

ON THE REVERSE ISOPERIMETRIC INEQUALITY IN GAUSS SPACE

F. BROCK¹ - F. CHIACCHIO²

ABSTRACT. In this paper we investigate the reverse isoperimetric inequality with respect to the Gaussian measure for convex sets in \mathbb{R}^2 . While the isoperimetric problem for the Gaussian measure is well understood, many relevant aspects of the reverse problem have not yet been investigated. In particular, to the best of our knowledge, there seem to be no results on the shape that the isoperimetric set should take. Here, through of a local perturbation analysis, we show that smooth perimeter-maximizing sets have locally flat boundaries. Additionally, we derive sharper perimeter bounds than those previously known, particularly for specific classes of convex sets such as the convex sets symmetric with respect to the axes. Finally, for quadrilaterals with vertices on the coordinate axes, we prove that the set maximizing the perimeter “degenerates” into the x-axis, traversed twice.

Key words: Gauss space, reverse isoperimetric inequality, convex sets

Mathematics Subject Classification: 52A40, 49K15, 49Q10

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we study a reverse isoperimetric inequality in the plane with respect to the Gaussian measure. Clearly the problem is meaningful only if some constraints are imposed on the class of sets considered. Here we focus on convex sets in \mathbb{R}^2 . This problem, which has attracted the attention of many authors, see e.g. [1, 11, 12, 13] and the references therein, falls within the category of shape optimization problems (for an overview of this research topic, see, e.g., the classic monographs [9] and [10]).

The problem addressed here has significant applications. For instance, its importance in Computational Learning Theory is discussed in [4] and [8] (see also the references therein).

It is worth noticing that, while the isoperimetric problem with respect to the Gaussian measure has been thoroughly studied and fully understood, see [3, 5, 6, 14], many aspects of the reverse problem remain unclear.

Before discussing how our results fit into the existing literature, let us also mention that similar issues have been addressed for the unweighted case, see, e.g., [2, 7] and the references therein.

Let Ω be a convex set in \mathbb{R}^N , with $N \geq 2$, one defines its Gaussian measure and perimeter as follows

$$\gamma_N(\Omega) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{N}{2}}} \int_{\Omega} \exp\left(-\frac{|\mathbf{x}|^2}{2}\right) d\mathbf{x}$$

and

$$P_{\gamma_N}(\Omega) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{N}{2}}} \int_{\partial\Omega} \exp\left(-\frac{|\mathbf{x}|^2}{2}\right) d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}.$$

¹Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Landesstudienkolleg, 06114 Halle, Paracelsus-Str. 22, Germany, e-mail: friedemann.brock@studienkolleg.uni-halle.de

²Dipartimento di Matematica e Applicazioni “R. Caccioppoli”, Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II, Complesso Monte S. Angelo, via Cintia, 80126 Napoli, Italy, e-mail: francesco.chiacchio@unina.it

In [1] the author proves that

$$(1.1) \quad c_N := \sup \{ P_{\gamma_N}(\Omega), \Omega \text{ convex subset of } \mathbb{R}^N \} \leq 4N^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Nazarov, in [13], among other things, showed that the behavior of the constant c_N with respect to N , provided in the previous inequality, is optimal. However, for any fixed dimension N , it seems that neither the value of best constant nor the shape of the maximizing set is known.

We are now in position to state our main results. The first result, derived through a local analysis and presented in Section 2, shows that a perimeter-maximizing set within the considered class is locally flat. So it provides an indication of the shape that the maximizing set should take.

Theorem 1.1. *Let Ω be a maximizer for the shape functional:*

$$D \text{ convex subset of } \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow P_{\gamma_2}(D).$$

Assume that $\exists P \in \partial\Omega : B_{2\delta}(P) \cap \partial\Omega \in C^2$, for some $\delta > 0$. Then $B_\delta(P) \cap \partial\Omega$ is a straight segment.

Note that the Theorem above does not address the existence of a maximizing set. The following result addresses this issue this, but within a significantly small class of convex sets \tilde{T} , which is the class of convex quadrilaterals with the four vertices lying in the four different semiaxes. In Section 3, we prove the following

Theorem 1.2. *The following sharp inequality holds*

$$(1.2) \quad P_{\gamma_2}(T) < \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \quad \text{for any } T \in \tilde{T}.$$

We will prove the optimality of the constant in (1.2) by showing that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} P_{\gamma_2}(T_n) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}},$$

where $\{T_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of rhombuses that “converges” to the x -axis. Thus, loosely speaking, the optimal set within the class \tilde{T} is the x -axis traversed twice.

In the last section, we obtain a bound for c_2 sharper than the one presented in (1.1). On the other hand, our result holds true in \tilde{C} , which is a class of convex sets much larger than \tilde{T} , but still strictly contained within the class of all convex sets in \mathbb{R}^2 .

