν is even, one uses the subspace concentration condition (which was shown to be necessary and sufficient) [18]. However, the even Minkowski problem for the Gaussian cone volume measure, roughly corresponding to Theorem 1.9, was done recently by Hu [48] (the fact that the measure of K can be fixed is replaced by K satisfying a second moment inequality). In that work, she constructed a family of bodies yielding asymptotic equality in the strict subspace concentration inequality when ν is the Gaussian cone volume measure. Similar was shown in the so-called chord log-Minkowski problem [81]. It is for this reason we did not pursue the full subspace concentration condition in this work, as it seems to be a volume-esque phenomenon.

1.4. Existence results, negative p . Next, we consider $p < 0$, but we need an additional hypothesis on the measure. If μ is radially decreasing and rotational invariant, then it has a density ϕ of the form $\phi(x) = \psi(|x|)$, where ψ is a continuous and decreasing function on $(0, \infty)$. We will need explicitly that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \psi(t) \in (0, \infty)$; this forces continuity of ϕ on all of \mathbb{R}^n .

Theorem 1.10. *Let μ be a finite, rotational invariant, radially decreasing measure with continuous density on \mathbb{R}^n satisfying Property $(\mathbf{D})_p$. Fix $a \in (\frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n))$ and $p < 0$. Suppose ν is a finite Borel measure on the sphere. If ν is not concentrated on any great hemisphere, then there exists $K = K(a) \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ such that $\mu(K) = a$ and*

$$\nu = \frac{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}{S_p^\mu(K)} S_{K,p}^\mu.$$

If the density of μ is positive on ∂K , then the converse direction hold as well. If ν is even, then K can be taken to be symmetric.

We can extend the range of a by supposing our data measure is even.

Theorem 1.11. *Let μ be a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n with density $\psi(|\cdot|) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\psi \in C^+([0, \infty)) \cap L^1([0, \infty))$, such that ψ is decreasing and satisfies Property $(\mathbf{D})_p$ and $a \in (0, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Fix $p < 0$. Suppose ν is an even, finite Borel measure on the sphere. If ν is not concentrated on any great hemisphere, then there exists a symmetric convex body $K = K(a)$ such that $\mu(K) = a$ and*

$$\nu = \frac{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}{S_p^\mu(K)} S_{K,p}^\mu.$$

If the density of μ is positive on ∂K , then the converse direction hold as well.

Notice, in contrast to Theorem 1.4, we require μ to be finite in Theorem 1.11.

1.5. Existence Results in the small mass regime. Intuitively, the Gaussian measure behaves like the Lebesgue measure on convex bodies containing the origin with asymptotically small measure. Huang, Xi and Zhao initiated a program on analyzing the constant free, even Gaussian Minkowski problem by requiring K to have such a small measure. Feng, Liu and Xu [37] removed the symmetry assumptions. We will call this program the *small mass regime*. We remark here that the small mass regime in the planar case for the Gaussian measure was thoroughly investigated by Chen, Hu, Liu and Zhao in the beautiful work [23]. Liu [72] showed the existence of a solution to the the constant free, even, L^p Gaussian Minkowski problem, $p \geq 1$ in the small mass regime. Feng, Hu and Xu [36] later removed the assumption of symmetry. Tang [98] recently showed, when $1 \leq p < n$, existence of a solution to the constant-free, even, L^p Gaussian Minkowski problem in the small mass regime, with a twist: the body K which solves the problem satisfies $\gamma_n(K) < 1/2$, opposite the above mentioned results. Our next set of results use degree theory to work in the small mass regime.

Definition 1.12. Fix $p > 0$, and let μ be a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n . We say μ has an L^p isoperimetric function over \mathcal{K}_o^n (or \mathcal{K}_e^n) if there exists a nonnegative function I_p such that, for $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ (or \mathcal{K}_e^n),

$$S_p^\mu(K) \geq I_p(\mu(K)).$$

Using L^p isoperimetric functions, we obtain a result for the small mass regime. We discuss in the appendix existence of I_p . We also need another technical property, which we describe after the statement of the theorem.

Theorem 1.13. *Fix $0 < p < n$. Suppose $\psi \in C^1([0, \infty))$ is strictly decreasing on its support, satisfies properties $(\mathbf{D})_p$ and $(\mathbf{S})_p$, and is such that $\psi(|\cdot|) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let μ be the finite, rotational invariant Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n with density $\psi(|\cdot|)$. Suppose also that μ has L^p isoperimetric function I_p over \mathcal{K}_e^n .*

Let ν be an even, finite Borel measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , not concentrated on any great hemisphere, such that

$$\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) < \min\{I_p(a), I_p(\mu(\mathbb{R}^n) - a)\},$$

where a is a constant depending only on μ sufficiently close to $\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)$. In fact, one can take $a = \mu(\mathbb{R}^n)/2$. Then, there exist $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$ such that $\mu(K_1) > a, \mu(K_2) < \mu(\mathbb{R}^n) - a$, and

$$S_{K_1, p}^\mu = \nu = S_{K_2, p}^\mu.$$

To explain the necessity of our assumptions, we first established Theorem 1.13 in the case when ν is a multiple of the spherical Lebesgue measure (the so-called isotropic curvature flow problem), in Lemma 6.3 and Proposition 6.6 below. We require that the density of μ is radially decreasing and continuous at zero at this moment. We establish that there are at least two solutions to the isotropic curvature problem (each of which is a centered Euclidean ball). However, we need that there are exactly two solutions; this is precisely Property $(\mathbf{S})_p$, given in Definition 6.11. Pre-supposing such a fact may seem extreme. However, write $d\mu(x) = \psi(|x|)dx$. Then, in Proposition 6.7, we show that if ψ is concave far down enough along its support, then Property $(\mathbf{S})_p$ holds. More importantly, we show in Proposition 6.8 that if $\psi(t) = e^{-V(t)}$ with $t \mapsto V(e^t)$ convex, i.e. $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_n$, then Property $(\mathbf{S})_p$ holds. Thus, this is not a burdensome requirement.

Finally, in Lemma 6.10 and Theorem 6.13, we use degree theory to solve Theorem 1.13 when ν has smooth density f . The presence of Property $(\mathbf{D})_p$ is at every step. If we only care about a single solution, then we can drop the assumption of symmetry and expand the range of p .

Theorem 1.14. *Fix $p \geq 1$. Suppose $\psi \in C^1([0, \infty))$ is strictly decreasing on its support, satisfies properties $(\mathbf{D})_p$ and $(\mathbf{S})_p$, and is such that $\psi(|\cdot|) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let μ be the finite, rotational invariant Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n with density $\psi(|\cdot|)$. Suppose also that μ has L^p isoperimetric function I_p over \mathcal{K}_o^n .*

Let ν be a finite Borel measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , not concentrated on any great hemisphere, such that

$$\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) < I_p\left(\frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}\right).$$

Then, there exists $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ such that $\mu(K) \geq \frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}$ and $\nu = S_{K, p}^\mu$. Furthermore, if ν is even, then $K \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$.

Actually, when $p \geq n$, the properties $(\mathbf{D})_p$ and $(\mathbf{S})_p$ are automatically implied by the other hypotheses on ψ . In fact, for this range, we can even use a completely different method to avoid the use of the isoperimetric function. This is not surprising; the associated Monge-Ampère equation becomes much more pliable to classical PDE techniques. Below, κ_n denotes the volume of the Euclidean unit ball in \mathbb{R}^n .

Theorem 1.15. Fix $p \geq n$. Let μ be a rotational invariant measure on \mathbb{R}^n with density $\psi(|\cdot|)$. Suppose $\psi \in C^1([0, \infty))$ is strictly decreasing on its support. Let ν be a finite Borel measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , not concentrated on any great hemisphere.

If $p > n$: Then, there exists $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ such

$$S_{K,p}^\mu = \nu.$$

If $p = n$: Additionally assume that $\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \leq \psi(0)n\kappa_n$. Then, there exists $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ such

$$S_{K,n}^\mu = \nu.$$

The result of Lemma 2.7 below is showing the existence of I_p when $p > 1$ for radially decreasing measures μ that have an isoperimetric function I_μ . Therefore, Theorems 1.13, 1.14 and 1.15 yield the following corollary.

Corollary 1.16. Fix $p \geq 1$. Let μ be a finite, rotational invariant measure on \mathbb{R}^n with density $\psi(|\cdot|)$ satisfying properties $(D)_p$. Suppose $\psi \in C^1([0, \infty))$ is strictly decreasing on its support. Suppose also that μ has isoperimetric function I_μ . Let ν be a finite Borel measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , not concentrated on any great hemisphere.

(1) If $p > n$:

(a) Then there exists $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ such that $S_{K,p}^\mu = \nu$.

(b) If one also has

$$\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) < \left(\frac{n\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}\right)^{1-p} I_\mu\left(\frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}\right)^p,$$

then one can pick the K so that $\mu(K) \geq \mu(\mathbb{R}^n)/2$.

(2) If $p = n$:

(a) If ν additionally satisfies $\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \leq \psi(0)n\kappa_n$, then, there exists $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ such that $S_{K,n}^\mu = \nu$.

(b) If ν additionally satisfies $\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) < \left(\frac{n\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}\right)^{1-p} I_\mu\left(\frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}\right)^p$, then one can pick the K so that $\mu(K) \geq \mu(\mathbb{R}^n)/2$.

(3) If μ also satisfies $(S)_p$ and $1 \leq p < n$:

(a) If ν additionally satisfies $\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) < \left(\frac{n\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}\right)^{1-p} I_\mu\left(\frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}\right)^p$, then, there exists $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ such that $\mu(K) \geq \frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}$ and $\nu = S_{K,p}^\mu$.

(b) There exists a depending only on μ sufficiently close to $\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)$, such that if ν is even and

$$\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) < \left(n\mu(\mathbb{R}^n) \min\left\{\left(\frac{a}{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}\right) I_\mu(a)^{\frac{p}{1-p}}, \left(1 - \frac{a}{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}\right) I_\mu(\mu(\mathbb{R}^n) - a)^{\frac{p}{1-p}}\right\}\right)^{1-p},$$

then, there exist $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$ such that $\mu(K_1) > a, \mu(K_2) < \mu(\mathbb{R}^n) - a$, and

$$S_{K_1,p}^\mu = \nu = S_{K_2,p}^\mu.$$

1.6. Concavity of Measures. For our uniqueness results to make sense, we must first discuss concavity of measures, in particular the so-called F -concave measures explored in [39, 40, 74, 76]. We say a Borel measure μ is F -concave, where F is an invertible, (strictly) monotonic, continuous function F , if there exists a collection of Borel sets with finite μ -measure \mathcal{C} such that, for every $K, L \in \mathcal{C}$ and every $0 < \lambda < 1$ one has

$$(1.7) \quad \mu((1-\lambda)K + \lambda L) \geq F^{-1}((1-\lambda)F(\mu(K)) + \lambda F(\mu(L))).$$

For a fixed $s \in [-\infty, \infty)$, a measure μ is s -concave over \mathcal{C} if (1.7) holds for $F(x) = x^s$, i.e. for every $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and Borel sets $K, L \in \mathcal{C}$ one has

$$\mu((1-\lambda)K + \lambda L) \geq ((1-\lambda)\mu(K)^s + \lambda\mu(L)^s)^{\frac{1}{s}}.$$

The case $s = 0$ is log-concavity:

$$\mu((1-\lambda)K + \lambda L) \geq \mu(K)^{1-\lambda}\mu(L)^\lambda.$$

When $s = -\infty$, this should be read as $\mu((1-\lambda)K + \lambda L) \geq \min\{\mu(K), \mu(L)\}$. A function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is said to be κ -concave, $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$, if, for every $\lambda \in (0, 1)$,

$$f((1-\lambda)x + \lambda y) \geq ((1-\lambda)f(x)^\kappa + \lambda f(y)^\kappa)^{\frac{1}{\kappa}}$$

for every x, y such that $0 < f(x)f(y) < \infty$. The case $\kappa = 0$ means f is log-concave, $\kappa = \infty$ means f is constant.

In addition to the aforementioned result by Cordero-Erausquin and Rotem [30], showing that every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_n$ is $(1/n)$ -concave over \mathcal{K}_e^n , Rotem and Aishwarya [1] showed that, if V is a convex, q -homogeneous function and μ is a Borel measure such that $d\mu(x) = Ce^{-V(x)}dx$, for $C > 0$, then μ is $\frac{q-1}{qn}$ -concave over the class of star bodies. Note that, if one restricts to convex sets, the concavity is over \mathcal{K}_o^n . When $V(x) = \frac{1}{2}|x|^2$, then one obtains that γ_n is $\frac{1}{2n}$ -concave over \mathcal{K}_o^n , which was previously shown by Kolesnikov and Livshyts [63].

Borell's [11] classification states that a Radon measure μ is s -concave measure (with \mathcal{C} all Borel subsets of \mathbb{R}^n) if and only if it has density with respect to the Lebesgue measure that is $\kappa = s/(1-ns)$ -concave (so, if $s = \frac{1}{n}$, the measure is a multiple of the Lebesgue measure, and, if $s > 1/n$, the density is zero a.e.). Henceforth, we say such measures are s -concave in the sense of Borell. For brevity, we may simply say s -concave (thus, if we mention s -concavity without referencing some class \mathcal{C} , we mean implicitly in the sense of Borell).

Recall that a measure is said to be α -homogeneous if, for a Borel set A , one has $\mu(tA) = t^\alpha\mu(A)$, $\alpha, t > 0$, for all t such that tA is in the support of μ . The Lebesgue measure, which we denote as Vol_n , is an n -homogeneous, $\frac{1}{n}$ -concave measure. To illustrate the use of s -concave measures in Minkowski problems, Livshyts [76] considered and solved the constant-free, even Minkowski problem for a measure that is α -homogeneous, $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ -concave, in the sense of Borell, when $\alpha \geq n$; the result by Livshyts was extended to the L^p case, $p \geq n$, by Wu [100]. Kryvonos and Langharst [66] then did all $p \geq 1$.

For another example, the Gaussian measure γ_n is log-concave. In fact, γ_n is concave in the sense of (1.7) with F being the inverse function of $\gamma_1((-\infty, x))$, the so-called Ehrhard inequality [12, 32, 33, 68]; when \mathcal{C} is taken to be \mathcal{K}^n , then there is equality in Ehrhard's inequality if and only if the two bodies under consideration are identical (the Ehrhard inequality still holds with \mathcal{C} taken

to be all Borel sets, but then equality conditions are still open). Using the Ehrhard inequality in the case of convex bodies, and the additional assumption that $\gamma_n(K) \geq 1/2$, Huang, Xi and Zhao [51] obtained uniqueness in the even Gaussian Minkowski problem (this is a special case of Proposition 1.17 below).

1.6.1. *Uniqueness Results.* For our uniqueness results, we need make reference to Firey's L^p summation [38], $+_p$. Note that $p = 1$ is the usual Minkowski sum. We say μ is L^p F -concave if it satisfies (1.7) with Minkowski summation replaced by L^p summation. Note that L^p means of the form $(1 - \lambda) \cdot K +_p \lambda \cdot L$ for $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ are increasing with respect to set-inclusion as p increases. Thus, if μ is F -concave, then it is also L^p F -concave (with the same F) for $p > 1$. If μ is shown to be L^p F -concave from this method (i.e. if one already knows μ is F -concave, and then uses monotonicity of L^p means to obtain μ is L^p F -concave), then equality in the L^p version of (1.7), $p > 1$, yields $K = L$, solely from equality forcing the L^p mean to be independent of p .

However, this does not use the L^p summation in a "smart" way. For example, Roysdon and Xing [91] showed, extending on the volume case by Lutwak [78], that, if μ is s -concave (in the sense of Borell), $s > 0$, then it is (sp) -concave with respect to L^p summation for $p \geq 1$. As for equality conditions: we recall that Dubuc [31] showed, as elaborated on by Milman and Rotem [88], the following: let μ be s -concave (in the sense of Borell). If K and L are Borel sets such that, for some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ one has

$$(1.8) \quad \mu((1 - \lambda)K + \lambda L)^s = (1 - \lambda)\mu(K)^s + \lambda(L)^s,$$

then, $K = aL + b$ for some $a > 0$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$. In (1.8), if one replaces $+$ with $+_p$, and s with ps , then we lose the possibility of translation, i.e. equality holds in the (sp) -concavity of an s -concave measure with respect to L^p summation if and only if the two bodies are dilates.

As far as we are aware, the method of obtaining L^p F -concavity using monotonicity and the results by Roysdon-Xing and Lutwak for s -concave measures are the only examples of measures that are L^p F -concave for $p > 1$ (we save discussing $p < 1$ for the appendix). Thus, in our results below, the equality conditions for $p > 1$ should be read as $K = tL$. Making reference to the L^p version of (1.7), we recall the following from [66, Proposition 6.16].

Proposition 1.17. *Fix $p \geq 1$. Let μ , a Borel measure with continuous density on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, be L^p F -concave over $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{K}_o^n$ such that F is differentiable. Suppose $K, L \in \mathcal{C}$ are such that $S_{K,p}^\mu$ and $S_{L,p}^\mu$ are finite Borel measures on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} and*

$$S_{K,p}^\mu = S_{L,p}^\mu.$$

Then

$$\frac{F(\mu(L)) - F(\mu(K))}{F'(\mu(K))} \leq \frac{F(\mu(L)) - F(\mu(K))}{F'(\mu(L))}.$$

Furthermore, there is equality if and only if there is equality in the L^p version of (1.7).

As we have seen in our existence results, we were able to pin the measure of our convex bodies. Therefore, uniqueness follows as an immediate corollary of the above.

Theorem 1.18. *Fix $p \geq 1$. Let μ , a Borel measure with continuous density on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, be L^p F -concave over $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{K}_o^n$ such that F is differentiable. Suppose $K, L \in \mathcal{C}$ are such that $\mu(K) = \mu(L)$, $S_{L,p}^\mu$ are finite Borel measures on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} and*

$$S_{K,p}^\mu = S_{L,p}^\mu.$$

Then, there is equality in the L^p version of (1.7).

Let's return to the case of s -concave measures from (1.8), and let $s > 0$. If μ is s -concave, then it is also L^p s -concave (monotonicity of L^p means) and L^p (sp)-concave (Roysdon-Xing). Suppose we have equality in either one of these L^p concavities. Then, since we also know that $\mu(K) = \mu(L)$, $K = L$. Consequently, "equality in (1.7)" in Theorem 1.18, in the instance of s -concave measures for $p > 1$, should be read as $K = L$. For $p = 1$, one needs extra information to remove the translation from the equality conditions of (1.8) first, say both bodies are symmetric. We stated Proposition 1.17 and Theorem 1.18 in terms of a class $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{K}_o^n$ to allow us to consider, for example, $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{K}_e^n$. Thus, we can also apply Theorem 1.18 to the L^p ($1/n$)-concavity of $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_n$ over \mathcal{K}_e^n for $p \geq 1$. If $p > 1$, then we must have $K = L$. However, for $p = 1$, outside the case of rotational invariant measures that are also log-concave (where (1.8) and $\mu(K) = \mu(L)$ tells us that $K = L$), the equality conditions of (1.7) in this instance are seemingly still open.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give many formulas for variations of surface area measure needed in this work (among other preliminary facts). In Section 3, we prove Theorems 1.3, 1.4, and 1.6, which are the theorems concerning positive ranges for p . In Section 4, we prove Theorems 1.8 and 1.9, which are the weighted log-Minkowski problems. In Section 5, we prove Theorems 1.10 and 1.11, which concern negative p . For the constant free results in the small mass regime, we prove in Section 6.1 Theorem 1.13, and, in Section 6.3, Theorem 1.15. Finally, in Appendix A, we list examples of isoperimetric functions, concluding on a conjecture that would yield a sharp isoperimetric inequality for measures in \mathcal{M}_n .

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank professors Yong Huang, Deping Ye and Károly Böröczky for taking a look at a draft of this work.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We will be using in this work the radial function of star body. Given a Borel set $L \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, its radial function on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ is then $\rho_L(u) = \sup\{r > 0 : ru \in L\}$. We then say L is a star body if it is compact, contains the origin, its radial function ρ_L is continuous and, for every $x \in L$, the segment $[o, x] \subset L$. Every $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ is a star body. Note that

$$(2.1) \quad \text{Vol}_n(L) = \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \rho_L(u)^n du,$$

where the integration is with respect to the spherical Lebesgue measure (i.e. $du = dS_{B_2^n}$).

We would now like to mention that in [41, 42, 70], the first two of which pre-date the Gaussian Minkowski problem, Ye and his various collaborators studied the so-called generalized volume setting. The framework introduces the general volume function G on $(0, \infty) \times \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. From this, a measure on ∂K for $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ is introduced as a type of pushforward of $G(\rho_K(u), u)$. This framework

is very broad; indeed, set

$$(2.2) \quad G(t, u) = \int_0^t \phi(tu)t^{n-1} dt$$

for ϕ density of a measure μ on \mathbb{R}^n to obtain S_K^μ . They found necessary and sufficient conditions for existence in the associated Minkowski problem with a constant under various assumptions on $\partial_t G$. In particular, their results imply the L^p Gaussian Minkowski problem with a constant for all $p > 0$, in the strict sense of the definition of Minkowski problem. Crucially, however, the approach, when translated to S_K^μ via (2.2), does not allow control of $\mu(K)$. The ability to do, as first done by Huang, Xi and Zhao, is vital in Gaussian Minkowski problems, and is an important extra ingredient that we strove to keep. Consequently, the results for the Gaussian measure implied by [41, 42, 70] are very similar, but ultimately disjoint, from the majority of the mentioned results on Gaussian Minkowski problems with a constant, and, more pertinently, disjoint from the results we present herein. In addition to being able to control $\mu(K)$, the class of rotational invariant measures we consider allows us to drop the assumptions on ϕ that one would obtain using the aforementioned generalized volume results.

