

THE GAUSSIAN MINKOWSKI PROBLEM FOR C -PSEUDO-CONES

JUNJIE SHAN, WENCHUAN HU, WENXUE XU*

ABSTRACT. The Gaussian surface area measure of C -pseudo-cones is introduced and the corresponding Gaussian Minkowski problem for C -pseudo-cones is posed. The existence and uniqueness results are established.

1. INTRODUCTION

The classical Minkowski problem first studied by Minkowski for polytope in 1897, which aims to answer the question: What are the necessary and sufficient conditions on a Borel measure on the unit sphere to be the surface area measure of a convex body (i.e., compact convex subsets of \mathbb{R}^n with nonempty interiors)? In recent decades, the theory of Minkowski problems has expanded considerably, some significant advances have been made, for example, the L_p Minkowski problem [24], the logarithmic Minkowski problem [2], the dual Minkowski problem [13], the Gauss Minkowski problem [15], the chord Minkowski problem [26] and so on, in the framework of Brunn-Minkowski theory of convex bodies. The above mentioned contributions not only greatly enrich the field of convex geometry, but also further advance the connections among convex geometry, differential geometry, and partial differential equations. The new paper [16] surveys classical and new results on Minkowski problems and their related subjects.

Unlike dealing with convex bodies of the Minkowski problems mentioned above, another type of the Minkowski problem related to unbounded closed convex sets in \mathbb{R}^n has recently also been studied by Li, Ye and Zhu [21], Schneider [31–34], Zhang [41], Ai, Yang and Ye [1] following from the pioneer works of establishing the Brunn-Minkowski theory for C -coconvex sets by Milman and Rotem [27], Schneider [30], Yang, Ye and Zhu [40]. In this paper, unbounded closed convex sets of interest are C -pseudo-cones introduced by Schneider [32, 33]. The set of pseudo cones can be seen as a counterpart to the set of convex bodies containing the origin in the interior. A pseudo cone is a nonempty closed convex set K not containing the origin and satisfying $\lambda K \subseteq K$ for $\lambda \geq 1$. The recession cone of a nonempty closed convex set

2010 Math Subject Classifications: 52A40, 52A38.

Keywords: Gaussian measure, C -pseudo-cone, Gaussian Minkowski problem.

This paper was supported by the NSFC (No. 12371060) and the Natural Science Foundation of Chongqing (No. cstc2021jcyj-msxmX1057).

* Corresponding author.

$K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ defined by

$$\text{rec } K = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n : K + z \subseteq K\}.$$

A C -pseudo-cone is a pseudo-cone with recession cone C (see Section 2 for a precise definition). Roughly speaking, its asymptotic behavior is controlled by C . Then, it is easy to see that pseudo-cones are special unbounded convex sets.

Let K be a pseudo-cone with recession cone C . For a cone C , we always assume that it is pointed (not containing any line) and n -dimensional. Let C° be the polar cone of the cone C defined by $C^\circ = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, y \rangle \leq 0 \text{ for all } y \in C\}$, where $\langle x, y \rangle$ is the inner product of $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. For a given C , the subsets

$$\Omega_C = S^{n-1} \cap \text{int } C, \quad \Omega_{C^\circ} = S^{n-1} \cap \text{int } C^\circ$$

of the unit sphere S^{n-1} , where $\text{int } C$ is the interior of C . We denote $\Omega := \Omega_{C^\circ} = S^{n-1} \cap \text{int } C^\circ$ in this paper.

For C -pseudo-cone, the Minkowski problem asks that: *What are the necessary and sufficient conditions on a Borel measure μ on Ω_{C° to be the surface area measure of a C -pseudo-cone?* However, the solution to this problem has not yet been completely obtained. The reason is that the surface area measure $S_{n-1}(K, \cdot)$ of a C -pseudo-cone K is only defined on Ω_{C° and it may be infinite, which is different from the case of convex bodies. But for finite Borel measure μ on Ω_{C° , some interesting advances have been made. If $C \setminus K$ has finite volume, then every nonzero μ is the surface area measure of a C -pseudo-cone, which was shown by Schneider [31]. Minkowski type theorem for pseudo-cones were treated by Yang, Ye and Zhu [40], and versions for dual curvature measures by Li, Ye and Zhu [21]. A further extension, namely (p, q) -dual curvature measures, is due to Ai, Yang and Ye [1].

However, for infinite measures, necessary and sufficient conditions are still unknown. As Schneider pointed out in [33, 34], for C -pseudo-cones, their shape is strongly influenced by the shape of C if the distance from the origin tends to infinity. In order to neglect those regions where the measures loose interest, it seems that suitable weightings are even more desirable than weighted Minkowski problems for convex bodies [18, 23]. Based on this, the Θ -weighted surface area measure $S_{n-1}^\Theta(K, \cdot)$ of the C -pseudo-cone K was considerable by Schneider [33], which is defined by

$$S_{n-1}^\Theta(K, w) = \int_{\nu_K^{-1}(\omega)} \Theta(x) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x) \quad (1.1)$$

for Borel set $\omega \subset \Omega_{C^\circ}$, where $\Theta : C \setminus \{o\} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is continuous and homogeneous of degree $-q$ with $n-1 < q < n$ and ν_K is the outer unit normal vector of K at points $x \in \partial K$. Then the measure $S_{n-1}^\Theta(K, \cdot)$ is finite and the weighted Minkowski theorem for C -pseudo-cones is proved [33]. Further references involving pseudo-cones, we refer to [35, 31, 32, 34, 39].

Motivated by the weighted Minkowski theorem for C -pseudo-cones[33], a natural question to ask is: *is there any other suitable weighting that leads to a finite measure*

on Ω_{C° ? Considering that the Gaussian density $e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}}$ has similar property as mentioned above that Gaussian density decreases as $|x|$ increases, it seems feasible for our purpose to replace the weighting $\Theta(x)$ in (1.1) by the Gaussian density, which can be stated as

$$S_{\gamma^n}(K, \eta) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^n} \int_{\nu_K^{-1}(\eta)} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x) \quad (1.2)$$

for Borel set $\eta \subset \Omega_{C^\circ}$, where γ^n denotes the standard Gaussian probability measure. The measure $S_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot)$ is obviously finite. The Minkowski problem prescribing this measure, called *the Gaussian Minkowski problem for C -pseudo-cone*, is then formulated as follows:

Problem 1.1. Given a nonzero finite Borel measure μ on Ω_{C° , is there a C -pseudo-cone K such that $\mu = S_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot)$?

For convex body K and $\eta \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, $S_{\gamma^n}(K, \eta)$ is known as *the Gaussian surface area measure* of K constructed by Huang, Xi and Zhao [15]. The corresponding *Gaussian Minkowski problem* was studied in [15] and its L_p extension was posed by Liu [22], and the non-symmetric case was obtained by Feng, Liu and Xu [8]. For the latest achievements about the Gaussian Minkowski problem, we refer to [3, 7, 23].