More precisely, the class \tilde{C} is made by all convex bounded sets in \mathbb{R}^2 such that

$$C \in \tilde{C} \Leftrightarrow C = \{(x, y) \in [a, b] \times \mathbb{R} : -g(x) \leq y \leq f(x)\},$$

where $a < 0 < b$, $f, g : [a, b] \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ are two concave functions such that

$$f(a) = f(b) = g(a) = g(b) = 0$$

and

$$\max_{[a,b]} f(x) = f(0), \quad \min_{[a,b]} g(x) = g(0).$$

In the fourth and last section, we prove the following

Theorem 1.3. *For any $C \in \tilde{C}$ it holds that*

$$(1.3) \quad P_{\gamma_2}(C) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\partial C} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2 + y^2}{2}\right) d\mathcal{H}^1 \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}}.$$

2. A MAXIMIZER IS LOCALLY FLAT

The next two Lemmas will be used in the proof (obtained arguing by contradiction) of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a maximizer, $(x_0, y_0) \in \partial\Omega$ with $y_0 > 0$ such that for some $\delta > 0$ it holds*

$$\partial\Omega \cap \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x - x_0| \leq \delta\} = \{(x, f(x)) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x - x_0| \leq \delta\},$$

where $f \in C^2([x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta]; \mathbb{R})$, $f'(x_0) = 0$, $f''(x_0) < 0$. Then

$$(2.1) \quad f''(x_0) \leq -2y_0.$$

Proof of Lemma 2.1. Assumption (2.1) tells us that, if $t > 0$ is small enough, say $t \leq t_0$, then there are unique numbers $x_1(t), x_2(t)$ such that

$$x_1(t) < x_0 < x_2(t), \quad f(x_1(t)) = f(x_2(t)) = y_0 - t \quad \text{and} \quad |x_i(t) - x_0| < \delta, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Further, for $i = 1, 2$, we have

$$(2.2) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} x_i(t) = x_0$$

and

$$(2.3) \quad x'_i(t) = -\frac{1}{f'(x_i(t))}.$$

Let

$$\Omega(t) := \Omega \cap \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y < y_0 - t\}.$$

We have

$$2\pi [P_{\gamma_2}(\Omega(t)) - P_{\gamma_2}(\Omega)] = \int_{x_1(t)}^{x_2(t)} \left[\exp\left(-\frac{x^2 + (y_0 - t)^2}{2}\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{x^2 + f'(x)^2}{2}\right) \sqrt{1 + f'(x)^2} \right] dx$$

and

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} 2\pi \frac{d}{dt} P_{\gamma_2}(\Omega(t)) &= -\frac{1}{f'(x_2(t))} \exp\left(-\frac{x_2(t)^2 + (y_0 - t)^2}{2}\right) \left(1 - \sqrt{1 + f'(x_2(t))^2}\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{f'(x_1(t))} \exp\left(-\frac{x_1(t)^2 + (y_0 - t)^2}{2}\right) \left(1 - \sqrt{1 + f'(x_1(t))^2}\right) \\ &\quad + \int_{x_1(t)}^{x_2(t)} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2 + (y_0 - t)^2}{2}\right) (y_0 - t) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$f'(x_1(t)) > 0 > f'(x_2(t))$$

and, by (2.3) and (2.2),

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f'(x_2(t))}{f'(x_1(t))} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f''(x_2(t)) x'_2(t)}{f''(x_1(t)) x'_1(t)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f''(x_2(t)) f'(x_1(t))}{f''(x_1(t)) f'(x_2(t))} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f'(x_1(t))}{f'(x_2(t))}.$$

Therefore

$$(2.5) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{f'(x_2(t))}{f'(x_1(t))} = -1.$$

From (2.4) and (2.5) we deduce that

$$(2.6) \quad 2\pi \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \left[\frac{1}{f'(x_1(t))} \frac{d}{dt} P_{\gamma_2}(\Omega(t)) \right] = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{-1}{f'(x_2(t))} \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{x_2(t)^2 + (y_0 - t)^2}{2}\right)}{f'(x_1(t))} \left(1 - \sqrt{1 + f'(x_2(t))^2}\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{f'(x_1(t))^2} \exp\left(-\frac{x_1(t)^2 + (y_0 - t)^2}{2}\right) \left(1 - \sqrt{1 + f'(x_1(t))^2}\right) \\
& + \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{f'(x_1(t))} \int_{x_1(t)}^{x_2(t)} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2 + (y_0 - t)^2}{2}\right) (y_0 - t) dx =: L_1 + L_2 + L_3.
\end{aligned}$$

We have

(2.7)

$$L_1 = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \exp\left(-\frac{x_2(t)^2 + (y_0 - t)^2}{2}\right) \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{-f'(x_2(t))}{f'(x_1(t))} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 + f'(x_2(t))^2}}{f'(x_2(t))^2} = -\frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{x_0^2 + y_0^2}{2}\right),$$

$$(2.8) \quad L_2 = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \exp\left(-\frac{x_2(t)^2 + (y_0 - t)^2}{2}\right) \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 + f'(x_1(t))^2}}{f'(x_1(t))^2} = -\frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{x_0^2 + y_0^2}{2}\right)$$

and finally

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} L_3 &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{-f'(x_1(t))}{f''(x_1(t))} \left\{ \frac{-1}{f'(x_2(t))} \exp\left(-\frac{x_2(t)^2 + (y_0 - t)^2}{2}\right) (y_0 - t) \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{f'(x_1(t))} \exp\left(-\frac{x_1(t)^2 + (y_0 - t)^2}{2}\right) (y_0 - t) \right\} = -\frac{2y_0}{f''(x_0)} \exp\left(-\frac{x_0^2 + y_0^2}{2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

From (2.6), (2.7), (2.8) and (2.9) we deduce that

$$2\pi \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \left[\frac{1}{f'(x_1(t))} \frac{d}{dt} P_{\gamma_2}(\Omega(t)) \right] = \left(-1 - \frac{2y_0}{f''(x_0)} \right) \exp\left(-\frac{x_0^2 + y_0^2}{2}\right).$$