Fix an arbitrary $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$. We say a convex body is strictly convex if its boundary does not contain a line-segment. The subgradient of h_K is precisely the set function given by

$$\partial h_K(u) = \{z : \mathbb{R}^n : h_K(y) \geq h_K(u) + \langle y, z - u \rangle \forall y \in K\}.$$

Denoting ∇ the usual gradient operator, one has that $\partial h_K(u)$ is a singleton, namely $\nabla h_K(u)$, if and only if h_K is differentiable at u . In general, for $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$,

$$(2.3) \quad \partial h_K(u) = F(K, u) = \{y \in K : h_K(u) = \langle u, y \rangle\}$$

where $F(K, u)$ is the face of K with outer-unit normal u . For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{o\}$, one has

$$\partial h_K(x) = F\left(K, \frac{x}{|x|}\right).$$

The Gauss map and the support function are related: n_K is invertible at $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ if and only if h_K is differentiable at u , in which case $n_K^{-1}(u) = \nabla h_K(u)$ [94, Corollary 1.7.3]. Hence, K is strictly convex if and only if $h_K \in C^1$ [94, Page 115].

The surface area measure is closely related to the so-called Monge-Ampère measure: given a convex function h defined on an open, d -dimensional convex set Ω (equipped with the d -dimensional Hausdorff measure), its Monge-Ampère measure is precisely $\mu_h(E) = \mathcal{H}^d(N_h(E))$, where

$$N_h(E) = \bigcup_{x \in E} \partial h(x)$$

for a Borel subset $E \subset \Omega$. Here, ∂h is the subgradient of h ; since we will only use this when h is the support function of a convex body, we do not define the subgradient of an arbitrary convex function. If h is C^2 , then one obtains the following integral representation:

$$(2.4) \quad \mu_h(E) = \int_E \text{Hess}(h(x)) d\mathcal{H}^d(x),$$

where Hess is the Hessian operator on \mathbb{R}^n . As an example, the surface area measure is then the Monge-Ampère measure of the support function:

$$(2.5) \quad S_K(E) = \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \left(\bigcup_{u \in E} F(K, u) \right) = \mathcal{H}^{n-1} \left(\bigcup_{u \in E} \partial h_K(u) \right) = \mu_{h_K}(E).$$

If the boundary of K is a C^2 manifold, then it turns out this is equivalent to $h_K \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ [94, Corollary 2.5.3], and implies that S_K is absolutely continuous with respect to the spherical Lebesgue measure. If K additionally has positive Gauss curvature everywhere, then we can write explicitly $dS_K(u) = \det(\nabla^2 h_K + h_K I) du$. Here, I is the $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ identity matrix and ∇^2 is the spherical Hessian. We denote by ∇_s the spherical Gradient.

Since $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ is a star body, $\rho_K(\theta)$ is continuous, and so there exists some $\theta_K \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ such that $\rho_K(\theta_K)$ is maximal. One has that the line segment $[-\rho_K(\theta_K)\theta_K, \rho_K(\theta_K)\theta_K]$ is completely contained in K , and yet K is contained in the ball of radius $\rho_K(\theta_K)$. Let $g(t) = |t|$ if K is symmetric and $g(t) = t_+ = \max\{t, 0\}$ otherwise. From convexity, one has

$$(2.6) \quad h_K(u) \geq \rho_K(\theta_K)g(\langle \theta_K, u \rangle)$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Note that, at the point θ_K , $\rho_K(\theta_K) = h(\theta_K)$. Recalling that h_K is 1-homogeneous, we have (by differentiating $h(tu)$ at $t = 1$) that, for every $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ such that h_K is differentiable at u ,

$$(2.7) \quad h_K(u) = \langle \nabla h_K(u), u \rangle.$$

Consequently, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, $h_K(u) \leq |\nabla h_K(u)|$. These two estimates yield

$$(2.8) \quad h_K(\theta_K)g(\langle u, \theta_K \rangle) \leq |\nabla h_K(u)|$$

for $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$.

It is also well-known that for every $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, there exists a v such that $\rho_K(v)v = h_K(u)u + \nabla_s h_K(u)$. This implies that

$$(2.9) \quad \rho_K^2(v) = h_K^2(u) + |\nabla_s h_K(u)|^2.$$

Recall also the fact that, when K is C^2 ,

$$(2.10) \quad \det(\nabla^2 h_K(u) + h_K(u)I) = \frac{(h_K(u)^2 + |\nabla_s h_K(u)|^2)^{\frac{n}{2}}}{h_K(u)} = \frac{\rho_K(v)^n}{h_K(u)},$$

where v and u are related via (2.9). Notice then that (2.10) yields

$$(2.11) \quad h_K(u) \det(\nabla^2 h_K(u) + h_K(u)I) \leq \max_{v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \rho_K(v)^n = \max_{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_K(u)^n.$$

For every positive $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, the *Wulff shape* of f is the convex body given by

$$(2.12) \quad [f] = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, u \rangle \leq f(u) \forall u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}\}.$$

One has that, for $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$, $[h_K] = K$. Since f is positive, $[f] \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$. Furthermore, if f is even, then $[f]$ is symmetric. Next, for $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, Aleksandrov [2] defined a perturbation of $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ to be the Wulff shape of the function

$$(2.13) \quad h_t(u) = h_K(u) + tf(u),$$

where $t \in (-\delta, \delta)$, δ small enough so that h_t is positive for all u .

It was shown [51, 66] that, for almost all $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ up to a set of spherical Lebesgue measure zero,

$$(2.14) \quad \left. \frac{d\rho_{[h_t]}(u)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\rho_{[h_t]}(u) - \rho_K(u)}{t} = \frac{f(n_K(r_K(u)))}{h_K(n_K(r_K(u)))} \rho_K(u).$$

Here, $r_K(u) = \rho_K(u)u$ is the radial map, which is defined almost everywhere. In fact, (2.14) was proven using tools from [49]. Let us elaborate: In [49], they introduced the following concept: for $h, f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ and some small δ , define a function $h_t : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ via

$$(2.15) \quad \log(h_t(u)) = \log(h(u)) + tf(u) + o(t, u)$$

where $o(t, u)/t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$ for all $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Then, the Wulff shapes $[h_t]$ are said to be the logarithmic family of Wulff shapes formed by the pair (h, f) . One can readily verify that h_t defined by (2.13) is the logarithmic family of Wulff shapes formed by the pair $(h_K, \frac{f}{h_K})$; then, (2.14) follows from [49, Lemma 4.3]. However, there was actually no need to use this specific family. The same proof yields the following.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ and $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ be such that (h_K, f) is a logarithmic family. Then, defining h_t via (2.15), we have*

$$(2.16) \quad \left. \frac{d\rho_{[h_t]}(u)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\rho_{[h_t]}(u) - \rho_K(u)}{t} = f(n_K(r_K(u)))\rho_K(u).$$

In fact, there exist constants $M, \delta > 0$ so that, for almost every $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and every $t \in (-\delta, \delta)$,

$$|\rho_{[h_t]}(u) - \rho_K(u)| \leq M|t|.$$

The following result was shown by Langharst and Kryvonos [66], extending on the partial cases by Hosle-Kolesnikov-Livshyts [47, 76], Gardner-Hug-Weil-Xing-Ye [41], Kolesnikov-Milman [65], Bobkov [10] and Aleksandrov [2].

Proposition 2.2. *Let μ be a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n with locally integrable density ϕ . Let K be a convex body, such that ∂K , up to set of $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure zero, is in the Lebesgue set of ϕ . Then, for $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, one has that*

$$(2.17) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu([h_K + tf]) - \mu(K)}{t} = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) dS_K^\mu(u).$$

The assumption that μ has locally integrable density can be dropped, i.e. μ can have singular components, as long as there exists a δ -neighborhood of ∂K not intersecting the region of \mathbb{R}^n assigned singular mass. When $f = h_L$, where L is a compact, convex set, one has $[h_K + \epsilon h_L] = K + \epsilon L$ if $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$.

Recently, (2.17) was re-proven in [35] in the case when $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ and μ has continuous density ω ; we now elaborate. Recall that $S_{K,0}^\mu$ is the weighted cone measure, i.e. $dS_{K,0}^\mu = h_K dS_K^\mu$. Then, (2.17) can be written as, when $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu([h_K + tf]) - \mu(K)}{t} = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \frac{f(u)}{h_K(u)} dS_{K,0}^\mu(u),$$

which is what appears in [35, Lemma 2.1] (note in that work $S_{K,0}^\mu$ is called the dual ω -Orlicz moment of K). The choice to use $\frac{1}{h_K(u)}dS_{K,0}^\mu(u)$, and not simply S_K^μ , forces one to have the origin in the interior of K .

By using S_K^μ in (2.17), one can merely shift both the measure and the convex body K to remove any necessity for K to contain the origin; that is, the case for a general convex body K actually follows from the case containing the origin. Indeed, for a convex body K , let $K - \int_K x dx = K' \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$. For a Borel measure μ with density ϕ containing ∂K in its Lebesgue set, let μ' be the Borel measure with density $\phi'(y) = \phi(y + \int_K x dx)$. Then, notice that $S_{K'}^{\mu'} = S_K^\mu$, $\mu(K) = \mu'(K')$, and, for t small enough, $[h_{K'} + tf] = [h_K + tf] - \int_K x dx$ implies $\mu'([h_{K'} + tf]) = \mu([h_K + tf])$.

Schneider [93] recently gave a new, geometric proof of Proposition 2.2 for when μ has continuous density. This elegant proof is in-contrast to the approach taken in [66], which used the radial variations (2.14) to prove (2.17). One advantage to using (2.14), however, is that, if one uses Proposition 2.1, the exact same proof yields the following.

Theorem 2.3. *Let μ be a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n with locally integrable density ϕ . Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ be such that ∂K , up to set of $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure zero, is in the Lebesgue set of ϕ . Suppose $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ is such that (h_K, f) are a logarithmic family, and define h_t via (2.15).*

Then, one has that

$$(2.18) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu([h_t]) - \mu(K)}{t} = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) dS_{K,0}^\mu(u).$$

Notice that, by taking the Taylor series expansion of e^x , a perturbation of h_K of the form $h_K e^{tf}$ satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 2.3. Thus, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 2.4. *Let μ be a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n with locally integrable density ϕ . Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ be such that ∂K , up to set of $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure zero, is in the Lebesgue set of ϕ . Suppose $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. Then,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu([h_K e^{tf}]) - \mu(K)}{t} = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) dS_{K,0}^\mu(u).$$

This extends on the volume case from [17] and the Gaussian case from [36, 48].

The L^p surface area was also given a weighted analogue in [66]. The associated variational formula is the same as above, except $[h_K + \epsilon h_L]$ is replaced with $[(h_K^p + \epsilon h_L^p)^{1/p}]$ and dS_K^μ is replaced with $\frac{1}{p} dS_{K,p}^\mu$; here, of course, K must contain the origin. This extends on partial cases by Lutwak [78], Wu [100], and Liu [72]. Note that in [66] it is assumed that $p \geq 1$, but this is not used in the proof.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $p \neq 0$, let K be a convex body in \mathbb{R}^n , and let μ be a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n with density that contains ∂K in its Lebesgue set. Assume that $S_{K,p}^\mu$ is a finite Borel measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . Then,*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu([(h_K^p + \epsilon f^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}]) - \mu(K)}{\epsilon} = \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) dS_{K,p}^\mu(u).$$

Let μ be a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n . Then, Livshyts [76] introduced the *mixed measure* of Borel sets K and L as

$$(2.19) \quad \mu(K; L) := \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(K + \epsilon L) - \mu(K)}{\epsilon}.$$

In the same work, it was shown that, if μ has continuous density and K and L are convex sets, then the liminf is a limit and

$$(2.20) \quad \mu(K; L) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u) dS_K^\mu(u).$$

In [66], the assumption that μ has continuous density was weakened to assuming that μ has density containing ∂K in its Lebesgue set. When $\mu = \gamma_n$, the quantity $\gamma_n(K; L)$ would reappear in [51]. Notice that $\mu(K; B_2^n) = \mu^+(\partial K)$. Mixed measures were later systematically studied in [39, 40].

We mention now that Firey's L^p summation is precisely, for $a, b \geq 0$ and $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$,

$$a \cdot K + b \cdot L = [(ah_K^p + bh_L^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}].$$

The L^p version of mixed measures, where summation was replaced by L^p summation, was introduced in [66]: under the same assumptions on K, L and μ in (2.20), one has

$$(2.21) \quad \mu_p(K; L) := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(K +_p \epsilon \cdot L) - \mu(K)}{\epsilon} = \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u)^p dS_{K,p}^\mu(u),$$

whenever $S_{K,p}^\mu$ is a finite Borel measure on the sphere. This extends on the Gaussian case from Liu [72] and the volume case by Lutwak [77], Lutwak, Yang, and Zhang [86], and Böröczky, Lutwak, Yang, and Zhang [18]. Notice that $\mu_p(K; K) = \frac{1}{p}\mu(K; K)$. While it is true that

$$(2.22) \quad \text{Vol}_n(K) = \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_K(u) dS_K(u),$$

this does not hold for measures: $n\mu(K) \neq \mu(K; K)$. The following proposition shown in [39, Proposition 2.1], relates them.

Proposition 2.6. *Let μ be a radially decreasing measure on \mathbb{R}^n . Then, for every convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ such that the density of μ is defined on ∂K , one has*

$$n\mu(K) \geq \mu(K; K),$$

with equality if and only if for almost every $y \in \partial K$, the density of μ is a constant almost everywhere on $(0, y]$.

We conclude this section by obtaining an isoperimetric inequality for $S_p^\mu(K)$ when $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ and μ is radially decreasing.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ and let $p \geq 1$. Let μ be a radially decreasing measure on \mathbb{R}^n and I a function satisfying (1.2) for μ and K . Then,*

$$S_p^\mu(K) \geq (n\mu(K))^{1-p} I(\mu(K))^p.$$

Proof. By applying Jensen's inequality to the probability measure $\frac{h_K(u)dS_K^\mu(u)}{\mu(K;K)}$ on the sphere, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{S_p^\mu(K)}{\mu(K;K)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} &= \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_K(u)^{-p} \frac{h_K(u)dS_K^\mu(u)}{\mu(K;K)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\geq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_K(u)^{-1} \frac{h_K(u)dS_K^\mu(u)}{\mu(K;K)} = \frac{\mu^+(\partial K)}{\mu(K;K)}. \end{aligned}$$

Upon re-arrangement, this becomes

$$S_p^\mu(K)^{\frac{1}{p}} \geq \mu(K;K)^{\frac{1-p}{p}} \mu^+(\partial K).$$

Applying Proposition 2.6, we obtain

$$S_p^\mu(K)^{\frac{1}{p}} \geq (n\mu(K))^{\frac{1-p}{p}} \mu^+(\partial K).$$

Using that $\mu^+(\partial K) \geq I(\mu(K))$ by hypothesis and raising both sides to the p th power yields the result. \square

We note that the case $\mu = \gamma_n$ (and $I = I_{\gamma_n}$) of Lemma 2.7 was previously done in [36].

3. THE CASE OF POSITIVE p

In this section, we will prove Theorem 1.3, Theorem 1.4, and Theorem 1.6 using the variational approach. The use of this technique can be traced through [27, 36, 37, 42, 44, 51, 66, 78, 84, 85, 99]. We denote by $C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ the set of continuous functions on the sphere. If there is a “+” superscript, then the functions are additionally nonnegative; if there is an “e” subscript, then the functions are additionally even.

We will work with the following two functionals: the first

$$(3.1) \quad \psi_\nu(f) := \mu([f]) - \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f^p(u) d\nu(u); \quad \psi_\nu(K) := \psi_\nu(h_K),$$

will be taken over $C_e^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, and the second

$$(3.2) \quad \Omega_\nu(f) := -\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f^p(u) d\nu(u); \quad \Omega_\nu(K) := \Omega_\nu(h_K),$$

can be taken over $C^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ or $C_e^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$.

We break the proof into fourth steps:

- (1) First, show that, for $p \neq 0$, any maximiser of (3.1) or (3.2) on $C_e^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ is the support function of a symmetric convex body, and any maximiser of (3.2) on $C^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ is the support function of a convex body containing the origin in its interior.
- (2) Second, show that, when $p \neq 0$, a maximiser K of (3.1) satisfies $\nu = S_{K,p}^\mu$, and a maximiser K of (3.2) satisfies $\nu = \frac{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}{S_p^\mu(K)} S_{K,p}^\mu$.
- (3) Third, establish the existence of a maximiser when the measure of the body is pinned and p is positive, that is to prove Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4.
- (4) Finally, establish the existence of a maximiser when $p > n$ and there are the assumptions of symmetry and Property **(D)** _{p} , that is to prove Theorem 1.6.

Lemma 3.1. *Let μ be a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n , and fix a Borel measure ν on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$. Then, for a fixed $p \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \neq 0$:*

(1) *K solves*

$$(3.3) \quad \sup\{\psi_\nu(K) : K \in \mathcal{K}_e^n\}$$

if and only if h_K solves

$$\sup\{\psi_\nu(f) : C_e^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})\}.$$

(2) *For a fixed $a \in (0, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n))$, K solves*

$$(3.4) \quad \sup\{\Omega_\nu(K) : \mu(K) = a, K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n\}$$

if and only if h_K solves

$$\sup\{\Omega_\nu(f) : \mu([f]) = a, C^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})\}.$$

Additionally, in (3.4), if K is also assumed to be symmetric in the first optimization problem, then the set $C^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ is replaced by $C_e^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ in the second optimization problem.

Proof. Recall for $f \in C^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, $h_{[f]}(u) \leq f(u)$ point-wise and $[h_{[f]}] = [f]$. Suppose $p > 0$. Then, $h_{[f]}^p \leq f^p$ but $-\frac{1}{p}h_{[f]}^p \geq -\frac{1}{p}f^p$. If $p < 0$, then, we instead have $h_{[f]}^p \geq f^p$, but still obtain $-\frac{1}{p}h_{[f]}^p \geq -\frac{1}{p}f^p$. Therefore, for all $p \neq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_\nu([f]) &= -\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{[f]}^p(u) d\nu(u) \\ &\geq -\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f^p(u) d\nu(u) = \Omega_\nu(f). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, a maximiser of Ω_ν is the support function of a symmetric convex body. Since one always has $\mu([f]) = \mu([h_{[f]}])$, the above also shows $\psi_\nu([f]) \geq \psi_\nu(f)$. This establishes both equivalences. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$, and let μ be a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n with density that contains ∂K in its Lebesgue set. Then, for a fixed $p \in \mathbb{R}$, $p \neq 0$:*

(1) *If K solves (3.3), then $\nu = S_{K,p}^\mu$.*

(2) *If K solves (3.4), then $\nu = \frac{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}{S_p^\mu(K)} S_{K,p}^\mu$.*

Proof. First suppose that K solves (3.3). Then, we perturb K by $f \in C_e^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$: let

$$h_t = (h_K^p + tf)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where $t \in (-\delta, \delta)$, δ chosen so that h_t is strictly positive on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . Then, by Proposition 2.5, we obtain

$$0 = \left. \frac{d\psi_\nu(h_t)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) dS_{K,p}^\mu(u) - \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) d\nu(u).$$

Since this is true for every $f \in C_e^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, we have by the Riesz representation theorem that $\nu = S_{K,p}^\mu$, thus establishing the first claim.

Next, suppose that K solves (3.4). Since perturbing K causes us to break the condition that $\mu(K) = a$, we must modify our direct variational approach with Lagrange multipliers. We define

$$\Phi(t, \epsilon) = \Omega_\nu((h_K^p + tf + \epsilon)^{\frac{1}{p}})$$

and

$$\Psi(t, \epsilon) = \mu([(h_K^p + tf + \epsilon)^{\frac{1}{p}}]),$$

where $f \in C_e^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ if ν is even and one wants to take K symmetric, or $f \in C^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ otherwise. We again set $h_t = (h_K^p + tf)^{\frac{1}{p}}$. It can be noticed that

$$\Psi(0, 0) = \mu(K) = a,$$

and, from Proposition 2.5,

$$\Psi_\epsilon(0, 0) = \frac{1}{p} S_p^\mu(K) \neq 0.$$

Here, Ψ_ϵ denotes partial differentiation of Ψ in the variable ϵ . Thus, when $t_0, \epsilon_0 > 0$ are sufficiently small, we can apply the implicit function theorem on $R = (-t_0, t_0) \times (-\epsilon_0, \epsilon_0)$, to obtain that there exists a function $\xi(t)$ such that $(t, \xi(t))$ is the unique solution of $\Psi(t, \epsilon) = a$ on R .