However, the assertion in problem 1.1 is false for any cone. The main challenges arise from the lack of homogeneity in the Gaussian measure and its unusual decay rate. Additionally, the substantial differences between unbounded closed convex sets and convex bodies (sometimes the conclusion is just the opposite) further complicate the problem. These disparities pose significant obstacles to addressing the problem of pseudo-cones in Gaussian space. In fact, for solving problem 1.1, the variational arguments in cases of homogeneous weighted Minkowski problem [33, 34] and the classical Gaussian Minkowski problem in convex bodies [15] are invalid.

In this paper, the (normalized) Gaussian Minkowski problem for C -pseudo-cones will be solved by the variational method. Due to the inhomogeneity of Gaussian measure, it is generally impossible to restrict its (Gaussian) volume within the variational argument. The first assertion is as follows:

Theorem 1.2. *Let μ be a nonzero, finite Borel measure on Ω_{C° . Then there exists a C -pseudo cone K with*

$$\mu = cS_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot)$$

where $c = \frac{\int_{\Omega} \bar{h}_K d\mu}{\gamma^n(K)}$.

Meanwhile, as we will show in Section 5, the uniqueness result of the Gaussian Minkowski problem can be established when restricting the volume of C -pseudo-cone.

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose $K, L \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$ for some nonempty compact $\omega \subset \Omega_{C^\circ}$, $\gamma^n(K) = \gamma^n(L)$, if*

$$S_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot) = S_{\gamma^n}(L, \cdot),$$

then $K = L$.

Here $\mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$ is the set of C -pseudo-cones that are C -determined by ω (see Section 2). Roughly speaking, its shape is determined by some compact ω . In some special cases we can relax the volume restriction in Theorem 1.3 to $\gamma^n(K), \gamma^n(L) \leq \frac{1}{2}\gamma^n(C)$ and obtain the uniqueness result. Due to the unusual decay rate of Gaussian measure, if without the volume constraints, its uniqueness results differ significantly from the classical case:

Theorem 1.4. *For any pointed, closed convex cone C in \mathbb{R}^n and any nonempty compact $\omega \subset \Omega_{C^\circ}$, there exist $K, L \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$, such that $S_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot) = S_{\gamma^n}(L, \cdot)$, but $K \neq L$.*

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we list some notations and recall some basic facts about pseudo-cones. For a general reference on the theory of convex geometry, the readers may wish to consult Gardner [10] and Schneider [29].

Let S^{n-1} be the unit sphere, B the unit ball and o the origin in n -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n .

A subset C is a *cone* if $x \in C$ implies $\lambda x \in C$ for any $\lambda \geq 0$. For a pointed, n -dimensional closed convex cone $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is given. We recall that

$$C^\circ = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, y \rangle \leq 0 \text{ for all } y \in C\}$$

is its dual cone. A nonempty closed convex set K is called a *pseudo cone* if for any $x \in K$ we have $\lambda x \in K$, $\lambda \geq 1$. The recession cone of a nonempty closed convex set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ defined by

$$\text{rec } A = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^n : A + z \subseteq A\},$$

a C -pseudo-cone is a pseudo-cone with recession cone C . A unit vector $\mathbf{v} \in \text{int } C \cap \text{int } (-C^\circ)$ is fixed. The hyperplanes and halfspaces in \mathbb{R}^n are defined by

$$H(u, t) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, u \rangle = t\}, \quad H^-(u, t) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, u \rangle \leq t\}$$

and

$$H^+(u, t) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, u \rangle \geq t\}$$

for $u \in S^{n-1}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. For $t > 0$ we define

$$C^-(t) := C \cap H^-(\mathbf{v}, t), \quad C^+(t) := C \cap H^+(\mathbf{v}, t), \quad \text{and} \quad C(t) := C \cap H(\mathbf{v}, t).$$

Similarly, we will write $K(t) = K \cap C(t)$, $K^-(t) = K \cap C^-(t)$ and $K^+(t) = K \cap C^+(t)$.

The support function of C -pseudo-cone K is defined by

$$h_K(x) := \sup\{\langle x, y \rangle : y \in K\}, \quad x \in C^\circ. \quad (2.1)$$

We note that the supremum is a maximum if $x \in \text{int } C^\circ$ and that h_K is bounded and non-positive (it is negative on $\text{int } C$). From [35, 38] we know K is C -asymptotic if and only if $h_K(\partial\Omega) = 0$. For obtain the positive function we also write

$$\bar{h}_K := -h_K.$$

The radial function of K is defined by

$$\varrho_K(v) := \min\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \lambda v \in K\} \quad \text{for } v \in \Omega_C. \quad (2.2)$$

The radial map $r_K : \Omega_C \rightarrow \partial K$ is defined by

$$r_K(v) := \varrho_K(v)v, \quad v \in \Omega_C \quad (2.3)$$

and the radial Gauss map α_K of K is defined by

$$\alpha_K := \nu_K \circ r_K. \quad (2.4)$$

Let K be a C -pseudo-cone in \mathbb{R}^n , and define $\partial_i K := \partial K \cap \text{int } C$. It is known that the set $\sigma_K \subset \partial_i K$ that the outer unit normal vector $\nu_K(y)$ is not unique satisfies $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(\sigma_K) = 0$, and the map $\nu_K : \partial_i K \setminus \sigma_K \rightarrow \Omega_{C^\circ}$ is continuous. The following lemma was established in [32].

Lemma 2.1. *Let K be a C -pseudo-cone, $c_1, c_2 > 0$ be two constants, and $v \in \Omega$. There exists $t_0 > 0$ dependent only on c_1 and c_2 such that if $\text{dist}(o, K) < c_1$ and $\delta_{\partial\Omega}(v) \geq c_2$, then*

$$\nu_K^{-1}(v) \subset K^-(t_0) \subset C^-(t_0),$$

where $\delta_{\partial\Omega}(v)$ denote the spherical distance between $v \in \Omega$ and $\partial\Omega$.

Convergence of C -pseudo-cone is defined by Schneider:

Definition 2.2. We say a sequence of C -pseudo-cones K_i is convergent to a C -pseudo-cone K if there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $K_i^-(t_0) \neq \emptyset$ for all i and $K_i^-(t) \rightarrow K^-(t)$ in terms of Hausdorff metric for each $t \geq t_0$.

We will use the following selection theorem for C -pseudo cones in [32].

Lemma 2.3. *If K_i is a sequence of C -pseudo-cones and $\text{dist}(o, K_i)$ is uniformly bounded, then there exists a subsequence K_{i_j} such that $K_{i_j} \rightarrow K_0$ for some C -pseudo-cone K_0 .*

For $u \in \Omega$, we denote by

$$H_K(u) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, u \rangle = h_K(u)\}, \quad H_K^-(u) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, u \rangle \leq h_K(u)\}.$$

We recall that K is C -determined by the nonempty, compact set $\omega \subset \Omega$ if

$$K = C \cap \bigcap_{u \in \omega} H_K^-(u),$$

by $\mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$ we denote the set of C -pseudo-cones that are C -determined by ω . If $K \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$, then the absolute support function \bar{h}_K , restricted to ω , is positive and bounded away from zero. If K is C -determined by ω , then $C \setminus K$ is bounded. We will need the following lemma in [34].

