

# SUPERFORMS, SUPERCURRENTS AND CONVEX GEOMETRY.

BO BERNDTSSON

ABSTRACT. We develop the calculus of superforms as a tool for convex geometry. The formalism is applied to valuations on convex bodies, the Alexandrov-Fenchel inequalities and Monge-Ampère equations on the boundary of convex bodies.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The calculus of superforms and supercurrents was introduced by Lagerberg in [30], after a brief suggestion in [12]. The main motivation in [30] was applications to tropical geometry and Lagerberg proved in particular that tropical varieties in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  can be described as supercurrents of a certain type. After pioneering work in [19], this point of view has also been used to develop a potential theory on Berkovich spaces; see [18] for recent work and further references. In another direction, in [13] we applied the same formalism to (extrinsic) Riemannian geometry, and used it, e.g. to give volume estimates for minimal surfaces and a proof of Weyl’s tube formula. In this paper we shall explore yet another setting and apply the formalism to convex geometry. This has already been done in [31], which gives an account of Alexandrov’s second proof of the Alexandrov-Fenchel theorem in terms of superforms, and part of our work here builds on, and develops, this. Our main objective is not to prove new results – although there are some – but to provide a convenient framework in which many known results can be formulated in a seemingly natural way.

The basic idea of superforms and -currents is to use a formalism inspired by Kähler geometry for problems in real geometry. We will give a very brief outline of the theory in the next section and refer to [30] and [13] for a more precise account. It should be said, however, that the setting in [30] is somewhat different, but it is nevertheless close enough to give an almost isomorphic theory (see [35]). A crucial concept in Kähler geometry is positivity of forms and currents and we will dedicate section 3 to develop the analogous theory in the real setting. This has already been done in [30], and been much further developed in [18] in the setting of toric varieties, but we shall go through this work from scratch, highlighting some concepts that are fundamental for the rest of the paper. The main difference between the complex and the real case is that in the complex case, the concept of weak positivity is central and serves as a hypothesis for a number of basic results. This is a bit more complicated in the real setting (see [18]) since forms can be weakly positive and weakly negative at the same time; we call such forms weakly null. In [30] and [18] the authors avoid this difficulty by working with a stronger notion of positivity, but for our applications (especially to valuations) we need to consider weak positivity. Nevertheless, the problem can be overcome, by restricting to a subclass of weakly positive forms, ‘orthogonal’ to

the weakly null forms. Fortunately, and somewhat miraculously, the forms that appear in our applications to valuations satisfy this orthogonality condition (see Theorem 8.12).

Once this is done we develop, following [30], the analog of the theory of Bedford and Taylor of wedge products of closed positive currents, and use that to define mixed volumes of convex bodies. Following [31] we sketch the proof of Alexandrov mentioned above using the superformalism. After that, we give another proof of the Alexandrov-Fenchel theorem, based on an idea of Gromov, [25], to prove the Khovanski-Teissier theorem from algebraic geometry. Gromov also sketches how to get the Alexandrov-Fenchel theorem from there, by using the theory of toric varieties. Our main point here is to avoid the last part and substitute for toric varieties a compactification of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  as a real manifold, by adding a sphere at infinity. In this connection one should also mention the work of Wang, [42], that also eliminates the use of toric compactifications by working with complete Kähler metrics on the complex torus instead. We close this section with a remark, suggesting a possible version of Hodge theory for supercurrents, that may be related to [4] and the recent [15]. We do not develop this idea further in this paper, but hope to come back to the relation between toric geometry and superforms later.

The work in section 3, was carried out partly with a view towards applications to translation invariant valuations on convex bodies. In section 8 we give a characterization of two classes of such valuations in terms of supercurrents. We first show that there is a one-to-one correspondence between ‘smooth’ valuations (introduced by Alesker in [2]) and certain smooth ‘strongly homogeneous’ (super)forms on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . This part may be new, but it should be stressed that it is based on Alesker’s work, as amplified by Knoerr, [29] and van Handel (unpublished). It is also closely related to a description of smooth valuations as integrals of a differential form over the ‘normal cycle’ of a convex body (cf. [5]), and we give a translation between the two approaches at the end of the section – as far as smooth valuations are concerned they are equivalent. One advantage with the superformalism may be that it shows a close analogy between the theory of valuations and intersection products in Kähler geometry; another that it adapts in a natural way to non-smooth valuations. We also show that the representation of a valuation in terms of a supercurrent can be seen as a sort of Fourier transform that maps currents to valuations, see (8.2). After this, we characterize monotonically increasing valuations; they correspond precisely to closed and weakly positive currents of a certain type. For smooth valuations, related results in terms of the normal cycle have been obtained previously by Bernig and Fu, [17], and the case of general valuations that are homogeneous of degree 1 and  $(n - 1)$  respectively is due to McMullen, [34], and Firey, [24], respectively.

Finally, in section 11 we discuss Minkowski’s surface area measure, and relate it to the Monge-Ampère equation on the boundary of convex bodies. The main point here is to show how well known results on the surface area measure allow us to show solvability of Monge-Ampère-type equations on the boundary of any convex body. The most interesting case here is, perhaps, the case of polytopes, or even simplices, where such questions have been studied lately in works motivated by mirror symmetry, see e.g. [28]. We will not enter into this theory at all here, but just give a comparison between the two Monge-Ampère operators. The Monge-Ampère operator studied here – which is related to Minkowski’s surface area measure – is not identical to the one in [28], but the two operators differ only in the singular contributions coming from lower-dimensional faces of the polytope.

I would like to thank Rolf Andreasson, Jakob Hultgren, Mattias Jonsson, Simon Larsson and Xu Wang for many discussions on the topic of this paper. Special thanks go to Thomas Wannerer, Ramon van Handel and Semyon Alesker for generous comments on a preliminary version.

## 2. BRIEF RECAP OF SUPERFORMS AND SOME CONVENTIONS.

A superform on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is a differential form on  $\mathbb{C}^n = \{x + i\xi; x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ ,

$$\alpha = \sum_{IK} \alpha_{IK}(x) dx_I \wedge d\xi_K,$$

whose coefficients do not depend on  $\xi$ . We use standard multiindex notation and if  $|I| = p$  and  $|K| = q$  for all non-zero terms in the sum we say that  $\alpha$  is of bidegree  $(p, q)$ . Notice that this bigrading differs from the standard one for differential forms on  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , where one would use instead the basis  $dz_I \wedge d\bar{z}_K$ ,  $z = x + i\xi$ . The exterior derivative,  $d$  operates on superforms.

We define the complex structure,  $J$ , on differential forms on  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , by

$$J(d\xi_j) = dx_j, \quad J(dx_j) = -d\xi_j.$$

This convention (unfortunately) differs from the one in [13] by a sign, but is here chosen in the standard way so that  $J(dx_j + id\xi_j) = i(dx_j + id\xi_j)$ . To avoid unpleasant minuses we shall sometimes use the notation  $\alpha^\# = -J(\alpha)$  when  $\alpha = \sum \alpha_j dx_j$  is a  $(1, 0)$ -form, so that

$$\alpha^\# = \sum \alpha_j d\xi_j.$$

We say that a form of bidegree  $(p, p)$ ,

$$\Omega = \sum \Omega_{IK} dx_I \wedge d\xi_K$$

is *symmetric* if  $J(\Omega) = \Omega$ . Since

$$J(\Omega) = \sum \Omega_{IK} (-1)^p d\xi_I \wedge dx_K = \sum \Omega_{IK} dx_K \wedge d\xi_I,$$

this means that  $\Omega_{IK} = \Omega_{KI}$  if we sum only over increasing multiindices, so that the representation is unique.

If  $\psi$  is a function we define

$$d^\# \psi = \sum \psi_j d\xi_j = J^{-1} d\psi,$$

and for general superforms

$$d^\# \alpha = \sum (d^\# \alpha_{IK}) \wedge dx_I \wedge d\xi_K = J^{-1} dJ\alpha.$$

This coincides with the operator  $d^c$  from Kähler geometry, but we write  $d^\#$  to emphasize that it acts on superforms.

If  $\alpha = f dx_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx_n \wedge d\xi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge d\xi_n =: f dx \wedge d\xi$  is a superform of bidegree  $(n, n)$  (with, say, compact support) we define its superintegral as

$$\int \alpha = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f dx \int d\xi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f dx (-1)^{n(n-1)},$$

i.e. we *define* the integral of  $d\xi$  to be  $(-1)^{n(n-1)}$ . This is sometimes called the Berezin integral, except for the possible minus-sign that we have inserted in order to make the integral of

$$f dx_1 \wedge d\xi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx_n \wedge d\xi_n$$

positive if  $f \geq 0$  (in accordance with the conventions for integrals over  $\mathbb{C}^n$ ). If  $M$  is an (oriented) submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  of dimension  $m$  we can integrate superforms

$$\alpha = \sum_{|I|=m} \alpha_I dx_I \wedge d\xi$$

of bidegree  $(m, n)$  in the same way

$$(2.1) \quad \int_M \alpha = (-1)^{n(n-1)} \int_M \sum_{|I|=m} \alpha_I dx_I.$$

It is clear that Stokes' formula holds, e.g.

$$(2.2) \quad \int_{\partial D} \alpha = \int_D d\alpha,$$

if  $D$  is a bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\alpha$  is of bidegree  $(n-1, n)$ . Similarly, if  $\alpha$  is an  $(n-1, n)$ -form of compact support, the integral of  $d\alpha = 0$ . Hence

$$\int du \wedge v = (-1)^{\deg(u)+1} \int u \wedge dv$$

if either  $u$  or  $v$  has compact support (and  $\deg(u)$  is the total degree of  $u$ ). Since

$$\int \alpha = \int J(\alpha)$$

and  $d^\# = J^{-1}dJ$ , the same holds for  $d^\#$ . This leads to the useful formula

$$\int (dd^\#u) \wedge v = \int u \wedge dd^\#v.$$

Notice, however, that there is no counterpart to Stokes' formula (2.2) for  $d^\#$ ; in fact

$$\int_{\partial D} \alpha$$

is not even defined if  $\alpha$  is of bidegree  $(n, n-1)$ .

So far we have tacitly assumed that we have fixed a coordinate system on  $\mathbb{C}^n$ ,  $z_j = x_j + i\xi_j$ . If we change coordinates to

$$w = Az, \quad w = y + i\eta$$

where  $A \in GL(n, \mathbb{R})$  (i.e.  $A$  is a matrix with *real* entries), most of what we have said does not change, with the exception that

$$\int d\xi \neq \int d\eta$$

in general. We therefore endow  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with a scalar product, which induces a scalar product on forms, and consider only orthonormal changes of coordinates. We define the volume form

$$dV = dx \wedge d\xi (-1)^{n(n-1)} = dx_1 \wedge d\xi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx_n \wedge d\xi_n$$

for any such system of coordinates.

Finally, a supercurrent of bidegree  $(p, q)$  is an element in the dual of the space of smooth superforms of bidegree  $(n-p, n-q)$  with compact support, endowed with the usual topology from the theory of distributions. There are two main examples (and many more will appear later on in this paper): A superform  $\gamma$  with, say, continuous coefficients defines a supercurrent by

$$(2.3) \quad \gamma \cdot \alpha = \int \gamma \wedge \alpha.$$

Here the integral is the superintegral and components of  $\gamma \wedge \alpha$  that are not of bidegree  $(n, n)$  give zero contribution to the integral. The second example is integration over an  $m$ -dimensional submanifold of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , by (2.1). Since this acts on superforms of bidegree  $(m, n)$ , this supercurrent has bidegree  $(n-m, 0)$  or, as is sometimes said, of bidimension  $(m, n)$ .

In analogy with (2.3) any supercurrent,  $T$  of bidegree  $(p, q)$ , can be written

$$(2.4) \quad T = \sum T_{IK} dx_I \wedge d\xi_K.$$

Here  $T_{IK}$  acts on smooth forms of full bidegree, so they are distributions, or generalized functions. We will almost only deal with currents with measure coefficients. Strictly speaking, a measure is an element in the dual of the space of functions, so it should be considered as a supercurrent of bidegree  $(n, n)$ . Here, however, we identify measures with (super)currents of bidegree  $(0, 0)$  by dividing with the volume form  $dV$  and think of measures as generalized functions. Hence, if  $T$  in (2.4) has measure coefficients, the  $T_{IK}$  are considered to be measures, even though it would be more correct to say that  $T_{IK} dV$  is a measure. As an example, if  $M$  is a hypersurface, defined by an equation  $\rho(x) = 0$ , the current of integration on  $M$  is given by

$$dS_M \frac{d\rho}{|d\rho|},$$

where  $dS_M$  is surface measure on  $M$ .

One final convention: This paper is about superforms and supercurrents but to alleviate the language a little we will mostly omit the ‘super’ in the sequel. Thus we will often talk about ‘forms’ and ‘currents’ and ‘integrals’, hoping that it will be clear from the context when a ‘super’ should be inserted (which is almost all of the time).

### 3. POSITIVITY OF SUPERFORMS

We first look at symmetric superforms of bidegree  $(p, p)$  at a point, i.e. forms

$$\Omega = \sum \Omega_{IJ} dx_I \wedge d\xi_J (-1)^{p(p-1)/2}$$

where the coefficients  $\Omega_{IJ}$  are real constants, symmetric in the indices  $I$  and  $J$ . We also sum only over increasing multiindices in order to have a unique representation. As in the complex case (see e.g. [26]), we will (as in [30]) consider three types of positivity: (Cf. also [32], where

positivity of forms and currents was first introduced, and [21], but notice that the terminology there is slightly different.)

First, we define an *elementary form* of bidegree  $(p, p)$  to be a form that can be written

$$E = \alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_1^\# \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_p \wedge \alpha_p^\#$$

for  $\alpha_j$  of bidegree  $(1, 0)$ . The cone of *strongly positive* forms is the closure of the set of forms that can be written as a finite sum

$$\Omega = \sum c_s E_s,$$

where  $c_s > 0$  and  $E_s$  are elementary forms.

A weaker notion is just plain positivity.  $\Omega$  is called *positive* if the matrix  $(\Omega_{IJ})$  is positive definite. This is equivalent to saying that the quadratic form

$$Q(\alpha, \alpha) := \Omega \wedge \alpha \wedge \alpha^\# (-1)^{(n-p)(n-p-1)/2},$$

defined on the space of forms  $\alpha$  of bidegree  $(p, 0)$ , is positive definite.

Finally,  $\Omega$  is said to be *weakly positive* if

$$\Omega \wedge E \geq 0,$$

for all elementary forms  $E$ , or equivalently  $\Omega \wedge \sigma \geq 0$  for all strongly positive forms  $\sigma$ . One easily sees that elementary forms, and hence all strongly positive forms are positive. Likewise, a positive form wedged with a positive form of complementary bidegree is a positive form of full degree. Hence a positive form wedged with a strongly positive form is also positive, so positive forms are weakly positive.

If  $\omega$  is of bidegree  $(1, 1)$ ,

$$\omega = \sum a_{jk} dx_j \wedge d\xi_k$$

with  $(a_{jk})$  symmetric, we can, by the spectral theorem write  $\omega = \sum \lambda_j dy_j \wedge d\xi_j$  after a change of coordinates. Hence  $\omega$  is strongly positive if and only if all the eigenvalues  $\lambda_j \geq 0$ , i. e. if  $(a_{jk})$  is positively semidefinite. It is easily seen that this is equivalent to  $\omega$  being weakly positive.

Thus we have three closed cones in  $\Lambda^{p,p}(R_x^n \oplus \mathbb{R}_\xi^n)$ ,  $SP_p \subseteq P_p \subseteq WP_p$ , strongly positive, positive and weakly positive respectively. In bidegree  $(1, 1)$  and  $(n-1, n-1)$  all the cones are equal; otherwise all inclusions are strict. By definition the cone of strongly positive  $(p, p)$ -forms is dual to the cone of weakly positive  $(n-p, n-p)$ -forms under the non degenerate pairing coming from the wedge product. The cone of positive  $(p, p)$ -forms is dual to the cone of positive forms of bidegree  $(n-p, n-p)$ . Note also that if  $\Omega$  is positive in any of these senses and  $\omega$  is a positive  $(1, 1)$ -form, then  $\omega \wedge \Omega$  is again positive in the same sense (use the spectral theorem again).

So far the discussion is completely parallel to the complex case. There are, however, important differences, due to the fact that we have a different notion of bigrading; (number of  $dx_i$ , number of  $d\xi_j$ ) versus (number of  $d(x_i + id\xi_i)$ , number of  $d(x_j - id\xi_j)$ ) in the complex setting. To distinguish the two bigradings we will sometimes write bidegree  $(p, q)_\mathbb{R}$  for the real case and bidegree  $(p, q)_\mathbb{C}$  for the complex case.

In the complex case the counterparts of our forms  $\alpha \wedge \alpha^\#$ ,  $\alpha (1, 0)_\mathbb{R}$ , are forms  $ia \wedge \bar{a}$ ,  $a (1, 0)_\mathbb{C}$ . An elementary form in the complex setting is a  $p$ -fold wedge product of such forms

$$ia_1 \wedge \bar{a}_1 \wedge \dots a_p \wedge \bar{a}_p,$$

and a form is strongly positive in the complex setting if it is a positive combination of such elementary forms. A complex  $(1, 0)_\mathbb{C}$  form  $a$  is uniquely determined by its real part,  $\gamma$ ,

$$a = \gamma - iJ(\gamma), \text{ and } ia \wedge \bar{a} = -2\gamma \wedge J(\gamma)$$

( $J$  is the complex structure). Looking at the real bigrading we can write  $\gamma = \alpha + \beta$  where  $\alpha$  is  $(1, 0)_\mathbb{R}$  and  $\beta$  is  $(0, 1)_\mathbb{R}$ . Therefore

$$\gamma \wedge J(\gamma) = \alpha \wedge J(\beta) + \beta \wedge J(\alpha) + \alpha \wedge J(\alpha) + \beta \wedge J(\beta),$$

so  $ia \wedge \bar{a}$  is of real bidegree  $(1, 0)$  if and only if

$$\alpha \wedge J(\beta) + \beta \wedge J(\alpha) = 0.$$

Since the two terms here are of different real bidegree, each of them must vanish, which means that  $\alpha$  and  $J(\beta)$  are parallel. Equivalently, after multiplication with a complex number,  $a = \gamma - iJ(\gamma)$ , where  $\gamma$  is  $(1, 0)_\mathbb{R}$ .

A fundamental fact in the complex case is that any real symmetric  $(p, p)$ -form

$$\Omega = \sum \Omega_{IJ} dz_I \wedge d\bar{z}_J (-1)^{p(p-1)/2}, \Omega_{IJ} = \Omega_{JI}$$

can be written as a finite real combination of complex elementary forms, i. e. as a difference of strongly positive forms (see [26] and [21]). The analog of this fails in the real setting (see also [18]); a general symmetric  $(p, p)_\mathbb{R}$  form can not be written as (a limit of) a finite combination of real elementary forms. To see this we introduce the linear map on superforms

$$(3.1) \quad Tu := \sum dx_i \wedge \delta_{\xi_i}(u),$$

where  $\delta_{\xi_i}$  is contraction with the vector field  $\partial/\partial\xi_i$ . This operator will reappear and be more motivated later. For the moment we just notice that it has the following properties:

1. It is independent of choice of linear coordinates.
2. It is a derivation;  $T(u \wedge v) = T(u) \wedge v + u \wedge T(v)$ .
3. If  $\alpha$  is  $(1, 0)_\mathbb{R}$ , then  $T(\alpha) = 0$  and  $T(\alpha^\#) = \alpha$ .

By properties 3 and 2,  $T(\alpha \wedge \alpha^\#) = 0$ , which, using property 2 again, means that any elementary form, and hence any linear combination of elementary forms, are annihilated by  $T$ . On the other hand, there are symmetric  $(p, p)_\mathbb{R}$ -forms that are not annihilated by  $T$ , like

$$dx_1 \wedge dx_2 \wedge d\xi_3 \wedge d\xi_4 + dx_3 \wedge dx_4 \wedge d\xi_1 \wedge d\xi_2$$

in the complexification of  $\mathbb{R}^4$ , and such forms can not be written as combinations of elementary forms. For lack of better terminology we say that a (necessarily symmetric)  $(p, p)_\mathbb{R}$  form is *strong* if it is a difference between two strongly positive forms, and we denote the space of all strong forms of bidegree  $(p, p)$ ,  $S_p$  - or sometimes just  $S$  when the degree is understood or variable.

Thus  $S \subseteq \text{Ker}(T)$  and  $\text{Ker}(T)$  is a proper subspace of the space of all symmetric forms. The next theorem follows from Theorem 8.12 in section 8. We postpone the proof till there since it uses tools that will be developed later.

**Theorem 3.1.** *A closed  $(p, p)$ -form (thus in particular a form with constant coefficients),  $\Omega$ , that satisfies  $T(\Omega) = 0$  is strong. In other words,  $S = \text{Ker}(T)$ .*

The next lemma will play an important role later when we discuss valuations on convex bodies.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a strong  $(p, p)_{\mathbb{R}}$ -form and assume that*

$$\Omega \wedge \Omega' = 0$$

*for all strong (or elementary) forms  $\Omega'$  of bidegree  $(n - p, n - p)_{\mathbb{R}}$ . Then  $\Omega = 0$ .*

*Proof.* We will use the Hodge  $*$ -operator on  $\mathbb{R}_x^n \oplus \mathbb{R}_\xi^n$ , defined so that

$$A \wedge *B = (A, B)dV,$$

for  $(p, q)$ -forms  $A$  and  $B$ . Here  $(A, B)$  is the Euclidean scalar product and  $dV$  the volume element. We first claim that if  $E$  is an elementary  $(p, p)$ -form,

$$E = \alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_1^\# \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_p \wedge \alpha_p^\#$$

then  $*E$  is also elementary, of bidegree  $(n - p, n - p)$ . To see this, use first that up to a sign  $E$  equals

$$\alpha_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_p \wedge \alpha_1^\# \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_p^\#.$$

We can replace  $\alpha_j$  by an orthonormal basis  $e_j$  for the space spanned by  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p$ ; this changes  $E$  only by multiplication with some non-zero number. Now complete the  $e_j$ 's to an orthonormal basis for all  $(1, 0)$ -forms,  $e_1, \dots, e_n$ . Then

$$*E = \pm e_{p+1} \wedge \dots \wedge e_n \wedge e_{p+1}^\# \wedge \dots \wedge e_n^\#,$$

hence elementary. Therefore  $*\Omega$  is a strong form if  $\Omega$  is strong. From the hypothesis we get

$$0 = \Omega \wedge *\Omega = \|\Omega\|^2 dV.$$

Hence  $\Omega = 0$ . □

The next lemma gives a criterion for the vanishing of a strong form which is more useful in practice.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Any elementary  $(p, p)$ -form  $E$  can be written*

$$E = Q^p / p!,$$

*where*

$$Q = \sum q_{jk} dx_j \wedge d\xi_k,$$

*and the matrix  $(q_{jk})$  is positively semidefinite. Hence, a strong  $(p, p)$ -form  $\Omega$  must vanish if*

$$\Omega \wedge Q^{n-p} = 0$$

*for any  $Q$  of this type. Conversely, any power  $Q^p$  of such a form  $Q$  is strongly positive.*



*Proof.* As in the proof of lemma 3.2 we may assume that

$$E = e_1 \wedge e_1^\# \wedge \dots \wedge e_p \wedge e_p^\#,$$

where  $e_1, \dots, e_p$  are the first  $p$  elements in some orthonormal basis for the space of  $(1, 0)$ -forms.

Putting

$$Q = \sum_1^p e_j \wedge e_j^\#$$

we get the first part of the lemma. The last part follows from the spectral theorem: Any positively semidefinite  $(1, 1)$ -form can be written

$$\sum \lambda_j dy_j \wedge d\eta_j$$

after an orthonormal change of coordinates. □

The fact that not all forms can be written as linear combinations of elementary forms, i.e. as differences of strongly positive forms, has the inconvenient consequence that some non-zero forms are both weakly positive and weakly negative. Recall that  $WP$  denotes the cone of weakly positive forms, and  $SP$  the cone of strongly positive forms. (We look at forms of a fixed bidegree but suppress the bidegree in the notation when the degree is understood.) We put

$$W_0 := WP \cap (-WP).$$

Thus  $W_0$  is the linear space of forms that are both weakly positive and weakly negative; we will call them *weakly null*. We claim that  $W_0$  is the orthogonal complement of  $S$  both with respect to the scalar product on  $(p, p)$ -forms and with respect to the pairing given by the wedge product. Indeed,

$$W_0 = \{\Omega; \Omega \wedge \Omega' = 0, \Omega' \in SP_{n-p}\} = \{\Omega; \Omega \wedge \Omega' = 0, \Omega' \in S_{n-p}\} = \{\Omega; (\Omega, \Omega') = 0, \Omega' \in S_p\},$$

since the Hodge  $*$  of a strong form is strong.

