

ON THE VOLUME OF SUMS OF ANTI-BLOCKING BODIES

AUTTAWICH MANUI, CHEIKH SALIOU NDIAYE AND ARTEM ZVAVITCH

ABSTRACT. We study inequalities on the volume of Minkowski sum in the class of anti-blocking bodies. We prove analogues of Plünnecke-Ruzsa type inequality and V. Milman inequality on the concavity of the ratio of volumes of bodies and their projections. We also study Firey L_p -sums of anti-blocking bodies and prove Plünnecke-Ruzsa type inequality; V. Milman inequality and Roger-Shephard inequality. The sharp constants are provided in all of those inequalities, for the class of anti-blocking bodies. Finally, we extend our results to the case of unconditional product measures with decreasing density.

1. INTRODUCTION

The notion of sumset is a standard operation in the field of additive combinatorics which makes sense for any sets in a commutative group, i.e., for any sets A, B in a commutative group, their sumset $A + B$, is defined as the set of all possible sums of elements from A, B , i.e., $A + B = \{a + b : a \in A, b \in B\}$. One useful and elegant inequality in additive combinatorics that provides bounds on the cardinality of sumsets of finite sets is the *Plünnecke-Ruzsa inequality* [31, 38]: For any finite sets A, B_1, \dots, B_m in a commutative group, there exists a set $X \subset A$,

$$(1) \quad \#(A)^m \#(X + B_1 + \dots + B_m) \leq \#(X) \prod_{i=1}^m \#(A + B_i).$$

Here, $\#(A)$ denotes the cardinality of the set A . This inequality was introduced by Plünnecke [28] and further improved by Ruzsa [33] to the case of compact sets on a locally compact commutative group.

The comparison between inequalities in Information Theory and Convex Geometry have been thoroughly investigated. Bobkov and Madiman [9] introduced an inequality that is inspired by (1): For any convex bodies $A, B, C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, one has

$$|A| |A + B + C| \leq 3^n |A + B| |A + C|.$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 52A20, 52A21; Secondary:

Key words and phrases. Volume, Anti-blocking bodies, Plünnecke-Ruzsa inequality, p -Roger-Shephard inequality.

Authors are supported in part by the U.S. National Science Foundation Grant DMS-1101636, the United States - Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF) Grant 2018115, and the Thailand Development and Promotion of Science and Technology talent project (DPST).

The constant 3^n is known to not be sharp. Fradelizi, Madiman, and the third named author [18] explored this further, determining the lower bound and upper bound of the best possible constant c_n ,

$$(2) \quad c_n = \sup \frac{|A| |A + B + C|}{|A + B| |A + C|},$$

where the supremum is taken over all convex bodies A, B, C in \mathbb{R}^n :

$$(4/3 + o(1))^n \leq c_n \leq \varphi^n,$$

where $\varphi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ is the golden ratio.

The second named author generalized results from [9] to the case of m -convex bodies. More precisely, let $c_{n,m}$ be the smallest possible constant such that

$$(3) \quad |A|^{m-1} |A + B_1 + \dots + B_m| \leq c_{n,m} \prod_{i=1}^m |A + B_i|,$$

for any convex bodies A, B_1, \dots, B_m in \mathbb{R}^n . Then,

$$\frac{e}{\sqrt{2\pi n(e-1)}} \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^n + 1/2 \leq c_{n,m} < 2^n.$$

Moreover, sharper lower and upper bounds depending on m were established in [27].

Ruzsa distance was introduced in [32] as

$$d(A, B) = \log \frac{\#(A - B)}{\sqrt{\#(A)\#(B)}},$$

where A, B are finite subsets of a commutative group (see also [38, Chapter 2.33]). Ruzsa distance is not a metric, however it satisfies the triangle inequality: For any finite sets A, B, C in a commutative group,

$$\#(A)\#(B - C) \leq \#(B - A)\#(A - C).$$

An analog of this inequality to the case of volume of convex bodies was presented in [18]: For any convex bodies A, B, C , one has

$$|A| |A + B + C| \leq \frac{1}{2^n} \binom{2n}{n} c_n |A - B| |A - C|,$$

where c_n is defined in (2).

We note that the lower bounds for c_n and $c_{n,m}$ in [18, 27] were obtained by considering a convex body which has many symmetries. This inspired us to explore Ruzsa type inequalities for the class of anti-blocking bodies.

We say that a convex body K is an *anti-blocking body* if $K \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and orthogonal projection on every coordinate subspace equals to its section by the same subspace (see Section 2.2 for more details). Many crucial inequalities were proved for the class of anti-blocking bodies see [6, 36]. In

Corollary 10, we prove a sharp analog of (3): For any anti-blocking bodies $A, B_1, \dots, B_m \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$, one has

$$(4) \quad |A|^{m-1} |A + B_1 + \dots + B_m| \leq \zeta_{n,m} \prod_{i=1}^m |A - B_i|,$$

where $\zeta_{n,m}$ is defined as follows: For any integers $0 \leq \alpha_i \leq n$, let

$$(5) \quad d_{n,m}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) := \frac{\prod_{i=1}^m \binom{\alpha_i}{N}}{\binom{n}{N}^{m-1}},$$

where $N = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i - n(m-1) \geq 0$ and

$$\zeta_{n,m} := \max_{0 \leq \alpha_i \leq n} d_{n,m}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m).$$

The next observation of this paper is related to the conjecture of the concavity of the ratio of volumes to volumes of projections: For any convex bodies $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$(6) \quad \frac{|A|}{|P_E A|} + \frac{|B|}{|P_E B|} \leq \frac{|A+B|}{|P_E(A+B)|},$$

where E is a hyperplane of \mathbb{R}^n and P_E is the orthogonal projection onto E . The conjecture (6) is connected to a question of V. Milman [35], whether there exists a version of the Bergstrom inequality for convex bodies. It is also connected to Dembo, Cover, Thomas conjecture [15] which motivated by Fisher information inequality. The conjecture (6) is known to be true in \mathbb{R}^2 (see, for example, [20]), but it is false in general starting from dimension 3, even for the weaker version,

$$(7) \quad \frac{|A|}{|P_E A|} \leq \frac{|A+B|}{|P_E(A+B)|}.$$

The counterexample was presented in [19]. It has been demonstrated in [20] that (7) is valid for the class of zonoids when $n = 3$ (the case of the zonoids in higher dimensions is still open). We refer to [20, 18] for detailed discussion of those conjectures and their equivalent versions.

We study an analog of conjecture (6) for anti-blocking bodies in the view of Ruzsa's triangle inequality by replacing the Minkowski sum with the difference. Let $r_{n,i}$ be the best possible constant for the following inequality:

$$(8) \quad \frac{|A|}{|P_E A|} + \frac{|B|}{|P_E B|} \leq r_{n,i} \frac{|A-B|}{|P_E(A-B)|},$$

for any anti-blocking bodies $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and for any i -dimensional coordinate subspace E . We prove in Theorem 12 that

$$r_{n,i} = \max_{0 \leq j \leq n} d_{n,2}(i, j),$$

where $d_{n,2}(i, j)$ is defined in (5).

Inspired by [20], we extend (4) and (8) to a more general operation on the pair of convex bodies introduced by Firey [17], called the L_p -sums.

An upper bound for the volume of difference body $K - K$ is given by the Rogers-Shephard inequality, originally proven in [29] (see also [35]). The L_p sum analog of this inequality was proved in \mathbb{R}^2 by Bianchini and Colesanti [8] and it is an open question to prove the sharp L_p -Rogers-Shephard inequality in \mathbb{R}^n , $n \geq 3$. We prove this inequality in the case of locally anti-blocking bodies, where a *locally anti-blocking body* can be viewed as a body which is anti-blocking body in each orthant. Let $\kappa_{n,q}$ be the best possible constant for the following inequality:

$$|K \oplus_p - K| \leq \kappa_{n,q} |K|,$$

for any locally anti-blocking body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ and $p \geq 1$. We prove in Lemma 23 that

$$\kappa_{n,q} = \sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n/q}{i/q}^{-1} \binom{n}{i}^2,$$

where the binomial coefficient is defined by the Gamma function:

$$\binom{x}{y} := \frac{\Gamma(x+1)}{\Gamma(y+1)\Gamma(x-y+1)}.$$

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is dedicated to the background materials. In section 3, we present an improvement of Local Loomis-Whitney inequality, of Bollobás and Thomason [10], for a λ -uniform cover. Following this, in section 4, we present the best possible constants of a Plünnecke-Ruzsa type inequality and the concavity of the ratio of volumes to volumes of projections for anti-blocking bodies. Moving on to section 5, we present our results with L_p -sums, and also present a sharp constant of a L_p -Rogers-Shephard inequality for a locally anti-blocking body. Section 6 delves deeper into inequalities when considering volumes with respect to an s -concave measure. Finally, Section 7 is an Appendix where we collect optimizations of constants and numerous technical calculations, used in the paper.

Acknowledgments. We are grateful to Shay Sadovsky for numerous useful comments greatly improved the presentation of this paper.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. Preliminaries. We refer to [3, 4, 35] for basic definitions and facts used in this paper. We write $\langle x, y \rangle$ for the *inner product* of $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and e_1, \dots, e_n for the *standard orthonormal basis* of \mathbb{R}^n . A *convex body* is defined as a convex, compact non-empty set. If a convex body K containing the origin, then, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define the *Minkowski functional* by

$$\|x\|_K := \inf\{t > 0 : x \in tK\}.$$

We note that if $0 \in \partial K$, then the above infimum may be taken over the empty set, in this case we set such infimum to be infinity. We also define a

polar body of K by

$$K^\circ := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, y \rangle \leq 1 \text{ for all } x \in K\}.$$

For a convex body K , we define the *support function* of K by $h_K(x) := \max_{y \in K} \langle x, y \rangle$. Note that $h_K(x) = \|x\|_{K^\circ}$ if $0 \in K$.

