

# UPPER BOUNDS FOR EDGE-ANTIPODAL AND SUBEQUILATERAL POLYTOPES

KONRAD J. SWANEPOEL

ABSTRACT. A polytope in a finite-dimensional normed space is *subequilateral* if the length in the norm of each of its edges equals its diameter. Subequilateral polytopes occur in the study of two unrelated subjects: surface energy minimizing cones and edge-antipodal polytopes. We show that the number of vertices of a subequilateral polytope in any  $d$ -dimensional normed space is bounded above by  $(\frac{d}{2} + 1)^d$  for any  $d \geq 2$ . The same upper bound then follows for the number of vertices of the edge-antipodal polytopes introduced by I. Talata (Period. Math. Hungar. **38** (1999), 231–246). This is a constructive improvement to the result of A. Pór (to appear) that for each dimension  $d$  there exists an upper bound  $f(d)$  for the number of vertices of an edge-antipodal  $d$ -polytopes. We also show that in  $d$ -dimensional Euclidean space the only subequilateral polytopes are equilateral simplices.

## 1. NOTATION

Denote the  $d$ -dimensional real linear space by  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , a norm on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  by  $\|\cdot\|$ , its unit ball by  $B$ , and the ball with centre  $x$  and radius  $r$  by  $B(x, r)$ . Denote the diameter of a set  $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  by  $\text{diam}(C)$ , and (if it is measurable) its volume (or  $d$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure) by  $\text{vol}(C)$ . The *dual norm*  $\|\cdot\|^*$  is defined by  $\|x\|^* := \sup\{\langle x, y \rangle : \|y\| \leq 1\}$ , where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is the inner product on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Denote the number of elements of a finite set  $S$  by  $|S|$ . The *difference body* of a set  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  is  $S - S := \{x - y : x, y \in S\}$ . A *polytope* is the convex hull of finitely many points in some  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . A  *$d$ -polytope* is a polytope of dimension  $d$ . A *convex body*  $C$  is a compact convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with nonempty interior. The boundary of  $C$  is denoted by  $\text{bd } C$ . Given any convex body  $C$  we define the *relative norm*  $\|\cdot\|_C$  *determined by*  $C$  to be the norm with unit ball  $C - C$ , or equivalently,

$$\|x\|_C := \sup\{\lambda > 0 : a + \lambda x \in C \text{ for some } a \in C\}.$$

See [9, 1, 17] for background on polytopes, convexity, and finite-dimensional normed spaces.

---

This material is based upon work supported by the South African National Research Foundation under Grant number 2053752.

## 2. INTRODUCTION

**2.1. Antipodal and edge-antipodal polytopes.** A  $d$ -polytope  $P$  is *antipodal* if for any two vertices  $x$  and  $y$  of  $P$  there exist two parallel hyperplanes, one through  $x$  and one through  $y$ , such that  $P$  is contained in the closed slab bounded by the two hyperplanes. Klee [10] posed the problem of finding an upper bound for the number of vertices of an antipodal  $d$ -polytope in terms of  $d$ . Danzer and Grünbaum [7] proved the sharp upper bound of  $2^d$ . See [12] for a recent survey.

A  $d$ -polytope  $P$  is *edge-antipodal* if for any two vertices  $x$  and  $y$  joined by an edge there exist two parallel hyperplanes, one through  $x$  and one through  $y$ , such that  $P$  is contained in the closed slab bounded by the two hyperplanes. This notion was introduced by Talata [18], who conjectured that the number of vertices of an edge-antipodal 3-polytope is bounded above by a constant. Csikós [6] proved an upper bound of 12, and K. Bezdek, Bisztriczky and Böröczky [2] gave the sharp upper bound of 8. Pór [15] proved that the number of vertices of an edge-antipodal  $d$ -polytope is bounded above by a function of  $d$ . However, his proof is existential, with no information on the size of the upper bound. Our main result is an explicit bound.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $d \geq 2$ . Then the number of vertices of an edge-antipodal  $d$ -polytope is bounded above by  $(\frac{d}{2} + 1)^d$ .*

In the plane, an edge-antipodal polytope is clearly antipodal, and in this case the above theorem is sharp. The bound given is not sharp for  $d \geq 3$  (since the bound in Theorem 2 below is not sharp). In [2] it is stated without proof that all edge-antipodal 3-polytopes are antipodal. On the other hand, Talata has an example of an edge-antipodal  $d$ -polytope that is not antipodal for each  $d \geq 4$  (see [6] and Section 4 below). Most likely the largest number of vertices of an edge-antipodal  $d$ -polytope has an upper bound exponential in  $d$ , perhaps even  $2^d$ . We also mention the paper by Bisztriczky and Böröczky [3] discussing edge-antipodal 3-polytopes.

