



HAL
open science

VOLUME OF THE MINKOWSKI SUMS OF STAR-SHAPED SETS

Matthieu Fradelizi, Zsolt Lángi, Artem Zvavitch

► **To cite this version:**

Matthieu Fradelizi, Zsolt Lángi, Artem Zvavitch. VOLUME OF THE MINKOWSKI SUMS OF STAR-SHAPED SETS. Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, Series B, 2022, 9 (34), pp.358-372. 10.1090/bproc/97 . hal-02924430

HAL Id: hal-02924430

<https://hal.science/hal-02924430v1>

Submitted on 28 Aug 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

VOLUME OF THE MINKOWSKI SUMS OF STAR-SHAPED SETS

MATTHIEU FRADELIZI, ZSOLT LÁNGI, AND ARTEM ZVAVITCH

ABSTRACT. For a compact set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and an integer $k \geq 1$, let us denote by

$$A[k] = \{a_1 + \dots + a_k : a_1, \dots, a_k \in A\} = \sum_{i=1}^k A$$

the Minkowski sum of k copies of A . A theorem of Shapley, Folkmann and Starr (1969) states that $\frac{1}{k}A[k]$ converges to the convex hull of A in Hausdorff distance as k tends to infinity. Bobkov, Madiman and Wang (2011) conjectured that the volume of $\frac{1}{k}A[k]$ is non-decreasing in k , or in other words, in terms of the volume deficit between the convex hull of A and $\frac{1}{k}A[k]$, this convergence is monotone. It was proved by Fradelizi, Madiman, Marsiglietti and Zvavitch (2016) that this conjecture holds true if $d = 1$ but fails for any $d \geq 12$. In this paper we show that the conjecture is true for any star-shaped set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ for arbitrary dimensions $d \geq 1$ under the condition $k \geq d - 1$. In addition, we investigate the conjecture for connected sets and present a counterexample to a generalization of the conjecture to the Minkowski sum of possibly distinct sets in \mathbb{R}^d , for any $d \geq 7$.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Minkowski sum of two sets $K, L \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is defined as $K + L = \{x + y : x \in K, y \in L\}$, where, for brevity, we set $A[k] = \sum_{i=1}^k A$, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and any compact set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Since Minkowski sum preserves the convexity of the summands and the set $\frac{1}{k}A[k]$ consists in some particular convex combinations of elements of A , the containment $\frac{1}{k}A[k] \subseteq \text{conv } A$, and, for the special case of convex sets, the equality $\frac{1}{k}A[k] = \text{conv } A$ trivially holds; here $\text{conv } A$ denotes the convex hull of A . These observations suggest that for any compact set A , the set $\frac{1}{k}A[k]$ looks “more convex” for larger values of k . This intuition was formalized by Starr [St1, St2], crediting also Shapley and Folkman, and independently by Emerson and Greenleaf [EG], by proving that the set $\frac{1}{k}A[k]$ approaches $\text{conv } A$ in Hausdorff distance as k approaches infinity and by giving bounds on the speed of this convergence (we refer to [FMMZ2] for more discussion of this fact).

A further step in the investigation of the sequence $\{\frac{1}{k}A[k]\}$ is to examine the monotonicity of this convergence. Whereas this sequence is clearly not monotonous

Date: October 15, 2019.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 52A40; Secondary: 52A38, 60E15.

Key words and phrases. Minkowski sum, star-shaped set, convex hull.

The first author is supported in part by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche, projet AS-PAG - ANR-17-CE40-0017; the second author is partially supported by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office, NKFI, K-119670, the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, and grants BME FIKP-VÍZ and ÚNKP-19-4 New National Excellence Program by the Ministry of Innovation and Technology; the third author is supported in part by the U.S. National Science Foundation Grant DMS-1101636 and the Bézout Labex.

in terms of containment, the main object of this paper is the following conjecture of Bobkov, Madiman, Wang [BMW], relating the volumes of the elements of the sequence, and in which $\text{vol}(K)$ denotes the Lebesgue measure (volume) of the measurable set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

Conjecture 1 (Bobkov-Madiman-Wang). Let A be a compact set in \mathbb{R}^d for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the sequence

$$\left\{ \text{vol} \left(\frac{1}{k} A[k] \right) \right\}_{k \geq 1}$$

is non-decreasing in k .

Equivalently, this conjecture asks whether for any integer $k \geq 1$ and compact set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the following inequality holds

$$(1) \quad \text{vol} \left(\frac{1}{k} A[k] \right) \leq \text{vol} \left(\frac{1}{k+1} A[k+1] \right).$$

This inequality trivially holds for any compact set A if $k = 1$ since $A \subset \frac{1}{2} A[2]$. In the same way, it is easy to find monotone subsequences of the sequence $\{\text{vol}(\frac{1}{k} A[k])\}_{k \geq 1}$ by the same argument; one such example is $\{\text{vol}(\frac{1}{2^m} A[2^m])\}_{m \geq 0}$. On the other hand, even the first nontrivial case; that is, the inequality $\text{vol}(\frac{1}{2} A[2]) \leq \text{vol}(\frac{1}{3} A[3])$ seems to require new methods to approach. Conjecture 1 was partially resolved in [FMMZ1, FMMZ2], where, following the approach of [GMR], the authors proved it for any 1-dimensional compact set A , but constructed counterexamples in \mathbb{R}^d for any $d \geq 12$. More precisely, they showed that for every $k \geq 2$, there is $d_k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $d \geq d_k$ there is a compact set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\text{vol}(\frac{1}{k} A[k]) > \text{vol}(\frac{1}{k+1} A[k+1])$. In particular, one has $d_2 = 12$, whence Conjecture 1 fails for \mathbb{R}^d if $d \geq 12$.

Our goal is to find additional conditions on A and k under which the statement in Conjecture 1, or more precisely when the inequality (1) is satisfied.

In the paper, for any set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ we denote by $\dim A$ the dimension of the smallest affine subspace containing A , and for any $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote the closed segment with endpoints p, q by $[p, q]$. To state our main result, let us recall the following well-known concept.

Definition 1. A nonempty set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is called *star-shaped* with respect to a point p if for any $q \in S$, we have $[p, q] \subseteq S$.

Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1. *Let $d \geq 2$ and $k \geq d - 1$ be positive integers. Then for any compact, star-shaped set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ we have*

$$\text{vol} \left(\frac{1}{k+1} S[k+1] \right) \geq \text{vol} \left(\frac{1}{k} S[k] \right),$$

with equality if only if $\frac{1}{k} S[k] = \text{conv}(S)$.

We feel it is worth noting that the compact sets A constructed in [FMMZ2] as counterexamples to Conjecture 1 are star-shaped, which makes Theorem 1 fairly unexpected.

