

Isometries of the class of ball-bodies

Shiri Artstein-Avidan, Arnon Chor, Dan Florentin *

March 5, 2025

Abstract

We characterize the surjective isometries, with respect to the Hausdorff distance, of the class of bodies given by intersections of Euclidean unit balls. We show that any such isometry is given by the composition of a rigid motion with either the identity or the c -duality mapping, which maps a body in this class to the intersection of Euclidean unit balls centered at points in the body.

Let \mathcal{K}^n stand for the set of all convex bodies (i.e. compact, convex, non-empty sets) in \mathbb{R}^n , and let δ stand for Hausdorff distance on \mathcal{K}^n , given by

$$\delta(K_0, K_1) = \inf\{\lambda > 0 : K_0 \subseteq K_1 + \lambda B_2^n, K_1 \subseteq K_0 + \lambda B_2^n\},$$

where B_2^n is the Euclidean unit ball.

The class $\mathcal{S}_n \subseteq \mathcal{K}^n$ consists of convex bodies which are intersections of unit Euclidean balls in \mathbb{R}^n . It can also be characterized at the class of summands of B_2^n , namely bodies $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ for which there exists $L \in \mathcal{K}^n$ with $K + L = B_2^n$. We have recently studied this class intensively [1], noting that up to rigid motions, there is a unique order reversing bijection defined on this set, mapping a body $K \in \mathcal{S}_n$ to the unique $L \in \mathcal{S}_n$ with $K - L = B_2^n$. We denoted this L by K^c and called this mapping the c -duality on \mathcal{S}_n . In terms of support functions (defined as $h_K(u) = \sup_{x \in K} \langle x, u \rangle$), this means $h_K(u) = 1 - h_L(-u)$. In particular, the c -duality mapping is an isometry with respect to the Hausdorff metric, which can be realized as the L_∞ norm on the support functions defined on the unit sphere S^{n-1} . We note that for any $K \in \mathcal{S}_n$, $K^{cc} = K$. In geometric terms one may explicitly write this duality as

$$K^c = \bigcap_{x \in K} (x + B_2^n).$$

In this note we show that up to rigid motions, there are precisely two bijective isometries on the class \mathcal{S}_n , one is the identity and the other is this c -duality $K \mapsto K^c$.

*The first and second named authors are supported in part by the ERC under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement no. 770127), by ISF grant Number 784/20, and by the Binational Science Foundation (grant no. 2020329).

Theorem 1. *Let $T : \mathcal{S}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n$ be a bijective isometry with respect to the Hausdorff distance. Then there exists a rigid motion (orthogonal transformation and translation) $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that either $TK = gK$ for all $K \in \mathcal{S}_n$ or $TK = gK^c$ for all $K \in \mathcal{S}_n$.*

We rely heavily on the ideas from the paper of Schneider [3] where he showed that the only surjective isometries of \mathcal{K}^n with respect to δ are those given by rigid motions. We mention also the work of Gruber and Lettl [2] who showed that without assuming surjectivity, an isometry F of \mathcal{K}^n takes the form $F(K) = gK + L$ for some rigid motion g and convex L .

We make use of the following easily verifiable fact, which holds since elements of \mathcal{S}_n are intersections of unit balls.

Fact 2. *Let $K \in \mathcal{S}_n$ and $u \in S^{n-1}$. Then there exists a unique point $x \in \partial K$ such that $u \in N_K(x)$, namely such that u is a normal vector to K at x .*

We also use the immediate fact that for $A, B, C \in \mathcal{K}^n$ it holds that

$$(1 - \lambda)\delta(A, B) = \delta((1 - \lambda)A + \lambda C, (1 - \lambda)B + \lambda C).$$