We now move on to discuss positivity of smooth (or continuous) forms with variable coefficients and of currents. A form with continuous coefficients is defined to be positive in any of the senses discussed if it is positive at any fixed point. Similarly, it belongs to the spaces  $S$  and  $W_0$  if it does at any point. The corresponding notions for currents is defined by duality. We will denote the action of a current on a smooth form by integrals, which is reasonable since in the end we will only work with currents with measure coefficients.

Thus, a symmetric current,  $\Omega$ , of bidegree  $(p, p)$  is strongly positive if

$$\int \Omega \wedge \Omega' \geq 0$$

for all weakly positive  $\Omega'$  (of bidegree  $(n-p, n-p)$ ) with compact support, and  $\Omega$  is (weakly) positive if the same thing holds for  $\Omega'$  (strongly) positive. In case  $\Omega$  is actually a continuous form, this coincides with the notions for forms, by duality of the respective cones. In the same way we define the spaces  $S$  and  $W_0$  for currents. Just like for smooth forms, all these positivity notions are preserved if we wedge  $\Omega$  with a smooth positive  $(1, 1)$ -form, as can be seen by duality, and the spaces  $S$  and  $W_0$  are also preserved.

Note that if a current is positive in any of these senses, its translates are positive in the same sense. This means that convolutions with a smooth positive function,  $\Omega \star \chi$  (defined coefficient-wise) is also positive. As a consequence, we can regularize a positive current, and approximate it by smooth positive forms, and also approximate a current in  $S$  by smooth forms in  $S$ . This means that for many statements about positive currents, it is enough to prove them for smooth positive forms. As a consequence we get from Lemma 3.3

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a current in  $S$  of bidegree  $(p, p)$  and assume that*

$$(3.2) \quad \int \Omega \wedge \chi Q^{n-p} = 0$$

for all smooth forms  $Q = \sum q_{ij} dx_i \wedge d\xi_j$  with symmetric coefficients such that  $(q_{ij})$  is positively semidefinite, and  $\chi$  a smooth function with compact support. Then  $\Omega = 0$ . The same conclusion follows if (3.2) is only supposed to hold when  $Q = dd^\# \psi$ , where  $\psi$  is smooth.

*Proof.* The first part of the proposition follows from Lemma 3.3 by regularization since the hypothesis is invariant under translation. In the same way we see that it is enough to prove the last part under the assumption that  $\Omega$  is smooth. But then 3.2 implies that  $\Omega \wedge (dd^\# \psi)^{n-p} = 0$  pointwise and we can just apply Lemma 3.3 again (to  $\psi = \sum q_{ij} x_i x_j$ ).  $\square$

For emphasis we state the following stronger version of Proposition 3.2 separately.

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a current of bidegree  $(p, p)$  in an open set  $U$  and assume that*

$$(3.3) \quad \int \Omega \wedge \chi Q^{n-p} \geq 0$$

for all  $(1, 1)$ -forms  $Q = dd^\# \psi$  where  $\chi \geq 0$  is smooth of compact support in  $U$  and  $\psi$  is smooth and convex. Then  $\Omega$  is weakly positive. Conversely, if  $\Omega$  is weakly positive (3.3) holds.

*Proof.* Again, it is enough to prove that  $\Omega$  is weakly positive assuming that  $\Omega$  is smooth. Then the hypothesis says that  $\Omega \wedge (dd^\# \psi)^{n-p} \geq 0$  for all convex  $\psi$ . The conclusion then follows from the first part of Lemma 3.3. The second part follows from the second part of the same lemma.  $\square$

It will later be important to know that currents that are positive in various senses have measure coefficients and we will end this section with a result to that effect. If

$$\Omega = \sum \Omega_{IJ} dx_I \wedge d\xi_J (-1)^{p(p-1)/2}$$

we call

$$\tau_\Omega := \sum \Omega_{II}$$

the trace of  $\Omega$ . Notice that

$$dd^\# |x|^2/2 = \sum dx_i \wedge d\xi_j =: \beta \quad \text{and} \quad \beta^q/q! = \sum_{|I|=q} dx_I \wedge d\xi_I (-1)^{q(q-1)/2},$$

from which it follows that

$$\tau_\Omega = \Omega \wedge \beta^{n-p}/(n-p)!$$

Hence the trace of  $\Omega$  does not depend on the choice of orthonormal coordinates. It also follows, since  $\beta^{n-p}$  is strongly positive, that the trace is nonnegative if  $\Omega$  is weakly positive. Notice also

that, for any choice of orthonormal coordinates and for any multiindex, that we can take to be  $I = (1, 2 \dots p)$ ,

$$\Omega_{II} dV = \Omega \wedge e_{p+1} \wedge e_{p+1}^\# \wedge \dots \wedge e_n \wedge e_n^\# \geq 0$$

if  $\Omega$  is weakly positive and therefore  $\Omega_{JJ} \leq \tau_\Omega$  for any  $J$ .

The trace, however, may be zero; indeed this happens if  $\Omega \in W_0$ . Thus there is no way to estimate the whole current in terms of the trace (like there is in the complex setting) if  $\Omega$  is only weakly positive.

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let*

$$\Omega = \sum \Omega_{IJ} dx_I \wedge d\xi_J (-1)^{p(p-1)/2}$$

*be a symmetric  $(p, p)$ -form which is either positive or weakly positive and strong. Then, there is a uniform constant depending only on  $p$  and  $n$  such that for all indices  $I, J$*

$$|\Omega_{IJ}| \leq C\tau_\Omega.$$

*Proof.* When  $\Omega$  is positive this is a direct consequence of Cauchy's inequality,

$$|\Omega_{IJ}| \leq (\Omega_{II} + \Omega_{JJ})/2 \leq \tau_\Omega/2.$$

Now assume that  $\Omega$  is weakly positive and strong. Since  $S$  is a subspace of the space of all symmetric  $(p, p)$ -forms it is spanned by a finite number,  $N$ , of elementary forms,  $E_1, \dots, E_N$ , with  $N$  depending only on  $n$  and  $p$ . Discarding some of them we may assume the  $E_j$  form a basis, which we fix. As in the proof of Lemma 3.2, we may assume that each  $E_j$  has the form

$$E_j = e_1 \wedge \dots \wedge e_p \wedge e_1^\# \wedge \dots \wedge e_p^\#$$

where the  $e_k$  are elements in an orthonormal basis for the space of  $(1, 0)$ -forms (which basis depends on  $j$ ). Writing  $\Omega$  in this basis, we see that, with  $I = (1, \dots, p)$ ,

$$(\Omega, E_j) = \Omega_{II} \leq \tau_\Omega,$$

for all  $j$  since the trace is independent of the choice of orthonormal basis. Write  $\Omega = \sum c_i E_i$ . Then

$$0 \leq \sum c_i (E_i, E_j) \leq \tau_\Omega$$

for all  $j$ . Since the matrix  $(E_i, E_j)$  is invertible it follows that  $(\sum c_j^2)^{1/2} \leq C\tau_\Omega$  (where  $C$  does not depend on  $\Omega$ ). Since

$$|\Omega_{IJ}| \leq \sum |c_i| |(E_i)_{IJ}|,$$

the lemma follows. □

The next proposition is the main consequence of the lemma.

**Proposition 3.7.** *Let*

$$\Omega = \sum \Omega_{IJ} dx_I \wedge d\xi_J (-1)^{p(p-1)/2}$$

*be a symmetric  $(p, p)$ -current which is either positive or weakly positive and strong. Then all the coefficients of  $\Omega$  are measures, absolutely continuous with respect to the trace measure  $\tau_\Omega$ , with a Radon-Nikodym derivative bounded by a constant independent of  $\Omega$ .*

*Proof.* Assume first that  $\Omega$  is smooth. Then, if  $\chi$  is a smooth function with compact support we have by the previous lemma that

$$\left| \int \chi \Omega_{IJ} \right| \leq C \int |\chi| \tau_\Omega.$$

By regularization, the same thing holds if  $\Omega$  is just a current, positive or weakly positive and strong. Since  $\tau_\Omega \geq 0$ , it is a positive measure, so the claim follows.  $\square$

#### 4. THE THEORY OF BEDFORD AND TAYLOR.

In [10] and [11] Bedford and Taylor defined and studied currents of the form

$$dd^c \phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^c \phi_p,$$

where  $\phi_i$  are locally bounded plurisubharmonic functions. (It is a priori not evident that such currents are well defined since currents with measure coefficients, like  $dd^c \phi$  where  $\phi$  is plurisubharmonic, cannot in general be multiplied.) Following [30] we will mimic their arguments in the setting of supercurrents defined by convex functions. Our aim is to prove that currents like

$$dd^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \psi_p \wedge \Omega$$

where  $\psi_i$  are convex and  $\Omega$  is positive (in various senses) are well defined and continuous under uniform convergence of the  $\psi_i$  and weak convergence of  $\Omega$ . This is essentially included in Lagerberg's work but we repeat the arguments here, partly for completeness and partly since we need the results in a more general setting: Lagerberg worked with positive currents but for us it will be important to allow currents that are weakly positive and strong as well. The real setting is quite a bit easier than the complex setting since (finite valued) convex functions are automatically continuous. We start with a basic lemma.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a closed current of bidegree  $(p, p)$  which is either positive or weakly positive and strong in an open set  $U$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $K$  be a compact subset of  $U$  and let  $\psi$  be smooth and convex in  $U$ . Put*

$$\Omega_\psi := dd^\# \psi \wedge \Omega.$$

*Then  $\Omega_\psi$  is also positive or weakly positive and strong, respectively, and*

$$\int_K \tau_{\Omega_\psi} \leq C \sup_U |\psi| \int_U \tau_\Omega,$$

*where  $C$  does not depend on  $\Omega$  or  $\psi$ .*

*Proof.* That  $\Omega_\psi$  has the same positivity properties as  $\Omega$  follows immediately from the definitions when  $\Omega$  is smooth and in general by regularization (or duality). Recall that we defined

$$\beta = \sum dx_i \wedge d\xi_i,$$

and we have

$$\tau_\Omega = \Omega \wedge \beta^{n-p} / (n-p)! \text{ and } \tau_{\Omega_\psi} = dd^\# \psi \wedge \Omega \wedge \beta^{n-p-1} / (n-p-1)!.$$

Let  $\chi$  be a smooth cutoff function which is equal to 1 on  $K$  and compactly supported in  $U$ . Then

$$\int_K \tau_{\Omega_\psi} \leq \int_U \chi dd^\# \psi \wedge \Omega \wedge \beta^{n-p-1} / (n-p-1)!.$$

By Stokes' theorem this equals

$$\int_U \psi dd^\# \chi \wedge \Omega \wedge \beta^{n-p-1} / (n-p-1)! \leq C \sup_U |\psi| \int_U \tau_\Omega,$$

since all coefficients of  $\Omega$  can be estimated by its trace by Proposition 3.7. □

We are now ready to give the main result of this section. We aim to define the map

$$(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_k, \Omega) \rightarrow dd^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \psi_k \wedge \Omega$$

for all convex functions and as large a class of  $\Omega$  as possible. The map is clearly defined when  $\psi_j$  are smooth and we will define its extension to general  $\psi_j$  by continuity.

**Theorem 4.2.** *The map*

$$(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_k, \Omega) \rightarrow dd^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \psi_k \wedge \Omega =: M(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_k, \Omega)$$

*defined for  $\psi_j$  smooth, has an extension to all convex functions and  $(p, p)$  currents  $\Omega$  that are closed, weakly positive and strong, that is continuous in the following sense: If  $\psi_j^i$  converge to  $\psi_j$  uniformly and  $\Omega^i$  converges to  $\Omega$  weak\* as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $M(\psi_1^i, \dots, \psi_k^i, \Omega^i)$  converges weak\* to  $M(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_k, \Omega)$ .  $M(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_k, \Omega)$  is again closed, weakly positive and strong.*

*Proof.* By induction it is enough to prove the theorem when  $k = 1$ . We need to prove that if  $\psi^i$  and  $\Omega^i$  converge in the sense described, and  $\psi^i$  are smooth, then

$$dd^\# \psi^i \wedge \Omega^i$$

has a weak\* limit. Note that the fact that  $\Omega^i$  converges implies that the trace measures of  $\Omega^i$  are uniformly bounded on each compact. Lemma 4.1 implies that this holds also for the trace measures of  $dd^\# \psi^i \wedge \Omega^i$ . Since these currents are weakly positive and strong it follows by Proposition 3.7 that all the coefficients are measures with uniformly bounded mass on compacts, so there is at least a subsequence that converges. We need to prove that all convergent subsequences have the same limit.

For this it is enough to prove that the limits of

$$I_i(\chi) := \int \chi \wedge dd^\# \psi^i \wedge \Omega^i$$

exist when  $\chi$  is a smooth and compactly supported form of bidegree  $(n-p-1, n-p-1)$ . We have

$$I_i = \int \psi^i dd^\# \chi \wedge \Omega^i.$$

Take a large  $k$  and put

$$I_{i,k} = \int \psi^k dd^\# \chi \wedge \Omega^i.$$

Then

$$|I_{i,k} - I_i| \leq C \sup |\psi^i - \psi^k|,$$

the supremum taken over the support of  $\chi$ . Thus  $|I_{i,k} - I_i| < \epsilon$  if  $i$  and  $k$  are large enough. On the other hand the limit of  $I_{i,k}$  as  $i$  tends to infinity exists by the weak convergence of  $\Omega^i$ . Therefore the limits of any two subsequences of  $I_i$  can differ at most by  $2\epsilon$  for any  $\epsilon > 0$ . Hence the limit of  $I^i$  exists, which concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 4.3.** Note that the same result, with ‘weakly positive and strong’ replaced by ‘positive’ also holds, with the same proof.

In particular, it follows from Theorem 4.2 that if  $\psi$  is convex,

$$(dd^\# \psi)^n / n!$$

is a well defined measure and is continuous in  $\psi$ . When  $\psi$  is smooth

$$(dd^\# \psi)^n / n! = \det(\psi_{j\bar{k}}) dV$$

and one therefore defines it to be the Monge- Ampère measure,  $MA(\psi)$ , of  $\psi$  in general.

The classical definition of Alexandrov ([7]) of the Monge- Ampère measure starts by defining the Monge- Ampère measure of an open set  $U$ :

$$MA(\psi)(U) = \lambda(\nabla \psi(U)),$$

where  $\nabla \psi$  is the (multivalued) subgradient of  $\psi$  and  $\lambda$  is Lebesgue measure. The two definitions coincide when  $\psi$  is smooth ( see e.g. the next section) and are continuous in  $\psi$  so they agree in general.

One remark is in order here (and will be important when we discuss Monge- Ampère measures on the boundary of a convex body). Alexandrov’s definition obviously depends on a choice of Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ; it is only determined up to a multiplicative constant. In our definition this normalization is hidden in a choice of coordinates such that

$$\int d\xi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge d\xi_n (-1)^{n(n-1)/2} = 1,$$

or rather in the choice of a scalar product on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  such that this holds for any orthonormal coordinates. This is a difference compared to the complex case; the complex Monge- Ampère measure is uniquely determined by the complex structure. (I thank Mattias Jonsson for this remark.)

We list a few consequences of Theorem 4.2 that will be useful. The first is that if  $\psi$  is convex and  $\Omega$  satisfies the hypothesis of the proposition, then

$$d\psi \wedge dd^\# \psi \wedge \Omega$$

is well defined and has the same continuity properties as  $dd^\# \psi \wedge \Omega$ . In the proof of this we may of course assume that  $\psi > 0$ . Then  $\psi^2$  is again convex with

$$dd^\# \psi^2 / 2 = \psi dd^\# \psi + d\psi \wedge d^\# \psi.$$

Since our claim holds for  $dd^\# \psi^2$  and  $\psi dd^\# \psi$  it must hold for  $d\psi \wedge d^\# \psi$  as well.

The next thing we want to record is that our closed positive currents can also be wedged with the supercurrent of integration on a convex hypersurface. More precisely, let  $\mu$  be a convex

gauge function. By this we mean a convex function on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , which is homogeneous of order 1 and strictly positive outside the origin. Then

$$B_\mu := \{x; \mu(x) \leq 1\}$$

is a convex body, containing the origin in its interior. Conversely, any such convex body can be represented this way by a unique gauge. We define the supercurrent of integration on the boundary of  $B_\mu$ ,  $S_\mu$ , by

$$\int [S_\mu]_s \wedge \chi = \int_{S_\mu} d^\# \mu \wedge \chi$$

for any smooth form  $\chi$  of degree  $2n - 2$ . This is well defined if  $\mu$  (and hence  $S_\mu$ ) is smooth. We will show that we can extend the definition by continuity to all gauge functions and that the map

$$(\mu, \Omega) \rightarrow [S_\mu]_s \wedge \Omega$$

is jointly continuous in  $\mu$  and  $\Omega$  as in Theorem 4.2, provided we only look at currents  $\Omega$  that are *homogeneous of order zero* (it does not hold in general). By this we mean that

$$F_t^*(\Omega) = \Omega,$$

where  $F_t(x, \xi) = (tx, \xi)$ . If  $\Omega$  is of bidegree  $(p, p)$  this means that its coefficients are homogeneous of order  $-p$ . Homogeneous forms and currents will play an important role later and will be discussed in more detail in section 6. For the moment we just note that if a function  $\psi$  is homogeneous of order 1, then its second order derivatives are homogeneous of order  $-1$ , so currents like  $dd^\# \psi$  and their wedge products are homogeneous of order zero.

To define  $[S_\mu]_s$  for general  $\mu$  we put  $\mu^+ = \max(1, \mu)$ , and

$$T_\mu := dd^\# \mu^+ = dd^\# \max(0, \mu - 1).$$

We claim that, if  $\mu$  is smooth,

$$T_\mu = [S_\mu]_s + \chi_{\{\mu > 1\}} dd^\# \mu.$$

For this we use Stokes' formula again: If  $\chi$  is smooth with compact support

$$\int \chi \wedge T_\mu = \int \max(0, \mu - 1) dd^\# \chi = \int_{\mu > 1} (\mu - 1) dd^\# \chi = \int_{\mu > 1} \chi \wedge dd^\# \mu + \int_{S_\mu} d^\# \mu \wedge \chi$$

(the sign of the last term comes from integrating over the exterior of  $B_\mu$ ). We therefore define, in general,

$$[S_\mu]_s = \chi_{\mu \leq 1} T_\mu.$$

**Proposition 4.4.** *The map*

$$(\mu, \Omega) \rightarrow [S_\mu]_s \wedge \Omega,$$

*defined for  $\mu$  a smooth gauge function and  $\Omega$  a smooth  $(p, p)$  form, has an extension to all convex gauge functions and all  $(p, p)$ -currents  $\Omega$  that are homogeneous of order zero, closed, weakly positive and strong. The map is continuous in the following sense: If  $\mu^i \rightarrow \mu$  uniformly and  $\Omega^i \rightarrow \Omega$  weak\*, then*

$$[S_{\mu^i}]_s \wedge \Omega^i \rightarrow [S_\mu]_s \wedge \Omega$$

*in the weak\* topology.*

*Proof.* We have

$$[S_\mu]_s = \chi_{\mu \leq 1} T_\mu.$$

Therefore continuity almost follows from the continuity properties of  $T_\mu \wedge \Omega$  in Theorem 4.2, except for the problem that  $\chi_{\mu \leq 1}$  is not continuous. To overcome this we approximate  $\chi_{\mu \leq 1}$  by  $\chi_\epsilon(\mu)$  where  $\chi_\epsilon(t)$  is a nonnegative smooth function that equals 1 when  $t \leq 1$  and is supported where  $t < 1 + \epsilon$ . We will use the general fact that if currents  $R^i$  with measure coefficients converge weak\* to  $R$  and continuous functions  $\phi^i$  converge uniformly to  $\phi$ , then  $\phi^i R^i$  converge weak\* to  $\phi R$ . Put

$$S_\mu^\epsilon = \chi_\epsilon(\mu) T_\mu.$$

Since  $\chi_\epsilon(\mu)$  is a continuous function and continuous in  $\mu$  it follows from Theorem 4.2 and the remark above that  $S_\mu^\epsilon \wedge \Omega$  is jointly continuous in  $\mu$  and  $\Omega$ .

Therefore it suffices to show that

$$\int (S_{\mu^i}^\epsilon - [S_{\mu^i}]_s) \wedge \Omega^i \wedge \Omega' = \int_{1 < \mu^i < 1 + \epsilon} \chi_\epsilon(\mu^i) dd^\# \mu^i \wedge \Omega^i \wedge \Omega'$$

is uniformly small when  $\Omega^i$  tend weak\* to  $\Omega$ ,  $\mu^i$  tend uniformly to  $\mu$  and  $\Omega'$  is continuous with compact support. But, by Lemma 4.1 the mass of the currents

$$dd^\# \mu^i \wedge \Omega^i$$

over any bounded domain in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$  is uniformly bounded. By homogeneity this gives that the mass over a domain  $\{1 < \mu^i < 1 + \epsilon\}$  is bounded by a constant times  $\epsilon$ , which concludes the proof.  $\square$

Although it is not quite indispensable, this proposition will be useful in computations later, since we may assume that e.g.  $\mu$  (and hence  $S_\mu$ ) is smooth.

We end this section with a useful estimate for Monge- Ampère masses. Say that a convex function in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is of linear growth if

$$\psi(x) \leq A|x| + B$$

for some constants  $A$  and  $B$ . For such functions we can define their indicator functions

$$\psi^\circ(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi(tx)}{t}.$$

Such limits exist since

$$t \rightarrow \frac{\psi(tx) - \psi(0)}{t}$$

is increasing and bounded from above. The next theorem is also essentially contained in [30].

**Theorem 4.5.** *Let  $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n$  be convex functions of linear growth in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Then*

$$V(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n) := \int dd^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \psi_n / n! < \infty.$$

*If  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n$  is another  $n$ -tuple of convex functions of linear growth with  $\psi_i^\circ \leq \phi_i^\circ$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , then*

$$V(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n) \leq V(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n).$$



In particular,  $V(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n)$  depends only on  $\psi_i^\circ$ .

*Proof.* To prove the first part we may of course assume that  $\psi_i(x) \leq |x|/2$  for all  $i$ . It suffices to show that there is a constant  $C$ , such that for any  $R > 0$ ,

$$\int_{|x| < R} dd^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \psi_n \leq C.$$

Choose  $A$  so large that  $\psi_i(x) \geq |x| - A$ , when  $|x| \leq R$ , and put

$$\phi_i(x) = \max(\psi_i, |x| - A).$$

Then  $\phi_i$  are convex functions and  $\phi_i(x) = \psi_i(x)$  when  $|x| \leq R$  and  $\phi_i(x) = |x| - A$  when  $|x| \geq R'/2$  for  $R'$  sufficiently large. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|x| < R} dd^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \psi_n &\leq \int_{|x| < R'} dd^\# \phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \phi_n = \int_{|x|=R'} d^\# |x| \wedge (dd^\# |x|)^{n-1} = \\ &\int_{|x| < R'} (dd^\# |x|)^n. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $|x|$  is homogeneous of order 1,  $(dd^\# |x|)^n = 0$  outside the origin. This is a general fact that will be discussed further in the next section, but is of course easy to verify directly. The last integral is therefore independent of  $R'$ , which proves the claim. (The reader who so prefers can also replace  $|x|$  here by  $(1 + |x|^2)^{1/2}$  and verify that one gets convergent integrals in this case.)

The proof of the second part is similar. Replacing  $\phi_i$  by  $\phi_i + \epsilon|x|$  (and letting  $\epsilon$  tend to zero in the end) we may assume that  $\phi_j^\circ \geq \psi_j^\circ + \epsilon|x|$ . Clearly, we may also assume that  $\psi_i(0) = \phi_i(0) = 0$  for all  $i$ . Fix  $R > 0$ . Then

$$\phi_i(tx)/t \uparrow \phi_i^\circ(x).$$

Since  $\phi_i^\circ$  is continuous it follows from Dini's lemma that the convergence is uniform on  $|x| = 1$ . Hence, if  $|x| > R'/2$ , ( $R'$  sufficiently large)

$$\phi_i(x) > \phi_i^\circ(x) - \epsilon|x|/2.$$

We also have that  $t \rightarrow \psi(tx)/t$  increases so

$$\psi_i(x) \leq \psi_i^\circ(x) \leq \phi_i^\circ(x) - \epsilon|x|$$

for all  $x$ . Hence

$$\psi_i(x) < \phi_i(x) - \epsilon/2|x|$$

if  $|x| > R'/2$ . Put

$$\Phi_i(x) = \max(\psi_i(x), \phi_i(x) - A),$$

where  $A$  is so large that  $\Phi_i(x) = \psi_i(x)$  for  $|x| < R$ . If  $R'$  is large enough we also have that  $\Phi_i(x) = \phi_i(x) - A$  when  $|x| > R'/2$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{|x| < R} dd^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \psi_n &\leq \int_{|x| < R'} dd^\# \Phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \Phi_n = \int_{|x|=R'} d^\# \phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \phi_n = \\ &\int_{|x| < R'} dd^\# \phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \phi_n \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} dd^\# \phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \phi_n. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $R$  is arbitrary, this completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5. VOLUMES AND MIXED VOLUMES OF CONVEX BODIES.

