

The Gauss image problem for pseudo-cones

Rolf Schneider

Abstract

The Gauss image problem for convex bodies asks for the existence of a convex body that “links” two given measures on the unit sphere in a certain way. We treat here a corresponding question for pseudo-cones, that is, for unbounded closed convex sets strictly contained in their recession cones.

Keywords: Gauss image problem, pseudo-cone

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 52A20 49Q20

1 Introduction

The Gauss image problem, as suggested by Böröczky, Lutwak, Yang, Zhang, Zhao [4], can be described as follows. In Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n ($n \geq 2$) with unit sphere \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , let K be a compact convex set containing the origin o in the interior. Define the radial map $r_K : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \rightarrow \partial K$ such that $r_K(u) = ru \in \partial K$ with $r > 0$. For $\eta \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, the radial Gauss image $\alpha_K(\eta)$ is defined as the set of all outer unit normal vectors of K at points of $r_K(\eta)$. If η is a Borel set, then $\alpha_K(\eta)$ is known ([10], p. 88) to be (spherically) Lebesgue measurable. Let λ be a finite measure on the Lebesgue measurable subsets of \mathbb{S}^{n-1} which is absolutely continuous with respect to spherical Lebesgue measure. The Gauss image measure of λ , associated with K , is defined by

$$\lambda(K, \eta) := \lambda(\alpha_K(\eta)), \quad \eta \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \text{ Borel.}$$

It is known ([4, Sect. 3]) that $\lambda(K, \cdot)$ is a measure. The Gauss image problem now asks: Given a finite Borel measure μ on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , what are the necessary and sufficient conditions on λ and μ in order that there is a convex body K (with $o \in \text{int } K$) such that $\lambda(K, \cdot) = \mu$ on the Borel subsets of \mathbb{S}^{n-1} ?

When λ is spherical Lebesgue measure, then $\lambda(K, \cdot)$ is known as Aleksandrov’s integral curvature; in this case, the problem was already solved by Aleksandrov [1]. The general Gauss image problem was proposed in [4]. In that article, it was proved that for the existence of K with $\lambda(K, \cdot) = \mu$ (where λ and μ are non-zero) it is sufficient that the measures λ and μ are Aleksandrov related (for the explanation of which we refer to [4]). If λ is positive on nonempty open sets, these authors also showed that the latter condition is necessary, and that K , if it exists, is uniquely determined up to a dilatation. If μ is discrete, Semenov [15] found a relaxation of the Aleksandrov condition that is necessary and sufficient. Semenov [16] also treated a variant of the

Gauss image problem for convex bodies, where both measures are discrete. In [17] he studied the uniqueness question for the Gauss image problem in a general version (that is, without special assumptions on λ) and obtained several new properties of the (multi-valued) radial Gauss image map.

The aim of the following is to treat an analogue of the Gauss image problem for pseudo-cones. These sets can be considered, under several aspects, as a counterpart to the convex bodies containing the origin in the interior. By definition, a pseudo-cone in \mathbb{R}^n is a nonempty closed convex subset $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ not containing the origin and such that $\lambda K \subseteq K$ for $\lambda \geq 1$ (equivalently, a closed convex set not containing the origin and contained in its recession cone; see [18, Thm. 3.2]). Thus, such a set is unbounded. Its recession cone, a closed convex cone, is denoted by C , and we assume in the following that it is always pointed and n -dimensional. Its dual cone is defined by $C^\circ = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, y \rangle \leq 0 \ \forall y \in C\}$. We are interested in the pseudo-cones K with given recession cone C , called C -pseudo-cones. The role that the unit sphere plays above is now split between two open subsets of the unit sphere, given by

$$\Omega_C := \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap \text{int } C, \quad \Omega_{C^\circ} := \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap \text{int } C^\circ$$

(or their closures, indicated by cl).

Part of the following is restricted to a special class of pseudo-cones. The C -pseudo-cone K is called *internal* if the vectors of Ω_{C° are attained as outer normal vectors of K only at points in the interior of C . If K is internal, it suffices (for the treatment of $\lambda(K, \cdot)$) to define the radial Gauss image $\alpha_K(\eta)$ only for sets $\eta \subset \Omega_C$, namely as the set of all outer unit normal vectors of K at points $rv \in \partial K$, where $v \in \eta$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$. We have $\alpha_K(\eta) \subset \text{cl } \Omega_{C^\circ}$, since all outer unit normal vectors of K belong to the closure of Ω_{C° .

We assume that λ is a non-zero, finite measure on the Lebesgue measurable subsets of $\text{cl } \Omega_{C^\circ}$, which is zero on Borel sets of Hausdorff dimension $n - 2$ (an assumption slightly weaker than the absolute continuity demanded in [4]). For Borel sets $\eta \subset \Omega_C$ we define $\lambda(K, \eta) := \lambda(\alpha_K(\eta))$. Let μ be a Borel measure on Ω_C . The Gauss image problem for pseudo-cones asks: What are the necessary and sufficient conditions on λ and μ in order that there is a C -pseudo-cone K with $\lambda(K, \cdot) = \mu$?

We have already seen in [11, 12, 13] that conditions on the measures appearing in Minkowski type problems for convex bodies, such as not being restricted to a great subsphere, a centroid condition for surface area measures or a subspace concentration condition for cone-volume measures, do not play a role in the case of pseudo-cones. On the other hand, new problems arise with pseudo-cones, since their surface area measures and cone-volume measures can be infinite. Since presently we assume that the measures λ and μ are finite, the Gauss image problem for pseudo-cones turns out to be easier than for convex bodies. We shall prove the following result.

Theorem 1. *Let λ be a measure on the Lebesgue measurable subsets of $\text{cl } \Omega_{C^\circ}$ which is non-zero, finite, and zero on Borel sets of Hausdorff dimension $n - 2$. Let μ be a Borel measure on Ω_C . There exists a C -pseudo-cone K with*

$$\mu = \lambda(K, \cdot)$$

if and only if $\lambda(\Omega_{C^\circ}) = \mu(\Omega_C)$.

We have simplified here the Gauss image problem for pseudo-cones by allowing only measures μ on Ω_C , and not on its closure. That this is indeed a restriction, can be seen from the following simple example. Let K be the intersection of C and a closed halfspace not containing the origin, which has an outer normal vector belonging to Ω_{C° . Extending the definition of $\lambda(K, \cdot)$ to $\text{cl}\Omega_C$, we see that this measure is concentrated on the boundary of Ω_C . A generalization of Theorem 1 to measures on $\text{cl}\Omega_C$ remains open.