Theorem 1 is proved by considering a metric relative of edge-antipodal polytopes, discussed next.

**2.2. Equilateral and subequilateral polytopes.** A polytope  $P$  is *equilateral* with respect to a norm  $\|\cdot\|$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  if its vertex set is an *equidistant set*, i.e., the distance between any two vertices is a constant. This notion was first considered by Petty [14], who showed that equilateral polytopes are antipodal, hence have at most  $2^d$  vertices. We now introduce the following natural weakening of this notion, analogous to the weakening from antipodal to edge-antipodal. We say that a  $d$ -polytope  $P$  is *subequilateral* with respect to a norm  $\|\cdot\|$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  if the length of each of its edges equals its diameter.

Although not explicitly given a name, the vertex sets of subequilateral polytopes appear in the study of surface energy minimizing cones by Lawlor and Morgan [11]; see Section 4 for a discussion.

It is well-known and easy to prove that an edge-antipodal polytope  $P$  is subequilateral with diameter 1 in the relative norm  $\|\cdot\|_P$  determined by  $P$  [18, 6]. It is also easy to see that any subequilateral polytope is edge-antipodal. In order to prove Theorem 1 it is therefore sufficient to bound the number of vertices of a subequilateral  $d$ -polytope.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $d \geq 2$ . Then the number of vertices of a subequilateral  $d$ -polytope with respect to some norm  $\|\cdot\|$  is bounded above by  $(\frac{d}{2} + 1)^d$ .*

The proof is in Section 3. In two-dimensional normed spaces subequilateral polytopes are always equilateral. Therefore, the above theorem is sharp for  $d = 2$ . By analyzing equality in the proof of Theorem 2, it can be seen that the bound is not sharp for  $d \geq 3$ . Since edge-antipodal 3-polytopes have at most 8 vertices, with equality only for parallelepipeds [2], it follows that subequilateral 3-polytopes with respect to any norm has size at most 8, with equality only if the unit ball of the norm is a parallelepiped homothetic to the polytope.

We finally mention that in Euclidean  $d$ -space  $\mathbb{E}^d$  the only subequilateral polytopes are equilateral simplices, and give a proof. In the proof we have to consider subequilateral polytopes in spherical spaces, making it possible to formulate a more general theorem for spaces of constant curvature. Note that if we restrict ourselves to a hemisphere of the  $d$ -sphere  $\mathbb{S}^d$  in  $\mathbb{E}^{d+1}$ , the notion of a polytope can be defined without ambiguity. The definition of a subequilateral polytope then still makes sense in a hemisphere of  $\mathbb{S}^d$ , as well as in hyperbolic  $d$ -space  $\mathbb{H}^d$ .

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $P$  be a subequilateral  $d$ -polytope in either  $\mathbb{E}^d$ ,  $\mathbb{H}^d$ , or a hemisphere of  $\mathbb{S}^d$ . Then  $P$  is an equilateral  $d$ -simplex.*

*Proof.* The proof is by induction on  $d \geq 1$ , with  $d = 1$  trivial and  $d = 2$  easy. Suppose now  $d \geq 3$ . Let  $P$  be a subequilateral  $d$ -polytope in any of the three spaces. By induction all facets of  $P$  are equilateral simplices. In particular,  $P$  is simplicial. Since  $d \geq 3$ , it is sufficient to show that  $P$  is simple (see section 4.5 and exercise 4.8.11 of [9]).

Consider any vertex  $v$  with neighbours  $v_1, \dots, v_k$ ,  $k \geq d$ . Then  $v_1, \dots, v_k$  are contained in an open hemisphere  $S$  of the  $(d-1)$ -sphere of radius  $\text{diam}(P)$  and centre  $v$ . (This sphere will be isometric to some sphere in  $\mathbb{E}^d$ , not necessarily of radius  $\text{diam}(P)$ .)

