

ADDITIVE COLOURFUL CARATHÉODORY TYPE RESULTS WITH AN APPLICATION TO RADII

MATTHIAS BRUGGER, MAXIMILIAN FIEDLER, BERNARDO GONZÁLEZ MERINO,
AND ANJA KIRSCHBAUM

ABSTRACT. In this paper we study the behavior of the circumradius with respect to the Minkowski addition in generalized Minkowski spaces. To do so, we solve additive colourful Carathéodory type results, under certain equilibria conditions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let us denote by \mathcal{K}^n the set of all n -dimensional convex bodies, i.e., convex and compact sets.

The *circumradius* of a convex body K with respect to a second convex body C is the smallest rescaling λC containing a translation of K , and is denoted by $R(K, C)$. The *inradius* of K w.r.t. C is the largest rescaling λC containing a translation of K , and is denoted by $r(K, C)$. The *diameter* of K w.r.t. C is the maximum distance between two points of K measured w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_{(C-C)/2}$, and is denoted by $D(K, C)$. Finally, the *minimal width* of K w.r.t. C is the smallest distance between two parallel supporting hyperplanes to K measured w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_{(C-C)/2}$, and is denoted by $w(K, C)$. In the Euclidean space $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|_2)$ with unit ball $\mathbb{B}_2^n := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\|_2 \leq 1\}$, where $\|x\|_2 := \sqrt{x_1^2 + \cdots + x_n^2}$, and unit sphere $\mathbb{S}^{n-1} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\|_2 = 1\}$, we write $R(K) := R(K, \mathbb{B}_2^n)$, and the same for $r(K)$, $D(K)$, and $w(K)$.

The authors of [14, Theorems 1.1 and 1.2] initiated the study of the behavior of the successive radii (which are generalizations of the classical radii above) w.r.t. the Minkowski (or vectorial) addition in the Euclidean space with unit ball \mathbb{B}_2^n . In particular, the authors showed that for any two convex bodies K and L

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} R(K) + R(L) &\leq \sqrt{2}R(K + L), & r(K) + r(L) &\leq r(K + L), \\ D(K) + D(L) &\leq \sqrt{2}D(K + L), & w(K) + w(L) &\leq w(K + L). \end{aligned}$$

Other authors have studied the same questions for the different families of successive radii in the Euclidean space [11], for the mean successive radii [1], for the Firey (or p) sum [15], or for the Orlicz-Minkowski sum [9].

Date: September 23, 2021.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 52A20, Secondary 52A40.

Key words and phrases. Additive Helly theorem; Additive colourful Carathéodory theorem; Convex bodies; Outer and Inner radii; Vector sums; Minkowski addition.

The third author is partially supported by Fundación Séneca, through the Programa de Formación Postdoctoral de Personal Investigador, project reference 19769/PD/15, and the Programme in Support of Excellence Groups of the Región de Murcia, Spain, project reference 19901/GERM/15, and by MINECO project reference MTM2015-63699-P, Spain.

In this paper, however, our aim is to focus on the Minkowski addition of convex bodies, and to compute its behavior under the circumradius *measured with respect to an arbitrary convex set* $C \in \mathcal{K}^n$. Hence, we study inequalities of the form

$$c_1 \sum_{i=1}^j R(K_i, C) \leq R(K_1 + \cdots + K_j, C) \leq c_2 \sum_{i=1}^j R(K_i, C),$$

where $K_i, C \in \mathcal{K}^n$, $i \in [j]$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and $c_1, c_2 > 0$ are some absolute constants. We can easily deduce the upper bound in the inequality above, i.e., for any $K_i, C \in \mathcal{K}^n$, $i \in [j]$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, since $K_i \subset x^i + R(K_i, C)C$, for some $x^i \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then

$$K_1 + \cdots + K_j \subset (x^1 + \cdots + x^j) + (R(K_1, C) + \cdots + R(K_j, C))C,$$

and thus

$$R(K_1 + \cdots + K_j, C) \leq R(K_1, C) + \cdots + R(K_j, C).$$

Therefore, the lower bound is the interesting case, and the main case in our investigations.

Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$. We denote by $\text{bd}(K)$ the *boundary* of K . Moreover, letting $p \in \text{bd}(K)$, we say that $u \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ is an *exterior outer normal* to some K at p if $x^T u \leq p^T u$ for every $x \in K$. The solution to the first inequality in (1.1) was achieved by two *main ingredients*. The first of them is the *optimal containment under homothetics condition* (cf. [7, Thm. 2.3]).

Proposition 1.1. *Let $K, C \in \mathcal{K}^n$ be such that $K \subset C$. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) $R(K, C) = 1$.
- (2) *There exist $p^1, \dots, p^j \in K \cap \text{bd}(C)$, exterior outer normals u^1, \dots, u^j to C at p^1, \dots, p^j , respectively, and scalars $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_j > 0$, $2 \leq j \leq n+1$, such that*

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^j \lambda_i u^i.$$

Moreover, if $C = \mathbb{B}_2^n$, the conditions above are also equivalent to

- (3) *There exist $p^1, \dots, p^j \in K \cap \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and scalars $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_j > 0$, $2 \leq j \leq n+1$, such that*

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^j \lambda_i p^i.$$

- (4) *For every $a \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, $K \cap \{x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} : x^T a \geq 0\} \neq \emptyset$.*

The second ingredient is a somewhat hidden but repeatedly used minmax result (see [14]), which can be expressed in the following proposition.