Lemma 2.4. *If K_j are C -pseudo-cones, $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, satisfy $K_j \rightarrow K_0$ and if $\emptyset \neq \omega \subset \Omega$ is compact, then*

$$K_j^{(\omega)} \rightarrow K_0^{(\omega)}.$$

We will use Wulff shapes in given cone C . Let $\emptyset \neq \omega \subset \Omega$ be a compact set and $h : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ a positive continuous function. We define

$$[h] := C \cap \bigcap_{u \in \omega} \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle y, u \rangle \leq -h(u)\} \quad (2.5)$$

and this set will be called the *Wulff shape* with (C, ω, h) . The *Wulff shape* with (C, ω, h) belongs to $\mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$.

Let γ^n denote the standard Gaussian probability measure on Euclidean space $(\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|)$

$$\gamma^n(E) := \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}}} \int_E e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}} dx,$$

with a measurable set E . Compared with Lebesgue measure, Gaussian probability measure is neither translation invariant nor homogeneous.

The isoperimetric inequality in Gaussian space asserts that among all subsets of \mathbb{R}^n with prescribed Gaussian measure, half-spaces have the least Gaussian perimeter (see e.g., [19]). In [11], Gardner and Zvavitch studied the Brunn-Minkowski theory in Gaussian space, where it was asked whether the dimensional Brunn-Minkowski inequality holds with the Lebesgue measure replaced by γ^n . Very recently, this problem was settled in [6] for every symmetric convex sets K, L in \mathbb{R}^n and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$,

$$\gamma^n(\lambda K + (1 - \lambda)L)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \lambda \gamma^n(K)^{\frac{1}{n}} + (1 - \lambda) \gamma^n(L)^{\frac{1}{n}}, \quad (2.6)$$

with equality if and only if $K = L$. When the convex sets are not symmetric, a counterexample was produced in [28]. More references involving inequalities in Gaussian space can refer to [4, 11, 17, 24, 25, 20].

3. GAUSSIAN SURFACE AREA MEASURE

Let K be a C -pseudo-cone in \mathbb{R}^n . The Gaussian surface area measure of K is then defined by

$$S_{\gamma^n}(K, \eta) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^n} \int_{\nu_K^{-1}(\eta)} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x) \quad (3.1)$$

for every Borel set $\eta \subset \Omega$. We denote $\Omega := \Omega_{C^\circ} = S^{n-1} \cap \text{int } C^\circ$ in this paper.

Next, we need some properties of the Gaussian surface area measure.

Lemma 3.1. *Let K be a C -pseudo-cone, then the measure $S_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot)$ is finite.*

Proof. Let $\Theta(x) = |x|^{-q}$ with some $q > n - 1$, then exist $t_0 > 0$ such that for any $x \in C^+(t_0)$, we have $e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}} \leq \Theta(x)$. From [34] we know

$$\int_{\partial K \cap C^+(t_0)} \Theta(x) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x) < \infty,$$

so we get

$$\int_{\partial K \cap C^+(t_0)} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x) < \infty.$$

Since

$$\int_{\partial K \cap C^-(t_0)} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x) < \infty,$$

then the desired result follows. \square

We now require the transform integral formula from ∂K to Ω_C , the following result can be found in [34]. Note that for convex bodies, the similar result is presented in [13].

Lemma 3.2. *Let K be a C -pseudo-cone. Let $F : \partial_i K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be nonnegative and Borel measurable or \mathcal{H}^{n-1} -integrable. Then*

$$\int_{\partial_i K} F(y) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}y = \int_{\Omega_C} F(r_K(v)) \frac{\varrho_K^n(v)}{h_K(\alpha_K(v))} dv \quad (3.2)$$

$$= \int_{\Omega_C} F(r_K(v)) \frac{\varrho_K^{n-1}(v)}{|\langle v, \alpha_K(v) \rangle|} dv. \quad (3.3)$$

The following transform integral formula for the Gaussian surface area measure will be needed in the proof of the variational formula.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\omega \subseteq \Omega$ be a nonempty Borel set and $g : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be bounded and measurable. Then*

$$\int_{\omega} g(u) dS_{\gamma^n}(K, u) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^n} \int_{\alpha_K^{-1}(\omega)} g(\alpha_K(v)) e^{-\frac{e_K^2(v)}{2}} \frac{\varrho_K^{n-1}(v)}{|\langle v, \alpha_K(v) \rangle|} dv. \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. Let $F(y) := 1_{\omega}(\nu_K(y)) g(\nu_K(y)) e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{2}}$, from Lemma 3.2 we get

$$\int_{\partial_i K} 1_{\omega}(\nu_K(y)) g(\nu_K(y)) e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{2}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(y) = \int_{\alpha_K^{-1}(\omega)} g(\alpha_K(v)) e^{-\frac{e_K^2(v)}{2}} \frac{\varrho_K^{n-1}(v)}{|\langle v, \alpha_K(v) \rangle|} dv.$$

By the definition of Gaussian surface area measure we have

$$\int_{\omega} g(u) dS_{\gamma^n}(K, u) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^n} \int_{\partial_i K} 1_{\omega}(\nu_K(y)) g(\nu_K(y)) e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{2}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(y),$$

then the desired result follows. \square

Firstly we focus on the Minkowski type problem in $\mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$ for some compact $\omega \subset \Omega$, therefore we need shows the Gaussian surface area measure are weakly continuous in Definition 2.2 sense by Lemma 3.3.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\omega \subset \Omega$ be a nonempty compact subset, and let $K_j \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then $K_j \rightarrow K$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ implies the weak convergence $S_{\gamma^n}(K_j, \cdot) \xrightarrow{w} S_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot)$.*

Proof. Let $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be bounded and continuous. By Lemma 3.3 we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} g(u) dS_{\gamma^n}(K_j, u) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^n} \int_{\Omega_C} g(\alpha_{K_j}(v)) e^{-\frac{\varrho_{K_j}^2(v)}{2}} \frac{\varrho_{K_j}^{n-1}(v)}{|\langle v, \alpha_{K_j}(v) \rangle|} dv.$$

For almost everywhere $v \in \Omega_C$ we have

$$g(\alpha_{K_j}(v)) e^{-\frac{\varrho_{K_j}^2(v)}{2}} \frac{\varrho_{K_j}^{n-1}(v)}{|\langle v, \alpha_{K_j}(v) \rangle|} \rightarrow g(\alpha_K(v)) e^{-\frac{\varrho_K^2(v)}{2}} \frac{\varrho_K^{n-1}(v)}{|\langle v, \alpha_K(v) \rangle|}.$$

Since $K_j \rightarrow K$ in $\mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$, $|\langle v, \alpha_{K_j}(v) \rangle|$ is bounded away from 0 because $\alpha_{K_j}(v) \subset \omega$ and ω is compact, and ϱ_{K_j} is uniformly bounded. Then the left-hand side are uniformly bounded, this result follows from the dominated convergence theorem. \square

To study the Minkowski type existence problem using variational methods, we need the variational formula for Gaussian measure in pseudo-cones. The following result can be found in [34]. The similar result for convex bodies is presented in [13].

