

Reconstruction of symmetric convex bodies from Ehrhart-like data

Tiago Royer

Abstract

In a previous paper [2], we showed how to use the Ehrhart function $L_P(s)$, defined by $L_P(s) = \#(sP \cap \mathbb{Z}^d)$, to reconstruct a polytope P . More specifically, we showed that, for rational polytopes P and Q , if $L_{P+w}(s) = L_{Q+w}(s)$ for all integer vectors w , then $P = Q$. In this paper we show the same result, but assuming that P and Q are symmetric convex bodies instead of rational polytopes.

1 Introduction

Given a polytope $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, the classical Ehrhart lattice point enumerator $L_P(t)$ is defined as

$$L_P(t) = \#(tP \cap \mathbb{Z}^d), \quad \text{integer } t \geq 0.$$

Here, $\#(A)$ is the number of elements in A and $tP = \{tx \mid x \in P\}$ is the dilation of P by t . The above definition may be extended to allow for P to be an arbitrary convex body, and for t to be an arbitrary real number.

To minimize confusion, we will denote real dilation parameters with the letter s , so that $L_P(t)$ denotes the classical Ehrhart function and $L_P(s)$ denotes the extension considered in this paper. So, for example, $L_P(t)$ is just the restriction of $L_P(s)$ to integer values.

It is clear from the definition that the classical Ehrhart function is invariant under integer translations; that is, for every polytope P and every integer vector w , we have

$$L_{P+w}(t) = L_P(t)$$

for all t . This is not true for the real Ehrhart function $L_P(s)$. In fact, an earlier paper [2] shows that the list of functions $L_{P+w}(s)$, for integer w , is a complete set of invariants for full-dimensional rational polytopes. More precisely:

Theorem 1. *Let P and Q be full-dimensional rational polytopes, and suppose that $L_{P+w}(s) = L_{Q+w}(s)$ for all $s > 0$ and all integer w . Then $P = Q$.*

It is also conjectured that the rationality hypothesis may be dropped. In this paper, we will show a special case of this conjecture, where we assume that the polytopes are symmetric (that is, $x \in P$ if and only if $-x \in P$). In fact, we never use the fact that P and Q are polytopes; we just need convexity. So we have the following.

Theorem 2. *Let K and H be symmetric convex bodies, and assume that $L_{K+w}(s) = L_{H+w}(s)$ for all real $s > 0$ and all integer w . Then $K = H$.*

2 Notation and basic results

The punchline is Aleksandrov's projection theorem. Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a convex body (that is, a convex, compact set with nonempty interior). For any unit vector v , we will denote by $V_K(v)$ the $(d-1)$ -dimensional area of the orthogonal projection of K in $\{v\}^\perp$.

For example, let $K = [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$, $v = (0, 1)$ and $v' = (\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2})$. Then $V_K(v) = 1$ and $V_K(v') = \sqrt{2}$.

A convex body K is said to be *symmetric* if $x \in K$ if and only if $-x \in K$. An important reconstruction theorem for symmetric convex bodies is Aleksandrov's projection theorem (see e.g. [1, p. 115]).

Theorem 3 (Aleksandrov's projection theorem). *Let K and H be two symmetric convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^d such that $V_K(v) = V_H(v)$ for all unit vectors v . Then $K = H$.*

So, the goal is to compute the function V_K using the Ehrhart functions L_{K+w} . The two main tools are the Hausdorff distance and pseudopyramids.

For $\lambda \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, denote by $B_\lambda(x)$ the ball with radius λ centered at x . If K is a convex body and $\lambda \geq 0$, define K_λ by

$$K_\lambda = \bigcup_{x \in K} B_\lambda(x).$$

The Hausdorff distance $\rho(K, H)$ between two convex bodies K and H is defined to be (Figure 1)

$$\rho(K, H) = \inf\{\lambda \geq 0 \mid K \subseteq H_\lambda \text{ and } H \subseteq K_\lambda\}.$$

It can be shown that the set of convex sets in \mathbb{R}^d is a metric space under the Hausdorff distance and that the Euclidean volume is continuous in this space (see e.g. [1, p. 9]), but we just need the following special case of this theory.

Lemma 4. *Let K and A_1, A_2, \dots be convex bodies. If $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \rho(K, A_i) = 0$, then $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \text{vol } A_i = \text{vol } K$.*

The concept of pseudopyramid was introduced in [2]. If K is a convex body, the pseudopyramid $\text{ppyr } K$ is defined to be (Figure 2)

$$\text{ppyr } K = \bigcup_{0 \leq \lambda \leq 1} \lambda K.$$

We will use the following lemma, which is a consequence of Lemma 1 of [2].