From $\Psi(t, \xi(t)) = a$, we get $\Psi_t(0, 0) + \Psi_\xi(0, 0)\xi'(0) = 0$, i.e., $\xi'(0) = \frac{-p\Psi_t(0, 0)}{S_p^\mu(K)}$. Recalling by hypothesis

$$\Omega_\nu(h_K) = \sup\{\Omega_\nu(f) : \mu([f]) = a, f \in C^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})\},$$

(or $f \in C_e^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ if ν is even and we wish to take K symmetric), we obtain that the function $t \mapsto \Phi(t, \xi(t))$ is maximized at 0. Consequently, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{d}{dt}\Phi(t, \xi(t))|_{t=0} = \Phi_t(0, 0) + \Phi_\xi(0, 0)\xi'(0) \\ &= \Phi_t(0, 0) + \frac{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})\Psi_t(0, 0)}{S_p^\mu(K)} = \frac{d}{dt}\Omega_\nu(h_t)|_{t=0} + \frac{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}{S_p^\mu(K)} \frac{d}{dt}\mu([h_t])|_{t=0} \\ &= -\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) d\nu(u) + \frac{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}{pS_p^\mu(K)} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) dS_{K,p}^\mu. \end{aligned}$$

The last-step follows from Proposition 2.5. Then by the arbitrariness of f , the second claim follows from the Riesz Representation theorem. \square

There are a few steps that will be common to all proofs. Therefore, we list these as preparatory propositions. The first is pretty standard, we follow [50, Lemma 6.3].

Proposition 3.3. *Let ν be a finite Borel measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} not concentrated on any great hemisphere, let $g(t) = |t|$ or $g(t) = t_+$ and let $p > 0$. Then, there exists a constant $C_\nu(p) > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} g(\langle \theta, u \rangle)^p d\nu(u) \geq C_\nu(p)^p \nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}).$$

Furthermore, for $p \geq 1$, $C_\nu(p) = C_\nu$, where $C_\nu \in (0, 1]$ is a constant independent of p .

Proof. Observe that the map, for $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$,

$$\theta \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \langle \theta, u \rangle_+ d\nu(u)$$

is strictly positive, since ν is not concentrated on any hemisphere. Since ν is finite, we can find a constant C_ν such that

$$\frac{1}{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle \theta, u \rangle| d\nu(u) \geq \frac{1}{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \langle \theta, u \rangle_+ d\nu(u) \geq C_\nu > 0.$$

Furthermore, one has that $C_\nu \leq 1$ since $|\langle \theta, u \rangle| \leq 1$. Notice via Jensen's inequality that, when $p \geq 1$,

$$\frac{1}{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle \theta, u \rangle|^p d\nu(u) \geq \frac{1}{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \langle \theta, u \rangle_+^p d\nu(u) \geq C_\nu^p,$$

and the claim follows. When $p \in (0, 1)$, we do not have such nice control over $C_\nu(p)$. We simply use that, since ν is not concentrated on any great hemisphere, one has that the function

$$\theta \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \langle \theta, u \rangle_+^p d\nu(u)$$

is continuous, and therefore obtains a strictly positive minimum on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . \square

Proposition 3.4. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$. Let μ be a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n with density ϕ , such that ϕ contains ∂K in its Lebesgue set and $\phi > C > 0$ on ∂K . Let $p \in \mathbb{R}$ be so that $S_{K,p}^\mu$ is a finite Borel measure. Then, $S_{K,p}^\mu$ is not concentrated on any great hemisphere.*

Proof. Let

$$c_1 = \begin{cases} \min_{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_K(u) & p < 1, \\ 1 & p = 1, \\ \max_{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_K(u) & p > 1. \end{cases}$$

Notice that $c_1 > 0$ by the assumptions on K . For all $p \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $h_K^{1-p} \geq c_1^{1-p}$ on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . Observe that, for every $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \langle \theta, u \rangle_+ dS_{K,p}^\mu(u) &= \int_{\partial K} h_K^{1-p}(n_K(u)) \langle \theta, n_K(y) \rangle_+ \phi(y) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(y) \\ &\geq c_1^{1-p} C \int_{\partial K} \langle \theta, n_K(y) \rangle_+ d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(y) \\ &= c_1^{1-p} C \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \langle \theta, u \rangle_+ dS_K(u) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

since S_K is not concentrated on any great hemisphere. \square

The next two propositions will be used to show non-degeneracy. The first proposition will be used in the proof of Theorems 1.4 and 1.9. In those proofs, we are able to prove upper-and-lower bounds on sequences solving the optimization problems independently of each other, and so we may assume we have already shown bounded-ness when establishing the non-degeneracy.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $\psi \in C^+((0, \infty)) \cap L_{loc}^1((0, \infty))$ be such that $\psi(|\cdot|) \in L_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then, define the rotational invariant Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R}^n with density $\psi(|\cdot|)$ and fix $a \in (0, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Suppose $\{K_\ell\}$ is a bounded sequence of symmetric convex bodies such that, $\mu(K_\ell) = a$ for all ℓ and one has K_ℓ converges to a symmetric, compact convex set K in the Hausdorff metric as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$. Then, $K \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$.*

Proof. We must show that the limiting set K is non-degenerate, i.e. has non-empty interior. By way of contradiction, suppose it is. Then, by passing to a subsequence if need be, we can find a sequence of directions θ_ℓ such that $\theta_\ell \in \operatorname{argmin}_{v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_\ell}(v)$, $h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell) \rightarrow 0$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ and $\theta_\ell \rightarrow \theta$ for some $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Since each K_ℓ is symmetric, it is contained in the symmetric slab supporting K_ℓ with outer-unit normals $\pm\theta_\ell$, i.e. if we set

$$W(v) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\langle v, x \rangle| \leq 1\},$$

then $K_\ell \subset W\left(\frac{\theta_\ell}{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)}\right) = h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)W(\theta_\ell)$. Next, let O_ℓ be a sequence of rotations such that $O_\ell W(\theta_\ell) = W(e_n)$; by construction, there exists $O \in SO(n)$ such that $O_\ell \rightarrow O$ and $OW(\theta) = W(e_n)$. Let $Q_\ell = O_\ell K_\ell$ and $Q = OK$; since μ is rotational invariant, $\mu(O_\ell K_\ell) = a$. We have $Q_\ell \subset h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)W(e_n)$.

But also, since Q is bounded and $Q_\ell \rightarrow Q$ by hypothesis, there exists $R = R(Q) > 0$ such that $Q, Q_\ell \subset [-R, R]^n$ for ℓ large enough; also, $h_K(\theta) < R$ for ℓ large enough. Consequently, $Q_\ell \subseteq [-R, R]^{n-1} \times [-h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell), h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)]$.

Next, decompose \mathbb{R}^n into $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times e_n \mathbb{R}$, and write $x = (\bar{x}, x_n)$, with $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} a = \mu(Q_\ell) &\leq \mu\left([-R, R]^{n-1} \times [-h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell), h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)]\right) \\ &= 2 \int_{[-R, R]^{n-1}} \int_0^{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} \psi(|(\bar{x}, x_n)|) dx_n d\bar{x} \\ &= 2h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell) \int_{[-R, R]^{n-1}} \left(\frac{1}{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} \int_0^{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} \psi(|(\bar{x}, x_n)|) dx_n \right) d\bar{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Define the $(d-1)$ th moment of ψ on $(0, r)$:

$$I_d(r) := \int_0^r t^{d-1} \frac{\psi(t) dt}{\int_0^r \psi(t) dt}.$$

We now show that $I_{n-1}(R)$ is finite for every $R < \infty$. We already have from polar coordinates that $\int_{\mathbb{R}B_2^n} \psi(|x|) dx < \infty$ is totally equivalent to $I_n(R) < \infty$ for every $R < \infty$. We now show the rudimentary fact that if a function ψ has finite $(n-1)$ th moment on $(0, R)$, then it has finite $(n-2)$ nd moment on $(0, R)$ ($n \geq 2$). Indeed, we obtain from Jensen's inequality

$$I_{n-2}(R) = \int_0^R (t^{n-1})^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}} \frac{\psi(t) dt}{\int_0^R \psi(t) dt} \leq \left(\frac{\int_0^R \psi(t) t^{n-1} dt}{\int_0^R \psi(t) dt} \right)^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}} = I_n(R)^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}} < \infty.$$

Abusing notation and keeping $|\cdot|$ for the Euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^{n-1} , one then deduces that, for every $R > 0$, $\int_{RB_2^{n-1}} \psi(|\bar{x}|) d\bar{x} < \infty$. Notice that, by Lebesgue's differentiation theorem,

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} \int_0^{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} \psi(|(\bar{x}, x_n)|) dx_n = \psi(|\bar{x}|).$$

Thus, by dominated convergence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (3.5) \quad & \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_{[-R, R]^{n-1}} \left(\frac{1}{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} \int_0^{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} \psi(|(\bar{x}, x_n)|) dx_n \right) d\bar{x} \\ &= \int_{[-R, R]^{n-1}} \psi(|\bar{x}|) d\bar{x} < \int_{\sqrt{n-1}RB_2^{n-1}} \psi(|x|) dx \\ &= \left((n-1) \text{Vol}_{n-1}(B_2^{n-1}) \int_0^{\sqrt{n-1}R} \psi(t) dt \right) I_{n-1}(\sqrt{n-1}R), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from polar coordinates. Fix a very small $\epsilon > 0$. Then, for ℓ large enough, (3.5) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{[-R, R]^{n-1}} \left(\frac{1}{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} \int_0^{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} \psi(|(\bar{x}, x_n)|) dx_n \right) d\bar{x} < \int_{[-R, R]^{n-1}} \psi(\bar{x}) d\bar{x} + \epsilon \\ & < \left((n-1) \text{Vol}_{n-1}(B_2^{n-1}) \int_0^{\sqrt{n-1}R} \psi(t) dt \right) I_{n-1}(\sqrt{n-1}R) + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for ℓ large enough,

$$0 < \frac{a}{(n-1) \text{Vol}_{n-1}(B_2^{n-1}) I_{n-1}(\sqrt{n-1}R) \int_0^{\sqrt{n-1}R} \psi(t) dt + \epsilon} < 2h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell).$$

But, $h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell) \rightarrow 0$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, a contradiction. \square

The next proposition will be used for non-degeneracy in the proofs of Theorems 1.3 and 1.8.

Proposition 3.6. *Let μ be a finite, rotational invariant Radon measure with density continuous on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. Fix $a \in [\frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n))$. If K is a compact, convex set so that $o \in K$ and $\mu(K) = a$, then, $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$.*

Proof. By way of contradiction, suppose that the origin is on the boundary of K . Then, there exists $v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ such that $h_K(v) = 0$. Let $H^+ = \{x : \langle x, v \rangle \geq 0\}$ and define H^- similarly, but with \geq replaced with \leq . Without loss of generality, $K \subset H^+$. Since μ is rotational invariant, $\mu(H^+) = \frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}$. But, this means $\frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2} \leq a = \mu(K) < \mu(H^+) = \frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}$, a contradiction. Thus, K contains the origin in its interior. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4. We will work with the functional Ω_ν . In light of Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2, it suffices to show that a solution exists to

- (1) (3.4) for Theorem 1.3 and

- (2) the variant of (3.4) consisting of $C_e^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ under the assumption ν is even for Theorem 1.4 and the extra claim of Theorem 1.3, concerning the existence of $K \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$.

We note the converse direction in each case follows from Proposition 3.4. As for the forward directions, we first start with (3.4). Let K_ℓ be a maximising sequence, that is

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \Omega_\nu(K_\ell) = \sup\{\Omega_\nu(K) : \mu(K) = a, K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n\}.$$

We claim that this sequence is bounded. Indeed, suppose not. If ν is even and we are aiming to show the existence of a symmetric maximiser, replace \mathcal{K}_o^n with \mathcal{K}_e^n in the maximisation problem and let $g(t) = |t|$. Otherwise, let $g(t) = t_+$.

For each K_ℓ , there exists a $\theta_\ell \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ such that $\rho_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)$ is maximal. Furthermore, from (2.6), one has $h_{K_\ell}(u) \geq \rho_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)g(\langle \theta_\ell, u \rangle)$. Notice then that, from the above estimate and Proposition 3.3,

$$\Omega_\nu(K_\ell) \leq -\frac{1}{p}\rho_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)^p \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} g(\langle \theta_\ell, u \rangle)^p d\nu(u) \leq -\frac{C_\nu(p)^p \nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}{p} \rho_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)^p.$$

Sending $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, the above becomes $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \Omega_\nu(K_\ell) = -\infty$, contradicting K_ℓ being a maximising sequence. Therefore, the convex sets K_ℓ are uniformly bounded, and so, by Blaschke selection, they, by passing to a subsequence if need be, converge to a compact, convex set K containing the origin (which is symmetric if ν is even). For Theorem 1.3, the claim follows from Proposition 3.6. Similarly, for Theorem 1.4, the non-degeneracy follows from Proposition 3.5. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.6. We will work with the functional ψ_ν . In light of Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2, it suffices to show that a solution to (3.3) exists under the assumption $p > n$. Let

$$\Psi(r, \nu) = \psi_\nu(h_{rB_2^n}) = \mu(rB_2^n) - \frac{r^p}{p}\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}).$$

Let ϕ be the density of μ , and write

$$\mu(rB_2^n) = r^n \text{Vol}_n(B_2^n) \frac{1}{\text{Vol}_n(rB_2^n)} \int_{rB_2^n} \phi(x) dx.$$

Consequently,

$$\Psi(r, \nu) = r^n \text{Vol}_n(B_2^n) \left(\frac{1}{\text{Vol}_n(rB_2^n)} \int_{rB_2^n} \phi(x) dx - r^{p-n} \frac{n}{p} \frac{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}{\text{Vol}_{n-1}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})} \right).$$

Therefore, as $r \rightarrow 0^+$, $r^{p-n} \frac{n}{p} \frac{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}{\text{Vol}_{n-1}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})} \rightarrow 0$, but, from the Lebesgue differentiation theorem,

$$\frac{1}{\text{Vol}_n(rB_2^n)} \int_{rB_2^n} \phi(x) dx \rightarrow \lim_{|x| \rightarrow 0} \phi(x) > 0$$

as $r \rightarrow 0$. This shows, $\Psi(r) > 0$ for r small enough. On the other-hand, write

$$\Psi(r, \nu) = r^p \left(\frac{\mu(rB_2^n)}{r^p} - \frac{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}{p} \right).$$

Next, notice Property **(D)**_p implies that, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$,

$$(3.6) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^{n-p} \phi(rx) = 0.$$

Observe that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu(rB_2^n)}{r^p} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{r^p} \int_{rB_2^n} \phi(x) dx = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \int_{B_2^n} r^{n-p} \phi(rx) dx.$$

For r large enough, $r^{n-p} \phi(rx)$ is dominated by, say, 1 for almost all $x \in B_2^n$. Hence, by dominated convergence, we obtain

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu(rB_2^n)}{r^p} = 0.$$

Thus, $\Psi(r, \nu) < 0$ for r large enough. We therefore let $R(\nu) = \sup\{r > 0 : \Psi(r, \nu) > 0\}$; we have just shown that $R(\nu) \in (0, \infty)$. We emphasize here that we view R as a function from the set of Borel measures on the sphere to $(0, \infty)$.

Arguing like in the proofs of Theorem 1.3 and 1.4, fix an arbitrary symmetric convex body K ; then, from (2.6), $h_K(u) \geq \rho_K(\theta_K) |\langle \theta_K, u \rangle|$, where $\theta_K \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ is so that $\rho_K(\theta_K)$ is maximal, and K is contained in the ball of radius $\rho_K(\theta_K)$.

We can now directly compute using the above estimate and Proposition 3.3:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_\nu(h_K) &\leq \mu(K) - \frac{\rho_K(\theta_K)^p}{p} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle \theta_K, u \rangle|^p d\nu(u) \\ &\leq \mu(K) - \frac{(\rho_K(\theta_K) C_\nu)^p}{p} \nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \\ &\leq \mu(\rho_K(\theta_K) B_2^n) - \frac{(\rho_K(\theta_K) C_\nu)^p}{p} \nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \\ &= \Psi(\rho_K(\theta_K), C_\nu^p \nu). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\psi_\nu(h_K) > 0$ implies $\Psi(\rho_K(\theta_K), C_\nu^p \nu) > 0$, which means

$$\rho_K(\theta_K) \leq R(C_\nu^p \nu) \leq \max\{R(C_\nu^p \nu), R(\nu)\} =: R,$$

and so $K \subseteq RB_2^n$. Formally, we can restrict our search for the maximiser to the set

$$\mathcal{F} = \{K \in \mathcal{K}_e^n : K \subset RB_2^n\}.$$

We have that $\sup\{\psi_\nu(h_K) : K \in \mathcal{F}\} > 0$ by the construction of R . Let $\{K_\ell\} \subset \mathcal{K}_e^n$ be a sequence of convex bodies so that $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \psi_\nu(h_{K_\ell}) = \sup\{\psi_\nu(h_K) : K \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Via Blaschke selection, there exists some $K \in \mathcal{F}$ and a sub-sequence $\{K_{\ell_j}\} \subset \{K_\ell\}$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \psi_\nu(h_{K_{\ell_j}}) = \psi_\nu(h_K)$, and so $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{\ell_j} = K$ with respect to the Hausdorff metric. Finally, we see that, from the definition of \mathcal{F} ,

$$\mu(K) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu(K_{\ell_j}) \geq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \psi_\nu(h_{K_{\ell_j}}) > 0,$$

and so K has non-empty interior, and is thus a convex body in the proper sense. The final claim follows from Proposition 3.4. \square

4. THE CASE WHEN P IS ZERO

This section is dedicated to proving Theorems 1.8 and 1.9. Our technique can be traced through [18, 49, 51, 67], especially [18]. We will be working with the entropy functional

$$(4.1) \quad \mathcal{E}_\nu(f) = -\frac{1}{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \log f(u) d\nu(u); \quad \mathcal{E}_\nu(K) := \mathcal{E}_\nu(h_K),$$

which will be taken over $C^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ or $C_e^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. We will consider the following optimization problem.

Lemma 4.1. *Let μ be a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n , and fix a Borel measure ν on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$. Then, for a fixed $a \in (0, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n))$, K solves*

$$(4.2) \quad \sup\{\mathcal{E}_\nu(K) : \mu(K) = a, K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n\}$$

if and only if h_K solves

$$\sup\{\mathcal{E}_\nu(f) : \mathcal{E}_\nu([f]) = a, C^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})\}.$$

Additionally, if K is also assumed to be symmetric in the first optimization problem, then the set $C^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ is replaced by $C_e^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ in the second optimization problem.

Proof. One must simply notice that the function $-\log x$ is monotonically decreasing to obtain, since $h_{[f]}(u) \leq f(u)$ point-wise,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})\mathcal{E}_\nu([f]) &= - \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \log h_{[f]}(u) d\nu(u) \\ &\geq - \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \log f(u) d\nu(u) = \mathcal{E}_\nu(f)\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}). \end{aligned}$$

The equivalence follows since $[h_{[f]}] = [f]$. □

The next lemma shows that solving the optimization problem solves our weighted log-Minkowski problem.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$, and let μ be a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n with density that contains ∂K in its Lebesgue set. If K solves (4.2), then $\nu = \frac{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}{S_0^\mu(K)} S_{K,0}^\mu$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of the second claim in Lemma 3.1; define

$$\Phi^{(2)}(t, \epsilon) = \mathcal{E}_\nu(h_K e^{tf+\epsilon})$$

and

$$\Psi^{(2)}(t, \epsilon) = \mu([h_K e^{tf+\epsilon}]).$$

It can again be noticed that

$$\Psi^{(2)}(0, 0) = \mu(K) = a,$$

and

$$\Psi_\epsilon^{(2)}(0, 0) = S_0^\mu(K) \neq 0.$$

Then, repeat the use of the implicit function theorem and the subsequent computations; note that one will have to use Corollary 2.4 in place of Proposition 2.5. □

We now prove our theorems for this section.

Proof of Theorems 1.8 and 1.9. In light of Lemmas 4.2 and Lemma 4.1, it suffices to show a solution exists to (4.2). Let K_ℓ be a maximizing sequence, that is

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_\nu(K_\ell) = \sup \{ \mathcal{E}_\nu(K) : \mu(K) = a, K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n \}$$

for Theorem 1.8, the not necessarily even case, and

$$(4.3) \quad \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_\nu(K_\ell) = \sup \{ \mathcal{E}_\nu(K) : \mu(K) = a, K \in \mathcal{K}_e^n \}$$

for the even case of Theorem 1.8 and Theorem 1.9.