Proposition 1.2. *Let $U := \{u^1, \dots, u^i\} \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, $V := \{v^1, \dots, v^j\} \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, and $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_j > 0$ be such that*

$$0 = \sum_{k=1}^i \lambda_k u^k = \sum_{l=1}^j \mu_l v^l.$$

Then there exist $k \in [i]$ and $l \in [j]$ such that

$$\|u^k + v^l\|_2 \geq \sqrt{2}.$$

The acquainted reader will quickly realize that Proposition 1.2 hides an *additive colourful Carathéodory (or Helly) type* result. Similar results have been already considered by other authors (cf. [2, 4]). Furthermore, the intimate connection between some Helly type results and some radii notions is not that surprising since one can directly link Proposition 1.1 with Helly's theorem via Rubin's lemma, and strengthen Proposition 1.1(2) replacing " $j \leq n + 1$ " by " $j \leq h(C)$ ", where $h(C)$ denotes the well-known *Helly number* of C (cf. [10]).

Our first result generalizes Proposition 1.2 onto an arbitrary number of a finite amount of subsets. Before stating it, we remember that $K, L \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ are *mutually orthogonal* if $x^T y = 0$ for every $x \in K$ and $y \in L$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $U_i := \{u_1^i, \dots, u_{k_i}^i\} \subset r_i \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, $r_i > 0$, $i \in [j]$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda_1^i, \dots, \lambda_{k_i}^i > 0$, $2 \leq k_i \leq n + 1$, and $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, be such that*

$$0 = \sum_{l=1}^{k_1} \lambda_l^1 u_l^1 = \dots = \sum_{l=1}^{k_j} \lambda_l^j u_l^j.$$

Then

$$\max_{l_1, \dots, l_j} \left\| u_{l_1}^1 + \dots + u_{l_j}^j - c \right\|_2 \geq \sqrt{r_1^2 + \dots + r_j^2}.$$

Moreover, equality holds if and only if $c = 0$, $j \in [n]$, and U_k and U_l are mutually orthogonal, for any choice $1 \leq k < l \leq j$.

Theorem 1.1 implies, in particular, the existence of indices $l_i \in [k_i]$, $i \in [j]$, such that $\left\| u_{l_1}^1 + \dots + u_{l_j}^j \right\|_2 \geq \sqrt{r_1^2 + \dots + r_j^2}$. Let us also note that the case $U_i = \{-u^i, u^i\}$ in Theorem 1.1 follows by a basic averaging argument.

In this paper we study questions analogous to (1.1) specially focused on the circumradius functional. For any $K, C \in \mathcal{K}^n$, it is known that all radii can be described by means of the outer radius (cf. [8]), so in some sense we focus in the *first natural step* towards understanding the behavior of the radii functionals with respect to the Minkowski addition. Making use of Theorem 1.1, we extend [14, Theorem 1.1, $i = n$].

Theorem 1.2. *Let $K_i \in \mathcal{K}^n$, $i \in [j]$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$R(K_1) + \dots + R(K_j) \leq \sqrt{j} R(K_1 + \dots + K_j).$$

Moreover, equality holds if K_k and K_l are contained in orthogonal linear subspaces, for any choice $1 \leq k < l \leq j$, and $R(K_1) = \dots = R(K_j)$.

Let us observe that the *if* in the equality case above is not *only if*. For instance, the planar sets

$$K := \text{conv}(\{(\pm 1, 0)^T, (0, \pm(\sqrt{2} - 1))^T\}), \quad L := \text{conv}(\{(0, \pm 1)^T, (\pm(\sqrt{2} - 1), 0)^T\}),$$

fulfill $R(K) = R(L) = 1$ and $R(K + L) = \sqrt{2}$, but K and L are not mutually orthogonal.

Theorem 1.1 presents an optimal estimate only if U_1, \dots, U_j are *no more* than $j \leq n$ sets. If we are given more than n of those sets, then the optimal analogous result to Theorem 1.1 turns out to be more involved. In this regard, we have been able to show the following additive Helly type result, which improves Theorem 1.1 in the case of $n = 2$, $j = 3$, and $r_i = 1$, $i \in [3]$, from $\sqrt{3}$ to 2, which is the optimal value in this case.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $U_i := \{u_1^i, \dots, u_{k_i}^i\} \subset \mathbb{S}^1$, $i \in [3]$, $\lambda_1^i, \dots, \lambda_{k_i}^i > 0$, $2 \leq k_i \leq 3$, and $c \in \mathbb{R}^2$, be such that*

$$0 = \sum_{l=1}^{k_1} \lambda_l^1 u_l^1 = \sum_{l=1}^{k_2} \lambda_l^2 u_l^2 = \sum_{l=1}^{k_3} \lambda_l^3 u_l^3.$$

Then

$$\max_{l_1, l_2, l_3} \|u_{l_1}^1 + u_{l_2}^2 + u_{l_3}^3 - c\|_2 \geq 2.$$

Moreover, equality holds if and only if $c = 0$ and, after a suitable common rotation, we have that

$$U_i = \{\pm(\cos(i\pi/3), \sin(i\pi/3))\}, \quad i \in [3].$$

We would like to point out a fundamental difference between the equality cases of Theorems 1.1 and 1.3, which reflects a reason why the latter is more complicated than the former. On the one hand, if U_1, \dots, U_j achieve equality in Theorem 1.1, then *any* choice of vectors $u_{l_i}^i \in U_i$, $i \in [j]$, $j \in [n]$, provides the optimal bound $\|u_{l_1}^1 + \dots + u_{l_j}^j\|_2 = \sqrt{r_1^2 + \dots + r_j^2}$. On the other hand, *some* choices in the sets of pairs of vectors $\{\pm(\cos(i\pi/3), \sin(i\pi/3))\}$, $i \in [3]$ (cf. Theorem 1.3), may lead to *worse values* than the optimal one, for instance,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\cos(\pi/3), \sin(\pi/3))^T - (\cos(2\pi/3), \sin(2\pi/3))^T + (\cos(\pi), \sin(\pi))^T \\ &= (1/2, \sqrt{3}/2)^T - (-1/2, \sqrt{3}/2)^T + (-1, 0)^T = (0, 0)^T. \end{aligned}$$

Again, a consequence of Theorem 1.3 is the following result.