We write $|K|$ for the m -dimensional Lebesgue measure (volume) of a measurable set K where m is a dimension of the minimal affine space containing K . For any sets K and L , the sumset $K+L = \{x+y : x \in K, y \in L\}$ is called *Minkowski sum* of K and L .

2.2. Anti-blocking bodies. A subspace E is a *coordinate subspace* if E is spanned by $\{e_i\}_{i \in I}$, where $I \subset [n]$, (where we use the notation $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$). Denote by \mathcal{G}_n^c the collection of coordinate subspaces of \mathbb{R}^n and $\mathcal{G}_{n,k}^c \subset \mathcal{G}_n^c$ the collection of coordinate subspace of dimension k .

A convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is called *anti-blocking* if for any $E \in \mathcal{G}_n^c$, $P_E(K) = K \cap E$. Note that the collection of anti-blocking bodies are closed under Minkowski sum.

The following decomposition of anti-blocking bodies was proved in [14, 6]: for any pair of anti-blocking bodies A and B , one has

$$(9) \quad A - B = \bigcup_{E \in \mathcal{G}_n^c} (P_E A - P_{E^\perp} B).$$

The above union is almost disjoint with respect to Lebesgue measure which immediately gives a very useful formula:

$$(10) \quad |A - B| = \sum_{E \in \mathcal{G}_n^c} |P_E A| |P_{E^\perp} B|.$$

It is worth mentioning that we agree that $|P_E K| = 1$ when $E = \{0\}$. Note that it is clear that (10) holds for any measure that is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure.

It was proved in [6] that for any pair of anti-blocking bodies A and B , one has

$$(11) \quad |A + B| \leq |A - B|.$$

The proof of (11) relies on the Reverse Kleitman inequality [11]. The inequality (11) can be also proved directly using a symmetrization argument, which we reproduce for the case of L^p -sums in Lemma 19, below.

Consider $\delta \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ and a set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we define δS to be a set such that $\delta S := \{(\delta_1 x_1, \dots, \delta_n x_n) : x \in S\}$. A convex body K is *locally anti-blocking*, if for any $\delta \in \{-1, 1\}^n$, $\delta K \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is anti-blocking. A *1-unconditional convex body* K is defined by $\delta K = K$, for all $\delta \in \{-1, 1\}^n$. We observe that any 1-unconditional convex body is a locally anti-blocking body. We refer to [6, 36] for many more results and inequalities for (locally) anti-blocking bodies.

2.3. Inequalities on the volume of projections. A classical inequality relating volume of a convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and volume of its projections is the *Loomis-Whitney inequality* [23]:

$$(12) \quad |K|^{n-1} \leq \prod_{i=1}^n |P_{e_i^\perp} K|.$$

The inequality (12) was generalized by Bollobás and Thomason in [10]. For every $\tau \subset [n]$, we define $E_\tau := \text{span}\{e_i : i \in \tau\}^\perp$. For $\sigma \subset [n]$, the sets $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m \subset \sigma$ form a λ -uniform cover of σ , if every $j \in \sigma$, it belongs to exactly λ of the sets σ_i . Note that $E_\sigma \subset E_{\sigma_i}$ for any $i \in [m]$.

It was proved in [10] that for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and for any λ -uniform cover $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$ of $[n]$, one has

$$(13) \quad |K|^\lambda \leq \prod_{i=1}^m |P_{E_{\sigma_i}^\perp} K|.$$

The local version of (13) is a particular case of local versions of Alexandrov-Fenchel's inequality. The first inequality of such type was proved by Fenchel (see [16] and also [35]) and further generalized in [19, 5, 37, 39].

A local version of (13) was observed by Brazitikos, Giannopoulos and Liakopoulos in [13]: For any convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and for any λ -uniform cover $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$ of σ ,

$$(14) \quad |K|^{m-\lambda} |P_{E_\sigma} K|^\lambda \leq \binom{n}{n-|\sigma|}^{\lambda-m} \binom{n-\frac{\lambda|\sigma|}{m}}{n-|\sigma|}^m \prod_{i=1}^m |P_{E_{\sigma_i}} K|,$$

where from now we will denote the cardinality of σ by $|\sigma|$.

Inequality (14) was further improved by Alonso-Gutiérrez, Artstein-Avidan, González Merino, Jiménez and Villa in [2]: For any convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and for any 1-uniform cover (σ_1, σ_2) of σ ,

$$(15) \quad |K| |P_{E_\sigma} K| \leq \frac{\binom{i}{i+j-n} \binom{j}{i+j-n}}{\binom{n}{i+j-n}} |P_{E_{\sigma_1}} K| |P_{E_{\sigma_2}} K|,$$

where $i = \dim E_{\sigma_1}$, $j = \dim E_{\sigma_2}$.

Inequality (15) was used in [18] to compute the lower bound for the best constant c_n defined in (2). In Section 3 of this paper, we extend inequality (15) to the case of λ -uniform cover $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$ of σ .

Finally, we would like to remind a result of Rogers and Shephard [30], who established a sharp lower bound for the volume of a convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ in terms of the volumes of its projection and a maximal section:

$$(16) \quad |P_H K| \max_{x_0 \in H} |K \cap (x_0 + H^\perp)| \leq \binom{n}{k} \text{vol}(K),$$

where H is a k -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^n .

2.4. s -concave measure. A measure μ on \mathbb{R}^n is s -concave if for any non-empty compact sets $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and for any $t \in [0, 1]$, one has

$$\mu(tA + (1-t)B)^s \geq t\mu(A)^s + (1-t)\mu(B)^s.$$

The classical Brunn-Minkowski inequality demonstrates that the Lebesgue measure is $1/n$ -concave (See [35]), i.e.,

$$(17) \quad |tA + (1-t)B|^{1/n} \geq t|A|^{1/n} + (1-t)|B|^{1/n}.$$

We say that the Borel measure μ has *density*, if it has a locally integrable derivative, i.e.,

$$\frac{d\mu(x)}{dx} = \phi(x),$$

where $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\phi \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. A measure μ is *unconditional with decreasing density*, if

1. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\phi(\pm x_1, \dots, \pm x_n) = \phi(x)$.
2. For any $i \in [n]$ and $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}$, the function

$$t \mapsto \phi(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, t, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$$

is non-increasing on $[0, \infty)$.

Livshyts, Marsiglietti, Nayar and the third named author proved in [22] that

Theorem 1. *Any unconditional, product measure with decreasing density is $1/n$ -concave on the class of 1-unconditional convex bodies.*

2.5. Berwald inequality. The classical Berwald inequality was introduced in [7, 12]:

Theorem 2 (Berwald inequality). *Let f be a non-negative, concave function supported on a convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, for any $-1 < p \leq q < \infty$,*

$$(18) \quad \left(\frac{\binom{n+p}{p}}{|K|} \int_K f(y)^p dy \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \left(\frac{\binom{n+q}{q}}{|K|} \int_K f(y)^q dy \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

Recently, Langharst and Putterman [21] extended the inequality (18) to the case of s -concave measures.

Theorem 3 (Berwald inequality for s -concave measures). *Fix $s > 0$ and let f be a non-negative, concave function supported on a convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Let μ be a finite, Borel s -concave measure supported on K . Then, for any $-1 < p \leq q < \infty$,*

$$(19) \quad \left(\frac{\binom{\frac{1}{s}+p}{p}}{|K|} \int_K f(y)^p d\mu(y) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \left(\frac{\binom{\frac{1}{s}+q}{q}}{|K|} \int_K f(y)^q d\mu(y) \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

3. LOCAL LOOMIS-WHITNEY INEQUALITY

We remind that $E_\tau = \text{span}\{e_i : i \in \tau\}^\perp$, for every $\tau \subset [n]$ and for $\sigma \subset [n]$, the sets $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m \subset \sigma$ form a λ -uniform cover of σ , if every $j \in \sigma$, it belongs to exactly λ of the sets σ_i .

The Theorem 4 gives a slight improvement of (14), so that the multiplicative constant in (14) depends on the cover and is sharp. The case $|\sigma_1| = \dots = |\sigma_m|$ of Theorem 4 is included in (14).

Theorem 4. *Let $\sigma \subset [n]$, $m \geq \lambda \geq 1$ and let $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$ be λ -uniform cover of σ . For any convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, one has*

$$(20) \quad |K|^{m-\lambda} |P_{E_\sigma} K|^\lambda \leq \frac{\prod_{i=1}^m \binom{n-|\sigma_i|}{n-|\sigma|}}{\binom{n}{n-|\sigma|}^{m-\lambda}} \prod_{i=1}^m |P_{E_{\sigma_i}} K|.$$

Proof. The proof is based on the method from [13]. The case $m = \lambda$ is trivial. Assume $m > \lambda$. We have

$$\lambda|\sigma| = \sum_{i=1}^m |\sigma_i|.$$

For every $y \in P_{E_\sigma} K$, we define the sets

$$K(y) := \{t \in E_\sigma^\perp : y + t \in K\},$$

and

$$K_i(y) := \{t \in E_\sigma^\perp \cap E_{\sigma_i} : y + t \in P_{E_{\sigma_i}} K\}.$$

Note that $(\sigma \setminus \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma \setminus \sigma_m)$ is $(m - \lambda)$ -uniform cover of σ . Using (13), we have

$$|K| = \int_{P_{E_\sigma} K} |K(y)| dy \leq \int_{P_{E_\sigma} K} \prod_{i=1}^m |K_i(y)|^{\frac{1}{m-\lambda}} dy.$$