Since Ω is a maximizer, the above limit must be nonpositive. We conclude that

$$-1 - \frac{2y_0}{f''(x_0)} \leq 0$$

and (2.1) immediately follows. \square

Lemma 2.2. *Let Ω as in Lemma 2.1, then*

$$(2.10) \quad f''(x_0) = -y_0.$$

Proof of Lemma 2.2. Let $h \in C^2([x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta]; \mathbb{R})$, suppose that $\text{supp}(h) \subset [x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta]$, and define

$$f_t(x) := f(x) + th(x), \text{ for } |x - x_0| \leq \delta.$$

Clearly for small enough $|t|$ - say $|t| \leq \delta$ - we have $f_t''(x) < 0$. Finally, let

$$\Omega(t) := \Omega \cap \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y < f_t(x), |x - x_0| < \delta\}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq 2\pi [P_{\gamma_2}(\Omega(t)) - P_{\gamma_2}(\Omega)] \\
&= \int_{x_0 - \frac{\delta}{2}}^{x_0 + \frac{\delta}{2}} \left(\exp\left(-\frac{x^2 + f_t(x)^2}{2}\right) \sqrt{1 + f_t'(x)^2} - \exp\left(-\frac{x^2 + f(x)^2}{2}\right) \sqrt{1 + f'(x)^2} \right) dx
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$0 = 2\pi \frac{d}{dt} P_{\gamma_2}(\Omega(t)) \Big|_{t=0} = \int_{x_0 - \frac{\delta}{2}}^{x_0 + \frac{\delta}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2 + f(x)^2}{2}\right) \left[-fh \sqrt{1 + f'(x)^2} + \frac{f'h'}{\sqrt{1 + f'(x)^2}} \right] dx.$$

Taking into account that $h(x_0 \pm \frac{\delta}{2}) = 0$ and integrating by parts we obtain

$$0 = \int_{x_0 - \frac{\delta}{2}}^{x_0 + \frac{\delta}{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2 + f(x)^2}{2}\right) \left[-fh\sqrt{1 + f'(x)^2} + (x + ff') \frac{f'h}{\sqrt{1 + f'(x)^2}} - \left(\frac{f'}{\sqrt{1 + f'(x)^2}}\right)' h \right] dx.$$

Now the Fundamental Lemma of the Calculus of variations yields

$$-f\sqrt{1 + f'(x)^2} + (x + ff') \frac{f'}{\sqrt{1 + f'(x)^2}} - \left(\frac{f'}{\sqrt{1 + f'(x)^2}}\right)' = 0 \quad \text{on } \left(x_0 - \frac{\delta}{2}, x_0 + \frac{\delta}{2}\right)$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} -f\sqrt{1 + f'(x)^2} + \frac{xf' + ff'^2}{\sqrt{1 + f'(x)^2}} - \frac{f''}{\sqrt{1 + f'(x)^2}} + \frac{f'^2 f''}{(1 + f'(x)^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} &= 0 \\ \Rightarrow \frac{-f(1 + f'^2) + xf' + ff'^2}{\sqrt{1 + f'(x)^2}} - \frac{f''}{(1 + f'(x)^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} &= 0 \\ \Rightarrow (-f(1 + f'^2) + xf' + ff'^2)(1 + f'^2) - f'' &= 0 \\ \Rightarrow (-f + xf')(1 + f'^2) - f'' &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $y_0 = f(x_0)$ and $f'(x_0) = 0$ we get

$$-y_0 - f''(x_0) = 0,$$

which is equality (2.10). □

Proof of Theorem 1.1 Assume that the assertion is not true. Then there exists a point $P \in \partial\Omega$ and $\delta > 0$, such that $B_{2\delta}(P) \cap \partial\Omega \in C^2$ and $B_\delta(P) \cap \Omega$ is strictly convex. Note also that the convexity of Ω ensures that $B_{2\delta}(P) \cap \Omega$ lies on one side of $B_{2\delta}(P) \cap \partial\Omega$ only. Let g be the tangent line to $\partial\Omega$ passing through P , by the strict convexity of $B_\delta(P) \cap \Omega$ we have that $\overline{\Omega} \cap g = \{P\}$.

Suppose for a moment that the origin O and Ω are on opposite sides of g , or $O \in g$. Let \mathbf{N} be the normal to g pointing away from Ω . Shifting Ω a little bit in direction \mathbf{N} , we then get a convex set with larger Gaussian perimeter than Ω , contradicting the assumptions. Hence we must have that $O \notin g$ and O and Ω lie on the same side of g .

This means that we can achieve by a rotation of the coordinate system that

$$\begin{aligned} P &= (x_0, y_0), \quad \text{with } y_0 > 0, \\ \overline{B_\delta(P)} \cap \partial\Omega &= \{(x, f(x)) : |x - x_0| < \delta\}, \\ f(x_0) &= y_0, \quad f'(x_0) = 0 \quad \text{and } f''(x) < 0 \quad \text{on } [x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\Omega \cap \{(x, y) : y > f(x), |x - x_0| < \delta\} = \emptyset.$$

But then Lemma 2.1 and 2.2 would ensure that

$$f''(x_0) \leq -2y_0$$

and

$$f''(x_0) = -y_0,$$

which is impossible. □

In view of Theorem 1.1, it is natural to ask whether the Gaussian perimeter attains its maximum for regular polygons centered at the origin. However, the next result shows that the answer is negative.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $T_n(r)$ be the regular n -gon ($n \geq 3$) symmetric with respect to the origin, such that the maximum distance of its boundary from the origin is r . It holds that*

$$P_\gamma(T_n(r)) < \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \quad \forall r > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \forall n \geq 3.$$

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Let us first analyze the case $n \geq 5$.

