ON THE GARDNER-ZVAVITCH CONJECTURE: SYMMETRY IN INEQUALITIES OF BRUNN-MINKOWSKI TYPE
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Abstract. In this paper, we study the conjecture of Gardner and Zvavitch from [21], which suggests that the standard Gaussian measure $\gamma$ enjoys $\frac{1}{n}$-concavity with respect to the Minkowski addition of symmetric convex sets. We prove this fact up to a factor of 2: that is, we show that for symmetric convex $K$ and $L$, and $\lambda \in [0,1]$,

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

More generally, this inequality holds for convex sets containing the origin. Further, we show that under suitable dimension-free uniform bounds on the Hessian of the potential, the log-concavity of even measures can be strengthened to $p$-concavity, with $p > 0$, with respect to the addition of symmetric convex sets.

1. Introduction

We work in the Euclidean $n$-dimensional space $\mathbb{R}^n$. The unit ball will be denoted by $B^n_2$ and the unit sphere by $S^{n-1}$. The Lebesgue measure of a measurable set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is denoted by $|A|$.

Recall that a measure $\mu$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is called log-concave if for every pair of Borel sets $K$ and $L$,

$$\mu(\lambda K + (1 - \lambda)L) \geq \mu(K)\lambda \mu(L)^{1-\lambda}. \quad (1)$$

More generally, $\mu$ is called $p$-concave for $p \geq 0$, if

$$\mu(\lambda K + (1 - \lambda)L)^p \geq \lambda \mu(K)^p + (1 - \lambda)\mu(L)^p. \quad (2)$$

Log-concavity corresponds to the limiting case $p = 0$. By Hölder’s inequality, if $p > q$, and a measure is $p$-concave, it is also $q$-concave.

Borell’s theorem ensures that a measure with a log-concave density is log-concave [9]. Further, the celebrated Brunn-Minkowski inequality states that for all Borel sets $K$ and $L$, and for every $\lambda \in [0,1]$,

$$|\lambda K + (1 - \lambda)L|^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \lambda |K|^{\frac{1}{n}} + (1 - \lambda)|L|^{\frac{1}{n}}. \quad (3)$$

See more on the subject in Gardner’s survey [20], and some classical textbooks in Convex Geometry, e.g. Bonnesen, Fenchel [5], Schneider [37]. In view of Hölder’s inequality, (3) implies the log-concavity of the Lebesgue measure:

$$|\lambda K + (1 - \lambda)L| \geq |K|^{\lambda} |L|^{1-\lambda}. \quad (4)$$

The homogeneity of the Lebesgue measure ensures that, in fact, (4) is equivalent to (3). However, this is not the case for general (non-homogeneous) measures $\mu$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$: the log-concavity property (1) does not imply the stronger inequality

$$\mu(\lambda K + (1 - \lambda)L)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \lambda \mu(K)^{\frac{1}{n}} + (1 - \lambda)\mu(L)^{\frac{1}{n}}. \quad (5)$$
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In fact, (5) cannot hold in general for a probability measure: if $K$ is fixed, and $L$ is shifted far away from the origin, then the left hand side of (5) is close to zero (thanks to the decay of the measure at infinity), while the right hand side is bounded from below by a positive constant.

Gardner and Zvavitch conjectured [21] that for the standard Gaussian measure $\gamma$, any pair of symmetric convex sets $K$ and $L$, and any $\lambda \in [0,1]$, one has
\begin{equation}
\gamma(\lambda K + (1 - \lambda)L) \geq \lambda \gamma(K) + (1 - \lambda)\gamma(L).
\end{equation}
In fact, initially they considered the possibility that (6) may hold for sets $K$ and $L$ containing the origin, but a counterexample to that was constructed by Nayar and Tkocz [31].

Symmetry seems to play crucial role in the improvement of isoperimetric type inequalities. One simple example when such phenomenon occurs is the Poincaré inequality: for any $C^1$-smooth $2\pi$-periodic function $\psi$ on $\mathbb{R}$,
\begin{equation}
\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \psi^2 \, dx - \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \psi \, dx \right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \dot{\psi}^2 \, dx,
\end{equation}
and in the case when $\psi$ is also $\pi$-periodic one has the stronger inequality
\begin{equation}
\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \psi^2 \, dx - \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \psi \, dx \right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \dot{\psi}^2 \, dx.
\end{equation}
Note that $\pi$-periodicity of $\psi$ is equivalent to the property that $\psi$ is an even function of $S^1$ after identification of the circle $S^1$ with $[0,2\pi)$ under $t \to e^{it}$. The standard proof of (7) applies Fourier series expansion:
\begin{equation*}
f(x) = \frac{a_0}{\sqrt{2\pi}} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \cos nx + b_n \sin nx.
\end{equation*}
Observe that $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x)dx = \sqrt{2\pi}a_0$, $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f^2dx = a_0^2 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n^2 + b_n^2$, and $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} (f')^2dx = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n(a_n^2 + b_n^2)$. This implies (7). If, in addition, $f$ is $\pi$-periodic, then
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{2\pi} \psi(x) \cos(x)dx = \int_{0}^{2\pi} \psi(x) \sin(x)dx = 0,
\end{equation*}
and we get (8). See, e.g., Groemer [22], Theorem 4.4.1 on page 149.

In general, given a log-concave probability measure $\mu$ with density $e^{-V}$ such that $\nabla^2V \geq k_1 \text{Id}$, $k_1 > 0$, one has
\begin{equation}
\int \psi^2 \, d\mu - \left( \int \psi \, d\mu \right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{k_1} \int |\nabla \psi|^2 \, d\mu;
\end{equation}
this follows from the Brascamp-Lieb inequality [10]. Cordero-Erasquin, Fradelizi and Maurey [17] proved a strengthening of (9), which implies, in particular, that for even functions and uniformly log-concave measures with even densities the following inequality holds:
\begin{equation}
\int \psi^2 \, d\mu - \left( \int \psi \, d\mu \right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2k_1} \int |\nabla \psi|^2 \, d\mu.
\end{equation}
In the recent years, a number of conjectures have appeared concerning the improvement of inequalities of Brunn-Minkowski type under additional symmetry assumptions. For instance, in the case of the Gaussian measure, Schechtman, Schlumprecht
and Zinn [38] obtained an exciting inequality in the style of the conjecture of Dar [18]; Tehranchi [39] has recently found an extension of their results, which is also a strengthening of the famous Gaussian correlation conjecture, recently proved by Royen [33] (see also Latała, Matlak [28]).