For each i , we define $f_i : P_{E_\sigma} K \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ by

$$f_i(y) := |K_i(y)|^{\frac{1}{|\sigma| - |\sigma_i|}}.$$

Using Hölder inequality, we have

$$|K| \leq \int_{P_{E_\sigma} K} \prod_{i=1}^m f_i(y)^{\frac{|\sigma| - |\sigma_i|}{m-\lambda}} dy \leq \prod_{i=1}^m \left(\int_{P_{E_\sigma} K} f_i(y)^{|\sigma|} dy \right)^{\frac{|\sigma| - |\sigma_i|}{|\sigma|(m-\lambda)}}.$$

Applying (17), we get that f_i is concave, thus, we can apply the Berwald inequality (18) to get

$$\left(\frac{\binom{n}{n-|\sigma|}}{|P_{E_\sigma} K|} \int_{P_{E_\sigma} K} f_i(y)^{|\sigma|} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{|\sigma|}} \leq \left(\frac{\binom{n-|\sigma_i|}{n-|\sigma|}}{|P_{E_\sigma} K|} \int_{P_{E_\sigma} K} f_i(y)^{|\sigma| - |\sigma_i|} dy \right)^{\frac{1}{|\sigma| - |\sigma_i|}}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
|K|^{m-\lambda} &\leq \prod_{i=1}^m \left(\int_{P_{E_\sigma} K} f_i(y)^{|\sigma|} dy \right)^{\frac{|\sigma|-|\sigma_i|}{|\sigma|}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\binom{n}{n-|\sigma|}^{m-\lambda} |P_{E_\sigma} K|^\lambda} \prod_{i=1}^m \binom{n-|\sigma_i|}{n-|\sigma|} \int_{P_{E_\sigma} K} f_i(y)^{|\sigma|-|\sigma_i|} dy \\
&= \frac{1}{\binom{n}{n-|\sigma|}^{m-\lambda} |P_{E_\sigma} K|^\lambda} \prod_{i=1}^m \binom{n-|\sigma_i|}{n-|\sigma|} |P_{E_{\sigma_i}} K|. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 5. The equality in (20) can be achieved by using the Hanner polytope,

$$K = \text{conv} \left\{ \sum_{i \in \sigma} [-e_i, e_i], \sum_{i \notin \sigma} [-e_i, e_i] \right\}.$$

We include a detailed computation in the Appendix, Lemma 31.

Corollary 6. Let $\sigma \subset [n]$, $m \geq 1$ and $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$ be 1-uniform cover of σ . For any convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$(21) \quad |K|^{m-1} |P_{E_\sigma} K| \leq d_{n,m}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \prod_{i=1}^m |P_{E_{\sigma_i}} K|,$$

where $\alpha_i = \dim E_{\sigma_i}$, and

$$(22) \quad d_{n,m}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) := \frac{\prod_{i=1}^m \binom{\alpha_i}{N}}{\binom{n}{N}^{m-1}},$$

where $N = \dim E_\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i - n(m-1) \geq 0$.

Remark 7. We note that (15) is a particular case of (21) when $m = 2$.

4. INEQUALITIES FOR ANTI-BLOCKING BODIES

We start with a lemma which provides an upper bound on the Minkowski sum of anti-blocking bodies using the volume of their projections.

Lemma 8. Fix a positive integer r and let A_1, \dots, A_r be anti-blocking bodies in \mathbb{R}^n . Then,

$$(23) \quad |A_1 + \dots + A_r| \leq \sum_{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^r |P_{E_{\sigma_i}^\perp} A_i| \right),$$

where the sum is taken over all 1-uniform covers $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r)$ of $[n]$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on r . The case $r = 1$ is trivial. Using inductive assumption, we get

$$|A_1 + \dots + A_r| \leq \sum_{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{r-1})} \left(|P_{E_{\sigma_{r-1}}^\perp} (A_{r-1} + A_r)| \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{r-2} |P_{E_{\sigma_i}^\perp} A_i| \right).$$

From (11) and (10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| P_{E_{\sigma_{r-1}}^\perp} (A_{r-1} + A_r) \right| &\leq \left| P_{E_{\sigma_{r-1}}^\perp} A_{r-1} - P_{E_{\sigma_{r-1}}^\perp} A_r \right| \\ &= \sum_{(\sigma'_{r-1}, \sigma'_r)} \left| P_{E_{\sigma'_{r-1}}^\perp} A_{r-1} \right| \left| P_{E_{\sigma'_r}^\perp} A_r \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where the sum is taken over 1-uniform cover $(\sigma'_{r-1}, \sigma'_r)$ of σ_{r-1} . Then,

$$|A_1 + \dots + A_r| \leq \sum_{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{r-2}, \sigma'_{r-1}, \sigma'_r)} \left(\left| P_{E_{\sigma'_{r-1}}^\perp} A_{r-1} \right| \left| P_{E_{\sigma'_r}^\perp} A_r \right| \prod_{i=1}^{r-2} \left| P_{E_{\sigma_i}^\perp} A_i \right| \right).$$

The proof is finished since $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{r-2}, \sigma'_{r-1}, \sigma'_r)$ is 1-uniform of $[n]$. \square

Theorem 9. Fix $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $c_1(n, m)$ be the best constant such that for any anti-blocking bodies A, B_1, \dots, B_m in \mathbb{R}^n , one has

$$|A|^{m-1} |A - B_1 - \dots - B_m| \leq c_1(n, m) \prod_{i=1}^m |A - B_i|.$$

Let $c_2(n, m)$ be the best constant such that for any anti-blocking body A in \mathbb{R}^n and for any 1-uniform cover $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$ of σ , one has

$$(24) \quad |A|^{m-1} |P_{E_\sigma} A| \leq c_2(n, m) \prod_{i=1}^m |P_{E_{\sigma_i}} A|.$$

Then, $c_1(n, m) = c_2(n, m)$.

Proof. The existence of constants $c_1(n, m)$ and $c_2(n, m)$ are known (see, for example, [27]), moreover, it was proved in [27, Theorem 10] that $c_2(n, m) \leq c_1(n, m)$. Using (10) and (23), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|A|^{m-1} |A - B_1 - \dots - B_m| \\ &\leq |A|^{m-1} \sum_{\sigma \subset [n]} |P_{E_\sigma} A| \left| P_{E_\sigma^\perp} (B_1 + \dots + B_m) \right| \\ &\leq |A|^{m-1} \sum_{\sigma \subset [n]} \left(|P_{E_\sigma} A| \sum_{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^m |P_{E_{\sigma_i}^\perp} B_i| \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$ is 1-uniform cover of σ . Using (10), we have

$$(25) \quad \prod_{i=1}^m |A - B_i| = \prod_{i=1}^m \left(\sum_{G_i \in \mathcal{G}_n^c} \left(|P_{G_i} A| |P_{G_i^\perp} B_i| \right) \right).$$

Using (24) and (25), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |A|^{m-1} |A - B_1 - B_2 - \cdots - B_m| \\
& \leq \sum_{\sigma \subset [n]} \left(c_2(n, m) \prod_{i=1}^m |P_{E_{\sigma_i}} A| \sum_{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)} \prod_{i=1}^m |P_{E_{\sigma_i}^\perp} B_i| \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{\sigma \subset [n]} \left(c_2(n, m) \sum_{(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)} \prod_{i=1}^m (|P_{E_{\sigma_i}} A| |P_{E_{\sigma_i}^\perp} B_i|) \right) \\
& \leq c_2(n, m) \prod_{i=1}^m \left(\sum_{G_i \in \mathcal{G}_n^c} (|P_{G_i} A| |P_{G_i^\perp} B_i|) \right) \\
& = c_2(n, m) \prod_{i=1}^m |A - B_i|.
\end{aligned}$$

This means that $c_1(n, m) \leq c_2(n, m)$. \square

The following Corollary 10 is a consequent of the proof of Theorem 9 and Corollary 6. Moreover, together with (11), it implies inequality (4) with the best possible constant $\zeta_{n,m}$ for the case of anti-blocking bodies.

Corollary 10. *For anti-blocking bodies $A, B_1, \dots, B_m \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$, we have*

$$(26) \quad |A|^{m-1} |A \pm B_1 \pm \cdots \pm B_m| \leq \zeta_{n,m} \prod_{i=1}^m |A - B_i|,$$

where

$$\zeta_{n,m} := \max_{0 \leq \alpha_i \leq n} d_{n,m}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m),$$

where $d_{n,m}$ is defined in (22). Moreover, $\zeta_{n,m}$ is the best possible constant.

Remark 11. *We provide the explicit formula of the constant $\zeta_{n,m}$ when $m = 2$ in Lemma 32 (see Appendix below),*

$$\zeta_{n,2} = \begin{cases} \frac{(2k)!^3}{(3k)!k!^3}; & n = 3k, \\ \frac{(2k+1)^2 (2k)!^3}{(k+1)(3k+1)(3k)!k!^3}; & n = 3k+1, \\ \frac{2(2k+1)^3 (2k)!^3}{(k+1)(3k+1)(3k+2)(3k)!k!^3}; & n = 3k+2. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 12. *Let $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be anti-blocking bodies. Then, for any proper coordinate subspace $E \in \mathcal{G}_{n,i}^c$,*

$$(27) \quad \frac{|A|}{|P_E A|} + \frac{|B|}{|P_E B|} \leq r_{n,i} \frac{|A - B|}{|P_E(A - B)|},$$

where

$$r_{n,i} := \max_{0 \leq j \leq n} d_{n,2}(i, j),$$

where $d_{n,2}$ is defined in (22). Moreover, the constant $r_{n,i}$ is the best possible constant.

We will prove Theorem 12 as a part (case $p = 1$) of a more general result on Firey sums (see Theorem 16 below).