We shall prove Theorem 1 in Section 5, after some preparations. Section 6 contains a uniqueness result.

The following has been pointed out to the author by Yiming Zhao. After applying two gnomonic projections, the Gauss image problem for C -pseudo-cones can be viewed as a measure transport problem in a Euclidean space of dimension $n - 1$. Then a result of McCann [8] (refining an earlier result of Brenier) comes to mind, according to which the transport can be achieved by the gradient map of a suitable convex function. However, in the setting of the current work, the sought-for transport map should be a *normalized* version of the gradient map. There seems to be no obvious way to directly apply the result of McCann.

As mentioned, the Gauss image problem for convex bodies reduces to Aleksandrov's integral curvature problem if one considers Lebesgue measure. Oliker [9] pointed out that this problem is connected to optimal mass transport, and he showed how his solution of Aleksandrov's problem implies the extremality of a certain total cost. A new solution of Aleksandrov's problem by mass transportation methods was given by Bertrand [3]. It appears conceivable that his proof can be extended to more general measures, and can then be carried over to pseudo-cones. The following treatment of the Gauss image problem for pseudo-cones seems to be more elementary.

2 Fundamentals about pseudo-cones

This section fixes the notation and collects some known results. We recall that $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a closed convex cone, pointed and with interior points. Then its dual cone, C° , has the same properties. A C -pseudo-cone K is a closed convex set with $o \notin K$ and $\lambda K \subseteq K$ for $\lambda \geq 1$, with recession cone C . Necessarily,

$$K = C \cap \bigcap_{u \in \Omega_{C^\circ}} H_K^-(u),$$

where $H_K^-(u)$ is the supporting halfspace of K with outer normal vector u . The set of all C -pseudo-cones is denoted by $ps(C)$, and $psi(C)$ denotes the set of all internal C -pseudo-cones.

If $\omega \subset \Omega_{C^\circ}$ is a nonempty compact subset, we say as in [11, Sect. 8] that the C -pseudo-cone K is C -determined by ω if

$$K = C \cap \bigcap_{u \in \omega} H_K^-(u).$$

The set of all C -pseudo-cones which are C -determined by ω is denoted by $\mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$.

Convergence of pseudo-cones can be defined via the usual convergence of convex bodies. Let B^n be the unit ball of \mathbb{R}^n with center o . Let K_1, K_2, \dots be a sequence in $ps(C)$. We say that this sequence converges to the C -pseudo-cone K and write

$$K_j \rightarrow K \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty$$

if there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $K_j \cap t_0 B^n \neq \emptyset$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (K_j \cap t B^n) = K \cap t B^n \quad \text{for each } t \geq t_0.$$

This is, of course, equivalent to Definition 2 in [14].

To emphasize the distinction between Ω_{C° and Ω_C , we will mostly denote vectors and subsets of Ω_{C° by u, ω , and vectors and subsets of Ω_C by v, η .

Let $K \in ps(C)$. We recall some notation from [14]. The support function of K is defined by

$$h_K(x) := \sup\{\langle x, y \rangle : y \in K\} \quad \text{for } x \in C^\circ.$$

Here sup can be replaced by max if $x \in \text{int } C^\circ$. We have $h_K \leq 0$, and therefore we also write $\bar{h}_K = -h_K$.

We define the radial function of K by

$$\rho_K(v) := \min\{r > 0 : rv \in K\} \quad \text{for } v \in \Omega_C$$

(thus we define here the radial function only on Ω_C). It is easy to see that K is uniquely determined by its support function, as well as by its radial function.

The relations between support function and radial function are given by (1) and (2) in [14], namely

$$\bar{h}_K(u) = \inf_{v \in \Omega_C} |\langle u, v \rangle| \rho_K(v) \quad \text{for } u \in \text{cl } \Omega_{C^\circ} \quad (1)$$

(where inf can be replaced by min if $u \in \Omega_{C^\circ}$) and

$$\frac{1}{\rho_K(v)} = \min_{u \in \text{cl } \Omega_{C^\circ}} \frac{|\langle v, u \rangle|}{\bar{h}_K(u)} \quad \text{for } v \in \Omega_C.$$

The radial map $r_K : \Omega_C \rightarrow \partial K$ is defined by

$$r_K(v) := \rho_K(v)v \quad \text{for } v \in \Omega_C.$$

For $\sigma \subseteq \partial K$, we denote by $\nu_K(\sigma)$ the set of all outer unit normal vectors of K at points of σ , and we repeat that the radial Gauss image of $\eta \subseteq \Omega_C$ is defined by

$$\alpha_K(\eta) := \nu_K(r_K(\eta));$$

thus $\alpha_K(\eta) \subseteq \text{cl } \Omega_{C^\circ}$.

By η_K we denote the set of all $v \in \Omega_C$ for which the outer unit normal vector of K at $r_K(v)$ is not unique. By $\omega_K \subset \text{cl}\Omega_{C^\circ}$ we denote the set of all $u \in \text{cl}\Omega_{C^\circ}$ which are outer unit normal vectors of K at more than one point of ∂K . It is known that η_K and ω_K have spherical Lebesgue measure zero. The set $\sigma_K := r_K(\eta_K)$ has $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure zero. About ω_K , we are more precise. It follows from [10, Thm. 2.2.5] and polarity that ω_K can be covered by countably many sets of finite $(n-2)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure, hence if we assume that the measure λ is zero on sets of Hausdorff dimension $n-2$, then

$$\lambda(\omega_K) = 0. \quad (2)$$

The Gauss map $\nu_K : \partial K \setminus \sigma_K \rightarrow \Omega_{C^\circ}$ of K is defined by letting $\nu_K(y)$ be the unique outer unit normal vector of K at $y \in \partial K \setminus \sigma_K$. The reverse spherical Gauss map $x_K : \Omega_{C^\circ} \setminus \omega_K \rightarrow \partial K$ is defined by letting $x_K(u)$ be the unique point of ∂K at which $u \in \Omega_{C^\circ} \setminus \omega_K$ is attained as outer unit normal vector. (Note that a vector in $\partial\Omega_{C^\circ}$ (boundary with respect to \mathbb{S}^{n-1}) may be attained as a normal vector of K , but never at a unique boundary point.)