We prove Theorem 1 in Section 2. In Section 3 we adapt our techniques to investigate connected sets. Our main result in this section is summarized in Theorem 2. Finally, in Section 4 we collect some additional remarks and questions, and, in particular, we construct low dimensional counterexamples to a generalization of Conjecture 1, which also appeared in [BMW].

2. CONJECTURE 1 FOR STAR-SHAPED SETS: THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1

We start this section with a couple of Lemmata which are needed for the proof. Throughout this section, we denote $X_d(t) = \{(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d : x_1 + \dots + x_d = t\}$ and $N_d(t) = \text{card } X_d(t)$ to be the number of elements of $X_d(t)$.

Lemma 1. *For any integer $t \geq 1$, and $d \geq 2$, we have $N_d(t) = \binom{t+d-1}{d-1}$.*

Proof. If $d = 2$, then, clearly, $N_2(t) = t + 1 = \binom{t+2-1}{1}$. On the other hand, by induction, we have

$$N_d(t) = \sum_{s=0}^t N_{d-1}(s) = \sum_{s=0}^t \binom{s+d-2}{d-2} = \binom{t+d-1}{d-1}.$$

□

Lemma 2. *Let o be the origin of \mathbb{R}^d , (p_1, \dots, p_d) be a basis of \mathbb{R}^d , and, let $B = \bigcup_{i=1}^d [o, p_i]$. Consider $M \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $B[k] \subseteq M \subseteq k \text{ conv}(B)$, then*

$$(2) \quad \text{vol} \left(\frac{1}{k+1} (M + B) \right) \geq \text{vol} \left(\frac{1}{k} M \right),$$

where, equality holds if and only if $M = k \text{ conv}(B)$. Furthermore, if $\text{vol} \left(\frac{1}{k} M \right) \geq \text{vol} \left(\frac{1}{k+1} (M + B) \right) - \delta$ for some $\delta \geq 0$, then $\text{vol}(M) \geq \text{vol}(k \text{ conv}(B)) - C(d, k)\delta$ for some constant $C(d, k)$ depending only on d and k .

Proof. Since the inequality (2) is independent of a non-degenerate linear transformation applied to B and M simultaneously, we may assume that (p_1, \dots, p_d) is the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^d . Let

$$V(t) = \text{vol}\{(x_1, \dots, x_d) \in [0, 1]^d : x_1 + \dots + x_d \leq t\}.$$

Let $C_i = i + [0, 1]^d$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ be the unit cube cells of the lattice \mathbb{Z}^d , and set $\mu_i = \text{vol}(C_i \cap M)$, and $\lambda_i = \text{vol}(C_i \cap (M + B))$.

Note that for any $i \in X_d(t)$, $\text{vol}(C_i \cap k \text{ conv}(B))$ is independent of i , namely it is equal to 1, if $t \leq k-d$, and to $V(k-t)$ if $t = k-d+1, \dots, k-1$. A similar statement holds for $\text{vol}(C_i \cap (k+1) \text{ conv}(B))$. The number of unit cells contained in $k \text{ conv}(B)$ is equal to the number of the solutions of the inequality $x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_d \leq k$, where each variable is a positive integer, and thus, it is $\binom{k}{d}$. This yields that the volume of these cells is $k^d V$, where $k^d = k(k-1) \dots (k-d+1)$, and $V = \text{vol}(\text{conv } B) = \frac{1}{d!}$.

Thus,

$$(3) \quad \text{vol}(M) = k^d V + \sum_{t=k-d+1}^{k-1} \sum_{i \in X_t} \mu_i,$$

and

$$\text{vol}(M + B) = (k + 1)^d V + \sum_{t=k-d+2}^k \sum_{i \in X_t} \lambda_i.$$

In the following step, we give a lower bound on the λ_i 's depending on the values of the μ_i 's. We say that $i \in X_d(t)$ and $i' \in X_d(t+1)$ are *adjacent* if the corresponding cells C_i and $C_{i'}$ have a common facet, or in other words, if $i' - i$ coincides with one of the standard basis vectors p_j . In this case we write $ii' \in I$. Let $i \in X_d(t)$, and let $S = M \cap C_i$. Then, for every $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$, $S + p_j \subset (M + B) \cap C_{i'}$ with $i' = i + p_j$. Thus, for any $i \in X_d(t+1)$,

$$(4) \quad \lambda_i \geq \max\{\mu_{i'} : i' \in X_d(t) \text{ is adjacent to } i\}.$$

Note that the right-hand side of this inequality is not less than any convex combination of the corresponding $\mu_{i'}$ s. We show that, using a suitable convex combination for each $i \in X_d(t+1)$ this inequality implies that

$$(5) \quad \sum_{i \in X_d(t+1)} \lambda_i \geq \frac{t+d}{t+1} \sum_{i \in X_t} \mu_i.$$

Consider some $i = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d) \in X_d(t+1)$. Then the indices in $X_d(t)$ adjacent to i are all of the form $i - p_j$ for some $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$. Furthermore, $i - p_j$ is adjacent to i iff $i_j \geq 1$, or in other words, iff $i_j \neq 0$. Now, for any $i' \in X_d(t)$ adjacent to i we set $\alpha_{ii'} = \frac{i_j}{t+1}$, where $i - i' = p_j$ (cf. Figure 1). Then, since $i \in X_d(t+1)$, we clearly have $1 = \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{i_j}{t+1} = \sum_{i' \in X_d(t), ii' \in I} \alpha_{ii'}$. Thus, by (4), we have

$$(6) \quad \lambda_i \geq \sum_{i' \in X_d(t), ii' \in I} \alpha_{ii'} \mu_{i'}$$

for all $i \in X_d(t+1)$. Now, let $i' \in X_d(t)$, and $i' = (i'_1, i'_2, \dots, i'_d)$. Then the indices in $X_d(t+1)$ adjacent to i' are exactly those of the form $i' + p_j$ for some $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$. Hence,

$$(7) \quad \sum_{i \in X_d(t+1), ii' \in I} \alpha_{ii'} = \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{i'_j + 1}{t+1} = \frac{t+d}{t+1}.$$

Finally, by (6) and (7)

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in X_d(t+1)} \lambda_i &\geq \sum_{i \in X_d(t+1)} \sum_{i' \in X_d(t), ii' \in I} \alpha_{ii'} \mu_{i'} = \\ &= \sum_{i' \in X_d(t)} \left(\sum_{i \in X_d(t+1), ii' \in I} \alpha_{ii'} \right) \mu_{i'} = \frac{t+d}{t+1} \sum_{i' \in X_d(t)} \mu_{i'}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the sequence $\left\{ \frac{t+d}{t+1} \right\}$, where $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, is strictly decreasing. Hence, using the fact that if $i \in X_d(t)$, then $\mu_i \leq V(k-t)$, it follows that

$$(8) \quad \text{vol}(M + B) \geq (k+1)^d V + \frac{k+1}{k-d+2} \sum_{t=k-d+1}^{k-1} \sum_{i \in X_d(t)} \mu_i$$