One of the most famous such conjectures is the Log-Brunn-Minkowski conjecture of Böröczky, Lutwak, Yang and Zhang (see [7], [8], [9]). It states that for all symmetric convex bodies $K$ and $L$ with support functions $h_K$ and $h_L$,

$$\lambda K +_0 (1 - \lambda)L \geq |K|^\lambda |L|^{1-\lambda},$$

where $+_0$ stands for the geometric mean

$$\lambda K +_0 (1 - \lambda)L = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, u \rangle \leq h_K^\lambda(u) h_L^{1-\lambda}(u) \; \forall u \in S^{n-1}\}.$$

Böröczky, Lutwak, Yang and Zhang [7] showed that the Log-Brunn-Minkowski conjecture holds for $n = 2$. Saroglou [35] and Cordero-Erasquin, Fradelizi, Maurey [17] proved that (11) is true when $K$ and $L$ are unconditional (that is, they are symmetric with respect to every coordinate hyperplane). The conjecture was verified in a neighborhood of the Euclidean ball by Colesanti, Livshyts and Marsiglietti [15], [16]. In [27], Kolesnikov and E. Milman found a relation between the Log-Brunn-Minkowski conjecture and the second eigenvalue problem for certain elliptic operators. In addition, the “local version” of the Log-Brunn-Minkowski conjecture was verified in [27] for the cube and for $l_q$-balls, $q \geq 2$, when the dimension is sufficiently large. By “local version”, we mean an inequality of isoperimetric or Poincaré type, obtained by differentiating the inequality on an appropriate family of convex sets. Building up on the results from [27], Chen, Huang, Li, Liu [11] managed to verify the $L_p$-Brunn-Minkowski inequality for symmetric sets, using techniques from PDE. Saroglou [36] showed that the validity of (11) for all convex bodies is equivalent to the validity of the analogous statement for an arbitrary log-concave measure.

In [30], Livshyts, Marsiglietti, Nayar and Zvavitch proved that the Log-Brunn-Minkowski conjecture is stronger than the conjecture of Gardner and Zvavitch. In fact, if (11) was proved to be true, then (5) would hold for any even log-concave measure $\mu$ and for all symmetric convex $K$ and $L$. Therefore, (5) holds for all unconditional log-concave measures and unconditional convex sets, as well as for all even log-concave measures and symmetric convex sets in $\mathbb{R}^2$.

The main result of this paper is the following.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let $\mu$ be a symmetric log-concave measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with density $e^{-V(x)}$, for some convex function $V : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that $k_1, k_2 > 0$ are such constants that

$$\nabla^2 V \geq k_1 \text{Id},$$

$$\Delta V \leq k_2 n.$$

Let $R = k_2/k_1 \geq 1$. Then for symmetric convex sets $K$ and $L$, and any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, one has

$$\mu(\lambda K + (1 - \lambda)L) \geq \lambda \mu(K) + (1 - \lambda)\mu(L),$$

where

$$c = c(R) = \frac{2}{(\sqrt{R} + 1)^2}. $$
Recall that the standard Gaussian measure $\gamma$ is the measure with the density $\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right)^n e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}}$. In this case, $\nabla V = x$, $\nabla^2 V = \text{Id}$, and hence $k_1 = k_2 = R = 1$. Therefore, Theorem 1.1 implies $\frac{1}{en} - \text{concavity}$ of the standard Gaussian measure. We shall prove a more general fact.

**Theorem 1.2.** Let $\gamma$ be the standard Gaussian measure. For convex sets $K$ and $L$ which contain the origin, and any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, one has

$$\gamma(\lambda K + (1 - \lambda) L)^{\frac{1}{2n}} \geq \lambda \gamma(K)^{\frac{1}{2n}} + (1 - \lambda) \gamma(L)^{\frac{1}{2n}}. \tag{16}$$

Interestingly, it was shown by Nayar and Tkocz that only under the assumption of the sets containing the origin, (16) fails in dimension two. Theorem 1.2 shows, however, that (16) does hold, even under this assumption.

In order to derive all our results, we reduce the problem to its infinitesimal version following the approach of [12], [15], [16], [24], [25], [26], [27]. In particular, we use a Bochner-type identity obtained in [24]. The arguments are based on the application of the elliptic boundary value problem $Lu = F$ with Neumann boundary condition $u_\nu = f$. Our main result corresponds to the simplest choice of $F$, namely $F = 1$. However, we demonstrate that a choice of non-constant $F$ can lead to sharp estimates (see Section 6). This is an important observation which we believe could be useful for further developments. In Section 6 we also prove that constant $c$ in (15) can be estimated by the parameter

$$\inf_K \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{n\mu(K)} \int_K \langle (\nabla^2 V + \frac{1}{n} \nabla V \otimes \nabla V)^{-1} \nabla V, \nabla V \rangle d\mu \right],$$

where infimum is taken over all symmetric convex sets.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we outline the high-level structure of the proof of Theorem 1.1 with the goal of indicating the main steps in the estimate. In Sections 3, 4 and 5 we proceed with the said steps, one at a time. At the end of Section 5 we include the proof of Theorem 1.2. In Section 6 we discuss some concluding remarks: namely, in subsection 6.1 we formulate a more general version of Theorem 1.1 and in subsection 6.2 we discuss a more general approach to the proof which recovers the result of Gardner and Zvavitch about dilates of convex bodies.