For $K \in ps(C)$ we define the radial Gauss map

$$\alpha_K : \Omega_C \setminus \eta_K \rightarrow \text{cl}\Omega_{C^\circ} \quad \text{by} \quad \alpha_K := \nu_K \circ r_K.$$

We point out that the radial map and the radial Gauss map are only defined on (parts of) Ω_C , not on its closure. Modifying (2.17) in [6], we define for $K \in psi(C)$ the reverse radial Gauss map

$$\alpha_K^* : \Omega_{C^\circ} \setminus \omega_K \rightarrow \Omega_C \quad \text{by} \quad \alpha_K^* := r_K^{-1} \circ x_K.$$

Thus, α_K^* is not defined on the boundary of Ω_{C° . We have restricted this definition to $psi(C)$, in order that for $u \in \Omega_{C^\circ} \setminus \omega_K$ the vector $r_K^{-1}(x_K(u))$ belong to Ω_C . The maps α_K and α_K^* are continuous.

On $\Omega_{C^\circ} \setminus \omega_K$ the inverse map α_K^{-1} is well defined, thus for $K \in psi(C)$ we have

$$\alpha_K^{-1} = \alpha_K^* \quad \lambda\text{-almost everywhere on } \Omega_{C^\circ}.$$

We state that for $K \in psi(C)$

$$\alpha_K(\eta) \setminus \omega_K = (\alpha_K^*)^{-1}(\eta) \quad \text{for } \eta \subset \Omega_C. \quad (3)$$

For the proof, let $\eta \subset \Omega_C$ and $u \in \Omega_{C^\circ} \setminus \omega_K$. Then $\mathbf{x}_K(\{u\}) = x_K(u)$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} u \in \alpha_K(\eta) &= \nu_K(r_K(\eta)) \\ &\Leftrightarrow x_K(u) \in r_K(\eta) \Leftrightarrow r_K^{-1}(x_K(u)) \in \eta \Leftrightarrow \alpha_K^*(u) \in \eta \\ &\Leftrightarrow u \in (\alpha_K^*)^{-1}(\eta). \end{aligned}$$

For a C -pseudo-cone $K \in ps(C)$, the copolar set is defined by

$$K^* := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, y \rangle \leq -1 \forall y \in K\}.$$

Clearly, this is a pseudo-cone, and since $\text{rec } K^* = (\text{rec } K)^\circ = C^\circ$ by [13, Lem. 4], it is a C° -pseudo-cone. Therefore, the functions and maps defined above for K are also well defined for K^* , with correspondingly changed domains.

We have

$$\rho_K(v) = \frac{1}{|h_{K^*}(v)|} \quad \text{for } v \in \Omega_C. \quad (4)$$

For the proof, we refer to [18, Thm. 3.10].

According to [13, Def. 4], a pair $(y, w) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ is a crucial pair of K if $y \in \partial K$ and w is an outer normal vector of K at y , normalized so that $\langle y, w \rangle = -1$. By [13, Lem. 6] and $K^{**} = K$, we know that (y, w) is a crucial pair of K if and only if (w, y) is a crucial pair of K^* . From this, it follows easily that, for $K \in \text{psi}(C)$,

$$\alpha_K^*(u) = \alpha_{K^*}(u) \quad \text{for } u \in \Omega_{C^\circ} \setminus \omega_K. \quad (5)$$

From (4), we can deduce the following. If $K_j \in \text{ps}(C)$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, then

$$K_j \rightarrow K_0 \Leftrightarrow K_j^* \rightarrow K_0^*.$$

Using (4), we can also prove the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *Let $K_j \in \text{psi}(C)$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. If $K_j \rightarrow K_0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, then*

$$\alpha_{K_j}^* \rightarrow \alpha_{K_0}^*$$

almost everywhere on Ω_{C° , with respect to spherical Lebesgue measure.

Proof. The arguments are so similar to those used in the proof of (3.8) in [4] that we need not repeat them here. The uniform convergence appearing in the employed Lemma 2.2 of [6] can be replaced by uniform convergence on compact sets. \square

Wulff shapes in cones were introduced in [11], and we repeat the definition here. Given a nonempty compact set $\omega \subset \Omega_{C^\circ}$ and a continuous function $f : \omega \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, let

$$[f] := C \cap \bigcap_{u \in \omega} \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle y, u \rangle \leq -f(u)\}.$$

Then $[f] \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$, and $[f]$ is called the Wulff shape associated with (C, ω, f) . We have

$$\bar{h}_{[f]}(u) \geq f(u) \quad \text{for } u \in \omega,$$

as follows immediately from the definition. According to [14, (15)], the radial function of the Wulff shape is given by

$$\frac{1}{\rho_{[f]}(v)} = \min_{u \in \omega} \frac{|\langle v, u \rangle|}{f(u)} \quad \text{for } v \in \Omega_C. \quad (6)$$

We modify a definition in [6] (see also [7, Sect. 4]). Given a nonempty compact set $\eta \subset \Omega_C$ and a continuous function $f : \eta \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, we define

$$\langle f \rangle := \bigcap \{K \in \text{ps}(C) : f(v)v \in K \ \forall v \in \eta\}.$$

Since f is positive, there always exists $K \in ps(C)$ with $f(v)v \in K$ for all $v \in \eta$. Clearly, $\langle f \rangle$ is a C -pseudo-cone. It is contained in $\text{int } C$, so that, in particular, $\langle f \rangle \in psi(C)$. We call $\langle f \rangle$ the *convexification* associated with (C, η, f) . The definition implies that

$$\rho_{\langle f \rangle}(v) \leq f(v) \quad \text{for } v \in \eta. \quad (7)$$

For the support function of the convexification we have

$$\bar{h}_{\langle f \rangle}(u) = \min_{v \in \eta} |\langle u, v \rangle| f(v) \quad \text{for } u \in \text{cl } \Omega_{C^\circ}. \quad (8)$$

In fact, from (1) and (7) it follows that

$$\bar{h}_{\langle f \rangle}(u) = \inf_{v \in \Omega_C} |\langle u, v \rangle| \rho_{\langle f \rangle}(v) \leq \min_{v \in \eta} |\langle u, v \rangle| \rho_{\langle f \rangle}(v) \leq \min_{v \in \eta} |\langle u, v \rangle| f(v).$$

On the other hand, if $\min_{v \in \eta} |\langle u, v \rangle| f(v) =: t$ then

$$C \cap \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : |\langle y, u \rangle| \geq t\} \in ps(C)$$

and hence $\bar{h}_{\langle f \rangle}(u) \geq t$.