If  $K$  is a convex body its support function is defined as

$$h_K(x) = \sup_{y \in K} x \cdot y.$$

It is immediate that support functions are convex and homogeneous of order 1. Conversely, if  $\psi$  is convex and homogeneous of order 1 we can consider its Legendre transform

$$\psi^*(y) = \sup_x x \cdot y - \psi(x).$$

Clearly  $\psi^* \geq 0$ . If  $\psi^*(y) > 0$  for a certain  $y$  we see that actually  $\psi^*(y) = \infty$ , since  $x \cdot y - \psi(x)$  is homogeneous of order 1 in  $x$ . Let  $K = \{\psi^* = 0\}$ . It is a closed set, since  $\psi^*$  is lower semicontinuous, and bounded since  $\psi$  is of linear growth, so  $K$  is compact. By the involutivity of the Legendre transform

$$\psi(x) = \sup_y x \cdot y - \psi^*(y) = \sup_{y \in K} x \cdot y$$

is the support function of  $K$ . As we have seen  $K$  is also uniquely determined by  $\psi$  so we have a one-to-one correspondence between convex bodies and 1-homogeneous convex functions. The positive  $(1, 1)$ -current  $\omega_K := dd^\# h_K$  determines  $K$  up to translation, and in the next section we shall see which positive  $(1, 1)$ -currents that arise in this way.

The following proposition from [30] plays an important role in this paper, but we give a different proof here.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $\psi$  be a convex function in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  of linear growth, and  $\psi^\circ$  its indicator function. Then  $\psi^\circ$  is the support function  $h_K$  for a uniquely determined convex body  $K$ . We have*

$$V(\psi, \dots, \psi) = \int (dd^\# \psi)^n / n! = \int MA(\psi) = |K|,$$

the Lebesgue measure of  $K$ .

*Proof.* We first note that if  $K$  has empty interior, then  $K$  is included in a hyperplane, that we can take to be  $\{x_1 = 0\}$ , and so has measure zero. Then  $h_K(x)$  depends only on  $x_2, \dots, x_n$ , so  $(dd^\# h_K)^n = 0$ . So the proposition holds in this case and we assume from now on that the interior of  $K$  is non-empty. By Theorem 4.5 it is enough to prove the proposition for *some*  $\psi$  with  $\psi^\circ$ .

A convenient choice (cf. [25]) is

$$\psi(x) := \log \int_K e^{x \cdot y} d\lambda(y).$$

Then  $\psi$  is convex and  $\psi^\circ = h_K$ , since  $L^t$ -norms tend to the  $L^\infty$ -norm when  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Put

$$g(x) := \partial\psi(x),$$

the gradient map of  $\psi$ . We claim that  $g$  is a diffeomorphism from  $\mathbb{R}^n$  to the interior of  $K$ . To start with

$$\partial\psi(x) = \frac{\int_K y e^{x \cdot y} d\lambda(y)}{\int_K e^{x \cdot y} d\lambda(y)}$$

is the barycenter of a probability measure with full support on  $K$ , so it must lie in the interior of  $K$ .

To prove that  $g$  is bijective we take a point in the interior of  $K$ , that we may assume is the origin. We need to prove that there is exactly one  $x$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with  $g(x) = 0$ . Since  $\psi$  is smooth and strictly convex, this amounts to saying that  $\psi$  has a unique minimum. But, if  $0 \in K^\circ$ ,

$$\psi(x) \geq \log \int_{|x| < \epsilon} e^{x \cdot y} d\lambda(y),$$

so  $\psi$  is proper. Hence  $\psi$  has a minimum, which is unique by strict convexity. The claim of the theorem now follows from a change of variables  $y = g(x)$ ;

$$V(\psi, \dots, \psi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \det(\psi_{jk}) d\lambda = \int_{y \in K} d\lambda = |K|.$$

□

As a corollary we get a theorem from [30].

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let  $K$  be a convex body and  $h_K$  its support function. Then*

$$MA(h_K) = |K|\delta_0,$$

where  $\delta_0$  is the unit Dirac mass at the origin.

*Proof.* We know that  $MA(h_K)$  is a positive measure. Since  $h_K$  is 1-homogeneous the Monge-Ampère measure must vanish outside the origin. This is evident when  $h_K$  is smooth (since  $MA(\psi) = \det(\psi_{jk})d\lambda$  for smooth functions), and again we refer to the next section for the general case. Hence

$$MA(h_K) = c\delta_0$$

for some  $c$  and  $c = |K|$  by Theorem 5.1. □

Next we consider an  $n$ -tuple of convex bodies,  $K_1, \dots, K_n$  and their weighted Minkowski sum

$$K_t := t_1 K_1 + \dots + t_n K_n = \left\{ \sum t_i x_i; x_i \in K_i \right\}.$$

It is immediate that

$$h_{K_t} = \sum t_i h_{K_i},$$

so

$$|K_t| = \int (\sum t_i dd^\# h_{K_i})^n / n!$$

is a polynomial in  $t$ . The coefficient of  $t_1 \dots t_n$  here is

$$\int dd^\# h_{K_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# h_{K_n} = V(h_{K_1}, \dots, h_{K_n}) n!.$$

The *mixed volume* of  $K_1, \dots, K_n$  is defined as

$$V(K_1, \dots, K_n) := V(h_{K_1}, \dots, h_{K_n}) = \int dd^\# h_{K_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# h_{K_n} / n!.$$

Hence  $V(K, \dots, K) = |K|$  and  $V(K_1, \dots, K_n)$  is symmetric under permutations. Moreover it is Minkowski linear in each variable so can be seen as a polarization of the volume function. By Theorem 4.5

$$V(K_1, \dots, K_n) = V(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n)$$

where  $\psi_i$  are any convex functions of linear growth with indicators equal to  $h_{K_i}$ .

Because of the  $n$ -linearity of  $V$  it is natural to extend its definition to functions,  $f_i = \psi_i - \phi_i$ , that can be written as differences of convex functions of linear growth

$$V(f_1, \dots, f_n) = \int dd^\# f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# f_n / n!.$$

Notice that such functions also have indicator functions  $f_i^\circ = \psi_i^\circ - \phi_i^\circ$  and that  $V(f_1, \dots, f_n)$  only depends on their indicators.

Let us define  $\Delta$  as the linear space of functions that can be written as a difference of two 1-homogeneous convex functions,  $f = \psi - \phi$ . 1-homogeneous functions are uniquely determined by their values on the unit sphere (or on any 'sphere'  $S_\mu$ , where  $\mu$  is a gauge function). Conversely, any function on the sphere has a unique extension to a 1-homogeneous function. We can endow  $\Delta$  with two norms in the following ways.

The first choice is simply the supremum norm

$$(5.1) \quad \|f\|_0 := \sup_{|x|=1} |f(x)|$$

which is well defined since (differences of) convex functions are continuous. However, it is not complete. In fact any smooth function lies in  $\Delta$ , so  $\Delta$  is dense in the space of continuous functions, but continuous functions cannot in general be written as differences of convex functions. The second choice, which is complete, is

$$(5.2) \quad \|f\| := \inf_{\psi - \phi = f} \|\psi\|_0 + \|\phi\|_0.$$

This is indeed a norm and  $\|f_j\| \rightarrow 0$  if and only if there are convex functions  $\psi_j, \phi_j$  such that  $f_j = \psi_j - \phi_j$ , and both  $\psi_j$  and  $\phi_j$  tend to zero uniformly. If  $f_j$  forms a Cauchy sequence for this norm there is a subsequence, which we may assume is the whole sequence, such that

$$\|f_j - f_{j+1}\| < 2^{-j}.$$

This means that there are convex  $\psi_j, \phi_j$  with  $f_j = \psi_j - \phi_j$  and  $\|\psi_j\| + \|\phi_j\| \leq 2^{-j}$ . Hence their sums converge to convex functions  $\psi$  and  $\phi$  respectively and it follows that  $f_N - f_1$  converges to  $\psi - \phi$ . Hence this norm is complete. It also follows from the continuity properties of  $V(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n)$  for convex functions that  $V(f_1, \dots, f_n)$  is continuous for this norm. There is, however, also a disadvantage with this norm that we will need to come back to later: It seems hard to determine its dual.

## 6. HOMOGENEOUS FORMS.

In the previous section, currents of the form

$$\omega = dd^\# \psi$$

where  $\psi$  is convex and 1-homogeneous played an important role. Such currents are obviously closed (and  $d^\#$ -closed) but they also have one more important property that we now introduce. Let

$$E := \sum x_j \partial / \partial x_j$$

be the Euler vector field on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Its flow, regarded as a vector field on  $\mathbb{C}^n = \mathbb{R}_x^n \oplus \mathbb{R}_\xi^n$ , is

$$F_t(x, \xi) = (e^t x, \xi).$$

We also put

$$E^\# := \sum x_j \partial / \partial \xi_j,$$

whose flow is

$$G_t(x, \xi) = (x, \xi + tx).$$

We denote by  $\delta$  contraction with the field  $E$  and  $\delta^\#$  contraction with  $E^\#$ . By Euler's formulas,  $\delta(df) = E(f) = qf$  if  $f$  is homogeneous of order  $q$ .

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $\omega = dd^\#\psi$  where  $\psi$  is convex and homogeneous of order 1. Then  $\delta\omega = 0$ . Conversely if  $\omega$  is a closed positive  $(1, 1)$ -current satisfying  $\delta\omega = 0$ , then  $\omega = dd^\#\psi$  for some convex and 1-homogeneous function.*

*Proof.* If  $\psi$  is 1-homogeneous, the partial derivatives of  $\psi$ ,  $\psi_k = \partial\psi / \partial x_k$ , are homogeneous of order zero. Hence

$$\delta\omega = \sum x_j \psi_{jk} d\xi_k = \sum E(\psi_k) d\xi_k = 0$$

by Euler's formulas.

For the converse, we can always write  $\omega = dd^\#\psi$  for some convex function  $\psi$ . Then  $\delta\omega = 0$  means

$$\sum_j x_j \psi_{jk} = 0$$

for all  $k$ . This means that all  $\psi_k$  are homogeneous of order zero. Thus

$$\phi(x) := \sum x_j \psi_j$$

is 1-homogeneous and

$$\phi_k = \psi_k + \sum x_j \psi_{jk} = \psi_k.$$

Hence  $d^\#\phi = d^\#\psi$ , so  $dd^\#\phi = dd^\#\psi = \omega$ .  $\square$

Since  $\psi$  is 1-homogeneous it follows that the coefficients of  $\omega$ ,  $\psi_{jk}$  are homogeneous of order -1. In other words

$$F_t^*(\omega) = \omega,$$

so, as a current,  $\omega$  is homogeneous of order zero. However, not every closed symmetric current that is homogeneous of order zero can be written as  $dd^\#$  of a 1-homogeneous function, as the example

$$x_1^{-1} dx_1 \wedge d\xi_1 = dd^\# x_1 \log |x_1|$$

shows. Hence, the condition  $\delta\omega = 0$  is stronger.

**Definition 6.2.** Let  $\Omega$  be a symmetric and closed current with measure coefficients of bidegree  $(p, p)$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ . We say that  $\Omega$  is strongly homogeneous if  $\delta\Omega = 0$  (and hence  $\delta^\# \Omega = 0$ ). We write  $\Omega \in SH_p$ .

We shall prove later, in section 8.1, that if  $\Omega$  is  $d$ -closed and  $\delta^\# \Omega = 0$ , then  $\Omega$  is automatically symmetric. Thus closed forms (with measure coefficients) that satisfy  $\delta^\# \Omega = 0$  are strongly homogeneous, and we could have taken that as a more economical definition of strongly homogeneous. Since we are assuming that  $\Omega$  is of bidegree  $(p, p)$ , this can also be written

$$(6.1) \quad (d + \delta^\#)\Omega = 0.$$

As we have seen, currents of the form  $\omega = dd^\# \psi$  where  $\psi$  is (convex and) 1-homogeneous are strongly homogeneous. Since contraction with a vector field is an antiderivation, it follows that any wedge product

$$\Omega = dd^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \psi_p$$

is also strongly homogeneous. By Cartan's magic formula, the Lie derivative of a form or current along  $E$  is

$${}_E \Omega = (d\delta + \delta d)\Omega.$$

Therefore a strongly homogeneous current of bidegree  $(p, p)$  is invariant under the flow of  $E$ , which means that its coefficients are homogeneous of order  $-p$ .

By symmetry, a strongly homogeneous current also satisfies  $\delta^\# \Omega = 0$ , which implies in the same way that it is invariant under the flow

$$G_t(x, \xi) = (x, \xi + tx)$$

since  ${}_E \Omega = 0$ . Notice that the coefficients of  $\Omega$  automatically satisfy this since they are independent of  $\xi$ . Therefore  ${}_E \#$  is a pure algebraic operator on superforms, and it is easily checked that

$${}_E \#(\chi) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \right|_{t=0} G_t^*(\chi) = \sum dx_i \wedge \delta_{\xi_i}(\chi) = T\chi$$

is the operator introduced in formula 3.1. (Since  ${}_E \#$  and  $T$  are derivations and they obviously both vanish on functions and  $(p, 0)$ -forms, it is enough to check this for  $\chi = d\xi_J$  - or even just for  $\chi = d\xi_k$ .)

Summing up, we have shown that strongly homogeneous currents are homogeneous of order zero under scaling in the  $x$ -variable and belong to the kernel of  $T$ . By Theorem 3.1 this implies that strongly homogeneous currents are strong. (When the current is smooth this is precisely the content of the theorem and the generalization to currents follows by regularization by convolution with an approximate identity - note that the kernel of  $T$  is invariant under translation.)

We next introduce a natural and useful pairing between strongly homogeneous currents and 1-homogeneous functions. Recall that we defined a gauge function as a convex 1-homogeneous function  $\mu$  that is strictly positive outside the origin. Its associated unit sphere,  $S_\mu$ , is the set where  $\mu = 1$ . We also defined the supercurrent of  $S_\mu$  by

$$[S_\mu]_s \cdot \chi = \int d^\# \mu \wedge \chi$$

if  $\chi$  is a smooth form of bidegree  $(n-1, n-1)$ . We then showed that the wedge product

$$[S_\mu]_s \wedge \Omega$$

is well defined. By Proposition 4.4 it is continuous in  $\Omega$  in the weak\*-topology on the space of  $\Omega$ 's that are weakly positive and ‘strong’, and also continuous under uniform convergence in  $\mu$ .

**Definition 6.3.** Let  $\mu$  be a gauge function and  $f$  a continuous 1-homogeneous function, and let  $\Omega$  be a current in  $SH_{n-1}$ . Then

$$\langle f, \Omega \rangle_\mu = \int_{S_\mu} f d^\# \mu \wedge \Omega = [S_\mu]_s \cdot f \Omega.$$

**Proposition 6.4.** *The pairing  $\langle f, \Omega \rangle_\mu$  does not depend on  $\mu$ .*

The proof uses a simple but fundamental lemma that we will have use for in other contexts as well.

**Lemma 6.5.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a current of bidegree  $(p, p)$  satisfying  $\delta^\# \Omega = 0$ , and let  $f$  and  $g$  be 1-homogeneous and smooth. Then*

$$(6.2) \quad f d^\# g \wedge \Omega = g d^\# f \wedge \Omega.$$

*Proof.* Applying  $\delta^\#$  to both sides we get

$$\delta^\#(f d^\# g \wedge \Omega) = f g \Omega = \delta^\#(g d^\# f \wedge \Omega).$$

Since both sides in (6.2) are of full degree in  $d\xi$  this implies that they are equal.  $\square$

In the same way one sees that a strongly homogeneous current,  $\Omega$ , of bidegree  $(n, n)$ , like  $dd^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \psi_n$  where  $\psi_i$  are 1-homogeneous, vanishes outside the origin, since  $\delta \Omega = 0$  – a fact that we have used repeatedly. Given the lemma we can now prove Proposition 6.4.

*Proof.* (Of Proposition 6.4) Let  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  be two gauges. Assume first that  $S_{\mu'} \subset \{\mu < 1\}$ . We want to prove that

$$\langle f, \Omega \rangle_\mu = \int_{S_\mu} f d^\# \mu \wedge \Omega = \int_{S_{\mu'}} f d^\# \mu' \wedge \Omega = \langle f, \Omega \rangle_{\mu'}$$

for all continuous 1-homogeneous functions  $f$  and we may of course assume that  $f$  is smooth. Note first that

$$dd^\# f \wedge \Omega = 0$$

outside the origin since it is strongly homogeneous of full degree. Therefore

$$\langle f, \Omega \rangle_\mu = \int_{S_\mu} f d^\# \mu \wedge \Omega = \int_{S_\mu} \mu d^\# f \wedge \Omega = \int_{S_\mu} d^\# f \wedge \Omega = \int_{S_{\mu'}} \mu' d^\# f \wedge \Omega = \langle f, \Omega \rangle_{\mu'}$$

where we have used in turn Proposition 6.2, that  $\mu = 1$  on  $S_\mu$  and Stokes’ theorem. If  $S_{\mu'}$  is not a subset of the set where  $\mu < 1$  we can take a third gauge  $\mu''$  such that both  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  are larger than 1 on  $S_{\mu''}$ . Then the pairings defined by  $\mu$  and  $\mu'$  are both equal to the pairing defined by  $\mu''$ , hence equal.  $\square$

The next proposition explains better the pairing and could be developed into an alternative proof of Proposition 6.4.

**Proposition 6.6.** *Let  $\Omega = dd^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \psi_{n-1}$  and  $f = \psi_n$ , all  $\psi_i$  being convex and 1-homogeneous. Then the pairing becomes*

$$\langle \psi_n, dd^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \psi_{n-1} \rangle_\mu = V(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n) n!.$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi_n, dd^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \psi_{n-1} \rangle_\mu &= \int_{\mu(x)=1} \psi_n dd^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \psi_{n-1} d^\# \mu = \int_{\mu(x)=1} dd^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \psi_{n-1} \wedge d^\# \psi_n = \\ &= \int dd^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \psi_n, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 6.5. □

We remark that Proposition 6.4 can be localized at no extra cost: If  $\mathcal{K}$  is an open cone in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with vertex at the origin we have

$$\int_{S_\mu \cap \mathcal{K}} f \Omega = \int_{S_{\mu'} \cap \mathcal{K}} f \Omega.$$

This is simply because the characteristic function of the cone is homogeneous of order zero. Admittedly, it is not continuous, but this poses no problems since it can be approximated by an increasing sequence of smooth functions, homogeneous of order zero. Yet another rewrite of Proposition 6.4 is the following

**Proposition 6.7.** *Under the same assumptions as in Proposition 6.4 define measures*

$$d\nu = d^\# \mu \wedge \Omega, \quad d\nu' = d^\# \nu' \wedge \Omega$$

*on  $S_\mu$  and  $S_{\mu'}$  respectively. Let  $\pi$  be the radial projection from  $S_{\mu'}$  to  $S_\mu$ . Then*

$$\pi_*(d\nu') = \mu' d\nu.$$

*Proof.* Note first that

$$\pi(x) = x/\mu(x)$$

so the proposition says that if  $f$  is any continuous function on  $S_\mu$ , then

$$(6.3) \quad \int_{S_\mu} f \mu' d\nu = \int_{S_{\mu'}} f(x/\mu(x)) d\nu'.$$

We know from Proposition 6.4 that if  $g$  is 1-homogeneous, then

$$\int_{S_\mu} g d\nu = \int_{S_{\mu'}} g d\nu'.$$

Taking  $g = f(x/\mu(x))\mu'$  we get (6.3). □

Our next objective is to prove that the pairing, that we can now denote as  $\langle f, \Omega \rangle$ , is non degenerate. We deduce one part of that from a more general proposition.



**Proposition 6.8.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a closed positive strongly homogeneous current of bidegree  $(n-1, n-1)$ . Assume that*

$$\langle f, \Omega \rangle = 0$$

for all smooth  $f$ . Then  $\Omega = 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ .

*Proof.* By Proposition 6.4 it is enough to prove that  $\Omega = 0$  if  $[S_\mu] \wedge \Omega = 0$  for some  $\mu$ , that we may take to be smooth. Then the hypothesis means that

$$d\mu \wedge d^\# \mu \wedge \Omega = 0$$

when  $\mu = 1$ . Applying  $\delta$  and then  $\delta^\#$  we get, since  $\delta(d\mu) = \mu$  and  $\delta^\# d^\# \mu = \mu$  that  $\Omega = 0$  when  $\mu = 1$ . Since the coefficients of  $\Omega$  are homogeneous of order  $-p$ ,  $\Omega$  vanishes outside the origin.  $\square$

This proves one part of nondegeneracy. We now turn to the remaining part.

**Theorem 6.9.** *Let  $\mu$  be a gauge and let  $d\nu$  be a measure on  $S_\mu$ . Then there is a unique strongly homogeneous current in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $\Omega$ , such that  $\Omega \wedge d^\# \mu = d\nu$ , i.e.*

$$\int_{S_\mu} f d\nu = \int_{S_\mu} f \Omega \wedge d^\# \mu,$$

for any continuous  $f$ . Moreover, the trivial extension of  $\Omega$ ,  $\tilde{\Omega}$ , on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is closed if and only if  $d\nu$  has barycenter zero.

Conversely, we already know that if  $\Omega$  is weakly positive and strongly homogeneous of bidegree  $(n-1, n-1)$  then its trace on  $S_\mu$  is a well defined positive measure measure. Hence there is a one-to-one correspondence between positive measures on, say, the sphere, and weakly positive currents in  $SH_{n-1}$ . We also remark that any homogeneous current of bidegree  $(p, p)$  ( $p < n$ ) has a trivial extension across the origin. When  $p < n-1$ , the singularity at the origin is too weak to give a contribution to  $d\tilde{\Omega}$ , but when  $p = n-1$  we may get Dirac masses at the origin as the theorem shows.

*Proof.* By Proposition 6.7 it is enough to prove this for  $\mu(x) = |x|$ . We define  $\tilde{\Omega}$  directly and then show that it has the desired properties. Let

$$\eta = \sum \eta_{ik} dx_i \wedge d\xi_k$$

be a smooth form with compact support in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We define an  $(n-1, n-1)$  current  $\tilde{\Omega}$  by

$$\tilde{\Omega} \cdot \eta = \sum_{ik} \int_{|x|=1} x_i x_k d\nu(x) \int_0^\infty \eta_{ik}(tx) dt.$$

Then  $\tilde{\Omega}$  is a symmetric current with measure coefficients. In order to prove that  $\delta\tilde{\Omega} = 0$  outside the origin we also define an  $(n, n-1)$  current  $\rho$  outside the origin by

$$\rho \cdot \tau = \sum_k \int_{|x|=1} x_k d\nu(x) \int_0^\infty \tau_k(tx) dt/t,$$

if  $\tau = \sum \tau_k d\xi_k$  is a smooth  $(0, 1)$  form compactly supported in  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ . If  $\eta = 0$  near the origin we have, since  $\delta\eta = \sum x_i \eta_{ik} d\xi_k$ , that

$$\rho.\delta\eta = \sum_{ik} \int_{|x|=1} x_i x_k d\nu(x) \int_0^\infty \eta_{ik}(tx) dt = \Omega.\eta.$$

Hence  $\delta\rho = \Omega$  so  $\delta\Omega = 0$ .

Let now  $\eta = d\tau$ ,  $\tau(0, 1)$  with compact support in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Omega}.d\tau &= \sum_{ik} \int_{|x|=1} x_i x_k d\nu(x) \int_0^\infty \frac{\partial \tau_k}{\partial x_i}(tx) dt = \sum_k \int_{|x|=1} x_k d\nu(x) \int_0^\infty (d/dt)\tau_k(tx) dt = \\ &= - \sum \tau_k(0) \int_{|x|=1} x_k d\nu(x). \end{aligned}$$

This means that

$$d\tilde{\Omega}.\tau = \sum \tau_k(0) \int_{|x|=1} x_k d\nu(x)$$

so  $d\tilde{\Omega}$  is zero outside the origin and equal to zero across the origin if and only if the barycenter of  $d\nu$  is zero. It remains only to prove that the trace of  $\Omega$  on the unit sphere is  $d\nu$ . This is equivalent to saying that for any smooth function  $f$  supported outside the origin (with  $\mu(x) = |x|$ )

$$(6.4) \quad \int_{|x|<1} df \wedge \Omega \wedge d^\# \mu = \int_{|x|=1} f d\nu - \int_{|x|<1} f \tilde{\Omega} \wedge d d^\# \mu.$$

But the LHS is

$$\sum_{ik} \int_{|x|=1} x_i x_k d\nu(x) \int_0^\infty f_i(tx) \mu_k(tx) dt = \int_{|x|=1} d\nu \int_0^1 (d/dt)f(tx)(d/dt)\mu(tx) dt.$$

The formula (6.4) therefore follows from integration by parts if we use that  $(d/dt)\mu(tx) = \mu = 1$  when  $|x| = 1$ . □

**Remark 6.10.** Notice that since any measure on the sphere can be written as a difference between two positive measures, the currents  $\Omega$  that we get from the theorem are differences between two positive currents.