Lemma 5. *Let K and H be convex bodies, and suppose that $L_K(s) = L_H(s)$ for all $s > 0$. Then $\text{vol ppyr } H = \text{vol ppyr } K$.*




Figure 1: Hausdorff distance between two convex sets. The thick lines are the boundaries of the sets K and H ; the thin lines are the boundaries of the sets K_λ and H_λ .




Figure 2: Pseudopyramid of a polytope.

In other words, whenever we know L_K , we may assume we also know $\text{vol ppyr } K$.

Proof. Lemma 1 of [2] states that,¹ if $L_K(s) = L_H(s)$, then $L_{\text{ppyr } K}(s) = L_{\text{ppyr } H}(s)$. Since

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_{\text{ppyr } K}(s)}{s^d} = \text{vol ppyr } K$$

(and similarly for H), we have $\text{vol ppyr } K = \text{vol ppyr } H$. □

¹ Technically, Lemma 1 of [2] only states this for polytopes, but the proof holds verbatim for convex bodies.




Figure 3: Spherical projection of $K + v$.

3 Pseudopyramid volumes and areas of projections

In this section, we will show how to compute the function V_K in terms of the numbers $\text{volppyr}(P + w)$ for integer w .

Given a convex body K , define its spherical projection $S(K)$ by (Figure 3)

$$S(K) = \left\{ \frac{x}{\|x\|} \mid x \in K \text{ and } x \neq 0 \right\}.$$

The connection between pseudopyramid volumes and areas of projections can be seen in Figure 3. The set $\|v\| S(K + v)$ is a dilation of the projection $S(K + v)$ of K . Note that the shape of $\|v\| S(K + v)$ “looks like” the orthogonal projection of K in $\{v\}^\perp$; that is, the area of $\|v\| S(K + v)$ approximates $V_K(v)$.

If the pseudopyramid were an actual pyramid (with base $\|v\| S(K + v)$), then using the formula $v = \frac{Ah}{d}$ for the volume of a pyramid would allow us to discover what is the area of the projection, which would give an approximation to $V_K(v)$. We will show that this formula is true “in the infinity”; that is, using limits, we can recover the area of the projection using taller and taller pseudopyramids.

3.1 Approximating spherical projections

For convex bodies K , the set $S(K)$ is a manifold². If K does not contain the origin in its interior, then $S(K)$ may be parameterized with a single coordinate system; that is, there is a set $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ and a continuously differentiable function $\varphi : U \rightarrow S(K)$ which is a bijection between U and $S(K)$. Since we want to

² Technically, $S(K)$ will be a manifold-with-corners (see [3, p. 137]). However, their interiors relative to the $(d - 1)$ -dimensional sphere S^{d-1} are manifolds, and since we’re dealing with areas there will be no harm in ignoring these boundaries.




Figure 4: The spherical projection $\mu S(K + \mu v)$, when projected orthogonally to the plane $x_d = 0$ (the set K_μ), approaches the volume of the projection K' .

move P towards infinity, this shall always be the case if the translation vector is long enough. In this case, we define its area to be [3, p. 126]

$$\begin{aligned} \text{area } S(K) &= \int_U \|D_1\varphi \times \cdots \times D_{d-1}\varphi\| \\ &= \int_U \left\| \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial x_1} \times \cdots \times \frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial x_{d-1}} dx_1 \dots dx_{d-1} \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

The following theorem states that the spherical projection approximates, in a sense, the orthogonal projection, for large enough translation vectors.

Theorem 6. *Let v be a unit vector and $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ a convex body. Then*

$$\lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} \mu^{d-1} \text{area } S(P + \mu v) = V_K(v).$$

Proof. By rotating all objects involved if needed, we may assume that $v = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$. Let N be large enough that $K \subseteq B_N(0)$; we'll assume that $\mu > N$, so that $K + \mu v$ lies strictly above the hyperplane $x_d = 0$.

Let K' be the orthogonal projection of K into $\{v\}^\perp$. We'll think of K' as being a subset of \mathbb{R}^{d-1} . Denote by K_μ the projection of the set $\mu S(K + \mu v)$ on \mathbb{R}^{d-1} (Figure 4); that is, first project $K + \mu v$ to the sphere with radius μ , then discard the last coordinate. Note this is similar to project it to the hyperplane $x_d = 0$. We'll show that, as μ goes to infinity, both the Hausdorff distance between K_μ and K' and the difference between the volume of K_μ and the area of $\mu S(K + \mu v)$ tend to zero.

