

MEASURE THEORETIC MINKOWSKI'S EXISTENCE THEOREM AND PROJECTION BODIES

LIUDMYLA KRYVONOS AND DYLAN LANGHARST

ABSTRACT. The Brunn-Minkowski Theory has seen several generalizations over the past century. Many of the core ideas have been generalized to measures. With the goal of framing these generalizations as a measure theoretic Brunn-Minkowski theory, we prove the Minkowski existence theorem for a large class of Borel measures with density, denoted by Λ' : for ν a finite, even Borel measure on the unit sphere and $\mu \in \Lambda'$, there exists a symmetric convex body K such that

$$d\nu(u) = c_{\mu,K} dS_{\mu,K}(u),$$

where $c_{\mu,K}$ is a quantity that depends on μ and K and $dS_{\mu,K}(u)$ is the surface area-measure of K with respect to μ . Examples of measures in Λ' are homogeneous measures (with $c_{\mu,K} = 1$) and probability measures with continuous densities (e.g. the Gaussian measure). We will also consider measure dependent projection bodies $\Pi_{\mu}K$ by classifying them and studying the isomorphic Shephard problem: if μ and ν are even, homogeneous measures with density and K and L are symmetric convex bodies such that $\Pi_{\mu}K \subset \Pi_{\nu}L$, then can one find an optimal quantity $\mathcal{A} > 0$ such that $\mu(K) \leq \mathcal{A}\nu(L)$? Among other things, we show that, in the case where $\mu = \nu$ and L is a projection body, $\mathcal{A} = 1$.

1. INTRODUCTION

A convex body is a convex, compact set with nonempty interior. The set of convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^n (the n -dimensional Euclidean space equipped with its usual structure) will be denoted as \mathcal{K}^n . An important subset of \mathcal{K}^n is the set of convex bodies containing the origin in their interior, denoted \mathcal{K}_0^n . For $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$, we say K is centrally symmetric, or just symmetric, if $K = -K$. Convex bodies are often studied through their support function, which is given by, for $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$,

$$h_K(x) = \sup_{y \in K} \langle x, y \rangle.$$

A set L is said to be star-shaped if its radial function $\rho_L(x) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $\rho_L(x) = \sup\{\lambda > 0 : \lambda x \in L\}$ is continuous; so every $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ is star-shaped. Notice that, for a unit vector u , one has that $\rho_L(u)u \in \partial L$, where ∂L denotes the boundary of L . In fact, for $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$, $\rho_K(x) = \|x\|_K^{-1}$, where $\|x\|_K$ is the Minkowski functional of K given by

$$\|x\|_K = \inf\{r > 0 : x \in rK\}.$$

For $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, the volume of Ω is its d -dimensional Lebesgue measure, denoted $\text{Vol}_d(\Omega)$, where d is the dimension of the least affine subspace of \mathbb{R}^n containing Ω . The closed unit ball in \mathbb{R}^n will be

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 52A39, 52A40, Secondary: 52A21, 49J10.

Key words and phrases. Minkowski's Existence Theorem, Shephard Problem, Petty Projection Inequality, Projection Body, Ehrhard's Inequality.

The second named author was supported in part by the U.S. National Science Foundation Grant DMS-2000304 and the United States - Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF).

denoted by B_2^n ; its volume will be written as κ_n . If we denote the boundary of B_2^n by \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , then a convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ can also be studied through its surface area measure: for $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ one has

$$dS_K(\theta) = d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(n_K^{-1}(\theta)),$$

where \mathcal{H}^{n-1} is the $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure and $n_K : \partial K \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ is the Gauss map, which associates an element y of ∂K with its outer unit normal. For almost all $x \in \partial K$, $n_K(x)$ is well-defined (i.e. x has a single outer unit normal); we shall denote $\partial'K = \partial K \setminus \{x : n_K(x) \text{ is not well-defined}\}$. A convex body is said to be *strictly convex* if ∂K does not contain a line segment, in which case the Gauss map is an injection between $\partial'K$ and \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . The Gauss map is related to the support function: fix $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Then, $\nabla h_K(u)$ exists if, and only if, $n_K^{-1}(u)$ is a single point $x \in \partial K$, and, furthermore, $\nabla h_K(u) = x = n_K^{-1}(u)$ [76, Corollary 1.7.3]. Hence, K is strictly convex if, and only if, $h_K \in C^1$ [76, Page 115].

If a convex body K has positive radii of curvature everywhere, we say K has *positive curvature*. In this instance, there exists a continuous, strictly positive function $f_K(u)$, the *curvature function* of K , such that one has $dS_K(u) = f_K(u)du$. One has that K has positive curvature and is smooth if, and only if $h_K \in C^2$ [76, Page 115]. Hence, it is standard to denote convex bodies with positive curvature as being of the class C_+^2 . From [31, Theorem 5.4] every convex body can be uniformly approximated by convex bodies that are C_+^2 .

