

# THE JOHN INCLUSION FOR LOG-CONCAVE FUNCTIONS

GRIGORY IVANOV

ABSTRACT. John's inclusion states that a convex body in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  can be covered by the  $d$ -dilation of its maximal volume ellipsoid. We obtain a certain John-type inclusion for log-concave functions. As a byproduct of our approach, we establish the following asymptotically tight inequality: For any log-concave function  $f$  with finite, positive integral, there exist a positive definite matrix  $A$ , a point  $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and a positive constant  $\alpha$  such that

$$\chi_{\mathbf{B}^d}(x) \leq \alpha f(A(x-a)) \leq \sqrt{d+1} \cdot e^{-\frac{|x|}{d+2} + (d+1)},$$

where  $\chi_{\mathbf{B}^d}$  is the indicator function of the unit ball  $\mathbf{B}^d$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The maximal volume ellipsoid contained within a given convex body, called the *John ellipsoid*, is fundamental in modern convexity and asymptotic geometric analysis. Fritz John, in his seminal paper [Joh14], derived the following property of the maximal volume ellipsoid, sometimes referred to as the *weak John theorem* [AAGM15] or *John's inclusion* :

**Proposition 1.1.** *Let  $K$  be a convex body in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  whose John's ellipsoid is the unit ball  $\mathbf{B}^d$ . Then the following inclusion holds:*

$$(1) \quad \mathbf{B}^d \subset K \subset d \cdot \mathbf{B}^d.$$

Recently, the notion of the John ellipsoid has been extended to the setting of logarithmically concave functions [AGMJV18, IN22, IN23]. The generalization is rather straightforward. Instead of convex bodies, one considers upper semi-continuous log-concave functions of finite and positive integral, which will be called *proper* log-concave functions. The set of ellipsoids is the set of "affine positions" of the unit ball  $\mathbf{B}^d$ . In the functional setting, one considers the *positions* of a given function  $g$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , defined as

$$\mathcal{E}[g] = \left\{ \alpha g(Ax + a) : A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \text{ non-singular, } \alpha > 0, a \in \mathbb{R}^d \right\}.$$

Instead of set inclusions, one compares functions pointwise:

We say that a function  $f_1$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is *below* another function  $f_2$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (or that  $f_2$  is *above*  $f_1$ ) and denote it as  $f_1 \leq f_2$  if  $f_1$  is pointwise less than or equal to  $f_2$ , that is,  $f_1(x) \leq f_2(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

We say that any solution to the problem:

**Functional John problem:** Find

$$(2) \quad \max_{g \in \mathcal{E}[w]} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g \quad \text{subject to} \quad g \leq f,$$

is the *John function of  $f$  with respect to a given function  $w$* .

The only remaining issue is to choose which function  $w$  should be considered as the analogue of the unit ball. Following [IN22], we will mostly use the *height function* of  $\mathbf{B}^{d+1}$ , defined as

$$\hbar(x) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{1 - |x|^2}, & \text{if } x \in \mathbf{B}^d, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 52A23 (primary), 52A40, 46T12.

*Key words and phrases.* log-concave function, John ellipsoid, Löwner ellipsoid.

The author is supported by Projeto Paz and by CAPES (Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior) - Brasil, grant number 23038.015548/2016-06.

as  $w$  in (2).

Even though many properties of solutions to (2) for various choices of  $w$  have been understood, there has been no analogue of John's inclusion in the functional setting. Our goal is to correct this oversight.

We believe that the root of the issue lies in the hidden polar duality in (1). We will elaborate on this in the next section.

Recall that the polar  $K^\circ$  of a set  $K$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is defined by

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

Using the notion of polarity, one can re-write John's inclusion (1) in the following equivalent form:

$$(3) \quad \mathbf{B}^d \subset K \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\mathbf{B}^d}{d} \subset K^\circ.$$

Interestingly, this form can be easily translated to the functional setting.

Recall that the *polar function*  $f^\circ$  of a given non-negative function  $f$  is defined as

$$f^\circ(p) = \inf_{\{x: f(x) > 0\}} \frac{e^{-\langle p, x \rangle}}{f(x)}.$$

The main result of this paper is the following John-type inclusion in the functional setting:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Assume a proper log-concave function  $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  is in a position such that  $\tilde{h}$  is the John function of  $f$  with respect to  $\tilde{h}$ . Then*

$$\tilde{h} \leq f \quad \text{and} \quad e^{-(d+1)} \cdot \tilde{h} \circ [(d+1) \text{Id}_d] \leq f^\circ,$$

where  $\text{Id}_d$  is the identity on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

One of the most basic inequalities related to log-concave functions states that a proper log-concave function is above some position of the indicator function of the unit ball and is below a position of the function  $e^{-|x|}$ . As a byproduct of our method, we establish the following asymptotically optimal version of this basic inequality:

**Lemma 1.1.** *Let  $f$  be a proper log-concave function on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . There exist a positive definite matrix  $A$ , a point  $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and a positive constant  $\alpha$  such that*

$$\chi_{\mathbf{B}^d}(x) \leq \alpha f(A(x-a)) \leq \sqrt{d+1} \cdot e^{-\frac{|x|}{d+2} + (d+1)}.$$

A dual construction to the John ellipsoid is the so-called Löwner ellipsoid, which is the minimal volume ellipsoid containing a given convex body. In the classical setting, the two ellipsoids are related by polar duality — the unit ball  $\mathbf{B}^d$  is the John ellipsoid of  $K$  if and only if  $\mathbf{B}^d$  is the Löwner ellipsoid of  $K^\circ$ . This polarity property directly yields an inclusion for the Löwner ellipsoid similar to that of Proposition 1.1.

The notion of the Löwner ellipsoid can be extended to the setting of log-concave functions as well (see [LSW19, IT21, IN23]). However, we will show in Section 6 that there is no Löwner-type inclusion for reasonable candidates for a Löwner function.