We point out that, in the definition of $\langle f \rangle$, the function f is defined on a compact subset of Ω_C , whereas in the case of the Wulff shape it is defined on a compact subset of Ω_{C° . Of course, there is also the Wulff shape $[f]$ for f defined on a compact subset of Ω_C ; in this case, $[f]$ is a C° -pseudo-cone. Analogously, for a function f on a compact subset $\omega \subset \Omega_{C^\circ}$, the convexification associated with (C°, ω, f) , denoted also by $\langle f \rangle$, is a C° -pseudo-cone. It is not necessary to use different notations, since the domain of f determines whether the result is in $ps(C)$ or in $ps(C^\circ)$.

Now we can state the relation

$$[f]^* = \langle 1/f \rangle \quad (9)$$

for a continuous function $f : \eta \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ defined on a nonempty compact set $\eta \subset \Omega_C$. In fact, for $u \in \Omega_{C^\circ}$ we have by (6), (8), (4) and $K^{**} = K$ that

$$\rho_{[f]}^{-1}(u) = \min_{v \in \eta} |\langle u, v \rangle| f^{-1}(v) = \bar{h}_{\langle f^{-1} \rangle}(u) = \rho_{\langle f^{-1} \rangle^*}^{-1}(u)$$

and thus $[f] = \langle f^{-1} \rangle^*$, hence $[f]^* = \langle f^{-1} \rangle$.

We use (9) to show the following continuity property of the convexification.

Lemma 2. *Let $\eta \subset \Omega_C$ be a nonempty compact set, and let f_j be a positive, continuous function on η , for $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. If the sequence $(f_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges uniformly on η to f_0 , then $\langle f_j \rangle \rightarrow \langle f_0 \rangle$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. If $f_j \rightarrow f_0$ uniformly on η , where f_0 has a positive minimum, then also $f_j^{-1} \rightarrow f_0^{-1}$ uniformly on η . By Lemma 5 of [11] the Wulff shapes satisfy $[f_j^{-1}] \rightarrow [f_0^{-1}]$. By (9) and (4) this implies the assertion. \square

Given a nonempty compact subset ω of Ω_{C° , we have defined the C -pseudo-cones that are C -determined by ω . Correspondingly, given a nonempty compact subset η of Ω_C we now say that $K \in \text{psi}(C)$ is C -defined by η if $K = \langle \rho_K|_\eta \rangle$, that is, if K is the convexification associated with $(C, \eta, \rho_K|_\eta)$, where $\rho_K|_\eta$ is the restriction of the radial function of K to η . We remark that also

$$\langle \rho_K|_\eta \rangle = r_K(\eta) + C,$$

so that $\langle \rho_K|_\eta \rangle \in \text{psi}(K)$. The set of all C -pseudo-cones that are C -defined by η is denoted by $\mathcal{K}^*(C, \eta)$. We have

$$K \in \mathcal{K}^*(C, \eta) \Leftrightarrow K^* \in \mathcal{K}(C^\circ, \eta). \quad (10)$$

This can be proved along the following lines, using [13, Lem. 6]:

$$\begin{aligned} & K \in \mathcal{K}^*(C, \eta) \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{if } (y, w) \text{ is a crucial pair of } K \text{ with } y/\|y\| \notin \eta, \text{ then } w \in \partial C^\circ \\ \Leftrightarrow & \text{if } (w, y) \text{ is a crucial pair of } K^* \text{ with } y/\|y\| \notin \eta, \text{ then } w \in \partial C^\circ \\ \Leftrightarrow & K^* \in \mathcal{K}(C^\circ, \eta). \end{aligned}$$

Concerning (10), we remark that (for compact $\eta \subset \Omega_C$) $K^* \in \mathcal{K}(C^\circ, \eta)$ is always C° -full (that is $C^\circ \setminus K^*$ is bounded), but $K \in \mathcal{K}^*(C, \eta)$ is never C -full.

3 About $\lambda(K, \cdot)$

In this section we assume that $K \in \text{psi}(C)$. Let λ be a non-zero finite measure on the σ -algebra of Lebesgue measurable subsets of $\text{cl } \Omega_{C^\circ}$ which vanishes on Borel sets of Hausdorff dimension $n - 2$. As already mentioned, we define

$$\lambda(K, \eta) := \lambda(\alpha_K(\eta)), \quad \eta \subseteq \Omega_C \text{ Borel.}$$

That $\alpha_K(\eta)$ is indeed Lebesgue measurable, follows from the continuity of the radial map and [10, Lem. 2.2.13].

We state that, for $\eta_1, \eta_2 \subseteq \Omega_C$,

$$\eta_1 \cap \eta_2 = \emptyset \Rightarrow \alpha_K(\eta_1) \cap \alpha_K(\eta_2) \in \omega_K.$$

In fact, suppose that $\eta_1 \cap \eta_2 = \emptyset$ and let $u \in \alpha_K(\eta_1) \cap \alpha_K(\eta_2)$. Then $u \in \nu_K(r_K(\eta_i))$ for $i = 1, 2$, hence u is a normal vector of K at a point $y_1 \in r_K(\eta_1)$ and a point $y_2 \in r_K(\eta_2)$. Since $r_K(\eta_1) \cap r_K(\eta_2) = \emptyset$, we have $y_1 \neq y_2$ and thus $u \in \omega_K$.

It follows that if η_1, η_2, \dots is a sequence of pairwise disjoint Borel sets in Ω_C , then the sets of the sequence $\alpha_K(\eta_1), \alpha_K(\eta_2), \dots$ are pairwise disjoint up to a set belonging to ω_K . By (2), $\lambda(\omega_K) = 0$. Now it follows as in [4] that $\lambda(K, \cdot)$ is a measure. Then, in particular, $\lambda(\partial \Omega_{C^\circ}) = 0$.

Since now $\lambda(K, \cdot)$ is a measure, it follows from (3) that $\lambda(K, \cdot)$ is the image measure (or push-forward) of λ under the continuous and hence measurable map $\alpha_K^* : \Omega_{C^\circ} \setminus \omega_K \rightarrow \Omega_C$. We write this as

$$\lambda(K, \cdot) = (\alpha_K^*)\#\lambda. \quad (11)$$

Below we shall use tacitly the following lemma.

Lemma 3. *If $\eta \subset \Omega_C$ is compact and $K \in \mathcal{K}^*(C, \eta)$, then $\lambda(K, \cdot)$ is concentrated on η .*

Proof. Setting $\eta' := \Omega_C \setminus \eta$, any outer unit normal vector of K at $r_K(v)$ with $v \in \eta'$ belongs to $\partial\Omega_{C^\circ}$. Thus, $\alpha_K(\eta') \subset \partial\Omega_{C^\circ}$ and hence $\lambda(\alpha_K(\eta')) = 0$. \square

The following lemma corresponds to Lemma 3.3 in [4], but the approach is different.