Given a finite Borel measure μ on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , one may ask: does there exist a unique (up to translations) convex body K such that $dS_K = d\mu$? Minkowski's existence theorem [76, p. 455] shows that if μ satisfies the following two conditions, then the answer is yes:

- (1) The measure μ is not concentrated on any great hemisphere, that is

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle \theta, \xi \rangle| d\mu(\xi) > 0 \quad \text{for all } \theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}.$$

- (2) The measure is centered, that is

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \xi d\mu(\xi) = 0.$$

Minkowski's existence theorem was proven by Aleksandrov using the following schema [1]. For every positive $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, the *Wulff shape* of f is the convex body given by

$$(1) \quad [f] = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, u \rangle \leq f(u) \forall u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}\}.$$

One has that, for $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$, $[h_K] = K$. Since f is positive, $[f] \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$. Furthermore, if f is even, then $[f]$ is symmetric. Next, for $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, Aleksandrov defined a perturbation of K to be the Wulff shape of the function

$$h_t(u) = h_K(u) + tf(u),$$

where $t \in (-\delta, \delta)$, δ small enough so that h_t is positive for all u . From here, Aleksandrov showed his variational formula:

$$\left. \frac{d\text{Vol}_n([h_t])}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{Vol}_n([h_t]) - \text{Vol}_n(K)}{t} = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) dS_K(u);$$

setting $f = h_L$ for $L \in \mathcal{K}^n$ then yields that the *mixed volume* of $(n-1)$ copies of K and L [25] is

$$(2) \quad V(K, L) = \frac{1}{n} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{Vol}_n(K + \epsilon L) - \text{Vol}_n(K)}{\epsilon} = \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u) dS_K(u),$$

and, furthermore, mixed volume satisfies *Minkowski's inequality*:

$$(3) \quad V(K, L)^n \geq \text{Vol}_n(K)^{n-1} \text{Vol}_n(L).$$

Using these ingredients, Aleksandrov settled the question of Minkowski's existence theorem. By setting $L = K$ in Equation 2, one has that the volume of $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ is given by

$$\text{Vol}_n(K) = \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_K(u) dS_K(u).$$

Next, consider a homogeneous function of order 1, $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$. It can easily be shown that g is a norm on \mathbb{R}^n if, and only if, its unit ball $L = \{x : g(x) \leq 1\}$ is a symmetric convex body; given symmetric $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$, the Minkowski functional is precisely the associated norm. For $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$, the dual body of K is given by

$$K^\circ = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : h_K(x) \leq 1\}.$$

We see that K° is the unit ball of $h_K(x)$, and so, by definition $h_K(x) = \|x\|_{K^\circ}$. For $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$, we denote the orthogonal projection of K onto a linear subspace H as $P_H K$. *Cauchy's projection formula* then states [76]: for $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, one has that

$$(4) \quad \text{Vol}_{n-1}(P_{\theta^\perp} K) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle \theta, u \rangle| dS_K(u),$$

where $\theta^\perp = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle \theta, x \rangle = 0\}$ is the subspace orthogonal to $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. If one extends Equation 4 to all of \mathbb{R}^n 1-homogeneously (merely replace θ in the above with arbitrary x), then we see it is a norm on \mathbb{R}^n . Using the above arguments concerning unit balls of norms and the relation between the Minkowski functional of a convex body and the support function of its dual, one can then define the *projection body of K* , denoted ΠK , as the symmetric convex body whose support function is given by

$$(5) \quad h_{\Pi K}(\theta) = \text{Vol}_{n-1}(P_{\theta^\perp} K) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle \theta, u \rangle| dS_K(u).$$

The projection body operator $\Pi : \mathcal{K}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_0^n$ was introduced by Minkowski, and became a cornerstone of the larger *Brunn-Minkowski theory* along with the other concepts discussed above, such as mixed volume, Aleksandrov's variational formula, and Minkowski's inequality (among others not pertinent to our current discussion, see Schneider [76] and the references therein for a thorough overview). We say a function $P : \mathcal{K}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is an affine invariant quantity if for every $T \in GL(n)$, $P(TK) = P(K)$. It is natural to ask if an affine invariant quantity is bounded above or below. If one uses the notation $(\Pi K)^\circ = \Pi^\circ K$, then one can check that $P(K) = \text{Vol}_n(K)^{n-1} \text{Vol}_n(\Pi^\circ K)$ is affine invariant; the inequalities of Petty [69] and Zhang [79], bounded this quantity from above and below respectively. Other inequalities on affine invariant quantities are the classical isoperimetric inequality and the Rogers-Shephard inequality [71]. In general, inequalities concerning projections are Shephard-type problems; the Shephard problem, asked by Shephard in 1964 [78] is the following: Consider symmetric $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ such that

$$h_{\Pi K}(\theta) = \text{Vol}_{n-1}(P_{\theta^\perp} K) \leq \text{Vol}_{n-1}(P_{\theta^\perp} L) = h_{\Pi L}(\theta)$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$; is it true that $\text{Vol}_n(K) \leq \text{Vol}_n(L)$? One sees that the above inequality means $\Pi K \subset \Pi L$. It was shown to be false in general independently by Schneider [77] and Petty [70], but true if L itself is a projection body, that is $L = \Pi M$ for some convex body $M \in \mathcal{K}^n$. Therefore it is true in dimension $n = 2$ for symmetric L , as every symmetric convex body in the plane is a projection body [25].