**1.1. Notations.** The standard Euclidean unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is denoted by  $\mathbf{B}^d$ . We identify the space  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with the subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  consisting of vectors whose last coordinate vanishes. We use  $[n]$  to denote  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  for a natural  $n$ . The support  $\text{supp } f$  of a non-negative function  $f$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is the set on which the function is positive:

$$\text{supp } f = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : f(x) > 0\}.$$

The supremum norm of a bounded function  $f$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is denoted by  $\|f\|_\infty$ .

## 2. JOHN'S ELLIPSOID AND JOHN'S FUNCTION

In this section, we recall several useful properties of the John ellipsoid and John functions.

**2.1. John ellipsoid and Duality.** Proposition 1.1 follows from Fritz John’s characterization [Joh14, Bal92] of the maximal volume ellipsoid within a convex body:

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $K$  be a convex body in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  containing the unit ball  $\mathbf{B}^d$ . Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\mathbf{B}^d$  is the John ellipsoid of  $K$ .
- (2) There are points  $u_1, \dots, u_m$  on the boundaries of  $\mathbf{B}^d$  and  $K$ , and positive weights  $c_1, \dots, c_m$  such that

$$(4) \quad \sum_{i \in [m]} c_i u_i \otimes u_i = \text{Id}_d \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i \in [m]} c_i u_i = 0.$$

We believe the core issue in obtaining a John-type inclusion in the functional setting lies in the usual identification of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and its dual space  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^*$ . Looking at John’s condition (4), the operator  $u_i \otimes u_i$  can be written as  $u_i u_i^T$ . Formally,  $u_i^T$  is a functional in the dual space  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^*$ . Also, the polar set  $K^\circ$  is a subset of the dual space, defined this way in Banach space theory. Moreover, by examining the proof of Proposition 1.1 (which is even more transparent in more general settings of criteria for the maximal volume position of one convex body inside another [GLM<sup>+</sup>04, Theorem 3.8]), one sees that instead of the inclusion (1), one obtains the equivalent inclusion (3).

We now turn to an explanation on the functional side of the story.

**2.2. John’s inclusion for functions and Duality.** The main problem is that a direct “translation” of John’s inclusion (1) to the functional setting makes no sense. Indeed, it is easy to see that the class of functions  $w$  for which the family  $\{g \in \mathcal{E}[w] : g \leq f\}$  is nonempty for any proper log-concave function  $f$  must consist of functions with bounded support. Hence, all considered functional analogues of the unit ball are of bounded support. But then, for a strictly positive log-concave function  $f$  (for instance, the standard Gaussian density), there is no position of  $w$  above  $f$ . Thus, to obtain an analogue of Proposition 1.1, one must either relax the inclusion (e.g., by cutting off the “tails” of the functions) or, equivalently, re-formulate it in a way that can be translated into the functional setting. We adopt the latter approach via polar duality.

**2.3. John functions.** We refer to a solution to Functional John problem (2) for any proper log-concave function  $f$  with respect to  $\hbar$  as the *John function* of  $f$ . Theorem 4.1 of [IN22] essentially shows that the John function of any proper log-concave function  $f$  exists and is unique. Furthermore, in [IN22, Theorem 5.1] it is shown that the following John-type characterization holds:

**Definition 2.1** (John’s decomposition of the identity for functions). We say that points  $u_1, \dots, u_m \in \mathbf{B}^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and positive weights  $c_1, \dots, c_m$  form the *John decomposition of the identity for functions* if they satisfy the identities:

- (1)  $\sum_{i \in [m]} c_i u_i \otimes u_i = \text{Id}_d$ ;
- (2)  $\sum_{i \in [m]} c_i \hbar(u_i) \hbar(u_i) = 1$ ;
- (3)  $\sum_{i \in [m]} c_i u_i = 0$ .

**Proposition 2.2.** *Let  $f$  be a proper log-concave function on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\hbar \leq f$ . Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\hbar$  is the John function of  $f$ .
- (2) There is a John decomposition of the identity for functions, given by points  $u_1, \dots, u_m \in \mathbf{B}^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and positive weights  $c_1, \dots, c_m$ , such that  $u_1, \dots, u_m$  are “contact” points. In other words, for each  $i \in [m]$ , either  $f(u_i) = \hbar(u_i)$  or  $u_i$  is a unit vector from the boundary of  $\text{supp } f$ .

We also bounded [IN22, Lemma 4.5] the supremum norm of the John function of  $f$ :

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $f$  be a proper log-concave function on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\hbar$  is its John function. Then*

$$\|f\|_\infty \leq e^d.$$

Interestingly, as we will show, the bound  $e^d$  cannot be attained for the John function, yet it is optimal in the case  $w$  is the indicator function of the unit ball (see [AGMJV18]).

In view of a more general result [IN23], we state a broader claim, whose proof we will sketch in Appendix A because it closely follows the arguments from [AGMJV18, Theorem 1.1]:

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $f, w: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be two proper log-concave functions such that the support of  $w$  is bounded. Then there is a solution  $\tilde{g}$  to Functional John problem (2) and  $\tilde{g}$  satisfies*

$$\|\tilde{g}\|_\infty \leq \|f\|_\infty \leq e^d \|\tilde{g}\|_\infty.$$

### 3. INEQUALITIES FOR “SUPPORTING” CONDITIONS

The main observation in the proof of Proposition 1.1 is the following “supporting” inclusion:

*Assume  $\mathbf{B}^d$  is a subset of a convex set  $K$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and let the unit vector  $u$  lie on the boundary of  $K$ . Then  $K$  is contained in the half-space*

$$H_u^\leq = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle u, x \rangle \leq 1\}.$$

In this section, we discuss an extension of this result to log-concave functions and derive some basic corollaries.

The following proposition follows immediately from the supporting condition for the corresponding convex functions and was formally proven in [IN22, Lemma 3.1]:

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $\psi_1$  and  $\psi_2$  be convex functions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and set  $f_1 = e^{-\psi_1}$  and  $f_2 = e^{-\psi_2}$ . Suppose  $f_2 \leq f_1$  and  $f_1(x_0) = f_2(x_0) > 0$  at some point  $x_0$  in the interior of the domain of  $\psi_2$ . Assume that  $\psi_2$  is differentiable at  $x_0$ . Then  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  are differentiable at  $x_0$ ,  $\nabla f_1(x_0) = \nabla f_2(x_0)$ , and*

$$f_1(x) \leq f_2(x_0) \exp(-\langle \nabla \psi_2(x_0), x - x_0 \rangle)$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ .

For each  $u \in \mathbf{B}^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , define a function  $\ell_u: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$  by

$$\ell_u(x) = \hbar(u) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\hbar^2(u)} \langle u, x - u \rangle\right)$$

if  $|u| < 1$ ; and by

$$\ell_u(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \langle x, u \rangle \geq 1, \\ +\infty, & \langle x, u \rangle < 1, \end{cases}$$

if  $|u| = 1$ .

As a corollary of Proposition 3.1, we get:

**Corollary 3.1.** *Let  $g$  be a log-concave function on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $g \geq \hbar$ , and let  $u$  be a vector from  $\mathbf{B}^d$  with  $g(u) = \hbar(u)$ . Then  $g \leq \ell_u$ .*

This observation is the key technical tool in our proof of Theorem 1.1.

**3.1. The origin yields almost everything.** We will often use the following direct corollary of the definition of the polar function:

**Claim 3.1.** *Assume a bounded, non-negative function  $g: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  takes at least one positive value. Then*

$$g^\circ(0) = \frac{1}{\|g\|_\infty}.$$

Define  $\zeta: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  by  $\zeta(t) = t^{-t}$  on  $(0, 1]$  and  $\zeta(0) = 1$ .

**Claim 3.2.** *The function  $\zeta$  is continuous and log-concave on  $[0, 1]$ , and it attains its minimum, equal to 1, only at 0 and 1.*

*Proof.* By routine calculus, the second derivative of  $t \ln t$  on  $(0, 1]$  is  $\frac{1}{t}$ , so  $\zeta$  is log-concave on  $(0, 1]$ . Clearly,  $\zeta(t) > 1$  for all  $t \in (0, 1]$ . Moreover,  $\zeta(t)$  converges monotonically to 1 as  $t \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

For a subset  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , we denote by  $\chi_S$  the indicator function of  $S$ , that is,

$$\chi_S(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in S, \\ 0, & x \notin S. \end{cases}$$

**Claim 3.3.** *For a vector  $u \in \mathbf{B}^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $|u| < 1$ , we have*

$$(\ell_u)^\circ = \frac{1}{\bar{h}(u)} \exp\left(-\frac{|u|^2}{\bar{h}^2(u)}\right) \chi_{\frac{u}{\bar{h}^2(u)}}.$$

*Proof.* If  $u = 0$ , then  $(\ell_u)^\circ = \chi_u$ . If  $u \neq 0$ , it follows from the definition of the polar function that

$$(\ell_u)^\circ(p) = \frac{1}{\bar{h}(u)} \exp\left(-\frac{|u|^2}{\bar{h}^2(u)}\right) \cdot \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \exp\left(-\left\langle x, p - \frac{u}{\bar{h}^2(u)} \right\rangle\right).$$

Clearly, the above infimum is zero unless  $p = \frac{u}{\bar{h}^2(u)}$ , in which case it equals 1. This completes the proof of [Claim 3.3](#).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.1.** *Assume a bounded, non-negative function  $g: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  satisfies  $\|g\|_\infty \geq 1$  and  $g \leq \ell_u$  for some  $u \in \mathbf{B}^d$  with  $0 < |u| < 1$ . Then*

$$(5) \quad g^\circ(u) \geq \frac{g^\circ(0)}{e}.$$

*Proof.* By [Claim 3.1](#) and since  $g$  is bounded,  $0 < g^\circ(0) \leq 1$ . Since  $g \leq \ell_u$ , we have  $g^\circ \geq (\ell_u)^\circ$ . By log-concavity,

$$g^\circ\left(t \frac{u}{|u|}\right) \geq \left((\ell_u)^\circ\left(\frac{u}{\bar{h}^2(u)}\right)\right)^{\frac{\bar{h}^2(u)}{|u|} t} (g^\circ(0))^{1 - \frac{\bar{h}^2(u)}{|u|} t}$$

for all  $t \in \left[0, \frac{|u|}{\bar{h}^2(u)}\right]$ . By [Claim 3.3](#),

$$g^\circ\left(t \frac{u}{|u|}\right) \geq (\bar{h}(u))^{-\frac{\bar{h}^2(u)}{|u|} t} \cdot (g^\circ(0))^{1 - \frac{\bar{h}^2(u)}{|u|} t} \cdot e^{-|u| t}$$

for all  $t \in \left[0, \frac{|u|}{\bar{h}^2(u)}\right]$ . Choosing  $t = |u|$  (note  $|u| \leq \frac{|u|}{\bar{h}^2(u)}$ ), we obtain

$$g^\circ(u) \geq (\bar{h}(u))^{-\bar{h}^2(u)} (g^\circ(0))^{1 - \bar{h}^2(u)} \cdot e^{-|u|^2}.$$

Next, by [Claim 3.2](#),

$$(\bar{h}(u))^{-\bar{h}^2(u)} = \sqrt{(\bar{h}^2(u))^{-\bar{h}^2(u)}} > 1.$$

Combining this with  $|u| < 1$ , we get

$$g^\circ(u) \geq (g^\circ(0))^{1-h^2(u)} \cdot e^{-1}.$$

By [Claim 3.1](#),  $g^\circ(0) \leq 1$ , so

$$g^\circ(0)^{1-h^2(u)} \geq g^\circ(0).$$

Hence (5) follows. □

#### 4. PROPERTIES OF DECOMPOSITIONS OF THE IDENTITY

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let vectors  $u_1, \dots, u_m \in \mathbf{B}^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and positive weights  $c_1, \dots, c_m$  satisfy*

$$\sum_{i \in [m]} c_i u_i \otimes u_i = \text{Id}_d \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i \in [m]} c_i u_i = 0.$$

*Denote by  $K$  the convex hull of  $u_1, \dots, u_m$ . Then*

$$\mathbf{B}^d \subset \sum_{i \in [m]} c_i \cdot K.$$

*Proof.* Since  $u_1, \dots, u_m \in \mathbf{B}^d$ , we know

$$(6) \quad |x| \geq \max_{i \in [m]} \langle x, u_i \rangle \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Hence,

$$-x = -\text{Id}_d(x) = -\sum_{i \in [m]} c_i \langle u_i, x \rangle u_i \stackrel{(*)}{=} |x| \sum_{i \in [m]} c_i u_i - \sum_{i \in [m]} c_i \langle u_i, x \rangle u_i = \sum_{i \in [m]} c_i (|x| - \langle u_i, x \rangle) u_i,$$

where in  $(*)$  we used  $\sum_{i \in [m]} c_i u_i = 0$ .

