

## ON THE POLAR OF SCHNEIDER'S DIFFERENCE BODY

JULIÁN HADDAD, DYLAN LANGHARST,  
GALYNA V. LIVSHYTS, AND ELI PUTTERMAN

ABSTRACT. In 1970, Schneider introduced the  $m$ th-order extension of the difference body  $DK$  of a convex body  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , the convex body  $D^m(K)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{nm}$ . He conjectured that its volume is minimized for ellipsoids when the volume of  $K$  is fixed. In this note we solve a dual version of this problem: we show that the volume of the polar body of  $D^m(K)$  is maximized precisely by ellipsoids. For  $m = 1$  this recovers the symmetric case of the celebrated Blaschke-Santaló inequality. We also show that Schneider's conjecture cannot be tackled using standard symmetrization techniques, contrary to this new inequality. As an application of our results, we prove Schneider's conjecture asymptotically à la Bourgain-Milman. We also consider a functional version.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Given a convex body  $K$  (a compact, convex set with non-empty interior) in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , one has the re-knowned Rogers-Shephard inequality [37]:

$$|DK|_n |K|_n^{-1} \leq \binom{2n}{n},$$

with equality if and only if  $K$  is an  $n$ -dimensional simplex. Here,

$$DK = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : K \cap (K + x) \neq \emptyset\} = K + (-K)$$

is the difference body of  $K$ ,  $A + B = \{a + b : a \in A, b \in B\}$  is the Minkowski sum of sets  $A$  and  $B$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $|\cdot|_n$  denotes the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

For  $m \geq 1$ , R. Schneider introduced in [41] an  $m$ th-order analogue of this inequality. Firstly, he defined the  $m$ th-order difference body  $D^m(K) \subset \mathbb{R}^{nm}$  as

$$D^m(K) = \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^m : K \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^m (K + x_i) \neq \emptyset \right\}.$$

Then, he showed the following generalization of the Rogers-Shephard inequality:

$$(1) \quad |D^m(K)|_{nm} |K|_n^{-m} \leq \binom{nm+n}{n},$$

---

MSC 2020 Classification: 52A40; Secondary: 28A75. Keywords: Schneider's conjecture, Blaschke-Santaló inequality, polarity.

again with equality if and only if  $K$  is an  $n$ -dimensional simplex. Recently, M. Roysdon [39] established a generalization of (1) involving measures that have radially decreasing density.

We recall that  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is said to be origin-symmetric if  $A = -A$ , and merely symmetric if a translate of  $A$  is origin-symmetric. It is natural to ask, what is the sharp lower-bound of  $|D^m(K)|_{nm}$  among convex bodies with the same volume? If  $m = 1$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , or  $n = 2$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , then the lower-bound is obtained by all symmetric convex bodies. For the range  $n \geq 3$  and  $m \geq 2$ , this is not the case. Schneider's conjecture states that the lower-bound is attained by ellipsoids for  $n$  and  $m$  in this range.

A common method of proving isoperimetric-type inequalities, with an extremizer being a ball, is by using the technique of Steiner symmetrization. In this note, we study how one may apply Steiner symmetrization in a few of its guises to tackle Schneider's conjecture. The takeaway is that most of the well-known variants of Steiner symmetrization, including a more recent one called fiber symmetrization, cannot be used to prove Schneider's conjecture. However, we are able to use these techniques to solve a problem that is dual to Schneider's conjecture.

Our main result is the following inequality, which we call the Polar Schneider inequality, as it is the dual counterpart to Schneider's conjectured inequality. We recall that the polar of a convex body  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  containing the origin is given by

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

We introduce the notation:  $D^{m,\circ}(K) = (D^m(K))^\circ$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Fix  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  be a convex body. Then,*

$$|D^{m,\circ}(K)|_{nm} |K|_n^m \leq |D^{m,\circ}(B_2^n)|_{nm} |B_2^n|_n^m,$$

*with equality if and only if  $K$  is an ellipsoid.*

Here,  $B_2^n$  denotes the centered unit Euclidean ball; note that  $D^m(B_2^n)$  is not a dilate of  $B_2^{nm}$  when  $m > 1$ . Since  $DK = 2K$  for an origin-symmetric convex body, the  $m = 1$  case of Theorem 1 for such bodies implies the origin-symmetric case of the famous Blaschke-Santaló inequality (see e.g. the survey [15]): for any convex body  $K$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $K$  or  $K^\circ$  has center of mass at the origin, it holds

$$(2) \quad |K|_n |K^\circ|_n \leq |B_2^n|_n^2,$$

with equality if and only if  $K$  is a centered ellipsoid. We remark that there exists a unique  $s(K) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , known as the Santaló point of  $K$ , so that  $(K - s(K))^\circ$  has center of mass at the origin. Conversely, one may note that

$$(3) \quad |(DK)^\circ|_n \leq 2^{-n} |K^\circ|_n,$$

which follows from writing

$$(DK)^\circ = ((K^\circ)^\circ + (-K^\circ)^\circ)^\circ$$

and using the dual-Brunn-Minkowski inequality (cf [16, Eq (85)]). Combining (2) and (3) then yields the  $m = 1$  case of Theorem 1.

We prove Theorem 1 using the Rogers-Brascamp-Lieb-Luttinger inequality in Section 2. We will supply two additional proofs of Theorem 1 in the case of origin-symmetric  $K$  that are of independent interest. For example, in the second proof we will use shadow systems, whose definition we save for Section 2.2. For the third proof, which is the content of Section 2.3, we use an analogue of Steiner symmetrization called fiber symmetrization. This symmetrization has been explored recently in [18, 17, 19]. It is part of a larger framework introduced by P. McMullen [28], Bianchi-Gardner-Gronchi [5] and J. Ulivelli [44].

As an application of our results, we establish the following Bourgain-Milman-type inequalities for Schneider's conjecture in Section 3. To make sense of the result, note that, for  $m \geq 2$ ,  $D^m(K)$  is origin-symmetric if and only if  $K$  is symmetric. Also, if  $K$  is a zonoid (see (25) below for the definition), then so too is  $D^m(K)$ . Both observations follow from (12) below.

**Theorem 2.** *Fix  $n \geq 3, m \geq 2$ . Let  $K$  be a convex body in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Then, the inequality*

$$\left( \frac{|D^m(K)|_{nm} |K|_n^{-m}}{|D^m(B_2^n)|_{nm} |B_2^n|_n^{-m}} \right)^{\frac{1}{nm}} \geq c (\pi nm)^{\frac{1}{nm}}$$

holds with  $c = \frac{1}{4}$  in general and with  $c = \frac{1}{2}$  when  $K$  is symmetric. Furthermore, if  $K$  is a zonoid, then we have the inequality

$$\left( \frac{|D^m(K)|_{nm} |K|_n^{-m}}{|D^m(B_2^n)|_{nm} |B_2^n|_n^{-m}} \right)^{\frac{1}{nm}} \geq \left( \frac{2}{\pi} \right) \left( \frac{nm\pi}{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2nm}} e^{-\frac{1}{12(nm)^2}}.$$

Besides the recent articles [42, 41, 22, 24, 21, 23, 46], exploring Schneider's conjecture and the framework he introduced, there is a deep connection between the conjecture and a celebrated conjecture of Petty. Recall that the support function of a convex body  $L$  is given by  $h_L(u) = \sup_{y \in L} \langle u, y \rangle$ . In fact, if  $L$  contains the origin in its interior, then  $h_L$  is a (pseudo)-norm whose unit ball is  $L^\circ$ .

For  $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , the unit sphere, let  $u^\perp = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, u \rangle = 0\}$  denote the hyperplane through the origin orthogonal to  $u$ , and let  $P_{u^\perp}K$  denote the orthogonal projection of a convex body  $K$  onto  $u^\perp$ . Cauchy showed that there exists an origin-symmetric convex body, called the projection body  $\Pi K$  of  $K$ , whose support function satisfies  $h_{\Pi K}(u) = |P_{u^\perp}K|_{n-1}$ . If  $K$  is a planar convex body, then one has

$$4 \leq P_2(K) := \frac{|\Pi K|_2}{|K|_2} \leq 6,$$

with equality on the left-hand side when  $K$  is symmetric, and equality on the right-hand side when  $K$  is a triangle.

Thus, like in the case of Schneider's conjecture for bounding  $|D^m(K)|_{nm}$  from below, bounds on  $|\Pi K|_n$  are only meaningful when  $n \geq 3$ . For  $n \geq 3$ , Petty's conjecture is precisely that the *Petty product of  $K$*

$$P_n(K) := \frac{|\Pi K|_n}{|K|_n^{n-1}}$$

is minimized by ellipsoids [31]. We remark that sharp lower-and-upper bounds for the volume of  $\Pi^\circ K = (\Pi K)^\circ$ , the polar projection body of  $K$ , are now classical; see [47, 30, 31].

It will be shown in the forthcoming work by the last named author [32] (it is also indirectly implied by [42, Eq. 18]) that, for any symmetric convex body  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  and  $m \geq 2$ , one has the relation

$$(4) \quad |D^m(K)|_{3m} = |K|_n^m \left( 21 + \frac{3}{4} \frac{|\Pi K|_3}{|K|_3^2} \right).$$

Similar expressions hold for  $n \geq 3$ , but there are additional terms in the summation. This formula connects Schneider's conjectured inequality for  $D^m(K)$  and Petty's conjectured inequality for  $\Pi K$ .

With this connection in hand, we immediately obtain the following. Another conjecture of R. Schneider is that, among symmetric convex bodies, the maximum of  $P_n(K)$  is  $2^n$ , with equality if and only if  $K$  is the affine image of Cartesian products of line segments or centrally symmetric planar convex figures. This was shown to be false by Brannen [7]. However, he conjectured it was true for the class of zonoids. Saroglou verified this conjecture when  $n = 3$  (see [40]). Thus, from (4), the verification of the Brannen-Schneider conjecture by Saroglou immediately implies the following.

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $Z$  be a zonoid in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Then, for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , one has*

$$(5) \quad |Z|_3^{-m} |D^m(Z)|_{3m} \leq |Q_3|_3^{-m} |D^m(Q_3)|_{3m}.$$

*Equality holds if and only if  $Z$  can be written as the Minkowski sum of five line segments or as the sum of a cylinder and a line segment.*

Finally, in Section 4, we establish a functional version of Theorem 1. For a non-identically zero function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ , its polar is given by

$$(6) \quad f^\circ(x) = \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{e^{-\langle x, y \rangle}}{f(y)}.$$

For a convex body  $K$  containing the origin, one has that

$$(7) \quad [e^{-\|\cdot\|_K^2/2}]^\circ(x) = e^{-\|x\|_{K^\circ}^2/2}, \quad \text{and} \quad 1_K^\circ(x) = e^{-\|x\|_{K^\circ}}.$$

Here,  $\|x\|_K = \inf\{t > 0 : x \in tK\}$  is the *gauge function* of  $K$ , and one has  $h_K = \|\cdot\|_{K^\circ}$ . Also,  $1_K$  is the usual characteristic function of  $K$ :  $1_K(x) = 1$  if  $x \in K$  and zero otherwise.