**Acknowledgement.** First author supported by RFBR project 17-01-00662, DFG project RO 1195/12-1 and the Simons Foundation. Second author supported by NSF CAREER DMS-1753260. The article was prepared within the framework of the HSE University Basic Research Program and funded by the Russian Academic Excellence Project ‘5-100’. The work was partially supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-1440140 while the authors were in residence at the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute in Berkeley, California, during the Fall 2017 semester. The authors are grateful to Emanuel Milman for fruitful discussions. The authors are very grateful to Tomasz Tkocz for pointing out to them Lemma 5.3, leading to the formulation of Theorem 1.2. The authors are grateful to the anonymous referee for the detailed and helpful report.

2. **High-level structure of the proof**

We shall work in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Throughout, $K$ stands for a convex body (compact convex set with non-empty interior) and $\mu$ for a log-concave measure with density $e^{-V}$, where
V is twice continuously differentiable. The norm sign $\| \cdot \|$ with respect to a matrix stands for Hilbert-Schmidt norm
\[ \|A\| = \sqrt{\text{Tr}(AA^T)}. \]

Given vectors $a, b$ the corresponding tensor product $a \otimes b$ is a bilinear form defined by
\[ a \otimes b(v, w) = \langle a, v \rangle \langle b, w \rangle. \]

We shall assume without loss of generality that the boundary of $K$ is $C^2$-smooth and $K$ is strictly convex; the general bound follows by approximation. The notation $\nabla^2 u$ stands for the Hessian matrix of $u$.

**Definition 2.1** (Assumption (S): Stability under Minkowski convex interpolation). We say that a family $\mathcal{F}$ of convex sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies Assumption (S) if for every pair of convex sets $K, L \in \mathcal{F}$, and every $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, we have
\[ \lambda K + (1 - \lambda)L \in \mathcal{F}. \]

Most of our results deal with the following two classes of sets which both satisfy assumption (S):
\[ \mathcal{F}_{\text{sym}} = \{ \text{symmetric convex sets} \}, \]
\[ \mathcal{F}_o = \{ \text{convex sets containing the origin} \}. \]

In this section, we outline the steps of the proof by gradually introducing several definitions and lemmas.

**Definition 2.2.** Fix the dimension $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The Gardner-Zvavitch constant $C_0 = C_0(\mu) = C_0(\mu, \mathcal{F})$ is the largest number so that for all convex sets $K, L \in \mathcal{F}$, and for any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$,
\[ \mu(\lambda K + (1 - \lambda)L) \geq \lambda \mu(K) + (1 - \lambda)\mu(L). \]

It can be verified, by considering small balls centered at the origin, that
\[ C_0(\mu, \mathcal{F}_{\text{sym}}) \leq 1 \]
for every log-concave measure $\mu$ which is not supported on a subspace. By Hölder’s inequality, (17) implies (6) for all $c \in [0, C_0]$. Therefore, we shall be concerned with estimating $C_0$ from below.

We consider the weighted Laplace operator $L$ associated with the measure $\mu$, that is
\[ Lu = \Delta u - \langle \nabla u, \nabla V \rangle. \]

In the partial case when $\mu$ is Gaussian, this operator is commonly referred to as the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck operator. We shall make use of the generalized integration by parts identity:
\[ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} v \cdot Lu \, d\mu = - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \langle \nabla v, \nabla u \rangle \, d\mu. \]

**Definition 2.3.** Define $C_1 = C_1(\mu) = C_1(\mu, \mathcal{F})$ to be the largest number, such that for every $u \in C^2(K)$ and $K \in \mathcal{F}$ with $Lu = 1_K$,
\[ \frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K ||\nabla^2 u||^2 + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle \, d\mu \geq \frac{C_1(\mu, \mathcal{F})}{n}. \]

The first key step in our proof is outlined in the following lemma:
Lemma 2.4. For every $\mathcal{F}$ satisfying the assumption $(S)$
\[ C_0(\mu, \mathcal{F}) \geq C_1(\mu, \mathcal{F}). \]

Next, we conclude with two more lemmas.

Lemma 2.5. Assume that $\nabla^2 V \geq k_1 \mathrm{Id}$.

1. Assume, in addition, that $V$ is even. Then for every $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$,
\[
C_1(\mu, \mathcal{F}_{\text{sym}}) \geq \frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K \frac{1}{\frac{|\nabla V|^2}{(1+\varepsilon)nk_1} + \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}} d\mu.
\]

2. For every family $\mathcal{F}$ of convex sets satisfying the assumption $(S)$, one has
\[
C_1(\mu, \mathcal{F}) \geq \frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K \frac{1}{\frac{|\nabla V|^2}{nk_1} + 1} d\mu.
\]

Lemma 2.6. Fix a convex function $V$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Assume that $\Delta V \leq k_2 n$. Fix a constant $k_1 > 0$ and denote $R = k_2/k_1$.

1. If a convex set $K$ and the measure $\mu$ with density $e^{-V}$ satisfy $\int_K \nabla V d\mu = 0$, then there exists an $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ such that
\[
\frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K \frac{1}{\frac{|\nabla V|^2}{(1+\varepsilon)nk_1} + \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}} d\mu \geq \frac{2}{(\sqrt{R} + 1)^2}.
\]

2. If $\mu$ is the standard Gaussian measure (which we denote by $\gamma$), then for every convex set $K$ which contains the origin, we have
\[
\frac{1}{\gamma(K)} \int_K \frac{1}{\frac{|V|^2}{n} + 1} d\gamma \geq \frac{1}{2}.
\]

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The theorem follows immediately from Lemma 2.4 applied to $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{\text{sym}}$, Lemma 2.5 (1) and Lemma 2.6 (1). □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let us take into account that the family of convex sets $\mathcal{F}_o$ containing the origin satisfies assumption $(S)$. The result follows from Lemma 2.4 applied to $\mathcal{F}_o$, Lemma 2.5 (2) and Lemma 2.6 (2). □

In the following sections we shall prove each of the lemmas separately.