(We use averages since if A, B, C belong to \mathcal{S}_n then so do their averages.) In particular we see that given $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{K}^n$, the “line” $\lambda \mapsto K_\lambda = (1 - \lambda)K_0 + \lambda K_1$ is a geodesic curve namely

$$\delta(K_0, K_\lambda) + \delta(K_\lambda, K_1) = \delta(K_0, K_1).$$

An isometry maps geodesics to geodesics, which would have been extremely helpful had it been the case that these Minkowski averages are the only geodesics between a pair of bodies. However, we can easily find K_0, K_1 and some $T \neq \frac{K_0 + K_1}{2}$ with

$$\delta(K_0, T) = \delta(K_1, T) = \frac{1}{2}\delta(K_0, K_1).$$

For example we can let $K_0 = \frac{1}{2}B_2^n$ and $K_1 = x + \frac{1}{2}B_2^n$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $d(x, 0) = 1$. Clearly $\delta(K_0, K_1) = 1$. Any T which includes the segment $[0, x]$ and is included in the intersection $\frac{1}{2}B_2^n \cap (x + \frac{1}{2}B_2^n)$, is in distance $\frac{1}{2}$ to both K_0 and K_1 . Since there are many such bodies, we see that the “midpoint” is not unique. Having fixed one such point, we can complete it to a geodesic using the aforementioned averages construction, and since Hausdorff distance is sub-additive we get many different geodesics. In this example we find many midpoints even in \mathcal{S}_n , not just \mathcal{K}_n ; any body lying between the so-called “1-lens” $[0, x]^{cc}$ and the intersection $\frac{1}{2}B_2^n \cap (x + \frac{1}{2}B_2^n)$. However, had we started with 1-balls instead of $\frac{1}{2}$ -balls, there would only be one midpoint within \mathcal{S}_n , although many in \mathcal{K}^n , as we shall see below. This gives a hint on our method of proof - detecting those pairs of bodies which admit unique geodesics.

Definition 3. *A pair $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{S}_n$ is called \mathcal{S}_n -cute if $M = \frac{K_0 + K_1}{2} \in \mathcal{S}_n$ is the unique body in \mathcal{S}_n satisfying*

$$\delta(K_0, M) = \frac{1}{2}\delta(K_0, K_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(K_1, M) = \frac{1}{2}\delta(K_0, K_1).$$

Lemma 4. *Let $T : \mathcal{S}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n$ be a bijective isometry with respect to the Hausdorff distance and let (K_0, K_1) be an \mathcal{S}_n -cute pair. Then so is the pair (TK_0, TK_1) . Moreover,*

$$T\left(\frac{1}{2}K_0 + \frac{1}{2}K_1\right) = \frac{1}{2}(T(K_0) + T(K_1)).$$

Proof. Indeed, since T is surjective, a midpoint of TK_0 and TK_1 must be the image of a midpoint of K_0 and K_1 , and since only one such midpoint exists for the latter, the same is true for the former. For the “moreover” we note that the Minkowski average of two bodies is always a midpoint of the two with respect to Hausdorff distance. \square

Lemma 5. *For two points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the pair $(\{x\}, \{y\})$ is an \mathcal{S}_n -cute pair, and the pair $(x + B_2^n, y + B_2^n)$ is an \mathcal{S}_n -cute pair.*

Remark 6. *As the proof shall demonstrate, a pair of points $(\{x\}, \{y\})$ is not only \mathcal{S}_n -cute but in fact \mathcal{K}^n -cute (with the natural definition - this is Schneider’s [3] definition of “ein zentriertes Paar”). However, it is easy to check that a pair of unit balls $(x + B_2^n, y + B_2^n), x \neq y$ is not \mathcal{K}^n -cute.*

Proof. For convenience we denote x instead of $\{x\}$. Clearly $\delta(x_0, x_1) = \|x_0 - x_1\|_2$, let us denote this distance by d . If $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ satisfies

$$\delta(x_0, K) = \frac{d}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(x_1, K) = \frac{d}{2},$$

then $K \subseteq B(x_0, \frac{d}{2}) \cap B(x_1, \frac{d}{2}) = \frac{x_0 + x_1}{2}$. This shows that (x_0, x_1) is an \mathcal{S}_n -cute pair.

To show that $(x + B_2^n, y + B_2^n)$ forms an \mathcal{S}_n -cute pair we use Lemma 4 with the isometry $K \mapsto K^c$. Since $x^c = x + B_2^n$ and $y^c = y + B_2^n$ they must be an \mathcal{S}_n -cute pair. \square

We next show that when the distance between two bodies in \mathcal{S}_n is not small, the pairs discussed in Lemma 5 are actually the only \mathcal{S}_n -cute pairs.