We conclude this section with a few results related to non-degeneracy that will be important in Section 8.

**Proposition 6.11.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a strongly homogeneous and weakly positive current of bidegree  $(p, p)$ . Put*

$$\langle \psi_{n-p}, \Omega \wedge d d^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge d d^\# \psi_{n-p-1} \rangle = V_\Omega(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_{n-p}).$$

*Then  $V_\Omega$  is symmetric in the  $\psi_i$ .*

*Proof.* The assumption on weak positivity implies that  $\Omega \wedge dd^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots dd^\# \psi_{n-p-1}$  is a well defined current. It is clear that  $V_\Omega$  is symmetric in  $\psi_i$  for  $i < n - p$ . What we need to prove is that  $\psi_{n-p}$  and e.g.  $\psi_1$  can be interchanged. This follows from Stokes' formula

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \psi_{n-p}, \Omega \wedge dd^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots dd^\# \psi_{n-p-1} \rangle = \\ &= \int_{\mu(x)=1} \psi_{n-p} \Omega \wedge dd^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots dd^\# \psi_{n-p-1} \wedge d^\# \mu = \int_{\mu(x)=1} \Omega \wedge dd^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots dd^\# \psi_{n-p-1} \wedge d^\# \psi_{n-p} = \\ &= \int_{\mu(x)=1} \Omega \wedge d^\# \psi_1 \wedge \dots dd^\# \psi_{n-p-1} \wedge dd^\# \psi_{n-p}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Proposition 6.12.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a current of bidegree  $(p, p)$  that can be written as a difference between two weakly positive strongly homogeneous currents. Assume that*

$$\langle \psi, \Omega \wedge (dd^\# \psi)^{n-p-1} \rangle = 0$$

*for all  $\psi$  smooth, convex and 1-homogeneous. Then  $\Omega = 0$*

*Proof.* By polarization and the previous proposition it follows that

$$\langle \phi, \Omega \wedge (dd^\# \psi)^{n-p-1} \rangle = 0$$

for any smooth convex and 1-homogeneous functions  $\phi$  and  $\psi$ . Since any smooth function can be written as a difference of two convex functions, this actually holds even if  $\phi$  is not convex. Then it follows from Proposition 6.8 that  $\Omega \wedge (dd^\# \psi)^{n-p-1} = 0$  for any 1-homogeneous convex  $\psi$ . Restrict this to a hyperplane, that we take as  $\{x_1 = 1\}$ . Then we get that  $\Omega \wedge (dd^\# \psi)^{n-p-1} = 0$  when restricted to this hyperplane. By Proposition 3.4 (in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ ),  $\Omega$  vanishes on the hyperplane (intersected with  $\mathcal{K}$ ), i. e.

$$\Omega \wedge dx_1 \wedge d\xi_1 = 0$$

when  $x_1 = 1$  (note that if  $\Omega$  lies in  $S$ , then its restriction to a hyperplane lies in  $S$  there). Applying first  $\delta$  and then  $\delta^\#$  we get that  $\Omega = 0$  when  $x_1 = 1$ , and therefore in all of  $\mathcal{K}$  by homogeneity. □

**Proposition 6.13.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a current of bidegree  $(p, p)$  that can be written as a difference between two weakly positive strongly homogeneous currents. Assume that*

$$\langle f, \Omega \wedge \Omega' \rangle \geq 0$$

*for all 1-homogeneous smooth  $f \geq 0$  and all  $\Omega' = (dd^\# \psi)^{n-p-1}$  where  $\psi$  is smooth, convex and 1-homogeneous. Then  $\Omega$  is weakly positive.*

*Proof.* We can start the proof exactly as in the previous proposition and arrive at the conclusion that  $\Omega$  is weakly positive on the hyperplane  $x_1 = 1$ , i.e. that

$$\Omega \wedge dx_1 \wedge d\xi_1 \wedge F' \geq 0$$

for all elementary forms  $F'$  of bidegree  $(n - p - 1, n - p - 1)$ , using Proposition 3.5 instead of Proposition 3.4. We need to prove that this implies that  $\Omega$  is weakly positive. Let  $F$  be an elementary form. We start from the identity

$$x_1^2 \Omega \wedge F = \Omega \wedge dx_1 \wedge d\xi_1 \wedge \delta^\# \delta F,$$

which is easily proved using that  $\delta$  and  $\delta^\#$  are antiderivations. The proposition will therefore follow if we can prove that  $\delta^\# \delta F$  is an elementary form when  $F$  is elementary.

Write  $F = \alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_1^\# \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_p \wedge \alpha_p^\#$ . Let  $V := [\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p]$  and let  $N := \{\alpha; \delta(\alpha) = 0\}$ . If  $V$  is included in  $N$  there is nothing to prove. Otherwise  $N \cap V$  has codimension 1 in  $V$  and we may choose a basis for  $V$  such that  $e_1, \dots, e_{p-1}$  lie in  $N$ . Then

$$F = ce_1 \wedge e_1^\# \wedge \dots \wedge e_p \wedge e_p^\#, \quad c > 0,$$

and

$$\delta^\# \delta F = (\delta(e_p))^2 ce_1 \wedge e_1^\# \wedge \dots \wedge e_{p-1} \wedge e_{p-1}^\#$$

which is an elementary form.  $\square$

**6.1. Fourier transforms.** If  $F$  is a differential  $p$ -form on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with tempered coefficients, it has a well defined Fourier transform,  $\hat{F}$ , which is a current of degree  $(n-p)$ . This is due to Scarfiello, see [37] and also [38]. The Fourier transform of a form is defined in the following way. Let  $F = F_I dx_I$ . Then

$$\hat{F} := \sum \hat{F}_I * dx_I,$$

where  $*$  is the Hodge  $*$ -operator and  $\hat{F}_I$  is the classical Fourier transform on functions. This definition naturally extends to superforms (or -currents): If  $\Omega = \sum \Omega_{IJ} dx_I \wedge d\xi_J$ , then

$$\hat{\Omega} = \sum \widehat{\Omega}_{IJ} * (dx_I \wedge d\xi_J),$$

where we use the  $*$ -operator on  $R_x^n \oplus \mathbb{R}_\xi^n$  and the Fourier transform on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . More elegantly we can, following Andersson [9], write the Fourier transform as a superintegral

$$\hat{\Omega} = \int e^{-ix \cdot y + \sum dx_i \wedge dy_i + d\xi_i \wedge d\eta_i} \wedge \Omega$$

(the superintegral is with respect to  $x$  and  $\xi$  and it returns a current in  $y$  and  $\eta$ ).

The Fourier transform interchanges the operators  $d$  and  $\delta$ , so that

$$\widehat{d\Omega} = \pm \delta \hat{\Omega}, \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\delta \Omega} = \pm d \hat{\Omega}.$$

This means that strongly homogeneous forms are mapped to strongly homogeneous currents.

## 7. CHARTS.

If  $\mu$  is a gauge function and  $\Omega$  is a weakly positive strongly homogeneous current, we have seen that  $[S_\mu]_s \wedge \Omega =: R_\mu(\Omega)$  is a well defined current. We will think, at least provisionally, of  $R_\mu(\Omega)$  as the restriction of  $\Omega$  to  $S_\mu$ . As we have seen,  $\Omega$  is uniquely determined by its restriction to any  $S_\mu$ . This holds even locally, so if  $\mathcal{K}$  is an open cone in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with vertex at the origin, then  $\Omega$  is determined in  $\mathcal{K}$  by its restriction to  $\mathcal{K} \cap S_\mu$ .

Therefore we can think of strongly homogeneous currents as currents on some – any –  $S_\mu$ , but since  $\mu$  is arbitrary one should rather think of  $S_\mu$  as a global chart of some space ( $\mathbb{R}^n / \mathbb{R}_+$  ?) on which the currents live. This point of view is especially useful if we have a cone,  $\mathcal{K}$ , such that  $\mathcal{K} \cap S_\mu$  is part of a hyperplane, like e.g. if  $S_\mu$  is (the boundary of) a polytope. As usual, we choose coordinates so that this hyperplane is given by  $H_1 := \{x_1 = 1\}$ . The largest cone on which our currents can be determined by their restriction to  $H_1$  is the halfspace  $\{x_1 > 0\}$ . This way  $H_1$

plays the role of a local chart, and letting  $H_i := \{x_i = 1\}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , we get a collection of local charts that cover the whole space. Each  $H_i$  can be identified with  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . Therefore we can think of a strongly homogeneous form or current on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  as a collection of currents on  $n$  copies of  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  that satisfy certain compatibility conditions.

Not every closed current on  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ , however, arises this way. We have seen that if  $\Omega$  is strongly homogeneous on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  then it satisfies  $T(\Omega) = 0$  where

$$T = \sum dx_i \wedge \delta_{\xi_i} = d\delta^\# + \delta^\# d.$$

If one prefers one can write

$$R_{x_1}(\Omega) = dx_1 \wedge d\xi_1 \wedge \Omega',$$

where  $\Omega'$  is a current in  $x' = (x_2, \dots, x_n)$  and think of  $\Omega'$  as the restriction of  $\Omega$  to  $H_1$ . Then it follows from  $T(\Omega) = 0$  that  $T(\Omega \wedge dx_1 \wedge d\xi_1) = 0$ , or equivalently  $T(\Omega') = 0$  on  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ , so the restriction of  $\Omega$  to  $H_1$  satisfies one restriction. We shall now see that this is the only condition.

**Proposition 7.1.** *Let  $\Omega'$  be a closed symmetric  $(p, p)$ -current on  $\mathbb{R}_{x_2, \dots, x_n}^{n-1}$  such that  $T(\Omega') = 0$ , i.e.*

$$\sum_2^n dx_i \wedge \delta_{\xi_i}(\Omega') = 0.$$

*Then there is a closed symmetric current,  $\Omega$  on  $\{x_1 > 0\}$ , satisfying  $\delta\Omega = 0$  that restricts to  $\Omega'$  on  $H_1$ .*

*If  $\Omega'$  is weakly (strongly) positive,  $\Omega$  is weakly (strongly) positive.*

*Proof.* We first claim that the commutator

$$(7.1) \quad \delta T - T\delta = \delta^\#.$$

This follows from the computation

$$\delta T(\chi) = \delta \sum dx_i \wedge \delta_{\xi_i}(\chi) = \sum x_i \delta_{\xi_i}(\chi) + T\delta(\chi) = \delta^\#(\chi) + T\delta(\chi).$$

Think of  $\Omega'$  as defined on  $H_1$  and extend it to the half space  $\{x_1 > 0\}$  so that it becomes homogeneous of order zero (i.e. the coefficients are homogeneous of order  $-p$ ). Put

$$\Omega := \delta^\# \delta(dx_1 \wedge d\xi_1 \wedge \Omega').$$

Then  $\Omega$  is symmetric and  $\delta\Omega = 0$ . The identity

$$\delta^\# \delta(dx_1 \wedge d\xi_1 \wedge \Omega') \wedge dx_1 \wedge d\xi_1 = x_1^2(dx_1 \wedge d\xi_1 \wedge \Omega')$$

shows that its restriction to  $H_1$  is  $(dx_1 \wedge d\xi_1 \wedge \Omega')$ . Writing  $F = dx_1 \wedge d\xi_1 \wedge \Omega'$ ,

$$d\Omega = (d\delta^\# + \delta^\# d)\delta(F) - \delta^\# d\delta(F) = T\delta(F) - \delta^\#(d\delta + \delta d)(F),$$

since  $dF = 0$ . We have, since  $T(F) = 0$ ,

$$T\delta(F) = (T\delta - \delta T)(F) = \delta^\#(F)$$

by (7.1). Moreover, since  $(d\delta + \delta d) =_E$  and  $_E(\Omega') = 0$ ,  $_E(F) = F$ . Hence

$$\delta^\#(d\delta + \delta d)(F) = \delta^\#(F).$$

Putting together we see that  $d\Omega = 0$ .

The last claim follows from the explicit form of  $\Omega$ , using that if a form  $F$  is elementary, then  $\delta^\# \delta F$  is also elementary (see the proof of Proposition 6.13).  $\square$

It is worth pointing out that the case  $p = 1$  is a lot simpler. If  $\omega'$  is a closed symmetric  $(1, 1)$  current on  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  it automatically satisfies  $T\omega = 0$ , so the hypothesis is vacuous in this case. If  $\psi$  is a function on  $H_1$ , we can extend it to a 1-homogeneous function on  $\{x_1 > 0\}$  by

$$(7.2) \quad \Psi(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_1 \psi(x'/x_1).$$

It is a well known fact that if  $\psi$  is convex, so is  $\Psi$ . (It is enough to check this when  $\psi(x) = a \cdot x' + b$  is an affine function since convex functions are suprema of collections of affine functions). Write  $\omega' = dd^\# \psi$  and extend  $\psi$  to  $\Psi$  by (7.2). Then

$$\omega := dd^\# \Psi$$

is a closed extension satisfying  $\delta\omega = 0$  by Proposition 6.1. If  $\omega' \geq 0$ , then  $\psi$  is convex, so  $\Psi$  is convex and  $\omega \geq 0$ .

For later use we record a few simple facts. Let  $\psi$  be a convex function on  $H_1$ . It is of linear growth if and only if, for some  $C$ ,

$$|\psi| \leq C(1 + |x'|^2)^{1/2}.$$

Passing to the homogeneous extension this means that

$$|\Psi| \leq C|x|,$$

so  $\Psi$  is bounded on the half-sphere. On the other hand, that  $\psi$  is bounded on  $H_1$  can be written  $|\psi| \leq Cx_1$ . This means that  $|\Psi| \leq Cx_1$ , so  $\Psi$  vanishes to order one on the boundary of the half-sphere. We also see that  $\Psi$  has a continuous extension to the hyperplane  $\{x_1 = 0\}$ ,

$$\Psi(0, x') := \lim_{x_1 \rightarrow 0^+} \Psi(x_1, x') = \psi^\circ(x'),$$

the indicator of  $\psi$ , by (7.2).

Let now  $\Omega$  be a strongly homogeneous  $(n-1, n-1)$ -current on the half-space  $\{x_1 > 0\}$ , and define a measure on the half-sphere by

$$d\nu = \Omega \wedge d^\# \mu$$

for  $\mu = |x|$ . The corresponding measure on  $H_1$  is

$$d\nu' = \Omega \wedge d^\# \mu',$$

for  $\mu' = x_1$ . If  $\pi$  denotes the radial projection from  $H_1$  to the half-sphere we have by Proposition 6.7, that

$$\pi_*(d\nu') = x_1 d\nu,$$

and if  $\pi'$  is the projection from the half-sphere to  $H_1$ , then

$$\pi'_*(d\nu) = |x| d\nu'.$$

## 8. VALUATIONS ON CONVEX BODIES.

In this section we will apply the formalism developed in the previous sections to the theory of valuations on convex bodies. Our basic background reference is the concise [39], see also [40] and [2]. At the end, in subsection 8.1, we will compare this approach to the use of the so called normal cycle (see e.g. [15]), and in the last subsection we will, using this comparison, give a proof of the characterization of strong forms from section 3.

Let  $\Gamma$  be an additive commutative semigroup. We will be mainly interested in the cases  $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}$  or  $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}_+$ , but it will also be convenient to let  $\Gamma$  be the space of 1-homogeneous convex functions or positive currents occasionally. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the space of convex bodies in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . A *valuation* on  $\mathcal{C}$  is map,  $\theta$ , from  $\mathcal{C}$  to  $\Gamma$  such that

$$\theta(K \cup L) + \theta(K \cap L) = \theta(K) + \theta(L),$$

*provided that  $K \cup L$  is convex.* In case  $\Gamma$  has a topology, we say that  $\theta$  is continuous if it is continuous for the Hausdorff metric on  $\mathcal{C}$ . We will focus on valuations that are translation invariant, i.e. satisfy  $\theta(K + x) = \theta(K)$  for any  $x$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . The following theorem of Salee, [36] is simple but very useful.

**Theorem 8.1.** *Assume that  $K$  and  $L$  are convex bodies such that  $K \cup L$  is convex. Then (+ denotes Minkowski addition)*

$$K \cup L + K \cap L = K + L.$$

*Proof.* Assume  $K \cup L$  is convex and take  $k \in K, l \in L$ . Then

$$x_t := tk + (1-t)l$$

lies in  $K \cup L$  for any  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Let

$$I_0 = \{t \in [0, 1]; x_t \in K\}, \quad I_1 = \{t \in [0, 1]; x_t \in L\}.$$

$I_0$  and  $I_1$  are closed and non empty with union equal to the whole interval  $[0, 1]$ . Therefore they have at least one point  $t_0$  in common. Then

$$k + l = x_{1-t_0} + x_{t_0} \in K \cup L + K \cap L.$$

Since the opposite inclusion is trivial, this proves the theorem. □

**Corollary 8.2.** *Assume  $K \cup L$  is convex. Then*

$$h_{K \cup L} + h_{K \cap L} = h_K + h_L.$$

*Thus the map  $K \rightarrow h_K$  defines a valuation with values in the space of convex functions.*

Let  $\omega_K := dd^\# h_K$ . Then we also have that  $\omega_{K \cup L} + \omega_{K \cap L} = \omega_K + \omega_L$ , so the map  $K \rightarrow \omega_K$  is a translation invariant current-valued valuation. The next theorem, which is a consequence of a more general result of Alesker ([3]), generalizes this.

**Theorem 8.3.** *Assume  $K \cup L$  is convex. Then*

$$\omega_{K \cup L}^p + \omega_{K \cap L}^p = \omega_K^p + \omega_L^p$$

*for  $p = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Hence all powers*

$$K \rightarrow \omega_K^p$$

define translation invariant current-valued valuations.

This is a bit more subtle than the case  $p = 1$ ; it is certainly not a direct consequence of the corollary. When all the currents involved are smooth (outside the origin) it is not too hard to verify using that  $h_{K \cup L} = \max(h_K, h_L)$  and, as it turns out, that  $h_{K \cap L} = \min(h_K, h_L)$ , but it is not immediate to reduce the general case to this. Alesker proves a more general result on mixed Monge-Ampère measures of plurisubharmonic functions, based on earlier work of Blocki, [14]. Here we will give a proof in our case which uses the results in the previous sections.

Partly as a preparation for this we will discuss briefly the translate of a valuation by a convex body,  $A$ , defined as

$$\theta_A(K) = \theta(K + A).$$

We first verify that the translate is a valuation. The main step is the following lemma.

**Lemma 8.4.** *Let  $K$  and  $L$  be convex bodies such that  $K \cup L$  is convex, and let  $A$  be an arbitrary convex body. Then*

$$(K + A) \cup (L + A) = K \cup L + A, \text{ and } (K + A) \cap (L + A) = K \cap L + A.$$

*In particular,  $(K + A) \cup (L + A)$  is convex.*

*Proof.* The first claim is just an exercise in logic. It implies that  $(K + A) \cup (L + A)$  is convex and so

$$h_{(K+A) \cup (L+A)} + h_{(K+A) \cap (L+A)} = h_{(K+A)} + h_{(L+A)}.$$

Hence, invoking the first claim,

$$h_{K \cup L} + h_A + h_{(K+A) \cap (L+A)} = h_K + h_L + 2h_A.$$

Thus

$$h_{(K+A) \cap (L+A)} = h_K + h_L - h_{K \cup L} + h_A = h_{K \cap L} + h_A,$$

which proves the second claim, since the right hand side is the support function of  $K \cap L + A$  and the support function determines the convex body.  $\square$

It follows from the lemma that

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_A(K \cup L) + \theta_A(K \cap L) &= \theta(K \cup L + A) + \theta(K \cap L + A) = \\ &= \theta((K + A) \cup (L + A)) + \theta((K + A) \cap (L + A)) = \theta(K + A) + \theta(L + A) = \theta_A(K) + \theta_A(L). \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\theta_A$  is indeed a valuation. Notice that  $\theta_A$  is continuous if  $\theta$  is continuous and translation invariant if  $\theta$  is translation invariant.

With this, we are ready to prove Theorem 8.3. The starting point is that we know the theorem holds when  $p = n$ , simply because

$$\omega_K^n/n! = |K|\delta_0,$$

and Lebesgue measure is a valuation. This implies that its translates by any convex body  $A$ ,

$$K \rightarrow (\omega_{K+A})^n/n!$$

is a valuation, whence

$$K \rightarrow (\omega_K + \omega_A)^n$$



is a current valued valuation. Replacing  $A$  by  $tA$  and identifying terms we conclude that

$$K \rightarrow \omega_K^p \wedge \omega_A^{n-p}$$

is a current valued valuation for any  $p$  and any convex body  $A$ . Taking  $A = tB + C$  ( $B$  and  $C$  arbitrary convex bodies) and identifying the first power of  $t$  we see that

$$K \rightarrow \omega_K^p \wedge \omega_B \wedge \omega_C^{n-p-1}$$

is a valuation. Write  $h_B = \phi$  and  $h_C = \psi$ . By Stokes' theorem and Proposition 6.6

$$K \rightarrow \int_{|x|=1} \phi \omega_K^p \wedge (dd^\# \psi)^{n-p-1} \wedge d^\# |x|$$

is a valuation. The conclusion of the theorem now follows from Proposition 6.12 applied to

$$\Omega = \omega_{K \cup L}^p + \omega_{K \cap L}^p - \omega_K^p - \omega_L^p.$$

□

A translation invariant valuation is said to be (homogeneous ) of degree  $p$  if it scales like

$$\theta(tK) = t^p \theta(K)$$

for  $t > 0$ . A fundamental theorem of McMullen (for which we refer to [33]) says that any translation invariant continuous valuation can be decomposed

$$\theta = \sum_0^n \theta_p$$

where  $\theta_p$  is of degree  $p$ . Any continuous and translation invariant valuation of degree zero, is a multiple of the *trivial valuation*

$$\theta_0(K) = 1,$$

since, by homogeneity,  $\theta(K) = \theta(\{0\})$ . On the other side, all translation invariant continuous valuations of degree  $n$  are multiples of Lebesgue measure. This result is due to Hadwiger, see [33]. As for valuations of intermediate order, any mixed volume

$$V(K[p], A_1, \dots, A_{n-p}) := V(K, K \dots K, A_1, \dots, A_{n-p}) = \int \omega_K^p \wedge \omega_{A_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_{A_{n-p-1}} / n!$$

defines a translation invariant continuous valuation [39]. This also follows immediately from Theorem 8.3, which moreover implies the following generalization of this fact:

**Theorem 8.5.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a strongly homogeneous current of bidegree  $(n - p, n - p)$  which is weakly positive. Then*

$$\mathcal{F}(\Omega)(K) := \int \omega_K^p \wedge \Omega / p!,$$

*defines a continuous and translation invariant valuation of degree  $p$  with values in  $\mathbb{R}_+$ . If  $\Omega$  is not weakly positive but can be written as a difference of weakly positive currents, we get a  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued valuation.*

Note that mixed volumes corresponds to  $\Omega = \omega_{A_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_{A_{n-p}}$ ; the wedge product of  $(n-p)$  currents of bidegree  $(1, 1)$ .

By Proposition 6.12, the map  $\mathcal{F}$  is injective, since

$$\int \omega_K^p \wedge \Omega = \int_{|x|=1} h_K(\omega_K)^{p-1} \wedge \Omega \wedge d^\#|x|.$$

(The underlying reason for injectivity is that strongly homogeneous currents are ‘strong’. This is the reason why we have insisted on this property.)

$\mathcal{F}$  is, however, not surjective: Not every continuous translation invariant valuation of degree 1 can be written as  $\mathcal{F}(\Omega)$  where  $\Omega$  is a strongly homogeneous current that can be written as a difference of two weakly positive currents. Indeed, a valuation that can be written that way can be rewritten as

$$\theta(K) = \int dd^\# h_K \wedge \Omega = \int_{|x|=1} d^\# h_K \wedge \Omega = \int_{|x|=1} h_K \Omega \wedge d^\#|x|,$$

where we have used Lemma 6.5 in the last step. This means that

$$\theta(K) = \int_{|x|=1} h_K d\nu$$

for some measure  $d\nu$  on the sphere. (Recall that, conversely, any measure on the sphere can be obtained this way by Theorem 6.9.) Hence, for some constant  $C$ ,

$$|\theta(K) - \theta(L)| \leq C \sup_{|x|=1} |h_K - h_L| = C \|h_K - h_L\|_0$$

in the notation of (5.1). This is not automatically satisfied by a continuous valuation which is just supposed to be continuous under uniform convergence of the support functions. (The two things are not equivalent since the space of convex functions is not a linear space). Indeed, it is not hard to see that a valuation is continuous if and only if it satisfies

$$|\theta(K) - \theta(L)| \leq C \|h_K - h_L\|,$$

where  $\|\cdot\|$  is defined in (5.2), which is a weaker requirement since  $\|\cdot\|_0 \leq \|\cdot\|$ . This argument perhaps also suggests that the question of characterizing the space of all continuous translation invariant valuations is unlikely to have any good answer, since it would include determining the dual of the space  $\Delta$  with the norm (5.2).