Over the last several decades, various extensions of the Brunn-Minkowski theory have occurred. Each extension is a generalization of the core ingredients of the theory, which reduce to the classical case in some way. The L_p *Brunn-Minkowski theory*, or Firey-Brunn-Minkowski theory, was introduced in the 1960's when Firey discovered an L_p extension of Minkowski addition; in the 1990's, a series of papers by Lutwak [60, 61] established the modern L_p Brunn-Minkowski theory. Further extensions of concepts from the classical theory were extended to the L_p setting; the L_p analog of the projection operator was established in [62], and extended to a larger family of operators in [58]. A family of L_p extensions of Petty's inequality was established in [34, 35]. The L_p extension of Minkowski's existence theorem was analyzed by Chou and Wang in [14]. The next development of the Brunn-Minkowski theory was presented (comparatively recently) in a series of papers by Lutwak, Yang and Zhang, called the *Orlicz-Brunn-Minkowski theory* [63, 64, 33] (where the third citation was done also with Haberl). In [63], the projection body operator was further generalized (and the associated Petty inequality was shown), and in [33], the associated Minkowski's existence theorem was shown. For more on the Firey and Orlicz Brunn-Minkowski theories, the reader is encouraged to see [76] and the references in [63]. In particular, the logarithmic Brunn-Minkowski conjecture [8, 9] is an active area of interest for many.

In parallel with these developments, primarily over the last two decades, extensions of various problems from the classical Brunn-Minkowski setting to that of general measures were established. Let Λ be the set of all Borel measures μ whose Radon-Nikodym derivative, or density, is from \mathbb{R}^n to $\mathbb{R}^+ = [0, \infty)$, i.e.,

$$\mu \in \Lambda \iff \frac{d\mu(x)}{dx} = \phi(x), \text{ with } \phi: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+;$$

the Lebesgue measure itself is denoted as an element of Λ by λ . Extensions of the classical Brunn-Minkowski theory to general measures often involve replacing the concept of the Lebesgue measure in a given statement with some $\mu \in \Lambda$. We shall call the collection of such extensions the *measure theoretic Brunn-Minkowski theory*. The Lebesgue measure is a n -homogeneous measure, and so we must often impose homogeneity requirements on measures under consideration. We say a measure μ is α -homogeneous, $\alpha > 0$, if $\mu(tK) = t^\alpha \mu(K)$, $t > 0$, for all Borel measurable K . Furthermore, if the density of μ is ϕ , then one can check using the Lebesgue differentiation theorem that ϕ is $(\alpha - n)$ -homogeneous. We will need to state a broadening of a property of the Lebesgue measure.

First recall that, for $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$, the *Minkowski sum* of non-empty compact Borel sets is given by

$$\alpha A + \beta B = \{\alpha x + \beta y : x \in A, y \in B\}.$$

We can now remind the reader that a measure $\mu \in \Lambda$ is said to be s -concave on a class of compact Borel sets \mathcal{C} if, for every pair $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$ and every $t \in [0, 1]$, one has

$$\mu(tA + (1-t)B) \geq (t\mu(A)^s + (1-t)\mu(B)^s)^{\frac{1}{s}}$$

whenever $\mu(A)\mu(B) > 0$; the right-hand side is taken to be zero otherwise. When $s = 1$, we merely say the measure is concave. In the limit as $s \rightarrow 0$, we obtain the case of log-concavity:

$$\mu(tA + (1-t)B) \geq \mu(A)^t \mu(B)^{1-t}.$$

When $s = -\infty$, the right-hand side is taken to be $\min\{\mu(A), \mu(B)\}$. If there exists an invertible function F such that $F \circ \mu$ is concave, then we say μ is F -concave. The classical Brunn-Minkowski inequality states both the $1/n$ -concavity and the log-concavity of the Lebesgue measure on the class

of non-empty, compact Borel sets, and this fact is used in most problems in the classical Brunn-Minkowski theory.

A cornerstone of the generalization of the Brunn-Minkowski theory to the setting of measures is Borell's classification of s -concave measures, specifically in Theorem 3.2 of [6]: Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open, convex subset of \mathbb{R}^d (possibly \mathbb{R}^d itself), where $1 \leq d \leq n$ is the dimension so that \mathbb{R}^d is the least affine subspace containing Ω . Then, μ is an s -concave measure on Borel subsets of Ω if, and only if, there exists $f \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$ such that $d\mu = f dx_\Omega$ and the following relations hold

$$\begin{aligned} s \in [-\infty, 0) &\longleftrightarrow f^{\frac{s}{1-sd}} \text{ is convex} \\ s = 0 &\longleftrightarrow \log f \text{ is concave} \\ s \in (0, 1/d) &\longleftrightarrow f^{\frac{s}{1-sd}} \text{ is concave} \\ s = 1/d &\longleftrightarrow f \text{ is a constant} \\ s > 1/d &\longleftrightarrow f = 0 \text{ a.e..} \end{aligned}$$

For the purposes of this paper, we will be focusing on the case when Ω is of full dimension, i.e. $d = n$ (where Ω may be \mathbb{R}^n), and $s = p \in (0, 1/n]$. To emphasize this, we will say a measure μ is p -concave when these two conditions are satisfied. One can see that if a p -concave measure μ is also α -homogeneous, then the function given by $t \rightarrow t^{p\alpha}$ must be concave, and so $p\alpha \leq 1$.