Corollary 1.1. *Let $K_i \in \mathcal{K}^2$, $i \in [3]$, be such that $K_i \subset \mathbb{B}_2^2$ with $R(K_i) = 1$, for $i \in [3]$. Then*

$$R(K_1 + K_2 + K_3) \geq 2.$$

Moreover, equality holds only if, after a suitable common rotation, K_i contains a segment $[(\cos(i\pi/3), \sin(i\pi/3)), -(\cos(i\pi/3), \sin(i\pi/3))]$, $i \in [3]$.

Very recently, special attention has been paid to the radii functionals measured with respect to an arbitrary $C \in \mathcal{K}^n$ (cf. [6, 7]). This motivated us to study the behavior of the outer radius $R(\cdot, C)$ of the sum of a finite amount of convex bodies. For $K_1, \dots, K_m \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, let $K_1 + \dots + \widehat{K_i} + \dots + K_m$ be the sum of all sets K_j such that $j \in [m] \setminus \{i\}$.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $K_i, C \in \mathcal{K}^n$, $i \in [j]$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$(1.2) \quad R(K_1, C) + \dots + R(K_j, C) \leq j R(K_1 + \dots + K_j, C).$$

Equality holds if and only if there exist polyhedral cylinders C_i with facets parallel to $\text{aff}(K_1 + \dots + \widehat{K_i} + \dots + K_j)$ and some $\lambda > 0$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$K_1 + \dots + K_j \subset z + \lambda C \subset C_1 \cap \dots \cap C_j$$

with $R(K_1, C_1) = \dots = R(K_j, C_j) = 1$.

Before going on, we will now explain the notation used in the remaining sections of the paper. For any $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we write $A \perp B$ if A and B are mutually orthogonal. For any set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote by $\text{conv}(A)$, $\text{lin}(A)$, and $\text{aff}(A)$, the *convex*, *linear*, and *affine hull* of A , respectively. We denote by $\dim(A)$ the *dimension* of A , and it is defined as $\dim(A) := \dim(\text{aff}(A))$. For any $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we say that $A \subset_t B$

(resp. $A \not\subset_t B$) if there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $A \subset x + B$ (resp. $A \not\subset x + B$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$).

2. EUCLIDEAN CASE

We start this section proving Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $\lambda_1^i, \dots, \lambda_{k_i}^i > 0$ be such that $0 = \sum_{l=1}^{k_i} \lambda_l^i u_l^i$ for all $i \in [j]$. Considering the scalar product

$$\left(\sum_{l=1}^{k_1} \lambda_l^1 u_l^1 \right)^T c = \sum_{l=1}^{k_1} \lambda_l^1 (u_l^1)^T c = 0,$$

then there exists $m_1 \in [k_1]$ such that $(u_{m_1}^1)^T c \leq 0$. Secondly, and again due to

$$\left(\sum_{l=1}^{k_2} \lambda_l^2 u_l^2 \right)^T (u_{m_1}^1 - c) = \sum_{l=1}^{k_2} \lambda_l^2 (u_l^2)^T (u_{m_1}^1 - c) = 0$$

there exists $m_2 \in [k_2]$ such that $(u_{m_2}^2)^T (u_{m_1}^1 - c) \geq 0$. In general and because of the same reason, for every $t = 3, \dots, j$, we choose $m_t \in [k_t]$ such that

$$(u_{m_t}^t)^T (u_{m_1}^1 + \dots + u_{m_{t-1}}^{t-1} - c) \geq 0.$$

Hence, for every $t = 2, \dots, j$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_{m_1}^1 + \dots + u_{m_t}^t - c\|_2^2 \\ &= \|u_{m_1}^1 + \dots + u_{m_{t-1}}^{t-1} - c\|_2^2 + 2(u_{m_1}^1 + \dots + u_{m_{t-1}}^{t-1} - c)^T (u_{m_t}^t) + \|u_{m_t}^t\|_2^2 \\ &\geq \|u_{m_1}^1 + \dots + u_{m_{t-1}}^{t-1} - c\|_2^2 + \|u_{m_t}^t\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{m_1}^1 + \dots + u_{m_j}^j - c\|_2^2 &\geq \|c\|_2^2 + \|u_{m_1}^1\|_2^2 + \dots + \|u_{m_j}^j\|_2^2 \\ &\geq \|u_{m_1}^1\|_2^2 + \dots + \|u_{m_j}^j\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{l_1, \dots, l_j} \|u_{l_1}^1 + \dots + u_{l_j}^j - c\|_2^2 &\geq \|u_{m_1}^1 + \dots + u_{m_j}^j - c\|_2^2 \\ &\geq \|u_{m_1}^1\|_2^2 + \dots + \|u_{m_j}^j\|_2^2 \\ &= r_1^2 + \dots + r_j^2. \end{aligned}$$