One may also note that for the integrand in Theorem 8.5 to be well defined for general convex bodies  $K$  we need, in order to apply Theorem 4.2, that  $\Omega$  be strong and weakly positive, or can be written as a difference of such currents. We shall see shortly that this corresponds to valuations that can be written as differences between two *monotone* valuations. This class of valuations therefore seems to be the largest class that can be described by currents, unless Theorem 4.2 can be generalized.

The definition of  $\mathcal{F}$  can be rewritten in a more suggestive way. For convex bodies  $K$  let

$$(8.1) \quad e^{\omega_K} = \sum_0^n \omega_K^k / k!$$

(higher power than  $n$  vanish for degree reasons). With this notation we get

$$(8.2) \quad \mathcal{F}(\Omega)(K) = \int e^{\omega_K} \wedge \Omega,$$

since, if  $\Omega$  is of bidegree  $(n-p, n-p)$ , only the term with  $k = p$  in (8.1) gives a non-zero contribution to the integral. One advantage of this formulation is that we can treat valuations of different homogeneity simultaneously and allow  $\Omega$  to be a sum of terms of bidegree  $(p, p)$  for different  $p$ . Formally,  $\mathcal{F}$  behaves like a Fourier transform, taking currents to (translation invariant) valuations. As a first example

$$\mathcal{F}(1)(K) = \int \omega_K^n / n! = |K|$$

so  $\mathcal{F}(1)$  is Lebesgue measure. Furthermore, the trivial valuation is obtained as  $\mathcal{F}(\delta_0)$ , the ‘Fourier transform’ of the Dirac delta function, viewed as having full bidegree (so that it acts only on the constant term in the series expansion of  $e^{\omega_K}$ ). Note also that

$$(8.3) \quad e^{\omega_{K+L}} = e^{\omega_K} \wedge e^{\omega_L},$$

so we can think of the exponential of  $\omega_K$  as a sort of character on the space of convex bodies with Minkowski addition, taking values in a space of currents. This implies immediately that

$$\mathcal{F}(e^{\omega_A} \wedge \Omega) = \mathcal{F}(\Omega)_A,$$

the translate of  $\mathcal{F}(\Omega)$  by  $A$ . Thus (wedge-)multiplication with a character corresponds to translates on the transform side. In particular, the translate of Lebesgue measure

$$(8.4) \quad K \rightarrow |K + A| =: \mu_A(K)$$

by a convex body,  $A$ , corresponds to the current  $\Omega = e^{\omega_A}$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{F}(e^{\omega_A}) = \mu_A$ . By a theorem of Alesker, [1], the linear span of such valuations is dense in the space of continuous translation invariant valuations.

In [17], Bernig and Fu introduced a convolution product on the space of smooth translation invariant valuations. This product has the property that, with  $\mu_A$  as defined in (8.4),

$$\mu_A \star \mu_B = \mu_{A+B},$$

and is actually characterized by this. This leads to the formula

$$(8.5) \quad \mathcal{F}(\Omega_0 \wedge \Omega_1) = \mathcal{F}(\Omega_0) \star \mathcal{F}(\Omega_1),$$

so wedge product on the current side corresponds to convolution on the valuation side, in close analogy to the standard property of the usual Fourier transform. To prove (8.5) it is enough to consider the case when  $\Omega_0 = e^{\omega_A}$  and  $\Omega_1 = e^{\omega_B}$ , so that the corresponding valuations are  $\mu_A$  and  $\mu_B$  respectively. The formula is then an immediate consequence of (8.3).

Formula (8.5) is the counterpart in our formalism of Theorem 2.6 in [15], see also [17], and subsection 8.1 for a comparison between the two ways of writing smooth valuations.

We next discuss which valuations that lie in the image of  $\mathcal{F}$ , i. e. are defined by strongly homogeneous currents. We start from a fundamental theorem by Alesker, see [2]. According to

the definition of Alesker a translation invariant continuous valuation,  $\theta$  is *smooth* if the map

$$g \rightarrow \theta(gK),$$

defined for  $g \in GL(n, \mathbb{R})$ , is smooth for each fixed convex body  $K$ . Regularizing by taking convolution (with respect to Haar measure) on  $GL(n, \mathbb{R})$  with an approximate identity one sees that smooth translation invariant valuations are dense among continuous translation invariant valuations. Alesker proved a conjecture of McMullen, that linear combinations of mixed volumes are dense in the translation invariant continuous valuations, by showing that any smooth translation invariant valuation can be represented as a convergent superposition of mixed volumes. This result was later sharpened by Knoerr ([29]) and van Handel (unpublished) who showed that such a valuation is even a finite linear combination of mixed volumes. Moreover, these mixed volumes can be taken of the form

$$V(K[p], A_1, \dots, A_{n-p})$$

where  $A_i$  are smoothly bounded and strictly convex (they can actually be specified even further). This gives directly a characterization of smooth valuations in terms of currents.

**Theorem 8.6.** *Let  $\theta$  be a smooth and translation invariant valuation of order  $p$ . Then there is a unique smooth, strong and strongly homogeneous form  $\Omega$  of bidegree  $(p, p)$  such that*

$$\theta(K) = \mathcal{F}(\Omega) = \int e^{\omega_K} \wedge \Omega.$$

*Conversely, any such  $\Omega$  defines a smooth translation invariant valuation of order  $p$ .*

The uniqueness of  $\Omega$  follows again by Proposition 6.12. Notice also that  $\Omega$  is automatically strong, since all forms  $\omega_{A_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_{A_{n-p}}$  defining mixed volumes are strong. Thus, there is a one-to-one correspondence between smooth valuations and smooth strongly homogeneous forms.

We shall now extend the correspondence in theorem 8.6 to one class of non-smooth valuations. Recall the following definition:

**Definition 8.7.** A continuous valuation  $\theta$  is monotone if  $K \subseteq L$  implies that  $\theta(K) \leq \theta(L)$ .

By a theorem of McMullen, a monotone translation invariant valuation is automatically continuous. We shall show that there is a one-to-one correspondence between monotone translation invariant valuations and weakly positive, strongly homogeneous currents:

**Theorem 8.8.** *Let  $\theta$  be a monotone translation invariant valuation of order  $p$ . Then there is a unique weakly positive, strong and strongly homogeneous current  $\Omega$  of bidegree  $(n-p, n-p)$  such that*

$$\theta(K) = \mathcal{F}(\Omega) = \int e^{\omega_K} \wedge \Omega.$$

*Conversely, if  $\Omega$  is weakly positive and strongly homogeneous, then  $\mathcal{F}(\Omega)$  is monotone (and translation invariant).*

*Proof.* Let the valuation  $\theta$  be monotone and translation invariant. Regularizing by convolution with an approximate identity on  $GL(n, \mathbb{R})$  we get a sequence of smooth monotone valuations  $\theta_j$

converging to  $\theta$ . By the previous theorem we get smooth strongly homogeneous  $(n-p, n-p)$ -forms  $\Omega_j$  such that

$$\theta_j(K) = \int \omega_K^p \wedge \Omega_j.$$

Take  $f \geq 0$  smooth and 1-homogeneous. Let  $K$  be smoothly bounded and strictly convex so that  $h_K$  is smooth and strictly convex. Then, for  $t > 0$  small enough  $h_K + tf$  is still convex so there is a convex body,  $K_t$  such that

$$h_{K_t} = h_K + tf.$$

Since  $h_K + tf \geq h_K$ ,  $K \subseteq K_t$  for  $t > 0$ . It follows that

$$0 \leq (d/dt)|_{t=0} \theta_j(K_t) = \int dd^\# f \wedge \omega_K^{p-1} \wedge \Omega_j.$$

By Stokes' theorem and Lemma 6.5 this equals

$$\int_{|x|=1} f \omega_K^{p-1} \wedge \Omega_j \wedge d^\# \mu / (p-1)!.$$

By Proposition 6.13 this implies that  $\Omega_j$  is weakly positive. Taking  $K$  equal to the unit ball one gets a bound on the trace measure of  $\Omega_j$  independent of  $j$ . By Lemma 3.6 this gives a bound for all the coefficients of  $\Omega_j$ . Hence we can take a weak\* limit of a subsequence of  $\Omega_j$  as  $j$  tends to infinity. The limit of any subsequence gives the same valuation so, by uniqueness, there is actually one limit of the whole sequence,  $\Omega$ . It is clear that  $\Omega$  is weakly positive and strong, since both these properties are preserved under weak limits.

For the converse direction we take  $K \subseteq L$  and define

$$K_t = tL + (1-t)K.$$

As in the previous argument we see that  $(d/dt)\theta(K_t) \geq 0$  if  $\theta = \mathcal{F}(\Omega)$  where  $\Omega$  is strictly positive (it is enough to consider  $t = 0$ , since  $K_{t+\Delta t}$  is a convex combination of  $K_t$  and  $L$ ). Hence  $\theta$  is monotone. □

The smooth case of this theorem is closely related to Theorem 2.7 in [16], where Bernig and Fu give a characterization of smooth monotone translation invariant valuations in terms of positivity of certain 'curvature measures'. When  $p = n-1$  in the theorem we get a strongly homogeneous current  $\Omega$  of bidegree  $(1,1)$ . By Proposition 6.1,  $\Omega = dd^\# \psi$  for some 1-homogeneous and convex function  $\psi$ , which is necessarily the support function of some convex body,  $L$  (see the beginning of section 5). Then Theorem 8.8 says that

$$\theta(K)/n = \int \omega_K^{n-1} \wedge \omega_L/n! = V(K[n-1], L),$$

the mixed volume of  $(n-1)$  copies of  $K$  with  $L$ . This is a theorem of McMullen, [34].

At the other extreme, when  $p = 1$ ,  $\Omega$  is of bidegree  $(n-1, n-1)$  and

$$\theta(K) = \int \omega_K \wedge \Omega = \int_{|x|=1} h_K \Omega \wedge d^\# |x|,$$

by Lemma 6.5 and Stokes' theorem. The (super)integral in the right hand side is well defined by Proposition 4.4, which also shows that

$$\int_{|x|=1} h_K \Omega \wedge d^\#|x| = \int_{|x|=1} h_K d\nu,$$

for a certain positive measure  $d\nu$  on the sphere. If  $K$  is a point, then  $\theta(K) = 0$  by homogeneity, so  $d\nu$  has barycenter zero. Let us now, for a moment, suppose that  $d\nu$  is not supported on any hyperplane through the origin. It then follows from the solution to Minkowski's surface area problem (see the beginning of Section 11) that there is a convex body,  $L$ , with

$$d\nu = (dd^\#h_L)^{n-1} \wedge d^\#|x|.$$

Applying Lemma 6.5 and Stokes' theorem again we find that

$$\theta(K) = \int dd^\#h_K \wedge (dd^\#h_L)^{n-1} / (n-1)! = nV(K, L[n-1])$$

is again a mixed volume. This is under the assumption that  $d\nu$  is not supported on any hyperplane through the origin, but similar arguments apply in general: If  $d\nu$  is supported on a plane,  $V$ , of codimension  $m$ , but not on any smaller plane we can write

$$\Omega = \Omega' \wedge [V]_s,$$

and use the solution of Minkowski's problem on  $V$ . This leads to a result of Firey, [24], that  $\theta$  still can be represented as a mixed volume, but we omit the details. In the survey [33], McMullen states the conjecture that a monotone translation invariant valuation, which is homogeneous of any order  $p$ , is given by a mixed volume (but adds that evidence in this direction is 'meager'). This does indeed seem highly unlikely, since it would mean that the current  $\Omega$  given by Theorem 8.8 could be written

$$\Omega = dd^\#h_{L_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\#h_{L_{n-p}},$$

for some convex bodies  $L_i$ , but we will not pursue this question now.

**8.1. The normal cycle.** A classical approach to smooth valuations is to write a valuation  $K \rightarrow \theta(K)$  as an integral of a certain differential form – determined by  $\theta$  – over the 'normal cycle' of  $K$ . In this subsection we will translate this formalism to our setting of supercurrents, and show that the two approaches are equivalent, as far as smooth valuations are concerned. Consider a convex body,  $K$ , which is smoothly bounded and strictly convex.

Let us also assume that the origin lies in  $K$  and that  $\phi$  is its Minkowski gauge;

$$K = \{y; \phi(y) \leq 1\}.$$

Let

$$S\mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{R}_y^n \times S_x^{n-1}$$

be the trivial unit circle bundle over  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and put

$$nc(K) = \{(y, x) \in S\mathbb{R}^n; y \in \partial K, \quad x = n(y)\},$$

where  $n(y) = \partial\phi(y)/|\partial\phi(y)|$  is the normal to  $\partial K$  at  $y$ . This is the normal cycle of  $K$ ; it is an  $n-1$ -dimensional submanifold of the circle bundle. This construction actually extends to general

convex bodies, and the normal cycle is then a Lipschitz manifold, but we will limit ourselves to convex bodies that are smoothly bounded and strictly convex here.

Let  $\omega$  be a smooth differential form on  $S\mathbb{R}^n$  of bidegree  $(k, \cdot)$  in  $(y, x)$ ;

$$\omega = \sum_{IJ} \omega_{IJ}(x) dy_I \wedge dx_J$$

whose coefficients depend only on  $x$ . Such forms are called translation invariant, since they are invariant under the natural translations  $(y, x) \rightarrow (y + a, x)$  on the circle bundle. By e.g. Theorem 2.2 in [15] any translation invariant smooth valuation, which has no component that is homogeneous of degree  $n$ , can be written as

$$\theta(K) = \int_{nc(K)} \omega$$

for some translation invariant  $\omega$ . Here we will restrict ourselves to such valuations, since the component of degree  $n$  is just a multiple of Lebesgue measure and can be treated separately. We will now try to translate this representation to super-language.

First, there is a map from the space of differential forms  $\omega = \sum \omega_{IJ} dx_I \wedge dy_J$  of bidegree  $(p, k)$  in  $(x, y)$  to superforms  $\tilde{\omega}$  in  $(x, \xi)$  of bidegree  $(p, n - k)$ , defined in the following way. Let  $\beta(\xi, y) = \sum d\xi_i \wedge dy_i$ . Then  $\tilde{\omega}$  is defined by

$$(8.6) \quad \omega \wedge \beta(\xi, y)^{n-k} / (n - k)! =: \tilde{\omega} \wedge dy.$$

( This means that

$$\omega \rightarrow \tilde{\omega} = \sum \pm \omega_{IJ}(x) dx_J \wedge d\xi_{I^c}.)$$

Notice that the map  $\omega \rightarrow \tilde{\omega}$  commutes with the exterior derivative, so  $\widetilde{d\omega} = d\tilde{\omega}$  and closed forms are mapped to closed forms.

**Lemma 8.9.** *The inverse of this map is given by*

$$\tilde{\omega} \wedge \beta(y, \xi)^k / k! = \omega \wedge d\xi (-1)^{n(n+1)/2}$$

This lemma can of course be proved by brute computation, but it seems worth while to elaborate it somewhat. Recall the definition of *Berezin integration*. If  $F$  is a differential form, depending on any number of variables, its Berezin integral with respect to one of them, say  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , is obtained as follows: Write

$$F = f \wedge dy_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dy_n + \dots = f \wedge dy + \dots$$

where the dots stand for terms that are not of full degree in  $y$ . Then

$$BI_y(F) := f.$$

With this definition, we see that  $\tilde{\omega}$  is the Berezin integral with respect to  $y$  of

$$\omega(x, y) \wedge \beta(\xi, y)^{n-k} / (n - k)!.$$

It is convenient to rewrite this in a way that handles all bidegrees at the same time, as

$$(8.7) \quad \tilde{\omega} := BI_y(\omega \wedge e^{\beta(\xi, y)}) := \Phi(\omega).$$

Let us now apply the operator  $\Phi$  to  $\tilde{\omega}$ , taking the Berezin integral with respect to  $\xi$ . This gives

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi^2(\omega) &= BI_\xi(\tilde{\omega}(x, \xi) \wedge e^{\beta(z, \xi)}) = BI_\xi BI_y(\omega(x, y) \wedge e^{\beta(\xi, y)} \wedge e^{\beta(z, \xi)}) = \\ &BI_\xi BI_y(\omega(x, y) \wedge e^{\beta(\xi, y-z)}) = BI_\xi BI_y(\omega(x, y) \wedge \beta(\xi, y-z)^n / n!) = \\ &BI_\xi BI_y(\omega(x, y-z+z) \wedge \beta(\xi, y-z)^n / n!) = \omega(x, z) BI_\xi BI_y(\beta(\xi, y-z)^n / n!) = \\ &\omega(x, z) (-1)^{n(n+1)/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, up to a sign,  $\Phi$  is its own inverse, which gives Lemma 8.9.

Next we will parameterize the normal cycle by the unit sphere. The map

$$x \rightarrow \partial\phi(y) = x$$

is a bijection between the boundary of  $K$  and the boundary of its polar,  $K^\circ$ . Its inverse is

$$y \rightarrow \partial h_K(x),$$

where  $h_K$  is the support function of  $K$ . The map

$$\gamma(y) := \partial\phi / |\partial\phi| = n(y)$$

is the Gauss map to the unit sphere. The inverse of the Gauss map is also given by

$$x \rightarrow \partial h_K(x),$$

since  $\partial h_K$  is homogeneous of order zero:

$$\partial h_K(\partial\phi / |\partial\phi|) = \partial h_K \circ \partial\phi = id.$$

Now we can parameterize the normal cycle by  $S^{n-1}$  by

$$x \in S^{n-1} \rightarrow F(x) = (\partial h_K(x), x) \in nc(K).$$

In the next computations we will use that

$$(8.8) \quad F^*(\omega) \wedge d\xi = (-1)^{n(n+1)/2} \tilde{\omega} \wedge (dd^\# h_K)^k / k!,$$

which follows from

$$(8.9) \quad \omega \wedge d\xi = (-1)^{n(n+1)/2} \tilde{\omega} \wedge \beta^k / k!, \quad F^*(\beta) = dd^\# h_K.$$

Putting this together we get first that

$$\theta(K) = \int_{nc(K)} \omega = \int_{|x|=1} F^*(\omega) = (-1)^{n(n-1)/2} \int_{|x|=1} F^*(\omega) \wedge d\xi,$$

where the last equality is the definition of superintegrals. Finally, using (8.8) we get

$$(-1)^n \theta(K) = \int_{|x|=1} \tilde{\omega} \wedge (dd^\# h_K)^k / k!.$$

This representation of  $\theta(K)$  is, however, not unique. Following [15] we say that a form  $\omega$  on the circle bundle is *vertical* if  $\alpha \wedge \omega = 0$ , where  $\alpha$  is the contact form

$$\alpha = \sum x_i dy_i$$

on  $S\mathbb{R}^n$ . This translates as follows to the superformalism (Recall that  $\delta^\#$  is contraction with the vector field  $E^\# = \sum x_i \partial / \partial \xi_i$ ):



**Lemma 8.10.** *A form  $\omega = \sum \omega_{IJ} dy_I \wedge dx_J$  of bidegree  $(k, \cdot)$  in  $(y, x)$  is vertical if and only if  $\delta^\# \tilde{\omega} = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $\alpha = \delta^\# \beta$ , where  $\beta = \sum d\xi_i \wedge dy_i$ . Since  $\alpha \wedge \omega = 0$  if and only if  $\alpha \wedge \omega \wedge d\xi = 0$ , Lemma 8.9, shows that  $\omega$  is vertical if and only if

$$\delta^\#(\beta) \wedge \beta^k \wedge \tilde{\omega} = \delta^\#(\beta^{k+1}) \wedge \tilde{\omega} / (k+1) = 0.$$

Since  $\delta^\#$  is an antiderivation and  $\beta^{k+1} \wedge \tilde{\omega} = 0$  for degree reasons, this means that

$$\delta^\#(\tilde{\omega}) \wedge \beta^{k+1} = 0,$$

which is equivalent to  $\delta^\# \tilde{\omega} = 0$  since  $\delta^\# \tilde{\omega}$  is of degree  $(n-k-1)$  in  $d\xi_i$ .  $\square$

If  $\eta$  is vertical form of bidegree  $(k, \cdot)$  in  $(y, x)$ , then

$$f := \tilde{\eta} \wedge (dd^\# h_K)^k = 0,$$

since  $\delta^\# f = 0$  and  $f$  is of full degree in  $d\xi$ . Therefore we can replace  $\omega$  by  $\omega + \eta$ , where  $\eta$  is vertical in the computations. By [15], page 9, there is a unique choice of  $\eta$  such that  $d(\omega + \eta)$  is vertical. Hence we can assume that we have already chosen  $\omega$  so that  $d\omega =: \tau$  is vertical. By Stokes' theorem,

$$(-1)^n \theta(K) = \int_{|x|=1} \tilde{\omega} \wedge (dd^\# h_K)^k / k! = \int_{|x|=1} \tilde{\tau} \wedge (dd^\# h_K)^{k-1} \wedge d^\# h_K / k!,$$

since  $d\tilde{\omega} = \tilde{\tau}$ . Here  $\tilde{\tau}$  is closed of bidegree  $(n-k, n-k)$  and it satisfies  $\delta^\# \tilde{\tau} = 0$  since  $\tau$  is vertical. Let  $\Omega$  be the pullback of  $\tilde{\tau}$  to  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$  under the map  $x \rightarrow x/|x|$ . Then

$$d\Omega = 0, \quad \delta^\# \Omega = 0,$$

and, by Stokes',

$$\theta(K) = \int_{|x|=1} \tilde{\tau} \wedge (dd^\# h_K)^{k-1} \wedge d^\# h_K / k! = \int \Omega \wedge (dd^\# h_K)^k / k!$$

The right hand side here is precisely what appears in Theorem 8.6, but we also need to verify that  $\Omega$  is symmetric. This follows from the next proposition. (See [23], Lemma 4.8 and its proof. I thank Thomas Wannerer for insisting that symmetry should be automatic and directing me to this reference. The proof we give here is different.)

**Proposition 8.11.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a superform of bidegree  $(p, p)$  satisfying  $d\Omega = 0$  and  $\delta^\# \Omega = 0$ . Then  $\Omega$  is symmetric.*

*Proof.* As in section 6

$$E^\# \Omega = (d\delta^\# + \delta^\# d)\Omega = 0,$$

so  $\Omega$  is invariant under the flow  $(x, \xi) \rightarrow (x, \xi + tx)$ . Hence

$$\Omega = \sum \Omega_{IJ} dx_I \wedge d\xi_J = \sum \Omega_{IJ} dx_I \wedge d(\xi + x)_J.$$

Change variables  $(y, \eta) = (x + \xi, \xi)$ ,  $(x, \xi) = (y - \eta, \eta)$ . Then

$$\sum \Omega_{IJ} d(y - \eta)_I \wedge d\eta_J = \sum \Omega_{IJ} d(y - \eta)_I \wedge dy_J.$$

Identifying terms of bidegree  $(p, p)$  in  $(y, \eta)$  we get

$$\sum \Omega_{IJ} dy_I \wedge d\eta_J = \sum \Omega_{IJ} d(-\eta)_I \wedge dy_J = \sum \Omega_{IJ} dy_J \wedge d\eta_I,$$

so  $\Omega$  is symmetric.  $\square$

**8.2. Characterization of strong forms.** Here we will give the proof of Theorem 3.1 from section 3. Let

$$\Omega = \sum \Omega_{IJ} dx_I \wedge d\xi_J$$

be a  $(p, p)$ -form with constant coefficients. Recall that  $\Omega$  is ‘strong’ if it can be written as a linear combinations of elementary forms

$$\alpha_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_p \wedge \alpha_1^\# \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_p^\#.$$

Recall also that the operator

$$\chi \rightarrow T(\chi) = \sum dx_i \wedge \delta_{\xi_i}(\chi)$$

annihilates all elementary, and therefore all strong, forms. The next theorem is the converse of this fact.

**Theorem 8.12.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a  $(p, p)$ -form with constant coefficients satisfying  $T(\Omega) = 0$ . Then  $\Omega$  can be written as a linear combination of elementary forms.*

We will deduce this theorem from a more general result on forms

$$\tau = \sum_{|I|+|K|=N} \tau_{IK} dx_I \wedge dy_K$$

on  $\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_y^n = \mathbb{C}_{x+iy}^n$ , using the translation between the two pictures from section 8.1. As it turns out,  $(p, p)$ -forms in the kernel of  $T$  correspond precisely to *primitive* forms of total degree  $n$  on the Kähler manifold  $\mathbb{C}_{x+iy}^n$  and we can then use the characterization of primitive forms in Theorem 8.13.