Consider the  $(d-1)$ -polytope  $P'$  in  $S$  generated by  $v_1, \dots, v_k$  and any facet of  $P'$  with vertex set  $F \subset \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ . There exists a great sphere  $C$  of  $S$  passing through  $F$  with  $P'$  in one of the closed hemispheres determined by  $C$ . It follows that the hyperplane  $H$  generated by  $C$  and  $v$  passes through  $F \cup \{v\}$ , and  $P$  is contained in one of the closed half spaces bounded by  $H$ . Therefore,  $F \cup \{v\}$  is the vertex set of a facet of  $P$ .

Similarly, it follows that for any vertex set  $F$  of a facet of  $P$  containing  $v$ ,  $F \setminus \{v\}$  is the vertex set of a facet of  $P'$ . Therefore, any edge  $v_i v_j$  of  $P'$  is an edge of  $P$ , hence of length the diameter of  $P$ . It follows that the distance between  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  in  $H$  is the diameter of  $P'$  as measured in  $H$ . This shows that  $P'$  is subequilateral in  $H$ , and so by induction is an equilateral  $(d-1)$ -simplex. Therefore,  $k = d$ , giving that  $P$  is a simple polytope, which finishes the proof.  $\square$

### 3. A MEASURE OF NON-EQUIDISTANCE

The key to the proof of Theorem 2 is a lower bound for the distance between two nonadjacent vertices of a subequilateral polytope. For any finite set of points  $V$  we define

$$\lambda(V; \|\cdot\|) = \text{diam}(V) / \min_{x,y \in V, x \neq y} \|x - y\|.$$

Since  $\lambda(V; \|\cdot\|) \geq 1$ , with equality if and only if  $V$  is equidistant in the norm  $\|\cdot\|$ , this functional measures how far  $V$  is from being equidistant. The next lemma generalizes the theorem of Petty [14] and Soltan [16] that the number of points in an equidistant set is bounded above by  $2^d$ . In [8] a proof of the  $2^d$ -upper bound was given using the isodiametric inequality for finite-dimensional normed spaces due to Busemann (equation (2.2) on p. 241 of [4]; see also Mel'nikov [13]). However, since the isodiametric inequality has a quick proof using the Brunn-Minkowski inequality [5], it is not surprising that the latter inequality occurs in the following proof.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $V$  be a finite set in a  $d$ -dimensional normed space. Then  $|V| \leq (\lambda(V; \|\cdot\|) + 1)^d$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda = \lambda(V; \|\cdot\|)$ . By scaling we may assume that  $\text{diam}(V) = \lambda$ . Then  $\|x - y\| \geq 1$  for all  $x, y \in V$ ,  $x \neq y$ , hence the balls  $B(v, 1/2)$ ,  $v \in V$ , have disjoint interiors. Define  $C = \bigcup_{v \in V} B(v, 1/2)$ . Then  $\text{vol}(C) = |V|(1/2)^d \text{vol}(B)$  and  $\text{diam}(C) \leq 1 + \lambda$ . By the Brunn-Minkowski inequality [5] we obtain  $\text{vol}(C - C)^{1/d} \geq \text{vol}(C)^{1/d} + \text{vol}(-C)^{1/d}$ . Noting that  $C - C \subseteq (1 + \lambda)B$ , the result follows.  $\square$

In order to find an upper bound on the number of vertices of a subequilateral polytope with vertex set  $V$ , it remains to bound  $\lambda(V; \|\cdot\|)$  from above.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $d \geq 2$  and let  $V$  be the vertex set of a subequilateral  $d$ -polytope. Then  $\lambda(V; \|\cdot\|) \leq d/2$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $P$  be a subequilateral  $d$ -polytope of diameter 1, and let  $V$  be its vertex set. We have to show that  $\|x - y\| \geq 2/d$  for any distinct  $x, y \in V$ . Since this follows from the definition if  $xy$  is an edge of  $P$ , we assume without loss that  $xy$  is not an edge of  $P$ . Then  $xy$  intersects the convex hull  $P'$  of  $V \setminus \{x, y\}$  in a (possibly degenerate) segment, say  $x'y'$ , with  $x, x', y', y$

in this order on  $xy$ . Let  $F_x$  and  $F_y$  be facets of  $P'$  containing  $x'$  and  $y'$ , respectively.