We now show the equality case. Since we must have equality in all inequalities above, we start observing that $\|c\|_2 = 0$ implies $c = 0$. Moreover, we also have that

$$(u_{l_t}^t)^T (u_{l_1}^1 + \dots + u_{l_{t-1}}^{t-1}) = 0$$

for every $t = 2, \dots, j$, and every $l_t \in [k_t]$. This gives, for $t = 2$, that $(u_{l_2}^2)^T u_{l_1}^1 = 0$ for every l_1, l_2 , and thus $U_1 \perp U_2$. For $t = 3$, we get $(u_{l_3}^3)^T (u_{l_1}^1 + u_{l_2}^2) = 0$ for every l_1, l_2, l_3 . Clearly

$$\text{lin}(\{u_{l_1}^1 + u_{l_2}^2 : 1 \leq l_i \leq k_i\}) = \text{lin}(U_1 \cup U_2) = \text{lin}(U_1) + \text{lin}(U_2)$$

and thus $U_3 \perp (U_1 + U_2)$. Analogously, we obtain that for every $t = 2, \dots, j$ then $U_t \perp (U_1 + \dots + U_{t-1})$, i.e., $U_i \perp U_l$ for every $1 \leq i < l \leq j$. Finally, we also observe that $U_i \perp U_l$ for every $1 \leq i < l \leq j$ implies that

$$\dim(U_1) + \dots + \dim(U_j) = \dim(U_1 + \dots + U_j) \leq n$$

which, since $\dim(U_i) \geq 1$ for $i \in [j]$, hence $j \leq n$, concludes the equality case. \square

Making use of Theorem 1.1, we are able to show the following result, which is a nonlinear sharp bound explaining the behavior of the Euclidean circumradius with respect to the Minkowski addition of convex sets.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $K_i \in \mathcal{K}^n$, $i \in [j]$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$R(K_1)^2 + \cdots + R(K_j)^2 \leq R(K_1 + \cdots + K_j)^2.$$

Equality holds if K_k and K_l are mutually orthogonal, for any choice $1 \leq k < l \leq j$.

Proof. Let $c_i \in K_i$ be such that $K_i \subset c_i + R(K_i)\mathbb{B}_2^n$, $i \in [j]$, and define $K'_i := K_i - c_i$. Letting $r_i := R(K_i)$ for $i \in [j]$, by Proposition 1.1, there exist

$$u_1^i, \dots, u_{k_i}^i \in r_i \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap K'_i,$$

such that $0 \in \text{conv}(\{u_1^i, \dots, u_{k_i}^i\})$. Let us denote by $U_i := \{u_1^i, \dots, u_{k_i}^i\}$ for every $i \in [j]$. By Theorem 1.1 we then have that

$$\begin{aligned} R(K_1 + \cdots + K_j) &\geq R(\text{conv}(U_1) + \cdots + \text{conv}(U_j)) \\ &\geq R(U_1 + \cdots + U_j) \\ &= \min_{c \in \mathbb{R}^n} \max_{l_1, \dots, l_j} \|u_{l_1}^1 + \cdots + u_{l_j}^j - c\|_2 \\ &\geq \sqrt{r_1^2 + \cdots + r_j^2}. \end{aligned}$$

For the equality case, let us observe that if K_k and K_l are mutually orthogonal, for any choice $1 \leq k < l \leq j$, then U_k and U_l are mutually orthogonal as well, for any $1 \leq k < l \leq j$, and thus the equality cases of Theorem 1.1 implies the result. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Applying Hölder's inequality to $(R(K_1), \dots, R(K_j))^T$ and $(1, \dots, 1)^T \in \mathbb{R}^j$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^j R(K_i) &= \|(R(K_1), \dots, R(K_j))^T\|_1 \\ &\leq \|(1, \dots, 1)^T\|_2 \|(R(K_1), \dots, R(K_j))^T\|_2 \\ &= j^{\frac{1}{2}} \|(R(K_1), \dots, R(K_j))^T\|_2 \\ &\leq j^{\frac{1}{2}} R(K_1 + \cdots + K_j) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Theorem 2.1.

Let us assume that we have equality. Then we have equality in Theorem 2.1. Moreover, we have equality in Hölder's inequality applied to $(R(K_1), \dots, R(K_j))^T$ and $(1, \dots, 1)^T$, hence $R(K_1) = \cdots = R(K_j)$, concluding the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We start by showing the following claim.

Claim. There exist two points, each from a different group of points U_i , $i \in [3]$, say w.l.o.g. u_1^1 and u_1^2 , such that

$$(u_1^1 + u_1^2)^T(-c) \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (u_1^1)^T u_1^2 \geq \frac{1}{2},$$




FIGURE 1. Arcs $B(e_2, \pi/6)$, $B((-\sqrt{3}/2, 1/2), \pi/6)$ and $B((\sqrt{3}/2, 1/2), \pi/6)$ in the proof of Theorem 1.3.




FIGURE 2. All vectors in the gray region, together with u_1^2 , fulfill the requirements of (I).




FIGURE 3. Since 0 is contained in the convex hull of U^3 there must be a point u_2^3 on the green arc.




FIGURE 4. Equality case in the proof of Theorem 1.3 up to a rotation.

cf. Figure 3. Geometrically speaking, the claim states that $(u_1^1 + u_1^2)$ has a positive component in the direction of $-c$ and that the angle between u_1^1 and u_1^2 is no greater than $\frac{\pi}{3}$.