Remark 13. We provide the explicit formula of the constant $r_{n,i}$ in Proposition 34,

$$r_{n,i} = \begin{cases} \frac{(2k)!(n-k)!^2}{k!^2(n-2k)!n!}; & i = 2k, \\ \frac{(2k+1)(n-2k)(2k)!(n-k)!^2}{(k+1)(n-k)k!^2(n-2k)!n!}; & i = 2k+1. \end{cases}$$

5. L_p -SUMS OF ANTI-BLOCKING BODIES

Firey [17] extended the concept of Minkowski sum to L_p -sums of convex bodies K and L containing the origin, so-called $K \oplus_p L$ where $p \geq 1$, by using support functions:

$$h_{K \oplus_p L}^p = h_K^p + h_L^p.$$

The theory of Firey sum was further developed by Lutwak, who created the notion of L_p -mixed volumes and proved a number of very useful inequalities [24, 25]. Lutwak, Yang, Zhang [26] extended the notion of L_p -sums to the case of non-convex sets: for any $K, L \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $p > 1$:

$$K \oplus_p L := \{(1-t)^{1/q}x + t^{1/q}y : x \in K, y \in L, t \in [0, 1]\},$$

where $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} = 1$. The following lemma is a well-known formula for the volume of a direct Firey sum.

Lemma 14. Let E be an i -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^n and A, B be convex bodies, containing the origin, such that $A \subset E$ and $B \subset E^\perp$. Then, for any $p \geq 1$,

$$(28) \quad |A \oplus_p B| = \binom{n/q}{i/q}^{-1} |A| |B|.$$

Proof. Using that A and B belong to orthogonal subspaces, we get that

$$\|x\|_{A \oplus_p B}^q = \|x\|_{(A \oplus_p B)^\circ}^q = h_{A \oplus_p B^\circ}^q = h_{A^\circ}^q + h_{B^\circ}^q = \|x_1\|_A^q + \|x_2\|_B^q,$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $x_1 = P_E x, x_2 = P_{E^\perp} x$. Next, using that

$$(29) \quad |K| = \Gamma \left(1 + \frac{n}{q} \right)^{-1} \int_0^\infty e^{-\|x\|_K^q} dx,$$

for a convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, containing the origin (see, for example, [34]), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |A \oplus_p B| &= \frac{1}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)} \int_0^\infty e^{-\|x\|_{A \oplus_p B}^q} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)} \int_E e^{-\|x_1\|_A^q} dx_1 \int_{E^\perp} e^{-\|x_2\|_B^q} dx_2 \\ &= \frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n-i}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)} |A| |B|. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Lemma 15. *Let $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be anti-blocking bodies. Then, for any $p \geq 1$,*

$$(30) \quad |A \oplus_p - B| = \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{E \in \mathcal{G}_{n,i}^c} \binom{n/q}{i/q}^{-1} |P_E A| |P_{E^\perp} B|.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} A \oplus_p - B &= \bigcup_{t \in [0,1]} \left\{ (1-t)^{1/q} x + t^{1/q} y : x \in A, y \in -B \right\} \\ &= \bigcup_{t \in [0,1]} \left((1-t)^{1/q} A - t^{1/q} B \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from (9),

$$\begin{aligned} A \oplus_p - B &= \bigcup_{t \in [0,1]} \left((1-t)^{1/q} A - t^{1/q} B \right) \\ &= \bigcup_{t \in [0,1]} \bigcup_{E \in \mathcal{G}_n^c} \left((1-t)^{1/q} P_E A - t^{1/q} P_{E^\perp} B \right) \\ &= \bigcup_{E \in \mathcal{G}_n^c} (P_E A \oplus_p - P_{E^\perp} B). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$|A \oplus_p - B| = \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{E \in \mathcal{G}_{n,i}^c} |P_E A \oplus_p - P_{E^\perp} B|.$$

We use (28) to finish the proof. \square

Theorem 16. *Let $p \geq 1$, $i \in [n-1]$ and $\nu(n, p, i)$ be the smallest constant such that for any anti-blocking bodies $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and for any coordinate subspace $E \in \mathcal{G}_{n,i}^c$ we have*

$$(31) \quad \frac{|A|}{|P_E A|} + \frac{|B|}{|P_E B|} \leq \nu(n, p, i) \frac{|A \oplus_p - B|}{|P_E (A \oplus_p - B)|}.$$

Then,

$$\nu(n, p, i) = \max_{0 \leq j \leq n} \left(d_{n,2}(i, j) \frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i+j-n}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{j}{q}\right)} \right),$$

where $d_{n,2}$ is defined in (22).

Proof. Let

$$\beta := \max_{0 \leq j \leq n} \left(d_{n,2}(i, j) \frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i+j-n}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{j}{q}\right)} \right).$$

To prove that $\nu(n, p, i) \leq \beta$, it's enough to show that

$$(|A| |P_E B| + |B| |P_E A|) |P_E(A \oplus_p - B)| \leq d |P_E A| |P_E B| |A \oplus_p - B|.$$

Using (28), one has

$$(32) \quad |A| |P_E B| |P_E(A \oplus_p - B)| \\ = \sum_{k=0}^i \sum_{\substack{F \in \mathcal{G}_{n,k}^c \\ F \subset E}} \left(\frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{k}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i-k}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i}{q}\right)} |A| |P_E B| |P_F A| |P_{F^\perp \cap E} B| \right),$$

also

$$(33) \quad |B| |P_E A| |P_E(A \oplus_p - B)| \\ = \sum_{k=0}^i \sum_{\substack{G \in \mathcal{G}_{n,k}^c \\ G \subset E}} \left(\frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{k}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i-k}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i}{q}\right)} |B| |P_E A| |P_G A| |P_{G^\perp \cap E} B| \right),$$

and

$$(34) \quad |P_E A| |P_E B| |A \oplus_p - B| \\ = \sum_{j=0}^n \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}_{n,j}^c} \left(\frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{j}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n-j}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)} |P_E A| |P_E B| |P_H A| |P_{H^\perp} B| \right).$$

Next, we will bound each term of (32) and (33) by corresponding terms of (34). First fixing subspace F in (32) and taking $H^\perp = F^\perp \cap E$ in (34), it is enough to prove that

$$(35) \quad \frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i+j-n}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i}{q}\right)} |A| |P_F A| \leq \beta \frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{j}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)} |P_E A| |P_H A|.$$

Next, repeating the same procedure for (33) and (34) with $H = G$, it is enough to show that

$$(36) \quad \frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i-j}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i}{q}\right)} |B| |P_{G^\perp \cap E} B| \leq \beta \frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n-j}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)} |P_E B| |P_{H^\perp} B|.$$

We remark that we used terms of (34) at most once. Using (15), we see that it is sufficient to take

$$\nu(n, p, i) \leq \beta.$$

to satisfy inequalities (35) and (36).

Let us now show that β is the best possible constant in the class of anti-blocking bodies. Fix j , let $H \in \mathcal{G}_{n,j}^c$ be such that $H^\perp \subset E$. Let's observe when $B = U + \epsilon V$, with U is a unit cube in H^\perp and V is a unit cube in H . Let $A = tK$, where $t > 0$ and K is an intersection of the Hanner polytope in Remark 5 and the positive orthant. Note that K is an anti-blocking body satisfying the equality case of inequality (21), i.e.,

$$(37) \quad \frac{|K| |P_{E \cap H} K|}{|P_E K| |P_H K|} = d_{n,2}(i, j).$$

Then, by equation (30),

$$\begin{aligned} & |A \oplus_p - B| \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^n \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_{n,m}^c} \left(\frac{\Gamma(1 + \frac{m}{q}) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n-m}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)} t^m |P_G K| |P_{G^\perp}(U + \epsilon V)| \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$|P_{G^\perp} U|_{n-m} = \begin{cases} 1 & ; \text{ if } H \subset G \\ 0 & ; \text{ otherwise } \end{cases},$$

where by $|L|_i$ we denote the i -dimensional Lebesgue volume of L . If we take $\epsilon = 0$, then the right hand side will be

$$\beta_1 := \sum_{m=j}^n \sum_{\substack{G \in \mathcal{G}_{n,m}^c \\ H \subset G}} \left(\frac{\Gamma(1 + \frac{m}{q}) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n-m}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)} t^m |P_G K| \right).$$

Using (30), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |P_E(A \oplus_p - B)| \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^i \sum_{\substack{F \in \mathcal{G}_{n,m}^c \\ F \subset E}} \left(\frac{\Gamma(1 + \frac{m}{q}) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i-m}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i}{q}\right)} t^m |P_F K| |P_{F^\perp \cap E}(U + \epsilon V)| \right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking $\epsilon = 0$, the terms in the right hand side that will remain in the sum are those where $E \cap H \subset F$, i.e.,

$$\beta_2 := \sum_{m=i+j-n}^i \sum_{\substack{F \in \mathcal{G}_{n,m}^c, \\ E \cap H \subset F \subset E}} \left(\frac{\Gamma(1 + \frac{m}{q}) \Gamma(1 + \frac{i-m}{q})}{\Gamma(1 + \frac{i}{q})} t^m |P_F K| \right).$$

By taking $\epsilon = 0$ in (31), we have

$$t^{n-i} \left(\frac{|K|}{|P_E K|} \right) \leq \nu(n, p, i) \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_2}.$$

Dividing the above inequality by t^{n-i} and taking $t = 0$, we get equation

$$\frac{|K|}{|P_E K|} \leq \nu(n, p, i) \frac{\Gamma(1 + \frac{i}{q}) \Gamma(1 + \frac{i}{q}) |P_H K|}{\Gamma(1 + \frac{i+j-n}{q}) \Gamma(1 + \frac{n}{q}) |P_{E \cap H} K|}.$$

Using (37), we have

$$d_{n,2}(i, j) \frac{\Gamma(1 + \frac{i+j-n}{q}) \Gamma(1 + \frac{n}{q})}{\Gamma(1 + \frac{i}{q}) \Gamma(1 + \frac{i}{q})} \leq \nu(n, p, i).$$

The proof is completed by taking the supremum over j . \square

The next corollary follows directly from Theorem 16.