FIGURE 1. Illustration on choosing the weights if $d = 3$ and $t = 3$. The black and empty dots represent the elements of the set $X_3(3)$ and $X_3(4)$, respectively. Dots illustrating adjacent indices are connected by a segment. The weight assigned to the segment connecting the dots representing i and i' is equal to $\alpha_{ii'}$.

$$-\frac{k+1}{k-d+2} \sum_{t=k-d+1}^{k-1} V(k-t)N_d(t) + \sum_{t=k-d+1}^{k-1} \frac{t+d}{t+1} V(k-t)N_d(t).$$

Observe that $\sum_{t=k-d+1}^{k-1} V(k-t)N_d(t)$ is the volume of the part of $k \operatorname{conv}(B)$ belonging to cells that are not contained in it, and thus, it is equal to $(k^d - k^d)V$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=k-d+1}^{k-1} \frac{t+d}{t+1} V(k-t)N_d(t) &= \sum_{t=k-d+1}^{k-1} \frac{t+d}{t+1} V(k-t) \binom{t+d-1}{d-1} = \\ \sum_{t=k-d+1}^{k-1} \sum_{i \in X_d(t)} V(k-t) \binom{t+d}{d-1} &= \sum_{t'=k-d+2}^k \sum_{i \in X_d(t')} V(k+1-t')N_d(t') \end{aligned}$$

is the volume of the part of $(k+1) \operatorname{conv}(B)$ belonging to cells that are not contained in it. Thus, it is equal to $((k+1)^d - (k+1)^d)V$. Substituting these into (8) and by (3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{vol}(M+B) &\geq (k+1)^d V + \frac{k+1}{k-d+2} (\operatorname{vol}(M) - k^d V) - \frac{k+1}{k-d+2} (k^d - k^d)V \\ &\quad + ((k+1)^d - (k+1)^d)V \\ &= \frac{k+1}{k-d+2} \operatorname{vol}(M) + \left((k+1)^d - \frac{k+1}{k-d+2} k^d \right) V. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$(9) \quad \operatorname{vol} \left(\frac{1}{k+1} (M+B) \right) \geq \frac{k^d}{(k-d+2)(k+1)^{d-1}} \operatorname{vol} \left(\frac{1}{k} M \right) + \left(1 - \frac{k^d}{(k-d+2)(k+1)^{d-1}} \right) V.$$

Since $\operatorname{vol} \left(\frac{1}{k} M \right) \leq V$, the first inequality of the lemma readily follows.

Now we prove the equality case. By (9), equality in the lemma implies that $\text{vol}(\frac{1}{k}M) = V$, or equivalently, $\text{vol}(k \text{conv}(B) \setminus M) = 0$. Note that since $\text{vol}(k \text{conv}(B)) > 0$, its interior is not empty. Thus, $k \text{conv}(B)$ is equal to the closure of its interior. On the other hand, $\text{vol}(k \text{conv}(B) \setminus M) = 0$ implies that $\text{int}(k \text{conv} B) \subset M$, but as M is compact, $M = k \text{conv} B$ follows.

Finally, if $\text{vol}(\frac{1}{k+1}(M+B)) - \delta \leq \text{vol}(\frac{1}{k}M)$, then in the same way (9) yields the inequality $\text{vol}(M) \geq \text{vol}(k \text{conv}(B)) - C(d, k)\delta$, with $C(d, k) = \frac{k^d}{1 - \frac{k^d}{(k-d+2)(k+1)^{d-1}}}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. Without loss of generality, we may assume that S is star-shaped with respect to the origin. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be an arbitrary positive number. By Carathéodory's theorem, we may choose a finite point set $A_0 \subset S$ such that $\text{vol}(\text{conv}(S)) - \varepsilon \leq \text{vol}(\text{conv}(A_0))$, and without loss of generality, we may assume that the points of A_0 are in convex position. Clearly, the star-shaped set $A = \bigcup_{a \in A_0} [o, a]$ is a subset of S , satisfying $\text{vol}(\text{conv}(S)) - \varepsilon \leq \text{vol}(\text{conv}(A))$. Consider a simplicial decomposition \mathcal{F} of the boundary of $\text{conv}(A)$ such that all vertices of \mathcal{F} are vertices of $\text{conv}(A)$. Let the $(d-1)$ -dimensional faces of \mathcal{F} be F_1, F_2, \dots, F_m , and for $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, let $B_j = \bigcup_{t=1}^d [o, p_t^j]$, where $p_1^j, p_2^j, \dots, p_d^j$ are the vertices of F_j . Then $B_j \subseteq S$ for all values of j , the sets $\text{conv}(B_j)$ are mutually non-overlapping, and $\text{conv}(A) = \bigcup_{j=1}^m \text{conv}(B_j)$. Finally, let $M_j = S[k] \cap (k \text{conv}(B_j))$. Then, since $B_j \subseteq S$, we have $B_j[k] \subseteq M_j \subseteq (k \text{conv}(B_j))$. Thus, Lemma 2 implies that $\text{vol}(\frac{1}{k+1}(M_j + B_j)) \geq \text{vol}(\frac{1}{k}M_j)$, or in other words, $\text{vol}(M_j + B_j) \geq \frac{(k+1)^d}{k^d} \text{vol}(M_j)$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(k+1)^d}{k^d} \text{vol}(S[k] \cap \text{conv}(kA)) &= \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{(k+1)^d}{k^d} \text{vol}(M_j) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^m \text{vol}(M_j + B_j) \leq \text{vol}(S[k+1]). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $0 \leq \text{vol}(\text{conv}(S)) - \text{vol}(\text{conv}(A)) \leq \varepsilon$, we have $0 < \text{vol}((S[k] \setminus \text{conv}(kA))) \leq k^d \varepsilon$, implying that

$$\text{vol}\left(\frac{1}{k}S[k]\right) - \varepsilon \leq \text{vol}\left(\frac{1}{k+1}S[k+1]\right).$$

This inequality is satisfied for all positive ε , and thus, the inequality part of Theorem 1 holds.