3. PROOF OF LEMMA 2.4

The proof of Lemma 2.4 is a combination of a variational argument, integration by parts, and an application of Cauchy inequality. We start by introducing the variational argument.

3.1. Variational argument. Infinitesimal versions of Brunn-Minkowski type inequalities have been considered and extensively studied in Bakry, Ledoux [11], Bobkov [3, 4], Colesanti [12, 13], Hug, Saorin-Gomez [14], Kolesnikov, Milman [23, 26, 27], Livshyts, Marsiglietti [15, 16], and many others.

Following Schneider (37, page 115) we say that a convex body $K$ is of class $C^2$ if its support function is of class $C^2$. Further, we say that $K$ is of class $C^2_+$ if $K$ is of class $C^2$ and admits positive Gauss curvature. We say that a function $h: S^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a $C^2_+(S^{n-1})$-function if it is a support function of a convex $C^2_+$ body.

In what follows we consider a family $\mathcal{F}$ of convex sets satisfying assumption $(S)$, i.e. $\mathcal{F}$ is stable under Minkowski convex interpolation.
Let $h$ be the support function of a $C^2_+$ convex body $K$ and let $ψ ∈ C^2(𝕊^n)$ be a positive density, $c$ is a positive constant, and $F$ satisfies assumption $(S)$. The inequality

$$ (20) \quad μ(λK + (1 − λ)L) ≥ \lambda μ(K) + (1 − λ)μ(L); $$

holds for all $K, L ∈ F$ and every $λ ∈ [0, 1]$, if and only if for every one-parameter family $K(h, ψ, I)$ satisfying $K ∈ F$

$$ (21) \quad \frac{d^2}{ds^2}μ(K_s) \bigg|_{s=0} \cdot μ(K_0) \leq \frac{n-c}{n} \left( \frac{d}{ds}μ(K_s) \bigg|_{s=0} \right)^2. $$

**Proof.** Assume first that $μ$ satisfies (20). Then the equality $h_{K_s} = h + sψ$, $s ∈ I$, and the linearity of support function with respect to Minkowski addition, imply that for every $s, t ∈ I$ and for every $λ ∈ [0, 1]$

$$ K_{λs+(1−λ)t} = λK_s + (1−λ)K_t. $$

Inequality (20) implies

$$ μ(K_{λs+(1−λ)t}) = μ(λK_s + (1−λ)K_t) ≥ \lambda μ(K_s) + (1−λ)μ(K_t), $$

which means that the function $μ(K_s)$ is concave on $I$, and this implies (21).

Conversely, suppose that for every system $K(h, ψ, I)$, $K_s ∈ F$ the function $μ(K_s)$ has non-positive second derivative at 0, i.e. (21) holds. We observe that this implies concavity of $μ(K_s)$ on the entire interval $I$. Indeed, given $s_0$ in the interior of $I$, consider $h = h + s_0ψ$, and define a new system $K(h, ψ, J)$, where $J$ is a new interval such that $h + s_0ψ = h + (s + s_0)ψ ∈ C^2_+$ for every $s ∈ J$. Then the second derivative of $μ(K_s)$ at $s = s_0$ is negative, as it is equal to the second derivative of $μ(K_s)$ at $s = 0$. Thus (21) implies concavity of $s → μ(K_s)$ on $[0, 1]$

$$ μ(K_{s}) ≥ μ(K_{s_0}) + (s - s_0)μ(K_s), \ ∀s ∈ [0, 1]. $$

Take $s = 1 - λ$, $h = h_K$, $ψ = h_L - h_K$ and observe that $K_s = λK + (1−λ)L$. This completes the proof. □

The normal vector to the boundary of $K$ at the point $x$ shall be denoted by $n_x$. Recall that without loss of generality we may assume that $K$ is strictly convex and $C^2$—smooth, and hence the normal is unique; the general case may be derived by approximation. We shall write

$$ μ_{∂K}(x) = e^{−V(x)} · H^{n-1}|_{∂K}, $$

where $H^{n-1}$ stands for the $(n − 1)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure; the notation $∇_{∂K}$ means the boundary gradient (i.e., the projection of the gradient onto the support hyperplane). The second fundamental form of $∂K$ shall be denoted by $H$, and the weighted mean curvature at a point $x$ is given by

$$ H_x = tr(II) − ⟨∇V, n_x⟩. $$

The following proposition was shown by Kolesnikov and Milman [25] (Theorem 6.9):
Proposition 3.2. Let \( f(x) = \psi(n_x) \). Then

\[
\mu(K_s)'|_{s=0} = \int_{\partial K} f(x) \, d\mu_{\partial K}(x);
\]

\[
\mu(K_s)''|_{s=0} = \int_{\partial K} (H_x f^2 - \langle \Pi^{-1} \nabla_{\partial K} f, \nabla_{\partial K} f \rangle) \, d\mu_{\partial K}(x).
\]

Definition 3.3. For a fixed class \( \mathcal{F} \) of convex sets which is closed under dilates, and a fixed convex body \( K \in \mathcal{F} \), we consider a class \( C_\mathcal{F}(K) \) of \( C^2 \)-smooth real-valued functions on \( \partial K \), given by

\[
C_\mathcal{F}(K) = \{ f(x) = h_L(n_x) - h_K(n_x) : L \in \mathcal{F}, t > 0 \} \cap C^2(\partial K).
\]

Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.2 imply:

Corollary 1. Fix a class \( \mathcal{F} \) of convex sets in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) satisfying assumption (S). Suppose that for any convex body \( K \in \mathcal{F} \) and for any function \( f(x) \in C_\mathcal{F}(K) \),

\[
\int_{\partial K} (H_x f^2 - \langle \Pi^{-1} \nabla_{\partial K} f, \nabla_{\partial K} f \rangle) \, d\mu_{\partial K}(x) - \frac{n - C}{n \mu(K)} \left( \int_{\partial K} f(x) \, d\mu_{\partial K}(x) \right)^2 \leq 0.
\]

Then

\[
C_0(\mu, \mathcal{F}) \geq C.
\]

In our proofs below, we shall generally verify statements for more general classes of functions, and will make sure that the functions from \( C_\mathcal{F}(K) \) are included in the consideration.