Corollary 17. *Let $p \geq 1$ and $i \in [n-1]$. For any anti-blocking bodies $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$, then, for any coordinate subspace $E \in \mathcal{G}_{n,i}^c$, we have*

$$\left(\frac{|A|}{|P_E A|} \right)^p + \left(\frac{|B|}{|P_E B|} \right)^p \leq \nu^p(n, p, i) \left(\frac{|A \oplus_p B|}{|P_E(A \oplus_p B)|} \right)^p.$$

We borrow the idea from [11] to prove a generalization of (11) to the case of L_p -sums. Let K be a convex body. For each coordinate hyperplane e_i^\perp , we define a symmetrization of K , $S_i(K)$ as follows: For each straight line L orthogonal to e_i^\perp such that $L \cap K \neq \emptyset$, shift the line segment $K \cap L$ along L until the segment is in the positive half-space of hyperplane, with one of its endpoints on the hyperplane e_i^\perp . More precisely,

$$S_i(K) = \left\{ x + ye_i : x \in P_{e_i^\perp} K, 0 \leq y \leq |K \cap (x + \mathbb{R}e_i)| \right\}.$$

Note that,

- S_i preserves volume, i.e. $|S_i(K)| = |K|$.
- For $\lambda > 0$, $S_i(\lambda A) = \lambda S_i(A)$.
- $S_i(K) \subset S_i(K')$ if $K \subset K'$.

The case of anti-blocking body, $S_i(K) = K$.

Lemma 18. *Let A, B be convex bodies. Then,*

$$S_i(A) \oplus_p S_i(B) \subset S_i(A \oplus_p B).$$

Proof. The proof follows from the definition of L_p -sums and the properties of the symmetrization:

$$\begin{aligned}
S_i(A) \oplus_p S_i(B) &= \bigcup_{t \in [0,1]} \left(t^{1/q} S_i(A) + (1-t)^{1/q} S_i(B) \right) \\
&= \bigcup_{t \in [0,1]} \left(S_i(t^{1/q} A) + S_i((1-t)^{1/q} B) \right) \\
&\subset S_i \left(\bigcup_{t \in [0,1]} \left(t^{1/q} A + (1-t)^{1/q} B \right) \right) \\
&= S_i(A \oplus_p B). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 19. *Let $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be anti-blocking bodies. Then,*

$$(38) \quad |A \oplus_p B| \leq |A \oplus_p -B|.$$

Proof. Using Lemma 18, we have

$$|A \oplus_p -B| = |S_n(A \oplus_p -B)| \geq |S_n(A) \oplus_p S_n(-B)| = |A \oplus_p S_n(-B)|.$$

We repeat the process by applying S_1, \dots, S_{n-1} to get

$$|A \oplus_p -B| \geq |A \oplus_p S_1 S_2 \cdots S_n(-B)|.$$

We finish the proof using that $S_1 S_2 \cdots S_n(-B) = B$. □

Theorem 20. *Let $p \geq 1$ and $b(n, p)$ be the smallest constant such that for any anti-blocking bodies $A, B, C \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$, the following statement holds:*

$$(39) \quad |A| |A \oplus_p -B \oplus_p -C| \leq b(n, p) |A \oplus_p -B| |A \oplus_p -C|$$

Then,

$$b(n, p) = \max_{0 \leq i, j \leq n} \left(d_{n,2}(i, j) \frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i+j-n}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{j}{q}\right)} \right),$$

where $d_{n,2}(i, j)$ is defined in (22).

Proof. We follow the proof of Theorem 9. Let

$$\beta := \max_{0 \leq i, j \leq n} \left(d_{n,2}(i, j) \frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i+j-n}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{j}{q}\right)} \right),$$

To prove that $b(n, p) \leq \beta$, it is enough to check that

$$|A| |A \oplus_p -B \oplus_p -C| \leq \beta |A \oplus_p -B| |A \oplus_p -C|.$$

Using (30) and (38), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |A| |A \oplus_p - B \oplus_p - C| \\
&= |A| \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{E \in \mathcal{G}_{n,k}^c} \left(\frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{k}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n-k}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)} |P_E A| |P_{E^\perp}(B \oplus_p C)| \right) \\
&\leq |A| \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{E \in \mathcal{G}_{n,k}^c} \left(\frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{k}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n-k}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)} |P_E A| |P_{E^\perp} B \oplus_p - P_{E^\perp} C| \right) \\
&= |A| \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{E \in \mathcal{G}_{n,k}^c} \sum_{l=0}^{n-k} \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}_{n,l}^c \\ H \subset E^\perp}} \left(\beta_1(k, l) |P_E A| |P_H B| |P_{(E+H)^\perp} C| \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\beta_1(k, l) := \frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{k}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{l}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n-k-l}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)}.$$

Using (30), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |A \oplus_p - B| |A \oplus_p - C| \\
(40) \quad &= \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{F \in \mathcal{G}_{n,i}^c} \sum_{j=0}^n \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_{n,j}^c} (\beta_2(i, j) |P_F A| |P_G A| |P_{F^\perp} B| |P_{G^\perp} C|),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\beta_2(i, j) := \frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n-i}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{j}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n-j}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)^2}.$$

It is enough to consider only the terms with $F = H^\perp$ and $G = E + H$ in the right hand side of (40). By comparing term by term, it's enough to check that

$$\beta_1(i + j - n, n - i) |A| |P_{F \cap G} A| \leq \beta \cdot \beta_2(i, j) |P_F A| |P_G A|,$$

where $F + G = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $F \cap G = E$ which is true by the definition of d .

Next, we will prove that β is the best constant. Fix i, j such that $i + j - n \geq 0$, let $E \in \mathcal{G}_{n,i}^c, F \in \mathcal{G}_{n,j}^c$ be such that $F + E = \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $B = U, C = V$ be unit cubes in E^\perp and F^\perp , respectively. Let $A = tK$ for $t > 0$ and K is an intersection of the Hanner polytope in Remark 5 and the positive orthant. Note that K is an anti-blocking body satisfying the equality case of inequality (21), i.e.,

$$(41) \quad \frac{|K| |P_{E \cap H} K|}{|P_E K| |P_H K|} = d_{n,2}(i, j).$$

Using (30), we have

$$(42) \quad |A \oplus_p - B \oplus_p - C| = \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}_{n,k}^c} \left(\frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{k}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n-k}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)} t^k |P_H K| |P_{H^\perp}(U \oplus_p V)|_{n-k} \right).$$

Since V is a cube, we have

$$|P_{H^\perp}(U \oplus_p V)|_{n-k} = |P_{H^\perp} U \oplus_p - P_{H^\perp} V|_{n-k}.$$

Using (30), we can write $|P_{H^\perp} U \oplus_p - P_{H^\perp} V|_{n-k}$ as

$$\sum_{l=0}^{n-k} \sum_{\substack{L \in \mathcal{G}_{n,l}^c \\ L \subset H^\perp}} \left(\frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{l}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n-k-l}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n-k}{q}\right)} |P_L U|_l |P_{L^\perp \cap H^\perp} V|_{n-k-l} \right).$$

Note that we only need to consider the case $L = H^\perp \cap E^\perp$ and $E \cap F \subset H$, because at least one of $|P_L U|_l$ and $|P_{L^\perp \cap H^\perp} V|_{n-k-l}$ is zero in all other cases. We will have only one term left, i.e.,

$$(43) \quad |P_{H^\perp} U \oplus_p - P_{H^\perp} V|_{n-k} = \frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{k}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{l}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n-k}{q}\right)},$$

where l is the dimension of $H^\perp \cap E^\perp$. Then, (42) yields together with (43),

$$(44) \quad |A| |A \oplus_p - B \oplus_p - C| = t^n |K| \sum_{k=i+j-n}^n \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}_{n,k}^c \\ E \cap F \subset H}} \left(\beta_3(k, l) t^k |P_H K| \right),$$

where

$$\beta_3(k, l) = \frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{k}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{l}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n-k-l}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$(45) \quad |A \oplus_p - B| |A \oplus_p - C| = \sum_{m=i}^n \sum_{\substack{M \in \mathcal{G}_{n,m}^c \\ F \subset M}} \sum_{r=j}^n \sum_{\substack{R \in \mathcal{G}_{n,r}^c \\ E \subset R}} \left(\beta_4(m, r) t^{m+r} |P_M K| |P_R K| \right),$$

where

$$\beta_4(m, r) = \frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{m}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n-m}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{r}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n-r}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)^2}.$$

Using (43) and (45) in (39), by dividing the result by t^{i+j} and taking $t = 0$, we get

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i+j-n}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{j}{q}\right)} |K| |P_{E \cap F} K| \leq b(n, p) |P_F K| |P_E K|.$$

We are finished the proof using (41). \square

Remark 21. *An upper and lower bounds for the constant $b(p, n)$ are provided in Proposition 35 below. One can also use a similar method as in the proof of Theorem 9 to generalize Theorem 20 to the case of m -convex bodies: For any anti-blocking bodies $A, B_1, \dots, B_m \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$, one has*

$$|A|^{m-1} |A \oplus_p \pm B_1 \oplus_p \dots \oplus_p \pm B_m| \leq \varrho_{n,m} \prod_{i=1}^m |A \oplus_p - B_i|,$$

where

$$\varrho_{n,m} = \max_{0 \leq \alpha_i \leq n} \left(d_{n,m}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{N}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)^{m-1}}{\prod_{i=1}^m \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{\alpha_i}{q}\right)} \right),$$

where $d_{n,m}$ is defined in (22). Moreover, $\varrho_{n,m}$ is the best possible constant.