First, let's bound the Hausdorff distance between K' and K_μ . If $x \in K + \mu v$, then x gets projected to a point $x_0 \in K'$ by just discarding the last coordinate;

however, to be projected to a point $x_1 \in K_\mu$, first we replace x by $x' = \frac{\mu}{\|x\|}x$ to get a point $x' \in \mu S(K + \mu v)$, and then the last coordinate of x' is discarded. Note that $x_1 = \frac{\mu}{\|x\|}x_0$; therefore, the distance between these two points is

$$\|x_0 - x_1\| = \left| 1 - \frac{\mu}{\|x\|} \right| \|x_0\| = \frac{|\|x\| - \mu|}{\|x\|} \|x_0\|$$

We have $x \in K + \mu v \subseteq B_N(\mu v)$, so $\mu - N \leq \|x\| \leq \mu + N$. As $v = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$ and x_0 is x without its last coordinate, we have $\|x_0\| \leq N$ (because, in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} , we have $x_0 \in B_N(0)$). So, the distance between x_0 and x_1 is at most $\frac{N^2}{\mu + N}$.

Every point in K' and in K_μ is obtained through these projections. This means that, given any point x_0 in one of the sets, we may find another point x_1 in the other set which is at a distance of at most $\frac{N^2}{\mu + N}$ from the former, because we can just pick a point x whose projection is x_0 ; then its other projection x_1 will be close to x_0 . Thus

$$\rho(K', K_\mu) \leq \frac{N^2}{\mu + N},$$

so by Theorem 4 the volumes of K_μ converges to $\text{vol } K'$.

Now, let's relate $\text{vol } K_\mu$ with μ^{d-1} area $S(K + \mu v)$. If $y = (y_1, \dots, y_d)$ is a point in $\mu S(K + \mu v)$, we know that $\|y\| = \mu$ and that $y_d > 0$ (because we're assuming $\mu > N$). Therefore, if we define $\varphi : K_\mu \rightarrow \mu S(K + \mu v)$ by

$$\varphi(y_1, \dots, y_{d-1}) = \left(y_1, \dots, y_{d-1}, \sqrt{\mu^2 - y_1^2 - \dots - y_{d-1}^2} \right),$$

then φ will be a differentiable bijection between K_μ and $\mu S(K + \mu v)$, so that φ is a parametrization for $\mu S(K + \mu v)$.

For the partial derivatives, we have $\frac{\partial \varphi_i}{\partial y_j} = [i = j]$ if $i < d$; that is, the partial derivatives behave like the identity. For $i = d$, we have

$$\frac{\partial \varphi_d}{\partial y_j} = \frac{y_j}{\sqrt{\mu^2 - y_1^2 - \dots - y_{d-1}^2}}.$$

Now, by definition of N , we have

$$\left| \frac{\partial \varphi_d}{\partial y_j} \right| \leq \frac{N}{\sqrt{\mu^2 - N^2}},$$

so the vectors $D_i \varphi$ converge uniformly to e_i for large μ . Since the generalized cross product is linear in each entry, the vector $D_1 \varphi \times \dots \times D_{d-1} \varphi$ converges uniformly to e_d , and thus the number

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{vol } K_\mu - \text{area } \mu S(K + \mu v)| &= \left| \int_{K_\mu} 1 - \int_{K_\mu} \|D_1 \varphi \times \dots \times D_{d-1} \varphi\| \right| \\ &\leq \int_{K_\mu} \left| 1 - \|D_1 \varphi \times \dots \times D_{d-1} \varphi\| \right| \end{aligned}$$




Figure 5: Inner and outer radius for two pseudopyramids.

converges to zero.

Now, since $\text{area}(\mu S(K + \mu v)) = \mu^{d-1} \text{area } S(K + \mu v)$, combining these two convergence results gives the theorem. \square

3.2 Limit behavior of pseudopyramids

Now we'll show how to use the pseudopyramids to compute these projections.

Let K be a pseudopyramid. Define the *outer radius* $R(K)$ of K to be the smallest number such that the ball of radius $R(K)$ around the origin contains K . That is,

$$R(K) = \inf\{R \geq 0 \mid K \subseteq B_R(0)\}.$$

Define the *front shell* of K to be the set of points in the boundary of K which are not contained in any facet passing through the origin; that is, the set of points x in the boundary of K such that λx is contained in the interior of K for all $0 < \lambda < 1$. Define, then, the *inner radius* $r(K)$ of K to be the largest number such that the ball of radius $r(K)$ around the origin contains no points of the front shell of K (Figure 5). Note that this is equivalent to $r(K)S(K)$ to be contained in K ; that is,

$$r(K) = \sup\{r \geq 0 \mid rS(K) \subseteq K\}.$$

We leave the following lemma to the reader. It relates the inner and outer radii with the area of the spherical projection.

