

NEW FIBER AND GRAPH COMBINATIONS OF CONVEX BODIES

STEVEN HOEHNER AND SUDAN XING

ABSTRACT. Three new combinations of convex bodies are introduced and studied: the L_p fiber, L_p chord and graph combinations. These combinations are defined in terms of the fibers and graphs of pairs of convex bodies, and each operation generalizes the classical Steiner symmetral, albeit in different ways. For the L_p fiber and L_p chord combinations, we derive Brunn–Minkowski-type inequalities and the corresponding Minkowski’s first inequalities. We also prove that the general affine surface areas are concave (respectively, convex) with respect to the graph sum, thereby generalizing fundamental results of Ye (*Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 2014) on the monotonicity of the general affine surfaces under Steiner symmetrization. As an application, we deduce a corresponding Minkowski’s first inequality for the L_p affine surface area of a graph combination of convex bodies.

1. INTRODUCTION

We shall work in n -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n with inner product $\langle x, y \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i$ and norm $\|x\| = \sqrt{\langle x, x \rangle}$. The standard orthonormal basis of \mathbb{R}^n is $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$, and the origin of \mathbb{R}^n is denoted by o . The unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^n centered at the origin is denoted by $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\| = 1\}$.

A *convex body* is a convex, compact subset of \mathbb{R}^n with nonempty interior. The support function of a convex body K in \mathbb{R}^n is $h_K(u) = \max_{x \in K} \langle x, u \rangle$. Let \mathcal{K}_o^n denote the class of convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^n which contain the origin o in their interiors. For $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$, the Hausdorff distance $d_H(K_1, K_2)$ may be defined by

$$d_H(K_1, K_2) = \max \left\{ \sup_{x \in K_1} d(x, K_2), \sup_{y \in K_2} d(y, K_1) \right\}$$

where for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a closed set $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $d(x, C) = \inf_{y \in C} \|x - y\|$. For $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$, the orthogonal projection of K into the hyperplane $u^\perp = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, u \rangle = 0\}$ is denoted by $K|u^\perp$.

For fixed $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, we let $f_u : K|u^\perp \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g_u : K|u^\perp \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote the *overgraph* and *undergraph* functions of K with respect to u^\perp , respectively, which are defined by

$$f_u(x') = \max\{t \in \mathbb{R} : (x', t) \in (K|u^\perp) \times \mathbb{R}\} \quad \text{and} \quad g_u(x') = \min\{t \in \mathbb{R} : (x', t) \in (K|u^\perp) \times \mathbb{R}\}.$$

This means that

$$K = \{(x', t) : x' \in K|u^\perp, g_u(x') \leq t \leq f_u(x')\}.$$

Date: March 10, 2025.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 52A20 (52A38, 52A40, 53A15).

Key words and phrases. Affine surface area, L_p fiber sum, graph sum, L_p chord sum, L_p Brunn–Minkowski inequality.

For $x' \in u^\perp$, we denote by

$$(1.1) \quad \ell_K(u; x') := \text{vol}_1(K \cap (x' + \mathbb{R}u))$$

the length of the chord of K (in the direction of u) passing through $x' \in u^\perp$. Note that in terms of the overgraph and undergraph functions of K , we have

$$\ell_K(u; x') = f_u(x') - g_u(x').$$

For a convex body K in \mathbb{R}^n and a direction $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, the *Steiner symmetral* $S_u(K)$ of K with respect to the $(n-1)$ -dimensional hyperplane u^\perp may be defined as follows. Translate each chord of K in the direction of u until u^\perp bisects the chord. The union of all the translated chords is $S_u(K)$. In terms of the overgraph and undergraph of K , the Steiner symmetral $S_u(K)$ may be expressed as

$$(1.2) \quad S_u(K) = \left\{ (x', t) \in (K|_{u^\perp}) \times \mathbb{R} : -\frac{1}{2}(f_u(x') - g_u(x')) \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2}(f_u(x') - g_u(x')) \right\}.$$

A key feature of the Steiner symmetrization is that it preserves volume, which follows by Cavalieri's principle. Furthermore, any convex body can be transformed into a Euclidean ball of the same volume via a sequence of Steiner symmetrizations. These properties make the Steiner symmetrization an indispensable tool in a wide variety of "shape optimization" problems. For more background on Steiner symmetrizations, we refer the reader to, for example, Section 10.3 of Schneider's book [40], the article [4] by Bianchi, Gardner and Gronchi and the chapter [5] by Bianchi and Gronchi.

Various constructions have been introduced to interpret the Steiner symmetrization as a sum or combination of two objects (see, e.g., [4, 5, 15, 35]). An example is the classical fiber sum of convex bodies, which was defined by McMullen [35] as follows. Fix two complementary linear subspaces $L, M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Any vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ can be decomposed as $x = x' + y$, where $y \in L$ and $x' \in M$; we denote this orthogonal decomposition by $x = (x', y)$. For convex bodies K_1 and K_2 in \mathbb{R}^n and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, McMullen [35] defined the *fiber combination* $a \circ K_1 \uplus b \circ K_2 = a \circ_{L|M} K_1 \uplus_{L|M} b \circ_{L|M} K_2$ by

$$(1.3) \quad a \circ K_1 \uplus_{L|M} b \circ K_2 = \{(x', ay_1 + by_2) : (x', y_i) \in K_i \text{ for } i = 1, 2\},$$

where for a convex body K in \mathbb{R}^n and $a \in \mathbb{R}$, the *fiber dilation* $a \circ K = a \circ_{L|M} K$ is defined by (see [35])

$$a \circ K = \{(x', ay) : (x', y) \in K\}.$$

Here we have adapted McMullen's notation to suit our purposes (see also [4, 5]). This definition means that vectors are only added in their L -components, while the M -components are fixed. By construction, the fiber of the sum $K_1 \uplus_{L|M} K_2$ in the "direction" L and passing through $x' \in M$ is obtained by summing the corresponding fibers of K_1 and K_2 . In particular, if $L = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $M = \{o\}$, then (1.3) becomes the usual Minkowski addition $K_1 + K_2 = \{x + y : x \in K_1, y \in K_2\}$, and if $L = \{o\}$ and $M = \mathbb{R}^n$, then (1.3) is the usual intersection $K_1 \cap K_2$. Furthermore, as observed in [35], if L is a line and M is its orthogonal hyperplane, then the fiber combination $(\frac{1}{2} \circ K) \uplus ((-\frac{1}{2}) \circ K)$ is just the Steiner symmetral of K with respect to M . Relative to the complementary subspaces L and M , the fiber sum operation is associative and commutative.

It was also shown in [35, Theorem 2.3] that if K_1 and K_2 are convex, then $K_1 \boxplus K_2$ is also convex.

McMullen proved the following Brunn–Minkowski-type inequality for fiber combinations of convex bodies [35]. Setting $\ell := \dim L$, the result asserts that the n -dimensional volume vol_n is $\frac{1}{\ell}$ -concave with respect to the fiber sum of convex bodies. More specifically, McMullen proved that for all convex bodies $K_1, K_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and every $\vartheta \in [0, 1]$, it holds that

$$(1.4) \quad \text{vol}_n((1 - \vartheta) \circ K_1 \boxplus \vartheta \circ K_2)^{1/\ell} \geq (1 - \vartheta) \text{vol}_n(K_1)^{1/\ell} + \vartheta \text{vol}_n(K_2)^{1/\ell}.$$

To our knowledge, the equality cases have not yet been characterized.

In [4], Bianchi, Gardner and Gronchi introduced and studied an abstract framework for symmetrizations in geometry, which includes the fiber sum as a special case (see also [5]). In particular, they studied general properties of these symmetrizations, including convergence of successive symmetrizations. The convergence properties of fiber symmetrizations were also recently studied by Ulivelli [43]. Some recent applications of fiber sums can also be found in [20, 21]. We also mention the related work [15] of Gardner, Hug and Weil, where abstract operations between sets in geometry were studied, as well as their general properties.

In this article, we introduce new combinations of convex bodies called the L_p fiber, L_p chord and graph combinations. Our main results include Brunn–Minkowski-type inequalities for the L_p fiber and L_p chord combinations of convex bodies. In terms of these operations, we introduce mixed volumes via variational formulas, and we subsequently derive several isoperimetric-type inequalities.

These new operations are connected by the fact that they all generalize the classical Steiner symmetral, albeit in different ways. In particular, we prove that the general L_ϕ (respectively L_ψ) affine surface areas are concave (respectively, convex) under the graph sum operation, thereby generalizing fundamental results of Ye [49] on the monotonicity of the general affine surface areas under Steiner symmetrizations. Consequently, we derive an analogue of Minkowski’s first inequality for the L_p affine surface area of a graph sum of convex bodies.

Therefore, our focus is essentially on various concavity properties of these three operations and applications thereof, which distinguishes this paper from the recent works [4, 15, 43], where general properties of an abstract framework of symmetrizations were studied.

The remainder of the paper is essentially divided into thirds. First, in Section 2, the L_p fiber combination of convex bodies is introduced and studied. Next, Section 3 covers graph combinations, and finally, Section 4 is devoted to L_p chord combinations.

2. L_p FIBER COMBINATIONS OF CONVEX BODIES

In this section, we define an L_p analogue of McMullen’s classical fiber sum. Let L and M be complementary subspaces of \mathbb{R}^n , and let $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be two convex functions. McMullen [35] defined the *fiber convolute* $\varphi_1 \boxplus \varphi_2 = \varphi_1 \boxplus_{L|M} \varphi_2$ relative to the subspace pair (L, M) by

$$(2.5) \quad (\varphi_1 \boxplus \varphi_2)(x', y) := \inf\{\varphi_1(x', y_1) + \varphi_2(x', y_2) : y_1 + y_2 = y\}$$

where again we denote $x = (x', y)$ with $x' \in M$ and $y \in L$. As remarked by McMullen [35], in the case $L = \{o\}$ and $M = \mathbb{R}^n$, we recover the sum $\varphi_1 + \varphi_2$, while for $L = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $M = \{o\}$ we recover the infimal convolute

$$(\varphi_1 \square \varphi_2)(x) = \inf\{\varphi_1(x) + \varphi_2(y - x) : y \in \mathbb{R}^n\}.$$

In [35, Lemma 8.3], McMullen proved that the domain of the fiber convolute is $\text{dom}(\varphi_1 \boxplus_{L|M} \varphi_2) = \text{dom}(\varphi_2) \boxplus_{L|M} \text{dom}(\varphi_1)$. Furthermore, he proved that the support function of the fiber sum satisfies the property

$$(2.6) \quad h_{K_1 \boxplus_{L|M} K_2} = h_{K_1} \boxplus_{L^\perp|M^\perp} h_{K_2}.$$

In the 1960s, Firey [13] extended the classical Minkowski combination of convex bodies to the L_p setting as follows. For $p \geq 1$, $a, b \geq 0$ and $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$, Firey defined the L_p combination $a \cdot_p K_1 +_p b \cdot_p K_2$ by the relation

$$(2.7) \quad h_{a \cdot_p K_1 +_p b \cdot_p K_2} = (ah_{K_1}^p + bh_{K_2}^p)^{1/p}.$$

In particular, Firey also established the L_p Brunn–Minkowski inequality and L_p Minkowski’s first inequality in [13] (see Subsections 2.3 and 2.4 below).

Firey’s work [13] was the starting point for the subsequent L_p Brunn–Minkowski–Firey theory, which made a huge leap forward several decades later with the groundbreaking works [29, 30] of Lutwak. Since then, the L_p Brunn–Minkowski–Firey theory has seen tremendous activity in Convex Geometry and Functional Analysis; for some examples, we refer the reader to [8, 11, 12, 18, 19, 31–34, 38, 39, 46].

If L and M are complementary orthogonal subspaces of \mathbb{R}^n , then $L \oplus M = \mathbb{R}^n$, $M^\perp = L$, $L^\perp = M$ and $L \cap M = \{o\}$. Hence, in view of (2.6) and (2.7), it is natural to define the following L_p extension of McMullen’s fiber combination.

Definition 2.1. *Let L and M be orthogonal complementary subspaces of \mathbb{R}^n , and let $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$. For $p \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, the L_p fiber sum $K_1 \boxplus_p K_2$ with respect to (L, M) is defined by*

$$(2.8) \quad h_{K_1 \boxplus_p K_2} := \left(h_{K_1}^p \boxplus_{L|M} h_{K_2}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

and the L_p fiber dilate $a \circ_p K$ of $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ is defined by

$$(2.9) \quad a \circ_p K := a^{1/p} \circ K.$$

For $a, b \geq 0$ which are not both zero, the L_p fiber combination $a \circ_p K_1 \boxplus_p b \circ_p K_2$ is then defined by

$$(2.10) \quad h_{a \circ_p K_1 \boxplus_p b \circ_p K_2} := \left(h_{a \circ_p K_1}^p \boxplus_{L|M} h_{b \circ_p K_2}^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

In particular, choosing $p = 1$, we recover the classical fiber sum and dilation operations of McMullen in (2.6); in this case, we drop the subscripts and write $\boxplus = \boxplus_1$ and $\circ = \circ_1$.

Let $\cdot|M$ denote the projection into M in the “direction” L . Observe that if $(K_1|M) \cap (K_2|M) = \emptyset$, then $K_1 \boxplus_p K_2 = \emptyset$. Moreover, if $\text{relint}(K_1|M) \cap \text{relint}(K_2|M) = \emptyset$, then $K_1 \boxplus_p K_2$ may have dimension less than n (and thus empty interior). Therefore, we shall henceforth assume that $\text{relint}(K_1|M) \cap \text{relint}(K_2|M) \neq \emptyset$ when dealing with the L_p fiber sum $K_1 \boxplus_p K_2$.