Next, in Lemma 23, we will present a sharp constant for a Roger-Shephard type inequality for L_p -difference of a locally anti-blocking body. We will use a method from [36]. It was proved in [6] that for locally anti-blocking bodies K, L , one has

$$K + L = \bigcup_{\delta \in \{-1, 1\}^n} (K_\delta + L_\delta),$$

where $K_\delta = K \cap \delta \mathbb{R}_+^n$. The following is a very nice observation from [36].

Lemma 22. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be locally anti-blocking, and let $E := \text{span}\{e_i : i \in I\}$ for some $I \subset [n]$. Let $\tau, \delta \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ be two orthant signs, such that $\tau|_I = \delta|_I$. Then,*

$$P_E K_\delta = P_E K_\tau.$$

Lemma 23. *Let K be a locally anti-blocking body. Then,*

$$|K \oplus_p - K| \leq \kappa_{n,q} |K|$$

where

$$\kappa_{n,q} = \sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n/q}{i/q}^{-1} \binom{n}{i}^2.$$

Moreover, $\kappa_{n,q}$ is the best possible constant.

Proof. For any locally anti-blocking bodies K, L , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
K \oplus_p L &= \bigcup_{t \in [0,1]} \left((1-t)^{1/q} K + t^{1/q} L \right) \\
&= \bigcup_{t \in [0,1]} \bigcup_{\delta \in \{-1,1\}^n} \left((1-t)^{1/q} K_\delta + t^{1/q} L_\delta \right) \\
&= \bigcup_{\delta \in \{-1,1\}^n} \bigcup_{t \in [0,1]} \left((1-t)^{1/q} K_\delta + t^{1/q} L_\delta \right) \\
&= \bigcup_{\delta \in \{-1,1\}^n} (K_\delta \oplus_p L_\delta).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that sets $K_\delta \oplus_p L_\delta$, in the above union, are disjoint up to a set of measure zero, so we have

$$|K \oplus_p -K| = \sum_{\delta \in \{-1,1\}^n} |K_\delta \oplus_p (-K)_\delta|.$$

Using (38), since $(-K)_\delta = -(K_{-\delta})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|K \oplus_p -K| &= \sum_{\delta \in \{-1,1\}^n} |K_\delta \oplus_p (-K)_\delta| \\
&= \sum_{\delta \in \{-1,1\}^n} |K_\delta \oplus_p -(K_{-\delta})| \\
&\leq \sum_{\delta \in \{-1,1\}^n} |K_\delta \oplus_p K_{-\delta}|.
\end{aligned}$$

Next,

$$\sum_{\delta \in \{-1,1\}^n} |K_\delta \oplus_p K_{-\delta}| = \sum_{\delta \in \{-1,1\}^n} \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{E \in \mathcal{G}_{n,i}^c} \binom{n/q}{i/q}^{-1} |P_E K_\delta| |P_{E^\perp} K_{-\delta}|.$$

Fixing $E = \text{span}\{e_i : i \in I\} \in \mathcal{G}_{n,i}^c$, for each $\delta \in \{-1,1\}^n$, we claim that there exists $\tau \in \{-1,1\}^n$ such that

$$(46) \quad P_E K_\delta = P_E K_\tau \text{ and } P_{E^\perp} K_{-\delta} = P_{E^\perp} K_\tau.$$

Moreover, it is a bijection. Indeed, the map $\tau \mapsto \delta(E, \tau)$ where $\delta = \delta(E, \tau)$ is unique vector satisfying

$$\delta|_I = \tau|_I, \quad \delta|_{I^c} = -\tau|_{I^c}.$$

Applying Lemma 22, we get (46). Using (46), (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|K \oplus_p - K| &\leq \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{E \in \mathcal{G}_{n,i}^c} \binom{n/q}{i/q}^{-1} \sum_{\tau \in \{-1,1\}^n} |P_E K_\tau| |P_{E^\perp} K_\tau| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{E \in \mathcal{G}_{n,i}^c} \binom{n/q}{i/q}^{-1} \sum_{\tau \in \{-1,1\}^n} \binom{n}{i} |K_\tau| \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{E \in \mathcal{G}_{n,i}^c} \binom{n/q}{i/q}^{-1} \binom{n}{i} |K| \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n/q}{i/q}^{-1} \binom{n}{i}^2 |K|.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the constant is sharp when K is a simplex. \square

We note that it follows from Lutwak's Brunn-Minkowski inequality for L_p -sums [24, 26] that $|K \oplus_p - K| \geq 2^{n/p} |K|$. Using comparison between L_p -sums and Minkowski sums together with classical Rogers-Shephard inequality one can get that $\kappa_{n,q} \leq \binom{2n}{n}$. One can also get this estimate directly using the properties of Binomial coefficients, see Proposition 36 below.

It is a very natural question to ask for equality cases of Lemma 23:

Conjecture: The equality in Lemma 23 holds if and only if K is a simplex.

6. THE CASE OF UNCONDITIONAL PRODUCT MEASURES

In this section, we will extend our result to an unconditional, product measure $\mu = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mu_i$ with decreasing density which is $1/n$ -concave on 1-unconditional convex bodies.

We note that the proof of (13) works if the volume is replaced by a product measure with decreasing density, i.e., for any compact set K , λ -uniform cover $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$ of $[n]$, we have

$$(47) \quad \mu(K)^\lambda \leq \prod_{i=1}^m \mu_{\sigma_i} \left(P_{E_{\sigma_i}^\perp} K \right),$$

where $\mu_{\sigma_i} = \bigotimes_{k \in \sigma_i} \mu_k$.

The proof of the next theorem directly follows from the proof of Theorem 4 together with (47), Theorem 1 and (19). It is important to note that our result applies to the class of 1-unconditional convex bodies, where the measure is $1/n$ -concave, as established in Theorem 1.

Theorem 24. *Let $\sigma \subset [n]$. Fix $m \geq \lambda \geq 1$ and let $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_m)$ be λ -uniform cover of σ . For any 1-unconditional convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, one*

has

$$(48) \quad \mu(K)^{m-\lambda} \mu_{\sigma^c}(P_{E_\sigma} K)^\lambda \leq \frac{\prod_{i=1}^m \binom{n-|\sigma_i|}{n-|\sigma|}}{\binom{n}{n-|\sigma|}^{m-\lambda}} \prod_{i=1}^m \mu_{\sigma_i^c}(P_{E_{\sigma_i}} K),$$

where $\sigma^c = [n] \setminus \sigma$.

Corollary 25. *The inequality (48) holds for the class of anti-blocking bodies.*

The following theorem follows from the proof of Theorem 12 and inequality (48).

Theorem 26. *Let $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be anti-blocking bodies. Then, for any proper coordinate subspace $E \in \mathcal{G}_{n,i}^c$,*

$$(49) \quad \frac{\mu(A)}{\mu_{\sigma_i^c}(P_E A)} + \frac{\mu(B)}{\mu_{\sigma_i^c}(P_E B)} \leq r_{n,i} \left(\frac{\mu(A-B)}{\mu_{\sigma_i^c}(P_E(A-B))} \right),$$

where $r_{n,i}$ is defined in Theorem 12.

Lemma 27. *Let K be a locally anti-blocking body. Then, for any i ,*

$$(50) \quad \mu(S_i(K)) \leq \mu(K),$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that $i = n$. For each $x \in P_{e_n^\perp} K$, there exist $t_1 \leq 0 \leq t_2$ such that

$$K \cap (x + \mathbb{R}e_n) = \{x + te_n : t_1 \leq t \leq t_2\}.$$

This implies that

$$S_n(K) \cap (x + \mathbb{R}e_n) = \{x + te_n : 0 \leq t \leq t_2 - t_1\}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n(K \cap (x + \mathbb{R}e_n)) &= \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \phi(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, t) d\mu_n(t) \\ &\geq \int_0^{t_2-t_1} \phi(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, t) d\mu_n(t) \\ &\geq \mu_n(S_i(K) \cap (x + \mathbb{R}e_i)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(K) &= \int_{P_{e_n^\perp} K} \mu_n(K \cap (x + \mathbb{R}e_i)) d\mu_{n^c} \\ &\geq \int_{P_{e_n^\perp} K} \mu_n(S_i(K) \cap (x + \mathbb{R}e_i)) d\mu_{n^c} \\ &= \mu(S_n(K)). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Lemma 28. *Let $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be anti-blocking bodies. Then,*

$$\mu(A+B) \leq \mu(A-B).$$

Proof. Using (50), we have

$$\mu(A - B) \geq \mu(S_n(A - B)) \geq \mu(S_n(A) + S_n(-B)) = \mu(A + S_n(-B)).$$

Repeat the process by applying S_1, \dots, S_{n-1} , we will get

$$\mu(A - B) \geq \mu(A + S_1 S_2 \cdots S_n(-B)).$$

We end the proof here since $S_1 S_2 \cdots S_n(-B) = B$. □

Next theorem can be proved using the the proof of Theorem 9 together with Lemma 28 and (48).

Theorem 29. *Let $A, B_1, \dots, B_m \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be anti-blocking bodies. Then,*

$$(51) \quad \mu(A)^{m-1} \mu(A \pm B_1 \pm B_2 \pm \cdots \pm B_m) \leq \zeta_{n,m} \prod_{i=1}^m \mu(A - B_i),$$

where $\zeta_{n,m}$ is defined in Corollary 10.