Now, assume that

$$\text{vol}\left(\frac{1}{k}S[k]\right) = \text{vol}\left(\frac{1}{k+1}S[k+1]\right).$$

Then, since $\text{vol}((S[k] \setminus \text{conv}(kA))) \leq k^d \varepsilon$, it follows that $\text{vol}(S[k+1]) - k^d \varepsilon \leq \frac{(k+1)^d}{k^d} \text{vol}(S[k] \cap \text{conv}(kA))$, and thus,

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \left(\text{vol}\left(\frac{1}{k+1}(M_j + B_j)\right) - \text{vol}\left(\frac{1}{k}M_j\right) \right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{(k+1)^d}.$$

For $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, set $\delta_j = \text{vol}\left(\frac{1}{k+1}(M_j + B_j)\right) - \text{vol}\left(\frac{1}{k}M_j\right)$. Then, clearly $\sum \delta_j \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{(k+1)^d}$. On the other hand, by Lemma 2, for every $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, we have $\text{vol}(k \text{ conv } B_j) - \text{vol}(M_j) \leq C(k, d)\delta_j$ for some constant depending only on k and d . Thus, it follows that

$$\frac{\varepsilon C(k, d)}{(k+1)^d} \geq \text{vol}(\text{conv}(kA)) - \text{vol}(S[k] \cap \text{conv}(kA)),$$

implying that $\varepsilon\left(k^d + \frac{C(k, d)}{(k+1)^d}\right) \geq \text{vol}(\text{conv}(kS)) - \text{vol}(S[k])$. This inequality holds for any value $\varepsilon > 0$, and hence, $\text{vol}(\text{conv}(S)) = \text{vol}\left(\frac{1}{k}S[k]\right)$, or equivalently, $\text{vol}\left(\text{conv}(S) \setminus \frac{1}{k}S[k]\right) = 0$. Since $\text{conv}(S)$ is a compact, convex set with nonempty interior, and $\frac{1}{k}S[k]$ is compact, to show the equality $\text{conv}(S) = \frac{1}{k}S[k]$, we may apply the argument at the end of the proof of Lemma 2. \square

3. CONJECTURE 1 FOR CONNECTED SETS

In the first few lemmata we collect some elementary properties of the Minkowski sum of connected sets. Throughout this section, e_1, e_2 denotes the elements of the standard orthonormal basis of \mathbb{R}^2 .

Lemma 3. *Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact set with a connected boundary and let $\partial A \subseteq B \subseteq A$. Then $B + B = A + A$.*

Proof. We have $\partial A + \partial A \subseteq B + B \subseteq A + A$. Thus it is sufficient to prove that $\partial A + \partial A = A + A$. Clearly, $A + A \supseteq \partial A + \partial A$. We show that $\frac{A+A}{2} \subseteq \frac{\partial A + \partial A}{2}$, which then yields the assertion. Consider a point $p \in \frac{A+A}{2}$. Then p is the midpoint of a segment whose endpoints are points of A . Let $\chi_p : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be the reflection about p . To prove that $p \in \frac{\partial A + \partial A}{2}$ we need to show that for some $q \in \partial A$, we have $\chi_p(q) \in \partial A$. To do this, let us define $f_p(x)$ ($x \in \mathbb{R}^d$) as the signed distance of $\chi_p(x)$ from the boundary of A , where the sign is positive if $\chi_p(x) \notin A$, and not positive if $\chi_p(x) \in A$. Here we remark that since A is compact, ∂A is compact as well. Let x_1 be a point of ∂A farthest from p . If $\chi_p(x_1) \in A$ then $\chi_p(x_1) \in \partial A$, and we are done. Thus, assume that $\chi_p(x_1) \notin A$, implying that $f_p(x_1) > 0$. Now, since $p \in \frac{A+A}{2}$, we have some $y \in A$ such that $\chi_p(y) \in A$. Let L be the line through y, p and $\chi_p(y)$. Let y' and y'' be points of $L \cap \partial A$ closest to y and $\chi_p(y)$, respectively. If $0 < |y' - y| \leq |y'' - \chi_p(y)|$, then $y' \in \partial A$ and $\chi_p(y') \in A$. If $0 < |y'' - \chi_p(y)| \leq |y' - y|$, then the same holds for y'' in place of y' . Thus, it follows that for some point $x_2 \in \partial A$, $\chi_p(x_2) \in A$. If $\chi_p(x_2) \in \partial A$, then we are done, and so we may assume that $\chi_p(x_2) \in \text{int } A$, which yields that $f_p(x_2) < 0$.

We have shown that $f_p : \partial A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ attains both a positive and a negative value on its domain. On the other hand, since f is continuous and ∂A is connected, $f_p(q) = 0$ for some $q \in \partial A$, from which the assertion readily follows. \square

Remark 1. Lemma 3 holds also for the boundary of the external connected component of $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A$ in place of ∂A .

Remark 2. We note that the equality $A_1 + A_2 = \partial A_1 + \partial A_2$ does not hold in general for different compact sets A_1, A_2 with connected boundaries. To show it, one may consider the sets $A_1 = B_2^2$ and $A_2 = \varepsilon B_2^2$ for some sufficiently small value of ε , where B_2^d be the Euclidean unit ball of dimension d centered at the origin.

Remark 3. Lemma 3 does not hold if we omit the condition that ∂A is connected. To show it, we may choose A as the union of B_2^2 and a singleton $\{p\}$ with $|p|$ being sufficiently large.

Corollary 1. *If A is a compact set with a connected boundary then $A + A = A + \partial A = \partial A + \partial A$. Thus, for any positive integer $k \geq 2$, we have $\sum_{i=1}^k A = \sum_{i=1}^k \partial A$.*

Corollary 2. *For any $k \geq d - 1$ and compact set A such that $\partial S \subseteq A \subseteq S$ for some compact, star-shaped set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we have*

$$\text{vol} \left(\frac{1}{k} A[k] \right) \leq \text{vol} \left(\frac{1}{k+1} A[k+1] \right)$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that S is star-shaped with respect to the origin. Set $S' = S + \varepsilon B_2^d$ for some small value $\varepsilon > 0$.

First, we show that $\partial S'$ is path-connected. Let L be a ray starting at o . Since $o \in \text{int } S'$, $L \cap \partial S' \neq \emptyset$. Let $p \in L \cap \partial S'$. Then there is a point $q \in S$ such that $|q - p| = \varepsilon$. Now, if x is any relative interior point of $[o, q]$, then the line through x and parallel to $[p, q]$ intersects $[o, q]$ at a point at distance less than ε from x . Since $[o, q] \subseteq S$, from this it follows that $x \in S + \varepsilon \text{int } B_2^d \subseteq \text{int } S'$. In other words, for any $p \in \partial S'$, all points of $[o, p]$ but p lie in $\text{int } S'$. Thus, $L \cap \partial S'$ is a singleton for any ray L starting at o .