Let

$$L\tau = \beta \wedge \tau,$$

where  $\beta = \beta(x, y) = \sum dx_i \wedge dy_i$ ; this is the  $L$ -operator from Kähler geometry on  $\mathbb{C}^n$  with the Kähler form  $\beta$ . Obviously it increases the total degree by two units. Its adjoint is defined by

$$(\Lambda\tau, \tau') = (\tau, L\tau'),$$

where  $(\cdot, \cdot)$  is the standard Euclidean scalar product on forms on  $\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_y^n$ . Explicitly

$$\Lambda = \sum dy_i \lrcorner dx_i \text{ or } \sum \delta_{x_i} \delta_{y_i}.$$

Following the terminology of Kähler geometry we define the space of primitive forms of degree  $N$  as

$$P(N) = \left\{ \tau = \sum_{|I|+|K|=N} \tau_{IK} dx_I \wedge dy_K; \Lambda\tau = 0 \right\}.$$

We also define a form of degree  $N$  to be decomposable if it can be written as

$$\alpha_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_q \wedge \alpha_{q+1}^\# \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_N^\#,$$

where  $\alpha_i$  are 1-forms on  $\mathbb{R}_x^n$ ,  $\alpha^\# = \sum \alpha^j dy_j$  if  $\alpha = \sum \alpha^j dx_j$  and all  $\alpha_i$  with  $i \leq q$  are orthogonal to all  $\alpha_i$  with  $i \geq q + 1$ . Finally we let  $D(N)$  be the linear span of the space of all decomposable forms. Note that there are no non-zero decomposable forms in degree  $N > n$ .

**Theorem 8.13.** *For any degree  $N$ ,*

$$P(N) = D(N).$$

*In particular, if  $N > n$ , there are no non-trivial primitive forms.*

*Proof.* It is easy to see that any decomposable form is primitive, so  $D(N) \subseteq P(N)$ . Indeed, we may assume that all the  $\alpha_i = e_i$  form a part of an orthonormal basis of the space of 1-forms on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and write

$$\Lambda = \sum e_i^\# \rfloor e_i \rfloor.$$

For the converse we use induction and assume the theorem has been proved in all smaller dimensions. Let  $\tau$  be of degree  $N$  on  $\mathbb{R}_x^n \times \mathbb{R}_y^n$  and assume  $\Lambda\tau = 0$ . It is enough to prove that if  $\tau \perp D(N)$  then  $\tau = 0$ , and we may assume that  $\tau$  is of pure bidegree  $(p, q)$ , with  $p \geq q$ . Let  $a$  be a form of bidegree  $(1, 0)$  and put

$$E := a^{\perp c} := \{b_0 + b_1^\#; b_i \text{ (1, 0) - forms, } (a, b_i) = 0\},$$

the orthogonal complement of  $a$  in the space of 1-forms on  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . We claim that the orthogonal projection of  $a \rfloor \tau$  on  $\bigwedge^{N-1}(E)$  is primitive on  $E$  and orthogonal to all decomposable forms on  $E$ . It then follows from the inductive assumption that the orthogonal projection of  $a \rfloor \tau$  vanishes, which is the main step of the argument.

For the first part, we may assume that  $a = e_n$  is the last element in an orthonormal basis of the space of  $(1, 0)$ -forms. Write  $\beta = \sum_1^n e_1 \wedge e_i^\#$  and  $\beta' = \sum_1^{n-1} e_1 \wedge e_i^\#$ . That  $e_n \rfloor \tau$  is primitive on  $E$  means that

$$(8.10) \quad (e_n \rfloor \tau, \beta' \wedge \chi) = 0$$

for any  $\chi \in \bigwedge(E)$ , and we know that

$$(e_n \rfloor \tau, \beta \wedge \chi) = (\tau, e_n \wedge \beta \wedge \chi) = 0$$

since  $\tau$  is primitive. (8.10) therefore follows since

$$(e_n \rfloor \tau, e_n \wedge e_n^\# \wedge \chi) = (\tau, e_n \wedge e_n \wedge e_n^\# \wedge \chi) = 0.$$

Let next  $\chi$  be a decomposable  $(N-1)$ -form on  $E$  of bidegree  $(p-1, q)$ . This means that

$$\chi = \alpha_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_{p-1} \wedge \alpha_{p+1}^\# \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_N^\#,$$

where all the  $\alpha_i$  are orthogonal to  $a$  and  $\alpha_i \perp \alpha_j$  if  $i < p$  and  $j \geq p+1$ . For the second part of the claim we need to verify that

$$(a \rfloor \tau, \chi) = 0.$$

But this is clear since

$$(a \rfloor \tau, \chi) = (\tau, a \wedge \alpha_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_{p-1} \wedge \alpha_{p+1}^\# \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_N^\#)$$

and  $a \wedge \alpha_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_{p-1} \wedge \alpha_{p+1}^\# \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_N^\#$  lies in  $D(N)$ .

By the induction hypothesis, this means that the orthogonal projection of  $a \rfloor \tau$  on  $\bigwedge^{N-1}(E)$  vanishes, so as soon as all  $\alpha_i$  are orthogonal to  $a$ ,

$$(\tau, \alpha_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_{p-1} \wedge a \wedge \alpha_{p+1}^\# \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_N^\#) = 0.$$

Expressed more symmetrically

$$(\tau, \alpha_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_p \wedge \alpha_{p+1}^\# \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_N^\#) = 0$$

if one of the  $\alpha_i$  with  $i \leq p$  is orthogonal to all  $\alpha_j$  with  $j \geq p+1$ , or even if some linear combination  $\sum_1^p c_i \alpha_i$  is orthogonal to all  $\alpha_j$  with  $j \geq p+1$ .

Choose a basis for  $(p, q)$ -forms

$$\alpha_{IJK} := dx_I \wedge dy_J \wedge dV_K,$$

where the multiindices are disjoint and

$$dV_K = dx_{k_1} \wedge dy_{k_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dx_{k_s} \wedge dy_{k_s}, \quad s = |K|.$$

Writing

$$\tau = \sum c_{IJK} \alpha_{IJK}$$

in this basis, our conclusion so far implies that all multiindices  $I$  must be empty. Since  $q \leq p$  all  $J$  are also empty, so

$$\tau = \sum \lambda_K dV_K.$$

If  $L$  is a multiindex not containing  $j$  and  $k$ , we have that  $\tau$  is orthogonal to  $(dx_j - dx_k) \wedge (dy_j + dy_k) \wedge dV_L$  and to  $dx_j \wedge dy_k \wedge dV_L$ , which gives that

$$\lambda_{\{j\} \cup L} = \lambda_{\{k\} \cup L}.$$

This implies that all  $\lambda_K$  are equal, which immediately implies that  $\tau = 0$  if  $\Lambda \tau = 0$ . □

The only thing that remains is now to show that Theorem 8.13 implies Theorem 8.12. For this we will use the map  $\Phi$  from the previous section that takes translation invariant forms  $\omega$  on  $\mathbb{C}_{x+iy}^n$  to (super)forms on  $C_{x+i\xi}^n$ , defined by (cf. (8.6),

$$\Phi(\omega) \wedge dy = \omega(x, y) \wedge e^{\beta(\xi, y)}.$$

It is immediate that  $T(\beta(\xi, y)) = \beta(x, y)$ , from which follows that

$$T(e^{\beta(\xi, y)}) = \beta(x, y) \wedge e^{\beta(\xi, y)}$$

since  $T$  is a derivation. Hence

$$T(\Phi(\omega)) = \Phi(\beta \wedge \omega),$$

so, under the map  $\Phi$ , elements in the kernel of  $L = \beta \wedge$  on the  $\mathbb{C}_{x+iy}^n$ -side correspond to elements in the kernel of  $T$ . This holds in any bidegree. Now note that forms of total degree  $n$  on the  $\mathbb{C}_{x+iy}^n$ -side correspond to forms of bidegree  $(p, p)$  on the super-current side ( $\Phi$  maps  $(p, k)$ -forms to  $(p, n-k)$ -forms). Thus  $(p, p)$ -forms in the kernel of  $T$  correspond to  $n$ -forms in the kernel of  $L$ . But, it is well known (and follows easily from Theorem 8.13), that in degree  $n$ , the kernel of  $L$  equals the kernel of  $\Lambda$ . The proof is then completed by the easily checked fact that in degree  $n$ , decomposable forms are mapped under  $\Phi$  to elementary forms.

**Remark 8.14.** It is a bit curious that Kähler theory on the ‘normal cycle side’ of the map  $\Phi$  plays a role in this argument, since the idea of superforms is to use Kähler methods on the other side, of ‘superforms’. On the formal level, the isomorphism  $\Phi$  behaves somewhat like a mirror symmetry between the Kähler manifolds  $\mathbb{C}_{x+i\xi}^n$  and  $\mathbb{C}_{x+iy}^n$ , mapping the vertical diagonal of the Hodge diamond ( $(p, p)$ -forms) in the first space to the horizontal diagonal ( $n$ -forms) in the second.

## 9. ALEXANDROV’S DIFFERENTIAL OPERATOR.

Alexandrov’s second proof of the Alexandrov-Fenchel inequalities (see [8]) is a generalization of Hilbert’s proof of the Brunn-Minkowski inequality in two dimensions, [27]. It is based on a study of the eigenvalues of a certain elliptic second order differential operator on the sphere,  $u \rightarrow A(u)$ , that we shall now discuss, using superforms.

Our first incarnation of Alexandrov’s operator maps 1-homogeneous functions on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  to (strongly homogeneous)  $(n-1, n-1)$ -currents. In the sequel we will sometimes write that a 1-homogeneous function is strictly convex. This is of course never literally true since the function is linear on any line through the origin. What we mean is that the function is strictly convex along any other line, which in case of smooth functions means that the Hessian has  $(n-1)$  positive eigenvalues.

Let  $\phi_3, \dots, \phi_n$  be smooth strictly convex 1-homogeneous functions and put

$$\Omega = dd^\# \phi_3 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \phi_n,$$

it is a strongly homogeneous and positive  $(n-2, n-2)$ -form (if  $n=2$  we put  $\Omega=1$ ). We could also define it for non-smooth  $\phi_i$  but for the proof of the Alexandrov-Fenchel inequalities, it is enough to consider smooth functions. (The question of when equality holds in the inequalities is a different matter; there it might be useful to consider general convex functions (cf. [41] and the references there for recent results on this problem).)

We now define, for  $v$  a smooth 1-homogeneous function

$$(9.1) \quad \mathcal{A}(v) := dd^\# v \wedge \Omega.$$

We thus get one operator for each choice of  $\phi_3, \dots, \phi_n$  and we will fix one such choice from now. We next define a bilinear form on the space of smooth 1-homogeneous functions through the pairing described in Section 6, by

$$(9.2) \quad Q(u, v) := \langle u, \mathcal{A}(v) \rangle = \int_{\mu=1} u \mathcal{A}(v) \wedge d^\# \mu,$$

where  $\mu$  is any gauge function, cf. Proposition 6.4. The standard choice, corresponding to the original setting of Alexandrov, is  $\mu(x) = |x|$ , but it is useful to allow general gauges. Here  $u$  and  $v$  are 1-homogeneous functions on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , but we could also consider them as functions on  $S_\mu = \{\mu=1\}$  since any function there has a unique homogeneous extension.

We now proceed to relate our definition of the Alexandrov operator  $\mathcal{A}(v)$  to the more standard one as a differential operator on the ‘sphere’  $S_\mu$ . The differential form  $\mathcal{A}(v) \wedge d^\# \mu$  is of degree  $(n-1)$  in  $dx$  and of full degree  $n$  in  $d\xi$ . If  $v$  is smooth as a 1-homogeneous function on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  it defines a measure on  $S_\mu$  which is absolutely continuous with respect to surface measure  $dS$ . Note that  $S_\mu$  does not need to be smooth, so there is no a priori definition of being smooth ‘on

$S_\mu$ . As an example, the function 1 on  $S_\mu$  is here interpreted as  $\mu$ , so it is not smooth in our sense, if  $\mu$  is not smooth.

Let  $dm$  be any choice of measure on  $S_\mu$  satisfying

$$cdS \leq dm \leq CdS.$$

We will call such measures non-degenerate. Then we can write

$$(9.3) \quad \mathcal{A}(v) \wedge d^\# \mu|_{\mu=1} = A_m(v)dm,$$

where  $A_m(v)$  is a function on  $S_\mu$ . This is our second incarnation of the Alexander operator, and we have

$$Q(u, v) = \int_{\mu=1} u A_m(v) dm.$$

When  $\mu = |x|$  and  $dm$  is surface measure on the sphere  $A_m$  is a rewrite of Alexandrov's original operator and we will denote it simply by  $A$ . The next proposition says that any  $A_m$  uniquely determines  $\mathcal{A}$ , so we can view all these operators as different incarnations of the same object.

**Proposition 9.1.** *If  $u$  is 1-homogeneous and  $A_m(u) = 0$  for some choice of gauge  $\mu$  and reference measure  $dm$  on  $S_\mu$ , then  $\mathcal{A}(u) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* That  $A_m(u) = 0$  means that

$$\mathcal{A}(u) \wedge d^\# \mu = 0$$

restricted as a form to  $S_\mu$ , or equivalently

$$\mathcal{A}(u) \wedge d\mu \wedge d^\# \mu = 0$$

when  $\mu = 1$ . Contracting with  $\delta$  and  $\delta^\#$  we get (since  $\delta \mathcal{A}(u) = 0$ ) that  $\mathcal{A}(u) = 0$  when  $\mu = 1$ . Since  $\mathcal{A}(u)$  is homogeneous of order zero, it vanishes everywhere.  $\square$

Notice that

$$(9.4) \quad Q(u, v) = \int_{\mu=1} u \mathcal{A}(v) \wedge d^\# \mu = V(u, v, \phi_3, \dots, \phi_n) n!,$$

so it is symmetric in  $u$  and  $v$ .

We are now ready to state a first version of the Alexandrov-Fenchel theorem:

**Theorem 9.2.** *The quadratic form  $Q(u, u)$  has Lorentzian signature in the sense that it is strictly positive somewhere and negative semidefinite on some subspace of  $C^2$  of codimension 1. More precisely, if  $Q(\phi, \phi) > 0$ ,  $Q$  is negative semidefinite on the space of all functions  $u$  such that  $Q(u, \phi) = 0$ .*

The first part of the statement is of course evident since  $Q(\phi, \phi) > 0$  is  $\phi$  if strictly convex. The next section will be devoted to two different proofs of the last part.

**Corollary 9.3.** *If  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are convex, then*

$$Q(\phi, \psi)^2 \geq Q(\phi, \phi)Q(\psi, \psi).$$

*In other words*

$$V(\phi, \psi, \phi_3, \dots, \phi_n)^2 \geq V(\phi, \phi, \phi_3, \dots, \phi_n)V(\psi, \psi, \phi_3, \dots, \phi_n).$$

This follows from the theorem by the Cauchy inequality for time-like vectors in Lorentz space. We include the statement and its proof for completeness, and also to check the precise assumptions needed.

**Theorem 9.4.** *Let  $Q(u, u)$  be a quadratic form on a vector space such that for some vector  $u_0$ ,  $Q(u_0, u_0) > 0$  and  $Q$  is negative semidefinite on some subspace of codimension 1. Then, if  $Q(v, v) \geq 0$*

$$(9.5) \quad Q(u, v)^2 \geq Q(u, u)Q(v, v).$$

*Moreover, if  $Q(v, v) > 0$ ,  $Q$  is negative semidefinite on the subspace  $\{u; Q(u, v) = 0\}$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the polynomial in  $t$

$$p(t) = Q(u + tv, u + tv).$$

Assume  $Q(v, v)$  is positive (if  $Q(v, v) = 0$  there is nothing to prove). Then  $p$  is a second degree polynomial with positive leading coefficient. We may assume that  $u$  and  $v$  are linearly independent since the inequality is trivial if they are proportional. Then the minimum of  $p$  must be less than or equal to zero, since if it were positive,  $Q$  would be positive definite on a subspace of dimension 2. (This subspace would have to intersect the codimension 1 subspace where  $Q$  is negative semidefinite, leading to a contradiction.) Computing derivatives we see that the minimum is attained where

$$t = -Q(u, v)/Q(v, v),$$

so the minimum value is  $Q(u, u) - Q(u, v)^2/Q(v, v)$ . Hence the Cauchy inequality follows. This in turn implies that if  $Q(u, v) = 0$ , then  $Q(u, u) \leq 0$ , which proves the last claim.  $\square$

The corollary follows since  $Q(\phi, \phi) \geq 0$  if  $\phi$  is convex; the last part follows from (9.4). Note also that  $Q(\phi, \psi) \geq 0$  if both  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  are convex so we also have that

$$Q(\phi, \psi) \geq (Q(\phi, \phi)Q(\psi, \psi))^{1/2}.$$

We next record an alternative description of the bilinear form  $Q$ , that gives another interpretation of the Alexandrov-Fenchel theorem.

**Proposition 9.5.** *If  $u$  is a sufficiently regular 1-homogeneous function, and  $\mu$  is any gauge function, then*

$$Q(u, u) = \int_{\mu=1} u^2 d^\# \mu \wedge dd^\# \mu \wedge \Omega_{n-2} - \int_{\mu=1} du \wedge d^\# u \wedge d^\# \mu \wedge \Omega_{n-2}.$$

In the light of the proposition we see that Theorem 9.2 can be seen as a Poincaré inequality:

$$(9.6) \quad \int_{\mu=1} u^2 d^\# \mu \wedge dd^\# \mu \wedge \Omega_{n-2} \leq \int_{\mu=1} du \wedge d^\# u \wedge d^\# \mu \wedge \Omega_{n-2},$$

if  $u$  satisfies any orthogonality condition

$$Q(u, \phi) = 0,$$

with  $Q(\phi, \phi) > 0$ .

The first term on the right hand side here is the squared  $L^2$ -norm of the function  $u$  with respect to a certain measure on  $\{\mu = 1\}$  and the second term is an  $L^2$ -norm of the gradient of  $u$ . Explicitly, the orthogonality condition means that

$$(9.7) \quad Q(u, \phi) = \int_{\mu=1} u d d^{\#} \phi \wedge \Omega_{n-2} \wedge d^{\#} \mu = 0.$$

We want to stress the curious fact that all such Poincaré inequalities – corresponding to different choices of  $\mu$  and  $\phi$  – are equivalent. In other words, if (9.7) implies (9.6) for a certain pair  $\mu$  and  $\phi$ , the quadratic form  $Q$  (which does not depend on  $\mu$  or  $\phi$ ) has Lorentz signature, so the same thing must hold for any other choice of  $\mu$  and  $\phi$ . We will give one simple example of this after the proof of the proposition.

*Proof.* (Of Proposition 9.5) By Stokes' theorem on the closed manifold  $\mu = 1$  we have

$$\int_{\mu=1} du \wedge d^{\#} u \wedge d^{\#} \mu \wedge \Omega_{n-2} = - \int_{\mu=1} u d d^{\#} u \wedge \Omega_{n-2} \wedge d^{\#} \mu + \int_{\mu=1} u d^{\#} u \wedge d d^{\#} \mu \wedge \Omega_{n-2}.$$

The first term on the right hand side is  $-Q(u, u)$ . By Lemma 6.5, the second equals

$$\int_{\mu=1} u^2 d^{\#} \mu \wedge d d^{\#} \mu \wedge \Omega_{n-2},$$

and the proposition follows.  $\square$

**Example:** (A proof of Wirtinger's inequality.) Take  $n = 2$  and choose  $\mu$  so that  $\{\mu < 1\}$  is a triangle. Then  $d d^{\#} \mu$  is supported on the rays through the vertices of the triangle. The measure on  $\{\mu = 1\}$  defined by

$$d^{\#} \mu \wedge d d^{\#} \mu|_{\mu=1}$$

is therefore a sum of point masses at the vertices of the triangle, say  $p_1, p_2, p_3$ . Hence the Poincaré inequality says that

$$Q(u, u) = \sum c_j u^2(p_j) - \int_{\mu=1} du \wedge d^{\#} u \wedge d^{\#} \mu \leq 0,$$

if  $u$  satisfies the condition  $Q(u, \phi) = 0$ . Here we are free to choose e.g.  $\phi = \mu$ , in which case the orthogonality condition is

$$\sum c_j u(p_j) = 0.$$

Let  $F(x) = a + b \cdot x$  be an affine function that interpolates the values of  $u$  at the points  $p_j$ . The compatibility condition is automatically satisfied for any linear function, so the condition

$$\sum c_j F(p_j) = 0$$

means just that  $a = 0$ , i. e.  $F$  is linear. We trivially have that  $Q(u - F, u - F) \leq 0$  since  $u - F$  vanishes at the points  $p_j$ . But

$$Q(u - F, u - F) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d d^{\#} (u - F) \wedge d d^{\#} (u - F) = Q(u, u)$$



if  $F$  is linear. (Here we need  $F$  to be linear since affine functions are 1-homogeneous only when they are linear.) Hence  $Q(u, u) \leq 0$ . Finally, since these inequalities are equivalent for different choices of  $\mu$  and  $\phi$  we get that

$$\int_{|x|=1} u^2 d^\#|x| \wedge dd^\#|x| \leq \int_{|x|=1} du \wedge d^\#u \wedge d^\#||x|$$

if

$$\int_{|x|=1} ud^\#|x| \wedge dd^\#|x| = 0.$$

This is the classical Wirtinger's inequality. Indeed, the measures on the circle appearing here are rotation invariant so they are equal to arc length on the circle up to constants, and the constants must be the right ones since we have equality for linear functions. Along the way we have also proved the Alexandrov-Fenchel theorem in the 2-dimensional case, i. e. the 2-dimensional case of the Brunn-Minkowski theorem.  $\square$

To fix ideas we now take  $\mu(x) = |x|$  and the reference measure  $dm = dS$  to be surface measure on the sphere. Write  $A = A_m$  for these choices. Clearly  $A$  is a second order operator and it is well known that it is elliptic: Take a point, say  $p = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$ , on the sphere. In the coordinates  $(x_2, \dots, x_n)$  near  $p$  the Alexandrov operator has the form

$$A(v) = \sum_2^n a_{ij}v_{ij} + \sum b_i v_i + cv.$$

We want to prove that

$$\sum_2^n a_{ij}a_i a_j > 0$$

at  $p$  if  $a' = (a_2, \dots, a_n) \neq 0$ . Take  $u(x') = (x' \cdot a')^2 / |x|$ ; it is 1-homogeneous and vanishes to second order at  $p$ . Hence

$$\sum_2^n a_{ij}a_i a_j = A(u)(p).$$

But,

$$A(u)(p)dS = d(x' \cdot a') \wedge d^\#(x' \cdot a') \wedge \Omega \wedge d^\#|x| > 0.$$

Hence,  $A$  is elliptic. Taking  $v = |x|$  ( $= 1$  on the sphere) we also see that

$$A(v)dS = \Omega \wedge dd^\#\mu \wedge d^\#\mu > 0,$$

so  $c$ , the coefficient of the zeroth order term of  $A$  is strictly positive.

We also have that

$$\int uA(v)dS = \langle u, A(v) \rangle = \int vA(u)dS,$$

so  $A$  is a symmetric operator. It follows that  $A$  extends to a closed and densely defined self adjoint operator on  $L^2(dS)$  and we get the orthogonal decomposition

$$(9.8) \quad L^2(dS) = R(A) \oplus N(A),$$

where  $R(A)$  is the range of  $A$  and  $N(A)$  is the null space (see e.g. [43], chapter 6). The centerpiece of the proof of the Alexandrov-Fenchel theorem is the fact that

$$N(A) = \{u = x \cdot a; a \in \mathbb{R}^n\},$$

which thus implies that the equation  $A(u) = f$  can be solved on the sphere if and only if

$$\int_{|x|=1} x_i f dS = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

We will also have use for the corresponding results for the Dirichlet problem for  $A$  on certain subdomains of the sphere, namely the spherical caps

$$S_t = \{x \in S^{n-1}; x_1 > t\}.$$

We first claim that  $A$  is formally self adjoint on the space of smooth functions on the closure of  $S_t$  that vanish on the boundary. This follows from

$$\int_{S_t} u A(v) = \int u d d^\# v \wedge \Omega \wedge d^\# |x| = - \int_{S_t} du \wedge d^\# v \wedge \Omega \wedge d^\# |x| + \int u d^\# v \wedge \Omega \wedge d d^\# |x|.$$

The first term on the right hand side is symmetric since  $\Omega$  is symmetric. The second term equals, by Lemma 6.5,

$$\int u v d^\# |x| \wedge d d^\# |x| \wedge \Omega,$$

so it is also symmetric.

It follows from the theory of second order elliptic equations (see e.g. [22], Chapter 6, Theorem 4) that the Dirichlet problem

$$Au = f, \quad u(x) = 0 \text{ on } \partial S_t$$

can be solved if and only if  $f$  is orthogonal to the null space of  $A$ ,  $N(A) = \{u; Au = 0, u(x) = 0 \text{ on } \partial S_t\}$ .