2.1. Properties of the L_p fiber combination. We begin with a useful characterization of the support function of an L_p fiber dilation.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$, $a > 0$ and $p \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Then*

$$h_{a \circ_p K}(x', y) = h_K(x', a^{1/p}y).$$

Proof. First, assume that $p = 1$. Observe that for any $a > 0$, we have $(x', aw) \in a \circ K$ if and only if $(x', w) \in K$ (where $x' \in M$ and $w \in L$). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} h_{a \circ K}(x', y) &= \sup_{(z', aw) \in a \circ K} \langle (z', aw), (x', y) \rangle = \sup_{(z', w) \in K} \langle (z', aw), (x', y) \rangle \\ &= \sup_{(z', w) \in K} \{ \langle z', x' \rangle + \langle aw, y \rangle \} = \sup_{(z', w) \in K} \{ \langle z', x' \rangle + \langle w, ay \rangle \} \\ &= \sup_{(z', w) \in K} \langle (z', w), (x', ay) \rangle = h_K(x', ay). \end{aligned}$$

The general case for $p \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ now follows from (2.9):

$$h_{a \circ_p K}(x', y) = h_{a^{1/p} \circ K}(x', y) = h_K(x', a^{1/p}y).$$

□

Next, we highlight some basic properties of L_p fiber combinations.

Proposition 2.2. *Let L and M be complementary subspaces of \mathbb{R}^n , and let $\ell := \dim L$. Let $p \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Let $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ and $a, b \geq 0$. Then:*

(i) *(Shadow property)* If a and b are not both 0, then

$$(a \circ_p K_1 \uplus_p b \circ_p K_2)|M = (K_1|M) \cap (K_2|M).$$

(ii) *(Commutativity)* It holds that

$$K_1 \uplus_p K_2 = K_2 \uplus_p K_1.$$

(iii) *(Associativity of sum)* Let K_3 also be a convex body in \mathcal{K}_o^n . Then

$$(K_1 \uplus_p K_2) \uplus_p K_3 = K_1 \uplus_p (K_2 \uplus_p K_3).$$

(iv) *(Associativity of dilation)* It holds that

$$(ab) \circ_p K = a \circ_p (b \circ_p K).$$

(v) *(Distributivity)* We have

$$a \circ_p (K_1 \uplus_p K_2) = a \circ_p K_1 \uplus_p a \circ_p K_2.$$

(vi) *(Monotonicity)* Let $L_1, L_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ be such that $K_1 \subset L_1$ and $K_2 \subset L_2$. Then

$$a \circ_p K_1 \uplus_p b \circ_p K_2 \subset a \circ_p L_1 \uplus_p b \circ_p L_2.$$

Proof. Properties (i) and (ii) follow directly from Definition 2.1. To see (iii), note that

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{K_1 \circlearrowleft_p (K_2 \circlearrowleft_p K_3)}^p(x', y) &= \inf_{y_1 + y_2 = y} \left\{ h_{K_1}^p(x', y_1) + h_{K_2 \circlearrowleft_p K_3}^p(x', y_2) \right\} \\
&= \inf_{y_1 + y_2 = y} \left\{ h_{K_1}^p(x', y_1) + \inf_{z_1 + z_2 = y_2} \left\{ h_{K_2}^p(x', z_1) + h_{K_3}^p(x', z_2) \right\} \right\} \\
&= \inf_{\substack{y_1 + y_2 = y \\ z_1 + z_2 = y_2}} \left\{ h_{K_1}^p(x', y_1) + h_{K_2}^p(x', z_1) + h_{K_3}^p(x', z_2) \right\} \\
&= \inf_{y_1 + z_1 + z_2 = y} \left\{ h_{K_1}^p(x', y_1) + h_{K_2}^p(x', z_1) + h_{K_3}^p(x', z_2) \right\} \\
&= \inf_{\substack{w + z_2 = y \\ y_1 + z_1 = w}} \left\{ h_{K_1}^p(x', y_1) + h_{K_2}^p(x', z_1) + h_{K_3}^p(x', z_2) \right\} \\
&= \inf_{w + z_2 = y} \left\{ \inf_{y_1 + z_1 = w} \left\{ h_{K_1}^p(x', y_1) + h_{K_2}^p(x', z_1) \right\} + h_{K_3}^p(x', z_2) \right\} \\
&= \inf_{w + z_2 = y} \left\{ h_{K_1 \circlearrowleft_p K_2}^p(x', w) + h_{K_3}^p(x', z_2) \right\} \\
&= h_{(K_1 \circlearrowleft_p K_2) \circlearrowleft_p K_3}^p(x', y).
\end{aligned}$$

The identity in (iii) follows.

Next, observe that the classical fiber dilation is associative:

$$(ab) \circ K = \{(x', aby) : (x', y) \in K\} = a \circ \{(x', by) : (x', y) \in K\} = a \circ (b \circ K).$$

Part (iv) thus follows from this fact and (2.9). For (v), by Lemma 2.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{a \circlearrowleft_p (K_1 \circlearrowleft_p K_2)}(x', y) &= h_{K_1 \circlearrowleft_p K_2}(x', a^{1/p}y) \\
&= \left(\inf \left\{ h_{K_1}^p(x', y_1) + h_{K_2}^p(x', y_2) : y_1 + y_2 = a^{1/p}y \right\} \right)^{1/p} \\
&= \left(\inf \left\{ h_{K_1}^p(x', a^{1/p}y_1) + h_{K_2}^p(x', a^{1/p}y_2) : y_1 + y_2 = y \right\} \right)^{1/p} \\
&= \left(\inf \left\{ h_{a \circlearrowleft_p K_1}^p(x', y_1) + h_{a \circlearrowleft_p K_2}^p(x', y_2) : y_1 + y_2 = y \right\} \right)^{1/p} \\
&= h_{(a \circlearrowleft_p K_1) \circlearrowleft_p (a \circlearrowleft_p K_2)}(x', y).
\end{aligned}$$

This implies the desired identity. \square

Remark 2.1. *The corresponding properties (i)-(iii) for the classical fiber combination were shown by McMullen in [35].*

The next result states that n -dimensional volume is $\frac{\ell}{p}$ -homogeneous with respect to the L_p fiber dilation.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$, $p \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and $a \geq 0$. Then*

$$\text{vol}_n(a \circlearrowleft_p K) = a^{\ell/p} \text{vol}_n(K).$$

Proof. For $x' \in K|M$, let $K(x') = \{t \in L : (x', t) \in K\}$ denote the fiber of K over x' . Let $\theta(L, M)$ denote the angle between L and M . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vol}_n(a \circ_p K) &= \theta(L, M) \int_{(a \circ_p K)|M} \text{vol}_\ell((a \circ_p K)(x')) dx' \\ &= \theta(L, M) \int_{K|M} \text{vol}_\ell(a^{1/p} K(x')) dx' \\ &= a^{\ell/p} \theta(L, M) \int_{K|M} \text{vol}_\ell(K(x')) dx' \\ &= a^{\ell/p} \text{vol}_n(K). \end{aligned}$$

□

2.2. The L_p graph sum preserves convexity for $p \geq 1$. Next, we show that when $p \geq 1$, the L_p fiber sum is a binary operation on \mathcal{K}_o^n .

Theorem 2.3. *For all $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ and $p \geq 1$, we have $K_1 \boxplus_p K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$.*

To prove this, we will need

Lemma 2.3. *Let $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous and increasing function, and let A be a subset of \mathbb{R} . If A is bounded below, then $g(\inf A) = \inf g(A)$.*

Proof. A proof can be found, for example, in [1]; we include the details for the reader's convenience. Since A is bounded below, $\inf A$ exists. Let $a = \inf A$. On one hand, since g is increasing, for every $x \in A$ we have $g(a) \leq g(x)$, which implies $g(\inf A) \leq \inf g(A)$. On the other hand, by the definition of infimum, for every $\delta > 0$ the set $(a - \delta, a + \delta) \cap A$ is nonempty, which implies that $g((a - \delta, a + \delta) \cap A)$ is nonempty. Since g is continuous, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$g((a - \delta, a + \delta) \cap A) \subset (g(a) - \varepsilon, g(a) + \varepsilon) \subset g(A).$$

Therefore, $\inf g(A) \leq g(a) = g(\inf A)$. □

Proof of Theorem 2.3. The proof is inspired by Firey's original proof in [13] for the p -means of convex bodies (see also [40, Section 9.1]). Recall that the support function of a convex body is characterized by the three properties of nonnegativity, positive homogeneity and sublinearity (see, e.g., [40, Section 1.7]). Consider the function defined by

$$f(x) := \left(h_{K_1}^p(x) \boxplus_{L^\perp|M^\perp} h_{K_2}^p(x) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We shall show that this function satisfies these three properties and is therefore the support function of a convex body in \mathbb{R}^n .

First, as support functions, $h_{K_1}, h_{K_2} \geq 0$, and hence

$$f(x) = \left(h_{K_1}^p(x', y) \boxplus_{L^\perp|M^\perp} h_{K_2}^p(x', y) \right)^{1/p} = \left(\inf \{ h_{K_1}^p(x', y_1) + h_{K_2}^p(x', y_2) : y_1 + y_2 = y \} \right)^{1/p} \geq 0,$$

where $x = (x', y)$.

Next, for $\lambda > 0$, by the positive homogeneity of the support functions h_{K_1} and h_{K_2} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\lambda x) &= \left(h_{K_1}^p(\lambda x) \boxplus_{L^1|_{M^1}} h_{K_2}^p(\lambda x) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= \left(\inf \left\{ h_{K_1}^p(\lambda x', \lambda y_1) + h_{K_2}^p(\lambda x', \lambda y_2) : y_1 + y_2 = y \right\} \right)^{1/p} \\ &= \left(\inf \left\{ \lambda^p \left(h_{K_1}^p(x', y_1) + h_{K_2}^p(x', y_2) \right) : y_1 + y_2 = y \right\} \right)^{1/p} \\ &= \lambda \left(\inf \left\{ h_{K_1}^p(x', y_1) + h_{K_2}^p(x', y_2) : y_1 + y_2 = y \right\} \right)^{1/p} \\ &= \lambda f(x). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to show that f is sublinear, i.e., for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $f(x_1 + x_2) \leq f(x_1) + f(x_2)$. We apply Lemma 2.3 with $g(x) = x^{1/p}$ for $p \geq 1$, use the identity $\inf(A + B) = \inf A + \inf B$, and set $x_1 = (x'_1, y_1)$ and $x_2 = (x'_2, y_2)$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_1) + f(x_2) &= h_{K_1 \circledast_p K_2}(x_1) + h_{K_1 \circledast_p K_2}(x_2) \\ &= \left(\inf \left\{ h_{K_1}^p(x'_1, w_1) + h_{K_2}^p(x'_1, w_2) : w_1 + w_2 = y_1 \right\} \right)^{1/p} \\ &\quad + \left(\inf \left\{ h_{K_1}^p(x'_2, w_3) + h_{K_2}^p(x'_2, w_4) : w_3 + w_4 = y_2 \right\} \right)^{1/p} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \left(h_{K_1}^p(x'_1, w_1) + h_{K_2}^p(x'_1, w_2) \right)^{1/p} + \left(h_{K_1}^p(x'_2, w_3) + h_{K_2}^p(x'_2, w_4) \right)^{1/p} : w_1 + w_2 = y_1, w_3 + w_4 = y_2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, to apply Lemma 2.3, we have used the fact that the sets

$$\left\{ h_{K_1}^p(x'_1, w_1) + h_{K_2}^p(x'_1, w_2) : w_1 + w_2 = y_1 \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{ h_{K_1}^p(x'_2, w_3) + h_{K_2}^p(x'_2, w_4) : w_3 + w_4 = y_2 \right\}$$

are bounded below by zero, which follows since $h_{K_i} \geq 0$ for $i = 1, 2$. Next, by the inequality

$$\left[(a + a')^p + (b + b')^p \right]^{1/p} \leq (a^p + b^p)^{1/p} + \left((a')^p + (b')^p \right)^{1/p},$$

which holds for $p > 1$ and $a, a', b, b' > 0$, along with the sublinearity of the support functions h_{K_1} and h_{K_2} , we get that the previous expression is greater than or equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf \left\{ \left[\left(h_{K_1}(x'_1, w_1) + h_{K_1}(x'_2, w_3) \right)^p + \left(h_{K_2}(x'_1, w_2) + h_{K_2}(x'_2, w_4) \right)^p \right]^{1/p} : w_1 + w_2 = y_1, w_3 + w_4 = y_2 \right\} \\ &\geq \inf \left\{ \left[h_{K_1}^p(x'_1 + x'_2, w_1 + w_3) + h_{K_2}^p(x'_1 + x'_2, w_2 + w_4) \right]^{1/p} : w_1 + w_2 = y_1, w_3 + w_4 = y_2 \right\} \\ &\geq \inf \left\{ \left[h_{K_1}^p(x'_1 + x'_2, w_1 + w_3) + h_{K_2}^p(x'_1 + x'_2, w_2 + w_4) \right]^{1/p} : (w_1 + w_3) + (w_2 + w_4) = y_1 + y_2 \right\} \\ &= f(x_1 + x_2). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

2.3. Brunn–Minkowski-type inequality for the L_p fiber combination. As mentioned earlier, Firey [13] established the L_p Brunn–Minkowski–Firey inequality, which asserts that for any $p \geq 1$, the volume functional is $\frac{p}{n}$ -concave with respect to L_p addition on \mathcal{K}_o^n . More precisely, for all $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ and every $\vartheta \in [0, 1]$,

$$(2.11) \quad \text{vol}_n \left((1 - \vartheta) \cdot_p K_1 +_p \vartheta \cdot_p K_2 \right)^{\frac{p}{n}} \geq (1 - \vartheta) \text{vol}_n(K_1)^{\frac{p}{n}} + \vartheta \text{vol}_n(K_2)^{\frac{p}{n}}$$

with equality if and only if $K_1 = K_2$. In particular, choosing $p = 1$, one recovers the classical Brunn–Minkowski inequality.