3.2. Integration by parts. The following Bochner-type identity was obtained by Kolesnikov and Milman. It is a particular case of Theorem 1.1 in [24] (note that \( \text{Ric}_\mu = \nabla^2 V \) in our case). This is a generalization of a classical result of R.C. Reilly.

Proposition 3.4. Let \( u \in C^2(K) \) and \( u_n = \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle \in C^1(\partial K) \). Then

\[
\int_K (Lu)^2 \, d\mu = \int_K \left( \| \nabla^2 u \|^2 + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle \right) \, d\mu + \int_{\partial K} (H_x u_n^2 - 2\langle \nabla_{\partial K} u, \nabla_{\partial K} u_n \rangle + \langle \Pi \nabla_{\partial K} u, \nabla_{\partial K} u \rangle) \, d\mu_{\partial K}(x).
\]

3.3. Proof of Lemma 2.4. In view of Corollary 1 it is sufficient to verify (22) with \( C = C_1(\mu, \mathcal{F}) \). Fix a \( C^1 \) function \( f : \partial K \to \mathbb{R} \). In the case when \( \int_{\partial K} f \, d\mu_{\partial K} = 0 \), we automatically get (22) with an arbitrary constant \( C \), as a consequence of the log-concavity of \( \mu \) (see Theorem 1.1. in [25]). If \( \int_{\partial K} f \, d\mu_{\partial K} \neq 0 \), after a suitable renormalization one can assume that \( \int_{\partial K} f \, d\mu_{\partial K} = \mu(K) \).

We let \( u \) to be the solution of the Poisson equation

\[
Lu = 1
\]

with the Neumann boundary condition

\[
\langle \nabla u(x), n_x \rangle = f(x).
\]

We refer to subsection 2.4 in [25], where the reader can find the precise statement ensuring well-posedness of this equation and several references to classical PDE’s textbooks for further reading.
Applying (23) and the definition of $C_1(\mu, F)$ one obtains
\[
\mu(K) \geq \frac{C_1(\mu, F)}{n} \mu(K) + \int_{\partial K} (H_x f^2 - 2\langle \nabla_{\partial K} u, \nabla_{\partial K} f \rangle + \langle II \nabla_{\partial K} u, \nabla_{\partial K} u \rangle) d\mu_{\partial K}(x).
\]

Recall that for a symmetric positive-definite matrix $A$,
\[
\langle Ax, x \rangle + \langle A^{-1} y, y \rangle \geq 2 \langle x, y \rangle.
\]
Indeed, choosing an orthogonal frame making $A$ diagonal with eigenvalues $\lambda_i$ we reduce (24) to the inequality
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i x_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{y_i^2}{\lambda_i} \geq 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i y_i,
\]
which follows from the Cauchy inequality.

Applying (24) with $A = II$, $x = \nabla_{\partial K} u$ and $y = \nabla_{\partial K} f$, we obtain
\[
\int_{\partial K} \left( H_x f^2 - \langle II^{-1} \nabla_{\partial K} f, \nabla_{\partial K} f \rangle \right) d\mu_{\partial K}(x) - \frac{n - C_1(\mu, F)}{n} \mu(K) \leq 0.
\]
The result of the Lemma follows from Corollary 1. □

4. PROOF OF LEMMA 2.5

Firstly, suppose that $u$ is a $C^2$-smooth function on a symmetric convex set $K$ with $Lu = 1_K$ on $K$.

Since $K$ is symmetric and $V$ is even, the function $u$ is even as well. Indeed, we get by symmetry that $(u(x) + u(-x))/2$ is a solution to our system as well. Uniqueness of the solution implies $u(-x) = u(x)$.

To prove the lemma, it suffices to show that
\[
\int_{K} ||\nabla^2 u||^2 + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle d\mu \geq \int_{K} \frac{1}{\frac{|V|^2}{(1+\varepsilon)k_{1\varepsilon}} + \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}} d\mu.
\]

By Cauchy’s inequality,
\[
\int_{K} ||\nabla^2 u||^2 d\mu \geq \frac{1}{n} \int_{K} |\Delta u|^2 d\mu.
\]
Note that the symmetry of $u$ implies
\[
\int_{K} u_x d\mu = 0.
\]