Lemma 4. *Let $K \in \text{psi}(C)$, and let $g : \Omega_C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded Borel function. Then*

$$\int_{\Omega_{C^\circ}} g(\alpha_K^*(u)) \lambda(du) = \int_{\Omega_C} g(v) \lambda(K, dv). \quad (12)$$

Proof. By (11), the transformation theorem for integrals gives that, for each bounded Borel function $g : \Omega_C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_{\Omega_C} g(v) \lambda(K, dv) = \int_{\Omega_{C^\circ} \setminus \omega_K} g(\alpha_K^*(u)) \lambda(du).$$

Since ω_K has λ -measure zero, we can also write

$$\int_{\Omega_C} g(v) \lambda(K, dv) = \int_{\Omega_{C^\circ}} g(\alpha_K^*(u)) \lambda(du),$$

as stated. \square

A first consequence is the following weak continuity.

Lemma 5. *Let $K_j \in \text{psi}(C)$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then $K_j \rightarrow K_0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ implies the weak convergence $\lambda(K_j, \cdot) \xrightarrow{w} \lambda(K_0, \cdot)$.*

Proof. Let $g : \Omega_C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and bounded. By (12) we have

$$\int_{\Omega_C} g(v) \lambda(K_j, dv) = \int_{\Omega_{C^\circ}} g(\alpha_{K_j}^*(u)) \lambda(du).$$

The map $\alpha_{K_j}^*$ is continuous on its domain, and it is defined on $\Omega_{C^\circ} \setminus \omega_{K_j}$, where ω_{K_j} has spherical Lebesgue measure zero. Therefore, the functions $g \circ \alpha_{K_j}^*$ are measurable, and they are uniformly bounded. Now Lemma 4 and the dominated convergence theorem show that

$$\int_{\Omega_C} g(v) \lambda(K_j, dv) \rightarrow \int_{\Omega_C} g(v) \lambda(K_0, dv) \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty,$$

which gives the assertion. \square

4 Variational lemmas

The following lemma, which was proved by adapting arguments from [6], is Lemma 5.4 in [7] and also Lemma 9 in [14].

Lemma 6. *Let $\omega \subset \Omega_{C^\circ}$ be nonempty and compact, and let $f_0 : \omega \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and $g : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous. Define f_t by*

$$\log f_t(u) = \log f_0(u) + tg(u) \quad \text{for } u \in \omega,$$

for $|t| \leq \delta$, for some $\delta > 0$. Let $[f_t]$ be the Wulff shape associated with (C, ω, f_t) . Then, for almost all $v \in \Omega_C$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \rho_{[f_t]}(v) - \log \rho_{[f_0]}(v)}{t} = g(\alpha_{[f_0]}(v)).$$

(Note that $[f_0] \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$, so that the outer unit normal vectors of K at $r_K(\Omega_C)$ belong to ω . Therefore, $\alpha_{[f_0]}(v) \in \omega$, so that $g(\alpha_{[f_0]}(v))$ is well defined for $v \in \Omega_C \setminus \eta_K$.)

We reformulate this lemma, interchanging the roles of C and C° .

Lemma 7. *Let $\eta \subset \Omega_C$ be nonempty and compact, and let $f_0 : \eta \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and $g : \eta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous. Define f_t by*

$$\log f_t(v) = \log f_0(v) + tg(v) \quad \text{for } v \in \eta$$

for $|t| \leq \delta$, for some $\delta > 0$. Let $[f_t]$ be the Wulff shape associated with (C°, η, f_t) . Then, for almost all $u \in \Omega_{C^\circ}$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \rho_{[f_t]}(u) - \log \rho_{[f_0]}(u)}{t} = g(\alpha_{[f_0]}(u)).$$

(Note that the mapping $\alpha_{[f_0]}$, according to the domain of f_0 , now goes from a part of Ω_{C° to Ω_C .)

The following two lemmas correspond to Section 4 in [4].

Lemma 8. *Let $\eta \subset \Omega_C$ be nonempty and compact, and let $f_0 : \eta \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ and $g : \eta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous. Define f_t by*

$$\log f_t(v) = \log f_0(v) + tg(v) \quad \text{for } v \in \eta$$

for $|t| \leq \delta$, for some $\delta > 0$. Let $\langle f_t \rangle$ be the convexification associated with (C, η, f_t) .

(a) For almost all $u \in \Omega_{C^\circ}$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \bar{h}_{\langle f_t \rangle}(u) - \log \bar{h}_{\langle f_0 \rangle}(u)}{t} = g(\alpha_{\langle f_0 \rangle}^*(u)). \quad (13)$$

(b) A constant M and the constant $\delta > 0$ can be chosen such that

$$|\log \bar{h}_{\langle f_t \rangle}(u) - \log \bar{h}_{\langle f_0 \rangle}(u)| \leq M|t|$$

for all $u \in \Omega_{C^\circ}$ and all $|t| \leq \delta$.

Proof. For the proof of part (a), we ‘reverse’ the arguments in the proof of Lemma 4.3 in [6]. We have

$$\log f_t^{-1} = \log f_0^{-1} - tg,$$

hence Lemma 7 (applied to f_t^{-1} and $-g$) gives

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \rho_{[f_t^{-1}]}(u) - \log \rho_{[f_0^{-1}]}(u)}{t} = -g(\alpha_{[f_0^{-1}]}(u))$$

for almost all $u \in \Omega_{C^\circ}$.

Since $[f_t^{-1}] = \langle f_t \rangle^*$ by (9) and $\rho_{K^*} = 1/\bar{h}_K$ by (4) (using $K^{**} = K$), we get

$$\log \rho_{[f_t^{-1}]} - \log \rho_{[f_0^{-1}]} = \log \rho_{\langle f_t \rangle^*} - \log \rho_{\langle f_0 \rangle^*} = -(\log \bar{h}_{\langle f_t \rangle} - \log \bar{h}_{\langle f_0 \rangle}).$$

Moreover, from (5) (noting that $\langle f_0 \rangle \in \text{psi}(C)$) we have

$$\alpha_{[f_0^{-1}]}(u) = \alpha_{\langle f_0 \rangle^*}(u) = \alpha_{\langle f_0 \rangle}^*(u) \quad \text{for } u \in \Omega_{C^\circ} \setminus \omega_{\langle f_0 \rangle}.$$

This completes the proof of (a).