It holds that

$$P_\gamma(T_n(r)) = \frac{n}{\pi} \exp\left(-\frac{r^2 \cos^2\left(\frac{\pi}{n}\right)}{2}\right) \int_0^{r \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{n}\right)} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right) d\sigma \leq r \exp\left(-\frac{r^2 \cos^2\left(\frac{\pi}{n}\right)}{2}\right).$$

Therefore $\forall n \geq 5$ and $\forall r > 0$ we have

$$P_\gamma(T_n(r)) \leq r \exp\left(-\frac{r^2 \cos^2\left(\frac{\pi}{n}\right)}{2}\right) \Big|_{r=\frac{1}{\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{n}\right)}} = \frac{1}{\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{n}\right)} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right) \leq \frac{1}{\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{5}\right)} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right) = 0.7497\dots$$

We get the claim since

$$\frac{1}{\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{5}\right)} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right) < \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} = 0.7979\dots$$

The case $n = 4$ is contained in Theorem 1.2.

It remains to treat the case $n = 3$.

We have

$$P_\gamma(T_3(r)) = \frac{3}{\pi} \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{8}\right) \int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}r} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right) d\sigma$$

and

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} P_\gamma(T_3(r)) = \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} P_\gamma(T_3(r)) = 0.$$

This implies that the function $P_\gamma(T_3(r))$ attains its maximum at some $r \in (0, +\infty)$.

Computing the derivative, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dr} P_\gamma(T_3(r)) = \frac{3}{2\pi} \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{8}\right) \left[\sqrt{3} \exp\left(-\frac{3r^2}{8}\right) - \frac{r}{2} \int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}r} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right) d\sigma \right].$$

Thus

$$\frac{d}{dr} P_\gamma(T_3(r)) \underset{(<)}{\geq} 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad g(r) := \sqrt{3} \exp\left(-\frac{3r^2}{8}\right) - \frac{r}{2} \int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}r} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right) d\sigma \underset{(<)}{\geq} 0.$$

Since

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} g(r) = \sqrt{3} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} g(r) = -\infty,$$

the function $g(r)$ must vanish at least once in $(0, +\infty)$.

Moreover, since $\sqrt{3} \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{8}\right)$ is strictly decreasing on $[0, +\infty)$ while $\frac{r}{2} \int_0^{\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}r} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right) d\sigma$ is strictly increasing on $[0, +\infty)$, it follows that there exists a unique $\hat{r} \in (0, +\infty)$ such that

$$\left. \frac{d}{dr} P_\gamma(T_3(r)) \right|_{r=\hat{r}} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad P_\gamma(T_3(\hat{r})) = \max_{[0, +\infty)} P_\gamma(T_3(r)).$$

Since

$$g(1.49) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad g(1.50) < 0,$$

we deduce that

$$\hat{r} \in (1.49, 1.50).$$

A straightforward computation yields

$$|P_\gamma(T_3(\hat{r})) - P_\gamma(T_3(1.49))| \leq \frac{1}{100} \max_{[1.49, 1.50]} \left| \frac{d}{dr} P_\gamma(T_3(r)) \right| < \frac{1}{100}.$$

We conclude by observing that

$$\max_{[0, +\infty)} P_\gamma(T_3(r)) = P_\gamma(T_3(\hat{r})) \leq P_\gamma(T_3(1.49)) + \frac{1}{100} < 0.7382 < \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} = 0.7979\dots$$

This completes the proof of the Lemma. □

3. THE CASE OF CONVEX QUADRILATERALS

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2.

Let us start by showing that inequality (1.2) is optimal. To this aim consider the sequence of rhombi $\{T_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with vertices in the points $(n, 0)$, $(0, \frac{1}{n})$, $(-n, 0)$ and $(0, -\frac{1}{n})$. One has

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} P_{\gamma_2}(T_n) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{4}{2\pi} \int_0^n \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(x^2 + \left(-\frac{x}{n^2} + \frac{1}{n}\right)^2\right)\right) \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{n^4}} dx \\ &= \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right) dx = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the optimal set degenerates into the x -axis, traversed two times.

In order to prove our claim we will obtain the assertion by treating each side of T in the same way. Or, equivalently, through suitable reflections with respect to the coordinate axes, the quadrilateral T can be replaced by a rhombus with vertices on the axes and larger Gaussian perimeter. So it is sufficient to estimate the Gaussian length of just one side of T . In other words we have to prove that for any $a, L > 0$, setting

$$f(x) = a - \frac{a}{L}x, \quad \text{with } x \in (0, L),$$

one has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{2} &= \int_0^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2}\right) dt > \int_0^L \exp\left(-\frac{t^2 + [f(t)]^2}{2}\right) \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{d}{dt}f(t)\right)^2} dt \\ &= \sqrt{1 + \frac{a^2}{L^2}} \int_0^L \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(t^2 + \left(a - \frac{a}{L}t\right)^2\right)\right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently we want to prove that for any $a, L > 0$ it holds

$$I := \sqrt{\frac{L^2 + a^2}{L^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{a^2}{2}\right) \int_0^L \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{L^2 + a^2}{L^2} t^2 - 2\frac{a^2}{L} t\right)\right) dt < \int_0^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2}\right) dt.$$