By (6),  $|x| - \langle u_i, x \rangle$  is nonnegative for every  $i \in [m]$ . Thus,

$$-x \in \sum_{i \in [m]} c_i (|x| - \langle u_i, x \rangle) K = \left( \sum_{i \in [m]} c_i \right) |x| K - \left( \left\langle \sum_{i \in [m]} c_i u_i, x \right\rangle \right) K.$$

Using the identities  $\sum_{i \in [m]} c_i u_i = 0$  and denoting  $C_{\text{tr}} = \sum_{i \in [m]} c_i$ , we get

$$-x \in C_{\text{tr}} |x| K.$$

In particular, if  $|x| \leq 1$  (that is,  $-x \in \mathbf{B}^d$ ), it follows that  $-x \in C_{\text{tr}} K$ . The lemma now follows. □

**Remark 4.1.** It is not hard to obtain a better bound in [Lemma 4.1](#) if  $\sum_{i \in [m]} c_i \geq d + 1$ . Using

[Proposition 1.1](#) in  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  and a straightforward “lift” of  $u_1, \dots, u_m$  sending  $u_i$  to the two vectors  $(u_i, \pm h(u_i))$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ , one can derive

$$\frac{\mathbf{B}^d}{d+1} \subset K.$$

**Corollary 4.1.** *Assume vectors  $u_1, \dots, u_m \in \mathbf{B}^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and positive weights  $c_1, \dots, c_m$  form a John decomposition of the identity for functions. Then  $\sum_{i \in [m]} c_i = d + 1$  and the convex hull  $K$*

*of  $u_1, \dots, u_m$  contains the ball  $\frac{\mathbf{B}^d}{d+1}$ .*

*Proof.* Taking traces in the first equation from the definition of a John decomposition of the identity for functions and adding the second, we conclude  $\sum_{i \in [m]} c_i = d + 1$ . Then, by [Lemma 4.1](#),

$K$  contains the ball  $\frac{\mathbf{B}^d}{d+1}$ . □

**4.1. Reduction to everywhere positive functions.** There are some technical difficulties in the case of “contact” at the boundary of the unit ball. There are several ways to circumvent these; we choose to employ a certain limit argument.

**Definition 4.2.** Assume vectors  $u_1, \dots, u_m \in \mathbf{B}^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and positive weights  $c_1, \dots, c_m$  form the John decomposition of the identity for functions. We call a function  $f$  of the form

$$f = \min_{i \in [m]} \ell_{u_i}$$

a *John bump function*. If all points  $u_1, \dots, u_m$  additionally lie in the interior of the unit ball, we call  $f$  a *regular John bump function*.

**Lemma 4.2.** Fix a point  $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and a positive constant  $\alpha$ . The following assertions are equivalent:

(1) For every proper log-concave function  $f$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\tilde{h}$  as its John function, the inequality

$$\alpha \leq f^\circ(p)$$

holds.

(2) The same inequality

$$\alpha \leq f^\circ(p)$$

holds for every regular John bump function  $f$ .

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.2 and Corollary 3.1, any proper log-concave function  $f$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  for which  $\tilde{h}$  is the John function lies below some John bump function  $\tilde{f}$ . Consequently,  $\tilde{f}$  is a proper log-concave function satisfying  $f^\circ \geq \tilde{f}^\circ$ . Hence, (1) is equivalent to:

“The inequality  $\alpha \leq f^\circ(p)$  holds for every John bump function  $f$ .”

This in turn clearly implies (2). Thus, it suffices to prove (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1).

By standard convex analysis (cf. [RW09, Chapter 7]), it is enough to construct a sequence  $\{f_n\}$  of regular John bump functions hypo-convergent to a given John bump function  $f$ , i.e.,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x_n) \leq f(x) \quad \text{for every } x_n \rightarrow x,$$

and

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x_n) \geq f(x) \quad \text{for some } x_n \rightarrow x.$$

Let us construct such a sequence. Take vectors  $u_1, \dots, u_m$  and weights  $c_1, \dots, c_m$  forming a John decomposition of the identity for functions, so that

$$f = \min_{i \in [m]} \ell_{u_i}.$$

For these vectors  $u_1, \dots, u_m$  and weights  $c_1, \dots, c_m$ , define a set of vectors  $\bar{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  and an associated multi-set of weights  $\tilde{C}$  as follows:

- (1) If  $|u_i| < 1$ , add the vectors  $(u_i, \pm \tilde{h}(u_i)) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  to  $\bar{U}$ , each with weight  $\frac{c_i}{2}$ ;
- (2) If  $|u_i| = 1$ , add the vector  $(u_i, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  to  $\bar{U}$  with weight  $c_i$ .

Since the original vectors and weights form a John decomposition of the identity for functions in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , the vectors in  $\bar{U}$  and weights in  $\tilde{C}$  satisfy the  $(d+1)$ -dimensional version of (4), namely

$$\sum \tilde{c} \bar{u} \otimes \bar{u} = \text{Id}_{d+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum \tilde{c} \bar{u} = 0,$$

where the sums run over  $\bar{u} \in \bar{U}$  and associated weights  $\tilde{c} \in \tilde{C}$ .