Proposition 7. *Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a convex body which does not contain the origin. Then*

$$\frac{\text{vol ppyr } K}{R(\text{ppyr } K)^d} \leq \frac{\text{area } S(K)}{d} \leq \frac{\text{vol ppyr } K}{r(\text{ppyr } K)^d}.$$

This lemma, combined with Lemma 6, shows how to calculate the volume of the orthogonal projection knowing only the volumes of the pseudopyramids.

Lemma 8. *Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a convex body, and v any unit vector. Then*

$$\lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{vol ppyr}(K + \mu v)}{\mu} = \frac{V_K(v)}{d}.$$

Proof. Let N be large enough so that $K \subseteq B_N(0)$. For any μ , as v is a unit vector, we have $K + \mu v \subseteq B_{N+\mu}(0)$, so

$$R(\text{ppyr}(K + \mu v)) \leq \mu + N.$$

Since all the points in the front shell of $\text{ppyr}(K + \mu v)$ are points of K , all of them must have norm greater or equal to $\mu - N$. Therefore, no origin-centered ball with radius smaller than that can contain these points. Thus,

$$r(\text{ppyr}(K + \mu v)) \geq \mu - N.$$

Using these two inequalities and Proposition 7 gives

$$\frac{\text{vol ppyr}(K + \mu v)}{(\mu + N)^d} \leq \frac{\text{area } S(K + \mu v)}{d} \leq \frac{\text{vol ppyr}(K + \mu v)}{(\mu - N)^d},$$

which may be rewritten as

$$\frac{(\mu - N)^d \mu^{d-1} \text{area } S(K + \mu v)}{\mu^d d} \leq \frac{\text{vol ppyr}(K + \mu v)}{\mu} \leq \frac{(\mu + N)^d \mu^{d-1} \text{area } S(K + \mu v)}{\mu^d d}.$$

Now Theorem 6 and the squeeze theorem finish the proof. \square

For example, for $K = [0, 1]^2$ and $v = (1, 0)$, we have $\text{vol ppyr}(K + \mu v) = 1 + \frac{\mu}{2}$, so $\lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{vol ppyr}(K + \mu v)}{\mu} = \frac{1}{2}$, which is precisely one-half of the area of $\{0\} \times [0, 1]$, the projection K' of K on the y -axis. This highlights that, for large μ , the pseudopyramid $\text{ppyr}(K + \mu v)$ “behaves like” an actual pyramid, with height μ and base K' .

3.3 Piecing everything together

Theorem 2. *Let K and H be symmetric convex bodies, and assume that $L_{K+w}(s) = L_{H+w}(s)$ for all real $s > 0$ and all integer w . Then $K = H$.*

Proof. By Lemma 5, we have $\text{vol ppyr}(K + w) = \text{vol ppyr}(H + w)$ for all integer w .

If w is a nonzero integer vector, let $v = \frac{w}{\|w\|}$; then, by Lemma 8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{V_K(v)}{d} &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{vol ppyr}(K + \mu v)}{\mu} \\ &= \lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{vol ppyr}(H + \mu v)}{\mu} \\ &= \frac{V_H(v)}{d} \end{aligned}$$

This shows that, whenever v is a multiple of a rational vector, we have $V_K(v) = V_H(v)$. Since the functions V_K and V_H are continuous, we have $V_K = V_H$, and thus by Aleksandrov’s projection theorem we conclude that $K = H$. \square

4 Final remarks

Theorems 1 and 2 both assume that $L_{K+w}(s) = L_{H+w}(s)$ for all integer w and real $s > 0$, and both conclude that $K = H$. The first theorem assume that the objects being considered are rational polytopes, but no symmetry condition is imposed; the second theorem assumes that the objects are symmetric, but otherwise permits arbitrary convex bodies.

This suggest the following common generalization of these theorems:

Conjecture 9. *Let K and H be any convex bodies, and assume that $L_{K+w}(s) = L_{H+w}(s)$ for all real $s > 0$ and all integer w . Then $K = H$.*

References

- [1] Richard J. Gardner. *Geometric tomography*, volume 58 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, New York, second edition, 2006.
- [2] Tiago Royer. Reconstruction of rational polytopes from the real-parameter Ehrhart function of its translates. 2017. Preprint. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.01973>.
- [3] Michael Spivak. *Calculus on Manifolds: A Modern Approach to Classical Theorems of Advanced Calculus*. W. A. Benjamin, 1965.