By the Brascamp–Lieb inequality (see [2], Theorem 4.9.1), we have
\[
\int_{K} u_{x_i}^2 d\mu \leq \int_{K} \langle (\nabla^2 V)^{-1} \nabla u_{x_i}, \nabla u_{x_i} \rangle d\mu.
\]
Applying the lower bound for $\nabla^2 V$ and summing over in $i = 1, ..., n$, we get
\[
\int_{K} ||\nabla^2 u||^2 d\mu \geq k_1 \int_{K} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu.
\]
In addition, we observe that $\nabla^2 V \geq k_1 \text{Id}$ implies that
\[
\int_{K} \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle d\mu \geq k_1 \int_{K} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu.
\]
Let \( \varepsilon > 0 \); multiplying (26) by \( 1 - \varepsilon \), multiplying (28) by \( \varepsilon \), summing up and using (29), we get that
\[
\int_K \left( ||\nabla^2 u||^2 + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle \right) d\mu \geq \int_K \left( \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{n} |\Delta u|^2 + k_1(1 + \varepsilon)|\nabla u|^2 \right) d\mu.
\]
Writing \( \Delta u = Lu + \langle \nabla V, \nabla u \rangle = 1_K + \langle \nabla V, \nabla u \rangle \), we get that the right hand side of (30) equals
\[
\int_K \left[ \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{n} + 2 \langle \nabla u, \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{n} \nabla V \rangle + \langle A_{\varepsilon} \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle \right] d\mu,
\]
where
\[
A_{\varepsilon} = \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{n} \nabla V \otimes \nabla V + k_1(1 + \varepsilon) \text{Id}.
\]
Note that \( A_{\varepsilon} \) is positive semi-definite, since it is a sum of positive semi-definite matrices. Using (24) once again, this time with \( A = A_{\varepsilon}, x = \nabla u \) and \( y = -\frac{1 - \varepsilon}{n} \nabla V \), we see that (31) is greater than or equal to
\[
\int_K \left[ 1 - \varepsilon \left( 1 - \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{n} \langle A_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \nabla V, \nabla V \rangle \right) \right] d\mu.
\]
We observe that for any vector \( z \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and for all \( a, b \in \mathbb{R} \),
\[
(a \text{Id} + bz \otimes z)^{-1} z = \frac{z}{a + b|z|^2}.
\]
Applying (33) with \( a = (1 - \varepsilon)/n, b = k_1(1 + \varepsilon), \) and \( z = \nabla V \), we rewrite (32) as
\[
k_1(1 + \varepsilon) \int_K \left[ \frac{1}{|\nabla V|^2 + k_1n \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{1 - \varepsilon}} \right] d\mu = \int_K \frac{d\mu}{\frac{|\nabla V|^2}{k_1(1 + \varepsilon)} + \frac{n}{1 - \varepsilon}}.
\]
The proof of part (1) is complete.
Secondly, if the class \( \mathcal{F} \) is arbitrary, we apply the same estimate with \( \varepsilon = 0 \) and avoid using (28). Note that (28) is the only place where the symmetry was used. This completes the proof of part (2). \( \square \)

5. **Proof of Lemma 2.6**

We shall need the following lemma, where symmetry is used in the crucial way: namely, we use the simple fact that log-concave **even** functions on the real line are concave at zero.

**Lemma 5.1.** For a log-concave measure \( \mu \) with density \( e^{-V} \) and a convex body \( K \), satisfying
\[
\int_K \frac{\partial V}{\partial x_i} d\mu = 0,
\]
for all \( i = 1, \ldots, n \), we have
\[
\int_K |\nabla V(x)|^2 d\mu \leq \int_K \Delta V d\mu.
\]
Proof. Let \( i \in \{e_1, ..., e_n\} \). By the Prékopa-Leindler inequality ([20], Theorem 4.2), the function
\[
g(t) = \int_K e^{-V(x+te_i)} \, dx
\]
is log-concave in \( t \). In particular,
\[
g(0)g''(0) - g'(0)^2 \leq 0.
\]
Note that
\[
g'(0) = -\int_K \frac{\partial V}{\partial x_i} e^{-V(x)} \, dx = 0.
\]
Therefore, by (36),
\[
g''(0) = \int_K \left( -\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial^2 x_i} + \left( \frac{\partial V}{\partial x_i} \right)^2 \right) e^{-V(x)} \, dx \leq 0.
\]
Applying (38) and summing over \( i = 1, ..., n \), we obtain the conclusion of the lemma. \( \square \)

Remark 5.2. Alternatively, Lemma 5.1 follows directly for the Brascamp–Lieb inequality applied to the functions \( V_{x_i} \):
\[
\int_K V^2_{x_i} \, d\mu \leq \int \langle (D^2 V)^{-1} \nabla V_{x_i}, \nabla V_{x_i} \rangle \, d\mu = \int_K V_{x_i} \, d\mu.
\]
Here we use log-concavity of the measure \( 1_K e^{-V} \, dx \)

We note below, that in the case of the standard Gaussian measure, the conclusion of Lemma 5.1 holds under an even weaker assumption of the sets containing the origin.

Recall that a set \( K \) is called star-shaped if it contains the interval \( \{tx, t \in [0, 1]\} \) for every \( x \in K \).

Lemma 5.3. Suppose \( K \) is a star-shaped body, and \( \gamma \) is the standard Gaussian measure. Then
\[
\int_K |x|^2 d\gamma(x) \leq n\gamma(K).
\]
Proof. Consider a function \( g(s) = \gamma(sK) \), and note that \( g \) is non-decreasing, since \( K \) is star-shaped. Observe, by Proposition 3.2,
\[
g'(1) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}}} \int_{\partial K} \langle n_x, x \rangle e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1},
\]
where by \( d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \) we denote the Hausdorff measure on \( \partial K \).

Applying the divergence theorem, we get
\[
0 \leq g'(1) = \int_K \text{div} \left( \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}}} xe^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}} \right) \, dx = n\gamma(K) - \int_K |x|^2 d\gamma.
\]
This implies (39). \( \square \)
5.1. **Proof of Lemma 2.6.** To prove (1) we use Jensen’s inequality ([34], Theorem 3.3.) and convexity of the function $\frac{1}{1+x}$ for $x > 0$. We get

$$
\frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K \frac{|\nabla V|^2}{(1+\varepsilon)nk_1} \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \, d\mu \geq \frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K \frac{|\nabla V|^2}{nk_1} \, d\mu + \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}.
$$

Next, we apply (40) and Lemma 5.1 along with the assumption $\Delta V \leq nk_2$, to get

$$
\frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K \frac{|\nabla V|^2}{nk_1} \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \, d\mu \geq \frac{1}{R(1+\varepsilon) + \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}},
$$

where, as before, $R = \frac{k_2}{k_1}$. Plugging in the optimal $\varepsilon = \frac{R + 1 - 2\sqrt{R}}{R - 1}$, we finish the proof of part (1).