For part (b), let $u \in \Omega_{C^\circ}$ be such that (13) is satisfied. We abbreviate $F(t) := \log \bar{h}_{\langle f_t \rangle}(u)$ and have

$$\left| \frac{F(t) - F(0)}{t} \right| - \left| \frac{dF(t)}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \right| \leq \left| \frac{F(t) - F(0)}{t} - \frac{dF(t)}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \right| \leq 1 \quad \text{for } |t| \leq \delta$$

by (a), if $\delta > 0$ is chosen appropriately. It follows that

$$\left| \frac{F(t) - F(0)}{t} \right| \leq \left| \frac{dF(t)}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \right| + 1 = g(\alpha_{\langle f_0 \rangle}^*(u)) + 1,$$

which is bounded by a constant M depending only on g . By continuity, this holds for all $u \in \Omega_{C^\circ}$. \square

The following lemma corresponds to the first part of Lemma 4.2 in [4]. Note that we define f_t only on η , so that $f_0 = \rho_K|_\eta$, the restriction of the radial function of K to η . Observe also that $\lambda(\langle f_0 \rangle, \cdot)$ is concentrated on η .

Lemma 9. *Let λ be a measure on Ω_{C° as in Section 3, let $K \in \text{ps}(C)$. Let $\eta \subset \Omega_C$ be nonempty and compact, and let $g : \eta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous. Define*

$$\log f_t(v) = \log \rho_K(v) + tg(v) \quad \text{for } v \in \eta$$

and let $\langle f_t \rangle$ be the convexification associated with (C, η, f_t) . Then

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_{C^\circ}} \log \rho_{\langle f_t \rangle^*}(u) \lambda(du) \Big|_{t=0} = - \int_\eta g(v) \lambda(\langle f_0 \rangle, dv). \quad (14)$$

Proof. We use (4), the dominated convergence theorem, Lemma 8 and Lemma 4 (extending g to Ω_C by putting it equal to 0 outside η), observing that $\langle f_0 \rangle \in \text{psi}(C)$ and the image of $\alpha_{\langle f_0 \rangle}^*$ is contained in η . In this way, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_{C^\circ}} \log \rho_{\langle f_t \rangle^*}(u) \lambda(du) \right|_{t=0} &= - \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \int_{\Omega_{C^\circ}} \frac{\log \bar{h}_{\langle f_t \rangle}(u) - \log \bar{h}_{\langle f_0 \rangle}(u)}{t} \lambda(du) \\ &= - \int_{\Omega_{C^\circ}} g(\alpha_{\langle f_0 \rangle}^*) \lambda(du) \\ &= - \int_{\eta} g(v) \lambda(\langle f_0 \rangle, dv) \end{aligned}$$

and thus the assertion. \square

Since $\rho_{K^*} = \bar{h}_K^{-1}$ by (4), we can write (14) also in the form

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_{C^\circ}} \log \bar{h}_{\langle f_t \rangle}(u) \lambda(du) \right|_{t=0} = \int_{\eta} g(v) \lambda(\langle f_0 \rangle, dv). \quad (15)$$

These lemmas serve as a preparation for deriving a variational formula for a useful functional. For a finite Borel measure μ and the Lebesgue measure λ on the sphere \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , Oliker [9] introduced the functional

$$K \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \log \rho_K d\mu - \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \log h_K d\lambda$$

for convex bodies K containing the origin in the interior. In [4], this functional was extended to more general measures λ and to functions as arguments. We adapt this definition here to pseudo-cones.

Definition 1. *Let λ be a non-zero, finite measure on the Lebesgue measurable subsets of Ω_{C° which vanishes on Borel sets of Hausdorff dimension $n - 2$. Let $\eta \subset \Omega_C$ be nonempty and compact, let $\mathcal{C}^+(\eta)$ be the space of positive continuous functions on η , equipped with the maximum norm, and let μ be a non-zero finite Borel measure on η . Then define*

$$\Phi_{\mu, \lambda, \eta}(f) := \frac{1}{\mu(\eta)} \int_{\eta} \log f(v) \mu(dv) - \frac{1}{|\lambda|} \int_{\Omega_{C^\circ}} \log \bar{h}_{\langle f \rangle}(u) \lambda(du)$$

for $f \in \mathcal{C}^+(\eta)$, where $|\lambda| := \lambda(\Omega_{C^\circ})$.

The functional $\Phi_{\mu, \lambda, \eta}$ is positively homogeneous of degree zero, as follows from $\bar{h}_{\langle af \rangle} = \bar{h}_{\langle f \rangle} = a \bar{h}_{\langle f \rangle}$ for $a > 0$, and continuous, by Lemma 2.

Lemma 10. *Let $\eta \subset \Omega_C$ be nonempty and compact. Let $K \in \text{ps}(C)$, and let $g : \eta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous. Define f_t by*

$$\log f_t(v) = \log \rho_K(v) + tg(v) \quad \text{for } v \in \eta$$

for $|t| \leq \delta$, for some $\delta > 0$. Then

$$\left. \frac{d}{dt} \Phi_{\mu, \lambda, \eta}(f_t) \right|_{t=0} = \frac{1}{\mu(\eta)} \int_{\eta} g(v) \mu(dv) - \frac{1}{|\lambda|} \int_{\eta} g(v) \lambda(\langle f_0 \rangle, dv).$$

Proof. We have

$$\int_{\eta} \log f_t(v) \mu(dv) = \int_{\eta} (\log \rho_K + tg)(v) \mu(dv),$$

hence

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\eta} \log f_t(v) \mu(dv) = \int_{\eta} g(v) \mu(dv).$$

Together with (15) this gives the assertion. \square

5 Proof of existence

We assume that λ, η, μ are as in Definition 1.

Lemma 11. *There exists $K_0 \in ps(C)$ such that*

$$\Phi_{\mu, \lambda, \eta}(\rho_{K_0} |_{\eta}) \leq \Phi_{\mu, \lambda, \eta}(\rho_K |_{\eta}) \quad \text{for all } K \in ps(C).$$

Proof. Let $(K_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of pseudo-cones satisfying

$$\Phi_{\mu, \lambda, \eta}(\rho_{K_j} |_{\eta}) \rightarrow \inf_{K \in ps(C)} \Phi_{\mu, \lambda, \eta}(\rho_K |_{\eta})$$

(note that $\Phi_{\mu, \lambda, \eta} > 0$). Since $\Phi_{\mu, \lambda, \eta}$ is homogeneous of degree zero, we can assume that each K_j has distance 1 from the origin. By Lemma 1 in [13], the sequence $(K_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a subsequence converging to a C -pseudo-cone $K_0 \in ps(C)$. The continuity of $\Phi_{\mu, \lambda, \eta}$ now gives the assertion. \square

From this, we can deduce the following.