Let $r(a)$ be so that $\mu(r(a)B_2^n) = a$, and set $B_a = r(a)B_2^n$. Then, observe that $\mathcal{E}_\nu(B_a) = -\log r(a)$. Consequently,

$$(4.4) \quad \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{E}_\nu(K_\ell) \geq -\log r(a).$$

Following the approach from [18, Theorem 6.3], since each K_ℓ is non-empty, there exists ellipsoids E_ℓ and vectors c_ℓ via John's theorem [58] such that $E_\ell \subset K_\ell \subset c_\ell + b(n)(E_\ell - c_\ell)$. Here, $b(n) = \sqrt{n}$ in the symmetric case (note $c_\ell = o$ in the symmetric case as well) and $b(n) = n$ in the general case. We then denote by $u_{1,\ell}, \dots, u_{n,\ell} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ the principal directions of E_ℓ indexed to satisfy $h_{1,\ell} \leq \dots \leq h_{n,\ell}$, where $h_{i,\ell} = h_{E_\ell}(u_{i,\ell})$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Defining the cross-polytopes

$$C_\ell = [\pm h_{1,\ell} u_{1,\ell}, \dots, \pm h_{n,\ell} u_{n,\ell}],$$

one obtains $C_\ell \subset E_\ell \subset \sqrt{n}C_\ell$. Consequently, we deduce

$$C_\ell \subset K_\ell \subset c_\ell + b(n)(\sqrt{n}C_\ell - c_\ell).$$

We must have that there exists a sequence of numbers A_ℓ such that $\text{Vol}_n(C_\ell) \geq A_\ell > 0$. Indeed, if $\text{Vol}_n(C_\ell) \rightarrow 0$, then $\text{Vol}_n(K_\ell) \rightarrow 0$. In the case when μ is finite, i.e. its density ϕ is in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, one obtains from dominated convergence that $\mu(K_\ell) \rightarrow 0$. Similarly, when $\phi \in L^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for some $s \in (1, \infty)$, we obtain from Hölder's inequality

$$\mu(K_\ell) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \chi_{K_\ell}(x) \phi(x) dx \leq \|\phi\|_{L^s(\mathbb{R}^n)} \text{Vol}_n(K_\ell)^{\frac{s-1}{s}},$$

which again goes to zero if $\text{Vol}_n(K_\ell)$ does. In either case, this contradicts $\mu(K_\ell) = a$ for all ℓ .

Using the formula of the volume of a cross-polytope, we then obtain that

$$(4.5) \quad \prod_{i=1}^n h_{i,\ell} = \frac{n! \text{Vol}_n(C_\ell)}{2^n} \geq \frac{n! A_\ell}{2^n}$$

Notice that, with $\widetilde{C}_\ell = \left(\frac{n! A_\ell}{2^n}\right)^{-\frac{1}{n}} C_\ell$,

$$(4.6) \quad \mathcal{E}_\nu(\widetilde{C}_\ell) = -\frac{1}{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \log h_{\widetilde{C}_\ell}(u) d\nu(u) = -\frac{1}{n} \log \left(\frac{2^n}{n! A_\ell} \right) + \mathcal{E}_\nu(C_\ell).$$

By way of contradiction, suppose the sequence $\{K_\ell\}$ is not bounded. Then, the sequence $\{C_\ell\}$ is not bounded. Therefore, by passing to a subsequence if need be, one has

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} h_{n,\ell} = \infty.$$

One then obtains from (4.5) and [18, Lemma 6.2] that $\{\mathcal{E}_\nu(\tilde{C}_\ell)\}$, and therefore $\{\mathcal{E}_\nu(C_\ell)\}$ via (4.6), are not bounded from below. Since $\mathcal{E}_\nu(C_\ell) \geq \mathcal{E}_\nu(K_\ell)$, this yields $\{\mathcal{E}_\nu(K_\ell)\}$ is not bounded from below, contradicting (4.4) for ℓ large enough. Thus, we must have that $\{K_\ell\}$ is bounded. Then, appealing to Propositions 3.6 and 3.5, for Theorems 1.8 and 1.9, respectively, we have that the sequences are non-degenerate. Our claim then follows from Blaschke selection. \square

5. THE CASE OF NEGATIVE P

This section is dedicated to proving Theorems 1.10 and 1.11. The techniques from our approach can be traced through, e.g. [21, 24, 27, 36]. We start with the following two propositions for non-degeneracy. The first will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.11. However, we need non-degeneracy when establishing bounded-ness on the optimizing sequence. Thus, the content strays from that in Proposition 3.5.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $\psi \in C^+((0, \infty)) \cap L^1((0, \infty))$ be such that $\psi(|x|) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then, define the rotational invariant Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R}^n with density $\psi(|\cdot|)$ and fix $a \in (0, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Suppose $\{K_\ell\}$ is a sequence of symmetric convex bodies such that, $\mu(K_\ell) = a$ for all ℓ and one has K_ℓ converges to a symmetric, closed convex set K in the Hausdorff metric as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$. Then, K is non-degenerate (i.e. has non-empty interior).*

Proof. By way of contradiction, suppose K is degenerate. Then, by passing to subsequence if need be, we can find a sequence of directions θ_ℓ such that $\theta_\ell \in \operatorname{argmin}_{v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_\ell}(v)$, $h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell) \rightarrow 0$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ and $\theta_\ell \rightarrow \theta$ for some $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Since each K_ℓ is symmetric, it is contained in the symmetric slab supporting K_ℓ with outer-unit normals $\pm\theta_\ell$, i.e. if we set

$$W(v) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\langle v, x \rangle| \leq 1\},$$

then $K_\ell \subset W\left(\frac{\theta_\ell}{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)}\right) = h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)W(\theta_\ell)$. Next, let O_ℓ be a sequence of rotations such that $O_\ell W(\theta_\ell) = W(e_n)$; by construction, there exists $O \in SO(n)$ such that $O_\ell \rightarrow O$ and $OW(\theta) = W(e_n)$. Let $Q_\ell = O_\ell K_\ell$ and $Q = OK$; since μ is rotational invariant, $\mu(O_\ell K_\ell) = a$. We have $Q_\ell \subset h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)W(e_n)$. We again decompose \mathbb{R}^n into $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times e_n\mathbb{R}$, and write $x = (\bar{x}, x_n)$, with $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} a = \mu(Q_\ell) &\leq \mu(\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times [-h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell), h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)]) \\ &= 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \int_0^{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} \psi(|(\bar{x}, x_n)|) dx_n d\bar{x} \\ &= 2h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell) \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \left(\frac{1}{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} \int_0^{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} \psi(|(\bar{x}, x_n)|) dx_n \right) d\bar{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that, from polar coordinates,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \psi(|x|) dx = n \operatorname{Vol}_n(B_2^n) \int_0^\infty \psi(t) t^{n-1} dt,$$

i.e., given a function ψ on $(0, \infty)$, the function $\psi(|x|)$ is integrable on \mathbb{R}^n if and only if ψ has finite $(n-1)$ th moment on \mathbb{R}_+ . We now show the rudimentary fact that if a function ψ has finite

$(n-1)$ th moment on \mathbb{R}_+ , then it has finite $(n-2)$ nd moment on \mathbb{R}_+ ($n \geq 2$). Indeed, we obtain from Jensen's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \psi(t)t^{n-2}dt &= \int_0^\infty \psi(t)dt \int_0^\infty (t^{n-1})^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}} \frac{\psi(t)}{\int_0^\infty \psi(t)dt} \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty \psi(t)dt \left(\frac{\int_0^\infty \psi(t)t^{n-1}dt}{\int_0^\infty \psi(t)dt} \right)^{\frac{n-2}{n-1}} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Abusing notation and keeping $|\cdot|$ for the Euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^{n-1} , one then deduces that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \psi(|\bar{x}|)d\bar{x} < \infty$. Notice that, by Lebesgue's differentiation theorem,

$$\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} \int_0^{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} \psi(|(\bar{x}, x_n)|)dx_n = \psi(|\bar{x}|).$$

Thus, we obtain

$$(5.1) \quad \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \left(\frac{1}{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} \int_0^{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} \psi(|(\bar{x}, x_n)|)dx_n \right) d\bar{x} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \psi(|\bar{x}|)d\bar{x}.$$

To justify the limit: first, truncate \mathbb{R}^{n-1} to RB_2^{n-1} for arbitrary R . Then, from the slightly stronger version of Lebesgue's differentiation theorem, which we recall asserts that

$$\frac{1}{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} \int_0^{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} |\psi(|(\bar{x}, x_n)|) - \psi(|(\bar{x}, 0)|)|dx_n$$

goes to zero, one easily obtains that (5.1) holds true (but with \mathbb{R}^{n-1} replaced by RB_2^{n-1}). Then, send R to ∞ to establish (5.1) via monotone convergence.

Fix a very small $\epsilon > 0$. Then, for ℓ large enough, (5.1) yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \left(\frac{1}{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} \int_0^{h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)} \psi(|(\bar{x}, x_n)|)dx_n \right) d\bar{x} < (n-1)\text{Vol}_{n-1}(B_2^{n-1}) \int_0^\infty \psi(t)t^{n-2}dt + \epsilon.$$

Thus, we have for ℓ large enough

$$0 < \frac{a}{(n-1)\text{Vol}_{n-1}(B_2^{n-1}) \int_0^\infty \psi(t)t^{n-2}dt + \epsilon} < 2h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell).$$

On the other-hand, $h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell) \rightarrow 0$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$, a contradiction. \square

The next proposition will be used to prove Theorem 1.10.

Proposition 5.2. *Let μ be a finite, rotational invariant Radon measure with density continuous on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$. Fix $a \in (\frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n))$. If K is a closed convex set so that $o \in K$ and $\mu(K) = a$, then, $o \in \text{int}(K)$.*

Proof. By way of contradiction, suppose that the origin is on the boundary of K . Then, there exists $v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ such that $h_K(v) = 0$. Let $H^+ = \{x : \langle x, v \rangle \geq 0\}$ and define H^- similarly, but with \geq replaced with \leq . Without loss of generality, $K \subseteq H^+$. Since μ is rotational invariant, $\mu(H^+) = \frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}$. But, this means $\frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2} < a = \mu(K) \leq \mu(H^+) = \frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}$, a contradiction. Thus, K contains the origin in its interior. \square

Unlike Proposition 3.6, we do not have bounded-ness in Proposition 5.2. Thus, we had to assume $a > \frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}$ to prevent $K = H^+$. We next prove Theorems 1.10 and 1.11 for when the data measure ν is zero on every great hemisphere. Then, we prove the general case via approximation.

Lemma 5.3. *Let μ be a finite, rotational invariant, radially decreasing Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n with continuous density. Let $p < 0$. We consider two cases.*

- (1) *Fix $a \in (0, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Let ν be an even, finite Borel measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} that vanishes on all great hemispheres. Then, there exists a symmetric convex body K with $\mu(K) = a$ solving (the variant of) (3.4) (with \mathcal{K}_e^n) for the given μ and ν .*
- (2) *Suppose also that, if $d\mu(x) = \psi(|\cdot|)dx$, then $\psi \in L^1([0, \infty))$. Fix $a \in (\frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n))$. Let ν be a finite Borel measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} that vanishes on all great hemispheres. Then, there exists a convex body K with $\mu(K) = a$ solving (3.4) for the given μ and ν .*

Proof. Let K_ℓ be a sequence tending to the supremum, that is

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{cases} \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \Omega_\nu(K_\ell) = \sup\{\Omega_\nu(K) : \mu(K) = a, K \in \mathcal{K}_e^n\} > 0 & \text{case 1,} \\ \lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} \Omega_\nu(K_\ell) = \sup\{\Omega_\nu(K) : \mu(K) = a, K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n\} > 0 & \text{case 2.} \end{cases}$$

It suffices to show that the sequence $\{K_\ell\}$ has a non-degenerate limit and is contained in a big ball; by Blaschke selection, this would then yield that there exists a convex body K such that, up to a subsequence, $K_\ell \rightarrow K$ and, by construction, K is a convex body with $\mu(K) = a > 0$ (that is symmetric for case 1).

The fact that the limit is non-degenerate follows from Proposition 5.1 for case 1 and Proposition 5.2 for case 2; we now show that K_ℓ is bounded. Again by way of contradiction, suppose otherwise. From polarity, the sequence K_ℓ° is then degenerate. That is, by passing to a subsequence if need be, K_ℓ° converges to a compact, convex set K° and there exists $v_0 \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ such that $h_{K^\circ}(v_0) = 0$. Define the set, for every $r \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$,

$$\omega_r(v_0) = \{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} : |\langle u, v_0 \rangle| > r\}.$$

Then, by [50, Lemma 6.2],

$$\rho_{K_\ell^\circ} \rightarrow 0$$

on $\omega_r(v_0)$. Since we have already shown that h_{K_ℓ} is bounded from below, it follows that $h_{K_\ell^\circ}$ is bounded from above. Consequently, $K_\ell^\circ \subset RB_2^n$ for some $R > 0$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} -p\Omega_\nu(K_\ell) &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_\ell}(u)^p d\nu(u) = \int_{\omega_r(v_0)} \rho_{K_\ell^\circ}(u)^{-p} d\nu(u) + \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \setminus \omega_r(v_0)} \rho_{K_\ell^\circ}(u)^{-p} d\nu(u) \\ &\leq \int_{\omega_r(v_0)} \rho_{K_\ell^\circ}(u)^{-p} d\nu(u) + R^{-p} \nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \setminus \omega_r(v_0)). \end{aligned}$$

Since ν vanishes on all great hemispheres, we obtain

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \setminus \omega_r(v_0)) = \nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap v_0^\perp) = 0.$$

We deduce that $\lim_{\ell \rightarrow \infty} -p\Omega_\nu(K_\ell) = 0$, contradicting (5.2). \square

We now recall some classical facts concerning Monge-Ampère equations. Suppose we have $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ and a Borel measure ν on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} such that

$$\nu = S_{K,p}^\mu$$

where μ is a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n with density ϕ that contains ∂K in its Lebesgue set. If ν has strictly positive density f on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} and K has C^2 smooth boundary, then this rewrites as the following Monge-Ampère equation:

$$(5.3) \quad h_K^{1-p} \phi(\nabla h_K) \det(\nabla^2 h_K + h_K I) = f.$$

Our first lemma turns the Minkowski problem on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} into one on \mathbb{R}^{n-1} . We will use radial projections. We use the usual notation that, for $e \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, $e^\perp = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, e \rangle = 0\}$ is the hyperplane through the origin orthogonal to e . Then, $H_e := e^\perp + e$ is the hyperplane tangential to \mathbb{S}^{n-1} at e . We denote by $\pi_e : e^\perp \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ the radial projection of H_e to \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , i.e.

$$(5.4) \quad \pi_e(y) = \frac{y + e}{\sqrt{1 + |y|^2}}.$$

Clearly, this yields

$$\langle \pi_e(y), e \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + |y|^2}}.$$

Proposition 5.4. *Fix $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ and let $h = h_K$ solve (5.3) for a given nonnegative function f on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} and Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R}^n with continuous density ϕ . Fix $e \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and define $H_K, F : e^\perp \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ as*

$$H_K(y) = h_K(e + y) \quad \text{and} \quad F(y) = (1 + |y|^2)^{-\frac{n+p}{2}} f\left(\frac{e + y}{\sqrt{1 + |y|^2}}\right),$$

Then, H_K solves the following Monge-Ampère equation weakly on $e^\perp \approx \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$:

$$H_K(y)^{1-p} \phi(\nabla H_K(y) - (H_K(y) - \langle \nabla H_K(y), e \rangle) \cdot e) \text{Hess}(H_K(y)) = G(y).$$

Proof. Begin by noticing that we can write from (5.4)

$$(5.5) \quad H_K(y) = \sqrt{1 + |y|^2} h_K(\pi_e(y)).$$

From this representation, we obtain via (2.3) that

$$\partial H_K(y) = \partial h_K(y + e)|_{y \in e^\perp} = F(K, y + e)|_{y \in e^\perp} = F(K, \pi_e(y))|_{y \in e^\perp}.$$

Using the 1-homogeneity of the support function, we differentiate (5.5) to obtain

$$\nabla H_K(y) = \nabla h_K(v)|_{v=\pi_e(y)}.$$

Therefore, there exists $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(5.6) \quad \nabla h_K(v) = \nabla H_K(y) - te,$$

with $v = \pi_e(y)$. Then, using (2.7),

$$h_K(v) = \langle \nabla h_K(v), v \rangle = \langle \nabla H_K(y), v \rangle - t \langle e, v \rangle.$$

Multiplying through by $\sqrt{1+|y|^2}$ and using (5.4) and (5.5), we obtain

$$t = \langle \nabla H_K(y), y \rangle - H_K(y).$$

Consequently, (5.6) becomes

$$(5.7) \quad \nabla h_K(v) = \nabla H_K(y) + (H_K(y) - \langle \nabla H_K(y), y \rangle) \cdot e,$$

From (2.5), one has

$$\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \left(\bigcup_{u \in \pi_e(E)} (F(K, u)|_{u \in e^\perp}) \right) = \int_{\pi_e(E)} \langle u, e \rangle dS_K(u).$$

We may re-formulate (5.3) as equality in the following:

$$dS_K(u) = \frac{1}{\phi(\nabla h_K(u))} h_K(u)^{p-1} f(u) du$$

(note the fact that $S_K(E) < S_K(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) < \infty$ manifestly yields the integrability of the right-hand side over \mathbb{S}^{n-1}). Consequently, using (2.4) and (2.5), we obtain, for an arbitrary Borel $E \subset e^\perp$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_E \text{Hess}(H_K(y)) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(y) &= \int_{\pi_e(E)} \langle u, e \rangle dS_K(u) \\ &= \int_{\pi_e(E)} \frac{\langle u, e \rangle}{\phi(\nabla h_K(u))} h_K(u)^{p-1} f(u) du \\ &= \int_E \frac{1}{\phi(\nabla H_K(y) + (H_K(y) - \langle \nabla H_K(y), y \rangle) \cdot e)} H_K(y)^{p-1} F(y) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(y), \end{aligned}$$

where, in the last line, we used that the determinant of the Jacobian of the coordinate transformation $v = \pi_e(y)$ is $(1 + |y|^2)^{-\frac{n}{2}}$. We note that at this point, we have shown weak equality in

$$\text{Hess}(H_K(y)) = \frac{1}{\phi(\nabla H_K(y) + (H_K(y) - \langle \nabla H_K(y), y \rangle) \cdot e)} H_K(y)^{p-1} F(y).$$

The claim follows from this; if we define a measure M_1 on e^\perp as the measure with density $\text{Hess}(H_K(y))$, and

$$dM_2(y) = \frac{1}{\phi(\nabla H_K(y) + (H_K(y) - \langle \nabla H_K(y), y \rangle) \cdot e)} H_K(y)^{p-1} F(y) dy,$$

then, by definition of weak equality,

$$\int_E g(y) dM_1(y) = \int_E g(y) dM_2(y)$$

for every continuous function g and compact E . Setting

$$g(y) = \phi(\nabla H_K(y) + (H_K(y) - \langle \nabla H_K(y), y \rangle) \cdot e) H_K(y)^{1-p}$$

yields the claimed equality. \square

Having established Proposition 5.4, the proof of the following lemma is line-by-line the same as [36, Theorem 3.1].

Lemma 5.5. *Let μ be a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n with continuous density ϕ . Fix $p \in \mathbb{R}, p \neq 0$. Suppose a function f on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} and $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ satisfy $0 < c_1 \leq f \leq c_2$ on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} and $dS_{K,p}^\mu(u) = f(u)du$. Then:*

- (1) ∂K is C^1 and strictly convex, and so h_K is C^1 smooth on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$;
- (2) if f is continuous, then the restriction of h_K to \mathbb{S}^{n-1} is in $C^{1,\alpha}$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$;
- (3) if $f \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, then h_K is $C^{2,\alpha}$ on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} .

Proof of Theorems 1.10 and 1.11. We first approximate ν with a sequence of Borel measures ν_ℓ such that $d\nu_\ell = f_\ell du$, with $f_\ell \in C^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ (or $f_\ell \in C_e^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ in the case of even ν). We see that ν_ℓ vanishes on all great hemispheres. Then, by Lemma 5.3 and Lemma 3.2, there exists a sequence $\{K_\ell\} \subset \mathcal{K}_o^n(\mathcal{K}_e^n)$ such that

$$\nu_\ell = \lambda_\ell S_{K_\ell,p}^\mu, \quad \lambda_\ell = \frac{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})}{S_p^\mu(K_\ell)} S_{K_\ell,p}^\mu.$$

But actually, we may assume that $0 < f_j \in C_e^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then, the following Monge-Ampère equation holds weakly:

$$h_{K_\ell}^{1-p} \psi(|\nabla h_{K_\ell}|) \det(\nabla^2 h_{K_\ell} + h_{K_\ell} I) = \frac{f_\ell}{\lambda_\ell},$$

where we used that μ has a density of the form $\psi(|x|)$, with ψ decreasing and continuous on $[0, \infty)$.

From Lemma 5.5 Item (3), h_K is then $C^{2,\alpha}$ smooth, and consequently each K_ℓ is smooth and uniformly convex. We will again show that the sequence is uniformly bounded; via Blaschke selection, the existence of a $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ (or \mathcal{K}_e^n) such that $\mu(K) = a$ and $\nu = \lambda S_{K,p}^\mu$ follows.

The proof of the fact that the sequence is non-degenerate follows from Proposition 5.1 for Theorem 1.11 and Proposition 5.2 for Theorem 1.10. All that remains is the upper bound. Let h_{K_ℓ} obtain its maximum on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} at θ_ℓ . We again let $g(t) = |t|$ if ν is even and the K_ℓ are symmetric and $g(t) = t_+$ otherwise.