Let $0 < r < R$ such that $\partial S' \subset H = RB_2^d \setminus (r \text{int } B_2^d)$. Let $P : H \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ be the central projection to \mathbb{S}^{d-1} . Note that P is Lipschitz, and thus continuous on H , and its restriction $P|_{\partial S'}$ to $\partial S'$ is bijective. On the other hand, since $\partial S'$ (as also S') are compact, this implies that the inverse of $P|_{\partial S'}$ is continuous, that is, $\partial S'$ and \mathbb{S}^{d-1} are homeomorphic. Thus, $\partial S'$ is path-connected.

On the other hand, $\partial S \subseteq A \subseteq S$ implies that $A' = A + \varepsilon B_2^d \subseteq S'$, and $\partial S' \subseteq \partial S + \varepsilon \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \subseteq \partial S + \varepsilon B_2^d \subseteq A'$. Now, we may apply Lemma 3 and Corollary 1, and obtain that for any value of $k \geq d - 1$, $A'[k] = S'[k]$. Thus, by Theorem 1 it follows that $\text{vol} \left(\frac{1}{k} A'[k] \right) \leq \text{vol} \left(\frac{1}{k+1} A'[k+1] \right)$. On the other hand, since volume is continuous with respect to Hausdorff distance, we have $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \text{vol} \left(\frac{1}{m} A'[m] \right) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \text{vol} \left(\frac{1}{m} A[m] + \varepsilon B_2^d \right) = \text{vol} \left(\frac{1}{k} A[k] \right)$, which implies the corollary. \square

Let us denote the closure of a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ by $\text{cl}(A)$.

Proposition 1. *Let $\gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a simple continuous curve connecting o and e_1 such that its intersection with the x -axis is $\{o, e_1\}$. Let D be the interior of the closed Jordan curve $\gamma \cup [o, e_1]$. For $i = 0, 1$, let $\gamma_i = \frac{i}{2}e_1 + \frac{1}{2}\gamma$, and $D_i = \frac{i}{2}e_1 + \frac{1}{2}D$. Then $\text{cl}(D \setminus (D_0 \Delta D_1)) \subseteq \frac{1}{2}\gamma[2]$, where Δ denotes symmetric difference.*

Proof. For convenience, we assume that γ lies in the half plane $\{y \leq 0\}$. As in the proof of Lemma 3, let $\chi_p : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ denote the reflection about $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and note that $p \in \frac{1}{2}\gamma[2]$ if and only if there is some point $q \in \gamma$ such that $\chi_p(q) \in \gamma$, or in other words, if $\gamma \cap \chi_p(\gamma) \neq \emptyset$. Let L denote the x -axis, $L_p = \chi_p(L)$, and let S_p be the infinite strip between L and L_p (cf. Figure 2).

First, observe that $o, e_1 \in \gamma$ yields that $\gamma_0 \cup \gamma_1 \subset \frac{1}{2}\gamma[2]$, and $\gamma \subset \frac{1}{2}\gamma[2]$ trivially holds. Thus, we need to show that if for some point p we have $p \in D \setminus \text{cl}(D_0 \cup D_1)$




FIGURE 2. An illustration for Proposition 1. The dashed region belongs to $\frac{1}{2}\gamma[2]$.

or $p \in D_0 \cap D_1 \cap D$, then $p \in \frac{1}{2}\gamma[2]$. We do it only for the case $p \in D \setminus \text{cl}(D_0 \cup D_1)$ since for the second case a similar argument can be applied.

Consider some point $p \in D \setminus (D_0 \cup D_1)$. Then $p \notin \text{cl}(D_0 \cup D_1)$ yields that $\chi_p(o) = 2p \notin \text{cl} D$, and the relation $\chi_p(e_1) \notin \text{cl} D$ follows similarly.

Case 1: $\gamma \subset S$. Note that in this case $\chi_p(\gamma) \subset S$. Since $p \in D$ and $\chi_p(o) \notin \text{cl} D$, $\partial D = \gamma \cup [o, e_1]$ and $[\chi_p(o), p] \cap [o, e_1] = \emptyset$, it follows by the continuity of γ that $\gamma \cap [\chi_p(o), p] \neq \emptyset$. Hence, by the compactness of γ , there is a point $x \in \gamma \cap [\chi_p(o), p]$ closest to p . By its choice, $\chi_p(x) \in D \cup \gamma$. If $\chi_p(x) \in \gamma$, we are done, and thus, we assume that $\chi_p(x) \in D$. This implies that $\chi_p(\gamma)$ contains both interior and exterior points of D . On the other hand, since $\chi_p(\gamma) \subset S$, this implies that $\chi_p(\gamma) \cap \gamma \neq \emptyset$.

Case 2: $\gamma \not\subset S$. Let $\gamma_p = \gamma \cap S_p$, and let γ_1 and γ_2 denote the connected components of γ_p containing o and e_1 , respectively. For $i = 0, 1$, we denote the endpoint of γ_i on L_p by x_i . Clearly, since γ is simple and continuous, x_1 is on the left-hand side of x_2 , and the curve $\gamma_1 \cup [x_1, x_2] \cup \gamma_2 \cup [o, e_1]$ is a Jordan curve. We denote the interior of this curve by D_p .

Consider the case where $p \notin D_p$. Then p is an exterior point of D_p , and there is a connected component γ^* of γ_p , with endpoints on L_p , that separates p from L . Since the reflections of the endpoints of γ^* about p lie on L , we may apply the argument in Case 1, and obtain that $\emptyset \neq \gamma^* \cap \chi_p(\gamma^*) \subseteq \gamma \cap \chi_p(\gamma)$. Thus, we may assume that $p \in D_p$.

If $\chi_p(x_1) \in [o, e_1]$, then the continuity of γ_1 and $\chi_p(o) \notin \text{cl} D$ implies that $\emptyset \neq \gamma_1 \cap \chi_p(\gamma_1) \subseteq \gamma \cap \chi_p(\gamma)$. If $\chi_p(x_2) \in [o, e_1]$, then we may apply a similar argument, and thus we may assume that $\chi_p(x_1), \chi_p(x_2) \notin [o, e_1]$. This implies that either $[\chi_p(x_1), \chi_p(x_2)]$ and $[o, p_1]$ are disjoint, or $[o, p_1] \subset [\chi_p(x_1), \chi_p(x_2)]$.