Remark 30. *We note that constants in inequalities (48), (49) and (51) are sharp. Indeed, those inequalities are invariant under multiplication of the density ϕ of μ by a positive constant. Thus we may assume that $\phi(0) = 1$. Next, taking anti-blocking bodies, belonging to a small enough Euclidean ball centered at the origin, using the continuity of ϕ we get that the constants in (48), (49) and (51) can not be better than the constants in the corresponding inequalities for Lebesgue measure.*

7. APPENDIX

In this section, our aim is to present the optimization of the constants along with some more technical calculations.

The first calculation is a specific example for the equality case in (20).

Lemma 31. *The equality in inequality (20) can be reached by using the following Hanner polytope,*

$$K = \text{conv} \left\{ \sum_{i \in \sigma} [-e_i, e_i], \sum_{i \notin \sigma} [-e_i, e_i] \right\},$$

where $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$ is a λ -uniform cover of σ .

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that $\sigma = \{1, \dots, |\sigma|\}$. Using (29) we get

$$\begin{aligned} |K| &= \frac{1}{n!} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-\|x\|_K} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{n!} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-\|x_1\|_{B_\infty^{|\sigma|}}} dx_1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-\|x_2\|_{B_\infty^{n-|\sigma|}}} dx_2 \\ &= \binom{n}{n-|\sigma|}^{-1} |B_\infty^{|\sigma|}| |B_\infty^{n-|\sigma|}| = \binom{n}{n-|\sigma|}^{-1} 2^n. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\left| P_{E_{\sigma_i}} K \right| = \binom{n - |\sigma_i|}{n - |\sigma|}^{-1} 2^{n - |\sigma_i|} \text{ and } |P_{E_\sigma} K| = 2^{n - |\sigma|}.$$

Then,

$$\frac{|K|^{m-\lambda} |P_{E_\sigma} K|^\lambda}{\prod_{i=1}^m |P_{E_{\sigma_i}} K|} = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^m \binom{n - |\sigma_i|}{n - |\sigma|}}{\binom{n}{n - |\sigma|}^{m-\lambda}}. \quad \square$$

We refer to [1], pp 254-259, for the basic properties of the digamma function. The digamma function is the logarithm derivative of the Gamma function. In particular, if

$$\psi(z) = \frac{d}{dz} \ln \Gamma(z) = \frac{\Gamma'(z)}{\Gamma(z)},$$

then

$$(52) \quad \psi(z+1) = \psi(z) + \frac{1}{z},$$

and, for any $z \neq -1, -2, \dots$, one has

$$(53) \quad \psi(z) = -\gamma + \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{t} - \frac{1}{t+z} \right),$$

where γ is known as the Euler constant.

Lemma 32. *The optimization of the constant in (26) when $m = 2$ is divided into three cases:*

$$\zeta_{n,2} = \begin{cases} \frac{(2k)!^3}{(3k)!k!^3}; & n = 3k \\ \frac{(2k+1)^2 (2k)!^3}{(k+1)(3k+1)(3k)!k!^3}; & n = 3k+1 \\ \frac{2(2k+1)^3 (2k)!^3}{(k+1)(3k+1)(3k+2)(3k)!k!^3}; & n = 3k+2. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Recall the definition $\zeta_{n,2}$ for $m = 2$,

$$\zeta_{n,2} = \max d_{n,2}(i, j) = \max \frac{\binom{i}{i+j-n} \binom{j}{i+j-n}}{\binom{n}{i+j-n}},$$

where the maximum is taken over all non-negative integers $i, j \leq n$ and $i + j - n \geq 0$. Let's fix $i + j = l$ and, without loss of generality, assume that $i \geq j$. We define the function f_l on $[n/2, n]$ as follows:

$$f_l(x) := \log \left[\frac{\Gamma(x+1)\Gamma(l-x+1)\Gamma(2n-l+1)}{\Gamma(n+1)\Gamma(l-n+1)\Gamma(n-x+1)\Gamma(n+x-l+1)} \right].$$

Note that for any integer i , $\log d(i, l-i) = f_l(i)$. Then,

$$f_l'(x) = \psi(x+1) - \psi(l-x+1) + \psi(n-x+1) - \psi(n+x-l+1).$$

Using (52), we have

$$\psi(x+1) - \psi(n+x-l+1) = \sum_{t=1}^{l-n} \frac{1}{t+x+n-l}$$

and

$$-\psi(l-x+1) + \psi(n-x+1) = -\sum_{t=1}^{l-n} \frac{1}{t-x+n}.$$

Thus,

$$f_l''(x) = -\sum_{t=1}^{n-l} \left(\frac{1}{(t+x+n-l)^2} + \frac{1}{(t-x+n)^2} \right) < 0.$$

Therefore, the function f_l is concave. Since $f_l(x) = f_l(l-x)$, one can deduce that f_l is reached the maximum at $x = l/2$. Similarly, we define a function g on $[n/2, n]$,

$$g(x) := \log \left[\frac{\Gamma^2(x+1)\Gamma(2n-2x+1)}{\Gamma(n+1)\Gamma(2x-n+1)\Gamma^2(n-x+1)} \right].$$

Note that for any integer i , $d_{n,2}(i, i) = g(i)$. Using (53), we have

$$\begin{aligned} g'(x) &= 2\psi(x+1) - 2\psi(2n-2x+1) - 2\psi(2x-n+1) + 2\psi(n-x+1) \\ &= 2 \sum_{t \geq 1} \left(\frac{1}{2n-2x+t} - \frac{1}{x+t} + \frac{1}{2x-n+t} - \frac{1}{n-x+t} \right) \\ &= 2(3x-2n) \sum_{t \geq 1} \left(\frac{1}{(2n-2x+t)(x+t)} - \frac{1}{(2x-n+t)(n-x+t)} \right) \\ &= 2(3x-2n)(x-n) \sum_{t \geq 1} \frac{n+2t}{(2n-2x+t)(x+t)(2x-n+t)(n-x+t)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the last summation is positive, we have that $g'(x) > 0$ for $x < 2n/3$ and $g'(x) < 0$ for $2n/3 < x$. Therefore, the maximum of g reaches at $x_{\max} = 2n/3$.

- If $n = 3k$, then $\max_{n/2 < i < n} g(i) = g(2k)$. We get

$$\zeta_{3k,2} = \frac{(2k)!^3}{(3k)!k!^3}.$$

- If $n = 3k+1$, then $x_{\max} = 2k+2/3$. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_{3k+1,2} &= \max\{g(2k), g(2k+1), f_{4k+1}(2k+1)\} \\ &= \frac{(2k+1)^2}{(k+1)(3k+1)} \frac{(2k)!^3}{(3k)!k!^3}. \end{aligned}$$

- If $n = 3k + 2$, then $x_{\max} = 2k + 4/3$. We get

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_{3k+2,2} &= \max\{g(2k+1), g(2k+2), f_{4k+3}(2k+2)\} \\ &= \frac{2(2k+1)^3}{(k+1)(3k+1)(3k+2)} \frac{(2k)!^3}{(3k)!k!^3}.\end{aligned}\quad \square$$

Remark 33. Using Stirling's approximation, we have $\zeta_{n,2} \sim \sqrt{\frac{4}{\pi n}} \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^n$.

Proposition 34. The optimization of the constant in (27) is divided into two cases:

$$r_{n,i} = \begin{cases} \frac{(2k)!(n-k)!^2}{k!^2(n-2k)!n!}; & i = 2k \\ \frac{(2k+1)(n-2k)}{(k+1)(n-k)} \frac{(2k)!(n-k)!^2}{k!^2(n-2k)!n!}; & i = 2k+1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Recall that,

$$r_{n,i} = \max_j d_{n,2}(i,j) = \max_j \frac{\binom{i}{i+j-n} \binom{j}{i+j-n}}{\binom{n}{i+j-n}},$$

where the maximum is taken over all non-negative integers $j \leq n$ such that $i+j \geq n+1$. We define the function g on $[n-i, n]$ as follow:

$$g(x) = \log \left[\frac{\Gamma(x+1)\Gamma(i+1)\Gamma(2n-i-x+1)}{\Gamma(n-x+1)\Gamma(n-i+1)\Gamma(i+x-n+1)\Gamma(n+1)} \right].$$

Note that for any integer j , $\log d_{n,2}(i,j) = g(j)$. By using (53), $g'(x)$ can be expanded as

$$(2x-2n+i)(i-n) \sum_{t \geq 1} \frac{2t+n}{(2n-i-x+t)(x+t)(n-x+t)(i+x-n+t)}.$$

Since the summation is positive, we have $g'(x) < 0$ for $x > n - i/2$ and $g'(x) > 0$ for $x < n - i/2$. So, g reaches the maximum at $n - i/2$.