In [47, 48, 49, 41, 42, 50, 82, 72, 36], slicing problems were analyzed in the measure theoretic setting. Of particular interest is the extension of Minkowski's existence theorem. For a convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and a Borel measure μ with density ϕ integrable on the boundary of K , the μ -surface area is defined implicitly by

$$(6) \quad S_{\mu,K}(E) = \int_{n_K^{-1}(E)} \phi(x) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x)$$

for every Borel set $E \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. If K is of class C^2_+ , then one has

$$dS_{\mu,K}(u) = \phi(n_K^{-1}(u)) f_K(u) du.$$

In [57], Livshyts extended Minkowski's existence theorem to α -homogeneous, p -concave measures: consider α -homogeneous, $\alpha > n$, $\mu \in \Lambda$ with density ϕ , such that a restriction of ϕ on some half space is p -concave for $p \geq 0$. Let φ be an arbitrary even measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , not supported on any great hemisphere, such that $\text{supp}(\varphi) \subset \text{int}(\text{supp}(\phi)) \cap \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Then there exists a unique, up to a set of μ -measure zero, convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ such that

$$dS_{\mu,K}(u) = d\varphi(u).$$

The first goal of this paper is to establish further generalizations of tools from the classical Brunn-Minkowski theory to the measure theoretic Brunn-Minkowski theory. In particular, mixed measures and Minkowski's extended inequality for mixed measures when the measure is F -concave, as introduced and shown in [57], Aleksandrov's variational formula, and Minkowski's existence theorem:

Question 1. *Let $\mu \in \Lambda$ with density ϕ and ν be a finite, even Borel measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} such that ν is not concentrated on any great hemisphere. Then, does there exist a K from \mathcal{K}^n_0 and a constant $c_{\mu,K}$ such that*

$$d\nu(u) = c_{\mu,K} dS_{\mu,K}(u)?$$

We solve this question for a large class of measures $\Lambda' \subset \Lambda$ defined as

$$(7) \quad \Lambda' = \left\{ \mu \in \Lambda : \exists \beta > 0 : \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu(rB_2^n)^{\frac{\beta}{n}}}{r} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(rB_2^n)^{\frac{\beta}{n}}}{r} = \infty \right\}.$$

Let us remark that Λ' is quite a rich class. For example, α -homogeneous, $\alpha > 0$, measures belong to Λ' , as in this instance it suffices that the exponent of $r^{\frac{\alpha\beta}{n}-1}$ be negative, and so any $\beta < \frac{n}{\alpha}$ suffices. In addition, any probability measure satisfies the first limit by taking the bound $0 \leq \mu(rB_2^n) \leq 1$. Any radially decreasing measure satisfies the second limit as well, as, for r small enough, if ϕ is the density of μ , one can use that $\phi(rx) \geq \phi(x)$ and a variable substitution to obtain $\left(\mu(rB_2^n)^{\frac{\beta}{n}}/r\right) \geq \left(\mu(B_2^n)^{\frac{\beta}{n}}/r^{1-\beta}\right)$; thus any $\beta < 1$ suffices. Therefore, one has that the Gaussian measure is in Λ' , as the Gaussian measure is a radially decreasing probability measure. Then, we prove the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let μ be an even Borel measure on the sphere such that $\mu \in \Lambda'$ for some $\beta > 0$. Suppose ν is a finite, even Borel measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} that is not concentrated on any hemisphere. Then, there exists a symmetric convex body K such that*

$$d\nu(u) = c_{\mu,K} dS_{\mu,K}(u); \quad c_{\mu,K} := \mu(K)^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}.$$

We then show in the case of α -homogeneous measures μ , $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$, the constant $c_{\mu,K}$ can be taken to be 1. We also analyze the equation $dS_{\mu,K}(u) = dS_{\mu,L}(u)$ and determine which conditions are required for μ so that one can conclude $K = L$. We discuss how, for the Gaussian measure γ_n , this constant cannot be removed, but we do obtain uniqueness: if $dS_{\gamma_n,K}(u) = dS_{\gamma_n,L}(u)$ then, if K and L are large enough in the sense that $\gamma_n(K), \gamma_n(L) \geq \frac{1}{2}$, one has $K = L$. This result had first been obtained by Huang, Xi and Zhao [39], who used an approach that relied on properties of the Gaussian measure.

In [54], the authors extended Zhang's inequality and the projection operator to arbitrary elements of Λ ; the extension of the projection operator is the following: consider $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $\mu \in \Lambda$ with density ϕ . Then, the measure dependent projection body of K with respect to μ is the convex body $\Pi_{\mu}K$ whose support function is given by

$$(8) \quad h_{\Pi_{\mu}K}(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial K} |\langle \theta, n_K(y) \rangle| \phi(y) dy = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle \theta, u \rangle| dS_{\mu,K}(u).$$

In [51], Zvavitch and Koldobsky considered the isomorphic Busemann-Petty problem: given $K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $\mu \in \Lambda$ such that

$$\mu(K \cap \theta^\perp) \leq \mu(L \cap \theta^\perp)$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, does there exist some $\mathcal{L} > 0$ such that $\mu(K) \leq \mathcal{L}\mu(L)$? They showed the answer is affirmative, with the worst possible constant being $\mathcal{L} = \sqrt{n}$. We should mention that the original Busemann-Petty problem asked this question with volume in place of μ and with $\mathcal{L} = 1$ [12]; it is true for $n = 2, 3, 4$ and false for $n \geq 5$ [24, 5, 30, 11, 26, 68, 80, 81, 28, 29]. In [83], Zvavitch solved the Busemann-Petty problem for general measures, obtaining the same results.

In this paper, we will further study the projection bodies $\Pi_{\mu}K$, and classify them into measure-dependent projective classes. In particular, motivated by the result of Zvavitch and Koldobsky, we answer the following *isomorphic Shephard problems* for these measure dependent projection bodies.