We shall prove in the next section that when  $t > 0$ , there are no non trivial functions in  $N(A)$  on  $S_t$ . Hence the Dirichlet problem for  $A$  is solvable for any right hand side in  $L^2$ , just like for the Laplacian in domains in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . For  $t = 0$ , however, the function  $u = x_1$  is obviously a non trivial function in  $N(A)$ , and we shall prove in the next section that it spans the null space. It follows that the Dirichlet problem on  $S_0$  can be solved precisely when the right hand side satisfies

$$\int_{S_0} x_1 f dS = 0.$$

## 10. TWO PROOFS OF THE ALEXANDROV-FENCHEL INEQUALITIES.

We start by stating Alexandrov's linear algebra lemma, which can be seen as the pointwise counterpart of the Alexandrov-Fenchel theorem.

**Theorem 10.1.** *Let  $\omega_2, \dots, \omega_n$  be positive  $(1, 1)$  (super)forms on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .*

$$\omega_k = \sum a_{ij}^k dx_i \wedge d\xi_j,$$

where the matrices  $M^k = (a_{ij}^k)$  are symmetric, positive definite and constant. Let

$$B = \sum b_{ij} dx_i \wedge d\xi_j$$

be an arbitrary  $(1, 1)$  (super)form with symmetric constant coefficients. Assume that

$$(10.1) \quad B \wedge \Omega_{n-1} = 0,$$

where  $\Omega_{n-1} = \omega_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_n$ . Then

$$(10.2) \quad B \wedge B \wedge \Omega_{n-2} \leq 0$$

where  $\Omega_{n-2} = \omega_3 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_n$ . Equality holds only when  $B = 0$ .

Before we give the proof we look at the case  $n = 2$  for motivation. We then only have one positive form,  $\omega_2$ , and we may assume it equals  $\sum dx_i \wedge d\xi_i$  after a linear change of coordinates. The assumption (10.1) says that the trace of the matrix  $(b_{ij})$  is zero, so its eigenvalues are  $\lambda$  and  $-\lambda$ . The conclusion is that its determinant is negative, which is clear since it equals  $-\lambda^2$ . Moreover, the determinant can only be zero if  $\lambda$  and hence  $B$  is zero.

*Proof.* We argue by induction, assuming  $n > 2$  and that the theorem holds in dimension  $n - 1$ . The first, and most important, step is to prove that the map

$$(10.3) \quad B \rightarrow B \wedge \Omega_{n-2}$$

is injective. Assume  $B \wedge \Omega_{n-2} = 0$ . Then

$$B \wedge \Omega_{n-2} \wedge dx_1 \wedge d\xi_1 = 0.$$

This means that the restriction of all the forms  $B, \omega_3, \dots, \omega_n$  to the complex hyperplane  $x_1 = 0 = \xi_1$  satisfy the assumption (10.1) in  $n - 1$  variables. By the inductive assumption

$$B \wedge B \wedge \omega_4 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_n \leq 0$$

on this hyperplane, or in other words

$$B \wedge B \wedge \omega_4 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_n \wedge dx_1 \wedge d\xi_1 \leq 0.$$

(If  $n = 3$  the wedge product  $\omega_4 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_n$  should be interpreted as 1.) We may assume that  $\omega_3 = \sum dx_i \wedge d\xi_i$  and then argue in the same way for the other coordinates. Summing up we get from the inductive assumption that

$$B \wedge B \wedge \Omega_{n-2} \leq 0,$$

but in fact equality must hold since  $B \wedge \Omega_{n-2} = 0$ . Hence

$$B \wedge B \wedge \omega_3 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_n \wedge dx_i \wedge d\xi_i = 0,$$

for all  $i$ , since the sum of these forms is zero and each term is non positive. Hence, the inductive assumption implies that the restriction of  $B$  to any complex coordinate hyperplane vanishes. But then  $B$  must be zero, so the map in (10.3) is indeed injective.

The rest of the proof is a deformation argument. Just like in the previous section the theorem says that the quadratic form

$$Q(B, B) = B \wedge B \wedge \Omega_{n-2}$$

has Lorentz signature and what we have just proved says that zero is not an eigenvalue. It is easy to check that the theorem does hold when  $\omega_2 = \dots \omega_n = \sum dx_i \wedge d\xi_i$ . Any other choice of  $\omega_i$ :s can be continuously deformed to this case and the eigenvalues change continuously under the deformation. Since zero is never an eigenvalue, we must always have one positive eigenvalue and the others strictly negative. Hence  $Q$  has Lorentz signature, which implies the conclusion of the theorem.  $\square$

**10.1. Alexandrov's proof.** We are now ready to describe Alexandrov's proof of his theorem. We assume that  $\phi_2, \dots, \phi_n$  are 1-homogeneous and positive outside the origin. In other words, they are support functions of convex bodies  $K_2, \dots, K_n$  that contain the origin as an interior point, and we also assume that these bodies are smoothly bounded and strictly convex. This means that  $\phi_j$  are smooth and their Hessians are strictly positive, apart from the zero eigenvalue in the radial direction. Here we also take the gauge function  $\mu$  to be smooth or even, to fix ideas, that  $\mu = |x|$ . In the latter case we take  $dm = dS$ , the surface measure on  $S^{n-1}$  and write  $A_m = A$ . The first, and main, step in Alexandrov's proof is the following result.

**Theorem 10.2.** (Alexandrov) *Let  $\mu$  be a gauge function and let  $dm$  be a reference measure on  $S_\mu$ . The only (1-homogeneous) functions  $u$  such that  $A(u) = 0$ , or equivalently*

$$A_m(u) = 0$$

*on  $S_\mu$ , are the linear functions. Consequently, if  $f \in L^2(dm)$ , the equation*

$$A_m(u) = f$$

*on  $S_\mu$  can be solved if and only if  $f$  is orthogonal to all linear functions. More generally, if  $d\nu$  is a measure on the sphere, the equation*

$$A(u) = d\nu$$

*is solvable if and only if  $d\nu$  has barycenter zero.*

*Proof.* The proof is very parallel to the first part of the proof we have given for Alexandrov's lemma. Assume  $A_m(u) = 0$ . By elliptic regularity,  $u$  is smooth and by Proposition 3.7

$$(10.4) \quad dd^\#u \wedge \Omega_{n-2} = 0.$$

Notice that this precisely what appears in the injectivity part of Alexandrov's lemma but we cannot conclude directly since the forms  $dd^\#\phi_j$  are not strictly positive. (In fact, we shall see later that *locally* there are many non-linear solutions to this equation.) We claim that (10.4) implies that

$$(10.5) \quad (dd^\#u)^2 \wedge \Omega_{n-3} \wedge d^\#\mu \leq 0$$

as a measure on the sphere. Indeed, (10.4) implies (and is by Proposition 3.7 actually equivalent to)

$$dd^\#u \wedge \Omega_{n-2} \wedge d\mu \wedge d^\#\mu = 0,$$

which means that  $dd^\#u$  satisfies the hypothesis in Alexandrov's lemma on the tangent space to  $S_\mu$ . (And, the forms  $dd^\#\phi_j$  are strictly positive on this subspace.) Hence (10.5) follows from Alexandrov's lemma (in dimension  $(n-1)!$ ). We will now use repeatedly that

$$(10.6) \quad V(u, v, \phi_3, \dots, \phi_n)n! = \int_{\mu=1} u dd^\#v \wedge \Omega_{n-2} \wedge d^\#\mu,$$

if  $u$  and  $v$  are 1-homogeneous. Multiplying (10.5) by  $\phi_3$  and integrating we get from (10.6) and the symmetry of  $V$  that,

$$V(u, u, \phi_3, \dots, \phi_n) = \int_{\mu=1} \phi_3 (dd^\#u)^2 \wedge \Omega_{n-3} \wedge d^\#\mu \leq 0.$$

On the other hand, (10.4) also implies that

$$V(u, u, \phi_3, \dots, \phi_n) = \int_{\mu=1} u dd^\#u \wedge \Omega_{n-2} \wedge d^\#\mu = \int_{\mu=1} u \mathcal{A}(u) \wedge d^\#\mu = 0$$

by assumption. Since  $\phi_3$  is strictly positive on  $S_\mu$  it follows that

$$(dd^\#u)^2 \wedge \Omega_{n-3} \wedge d^\#\mu = 0$$

identically on the sphere. It follows from the condition for equality in Alexandrov's lemma that

$$dd^\#u \wedge d\mu \wedge d^\#\mu = 0.$$

Contracting with  $E$  and  $E^\#$  again this gives that  $dd^\#u = 0$ , so  $u$  is linear.

The last claim on solvability of the inhomogeneous equation  $A_m(u) = f$  follows from (9.8). For the very last part, one can approximate  $d\nu$  in the weak\* topology by measures  $f_j dS$  where  $f_j$  are smooth and orthogonal to  $N(A)$ . The solve  $A(u_j) = f_j$  with  $u_j \in N(A)^\perp$ . If  $f$  is any continuous function in  $N(A)^\perp$  we solve  $A(u) = f$  and get, since  $A$  is formally selfadjoint, that

$$\int_{|x|=1} u_j f dS = \int_{|x|=1} u_j A(u) dS = \int_{|x|=1} f_j u dS.$$

Hence  $u_j$  converge weak\* to a weak solution of  $A(u) = d\nu$ . □

The remaining part of the proof is, just like in the proof of Alexandrov's lemma, a deformation argument, that, again, we only sketch. The theorem we have just proved says that the only eigenfunctions of the elliptic operator  $A_m$  with eigenvalue zero are the linear functions. One verifies that when  $\phi_3 = \dots, \phi_n = |x|$  the operator  $A_m$  has only one positive eigenvalue. The case of general  $\phi_j$  can be deformed continuously to this case, and the eigenvalues change in a continuous way. Finally, Theorem 10.2 says that the negative eigenvalues cannot pass the barrier  $\lambda = 0$ , so  $A_m$  has only one positive eigenvalue in the general case as well.

**Remark:** Actually, the proofs of Theorems 10.1 and 10.2 are so similar that they could be merged into one. Notice that in the proof of Theorem 10.2 in  $n$  dimensions we only used Alexandrov's lemma in dimension  $(n-1)$ . Hence, Alexandrov's lemma in dimension  $(n-1)$  implies the Alexandrov-Fenchel theorem in dimension  $n$ , which in turn gives Alexandrov's lemma in dimension  $n$  rather easily, so we could prove both theorems at the same time by induction.

**10.2. A real variable variant of Gromov's proof.** In [25], Gromov gave an alternative proof of the Alexandrov-Fenchel theorem, by giving a simplified proof of the Khovanski-Teissier theorem, and applying that result to toric varieties. Here we will avoid the use of toric varieties, and complex manifolds in general, and instead give a direct proof of Alexandrov-Fenchel, using a real variable version of Gromov's main idea.

In this alternative proof we will work with

$$V(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$$

where  $\phi_i$  are smooth, strictly convex of linear growth, instead of working with their indicator functions (recall that  $V(\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n)$  only depends on the indicators of  $\phi_i$  by Theorem 4.5). We will also assume that they satisfy one more assumption. For simplicity we will work on  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ , which we realize as  $H_1 = \{x_1 = 1\}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Recall from the end of section 7 that a (convex) function on  $H_1$  has a 1-homogeneous (convex) extension to the half-space  $\{x_1 > 0\}$ ,  $\Phi$ .

**Definition 10.3.** We say that a smooth function  $\phi$  on  $H_1$  is regular if its 1-homogeneous extension has a smooth extension to the closed half-space  $\{x_1 \geq 0\}$ .

Choose regular strictly convex functions  $\phi_2, \dots, \phi_n$  on  $H_1$  that will be kept fixed. Put  $dV = dd^\# \phi_2 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \phi_n$  (so that  $dV$  is a volume form of  $H_1$ ) and  $\Omega = dd^\# \phi_3 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \phi_n$ . If  $u$  is a smooth function on  $H_1$  we define a second order differential operator,  $L$  by

$$(10.7) \quad L(u)dV = dd^\# u \wedge \Omega.$$

Thus  $L$  is a second order linear differential operator on  $H_1$  which is easily seen to be elliptic. Note also that, contrary to Alexandrov's operator on the sphere,  $L$  contains no first order or zero order terms. In other words,  $L(u) = 0$  if  $u(x) = x \cdot a + b$  is an affine function. Nevertheless  $L$  is one avatar of Alexandrov's operator in the positive half-space as we shall now explain.

Let  $\Phi_i$  be the 1-homogeneous extensions of  $\phi_i$  to the positive half-space,  $\{x; x_1 > 0\}$ , and put

$$\tilde{\Omega} := dd^\# \Phi_3 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \Phi_n.$$

Then the (current-valued) operator  $\mathcal{A}$  associated to  $\tilde{\Omega}$  is

$$\mathcal{A}(U) = dd^\# U \wedge \tilde{\Omega},$$

if  $U$  is 1-homogeneous (cf. Section 9). In (9.3) we associated to  $\mathcal{A}$  a scalar differential operator,  $A_m$ , on any hypersurface  $S_\mu = \{\mu(x) = 1\}$ , by

$$(10.8) \quad \mathcal{A}(U) \wedge d^\# \mu|_{\mu=1} = A_m(U)dm,$$

where  $dm$  is any measure on  $S_\mu$  comparable to surface measure. Taking  $\mu(x) = x_1$  and  $dm = dV$ , we get precisely  $L(u)$ , where  $u$  is the restriction of  $U$  to  $H_1$ .

The main point of our argument is the interplay between  $L$  and the operator,  $A$ , on the positive half-sphere,  $S_+ = \{x; |x| = 1, x_1 > 0\}$ , given by (10.8) with  $\mu(x) = |x|$  and  $dm = dS$ , surface measure on the sphere. By Proposition 9.1 we see that  $L(u) = 0$  if and only if  $\mathcal{A}(U) = 0$ , which in turn is equivalent to  $A(U) = 0$ , where  $U$  is the 1-homogeneous extension of  $u$ .

**Theorem 10.4.** *Let  $u$  be a bounded regular function on  $H_1$  that solves  $L(u) = 0$ . Then  $u$  is constant.*

*Proof.* Let  $\chi$  be a smooth cut-off function on  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $\chi(t) = 1$  for  $t \leq 1$  and  $\chi(t) = 0$  for  $t \geq 2$ . Put, for  $R > 0$ ,  $\chi_R(x) := \chi(|x|/R)$ . Assuming  $L(u) = 0$  we get

$$(10.9) \quad I_R := \int \chi_R^2 du \wedge d^\# u \wedge \Omega = (2/R) \int \chi_R \chi'(|x|/R) u d|x| \wedge d^\# u \wedge \Omega.$$

Using the Cauchy inequality we get that the right hand side is dominated by

$$(1/2)I_R + (2/R^2) \int \chi'(|x|/R)^2 u^2 d|x| \wedge d^\# |x| \wedge \Omega.$$

The first term can be absorbed in the left hand side of (10.9), and we claim that the second term tends to zero as  $R \rightarrow \infty$  if  $u$  is bounded. Accepting this we get

$$\int du \wedge d^\# u \wedge \Omega = 0$$

which implies  $du = 0$  since  $\Omega$  is strictly positive. Hence  $u$  is constant. To verify the claim we note first that each

$$(10.10) \quad dd^\# \phi_i \leq C dd^\# (1 + |x|^2)^{1/2}.$$

This is because by assumption  $\phi_i$  has a convex 1-homogeneous extension,  $\Phi_i$ , to the right half-space, which extends smoothly to the closure. Similarly,  $(1 + |x|^2)^{1/2}$  has the homogeneous extension  $|x|$ . Obviously

$$dd^\# \Phi_i \leq C dd^\# |x|$$

on the closed unit half-sphere, and this implies (10.10) since both sides are homogeneous of order zero.

Because of this it is enough to prove that

$$(2/R^2) \int \chi'(|x|/R)^2 u^2 d|x| \wedge d^\# |x| \wedge (dd^\# (1 + |x|^2)^{1/2})^{n-2}.$$

But this follows from direct computation: The integrand is of order  $|x|^{2-n}$  and we integrate over  $\{R < |x| < 2R\}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ . The integral is therefore of order  $R$  which goes to zero when divided by  $R^2$

□

By the remarks immediately before the theorem we get

**Corollary 10.5.** *Let  $v$  be a solution to Alexandrov's equation*

$$A(v) = 0$$

*on the half-sphere, that vanishes for  $x_1 = 0$ . Then  $v = cx_1$  for some constant  $c$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $A$  is elliptic with coefficients that extend smoothly to the boundary, it follows from elliptic regularity that  $v$  extends smoothly to the boundary. Hence  $|v| \leq Cx_1$ . Then the 1-homogeneous extension,  $U$ , satisfies the same inequality, so its restriction to  $H_1$  is bounded. By Theorem 10.4,  $U$  is constant on  $H_1$  which implies  $U = cx_1$  on the positive half-space, and in particular on the half-sphere. □

From the theory of elliptic equations, as sketched at the end of section 9 we get one more consequence.

**Corollary 10.6.** *Let  $f$  be a smooth function on the closed half-sphere, satisfying*

$$(10.11) \quad \int_{S_+} x_1 f dS = 0.$$

*Then the equation*

$$A(u) = f$$

*has a smooth solution that vanishes when  $x_1 = 0$ .*

Now choose  $f$  of the form  $f = A(v)$  where  $v$  is a smooth function, not assumed to vanish on the boundary. Then ( denoting also by  $v$  the 1-homogeneous extension of  $v$ )

$$\int_{S_+} x_1 A(v) dS = \int_{S_+} x_1 \mathcal{A}(v) d\#|x| = \langle x_1, \mathcal{A}(v) \rangle = 0.$$

Changing the gauge from  $\mu = |x|$  to  $\mu = x_1$  we get , since the pairing does not depend on the gauge, that

$$\int_{H_1} L(v) dV = \int_{S_+} x_1 A(v) dS.$$

This leads to the next theorem.

**Theorem 10.7.** *Let  $v$  be a regular function on  $H_1$  of linear growth such that*

$$\int_{H_1} L(v) dV = 0.$$

*Then the equation*

$$L(u) = L(v)$$

*has a bounded regular solution.*

*Proof.* Denote by  $v$  also the 1-homogeneous extension of  $v$ . By Theorem 10.11 there is a solution to  $A(u) = A(v)$  on the half-sphere that vanishes on the boundary. By elliptic regularity,  $|u| \leq Cx_1$ . Hence its 1-homogeneous extension satisfies the same bound, so it is bounded on  $H_1$ . Since  $A(u - v) = 0$ ,  $L(u - v) = 0$ .  $\square$

We are now ready to give the proof of the Alexandrov-Fenchel theorem. Define for regular functions  $u$  and  $v$

$$Q(u, v) = \int_{H_1} dd\#u \wedge dd\#v \wedge dd\#\phi_4 \wedge \dots dd\#\phi_n.$$

We will need a converse to Theorem 10.7.

**Proposition 10.8.** *Assume  $u$  and  $v$  are regular and that  $u$  is bounded. Then  $Q(u, v) = 0$ .*



*Proof.* By Stokes' formula

$$\int \chi_R dd^\# u \wedge dd^\# v \wedge dd^\# \phi_4 \wedge \dots dd^\# \phi_n = \int u dd^\# \chi_R \wedge dd^\# v \wedge dd^\# \phi_4 \wedge \dots dd^\# \phi_n,$$

where  $\chi_R$  is defined in the proof of Theorem 10.4. Using this and

$$dd^\# \chi_R = (1/R)\chi'(|x|/R)dd^\# |x| + (1/R^2)\chi''(|x|/R)d|x| \wedge d^\# |x|$$

we see that the right hand side goes to zero as  $R \rightarrow \infty$  as in the last part of the proof of Theorem 10.4.  $\square$

**Remark 10.9.** Note that, for regular functions, being bounded is equivalent to having indicator function equal to zero, i.e. that

$$u^\circ(x') = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{u(tx')}{t} = 0.$$

Indeed, by the end of section 7, the indicator is

$$u^\circ(x') = \lim_{x_1 \rightarrow 0} U(x_1, x'),$$

where  $U$  is the 1-homogeneous extension of  $u$ . If this limit is zero and  $U$  is smooth on the closed half-space, then  $|U(x_1, x')| \leq Cx_1$  (when  $|x|$  is bounded and therefore everywhere), which implies that  $U$  is bounded on  $H_1$ .  $\square$

We want to prove that  $Q(u, u)$  has Lorentz signature, and it obviously is positive if  $u$  is convex. So, it suffices to prove that if

$$(10.12) \quad Q(v, \phi_3) = \int_{H_1} dd^\# v \wedge \Omega = 0,$$

then  $Q(v, v) \leq 0$ . But (10.12) says that

$$\int_{H_1} L(v) dV = 0.$$

By Theorem 10.7 there is a bounded regular function,  $u$ , that solves  $dd^\# u \wedge \Omega = dd^\# v \wedge \Omega$  on  $H_1$ . Then, by Alexandrov's lemma

$$(dd^\#(u - v))^2 \wedge dd^\# \phi_4 \wedge \dots dd^\# \phi_n \leq 0,$$

so

$$Q(u - v, u - v) \leq 0.$$

But, by Proposition 10.8, if  $u$  is bounded,

$$Q(u - v, u - v) = Q(v, v)$$

so we are done.

We end this section with a number of remarks.

**Remark 10.10.** If instead of  $S_+ = \{x; |x| = 1, x_1 > 0\}$  we consider  $S_t = \{x; |x| = 1, x_1 > t\}$  for  $t > 0$  the picture is quite different. Translating to  $H_1$  as before we see that the Dirichlet problem on  $S_t$  corresponds to the Dirichlet problem on a ball in  $H_1$  (with radius  $1/t$ ). By the maximum principle for the operator  $L$  on the ball we see that the only solution to  $L(u) = 0$  that vanish on the boundary of the ball is  $u = 0$ . In other words, all the eigenvalues of  $L$  are strictly negative. When  $t$  decreases to zero the ball increases to the entire space and we get that zero is a simple eigenvalue for  $t = 0$ . When  $t$  goes to  $-1$  we get finally the whole sphere where zero is an eigenvalue of multiplicity  $n$ , and there is one strictly positive eigenvalue. I have not investigated what happens for  $-1 < t < 0$ .

**Remark 10.11.** We have proved that the quadratic form  $Q$  has Lorentz signature on the space of regular functions. We will now argue that this gives the Alexandrov-Fenchel theorem for convex bodies that are smoothly bounded and strictly convex. (This easily gives the result for all convex bodies.) What we need to prove is then that for such a convex body there is a regular convex function,  $\phi$ , whose indicator function is  $h_K$  (which is also regular). This is fairly evident, but we will give a more elaborate argument that also gives some extra information.

Take a convex body  $K$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  with smooth support function  $h_K$ . We first find a convex body,  $\tilde{K}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , such that

$$h_{\tilde{K}}(0, x_2, \dots, x_n) = h_K(x_2, \dots, x_n).$$

By the definition of support function, this means that the projection of  $\tilde{K}$  on the hyperplane  $\{x_1 = 0\}$  is  $K$ . This is satisfied by any convex  $\tilde{K}$  which is symmetric under the map  $x_1 \rightarrow -x_1$ , such that

$$K = \tilde{K} \cap \{x_1 = 0\}$$

and it is clear that we can find such  $\tilde{K}$  that is smoothly bounded and strictly convex. Then  $h_{\tilde{K}}|_{H_1} =: \phi$  is regular with indicator function  $h_K$ .

**Remark 10.12.** Let us also compare our proof to Gromov's proof of the Khovanski-Teissier theorem. The Khovanski-Teissier theorem concerns Kähler forms,  $\omega_i, i = 1, \dots, n$  (or Kähler cohomology classes) on a compact  $n$ -dimensional complex manifold  $X$ . This is the analog of our convex bodies, or rather of our superforms  $dd^\# \phi$  where  $\phi$  is convex on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . In the Khovanski-Teissier theorem one studies bilinear forms defined by

$$\mathcal{Q}(\omega, \omega') \omega_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_n = \omega \wedge \omega' \wedge \omega_3 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_n$$

where  $\omega, \omega'$  are closed  $(1, 1)$ -forms; the theorem says that  $\mathcal{Q}$  has Lorentz signature. This is the analog of our  $Q(u, v) = V(u, v, \phi_3, \dots, \phi_n)$ , where the  $\phi_i$  are assumed convex but  $u$  and  $v$  are not. It is evident that  $\mathcal{Q}$  depends only on the cohomology classes of  $\omega, \omega', \omega_i$  in  $H^{1,1}(X)$ , since the manifold is compact without boundary. This is the analog of the fact that  $Q$  depends only on the indicator of the functions in our setting. Gromov defines an elliptic operator, by

$$(u) \omega_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_n = dd^c u \wedge \omega_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \omega_n$$

which was the motivation for our  $L$  on  $H_1$ . He then uses a standard solvability result for compact manifolds, that correspond to our Theorem 10.7.