Clearly we have

$$I = \sqrt{\frac{L^2 + a^2}{L^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{a^2}{2}\right) \int_0^L \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\sqrt{L^2 + a^2}}{L} t - \frac{a^2}{\sqrt{L^2 + a^2}}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{a^4}{L^2 + a^2}\right) dt.$$

Performing the change of variables

$$\sigma := \frac{\sqrt{L^2 + a^2}}{L} t - \frac{a^2}{\sqrt{L^2 + a^2}},$$

we obtain

$$I = \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2} \left(a^2 - \frac{a^4}{L^2 + a^2}\right)\right] \int_{-\frac{a^2}{\sqrt{L^2 + a^2}}}^{\frac{\sqrt{L^2 + a^2}}{L}} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right) d\sigma.$$

Now setting

$$\alpha := \frac{a^2}{\sqrt{L^2 + a^2}} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta := \frac{L^2}{\sqrt{L^2 + a^2}} > 0$$

we obtain

$$(3.1) \quad I = I(\alpha, \beta) = \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha\beta}{2}\right) \int_{-\alpha}^{\beta} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right) d\sigma.$$

Note that for all non-negative α and β we have

$$(3.2) \quad I(\alpha, \beta) = I(\beta, \alpha) \quad \text{and}$$

$$(3.3) \quad I(\alpha, 0) = \int_0^\alpha \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right) d\sigma < \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}.$$

With the new variables α and β , the claim of Theorem 1.2 can be written as

$$(3.4) \quad \sup_{\mathbb{R}_{++}^2} I(\alpha, \beta) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} I(t, 0) = \int_0^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2}\right) dt = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}},$$

where

$$\mathbb{R}_{++}^2 = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \alpha, \beta \geq 0\}.$$

The proof of (3.4) is rather lengthy, so we divide it into several Lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *If $\{(\alpha_n, \beta_n)\} \subset \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$ with $\alpha_n^2 + \beta_n^2 \rightarrow +\infty$, then*

$$(3.5) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} I(\alpha_n, \beta_n) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}.$$

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Suppose that (3.5) does not hold. Then there exist a number $\delta > 0$ and a sequence $\{(\alpha_n, \beta_n)\} \subset \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$ with $\alpha_n^2 + \beta_n^2 \rightarrow +\infty$, such that

$$(3.6) \quad I(\alpha_n, \beta_n) \geq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} + \delta \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In view of (3.2) we may assume w.l.o.g. that $\beta_n \rightarrow +\infty$. Further, since

$$I(\alpha_n, \beta_n) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha_n \beta_n}{2}\right) \cdot \sqrt{2\pi},$$

(3.6) yields that the sequence $\{\alpha_n \cdot \beta_n\}$ is bounded. In turn, this means that $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$. Finally, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} + \delta &\leq \exp\left(\frac{\alpha_n \beta_n}{2}\right) \cdot \left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} + \delta\right) \leq \exp\left(\frac{\alpha_n \beta_n}{2}\right) \cdot I(\alpha_n, \beta_n) \\ &= \int_{-\alpha_n}^{\beta_n} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right) d\sigma \longrightarrow \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. □

Next we study some properties of the mapping

$$t \longmapsto te^{-t^2/2}, \quad (t \in (0, +\infty)).$$

Since the mapping is strictly increasing for $0 \leq t < 1$ and strictly decreasing for $1 < t < +\infty$ with $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} te^{-t^2/2} = 0$, there is for every $x \in (0, 1]$ a unique number $y =: f(x) \in [1, +\infty)$ such that

$$x \cdot e^{-x^2/2} = y \cdot e^{-y^2/2}.$$

Further, there holds $f(1) = 1$ and $\lim_{x \searrow 0} f(x) = +\infty$.

Lemma 3.2. *The following properties hold:*

$$(3.7) \quad f \in C^1(0, 1],$$

$$(3.8) \quad f'(x) = \frac{(1-x^2) \cdot f(x)}{(1-f^2(x)) \cdot x} \text{ for } x \in (0, 1),$$

$$(3.9) \quad f'(1) = -1,$$

$$(3.10) \quad x \cdot f(x) < 1 \text{ for } x \in (0, 1),$$

$$(3.11) \quad \lim_{x \searrow 0} x \cdot f(x) = 0,$$

$$(3.12) \quad x + f(x) > 2 \text{ for } x \in (0, 1).$$

Proof of Lemma 3.2. (3.7) and (3.8) follow from differentiation of

$$(3.13) \quad x \cdot e^{-x^2/2} = f(x) \cdot e^{-f^2(x)/2}.$$

Then (3.9) follows from (3.8) by passing to the limit $x \nearrow 1$.