Next, to obtain the part (2) of the Lemma, we substitute $\varepsilon = 0$, and get

$$
\frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K \frac{|\nabla V|^2}{nk_1} \, d\mu \geq \frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K \frac{|\nabla V|^2}{nk_1} \, d\mu + 1.
$$

We apply the arguments of the proof of (1), but we use Lemma 5.3 instead of Lemma 5.1. This concludes the proof of part (2). □

Note, that in the case of the standard Gaussian measure the optimal choice is $\varepsilon = 0$.

### 6. ConcludingRemarks

#### 6.1. **An improved estimate.**

Everywhere in this subsection sets are assumed to be origin-symmetric and functions are assumed to be even.

We outline a sharper, more general estimate for the Gardner-Zvavitch constant in the following.

We recall that that $C(K,\mu)$ is called the Poincaré constant of $\mu|_K$ if it is the smallest number $a$ such that for all $C^1$-smooth functions $f$ on $K$, one has

$$
\int_K f^2 d\mu - \frac{1}{\mu(K)} \left( \int_K f \, d\mu \right)^2 \leq a \int_K |\nabla f|^2 d\mu.
$$

**Theorem 6.1.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a collection of origin-symmetric convex bodies in $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying assumption (S). Let

$$
C = C(\mu, \mathcal{F}) = \sup_{\varepsilon \in [0,1)} (1-\varepsilon) \inf_{K \in \mathcal{F}} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{n\mu(K)} \int_K \langle A^{-1}\nabla V, \nabla V \rangle \, d\mu \right],
$$

where

$$
A = \nabla^2 V + \frac{1}{n} \nabla V \otimes \nabla V + \frac{\varepsilon}{(1-\varepsilon)C(K,\mu)} \text{Id}
$$

and $C(K,\mu)$ is the Poincaré constant of $\mu|_K$.

Then, for all $K, L \in \mathcal{F}$, and for every $\lambda \in [0,1]$

$$
\mu(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L)^{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} \geq \lambda \mu(K)^{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + (1-\lambda)\mu(L)^{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}}.
$$

In particular,

$$
C \geq \inf_{K \in \mathcal{F}} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{n\mu(K)} \int_K \langle (\nabla^2 V + \frac{1}{n} \nabla V \otimes \nabla V)^{-1}\nabla V, \nabla V \rangle \, d\mu \right].
$$
Proof. Consider an arbitrary even \( u : K \to \mathbb{R} \) such that \( Lu = 1_K \). Then, by (26), along with the fact that \( \Delta u = 1 + \langle \nabla V, \nabla u \rangle \),

\[
\int_K \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle \, d\mu \geq \int_K \frac{1}{n} \left| 1 + \langle \nabla V, \nabla u \rangle \right|^2 + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle \, d\mu
\]
\[
= \int_K \frac{1}{n} + \frac{2}{n} \langle \nabla V, \nabla u \rangle + \langle \langle \nabla^2 V + \frac{1}{n} \nabla V \otimes \nabla V \rangle \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle \, d\mu.
\]

Next we apply the Poincaré inequality (42) to every \( u \times_i \) (here we use that \( u \) and \( V \) are even, hence \( \int u \times_i \, d\mu = 0 \)):

\[
\int_K u^2 \times_i \, d\mu \leq C(K, \mu) \int_K |\nabla u \times_i|^2 \, d\mu.
\]

Thus

\[
\int_K |\nabla u|^2 \, d\mu \leq C(K, \mu) \int_K \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 \, d\mu,
\]

and for every \( \varepsilon \in [0, 1] \) one has

\[
\int_K \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle \, d\mu \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{C(K, \mu)} \int_K |\nabla u|^2 \, d\mu
\]
\[
+ (1 - \varepsilon) \left( \int_K \frac{1}{n} + \frac{2}{n} \langle \nabla V, \nabla u \rangle + \langle \langle \nabla^2 V + \frac{1}{n} \nabla V \otimes \nabla V \rangle \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle \, d\mu \right).
\]

Applying (24) with the positive-definite matrix \( A \) and Lemma 2.4 we complete the proof.

Theorem 1.1 follows directly from Theorem 6.1. It is possible that \( C(\mu, \mathcal{F}) \) can be estimated for the class of symmetric convex sets under less restrictive assumptions than \( \nabla^2 V \geq k_1 \text{Id} \) and \( \Delta V \leq n \), however it is not clear to us at the moment.

6.2. The case of non-constant \( F \), and the Gardner-Zvavitch conjecture for dilates. In this subsection we show that the choice of a constant \( F \) in the equation \( Lu = F \) is not always optimal. We give an example showing that a result could be obtained with a non-constant \( F \).

Definition 6.2. For a \( C^2 \)-smooth even function \( F : K \to \mathbb{R} \), with \( \int_K F \, d\mu \neq 0 \), let \( C_F \) be the largest number, such that for every \( u \in C^2(K) \) with \( Lu = F \),

\[
\int_K \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle \, d\mu \geq \int_K F^2 \, d\mu - \frac{n - C_F}{n \mu(K)} \left( \int_K F \, d\mu \right)^2.
\]

We define

\[
C_2(\mu) = \sup_F C_F,
\]

where the supremum runs over all \( C^2 \)-smooth even functions \( F : K \to \mathbb{R} \), with \( \int_K F \, d\mu \neq 0 \).

We observe the following straightforward

Claim 2. \( C_2(\mu) \geq C_1(\mu, \mathcal{F}_{\text{sym}}) \).

Note, that the proof of Lemma 2.4 implies, in fact, a stronger statement:

Lemma 6.3. \( C_0(\mu, \mathcal{F}_{\text{sym}}) \geq C_2(\mu) \).
It is possible that in the case of the standard Gaussian measure, the only sub-optimal place in our argument is the application of Lemma 2.4 in place of the stronger statement of Lemma 6.3: indeed, solving the Neumann system with $F \neq 1_K$ could lead to a better bound, however our current proof of Lemma 2.5 does not allow us to use this freedom.