A key observation is that these equations are invariant under orthogonal transformations. Let  $H_{d-1}$  be a linear hyperplane in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  avoiding  $\bar{U} \cap \mathbb{R}^d$ . Denote by  $P_d$  the orthogonal projection of  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  onto  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and let  $O_n$  denote the rotation around  $H_{d-1}$  by angle  $\frac{1}{n}$  in a fixed direction. Define

$$U_n = P_d \circ O_n(\bar{U}).$$

For each natural  $n$ , the vectors in  $U_n$  together with the same weights  $\tilde{C}$  form a John decomposition of the identity for functions in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

For sufficiently large  $n$ , all vectors in  $U_n$  lie strictly inside the unit ball  $\mathbf{B}^d$ . Consequently, the functions

$$f_n = \min_{u \in U_n} \ell_u$$

are *regular* John bump functions. By a standard limit argument, they hypo-converge to  $f$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5. INEQUALITIES FOR JOHN'S FUNCTION

**5.1. John's inclusion for log-concave functions.** Theorem 1.1 is a direct consequence of the following:

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $f$  be a proper log-concave function on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\tilde{h}$  is its John function. Then*

$$e^{-(d+1)} \cdot \chi_{\frac{\mathbf{B}^d}{d+1}} \leq f^\circ.$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.2, it suffices to consider the case of a regular John bump function. Thus, assume

$$f = \min_{i \in [m]} \ell_{u_i},$$

where each  $u_i$  lies in the interior of  $\mathbf{B}^d$  and  $c_1, \dots, c_m$  are the associated weights from a John decomposition of the identity for functions.

Since  $\tilde{h} \leq f$ , Proposition 2.3 implies

$$e^{-d} \leq f^\circ(0) \leq 1.$$

Using (5) of Lemma 3.1,

$$f^\circ(u_i) \geq \frac{f^\circ(0)}{e} \geq e^{-(d+1)}.$$

By log-concavity,  $f^\circ$  is at least  $e^{-(d+1)}$  throughout the convex hull  $K$  of the  $u_i$ 's. By Corollary 4.1,  $K$  contains  $\frac{\mathbf{B}^d}{d+1}$ . Hence,  $f^\circ$  remains at least  $e^{-(d+1)}$  on  $\frac{\mathbf{B}^d}{d+1}$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 5.1.  $\square$

Lemma 1.1 follows from Theorem 5.1:

*Proof of Lemma 1.1.* Without loss of generality, place  $f$  so that  $\tilde{h}$  is its John function. By Theorem 5.1, we get

$$\tilde{h} \leq f \leq e^{-\frac{|x|}{d+1} + (d+1)}.$$

Also,  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{d+1}} \chi_{\sqrt{\frac{d}{d+1}} \mathbf{B}^d} \leq \tilde{h}$ . Combining these two inequalities, we see that

$$\tilde{f} = \sqrt{d+1} \cdot f \circ \left[ \sqrt{\frac{d}{d+1}} \text{Id}_d \right]$$

satisfies

$$\chi_{\mathbf{B}^d} \leq \tilde{f} \leq \sqrt{d+1} \cdot e^{-\sqrt{\frac{d}{d+1}} \frac{|x|}{d+1} + (d+1)}.$$

The lemma follows from the elementary inequality

$$\sqrt{\frac{d}{d+1}} \frac{1}{d+1} > \frac{1}{d+2},$$

valid for any natural  $d$ .  $\square$



## 5.2. What is the optimal bound on the height?

**Lemma 5.1.** *There is a positive constant  $\epsilon_d$  such that the following holds: If  $f$  is a proper log-concave function on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $\hbar$  as its John function, then*

$$\|f\|_\infty \leq e^d - \epsilon_d.$$

*Proof.* By [Claim 3.1](#) and by [Lemma 4.2](#), we may restrict to the case of a *regular* John bump function. Hence, suppose

$$f = \min_{i \in [m]} \ell_{u_i},$$

where each  $u_i$  lies strictly inside  $\mathbf{B}^d$ , and  $c_1, \dots, c_m$  are the corresponding weights from a John decomposition of the identity for functions. Denote the convex hull of these  $u_i$ 's by  $K$ .

*Step 1: A bound when a contact point is near the “North pole.”*

We claim that there is a positive constant  $\gamma_d$  such that if  $\hbar(u_i) \geq 1 - \gamma_d$  for some  $i \in [m]$ , then  $\|f\|_\infty \leq e^d - 1$ . Indeed, by monotonicity arguments,  $\max f$  is achieved in  $K^\circ$ . By [Corollary 4.1](#),  $K^\circ \subset (d+1)\mathbf{B}^d$ . The existence of such  $\gamma_d$  follows from continuity.

*Step 2: A lower bound on  $f^\circ(0)$  otherwise.*

Next, assume  $\hbar(u_i) < 1 - \gamma_d$  for all  $i \in [m]$ . By [Claim 3.1](#), it suffices to bound  $f^\circ(0)$  from below. For every  $i \in [m]$ ,

$$f^\circ\left(\frac{u_i}{\hbar^2(u_i)}\right) \geq (\ell_{u_i})^\circ\left(\frac{u_i}{\hbar^2(u_i)}\right) = \frac{1}{\hbar(u_i)} e^{-\frac{|u_i|^2}{\hbar^2(u_i)}}$$

by [Claim 3.3](#). Using first  $\sum_{i=1}^m c_i \hbar^2(u_i) = 1$  and then  $\sum_{i=1}^m c_i u_i = 0$ , we get

$$\prod_{i=1}^m \left( f^\circ\left(\frac{u_i}{\hbar^2(u_i)}\right) \right)^{c_i \hbar^2(u_i)} \leq f^\circ\left(\sum_{i=1}^m c_i u_i\right) = f^\circ(0)$$

by the log-concavity of  $f^\circ$ . Thus,

$$f^\circ(0) \geq \prod_{i=1}^m \left( \frac{1}{\hbar(u_i)} e^{-\frac{|u_i|^2}{\hbar^2(u_i)}} \right)^{c_i \hbar^2(u_i)} = e^{-\sum_{i \in [m]} c_i |u_i|^2} \prod_{i=1}^m \hbar(u_i)^{-c_i \hbar^2(u_i)} = e^{-d} \prod_{i=1}^m \hbar(u_i)^{-c_i \hbar^2(u_i)}.$$