Lemma 12. *With λ, η, μ as given above, there exists $K \in \mathcal{K}^*(C, \eta)$, having distance 1 from the origin, such that*

$$\mu = \frac{\mu(\eta)}{|\lambda|} \lambda(K, \cdot).$$

Proof. First, let $f \in \mathcal{C}^+(\eta)$. We have $f \geq \rho_{\langle f \rangle} |_{\eta}$ by (7), moreover $\langle \rho_{\langle f \rangle} |_{\eta} \rangle = \langle f \rangle$, hence $\bar{h}_{\langle \rho_{\langle f \rangle} |_{\eta} \rangle} = \bar{h}_{\langle f \rangle}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\mu, \lambda, \eta}(f) &= \frac{1}{\mu(\eta)} \int_{\eta} \log f(v) \mu(dv) - \frac{1}{|\lambda|} \int_{\Omega_{C^\circ}} \log \bar{h}_{\langle f \rangle}(u) \lambda(du) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\mu(\eta)} \int_{\eta} \log \rho_{\langle f \rangle} |_{\eta}(v) \mu(dv) - \frac{1}{|\lambda|} \int_{\Omega_{C^\circ}} \log \bar{h}_{\langle \rho_{\langle f \rangle} |_{\eta} \rangle}(u) \lambda(du) \\ &= \Phi_{\mu, \lambda, \eta}(\rho_{\langle f \rangle} |_{\eta}) \\ &\geq \Phi_{\mu, \lambda, \eta}(\rho_{K_0} |_{\eta}), \end{aligned}$$

if K_0 is the pseudo-cone provided by Lemma 11. Let g be a continuous function on η , and define f_t by

$$\log f_t(v) = \log \rho_{K_0}(v) + tg(v) \quad \text{for } v \in \eta.$$

Then the function $t \mapsto \Phi_{\mu, \lambda, \eta}(f_t)$ attains a minimum at $t = 0$. Therefore, it follows from Lemma 10 that

$$\frac{1}{\mu(\eta)} \int_{\eta} g(v) \mu(dv) - \frac{1}{|\lambda|} \int_{\eta} g(v) \lambda(\langle f_0 \rangle, dv) = 0.$$

Since this holds for all continuous functions g on η , we can conclude that

$$\mu = \frac{\mu(\eta)}{|\lambda|} \lambda(K, \cdot) \tag{16}$$

with $K := \langle f_0 \rangle = \langle \rho_{K_0} |_{\eta} \rangle$ (note that K depends on λ, η, μ). Since $\lambda(K, \cdot)$ is invariant under dilatations of K , we can assume that K has distance 1 from the origin. \square

Now we can prove our main result.

Proof of Theorem 1

Let λ and μ be as in Theorem 1. That the condition $\lambda(\Omega_{C^\circ}) = \mu(\Omega_C)$ is necessary, is clear. Now we assume that this condition is satisfied.

We choose a sequence $(\eta_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of compact sets $\eta_j \subset \Omega_C$ such that

$$\mu(\eta_1) > 0, \quad \eta_j \subset \eta_{j+1} \text{ for } j \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_j = \Omega_C.$$

Define the measure $\mu_j = \mu \llcorner \eta_j$, that is,

$$\mu_j(\beta) = \mu(\beta \cap \eta_j) \quad \text{for Borel sets } \beta \subset \Omega_C.$$

By Lemma 12, to each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $K_j \in \mathcal{K}^*(C, \eta_j) \subset ps(C)$, having distance 1 from the origin, such that

$$\mu_j = \frac{\mu(\eta_j)}{|\lambda|} \lambda(K_j, \cdot).$$

By Lemma 1 of [13], the sequence $(K_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a subsequence that converges to a C -pseudo-cone K . After changing the numbering, we may assume that $K_j \rightarrow K$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

Fix a number $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For a Borel set $\beta \subseteq \eta_k$ and for $j \geq k$ we have

$$\mu(\beta) = \mu_j(\beta) = \frac{\mu(\eta_j)}{|\lambda|} \lambda(K_j, \beta).$$

Thus, the restrictions to η_k satisfy

$$\frac{|\lambda|}{\mu(\eta_j)} \mu \llcorner \eta_k = \lambda(K_j, \cdot) \llcorner \eta_k.$$

As $j \rightarrow \infty$, we have $|\lambda|/\mu(\eta_j) \rightarrow 1$ and

$$\lambda(K_j, \cdot) \llcorner \eta_k \xrightarrow{w} \lambda(K, \cdot) \llcorner \eta_k,$$

as follows from Lemma 5. Thus for any Borel set $\beta \subseteq \eta_k$ we have $\mu(\beta) = \lambda(K, \beta)$. Since $k \in \mathbb{N}$ was arbitrary and $\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \eta_k = \Omega_C$, we conclude that $\mu = \lambda(K, \cdot)$. \square

According to (11), we can write the result also in the form

$$\mu = (\alpha_K^*)\#\lambda.$$

If λ is spherical Lebesgue measure, Theorem 1 concerns Aleksandrov's integral curvature. For measures μ with compact support, such a result was already obtained in [7, Thm. 8.3].

6 A uniqueness result

The uniqueness result provided by Lemma 3.8 of [4] can be carried over to pseudo-cones, under suitable assumptions. Originally, in the case of Aleksandrov's integral curvature, the approach is due to Aleksandrov [2]; see also Busemann [5, p. 30]. Aleksandrov's argument has repeatedly been adapted to other situations, so we claim no originality when we now carry over the proof of Lemma 3.8 in [4] from convex bodies to C -pseudo-cones. We just want to point out the necessary changes. We have to assume that the considered C -pseudo-cones are *restricted*, in the sense that all their outer unit normal vectors belong to Ω_{C° . This excludes all C -pseudo-cones K meeting the boundary of C , as well as, for example, the pseudo-cones $C + K$ with a convex body $K \subset \text{int } C$.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that the measures λ and μ are as in Theorem 1, and that λ is positive on nonempty open sets in Ω_{C° . If $K, L \in ps(C)$ are restricted pseudo-cones with $\lambda(K, \cdot) = \lambda(L, \cdot)$, then K is a dilate of L .*

Proof. Suppose that $K, L \in ps(C)$ are restricted and satisfy $\lambda(K, \cdot) = \lambda(L, \cdot)$. We assume that there exist a dilate K' of K and a vector $v_0 \in \Omega_C$ such that $y_0 := r_{K'}(v_0) = r_L(v_0)$ and such that K' and L have unique supporting hyperplanes at y_0 , which are different. As in [4], it suffices to show that this leads to a contradiction.