Proposition 7. *Assume $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{S}_n$ are an \mathcal{S}_n -cute pair with $\delta(K_0, K_1) \geq 4$. Then either both K_0, K_1 are two points or K_0, K_1 are two Euclidean unit balls.*

The proof will make use of several lemmas.

Lemma 8. *Assume $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{S}_n$ are an \mathcal{S}_n -cute pair with $\delta := \delta(K_0, K_1) \geq 4$. Then $\frac{1}{2}(K_0 + K_1)$ is a lens.*

Proof. Clearly $M = \frac{1}{2}(K_0 + K_1)$ is at distance $\frac{\delta}{2}$ from both K_0 and K_1 . Pick $u \in S^{n-1}$ which maximizes $h_{K_1}(u) - h_{K_0}(u)$ and $w \in S^{n-1}$ which maximizes $h_{K_0}(w) - h_{K_1}(w)$. Denote $\delta_0 = h_{K_1}(u) - h_{K_0}(u)$ and $\delta_1 = h_{K_0}(w) - h_{K_1}(w)$. Note that $\delta = \max\{\delta_0, \delta_1\}$, and additionally, $\delta_0, \delta_1 > 0$ since if $\delta_0 \leq 0$ then $K_1 \subseteq K_0$, but as K_0 is contained in some unit ball, for any $L \subseteq K_0$ we have $L + B_2^n \supseteq K_0$ and so $\delta(L, K_0) \leq 1$ (and the same reasoning gives $\delta_1 > 0$).

Denote by $x_{K_0}(u), x_M(u), x_{K_1}(u)$ the unique points of K_0, M, K_1 respectively that have u as a normal (these are unique by Fact 2). We claim that $x_{K_0}(u), x_{K_1}(u)$ and $x_M(u)$ must be aligned, that is,

$$x_{K_0}(u) + \frac{\delta_0}{2}u = x_M(u) = x_{K_1}(u) - \frac{\delta_0}{2}u.$$

Indeed, since u is a maximizer of $h_{K_1} - h_{K_0}$ on S^{n-1} , by the Lagrange multipliers theorem we get that $\nabla(h_{K_1} - h_{K_0})(u) = \lambda u$ for some constant λ . Since $\nabla h_{K_i}(u) = x_{K_i}(u)$ we see that $x_{K_1}(u) - x_{K_0}(u) = \lambda u$ but taking scalar product with u we find that $\delta_0 = h_{K_1}(u) - h_{K_0}(u) = \lambda$, and since the support set of the average is the average of the support sets, we are done. Similarly we get

$$x_{K_0}(w) - \frac{\delta_1}{2}w = x_M(w) = x_{K_1}(w) + \frac{\delta_1}{2}w,$$

where $x_{K_0}(w), x_M(w), x_{K_1}(w)$ are the unique points of K_0, M, K_1 respectively with normal w .

Next we intersect the balls tangent to M at $x_M(u)$ and $x_M(w)$, i.e., we construct the lens

$$L = (x_M(u) - u + B_2^n) \cap (x_M(w) - w + B_2^n).$$

Since $M \subseteq L$ (since $M \in \mathcal{S}_n$), we have that $L + \frac{\delta}{2}B_2^n \supseteq K_0 \cup K_1$.

On the other hand, $K_0 + \frac{\delta}{2}B_2^n \supseteq x_M(u) - u + B_2^n \supseteq L$. Indeed, since $\delta \geq 4$ and $\delta_0 > 0$, $(\frac{\delta_0}{2} - 1)u \in (\frac{\delta}{2} - 1)B_2^n$, i.e. $(\frac{\delta_0}{2} - 1)u + B_2^n \subseteq \frac{\delta}{2}B_2^n$. As $x_M(u) = x_{K_0}(u) + \frac{\delta_0}{2}u$, we have

$$x_M(u) - u + B_2^n = x_{K_0}(u) + \left(\frac{\delta_0}{2} - 1\right)u + B_2^n \subseteq x_{K_0}(u) + \frac{\delta}{2}B_2^n.$$