- If $i = 2k$, then

$$r_{n,2k} = \frac{(2k)!(n-k)!^2}{k!^2(n-2k)!n!}.$$

- If $i = 2k+1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}r_{n,2k+1} &= \max\{g(n-k-1), g(n-k)\} \\ &= \frac{(2k+1)(n-2k)}{(k+1)(n-k)} \frac{(2k)!(n-k)!^2}{k!^2(n-2k)!n!}.\end{aligned}\quad \square$$

Proposition 35. Let $b(n,p)$ be the constant from Theorem 20, then

$$\frac{2}{e\sqrt{\pi n}} \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^n \leq b(n,p) \leq \frac{2^{n+1/2}}{\sqrt{\pi n}}.$$

Proof. Recall that

$$b(n, p) = \max_{0 \leq i, j \leq n} \left(d_{n,2}(i, j) \frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i+j-n}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{j}{q}\right)} \right).$$

Fix n, i, j such that $k := i + j - n \geq 0$, and define a function $f : [1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$f(q) = \log \left[\frac{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{k}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{i}{q}\right) \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{j}{q}\right)} \right].$$

Then,

$$f'(q) = -\frac{k}{q^2} \psi\left(1 + \frac{k}{q}\right) - \frac{n}{q^2} \psi\left(1 + \frac{n}{q}\right) + \frac{i}{q^2} \psi\left(1 + \frac{i}{q}\right) + \frac{j}{q^2} \psi\left(1 + \frac{j}{q}\right).$$

Using (53), we have

$$f'(q) = (n - i) \sum_{t \geq 1} \left(\frac{t}{(qt + n)(qt + i)} - \frac{t}{(qt + j)(qt + k)} \right).$$

Then, f is decreasing on $[1, \infty)$ as a function of q , which implies that $b(n, p)$ is increasing as p increase. We have

$$\max_{0 \leq i, j \leq n} d_{n,2}(i, j) = b(n, 1) \leq b(n, p) \leq b(n, \infty) = \max_{0 \leq i, j \leq n} \frac{(2n - i - j)!}{(n - i)!(n - j)!}.$$

It was provided in [18] by using Stirling approximation that

$$\max_{0 \leq i, j \leq n} d_{n,2}(i, j) \geq \frac{2}{e\sqrt{\pi n}} \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^n.$$

Fix $l = i + j$, we define function g_l by

$$g_l(x) = \log \left[\frac{\Gamma(1 + 2n - l)}{\Gamma(1 + n - l + x)\Gamma(1 + n - x)} \right].$$

Taking the derivative and using (53), we get

$$g'_l(x) = \sum_{t \geq 0} \frac{l - 2x}{(n - l + x + t)(t + n - x)}.$$

The function g reaches the maximum when $x = l/2$. It implies that

$$\max_{0 \leq i, j \leq n} \frac{(2n - i - j)!}{(n - i)!(n - j)!} \leq \max_{0 \leq i, j \leq n} \frac{(2n - 2i)!}{((n - i)!)^2} \leq \binom{n}{n/2}.$$

By using the Stirling's approximation, we have

$$\binom{n}{n/2} \leq \frac{2^{n+1/2}}{\sqrt{\pi n}}. \quad \square$$

Proposition 36. *Let $\kappa_{n,q}$ be the constant from Lemma 23, then*

$$2^n \leq \kappa_{n,q} \leq \binom{2n}{n}.$$

Proof. Recall that,

$$\kappa_{n,q} = \sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n/q}{i/q}^{-1} \binom{n}{i}^2.$$

Fix n and i , we define a function f on $[1, \infty)$ as follows:

$$f(q) = \log \binom{n/q}{i/q} = \log \left[\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{q} + 1\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{i}{q} + 1\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{n-i}{q} + 1\right)} \right].$$

Then,

$$f'(q) = -\frac{n}{q^2} \psi\left(\frac{n}{q} + 1\right) + \frac{i}{q^2} \psi\left(\frac{i}{q} + 1\right) + \frac{n-i}{q^2} \psi\left(\frac{n-i}{q} + 1\right).$$

Using (53), we have

$$f'(q) = -\frac{i(n-i)}{q} \sum_{t \geq 1} \left(\frac{1}{(tq+i)(tq+n)} + \frac{1}{(tq+n-i)(tq+n)} \right).$$

Then, f is decreasing on $[1, \infty]$ which implies that $\kappa_{n,q}$ is increasing as q increase. Hence,

$$2^n = \kappa_{n,1} \leq \kappa_{n,q} \leq \kappa_{n,\infty} = \binom{2n}{n}. \quad \square$$

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Abramowitz, and I. A. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions: with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables*, National Bureau of Standards Applied Mathematics Series 55, Tenth Printing, 1972.
- [2] D. Alonso-Gutiérrez, S. Artstein-Avidan, B. González Merino, C. H. Jiménez, and R. Villa, *Rogers-Shephard and Local Loomis-Whitney Type Inequalities*. Math. Ann., 374(3-4):1719–1771, 2019.
- [3] S. Artstein-Avidan, A. Giannopoulos, and V. D. Milman, *Asymptotic Geometric Analysis. Part I*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 202. American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2015.
- [4] S. Artstein-Avidan, A. Giannopoulos, and V. D. Milman, *Asymptotic Geometric Analysis. Part II*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs., 262. American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2021.
- [5] S. Artstein-Avidan, D. Florentin, and Y. Ostrover, *Remarks about mixed discriminants and volumes*, Commun. Contemp. Math., 16(2):1350031, 14, 2014.
- [6] S. Artstein-Avidan, S. Sadosky, and R. Sanyal, *Geometric Inequalities for Anti-blocking Bodies*, Communications in Contemporary Mathematics 25 (2023), no. 03, 2150113.
- [7] L. Berwald, *Verallgemeinerung eines Mittelwertsatzes von J. Favard, für positive konkave Funktionen*, Acta Math. 79: 17-37, 1947.
- [8] C. Bianchini, and A. Colesanti, *A sharp Roger-Shephard Inequality for the p-difference Body of Planar Convex Bodies*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 136: 2575-2582, 2008.
- [9] S. Bobkov, and M. Madiman, *Reverse Brunn–Minkowski and reverse entropy power inequalities for convex measures*, J. Func. Ana., 262(7):3309-3339, 2012.
- [10] B. Bollobás, and A. Thomason, *Projections of bodies and hereditary properties of hypergraphs*, Bull. London Math. Soc., 27 (1995), 417-424, 1995

- [11] B. Bollobás, I. Leader, and A. J. Radcliffe, *Reverse Kleitman inequalities*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society 3 (1989), no. 1, 153-168.
- [12] C. Borell, *Integral inequalities for generalized concave or convex functions*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 43: 419–440, 1973.
- [13] S. Brazitikos, A. Giannopoulos and D. M. Liakopoulos, *Uniform cover inequalities for the volume of coordinate sections and projections of convex bodies*, Adv. Geom., 18, no. 3, 345–354, 2018.
- [14] T. Chappell, T. Friedl, and R. Sanyal, *Two double poset polytopes*, SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics 31 (2017), no. 4, 2378-2413.
- [15] A. Dembo, T. M. Cover, and J. A. Thomas, *Information-theoretic inequalities*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, 37(6):1501-1518, 1991.
- [16] W. Fenchel, *Generalisation du theoreme de Brunn et Minkowski concernant les corps convexes*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris., 203:764–766, 1936.
- [17] Wm. J. Firey, *p -means of convex bodies*, Math. Scand., 10:17–24, 1962.
- [18] M. Fradelizi, M. Madiman, and A. Zvavitch, *Sumset estimates in convex geometry*, Int. Math. Res. Not., 15:11426–11454, 2024
- [19] M. Fradelizi, A. Giannopoulos, and M. Meyer. *Some inequalities about mixed volumes*, Israel J. Math., 135:157–179, 2003.
- [20] M. Fradelizi, M. Madiman, M. Meyer, and A. Zvavitch, *On the volume of the Minkowski sum of zonoids*, J. Func. Ana., 286(3), 2024.
- [21] D. Langharst, and E. Putterman, *Weighted Berwald's Inequality*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., to appear. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.04438>.
- [22] G. Livshyts, A. Marsiglietti, P. Nayar, and A. Zvavitch, *On the Brunn-Minkowski inequality for general measures with applications to new isoperimetric-type inequalities*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 369:8725-8742, 2017
- [23] L. H. Loomis, and H. Whitney, *An inequality related to the isoperimetric inequality*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., 55: 961-962, 1949.
- [24] E. Lutwak, *The Brunn-Minkowski-Firey theory. I. Mixed Volumes and the Minkowski problem*, J. Diff. Geom., 38(1):131-150, 1993.
- [25] E. Lutwak, *The Brunn-Minkowski-Firey theory. II. Affine and geominimal surface areas*, Adv. Math., 118(1):244-294, 1996.
- [26] E. Lutwak, D. Yang, and G. Zhang, *The Brunn-Minkowski-Firey inequality for non-convex sets*, Adv. Appl. Math, 48 (2): 407–413, 2012.
- [27] C. S. Ndiaye, *A note on Bézout type inequality for mixed volumes and Minkowski sums*. Preprint, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2304.12065>.
- [28] H. Plüinecke, *Eine zahlentheoretische Anwendung der Graphentheorie*, J. Reine Angew. Math. 243 (1970), 171-183.
- [29] C. A. Rogers, and G. C. Shephard, *The difference body of a convex body*, Arch. Math. 8 (1957): 220–233.
- [30] C. A. Rogers, and G. C. Shephard, *Convex bodies associated with a given convex body*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. 1(3): 270-281, 1958.
- [31] I. Z. Ruzsa, *An application of graph theory to additive number theory*, Scientia, Ser. A, 3: 97-109, 1989.
- [32] I. Z. Ruzsa, *Sums of finite sets*, in Number Theory: New York Seminar, D. V. Chudnovsky, G.V. Chudnovsky and M. B. Nathanson (eds), Springer-Verlag, (1996), 281-293.
- [33] I. Z. Ruzsa, *The Brunn-Minkowski inequality and nonconvex sets*, Geom. Dedicata, 67(3):337-348, 1997.
- [34] D. Ryabogin and A. Zvavitch, *Analytic methods in convex geometry*, IM PAN Lecture Notes, Vol. 2, Warsaw 2014.

- [35] R. Schneider, *Convex Bodies: The Brunn-Minkowski Theory*, Second expanded edition. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications 151, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014.
- [36] S. Sadoivsky, *Godbersen's conjecture for locally anti-blocking bodies*, Preprint, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.03473>.
- [37] I. Soprunov, and A. Zvavitch, *Bézout inequality for mixed volumes*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN, (23):7230–7252, 2016.
- [38] T. Tao, and V. H. Vu., *Additive combinatorics*, volume 105 of Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.
- [39] J. Xiao, *Bézout-type inequality in convex geometry*, Int. Math. Res. Not., (16):4950–4965, 2019.