Each factor  $\hbar(u_i)^{-c_i \hbar^2(u_i)}$  is at least one. It remains to show that at least one of these factors is strictly greater than  $1 + \delta_d$  for some  $\delta_d > 0$ . By Carathéodory's theorem [[Car11](#)], we can assume  $m \leq 4d^2$ . Hence there exists some  $j \in [m]$  for which

$$c_j \hbar^2(u_j) \geq \frac{1}{m} \geq \frac{1}{4d^2}.$$

Then

$$\hbar(u_j) \geq \frac{1}{2d} \sqrt{\frac{1}{c_j}} \geq \frac{1}{2d} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\sum_{i \in [m]} c_i}} \geq \frac{1}{4d^2}.$$

This ensures the product above exceeds  $e^{-d}$  by some fixed gap  $\delta_d > 0$ , so that ultimately

$$f^\circ(0) > e^{-d} (1 + \delta_d),$$

hence  $\|f\|_\infty = \frac{1}{f^\circ(0)} < e^d - \epsilon_d$  for some  $\epsilon_d > 0$  depending only on  $d$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.1.** It is not difficult to show that  $c_i \leq 2$  for all  $i \in [m]$ .

## 6. ABSENCE OF LÖWNER'S INCLUSION OR MISBEHAVIOR OF TAILS

We refer the interested reader to [IN23] for a detailed discussion on Löwner functions and their relation to John functions. Below we recall several necessary definitions.

We will say that any solution to the problem:

**Functional Löwner problem:** Find

$$(7) \quad \max_{g \in \mathcal{E}[w]} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g \quad \text{subject to} \quad f \leq g,$$

is the *Löwner function* of  $f$  with respect to a given function  $w$ .

As in the case of Functional John problem (2), the set  $\{g \in \mathcal{E}[w] : f \leq g\}$  can be empty. However, it is not hard to describe the set of functions  $w$  for which it is nonempty — specifically, those whose polar functions have bounded support. In terms of the original function  $w$ , this property characterizes the behavior of the “tails” of  $w$  at infinity. We provide the following equivalent description without proving the equivalence here: there is a position  $g$  of  $w$  such that

$$e^{-|x|} \leq g.$$

Our goal in this section is to show that for a reasonably large class of functions  $w$ , there is no inclusion of the form

$$f \leq L \quad \text{and} \quad f^\circ \leq \alpha \cdot L \circ \frac{\text{Id}_d}{\alpha},$$

where  $L$  is a solution to the Functional Löwner problem (7).

The idea is that the “tails” of a function  $f$  impose multiple restrictions on the set of positions  $\{g \in \mathcal{E}[w] : f \leq g\}$ .

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $L$  be one of the functions  $e^{-|x|^p}$  with  $p \geq 1$ , or  $(\hbar^s)^\circ$  with  $s > 0$ . Define*

$$L_+(x) = \begin{cases} L(x), & \text{if } \langle x, e_1 \rangle \geq 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } \langle x, e_1 \rangle < 0. \end{cases}$$

*Then  $L$  is the unique Löwner function of  $L_+$  with respect to  $L$ . Moreover, the set of positions  $\{g \in \mathcal{E}[L] : (L_+)^\circ \leq L\}$  is empty.*

*Proof.* The emptiness of  $\{g \in \mathcal{E}[L] : (L_+)^\circ \leq L\}$  follows immediately from the observation that  $(L_+)^\circ$  is not proper: indeed,  $(L_+)^\circ(-te_1) = 1$  for all  $t \geq 1$ .

Now, assume  $\alpha L(A(x - a)) \geq L_+(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Clearly,  $\alpha \geq 1$ ; and if  $\alpha = 1$ , then  $a = 0$ .

Fix any unit vector  $u$  with  $\langle u, e_1 \rangle \geq 0$ , and denote  $v = Au$ . For all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\alpha \geq \frac{L_+(tu)}{L(tv - Aa)} = \frac{L(tu)}{L(tv - Aa)},$$

where in the last step we used  $\langle u, e_1 \rangle \geq 0$ , so  $L_+(tu) = L(tu)$ .

Taking the limit as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , and noting that  $L$  is rotationally invariant, we conclude  $|u| \geq |v|$ . Hence,  $\mathbf{AB}^d \subseteq \mathbf{B}^d$ . Consequently, the integral of  $\alpha L(A(x - a))$  is at least that of  $L$ . Moreover, equality is attained if  $\alpha = 1$ ,  $a = 0$ , and  $A$  is an orthogonal transformation. The lemma follows.  $\square$

We note that for the cases  $L = e^{-|x|}$  and  $L = (\hbar^s)^\circ$  with  $s > 0$ , similar arguments can be derived from the Löwner condition in [IN23]. The author was surprised by such a simple example for the Gaussian case  $L(x) = e^{-|x|^2}$ .

## 7. DISCUSSIONS

The primary purpose of this paper was to demonstrate the possibility of extending the John inclusion to the functional setting. However, the results raise several natural questions:

- (1) The set of possible weights  $c_1, \dots, c_m$  such that there exist unit vectors  $u_1, \dots, u_m$  satisfying  $\sum_{i \in [m]} c_i u_i \otimes u_i = \text{Id}_d$  is a convex polytope [Iva20, Lemma 2.4]. What is the set of possible weights appearing in a John decomposition of the identity for functions?  
For instance, in the classical setting a weight cannot exceed 1, but in the functional setting it can (yet, in our context, it cannot exceed 2).
- (2) In [IN22], the authors considered the solution to the Functional John problem (2) with  $w = \hbar^s$  for  $s > 0$ . We claim that Lemma 5.1 can be generalized to this case directly, but our approach to Theorem 1.1 provides a reasonable bound only if  $s \geq 1$ . It remains open what happens in the regime  $s \in (0, 1]$ , especially in the limit  $s \rightarrow 0$ . For example, is there a John-type inclusion for the solution of the Functional John problem (2) with  $w = \chi_{\mathbf{B}^d}$ ? Recall that  $w = \chi_{\mathbf{B}^d}$  was a starting point of the entire topic in [AGMJV18].
- (3) The polar function of a Gaussian density is again a Gaussian density. It is highly intriguing to investigate whether the duality between John and Löwner ellipsoids, discussed in the Introduction, can be generalized to the functional setting for  $w = e^{-|x|^2}$  in problems (2) and (7).