Similarly we can show that $K_1 + \frac{\delta}{2}B_2^n \supseteq x_M(w) - w + B_2^n \supseteq L$. We thus see that the lens L is indeed in distance $\frac{\delta}{2}$ from both K_0 and K_1 . Since the pair (K_0, K_1) was assumed to be \mathcal{S}_n -cute, we conclude that $M = L$, namely the Minkowski average of K_0 and K_1 is a lens. \square

It is quite hard for a Minkowski average of two bodies in \mathcal{S}_n to be a lens. In fact, the lemmas below show that the two bodies averaged must be translations of the same lens in opposite directions. We prove this in two steps. The first step appears in the paper [1], and we include the short proof here for completeness. The proof does use two non trivial facts about the class \mathcal{S}_n and the c -transform, which are proved in [1].

Lemma 9. *Let $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{S}_n$ and set $M = \frac{1}{2}(K_0 + K_1)$. Assume that B_2^n is a supporting ball of M , and that $A \subset \partial M$ is a spherically convex subset of the sphere ∂B_2^n . Then there exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $A + x_0 \subseteq \partial K_0$ and $A - x_0 \subseteq \partial K_1$.*

Proof. Since $A \subset \partial M \cap \partial B_2^n$, and $M \subseteq B_2^n$ by assumption, every $u \in A$ is also the unique point of M that has u itself as a normal. By Fact 2 and by the definition of Minkowski averages, every $u \in A$ can be written uniquely as $u = \frac{x_0(u) + x_1(u)}{2}$ where $x_0(u)$ is the unique point on K_0 where u is the normal, and $x_1(u)$ is the unique point on K_1 with u as the normal.

Since $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{S}_n$, we know that $x_0(u) - u \in \partial K_0^c$ and $x_1(u) - u \in \partial K_1^c$ (see [1]). Moreover, as $x_0(u) + x_1(u) = 2u$, we get that $x_0(u) - u = -(x_1(u) - u)$. Using the fact that the c -transform commutes with averages (see [1]), $M^c = \frac{1}{2}(K_0^c + K_1^c)$, and we see that for all $u, v \in A$ it hold that $\frac{x_0(u) - u + x_1(v) - v}{2} \in M^c$, which can equivalently be written as $\frac{x_0(u) - u - x_0(v) + v}{2} \in M^c$.

Assume by way of contradiction that for some $u, v \in A$ we have that $x_0(u) - u \neq x_0(v) - v$. Then all four averages of $x_0(u) - u$ or $x_0(v) - v$ with $x_1(u) - u = u - x_0(u)$ or $x_1(v) - v = v - x_0(v)$ lie in M^c , namely

$$0, \frac{x_0(u) - x_0(v) + v - u}{2}, \frac{x_0(v) - x_0(u) - u + v}{2} \in M^c.$$

Since B_2^n is a supporting ball of M , $0 \in \partial M^c$, and so there is some $\nu \in S^{n-1}$ normal to M^c at 0. As 0 is the average of the points $\frac{x_0(u) - x_0(v) + v - u}{2}$ and $\frac{x_0(v) - x_0(u) - u + v}{2}$, we have that $\nu \in N_{M^c}\left(\frac{x_0(u) - x_0(v) + v - u}{2}\right)$ as well, in contradiction to the fact that every direction has a single supporting point in $M^c \in \mathcal{S}_n$.

We conclude that the points $x_0(u)$ are all of the form $x_0 + u$ for some fixed x_0 , which means that $x_0 + A \subseteq \partial K_0$ and similarly we get that $-x_0 + A \subseteq \partial K_1$. \square

Corollary 10. *Let $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{S}_n$ and assume $M = \frac{1}{2}(K_0 + K_1)$ is a lens, namely the intersection of two balls. Then there exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $K_0 = M + x_0$ and $K_1 = M - x_0$.*

Proof. Assume $M = (z + B_2^n) \cap (-z + B_2^n)$ so that $A_1 = \partial M \cap \{x : \langle x, z \rangle \leq 0\}$ and $A_2 = \partial M \cap \{x : \langle x, z \rangle \geq 0\}$ are caps on its boundary. Clearly $M^c = [-z, z]^{cc}$. By Lemma 9 there are some x_1, x_2 with $A_1 + x_1 \subseteq \partial K_0$, $A_1 - x_1 \subseteq \partial K_1$, $A_2 + x_2 \subseteq \partial K_0$, $A_2 - x_2 \subseteq \partial K_1$.