The main result of this section is the following L_p analogue of (1.4).

Theorem 2.4. *For all $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$, $\vartheta \in [0, 1]$ and $p \geq 1$,*

$$(2.12) \quad \text{vol}_n((1 - \vartheta) \circ_p K_1 \uplus_p \vartheta \circ_p K_2)^{\frac{p}{\ell}} \geq \vartheta \text{vol}_n(K_1)^{\frac{p}{\ell}} + (1 - \vartheta) \text{vol}_n(K_2)^{\frac{p}{\ell}}.$$

McMullen’s fiber Brunn–Minkowski inequality (1.4) is the special case $p = 1$. We modify Firey’s original proof of the L_p Brunn–Minkowski inequality [13], which is obtained from the classical Brunn–Minkowski inequality. Analogously, Theorem 2.4 will be obtained from (1.4).

Proof. We may assume that $p > 1$. For $i = 1, 2$, let $\lambda_i = \text{vol}_n(K_i)^{1/\ell}$, and set $\vartheta' = \vartheta \lambda_2^p / [(1 - \vartheta) \lambda_1^p + \vartheta \lambda_2^p]$. For any $x = (x', y) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, since $g(x) = x^{1/p}$ is continuous and strictly increasing, by Lemma 2.3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h_{(1-\vartheta') \circ_p (\lambda_1^{-1} \circ K_1) \uplus_p \vartheta' \circ_p (\lambda_2^{-1} \circ K_2)}(x', y) &= h_{\frac{1-\vartheta'}{\lambda_1^p} \circ_p K_1 \uplus_p \frac{\vartheta'}{\lambda_2^p} \circ_p K_2}(x', y) \\ &= \left(\inf \left\{ \frac{1-\vartheta'}{\lambda_1^p} h_{K_1}^p(x', y_1) + \frac{\vartheta'}{\lambda_2^p} h_{K_2}^p(x', y_2) : y_1 + y_2 = y \right\} \right)^{1/p} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \left[\frac{1-\vartheta'}{\lambda_1^p} h_{K_1}^p(x', y_1) + \frac{\vartheta'}{\lambda_2^p} h_{K_2}^p(x', y_2) \right]^{1/p} : y_1 + y_2 = y \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \left[\frac{(1-\vartheta) h_{K_1}^p(x', y_1) + \vartheta h_{K_2}^p(x', y_2)}{(1-\vartheta) \lambda_1^p + \vartheta \lambda_2^p} \right]^{1/p} : y_1 + y_2 = y \right\} \\ &= h_{\frac{1-\vartheta}{\nu} \circ_p K_1 \uplus_p \frac{\vartheta}{\nu} \circ_p K_2}(x', y), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\nu := (1 - \vartheta) \lambda_1^p + \vartheta \lambda_2^p = (1 - \vartheta) \text{vol}_n(K_1)^{\frac{p}{\ell}} + \vartheta \text{vol}_n(K_2)^{\frac{p}{\ell}}.$$

Since the support function h_K uniquely determines the convex body K , this implies that

$$(1 - \vartheta') \circ_p (\lambda_1^{-1} \circ K_1) \uplus_p \vartheta' \circ_p (\lambda_2^{-1} \circ K_2) = \frac{1 - \vartheta}{\nu} \circ_p K_1 \uplus_p \frac{\vartheta}{\nu} \circ_p K_2.$$

Hence, by Proposition 2.2(v) and Lemma 2.2,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vol}_n((1 - \vartheta') \circ_p (\lambda_1^{-1} \circ K_1) \uplus_p \vartheta' \circ_p (\lambda_2^{-1} \circ K_2)) &= \text{vol}_n\left(\frac{1 - \vartheta}{\nu} \circ_p K_1 \uplus_p \frac{\vartheta}{\nu} \circ_p K_2\right) \\ &= \nu^{-\ell/p} \text{vol}_n((1 - \vartheta) \circ_p K_1 \uplus_p \vartheta \circ_p K_2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it suffices to show that

$$(2.13) \quad \text{vol}_n((1 - \vartheta') \circ_p (\lambda_1^{-1} \circ K_1) \uplus_p \vartheta' \circ_p (\lambda_2^{-1} \circ K_2)) \geq 1.$$

For any $p \geq 1$, we have $((1 - \vartheta')a^p + \vartheta'b^p)^{1/p} \geq (1 - \vartheta')a + \vartheta'b$. Hence,

$$(1 - \vartheta') \circ_p (\lambda_1^{-1} \circ K_1) \uplus_p \vartheta' \circ_p (\lambda_2^{-1} \circ K_2) \supset (1 - \vartheta') \circ_1 (\lambda_1^{-1} \circ K_1) \uplus_1 \vartheta' \circ_1 (\lambda_2^{-1} \circ K_2).$$

Therefore, by the monotonicity of volume, (1.4), Lemma 2.2, and the definition of λ_i , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{-\ell/p} \operatorname{vol}_n((1 - \vartheta) \circ_p K_1 \uplus_p \vartheta \circ_p K_2) &\geq \operatorname{vol}_n((1 - \vartheta') \circ_1 (\lambda_1^{-1} \circ K_1) \uplus_1 \vartheta' \circ_1 (\lambda_2^{-1} \circ K_2)) \\ &\geq \left[(1 - \vartheta') \operatorname{vol}_n(\lambda_1^{-1} \circ K_1)^{1/\ell} + \vartheta' \operatorname{vol}_n(\lambda_2^{-1} \circ K_2)^{1/\ell} \right]^\ell \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows. \square

2.4. Minkowski's first inequality for L_p fiber combinations. Let $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ and $p \geq 1$. In the groundbreaking work [29], Lutwak defined the L_p first mixed volume $V_p(K_1, K_2)$ to be

$$V_p(K_1, K_2) = \frac{p}{n} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\operatorname{vol}_n(K_1 +_p \varepsilon \cdot_p K_2) - \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1)}{\varepsilon}.$$

Choosing $p = 1$ yields the classical first mixed volume. The L_p Minkowski's first inequality, also due to Lutwak [29], states that

$$V_p(K_1, K_2) \geq \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1)^{\frac{n-p}{n}} \operatorname{vol}_n(K_2)^{\frac{p}{n}},$$

with equality if and only if K_1 and K_2 are dilates. The case $p = 1$ is the classical Minkowski's first inequality. For more background, we refer the reader to, e.g., [29, 40].

Naturally, this leads us to define the following mixed surface area with respect to the L_p fiber sum.

Definition 2.5. For complementary subspaces L and M of \mathbb{R}^n and $p \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, the L_p fiber mixed surface area $S_p^{(\uplus)}(K_1, K_2)$ of $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ is defined by

$$(2.14) \quad S_p^{(\uplus)}(K_1, K_2) := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\operatorname{vol}_n(K_1 \uplus_p \varepsilon \circ_p K_2) - \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1)}{\varepsilon}.$$

The next result is the Minkowski's first inequality for the L_p fiber sum.

Theorem 2.6. Let L and M be complementary subspaces of \mathbb{R}^n with $\dim L =: \ell$, and let $p \geq 1$. For all $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$,

$$(2.15) \quad S_p^{(\uplus)}(K_1, K_2) \geq \frac{\ell}{p} \cdot \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1)^{\frac{\ell-p}{\ell}} \operatorname{vol}_n(K_2)^{\frac{p}{\ell}}.$$

If, furthermore, $\operatorname{vol}_n(K_1) = \operatorname{vol}_n(K_2)$, then

$$S_p^{(\uplus)}(K_1, K_2) \geq \frac{\ell}{p} \cdot \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1).$$

Proof. Inequality (2.15) will be derived from Theorem 2.4 by modifying the standard arguments used to prove the classical Minkowski's first inequality (see, e.g., [14] or [40]). We include the details for the reader's convenience. Substituting $\varepsilon = t/(1-t)$ into (2.14), and using Proposition 2.2(v) and Lemma 2.2, we derive that

$$S_p^{(\uplus)}(K_1, K_2) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\operatorname{vol}_n\left(\frac{1}{1-t} \circ_p [(1-t) \circ_p K_1 \uplus_p t \circ_p K_2]\right) - \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1)}{t/(1-t)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{(1-t)^{-\ell/p} \operatorname{vol}_n((1-t) \circ_p K_1 \uplus_p t \circ_p K_2) - \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1)}{t/(1-t)} \\
&= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\operatorname{vol}_n((1-t) \circ_p K_1 \uplus_p t \circ_p K_2) - (1-t)^{\ell/p} \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1)}{t(1-t)^{\frac{\ell-p}{p}}} \\
&= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\operatorname{vol}_n((1-t) \circ_p K_1 \uplus_p t \circ_p K_2) - \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1)}{t} + \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{[1 - (1-t)^{\ell/p}] \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1)}{t} \\
&= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\operatorname{vol}_n((1-t) \circ_p K_1 \uplus_p t \circ_p K_2) - \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1)}{t} + \frac{\ell}{p} \cdot \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1).
\end{aligned}$$

We now set $f_{p,\ell}(t) := g_{p,\ell}(t)^{p/\ell}$, where $g_{p,\ell}(t) := \operatorname{vol}_n((1-t) \circ_p K_1 \uplus_p t \circ_p K_2)$. The preceding computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
f'_{p,\ell}(0) &= \frac{d^+}{dt} [g_{p,\ell}(t)^{p/\ell}]_{t=0} \\
&= \frac{p}{\ell} \cdot \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1)^{\frac{p-\ell}{\ell}} \cdot \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\operatorname{vol}_n((1-t) \circ_p K_1 \uplus_p t \circ_p K_2) - \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1)}{t} \\
&= \frac{p}{\ell} \cdot \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1)^{\frac{p-\ell}{\ell}} \left[S_p^\uplus(K_1, K_2) - \frac{\ell}{p} \cdot \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1) \right] \\
&= \frac{p}{\ell} \cdot \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1)^{\frac{p-\ell}{\ell}} S_p^\uplus(K_1, K_2) - \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1)^{\frac{p}{\ell}} \\
&= \frac{p S_p^\uplus(K_1, K_2) - \ell \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1)}{\ell \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1)^{\frac{\ell-p}{\ell}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note also that $f_p(0) = \operatorname{vol}_n(K_1)^{p/\ell}$ and $f_p(1) = \operatorname{vol}_n(K_2)^{p/\ell}$. Thus, the desired inequality (2.15) is equivalent to $f'_p(0) \geq f_p(1) - f_p(0)$. Now Theorem 2.4 says that $f_p(t)$ is concave, so the latter inequality holds true, and hence (2.15) holds true. \square

3. GRAPH COMBINATIONS OF CONVEX BODIES

Rather than defining a sum of convex bodies with respect to their fibers, we may instead define a sum of convex bodies with respect to their overgraphs and undergraphs. Let $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$. If f and $-g$ denote the overgraph and undergraph of K , respectively, with respect to u^\perp , then we write $K \approx (f, -g)_u$.

Definition 3.1. Let $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. Given convex bodies $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ with $K_1|_{u^\perp} = K_2|_{u^\perp}$ and $K_i \approx (f_i, -g_i)_u$, $i = 1, 2$, we define the graph combination $a \diamond_u K_1 \uplus_u b \diamond_u K_2$ by the relation

$$a \diamond_u K_1 \uplus_u b \diamond_u K_2 \approx (af_1 + bf_2, -(ag_1 + bg_2))_u.$$

We also define the graph dilation by

$$a \diamond_u K_1 \approx (af_1, -ag_1)_u.$$

Observe that if $K \approx (f, -g)_u$, then $R_u(K) \approx (g, -f)_u$. Hence, $S_u(K) \approx (\frac{1}{2}(f-g), -\frac{1}{2}(f-g))_u$, which implies that

$$(3.16) \quad \frac{1}{2} \diamond_u K \diamond_u \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right) \diamond_u R_u(K) = S_u(K).$$

Also note that $1 \diamond_u K = K$.

Next, we highlight some basic properties of graph combinations of convex bodies.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and $a, b \geq 0$. Let $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ be such that $K_i \approx (f_i, -g_i)_u$, $i = 1, 2$, and assume that $K_1|_{u^\perp} = K_2|_{u^\perp}$.*

(i) *(Shadow property) We have*

$$(a \diamond_u K_1 \diamond_u b \diamond_u K_2)|_{u^\perp} = K_1|_{u^\perp} = K_2|_{u^\perp}.$$

(ii) *(Commutativity) It holds that*

$$K_1 \diamond_u K_2 = K_2 \diamond_u K_1.$$

(iii) *(Associativity of sum) Let K_3 also be a convex body in \mathcal{K}_o^n with $K_1|_{u^\perp} = K_2|_{u^\perp} = K_3|_{u^\perp}$. Then*

$$(K_1 \diamond_u K_2) \diamond_u K_3 = K_1 \diamond_u (K_2 \diamond_u K_3).$$

(iv) *(Associativity of dilation) It holds that*

$$ab \diamond_u K = a \diamond_u (b \diamond_u K).$$

(v) *(Distributivity) We have*

$$a \diamond_u (K_1 \diamond_u K_2) = a \diamond_u K_1 \diamond_u a \diamond_u K_2$$

and

$$(a + b) \diamond_u K_1 = a \diamond_u K_1 \diamond_u b \diamond_u K_1.$$

(vi) *(Monotonicity) Let $L_1, L_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ be such that $K_1 \subset L_1$ and $K_2 \subset L_2$. Then*

$$a \diamond_u K_1 \diamond_u b \diamond_u K_2 \subset a \diamond_u L_1 \diamond_u b \diamond_u L_2.$$

Proof. Part (i) follows immediately from Definition 3.1. For (ii), we have

$$K_1 \diamond_u K_2 \approx (f_1 + f_2, -(g_1 + g_2))_u = (f_2 + f_1, -(g_2 + g_1))_u = K_2 \diamond_u K_1.$$

Part (iii) is similar. For (iv), we have

$$(ab) \diamond_u K_1 \approx ((ab)f, -(ab)g)_u = (a(bf), -a(bg))_u \approx a \diamond_u (b \diamond_u K_1).$$

Similarly, part (v) follows from Definition 3.1:

$$\begin{aligned} a \diamond_u K_1 \diamond_u a \diamond_u K_2 &\approx (af_1 + af_2, -(ag_1 + ag_2))_u \\ &= (a(f_1 + f_2), -a(g_1 + g_2))_u \approx a \diamond_u (K_1 \diamond_u K_2). \end{aligned}$$

The other distributive property in (v) is shown in the same way. Finally, for (vi) note that for $i = 1, 2$, the condition $K_i \subset L_i$ implies $f_i \leq h_i$ and $g_i \leq l_i$, where $L_i \approx (h_i, l_i)$. The result now follows from Definition 3.1. \square

Remark 3.1. *Observe that if $a, b \geq 0$ and $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ satisfy $K_1|_{u^\perp} = K_2|_{u^\perp}$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vol}_n(a \diamond_u K_1 \diamond_u b \diamond_u K_2) &= \int_{(a \diamond_u K_1 \diamond_u b \diamond_u K_2)|_{u^\perp}} \ell_{a \diamond_u K_1 \diamond_u b \diamond_u K_2}(u; x') dx' \\ &= \int_{K_1|_{u^\perp}} [a(f_1(x') - g_1(x')) + b(f_2(x') - g_2(x'))] dx' \\ &= a \int_{K_1|_{u^\perp}} \ell_{K_1}(u; x') dx' + b \int_{K_2|_{u^\perp}} \ell_{K_2}(u; x') dx' \\ &= a \text{vol}_n(K_1) + b \text{vol}_n(K_2). \end{aligned}$$

The next result shows that the graph sum is a binary operation on \mathcal{K}_o^n .