## APPENDIX A. BOUND ON THE “HEIGHT”

The idea behind the proof of Lemma 2.1 is to construct an “extremal curve” of positions, starting with a maximal one, and to use Minkowski’s determinant inequality

$$(8) \quad (\det(\lambda A + (1 - \lambda) B))^{1/d} \geq \lambda (\det A)^{1/d} + (1 - \lambda) (\det B)^{1/d},$$

to obtain certain convexity properties of the integrals of these positions along the curve. We need to use positive definite matrices to apply Minkowski’s determinant inequality. Let us introduce several definitions:

We denote by

$$\mathcal{E}^+[g] = \{ \alpha g(Ax + a) : A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \text{ is positive definite, } \alpha > 0, a \in \mathbb{R}^d \}$$

the *positive positions* of  $g$ .

**Fixed-height John problem for  $f$  and  $w$ :** Find

$$(9) \quad \max_{g \in \mathcal{E}^+[w]} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g \quad \text{subject to} \quad g \leq f \quad \text{and} \quad \|g\|_\infty = \xi.$$

Log-concavity allows us to consider a certain average position:

**Proposition A.1** (Inner interpolation of functions). *Let  $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  be a log-concave function and  $g: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  be any function. Let  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$ ,  $A_1, A_2$  be non-singular  $d \times d$  matrices, and  $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfy*

$$\alpha_1 g(A_1^{-1}(x - a_1)) \leq f(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_2 g(A_2^{-1}(x - a_2)) \leq f(x)$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $\beta_1, \beta_2 > 0$  be such that  $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = 1$ . Define

$$\alpha = \alpha_1^{\beta_1} \alpha_2^{\beta_2}, \quad A = \beta_1 A_1 + \beta_2 A_2, \quad a = \beta_1 a_1 + \beta_2 a_2.$$

Assume  $A$  is non-singular. Then

$$\alpha g(A^{-1}(x - a)) \leq f(x).$$

If  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are positive definite, and  $g$  is integrable, then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \alpha g(A^{-1}(x - a)) dx \geq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \alpha_1 g(A_1^{-1}(x - a_1)) dx \right)^{\beta_1} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \alpha_2 g(A_2^{-1}(x - a_2)) dx \right)^{\beta_2},$$

with equality if and only if  $A_1 = A_2$ .

The proposition is simple and purely technical. it was formally proven in [IN23, Lemma 4.8].

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $f, w: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be two proper log-concave functions such that  $w \leq f$ . Then there is a solution to Fixed-height John problem (9) for  $f$  and  $w$  with  $\xi = \|w\|_\infty$ . Moreover, if  $w$  has bounded support, then the solution to Fixed-height John problem (9) with  $\xi = \|w\|_\infty$  is unique.*

*Proof.* The lemma follows from Section 6 of [IN23]. The key point is that the set of  $(A, \alpha, a) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying

$$\alpha w(A^{-1}(x - a)) \leq f(x)$$

is either compact or empty (see [IN23, Lemma 6.1]). Existence thus follows by a standard compactness argument.

We only need to show uniqueness when  $w$  has bounded support, which is achieved by a slight modification of [IN23, Proposition 6.2]. Let  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  be rank- $d$  positive definite matrices,  $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , such that the functions

$$g_1(x) = \alpha w(A_1^{-1}(x - a_1)) \quad \text{and} \quad g_2(x) = \alpha w(A_2^{-1}(x - a_2))$$

are both solutions to Fixed-height John problem (9) for  $f$  and  $w$ . In particular, their integrals are equal. By Proposition A.1, it follows that  $A_1 = A_2$ . Hence the graphs of  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  differ by a translation.

Denote by  $\text{hypo } g$  the *hypograph* of a nonnegative function  $g$ :

$$\text{hypo } g = \{(x, t) : 0 \leq t \leq g(x)\}.$$

Because  $f$  is log-concave, the set  $\text{hypo}(g_1) + [0, 2v] \subset \text{hypo}(f)$  for some non-zero  $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . We claim that there is a position  $g$  of  $w$  under  $f$  such that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g > \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_1$ .

Indeed, consider  $g_{1.5}(x) = g_1(x - v)$ . Clearly,  $\text{hypo}(g_{1.5}) \subset \text{hypo}(g_1) + [0, 2v] \subset \text{hypo}(f)$ . Let  $g_{1.5}$  attain its maximum at  $z$ . Then  $z$  belongs to all non-empty level sets

$$[g_{1.5} > \Theta] = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : g_{1.5}(x) > \Theta\}$$

of  $g_{1.5}$  and positive  $\Theta$ , which are compact and convex because  $g_{1.5}$  is log-concave with bounded support. Let  $S_\epsilon$  be the linear transformation that scales  $\mathbb{R}^d$  in the direction of  $v$  by the factor  $1 + \epsilon$ . Then, for sufficiently small positive  $\epsilon$ ,

$$S_\epsilon([g_{1.5} > \Theta] - z) + z \subset [g_1 > \Theta] + [0, 2v]$$

holds for all  $\Theta \in (0, \|g_1\|_\infty)$ . That is,

$$S_\epsilon(\text{hypo}(g_{1.5}) - z) + z \subset \text{hypo}(f).$$

However, the left-hand set above is the hypograph of some positive position  $g$  of  $w$ . Uniqueness follows.  $\square$

By compactness and log-concavity, we have

**Lemma A.2.** *Let  $f, w: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be two proper log-concave functions such that the support of  $w$  is bounded. Then for any  $\xi \in (0, \|f\|_\infty)$ , there is a positive position  $g$  of  $w$  below  $f$  such that  $\|g\|_\infty = \xi$ .*