Finally, we outline the following

**Lemma 6.4.** Let $K$ be a convex body with $\int_K x \, d\gamma(x) = 0$, let $\gamma$ be the Gaussian measure and let

$$V(x) = u(x) = \frac{|x|^2}{2}$$
on K. Let

$$F = Lu = n - |x|^2$$
on $K$. Then

$$\int_K \left| |\nabla^2 u||^2 + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle \right| d\gamma \geq \int_K F^2 \, d\gamma - \frac{n - 1}{n \gamma(K)} \left( \int_K F \, d\gamma \right)^2.$$  

**Proof.** For all $x \in K$,

$$\frac{1}{4} \left| |\nabla^2 |x|^2| \right|^2 = n; \quad \frac{1}{4} \left| |\nabla |x|^2| \right|^2 = |x|^2.$$

Hence, (44) becomes

$$n \gamma(K) + \int_K |x|^2 \, d\gamma \geq n^2 \gamma(K) - 2n \int_K |x|^2 \, d\gamma + \int_K |x|^4 \, d\gamma$$

$$= n^2 \gamma(K) - 2n \int_K |x|^2 \, d\gamma + \frac{1}{\gamma(K)} \left( \int_K |x|^2 \, d\gamma \right)^2$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n} \left( n^2 \gamma(K) - 2n \int_K |x|^2 \, d\gamma + \frac{1}{\gamma(K)} \left( \int_K |x|^2 \, d\gamma \right)^2 \right),$$

and rearranging, we get

$$\left[ \int_K |x|^4 \, d\gamma - \frac{1}{\gamma(K)} \left( \int_K |x|^2 \, d\gamma \right)^2 - 2 \int_K |x|^2 \, d\gamma \right] +$$

$$\left[ - \int_K |x|^2 \, d\gamma + \frac{1}{n \gamma(K)} \left( \int_K |x|^2 \, d\gamma \right)^2 \right] \leq 0.$$  

Recall Lemma 2 from [17] (which was key in obtaining the B-theorem):

$$\int_K |x|^4 \, d\gamma - \frac{1}{\gamma(K)} \left( \int_K |x|^2 \, d\gamma \right)^2 - 2 \int_K |x|^2 \, d\gamma \leq 0;$$

also Lemma 5.1 implies that

$$- \gamma(K) + \frac{1}{n} \int_K |x|^2 \, d\gamma \leq 0.$$  

Applying (47) and (48) we obtain the validity of (46), which in turn implies the validity of (44).

As a consequence of Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 6.4, we confirm the conjecture of Gardner and Zvavitch in the case when $K$ and $L$ are dilates. This result was previously obtained by Gardner and Zvavitch [21], where the authors also used (47). We include the following proposition merely for completeness.
Proposition 6.5. Let $K$ be a convex set such that $\int_K x d\gamma(x) = 0$. Let $L = aK$ for some $a > 0$. Then for every $\lambda \in [0, 1]$,

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

Proof: Note that the class $\mathcal{F}$ of dilates of the same convex body satisfies assumption (S). Recall, from the proof of Lemma 3.1, that arbitrary $K$ and $L$ can be interpolated by a one-parameter family $K(h, \psi, I)$ with $h = h_K$ and $\psi = h_L - h_K$. Recall as well that the boundary condition in the Neumann problem we considered is given by $f(x) = \psi(n_x) = h_L(n_x) - h_K(n_x)$. In the case when $L = aK$, we are dealing with

$$f(x) = (a - 1)h_K(n_x) = (a - 1)\langle x, n_x \rangle.$$ 

By Corollary 1 and Proposition 3.4 we see that to verify the proposition, is suffices to show that for some $u : K \to \mathbb{R}$ with

$$\langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle = f(x) = (a - 1)\langle x, n_x \rangle,$$ 

one has

$$\int_K ||\nabla^2 u||^2 + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle \, d\gamma \geq \int_K (Lu)^2 \, d\gamma - \frac{n - 1}{n \gamma(K)} \left( \int_K Lu \, d\gamma \right)^2. \quad (50)$$ 

It remains to note that $u = \frac{a - 1}{2} |x|^2$ satisfies (49), and that Lemma 6.4 along with the homogeneity of (50), implies the validity of (50) for $u = \frac{a - 1}{2} |x|^2$. \qed

Remark 6.6. Note that Proposition 6.5 implies the validity of the conjecture of Gardner and Zvavitch in dimension 1, since every pair of symmetric intervals are dilates of each other. Further, directly verifying (44) in the case $n = 1$ boils down to the elementary inequality

$$\alpha(R) = \int_0^R (t^4 - 3t^2)e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} \, dt \leq 0,$$ 

which follows from the fact that $\alpha(0) = \alpha(+\infty) = 0$, $\alpha(R)$ decreases on $[0, \sqrt{3}]$ and increases on $[\sqrt{3}, +\infty]$. It of course also follows from (47) and (48), but that would be an overkill.

It is curious to note that Lemma 2.4 is also sharp when $n = 1$: for every $u : [-R, R] \to \mathbb{R}$ with $Lu = 1$ and with the boundary condition $u'(R) = -u'(-R)$, one has

$$\beta(R) = \frac{\int_{-R}^R (u')^2 + (u'')^2 \, e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} \, dt}{\int_{-R}^R e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} \, dt} \geq 1.$$ 

In fact, the equality is never attained unless $R = 0$, and $\lim_{R \to 0} \beta(R) = 1$. A routine computation shows that $\beta(R)$ is strictly increasing in $R$, and $\lim_{R \to \infty} \beta(R) = \infty$. Furthermore, $\beta(R)$ grows very fast.

This indicates that our proof of Lemma 2.5 is sub-optimal, at least in the case $n = 1$: we replace the term which includes $|\nabla u|^2$ with the much smaller term, while $|\nabla u|^2$ has large growth. The constant $1/2$ which we get after such replacement is attained when $R = \infty$, and in fact the estimate decreases as $R$ increases, contrary to the actual behavior of $\beta(R)$.
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