Consider the case where $[\chi_p(x_1), \chi_p(x_2)]$ and $[o, p_1]$ are disjoint; without loss of generality we may assume that $\chi_p(x_1), \chi_p(x_2), o$ and e_1 are in this consecutive order on L . Let U be the closure of the connected component of $S \setminus \gamma_1$ containing γ_2 . Then $\chi_p(p) = p \in \text{int} U \cap \chi_p(U)$, implying that $\emptyset \neq \gamma_1 \cap \chi_p(\gamma_1) \subseteq \gamma \cap \chi_p(\gamma)$. Thus, we may assume that $[o, p_1] \subset [\chi_p(x_1), \chi_p(x_2)]$. Since from this it follows that $[\chi_p(o), \chi_p(e_1)] \subset [x_1, x_2]$, $\chi_p(o) \notin \text{cl} D$ yields that there is a connected component

γ' , with endpoints on L_p , that separates $\chi_p(o)$ from L . Thus, γ' separates $\chi_p(o)$ also from $\chi_p(x_1) \in L$, which yields that $\emptyset \neq \gamma' \cap \chi_p(\gamma_1) \subseteq \gamma \cap \chi_p(\gamma)$. \square

The proof of Lemma 4 is based on the idea of the proof of Proposition 1, with some necessary modifications.

Lemma 4. *Let $k \geq 2$, and let $\gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a convex, continuous curve connecting o and e_1 such that its intersection with the x -axis is $\{o, e_1\}$. Let D be the interior of the closed Jordan curve $\gamma \cup [o, e_1]$. For $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$, let $\gamma_i = \frac{i}{k}e_1 + \frac{1}{k}\gamma$, and $D_i = \frac{i}{k}e_1 + \frac{1}{k}D$. Then $\text{cl}\left(D \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^k D_i\right)\right) \subseteq \frac{1}{k}\gamma[k]$, and for any $i \neq j$, $D_i \cap D_j \subseteq \frac{1}{k}\gamma[k]$.*

Proof. First observe that D is convex, hence D_i is contained in D for all values of i . In the proof, we denote the x -axis by L , for any $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$ the homothety with center p and ratio $-\frac{1}{k-1}$ by $\chi_p^k : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$. Furthermore, we set $L_p^k = \chi_p^k(L)$, and denote the infinite strip between L and L_p^k by S . The assertion for $k = 2$ is a special case of Proposition 1. To prove it for $k \geq 3$, we apply induction on k , and assume that the lemma holds for $\gamma[k-1]$.

Let $p \in \text{cl}(D) \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^k D_i\right)$. Clearly, since $\partial D = \gamma \subseteq \gamma[k]$, we may assume that $p \in D$. By the induction hypothesis for $\frac{k-1}{k}\gamma$, if $p \in X_1 = \frac{k-1}{k}\text{cl}D$, then $p \in \frac{k-1}{k} \cdot \frac{1}{k-1}\gamma[k-1] = \frac{1}{k}\gamma[k-1] \subseteq \frac{1}{k}\gamma[k]$. Similarly, if $p \in X_2 = \frac{1}{k}e_1 + \frac{k-1}{k}\text{cl}D$, then $p \in \frac{1}{k}e_1 + \frac{1}{k}\gamma[k-1] \subseteq \frac{1}{k}\gamma[k]$. Thus, assume that $p \notin X_1 \cup X_2$, which yields that $\chi_p^k(o)$ and $\chi_p^k(e_1)$ are in the exterior of D . Let the (unique) intersection point of $[p, \chi_p^k(o)]$ and γ be q_1 and the (unique) intersection point of $[p, \chi_p^k(e_1)]$ and γ be q_2 . As $\chi_p^k(q_1) \in [o, p]$, the convexity of D implies that $\chi_p^k(q_1) \in D$, and the containment $\chi_p^k(q_2) \in D$ follows similarly.

Similarly like in Proposition 1, if $\gamma \subset S$, then by continuity, $\gamma \cap \chi_p^k(\gamma) \neq \emptyset$, which implies the containment $p \in \frac{1}{k}\gamma[k]$. Assume that $\gamma \not\subset S$. Then $S \cap \gamma$ has two connected components γ_1, γ_2 , where we choose the indices such that $o \in \gamma_1$, and $e_1 \in \gamma_2$. Clearly, we have either $q_1 \in \gamma_2, q_2 \in \gamma_1$, or both. If $q_1 \in \gamma_2$, then the containment relations $\chi(q_1) \in D, \chi(e_1) \notin \text{cl}D$, and $\chi_p^k(\gamma_2) \subset S$ yield that $\emptyset \neq \gamma_1 \cap \chi_p^k(\gamma_2) \subset \gamma \cap \chi_p^k(\gamma)$. If $q_2 \in \gamma_1$, then the assertion follows by a similar argument.

Finally, we consider the case that $p \in D_i \cap D_j$ for some $i < j$. In this case the convexity of D implies that $p \in D_s$ for any $i \leq s \leq j$. This yields that there are some distinct values $i, j \leq k-1$ or $i, j \geq 2$ such that $p \in D_i \cap D_j$. Thus, the assertion readily follows from the induction hypothesis. \square

Lemma 5 is a variant of Lemma 2 for some path-connected sets in \mathbb{R}^2 .

Lemma 5. *Let $k \geq 2$ and γ be a bounded convex curve in \mathbb{R}^2 , and let $\gamma[k] \subseteq M \subseteq k \text{ conv } \gamma$. Then*

$$\text{area}\left(\frac{1}{k}M\right) \leq \text{area}\left(\frac{1}{k+1}(M + \gamma)\right).$$

Proof. If γ is closed, then Lemma 3 yields that $\frac{1}{k}\gamma[k] = \text{conv } \gamma$ for all $k \geq 2$, which clearly implies the statement. Assume that γ is not closed. Since the inequalities

in Lemma 5 do not change under affine transformations, we may assume that the endpoints of γ are o and e_1 , and the x -axis is a supporting line of $\text{conv } \gamma$.

Let us define

$$D = \text{conv } \gamma, \alpha = \text{area}(D \cap (e_1 + D)), \text{ and } \beta = \text{area}(D \cap ((e_1 + D) \cup (-e_1 + D))).$$

Note that $0 \leq \alpha \leq \beta \leq 2\alpha$. Let $D_i = ie_1 + D$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$. For $0 \leq i \leq k-1$, let μ_i be the area of the region of M in D_i that do not belong to any D_j , $j \neq i$, where we note that since $k \geq 2$, by Lemma 4 we have that all other points of D_i belong to M . Similarly, for $0 \leq i \leq k$, let λ_i be the area of the region of $M + \gamma$ in D_i that do not belong to any D_j , $j \neq i$. An elementary computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{area}(M) &= k^2 \text{area}(D) - 2(\text{area}(D) - \alpha) - (k-2)(\text{area}(D) - \beta) + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \mu_i \\ (10) \quad &= (k^2 - k) \text{area}(D) + 2\alpha + (k-2)\beta + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \mu_i, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly,

$$(11) \quad \text{area}(M + \gamma) = (k^2 + k) \text{area}(D) + 2\alpha + (k-1)\beta + \sum_{i=0}^k \lambda_i.$$