Question 2. Let $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$ be even and $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ be symmetric such that

$$h_{\Pi_\mu K}(\theta) \leq h_{\Pi_\nu L}(\theta)$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Does there exist a quantity $\mathcal{A} > 0$ such that $\mu(K) \leq \mathcal{A}\nu(L)$?

The celebrated result of K. Ball [4] showed the construction of a symmetric random polytope such that, under the hypothesis that $h_{\Pi K}(\theta) \leq h_{\Pi L}(\theta)$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, and L not a projection body, one had $\text{Vol}_n(K) \approx \sqrt{n}\text{Vol}_n(L)$. And yet, when L is a projection body, the same hypothesis yields $\text{Vol}_n(K) \leq \text{Vol}_n(L)$. Therefore, \mathcal{A} may depend on L and possibly the dimension. It is reasonable to suspect that \mathcal{A} will depend on μ and ν as well. However, for the quantity we obtain, the dependency on μ and ν vanishes when $\mu = \nu$. We will consider Question 2 in the case where μ, ν are both homogeneous of some degree; we will also discuss that the question is not well-posed for when $\mu = \nu = \gamma_n$. We list here some of the less complicated results. The constant $d_\Pi(L)$ below satisfies $1 \leq d_\Pi(L) \leq \sqrt{n}$, and $d_\Pi(L) = 1$ when L is a projection body.

Theorem 1.2 (Isomorphic Shephard Problem for Homogeneous Measures). *Suppose $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$ where ν is β -homogeneous, $\beta > 0$ and μ is p -concave and α -homogeneous, such that one of the two holds*

- (1) $\alpha \geq n$ and $p > 0$
- (2) $\alpha < n$ but $p = \frac{1}{\alpha}$.

Let $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ be symmetric such that

$$h_{\Pi_\mu K}(\theta) \leq h_{\Pi_\nu L}(\theta)$$

for every $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Then one has that $\mu(K) \leq \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \mathcal{A} d_\Pi(L) \nu(L)$ where

$$\mathcal{A} = \min \{ \mathcal{A}_K, \mathcal{A}_L \}, \quad \mathcal{A}_K = \left(\frac{\mu(K)}{\mu(L)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \quad \mathcal{A}_L = \left(\frac{\nu(L) \beta}{\mu(L) \alpha} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} d_\Pi^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}}(L).$$

The quantity \mathcal{A}_K in the above has the advantage of being independent of ν . The quantity \mathcal{A}_L is in some sense a measure of asymmetry between μ and ν on L . In both cases, when $\mu = \nu$ one obtains $\mu(K) \leq d_\Pi^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}(L) \mu(L)$. The case when $\alpha \in (0, n)$ and when μ is F -concave will be discussed as well. Besides being an extension of the classical Shephard problem to the setting of measures, there exists a geometric reason for the study of these questions. For $\mu \in \Lambda$ and convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$, denote the μ -measure of the boundary of K as

$$\mu(\partial K) := \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(K + \epsilon B_2^n) - \mu(K)}{\epsilon} = \int_{\partial K} \phi(y) dy.$$

Notice that, via Fubini's theorem, one has

$$(9) \quad \mu(\partial K) = \frac{1}{\kappa_{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{\Pi_\mu K}(\theta) d\theta.$$

Thus, Question 2 for the Gaussian measure is related to the result of Ball [3]: for $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$, $\gamma_n(\partial K) \leq 4n^{1/4}$, which was shown to be asymptotically sharp by Nazarov [67].

This paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we extend Minkowski's existence theorem; that is, answer Question 1 for measures in Λ' . We also discuss uniqueness conditions, and as a special case, we obtain the result of Livshyts [57]. In Section 3, we list the developments over the past twenty years in the application of harmonic analysis to convex geometry, following the works of Koldobsky, Ryabogin, Zvavitch, Yaskin and others [51, 43, 46, 44]. Also, we give a classification of the projection

bodies $\Pi_\mu K$ for a fixed μ from various perspectives. Section 4 concerns the isomorphic Shephard problems; we present various solutions to Question 2. Section 5 includes applications of the above results to the concept of capacity from potential theory. Finally, in the Appendix, we generalize Section 2 to the setting of the L_p -Brunn-Minkowski Theory.

Acknowledgements We would like to thank A. Zvavitch for the numerous, helpful comments and guidance.

2. EXTENSIONS OF MINKOWSKI'S EXISTENCE THEOREM AND MINKOWSKI'S INEQUALITY

We first recall that a measure μ is F -concave on a class of Borel sets \mathcal{C} if there exists an invertible function F such that, for every $K, L \in \mathcal{C}$, one has

$$(10) \quad \mu((1-\lambda)K + \lambda L) \geq F^{-1}((1-\lambda)F(\mu(K)) + \lambda F(\mu(L))).$$

Understanding equality conditions will be necessary further below. We first show that, if there is equality at a single $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, then there is equality for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let μ be F -concave on a class of Borel sets \mathcal{C} such that F is monotone. Suppose we have $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$ and some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$\mu((1-\lambda)K + \lambda L) = F^{-1}((1-\lambda)F(\mu(K)) + \lambda F(\mu(L)))$$

Then, equality holds for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. Since F is monotone and invertible, it is either increasing or decreasing, and so the function given by $f(t) = F(\mu((1-t)K + tL))$ is either concave or convex. Denote the linear function $g(t) = (1-t)F(\mu(K)) + tF(\mu(L))$. We have that $g(0) = f(0) = \mu(K)$ and $g(1) = f(1) = \mu(L)$. By hypothesis however, we also have $f(\lambda) = g(\lambda)$. But, since either f or $-f$ is concave, this implies $f = g$ on all of $[0, 1]$. \square

In the case of volume and the Brunn-Minkowski inequality, equality conditions imply that K is homothetic to L [76, Chapter 7]. When $F(x) = x^s$, $s \in [-\infty, 1/n]$ one can use the equality conditions of the Prékopa-Leindler inequality; this has been done previously by E. Milman and Rotem in [65], and we outline this in the following proposition.