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\omega \subset \Omega$ be nonempty and compact, let $K \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$. Let $f : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous. There is a constant $\delta > 0$ such that the function h_t defined by*

$$h_t(u) := \bar{h}_K(u) + tf(u), \quad u \in \omega$$

is positive for $|t| \leq \delta$. Let $[h_t]$ be the Wulff shape associated with (C, ω, h_t) , for $|t| \leq \delta$.

(a) *For almost all $v \in \Omega_C$,*

$$\left. \frac{d\varrho_{[h_t]}(v)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\varrho_{[h_t]}(v) - \varrho_K(v)}{t} = \frac{f(\alpha_K(v))}{\bar{h}_K(\alpha_K(v))} \varrho_K(v).$$

(b) *There is a constant M with*

$$|\varrho_{[h_t]}(v) - \varrho_K(v)| \leq M|t|$$

for all $v \in \Omega_C$ and all $|t| \leq \delta$.

For convenience of calculation, we define the Gaussian covolume $V_G(K)$ for C -pseudo-cone K by

Definition 3.6.

$$V_G(K) = \gamma^n(C \setminus K).$$

Then the variational formula for Gaussian covolume in pseudo-cones can be established.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$, for some nonempty, compact set $\omega \subset \Omega$. Let $f : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous, and let $[\bar{h}_K|_{\omega} + tf]$ be the Wulff shape associated with $(C, \omega, \bar{h}_K|_{\omega} + tf)$. Then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{V_G([\bar{h}_K|_{\omega} + tf]) - V_G(K)}{t} = \int_{\omega} f(u) dS_{\gamma^n}(K, u). \quad (3.5)$$

Proof. For convenience we denote $h_t := \bar{h}_K + tf$. From the Definition 3.6 we have

$$V_G([h_t]) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^n} \int_{\Omega_C} \int_0^{\varrho[h_t](v)} e^{-\frac{r^2}{2}} r^{n-1} dr dv = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^n} \int_{\Omega_C} F_t(v) dv,$$

where $F_t(v) = \int_0^{\varrho[h_t](v)} e^{-\frac{r^2}{2}} r^{n-1} dr$. Then we obtain

$$\frac{F_t(v) - F_0(v)}{t} = \frac{1}{t} \int_{\varrho_K(v)}^{\varrho[h_t](v)} e^{-\frac{r^2}{2}} r^{n-1} dr \quad (3.6)$$

$$= \frac{\varrho[h_t](v) - \varrho_K(v)}{t} \cdot \frac{1}{\varrho[h_t](v) - \varrho_K(v)} \int_{\varrho_K(v)}^{\varrho[h_t](v)} e^{-\frac{r^2}{2}} r^{n-1} dr. \quad (3.7)$$

The first item from Lemma 3.5 and the second item converges to $e^{-\frac{\varrho_K^2}{2}} \varrho_K^{n-1}$. Combine this we get

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{F_t(v) - F_0(v)}{t} = e^{-\frac{\varrho_K^2}{2}} \frac{f(\alpha_K(v))}{h_K(\alpha_K(v))} \varrho_K^n(v) \quad (3.8)$$

for almost all $v \in \Omega_C$. From Lemma 3.5 we have

$$\left| \frac{F_t(v) - F_0(v)}{t} \right| \leq M$$

for some $M > 0$ in sufficiently small $|t|$. From the dominated convergence theorem, $F(y) = f(\nu_K(y))e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{2}}$ in Lemma 3.2, and the fact for $K \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$, $S_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot)$ is concentrated on ω , we can get

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{V_G([h_t]) - V_G(K)}{t} &= \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^n} \int_{\Omega_C} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{F_t(v) - F_0(v)}{t} dv \\ &= \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^n} \int_{\Omega_C} e^{-\frac{\varrho_K^2}{2}} \frac{f(\alpha_K(v))}{h_K(\alpha_K(v))} \varrho_K^n(v) dv \\ &= \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^n} \int_{\partial_i K} f(\nu_K(y)) e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{2}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(y) \\ &= \int_{\omega} f(u) dS_{\gamma^n}(K, u). \end{aligned}$$

□

Hence the variational formula for **real** Gaussian volume can be obtained.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$, for some nonempty, compact set $\omega \subset \Omega$. Let $f : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous, and let $[\bar{h}_K|_{\omega} + tf]$ be the Wulff shape associated with $(C, \omega, \bar{h}_K|_{\omega} + tf)$. Then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\gamma^n([\bar{h}_K|_{\omega} + tf]) - \gamma^n(K)}{t} = - \int_{\omega} f(u) dS_{\gamma^n}(K, u). \quad (3.9)$$

Proof. This follows from the fact that for any C -pseudo-cone L

$$\gamma^n(L) + V_G(L) = \gamma^n(C) < \frac{1}{2}.$$

□

The continuity of Gaussian volume in Definition 2.2 sense as follows.

Lemma 3.9. *The Gaussian volume functional $\gamma^n(\cdot)$ is continuous.*

Proof. If $K_j \rightarrow K$, let $\epsilon > 0$ be given, we can choose sufficiently big t such that $\gamma^n(C^+(t)) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ and $K_j \cap C^-(t) \neq \emptyset$ for $j \in N$. Since

$$K_j \cap C^-(t) \rightarrow K \cap C^-(t),$$

from the continuity of Gaussian volume for convex bodies in [36], there exists j_0 such for all $j > j_0$,

$$|\gamma^n(K_j \cap C^-(t)) - \gamma^n(K \cap C^-(t))| < \frac{\epsilon}{2},$$

then we have

$$|\gamma^n(K_j) - \gamma^n(K)| < \epsilon.$$

□

4. GAUSSIAN MINKOWSKI PROBLEM FOR C-PSEUDO-CONES

The core of the proof in the Minkowski-type existence theorem is to identify a variational functional such that the extremum of this functional exactly corresponds to the solution of the existence problem. The main challenges arise from the lack of homogeneity in the Gaussian measure and its unusual decay rate. Additionally, the substantial difference between unbounded closed convex sets and convex bodies further complicate the problem. These disparities pose significant obstacles to addressing the problem of pseudo-cones in Gaussian space.

In fact, the variational argument in homogeneous weighted Minkowski problem [33, 34] and the classical Gaussian Minkowski problem in convex bodies [15] does not apply in this case. So we propose a new variational functional to solve this problem. Specifically, we employ the Gaussian volume instead of the covolume in the usual pseudo-cone theory.