We show that  $\|x - x'\| \geq 1/d$ . For each vertex  $z$  of  $F_x$ ,  $xz$  is an edge of  $P$ , hence  $\|x - z\| = 1$ . By Carathéodory's theorem [1, (2.2)], there exist  $d$  vertices  $z_1, \dots, z_d$  of the  $(d-1)$ -polytope  $F_x$  and real numbers  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$  such that

$$x' = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i z_i, \quad \lambda_i \geq 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i = 1.$$

Suppose without loss that  $\lambda_d = \max_i \lambda_i$ . Then  $\lambda_d \geq 1/d$ . By the triangle inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|x' - z_d\| &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \lambda_i (z_i - z_d) \right\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \lambda_i \|z_i - z_d\| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \lambda_i = 1 - \lambda_d \leq 1 - \frac{1}{d}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|x - x'\| &\geq \|x - z_d\| - \|x' - z_d\| \\ &\geq 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{d}\right) = \frac{1}{d}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,  $\|y - y'\| \geq 1/d$ , and we obtain  $\|x - y\| \geq 2/d$ .  $\square$

Lemmas 1 and 2 now imply Theorem 2.  $\square$

#### 4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

**4.1. Sharpness of Lemma 2.** The following example shows that Lemma 2 cannot be improved in general. Consider the subspace  $X = \{(x_1, \dots, x_{d+1}) : \sum_{i=1}^d x_i = 0\}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  with the  $\ell_1$  norm  $\|(x_1, \dots, x_{d+1})\|_1 := \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} |x_i|$ . Let the standard unit vector basis of  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  be  $e_1, \dots, e_{d+1}$ . Let  $c = \sum_{i=1}^d e_i$ . Then  $V = \{de_i - c : i = 1, \dots, d\} \cup \{\pm 2e_{d+1}\}$  is the vertex set of a  $d$ -polytope  $P$  in  $X$ , with all intervertex distances equal to  $2d$ , except for the distance between  $\pm 2e_{d+1}$ , which is 4. It follows that  $P$  is subequilateral and  $\lambda(V; \|\cdot\|) = d/2$ .

However, the above polytope  $P$  is in fact antipodal, and so it is equilateral in  $\|\cdot\|_P$ , which gives  $\lambda(V; \|\cdot\|_P) = 1$ . It is easy to see that for any polytope  $P$  subequilateral with respect to some norm  $\|\cdot\|$ , and with vertex set  $V$ , we have  $\lambda(V, \|\cdot\|) \leq \lambda(V, \|\cdot\|_P)$ . One may therefore hope that for the norm  $\|\cdot\|_P$  the upper bound in Lemma 2 may be improved, thus giving a better bound in Theorem 1. The following example shows that any such improved upper bound will still have to be at least  $(d-1)/2$ , indicating that essentially new ideas will be needed to improve the upper bounds in Theorems 1 and 2.

We consider Talata's example [6] of an edge-antipodal polytope that is not antipodal. Let  $d \geq 4$ ,  $e_1, \dots, e_d$  be the standard basis of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $p =$

$\frac{2}{d-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} e_i$ , and  $\lambda = (d-1)/2 - \varepsilon > 1$  for some small  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then the polytope  $P$  with vertex set  $V = \{o, e_1, \dots, e_d, p, e_d + \lambda p\}$  is edge-antipodal but not antipodal. In fact,  $\text{diam}(V) \leq 1$  by definition of  $\|\cdot\|_P$ , and since  $\|e_d - o\|_P = 1$  and  $\|p - o\|_P = 1/\lambda$ , we obtain  $\lambda(V, \|\cdot\|_P) \geq \lambda$ , which is arbitrarily close to  $(d-1)/2$ .

#### 4.2. Subequilateral polytopes in the work of Lawlor and Morgan.

Define the  $\|\cdot\|$ -energy of a hypersurface  $S$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to be  $\|S\| := \int_S \|n(x)\| dx$ , where  $n(x)$  is the Euclidean unit normal at  $x \in S$ . In [11] a sufficient condition is given to obtain an energy minimizing hypersurface partitioning a convex body. We restate a special case of the ‘‘General Norms Theorem I’’ in [11, pp. 66–67] in terms of subequilateral polytopes. (In the notation of [11] we take all the norms  $\Phi_{ij}$  to be the same. Then the points  $p_1, \dots, p_m$  in the hypothesis form an equidistant set with respect to the dual norm. The weakening of the hypothesis in the last sentence of the General Norms Theorem I is easily seen to be equivalent to the requirement that  $p_1, \dots, p_m$  is the vertex set of a subequilateral polytope.) We refer to [11] for the simple and enlightening proof using the divergence theorem.