Proposition 2.2 (Milman and Rotem [65]). *Suppose μ is s -concave, $s \in [-\infty, 1/n]$, on Borel subsets of \mathbb{R}^n . If A and B are Borel sets such that $\mu(A)\mu(B) > 0$ and*

$$\mu(tA + (1-t)B) = (t\mu(A)^s + (1-t)\mu(B)^s)^{\frac{1}{s}},$$

then there exists $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $A = \alpha B + \beta$.

One sees very quickly that an all encompassing schema for general μ and F cannot be expected in general. In fact, the equality conditions of the Ehrhard inequality constituted an entire paper [20]. Recall that the Gaussian measure is given by

$$d\gamma_n(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}}} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}} dx.$$

The Ehrhard inequality states that, for $0 < t < 1$ and closed convex sets K and L in \mathbb{R}^n ,

$$(11) \quad \Phi^{-1}(\gamma_n((1-t)K + tL)) \geq (1-t)\Phi^{-1}(\gamma_n(K)) + t\Phi^{-1}(\gamma_n(L)),$$

i.e. $\Phi^{-1} \circ \gamma_n$ is concave, where $\Phi(x) = \gamma_1((-\infty, x))$. It was first proven by Ehrhard himself [19, 20]. Latala [55] generalized Ehrhard's result to the case of arbitrary Borel K and convex L ; the general

case of Ehrhard's inequality on Borel sets was proven by Borell [7]. Equality is obtained when $\gamma_n(K)\gamma_n(L) > 0$ if, and only if, either $K = \mathbb{R}^n, L = \mathbb{R}^n, K = L$, or both K and L are half-spaces, one contained in the other. So, if $K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n$, one must have $K = L$. But also, since Φ^{-1} is strictly log-concave, so too is the Gaussian measure. That is, for $0 < \lambda < 1$ and closed convex sets K and L in \mathbb{R}^n ,

$$(12) \quad \gamma_n((1 - \lambda)K + \lambda L) \geq \gamma_n(K)^{1-\lambda}\gamma_n(L)^\lambda.$$

If we have equality, then $K = L$.

We now proceed with the extension of mixed volume to arbitrary measures, which is as follows: given $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ and $\mu \in \Lambda$, one has

$$(13) \quad \mu(K, L) = \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(K + \epsilon L) - \mu(K)}{\epsilon},$$

(see, for example, [65, 57, 36, 54] for recent uses of this definition). From the definition, one has that $\mu(K, tL) = t\mu(K, L)$, and, if μ is α -homogeneous, that is for $t > 0$, $\mu(tA) = t^\alpha\mu(A)$ for Borel sets, one then has $\mu(tK, L) = t^{\alpha-1}\mu(K, L)$. Also, we see that

$$\mu(tK, K) = \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu((t + \epsilon)K) - \mu(tK)}{\epsilon} = \frac{d\mu(tK)}{dt};$$

where the limit infimum is equal to the limit since $q(t) = \mu(tK)$ is a non-decreasing function in t . Since $q(0) = 0$, one then has

$$(14) \quad \mu(K) = \int_0^1 \mu(tK, K) dt.$$

From the definition, one can extend Equation 3, Minkowski's Inequality, to arbitrary measures, as shown in [57]. We replicate the proof here for completeness.

Theorem 2.3 (Minkowski's Inequality for F -Concave Measures, [57]). *Let μ be a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n , such that μ is F -concave, F is differentiable, with respect to a class of Borel sets \mathcal{C} . Then, for every $K, L \in \mathcal{C}$, one has that:*

$$\mu(K, L) \geq \mu(K, K) + \frac{F(\mu(L)) - F(\mu(K))}{F'(\mu(K))}.$$

Proof. In Equation 10, consider not K but $K_\lambda = \frac{K}{1-\lambda}$. Then we have that $\mu(K + \lambda L) = \mu((1 - \lambda)K_\lambda + \lambda L) \geq F^{-1}((1 - \lambda)F(\mu(K_\lambda)) + \lambda F(\mu(L)))$. Notice that we obtain equality when $\lambda = 0$, primarily we obtain $\mu(K)$. We must then have that the far left grows faster than the far right at $\lambda = 0$; from the chain rule, product rule and inverse function theory, we obtain

$$\mu(K, L) = \liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(K + \lambda L) - \mu(K)}{\lambda} \geq \frac{F(\mu(L)) - F(\mu(K))}{F'(\mu(K))} + \frac{1}{F'(\mu(K))} \left((1 - \lambda) \frac{d}{d\lambda} [F(\mu(K_\lambda))] \right) \Big|_{\lambda=0}.$$

From the fact that $\frac{d}{d\lambda} [F(\mu(K_\lambda))] \Big|_{\lambda=0} = F'(\mu(K)) \frac{d\mu(K_\lambda)}{d\lambda} \Big|_{\lambda=0}$, we have our claim, since, from the chain rule, $\frac{d\mu(K_\lambda)}{d\lambda} \Big|_{\lambda=0} = \mu(K, K)$. □

We will establish equality conditions of Theorem 2.3 below, after establishing an extension of Aleksandrov's variational formula to arbitrary measures. This will be done using variational techniques following [33]. One has that, up to a set of spherical Lebesgue measures zero, the map $r_K : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \rightarrow \partial K$ given by $r_K(u) = \rho_K(u)u$ is well-defined. For future use, we shall compute the Jacobian of the coordinate transformation r_K ; first recall the following proposition from [38].