K. Ball [3] extended the Blaschke-Santaló inequality to even, integrable, log-concave functions. We recall that a function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$  is log-concave if for every  $x, y$  such that  $f(x)f(y) > 0$ , it holds

$$f((1 - \lambda)x + \lambda y) \geq f(x)^{1-\lambda} f(y)^\lambda.$$

Regardless of the choice of  $f$ , one has that  $f^\circ$  is log-concave. Since  $f^{\circ\circ} = f^\circ$  and  $f \leq f^{\circ\circ}$ , with equality when  $f$  is log-concave and upper-semicontinuous, K. Ball's extension handles all even, integrable functions.

In the seminal work [1], S. Artstein, B. Klartag and V. Milman formally introduced the definition of polarity of a function and extended K. Ball's result to integrable functions; a major hurdle was handling how to shift a function so that the integral of its polar function is finite. For a non-identically zero function  $f$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , if either  $f$  or  $f^\circ$  has center of mass at the origin, then

$$(8) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f^\circ(x) dx \leq (2\pi)^n,$$

with equality if and only if  $f$  is Gaussian. To elucidate how one can modify  $f$  so that  $f^\circ$  has center of mass at the origin, it was shown by Lehec [25] that there exists a unique  $s(f) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the so-called Santaló point of  $f$ , so that  $(\tau_{s(f)} f)^\circ$  has center of mass at the origin, where  $\tau_z f(x) = f(x - z)$ .

In the same spirit, we establish a functional version of Theorem 1 in Section 4.

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  be an integrable function such that either  $f$  or  $f^\circ$  has center of mass at the origin. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f^{\frac{m+1}{m}} \right)^m \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^m f^\circ(x_i) \right) \left( f^\circ \left( -\sum_{i=1}^m x_i \right) \right) dx \\ & \leq \left( \frac{2\pi m}{m+1} \right)^{\frac{mn}{2}} \left( \frac{2\pi}{(m+1)^{\frac{1}{m}}} \right)^{\frac{nm}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

with equality if and only if there exists an  $n \times n$  positive-definite symmetric matrix  $A$  and a constant  $c > 0$  such that  $f(x) = ce^{-\frac{1}{2}\langle Ax, x \rangle}$ .

When  $m = 1$ , one obtains from Theorem 4 that

$$(9) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x)^2 dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f^\circ(x) f^\circ(-x) dx \leq \pi^n.$$

Inequality (9) implies (8) for log-concave, even functions. Let  $g$  be a log-concave function and set in (9)  $f = \sqrt{g}$ . Notice that  $\sqrt{g}$  and  $(\sqrt{g})^\circ$  will also be even. It then follows from the definition (6) that for such  $g$  one has  $(\sqrt{g})^\circ(x)^2 \geq g^\circ(2x)$ ; this estimate and a variable substitution then yields (8) from (9).

We compare Theorem 1 and Theorem 4 in Section 4.2. We conclude this work by using Theorem 4 to establish a Poincaré-type inequality in Section 4.3.

## 2. THE POLAR SCHNEIDER INEQUALITY

In the work [41], R. Schneider in fact considered a generalization of  $D^m(K)$  to  $(m + 1)$  convex bodies. Let  $\mathcal{K} = (K_0, K_1, \dots, K_m)$  be a collection of  $(m + 1)$  convex bodies in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Then, their  $m$ th-order difference body is the set

$$(10) \quad D^m(\mathcal{K}) = \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^m : K_0 \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^m (K_i + x_i) \neq \emptyset \right\}.$$

Then, he showed the Rogers-Shephard inequality for the collection  $\mathcal{K}$ :

$$\frac{|D^m(\mathcal{K})|_{nm} |\bigcap_{i=0}^m K_i|_n}{\prod_{i=0}^m |K_i|_n} \leq \binom{nm + n}{n}.$$

We will work in this more general setting. We first need to determine the support function of  $D^m(\mathcal{K})$ . We define the diagonal embedding  $\Delta_m : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{nm}$  by  $\Delta_m(x) = (x, \dots, x)$ .

**Proposition 5.** *Fix  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $K_0, K_1, \dots, K_m \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be convex bodies, and define the collection  $\mathcal{K} = (K_0, K_1, \dots, K_m)$ . Then, the support function of  $D^m(\mathcal{K})$  is given by*

$$(11) \quad h_{D^m(\mathcal{K})}((\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m)) = \sum_{i=1}^m h_{K_i}(\theta_i) + h_{K_0} \left( -\sum_{i=1}^m \theta_i \right).$$

*Proof.* Set for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ ,

$$\mathbf{K}_i = \{o\} \times \dots \times K_i \times \dots \times \{o\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{nm}$$

where  $K_i$  is in the  $i$ th copy of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  in the decomposition of  $\mathbb{R}^{nm}$  as  $m$  direct products of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We claim that

$$(12) \quad D^m(\mathcal{K}) = \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{K}_i + \Delta_m(-K_0).$$

Since for any convex body  $L \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$h_{\Delta_m L}((\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m)) = h_L \left( \sum_{i=1}^m \theta_i \right),$$

formula (11) immediately follows from (12).

As for (12), an  $m$ -tuple of vectors  $(x_1, \dots, x_m) \in D^m(\mathcal{K})$  if and only if there exists  $z_0 \in K_0 \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^m (K_i + x_i)$ . Therefore, there exists  $z_i \in K_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m$  such that  $z_0 = z_i + x_i$ . Solving for  $x_i$ , we have  $x_i = z_i - z_0$ . Thus,

$$(x_1, \dots, x_m) = (z_1, \dots, z_m) + (-z_0, \dots, -z_0) \in \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{K}_i + \Delta_m(-K_0).$$

The converse is similar and the claim follows.  $\square$

**2.1. Proof of Theorem 1 using the Rogers-Brascamp-Lieb-Luttinger inequality.** In the following theorem, we establish the Polar Schneider inequality for a collection  $\mathcal{K}$ .

**Theorem 6.** *Fix  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $K_0, K_1, \dots, K_m \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be  $(m+1)$  convex bodies with center of mass at the origin, under the constraint that  $|K_i^\circ|_n = |K_0^\circ|_n$  for all  $i$ . Define the collection  $\mathcal{K} = (K_0, K_1, \dots, K_m)$ . Then,*

$$|D^{m,\circ}(\mathcal{K})|_{nm} \prod_{i=1}^m |K_i|_n \leq |B_2^n|_n^m |D^{m,\circ}(B_2^n)|_{nm}.$$

*A necessary condition for equality is that each  $K_i$  is a centered ellipsoid, and a sufficient condition is when each  $K_i$  is the same centered ellipsoid.*

As one can see, there is a slight gap between the necessary and sufficient conditions for equality. This is because of the complicated nature of the equality conditions for the Rogers-Brascamp-Lieb-Luttinger inequality; we do not know if there is equality in Theorem 6 when all the  $K_i$  are centered ellipsoids, but at least one of them is different than the others.

As an operator on convex bodies,  $D^m$  is 1-homogeneous, i.e. for every  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , one has that  $D^m(tK) = tD^m(K)$ . However, as an operator on collections  $\mathcal{K}$  of  $(m+1)$  convex bodies, the homogeneity only holds if we dilate each  $K_i \in \mathcal{K}$  by the same factor  $t$ . Therefore, the requirement  $|K_i^\circ|_n = |K_0^\circ|_n$  in Theorem 6 should be viewed as a homogeneity constraint. We now show how Theorem 6 implies Theorem 1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.* First observe that  $D^m(K+x) = D^m(K)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . We may therefore assume that  $K$  has center of mass at the origin. Then, the claim of the inequality is immediate from Theorem 6 by setting  $K_i = K$  for all  $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$ . For the equality characterization, we simply note that when all the  $K_i$  are the same, there is equality in Theorem 6 if and only if  $K$  is an ellipsoid.  $\square$

We will establish a stronger version of Theorem 6. We say a function is quasi-concave if its superlevel sets

$$\{f \geq t\} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(x) \geq t\}$$

are convex. We recall that the Steiner symmetrization of a quasi-concave function is precisely

$$f^{(v)}(x) = \int_0^\infty 1_{S_v\{f \geq t\}}(t) dt,$$

where  $S_v K$  is the Steiner-symmetrization of a convex set  $K$  in the direction  $v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ . We suppress the definition of  $S_v K$ , as we will not explicitly use it, but it can be inferred by setting  $m = 1$  in (21) below. It is well known that Steiner symmetrization preserves volume, i.e.  $|S_u K|_n = |K|_n$ , and there exists a sequence of directions  $\{u_i\}$  such that, if  $S_1 K = S_{u_1} K$  and  $S_{i+1} K = S_{u_{i+1}}(S_i K)$ , then  $S_i K$  converges in the Hausdorff metric to the

centered Euclidean ball with the same volume as  $K$  (see e.g. [45, Theorem 6.6.5]).

The following inequality was shown independently by Rogers [36] and Brascamp, Lieb and Luttinger [9].

**Proposition 7.** *Let  $k, m \geq 1$  and  $f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , be nonnegative and measurable functions, and let  $a_j^{(i)}$  be real numbers with  $1 \leq j \leq m, 1 \leq i \leq k$ . Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \prod_{i=1}^k f_i \left( \sum_{j=1}^m a_j^{(i)} x_j \right) dx_1 \dots dx_m \\ \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_i^{(v)} \left( \sum_{j=1}^m a_j^{(i)} x_j \right) dx_1 \dots dx_m. \end{aligned}$$

This proposition says, upon iteration, that the quantity on the left-hand side is maximized when one replaces the superlevel sets of each  $f_i$  with centered Euclidean balls of the same volume.

We will need the following rudimentary fact. Recall that a measure  $\mu$  has density if there exists a locally integrable, nonnegative function  $\varphi$  such that  $\frac{d\mu(x)}{dx} = \varphi(x)$ . We say a nonnegative function  $\varphi$  is  $q$ -homogeneous,  $q \in \mathbb{R}$ , if  $\varphi(tx) = t^q \varphi(x)$  for  $t > 0$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{o\}$ .

**Proposition 8.** *Let  $L \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  be a convex body containing the origin in its interior. Let  $\mu$  be a Borel measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with  $q$ -homogeneous density. Then, for every  $p > 0$ , one has*

$$(13) \quad \mu(L) = \frac{1}{p^{\frac{q+d}{p}} \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{q+d}{p}\right)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\frac{\|x\|_L^p}{p}} d\mu(x).$$

In particular, applying this to  $L^\circ$ , one has

$$(14) \quad \mu(L^\circ) = \frac{1}{p^{\frac{q+d}{p}} \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{q+d}{p}\right)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\frac{h_L(x)^p}{p}} d\mu(x).$$

*Proof.* Observe that, since  $\mu$  has  $q$ -homogeneous density  $\varphi$ , then  $\mu$  is  $(q+d)$ -homogeneous. Indeed, for a Borel set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $t > 0$ , we have

$$\mu(tA) = \int_{tA} \varphi(x) dx = t^d \int_A \varphi(tx) dx = t^{d+q} \int_A \varphi(x) dx = t^{d+q} \mu(A).$$



Then, one has from Fubini's theorem

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\frac{\|x\|_L^p}{p}} d\mu(x) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\frac{\|x\|_L^p}{p}}^{\infty} e^{-t} d\mu(x) \\
&= \int_0^{\infty} \mu\left(\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \frac{\|x\|_L^p}{p} \leq t\right\}\right) e^{-t} dt \\
&= \int_0^{\infty} \mu\left((pt)^{\frac{1}{p}} L\right) e^{-t} dt = \mu(L) p^{\frac{q+d}{p}} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-t} t^{\frac{q+d}{p}} dt \\
&= \mu(L) p^{\frac{q+d}{p}} \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{q+d}{p}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

This establishes (13). The equation (14) follows by replacing  $L$  with  $L^\circ$  and using that  $\|\cdot\|_{L^\circ} = h_L$ .  $\square$

We now prove a more general version of Theorem 6, where we are able to allow the weight  $\prod_{i=1}^m |x_i|^{-q}$  on  $D^{m,\circ}(\mathcal{K})$ . We have to restrict to  $q \in [0, n)$  for integrability. We note that the function  $x \mapsto |x|^{-q}$  is invariant under Steiner symmetrization.