Theorem 4.1. *Let μ be a nonzero, finite Borel measure on Ω . Then there exists a C -pseudo cone K with*

$$cS_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot) = \mu$$

where $c = \frac{\int_{\Omega} \bar{h}_K d\mu}{\gamma^n(K)}$.

Let μ be a nonzero, finite Borel measure on ω with some compact $\omega \in \Omega$. For $f \in C^+(\omega)$, where we denote $C^+(\omega)$ the set of continuous functions $f : \omega \rightarrow (0, \infty)$. We define a functional $I_\mu : C^+(\omega) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ by

$$I_\mu(f) := \gamma^n([f]) \int_\omega f d\mu.$$

Where we recall that $[f]$ denotes the Wulff shape associated with (C, ω, f) and $\gamma^n(\cdot)$ denotes the real Gaussian measure.

Lemma 4.2. *Let μ be a nonzero, finite Borel measure on ω with some nonempty compact $\omega \in \Omega$. Then there exists a C -pseudo cone $K \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$ with*

$$\frac{\int_\omega \bar{h}_K d\mu}{\gamma^n(K)} S_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot) = \mu.$$

Proof. Note that for each $f \in C^+(\omega)$, by the definition of Wulff shape, we have $\bar{h}_{[f]} \geq f$, therefore

$$I_\mu(f) = \gamma^n([f]) \int_\omega f d\mu \leq \gamma^n([f]) \int_\omega \bar{h}_{[f]} d\mu = I_\mu(\bar{h}_{[f]}).$$

If $g = \bar{h}_K$ is a maximizer of $I_\mu(f)$, from Lemma 3.8, we have

$$0 = \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} I_\mu(\bar{h}_K + tf) = \gamma^n(K) \int_\omega f d\mu - \int_\omega f dS_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot) \int_\omega \bar{h}_K d\mu. \quad (4.1)$$

We assume that the support function \bar{h}_{K_i} such that

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} I_\mu(\bar{h}_{K_i}) = \sup \{I_\mu(f) : f \in C^+(\omega)\} > 0.$$

Now we set

$$r_i = \min\{r : rB \cap K_i \neq \emptyset\},$$

if there a subsequence, still denoted by r_i , such that $r_i \rightarrow \infty$, note the support function of K_i satisfies

$$\bar{h}_{K_i} \leq r_i,$$

and

$$K_i \subset \mathbb{R}^n - r_i B,$$

where $\gamma^n(\mathbb{R}^n - r_i B) = 1 - \gamma^n(r_i B)$. Then we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} I_\mu(\bar{h}_{K_i}) &= \gamma^n(K_i) \int_\omega \bar{h}_{K_i} d\mu \\ &\leq (1 - \gamma^n(r_i B)) \mu(\omega) r_i \\ &= \mathbb{P}(|x| > r_i) \mu(\omega) r_i \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbb{P} denotes the probability corresponding to the standard normal distribution. the last convergence follows from the Exponential decay of normal distribution. This contradicts $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} I_\mu(\bar{h}_{K_i}) = \sup I_\mu$, hence for each $K \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$, $I_\mu(\bar{h}_K) > 0$. Meanwhile, if $r_i \rightarrow 0$, we also have $I_\mu(\bar{h}_{K_i}) \rightarrow 0$ by above estimate, a contradiction.

This implies that $\text{dist}(o, \partial K_i)$ is uniformly bounded. We therefore may use Lemma 2.3 to extract a subsequence, denoted still as K_i such that $K_i \rightarrow K$ for some $K \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$ (see Lemma 2.4). In other words, we have $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} I_\mu(\bar{h}_{K_i}) = I_\mu(\bar{h}_K) = \sup I_\mu(f)$. From (4.1), the desired result follows. \square

We are ready to provide a proof of Theorem 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We will use the approximation methods. Firstly we choose a sequence $\{\omega_i\}$ of compact subsets of Ω and $\omega_i \subset \text{int } \omega_{i+1}$, and $\cup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \omega_j = \Omega$. Let $\mu_i = \mu \llcorner \omega_i$, where $\mu \llcorner \omega_i(\sigma) := \mu(\sigma \cap \omega_i)$ for any Borel subset $\sigma \subset \Omega$. There exists a i_0 such that $\mu_{i_0} \neq 0$. By Lemma 4.2, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $i \geq i_0$ there exists a C -pseudo-cone $K_i \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega_i)$ satisfying

$$\frac{\int_{\omega_i} \bar{h}_{K_i} d\mu_i}{\gamma^n(K_i)} S_{\gamma^n}(K_i, \cdot) = \mu_i.$$

For $K_i \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega_i)$,

$$K_i = C \cap \bigcap_{u \in \omega_i} H_{K_i}^-(u) \supset C \cap \bigcap_{u \in \omega_{i+1}} H_{K_i}^-(u) \supset C \cap \bigcap_{u \in \Omega} H_{K_i}^-(u) = K_i,$$

therefore $K_i \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega_{i+1})$, then we have $K_i = [\bar{h}_{K_i}|_{\omega_i}] = [\bar{h}_{K_i}|_{\omega_{i+1}}]$. Since $\mu_i \leq \mu_{i+1} \leq \mu$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < I_{\mu_i}(\bar{h}_{K_i}) &= \gamma^n([\bar{h}_{K_i}|_{\omega_i}]) \int_{\omega_i} \bar{h}_{K_i} d\mu_i \\ &= \gamma^n([\bar{h}_{K_i}|_{\omega_{i+1}}]) \int_{\omega_i} \bar{h}_{K_i} d\mu_i \\ &\leq \gamma^n([\bar{h}_{K_i}|_{\omega_{i+1}}]) \int_{\omega_{i+1}} \bar{h}_{K_i} d\mu_{i+1} \\ &\leq I_{\mu_{i+1}}(\bar{h}_{K_{i+1}}). \end{aligned}$$

Now we set

$$r_i = \min\{r : rB \cap K_i \neq \emptyset\},$$

similar as Lemma 4.2, if there a subsequence, still denoted by r_i , such that $r_i \rightarrow \infty$. The support function of K_i satisfies

$$\bar{h}_{K_i} \leq r_i,$$

and

$$K_i \subset \mathbb{R}^n - r_i B,$$

where $\gamma^n(\mathbb{R}^n - r_i B) = 1 - \gamma^n(r_i B)$. Then we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\mu_i}(\bar{h}_{K_i}) &= \gamma^n(K_i) \int_{\omega_i} \bar{h}_{K_i} d\mu_i \\ &\leq (1 - \gamma^n(r_i B)) \mu(\Omega) r_i \\ &= \mathbb{P}(|x| > r_i) \mu(\Omega) r_i \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

which contradict to $0 < I_{\mu_i}(\bar{h}_{K_i}) \leq I_{\mu_{i+1}}(\bar{h}_{K_{i+1}}) \leq \dots$ for $i \geq i_0$. Similarly, if $r_i \rightarrow 0$, $I_{\mu_i}(\bar{h}_{K_i}) \rightarrow 0$ by above estimate, a contradiction.