Since ν is not concentrated on any great hemisphere, there exists $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ such that

$$(5.8) \quad \int_{\{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} : g(\langle u, \theta_\ell \rangle) > \delta\}} f_\ell(u) du > \epsilon > 0$$

for large enough ℓ . Combining (5.8), (5.3), and (2.11) yields

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \frac{\epsilon}{\lambda_\ell} &< \int_{\{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} : g(\langle u, \theta_\ell \rangle) > \delta\}} \frac{f_\ell(u)}{\lambda_\ell} du \\ &= \int_{\{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} : g(\langle u, \theta_\ell \rangle) > \delta\}} h_{K_\ell}^{1-p}(u) \psi(|\nabla h_{K_\ell}(u)|) \det(\nabla^2 h_{K_\ell} + h_{K_\ell} I) du \\ &\leq h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)^{-p} \int_{\{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} : g(\langle u, \theta_\ell \rangle) > \delta\}} \psi(|\nabla h_{K_\ell}(u)|) h_{K_\ell}(u) \det(\nabla^2 h_{K_\ell} + h_{K_\ell} I) du \\ &\leq h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)^{n-p} \int_{\{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} : g(\langle u, \theta_\ell \rangle) > \delta\}} \psi(|\nabla h_{K_\ell}(u)|) du. \end{aligned}$$

If $g(\langle u, \theta_\ell \rangle) > \delta$, then (2.8) yields

$$(5.9) \quad |\nabla h_{K_\ell}(u)| > \delta h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell).$$

However, since μ is radially decreasing, the function ψ is decreasing. Hence, (5.9) provides the bound

$$(5.10) \quad \psi(|\nabla h_{K_\ell}(u)|) \leq \psi(\delta h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell))$$

whenever $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ is so that $g(\langle u, \theta_\ell \rangle) > \delta$. Therefore, we can continue using (5.10) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \epsilon < \lambda_\ell h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)^{n-p} \psi(\delta h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)) \int_{\{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} : g(\langle u, \theta_\ell \rangle) > \delta\}} du \\ \leq \lambda_\ell h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)^{n-p} \psi(\delta h_{K_\ell}(\theta_\ell)) \text{Vol}_{n-1}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}). \end{aligned}$$

But, the final line of the above goes to zero as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ (since μ satisfies Property **(D)**_p), a contradiction. The final claim follows from Proposition 3.4. \square

6. THE SMALL MASS REGIME

In this section, we will analyze smooth solutions to (5.3) when $p > -n - 1$ by utilizing degree theory; our technique follows largely [51], and can be traced through [36, 37, 72] as well. We will impose that our function ϕ is radially decreasing and rotational invariant. Therefore, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, $\phi(x) = \psi(|x|)$ for some continuous, decreasing function ψ on $(0, \infty)$. In which case, (5.3) becomes, after a change of notation that will be exclusive to this section,

$$(6.1) \quad h^{1-p} \psi(|\nabla h|) \det(h_{ij} + h \delta_{ij}) = f.$$

We follow the usual notation that $h_i = \partial_i h$ and $h_{ij} = \partial_{ij}^2 h$.

Definition 6.1. For a given nonnegative function $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, nonnegative, decreasing $\psi \in C^1((0, \infty))$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}$, we say h solves (6.1) for the triple (f, p, ψ) if

- (1) $h \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$,
- (2) if h is nonnegative, convex and 1-homogeneously extended to \mathbb{R}^n
- (3) and (6.1) holds true.

In the next lemma, we first consider the case when f is a constant; this is the so-called isotropic curvature problem. Recently, Ivaki and Milman [56], in a swooping *triumph*, established the following concerning solutions to isotropic curvature problems.

Proposition 6.2 (Solution to isotropic curvature problems, Theorem 1.3 in [56]). *Suppose $K \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$ and that ∂K is smooth, strictly convex and has strictly positive Gauss curvature κ .*

Let $\varphi : (0, \infty) \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be C^1 with $\partial_1 \varphi \geq 0, \partial_2 \varphi \geq 0$ such that at least one of these inequalities is strict. If K satisfies

$$\varphi(h, |\nabla h|) \kappa = h^{n+2},$$

then K is a centered Euclidean ball.

Recall that ∇ , the gradient on \mathbb{R}^n , and ∇_s , the gradient on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , are related via

$$(6.2) \quad \nabla h(u) = \nabla_s h(u) + h(u)u.$$

We remark that if h is a centered Euclidean ball, then its support function h is constant on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . Therefore, we refer to support functions of Euclidean balls as *constant solutions* to (6.1). If h is a (nonnegative) constant function on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , then the above becomes $\nabla h(u) = h \cdot u$, in particular

we have $|\nabla h(u)| = h$. Also, we recall that $\det(\nabla^2 h_K + hI)$ is precisely the reciprocal of the Gauss curvature of K (as a function of its outer-unit normals).

Lemma 6.3. *Fix $p > -n - 1$ and a nonnegative, decreasing $\psi \in C^1((0, \infty))$. Let $c > 0$ and suppose h solves (6.1) for the triple (c, p, ψ) . If $[h] \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$, then h has to be constant.*

Proof. Set $\varphi(x, t) = cx^{n+p+1}\psi(t)^{-1}$. Observe that (6.1) can be re-written as $\varphi(h, |\nabla h|)\kappa = h^{n+2}$, where κ denotes the Gauss curvature of $[h]$. Observe also that $\partial_t \varphi(x, t) = cx^{n+p+1} \frac{d}{dt} \psi(t)^{-1} \geq 0$ and $\partial_x \varphi(x, t) = c(n+p+1)x^{n+p}\psi(t)^{-1} > 0$. Then, according to Proposition 6.2, h is constant. \square

Recently, Ivaki [53] showed the following variant of [56, Theorem 1.3].

Proposition 6.4 (Solution to isotropic curvature problems, Theorem 1.2 in [53]). *Suppose $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ has support function h . Suppose also that ∂K is smooth, strictly convex and has strictly positive Gauss curvature κ .*

Let $\varphi : (0, \infty) \times (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ be C^1 with $\partial_1 \varphi \geq 0, \partial_2 \varphi \geq 0$ such that at least one of these inequalities is strict. If K satisfies

$$\varphi(h, |\nabla h|)\kappa = 1,$$

then K is a centered Euclidean ball. Furthermore, if $\partial_1 \varphi = 0$, then the same assumption holds with $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$.

We can then obtain the follow variant of Lemma 6.3.

Lemma 6.5. *Fix $p \geq 1$ and a nonnegative, decreasing $\psi \in C^1((0, \infty))$. Let $c > 0$ and suppose h solves (6.1) for the triple (c, p, ψ) . If $p > 1$ and $[h] \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$, or $p = 1$ and $[h] \in \mathcal{K}^n$, then h has to be constant.*

Proof. Set $\varphi(x, t) = cx^{p-1}\psi(t)^{-1}$, where $p \geq 1$. Observe that (6.1) can be re-written as $\varphi(h, |\nabla h|)\kappa = 1$, where κ denotes the Gauss curvature of $[h]$. Observe also that $\partial_t \varphi(x, t) = cx^{p-1} \frac{d}{dt} \psi(t)^{-1} \geq 0$ and, if $p > 1$ $\partial_x \varphi(x, t) = c(p-1)x^{p-2}\psi(t)^{-1} > 0$. If $p = 1$, then we see $\partial_x \varphi(x, t) = 0$. Then, according to Proposition 6.4, h is constant. \square

6.1. Small p . We now turn our attention to $p \in (-n - 1, n)$. We first show that, under Property $(\mathbf{D})_p$, there exist two constant solutions by making c small enough when $p \in (-n - 1, n)$. We recall the support of a nonnegative function is given by

$$\text{supp}(f) = \{x : f(x) > 0\}.$$

We define the set

$$(6.3) \quad L_p(\psi) = \left\{ t \in \text{supp}(\psi) : \psi(t) = -\frac{t\psi'(t)}{(n-p)} \right\}.$$

Recall that ψ is said to have Property $(\mathbf{D})_p$ if

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{n-p}\psi(t) = 0.$$

Proposition 6.6. *Fix $-n - 1 < p < n$. Let $\psi \in C^1([0, \infty))$ be a nonnegative, strictly decreasing function satisfying Property $(\mathbf{D})_p$ such that $\psi \not\equiv 0$.*

For $c < \max_{t \in \text{supp}(\psi)} t^{n-p}\psi(t)$, there exist two constant solutions h_1, h_2 solving (6.1) with $f = c$. If $\sup(L_p(\psi)) < \sup(\text{supp}(\psi))$, then c can be made small enough so that there are exactly two constant solutions.

Proof. First notice that, if h is a constant, then (6.1) becomes $h^{n-p}\psi(h) = c$. Therefore, if we set $g(t) = t^{n-p}\psi(t)$, we are looking at the level curve $g(t) = c$. We will analyse the critical points of g . By the hypotheses on ψ , g is differentiable on $(0, \infty)$. Observe that $g'(t) = t^{n-p-1}((n-p)\psi(t) + t\psi'(t))$ for $t \in (0, \infty)$. Therefore, t^* is a critical point of g if and only if $t^* \in L_p(\psi)$.

First, we show that 0 is not an accumulation point of $L_p(\psi)$. By way of contradiction, suppose it is. Then, there exists a sequence $t_k \in L_p(\psi)$ tending to zero. Observe then that

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow 0} \psi(t) \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \psi(t_k) = -\frac{\psi'(t_k)}{(n-p)}t_k = 0.$$

But ψ is decreasing, which then implies $\psi \equiv 0$, a contradiction.

Let $t_1 = \inf(L_p(\psi))$. Since $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} g(t) = 0$, we can at this moment pick any $c \in (0, g(t_1))$ and define $T_1 \in (0, t_1)$ to be so that $c = g(T_1)$. Notice that g is increasing on $(0, t_1)$. Next, we consider two cases. The first case is $\sup(L_p(\psi)) < \sup(\text{supp}(\psi))$. Then, since

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \sup(\text{supp}(\psi))} g(t) = 0,$$

we have that g is decreasing on $(\sup(L_p(\psi)), \sup(\text{supp}(\psi)))$. Let $b = \inf_{t \in L_p(\psi)} g(t)$. Then, we lower c if need be (and thus pick a new T_1) so that $c < b$, to obtain that $g(T_1) = c < b$ and there exists a unique $T_2 \in (\sup(L_p(\psi)), \sup(\text{supp}(\psi)))$ such that $g(T_2) = c$; additionally, $g(t) \geq b > c$ on $(t_1, \sup(L_p(\psi)))$. This shows T_1 and T_2 are the only $t \in \text{supp}(\psi)$ such that $g(t) = c$.

Finally, we consider the case when $\sup(L_p(\psi)) = \sup(\text{supp}(\psi))$. Then, there exists sequence $\{t_k\} \subset L_p(\psi)$ tending to $\sup(\text{supp}(\psi))$. Consequently, we have

$$(6.4) \quad 0 = (n-p) \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} t_k^{n-p}\psi(t_k) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} t_k^{n-p+1}(-\psi'(t_k)).$$

Therefore, there exist N such that, for $k \geq N$,

$$t_k^{n-p+1}(-\psi'(t_k)) < c(n-p);$$

note that we take $N = N(c)$ to be the smallest possible for our given c . This rewrites as

$$t_k^{n-p}\psi(t_k) < c.$$

Therefore, $g(t_N) < c$, but $g(t_{N-1}) > c$. By the intermediate value theorem, we pick T_2 to be the point such that $g(T_2) = c$ and $t_{N-1} < T_2 < t_N$. \square

The condition $\sup(L_p(\psi)) < \sup(\text{supp}(\psi))$ seems a bit mysterious. We give a few sufficient conditions so that this is the case.

Proposition 6.7. *Fix $-n-1 < p < n$. Let $\psi \in C^1([0, \infty))$ be a nonnegative, strictly decreasing function satisfying Property $(D)_p$ such that there exists $T > 0$ such that ψ is concave on $[T, \sup(\text{supp}(\psi))]$. Then, there exists small enough c so that there are exactly two constant solutions h_1, h_2 solving (6.1).*

Proof. Clearly, if the cardinality of $L_p(\psi)$ is finite, then $\sup(L_p(\psi)) < \sup(\text{supp}(\psi))$. Suppose the cardinality of $L_p(\psi)$ is infinite. Then, if $t_1, t_2 \in L_p(\psi)$, with $t_1 < t_2$, one has

$$-\frac{\psi'(t_2)}{(n-p)}t_2 = \psi(t_2) < \psi(t_1) = -\frac{\psi'(t_1)}{(n-p)}t_1.$$

Since ψ is decreasing, $-\psi'$ is a positive function. Then, the above re-writes as

$$-\psi'(t_2) < -\psi'(t_1)\frac{t_1}{t_2} < -\psi'(t_1).$$

Thus, ψ decreasing implies ψ' is strictly increasing on $L_p(\psi)$. By hypothesis, however, ψ' is decreasing on $[T, \sup(\text{supp}(\psi))]$. For both facts to be true, we must have $\sup(L_p(\psi)) \leq T$. Then, the claim follows from Proposition 6.6. \square

Proposition 6.7 is a bit weak, in the sense that many measures we care about are eventually convex. For example, e^{-t} is convex on $[0, \infty)$, and $e^{-t^2/2}$ is concave on $[0, 1)$ and convex on $(1, \infty)$. We now show that, if $\psi = e^{-V}$ where $t \mapsto V(e^t)$ is convex (e.g. V convex), $L_p(\psi)$ is a singleton.

Proposition 6.8. *Fix $-n - 1 < p < n$. Let $\psi \in C^1([0, \infty))$ be a nonnegative, strictly decreasing function satisfying Property $(D)_p$ such that $\psi = e^{-V}$ with $t \mapsto V(e^t)$ convex. Then, there exists small enough c so that there are exactly two constant solutions h_1, h_2 solving (6.1).*

Proof. As shown in the proof of Proposition 6.6, if we set $g(t) = t^{n-p}\psi(t)$, then $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g(t) = 0$. Thus, $L_p(\psi)$ is non-empty, being the critical points of g . We now claim that $L_p(\psi)$ is a singleton. Inserting that $\psi = e^{-V}$, the condition $t \in L_p(\psi)$ can be written as

$$(6.5) \quad \frac{(n-p)}{t} = V'(t).$$

We take a moment to consider the illuminating case when ψ is log-concave, and so V is convex. Then, V' is increasing. But, the function $(n-p)/t$ is decreasing; these two functions can agree only a point.

In our more general case, with $V(e^t)$, convex, we have that $(V(e^t))'$ is increasing. Also, from the chain rule, $(V(e^t))' = V'(e^t)e^t$. Therefore, (6.5) becomes from the chain rule and a change of variable,

$$(n-p) = (V(e^t))',$$

which ipso facto can be only be true at one point. The claim then follows from Proposition 6.6. \square

We note that, Proposition 6.6 yields a procedure for determining the number of solutions given the value of c given ψ and knowing $p \in (-n - 1, n)$. For example, the Gaussian case. We outline this in a proposition.

Proposition 6.9. *Suppose $h \in C^2$ solves the equation*

$$e^{-|\nabla h|^2/2} h^{1-p} \det(h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij}) = c(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

If $p = 1$ or $p > -n - 1$ and h is even and positive or $p > 1$ and h is positive, then h is constant, i.e. $[h]$ must be a centered Euclidean ball. Furthermore, we can characterize the number of solutions. If $p > n$, then, for every $c > 0$, there is exactly one solution. If $p = n$, there is exactly one solution

for $c \in (0, (2\pi)^{-n/2})$ and no solution for $c > (2\pi)^{-n/2}$. Finally, suppose $p \in (-n-1, n)$. Let $C(n, p) = (2\pi)^{-n/2}(n-p)^{\frac{n-p}{2}}e^{-(n-p)/2}$.

- (1) If $c < C(n, p)$, there are exactly two solutions.
- (2) If $c = C(n, p)$, there is exactly one solution.
- (3) If $c > C(n, p)$, there are no solutions.

Proof. According to the proof of Proposition 6.6, the number of solutions is determined by the number of solutions to $g(t) = c$, with $g(t) = (2\pi)^{-n/2}t^{n-p}e^{-t^2/2}$. Observe that, if $p > n$, then $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} g(t) = \infty$ and $g(t)$ is strictly decreasing to 0 on $(0, \infty)$ (with g having no critical points). Thus, g is a bijection from $(0, \infty)$ to $(0, \infty)$, and so $g(t) = c$ has a unique solution for every $c > 0$. If $p = n$, then g is a bijection from $[0, \infty)$ to $(0, (2\pi)^{-n/2}]$, and the claim follows.

For $p \in (-n-1, n)$, we examine the number of critical points of g , which is determined by solving

$$\psi(t) = -\frac{t\psi'(t)}{(n-p)}$$

with $\psi(t) = (2\pi)^{-n/2}e^{-t^2/2}$. Then, the formula reduces to $t^2 = (n-p)$. Thus, the critical point of g is at $t = \sqrt{n-p}$. We see therefore, that g increases on $(0, \sqrt{n-p})$ from 0 to its maximum $g = C(n, p)$, and then decreases on $(0, \infty)$ to 0.

Thus, for every $T \in (0, \sqrt{n-p})$, $g(t) = g(T)$ has exactly two solutions T_1, T_2 which satisfy $T_1 < \sqrt{n-p} < T_2$. Note this also shows that if $c > g(\sqrt{n-p}) (= C(n, p))$, then there are no solutions. The fact that these are the only possible solutions is from Lemmas 6.3 and 6.5. \square

This extends the result by Chen, Hu, Liu and Zhao [23] in the case $p = 1, n = 2$.

In the next lemma, we analyze the case when f is α -Hölder. We recall the Hölder norm of a function u over a set U is given by

$$\|u\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(U)} = \sum_{|\beta| \leq 2} \sup_{x \in U} |D^\beta u(x)| + \sum_{|\beta|=k} [D^\beta u]_{C^\alpha(U)} \text{ and } [D^\beta u]_{C^\alpha(U)} := \sup_{x,y \in U, x \neq y} \left\{ \frac{|u(x) - u(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha} \right\}.$$

Lemma 6.10. *Let $f \in C_e^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ be such that $\frac{1}{\tau} < f < \tau$ for some positive constant τ . Let $0 < p < n$ and let $\psi \in C^1((0, \infty))$ be function that is strictly decreasing and satisfies Property (D)_p. Suppose h is an even function that solves (6.1) for the triple (f, p, ψ) .*

Then, there exists a constant $\tau' > 0$, depending only on τ and ψ , such that

$$\frac{1}{\tau'} < h < \tau' \quad \text{and} \quad \|h\|_{C^{2,\alpha}} < \tau'.$$

Proof. We first show that h is bounded from above. Let $\{u_k\}$ be a sequence in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h(u_k) = \sup_{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h(u)$. Then from equation (6.1),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\tau} &< f(u_k) = h(u_k)^{1-p} \psi(|\nabla h(u_k)|) \det(h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij})|_{u_k} \\ (6.6) \quad &= h(u_k)^{n-p} \psi(|\nabla h(u_k)|) \frac{\det(h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij})|_{u_k}}{h(u_k)^{n-1}} \leq \frac{\det(h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij})|_{u_k}}{h(u_k)^{n-1}} h(u_k)^{n-p} \psi(h(u_k)), \end{aligned}$$

where, in the last step, we used ψ was decreasing and (2.7). If h is not bounded from above, then $h(u_k) \rightarrow \infty$, but, from (2.10), $\frac{\det(h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij})|_{u_k}}{h(u_k)^{n-1}} \rightarrow 1$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h(u_k)^{n-p}\psi(h(u_k)) = 0$; this contradicts (6.6). Thus $h_{\max} < C_0$ for some positive constant C_0 which only depends on τ and ψ .

Next, we will show that h also has a positive lower bound. We first establish that

$$(6.7) \quad h_{\max} \geq C_1$$

for some constant $C_1 > 0$ depending only on τ and ϕ . Indeed, let u_0 be a direction so that $h(u_0) = \sup_{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h(u) = h_{\max}$. Then, from (2.11) and (6.1), the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} h(u_0)^{n-1} &\geq \det(h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij})|_{u_0} = f(u_0)h(u_0)^{p-1} \frac{1}{\psi(|\nabla h(u_0)|)} \\ &\geq f(u_0)h(u_0)^{p-1} \frac{1}{\psi(h(u_0))} \geq \frac{1}{\tau} h(u_0)^{p-1} \cdot \min_{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \psi(h(u))^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $p < n$, the claim follows with

$$C_1 := \left(\min_{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (\tau\psi(h(u)))^{-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{n-p}}.$$

Next, using (6.1), we have

$$\frac{1}{n} h \det(h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij}) = \frac{1}{n\psi(|\nabla h|)} h^p f \geq \frac{1}{n\psi(h)} h^p f \geq \min_{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (n\tau\psi(h(u)))^{-1} h^p.$$

We obtain from (2.22) that the total integral of the left-hand side on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} is the volume of $[h]$. Therefore, by setting $C_2 = \min_{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (n\tau\psi(h(u)))^{-1}$, we have

$$(6.8) \quad \text{Vol}_n([h]) \geq C_2 \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h^p(u) du.$$

Combining (6.7), (6.8), and (2.6), we have

$$(6.9) \quad \text{Vol}_n([h]) \geq C_2 h_{\max}^p \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle u, u_0 \rangle|^p du \geq C_1^p C_2 \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle u, u_0 \rangle|^p du =: C_3.$$

Also note the truth

$$[h] \subset (h_{\max} B_2^n) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\langle x, u_0 \rangle| \leq h_{\min}\}.$$

This implies

$$(6.10) \quad \text{Vol}_n([h]) \leq 2^n h_{\max}^{n-1} h_{\min} < 2^n C_0^{n-1} h_{\min}.$$

Combining (6.9) and (6.10), h_{\min} is such that

$$h_{\min} > \frac{1}{2^n C_0^{n-1} C_3}.$$

We then define τ' so that $\tau' > C_0$ and $0 < \frac{1}{\tau'} < \frac{1}{2^n C_0^{n-1} C_3}$. Finally, by Lemma 5.5, the $C^{2,\alpha}$ priori estimate is also established. \square

We will recall from Proposition 6.6 that, for c small enough, we can find two constant solutions to the isotropic problem (6.1) with $f = c$. We gave examples in Propositions 6.7 and 6.8 when there are exactly two solutions; including when the measure μ with density $\psi(|\cdot|)$ is in \mathcal{M}_n . We will need the existence of exactly two solutions for the following theorem. Therefore, we make it an explicit property.