Proposition 2.4 (Lemma 2.9 in [38]). *Fix a convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$. Suppose $f : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$. Then,*

$$(15) \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) \rho_K^n(u) du = \int_{\partial' K} \langle x, n_K(x) \rangle f\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right) dx.$$

Proposition 2.5. *For $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$, the Jacobian of $r_K : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \rightarrow \partial K$ is $\frac{\rho_K^n(u)}{h_K(n_K(r_K(u)))}$ up to a set of measure zero.*

Proof. For non-negative $F \in L_1(\partial K)$, we set $f(u) = \frac{F(r_K(u))}{h_K(n_K(r_K(u)))}$ in Equation 15. Then, one obtains

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} F(r_K(u)) \frac{\rho_K^n(u)}{h_K(n_K(r_K(u)))} du = \int_{\partial' K} \langle x, n_K(x) \rangle \frac{F\left(r_K\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right)\right)}{h_K\left(n_K\left(r_K\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right)\right)\right)} dx.$$

Where the integral on the left-hand side is understood to be over

$$\mathbb{S}^{n-1} \setminus \{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} : n_K(r_K(u)) \text{ is not well-defined}\}.$$

Notice on ∂K that $r_K\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right) = \rho_K\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right) \frac{x}{|x|} = \rho_K(x)x = x$. Furthermore, one has $\langle x, n_K(x) \rangle = h_K(n_K(x))$. Hence,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} F(r_K(u)) \frac{\rho_K^n(u)}{h_K(n_K(r_K(u)))} du = \int_{\partial' K} F(x) dx = \int_{\partial K} F(x) dx.$$

□

In [38], the concept of a logarithmic family of Wulff shapes was introduced: for $h, f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ and some small δ , define a function $h_t : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ via

$$(16) \quad \log(h_t(u)) = \log(h(u)) + tf(u) + o(t, u)$$

where $o(t, u)/t \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$ for all $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Then, the Wulff shapes $[h_t]$ are said to be the logarithmic family of Wulff shapes formed by the pair (h, f) . It was shown in Lemma 4.3 of [38] that the radial functions of a logarithmic family satisfy, for almost all $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, the following limit:

$$\left. \frac{d \log \rho_{[h_t]}(u)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\log \rho_{[h_t]}(u) - \log \rho_{[h]}(u)}{t} = f(n_{[h]}(r_{[h]}(u))),$$

and, furthermore, one has that there exists some $M > 0$ such that

$$|\log \rho_{[h_t]}(u) - \log \rho_{[h]}(u)| < M|t|$$

for every $|t| < \delta$. Using this result, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 2.6 (First Variation of Radial Functions of Wulff Shapes). *Consider a convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$, $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ and δ small enough such that*

$$h_t(u) = h_K(u) + tf(u)$$

is positive for all $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and $|t| < \delta$. Then, one has, for almost all $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ up to a set of spherical Lebesgue measure zero, that

$$\left. \frac{d\rho_{[h_t]}(u)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\rho_{[h_t]}(u) - \rho_K(u)}{t} = \frac{f(n_K(r_K(u)))}{h_K(n_K(r_K(u)))} \rho_K(u),$$

and, furthermore, one has that there exists some $M > 0$ such that

$$|\rho_{[h_t]}(u) - \rho_K(u)| < M|t|$$

for all $|t| < \delta$.

Proof. We have that, for a fixed u , h_t is a linear function in t , positive in some neighborhood of zero. Thus, we can take the Taylor series expansion of $\log(h_t)$:

$$\log(h_t) = \log(h_K) + \frac{tf}{h_K} + o(t).$$

Therefore, we see h_t is a logarithmic family of the pair $(h_K, \frac{f}{h_K})$. Consequently, from [38, Lemma 4.3], we have for almost all $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ that

$$\left. \frac{d \log \rho_{[h_t]}(u)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = \frac{f(n_K(r_K(u)))}{h_K(n_K(r_K(u)))}.$$

However, from the chain rule, we also have

$$\left. \frac{d \log \rho_{[h_t]}(u)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = \rho_{[h_t]}^{-1}(u) \Big|_{t=0} \left. \frac{d\rho_{[h_t]}(u)}{dt} \right|_{t=0}.$$

Solving for $\left. \frac{d\rho_{[h_t]}(u)}{dt} \right|_{t=0}$ yields the first claim. This implies that for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta = \delta(\epsilon) > 0$ such that, when $|t| < \delta$:

$$\left| \left| \frac{\rho_{[h_t]}(u) - \rho_K(u)}{t} \right| - \left| \frac{d\rho_{[h_t]}(u)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \right| \leq \left| \frac{\rho_{[h_t]}(u) - \rho_K(u)}{t} - \frac{d\rho_{[h_t]}(u)}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \right| \leq \epsilon.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\left| \frac{\rho_{[h_t]}(u) - \rho_K(u)}{t} \right| \leq \left| \frac{d\rho_{[h_t]}(u)}{dt} \right| + \epsilon = \rho_K(u) \left| \frac{d \log \rho_{[h_t]}(u)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} + \epsilon.$$