Take a point $z_0 \in \partial M$ which belongs to both caps, and so its normal cone includes both $z_0 - z$ and $z_0 + z$. This point z_0 is the average of $z_0 + x_1 \in K_0$ and $z_0 - x_1 \in K_1$, and also the average of $z_0 + x_2 \in K_0$ and $z_0 - x_2 \in K_1$.

The normal cone to M at z_0 constitutes of all normals in the spherical convex hull of $z_0 - z$ and $z_0 + z$ (i.e. an arc). Take some u which belongs to this convex hull.

Note that

$$h_M(u) = \langle z_0, u \rangle = \left\langle \frac{1}{2}((z_0 + x_1) + (z_0 - x_1)), u \right\rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle z_0 + x_1, u \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle z_0 - x_1, u \rangle.$$

If the point in K_0 that has u as a normal is not $z_0 + x_1$, say $y \in K_0$, then $h_{K_0}(u) > \langle z_0 + x_1, u \rangle$ and so $\frac{1}{2}h_{K_0}(u) + \frac{1}{2}h_{K_1}(u) > h_M(u)$, which is a contradiction to $M = \frac{1}{2}(K_0 + K_1)$. Therefore $z_0 + x_1$ is the unique point in K_0 where u is the normal. The same reasoning applies to x_2 , so that $z_0 + x_2$ is once again the unique point of K_0 where u is a normal, which shows $x_1 = x_2$. This shows that K_0 and K_1 are opposite translates of M . \square

Lemma 11. *Let $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|z| > 1$ and denote $L = (B_2^n + x) \cap (B_2^n - x)$. The pair $(L + z, L - z)$ is an \mathcal{S}_n -cute pair if and only if either $x = 0$, or $|x| = 1$. In other words, two (far enough) translates of a lens are \mathcal{S}_n -cute if and only if they are either singletons or unit balls.*

Proof. When $x = 0$ or $|x| = 1$ we are in the two cases discussed in Lemma 5, and the pairs are \mathcal{S}_n -cute. We thus assume L is a proper lens, namely $x \neq 0$ and $|x| < 1$, and assume by way of contradiction that $(L + z, L - z)$ is an \mathcal{S}_n -cute pair.

Consider the unique point y on ∂L which has $z/|z|$ as a normal. By symmetry, $-y \in \partial L$ is the unique point where the normal is in direction $-z/|z|$. Note that $y - \frac{1}{|z|}z + B_2^n \supseteq L$.

We split the proof to cases based on the dimension n and the point $y \in \partial L$. If $n \geq 3$, or $n = 2$ and y is a smooth point of ∂L , the set $M = [-y, y]^{cc} \subsetneq L$, and so it satisfies $M \subseteq L + z + |z|B_2^n$ and $M \subseteq L - z + |z|B_2^n$. Note indeed that in this case $M \neq L$, since L is not a unit ball or a point. However, since $L \in \mathcal{S}_n$ and $|z| > 1$, we see that

$$y + |z|B_2^n \supseteq y + \left(1 - \frac{1}{|z|}\right)z + B_2^n \supseteq L + z.$$

Therefore (as $y \in M$) $L + z \subseteq M + |z|B_2^n$ and similarly $L - z \subseteq M + |z|B_2^n$, using the ball of radius $|z|$ centered at $-y$. We conclude that $\delta(M, L + z) = \delta(M, L - z) = |z|$. By assumption this means that $M = L$, a contradiction.

If $n = 2$ and y is a singular point of ∂L , the set

$$P = ((-y + z) + |z|B_2^n) \cap ((y - z) + |z|B_2^n) \supseteq [-y, y]^{cc} = L,$$

as it is an intersection of larger balls. Thus $P + |z|B_2^n \supseteq L + z, L - z$. Since $-y + z \in L + z$ and $y - z \in L - z$ we also have $L + z + |z|B_2^n \supseteq P$ and $L - z + |z|B_2^n \supseteq P$. Therefore $\delta(P, L + z) = \delta(P, L - z) = |z|$, so by assumption $P = L$, a contradiction. \square

With the above ingredients we prove that an \mathcal{S}_n -cute pair of bodies with distance at least 4 has to be either two balls or two points.