This implies that $\text{dist}(o, \partial K_i)$ is uniformly bounded. We therefore may use Lemma 2.3 to extract a subsequence, denoted still as K_i such that $K_i \rightarrow K$. Since K_i are C -pseudo, then there exists $z \in K_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $z + C \subset K_i$, i.e., $\gamma^n(K_i) \geq \gamma^n(z + C)$. So the $c_i := \frac{\int_{\Omega} \bar{h}_{K_i} d\mu_i}{\gamma^n(K_i)}$ is uniformly bounded, $c_i \rightarrow c = \frac{\int_{\Omega} \bar{h}_K d\mu}{\gamma^n(K)}$ by Lemma 3.9. Now we have

$$K_i \rightarrow K \quad \text{and} \quad c_i \rightarrow c.$$

We fix i , choose a compact $\beta \subset \Omega$ with $\omega_i \subset \text{int } \beta$, then it follows Lemma 13 in [34],

$$\nu_{K_j}^{-1}(\omega_i) = \nu_{K_j^{(\beta)}}^{-1}(\omega_i), \quad \nu_K^{-1}(\omega_i) = \nu_{K^{(\beta)}}^{-1}(\omega_i),$$

and from Lemma 2.4,

$$K_i^{(\beta)} \rightarrow K^{(\beta)}.$$

Lemma 3.4 shows that the $S_{\gamma^n}(K_j) \llcorner \omega_i$ converges to $S_{\gamma^n}(K^{(\beta)}) \llcorner \omega_i$ weakly. Then we have

$$c_j S_{\gamma^n}(K_j, \cdot) \llcorner \omega_i \xrightarrow{w} c S_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot) \llcorner \omega_i.$$

Since $c_i S_{\gamma^n}(K_i, \cdot) \llcorner \omega_i = \mu \llcorner \omega_i$, it follows that for each Borel set $\sigma \subset \omega_i$ we have $c S_{\gamma^n}(K, \sigma) = c S_{\gamma^n}(K^{(\beta)}, \sigma) = \mu_i(\sigma) = \mu(\sigma)$. Since $\cup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \omega_j = \Omega$, we deduce that $c S_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot) = \mu$.

5. UNIQUENESS OF SOLUTION

The Ehrhard inequality was shown by Ehrhard [5] and generalized in some other versions [19]. It implies the Gaussian isoperimetric inequality that among all subsets of \mathbb{R}^n with prescribed Gaussian measure, half-spaces have the least Gaussian perimeter. For C -pseudo-cones (convex sets), we need the Ehrhard inequality in [37] as follows.

Theorem 5.1. *Let K, L be two C -pseudo-cone in \mathbb{R}^n . For $0 < t < 1$, we have*

$$\Phi^{-1}(\gamma^n((1-t)K + tL)) \geq (1-t)\Phi^{-1}(\gamma^n(K)) + t\Phi^{-1}(\gamma^n(L)). \quad (5.1)$$

Here,

$$\Phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^x e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt.$$

Moreover, equality holds if and only if $K = L$.

General versions of the Ehrhard inequality, and the equality condition in (5.1) can be found in Shenfeld and van Handel [37]. The log concavity property of Gaussian measures, as stated below, can be deduced from Ehrhard inequality.

Lemma 5.2. *Let K, L be two C -pseudo-cone in \mathbb{R}^n . For $0 < t < 1$, we have*

$$\gamma^n((1-t)K + tL) \geq \gamma^n(K)^{1-t} \gamma^n(L)^t \quad (5.2)$$

with equality if and only if $K = L$.

From the variational formula (3.8), the following Minkowski type inequality for C -pseudo-cone was established.

Lemma 5.3. *If $K, L \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$ for some nonempty compact $\omega \subset \Omega$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{\gamma^n(K)} \int_{\omega} \bar{h}_K - \bar{h}_L dS_{\gamma^n} K \geq \log \gamma^n(L) - \log \gamma^n(K), \quad (5.3)$$

with equality if and only if $K = L$.

Proof. From the definition in (2.5), for $0 < t < 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [\bar{h}_K|_{\omega} + t(\bar{h}_L|_{\omega} - \bar{h}_K|_{\omega})] &= C \cap \bigcap_{u \in \omega} \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle y, u \rangle \leq (1-t)h_K(u) + th_L(u)\} \\ &\supset C \cap \bigcap_{u \in \Omega} \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle y, u \rangle \leq (1-t)h_K(u) + th_L(u)\} \\ &= (1-t)K + tL. \end{aligned}$$

If K is a C -pseudo-cone, for any $a > 0$, we have $aK \subset C$ and $aK + C = aK + aC = a(K + C) \subset aK$, hence aK also a C -pseudo-cone, then the last equality follows from [35, 38]. From Lemma 5.2 we obtain

$$\gamma^n([\bar{h}_K|_{\omega} + t(\bar{h}_L|_{\omega} - \bar{h}_K|_{\omega})]) \geq \gamma^n((1-t)K + tL) \geq \gamma^n(K)^{1-t} \gamma^n(L)^t,$$

in other words

$$\begin{aligned} \log(\gamma^n([\bar{h}_K|_{\omega} + t(\bar{h}_L|_{\omega} - \bar{h}_K|_{\omega})])) &\geq \log(\gamma^n((1-t)K + tL)) \\ &\geq (1-t) \log \gamma^n(K) + t \log \gamma^n(L). \end{aligned}$$

Since $K \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$, when $t = 0$, $\gamma^n([\bar{h}_K|_{\omega}]) = \gamma^n(K)$. Take the right derivative in $t = 0$ for

$$\log(\gamma^n([\bar{h}_K|_{\omega} + t(\bar{h}_L|_{\omega} - \bar{h}_K|_{\omega})])) \geq (1-t) \log \gamma^n(K) + t \log \gamma^n(L),$$

From Lemma 3.8 we get

$$-\frac{1}{\gamma^n(K)} \int_{\omega} \bar{h}_L - \bar{h}_K dS_{\gamma^n} K \geq \log \gamma^n(L) - \log \gamma^n(K).$$

If equality holds, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\log(\gamma^n([\bar{h}_K|_{\omega} + t(\bar{h}_L|_{\omega} - \bar{h}_K|_{\omega})])) - \log(\gamma^n(K))}{t} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\log(\gamma^n((1-t)K + tL)) - \log(\gamma^n(K))}{t} \\ &= \log \gamma^n(L) - \log \gamma^n(K). \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

Lemma 5.2 implies the function $g(t) = \log(\gamma^n((1-t)K + tL))$ is concave in $[0, 1]$. If equality holds, $g'(0) = g(1) - g(0)$ in (5.4), then $g(t)$ is a linear function. Equality holds in Lemma 5.2 implies $K = L$. \square

Now we define the Gaussian mixed volume $\gamma_1(K, L)$ for C -pseudo-cones.