**Lemma 9.** *Fix  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $K_0, K_1, \dots, K_m \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be  $(m+1)$  convex bodies with center of mass at the origin, under the constraint that  $|K_i^\circ|_n = |K_0^\circ|_n$  for all  $i$ . Define the collection  $\mathcal{K} = (K_0, K_1, \dots, K_m)$ . Fix  $q \in [0, n)$  and let  $\mu$  be the Borel measure on  $\mathbb{R}^{nm}$  with density  $(x_1, \dots, x_m) \mapsto \prod_{i=1}^m |x_i|^{-q}$ . Then, one has*

$$\mu(D^{m,\circ}(\mathcal{K})) \prod_{i=1}^m |K_i|_n^{1-\frac{q}{n}} \leq |B_2^n|_n^{m(1-\frac{q}{n})} \mu(D^{m,\circ}(B_2^n)).$$

A necessary condition for equality is that each  $K_i$  is a centered ellipsoid. When  $\mu$  is the Lebesgue measure, i.e.  $q = 0$ , a sufficient condition for equality is when all  $K_i$  are the same centered ellipsoid.

*Proof.* Notice that the density of  $\mu$  is  $(-qm)$ -homogeneous. From (14) with  $d = nm$ ,  $L = D^m(\mathcal{K})$ ,  $p = 1$  and  $q$  replaced by  $-qm$ , one obtains that

$$\begin{aligned}
(15) \quad \mu(D^{m,\circ}(\mathcal{K})) &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(1 + m(n-q))} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} e^{-h_{D^m(\mathcal{K})}(x)} d\mu(x) \\
&= \frac{1}{\Gamma(1 + m(n-q))} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \dots \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-h_{K_0}(-\sum_{i=1}^m x_i)} \prod_{i=1}^m e^{-h_{K_i}(x_i)} |x_i|^{-q} dx_i,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (11) for the formula of the support function of  $D^m(\mathcal{K})$ .

Let  $B$  be the centered Euclidean ball such that the volume of  $\{h_B \leq 1\} = B^\circ$  is the same as  $\{h_{K_i} \leq 1\} = K_i^\circ$  for all  $i = 0, \dots, m$ . If  $B = rB_2^n$ , then  $r$  is defined via  $|K_i^\circ|_n = r^{-n}\omega_n$  for all  $i = 0, \dots, m$ . Then, we have from (15) that iterating Proposition 7 (with  $k = 2m+1$ ) yields

$$\mu(D^{m,\circ}(\mathcal{K})) \leq \mu(D^{m,\circ}(B)) = r^{-m(n-q)} \mu(D^{m,\circ}(B_2^n)),$$

where we used that  $D^{m,\circ}$  is  $(-1)$ -homogeneous, e.g.

$$D^{m,\circ}(rB_2^n) = r^{-1}D^{m,\circ}(B_2^n),$$

and  $\mu$  is  $(nm - qm)$ -homogeneous. From the definition of  $r$ , we obtain

$$(16) \quad \mu(D^{m,\circ}(\mathcal{K})) \prod_{i=1}^m |K_i|_n^{1-\frac{q}{n}} \leq |B_2^n|_n^{m(1-\frac{q}{n})} \mu(D^{m,\circ}(B_2^n)) \prod_{i=1}^m \left( \frac{|K_i|_n |K_i^\circ|_n}{|B_2^n|^2} \right)^{1-\frac{q}{n}}.$$

We remark that the proof until this point does not require the  $K_i$  to have center of mass at the origin, only that they contain the origin in their interiors. By applying the Blaschke-Santaló inequality (2) to (16), we obtain the claimed inequality. As for the equality case, note that for any linear transformation  $A$ ,

$$|D^{m,\circ}(A\mathcal{K})|_{nm} \prod_{i=1}^m |AK_i|_n = |D^{m,\circ}(\mathcal{K})|_{nm} \prod_{i=1}^m |K_i|_n,$$

where  $A\mathcal{K} = (AK_0, \dots, AK_m)$ .  $\square$

The Theorem 6 then follows from Lemma 9 by taking  $\mu$  to be the Lebesgue measure. When  $K$  is origin-symmetric and  $m = 1$ , Lemma 9 recovers [11, Proposition 6.5].

**2.2. Proof of the origin-symmetric case of Theorem 1 using shadow systems.** In this section, we apply shadow systems to the object  $D^{m,\circ}(\mathcal{K})$  defined via (10). Shadow systems were first introduced by Rogers and Shephard [38, 43]: given a convex body  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , a shadow system of  $K$  in the direction  $v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  with (bounded) speed function  $\alpha : K \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  is a family of convex sets  $K(t) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  given by

$$(17) \quad K(t) = \text{conv} \{x + \alpha(x)tv : x \in K, t \in [-a, b], a, b > 0\}.$$

Here,  $\text{conv}$  denotes the convex hull operation. Our notation  $K(t)$  suppresses the direction  $v$ , the function  $\alpha$  and the interval  $[-a, b]$ . If one defines

$$\tilde{K} = \text{conv} \{x + \alpha(x)e_{n+1} : x \in K\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1},$$

then

$$(18) \quad h_{K(t)}(u) = h_{\tilde{K}}(u + t\langle u, v \rangle e_{n+1}).$$

They further established that  $|K(t)|_n$  is a convex function in the variable  $t$ . Campi and Gronchi [10] later established that, if  $K$  is origin-symmetric, then  $|K(t)^\circ|_n^{-1}$  is also convex in the variable  $t$ . Combining this fact with the following observation by Shephard [43] yields another proof of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality (2) in the origin-symmetric case.

**Proposition 10.** *Fix a collection  $\mathcal{K}$  of convex bodies in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  under the following condition:  $\mathcal{K}$  contains all dilates of  $B_2^n$  and, for every  $K \in \mathcal{K}$ , every shadow system  $K(t)$  of  $K$  satisfies  $K(t) \in \mathcal{K}$ . Next, let  $F : \mathcal{K} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$  be a functional that is continuous in the Hausdorff metric and reflection invariant such that  $F(K(t))$  is convex in the parameter  $t$ . Then, for a fixed*

$C \in \mathbb{R}_+$  the solution to  $\min\{F(K) : K \in \mathcal{K}, |K|_n = C\}$  is obtained at the Euclidean ball whose volume is  $C$ .

We pause to remark that Meyer and Reisner [29] extended Campi's and Gronchi's result to the case when  $K^\circ$  has center of mass at the origin, but their approach is difficult to extend to our setting.

We provide another proof of the origin-symmetric case of Theorem 1 by establishing the following analogous fact.

**Theorem 11.** *Fix  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $K_0, \dots, K_m \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be  $(m+1)$  origin-symmetric convex bodies. Let, for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$ ,  $K_i(t)$  be a shadow system of  $K_i$ , as in (17) each in the same direction and defined in a common interval  $[-a, b]$ . Set*

$$\mathcal{K}(t) = (K_0(t), K_1(t), \dots, K_m(t)).$$

Then,  $t \mapsto |D^{m, \circ}(\mathcal{K}(t))|_{nm}^{-1}$  is convex.

Clearly, Theorem 11 with the choice of  $K_i = K$  for all  $i$  together with Proposition 10 yields another proof of Theorem 1 in the origin-symmetric case. We will need the following corollary of the Borell-Brascamp-Lieb inequality (cf. [10]). For  $p \in \mathbb{R}$ , we say a function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$  is  $p$ -concave if, for every  $x, y$  such that  $f(x)f(y) > 0$ , it holds

$$f((1-\lambda)x + \lambda y) \geq [(1-\lambda)f(x)^p + \lambda f(y)^p]^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

When  $p \rightarrow 0$ , one recovers log-concavity.

**Proposition 12.** *Let  $F(x, y)$  be a non-negative,  $p$ -concave function on  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^s$ ,  $p \geq -1/d$ . If the function given by*

$$y \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} F(x, y) dx$$

*is well defined for every  $y \in \mathbb{R}^s$ , then it is a  $\frac{p}{1+dp}$ -concave function.*

Next, we need the following change of variables formula; it was established by Campi and Gronchi [10].

**Lemma 13.** *Let  $h$  be an even, integrable, positively 1-homogeneous function on  $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ . Then, by fixing a unit vector  $w$ , we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} h^{-d}(\theta) d\theta = 2 \int_{w^\perp} h^{-d}(x+w) dx.$$

*Proof of Theorem 11.* We start by observing that, from the origin-symmetry of  $K_0$ , we obtain from (11)

$$h_{D^m(\mathcal{K})}((\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m)) = \sum_{i=1}^m h_{K_i}(\theta_i) + h_{K_0} \left( \sum_{i=1}^m \theta_i \right).$$

Fix a vector  $v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ . From Lemma 13, with  $d = nm$ , applied to the function  $h_{D^m(\mathcal{K})}$  and  $w = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}(v, \dots, v)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(19) \quad & |D^{m,\circ}(\mathcal{K})|_{nm} = \frac{1}{nm} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{nm-1}} h_{D^m(\mathcal{K})}^{-nm}(\theta) d\theta \\
& = \frac{2}{nm} \int_{w^\perp} h_{D^m(\mathcal{K})}^{-nm}(x+w) dx \\
& = \frac{2}{nm} \int_{w^\perp} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^m h_{K_i} \left( x_i + \frac{v}{\sqrt{m}} \right) + h_{K_0} \left( \sqrt{m}v + \sum_{i=1}^m x_i \right) \right]^{-nm} dx.
\end{aligned}$$

For each  $i$ , let  $K_i(t)$  be a shadow system of  $K$  in the direction  $v$ . Then, replace each  $K_i$  with  $K_i(t)$  in (19) and use the relation (18) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{mn}{2} |D^{m,\circ}(\mathcal{K}(t))|_{nm} \\
& = \int_{w^\perp} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^m h_{\tilde{K}_i} \left( x_i + \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}(v + te_{n+1}) \right) + h_{\tilde{K}_0} \left( \sqrt{m}(v + te_{n+1}) + \sum_{i=1}^m x_i \right) \right]^{-nm} dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition 12, with  $p = -\frac{1}{nm}$  and  $d = nm - 1$ , we see that the function  $t \mapsto |D^{m,\circ}(\mathcal{K}(t))|_{nm}$  is  $\frac{-\frac{1}{nm}}{1 - \frac{nm-1}{nm}} = -1$  concave.  $\square$

**2.3. Proof of the symmetric case of Theorem 1 using fiber symmetrization.** In this section, we apply the operators  $D^m$  and  $D^{m,\circ}$  to only one convex body  $K$ . We saw in Section 2.2 that the volume of  $D^{m,\circ}(K)$  is monotone decreasing with respect to Steiner symmetrization on  $K$ . It is natural then to understand the appropriate analogue of Steiner symmetrization in the space  $\mathbb{R}^{nm}$ , and the behavior of  $D^{m,\circ}(K)$  with respect to it. We choose to show a third proof of Theorem 1 because a by-product of this proof is an important property of fiber-symmetrization of independent interest (Corollaries 17 and 18).