Before proving claim, let us observe that if the claim holds true, since $0 = \sum_{l=1}^{k_3} \lambda_l^3 u_l^3$, then $0 = \sum_{l=1}^{k_3} \lambda_l^3 (u_1^1 + u_1^2 - c)^T u_l^3$. From this we deduce that there exists an index l , say $l = 1$, such that $(u_1^1 + u_1^2 - c)^T u_1^3 \geq 0$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \|u_1^1 + u_1^2 + u_1^3 - c\|_2^2 \\
 = & \|u_1^1\|_2^2 + \|u_1^2\|_2^2 + 2(u_1^1)^T u_1^2 + \|c\|_2^2 + 2(u_1^1 + u_1^2)^T (-c) \\
 (2.1) \quad & + \|u_1^3\|_2^2 + 2(u_1^1 + u_1^2 - c)^T u_1^3 \\
 \geq & 1 + 1 + 2\frac{1}{2} + 0 + 0 + 1 + 0 = 4,
 \end{aligned}$$

concluding the proof of the inequality. Hence, we just need to show the claim.

Proof of Claim. After a suitable rotation, we can assume that $-c = \lambda e_2$, for some $\lambda \geq 0$. For the sake of clearness, we use the notation $B(u, \alpha) := \{x \in \mathbb{S}^1 : \arccos(u^T x) \leq \alpha\}$, where $u \in \mathbb{S}^1$ and $\alpha \in [0, \pi]$.¹ We first notice that if there exist two points from different sets of vectors U_1, U_2, U_3 , namely u_1^1 and u_1^2 , such that $u_1^1, u_1^2 \in B(e_2, \pi/6)$ or $u_1^1, u_1^2 \in B((-\sqrt{3}/2, 1/2), \pi/6)$ or $u_1^1, u_1^2 \in B((\sqrt{3}/2, 1/2), \pi/6)$ then we have that

$$(u_1^1 + u_1^2)^T e_2 = (u_1^1)^T e_2 + (u_1^2)^T e_2 \geq 0 + 0 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \arccos((u_1^1)^T u_1^2) \leq \frac{\pi}{3},$$

i.e., $(u_1^1)^T u_1^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}$, as desired (see Figure 1 for the corresponding arcs).

Let us suppose this were not the case. Since $B(e_2, \pi/6)$ and $B((\pm\sqrt{3}/2, 1/2), \pi/6)$ cover $C := \{x \in \mathbb{S}^1 : x_2 \geq 0\}$, and U_1, U_2 , and U_3 each intersect with C (cf. Proposition 1.1(4)), we can suppose w.l.o.g. that $U_1 \cap C \subset B((-\sqrt{3}/2, 1/2), \pi/6)$, $U_2 \cap C \subset B((0, 1), \pi/6)$, and $U_3 \cap C \subset B((\sqrt{3}/2, 1/2), \pi/6)$. Let us also suppose that $u_1^1 \in B((-\sqrt{3}/2, 1/2), \pi/6)$, $u_1^2 \in B(e_2, \pi/6)$, and $u_1^3 \in B((\sqrt{3}/2, 1/2), \pi/6)$. Moreover, we can also suppose that u_1^1 (resp. u_1^3) is the point from U_1 (resp. U_3) contained in $B((-\sqrt{3}/2, 1/2), \pi/6)$ (resp. $B((\sqrt{3}/2, 1/2), \pi/6)$) with biggest second coordinate. Furthermore, we can suppose that $u_1^1, u_1^3 \notin B(u_1^2, \pi/3)$, as otherwise we would be done by choosing either u_1^1 and u_1^2 or u_1^3 and u_1^2 (cf. Figure 2). Finally, let us also suppose w.l.o.g. that $(u_1^1)_2 \geq (u_1^3)_2$.

We now make a crucial observation: There must exist a point from U_3 in the arc of \mathbb{S}^1 containing e_2 and determined by u_1^1 and $-u_1^3$ (cf. green arc in Figure 3) *different* from u_1^3 . If this were not the case, then $0 \notin \text{conv}(U_3)$, a contradiction (again, cf. Proposition 1.1(4)). Assuming that this second point in this arc is u_2^3 , we furthermore observe that it must necessarily belong to the arc of \mathbb{S}^1 determined by $-u_1^3$ and the left-most vertex of $B(u_1^2, \pi/3)$. Since u_1^3 lies in \mathbb{S}^1 between e_1 and the right-most vertex of $B(u_1^2, \pi/3)$, we see that the angle between u_2^3 (as well as u_1^1) and the left-most vertex of $B(u_1^2, \pi/3)$ is at most $\pi/3$. Thus we also have that $\arccos((u_2^3)^T u_1^1) \leq \pi/3$, i.e., $(u_2^3)^T u_1^1 \geq 1/2$. Moreover, since $(u_2^3)_2 \geq (-u_1^3)_2$ and $(u_1^1)_2 \geq (u_1^3)_2$, we conclude that $(u_1^1 + u_2^3)^T e_2 = (u_1^1)_2 + (u_2^3)_2 \geq 0$, concluding the assertion for the choice u_1^1 and u_2^3 . This concludes the proof of the claim, possibly changing naming between U_2 and U_3 . \square

For the equality case, we should have equality in all the inequalities above, in particular in (2.1), assuming w.l.o.g. that $l_1 = l_2 = l_3 = 1$. This means that $c = 0$, $(u_1^1)^T u_1^2 = 1/2$ (i.e. $\arccos((u_1^1)^T u_1^2) = \pi/3$), and $(u_1^1 + u_1^2)^T u_1^3 = 0$. If

¹Observe that for $u \in \mathbb{S}^1$, $B(u, \alpha)$ is an arc of \mathbb{S}^1 and contains all vectors that span an angle of no more than α with u .