Definition 6.11. Fix $0 < p < n$. Let $\psi \in C^1([0, \infty))$ be nonnegative and strictly decreasing on its support. We say ψ has property $(\mathbf{S})_p$ if $\sup(L_p(\psi)) < \sup(\text{supp}(\psi))$, where $L_p(\psi)$ is given by (6.3).

Lemma 6.12. Fix $0 < p < n$. Let $\psi \in C^1([0, \infty))$ be nonnegative and strictly decreasing on its support such that ψ satisfies properties $(\mathbf{D})_p$ and $(\mathbf{S})_p$ and $\psi(|\cdot|) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let μ be the finite, rotational invariant measure on \mathbb{R}^n with density $\psi(|\cdot|)$. Then there exists $C, c, a, h_1, h_2 > 0$ such that, if $c < C$, h_1 and h_2 are the unique solutions to (6.1) with $f = c$ and the centered Euclidean balls $[h_1]$ and $[h_2]$ satisfy

$$\mu([h_1]) > a \quad \text{and} \quad \mu([h_2]) < \mu(\mathbb{R}^n) - a.$$

Furthermore, a can be made independent of c, h_1 and h_2 . Additionally, C can be small enough so that

$$\mu([h_2]) > \frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2} > \mu([h_1]).$$

Proof. Recall the isotropic equation with respect to (6.1), i.e.,

$$(6.11) \quad h^{1-p} \psi(|\nabla h|) \det(h_{ij} + h \delta_{ij}) = c.$$

From Proposition 6.6, there exist two constant solutions to (6.11), say h_1 and h_2 , for

$$0 < c < C := \max_{t \in \text{supp}(\psi)} t^{n-p} \psi(t);$$

by Property $(\mathbf{S})_p$, c can be made small enough so that these are the only two. Recall that c is related to h_1 and h_2 via $h_1^{n-p} \psi(h_1) = c = h_2^{n-p} \psi(h_2)$. From Lemma 6.3, these solutions, which are the support functions of centered Euclidean balls, are the only solutions among positive, even $C^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ convex functions. Set $h_3 = \inf L_p(\psi) > 0$. We then have

$$0 < h_1 < h_3 < h_2.$$

Observe that $[h_1] \subset [h_3] \subset [h_2]$. Thus,

$$\mu([h_1]) < \mu([h_3]) < \mu([h_2]) < \mu(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

But also, $\mu([h_2]) = \mu(\mathbb{R}^n) - \mu(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus [h_2])$. Naively, one can set, say,

$$a = \frac{99}{100} \min\{\mu([h_1]), \mu(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus [h_2])\}$$

to obtain $\mu([h_1]) > a$ and $\mu([h_2]) < \mu(\mathbb{R}^n) - a$. However, this bound depends on h_1, h_2 , and c . Instead, set

$$a = \min\{\mu([h_3]), \mu(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus [h_3])\}.$$

Then,

$$\mu([h_2]) > \mu([h_3]) \geq a$$

and

$$\mu([h_1]) < \mu([h_3]) = \mu(\mathbb{R}^n) - \mu(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus [h_3]) \leq \mu(\mathbb{R}^n) - a.$$

For the final claim, we recall that it was shown $h_1 \in (0, h_3)$ and $h_2 \in (h_4, h_5)$, where $h_4 = \sup L_p(\psi)$ and $h_5 = \sup(\text{supp}(\psi))$. On $(0, h_5)$, the function $h \mapsto \mu([h])$ is increasing from 0 to $\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Thus, there exists h_0 and h_6 such that $\mu([h]) < \frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}$ if we pick $h \in (0, h_0)$ and $\mu([h]) > \frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}$ if we pick $h \in (h_6, h_5)$. Consequently, we first set $C = \min\{h_0^{n-p}\psi(h_0), h_3^{n-p}\psi(h_3), h_4^{n-p}\psi(h_4), h_6^{n-p}\psi(h_6)\}$ and pick any $c \in (0, C)$ to obtain the corresponding, unique, h_1 and h_2 , that, by construction, satisfy $\mu([h_1]) < \frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2} < \mu([h_2])$. \square

For the reader unfamiliar with degree theory, we recommend the work by Li [71] for a thorough review.

Theorem 6.13. *Fix $0 < p < n$. Suppose $\psi \in C^1([0, \infty))$ is strictly decreasing on its support, satisfies properties $(\mathbf{D})_p$ and $(\mathbf{S})_p$, and is such that $\psi(|\cdot|) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let μ be the finite, rotational invariant measure on \mathbb{R}^n with density $\psi(|\cdot|)$. Suppose also that μ has an L^p isoperimetric function I_p over \mathcal{K}_e^n .*

Let $f \in C_e^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ be such that $\frac{1}{\tau} < f < \tau$ for some positive constant τ and

$$\|f\|_{L^1} < f_a := \min\{I_p(a), I_p(\mu(\mathbb{R}^n) - a)\},$$

where a is constant depending only on μ sufficiently close to $\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then, there exist $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$ such that $\mu(K_1) > a$ and $\mu(K_2) < \mu(\mathbb{R}^n) - a$ and both h_{K_1} and h_{K_2} solve (6.1) for the triple (f, p, ψ) . Furthermore, one can pick $a = \mu(\mathbb{R}^n)/2$.

Proof. We will work by using a degree theoretic argument. Firstly, we consider the isotropic equation (6.11), which is (6.1) when $f = c$, a positive constant. By Lemma 6.12, if we take, $0 < c < C := \max_{t \in \text{supp}(\psi)} t^{n-p}\psi(t)$, then we guarantee the existence of two solutions to the isotropic equation (6.11). We also obtain a constant $a \in (0, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n))$, independent of c , bounding the measures of the Wulff shapes of these solutions. Since a is independent of c , we can lower c if need be so that $\|c\|_{L^1} < f_a$ and the two solutions to (6.11) with this c , denoted say h_1 and h_2 , are the only two. Observe that $[h_1]$ and $[h_2]$ are centered Euclidean balls satisfying $\mu([h_1]) > a$ and $\mu([h_2]) < \mu(\mathbb{R}^n) - a$. In fact, we saw we can lower c even more, if it is necessary, and change a to the more concrete value $a = \mu(\mathbb{R}^n)/2$. If one decides to do so, continue to denote by h_1 and h_2 the two unique solutions to (6.11).

We denote by $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}$ the spherical Laplacian. We recall that $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}$ has a discrete spectrum. Therefore, by making c smaller if need be, we have that the linearized operator of the equation (6.11), i.e.

$$(6.12) \quad L_{h_i}(g) = h_i^{n-2} \left(\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} g + \left((n-p) + h_i \cdot \frac{\psi'(h_i)}{\psi(h_i)} \right) g \right)$$

is invertible for $i = 1, 2$.

Define a family of operators $F_t : C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \rightarrow C^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ by

$$F_t(h) = \det(\nabla^2 h + hI) - h^{p-1} \frac{1}{\psi(|\nabla h|)} f_t,$$

where $f_t = (1-t)c + tf$ for some $t \in [0, 1]$. Since $f \in C_e^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, there exists a constant $\tau > 0$ such that $\frac{1}{\tau} < f, c < \tau$ and $\|f\|_{C^\alpha} < \tau$. Then for each $t \in [0, 1]$, f_t has the same bound as f , i.e., $\frac{1}{\tau} < f_t < \tau$, $\|f_t\|_{L^1} < f_a$, and $\|f_t\|_{C^\alpha} < \tau$. We then set $\tau' > 0$ be the constant in Lemma 6.10.

For ease, set $\mathcal{S}_e = C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \cap \{h \in C_e^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) : h \text{ is convex}\}$ and define the sets $O_1, O_2 \subset \mathcal{S}_e$ by

$$O_1 = \left\{ h \in \mathcal{S}_e : \frac{1}{\tau'} < h < \tau', \|h\|_{C^{2,\alpha}} < \tau', \mu([h]) > a \right\}$$

and

$$O_2 = \left\{ h \in \mathcal{S}_e : \frac{1}{\tau'} < h < \tau', \|h\|_{C^{2,\alpha}} < \tau', \mu([h]) < \mu(\mathbb{R}^n) - a \right\}.$$

Under the $\|\cdot\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}$ norm, it is easy to see that each O_k is open and bounded. We claim that

$$(6.13) \quad \partial O_k \cap F_t^{-1}(0) = \emptyset$$

for $k = 1, 2$ and $t \in [0, 1]$. Indeed, if $h^{(k)} \in \partial O_k \cap F_t^{-1}(0)$, i.e. $F_t(h^{(k)}) = 0$, then $h^{(k)}$ solves

$$(6.14) \quad (h^{(k)})^{1-p} \psi(|\nabla h^{(k)}|) \det(h_{ij}^{(k)} + h^{(k)} \delta_{ij}) = f_t,$$

$\mu([h^{(1)}]) \geq a$ and $\mu([h^{(2)}]) \leq \mu(\mathbb{R}^n) - a$. But $h^{(k)} \in \partial O_k$ yields equality in each. Indeed, suppose either inequality is strict. Then, Lemma 6.10 shows that $h^{(k)}$ satisfies

$$\frac{1}{\tau'} < h^{(k)} < \tau', \|h^{(k)}\|_{C^{2,\alpha}} < \tau',$$

i.e. $h^{(k)} \in O_k$, which contradicts the O_k being open. Next, by hypothesis, we have

$$\|f_t\|_{L^1} = S_p^\mu([h^{(1)}]) \geq I_p(a) > 0 \text{ and } \|f_t\|_{L^1} = S_p^\mu([h^{(2)}]) \geq I_p(\mu(\mathbb{R}^n) - a) > 0$$

which contradicts the condition $\|f\|_{L^1} < f_a$. This proves (6.13). Then, by [71, Proposition 2.2], we obtain

$$\deg(F_0, O_k, 0) = \deg(F_1, O_k, 0) \neq 0,$$

i.e. the degree $\deg(F_t, O_k, 0)$ is well-defined for $t \in [0, 1]$ and does not depend on t . We now show that $\deg(F_1, O_k, 0) \neq 0$ by showing that $\deg(F_0, O_k, 0) \neq 0$.

For this, we will use our linear operator from (6.12). Recalling that it is invertible, we can use [71, Proposition 2.3] and Property $(\mathbf{S})_p$ to obtain

$$\deg(F_0, O_1, 0) = \deg(L_{h_1}, O_1, 0) \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \deg(F_0, O_2, 0) = \deg(L_{h_2}, O_2, 0) \neq 0,$$

where the last inequalities in each follows from [71, Proposition 2.4]. This implies the existence of $h^{(k)} \in O_k$ such that $F_1(h^{(k)}) = 0$. The claim follows. \square

Theorem 1.13 then follows from Theorem 6.13 via approximation arguments, like in the proof of Theorems 1.10 and 1.11.

6.2. Non-symmetric Case. In this section, we restrict the number of solutions to drop the assumption of symmetry. Recalling that Proposition 6.6 yields two solutions to the isotropic equation (6.11), and $(\mathbf{S})_p$ yields exactly two solutions via Lemma 6.12, we will take only the “larger” solution in order to drop symmetry.

Lemma 6.14. *Let $f \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ be such that $\frac{1}{\tau} < f < \tau$ for some positive constant τ . Let $p \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $\psi \in C^1((0, \infty))$ be function that is strictly decreasing and satisfies Property $(\mathbf{D})_p$. Suppose h is a function with $\mu([h]) \geq \frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}$ that solves (6.1) for the triple (f, p, ψ) .*

Then, there exists a constant $\tau' > 0$, depending only on τ and ψ , such that

$$\frac{1}{\tau'} < h < \tau' \quad \text{and} \quad \|h\|_{C^{2,\alpha}} < \tau'.$$

Proof. We first note that we have, $h_{\max} < C_0$ for some positive constant C_0 which only depends on τ and ψ , as the proof is the same as the first part of Lemma 6.10. Next, from Proposition 3.6, we then obtain $[h] \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$. This yields a positive lower bound on h , primarily $h \geq \min_{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h(u) > 0$. However, we claim we can find a uniform bound away from zero depending only on ψ and τ . Suppose not, i.e.

$$\inf_{K \in \mathcal{Q}} \left\{ \min_{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_K(u) \right\} = 0,$$

where

$$\mathcal{Q} := \left\{ K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n : \mu(K) \geq \frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2} \text{ and } h_K \text{ solves (6.1) for the triple } (f, p, \psi) \right\}.$$

Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $K_\epsilon \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ and $u_\epsilon \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ such that

$$h_{K_\epsilon}(u_\epsilon) := \min_{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_\epsilon}(u) < \epsilon.$$

Thus, $K_\epsilon \subset (H_\epsilon - \epsilon u_\epsilon) \cap RB_2^n$, where R is a finite, positive constant since $\max_{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{K_\epsilon}(u) < C_0$ and

$$H_\epsilon = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, u_\epsilon \rangle \geq 0\}.$$

Next, observe that

$$\mu(K_\epsilon) \geq \frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2} = \mu(H_\epsilon) = \mu(H_\epsilon \cap RB_2^n) + \mu(H_\epsilon \setminus RB_2^n) > \mu(H_\epsilon \cap RB_2^n),$$

where the last strict inequality is independent of ϵ . But observe that there exists $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(\epsilon)$ such that

$$\mu(K_\epsilon) \leq \mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, u_\epsilon \rangle \geq -\epsilon\} \cap RB_2^n) \leq \mu(H_\epsilon \cap RB_2^n) - \epsilon_0,$$

where the last inequality holds for ϵ small enough. Which contradicts the above. Thus, there exists a constant depending only on τ and ψ bounding $\inf_{K \in \mathcal{Q}} \left\{ \min_{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_K(u) \right\}$ away from zero. \square

Having established Lemma 6.14, the proof of the following theorem is exactly the same as Theorem 6.13, and is omitted. We simply note that one uses Lemma 6.5 for the uniqueness to the isotropic solutions, and we also have the necessary analogue of Lemma 6.12 when $p \geq n$, which means specifically we can find an unique solution to the isotropic problem (6.11) satisfying $\mu([h]) \geq \mu(\mathbb{R}^n)/2$ when c is small enough. In fact, the properties $(\mathbf{D})_p$ and $(\mathbf{S})_p$ are actually unnecessary. This follows from the function $g(t) = t^{n-p}\psi(t)$ being always decreasing when $p \geq n$

and ψ is decreasing, and the fact that $g(t)$ is a bijection from $(0, \infty)$ to $(0, \infty)$ for $p > n$ and from $[0, \infty)$ to $(0, \psi(0)]$ when $p = n$.

Theorem 6.15. *Fix $p \geq 1$. Suppose $\psi \in C^1([0, \infty))$ is strictly decreasing on its support, satisfies properties $(\mathbf{D})_p$ and $(\mathbf{S})_p$, and is such that $\psi(|\cdot|) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let μ be the finite, rotational invariant measure on \mathbb{R}^n with density $\psi(|\cdot|)$. Suppose also that μ has an L^p isoperimetric function I_p over \mathcal{K}_o^n .*

Let $f \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ be such that $\frac{1}{\tau} < f < \tau$ for some positive constant τ (if $p = n$, additionally assume that $\tau < \psi(0)$). Suppose also that

$$\|f\|_{L^1} < f_a := I_p\left(\frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}\right).$$

Then, there exist $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ such that $\mu(K) \geq \frac{\mu(\mathbb{R}^n)}{2}$ and h_K solves (6.1) for the triple (f, p, ψ) . Furthermore, if $f \in C_e^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, then $K \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$.

Theorem 1.14 then follows from Theorem 6.15 via approximation. As we will show in the next section, we can use a completely different method to study the range $p \geq n$ and remove the norm assumption on f .

6.3. Large p . In this subsection, we repeat many of the endeavours from the previous subsection, but when $p \geq n$. We are able to drop the symmetry assumption in this instance. We no longer need to assume Property $(\mathbf{D})_p$, as, for $p \geq n$, the fact ψ is strictly decreasing implies this property is true. We first establish uniqueness.

Lemma 6.16. *Fix $p \geq n$ and a nonnegative function $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. Let $\psi \in C^1([0, \infty))$ be a nonnegative, strictly decreasing function. Suppose the equation*

$$(6.15) \quad h^{1-p}\psi(|\nabla h|) \det(h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij}) = f$$

is solved by a positive $h \in C^{2,+}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. Then, h is unique.

Proof. Let $h_1, h_2 \in C^{2,+}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ be two positive solutions of (6.15), and set $G(x) = \frac{h_1(x)}{h_2(x)}$. By hypothesis G is positive and $G \in C^{2,+}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. Then, there exists $u_0 \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ such that G obtains its maximum at u_0 . Thus,

$$0 = \nabla G(u_0) = \frac{(\nabla h_1(u_0))h_2(u_0) - h_1(u_0)\nabla h_2(u_0)}{h_2(u_0)^2}$$

and

$$0 \geq \nabla^2 G(u_0) = \frac{h_2(u_0)\nabla^2 h_1(u_0) - h_1(u_0)\nabla^2 h_2(u_0)}{h_2^2(u_0)},$$

i.e.

$$\frac{\nabla^2 h_1(u_0)}{h_1(u_0)} \leq \frac{\nabla^2 h_2(u_0)}{h_2(u_0)}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} f(u_0)h_1(u_0)^{p-1}\psi(|\nabla h_1(u_0)|)^{-1} &= h_1(u_0)^{n-1} \det \left(\frac{\nabla^2 h_1(u_0)}{h_1(u_0)} + I \right) \\ &\leq h_1(u_0)^{n-1} \det \left(\frac{\nabla^2 h_2(u_0)}{h_2(u_0)} + I \right) \\ &= \frac{h_1(u_0)^{n-1}}{h_2(u_0)^{n-1}} f(u_0)h_2(u_0)^{p-1}\psi(|\nabla h_2(u_0)|)^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$h_1^{p-n}(u_0)\psi(|\nabla h_1(u_0)|)^{-1} \leq h_2(u_0)^{p-n}\psi(|\nabla h_2(u_0)|)^{-1}.$$

Set $\frac{|\nabla h_1(u_0)|}{h_1(u_0)} = \frac{|\nabla h_2(u_0)|}{h_2(u_0)} = c$, then

$$h_1^{p-n}(u_0)\psi(ch_1(u_0))^{-1} \leq h_2^{p-n}(u_0)\psi(ch_2(u_0))^{-1},$$

Observe that the function $t \mapsto t^{p-n}\psi(ct)^{-1}$ is increasing, since $p \geq n$ and ψ is decreasing. Hence

$$h_1(u_0) \leq h_2(u_0),$$

which implies $h_1 \leq h_2$ on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . Similarly we get that $h_1 \geq h_2$ on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . Thus $h_1 = h_2$. \square

Then, we turn to existence. Our first step is again a $C^{2,\alpha}$ -estimate.

Lemma 6.17. *For $p \geq n$, let $f \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ be such that $\frac{1}{\tau} < f < \tau$ for some positive constant τ when $p > n$, and $f < \psi(0)$ when $p = n$. Let $\psi \in C^1((0, \infty))$ be a function that is strictly decreasing. Suppose h solves (6.1) for the triple (f, p, ψ) . Then, there exists a constant $\tau' > 0$, depending only on τ and ϕ , such that*

$$\frac{1}{\tau'} < h < \tau' \quad \text{and} \quad \|h\|_{C^{2,\alpha}} < \tau'.$$

Proof. The upper bound is the same as Lemma 6.10. We only need to prove the positive lower bound. Let $\{v_k\}$ be a sequence in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} h(v_k) = \inf_{v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h(v)$. Then from (6.1) and (2.10),

$$\begin{aligned} \tau > f(v_k) &= h^{1-p}(v_k)\psi(|\nabla h(v_k)|) \det(h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij})|_{v_k} \\ (6.16) \quad &\geq h^{n-p}(v_k)\psi(|\nabla h(v_k)|) = h^{n-p}(v_k)\psi(h(v_k)) \frac{\psi(|\nabla h(v_k)|)}{\psi(h(v_k))}. \end{aligned}$$

By way of contradiction, suppose $h(v_k) \rightarrow 0$. From (6.2), $\frac{\psi(|\nabla h(v_k)|)}{\psi(h(v_k))} \rightarrow 1$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. On the other-hand, $h(v_k)^{n-p}\psi(h(v_k)) \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ when $p > n$, and $h(v_k)^{n-p}\psi(h(v_k)) \rightarrow \psi(0)$ when $p = n$; this contradicts (6.16). Thus $h > \tau'$ for some positive constant τ' which only depends on τ and ψ .