For a vector  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{nm}$  and  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we write

$$x^t v := (\langle x_1, v \rangle, \dots, \langle x_m, v \rangle) \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

The notation comes from regarding  $x$  as an  $n \times m$  matrix with columns  $x_1, \dots, x_m$ . For a fixed vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$  there is an orthogonal direct sum decomposition  $\mathbb{R}^{nm} = v^m \times v^{\perp m}$  with

$$\begin{aligned}
(20) \quad & v^m = \{v \otimes t : t \in \mathbb{R}^m\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{nm}, \\
& \text{and} \\
& v^{\perp m} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{nm} : x^t v = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^m\},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$v \otimes t = (t_1 v, \dots, t_m v)$$

is the tensor product of  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}^m$ .

Recently, the fiber symmetrization with respect to this decomposition was used to prove analogues of the Petty projection inequality, [18, 19], in Schneider's setting. There are actually two such fiber symmetrizations that can be defined with respect to the decomposition (20).

**Definition 14.** Fix  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and let  $L \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{nm}$  be a convex body. Then, we have the usual  $m$ th-order fiber symmetrization,

$$(21) \quad \bar{S}_v L = \left\{ x + v \otimes \frac{s_1 - s_2}{2} : x^t v = o, s_i \in \mathbb{R}^m, x + v \otimes s_i \in L \text{ for } i = 1, 2 \right\},$$

and the adjoint version,

$$\bar{S}_v^\perp L = \left\{ \frac{x_1 - x_2}{2} + v \otimes s : x_i^t v = o, s \in \mathbb{R}^m, x_i + v \otimes s \in L \text{ for } i = 1, 2 \right\}.$$

The first named author in [17] proved that Euclidean balls minimize the mean width of  $D^m(K)$ . The key was the following result.

**Lemma 15** ([17, Theorem 4.6]). *If  $K$  is a convex body in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , then*

$$D^m(S_v K) \subseteq \bar{S}_v(D^m(K)).$$

The reason why Lemma 15 implies that  $w(D^m(K))$  is minimized by Euclidean balls, is that, for a convex body  $L \subset \mathbb{R}^{nm}$ ,  $w(\bar{S}_v L) \leq w(L)$  (see [17, Proposition 2.4]). In this section we show that the volume of the polar of a convex set in  $\mathbb{R}^{nm}$  satisfies the same monotonicity property, and this fact implies Theorem 1. First we show:

**Proposition 16.** *Fix  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ . If  $L \subset \mathbb{R}^{nm}$  is an origin-symmetric convex body and  $v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , then  $\bar{S}_v^\perp(L^\circ) \subseteq (\bar{S}_v L)^\circ$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x + v \otimes t, y + v \otimes t \in L^\circ$  and  $z + v \otimes s, z + v \otimes r \in L$ . Since also  $-y - v \otimes t \in L^\circ$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \frac{x - y}{2} + v \otimes t, z + v \otimes \frac{s - r}{2} \right\rangle = \frac{1}{2} (\langle x - y, z \rangle + \langle v \otimes t, v \otimes (s - r) \rangle) \\ & = \frac{1}{2} (\langle x, z \rangle - \langle y, x \rangle + \langle v \otimes t, v \otimes s \rangle - \langle v \otimes t, v \otimes r \rangle) \\ & = \frac{1}{2} (\langle x + v \otimes t, z + v \otimes s \rangle + \langle -y - v \otimes t, z + v \otimes r \rangle) \\ & \leq 1 \end{aligned}$$

which for every  $z + v \otimes s, z + v \otimes r \in L$ , means (see Definition 14) that  $\frac{1}{2}(x - y) + v \otimes t \in (\bar{S}_v L)^\circ$ . Since this is true for every  $x + v \otimes t, y + v \otimes t \in L^\circ$ , we get the result.  $\square$

Unlike the usual Steiner symmetrization (which is the operator  $\bar{S}_v$  in the case  $m = 1$ ), fiber symmetrization does not always preserve volume. For a convex body  $L \subset \mathbb{R}^{nm}$  and  $v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , one has (see [44, Lemma 3.1])

$$(22) \quad |\bar{S}_\xi L|_{nm} \geq |L|_{nm} \quad \text{and} \quad |\bar{S}_v^\perp L|_{nm} \geq |L|_{nm}.$$

**Corollary 17.** *Fix  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ . If  $L \subset \mathbb{R}^{nm}$  is an origin-symmetric convex body and  $v \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ , then*

$$|(\bar{S}_v L)^\circ|_{nm} \geq |L^\circ|_{nm}.$$

*Proof.* By inequality (22) and Proposition 16,

$$|L^\circ|_{nm} \leq \left| \bar{S}_v^\perp L^\circ \right|_{nm} \leq |(\bar{S}_v L)^\circ|_{nm}.$$

□

Combining all these facts, we can now provide another proof of the inequality in Theorem 1 in the symmetric case:

*Third proof of Theorem 1.* By Lemma 15, we have the set inclusion

$$(\bar{S}_v D^m(K))^\circ \subseteq D^{m,\circ}(S_v K).$$

Observe that  $K$  being symmetric yields  $D^m(K)$  is origin-symmetric. Then by Corollary 17 we obtain

$$|D^{m,\circ}(K)|_{nm} \leq |(\bar{S}_v D^m(K))^\circ|_{nm} \leq |D^{m,\circ}(S_v K)|_{nm}.$$

Finally, iterate this procedure along a sequence of directions that transforms  $K$  in a ball of the same volume. □

We end this section with an application to fiber-symmetrization. As mentioned, the operator  $\bar{S}_v$  does not preserve the volume. We can balance this bad behavior with the following property.

**Corollary 18.** *There exists a universal constant  $c_0 > 1$  such that if  $v_1, \dots, v_k \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  with  $k \geq 1$  and  $L \subset \mathbb{R}^{nm}$  is an origin-symmetric convex body, then*

$$|\bar{S}_{v_k} \circ \dots \circ \bar{S}_{v_1} L|_{nm}^{1/(nm)} \leq c_0 |L|_{nm}^{1/(nm)}$$

*Proof.* By Corollary 17 applied  $k$ -times,

$$|(\bar{S}_{v_k} \circ \dots \circ \bar{S}_{v_1} L)^\circ|_{nm} \geq |L^\circ|_{nm}.$$

Then, the claim follows by using the Bourgain-Milman inequality (Proposition 19 below), the Blaschke-Santaló inequality (2) and Stirling's approximation ((29) below). □

### 3. A BOURGAIN-MILMAN INEQUALITY FOR SCHNEIDER'S CONJECTURE

In this section, we prove Theorem 2. We first recall that it was conjectured by K. Mahler [27] that, for a convex body  $L \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , one has

$$(23) \quad \frac{(d+1)^{d+1}}{(d!)^2} \leq |L|_d |L^\circ|_d,$$

with equality if and only if  $L$  is a centered simplex or its dual; in the same work, the conjecture was verified in the plane. We note that, usually one sees in the literature the requirement that  $L$  must be translated so that  $L^\circ$  has center of mass at the origin in Mahler's conjecture (and when using the Bourgain-Milman inequality (27) below). Such  $L$  are said to be in *Santaló*

*position.* There is another defining characteristic of the Santaló position:  $|L^\circ|_d \leq |(L - z)^\circ|_d$  for all  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Consequently, if the conjectured bound (23) holds for  $L$  in Santaló position, it holds regardless of which translate of  $L$  is taken. This will be vital for us later, as we do not know if  $D^m(K)$  or  $D^{m,\circ}(K)$  has center of mass at the origin. Since  $D^m(K) = D^m(K + x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the center of mass of  $D^m(K)$  is somehow independent of the center of mass of  $K$ .

In the origin-symmetric case, there is the sharper conjecture of

$$(24) \quad \frac{4^d}{d!} \leq |L|_d |L^\circ|_d,$$

with equality when  $L$  or  $L^\circ$  is a Hanner polytope, e.g. a (linear) transformation of  $Q_d := [-1, 1]^d$ . S. Reisner solved Mahler's conjecture in the origin-symmetric case for centered zonoids [33, 34]. We recall that a *zonotope*  $Z$  is the Minkowski sum of symmetric line-segments, i.e. it can be written in the form

$$(25) \quad Z = \sum_{i=1}^j a_i [c_i, d_i], \quad c_i, d_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad a_i \in (0, \infty),$$

Furthermore, a *zonoid* is the limit, with respect to the Hausdorff metric, of a sequence of zonotopes. Every planar symmetric convex body is a zonoid.

Using Stirling's formula, (23) and (24) imply, respectively,

$$(26) \quad \left( \frac{e^2 + o(1)}{d} \right)^d \leq |L|_d |L^\circ|_d \quad \text{and} \quad \left( \frac{4e + o(1)}{d} \right)^d \leq |L|_d |L^\circ|_d.$$

J. Bourgain and V. Milman verified Mahler's conjecture asymptotically [6], i.e. showing bounds of the form (26) with worse constants. The best-known bounds are due to Kuperberg.

**Proposition 19** ([20]). *Let  $L$  be a convex body in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Then, the inequality*

$$(27) \quad \left( \frac{c_1}{d} \right)^d \leq |L|_d |L^\circ|_d$$

*holds with  $c_1 = \frac{\pi e}{2}$ ; the larger bound  $c_1 = \pi e$  holds when  $L$  is origin-symmetric.*

With the necessary context completed, we now prove Theorem 2. We recall that

$$(28) \quad |B_2^n|_n = \frac{\pi^{\frac{n}{2}}}{\Gamma\left(1 + \frac{n}{2}\right)},$$

where  $\Gamma(\cdot)$  is the usual Gamma function. We will also make use of a version Stirling's formula [35] which states for  $x > 0$  one has

$$(29) \quad \sqrt{2\pi} x^{x+1/2} e^{-x} \leq \Gamma(1+x) \leq \sqrt{2\pi} x^{x+1/2} e^{-x} e^{\frac{1}{12x}}.$$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* The proof for all three cases starts the same. We have from Theorem 1 and the Blaschke-Santaló inequality (2) applied to  $D^m(K)$ ,

$$(30) \quad \frac{|K|_n^{-m} |D^m(K)|_{nm}}{|B_2^n|_n^{-m} |D^m(B_2^n)|_{nm}} \geq \frac{|D^m(K)|_{nm} |D^{m,\circ}(K)|_{nm}}{|D^m(B_2^n)|_{nm} |D^{m,\circ}(B_2^n)|_{nm}} \\ \geq |B_2^{nm}|_{nm}^{-2} |D^m(K)|_{nm} |D^{m,\circ}(K)|_{nm}.$$

For the first two cases, we then use (27) in  $\mathbb{R}^{nm}$  for the body  $D^m(K)$  and (28) to obtain

$$\frac{|D^m(K)|_{nm} |K|_n^{-m}}{|D^m(B_2^n)|_{nm} |B_2^n|_n^{-m}} \geq \left( \left( \frac{c_1}{nm\pi} \right)^{nm} \Gamma \left( 1 + \frac{nm}{2} \right)^2 \right).$$

Now, we use (29) to obtain the following estimate:

$$(31) \quad \frac{1}{nm} \Gamma \left( 1 + \frac{nm}{2} \right)^{\frac{2}{nm}} \geq (\pi nm)^{\frac{1}{nm}} \frac{1}{2e},$$

which implies

$$\left( \frac{|D^m(K)|_{nm} |K|_n^{-m}}{|D^m(B_2^n)|_{nm} |B_2^n|_n^{-m}} \right)^{\frac{1}{nm}} \geq \left( \frac{c_1}{2\pi e} \right) (\pi nm)^{\frac{1}{nm}},$$

and the first two claims follow.