u_1^1, u_1^2, u_1^3 are located within \mathbb{S}^1 in clockwise order, then $\arccos((u_1^2)^T u_1^3) = \pi/3 = \arccos((u_1^1)^T u_1^2)$, i.e., u_1^1, u_1^2, u_1^3 are vertices of a regular hexagon. Furthermore, the arc determined by $\pm u_1^3$ and containing u_1^1, u_1^2 must contain a second point from U_3 , say u_2^3 . At the same time this point cannot be in the relative interior of this arc (as otherwise we would have that $(u_1^1 + u_1^2)^T u_2^3 > 0$, a contradiction with (2.1)), hence showing $u_2^3 = -u_1^3$. Again, we must have points from U_1 (say u_2^1) and from U_2 (say u_2^2) inside the other arc determined by $\pm u_1^3$. Again, for the same reason, $U_i \cap \text{relint}(B(\pm u_1^3, \pi/3)) = \emptyset$, $i = 1, 2$. Assuming that $u_1^3 = e^1$, Proposition 1.1(4) implies that $U_i \cap \{x \in \mathbb{S}^1 : x_2 \leq 0\} \neq \emptyset$, $i = 1, 2$. Then $U_i \cap \{x \in \mathbb{S}^1 : x_2 \leq -1/2\} \neq \emptyset$, $i = 1, 2$, namely, $u_2^i \in B(-e_2, \pi/6)$, $i = 1, 2$.

Then we have that $(u_2^1)^T u_2^2 \geq 1/2$, with equality (as it actually happens) if and only if $u_2^1 = (-1/2, \sqrt{3}/2) = -u_1^1$ and $u_2^2 = (-1/2, -\sqrt{3}/2) = -u_1^2$. Moreover, no other points on U_1, U_2, U_3 are allowed so that some of those conditions are violated. Therefore, $U_i = \{\pm u^i\}$, $i \in [3]$, where $\arccos((u^i)^T u^j) = 1/2$, for all $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$, hence concluding the equality case and the theorem (cf. Figure 4 for a visualization). \square

Proof of Corollary 1.1. Since $R(K_i) = 1$ with $K_i \subset \mathbb{B}_2^2$, let us denote by $u_i^j \in K_j \cap \mathbb{S}^1$, for $i, j \in [3]$, the points given in Proposition 1.1(3). Denoting by $S_j := \text{conv}(\{u_i^j : i \in [3]\}) \subset K_j$, $j \in [3]$, due to the convexity of K_j we have that

$$R(K_1 + K_2 + K_3) \geq R(S_1 + S_2 + S_3).$$

In order to prove the inequality, we will show that for every $c \in \mathbb{R}^2$, then $S_1 + S_2 + S_3 \not\subseteq c + \rho \mathbb{B}_2$, for any $\rho < 2$. Applying Theorem 1.3 to the sets of vectors $U_j := \{u_i^j : i \in [3]\}$, $j \in [3]$, we then deduce the existence of indices $l_1, l_2, l_3 \in [3]$, such that $\|u_{l_1}^1 + u_{l_2}^2 + u_{l_3}^3 - c\|_2 \geq 2$, hence implying the result.

For the equality case, we obtain in particular that if K_1, K_2, K_3 attain equality above, then the set of vectors U_1, U_2, U_3 attain equality in Theorem 1.3 too, hence obtaining the result. \square

3. GENERALIZED MINKOWSKI SPACES

Lemma 3.1. *Let $K_i, C \in \mathcal{K}^n$, $i \in [j]$, $j \in [n]$. Then*

$$\max_{i=1, \dots, j} R(K_i, C) \leq R(K_1 + \dots + K_j, C).$$

The inequality is sharp.

Proof. Since $K_i \subset K_1 + \dots + K_j$ for every $i \in [j]$, we have $R(K_i, C) \leq R(K_1 + \dots + K_j, C)$ and thus

$$\max_{i=1, \dots, j} R(K_i, C) \leq R(K_1 + \dots + K_j, C).$$

\square

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Since $R(K_i, C) \leq \max_{i=1, \dots, j} R(K_i, C)$ for all $i \in [j]$ by Lemma 3.1 we have

$$(3.1) \quad \sum_{i=1}^j R(K_i, C) \leq j \max_{i=1, \dots, j} R(K_i, C) \leq j R(K_1 + \dots + K_j, C).$$

We now show the equality case and begin with the *only if* part. Assuming equality in eq. (1.2) we also obtain equality in eq. (3.1). From this we conclude that $R(K_1, C) = \dots = R(K_j, C)$. After suitable translations of K_i and a rescaling

of C , we can assume that $K_i \subset C$ and $R(K_i, C) = 1$ for every $i \in [j]$. Hence together with the equality in eq. (3.1) we also obtain $R(K_1 + \dots + K_j, C) = 1$. Moreover, let $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be such that $K_1 + \dots + K_j \subset z_0 + C$.

Since $K_i \subset C$ and $R(K_i, C) = 1$, Proposition 1.1 implies the existence of points $p_i^l \in K_i \cap \text{bd}(C)$ and vectors $a_i^l \in N(C, p_i^l)$, for $i \in [j]$, $l \in [k_i]$, $2 \leq k_i \leq n+1$, such that

$$0 \in \text{conv}(\{a_1^l : l \in [k_1]\}) \cap \dots \cap \text{conv}(\{a_j^l : l \in [k_j]\}).$$

Let us denote by $H_i := \text{lin}(\{a_i^l : l \in [k_i]\})$, for every $i \in [j]$. We will show that

$$(K_1 + \dots + \widehat{K_i} + \dots + K_j) \perp H_i,$$

for every $i \in [j]$. For the sake of contradiction, let us suppose that

$$\text{aff}(K_1 + \dots + \widehat{K_i} + \dots + K_j) \not\subset_t H_i^\perp,$$

for some $i \in [j]$, i.e., there exist $x, y \in K_1 + \dots + \widehat{K_i} + \dots + K_j$ such that the line $[x, y] \not\subset_t H_i^\perp$.