Moreover, by Lemma 5.5, the $C^{2,\alpha}$ priori estimate is also established. \square

In the next lemma, we introduce the linear operator of (6.15) and show it is invertible.

Lemma 6.18. *Fix $p \geq n$. Let $\psi \in C^1([0, \infty))$ be a nonnegative, strictly decreasing function. Fix a positive function $f \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. Suppose that $h \in C^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ is a convex function solving (6.15). Then the linearized operator of (6.15) at h , defined in (6.17) below, is invertible.*

Proof. Let $\Gamma \in C^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ and set $h_\epsilon = he^{\epsilon\Gamma}$. Then, the linear operator L_h of (6.15) at h acting on Γ , $L_h(\Gamma) \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.17) \quad L_h(\Gamma) &:= \frac{d}{d\epsilon} \det((h_\epsilon)_{ij} + h_\epsilon \delta_{ij})|_{\epsilon=0} - f \frac{d}{d\epsilon} [h_\epsilon^{p-1} \psi(|\nabla h_\epsilon|)^{-1}]|_{\epsilon=0} \\
&= \sum_{i,j} (\omega^{ij} (h_{ij}\Gamma + h_j\Gamma_i + h_i\Gamma_j + h\Gamma_{ij} + h\Gamma\delta_{ij})) \\
&\quad - f[(p-1)h^{p-1}\Gamma\psi(|\nabla h|)^{-1} + h^{p-1}(\psi(|\nabla h|)^{-1})'((h^2 + \sum_i h_i^2)\Gamma + \sum_i h(h_i\Gamma_i))]
\end{aligned}$$

where ω^{ij} is the cofactor matrix of $(h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij})_{i,j}$. Since $p \geq n$ and ψ is strictly decreasing, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
L_h(1) &= \sum_{i,j} \omega^{ij} (h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij}) \\
&\quad - f[(p-1)h^{p-1}\psi(|\nabla h|)^{-1} + h^{p-1}(\psi(|\nabla h|)^{-1})'(h^2 + \sum_i h_i^2)] \\
&= f[(n-p)h^{p-1}\psi(|\nabla h|)^{-1} - h^{p-1}(\psi(|\nabla h|)^{-1})'(h^2 + \sum_i h_i^2)] < 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that we can write

$$(6.18) \quad L_h(\Gamma) = \Gamma L_h(1) + \sum_{i,j} \omega^{ij} (h_j\Gamma_i + h_i\Gamma_j + h\Gamma_{ij}) - \sum_i f h^{p-1} h h_i \Gamma_i.$$

Suppose Γ is a function so that $L_h(\Gamma) = 0$. Let $u_0 \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ be a point where Γ obtains its maximum. Then, (6.18) becomes

$$\Gamma(u_0)L_h(1)[u_0] + \sum_{i,j} \omega^{ij}(u_0)h(u_0)\Gamma_{ij}(u_0) = 0.$$

Combining $L_h(1) < 0$ and the fact that ω^{ij} is positive definite (since h is convex), with Γ_{ij} being semi-negative definite at u_0 , we obtain

$$\Gamma(u_0) \leq 0,$$

and therefore $\Gamma \leq 0$. Similarly, by repeating the above procedure at a point where Γ obtains its minimum, we obtain $\Gamma \geq 0$. Thus,

$$\Gamma \equiv 0.$$

This indicates (6.17) is invertible. \square

Finally, we use convex combinations and the continuity of the Monge-Ampère equation to establish existence.

Theorem 6.19. *Fix $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $p \geq n$. Let $\psi \in C^1([0, \infty))$ be a nonnegative, strictly decreasing function.*

Let $f \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ be such that

- (1) *when $p > n$: $\frac{1}{\tau} < f < \tau$ for some positive constant τ .*
- (2) *when $p = n$: $f < \psi(0)$.*

Then, there exists a unique, positive, convex solution $h \in C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ to (6.15) for the triple (f, p, ψ) .

Proof. We first show that there exists a constant solution to (6.15). From Proposition 6.6, we see that the condition $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{n-p}\psi(t) = 0$ yields such a solution when $f = c_0$ for c_0 small enough. Since c_0 is strictly positive, we can find a constant $0 < \tau$ such that $\frac{1}{\tau} < c_0 < \tau$. Notice that, when $p = n$, the condition reduces to ψ being decreasing. Since ψ has its maximum at the origin, we are free to take $\tau = \psi(0)$ when $p = n$.

Now, consider a family of functions:

$$(6.19) \quad h^{1-p}\psi(|\nabla h|) \det(h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij}) = f_t,$$

where $f_t = (1-t)c_0 + tf$, $t \in [0, 1]$ and c_0, f such that $\frac{1}{\tau} < c_0, f < \tau$. Thus $\frac{1}{\tau} < f_t < \tau$. For ease, set $\mathcal{S} = C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \cap \{h \in C^+(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) : h \text{ is convex}\}$. Next, define

$$O = \{t \in [0, 1] : (6.19) \text{ admits a solution } h_t \in \mathcal{S}\}.$$

We have shown that $0 \in O$, and thus O is not empty. Next, we prove that O is an open set. Set $F(t, h) := h^{1-p}\psi(|\nabla h|) \det(h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij}) - f_t$. For any $t^* \in O$, by the definition of O , there exists a solution $h_{t^*} \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfying the equation (6.19), i.e., $F(t^*, h_{t^*}) = 0$. From Lemma 6.18, we may use the the Implicit Function Theorem to obtain $r, r_1 > 0$ such that, if we define the following metric balls, $B_r(t^*) \subset [0, 1]$ and $B_{r_1}(h_{t^*}) \subset \mathcal{S}$, then there exists a unique $u \in C^1(B_r(t^*), B_{r_1}(h_{t^*}))$ with the following property: $u(t^*) = h_{t^*}$ and $F(t, u(t)) = 0$ for any $t \in B_r(t^*)$. Thus, O is an open set.

Next, we prove that O is a closed set. Let $\{t_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a sequence in O and suppose $t_k \rightarrow t_0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. We will show that $t_0 \in O$. From the definition of O , for every t_k , there exists a solution $h^{(k)} := h_{t_k} \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfying (6.19). Notice that $\frac{1}{\tau} < f_{t_k} < \tau$. Thus, by Lemma 6.17, there exists a constant τ' , which only depends on τ and ψ , such that $\|h^{(k)}\|_{C^{2,\alpha}} < \tau'$. Then, by the Arzelà-Ascoli Theorem, there exists a subsequence $\{h^{(k_\ell)}\} \subset \{h^{(k)}\}$ and a $h^{(0)} \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfying $h^{(k_\ell)} \rightarrow h^{(0)}$ as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover,

$$(h^{(k_\ell)})^{1-p}\psi(|\nabla h^{(k_\ell)}|) \det(h_{ij}^{(k_\ell)} + h^{(k_\ell)}\delta_{ij}) = f_{t_{k_\ell}}.$$

Taking the limit as $\ell \rightarrow \infty$ in the above equation, we deduce

$$(h^{(0)})^{1-p}\psi(|\nabla h^{(0)}|) \det(h_{ij}^{(0)} + h^{(0)}\delta_{ij}) = f_{t_0},$$

which means $h_{t_0} := h^{(0)}$ solves (6.19) when $t = t_0$. By definition, $t_0 \in O$. Thus, O is a closed set.

Consequently, O is a universal set; since $[0, 1]$ is connected, we must have $O = [0, 1]$. Consequently, when $t = 1$, there exists a solution $h := h_1 \in \mathcal{S}$ to equation (6.15). From Lemma 6.17, this solution is positive. The uniqueness of the solution then follows from Lemma 6.16. \square

Theorem 1.15 follows from Theorem 6.19 via approximation.

APPENDIX A. ISOPERIMETRIC INEQUALITIES

This section is dedicated to discussing the isoperimetric function of a measure on \mathbb{R}^n , which we recall the is largest function satisfying the inequality $\mu^+(\partial A) \geq I_\mu(\mu(A))$.

Let's discuss a few examples; the first three can be found in, say, the work by Bakry and Ledoux [3], and the last is from Barthe and Maurey [5]:

- (1) The classic isoperimetric inequality on \mathbb{R}^n is precisely that $I_{\text{Vol}_n}(t) = n \text{Vol}_n(B_2^n)^{\frac{1}{n}} t^{\frac{n-1}{n}}$, and the extremal sets are the Euclidean balls.

- (2) Set $\Phi(t) = \gamma_1((-\infty, t))$. Then, $I_{\gamma_n} = \Phi' \circ \Phi^{-1}$. Here, Φ' denotes the derivative of Φ in t , Φ^{-1} denotes the inverse of Φ , and \circ denotes function composition. Here, the extremal sets are half-spaces.
- (3) Let μ be a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^n with strictly smooth, positive density e^{-V} such that $\text{Hess}(V(x)) \geq \rho \text{Id}_n$. Here, $\rho > 0$, Id_n is the $n \times n$ identity matrix, and the inequality is with respect to symmetric matrices uniformly for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, $I_\mu \geq \sqrt{\rho} I_{\gamma_n}$.
- (4) Let μ be the uniform measure on the cube $[-1, 1]^n$. Then, $I_\mu \geq \sqrt{2\pi} I_{\gamma_n}$.

All of the above examples are log-concave measures. Bobkov [8] completed the picture for this class of measures: if μ is a log-concave probability measure on \mathbb{R}^n , then, for every Borel set A , every point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and every $r > 0$, one has

$$2r\mu^+(\partial A) \geq -\mu(A) \log \mu(A) - (1 - \mu(A)) \log(1 - \mu(A)) + \log(\mu(rB_2^n + x_0)).$$

Since we are free to pick x_0 , we can set $x_0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x d\mu(x)$. Then, we can find an $r = r(\mu(A))$ sufficiently large so that the sum of the last two terms is zero, i.e. $r(t)$ on $[0, 1]$ is implicitly defined by

$$\mu\left(rB_2^n + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x d\mu(x)\right) = (1 - \mu(A))^{(1 - \mu(A))}.$$

Then, one obtains $\mu^+(\partial A) \geq \ell(\mu(A))$, i.e. $I_\mu \geq \ell$. Here, $\ell(t) = -\frac{t}{2r(t)} \log t$ is a function on $[0, 1]$.

Bobkov also studied [10] s -concave measures (in the sense of Borell). Let μ be s -concave. Then,

$$I_\mu \geq \frac{c(s)}{m(\mu)} (\min\{\mu(A), 1 - \mu(A)\})^{1-s},$$

where $m(\mu)$ is so that $\mu(\{x : |x| \leq m(\mu)\}) = \frac{1}{2}$ and

$$(A.1) \quad c(s) = \begin{cases} \frac{2^{-s}-1}{40(2^{s^2}-2^s-1)} & s < 0, \\ \frac{1}{80} & s = 0, \\ \frac{1}{16} & s \in (0, 1]. \end{cases}$$

From these results, we deduce that any finite, rotational invariant s -concave measure μ whose density is C^1 , has maximum at the origin, and satisfies Property $(\mathbf{D})_{\mathbf{p}}$ (for a fixed $p \in (-n-1, n)$) is valid for Corollary 1.16. In fact, we see that, for log-concavity ($s = 0$), we have two different choices of isoperimetric function. But we also have, from the ground-breaking work by Milman and Rotem [88], two different choices of isoperimetric functions for $s > 0$ under an additional homogeneity assumption: Let μ be s -concave and $1/s$ -homogeneous with $s \in (0, \frac{1}{n}]$. Then,

$$I_\mu(t) = \frac{1}{q} \mu(B_2^n)^q t^{1-q}, \quad \text{where } \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{s} + n,$$

and the extremal sets are precisely dilates of B_2^n .

We hope we have provided ample evidence for examples for Corollary 1.16. We wrap up with discussing Cheeger constants. We say that a probability measure μ satisfies an isoperimetric inequality of Cheeger-type if there exists a constant c such that

$$(A.2) \quad I_\mu(t) \geq c \min\{t, 1 - t\},$$

i.e. c satisfies

$$\mu^+(\partial A) \geq c \min\{\mu(A), 1 - \mu(A)\}.$$

The largest constant c where (A.2) holds is called the isoperimetric, or Cheeger, constant of μ , and this will be denoted as: $Is(\mu) = \inf \frac{\mu^+(\partial A)}{\min\{\mu(A), 1 - \mu(A)\}}$, where the infimum runs over all open sets with smooth boundary such that $\mu(A) \in (0, 1)$.

Similar to the case of the isoperimetric function, one usually shows a constant c satisfies (A.2), thus bounding $Is(\mu)$ from below. The isoperimetric constant was introduced in the context of spectral gaps and isoperimetric inequalities on compact manifolds by Cheeger [20].

Let μ be the Borel measure on \mathbb{R} with density $\chi_{[0, \infty)}(t)e^{-t}$. Then, Talagrand [97] showed that $I_\mu(t) = \min\{t, 1 - t\}$, which also yields that $Is(\mu) = 1$. This is a rare instance where the optimal isoperimetric inequality of the form (1.2) coincides with the optimal Cheeger-type isoperimetric inequality (A.2). It is natural to try and extend this result to higher dimensions. Bobkov and Houdré [9] showed that, if μ is a probability measure on \mathbb{R} and μ^n is the product measure on \mathbb{R}^n given by n products of μ , then

$$Is(\mu^n) \geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{6}} Is(\mu).$$

We are behoed to mention the following concerning the isoperimetric constant. A natural question is to bound $Is(\mu)$ from below independently of μ and the dimension. Firstly, set $Is(n) = \inf Is(\mu)$, where the infimum runs over all isotropic, log-concave measures on \mathbb{R}^n (recall a measure is isotropic if $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x_i d\mu(x) = 0$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x_i x_j d\mu(x) = \delta_{i,j}$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n$). The KLS conjecture [59] suggests that there exists a constant C independent of the dimension such that $Is(n) \geq C$. This conjecture is still open, and implies the famous hyperplane conjecture by Bourgain. As of writing, the most recent progress is by Klartag [60]: $Is(n) \geq C(\log n)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ for some absolute constant C .

We turn to the L^p isoperimetric function from Definition 1.12. We first recall the following from [66, Theorem 6.1].

Proposition A.1 (Lp Minkowski's First Inequality for F-concave measures). *Fix $p \in \mathbb{R}, p \neq 0$. Let μ be a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n , such that μ is L^p F-concave and F is differentiable, with respect to a class of Borel sets \mathcal{C} . Then, for every $K, L \in \mathcal{C}$, one has that:*

$$\mu_p(K; L) \geq \mu_p(K; K) + \frac{F(\mu(L)) - F(\mu(K))}{F'(\mu(K))}.$$

Next, notice that from (2.21),

$$\frac{r^{1/p}}{p} S_p^\mu(K) = r^{1/p} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(K +_p \epsilon \cdot B_2^n) - \mu(K)}{\epsilon} = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(K +_p \epsilon \cdot r B_2^n) - \mu(K)}{\epsilon} = \mu_p(K; r B_2^n).$$

Therefore, for $p > 0$ and $r > 0$, we obtain from Proposition A.1 that

$$(A.3) \quad S_p^\mu(K) \geq r^{-1/p} \left[\mu(K; K) + p \frac{F(\mu(r B_2^n)) - F(\mu(K))}{F'(\mu(K))} \right],$$

where we used that $p\mu_p(K; K) = \mu(K; K)$. Since $\mu(K; K) \geq 0$, we see that (A.3) can always be made positive. Indeed, define $r = r(\mu(K))$, as follows: pick r so that

$$\text{sgn}(F'(\mu(K)))F(\mu(r B_2^n)) > \text{sgn}(F'(\mu(K)))F(\mu(K)).$$

Therefore, for $p > 0$, (A.3) reduces the question of establishing an L^p isoperimetric inequality to establishing a measure is $L^p F$ -concave. Following Hosle, Kolesnikov, and Livshyts [47], let's consider the case when $F(x) = x^{\frac{q}{n}}$ for some $q > 0$, i.e. μ satisfies the following (p, q) -Brunn-Minkowski-type inequality

$$(A.4) \quad \mu((1 - \lambda) \cdot K +_p \lambda \cdot L) \geq \left((1 - \lambda)\mu(K)^{\frac{q}{n}} + \lambda\mu(L)^{\frac{q}{n}} \right)^{\frac{n}{q}}.$$

Then, (A.3) becomes

$$(A.5) \quad S_p^\mu(K) \geq r^{-\frac{1}{p}} \left(\mu(K; K) + \frac{np}{q} \left(\mu(rB_2^n)^{\frac{q}{n}} - \mu(K)^{\frac{q}{n}} \right) \mu(K)^{\frac{n-q}{q}} \right).$$

We have essentially covered the known examples of (A.4) when $p \geq 1$ in Section 1.6. As for $p < 1$, this is still an active area of research (even in the case of the Lebesgue measure). For example, it was shown in [17] that the case $(0, 0)$ for volume and symmetric convex bodies implies the case (p, p) for all $p > 0$; the $(0, 0)$ case was then verified for $n = 2$ in the same work, when both bodies are balls [29], and also when K is a ball and L is close to K [28]. Saroglou [92] established the $(0, 0)$ case for volume when all bodies are symmetric under orthogonal coordinate hyperplanes, and showed that the case $(0, 0)$ for symmetric convex bodies and volume implies the same for all even log-concave measures. As for other positive results, the (p, p) -inequality for volume has been shown to hold for p close enough to 1 (see e.g. Kolesnikov and Milman, [64], Putterman [90], and Chen, Huang, Li and Liu [24]). For measures besides volume, Livshyts [75] recently established that every even log-concave measure satisfies a $(1, n^{-3-o(1)})$ inequality over symmetric convex bodies. The reader is encouraged to see Hosle, Kolesnikov and Livshyts [47] for a thorough overview of other known results and the establishment of more partial cases, including results for measures besides Lebesgue.

For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_n$, when $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{K}_e^n$, (A.5) is valid when $q = 1$ and $p \geq 1$. The quantity $\mu(K; K)$ seems a bit mysterious. We conclude with a conjecture, that would supply a more quantifiable isoperimetric inequality for measures in \mathcal{M}_n using the $(1/n)$ -concavity. We follow a schema by Bobkov [10]. Firstly, one can verify, if μ is a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^n , K is a convex set and $r > 0$, that

$$(A.6) \quad \mu^+(\partial K) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\mu((1 - \epsilon)K + \epsilon rB_2^n) + \mu((1 - \epsilon)(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \text{int}(K)) + \epsilon rB_2^n) - 1}{2r\epsilon}.$$

Indeed, this follows from the fact that $\mu(K; rB_2^n) = r\mu(K; B_2^n)$ and (2.20), which actually holds in this instance; $\partial(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \text{int}(K))$ is the same as ∂K , but with opposite outer-unit normal.

Suppose also μ is a F -concave probability measure, in the sense of (1.7), over a collection of sets \mathcal{C} , such that F is C^1 smooth, $\{rB_2^n\}_{r>0} \subset \mathcal{C}$, and, if $K \in \mathcal{C}$, then so too is $(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \text{int}(K))$. Then, setting $I = (F^{-1})' \circ F$, one has from (A.6) that, for every $r > 0$ and $K \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$(A.7) \quad \begin{aligned} 2r\mu^+(\partial K) &\geq I(\mu(K))(F(\mu(rB_2^n)) - F(\mu(K))) \\ &\quad + I(1 - \mu(K))(F(\mu(rB_2^n)) - F(1 - \mu(K))). \end{aligned}$$

The result on s -concave probability measures by Bobkov followed by setting $F(t) = t^s$ in (A.7), and some further analysis.

If F satisfies $F(t) = -F(1-t)$, i.e. F is an odd function about $t = \frac{1}{2}$, then (A.7) reduces to

$$(A.8) \quad \mu^+(\partial A) \geq \frac{I(\mu(A))(F(\mu(rB_2^n)))}{r}.$$

The Ehrhard inequality is precisely that γ_n is Φ^{-1} -concave. Furthermore, Φ^{-1} is odd about $\frac{1}{2}$, and so (A.8) holds with $\mu = \gamma_n$ and $F = \Phi^{-1}$. Sending $r \rightarrow \infty$, and noting that $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Phi^{-1}(\mu(rB_2^n))}{r} = 1$, recovers that $I_{\gamma_n} = \Phi' \circ \Phi^{-1}$.