Assume that (3.10) was not true. Since $f(1) = 1$, there exists $x_0 \in (0, 1)$ with $x_0 \cdot f(x_0) \geq 1$ and such that

$$(x \cdot f(x))' \big|_{x=x_0} \leq 0.$$

By (3.9) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq f(x_0) + x_0 \cdot f'(x_0) = f(x_0) + \frac{(1-x_0^2) \cdot f(x_0)}{1-f^2(x_0)} \\ &= \frac{f(x_0) \cdot (x_0^2 + f^2(x_0) - 2)}{f^2(x_0) - 1}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$x_0^2 + f^2(x_0) \geq 2.$$

But this is impossible, since

$$2 \leq 2x_0 \cdot f(x_0) < x_0^2 + f^2(x_0).$$

Furthermore we calculate, using (3.10),

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x \searrow 0} x \cdot f(x) &= \lim_{x \searrow 0} \frac{f(x)}{1/x} = \lim_{x \searrow 0} \frac{f'(x)}{-1/x^2} \\ &= \lim_{x \searrow 0} \frac{(1-x^2) \cdot x \cdot f(x)}{f^2(x) - 1} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, (3.10) and (3.8) yield

$$\begin{aligned} (x + f(x))' &= 1 + f'(x) = 1 + \frac{(1-x^2) \cdot f(x)}{(1-f^2(x)) \cdot x} \\ &= \frac{(x + f(x)) \cdot (1 - xf(x))}{(1 - f^2(x)) \cdot x} < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now (3.12) follows from this and from the fact that $1 + f(1) = 2$. □

Next we study the function $I(\alpha, \beta)$ at critical points.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $(\alpha, \beta) \in (0, +\infty)^2$ such that $\nabla I(\alpha, \beta) = 0$. Then*

$$(3.14) \quad \int_{-\alpha}^{\beta} \exp\left(\frac{-\sigma^2}{2}\right) d\sigma = \frac{2}{\alpha} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{\beta^2}{2}\right) = \frac{2}{\beta} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha^2}{2}\right),$$

and if $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, then

$$(3.15) \quad \beta = f(\alpha) \quad \text{and}$$

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} I(\alpha, \beta) &= I(\alpha, f(\alpha)) = \\ &= \frac{2}{f(\alpha)} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha f(\alpha) + \alpha^2}{2}\right) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\alpha f(\alpha)}} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(\alpha + f(\alpha))^2}{4}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.3. We have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= I_\alpha = \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha\beta}{2}\right) \cdot \left(-\frac{\beta}{2} \cdot \int_{-\alpha}^{\beta} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right) d\sigma + \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha^2}{2}\right)\right), \\ 0 &= I_\beta = \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha\beta}{2}\right) \cdot \left(-\frac{\alpha}{2} \cdot \int_{-\alpha}^{\beta} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right) d\sigma + \exp\left(-\frac{\beta^2}{2}\right)\right), \end{aligned}$$

and (3.14)–(3.16) follow. □

Define

$$(3.17) \quad u(x) := \frac{2}{f(x)} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{xf(x) + x^2}{2}\right), \quad (0 < x \leq 1).$$

Note that (3.13) also yields

$$(3.18) \quad u(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{xf(x)}} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(x + f(x))^2}{4}\right), \quad (0 < x \leq 1).$$

Lemma 3.4. *It holds*

$$(3.19) \quad u(x) < \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \quad \forall x \in (0, 1].$$

Proof of Lemma 3.4. We have $\lim_{x \searrow 0} u(x) = 0$ and

$$0 < u(1) = \frac{2}{e} < \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}.$$

Thus, in order to prove (3.19), it is sufficient to show that

$$(3.20) \quad \text{if } u'(x_0) = 0 \text{ for some } x_0 \in (0, 1), \text{ then } u(x_0) < \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}.$$

Let $u'(x_0) = 0$, ($x_0 \in (0, 1)$). Then we evaluate :

$$0 = \frac{2}{f^2(x_0)} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{x_0 f(x_0) + x_0^2}{2}\right) \cdot \left[-f(x_0) \cdot \frac{f(x_0) + x_0 f'(x_0) + 2x_0}{2} - f'(x_0)\right].$$

This implies

$$0 = f(x_0) \cdot (f(x_0) + x_0 f'(x_0) + 2x_0) + 2f'(x_0),$$

and in view of (3.8) we obtain

$$(3.21) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &= f^2(x_0) + 2x_0 f(x_0) + \frac{1-x^2}{(1-f^2(x_0)) \cdot x} \cdot (x_0 f(x_0) + 2) \Rightarrow \\ 0 &= (f(x_0) + 2x_0)(x_0 - f^2(x_0)x_0) + (x_0 f(x_0) + 2)(1-x_0^2) \Rightarrow \\ 2(f(x_0)x_0 + 1) &= x_0 f(x_0) \cdot (x_0 + f(x_0))^2 \Rightarrow \\ \frac{(x_0 + f(x_0))^2}{2} - 1 &= \frac{1}{x_0 f(x_0)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now (3.18) and (3.21) yield

$$(3.22) \quad u(x_0) = 2 \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(x_0 + f(x_0))^2}{4}\right) \cdot \sqrt{\frac{(x_0 + f(x_0))^2}{2} - 1}.$$

Finally we set

$$(3.23) \quad v(t) := 2e^{-t} \cdot \sqrt{2t-1}, \quad (t \geq 1).$$

Since $v(1) = 2/e$ and

$$\begin{aligned} v'(t) &= -2e^{-t} \cdot \sqrt{2t-1} + 2e^{-t} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2t-1}} \\ &= \frac{4e^{-t}}{\sqrt{2t-1}} \cdot (1-t) \leq 0 \quad \text{for } t \geq 1, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$(3.24) \quad v(t) \leq \frac{2}{e} \quad \text{for } t \geq 1.$$