In order to conclude the proof, since $[x, y] + K_i \subset K_1 + \dots + K_j \subset z_0 + C$, we just need to show that $[x, y] + K_i \not\subset_t C$ holds. Indeed, assuming the contrary, we would have that

$$\begin{aligned} [x, y] + K_i &\subset z + C \\ &\subset z + H_{a_i^1, (p_i^1)^T a_i^1}^\leq \cap \dots \cap H_{a_i^{k_i}, (p_i^{k_i})^T a_i^{k_i}}^\leq, \end{aligned}$$

for some $z \in H_i^\perp$. Hence

$$(x + p_i^l)^T a_i^l \leq (p_i^l)^T a_i^l \quad \text{and} \quad (y + p_i^l)^T a_i^l \leq (p_i^l)^T a_i^l$$

for every $l \in [k_i]$. This means that $x^T a_i^l, y^T a_i^l \leq 0$ for $l \in [k_i]$. Using the fact that $0 \in \text{conv}(\{a_i^l : l \in [k_i]\})$, we have $0 = \sum_{l=1}^{k_i} \lambda_l a_i^l$ for suitable $\lambda_l > 0$. Thus $0 = \sum_{l=1}^{k_i} \lambda_l x^T a_i^l$, which necessarily implies that $x^T a_i^l = 0$ for all $l \in [k_i]$, and analogously $y^T a_i^l = 0$ for all $l \in [k_i]$. Hence $x, y \in H_i^\perp$, a contradiction.

Therefore $[x, y] + K_i \not\subset_t C$, implying the desired contradiction. Hence

$$\text{aff}(K_1 + \dots + \widehat{K_i} + \dots + K_j) \subset_t H_i^\perp$$

for every $i \in [j]$. Denoting by

$$C_i := H_{a_i^1, (p_i^1)^T a_i^1}^\leq \cap \dots \cap H_{a_i^{k_i}, (p_i^{k_i})^T a_i^{k_i}}^\leq$$

which is a polytopal cylinder for every $i = 1, \dots, j$, we have $R(K_i, C_i) = 1$, and since $K_1 + \dots + K_i \subset z_0 + C$ and $C \subset C_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, j$, then

$$K_1 + \dots + K_j \subset z_0 + C \subset z_0 + C_1 \cap \dots \cap C_j = (z_0 + C_1) \cap \dots \cap (z_0 + C_j),$$

as desired.

For the *if* part we obtain for all $i \in [j]$,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\geq R(K_1 + \dots + K_n, \lambda C) \\ &\geq R(K_i, \lambda C) \\ &\geq R(K_i, C_1 \cap \dots \cap C_n) \\ &\geq R(K_i, C_i) = 1 \end{aligned}$$

resulting in equality in the whole chain and in particular

$$R(K_1 + \dots + K_n, \lambda C) = R(K_i, \lambda C)$$

for all $i \in [j]$ which concludes the desired equality. \square

4. OPEN QUESTIONS

Denoting the l_p -unit ball by $\mathbb{B}_p^n := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\|_p^p = |x_1|^p + \dots + |x_n|^p \leq 1\}$, for $p \geq 1$, then Theorem 2.1 implies that

$$R(K_1 + \dots + K_j, \mathbb{B}_2^n) \geq \|(R(K_1, \mathbb{B}_2^n), \dots, R(K_j, \mathbb{B}_2^n))^T\|_2$$

whereas Lemma 3.1 implies that

$$R(K_1 + \dots + K_j, \mathbb{B}_\infty^n) \geq \|(R(K_1, \mathbb{B}_\infty^n), \dots, R(K_j, \mathbb{B}_\infty^n))^T\|_\infty,$$

and both inequalities are best possible. It is then quite tempting to conjecture the result below.

Conjecture 4.1. *Let $K_i \in \mathcal{K}^n$, $i \in [j]$, and $p \in [2, \infty]$. Then*

$$R(K_1 + \dots + K_j, \mathbb{B}_p^n) \geq \|(R(K_1, \mathbb{B}_p^n), \dots, R(K_j, \mathbb{B}_p^n))^T\|_p.$$

Moreover, the inequality is best possible, strengthening the general estimate given by Lemma 3.1. For instance, if $K_i := [-e_i, e_i]$, $i \in [n]$, then

$$R([-1, 1]^n, \mathbb{B}_p^n) = n^{\frac{1}{p}} = \|(1, \dots, 1)^T\|_p = \|(R(K_1, \mathbb{B}_p^n), \dots, R(K_n, \mathbb{B}_p^n))^T\|_p.$$

It does not seem easy to guess the optimal bounds in extending Theorem 1.3 to arbitrary $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \geq n+1$. Nevertheless, we were told by Alexandr Polyanskii [18] (see also [3]) that the following conjecture for $i = n+1$ seems reasonable.

Conjecture 4.2. *Let $U_i := \{u_1^i, \dots, u_{k_i}^i\} \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, $i \in [n+1]$, $\lambda_1^i, \dots, \lambda_{k_i}^i > 0$, $2 \leq k_i \leq n+1$, and $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, be such that*

$$0 = \sum_{l=1}^{k_i} \lambda_l^i u_l^i, \quad \text{for every } i \in [n+1].$$

Then

$$\max_{l_1, \dots, l_{n+1}} \|u_{l_1}^1 + \dots + u_{l_{n+1}}^{n+1} - c\|_2 \geq \sqrt{n+2}.$$

Moreover, equality holds if and only if $c = 0$ and, $U_i = \{\pm u^i\}$ $i = 1, \dots, n+1$, and if n is even then $u^1, \dots, u^{n+1} \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ are the vertices of an n -dimensional regular simplex, and if n is odd, then u^1, \dots, u^{2k+1} are the vertices of an $2k$ -dimensional regular simplex, and u^{2k+2}, \dots, u^{n+1} are some orthonormal set such that $u^i \perp u^j$ for every $1 \leq i \leq 2k+1 < j \leq n+1$.