Conjecture Let μ be a probability measure over \mathbb{R}^n , that is $(1/n)$ -concave over \mathcal{K}_e^n . Then, for every $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$ and $t \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mu((1-t)(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \text{int}(K)) + tL) \geq \left((1-t)\mu((\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \text{int}(K)))^{\frac{1}{n}} + t\mu(L)^{\frac{1}{n}} \right)^n.$$

Suppose the conjecture is true. Then, we could consider the case when $\mathcal{C} \supset \mathcal{K}_e^n$ and $F(x) = x^{\frac{1}{n}}$ in (A.7). Then, $(F^{-1})'(x) = nx^{n-1}$ and $I(x) = nx^{\frac{n-1}{n}}$. Consequently, (A.7) becomes, for every $r > 0$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$,

$$(A.9) \quad \mu^+(\partial K) \geq \frac{n}{2r} \left[\mu(rB_2^n)^{\frac{1}{n}} \left(\mu(K)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} + (1 - \mu(K))^{\frac{n-1}{n}} \right) - 1 \right].$$

Suppose μ has continuous density which contains the origin in the interior of its connected support. We then claim that we can define a function $r = r(\mu(K))$ so that the right-hand side of (A.9) is strictly positive. Indeed, we would need

$$\mu(rB_2^n) > \left(\mu(K)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} + (1 - \mu(K))^{\frac{n-1}{n}} \right)^{-n} = z(\mu(K)),$$

where

$$z(t) := \left(t^{\frac{n-1}{n}} + (1-t)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} \right)^{-n}.$$

Observe that $z(t)$ maps $[0, 1]$ onto $[\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, with maximum $z(0) = z(1) = 1$ and minimum $z(\frac{1}{2}) = \frac{1}{2}$. The function $r \rightarrow \mu(rB_2^n)$ is strictly increasing on its support. Thus, it has an inverse function, say \mathcal{R}_μ . Therefore, the function we need is, for $\epsilon > 0$,

$$(A.10) \quad r_\mu(t, \epsilon) = \mathcal{R}_\mu(z(t)) + \epsilon.$$

As this yields $\mu(r_\mu(\mu(K), \epsilon)B_2^n) > \mu(\mathcal{R}_\mu(z(\mu(K)))B_2^n) = z(\mu(K))$. We make this formal : Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_n$. Then, under the condition that the above conjecture is true, one has, for every $K \in \mathcal{K}_e^n$ and $\epsilon > 0$

$$\mu^+(\partial K) \geq \mathcal{I}_\mu(\mu(K), \epsilon),$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}_\mu(t, \epsilon) = \frac{n}{2r_\mu(t, \epsilon)} \left(\mu(r_\mu(t, \epsilon)B_2^n)^{\frac{1}{n}} \left(t^{\frac{n-1}{n}} + (1-t)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} \right) - 1 \right),$$

and $r_\mu(t, \epsilon)$ is the function defined in (A.10).

REFERENCES

- [1] Aishwarya, G. and Rotem, L. “New Brunn–Minkowski and functional inequalities via convexity of entropy”. *Preprint*, [arxiv: 2311.05446](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.05446) (2024).
- [2] Aleksandrov, A. D. “Zur Theorie der gemischten Volumina von konvexen Körper, III: Die Erweiterung zweier Lehrsätze Minkowskis über die konvexen Polyeder auf beliebige konvexe Flächen (in Russian)”. *Mat. Sbornik N. S.* 3 (1938), pp. 27–46.
- [3] Bakry, D. and Ledoux, M. “Lévy-Gromov’s isoperimetric inequality for an infinite-dimensional diffusion generator”. *Invent. Math.* 123.2 (1996), pp. 259–281.
- [4] Ball, K. “The reverse isoperimetric problem for Gaussian measure”. *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 10.4 (1993), pp. 411–420.
- [5] Barthe, F. and Maurey, B. “Some remarks on isoperimetry of Gaussian type”. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* 36.4 (2000), pp. 419–434.
- [6] Bianchi, G., Böröczky, K. J., and Colesanti, A. “Smoothness in the L_p Minkowski problem for $p < 1$ ”. *J. Geom. Anal.* 30.1 (2020), pp. 680–705.
- [7] Bianchi, G., Böröczky, K. J., Colesanti, A., and Yang, D. “The L_p -Minkowski problem for $-n < p < 1$ ”. *Adv. Math.* 341 (2019), pp. 493–535.
- [8] Bobkov, S. G. “Isoperimetric and analytic inequalities for log-concave probability measures”. *Ann. Probab.* 27.4 (1999), pp. 1903–1921.
- [9] Bobkov, S. G. and Houdré, C. “Isoperimetric constants for product probability measures”. *Ann. Probab.* 25.1 (1997), pp. 184–205.
- [10] Bobkov, S. G. “Large deviations and isoperimetry over convex probability measures with heavy tails”. *Electron. J. Probab.* 12 (2007), pp. 1072–1100.
- [11] Borell, C. “Integral inequalities for generalized concave or convex functions”. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 43 (1973), pp. 419–440.
- [12] Borell, C. “The Ehrhard inequality”. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 337.10 (2003), pp. 663–666.
- [13] Böröczky, K. J. “The logarithmic Minkowski conjecture and the L_p -Minkowski problem”. In: *Harmonic analysis and convexity*. Vol. 9. Adv. Anal. Geom. De Gruyter, Berlin, [2023] ©2023, pp. 83–118.
- [14] Böröczky, K. J., Hegedűs, P., and Zhu, G. “On the discrete logarithmic Minkowski problem”. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 6 (2016), pp. 1807–1838.
- [15] Böröczky, K. J. and Henk, M. “Cone-volume measure and stability”. *Adv. Math.* 306 (2017), pp. 24–50.
- [16] Böröczky, K. J. and Henk, M. “Cone-volume measure of general centered convex bodies”. *Adv. Math.* 286 (2016), pp. 703–721.
- [17] Böröczky, K. J., Lutwak, E., Yang, D., and Zhang, G. “The log-Brunn-Minkowski inequality”. *Adv. Math.* 231.3-4 (2012), pp. 1974–1997.
- [18] Böröczky, K. J., Lutwak, E., Yang, D., and Zhang, G. “The logarithmic Minkowski problem”. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 26.3 (2013), pp. 831–852.
- [19] Böröczky, K. J. and Trinh, H. T. “The planar L_p -Minkowski problem for $0 < p < 1$ ”. *Adv. in Appl. Math.* 87 (2017), pp. 58–81.

- [20] Cheeger, J. “A lower bound for the smallest eigenvalue of the Laplacian”. In: *Problems in analysis (Sympos. in honor of Salomon Bochner, Princeton Univ., Princeton, N.J., 1969)*. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970, pp. 195–199.
- [21] Chen, H., Chen, S., and Li, Q.-R. “Variations of a class of Monge-Ampère-type functionals and their applications”. *Anal. PDE* 14.3 (2021), pp. 689–716.
- [22] Chen, S., Feng, Y., and Liu, W. “Uniqueness of solutions to the logarithmic Minkowski problem in \mathbb{R}^3 ”. *Adv. Math.* 411 (2022), Paper No. 108782, 18.
- [23] Chen, S., Hu, S., Liu, W., and Zhao, Y. “On the planar Gaussian-Minkowski problem”. *Adv. Math.* 435 (2023), Paper No. 109351, 32.
- [24] Chen, S., Huang, Y., Li, Q.-R., and Liu, J. “The L_p -Brunn-Minkowski inequality for $p < 1$ ”. *Adv. Math.* 368 (2020), pp. 107166, 21.
- [25] Chen, S., Li, Q.-r., and Zhu, G. “On the L_p Monge-Ampère equation”. *J. Differential Equations* 263.8 (2017), pp. 4997–5011.
- [26] Chen, S., Li, Q.-r., and Zhu, G. “The logarithmic Minkowski problem for non-symmetric measures”. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 371.4 (2019), pp. 2623–2641.
- [27] Chou, K.-S. and Wang, X.-J. “The L_p -Minkowski problem and the Minkowski problem in centroaffine geometry”. *Adv. Math.* 205.1 (2006), pp. 33–83.
- [28] Colesanti, A. and Livshyts, G. V. “A note on the quantitative local version of the log-Brunn-Minkowski inequality”. In: *The mathematical legacy of Victor Lomonosov—operator theory*. Vol. 2. Adv. Anal. Geom. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2020, pp. 85–98.
- [29] Colesanti, A., Livshyts, G. V., and Marsiglietti, A. “On the stability of Brunn-Minkowski type inequalities”. *J. Funct. Anal.* 273.3 (2017), pp. 1120–1139.
- [30] Cordero-Erausquin, D. and Rotem, L. “Improved log-concavity for rotationally invariant measures of symmetric convex sets”. *Ann. Probab.* 51.3 (2023), pp. 987–1003.
- [31] Dubuc, S. “Critères de convexité et inégalités intégrales”. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* 27.1 (1977), pp. x, 135–165.
- [32] Ehrhard, A. “Éléments extrémaux pour les inégalités de Brunn-Minkowski gaussiennes”. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* 22.2 (1986), pp. 149–168.
- [33] Ehrhard, A. “Symétrisation dans l’espace de Gauss”. *Math. Scand.* 53.2 (1983), pp. 281–301.
- [34] Eskenazis, A. and Moschidis, G. “The dimensional Brunn-Minkowski inequality in Gauss space”. *J. Funct. Anal.* 280.6 (2021), Paper No. 108914, 19.
- [35] Fang, N., Ye, D., Zhang, Z., and Zhao, Y. “The dual Orlicz curvature measures for log-concave functions and their related Minkowski problems”. *Preprint*, arXiv: 2309.12260 (2023).
- [36] Feng, Y., Hu, S., and Xu, L. “On the L_p Gaussian Minkowski problem”. *J. Differential Equations* 363 (2023), pp. 350–390.
- [37] Feng, Y., Liu, W., and Xu, L. “Existence of non-symmetric solutions to the Gaussian Minkowski problem”. *J. Geom. Anal.* 33.3 (2023), Paper No. 89, 39.
- [38] Firey, W. J. “ p -means of convex bodies”. *Math. Scand.* 10 (1962), pp. 17–24.
- [39] Fradelizi, M., Langharst, D., Madiman, M., and Zvavitch, A. “Weighted Brunn-Minkowski Theory I: On weighted surface area measures”. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 529 (2 2024), p. 127519.
- [40] Fradelizi, M., Langharst, D., Madiman, M., and Zvavitch, A. “Weighted Brunn-Minkowski Theory II: On Inequalities for Mixed Measures”. *Preprint* (2023).

- [41] Gardner, R. J., Hug, D., Weil, W., Xing, S., and Ye, D. “General volumes in the Orlicz-Brunn-Minkowski theory and a related Minkowski problem I”. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 58.1 (2019), Paper No. 12, 35.
- [42] Gardner, R. J., Hug, D., Xing, S., and Ye, D. “General volumes in the Orlicz-Brunn-Minkowski theory and a related Minkowski problem II”. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 59.1 (2020), Paper No. 15, 33.
- [43] Gardner, R. J. and Zvavitch, A. “Gaussian Brunn-Minkowski inequalities”. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 362.10 (2010), pp. 5333–5353.
- [44] Haberl, C., Lutwak, E., Yang, D., and Zhang, G. “The even Orlicz Minkowski problem”. *Adv. Math.* 224.6 (2010), pp. 2485–2510.
- [45] He, Y., Li, Q.-R., and Wang, X.-J. “Multiple solutions of the L_p -Minkowski problem”. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 55.5 (2016), Art. 117, 13.
- [46] Henk, M. and Linke, E. “Cone-volume measures of polytopes”. *Adv. Math.* 253 (2014), pp. 50–62.
- [47] Hosle, J., Kolesnikov, A. V., and Livshyts, G. V. “On the L_p -Brunn-Minkowski and dimensional Brunn-Minkowski conjectures for log-concave measures”. *J. Geom. Anal.* 31.6 (2021), pp. 5799–5836.
- [48] Hu, J. “The Gaussian log-Minkowski problem”. *Preprint*, [arxiv: 2401.08427](https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.08427) (2024).
- [49] Huang, Y., Lutwak, E., Yang, D., and Zhang, G. “Geometric measures in the dual Brunn-Minkowski theory and their associated Minkowski problems”. *Acta Math.* 216.2 (2016), pp. 325–388.
- [50] Huang, Y., Lutwak, E., Yang, D., and Zhang, G. “The L_p -Aleksandrov problem for L_p -integral curvature”. *J. Differential Geom.* 110.1 (2018), pp. 1–29.
- [51] Huang, Y., Xi, D., and Zhao, Y. “The Minkowski problem in Gaussian probability space”. *Adv. Math.* 385 (2021), Paper No. 107769, 36.
- [52] Hug, D., Lutwak, E., Yang, D., and Zhang, G. “On the L_p Minkowski problem for polytopes”. *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 33.4 (2005), pp. 699–715.
- [53] Ivaki, M. “Uniqueness of solutions to a class of non-homogeneous curvature problems”. *Preprint*, [arxiv: 2307.06252](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.06252) (2024).
- [54] Ivaki, M. N. “A flow approach to the L_{-2} Minkowski problem”. *Adv. in Appl. Math.* 50.3 (2013), pp. 445–464.
- [55] Ivaki, M. N. and Milman, E. “ L^p -Minkowski Problem Under Curvature Pinching”. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 10 (2024), pp. 8638–8652.
- [56] Ivaki, M. N. and Milman, E. “Uniqueness of solutions to a class of isotropic curvature problems”. *Adv. Math.* 435 (2023), Paper No. 109350, 11.
- [57] Jian, H., Lu, J., and Wang, X.-J. “Nonuniqueness of solutions to the L_p -Minkowski problem”. *Adv. Math.* 281 (2015), pp. 845–856.
- [58] John, F. “Polar correspondence with respect to a convex region”. *Duke Math. J.* 3.2 (1937), pp. 355–369.
- [59] Kannan, R., Lovász, L., and Simonovits, M. “Isoperimetric problems for convex bodies and a localization lemma”. *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 13.3-4 (1995), pp. 541–559.
- [60] Klartag, B. “Logarithmic bounds for isoperimetry and slices of convex sets”. *Ars Inven. Anal.* (2023), Paper No. 4, 17.

- [61] Klartag, B. “On nearly radial marginals of high-dimensional probability measures”. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* 12.3 (2010), pp. 723–754.
- [62] Klartag, B. and Lehec, J. “Bourgain’s slicing problem and KLS isoperimetry up to polylog”. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 32.5 (2022), pp. 1134–1159.
- [63] Kolesnikov, A. V. and Livshyts, G. V. “On the Gardner-Zvavitch conjecture: symmetry in inequalities of Brunn-Minkowski type”. *Adv. Math.* 384 (2021), Paper No. 107689, 23.
- [64] Kolesnikov, A. V. and Milman, E. “Local L^p -Brunn-Minkowski inequalities for $p < 1$ ”. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 277.1360 (2022), pp. v+78.
- [65] Kolesnikov, A. V. and Milman, E. “Poincaré and Brunn-Minkowski inequalities on the boundary of weighted Riemannian manifolds”. *Amer. J. Math.* 140.5 (2018), pp. 1147–1185.
- [66] Kryvonos, L. and Langharst, D. “Weighted Minkowski’s Existence Theorem and Projection Bodies”. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 376 (12 2023), pp. 8447–8493.
- [67] Langharst, D. and Ulivelli, J. “The (Self-Similar, Variational) Rolling Stones”. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 11 (2024), pp. 9178–9193.
- [68] Latała, R. “A note on the Ehrhard inequality”. *Studia Math.* 118.2 (1996), pp. 169–174.
- [69] Li, Q.-R. “Infinitely many solutions for centro-affine Minkowski problem”. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 18 (2019), pp. 5577–5596.
- [70] Li, Q.-R., Sheng, W., Ye, D., and Yi, C. “A flow approach to the Musielak-Orlicz-Gauss image problem”. *Adv. Math.* 403 (2022), Paper No. 108379, 40.
- [71] Li, Y. Y. “Degree theory for second order nonlinear elliptic operators and its applications”. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* 14.11 (1989), pp. 1541–1578.
- [72] Liu, J. “The L_p -Gaussian Minkowski problem”. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 61.1 (2022), Paper No. 28, 23.
- [73] Liu, J. and Tang, S. “The Generalized Gaussian Minkowski Problem”. *J. Geom. Anal.* 34.302 (2024).
- [74] Livshyts, G., Marsiglietti, A., Nayar, P., and Zvavitch, A. “On the Brunn-Minkowski inequality for general measures with applications to new isoperimetric-type inequalities”. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 369.12 (2017), pp. 8725–8742.
- [75] Livshyts, G. V. “A universal bound in the dimensional Brunn-Minkowski inequality for log-concave measures”. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 376.9 (2023), pp. 6663–6680.
- [76] Livshyts, G. V. “An extension of Minkowski’s theorem and its applications to questions about projections for measures”. *Adv. Math.* 356 (2019), pp. 106803, 40.
- [77] Lutwak, E. “Extended affine surface area”. *Adv. Math.* 85.1 (1991), pp. 39–68.
- [78] Lutwak, E. “The Brunn-Minkowski-Firey theory. I. Mixed volumes and the Minkowski problem”. *J. Differential Geom.* 38.1 (1993), pp. 131–150.
- [79] Lutwak, E. “The Brunn-Minkowski-Firey theory. II. Affine and geominimal surface areas”. *Adv. Math.* 118.2 (1996), pp. 244–294.
- [80] Lutwak, E., Lv, S., Yang, D., and Zhang, G. “Extensions of Fisher information and Stam’s inequality”. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 58.3 (2012), pp. 1319–1327.
- [81] Lutwak, E., Xi, D., Yang, D., and Zhang, G. “Chord measures in integral geometry and their Minkowski problems”. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 77.7 (2024), pp. 3277–3330.

- [82] Lutwak, E., Yang, D., and Zhang, G. “Cramér-Rao and moment-entropy inequalities for Renyi entropy and generalized Fisher information”. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 51.2 (2005), pp. 473–478.
- [83] Lutwak, E., Yang, D., and Zhang, G. “Moment-entropy inequalities for a random vector”. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 53.4 (2007), pp. 1603–1607.
- [84] Lutwak, E., Yang, D., and Zhang, G. “On the L_p -Minkowski problem”. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 356.11 (2004), pp. 4359–4370.
- [85] Lutwak, E., Yang, D., and Zhang, G. “Optimal Sobolev norms and the L^p Minkowski problem”. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* (2006), Art. ID 62987, 21.
- [86] Lutwak, E., Yang, D., and Zhang, G. “The Brunn-Minkowski-Firey inequality for nonconvex sets”. *Adv. in Appl. Math.* 48.2 (2012), pp. 407–413.
- [87] Milman, E. “A sharp centro-affine isospectral inequality of Szegő-Weinberger type and the L^p -Minkowski problem”. *J. Differential Geom.* 127.1 (2024), pp. 373–408.
- [88] Milman, E. and Rotem, L. “Complemented Brunn-Minkowski inequalities and isoperimetry for homogeneous and non-homogeneous measures”. *Adv. Math.* 262 (2014), pp. 867–908.
- [89] Nayar, P. and Tkocz, T. “A note on a Brunn-Minkowski inequality for the Gaussian measure”. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 141.11 (2013), pp. 4027–4030.
- [90] Putterman, E. “Equivalence of the local and global versions of the L^p -Brunn-Minkowski inequality”. *J. Funct. Anal.* 280.9 (2021), Paper No. 108956, 20.
- [91] Roysdon, M. and Xing, S. “On L_p -Brunn-Minkowski type and L_p -isoperimetric type inequalities for measures”. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 374.7 (2021), pp. 5003–5036.
- [92] Saroglou, C. “Remarks on the conjectured log-Brunn-Minkowski inequality”. *Geom. Dedicata* 177 (2015), pp. 353–365.
- [93] Schneider, R. “A weighted Minkowski theorem for pseudo-cones”. *Adv. Math.* 450 (2024), Paper No. 109760, 26.
- [94] Schneider, R. *Convex Bodies: the Brunn-Minkowski Theory*. 2nd expanded. Vol. 151. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014.
- [95] Stancu, A. “On the number of solutions to the discrete two-dimensional L_0 -Minkowski problem”. *Adv. Math.* 180.1 (2003), pp. 290–323.
- [96] Stancu, A. “The discrete planar L_0 -Minkowski problem”. *Adv. Math.* 167.1 (2002), pp. 160–174.
- [97] Talagrand, M. “A new isoperimetric inequality and the concentration of measure phenomenon”. In: *Geometric aspects of functional analysis (1989–90)*. Vol. 1469. Lecture Notes in Math. Springer, Berlin, 1991, pp. 94–124.
- [98] Tang, S. “Existence of Solutions to L_p -Gaussian Minkowski problem”. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, to appear (2024+).
- [99] Wang, H. “On existence of the even L_p Gaussian Minkowski problem for $p > n$ ”. *Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. B* 45.2 (2024), pp. 179–192.
- [100] Wu, D. “A generalization of L_p -Brunn-Minkowski inequalities and L_p -Minkowski problems for measures”. *Adv. in Appl. Math.* 89 (2017), pp. 156–183.
- [101] Zhu, G. “The L_p Minkowski problem for polytopes for $0 < p < 1$ ”. *J. Funct. Anal.* 269.4 (2015), pp. 1070–1094.

- [102] Zhu, G. “The centro-affine Minkowski problem for polytopes”. *J. Differential Geom.* 101.1 (2015), pp. 159–174.
- [103] Zhu, G. “The logarithmic Minkowski problem for polytopes”. *Adv. Math.* 262 (2014), pp. 909–931.

INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE JUSSIEU, SORBONNE UNIVERSITÉ, 75005 PARIS, FRANCE
Email address: `dylan.langharst@imj-prg.fr`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, HENAN UNIVERSITY, JINMING AVENUE, 475001, KAIFENG, CHINA
Email address: `liujiaqian@henu.edu.cn`

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, HUNAN UNIVERSITY, LUSHAN S ROAD, 410082, CHANGSHA, CHINA
Email address: `tsy@hnu.edu.cn`