Theorem 3.3. *Let $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and $a, b \geq 0$ be given, with a, b not both zero. Suppose that $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ satisfy $K_1|_{u^\perp} = K_2|_{u^\perp}$. Then $a \diamond_u K_1 \diamond_u b \diamond_u K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$.*

Proof. Since $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ and $K_1|_{u^\perp} = K_2|_{u^\perp}$, the functions f_1, f_2, g_1, g_2 are concave on $K_i|_{u^\perp}$. Thus, since $a, b \geq 0$, the overgraph function $af_1 + bf_2$ and the undergraph function $ag_1 + bg_2$ are concave on $K_i|_{u^\perp}$. Since $(a \diamond_u K_1 \diamond_u b \diamond_u K_2)|_{u^\perp} = K_i|_{u^\perp}$, by definition of the graph combination this implies that $a \diamond_u K_1 \diamond_u b \diamond_u K_2$ is convex. The fact that $a \diamond_u K_1 \diamond_u b \diamond_u K_2$ is compact and contains the origin in its interior follows from the assumptions that $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ and $a, b \geq 0$ are not both zero, together with the Heine–Borel theorem and the definition of the graph combination. \square

Additionally, the graph sum of two convex polytopes is a convex polytope. More precisely, we have the following

Proposition 3.4. *Let $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ be polytopes which satisfy $P_1|_{u^\perp} = P_2|_{u^\perp}$. Then for any $a, b \geq 0$, the graph combination $a \diamond_u P_1 \diamond_u b \diamond_u P_2$ is a polytope in \mathbb{R}^n . If a, b are not both zero, then $a \diamond_u P_1 \diamond_u b \diamond_u P_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$.*

Proof. Let $P_1 \approx (f_1, -g_1)$ and $P_2 \approx (f_2, -g_2)$. Since P_1, P_2 are convex polytopes, the functions f_1, f_2, g_1, g_2 are piecewise affine and concave on their common domain $P_1|_{u^\perp} = P_2|_{u^\perp}$. Thus, for any $a, b \geq 0$ which are not both zero, the functions $af_1 + bf_2$ and $ag_1 + bg_2$ are piecewise affine and concave with the same domain. Since $a \diamond_u P_1 \diamond_u b \diamond_u P_2 \approx (af_1 + bf_2, -(ag_1 + bg_2))_u$ and $(a \diamond_u P_1 \diamond_u b \diamond_u P_2)|_{u^\perp} = P_1|_{u^\perp}$, this implies that $a \diamond_u P_1 \diamond_u b \diamond_u P_2$ is a polytope in \mathbb{R}^n . If a, b are not both zero, then $a \diamond_u P_1 \diamond_u b \diamond_u P_2$ contains the origin in its interior, and hence $a \diamond_u P_1 \diamond_u b \diamond_u P_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$. \square

3.1. General affine surface areas of graph combinations. In this subsection, we show that the general L_ϕ (respectively, L_ψ) affine surface areas are concave (respectively, convex) with respect to the graph sum. These inequalities generalize fundamental results due to Ye [49] on the monotone behavior of the general affine surface areas under Steiner symmetrizations. To formulate and prove our results, we will need a few more ingredients.

For a (smooth enough) function $f : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we set $\langle f(x) \rangle := f(x) - \langle x, \nabla f(x) \rangle$, where ∇f is the gradient of f . Note that for any two (smooth enough) functions $f, g : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and all

$a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\langle af(x) + bg(x) \rangle = a\langle f(x) \rangle + b\langle g(x) \rangle$. The Hessian matrix of $f(x)$ is denoted by $\text{Hess}(f(x))$, and we use $\det(T)$ to denote the determinant of a linear transformation T .

Let $\text{Conc}(0, \infty)$ denote the class of functions $\phi : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that either ϕ is a nonzero constant function or ϕ is concave with $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \phi(t) = 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\phi(t)}{t} = 0$, and set $\phi(0) = 0$. For $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$, the L_ϕ affine surface area $\text{as}_\phi(K)$ of K is defined by

$$(3.17) \quad \text{as}_\phi(K) = \int_{\partial K} \phi \left(\frac{\kappa_K(x)}{\langle x, N_K(x) \rangle^{n+1}} \right) \langle x, N_K(x) \rangle dS_K(x),$$

provided the integral exists. Here ∂K denotes the boundary of K , $\kappa_K(x)$ is the Gaussian curvature of K at $x \in \partial K$, $N_K(x)$ is outer unit normal at x and S_K is the classical surface area measure of K .

The L_ϕ affine surface area originated in valuation theory, where it was used to prove a fundamental result on the classification of upper semicontinuous $\text{SL}(n)$ -invariant valuations on \mathcal{K}_o^n . More specifically, Ludwig and Reitzner [28] proved that a functional $\Phi : \mathcal{K}_o^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an upper semicontinuous, $\text{SL}(n)$ -invariant valuation which vanishes on polytopes if and only if there exists a concave function $\phi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ with $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \phi(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \phi(t)/t = 0$ such that $\Phi(K) = \text{as}_\phi(K)$. Here the upper semicontinuity of the L_ϕ affine surface area means that for every sequence of convex bodies $\{K_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{K}_o^n$ which converges to K in the Hausdorff metric, we have

$$\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{as}_\phi(K_i) \leq \text{as}_\phi(K).$$

The next result is due to Ye [49]. It connects the L_ϕ affine surface area of a convex body to its overgraph and undergraph.

Lemma 3.1. [49, Lemma 2.1] *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$. For all $\phi \in \text{Conc}(0, \infty)$, it holds that*

$$\text{as}_\phi(K) = \int_{K|_{e_n^\perp}} \left\{ \phi \left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}(f_{e_n}(x')))|}{\langle f_{e_n}(x') \rangle^{n+1}} \right) \langle f_{e_n}(x') \rangle + \phi \left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}(g_{e_n}(x')))|}{\langle g_{e_n}(x') \rangle^{n+1}} \right) \langle g_{e_n}(x') \rangle \right\} dx'.$$

Let $\text{Conv}(0, \infty)$ denote the class of functions $\psi : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that either ψ is a nonzero constant function, or ψ is convex with $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \psi(t) = \infty$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \psi(t) = 0$ (in this case, we set $\psi(0) = \infty$). For a convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ and $\psi \in \text{Conv}(0, \infty)$, the L_ψ affine surface area $\text{as}_\psi(K)$ was defined by Ludwig [27] to be

$$\text{as}_\psi(K) = \int_{\partial K} \psi \left(\frac{\kappa_K(x)}{\langle x, N_K(x) \rangle^{n+1}} \right) \langle x, N_K(x) \rangle dS_K(x),$$

provided the integral exists. Ludwig [27, Theorem 6] proved that if $\psi \in \text{Conv}(0, \infty)$, then the L_ψ affine surface area is lower semicontinuous, that is, for every sequence of convex bodies $\{K_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{K}_o^n$ converging to K in the Hausdorff metric,

$$\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{as}_\psi(K_i) \geq \text{as}_\psi(K).$$

The following result is also due to Ye [49].

Lemma 3.2. [49, Lemma 2.2] For every $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ which has positive Gaussian curvature almost everywhere and every $\psi \in \text{Conv}(0, \infty)$, it holds that

$$\text{as}_\psi(K) = \int_{K|e_n^\perp} \left\{ \psi \left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}(f_{e_n}(x')))|}{\langle f_{e_n}(x') \rangle^{n+1}} \right) \langle f_{e_n}(x') \rangle + \psi \left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}(g_{e_n}(x')))|}{\langle g_{e_n}(x') \rangle^{n+1}} \right) \langle g_{e_n}(x') \rangle \right\} dx'.$$

For more background on the general affine surface areas and their numerous applications, we refer the reader to, for example, [2, 3, 10, 16, 19, 22, 23, 25, 28, 30, 36, 41, 44–48, 50–52].

The next lemma is a general form of Minkowski's determinant inequality (see, for example, [9, Lemma 8.C.1]).

Lemma 3.3. Let A and B be two $k \times k$ symmetric, positive semidefinite matrices. Then for any $a, b \geq 0$ which are not both zero and all $m \geq k$,

$$\det(aA + bB)^{\frac{1}{m}} \geq (a + b)^{\frac{k}{m}-1} \left(a \det(A)^{\frac{1}{m}} + b \det(B)^{\frac{1}{m}} \right).$$

If A and B are positive definite, then equality holds if and only if $A = B$.

Proof. We adapt the proof of Lemma 8.C.1 in [9]. We may assume that $m = k$, and that $A = (a_{ij})$ and $B = (b_{ij})$ are positive definite, and hence are diagonal matrices with positive eigenvalues. We first show that for any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \det(A)^{\frac{1}{m}} + (1 - \lambda) \det(B)^{\frac{1}{m}} &= \lambda \left(\prod_{i=1}^m a_{ii} \right)^{\frac{1}{m}} + (1 - \lambda) \left(\prod_{i=1}^m b_{ii} \right)^{\frac{1}{m}} \\ (3.18) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\leq \left(\prod_{i=1}^m (\lambda a_{ii} + (1 - \lambda) b_{ii}) \right)^{\frac{1}{m}} = \det(\lambda A + (1 - \lambda) B)^{\frac{1}{m}}. \end{aligned}$$

By the AM-GM inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda \left(\prod_{i=1}^m \frac{a_{ii}}{\lambda a_{ii} + (1 - \lambda) b_{ii}} \right)^{\frac{1}{m}} + (1 - \lambda) \left(\prod_{i=1}^m \frac{b_{ii}}{\lambda a_{ii} + (1 - \lambda) b_{ii}} \right)^{\frac{1}{m}} \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{a_{ii}}{\lambda a_{ii} + (1 - \lambda) b_{ii}} + \frac{1 - \lambda}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{b_{ii}}{\lambda a_{ii} + (1 - \lambda) b_{ii}} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (3.18).

For the general case, let $\lambda = a/(a + b)$. Since $a, b \geq 0$ are not both zero, we have $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Thus, by (3.18) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \det(aA + bB)^{\frac{1}{m}} &= \det \left((a + b) \left(\frac{a}{a + b} A + \frac{b}{a + b} B \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{m}} \\ &= (a + b)^{\frac{k}{m}} \det \left(\frac{a}{a + b} A + \frac{b}{a + b} B \right)^{\frac{1}{m}} \\ &\geq (a + b)^{\frac{k}{m}} \left(\frac{a}{a + b} \det(A)^{\frac{1}{m}} + \frac{b}{a + b} \det(B)^{\frac{1}{m}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$= (a+b)^{\frac{k}{m}-1} \left(a \det(A)^{\frac{1}{m}} + b \det(B)^{\frac{1}{m}} \right).$$

□

3.1.1. *Results for the L_ϕ general affine surface areas.* The main result of this section is the following concavity property of the L_ϕ surface area with respect to the graph sum.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $\phi \in \text{Conc}(0, \infty)$ and $a, b \geq 0$, with a, b not both zero. Suppose that the function $G(t) = \phi(t^{n+1})$ is concave for $t \in (0, \infty)$. Let $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ be such that $K_1|_{e_n^\perp} = K_2|_{e_n^\perp}$. Then we have*

$$\text{as}_\phi(a \diamond_u K_1 \diamond_u b \diamond_u K_2) \geq \frac{a}{a+b} \cdot \text{as}_\phi((a+b) \diamond_u K_1) + \frac{b}{a+b} \cdot \text{as}_\phi((a+b) \diamond_u K_2).$$

Proof. The argument follows along the same lines as Ye's original proof of [49, Theorem 3.5]. To begin, recall that as_ϕ is affine invariant, i.e., for all linear transformations T with $|\det(T)| = 1$, we have $\text{as}_\phi(TK) = \text{as}_\phi(K)$. Thus, without loss of generality, we may assume that $u = e_n$.