By (3.12) we have

$$\frac{(x_0 + f(x_0))^2}{4} \geq 1.$$

Hence (3.24) yields

$$u(x_0) = v\left(\frac{(x_0 + f(x_0))^2}{4}\right) \leq \frac{2}{e} < \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}},$$

which is (3.20). The Lemma is proved. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Let $(\alpha, \beta) \in (0, +\infty)^2$ such that $\nabla I(\alpha, \beta) = 0$. Then*

$$(3.25) \quad I(\alpha, \beta) < \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}.$$

Proof of Lemma 3.5. By (3.16) and (3.17) we have that

$$I(\alpha, \beta) = I(\alpha, f(\alpha)) = u(\alpha),$$

and the assertion follows from Lemma 3.4. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. The proof of (3.4), and, hence, of Theorem 1.2, is a direct consequence of (3.3), Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.5. \square

4. A REVERSE ISOPERIMETRIC INEQUALITY IN A SUITABLE CLASS OF CONVEX SETS

Proof of Theorem 1.3 Without loss of generality we may assume that $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are smooth and strictly concave functions. Inequality (1.3) is an immediate consequence of the following upper bound for J , the Gaussian measure of the portion of ∂C contained in the first quadrant:

$$(4.1) \quad J = \int_0^b \exp\left(-\frac{x^2 + [f(x)]^2}{2}\right) \sqrt{1 + (f'(x))^2} dx \leq \sqrt{\pi}.$$

Indeed by repeating the same considerations to the other portions of ∂C one gets

$$P_{\gamma_2}(C) \leq 4 \frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{\pi} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}},$$

which is (1.3). In the first quadrant we have that

$$y = f(x) \Leftrightarrow x = g(y),$$

$$1 + (f'(x))^2 \leq (1 - f'(x))^2$$

and

$$\sqrt{1 + (f'(x))^2} \leq 1 - f'(x).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} J &\leq \int_0^b \exp\left(-\frac{x^2 + [f(x)]^2}{2}\right) dt + \int_0^b \exp\left(-\frac{x^2 + [f(x)]^2}{2}\right) (-f'(x)) dt \\ &= \int_0^b \exp\left(-\frac{x^2 + [f(x)]^2}{2}\right) dt + \int_0^{f(0)} \exp\left(-\frac{[g(y)]^2 + y^2}{2}\right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$x^2 + \left(f(0) - \frac{f(0)}{b}x\right)^2 = x^2 \left(1 + \left(\frac{f(0)}{b}\right)^2\right) - 2\frac{[f(0)]^2}{b}x + [f(0)]^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left(x \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{f(0)}{b}\right)^2} - \frac{\frac{[f(0)]^2}{b}}{\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{f(0)}{b}\right)^2}} \right)^2 - \frac{\frac{[f(0)]^4}{b^2}}{1 + \left(\frac{f(0)}{b}\right)^2} + [f(0)]^2 \\
&= \left(x \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{f(0)}{b}\right)^2} - \frac{[f(0)]^2}{\sqrt{b^2 + [f(0)]^2}} \right)^2 + \frac{b^2 [f(0)]^2}{b^2 + [f(0)]^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\left(b - \frac{b}{f(0)}y \right)^2 + y^2 = \left(y \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{b}{f(0)}\right)^2} - \frac{b^2}{\sqrt{[f(0)]^2 + b^2}} \right)^2 + \frac{b^2 [f(0)]^2}{b^2 + [f(0)]^2}.$$

Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.2) \quad J &\leq \int_0^b \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left[\left(x \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{f(0)}{b}\right)^2} - \frac{[f(0)]^2}{\sqrt{b^2 + [f(0)]^2}} \right)^2 + \frac{b^2 [f(0)]^2}{b^2 + [f(0)]^2} \right] \right\} dx \\
&+ \int_0^a \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left[\left(y \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{b}{f(0)}\right)^2} - \frac{b^2}{\sqrt{[f(0)]^2 + b^2}} \right)^2 + \frac{b^2 [f(0)]^2}{b^2 + [f(0)]^2} \right] \right\} dy
\end{aligned}$$

Performing the change of variables

$$\xi = x \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{f(0)}{b}\right)^2} - \frac{[f(0)]^2}{\sqrt{b^2 + [f(0)]^2}}$$

in the first integral at the right hand side of (4.2) and

$$\eta = y \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{b}{f(0)}\right)^2} - \frac{b^2}{\sqrt{[f(0)]^2 + b^2}}$$

in the second we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.3) \quad J &\leq \frac{b}{\sqrt{b^2 + (f(0))^2}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{b^2 [f(0)]^2}{b^2 + [f(0)]^2} \right) \int_{-\frac{[f(0)]^2}{\sqrt{b^2 + [f(0)]^2}}}^{\frac{b^2}{\sqrt{b^2 + [f(0)]^2}}} \exp \left(-\frac{\xi^2}{2} \right) d\xi \\
&+ \frac{f(0)}{\sqrt{(f(0))^2 + b^2}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{b^2 [f(0)]^2}{b^2 + [f(0)]^2} \right) \int_{-\frac{b^2}{\sqrt{[f(0)]^2 + b^2}}}^{\frac{[f(0)]^2}{\sqrt{[f(0)]^2 + b^2}}} \exp \left(-\frac{\eta^2}{2} \right) d\eta \\
&= \frac{b + f(0)}{\sqrt{b^2 + (f(0))^2}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{b^2 [f(0)]^2}{b^2 + [f(0)]^2} \right) \int_{-\frac{[f(0)]^2}{\sqrt{b^2 + [f(0)]^2}}}^{\frac{b^2}{\sqrt{b^2 + [f(0)]^2}}} \exp \left(-\frac{t^2}{2} \right) dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Now setting