Definition 5.4. For C -pseudo-cone K, L , the *Gaussian mixed volume* is defined by

$$\gamma_1(K, L) = \int_{\Omega} h_L(u) dS_{\gamma^n}(K, u). \quad (5.5)$$

Then Lemma 5.3 implies

$$\gamma_1(K, K) - \gamma_1(K, L) \geq \gamma^n(K) \log \frac{\gamma^n(L)}{\gamma^n(K)}. \quad (5.6)$$

Then the uniqueness of the Gaussian Minkowski problem can be established when we restrict to the set of $\mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$ whose with the same Gaussian measure.

Theorem 5.5. *Suppose $K, L \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$ for some nonempty compact $\omega \subset \Omega$, $\gamma^n(K) = \gamma^n(L)$, if*

$$cS_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot) = S_{\gamma^n}(L, \cdot),$$

for any constant $c > 0$, then $K = L$.

Proof. From Lemma 5.3 and (5.6), if $cS_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot) = S_{\gamma^n}(L, \cdot)$ and $\gamma^n(K) = \gamma^n(L)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1(L, L) &= \int_{\Omega} h_L dS_{\gamma^n} L = c \int_{\Omega} h_L dS_{\gamma^n} K \\ &= c\gamma_1(K, L) \leq c\gamma_1(K, K). \end{aligned}$$

Switching the role of K and L , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1(K, K) &= \int_{\Omega} h_K dS_{\gamma^n} K = \frac{1}{c} \int_{\Omega} h_K dS_{\gamma^n} L \\ &= \frac{1}{c} \gamma_1(L, K) \leq \frac{1}{c} \gamma_1(L, L). \end{aligned}$$

Combine this two inequalities above we get

$$\gamma_1(L, L) \leq c\gamma_1(K, K) \leq c \left(\frac{1}{c} \gamma_1(L, L) \right) = \gamma_1(L, L).$$

Hence, the equality holds in above two inequalities, from Lemma 5.3, we have $K = L$. \square

In Lemma 4.2, if $\mu = cS_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot) = eS_{\gamma^n}(L, \cdot)$ and $\gamma^n(K) = \gamma^n(L)$. From Theorem 5.5, we have $K = L$.

Due to the unusual decay rate of Gaussian measure, if without the volume constraints, its uniqueness results differ significantly from the classical case:

Theorem 5.6. *For any pointed, closed convex cone C in \mathbb{R}^n and any nonempty compact $\omega \subset \Omega$, there exist $K, L \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$, such that $S_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot) = S_{\gamma^n}(L, \cdot)$, but $K \neq L$.*

Proof. For any pointed, closed convex cone C in \mathbb{R}^n and any compact $\omega \subset \Omega$, for each $b \in \omega$, since Gaussian measure is a rotational invariant, after applying a rotation, we can assume $b = -e_n \in \Omega$. Denoted $C \cap H(e_n, t)$ by $H(t)$ and

$$A = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : (x, 1) \in H(1)\}.$$

Let $g(t) = \int_{H(t)} e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{2}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(y)$, $t > 0$ is Gaussian surface area of $H(t)$ (up to a constant). Then

$$\begin{aligned} g(t) &= \int_{H(t)} e^{-\frac{|y|^2}{2}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(y) \\ &= \int_{(x,t) \in H(t)} e^{-\frac{|x|^2+t^2}{2}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x) \\ &= e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} \int_{tA} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x) \\ &= ae^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} \gamma^{n-1}(tA) \end{aligned}$$

for some constant a . Then we have $g(t) > 0$, if $t \rightarrow 0$, $g(t) \rightarrow 0$. And $t \rightarrow \infty$, $g(t) \rightarrow 0$. Then there exist $t_1, t_2 > 0$, $t_1 \neq t_2$ such that $g(t_1) = g(t_2)$.

Let $K = H(t_1) + C$ and $L = H(t_2) + C$. $K, L \in \mathcal{K}(C, b)$, then we have

$$S_{\gamma^n}(K, b) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^n} g(t_1)$$

and

$$S_{\gamma^n}(L, b) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{2\pi})^n} g(t_2),$$

$S_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot), S_{\gamma^n}(L, \cdot)$ has support in b . Therefore $S_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot) = S_{\gamma^n}(L, \cdot)$.

For any $E \in \mathcal{K}(C, b)$, we have

$$E = C \cap H_E^-(b) \supset C \cap \bigcap_{u \in \omega} H_E^-(u) \supset C \cap \bigcap_{u \in \Omega} H_E^-(u) = E,$$

hence $E = C \cap \bigcap_{u \in \omega} H_E^-(u) \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$. Therefore $K, L \in \mathcal{K}(C, \omega)$, the desired result follows. \square

Example 5.7. From Theorem 5.6 we have $g(t)$ is bounded, denoted by $g(t) \leq c$. **For any Borel measure μ on Ω , if $\mu(b) > c$ where $b \in \Omega$ in Theorem 5.6, there is no C -pseudo cone K such that $S_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot) = \mu$.**

For example, let $C = \{(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta) : r \geq 0, \theta \in [\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{3\pi}{4}]\}$, then $g(t) = \gamma^1(C \cap H(b, -t)) \leq \gamma^1(\partial C) = 1$, where $\gamma^1(\partial C) = 1$ from the rotation invariance in Gaussian space. Hence, if $\mu(b) > 1$, there is no C -pseudo cone K such that $S_{\gamma^n}(K, \cdot) = \mu$.

Next, we discuss a special case in \mathbb{R}^2 . This remark implies that it is possible to relax the volume restriction in Theorem 5.5 and obtain the uniqueness result.

Remark 5.8. Let $C = \{(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta) : r \geq 0, \theta \in [\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{3\pi}{4}]\}$, $\omega = (0, -1) \in \Omega$. Denoted $C \cap H((0, 1), t)$ by $H(t)$ and $H(t) \cap \partial C = (\pm a, t)$. Let $K_t = H(t) + C$ and K'_t is the convex hull of $(\pm a, \pm t)$. Then we have for $K, L \in K(C, \omega)$, $S_{\gamma^2}(K, \cdot) = S_{\gamma^2}(L, \cdot)$ if and only if $S_{\gamma^2}(K', \cdot) = S_{\gamma^2}(L', \cdot)$. From [15], if $\gamma^2(K'), \gamma^2(L') \geq \frac{1}{2}$, in other words, $\gamma^2(C \setminus K), \gamma^2(C \setminus L) \geq \frac{1}{2}\gamma^2(C)$, that is $\gamma^2(K), \gamma^2(L) \leq \frac{1}{2}\gamma^2(C)$, we have $K' = L'$, then $K = L$.