Finally, for the case of zonoids, we return to (30) and use (24) and (28) to obtain

$$\left( \frac{|D^m(K)|_{nm} |K|_n^{-m}}{|D^m(B_2^n)|_{nm} |B_2^n|_n^{-m}} \right)^{\frac{1}{nm}} \geq \left( \frac{4}{\pi} \right) \frac{\Gamma \left( 1 + \frac{nm}{2} \right)^{\frac{2}{nm}}}{\Gamma(1+nm)^{\frac{1}{nm}}}.$$

Now, from the upper-bound of (29), we have

$$(32) \quad \frac{1}{nm} \Gamma(1+nm)^{\frac{1}{nm}} \leq (2\pi nm)^{\frac{1}{2nm}} e^{\frac{1}{12(nm)^2}} \frac{1}{e},$$

and therefore (31) and (32) imply the claim.  $\square$

It is natural to ask concerning a lower-bound for  $|D^{m,\circ}(K)|_{nm} |K|_n^m$ ; the natural conjecture is that the minimizer is a simplex in general and a cube in the origin-symmetric case. The story here is similar to that of Theorem 2.

**Proposition 20.** *Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $m \geq 2$ . Then, for a convex body  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , the inequality*

$$|D^{m,\circ}(K)|_{nm} |K|_n^m \geq \binom{nm+n}{n}^{-1} \left( \frac{c_1}{nm} \right)^{nm},$$

*holds with  $c_1 = \frac{\pi e}{2}$ ; the larger bound  $c_1 = \pi e$  holds when  $K$  is symmetric.*

*Furthermore, if  $K$  is a zonoid, it holds*

$$|D^{m,\circ}(K)|_{nm} |K|_n^m \geq \frac{4^{nm} n!}{(nm+n)!}.$$



*Proof.* For all three cases, use Schneider's Rogers-Shephard inequality for  $D^m(K)$ , (1), to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |D^{m,\circ}(K)|_{nm} |K|_n^m &= \frac{|D^{m,\circ}(K)|_{nm} |D^m(K)|_{nm}}{|D^m(K)|_{nm} |K|_n^{-m}} \\ &\geq \binom{nm+n}{n}^{-1} |D^{m,\circ}(K)|_{nm} |D^m(K)|_{nm}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, conclude by using (26) for the first two cases (recall that for  $m \geq 2$ ,  $D^m(K)$  is origin-symmetric if and only if  $K$  is symmetric) and (24) for the case of zonoids.  $\square$

A sharper version of Proposition 20 when  $n = 3$  and  $K$  is a zonoid immediately follows from Theorem 3. Indeed, we may combine (5) with the resolved (24) for zonoids and obtain the inequality

$$\frac{|Q_{nm}|_{nm} |Q_{nm}^\circ|_{nm}}{|D^m(Q_n)|_{nm} |Q_n|_n^{-m}} \leq |K|_n^m |D^{m,\circ}(K)|_{nm}.$$

However, this inequality is strict, since  $D^m(Q_n) \neq Q_{nm}$ . This can be easily seen when  $n = 1, m = 2$ . We do have the property that  $D^m(Q_n) = (D^m(Q_1))^n$ . Indeed, it is clear that  $(Q_n + x) \cap (Q_n + y) \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $|x^i - y^i| \leq 1$ , where  $x^i, y^i$  are the coordinates of  $x$  and  $y$  respectively. A point  $(x_1, \dots, x_m) \in (\mathbb{R}^n)^m$  is in  $D^m(Q_n)$  if and only if the following inequalities are satisfied

$$(33) \quad |x_i^k - x_j^k| \leq 1, \quad |x_i^k| \leq 1, \quad \forall i, j, k \text{ with } 1 \leq i, j \leq m, 1 \leq k \leq n.$$

The claim follows.

**Remark 21.** *It is natural to ask if  $|D^m(K)|_{nm}$  decreases as  $K$  is more symmetric, i.e. if  $K$  is replaced by a (classical) Steiner symmetrization of  $K$ . Perhaps surprisingly, this is not true; recalling that  $Q_3$  is the unit cube in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , let  $v = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(1, 1, 1)$ . Let  $C_3 = S_v Q_3$  be the double cone generated by the Steiner symmetrization in this specific direction  $v$ . Then, [40, Theorem 3] states that, in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ ,  $|\Pi(C_3)|_3 > |\Pi(Q_3)|_3$ . Applying (4), we obtain that  $|D^m(C_3)|_6 > |D^m(Q_3)|_6$  when  $m \geq 2$ .*

*We can numerically verify this when  $m = 2$ : using (33), one has that*

$$D^2 Q_1 = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x|, |y| \leq 1, |x - y| \leq 1\},$$

*which has volume 3, and so  $|D^2(Q_3)|_6 = 27$ . Observe also that  $C_3$  has 8 vertices, and the equation (12) yields that  $D^2(C_3)$  is a 6-dimensional polytope whose  $8^3 = 512$  vertices are of the form  $(p+r, q+r)$  where  $p, q, r$  are vertices of  $C_3$ . Using Polymake, one can then compute that  $|D^2(C_3)|_6 = 27.75$ .*

#### 4. A FUNCTIONAL EXTENSION OF THE POLAR SCHNEIDER INEQUALITY

In this section, we establish Theorem 4. Like when we passed from Theorem 6 to Theorem 1, we will establish a more general inequality for  $(m+1)$  functions. We recall a function  $g$  is a centered Gaussian if there exists a

positive definite, symmetric,  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$  with real entries such that  $g(x) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\langle Ax, x \rangle}$ . We say  $A$  is the generating matrix of  $g$ .

**Theorem 22.** *Let, for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$ ,  $f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  be an integrable function such that either  $f_i$  or  $f_i^\circ$  has center of mass at the origin. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=0}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_i^{\frac{m+1}{m}} \right)^{\frac{m}{m+1}} \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^m f_i^\circ(x_i) \right) \left( f_0^\circ \left( -\sum_{i=1}^m x_i \right) \right) dx \\ \leq \left( \frac{2\pi m}{m+1} \right)^{\frac{mn}{2}} \left( \frac{2\pi}{(m+1)^{\frac{1}{m}}} \right)^{\frac{nm}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

with equality if and only if there exists a centered Gaussian  $g$  and constants  $C_0, \dots, C_m > 0$  such that  $f_i = C_i g$  for all  $i = 0, \dots, m$ . By the Hölder's inequality, we also have, with the same assumptions and equality conditions,

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \prod_{i=0}^m f_i^{\frac{1}{m}} \right)^m \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^m f_i^\circ(x_i) \right) \left( f_0^\circ \left( -\sum_{i=1}^m x_i \right) \right) dx \\ \leq \left( \frac{2\pi m}{m+1} \right)^{\frac{mn}{2}} \left( \frac{2\pi}{(m+1)^{\frac{1}{m}}} \right)^{\frac{nm}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

We list as a corollary the case  $m = 1$ .

**Corollary 23.** *For  $i = 0, 1$ , let  $f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  be an integrable function such that either  $f_i$  or  $f_i^\circ$  has center of mass at the origin. Then,*

$$\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_0^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_1^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_1^\circ(x) f_0^\circ(-x) dx \right) \leq \pi^n,$$

with equality if and only if there exists a centered Gaussian  $g$  and  $C_0, C_1 > 0$  such that  $f_0 = C_0 g$  and  $f_1 = C_1 g$ . By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we also have, with the same assumptions and equality conditions,

$$\left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_0 f_1 \right) \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_1^\circ(x) f_0^\circ(-x) dx \right) \leq \pi^n.$$

**4.1. The functional Polar Schneider inequality.** We prove Theorem 22 in two steps. First, we show the existence of a finite maximizing constant, and ensure that the constant is obtained on the set of centered Gaussians. Then, we compute the constant and determine that each maximizing centered Gaussian must be the same.

**Lemma 24.** *Let, for  $i = 0, \dots, m$ ,  $f_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  be an integrable function such that either  $f_i$  or  $f_i^\circ$  has center of mass at the origin. Then, there exists a sharp constant  $C(n, m) \in (0, \infty)$ , depending only on  $n$  and  $m$ , such that*

$$\prod_{i=0}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_i^{\frac{m+1}{m}} \right)^{\frac{m}{m+1}} \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^m f_i^\circ(x_i) \right) \left( f_0^\circ \left( -\sum_{i=1}^m x_i \right) \right) dx \leq C(n, m),$$

and the equality is obtained uniquely on the set of centered Gaussians.

To prove Lemma 24, we will need two major theorems. The first one is the following extension of the functional Blaschke-Santaló inequality by Fradelizi and Meyer [14] in the log-concave case and then Lehec [26] in general; the case (8) is recovered by setting  $g = f^\circ$  and  $\rho(t) = e^{-\frac{t}{2}}$ .

**Proposition 25.** *Let  $f, g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  be integrable functions such that either  $f$  or  $g$  has center of mass at the origin. Suppose there exists a measurable function  $\rho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that the following inequality holds*

$$f(x)g(y) \leq \rho^2(\langle x, y \rangle) \text{ for every } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ with } \langle x, y \rangle > 0.$$

Then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x)dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g(y)dy \leq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho(|x|^2)dx \right)^2.$$

We also need the Barthe-Brascamp-Lieb inequality. Fix  $d, k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$  and  $d_0, \dots, d_k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ , with  $d_i \leq d$ . We then define the *Brascamp-Lieb datum* as  $\mathcal{B} = (B_0, \dots, B_k)$  and  $\mathcal{C} = (c_0, \dots, c_k)$ , where each  $B_i : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$  is a surjective linear map and the constants  $c_0, \dots, c_k > 0$  are so that  $\sum_{i=0}^k c_i d_i = d$ . Define the Brascamp-Lieb functional on  $\mathcal{H} = (h_0, \dots, h_k) \in (L^1(\mathbb{R}^n))^{k+1}$ , with  $h_i$  non-identically zero and nonnegative for all  $i$ , as

$$(34) \quad \text{BL}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}; \mathcal{H}) := \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \prod_{i=0}^k h_i(B_i x)^{c_i} dx}{\prod_{i=0}^k \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_i}} h_i dx_i \right)^{c_i}}, \in (0, \infty].$$

Then, if  $\cap_{i \leq k} \ker B_i = \{o\}$ , the supremum of  $\text{BL}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}; \mathcal{H})$  over all such collections of functions  $\mathcal{H}$  is finite and equals the supremum over all such collections of the form  $(g_0, \dots, g_k)$ , where each  $g_i$  is a centered Gaussian. This was shown by Brascamp and Lieb [8] when each  $d_i = 1$  and by Barthe [4] in the general case.