Lemma 2.1 follows from the previous three statements and the following distilled version of [AGMJV18, Theorem 1.1]:

**Lemma A.3.** *Let  $f, w: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  be two proper log-concave functions such that  $w$  is the John function for  $f$  with respect to  $w$ . Additionally, assume that for every  $\xi \in (0, \|f\|_\infty)$  there is a positive position  $g$  of  $w$  below  $f$  with  $\|g\|_\infty = \xi$ . Then*

$$\|w\|_\infty \leq \|f\|_\infty \leq e^d \|w\|_\infty.$$

*Proof.* It is nothing to prove if  $\|f\|_\infty = \|w\|_\infty$ . Assume  $\|f\|_\infty > \|w\|_\infty$ . Define a function  $\Psi : (0, \|f\|_\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  as follows. By [Lemma A.1](#), for any  $\alpha \in (0, \|f\|_\infty)$ , there is a solution  $g_\alpha$  to Fixed-height John problem (9) for  $f$  and  $w$  with  $\xi = \alpha$ . Let

$$g_\alpha(x) = \tilde{\alpha} w(A_\alpha^{-1}(x - a_\alpha))$$

for some positive-definite  $A_\alpha$ , point  $a_\alpha$ , and  $\tilde{\alpha} = \frac{\alpha}{\|w\|_\infty}$ . Set

$$\Psi(\alpha) = \det A_\alpha.$$

For any  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (0, \|f\|_\infty)$  and  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , we claim

$$(10) \quad (\Psi(\alpha_1^\lambda \alpha_2^{1-\lambda}))^{1/d} \geq \lambda (\Psi(\alpha_1))^{1/d} + (1-\lambda) (\Psi(\alpha_2))^{1/d}.$$

Indeed, by [Proposition A.1](#),

$$\Psi(\alpha_1^\lambda \alpha_2^{1-\lambda}) \geq \det(\lambda A_1 + (1-\lambda) A_2).$$

Now, (10) follows immediately from Minkowski's determinant inequality (8).

Set

$$\Phi(t) = (\Psi(e^t))^{1/d}$$

for  $t \in (-\infty, \ln \|f\|_\infty)$ . By (10),  $\Phi$  is concave on its domain.

Also, since  $w$  is the solution to Functional John problem (2), for every  $\alpha$  in the domain of  $\Psi$ ,

$$\Psi(\alpha) \alpha \leq \Psi(\|w\|_\infty) \|w\|_\infty.$$

Letting and  $t_0 = \ln \|w\|_\infty$ , we obtain

$$\Phi(t) \leq \Phi(t_0) e^{\frac{t_0-t}{d}}$$

for any  $t$  in the domain of  $\Phi$ . The right-hand side is a convex function in  $t$ , whereas  $\Phi$  is concave. Since they agree at  $t = t_0$ , we conclude that the graph of  $\Phi$  lies below the tangent line to  $\Phi(t_0) e^{\frac{t_0-t}{d}}$  at the point  $t_0$ . Thus

$$\Phi(t) \leq \Phi(t_0) \left(1 - \frac{t - t_0}{d}\right).$$

As  $t \rightarrow \ln \|f\|_\infty$  and noting that  $\Phi$  remains positive, we get

$$0 \leq 1 - \frac{\ln \|f\|_\infty}{d} + \frac{t_0}{d}.$$

In other words,

$$t_0 \geq -d + \ln \|f\|_\infty.$$

Hence,

$$\|w\|_\infty = e^{t_0} \geq e^{-d} \|f\|_\infty.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [AAGM15] Shiri Artstein-Avidan, Apostolos Giannopoulos, and Vitali D. Milman. *Asymptotic geometric analysis, Part I*, volume 202. American Mathematical Soc., 2015.
- [AGMJV18] David Alonso-Gutiérrez, Bernardo González Merino, C. Hugo Jiménez, and Rafael Villa. John's ellipsoid and the integral ratio of a log-concave function. *The Journal of Geometric Analysis*, 28(2):1182–1201, 2018.
- [Bal92] Keith Ball. Ellipsoids of maximal volume in convex bodies. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 41(2):241–250, 1992.
- [Car11] Constantin Carathéodory. Über den Variabilitätsbereich der Fourierschen Konstanten von positiven harmonischen Funktionen. *Rendiconti Del Circolo Matematico di Palermo (1884-1940)*, 32(1):193–217, 1911.
- [GLM<sup>+</sup>04] Yehoram Gordon, A. E. Litvak, Mathieu Meyer, Alain Pajor, et al. John's decomposition in the general case and applications. *J. Differential Geom.*, 68(1):99–119, 09 2004.

- [IN22] Grigory Ivanov and Márton Naszódi. Functional John ellipsoids. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 282(11):109441, 2022.
- [IN23] Grigory Ivanov and Márton Naszódi. Functional John and Löwner Conditions for Pairs of Log-Concave Functions. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, September 2023.
- [IT21] Grigory Ivanov and Igor Tsiutsiurupa. Functional Löwner Ellipsoids. *The Journal of Geometric Analysis*, 31(11):11493–11528, 2021.
- [Iva20] Grigory Ivanov. On the volume of the John–Löwner ellipsoid. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 63(2):455–459, 2020.
- [Joh14] Fritz John. Extremum problems with inequalities as subsidiary conditions. In *Traces and emergence of nonlinear programming*, pages 197–215. Springer, 2014.
- [LSW19] Ben Li, Carsten Schütt, and Elisabeth M. Werner. The Löwner Function of a Log-Concave Function. *The Journal of Geometric Analysis*, 31(1):423–456, September 2019.
- [RW09] R. Tyrrell Rockafellar and Roger J-B Wets. *Variational analysis*, volume 317. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.

PONTIFÍCIA UNIVERSIDADE CATÓLICA DO RIO DE JANEIRO, DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA,, RUA MARQUÊS DE SÃO VICENTE, 225, EDIFÍCIO CARDEAL LEME, SALA 862,, 22451-900 GÁVEA, RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL

*Email address:* `grimivanov@gmail.com`