In other words, for any $v \in \Omega$, $K, L \in K(C, v)$, if $S_{\gamma^2}(K, \cdot) = S_{\gamma^2}(L, \cdot)$ and $\gamma^2(K), \gamma^2(L) \leq \frac{1}{2}\gamma^2(C)$, then $K = L$.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Ai, Y. Yang, D. Ye, *The L_p dual Minkowski problem for unbounded closed convex sets*, (2024), arXiv:2404.09804v1.
- [2] K.J. Böröczky, E. Lutwak, D. Yang, G. Zhang, *The logarithmic Minkowski problem*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **26** (2013), 831–852.
- [3] S. Chen, S. Hu, W. Liu, Y. Zhao, *On the planar Gaussian-Minkowski problem*, Adv. Math. **435**(2023), Paper No. 109351.
- [4] A. Cianchi, N. Fusco, F. Maggi, A. Pratelli, *On the isoperimetric deficit in Gauss space*, Amer. J. Math. **133** (2011), 131–186.
- [5] A. Ehrhard, *Symétrisation dans l'espace de Gauss*, Math. Scand. **53(2)** (1983), 281–301.
- [6] A. Eskenazis, G. Moschidis, *The dimensional Brunn-Minkowski inequality in Gauss space*, J. Funct. Anal. **280** (2021), 108914.
- [7] Y. Feng, S. Hu, L. Xu, *On the L_p Gaussian Minkowski problem*, J. Differ. Equa. **363** (2023), 350–390.
- [8] Y. Feng, W. Liu, L. Xu, *Existence of non-symmetric solutions to the Gaussian Minkowski problem*, J. Geom. Anal. **33** (2023), Paper No. 89.
- [9] R.J. Gardner, *The Brunn-Minkowski inequality*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **39** (2002) 355–405.
- [10] R.J. Gardner, *Geometric Tomography*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2nd edition, 2006.
- [11] R.J. Gardner, A. Zvavitch, *Gaussian Brunn-Minkowski inequalities*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **362** (2010), 5333–5353.
- [12] J. Hu, *The Gaussian log-Minkowski problem*, arXiv:2401.08427v4.
- [13] Y. Huang, E. Lutwak, D. Yang, G. Zhang, *Geometric measures in the dual Brunn-Minkowski theory and their associated Minkowski problems*, Acta Math. **216** (2016), 325–388.
- [14] Y. Huang, E. Lutwak, D. Yang, G. Zhang, *The L_p -Aleksandrov problem for L_p -integral curvature*, J. Differential Geom. **110** (2018), 1–29.

- [15] Y. Huang, D. Xi, Y. Zhao, *The Minkowski problem in Gaussian probability space*, Adv. Math. **385** (2021), 107769.
- [16] Y. Huang, D. Yang, G. Zhang, *Minkowski problems for Geometric measures*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (2024).
- [17] M. Klartag, V. Milman, *Geometry of log-concave functions and measures*, Geom. Dedicata **112** (2005), 169–182.
- [18] L. Kryvonos, D. Langharst, *Weighted Minkowski’s existence theorem and projection bodies*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **376** (2023), 8447–8493.
- [19] R. Latała, *On some inequalities for Gaussian measures*, In Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. II (Beijing, 2002), pages 813–822. Higher Ed. Press, Beijing, 2002.
- [20] J. Lehec, *A direct proof of the functional Santaló inequality*, C. R. Math. **347** (2009), 55–58.
- [21] N. Li, D. Ye, B. Zhu, *The dual Minkowski problem for unbounded closed convex sets*, Math. Ann. **388** (2024), 2001–2039.
- [22] J. Liu, *The L_p Gaussian Minkowski problem*, Calc. Var. Partial Differ. Equ. **61** (2022), 1–23.
- [23] G.V. Livshyts, *An extension of Minkowski’s theorem and its applications questions about projections for measures*, Adv. Math. **356** (2019), Paper No.106803, 40pp.
- [24] E. Lutwak, *The Brunn-Minkowski-Firey theory I: Mixed volumes and the Minkowski Problem*, J. Differential Geom. **38** (1993), 131–150.
- [25] E. Lutwak, *The Brun-Minkowski-Firey theory II: Affine and geominimal surface areas*, Adv. Math. **118** (1996), 244–294.
- [26] E. Lutwak, D. Xi, D. Yang, G. Zhang, *Chord measures in integral geometry and their Minkowski problem*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **77** (2024), 3277–3330.
- [27] E. Milman, L. Rotem, *Complemented Brunn-Minkowski inequalities and isoperimetry for homogeneous and non-homogeneous measures*, Adv. Math. **262** (2014), 867–908. Corrigendum: Adv. Math. **307** (2017), 1378–1379.
- [28] P. Nayar, T. Tkocz, *A note on a Brunn-Minkowski inequality for the Gaussian measure*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **141** (2013), 4027–4030.
- [29] R. Schneider, *Convex Bodies: The Brunn-Minkowski Theory*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2014.
- [30] R. Schneider, *A Brunn-Minkowski theory for coconvex sets of finite volume*, Adv. Math. **332** (2018), 199–234.
- [31] R. Schneider, *Minkowski type theorems for convex sets in cones*, Acta Math. Hungar. **164** (2021), 282–295.
- [32] R. Schneider, *Pseudo-cones*, Adv. in Appl. Math. **155** (2024), Paper No. 102657, 22pp.
- [33] R. Schneider, *A weighted Minkowski theorem for pseudo-cones*, Adv. Math. **450** (2024), Paper No. 109760, 26pp.

- [34] R. Schneider, *Weighted cone-volume measures of pseudo-cones*, (2024), arXiv:2407.05095v1.
- [35] V. Semenov, Y. Zhao, *The growth rate of surface area measure for noncompact convex sets with prescribed asymptotic cone*, (2024), arXiv:2409.18699v1.
- [36] J. Shan, W. Xu, L. Yin, *L_p Blaschke-Santaló and Petty projection inequalities in Gaussian space*, Arch. Math. **122** (2024), 331–342.
- [37] Y. Shenfeld, R. van Handel, *The equality cases of the Ehrhard-Borell inequality*, Adv. Math. **331** (2018), 339–386.
- [38] X. Wang, W. Xu, J. Zhou, B. Zhu, *Asymptotic theory of C -pseudo-cones*, (2024), arXiv:2410.14962v2.
- [39] Y. Xu, J. Li, G. Leng, *Dualities and endomorphisms of pseudo-cones*, Adv. Appl. Math. **142** (2023), 1–31.
- [40] J. Yang, D. Ye, B. Zhu, *On the L_p Brunn-Minkowski theory and the L_p Minkowski problem for C -coconvex sets*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **2023** (2022), 6252–6290.
- [41] N. Zhang, *The Minkowski problem for the non-compact convex set with an asymptotic boundary condition*, (2024), arXiv:2402.12802v1.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, SICHUAN UNIVERSITY, CHENGDU, SICHUAN, 610000, PR CHINA
Email address: shanjmath@163.com, wenchuan@scu.edu.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, SOUTHWEST UNIVERSITY, CHONGQING 400715, PR CHINA
Email address: xuwenxue83@swu.edu.cn