For $i = 1, 2$, let $K_i \approx (f_i, -g_i)_{e_n}$. For $x' \in K_1|_{e_n^\perp} = K_2|_{e_n^\perp}$, denote by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_{e_n}(x') &:= a f_1(x') + b f_2(x') \\ \tilde{g}_{e_n}(x') &:= a g_1(x') + b g_2(x') \end{aligned}$$

the overgraph and undergraph functions of $a \diamond_{e_n} K_1 \diamond_{e_n} b \diamond_{e_n} K_2$, respectively. Note that $\langle \tilde{f}_{e_n}(x) \rangle = a \langle f_1(x) \rangle + b \langle f_2(x) \rangle$ and $\langle \tilde{g}_{e_n}(x) \rangle = a \langle g_1(x) \rangle + b \langle g_2(x) \rangle$. By Lemma 3.3, for almost all $x' \in K_1|_{e_n^\perp}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\det(\text{Hess}(\tilde{f}_{e_n}(x')))|^{\frac{1}{n+1}} &= |a \det(\text{Hess}(f_1(x')) + b \text{Hess}(f_2(x')))|^{\frac{1}{n+1}} \\ (3.19) \quad &\geq (a+b)^{-\frac{2}{n+1}} \left[a |\det(\text{Hess}(f_1(x')))|^{\frac{1}{n+1}} + b |\det(\text{Hess}(f_2(x')))|^{\frac{1}{n+1}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$(3.20) \quad \phi \left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}(\tilde{f}_{e_n}(x')))|}{\langle \tilde{f}_{e_n}(x') \rangle^{n+1}} \right) = G \left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}(\tilde{f}_{e_n}(x')))|^{\frac{1}{n+1}}}{\langle \tilde{f}_{e_n}(x') \rangle} \right) = G \left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}(\tilde{f}_{e_n}(x')))|^{\frac{1}{n+1}}}{a \langle f_1(x') \rangle + b \langle f_2(x') \rangle} \right).$$

Since ϕ is an increasing function on $(0, \infty)$, so too is G . Thus, by (3.20) and (3.19) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \phi \left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}(\tilde{f}_{e_n}(x')))|}{\langle \tilde{f}_{e_n}(x') \rangle^{n+1}} \right) &\geq G \left(\frac{(a+b)^{-\frac{2}{n+1}} \left[a |\det(\text{Hess}(f_1(x')))|^{\frac{1}{n+1}} + b |\det(\text{Hess}(f_2(x')))|^{\frac{1}{n+1}} \right]}{a \langle f_1(x') \rangle + b \langle f_2(x') \rangle} \right) \\ &\geq \frac{a \langle f_1(x') \rangle}{a \langle f_1(x') \rangle + b \langle f_2(x') \rangle} \cdot G \left(\frac{(a+b)^{-\frac{2}{n+1}} |\det(\text{Hess}(f_1(x')))|^{\frac{1}{n+1}}}{\langle f_1(x') \rangle} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{b \langle f_2(x') \rangle}{a \langle f_1(x') \rangle + b \langle f_2(x') \rangle} \cdot G \left(\frac{(a+b)^{-\frac{2}{n+1}} |\det(\text{Hess}(f_2(x')))|^{\frac{1}{n+1}}}{\langle f_2(x') \rangle} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{a\langle f_1(x') \rangle}{a\langle f_1(x') \rangle + b\langle f_2(x') \rangle} \cdot G\left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}((a+b)f_1(x')))|^{\frac{1}{n+1}}}{\langle (a+b)f_1(x') \rangle}\right) \\
&+ \frac{b\langle f_2(x') \rangle}{a\langle f_1(x') \rangle + b\langle f_2(x') \rangle} \cdot G\left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}((a+b)f_2(x')))|^{\frac{1}{n+1}}}{\langle (a+b)f_2(x') \rangle}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

In the second inequality, we used the concavity of $G(t)$ on $(0, \infty)$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi\left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}(\tilde{g}_{e_n}(x')))|}{\langle \tilde{g}_{e_n}(x') \rangle^{n+1}}\right) &\geq \frac{a\langle g_1(x') \rangle}{a\langle g_1(x') \rangle + b\langle g_2(x') \rangle} \cdot G\left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}((a+b)g_1(x')))|^{\frac{1}{n+1}}}{\langle (a+b)g_1(x') \rangle}\right) \\
&+ \frac{b\langle g_2(x') \rangle}{a\langle g_1(x') \rangle + b\langle g_2(x') \rangle} \cdot G\left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}((a+b)g_2(x')))|^{\frac{1}{n+1}}}{\langle (a+b)g_2(x') \rangle}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using also Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 4.2(i), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{as}_\phi(a \diamond_{e_n} K_1 \diamond_{e_n} b \diamond_{e_n} K_2) \\
&= \int_{(a \diamond_{e_n} K_1 \diamond_{e_n} b \diamond_{e_n} K_2)|e_n^\perp} \left[\phi\left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}(\tilde{f}_{e_n}(x')))|}{\langle \tilde{f}_{e_n}(x') \rangle^{n+1}}\right) \langle \tilde{f}_{e_n}(x') \rangle + \phi\left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}(\tilde{g}_{e_n}(x')))|}{\langle \tilde{g}_{e_n}(x') \rangle^{n+1}}\right) \langle \tilde{g}_{e_n}(x') \rangle \right] dx' \\
&= \int_{(K_1|e_n^\perp) \cap (K_2|e_n^\perp)} \phi\left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}(\tilde{f}_{e_n}(x')))|}{\langle \tilde{f}_{e_n}(x') \rangle^{n+1}}\right) \langle \tilde{f}_{e_n}(x') \rangle dx' \\
&\quad + \int_{(K_1|e_n^\perp) \cap (K_2|e_n^\perp)} \phi\left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}(\tilde{g}_{e_n}(x')))|}{\langle \tilde{g}_{e_n}(x') \rangle^{n+1}}\right) \langle \tilde{g}_{e_n}(x') \rangle dx' \\
&\geq a \int_{(K_1|e_n^\perp) \cap (K_2|e_n^\perp)} \left[\langle f_1(x') \rangle \cdot G\left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}((a+b)f_1(x')))|^{\frac{1}{n+1}}}{\langle (a+b)f_1(x') \rangle}\right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \langle g_1(x') \rangle \cdot G\left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}((a+b)g_1(x')))|^{\frac{1}{n+1}}}{\langle (a+b)g_1(x') \rangle}\right) \right] dx' \\
&+ b \int_{(K_1|e_n^\perp) \cap (K_2|e_n^\perp)} \left[\langle f_2(x') \rangle \cdot G\left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}((a+b)f_2(x')))|^{\frac{1}{n+1}}}{\langle (a+b)f_2(x') \rangle}\right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \langle g_2(x') \rangle \cdot G\left(\frac{|\det(\text{Hess}((a+b)g_2(x')))|^{\frac{1}{n+1}}}{\langle (a+b)g_2(x') \rangle}\right) \right] dx' \\
&= \frac{a}{a+b} \cdot \text{as}_\phi((a+b) \diamond_{e_n} K_1) + \frac{b}{a+b} \cdot \text{as}_\phi((a+b) \diamond_{e_n} K_2).
\end{aligned}$$

□

In the special case $a+b=1$, we obtain the following

Corollary 3.1. *Let $\phi \in \text{Conc}(0, \infty)$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ be given. Suppose that the function $G(t) = \phi(t^{n+1})$ is concave for $t \in (0, \infty)$. Let $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ be such that $K_1|e_n^\perp = K_2|e_n^\perp$. Then we have*

$$\text{as}_\phi(\lambda \diamond_{e_n} K_1 \diamond_{e_n} (1-\lambda) \diamond_{e_n} K_2) \geq \lambda \text{as}_\phi(K_1) + (1-\lambda) \text{as}_\phi(K_2).$$

Remark 3.2. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ and $\phi \in \text{Conc}(0, \infty)$, and suppose that the function $G(t) = \phi(t^{n+1})$ is concave for $t \in (0, \infty)$. Ye [49, Theorem 3.5] proved that the L_ϕ affine surface area is monotone with respect to Steiner symmetrization:

$$\text{as}_\phi(K) \leq \text{as}_\phi(S_{e_n}(K)).$$

Recalling that $\frac{1}{2} \diamond_{e_n} K \diamond_{e_n} \frac{1}{2} \diamond_{e_n} R_{e_n}(K) = S_{e_n}(K)$, we see that Theorem 3.5 extends [49, Theorem 3.5] from the Steiner symmetrization of a single convex body to the graph sum of two convex bodies.

A convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ is said to have curvature function $f_K : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ if

$$V(L, \underbrace{K, \dots, K}_{n-1}) = \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u) f_K(u) d\sigma(u),$$

where $V(L, K, \dots, K)$ is the mixed volume and σ is the classical spherical measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . If $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ has curvature function $f_K : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\phi \in \text{Conc}(0, \infty)$, then the L_ϕ^* affine surface area $\text{as}_\phi^*(K)$ (see [27]) has the form

$$\text{as}_\phi^*(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \phi(f_{-n}(K, u)) h_K(u)^{-n} d\sigma(u),$$

where $f_{-n}(K, u) = h_K(u)^{n+1} f_K(u)$ is the L_p curvature function of K (see [30]) for $p = -n$. Ludwig [27] proved that if $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ has a curvature function, then

$$(3.21) \quad \text{as}_\phi^*(K) = \text{as}_\phi(K^\circ),$$

where $K^\circ = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, y \rangle \leq 1, \forall y \in K\}$ is the polar body of K . For $\psi \in \text{Conv}(0, \infty)$, the corresponding formulation and result holds for the L_ψ^* affine surface area $\text{as}_\psi^*(K)$ as well [27]. We thus obtain the following

Corollary 3.2. Let $\phi \in \text{Conc}(0, \infty)$ be given. Let $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ be convex bodies with curvature functions and which satisfy $K_1|_{e_n^\perp} = K_2|_{e_n^\perp}$. If the function $G(t) = \phi(t^{n+1})$ is concave for $t \in (0, \infty)$, then for every $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ we have

$$\lambda \text{as}_\phi^*(K_1) + (1 - \lambda) \text{as}_\phi^*(K_2) \leq \text{as}_\phi^*([\lambda \diamond_{e_n} K_1^\circ \diamond_{e_n} (1 - \lambda) \diamond_{e_n} K_2^\circ]^\circ).$$

Remark 3.3. Let $\phi \in \text{Conc}(0, \infty)$ and suppose that $G(t) = \phi(t^{n+1})$ is concave for $t \in (0, \infty)$. Ye [49, Corollary 3.6] proved that for every $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ with a curvature function and for which $[S_{e_n}(K^\circ)]^\circ$ has a curvature function, we have

$$\text{as}_\phi^*(K) \leq \text{as}_\phi^*([S_{e_n}(K^\circ)]^\circ).$$

Thus, in the special case $K_2 = R_{e_n}(K_1)$ and $\lambda = 1/2$, Corollary 3.2 reduces to [49, Corollary 3.6].

3.1.2. *Results for the L_ψ general affine surface areas.* In the case of the L_ψ general affine surface areas, we deduce the following results. Their proofs follow in completely analogous fashion to those for the L_ϕ general surface areas in the results above, and hence are omitted.

Theorem 3.6. *Let $\psi \in \text{Conv}(0, \infty)$ and $a, b \geq 0$, with a, b not both zero. Suppose that the function $G(t) = \psi(t^{n+1})$ is convex for $t \in (0, \infty)$. Let $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ be such that $K_1|_{e_n^\perp} = K_2|_{e_n^\perp}$, and assume that K_1, K_2 have positive Gaussian curvature almost everywhere. Then*

$$\text{as}_\psi(a \diamond_{e_n} K_1 \diamond_{e_n} b \diamond_{e_n} K_2) \leq \frac{a}{a+b} \cdot \text{as}_\psi((a+b) \diamond_{e_n} K_1) + \frac{b}{a+b} \cdot \text{as}_\psi((a+b) \diamond_{e_n} K_2).$$

In the special case $a+b=1$, we obtain the following

Corollary 3.3. *Let $\psi \in \text{Conv}(0, \infty)$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ be given. Suppose that the function $G(t) = \psi(t^{n+1})$ is convex for $t \in (0, \infty)$. Let $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ be such that $K_1|_{e_n^\perp} = K_2|_{e_n^\perp}$, and assume that K_1, K_2 have positive Gaussian curvature almost everywhere. Then we have*

$$\text{as}_\psi(\lambda \diamond_{e_n} K_1 \diamond_{e_n} (1-\lambda) \diamond_{e_n} K_2) \leq \lambda \text{as}_\psi(K_1) + (1-\lambda) \text{as}_\psi(K_2).$$

Remark 3.4. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ and $\psi \in \text{Conv}(0, \infty)$, and suppose that the function $G(t) = \psi(t^{n+1})$ is convex for $t \in (0, \infty)$. Ye [49, Theorem 3.10] proved that if K has positive Gaussian curvature almost everywhere, then*

$$\text{as}_\psi(K) \geq \text{as}_\psi(S_{e_n}(K)).$$

Again recalling that $\frac{1}{2} \diamond_{e_n} K \diamond_{e_n} \frac{1}{2} \diamond_{e_n} R_{e_n}(K_1) = S_{e_n}(K)$, we see that Corollary 3.3 extends [49, Theorem 3.10] from the case of the Steiner symmetral of a single convex body to the graph sum of two convex bodies.

Corollary 3.4. *Let $\psi \in \text{Conv}(0, \infty)$ be given. Let $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ be convex bodies with curvature functions and which satisfy $K_1|_{e_n^\perp} = K_2|_{e_n^\perp}$. If the function $G(t) = \psi(t^{n+1})$ is convex for $t \in (0, \infty)$, then*

$$\lambda \text{as}_\psi^*(K_1) + (1-\lambda) \text{as}_\psi^*(K_2) \geq \text{as}_\psi^*([\lambda \diamond_{e_n} K_1^\circ \diamond_{e_n} (1-\lambda) \diamond_{e_n} K_2^\circ]^\circ).$$

Remark 3.5. *Let $\psi \in \text{Conv}(0, \infty)$ and suppose that $G(t) = \psi(t^{n+1})$ is convex for $t \in (0, \infty)$. Ye [49, Corollary 3.11] proved that for every $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ with a curvature function and for which $[S_{e_n}(K^\circ)]^\circ$ has a curvature function, we have*

$$\text{as}_\psi^*(K) \geq \text{as}_\psi^*([S_{e_n}(K^\circ)]^\circ).$$

Thus, in the special case $K_2 = R_{e_n}(K_1)$, Corollary 3.4 reduces to [49, Corollary 3.11].