*Proof of Lemma 24.* Throughout the proof, we suppress the dependence of the maximizing constant on the datum  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$ . Set in (34)  $d = nm$ ,  $k = m$ , and  $d_i = n$  for all  $i$  to obtain that

$$\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^m h_i(B_i x)^{c_i} \right) (h_0(B_0 x)^{c_0}) dx}{\prod_{i=0}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} h_i \right)^{c_i}} \leq C_{BL},$$

where  $C_{BL}$  is the constant obtained by taking supremum over Gaussians. Next, define the symbols  $r_i := h_i^{c_i}$  to obtain

$$\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^m r_i(B_i x) \right) (r_0(B_0 x)) dx}{\prod_{i=0}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} r_i^{\frac{1}{c_i}} \right)^{c_i}} \leq C_{BL}.$$

We then set, for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ ,  $B_i x = x_i$  where  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$  and  $B_0 x = -\sum_{i=1}^m x_i$ , and for all  $i$ , set the exponents  $c_i = \frac{m}{m+1}$  to obtain

$$\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^m r_i(x_i) \right) \left( r_0 \left( -\sum_{i=1}^m x_i \right) \right) dx}{\prod_{i=0}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} r_i^{\frac{m+1}{m}} \right)^{\frac{m}{m+1}}} \leq C_{BL}.$$

Observe that  $\sum_{i=0}^m c_i d_i = \sum_{i=0}^m \left( \frac{m}{m+1} \right) n = nm = d$ , and thus  $C_{BL}$  is finite. We then set  $r_i = f_i^\circ$  for all  $i$  to obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^m f_i^\circ(x_i) \right) \left( f_0^\circ \left( -\sum_{i=1}^m x_i \right) \right) dx \leq C_{BL} \prod_{i=0}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (f_i^\circ)^{\frac{m+1}{m}} \right)^{\frac{m}{m+1}}.$$

Next, multiply both sides by  $\prod_{i=0}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_i^{\frac{m+1}{m}} \right)^{\frac{m}{m+1}}$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{i=0}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_i^{\frac{m+1}{m}} \right)^{\frac{m}{m+1}} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^m f_i^\circ(x_i) \right) \left( f_0^\circ \left( -\sum_{i=1}^m x_i \right) \right) dx \right) \\ & \leq C_{BL} \prod_{i=0}^m \left( \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (f_i^\circ)^{\frac{m+1}{m}} \right) \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f_i^{\frac{m+1}{m}} \right) \right)^{\frac{m}{m+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude by applying  $(m+1)$  times the Proposition 25 to the functions  $f_i^\circ$  and  $f_i$  with  $\rho(t) = e^{-\frac{m+1}{m} \frac{t}{2}}$ .

As for the equality cases, since each  $f_i$  satisfies  $f_i \leq f_i^{\circ\circ}$  and  $f_i^{\circ\circ\circ} = f_i^\circ$ , and thus the left-hand side increases when  $f_i$  is replaced by  $f_i^{\circ\circ}$ , we must have that each  $f_i$  is log-concave (since  $f^\circ$  is always log-concave). Then, the equality conditions for Proposition 25 from [14, Theorem 8] and the equality conditions of the Barthe-Brascamp-Lieb inequality complete the proof.  $\square$

We now move on to the second part of proving Theorem 22, which is computing  $C(n, m)$ . We start by writing  $C(n, m)$  as an optimization problem; denote by  $I_n$  the  $n \times n$  identity matrix.

**Proposition 26.** *Fix  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  and let  $C(n, m)$  be the constant from Theorem 22. Then,*

$$C(n, m) = \left( \frac{4\pi^2 m}{m+1} \right)^{\frac{nm}{2}} \sup \mathcal{F}_n(A_0, \dots, A_m),$$

where the supremum is taken over  $(m+1)$  tuples of positive-definite symmetric matrices and  $\mathcal{F}_n$  is given by

$$(35) \quad \mathcal{F}_n(A_0, \dots, A_m) = \prod_{i=0}^m \det(A_i)^{\frac{m}{2(m+1)}} \det(M)^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

with  $M = M(A_0, \dots, A_m)$  defined in (39) below.

*Proof.* We first recall the following well-known formula: for a symmetric, positive definite  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$ , one has

$$(36) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\langle Ax, x \rangle} dx = \frac{(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}}}{\det(A)^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Applying formula (36) to  $\frac{m+1}{m}A^{-1}$  instead of  $A$ , we see that

$$(37) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\frac{m+1}{m}\langle A^{-1}x, x \rangle} dx = \left(\frac{2\pi m}{m+1}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}} \det(A)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

It is well-known and easily verifiable that  $\left(e^{-\frac{1}{2}\langle A^{-1}\cdot, \cdot \rangle}\right)^\circ(x) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\langle Ax, x \rangle}$ . Also, we have for  $c > 0$  that  $(cf)^\circ = \frac{1}{c}f^\circ$ . Then, by setting each  $f_i$  in Theorem 22 to be a centered Gaussian generated by some  $A_i^{-1}$  and using (37), we must maximize

$$(38) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_n(A_0, \dots, A_m) &:= \left(\frac{2\pi m}{m+1}\right)^{\frac{nm}{2}} \prod_{i=0}^m \det(A_i)^{\frac{m}{2(m+1)}} \\ &\times \int_{(\mathbb{R}^n)^m} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\sum_{i=1}^m \langle A_i x_i, x_i \rangle + \langle A_0(\sum_{i=1}^m x_i), (\sum_{i=1}^m x_i) \rangle)} dx_1 \dots dx_m. \end{aligned}$$

Define the block matrix  $M$  given by

$$(39) \quad M = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 + A_0 & A_0 & \cdots & A_0 \\ A_0 & A_2 + A_0 & \cdots & A_0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_0 & A_0 & \cdots & A_m + A_0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, (38) becomes

$$(40) \quad \mathcal{G}_n(A_0, \dots, A_m) = \left(\frac{2\pi m}{m+1}\right)^{\frac{nm}{2}} \prod_{i=0}^m \det(A_i)^{\frac{m}{2(m+1)}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\langle Mz, z \rangle} dz.$$

We obtain from (40) and (36) the claimed formula by setting

$$\mathcal{F}_n(A_0, \dots, A_m) := \left(\frac{m+1}{4\pi^2 m}\right)^{\frac{nm}{2}} \mathcal{G}_n(A_0, \dots, A_m).$$

□

We can give an analytic description of the matrix  $M$  from Proposition 26. Recall that  $\Delta_m$  denotes the diagonal embedding. Let  $C_1, \dots, C_m : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{nm}$  be the coordinate inclusions, i.e.,  $C_i(x)$  has  $x$  in the  $i$ th block and 0 in the other blocks. We can think of  $\Delta_m$  and the  $C_i$  as  $nm \times n$  matrices, so that  $C_i^T$  is the projection to the  $i$ th block and  $\Delta_m^T(x) = \sum_{i=1}^m x_i$ . Then, the matrix  $M$  satisfies

$$M = \Delta_m A_0 \Delta_m^T + \sum_{i=1}^m C_i A_i C_i^T.$$

In the next proposition, we compute the determinant of  $M$ .

**Proposition 27.** *Fix  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . For positive-definite  $n \times n$  matrices  $A_0, \dots, A_m$ , let  $M$  be the block matrix given by (39). Then,*

$$\det(M) = \prod_{i=0}^m \det(A_i) \cdot \det\left(\sum_{i=0}^m A_i^{-1}\right).$$

*Proof.* Let  $D$  be the block diagonal matrix with  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  on the diagonal. Then,  $M = D^{1/2}ND^{1/2}$  where  $N = I_{nm} + SS^T$  and  $S = D^{-1/2}\Delta_m A_0^{1/2}$ , i.e.  $N$  is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_n + A_1^{-1/2} A_0 A_1^{-1/2} & A_2^{-1/2} A_0 A_1^{-1/2} & \cdots & A_m^{-1/2} A_0 A_1^{-1/2} \\ A_1^{-1/2} A_0 A_2^{-1/2} & I_n + A_2^{-1/2} A_0 A_2^{-1/2} & \cdots & A_m^{-1/2} A_0 A_2^{-1/2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A_1^{-1/2} A_0 A_m^{-1/2} & A_2^{-1/2} A_0 A_m^{-1/2} & \cdots & I_n + A_m^{-1/2} A_0 A_m^{-1/2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

So, using the identity

$$\det(I_k + LL^T) = \det(I_\ell + L^T L)$$

for  $L$  a  $k \times \ell$  matrix, we obtain

$$\det(N) = \det(I_n + S^T S) = \det(I_n + A_0^{1/2} \Delta_m^T D^{-1} \Delta_m A_0^{1/2}).$$

Now,  $\Delta_m^T D^{-1} \Delta_m$  is just  $\sum_{i=1}^m A_i^{-1}$ , so we may write

$$I_n + S^T S = A_0^{1/2} \left( \sum_{i=0}^m A_i^{-1} \right) A_0^{1/2}.$$

Hence, we obtain  $\det(N) = \det(A_0) \cdot \det\left(\sum_{i=0}^m A_i^{-1}\right)$ , yielding

$$\det(M) = \det(D) \det(N) = \prod_{i=0}^m \det(A_i) \cdot \det\left(\sum_{i=0}^m A_i^{-1}\right),$$

as claimed.  $\square$

Using Proposition 27, we solve the optimization problem introduced in Proposition 26.

**Corollary 28.** *Fix  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}_n$  be the function given by (35). Then,  $\sup \mathcal{F}_n(A_0, \dots, A_m)$  is obtained if and only if each  $A_i$  is the same  $A$ , for any  $n \times n$  positive-definite symmetric matrix  $A$ , i.e.*

$$\sup \mathcal{F}_n(A_0, \dots, A_m) = \mathcal{F}_n(A, \dots, A) = (m+1)^{-\frac{n}{2}}.$$

*Proof.* From Propositions 26 and 27, we must maximize

$$\mathcal{F}_n(A_0, \dots, A_m) = \prod_{i=0}^m \det(A_i)^{-\frac{1}{2(m+1)}} \cdot \det\left(\sum_{i=0}^m A_i^{-1}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

A special case of the Brunn-Minkowski inequality for determinants is

$$\det \left( \frac{1}{m+1} \sum_{i=0}^m A_i^{-1} \right) \geq \prod_{i=0}^m \det(A_i^{-1})^{\frac{1}{m+1}} = \prod_{i=0}^m \det(A_i)^{-\frac{1}{m+1}},$$

with equality if and only if  $A_0 = \dots = A_m$  (see [2, Lemma 2.1.5]). By the  $n$ -homogeneity of the determinant, this implies the claim.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 22.* From Lemma 24, the inequality is established, and we know the maximizing value  $C(n, m)$  is obtained only among centered Gaussians. From Proposition 26 and Corollary 28, we know that

$$C(n, m) = \left( \frac{2\pi m}{m+1} \right)^{\frac{mn}{2}} \left( \frac{2\pi}{(m+1)^{\frac{1}{m}}} \right)^{\frac{mn}{2}},$$

and that equality is obtained if and only if each function is a multiple of the same centered Gaussian.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.* The claim is immediate from Theorem 22 by setting each  $f_i$  to be the same.  $\square$

**4.2. Comparing functional and geometric results.** In this section, we compare Theorems 1 and 4, and, more generally, Theorems 6 and 22.