Since $o, e_1 \in \gamma$, we have $M, e_1 + M \subseteq M + \gamma$. Thus, $\lambda_0 \geq \mu_0$, $\lambda_k \geq \mu_{k-1}$, $\lambda_1 \geq \max\{\mu_0 - (\beta - \alpha), \mu_1\}$, $\lambda_{k-1} \geq \max\{\mu_{k-2}, \mu_{k-1} - (\beta - \alpha)\}$, and for $2 \leq i \leq k-2$, $\lambda_i \geq \max\{\mu_{i-1}, \mu_i\}$. Since $\lambda_i \geq \frac{i}{k}\mu_{i-1} + \frac{k-i}{k}\mu_i$ if $2 \leq i \leq k-2$, and $\lambda_i \geq \frac{i}{k}\mu_{i-1} + \frac{k-i}{k}\mu_i - \frac{1}{k}(\beta - \alpha)$ if $i = 1$ or $i = k-1$, it follows that $\sum_{i=0}^k \lambda_i \frac{k+1}{k} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mu_i - \frac{2}{k}(\beta - \alpha)$. Thus, by (10),

$$\sum_{i=0}^k \lambda_i \geq \frac{k+1}{k} (\text{area}(M) - (k^2 - k) \text{area}(D) - 2\alpha - (k-2)\beta) - \frac{2}{k}(\beta - \alpha).$$

After substituting this into (11) and simplifying, we obtain

$$\text{area}(M + \gamma) \geq \frac{k+1}{k} \text{area}(M) + (k+1) \text{area}(D),$$

which yields

$$\text{area}\left(\frac{1}{k+1}(M + \gamma)\right) \geq \frac{k}{k+1} \text{area}\left(\frac{1}{k}M\right) + \frac{1}{k+1} \text{area}(D).$$

Thus, the inequality $\text{area}\left(\frac{1}{k}M\right) \leq \text{area}(D)$ yields the assertion. \square

In Theorem 2, by an open topological disc we mean the bounded connected component defined by a Jordan curve.

Theorem 2. *Let $k \geq 2$. Let K be a plane convex body, and let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_i : i \in I\}$ be a family of pairwise disjoint topological discs open in K such that if $F_i \cap \partial K \neq \emptyset$ then $F_i \cap \partial K$ is a connected curve and F_i is convex. Let $X = K \setminus (\bigcup_{i \in I} F_i)$. Then*

$$\text{area}\left(\frac{1}{k}X[k]\right) \leq \text{area}\left(\frac{1}{k+1}X[k+1]\right).$$

Proof. First, note that since each member of \mathcal{F} has positive area, it has countably many elements; indeed, for any $\delta > 0$ there are only finitely many elements F_i of \mathcal{F} for which $\text{area}(F_i \cap K) \geq \delta$, and thus, we may list the elements according to area. Furthermore, since X is compact, $\text{area}(X)$ exists.

By Lemma 3, we may assume that every member of \mathcal{F} intersects ∂K . For any $i \in I$, let γ_i denote the part of ∂F_i in K . Clearly, γ_i is a convex curve, and the line through two of its endpoints supports $K \setminus F_i$. Choose some finite subfamily $I_\varepsilon \subseteq I$ such that $\text{area}(X_\varepsilon \setminus X) \leq \varepsilon$, where $X_\varepsilon = K \setminus (\bigcup_{i \in I_\varepsilon} F_i)$. This is possible, since for any ordering of the elements, $\sum_{i \in I} \text{area}(K \cap F_i)$ is a bounded series with positive elements, and hence, it is absolute convergent, and convex sets with small area and bounded diameter are contained in a small neighborhood of their boundary.

For any $i \in I_\varepsilon$, we set $D_i = F_i \cap K$, and observe that D_i is a convex set separated from X_ε by the convex curve γ_i . Clearly, for $k \geq 2$, only points in the D_i 's may not belong to $\frac{1}{k}X_\varepsilon[k]$, and by Lemma 4, only points contained in exactly one homothetic copy $\frac{1}{k}D_{ij}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ of $\frac{1}{k}D_i$ in D_i . Let $M_i = (X[k] \cap (kD_i))$. Then $M_i \subseteq \text{conv}(kD_i)$, and thus, Lemma 5 yields that

$$\text{area}\left(\frac{1}{k}M_i\right) \leq \text{area}\left(\frac{1}{k+1}(M_i + \gamma_i)\right).$$

On the other hand, with the notation $D_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{i \in I_\varepsilon} D_i$, we have

$$\text{area}\left(\frac{1}{k}X[k] \cap D\right) = \sum_{i \in I_\varepsilon} \text{area}\left(\frac{1}{k}M_i\right),$$

and

$$\text{area}\left(\frac{1}{k}X[k+1] \cap D\right) \geq \sum_{i \in I_\varepsilon} \text{area}\left(\frac{1}{k+1}(M_i + \gamma_i)\right),$$

and thus, we have $\text{area}\left(\frac{1}{k}X[k] \cap D\right) \leq \text{area}\left(\frac{1}{k+1}X[k+1] \cap D\right)$. On the other hand, since $\text{area}(X_\varepsilon \setminus X) < \varepsilon$, $X_\varepsilon \cup D = \text{conv} X$, and $X \subseteq X_\varepsilon$, we have that $\text{area}\left(\frac{1}{m}X[m] \setminus D\right) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $m \geq 1$. This implies that

$$\text{area}\left(\frac{1}{k}X[k]\right) \leq \text{area}\left(\frac{1}{k+1}X[k+1]\right) - \varepsilon.$$

This holds for all $\varepsilon > 0$, which yields the assertion. \square

4. ADDITIONAL REMARKS AND QUESTIONS

Remark 4. One can ask if the statement of Theorem 1 holds for arbitrary measure instead of volume. The answer to this question is negative. Indeed, consider the measure $\mu(K) = \text{vol}(K \cap C)$, where $C = [-\frac{1}{d}, \frac{1}{d}]^d$ and $S = \bigcup_{i=1}^d [o, e_i]$, where e_1, e_2, \dots, e_d are the vectors of the standard orthonormal basis. Then, clearly, we have

$$\mu\left(\frac{1}{2k}S[2k]\right) = \frac{1}{2d} \text{vol}(C) > \mu\left(\frac{1}{2k+1}S[2k+1]\right).$$

Remark 5. The statement of Theorem 1 does not hold for arbitrary measures even for rotationally invariant measures in the plane: for any value of k there is a compact, star-shaped set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\text{vol}\left(\frac{1}{k}S[k] \cap B_2^2\right) > \text{vol}\left(\frac{1}{k+1}S[k+1] \cap B_2^2\right)$.