3.2. Minkowski's first inequality for the L_p affine surface area of a graph sum. For $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ and $p \neq -n$, the L_p affine surface area $\text{as}_p(K)$ is defined by

$$(3.22) \quad \text{as}_p(K) = \int_{\partial K} \frac{\kappa_K(x)^{\frac{p}{n+p}}}{\langle x, N_K(x) \rangle^{\frac{n(p-1)}{n+p}}} d\mu_{\partial K}(x),$$

provided the integral exists. The L_p affine surface area is a key affine invariant in the L_p Brunn–Minkowski theory. It was introduced by Lutwak [30] for $p > 1$, and by Schütt and

Werner [41] for $p < 1$. In the special case $p = 1$, as_1 is the classical affine surface area, originally due to Blaschke [6] for sufficiently smooth convex bodies. In addition to its fundamental importance in affine differential geometry, the classical affine surface area has found numerous applications, including to, e.g., valuation theory [2, 3] and the approximation of convex bodies by polytopes [7, 17, 26]. It was also studied in the affine plateau problem, solved in \mathbb{R}^3 by Trudinger and Wang [42].

The L_p affine surface area is invariant under affine transformations, and is homogeneous of degree $n(n-p)/(n+p)$, that is,

$$\forall t > 0, \quad \text{as}_p(tK) = t^{\frac{n(n-p)}{n+p}} \text{as}_p(K).$$

We remark also that the L_p affine surface area itself has found numerous applications, including to, e.g., the information theory of convex bodies [24, 37, 41, 45] and L_p affine isoperimetric inequalities [31, 46, 47].

Given $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and any $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ satisfying $K_1|_{u^\perp} = K_2|_{u^\perp}$, we set

$$(3.23) \quad S_{u,p}^\diamond(K_1, K_2) := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\text{as}_p(K_1 \diamond_u \varepsilon \diamond_u K_2) - \text{as}_p(K_1)}{\varepsilon}.$$

The homogeneity of the L_p affine surface area allows us to deduce the following Minkowski's first inequality for a graph combination of convex bodies.

Theorem 3.7. *Let $p \in (0, 1)$. For all $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ satisfying $K_1|_{u^\perp} = K_2|_{u^\perp}$, we have*

$$(3.24) \quad S_{u,p}^\diamond(K_1, K_2) \geq \text{as}_p(K_2) + \frac{(n-p)(n-1)}{n+p} \text{as}_p(K_1).$$

If, furthermore, $\text{as}_p(K_1) = \text{as}_p(K_2) > 0$, then

$$S_{u,p}^\diamond(K_1, K_2) \geq \frac{n(n-p)}{n+p} \cdot \text{as}_p(K_1).$$

If $p \in (-n, 0)$ and K_1, K_2 have positive curvature almost everywhere, then the previous inequalities reverse.

Proof. Let $p \in (0, 1)$, and for $t \in (0, \infty)$, set $\phi_p(t) := t^{\frac{p}{n+p}}$. Note that $\phi_p \in \text{Conc}(0, \infty)$. Since $0 < (np+p)/(n+p) < 1$, the function $G_p(t) = \phi_p(t^{n+1})$ is strictly concave for $t \in (0, \infty)$. Thus, the hypotheses of Theorem 3.5 are satisfied by ϕ_p .

Next, we again adapt the standard arguments to prove the Minkowski's first inequality, modified for the setting of the graph sum. Substituting $\varepsilon = t/(1-t)$ into (3.23), and using Proposition 3.2 and the homogeneity of the L_p affine surface area, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} S_{u,p}^\diamond(K_1, K_2) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\text{as}_p\left(\frac{1}{1-t} \diamond_u [(1-t) \diamond_u K_1 \diamond_u t \diamond_u K_2]\right) - \text{as}_p(K_1)}{t/(1-t)} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{(1-t)^{-\frac{n(n-p)}{n+p}} \text{as}_p((1-t) \diamond_u K_1 \diamond_u t \diamond_u K_2) - \text{as}_p(K_1)}{t/(1-t)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\text{as}_p((1-t) \diamond_u K_1 \diamond_u t \diamond_u K_2) - (1-t)^{\frac{n(n-p)}{n+p}} \text{as}_p(K_1)}{t(1-t)^{\frac{(n-p)(n-1)}{n+p}}} \\
&= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\text{as}_p((1-t) \diamond_u K_1 \diamond_u t \diamond_u K_2) - \text{as}_p(K_1)}{t} + \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\left[1 - (1-t)^{\frac{n(n-p)}{n+p}}\right] \text{as}_p(K_1)}{t} \\
&= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\text{as}_p((1-t) \diamond_u K_1 \diamond_u t \diamond_u K_2) - \text{as}_p(K_1)}{t} + \frac{n(n-p)}{n+p} \cdot \text{as}_p(K_1).
\end{aligned}$$

We now set $f_p(t) := \text{as}_p((1-t) \diamond_u K_1 \diamond_u t \diamond_u K_2)$. Note that $f_p(0) = \text{as}_p(K_1)$ and $f_p(1) = \text{as}_p(K_2)$. The desired inequality (3.24) is equivalent to $f'_p(0) \geq f'_p(1) - f'_p(0)$, and this latter inequality holds by Theorem 3.5. Therefore,

$$S_{u,p}^\diamond(K_1, K_2) - \frac{n(n-p)}{n+p} \cdot \text{as}_p(K_1) \geq \text{as}_p(K_2) - \text{as}_p(K_1),$$

which is equivalent to (3.24). The result follows for the case $p \in (0, 1)$.

In the case $p \in (-n, 0)$, for $t \in (0, \infty)$ we set $\psi_p(t) := t^{\frac{p}{n+p}}$, and note that $\psi_p \in \text{Conv}(0, \infty)$. Since $(np+p)/(n+p) < 0$, the function $G_p(t) = \psi_p(t^{n+1})$ is convex on $(0, \infty)$. Thus, the hypotheses of Theorem 3.6 are satisfied, and the rest of the proof follows in the same way as before. \square

4. L_p CHORD COMBINATIONS OF CONVEX BODIES

Recall that for $a, b, s, t > 0$ and $p \in [-\infty, +\infty]$, the p -means $M_p^{(a,b)}(s, t)$ are defined by

$$(4.25) \quad M_p^{(a,b)}(s, t) = \begin{cases} (as^p + bt^p)^{1/p}, & \text{if } p \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}; \\ s^a t^b, & \text{if } p = 0; \\ \min\{s, t\}, & \text{if } p = -\infty; \\ \max\{s, t\}, & \text{if } p = +\infty. \end{cases}$$

The main concept of this section is the following

Definition 4.1. Let K_1 and K_2 be convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^n , $a, b > 0$, $p \in [-\infty, +\infty]$, and $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. The L_p chord combination $a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_2$ is defined so that the chord $(a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_2) \cap (x' + \mathbb{R}u)$ in the direction u and passing through $x' \in u^\perp$ has length

$$\ell_{a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_2}(u; x') = M_p^{(a,b)}(\ell_{K_1}(u; x'), \ell_{K_2}(u; x'))$$

and is bisected by u^\perp . The L_p chord dilation $a \odot_{u,p} K_1$ is defined so that the chord $(a \odot_{u,p} K_1) \cap (x' + \mathbb{R}u)$ has length

$$\ell_{a \odot_{u,p} K_1}(u; x') = a^{1/p} \ell_{K_1}(u; x')$$

and is bisected by u^\perp .

Put another way,

$$a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_2 := \left\{ x' + tu : x' \in u^\perp, -\frac{1}{2}M_p^{(a,b)}(\ell_{K_1}(u; x'), \ell_{K_2}(u; x')) \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2}M_p^{(a,b)}(\ell_{K_1}(u; x'), \ell_{K_2}(u; x')) \right\}.$$

Thus, by construction, the L_p chord combination and dilation are symmetric about u^\perp . In the special case $p = 1$, we write $\oplus_u := \oplus_{u,1}$ and $\odot_u := \odot_{u,1}$. We also denote $K_1 \oplus_{u,p} K_2 := 1 \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} 1 \odot_{u,p} K_2$. In particular, choosing $p = 1$, $a = \lambda \in (0, 1)$, $b = 1 - \lambda$ and $K_1 = K_2 = K$, we recover the classical Steiner symmetral of a convex body K with respect to u^\perp :

$$(4.26) \quad S_u(K) = \lambda \odot_{u,1} K \oplus_{u,1} (1 - \lambda) \odot_{u,1} K.$$

One may also obtain the Steiner symmetral by replacing an instance (or two) of K by $R_u(K)$ in (4.26).

Using the convention $1/(\pm\infty) = 0$, we have $a \odot_{u,\pm\infty} K = K + tu$ for some $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $K_1|u^\perp = K_2|u^\perp$, we also have $K_1 \oplus_{u,-\infty} K_2 = (K_1 \cap K_2) + su$ and $K_1 \oplus_{u,-\infty} K_2 = (K_1 \cup K_2) + tu$ for some $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$.

4.1. Properties of L_p chord combinations. Next, we highlight some basic properties of L_p chord combinations of convex bodies.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$, $p \in [-\infty, +\infty]$, $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and $a, b > 0$.*

(i) *(Shadow property) We have*

$$(a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_2)|u^\perp = (K_1|u^\perp) \cap (K_2|u^\perp).$$

(ii) *(Commutativity) It holds that*

$$K_1 \oplus_{u,p} K_2 = K_2 \oplus_{u,p} K_1.$$

(iii) *(Associativity of sum) Let K_3 also be a convex body in \mathcal{K}_o^n . Then*

$$(K_1 \oplus_{u,p} K_2) \oplus_{u,p} K_3 = K_1 \oplus_{u,p} (K_2 \oplus_{u,p} K_3).$$

(iv) *(Associativity of dilation) It holds that*

$$(ab) \odot_{u,p} K = a \odot_{u,p} (b \odot_{u,p} K).$$

(v) *(Distributivity) We have*

$$a \odot_{u,p} (K_1 \oplus_{u,p} K_2) = a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} a \odot_{u,p} K_2$$

and

$$(a + b) \odot_{u,p} K_1 = a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_1.$$

(vi) *(Monotonicity) Let $L_1, L_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ be such that $K_1 \subset L_1$ and $K_2 \subset L_2$. Then for every $a, b > 0$, we have*

$$a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_2 \subset a \odot_{u,p} L_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} L_2.$$

Proof. Part (i) follows immediately from Definition 4.1. Property (ii) also follows directly from Definition 4.1 and the commutativity of the p -means (4.25): $M_p^{(a,b)}(s,t) = M_p^{(b,a)}(t,s)$. To prove (iii), note that for any $x' \in u^\perp$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\ell_{(K_1 \oplus_{u,p} K_2) \oplus_{u,p} K_3}(u; x') &= M_p^{(1,1)}(\ell_{K_1 \oplus_{u,p} K_2}(u; x'), \ell_{K_3}(u; x')) \\ &= M_p^{(1,1)}(\ell_{K_1}(u; x'), \ell_{K_2 \oplus_{u,p} K_3}(u; x')) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\ell_{K_1 \oplus_{u,p} (K_2 \oplus_{u,p} K_3)}(u; x'). \end{aligned}$$

Since x' was arbitrary and the L_p chord sum is symmetric about u^\perp , the claim follows.

To prove (iv), note that $ab \odot_u K = a \odot_u (b \odot_u K)$ and hence

$$(ab) \odot_{u,p} K = (ab)^{\frac{1}{p}} \odot_u K = a^{\frac{1}{p}} b^{\frac{1}{p}} \odot_u K = a^{\frac{1}{p}} \odot_u \left(b^{\frac{1}{p}} \odot_u K \right) = a \odot_{u,p} (b \odot_{u,p} K).$$

For $p = 0$, we have

$$\ell_{(ab) \circ_{0,u} K}(u; x') = \ell_K(u; x')^{ab} = (\ell_K(u; x')^b)^a = \ell_{b \circ_{0,u} K}(u; x')^a = \ell_{a \circ_{0,u} (b \circ_{0,u} K)}(u; x').$$

Now invoke the symmetry of the L_p chord combination about u^\perp . The cases $p = \pm\infty$ are trivial.

For (v), assume first that $p \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\ell_{a \odot_{u,p} (K_1 \oplus_{u,p} K_2)}(u; x') &= \frac{1}{2}a^{\frac{1}{p}}\ell_{K_1 \oplus_{u,p} K_2}(u; x') \\ &= a^{\frac{1}{p}}M_p^{(1,1)}(\ell_{K_1}(u; x'), \ell_{K_2}(u; x')) \\ &= M_p^{(a,a)}(\ell_{K_1}(u; x'), \ell_{K_2}(u; x')) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\ell_{a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} a \odot_{u,p} K_2}(u; x'). \end{aligned}$$

Now, using this relation and the symmetry of each L_p chord combination about u^\perp , we obtain the desired identity. The special cases $p = 0, \pm\infty$ follow along the same lines. The second identity in (v) is established in a similar way.