Proof of Proposition 7. By Lemma 8, given an \mathcal{S}_n -cute pair (K_0, K_1) of distance at least 4, their Minkowski average is a lens, and by Corollary 10 they are both translates of the same lens. However by Lemma 11 two translates of a lens which are in distance at least 4 are \mathcal{S}_n -cute if and only if they are either singletons or balls. \square

Putting together Proposition 7 and Lemma 4 we get the following.

Lemma 12. *If $T : \mathcal{S}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n$ is a bijective isometry then either all points are mapped to points, or all points are mapped to unit balls.*

Proof. A pair of points x, y in distance at least 4 is \mathcal{S}_n -cute by Lemma 5. By Lemma 4 they must be mapped to an \mathcal{S}_n -cute pair Tx, Ty of the same distance, which by Proposition 7 means Tx, Ty are either a pair of points or a pair of Euclidean unit balls. We may then reach any other point by two jumps of length 4 or more, so we see that all points are mapped to points or all points are mapped to balls. \square

Finally, we will use the following simple fact, that a body can be reconstructed once we know its Hausdorff distance from all points in \mathbb{R}^n .

Lemma 13. *For any $K \in \mathcal{S}_n$,*

$$K = \bigcap_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} (x + \delta(x, K)B_2^n).$$

Proof. By definition of the Hausdorff distance,

$$K \subseteq \bigcap_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} (x + \delta(x, K)B_2^n) \subseteq \bigcap_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n: \delta(x, K) \leq 1} (x + B_2^n).$$

Note that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\delta(x, K) = \inf\{\lambda > 0 : K \subseteq x + \lambda B_2^n\}$ since the other inclusion then holds immediately. Thus $x \in K^c$ if and only if $\delta(x, K) > 1$, so

$$\bigcap_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n: \delta(x, K) \leq 1} (x + B_2^n) = \bigcap_{x \in K^c} (x + B_2^n) = (K^c)^c = K,$$

and so equality holds throughout. \square

We are finally ready to prove Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. Let $T : \mathcal{S}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n$ be a bijective isometry. By Lemma 12 either all points are mapped to points, or all points are mapped to unit balls. In the first case, consider $R = T$, and in the second, consider $R : \mathcal{S}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n$ given by $RK = (TK)^c$. In either case, R is an isometry of \mathcal{S}_n mapping points to points, so its restriction to points must be an isometry of \mathbb{R}^n , and these are well known to be given by rigid motions $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus $Q = g^{-1} \circ R : \mathcal{S}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_n$ is an isometry which, restricted to points, is the identity.

Let $K \in \mathcal{S}_n$. Note that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have $\delta(QK, x) = \delta(K, x)$, so using Lemma 13 twice, we get

$$QK = \bigcap_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} (x + \delta(x, QK)B_2^n) = \bigcap_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} (x + \delta(x, K)B_2^n) = K.$$

Thus either for all $K \in \mathcal{S}_n$, $K = QK = g^{-1}TK$, in which case $TK = gK$, or for all $K \in \mathcal{S}_n$, $K = QK = g^{-1}(TK)^c$, in which case $TK = (gK)^c = gK^c$. This completes the proof. \square

References

- [1] Shiri Artstein-Avidan and Dan I. Florentin. An in-depth study of ball-bodies. Preprint, 2025.
- [2] Peter M. Gruber and Günter Lettl. Isometries of the space of convex bodies in Euclidean space. *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, 12(6):455–462, 1980.

[3] Rolf Schneider. Isometrien des raumes der konvexen körper. In *Colloquium Mathematicum*, volume 2, pages 219–224, 1975.

S. Artstein-Avidan and A. Chor,

School of Mathematical Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Ramat Aviv, Tel Aviv, 69978, Israel.

Email: shiri@tauex.tau.ac.il, arnonchor@mail.tau.ac.il.

D.I. Florentin,

Department of Mathematics, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, 52900, Israel.

Email: dan.florentin@biu.ac.il.