Thus, in our setting the closure of  $S_+$  appears as a compactification of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  (or rather  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ ), and cohomology classes on  $X$  correspond to

$$[\psi] := \{dd^\# \phi; \phi^\circ = \psi^\circ\}.$$

This replaces the use of toric compactifications in Gromov's proof. Indeed, if a convex function  $\phi$  defines a toric metric on a toric line bundle over a toric compactification of  $(\mathbb{C}^*)^n$ , all this data can be read off from the indicator of  $\phi$ , so one might view the closure of  $S_+$  as containing all possible toric compactifications. Pushing the analogy between indicator functions and cohomology classes one step further, Theorem 10.7 suggests that, in analogy to Hodge's theorem, in each cohomology class, given by a convex body  $K$ ,

$$[h_K] = \{\omega; \omega = dd^\# v, v^\circ = h_K\}$$

there should be exactly one 'harmonic' representative.

Indeed, take  $\omega = dd^\# v$  in  $[h_K]$ . Then

$$\int \omega \wedge dd^\# \phi_2 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \phi_n = c \int dd^\# \phi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dd^\# \phi_n$$

for some constant  $c$ . Hence

$$\int L(v - c\phi_1) dV = 0.$$

By Theorem 10.7 there is a bounded  $u$  such that  $L(u) = L(v - c\phi_1)$ . This means that

$$L(v - u) = cL(\phi_1) = c.$$

Viewing  $L$  as a Laplace operator, this should mean that  $\Delta dd^\#(v - u) = dd^\#L(v - u) = 0$ , so  $dd^\#(v - u)$  should be considered to be a harmonic form – and  $v - u$  has the same indicator as  $v$  since  $u$  is bounded.

Perhaps this can be generalized to cohomology classes of higher degree – which might explain the recent results of [4] and [15] on Lefschetz theorems for valuations.

## 11. MINKOWSKI'S SURFACE AREA MEASURE.

Let  $K$  be a smoothly bounded strictly convex body, defined by

$$K = \{y; \psi(y) < 1\}$$

where  $\psi$  is a smooth 1-homogeneous function. Let  $dS$  be surface area on the boundary of  $K$ . Minkowski's surface area measure,  $dS^K$ , associated to  $K$  is the push-forward of  $dS$  under the Gauss map

$$y \rightarrow \gamma(y) = \partial\psi/|\partial\psi|.$$

The surface area measure is thus a measure on the unit sphere satisfying

$$\int_{|x|=1} f dS^K = \int_{\partial K} f(\partial\psi/|\partial\psi|) dS.$$

There is a well known formula for  $dS^K$  (see [40]) that in our formalism becomes

**Proposition 11.1.** *The surface area measure is given by*

$$(11.1) \quad \int_{|x|=1} f dS^K = \int_{|x|=1} f (dd^\# h_K)^{n-1} \wedge d^\# |x| / n!$$

where as before  $h_K$  is the support function of  $K$ .

*Proof.* Assume first that  $K$  is smoothly bounded and strictly convex. Then the polar of  $K$ ,  $K^\circ$  is also smooth and the map

$$y \rightarrow \partial\psi(y) = x$$

is a diffeomorphism from the boundary of  $K$  to the boundary of  $K^\circ$ , with inverse

$$x \rightarrow \partial h_K(x) = y.$$

Therefore the inverse of the Gauss map equals

$$x \rightarrow \partial h_K,$$

for  $x$  on the unit sphere, since  $\partial h_K$  is homogeneous of order zero. Surface measure on  $\partial K$  is given by the differential form

$$\sum \frac{\psi_i \wedge \widehat{dy}_i}{|\partial\psi|},$$

where  $\widehat{dy}_i$  is the wedge product of all  $dy_j$  except  $dy_i$ , with a sign so that  $dy_i \wedge \widehat{dy}_i = dy_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dy_n$ . Hence

$$\int_{\partial K} f(\partial\psi/|\partial\psi|) dS = \int_{\partial K} f(\partial\psi/|\partial\psi|) \sum \frac{\psi_i \wedge \widehat{dy}_i}{|\partial\psi|} = \int_{|x|=1} f(x) \sum x_i \widehat{d(h_K)_i}.$$

The formula (11.1) then follows from

$$\sum x_i \widehat{d(h_K)_i} \wedge d\xi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge d\xi_n (-1)^{n(n-1)/2} = (dd^\# h_K)^{n-1} \wedge d^\# |x| / (n-1)!,$$

which in turn follows from  $dd^\# h_K = \sum d(h_K)_i \wedge d\xi_i$ .

By the results of section 4, the right hand side of (11.1) makes sense even if  $K$  is not smoothly bounded and strictly convex and furnishes the unique definition of surface area measure which is continuous under uniform convergence in  $\psi$  and equals (11.1) when  $K$  is smoothly bounded and strictly convex. □

We will think of the right hand side of (11.1) as the Monge- Ampère measure of  $h_K$  on the boundary of the ball, and in analogy we define for a 1-homogeneous convex function  $\phi$  (which is necessarily the support function of some convex body) and gauge function  $\mu$  the Monge- Ampère measure of  $\phi$  on  $S_\mu$  as

$$(11.2) \quad MA_\mu(\phi) = (dd^\# \phi)^{n-1} \wedge d^\# \mu|_{\mu=1} / n!.$$

The following theorem has a long history, see [20].

**Theorem 11.2.** *Let  $d\nu$  be a measure on the unit sphere. Then there is a solution to*

$$MA_{|x|}(\phi) = d\nu$$

*if and only if  $d\nu$  has barycenter zero and is not supported on any hyperplane. If  $d\nu$  is absolutely continuous with respect to surface measure on the sphere with a smooth density, then  $\phi$  is smooth.*

We can easily translate this to the boundary of any convex body.

**Proposition 11.3.** *Let  $\pi(x) = x/|x|$  be the radial projection from  $S_\mu$  to the unit sphere,  $S^{n-1}$ . Let  $\phi$  be a 1-homogeneous convex function, and let  $d\nu$  be a measure on  $S_\mu$ . Then  $\phi$  solves*

$$MA_\mu(\phi) = d\nu,$$

*on  $S_\mu$ , if and only if*

$$MA_{|x|}(\phi) = (1/\mu)\pi_*(d\nu).$$

*Proof.* This is Proposition 6.7 with  $\Omega = (dd^\# \phi)^{n-1}/(n-1)!$  □

**Corollary 11.4.** *The equation*

$$MA_\mu(\phi) = d\nu$$

*on  $S_\mu$  has a solution if and only if  $d\nu$  has barycenter zero and is not supported on any hyperplane.*

*Proof.* It is easily checked that for any 1-homogeneous  $f$

$$\int_{S^{n-1}} (f/\mu)\pi_*(d\nu) = \int_{S_\mu} f d\nu.$$

Hence  $d\nu$  and  $(1/\mu)\pi_*(d\nu)$  have the same barycenter, and it is also clear that the condition on supports is preserved. Hence the conclusion follows from Proposition 11.3. □

Thus the conditions for solvability of the Monge- Ampère equation on  $S_\mu$  follow immediately from the classical result Theorem 11.2. In case  $\mu$  is not smooth we can, however, not reduce regularity questions to the sphere.

We will now discuss the particular case when  $S_\mu = P$  is a convex polytope. Then there is a competing definition of the Monge- Ampère measure from tropical geometry (see e.g. [6] and further references there) and we shall compare the two. First we need to take a step back and discuss the real Monge- Ampère measure on a (real) vector space,  $V$ , of dimension  $d$ .

Let  $t_1, \dots, t_d$  be linear coordinates on  $V$  and let  $\eta = dt_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dt_d$  be the associated volume form. Then, if  $u$  is a smooth function  $V$ ,

$$\det\left(\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t_i \partial t_k}\right)\eta^2,$$

is a well defined function with values in  $\Lambda^n(V^*) \otimes \Lambda^n(V^*)$ , independent of the choice of coordinates. In order to define the Monge- Ampère-operator we want instead an  $n$ -form on  $V$ . We therefore choose one fixed (reference)  $n$ -form,  $\eta_0 \in \Lambda^n(V^*)$ , and define

$$MA^{n_0}(u) = \det\left(\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t_i \partial t_k}\right)\eta^2/\eta_0.$$

We thus get one Monge- Ampère-operator for each choice of  $\eta_0$ , and different Monge- Ampère measures differ by a multiplicative constant. Equivalently, we can define

$$MA^{\eta_0}(u) = \det\left(\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t_i \partial t_k}\right)\eta,$$

for any choice of coordinates on  $V$  such that  $\eta = \eta_0$ .

In section 4 we defined the Monge- Ampère measure on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  as the measure defined by the current

$$(dd^\#u)^n/n! = \det\left(\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_k}\right)dx_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx_n \wedge d\xi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge d\xi_n (-1)^{n(n-1)/2}.$$

Thus, here,  $\eta_0 = dx_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx_n$ .

Let us now consider an affine hyperplane,  $V$ , in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , defined by an equation  $\mu(x) = 1$ , where  $\mu(x)$  is a linear function. We then define the Monge- Ampère measure of a (smooth) function  $u$  on  $V$  as the measure,  $MA_\mu(u)$ , defined by the form

$$(dd^\#u)^{n-1} \wedge d^\#\mu / (n-1)!|_V.$$

Unwinding the definition, we see that this means that our reference form,  $\eta_0$ , is an  $(n-1)$ -form on  $V$  such that  $\eta_0 \wedge d\mu = dx_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx_n$ . In other words

$$(11.3) \quad MA_\mu(u) = \det\left(\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial t_i \partial t_k}\right)dt_2 \wedge \dots \wedge dt_n,$$

where  $t_i, i = 2, \dots, n$  is any choice of coordinates on  $V$  such that  $d\mu \wedge dt_2 \wedge \dots \wedge dt_n = dx_1 \wedge \dots \wedge dx_n$ . Note that this definition depends on the defining equation.

Let now  $P$  be a polytope in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ; the convex hull of its vertices,  $v^1, \dots, v^N$ . We assume  $P$  contains the origin in its interior, so that its polar body

$$P^\circ = \{y; h_P(y) \leq 1\}$$

is also a compact convex body. Since

$$h_P(y) = \sup_{x \in P} y \cdot x = \max_i y \cdot v^i,$$

$P^\circ$  is also a polytope with vertices, say,  $u^1, \dots, u^M$ . Taking the polar again we get back  $P$ , so

$$P = \{x; h_{P^\circ}(x) \leq 1\} = \{x; \max_j u^j \cdot x \leq 1\},$$

so  $P$  is defined by the gauge function  $\mu(x) = \max_j u^j \cdot x = h_{P^\circ}(x)$ .

It follows that on the interior of each facet (face of maximal dimension),  $\{x \in P; u^j \cdot x = 1\}$ , of  $P$ , the Monge- Ampère measure defined in (11.2) has the explicit form (11.3) where  $\mu(x) = u^j \cdot x$ . We shall see in a while that there is also another contribution to the Monge- Ampère measure which is concentrated on the lower dimensional faces, but first we shall introduce the ‘competing’ definition of Monge- Ampère measure and see that, on the interior of the faces, the two definitions agree.

Fix one vertex of  $P$ , say  $v^1$ . The star of  $v^1$  is defined as the set of closed facets of  $P$  that contain  $v^1$ . A facet is defined by an equation  $u^j \cdot x = 1$  so it lies in the star of  $v^1$  precisely when

$u^j \cdot v^1 = 1$ . Choose an orthonormal coordinate system such that  $v^1 = (a, 0, \dots, 0)$ , where  $a > 0$  and write  $u^j = (u_1^j, (u^j)')$ .

Then  $u^j$  defines a facet in the star of  $v^1$  if and only if  $u^j = (1/a, (u^j)')$ . Say the set of  $j$  that correspond to facets in the star of  $v^1$  is  $\{1, \dots, M_1\}$ . Note that if  $j_0$  is not in this set, then

$$u^{j_0} \cdot x < \max_{j=1, \dots, M_1} (u^j \cdot x)$$

for  $x$  near  $v^1$ , since the left hand side is smaller than 1 while the right hand side equals 1, for  $x = v^1$ . Hence

$$\mu(x) = \max_{j=1, \dots, M} u^j \cdot x = \max_{j=1, \dots, M_1} u^j \cdot x = x_1/a + \max_{j=1, \dots, M_1} (u^j)' \cdot x' := x_1/a + \phi^1(x')$$

near  $v^1$ . Note that, with this definition, we have that  $dd^\# \mu = dd^\# \phi^1$ .

Summing up we have that each facet in the star of  $v^1$  is defined by

$$\mu(x) = x_1/a + (u^j)' \cdot x' = 1$$

and an entire neighbourhood of  $v^1$  in  $S_\mu$  is defined by

$$x_1/a + \phi^1(x') = 1.$$

Therefore we can use  $x'$  as linear coordinates on each facet in the star, and also parametrize a neighbourhood of  $v^1$  in  $S_\mu$  by  $x'$ .

The ‘competing’ definition of the Monge- Ampère measure from [6] is simply the Monge- Ampère operator in the coordinates  $x'$ , but for this to be well defined we need to choose a reference form  $\eta_0$ . We take  $\eta_0$  to be

$$\eta_0 = adx_2 \wedge \dots dx_n,$$

so that  $d\mu \wedge \eta_0 = dx_1 \wedge \dots dx_n$ . This is the same reference form as in (11.3) so on each facet in the star we get the same Monge- Ampère measure as in (11.2).

If we look at a whole neighbourhood of  $v^1$  in  $S_\mu$ , however, we also get an extra contribution from the edges where facets intersect. Explicitly, let  $f(x_1, x')$  be a smooth function defined in a neighbourhood of  $v^1$ . Writing the restriction of  $f$  to  $S_\mu$  in the coordinates  $x'$  we get

$$F(x') := f((a(1 - \phi^1(x')), x')).$$

Then the ‘competing’ definition is

$$\begin{aligned} MA_0(f) &= \det(F_{ij})(dx_2 \wedge \dots dx_n)^2 / \eta_0 = \\ &= (1/a)(dd^\# F)^{n-1} / (n-1)!. \end{aligned}$$

The point is that when  $f$  is smooth,  $F$  is not in general smooth since its definition contains the non-smooth function  $\phi^1$ . The contributions to  $MA_0$  that are not absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$  are multiples of powers of

$$f_1' dd^\# \phi^1 = f_1' dd^\# \mu,$$

so they vanish precisely when  $f$  does not depend on  $x_1$ . Expressed more invariantly, without reference to the coordinates that we have chosen, the singular part vanishes when  $\partial_{v^1}$ , the derivative of  $f$  in the direction  $v^1$ , vanishes. This also shows that this local definition of the Monge- Ampère measure (in a neighbourhood of a vertex) cannot be extended to a global definition on

all of  $S_\mu$ , since we may have  $\partial_{v^1} f = 0$  but  $\partial_{v^2} f \neq 0$ . In that case, one of the local definitions will have a singular part, and the other not.

We shall finally compare these singular terms to the singular terms that appear in the first definition (11.2) and conclude that the two definitions do not agree. We start from the following proposition.

**Proposition 11.5.** . *Let  $\mu$  be a gauge function and let  $f$  be a smooth function defined in a neighbourhood of  $S_\mu$ . Let  $F(x) = \mu(x)f(x/\mu(x))$  be the 1-homogeneous extension of  $u$  from  $S_\mu$ . . Then, for  $k = 1, \dots, n - 1$ ,*

$$(11.4) \quad (dd^\# F)^k \wedge [S_\mu]_s = (dd^\# f + (f - E(f))dd^\# \mu)^k \wedge [S_\mu]_s,$$

where  $E(f) = \sum x_i f_i$ , the Euler vector field acting on  $f$ . In particular, the right hand side depends only on the restriction of  $f$  to  $S_\mu$ .

*Proof.* When  $\mu$  is smooth, this follows from a direct computation of  $dd^\# F$ , using that  $F(x) = f(x/\mu(x))\mu(x)$ . (Since we are wedging with the supercurrent of integration on  $S_\mu$ , we may discard all terms containing  $d\mu$  or  $d^\# \mu$ .) We now argue that when  $\mu$  is not smooth, we can approximate by smooth functions and pass to the limit. Write  $F = F_\mu$  to emphasize the dependence on  $\mu$ . Note first that the case  $k = 1$  implies that for some positive constant

$$dd^\# F_\mu + C(dd^\# \mu + dd^\# |x|) \geq 0.$$

Indeed, this holds when wedged with  $[S_\mu]_s$  (since  $f$  is smooth) and we can then apply  $\delta$  and  $\delta^\#$ . The inequality therefore holds when  $\mu = 1$ , and hence everywhere by homogeneity. Write  $\mu = \lim \mu^i$  in the uniform norm, where  $\mu^i$  are smooth. Then  $F_{\mu^i}$  tend to  $F_\mu$  uniformly. Hence, Proposition 4.4 implies that

$$(dd^\# F_{\mu^i})^k \wedge [S_{\mu^i}]_s \rightarrow (dd^\# F_\mu)^k \wedge [S_\mu]_s.$$

(Since  $F_{\mu^i}$  may not be convex, we apply the proposition to  $\Omega^i = (dd^\#(F_{\mu^i} + C(\mu^i + |x|)))^k$ .) On the other hand, we also have

$$(dd^\# f + (f - E(f))dd^\# \mu^i)^k \wedge [S_{\mu^i}]_s \rightarrow (dd^\# f + (f - E(f))dd^\# \mu)^k \wedge [S_\mu]_s$$

by the same proposition. □

**Remark 11.6.** From the proposition, we see that, when  $\mu$  defines a polytope, the singular contribution to the Monge- Ampère measure again comes from powers of  $dd^\# \mu$ , but this time multiplied by  $f - E(f)$  instead of  $\partial_{v^i} f$ . Thus the singular part vanishes precisely when  $f$  is smooth and 1-homogeneous. Note also that the right hand side of (11.4) gives an explicit formula for the Monge- Ampère operator applied to a smooth function, that does not involve its homogeneous extension. The case  $k = 1$  and  $\mu = |x|$  also gives an explicit formula for Alexandrov's differential operator if we wedge with  $\Omega = dd^\# \psi_3 \wedge \dots dd^\# \psi_n$ .



## REFERENCES

- [1] Alesker, S. Description of translation invariant valuations on convex sets with solution of P. McMullen's conjecture. *Geom. Func. Anal.* 11, 244-272 (2001)
- [2] Alesker, S. The multiplicative structure on continuous polynomial valuations. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 14 (2004), no. 1, 1-26.
- [3] Alesker, S. Valuations on convex functions and convex sets and Monge- Ampère operator. *Adv. Geom.* 19 (2019), no. 3, 313-322.
- [4] Alesker, S. Hard Lefschetz theorem for valuations, complex integral geometry, and unitarily invariant valuations. *J. Differential Geom.* 63 (2003), no. 1, 63-95.
- [5] Alesker, S. and Fu, J. Theory of valuations on manifolds. III. Multiplicative structure in the general case. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 360 (2008), no. 4, 1951-1981.
- [6] Andreasson, R. and Hultgren, J.. Solvability of Monge-Ampère equations and tropical affine structures on reflexive polytopes. *Arxiv* :2303.05276.
- [7] Alexandrov, A.D. *Die innere geometrie der konvexen flachen*, Akademie Verlag, Berlin 1955.
- [8] Alexandrov, A.D. *Selected works*, part I. Gordon and Breach Publishers, Amsterdam, 1996.
- [9] Andersson, M. (Ultra)differentiable functional calculus and current extension of the resolvent mapping. *Annales de l'Institut Fourier*, Volume 53 (2003) no. 3, pp. 903-926.
- [10] Bedford, E. and Taylor, B.A: The Dirichlet problem for a complex Monge- Ampère equation. *Invent. Math.* 37 (1976), no. 1, 1-44.
- [11] Bedford, E. and Taylor, B.A: *Acta Math.* 149(1982), no.1-2, 1-40
- [12] Berndtsson, B.; Subharmonicity properties of the Bergman kernel and some other functions associated to pseudoconvex domains. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* 56 (2006), no. 6, 1633-1662.
- [13] Berndtsson, B.; Superforms, supercurrents, minimal manifolds and Riemannian geometry. *Arnold Math. J.* 5(2019), no.4, 501-532
- [14] Blocki, Z. Equilibrium measure of a product subset of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 128 (2000), no. 12, 3595-3599.
- [15] Bernig, A., Kotrbaty, J. and Wannerer, T. Hard Lefschetz theorem and Hodge-Riemann relations for convex valuations 2023arXiv231212294B
- [16] Bernig, A. and Fu, J. Hermitian integral geometry. *Ann. Math.* 173 (2011), 907-945.
- [17] Bernig, A. and Fu, J. Convolution of convex valuations. *Geom. Dedicata* 123(2006), 153-169.
- [18] Burgos Gil, J.I., Gubler, W., Jell, P. and Kunnemann, K. A comparison of positivity in complex and tropical toric geometry. *Math. Z.* 299 (2021), no. 3-4, 1199-1255.
- [19] Chambert-Loir, A. and Ducros, A. Formes différentielles réelles et courants sur les espaces de Berkovich. *arXiv*:1204.6277
- [20] Cheng, S.Y. and Yau, S.T. On the Regularity of the Solution of the n-Dimensional Minkowski Problem. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 29 (1976), no. 5, 495-516.
- [21] Demailly, J.P. *Complex Analytic and Differential Geometry*. Lecture notes available at <https://www.ime.usp.br/~cordaro/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Jean-Pierre-Demailly-Complex-Analytic-and-Differential-Geometry-1.pdf>
- [22] Evans, L. C. *Partial Differential equations*. Evans, Lawrence C. *Grad. Stud. Math.*, 19 American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1998, xviii+662 pp.
- [23] Faifman, D. and Wannerer, T. The Fourier transform on valuations is the Fourier transform. *J. Func. Anal.* 288 (2025),
- [24] Firey, William J. A functional characterization of certain mixed volumes. *Israel J. Math.* 24(1976), no.3-4, 274-281.
- [25] Gromov, M. *Convex sets and Kähler manifolds*. Lecture notes available at <https://www.ihes.fr/~gromov/expository/28/>

- [26] Harvey, R. and Knapp, A. W. Positive  $(p, p)$  forms, Wirtinger's inequality, and currents. In: Value distribution theory (Proc. Tulane Univ. Program, Tulane Univ., New Orleans, La., 1972-1973), Part A, pp. 43-62 Pure Appl. Math., 25 Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1974
- [27] Hilbert, D. Grundzuge einer allgemeinen Theorie der linearen Integralgleichungen. Chelsea Publishing Co., New York, 1953, xxvi+282 pp.
- [28] Hultgren, J., Jonsson, M., Mazzon, E. and McCleerey, N.. Tropical and non-Archimedean Monge- Ampère equations for a class of Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces. Adv. Math. 439 (2024), 109494.
- [29] Knoerr, J. Smooth valuations on convex bodies and finite linear combinations of mixed volumes. arXiv:2312.08183
- [30] Lagerberg, A; Super currents and tropical geometry. Math. Z. 270 (2012), no. 3-4, 1011-1050.
- [31] Larsson, S. On the Brunn-Minkowski and Aleksandrov-Fenchel Inequalities. Masters thesis, Chalmers University of Technology, 2014
- [32] Lelong, P. Fonctions plurisousharmoniques et formes différentielles positives. Gordon & Breach, Paris-London-New York; distributed by Dunod Editeur, Paris, 1968, ix+79 pp.
- [33] McMullen, P. Valuations and dissections. Handbook of convex geometry, Vol. A, B, 933-988. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1993
- [34] McMullen, P. Monotone translation invariant valuations on convex bodies. Arch. Math. (Basel)55(1990), no.6, 595-598.
- [35] Rubinstein, Y. Convex meets complex. arXiv:2410.23500
- [36] Sallee, G.T., A valuation property of Steiner points. Mathematika 13 (1966), 76-82.
- [37] Scarfiello, R. Sur le changement de variables dans les distributions et leurs transformées de Fourier. Nuovo Cimento (9) 12 (1954), 471-482.
- [38] Schwartz, L. Theorie des distributions. Hermann, Paris, 1973. (2nd Edition).
- [39] Schneider, R. Valuations on Convex Bodies: The Classical Basic Facts . In: Jensen, E., Kiderlen, M. (eds) Tensor Valuations and Their Applications in Stochastic Geometry and Imaging. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol 2177. Springer (2017)
- [40] Schneider, R. Convex Bodies: The Brunn-Minkowski Theory. Cambridge University Press (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139003858>
- [41] Shenfeld, Y. and van Handel, R. The extremals of the Alexandrov-Fenchel inequality for convex polytopes. Acta Math. 231 (2023), no. 1, 89-204.
- [42] Wang, X. A remark on the Alexandrov-Fenchel inequality. J. Funct. Anal. 274(2018), no.7, 2061-2088.
- [43] Warner, F. Foundations of differentiable manifolds and Lie groups. Grad. Texts in Math., 94 Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1983, ix+272 pp.