For (vi), since $K_i \subset L_i$, for every $x' \in u^\perp$ we have

$$\ell_{K_i}(u; x') \leq \ell_{L_i}(u; x') \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.$$

Hence, for all $a, b > 0$ and all $p \in [-\infty, +\infty]$, we have

$$M_p^{(a,b)}(\ell_{K_1}(u; x'), \ell_{K_2}(u; x')) \leq M_p^{(a,b)}(\ell_{L_1}(u; x'), \ell_{L_2}(u; x')).$$

The conclusion now follows from Definition 4.1. \square

The next result states that the L_p chord combination is a binary operation on \mathcal{K}_o^n when $0 < p \leq 1$.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $p \in (0, 1]$ and $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ be given. Then for all $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ with $K_1|_{u^\perp} = K_2|_{u^\perp}$ and all $a, b > 0$, we have $a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$.*

We will use the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ and $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. For any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and any $x_1, x_2 \in K|u^\perp$, we have*

$$(4.27) \quad \ell_K(u; \lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2) \geq \lambda \ell_K(u; x_1) + (1 - \lambda) \ell_K(u; x_2).$$

Proof. We begin by showing that for any $x_1, x_2 \in K|u^\perp$ and any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$(4.28) \quad K \cap [\lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2 + \mathbb{R}u] \supset \lambda [K \cap (x_1 + \mathbb{R}u)] + (1 - \lambda) [K \cap (x_2 + \mathbb{R}u)].$$

Let x be an element of the right-hand side of (4.28). Then $x = y + z$, where $y \in \lambda [K \cap (x_1 + \mathbb{R}u)]$ and $z \in (1 - \lambda) [K \cap (x_2 + \mathbb{R}u)]$. Hence $y = \lambda(x_1 + su)$ and $z = (1 - \lambda)(x_2 + tu)$ for some $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$, where $x_1 + su, x_2 + tu \in K$. Therefore,

$$x = y + z = \lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2 + [\lambda s + (1 - \lambda)t]u \in \lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2 + \mathbb{R}u,$$

and, since K is convex,

$$x = y + z = \lambda(x_1 + su) + (1 - \lambda)(x_2 + tu) \in K.$$

Thus, x is an element of the left-hand side of (4.28). This proves (4.28).

By (4.28), the monotonicity of vol_1 , the Brunn–Minkowski inequality, and the homogeneity of vol_1 , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_K(u; \lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2) &= \text{vol}_1(K \cap [\lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_2 + \mathbb{R}u]) \\ &\geq \text{vol}_1(\lambda [K \cap (x_1 + \mathbb{R}u)] + (1 - \lambda) [K \cap (x_2 + \mathbb{R}u)]) \\ &\geq \text{vol}_1(\lambda [K \cap (x_1 + \mathbb{R}u)]) + \text{vol}_1((1 - \lambda) [K \cap (x_2 + \mathbb{R}u)]) \\ &= \lambda \text{vol}_1(K \cap (x_1 + \mathbb{R}u)) + (1 - \lambda) \text{vol}_1(K \cap (x_2 + \mathbb{R}u)) \\ &= \lambda \ell_K(u; x_1) + (1 - \lambda) \ell_K(u; x_2). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 4.3. In view of the Heine–Borel theorem, it is clear that the compactness of K_1 and K_2 implies the compactness of $a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_2$. Moreover, the fact that K_1 and K_2 contain the origin in their interiors implies that $a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_2$ contains the origin in its interior. Thus, it remains to prove that $a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_2$ is convex when $p \in (0, 1]$.

Let $(x'_1, t_1), (x'_2, t_2) \in a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_2$. Then:

- (i) $x'_1, x'_2 \in K_1|u^\perp = K_2|u^\perp$;
- (ii) $-\frac{1}{2}M_p^{(a,b)}(\ell_{K_1}(u; x'_i), \ell_{K_2}(u; x'_i)) \leq t_i \leq \frac{1}{2}M_p^{(a,b)}(\ell_{K_1}(u; x'_i), \ell_{K_2}(u; x'_i)), i = 1, 2$.

Let $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ and consider the convex combination

$$\lambda(x'_1, t_1) + (1 - \lambda)(x'_2, t_2) = \underbrace{(\lambda x'_1 + (1 - \lambda)x'_2)}_{=:x'_\lambda}, \underbrace{\lambda t_1 + (1 - \lambda)t_2}_{=:t_\lambda} = (x'_\lambda, t_\lambda).$$

Then we have:

- (i)' By (i) and the convexity of $(K_1|u^\perp) \cap (K_2|u^\perp)$, we have $x'_\lambda \in (K_1|u^\perp) \cap (K_2|u^\perp) = K_i|u^\perp$ for $i = 1, 2$.

(ii)' Using (ii), Minkowski's inequality for sums and Lemma 4.1, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
t_\lambda &= \lambda t_1 + (1 - \lambda)t_2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \lambda M_p^{(a,b)}(\ell_{K_1}(u; x'_1), \ell_{K_2}(u; x'_1)) + \frac{1}{2} (1 - \lambda) M_p^{(a,b)}(\ell_{K_1}(u; x'_2), \ell_{K_2}(u; x'_2)) \\
&= \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} a^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda \ell_{K_1}(u; x'_1) \right)^p + \left(\frac{1}{2} b^{\frac{1}{p}} \lambda \ell_{K_2}(u; x'_1) \right)^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\quad + \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} a^{\frac{1}{p}} (1 - \lambda) \ell_{K_1}(u; x'_2) \right)^p + \left(\frac{1}{2} b^{\frac{1}{p}} (1 - \lambda) \ell_{K_2}(u; x'_2) \right)^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\leq \left[\frac{a}{2^p} (\lambda \ell_{K_1}(u; x'_1) + (1 - \lambda) \ell_{K_1}(u; x'_2))^p + \frac{b}{2^p} (\lambda \ell_{K_2}(u; x'_1) + (1 - \lambda) \ell_{K_2}(u; x'_2))^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} [a \ell_{K_1}(u; x'_\lambda)^p + b \ell_{K_2}(u; x'_\lambda)^p]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} M_p^{(a,b)}(\ell_{K_1}(u; x'_\lambda), \ell_{K_2}(u; x'_\lambda)).
\end{aligned}$$

The inequality $t_\lambda \geq -\frac{1}{2} M_p^{(a,b)}(\ell_{K_1}(u; x'_\lambda), \ell_{K_2}(u; x'_\lambda))$ is handled similarly.

By (i)' and (ii)', we have $(x'_\lambda, t_\lambda) \in a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_2$. The result follows. \square

Remark 4.1. If $p > 1$, then the L_p chord sum $K_1 \oplus_{u,p} K_2$ need not be convex. To illustrate, consider the following example in \mathbb{R}^2 . Let $K_1 = [-1, 1] \times [-1, 1]$ and $K_2 = \text{conv}\{\pm e_1, \pm e_2\}$. Then $K_1|e_2^\perp = K_2|e_2^\perp = \text{conv}\{\pm e_1\}$, which we write as $[-1, 1]$. For every $x' \in [0, 1]$, we have $\ell_{K_1}(e_2; x') = 2$ and $\ell_{K_2}(e_2; x') = 2(1 - x')$. For every $x' \in [-1, 0]$, we have $\ell_{K_1}(e_2; x') = 2$ and $\ell_{K_2}(e_2; x') = 2(1 + x')$. Thus, $K_1 \oplus_{e_2,p} K_2$ has overgraph

$$f_{K_1 \oplus_{e_2,p} K_2}(x') = \begin{cases} [1 + (1 - x')^p]^{1/p}, & \text{if } x' \in [0, 1]; \\ [1 + (1 + x')^p]^{1/p}, & \text{if } x' \in [-1, 0]. \end{cases}$$

Note that this function is not concave on $[-1, 1]$. Hence, in this example, $K_1 \oplus_{e_2,p} K_2$ is not convex if $p > 1$. This example also shows that if $p \neq 1$, then the L_p chord sum of two convex polytopes need not be a convex polytope.

4.2. Brunn–Minkowski-type inequalities for L_p chord sums of convex bodies. The main result of this section is the following Brunn–Minkowski-type inequality for L_p chord combinations of convex bodies.

Theorem 4.4. Let $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$, $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and $a, b > 0$. For $i = 1, 2$ and $x' \in (K_1|u^\perp) \cap (K_2|u^\perp)$, set $f_{u,i}(x') := \sup\{t \in \mathbb{R} : x' + tu \in K_i\}$, $g_{u,i}(x') := \inf\{t \in \mathbb{R} : x' + tu \in K_i\}$ and

$$\tilde{K}_i^u := \{(x', t) : x' \in (K_1|u^\perp) \cap (K_2|u^\perp), g_{u,i}(x') \leq t \leq f_{u,i}(x')\}.$$

(i) If $p \in (0, 1)$, then

$$\text{vol}_n(a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_2)^p \leq a \text{vol}_n(\tilde{K}_1^u)^p + b \text{vol}_n(\tilde{K}_2^u)^p$$

with equality if and only if $\tilde{K}_1^u = \frac{cb}{a} \odot_{u,p} \tilde{K}_2^u + tu$ for some constant $c > 0$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

(ii) If $p > 1$, then

$$\text{vol}_n(a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_2)^p \geq a \text{vol}_n(\tilde{K}_1^u)^p + b \text{vol}_n(\tilde{K}_2^u)^p$$

with equality if and only if $\tilde{K}_1^u = \frac{cb}{a} \odot_{u,p} \tilde{K}_2^u + tu$ for some constant $c > 0$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

(iii) If $p = 1$, then

$$\text{vol}_n(a \odot_u K_1 \oplus_u b \odot_u K_2) = a \text{vol}_n(\tilde{K}_1^u) + b \text{vol}_n(\tilde{K}_2^u).$$

Proof. (i) Let $p \in (0, 1)$. For $x' \in (K_1|u^\perp) \cap (K_2|u^\perp)$, set $\tilde{f}_u(x') := a\ell_{K_1}(u; x')^p$ and $\tilde{g}_u(x') := b\ell_{K_2}(u; x')^p$. Integrating along the chords orthogonal to u^\perp , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vol}(a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_2) &= \int_{(a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_2)|u^\perp} \ell_{a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_2}(u; x') dx' \\ &= \int_{(K_1|u^\perp) \cap (K_2|u^\perp)} (a\ell_{K_1}(u; x')^p + b\ell_{K_2}(u; x')^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} dx' \\ &= \int_{(K_1|u^\perp) \cap (K_2|u^\perp)} (\tilde{f}_u(x') + \tilde{g}_u(x'))^{\frac{1}{p}} dx' \\ &= \|\tilde{f}_u + \tilde{g}_u\|_{L_{\frac{1}{p}}}^{\frac{1}{p}} \end{aligned}$$

where $\|f\|_{L_{\frac{1}{p}}} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |f|^{\frac{1}{p}} dx \right)^p$ denotes the $L_{\frac{1}{p}}$ norm of a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Since $\frac{1}{p} \geq 1$, by Minkowski's integral inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{f}_u + \tilde{g}_u\|_{L_{\frac{1}{p}}}^{\frac{1}{p}} &\leq \left(\|\tilde{f}_u\|_{L_{\frac{1}{p}}} + \|\tilde{g}_u\|_{L_{\frac{1}{p}}} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= \left[\left(\int_{(K_1|u^\perp) \cap (K_2|u^\perp)} \tilde{f}_u(x')^{\frac{1}{p}} dx' \right)^p + \left(\int_{(K_1|u^\perp) \cap (K_2|u^\perp)} \tilde{g}_u(x')^{\frac{1}{p}} dx' \right)^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= \left[a \left(\int_{(K_1|u^\perp) \cap (K_2|u^\perp)} \ell_{K_1}(u; x') dx' \right)^p + b \left(\int_{(K_1|u^\perp) \cap (K_2|u^\perp)} \ell_{K_2}(u; x') dx' \right)^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= (a \text{vol}_n(\tilde{K}_1^u)^p + b \text{vol}_n(\tilde{K}_2^u)^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Equality holds in Minkowski's integral inequality if and only if \tilde{f}_u and \tilde{g}_u are proportional, i.e., if and only if $a\ell_{K_1}(u; x')^p = cb\ell_{K_2}(u; x')^p$ for all $x' \in (K_1|u^\perp) \cap (K_2|u^\perp)$ and some constant $c > 0$. This means that

$$\ell_{K_1}(u; x') = \frac{cb}{a} \odot_{u,p} \ell_{K_2}(u; x')$$

for all $x' \in (K_1|u^\perp) \cap (K_2|u^\perp)$ and some $c > 0$, which holds if and only if $\tilde{K}_1^u = \frac{cb}{a} \odot_{u,p} \tilde{K}_2^u + tu$ for some $c > 0$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

(ii) For $p > 1$, the same proof above holds with the inequalities reversed, and the same equality conditions hold there as well.

(iii) The case $p = 1$ follows from the definition of the L_1 chord sum and Cavalieri's principle. \square

The next result follows immediately from Theorem 4.4.

Corollary 4.1. *Let $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ and $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, and suppose that $K_1|_{u^\perp} = K_2|_{u^\perp}$.*

(i) *If $p \in (0, 1)$, then for all $a, b > 0$, we have*

$$(4.29) \quad \text{vol}_n(a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_2)^p \leq a \text{vol}_n(K_1)^p + b \text{vol}_n(K_2)^p$$

with equality if and only if $K_1 = \frac{cb}{a} \odot_{u,p} K_2 + tu$ for some constant $c > 0$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

(ii) *If $p > 1$, then for all $a, b > 0$, we have*

$$\text{vol}_n(a \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K_2)^p \geq a \text{vol}_n(K_1)^p + b \text{vol}_n(K_2)^p$$

with equality if and only if $K_1 = \frac{cb}{a} \odot_{u,p} K_2 + tu$ for some constant $c > 0$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

(iii) *If $p = 1$, then for all $a, b > 0$, we have*

$$\text{vol}_n(a \odot_u K_1 \oplus_u b \odot_u K_2) = a \text{vol}_n(K_1) + b \text{vol}_n(K_2).$$

Remark 4.2. *If $p = 0$, then for all $a, b > 0$, we have*

$$\text{vol}_n(a \odot_{u,0} K_1 \oplus_{u,0} b \odot_{u,0} K_2) \leq a \text{vol}_n(\tilde{K}_1^u) + b \text{vol}_n(\tilde{K}_2^u)$$

with equality if and only if $\tilde{K}_1^u = \tilde{K}_2^u$. This follows along the same lines as the proof of Theorem 4.4(i), but now we instead use the AM-GM inequality and its equality conditions.