Recall that the dual  $L^p$  sum, with  $p \geq 1$ , of two convex bodies  $K$  and  $L$  is the convex body  $K \tilde{+}_{-p} L$  with gauge given by  $(\|\cdot\|_K^p + \|\cdot\|_L^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ . In particular, one has that  $(DK)^\circ = K^\circ \tilde{+}_{-1} (-K)^\circ$ . Indeed,

$$(41) \quad \|\cdot\|_{(DK)^\circ} = h_{DK} = h_K + h_{-K} = \|\cdot\|_{K^\circ} + \|\cdot\|_{(-K)^\circ}.$$

Define the body  $D_2(K_0, K_1) = (K_1^\circ \tilde{+}_{-2} (-K_0)^\circ)^\circ$ . We remark that, in terms of Firey's  $L^p$  extension of Minkowski summation [13], one can verify that  $D_2(K_0, K_1)$  is nothing but the  $L^2$  Minkowski sum of  $K_1$  and  $-K_0$ . In Corollary 23, when one inserts  $f_i = e^{-\|\cdot\|_{K_i}^2}$ , where  $K_i$  is a centered convex body, then one obtains by using (13) (with  $\mu$  the Lebesgue measure and  $p = 2$ ), (7) and (28), the inequality

$$(42) \quad |K_0|^{\frac{1}{n}} |K_1|^{\frac{1}{n}} |(D_2(K_0, K_1))^\circ|_n \leq 2^{-\frac{n}{2}} |B_2^n|_n^2,$$

with equality if and only if  $K_0 = K_1$  is a linear image of  $B_2^n$ .

**Proposition 29.** *Fix  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and let  $K_0, K_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be convex bodies containing the origin in their interiors. Then,*

$$2^{-\frac{1}{2}} (D_2(K_0, K_1))^\circ \subseteq (K_1 + (-K_0))^\circ,$$

*with equality if and only if  $K_1 = -K_0$ . In particular, (42) implies the  $m = 1$  case of Theorem 1 when  $K_1 = K_0$  is origin-symmetric.*

*Proof.* Observe that, from (41) and the convexity of  $t \mapsto t^2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\cdot\|_{(K_1+(-K_0))^\circ}^2 &= (h_{K_1} + h_{-K_0})^2 = \left(\frac{1}{2}h_{2K_1} + \frac{1}{2}h_{-2K_0}\right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}h_{2K_1}^2 + \frac{1}{2}h_{-2K_0}^2 = 2(h_{K_1}^2 + h_{-K_0}^2) \\ &= 2\left(\|\cdot\|_{K_1^\circ}^2 + \|\cdot\|_{-K_0^\circ}^2\right) = 2\|\cdot\|_{(D_2(K_0, K_1))^\circ}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows; equality characterization comes from the fact that we must have  $h_{K_1} = h_{-K_0}$ , which means  $K_1 = -K_0$ .  $\square$

For the general case, the Theorem 22 seems to be disjoint from Theorem 1. Indeed, recalling the notation from (12), define the body

$$D_2^{m,\circ}(\mathcal{K}) := \widetilde{\sum_{i=1}^m} \mathbf{K}_i^\circ \tilde{+}_{-2} \Delta_m(-K_0)^\circ,$$

where the first summation means iterative  $\tilde{+}_{-2}$  sums. Then, taking  $f_i = e^{-\|\cdot\|_{K_i}^2/2}$ , where  $K_i$  is a centered convex body, in Theorem 22, we get

$$\prod_{i=0}^m |K_i|_n^{\frac{m}{m+1}} |D_2^{m,\circ}(\mathcal{K})|_{nm} \leq \frac{|B_2^n|_n^m |B_2^{nm}|_{nm}}{(m+1)^{\frac{n}{2}}},$$

with equality if and only if each  $K_i$  is the same centered ellipsoid. Similar to the  $m = 1$  case, we have the following.

**Proposition 30.** *Fix  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  and let, for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, m$ ,  $K_i \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a convex body containing the origin in its interior and define the collection  $\mathcal{K} = (K_0, \dots, K_m)$ . Then,*

$$(m+1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} D_2^{m,\circ}(\mathcal{K}) \subseteq D^{m,\circ}(\mathcal{K}).$$

*This set-inclusion is strict when  $m > 1$ .*

*Proof.* Indeed, we have, by applying Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(x_1, \dots, x_m)\|_{D^{m,\circ}(\mathcal{K})}^2 &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^m h_{K_i}(x_i) + h_{-K_0}\left(\sum_{i=1}^m x_i\right)\right)^2 \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{m+1} h_{(m+1)K_i}(x_i) + \frac{1}{m+1} h_{-(m+1)K_0}\left(\sum_{i=1}^m x_i\right)\right)^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{m+1} h_{(m+1)K_i}(x_i)^2 + \frac{1}{m+1} h_{-(m+1)K_0}\left(\sum_{i=1}^m x_i\right)^2 \\ &= (m+1) \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \|x_i\|_{K_i^\circ}^2 + \left\|\sum_{i=1}^m x_i\right\|_{(-K_0)^\circ}^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows.  $\square$



**4.3. An application to Poincaré-type inequalities.** Let  $\mu$  be a probability measure on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . The variance of a nonnegative, measurable function  $f$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with respect to  $\mu$  is

$$\text{Var}_\mu f := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x)^2 d\mu(x) - \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) d\mu(x) \right)^2.$$

We recall the standard Gaussian measure  $\gamma_n$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is given by

$$d\gamma_n(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}}} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}} dx.$$

The Poincaré inequality for the Gaussian measure asserts that, if  $f$  is a  $C^1$  smooth function that is integrable with respect to  $\gamma_n$ , then

$$(43) \quad \text{Var}_{\gamma_n} f \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla f(x)|^2 d\gamma_n(x).$$

It was shown by D. Cordero-Erausquin, M. Fradelizi and B. Maurey [12] that if  $f$  is also assumed to be even, then the inequality (43) improves by factor of 1/2:

$$(44) \quad \text{Var}_{\gamma_n} f \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla f(x)|^2 d\gamma_n(x).$$

It is well-known (see e.g. [11]) that one can linearize the classical functional Blaschke-Santaló inequality (8) in the case of even functions to arrive at (44). Following this well-trodden path, we obtain a Poincaré-type inequality as an application of Theorem 4. It will be convenient to write  $f = e^{-\psi}$ , in which case  $f^\circ = e^{-\psi^*}$ , where  $\psi^*(x) = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}^n} (\langle x, z \rangle - \psi(z))$  is the Legendre transform of  $\psi$ . We introduce, for  $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the function  $D^m \psi : \mathbb{R}^{nm} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by

$$D^m \psi(x_1, \dots, x_m) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^m \psi(x_i) + \psi \left( - \sum_{i=1}^m x_i \right) \right).$$

We denote by  $\gamma_n^\sigma$  the normal Gaussian measure on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with variance  $\sigma > 0$ , that is

$$d\gamma_n^\sigma(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma)^{\frac{n}{2}}} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2\sigma}} dx.$$

Furthermore, we define the *Schneider-Gaussian measure*  $\gamma_{n,m}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^{nm}$  by

$$d\gamma_{n,m}(x) = \left( \frac{m+1}{(2\pi)^m} \right)^{\frac{n}{2}} e^{-D^m \frac{|\cdot|^2}{2}(x)} dx.$$

**Corollary 31.** Fix  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  be an even  $C^1$  function with  $\psi, |\nabla\psi|^2 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \gamma_n^{\frac{m}{m+1}})$  and  $D^m\psi, |\nabla D^m\psi|^2 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{nm}, \gamma_{n,m})$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \frac{m+1}{m} \right) \text{Var}_{\gamma_n^{\frac{m}{m+1}}} \psi + \frac{1}{m+1} \text{Var}_{\gamma_{n,m}} D^m\psi \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{m+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} |\nabla D^m\psi(x)|^2 d\gamma_{n,m}(x) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla\psi(x)|^2 d\gamma_n^{\frac{m}{m+1}}(x) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that  $\nabla\psi$  refers to taking the gradient of  $\psi$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  while  $\nabla D^m\psi$  contains the gradient on  $\mathbb{R}^{nm}$ . The quantity  $|\nabla D^m\psi|^2$  seems a bit mysterious, but in fact it is not so complicated. Since  $\nabla$  respects the product structure of  $\mathbb{R}^{nm}$ , one has that

$$\nabla D^m\psi(x_1, \dots, x_m) = \left\{ \nabla\psi(x_i) - \nabla\psi\left(-\sum_{i=1}^m x_i\right) \right\}_{i=1}^m.$$

Thus,

$$|\nabla D^m\psi(x_1, \dots, x_m)|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^m \left| \nabla\psi(x_i) - \nabla\psi\left(-\sum_{i=1}^m x_i\right) \right|^2.$$

*Proof.* Using standard approximation techniques, and the fast decay of the densities of the measures  $\gamma_n^{\frac{m}{m+1}}$  and  $\gamma_{n,m}$ , we may assume that  $\psi$  is compactly supported. In Theorem 4, write  $f = e^{-V}$  and switch the roles of  $V$  and  $V^*$ . Then, one can take logarithm to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (45) \quad & m \log \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-\frac{m+1}{m} V^*(x)} dx \right) + \log \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} e^{-D^m(V(x))} dx \right) \\ & \leq m \log \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-\frac{m+1}{m} \frac{|x|^2}{2}} dx \right) + \log \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} e^{-D^m \frac{|x|^2}{2}(x)} dx \right). \end{aligned}$$

We consider the case when  $V(x) = V_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{|x|^2}{2} + \varepsilon\psi(x)$ . Focusing on the second integral in (45), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} e^{-D^m(V_\varepsilon(x))} dx \right) - \log \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} e^{-D^m \frac{|x|^2}{2}(x)} dx \right) \\ & = \log \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} \exp(-\varepsilon D^m(\psi(x))) d\gamma_{n,m}(x) \right) \\ & = \log \left( 1 - \varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} \left( D^m\psi(x) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} (D^m\psi(x))^2 \right) d\gamma_{n,m}(x) + o(\varepsilon^3) \right) \\ & = -\varepsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} D^m\psi(x) d\gamma_{n,m}(x) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} (\text{Var}_{\gamma_{n,m}} D^m\psi) + o(\varepsilon^3). \end{aligned}$$