**Lawlor-Morgan Theorem.** *Let  $\|\cdot\|$  be a norm on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and let  $p_1, \dots, p_m \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be the vertex set of a subequilateral polytope of  $\|\cdot\|$ -diameter 1. Let  $\Sigma = \bigcup H_{ij} \subset C$  be a hypersurface which partitions some convex body  $C$  into regions  $R_1, \dots, R_m$  with  $R_i$  and  $R_j$  separated by a piece  $H_{ij}$  of a hyperplane such that the parallel hyperplane passing through  $p_i - p_j$  supports the unit ball  $B$  at  $p_i - p_j$ .*

*Then for any hypersurface  $M = \bigcup M_{ij}$  which also separates the  $R_i \cap \text{bd } C$  from each other in  $C$ , with the regions touching  $R_i \cap \text{bd } C$  and  $R_j \cap \text{bd } C$  facing each other across  $M_{ij}$ , we have  $\|\Sigma\|^* \leq \|M\|^*$ , i.e.  $\Sigma$  minimizes  $\|\cdot\|^*$ -energy, where  $\|\cdot\|^*$  is the norm dual to  $\|\cdot\|$ .*

#### REFERENCES

- [1] A. Barvinok, *A Course in Convexity*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002.
- [2] K. Bezdek, T. Bisztriczky, and K. Böröczky, *Edge-antipodal 3-polytopes*, Discrete and Computational Geometry (J. E. Goodman, J. Pach, and E. Welzl, eds.), MSRI Special Programs, Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [3] T. Bisztriczky and K. Böröczky, *On antipodal 3-polytopes*, manuscript, 5 pages, 2005.
- [4] H. Busemann, *Intrinsic area*, Ann. Math. **48** (1947), 234–267.
- [5] Yu. D. Burago and V. A. Zalgaller, *Geometric inequalities*, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 1988.
- [6] B. Csikós, *Edge-antipodal convex polytopes – a proof of Talata’s conjecture*, Discrete Geometry, Monogr. Textbooks Pure Appl. Math., vol. 253, Dekker, New York, 2003, pp. 201–205.
- [7] L. Danzer and B. Grünbaum, *Über zwei Probleme bezüglich konvexer Körper von P. Erdős und von V. L. Klee*, Math. Z. **79** (1962), 95–99.
- [8] Z. Füredi, J. C. Lagarias, and F. Morgan, *Singularities of minimal surfaces and networks and related extremal problems in Minkowski space*, Discrete and computational

- geometry (New Brunswick, NJ, 1989/1990), DIMACS Ser. Discrete Math. Theoret. Comput. Sci., vol. 6, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1991, pp. 95–109.
- [9] B. Grünbaum, *Convex polytopes*, 2nd ed., Springer, New York, 2003.
  - [10] V. Klee, *Unsolved problems in intuitive geometry*, Mimeographed notes, Seattle, 1960.
  - [11] G. Lawlor and F. Morgan, *Paired calibrations applied to soap films, immiscible fluids, and surfaces or networks minimizing other norms*, Pacific J. Math. **166** (1994), 55–83.
  - [12] H. Martini and V. Soltan, *Antipodality properties of finite sets in Euclidean space*, Discrete Math. **290** (2005), 221–228.
  - [13] M. S. Mel’nikov, *Dependence of volume and diameter of sets in an  $n$ -dimensional Banach space (Russian)*, Uspehi Mat. Nauk **18** (1963), 165–170.
  - [14] C. M. Petty, *Equilateral sets in Minkowski spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **29** (1971), 369–374.
  - [15] A. Pór, *On  $e$ -antipodal polytopes*, 2005, submitted.
  - [16] P. S. Soltan, *Analogues of regular simplexes in normed spaces (Russian)*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **222** (1975), no. 6, 1303–1305. English translation: Soviet Math. Dokl. **16** (1975), no. 3, 787–789.
  - [17] A. C. Thompson, *Minkowski Geometry*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 63, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.
  - [18] I. Talata, *On extensive subsets of convex bodies*, Period. Math. Hungar. **38** (1999), 231–246.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA, PO BOX 392, PRETORIA 0003, SOUTH AFRICA

*E-mail address:* swanekj@unisa.ac.za