Remark 4.3. *Let $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, $a, b > 0$, $p \in \mathbb{R}$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vol}_n(a \odot_{u,p} K \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K) &= \int_{(a \odot_{u,p} K \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K)|_{u^\perp}} \ell_{a \odot_{u,p} K \oplus_{u,p} b \odot_{u,p} K}(u; x') dx' \\ &= \int_{K|_{u^\perp}} (a \ell_K(u; x')^p + b \ell_K(u; x')^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} dx' \\ &= (a + b)^{\frac{1}{p}} \text{vol}_n(K). \end{aligned}$$

4.3. L_p chord mixed surface area and its Minkowski's first inequality. For $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, $p \in [-\infty, +\infty]$, and $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$, we define the L_p chord mixed surface area by

$$(4.30) \quad S_{u,p}^\oplus(K_1, K_2) := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\text{vol}_n(K_1 \oplus_{u,p} \varepsilon \odot_{u,p} K_2) - \text{vol}_n(K_1)}{\varepsilon}.$$

The Minkowski's first inequality for the L_p chord sum reads as follows.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}_o^n$ be such that $K_1|_{u^\perp} = K_2|_{u^\perp}$ for some $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Let $p \in (0, 1)$. Then*

$$(4.31) \quad S_{u,p}^\oplus(K_1, K_2) \leq \frac{1}{p} \cdot \text{vol}_n(K_1)^{1-p} \text{vol}_n(K_2)^p.$$

If $p > 1$, then the inequality in (4.31) is reversed. Equality holds if and only if $K_1 = c \odot_{u,p} K_2 + tu$ for some $c > 0$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. We again adapt the proof of the classical L_p Minkowski's inequality in [14, Theorem 7.2] to the setting of the L_p chord sum. Substituting $\varepsilon = t/(1-t)$ in (4.30), by Proposition 4.2(iv) and Remark 4.3,

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{u,p}^\oplus(K_1, K_2) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\text{vol}_n(K_1 \oplus_{u,p} \frac{t}{1-t} \odot_{u,p} K_2) - \text{vol}_n(K_1)}{t/(1-t)} \\
&= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\text{vol}_n(\frac{1}{1-t} \odot_{u,p} [(1-t) \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} t \odot_{u,p} K_2]) - \text{vol}_n(K_1)}{t/(1-t)} \\
&= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{(1-t)^{-1/p} \text{vol}_n((1-t) \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} t \odot_{u,p} K_2) - \text{vol}_n(K_1)}{t/(1-t)} \\
&= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\text{vol}_n((1-t) \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} t \odot_{u,p} K_2) - (1-t)^{1/p} \text{vol}_n(K_1)}{t(1-t)^{\frac{1-p}{p}}} \\
&= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\text{vol}_n((1-t) \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} t \odot_{u,p} K_2) - \text{vol}_n(K_1)}{t} + \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{[1 - (1-t)^{1/p}] \text{vol}_n(K_1)}{t} \\
&= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\text{vol}_n((1-t) \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} t \odot_{u,p} K_2) - \text{vol}_n(K_1)}{t} + \frac{\text{vol}_n(K_1)}{p}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now consider the function $f_p : [0, 1] \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ defined by $f_p(t) := g_p(t)^p$, where $g_p(t) := \text{vol}_n((1-t) \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} t \odot_{u,p} K_2)$. The preceding computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
f_p'(0) &= \frac{d^+}{dt} [g_p(t)^p]_{t=0} \\
&= p \text{vol}_n(K_1)^{p-1} \cdot \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\text{vol}_n((1-t) \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} t \odot_{u,p} K_2) - \text{vol}_n(K_1)}{t} \\
&= p \text{vol}_n(K_1)^{p-1} \left[S_{u,p}^\oplus(K_1, K_2) - \frac{\text{vol}_n(K_1)}{p} \right] \\
&= \frac{p S_{u,p}^\oplus(K_1, K_2) - \text{vol}_n(K_1)}{\text{vol}_n(K_1)^{1-p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the desired inequality (4.31) is equivalent to $f_p'(0) \leq f_p(1) - f_p(0)$. Note that

$$f_p(1) = \text{vol}_n(0 \odot_{u,p} K_1 \oplus_{u,p} 1 \odot_{u,p} K_2)^p = \text{vol}_n(S_u(K_2))^p = \text{vol}_n(K_2)^p,$$

and similarly $f_p(0) = \text{vol}_n(K_1)^p$. Now Corollary 4.1 says that $f_p(t)$ is convex, and by Remark 4.3,

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{u,p}^\oplus(K_1, K_1) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\text{vol}_n(K_1 \oplus_{u,p} \varepsilon \odot_{u,p} K_1) - \text{vol}_n(K_1)}{\varepsilon} \\
&= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\left[(1+\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{p}} - 1 \right] \text{vol}_n(K_1)}{\varepsilon} \\
&= \frac{\text{vol}_n(K_1)}{p}.
\end{aligned}$$

The desired inequality (4.31) follows.

Now suppose that equality holds in (4.31). Then by the preceding remarks, $f'_p(0) = f_p(1) - f_p(0)$. Since f_p is convex,

$$\forall t \in (0, 1], \quad \frac{f_p(t) - f_p(0)}{t} = f_p(1) - f_p(0).$$

This is the equality in (4.29). Therefore, the equality conditions in (4.31) are the same as those in (4.29).

The inequality in the case $p > 1$ follows in the same way (with the same equality conditions), but now we use Corollary 4.1(ii) instead. \square

Acknowledgments. We are grateful to Dylan Langharst for the discussions on the topic of this paper. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-1929284 while the authors were in residence at the Institute for Computational and Experimental Research in Mathematics in Providence, RI, during the Harmonic Analysis and Convexity program.

REFERENCES

- [1] Field Theory/The real numbers. https://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Field_Theory/The_real_numbers, Nov. 6, 2017. [Online; accessed 11-February-2025].
- [2] S. Alesker. Continuous rotation invariant valuations on convex sets. *Annals of Mathematics*, 149:977–1005, 1999.
- [3] S. Alesker. Description of translation invariant valuations on convex sets with a solution of P. McMullen’s conjecture. *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA*, 11:244–272, 2001.
- [4] G. Bianchi, R. J. Gardner, and P. Gronchi. Symmetrization in geometry. *Advances in Mathematics*, 306:51–88, 2017.
- [5] G. Bianchi and P. Gronchi. Symmetrizations. In A. Colesanti and M. Ludwig, editors, *Convex Geometry: Cetraro, Italy 2021*, volume 2332 of *Lectures Notes in Mathematics*, chapter 5, pages 233–292. Springer, Cham, 1 edition, 2023.
- [6] W. Blaschke. *Vorlesungen über Differentialgeometrie II, Affine Differentialgeometrie*. Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1923.
- [7] K. J. Böröczky. Approximation of general smooth convex bodies. *Advances in Mathematics*, 153(2):325–341, 2000.
- [8] K. J. Böröczky, E. Lutwak, D. Yang, and G. Zhang. The log-Brunn–Minkowski inequality. *Advances in Mathematics*, 231:1974–1997, 2012.
- [9] K. J. Böröczky, J. P. G. Ramos, and A. Figalli. *The Isoperimetric inequality, the Brunn–Minkowski theory and Minkowski type Monge–Ampère equations on the sphere*. 2024.
- [10] U. Caglar and D. Ye. Affine isoperimetric inequalities in the functional Orlicz–Brunn–Minkowski theory. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 81:78–114, 2016.
- [11] S. Campi and P. Gronchi. The L_p -Busemann–Petty centroid inequality. *Advances in Mathematics*, 167(1):128–141, 2002.
- [12] S. Chen, Y. Huang, Q. Li, and J. Liu. The L_p -Brunn–Minkowski inequality for $p < 1$. *Advances in Mathematics*, 368:107166, 2020.
- [13] W. J. Firey. p -means of convex bodies. *Mathematica Scandinavica*, 10:17–24, 1962.
- [14] R. J. Gardner. The Brunn–Minkowski Inequality. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 39(3):355–405, 2002.

- [15] R. J. Gardner, D. Hug, and W. Weil. Operations between sets in geometry. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society (JEMS)*, 15:2297–2352, 2013.
- [16] R. J. Gardner and G. Zhang. Affine inequalities and radial mean bodies. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 120:505–528, 1998.
- [17] S. Glasauer and P. M. Gruber. Asymptotic estimates for best and stepwise approximation of convex bodies III. *Forum Mathematicum*, 9:383–404, 1997.
- [18] C. Haberl. L_p intersection bodies. *Advances in Mathematics*, 217:2599–2624, 2008.
- [19] C. Haberl and F. Schuster. General L_p affine isoperimetric inequalities. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 83:1–26, 2009.
- [20] J. Haddad, D. Langharst, E. Putterman, M. Roysdon, and D. Ye. Affine Isoperimetric Inequalities for Higher-Order Projection and Centroid Bodies. *arXiv:2304.07859*, 2023.
- [21] J. Haddad, D. Langharst, E. Putterman, M. Roysdon, and D. Ye. Higher-order L_p isoperimetric and Sobolev inequalities. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 288(2):110722, 2025.
- [22] S. Hoehner. Extremal general affine surface areas. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 505(2):Article 125506, 2022.
- [23] D. Hug. Contributions to Affine Surface Area. *Manuscripta Mathematica*, 91:283–301, 1996.
- [24] Jenkinson J. and Werner E. Relative entropies for convex bodies. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 366:2889–2906, 2014.
- [25] K. Leichtweiss. Zur Affinoberfläche konvexer Körper. *Manuscripta Mathematica*, 56:429–464, 1986.
- [26] M. Ludwig. Asymptotic approximation of smooth convex bodies by general polytopes. *Mathematika*, 46:103–125, 1999.
- [27] M. Ludwig. General affine surface areas. *Advances in Mathematics*, 224:2346–2360, 2010.
- [28] M. Ludwig and M. Reitzner. A characterization of affine surface area. *Advances in Mathematics*, 147:138–172, 1999.
- [29] E. Lutwak. The Brunn–Minkowski–Firey theory I: Mixed volumes and the Minkowski problem. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 38:131–150, 1993.
- [30] E. Lutwak. The Brunn–Minkowski–Firey theory II: Affine and geominimal surface areas. *Advances in Mathematics*, 118:244–294, 1996.
- [31] E. Lutwak, D. Yang, and G. Zhang. L_p affine isoperimetric inequalities. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 56(1):111–132, 2000.
- [32] E. Lutwak, D. Yang, and G. Zhang. Sharp affine L_p Sobolev inequalities. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 62(1):17–38, 2002.
- [33] E. Lutwak, D. Yang, and G. Zhang. On the L_p -Minkowski problem. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 356(11):4359–4370, 2004.
- [34] E. Lutwak, D. Yang, and G. Zhang. The Brunn–Minkowski–Firey inequality for non-convex sets. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 48:407–413, 2019.
- [35] P. McMullen. New combinations of convex sets. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 78(1):1–19, 1999.
- [36] M. Meyer and E. Werner. On the p -affine surface area. *Advances in Mathematics*, 152:288–313, 2000.
- [37] G. Paouris and E. Werner. Relative entropy of cone measures and L_p centroid bodies. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 104:253–286, 2012.
- [38] E. Putterman. Equivalence of the local and global versions of the L_p -Brunn–Minkowski inequality. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 280(9):108956, 2021.
- [39] C. Saroglou. Remarks on the conjectured log-Brunn–Minkowski inequality. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 177:353–365, 2015.
- [40] R. Schneider. *Convex Bodies: The Brunn–Minkowski Theory*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 2 edition, 2013.
- [41] C. Schütt and E. Werner. Surface bodies and p -affine surface area. *Advances in Mathematics*, 187:98–145, 2004.

- [42] N. S. Trudinger and X. Wang. The affine plateau problem. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 18(2):253–289, 2004.
- [43] J. Ulivelli. Convergence properties of symmetrization processes. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 146:102484, 2023.
- [44] W. Weidong and L. Gangsong. L_p -mixed affine surface area. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 335:341–354, 2007.
- [45] E. Werner. Rényi divergence and L_p -affine surface area for convex bodies. *Advances in Mathematics*, 230:1040–1059, 2012.
- [46] E. Werner and D. Ye. New L_p affine isoperimetric inequalities. *Advances in Mathematics*, 218(3):762–780, 2008.
- [47] E. Werner and D. Ye. Inequalities for mixed p -affine surface area. *Mathematische Annalen*, 347(3):703–737, 2010.
- [48] D. Ye. Inequalities for general mixed affine surface areas. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 85:101–120, 2012.
- [49] D. Ye. On the monotone properties of general affine surfaces under the Steiner symmetrization. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 14:1–19, 2014.
- [50] D. Ye. New Orlicz affine isoperimetric inequalities. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 427:905–929, 2015.
- [51] D. Ye. Dual Orlicz–Brunn–Minkowski theory: dual Orlicz L_ϕ affine and geominimal surface areas. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 443:352–371, 2016.
- [52] G. Zhang. New Affine Isoperimetric Inequalities. *International Congress of Chinese Mathematicians (ICCM)*, 2:239–267, 2007.

Steven Hoehner, hoehnersd@longwood.edu

Department of Mathematics & Computer Science, Longwood University, Farmville, Virginia 23909

Sudan Xing, sudanxing333@gmail.com

Department of Mathematics & Statistics, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, Little Rock, Arkansas 72204