Let us observe that in the optimal case above, one should recognize that if n is even then

$$\|u^1 + \dots + u^{\frac{n}{2}+1} - u^{\frac{n}{2}+2} - \dots - u^{n+1}\|_2 = \sqrt{n+2}$$

whereas, if n is odd, then

$$\|u^1 + \dots + u^{k+1} - u^{k+2} - \dots - u^{2k+1} \pm u^{2k+2} \pm \dots \pm u^{n+1}\|_2 = \sqrt{n+2}.$$

Moreover, Conjecture 4.2 might imply that for any $K_i \in \mathcal{K}^n$, $i \in [n+1]$, with $R(K_i) = 1$ for every $i \in [n+1]$, we have

$$R\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} K_i\right) \geq \sqrt{n+2}.$$

which again would be best possible.

Acknowledgement This paper started during the development of the lecture *Selected topics on Convex and Discrete Geometry*, Wintersemester 2016/17, at the Zentrum Mathematik of the Technische Universität München (cf. [12]). The third author also thanks Technische Universität München and the University Centre of Defence of San Javier, where part of this work has been done. Finally, we would like to thank the anonymous referee for helping us in improving several aspects of this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Abardia-Evéquoz, M. A. Hernández Cifre, E. Saorín Gómez, Mean projection and section radii of convex bodies, to appear in *Period. Math. Hung.*, 2017.
- [2] G. Ambrus, I. Bárány, V. Grinberg, Small subset sums, *Lin. Alg. Appl.*, **499** (2016), 66–78.
- [3] G. Ambrus, S. Nietert, Polarization, sign sequences and isotropic vector systems, arXiv:1904.10360.
- [4] I. Bárány, J. Jerónimo-Castro, Helly type theorems for the sum of vectors in a normed plane, *Lin. Alg. Appl.*, **469** (2015), 39–50.
- [5] U. Betke, M. Henk, Estimating sizes of a convex body by successive diameters and widths, *Mathematika*, **39** (1992), no. 2, 247–257.
- [6] R. Brandenberg, B. González Merino, Minkowski concentricity and complete simplices, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **454** (2017), no. 2, 981–994.
- [7] R. Brandenberg, S. König, No dimension-independent core-sets for containment under homothetics, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **49** (2013), no. 1, 3–21.
- [8] R. Brandenberg, S. König, Sharpening geometric inequalities using computable symmetry measures, *Mathematika* **61** (2015), 559–580.
- [9] F. Chen, C. Yang, M. Luo, Successive radii and Orlicz Minkowski sum, *Monatsh. Math.*, **179** (2016), no. 2, 201–219.
- [10] L. Danzer, B. Grünbaum, V. Klee, Hellys theorem and its relatives, in: Convexity, in: *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, vol. 7, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1963, 101–180.
- [11] B. González Merino, On the families of successive radii and the sum of convex sets, *Beitr. Algebra Geom.*, **55** (2014), no. 2, 433–440.
- [12] B. González Merino, <https://www-m9.ma.tum.de/WS2016/ConvDiscG>.
- [13] B. González Merino, M. A. Hernández Cifre, On successive radii and p -sums of convex bodies, *Adv. Geom.*, **14** (2014), no. 1, 117–128.
- [14] B. González Merino, M. A. Hernández Cifre, Successive radii and Minkowski addition, *Monatsh. Math.*, **166** (2012), no. 3–4, 395–409.
- [15] B. González Merino, M. A. Hernández Cifre, On successive radii of p -sums of convex bodies, *Adv. Geom.*, **14** (2014), no. 1, 117–128.
- [16] P. Gritzmann, V. Klee, Inner and outer j -radii of convex bodies in finite-dimensional normed spaces, *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, **7** (1992), 255–280.
- [17] F. John F. Extremum problems with inequalities as subsidiary conditions, *Studies and Essays Presented to R. Courant on his 60th Birthday*, Interscience (New York, 1948), p. 187–204.
- [18] A. Polyanskii, Private communication, 2019.
- [19] R. Schneider, Convex Bodies: The Brunn-Minkowski Theory, *Cambridge University Press*, Cambridge, 1993.

ZENTRUM MATHEMATIK, TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT MÜNCHEN, BOLTZMANNSTR. 3, 85747 GARCHING BEI MÜNCHEN, GERMANY

E-mail address: `matthias.brugger@tum.de`

ZENTRUM MATHEMATIK, TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT MÜNCHEN, BOLTZMANNSTR. 3, 85747 GARCHING BEI MÜNCHEN, GERMANY

E-mail address: `maximilian.fiedler@tum.de`

DEPARTAMENTO DE ANALISIS MATEMTICO, FACULTAD DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD DE SEVILLA, APDO. 1160, 41080-SEVILLA, SPAIN

E-mail address: `bgonzalez4@us.es`

ZENTRUM MATHEMATIK, TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT MÜNCHEN, BOLTZMANNSTR. 3, 85747 GARCHING BEI MÜNCHEN, GERMANY

E-mail address: `anja.kirschbaum@tum.de`