$$\alpha := \frac{[f(0)]^2}{\sqrt{b^2 + [f(0)]^2}} > 0, \quad \beta := \frac{b^2}{\sqrt{b^2 + [f(0)]^2}} > 0$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(\alpha + \beta) &= \frac{a^2}{\sqrt{b^2 + a^2}} \left(\frac{[f(0)]^2}{\sqrt{b^2 + [f(0)]^2}} + \frac{b^2}{\sqrt{b^2 + [f(0)]^2}} \right) = [f(0)]^2, \\ \beta(\alpha + \beta) &= \frac{b^2}{\sqrt{b^2 + [f(0)]^2}} \left(\frac{[f(0)]^2}{\sqrt{b^2 + a^2}} + \frac{L^2}{\sqrt{b^2 + a^2}} \right) = b^2, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\alpha + \beta = \frac{[f(0)]^2}{\sqrt{b^2 + [f(0)]^2}} + \frac{b^2}{\sqrt{b^2 + [f(0)]^2}} = \sqrt{b^2 + [f(0)]^2}.$$

With this change of variables (4.3) becomes

$$(4.4) \quad J \leq \frac{\sqrt{\alpha} + \sqrt{\beta}}{\sqrt{\alpha + \beta}} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha\beta}{2}\right) \int_{-\alpha}^{\beta} \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2}\right) dt = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha} + \sqrt{\beta}}{\sqrt{\alpha + \beta}} I(\alpha, \beta),$$

where $I(\alpha, \beta)$ is the function defined in (3.1). Clearly one has

$$\frac{\sqrt{\alpha} + \sqrt{\beta}}{\sqrt{\alpha + \beta}} \leq \sqrt{2} \quad \forall (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2.$$

This last inequality, together with (3.4), gives the claim. \square

Remark 4.1. *Let*

$$\Phi(\alpha, \beta) := \frac{\sqrt{\alpha} + \sqrt{\beta}}{\sqrt{\alpha + \beta}} I(\alpha, \beta).$$

Softwares, such as Mathematica, Matlab and Octave, assert that

$$\max_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2} \Phi(\alpha, \beta) = \Phi(0.8769, 0.8769) = 1.4950 =: M.$$

This would provide the bound

$$P_{\gamma_2}(C) \leq 4 \frac{1}{2\pi} M = 0.9517, \quad \forall C \in \tilde{C},$$

which, in turn, improves a bit on the one contained in Theorem 1.3

$$P_{\gamma_2}(C) \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} = 1.1284, \quad \forall C \in \tilde{C}.$$

Acknowledgements The research of Francesco Chiacchio was partially supported by “Linear and Nonlinear PDE’s: New directions and Applications” project, CUP E53D23018060001, - funded by European Union - Next Generation EU within the PRIN 2022 PNRR program and by Gruppo Nazionale per l’Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni (GNAMPA) of Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica (INdAM). The second author also thanks the University of Leipzig for kind hospitality.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ball K., *The reverse isoperimetric problem for Gaussian measure*. Discrete & Computational Geometry, 10 (4), 411-420, (1993).
- [2] Ball K., *Volume ratios and a reverse isoperimetric inequality*. J. London Math. Soc. 44 (1991) 351–359.
- [3] Borell C., *The Brunn-Minkowski inequality in Gauss space*. Invent. Math. **30** (1975), no. 2, 207–211.
- [4] Adam R. K. - O'Donnell R. - Servedio R. A. *Learning geometric concepts via Gaussian surface area*. In 2008 49th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, pages 541-550. IEEE, (2008).
- [5] Carlen E. A. - Kerse C., *On the cases of equality in Bobkov's inequality and Gaussian rearrangement*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 13 (2001), no. 1, 1-18.
- [6] Cianchi A. - Fusco N. - Maggi F. - Pratelli A., *On the isoperimetric deficit in Gauss space*. Amer. J. Math. 133 (2011), no. 1, 131-186.
- [7] Croce G. - Zakaria F. - Pisante G., *A reverse isoperimetric inequality for planar (α, β) convex bodies*. ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. 28 (2022), Paper No. 62, 18 pp.
- [8] Jog V., *Reverse Euclidean and Gaussian Isoperimetric Inequalities for parallel sets with applications*. IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory 67 (2021), no. 10, 6368-6383.
- [9] Henrot A., *Extremum problems for eigenvalues of elliptic operators*. Front. Math. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2006, x+202 pp.
- [10] Henrot A. - Pierre M., *Variation et optimisation de formes Shape variation and optimization*. Math. Appl. (Berlin), 48Springer, Berlin, 2005, xii+334 pp.
- [11] Livshyts G. V., *Some remarks about the maximal perimeter of convex sets with respect to probability measures*. Commun. Contemp. Math. 23 (2021), no. 5, 19 pp.
- [12] Livshyts G. V., *Maximal surface area of a convex set in \mathbb{R}^n with respect to exponential rotation invariant measure*. J. Math. Anal. Appl., vol. 404, no. 2, (2013), pp. 231–238.
- [13] F. Nazarov, *On the maximal perimeter of a convex set in \mathbb{R}^N* . Geometric aspects of functional analysis, Lectures Notes in Math., 1807. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 169-187, (2003).
- [14] Sudakov V. N. - Cirel'son B.S., *Extremal properties of half-spaces for spherically invariant measures*. Zap. Naučn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI) 41 (1974), 14-24.