We change the definitions of [4] as follows. We set

$$\eta' = \{v \in \Omega_C : \rho_{K'}(v) < \rho_L(v)\},$$

$$\eta = \{v \in \Omega_C : \rho_{K'}(v) > \rho_L(v)\},$$

$$\eta_0 = \{v \in \Omega_C : \rho_{K'}(v) = \rho_L(v)\},$$

so that $\Omega_C = \eta' \cup \eta \cup \eta_0$ is a disjoint decomposition. Also the subsequent argument must be changed a bit. Let $v \in \eta'$, and let H_L be a supporting hyperplane of L at $r_L(v)$. Since the normal vector of H_L belongs to Ω_{C° , the pseudo-cone K' has a parallel supporting hyperplane $H_{K'}$, at some point $r_{K'}(v')$ with $v' \in \Omega_C$. Then $H_{K'}$ is closer to o than H_L , since otherwise the half-open segment $[o, r_L(v))$ would not contain a point of K' , which would mean that $v \notin \eta'$, a contradiction. Since $H_{K'}$ is closer to o than H_L and $r_{K'}(v') \in H_{K'}$, we have $r_{K'}(v') < r_L(v')$ and thus $v' \in \eta'$. We have proved that

$$\alpha_L(\eta') \subseteq \alpha_{K'}(\eta') = \alpha_K(\eta') \tag{17}$$

As in [4], one shows that the sets $\eta \cup \eta_0$ and $\eta' \cup \eta_0$ are closed in Ω_C and hence that $\Omega_{C^\circ} \setminus \alpha_{K'}(\eta \cup \eta_0)$ and $\Omega_{C^\circ} \setminus \alpha_L(\eta' \cup \eta_0)$ are open. Further,

$$\Omega_{C^\circ} \setminus \alpha_{K'}(\eta \cup \eta_0) \subset \alpha_{K'}(\eta')$$

and

$$(\Omega_{C^\circ} \setminus \alpha_L(\eta' \cup \eta_0)) \cap \alpha_L(\eta') = \emptyset.$$

The set

$$\beta := (\Omega_{C^\circ} \setminus \alpha_{K'}(\eta \cup \eta_0)) \cap (\Omega_{C^\circ} \setminus \alpha_L(\eta' \cup \eta_0))$$

is open and

$$\beta \cap \alpha_L(\eta') = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \beta \subset \alpha_{K'}(\eta'). \quad (18)$$

As in [4], one obtains that β is not empty, hence $\lambda(\beta) > 0$. From (17) and (18) we have

$$\alpha_L(\eta') = \alpha_L(\eta' \setminus \beta) \subset \alpha_{K'}(\eta') \setminus \beta$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(L, \eta') = \lambda(\alpha_L(\eta')) &\leq \lambda(\alpha_{K'}(\eta') \setminus \beta) \\ &< \lambda(\alpha_{K'}(\eta') \setminus \beta) + \lambda(\beta) = \lambda(\alpha_{K'}(\eta')) = \lambda(K, \eta'), \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. □

References

- [1] Aleksandrov, A.D., An application of the theorem of the invariance of domain to existence proofs. (in Russian) *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.* **3** (1939), 99–102.
- [2] Aleksandrov, A.D., Existence and uniqueness of a convex surface with a given integral curvature. *C. R. (Doklady) Acad. Sci. URSS (N. S.)* **35** (1942), 131–134.
- [3] Bertrand, J., Prescription of Gauss curvature using optimal mass transport. *Geom. Dedicata* **183** (2016), 81–99.
- [4] Böröczky, K.J., Lutwak, E., Yang, D., Zhang, G., Zhao, Y., The Gauss image problem. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.* **73** (2020), 1406–1452.
- [5] Busemann, H., *Convex Surfaces*. Interscience Publ., New York, 1958.
- [6] Huang, Y., Lutwak, E., Yang, D., Zhang, G., Geometric measures in the dual Brunn–Minkowski theory and their associated Minkowski problems. *Acta Math.* **216** (2016), 325–388.
- [7] Li, N., Ye, D., Zhu, B., The dual Minkowski problem for unbounded closed convex sets. *Math. Ann.* **388** (2024), 2001–2039.
- [8] McCann, R.J., Existence and uniqueness of monotone measure-preserving maps. *Duke Math. J.* **80**(2) (1995), 309–323.

- [9] Oliker, V., Embedding \mathbb{S}^n into \mathbb{R}^{n+1} with given integral Gauss curvature and optimal mass transport in \mathbb{S}^n . *Adv. Math.* **213** (2007), 600–620.
- [10] Schneider, R., *Convex Bodies: The Brunn–Minkowski Theory*. 2nd edn., Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications, vol. **151**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014.
- [11] Schneider, R., A Brunn–Minkowski theory for coconvex sets of finite volume. *Adv. Math.* **332** (2018), 199–234.
- [12] Schneider, R., Minkowski type theorems for convex sets in cones. *Acta Math. Hungar.* **164** (2021), 282–295.
- [13] Schneider, R., Pseudo-cones. *Adv. in Appl. Math.* **155** (2024), Paper No. 102657, 22pp.
- [14] Schneider, R., A weighted Minkowski theorem for pseudo-cones. *Adv. Math.* **450** (2024), Paper No. 109760, 26pp.
- [15] Semenov, V., The Gauss image problem with weak Aleksandrov condition. *J. Funct. Anal.* **287** (2024), Paper No. 110611, 35pp.
- [16] Semenov, V., The discrete Gauss image problem. arXiv:2210.16974
- [17] Semenov, V., The uniqueness of the Gauss image measures. arXiv:2305.01779
- [18] Xu, Y., Li, J., Leng, G., Dualities and endomorphisms of pseudo-cones. *Adv. in Appl. Math.* **142** (2023), Paper No. 102434, 31pp.

Author’s address:

Rolf Schneider
 Mathematisches Institut, Albert–Ludwigs-Universität
 D-79104 Freiburg i. Br., Germany
 E-mail: rolf.schneider@math.uni-freiburg.de