We next need the well-known fact that if  $\psi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is compactly supported, then

$$V_\varepsilon^* = \frac{|x|^2}{2} - \varepsilon\psi(x) + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} |\nabla\psi|^2 + o(\varepsilon^3),$$

and the dependence of the term  $o(\varepsilon^3)$  on  $x$  is uniform on  $\text{supp}(\psi)$  (see e.g. [11, Lemma 7.1]). Then, for the first integral in (45), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& m \log \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-\frac{m+1}{m} V_\varepsilon^*(x)} dx \right) - m \log \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-\frac{m+1}{m} \frac{|x|^2}{2}} dx \right) \\
&= m \log \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \exp \left( \frac{m+1}{m} \left( \varepsilon \psi(x) - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} |\nabla \psi(x)|^2 + o(\varepsilon^3) \right) \right) d\gamma_n^{\frac{m}{m+1}}(x) \right) \\
&= m \log \left( 1 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( \left( \frac{m+1}{m} \right) \varepsilon \psi(x) + \left( \frac{m+1}{m} \right)^2 \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \psi(x)^2 \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \left( \frac{m+1}{m} \right) \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} |\nabla \psi(x)|^2 \right) d\gamma_n^{\frac{m}{m+1}}(x) + o(\varepsilon^3) \right) \\
&= \varepsilon(m+1) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \psi(x) d\gamma_n^{\frac{m}{m+1}}(x) \\
&\quad + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}(m+1) \left( \left( \frac{m+1}{m} \right) \text{Var}_{\gamma_n^{\frac{m}{m+1}}} \psi - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla \psi(x)|^2 d\gamma_n^{\frac{m}{m+1}}(x) \right) + o(\varepsilon^3).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the inequality (45) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \left( \left( \frac{m+1}{m} \right) \text{Var}_{\gamma_n^{\frac{m}{m+1}}} \psi - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla \psi(x)|^2 d\gamma_n^{\frac{m}{m+1}}(x) \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\varepsilon}{2(m+1)} \text{Var}_{\gamma_{n,m}} D^m \psi + o(\varepsilon^2) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{m+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} D^m \psi(x) d\gamma_{n,m}(x) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \psi(x) d\gamma_n^{\frac{m}{m+1}}(x).
\end{aligned}$$

In (45), we switch  $V$  and  $V^*$  to obtain something similar to the above, but with  $\psi$  and  $D^m \psi$  switching roles, e.g.  $\nabla D^m \psi$  appears instead of  $\nabla \psi$ . One gets

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\varepsilon}{2(m+1)} \left( \text{Var}_{\gamma_{n,m}} D^m \psi - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} |\nabla D^m \psi(x)|^2 d\gamma_{n,m}(x) \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \left( \frac{m+1}{m} \right) \text{Var}_{\gamma_n^{\frac{m}{m+1}}} \psi + o(\varepsilon^2) \\
&\leq - \left( \frac{1}{m+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{nm}} D^m \psi(x) d\gamma_{n,m}(x) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \psi(x) d\gamma_n^{\frac{m}{m+1}}(x) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can combine the two and obtain the claim when  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ .  $\square$

**Acknowledgments:** Part of this work was done while all the authors were in residence at the Hausdorff Research Institute for Mathematics in Bonn, Germany, during Spring 2024 for the Dual Trimester Program: “Synergies between modern probability, geometric analysis, and stochastic geometry” and also while all the authors were at the Oberwolfach Research Institute for Mathematics in Germany for the workshop ”Convex Geometry and its Applications”, ID 2451.

**Funding:** The first named author was supported by Grant RYC2021-031572 I, funded by the Ministry of Science and Innovation / State Research Agency / 10.13039 / 501100011033 and by the E.U. Next Generation EU/Recovery, Transformation and Resilience Plan, and by Grant PID2022-136320NB-I00 funded by the Ministry of Science and Innovation. The second named author was supported by a fellowship from the FSMP Post-doctoral program. The third named author is supported by NSF-BSF DMS-2247834.

## REFERENCES

- [1] ARTSTEIN, S., KLARTAG, B., AND MILMAN, V. The Santaló point of a function, and a functional form of the Santaló inequality. *Mathematika* 51, 1-2 (2004), 33–48 (2005).
- [2] ARTSTEIN-AVIDAN, S., GIANNOPOULOS, A., AND MILMAN, V. *Asymptotic Geometric Analysis, Part I*, vol. 202 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015.
- [3] BALL, K. *Isometric problems in  $l_p$  and sections of convex sets*. PhD thesis, Cambridge, 1987.
- [4] BARTHE, F. On a reverse form of the Brascamp-Lieb inequality. *Invent. Math.* 134, 2 (1998), 335–361.
- [5] BIANCHI, G., GARDNER, R. J., AND GRONCHI, P. Symmetrization in geometry. *Adv. Math.* 306 (2017), 51–88.
- [6] BOURGAIN, J., AND MILMAN, V. D. New volume ratio properties for convex symmetric bodies in  $\mathbf{R}^n$ . *Invent. Math.* 88, 2 (1987), 319–340.
- [7] BRANNEN, N. S. Volumes of projection bodies. *Mathematika* 43, 2 (1996), 255–264.
- [8] BRASCAMP, H. J., AND LIEB, E. H. Best constants in Young’s inequality, its converse, and its generalization to more than three functions. *Advances in Math.* 20, 2 (1976), 151–173.
- [9] BRASCAMP, H. J., LIEB, E. H., AND LUTTINGER, J. M. A general rearrangement inequality for multiple integrals. *J. Functional Analysis* 17 (1974), 227–237.
- [10] CAMPI, S., AND GRONCHI, P. On volume product inequalities for convex sets. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 134, 8 (2006), 2393–2402.
- [11] COLESANTI, A., KOLESNIKOV, A., LIVSHYTS, G. V., AND ROTEM, L. On weighted Blaschke-Santaló and strong Brascamp-Lieb inequalities. *Preprint*, [arxiv: 2409.11503](https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.11503) (2024).
- [12] CORDERO-ERAUSQUIN, D., FRADELIZI, M., AND MAUREY, B. The (B) conjecture for the Gaussian measure of dilates of symmetric convex sets and related problems. *J. Funct. Anal.* 214, 2 (2004), 410–427.
- [13] FIREY, W. J.  $p$ -means of convex bodies. *Math. Scand.* 10 (1962), 17–24.
- [14] FRADELIZI, M., AND MEYER, M. Some functional forms of Blaschke-Santaló inequality. *Math. Z.* 256, 2 (2007), 379–395.
- [15] FRADELIZI, M., MEYER, M., AND ZVAVITCH, A. Volume product. In *Harmonic analysis and convexity*, vol. 9 of *Adv. Anal. Geom.* De Gruyter, Berlin, 2023, pp. 163–222.
- [16] GARDNER, R. J. The Brunn-Minkowski inequality. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* 39, 3 (2002), 355–405.
- [17] HADDAD, J. E. A Rogers–Brascamp–Lieb–Luttinger inequality in the space of matrices. *Preprint*, [arxiv: 2309.13298](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.13298) (2023).
- [18] HADDAD, J. E., LANGHARST, D., PUTTERMAN, E., ROYSDON, M., AND YE, D. Affine isoperimetric inequalities for higher-order projection and centroid bodies. *Preprint*, [arXiv:2304.07859](https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.07859) (2023).
- [19] HADDAD, J. E., LANGHARST, D., PUTTERMAN, E., ROYSDON, M., AND YE, D. Higher order  $L_p$  isoperimetric and Sobolev inequalities. *J. Funct. Anal.* 288 (2025), 110722.

- [20] KUPERBERG, G. From the Mahler conjecture to Gauss linking integrals. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 18, 3 (2008), 870–892.
- [21] LANGHARST, D., MARÍN SOLA, F., AND ULIVELLI, J. Higher-order reverse isoperimetric inequalities for log-concave functions. *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.05712 (2024).
- [22] LANGHARST, D., PUTTERMAN, E., ROYSDON, M., AND YE, D. On higher-order extensions of the weighted projection body operator. *Pure and Applied Functional Analysis*, To appear, *Preprint available online at arxiv: 2305.00479* (2023).
- [23] LANGHARST, D., ROYSDON, M., AND ZHAO, Y. On the  $m$ th order affine Pólya-Szegő principle. *Preprint*, arXiv:2409.02232 (2024).
- [24] LANGHARST, D., AND XI, D. General higher-order  $L^p$  mean zonoids. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 152 (2024), 5299–5311.
- [25] LEHEC, J. A direct proof of the functional Santaló inequality. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 347, 1-2 (2009), 55–58.
- [26] LEHEC, J. Partitions and functional Santaló inequalities. *Arch. Math. (Basel)* 92, 1 (2009), 89–94.
- [27] MAHLER, K. Ein Übertragungsprinzip für konvexe Körper. *Časopis Pěst. Mat. Fys.* 68 (1939), 93–102.
- [28] MCMULLEN, P. New combinations of convex sets. *Geom. Dedicata* 78, 1 (1999), 1–19.
- [29] MEYER, M., AND REISNER, S. Shadow systems and volumes of polar convex bodies. *Mathematika* 53, 1 (2006), 129–148.
- [30] PETTY, C. M. Surface area of a convex body under affine transformations. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 12 (1961), 824–828.
- [31] PETTY, C. M. Isoperimetric problems. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Convexity and Combinatorial Geometry (Univ. Oklahoma, Norman, Okla., 1971)*. Dept. Math., Univ. Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, 1971, pp. 26–41.
- [32] PUTTERMAN, E. On the higher-order difference body of Schneider. *Forthcoming* (2025).
- [33] REISNER, S. Random polytopes and the volume-product of symmetric convex bodies. *Math. Scand.* 57, 2 (1985), 386–392.
- [34] REISNER, S. Zonoids with minimal volume-product. *Math. Z.* 192, 3 (1986), 339–346.
- [35] ROBBINS, H. A remark on Stirling's formula. *Amer. Math. Monthly* 62 (1955), 26–29.
- [36] ROGERS, C. A. A single integral inequality. *J. London Math. Soc.* 32 (1957), 102–108.
- [37] ROGERS, C. A., AND SHEPHARD, G. C. The difference body of a convex body. *Arch. Math. (Basel)* 8 (1957), 220–233.
- [38] ROGERS, C. A., AND SHEPHARD, G. C. Some extremal problems for convex bodies. *Mathematika* 5 (1958), 93–102.
- [39] ROYSDON, M. Rogers-Shephard type inequalities for sections. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 487, 1 (2020), 123958.
- [40] SAROGLU, C. Volumes of projection bodies of some classes of convex bodies. *Mathematika* 57, 2 (2011), 329–353.
- [41] SCHNEIDER, R. Eine Verallgemeinerung des Differenzkörpers. *Monatsh. Math.* 74 (1970), 258–272.
- [42] SCHNEIDER, R. Mixed functionals of convex bodies. *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 24(2000), no.2-3, 527–538. 2-3 (2000), 527–527.
- [43] SHEPHARD, G. C. Shadow systems of convex sets. *Israel J. Math.* 2 (1964), 229–236.
- [44] ULIVELLI, J. Convergence properties of symmetrization processes. *Adv. in Appl. Math.* 146 (2023), Paper No. 102484, 18.
- [45] WEBSTER, R. *Convexity*. Oxford Science Publications. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1994.
- [46] YE, D., ZHOU, X., AND ZHANG, Z. The  $m$ th order Orlicz projection bodies. *Preprint*, arXiv:2501.07565 (2025).
- [47] ZHANG, G. Restricted chord projection and affine inequalities. *Geom. Dedicata* 39, 2 (1991), 213–222.

DEPARTAMENTO DE ANÁLISIS MATEMÁTICO, UNIVERSIDAD DE SEVILLA, SEVILLA,  
SPAIN 29208

*Email address:* `jhaddad@us.es`

INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE JUSSIEU, SORBONNE UNIVERSITÉ, PARIS, FRANCE  
75252

*Email address:* `dylan.langharst@imj-prg.fr`

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, ATLANTA, GA,  
USA 30332

*Email address:* `glivshyts6@math.gatech.edu`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY, TEL AVIV 66978,  
ISRAEL

*Email address:* `putterman@mail.tau.ac.il`