To prove this, set $S = [o, e_1] \cup [o, e_2]$, and let E denote the ellipse centered at o and containing the points $(1 - 1/k, 0)$ and $(1 - 2/k, 1/k)$. It is an elementary computation to check that in this case $\text{vol}(\frac{1}{k}S[k] \cap E) = \frac{1}{4} \text{vol}(E)$. On the other hand, the boundary point $(1 - 2/(k+1), 1/(k+1))$ of $\frac{1}{k+1}S[k+1]$ lies in $\text{int}(E)$, which implies that $\text{vol}(\frac{1}{k+1}S[k+1] \cap E) < \frac{1}{4} \text{vol}(E)$. Now, if $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is defined as the linear transformation mapping E into B_2^2 , then $f(S)$ satisfies the required conditions.

One can use star-shaped sets together with ideas from [FMMZ2] to give a negative answer to a more general version of Conjecture 1, also from [BMW].

Conjecture 2 (Bobkov-Madiman-Wang). For any $k \geq 2$, star-shaped compact sets A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{k+1} in \mathbb{R}^d , we have

$$\text{vol}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} A_i\right)^{1/d} \geq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \text{vol}\left(\sum_{j \neq i} A_j\right)^{1/d}.$$

in particular, for $k = 2$,

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{vol}(A_1 + A_2 + A_3)^{1/d} \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{vol}_n(A_1 + A_2)^{1/d} + \text{vol}(A_1 + A_3)^{1/d} + \text{vol}(A_2 + A_3)^{1/d} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The above conjecture is trivial for convex sets. Moreover, (12) is true when $A_1 = A_2$ and A_1 is convex. Indeed, in this case (12) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vol}(A_1 + A_1 + A_3)^{1/d} & \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{vol}(2A_1)^{1/d} + 2 \text{vol}_n(A_1 + A_3)^{1/d} \right), \\ \text{vol}(A_1 + A_1 + A_3)^{1/d} & \geq \text{vol}(A_1)^{1/d} + \text{vol}(A_1 + A_3)^{1/d}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the Brunn-Minkowski inequality [Sch].

It was proved in [FMMZ2] that Conjecture 2 is true in \mathbb{R} . Since an affirmative answer to Conjecture 2 implies also Conjecture 1, the former is also false for $d \geq 12$ by [FMMZ1, FMMZ2]. Here we show that Conjecture 2 is false in \mathbb{R}^d even for $d \geq 7$.

Proposition 2. For any $d \geq 7$, there are compact, star-shaped sets $A_1, A_2, A_3 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying

$$\text{vol}(A_1 + A_2 + A_3)^{1/d} < \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{vol}(A_1 + A_2)^{1/d} + \text{vol}(A_1 + A_3)^{1/d} + \text{vol}(A_2 + A_3)^{1/d} \right).$$

Proof. We give the proof for $d = 7$ and the result follows for $d > 7$ by taking direct products with a cube. consider the sets

$$A_1 = [0, 1]^4 \times \{0\}^3; A_2 = \{0\}^4 \times [0, 1]^3 \text{ and } A_3 = ([0, a]^4 \times \{0\}^3) \cup (\{0\}^4 \times [0, b]^3),$$

where we select $a, b > 0$ later. An elementary consideration shows that

$$\text{vol}(A_1 + A_3) = b^3, \text{vol}(A_2 + A_3) = a^4 \text{ and } \text{vol}(A_1 + A_2) = 1,$$

and

$$\text{vol}(A_1 + A_2 + A_3) = (a + 1)^4 + (b + 1)^3 - 1.$$

The last step is to show that, with $a = 3$ and $b = 6$, the quantity

$$((a + 1)^4 + (b + 1)^3 - 1)^{1/7} - \frac{1}{2} \left(a^{4/7} + b^{3/7} + 1 \right)$$

is negative, which gives a counterexample to (12). \square

REFERENCES

- [BM1] S. Bobkov and M. Madiman. *The entropy per coordinate of a random vector is highly constrained under convexity conditions*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, 57(8):4940–4954, August 2011.
- [BM2] S. Bobkov and M. Madiman. *Reverse Brunn-Minkowski and reverse entropy power inequalities for convex measures*, J. Funct. Anal., 262:3309–3339, 2012.
- [BMW] S. G. Bobkov, M. Madiman, and L. Wang. *Fractional generalizations of Young and Brunn-Minkowski inequalities*. In C. Houdré, M. Ledoux, E. Milman, and M. Milman, editors, *Concentration, Functional Inequalities and Isoperimetry*, volume 545 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 35–53. Amer. Math. Soc., 2011.
- [EG] W. R. Emerson and F. P. Greenleaf. *Asymptotic behavior of products $C^p = C + \dots + C$ in locally compact abelian groups*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 145:171204, 1969.
- [Ga] R. J. Gardner, *Geometric tomography*. Second edition. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, 58, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.
- [GMR] K. Gyarmati, M. Matolcsi, and I. Z. Ruzsa. *A superadditivity and submultiplicativity property for cardinalities of sumsets*, Combinatorica, 30(2):163–174, 2010.
- [FMMZ1] M. Fradelizi, M. Madiman, A. Marsiglietti and A. Zvavitch, *Do Minkowski averages get progressively more convex?* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I, 354 (2016) 185-189.
- [FMMZ2] M. Fradelizi, M. Madiman, A. Marsiglietti and A. Zvavitch, *The convexification effect of Minkowski summation*, EMS Surv. Math. Sci. **5** (2018), 1-64.
- [Sch] R. Schneider, *Convex bodies: The Brunn-Minkowski theory*. 2nd expanded edition. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, 151. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014.
- [St1] R. M. Starr. *Quasi-equilibria in markets with non-convex preferences*. Econometrica, 37(1):2538, January 1969.
- [St2] R. M. Starr. *Approximation of points of convex hull of a sum of sets by points of the sum: an elementary approach*. J. Econom. Theory, 25(2):314317, 1981.

LAMA, UPEM, UPEC, CNRS, F-77447 MARNE-LA-VALLE, FRANCE

E-mail address: `matthieu.fradelizi@u-pem.fr`

MORPHODYNAMICS RESEARCH GROUP AND DEPARTMENT OF GEOMETRY, BUDAPEST UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, EGRY JÓZSEF UTCA 1., BUDAPEST 1111, HUNGARY

E-mail address: `zlangi@math.bme.hu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, KENT STATE UNIVERSITY, KENT, OH 44242, USA

E-mail address: `zvavitch@math.kent.edu`