But, from Lemma 4.3 of [38], we have that there exists a constant $A > 0$ such that

$$|\log \rho_{[h_t]}(u) - \log \rho_K(u)| < A|t|.$$

Dividing through by t and taking the limit as $t \rightarrow 0$ then yields $\left| \frac{d \log \rho_{[h_t]}(u)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} < A$. Thus, fixing a small ϵ and setting $M = A \max_{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \rho_K(u) + \epsilon$ yields the second claim. \square

We would like to mention that the first variation of support functions of Wulff shapes was done by Saroglou, Soprunov and Zvavitch in [74], where they obtained

$$\left. \frac{dh_{[h_t]}(u)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{h_{[h_t]}(u) - h_K(u)}{t} = f(u).$$

Lemma 2.7 (Aleksandrov's Variational Formula For Arbitrary Measures). *Let $\mu \in \Lambda$ with density ϕ . Then, for $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$, one has that*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu([h_K + tf]) - \mu(K)}{t} = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) dS_{\mu, K}(u).$$

Proof. Begin by writing in polar coordinates, with $h_t = h_K + tf$:

$$\mu([h_t]) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int_0^{\rho_{[h_t]}(u)} \phi(ru) r^{n-1} dr du = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} F_t(u) du,$$

where $F_t(u) = \int_0^{\rho_{[h_t]}(u)} \phi(ru) r^{n-1} dr$. First observe that $\left. \frac{dF_t}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = F'_0$ exists by the Lebesgue differentiation theorem; by denoting $I = [\rho_K(u), \rho_{[h_t]}(u)]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{F_t(u) - F_0(u)}{t} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \int_I \phi(ru) r^{n-1} dr = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\rho_{[h_t]}(u) - \rho_K(u)}{t} \frac{1}{|I|} \int_I \phi(ru) r^{n-1} dr \\ &= \phi(r_K(u)) \frac{f(n_K(r_K(u)))}{h_K(n_K(r_K(u)))} \rho_K^n(u). \end{aligned}$$

for almost all $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ via Lemma 2.6. But also, since

$$\frac{f(n_K(r_K(u)))}{h_K(n_K(r_K(u)))} \rho_K(u) = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\rho_{[h_t]}(u) - \rho_K(u)}{t} \leq M$$

for some $M > 0$, via Lemma 2.6, we have that the derivative is dominated by the integrable function $M \left(\max_{u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \rho_K(u) \right)^{n-1} \phi(r_K(u))$. Thus, our claim follows from using dominated convergence to differentiate underneath the integral sign:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} F'_0(u) du &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \phi(r_K(u)) \frac{f(n_K(r_K(u)))}{h_K(n_K(r_K(u)))} \rho_K^n(u) du \\ &= \int_{\partial' K} \phi(y) f(n_K(y)) dy = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) dS_{\mu, K}(u), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from Proposition 2.5 and the third equality follows from the Gauss map. \square

Theorem 2.8 (Representation of Mixed Measures). *Let $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ and suppose $\mu \in \Lambda$ with density ϕ . Then, one has that*

$$(17) \quad \mu(K, L) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u) dS_{\mu, K}(u) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u) \phi(n_K^{-1}(u)) f_K(u) du,$$

where the second equality holds if K is of class C_+^2 .

Proof. In Lemma 2.7, set $f = h_L$ for $L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$. \square

In [57], Equation 17 was obtained using a different approach, what is known as the second Nazarov coordinate system. The advantage of the approach done here is that we were able to establish Lemma 2.7 first. In fact, in [37], the second Nazarov coordinate system was also used to prove Lemma 2.7 in the case of origin symmetric K . Kolesnikov and Milman have previously shown the case of Lemma 2.7 for log-concave measures [53].

Remark 2.9. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ be of class C_+^2 . Then, from Equations 14 and 17 we can write

$$\mu(K) = \int_0^1 \mu(tK, K) dt = \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_K(u) \phi(tn_K^{-1}(u)) dS_{tK}(u)$$

and use that, in this instance, $dS_{tK}(u) = t^{n-1} f_K(u) du$ along with Fubini's theorem to obtain the representation

$$(18) \quad \mu(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_K(u) f_K(u) \int_0^1 t^{n-1} \phi(tn_K^{-1}(u)) dt du.$$

which can be found in various places (e.g. [15, 52, 57]).

Remark 2.10. Equations 15 and 17 yield

$$(19) \quad \mu(K, K) = n \int_K \phi(\rho_K(x)x) dx.$$

We are now able to establish equality conditions in Minkowski's inequality, which we will see is connected to the equality conditions of Equation 10.

Corollary 2.11 (Minkowski's Inequality - Concavity link). Let $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ and suppose $\mu \in \Lambda$ such that μ is F -concave and F is differentiable. Then,

$$\mu(K, L) = \mu(K, K) + \frac{F(\mu(L)) - F(\mu(K))}{F'(\mu(K))},$$

if, and only if, there is equality in Equation 10.

Proof. Suppose there is equality in Equation 10. Then, one has

$$F \circ \mu(\lambda L + (1 - \lambda)K) - \lambda F \circ \mu(L) - (1 - \lambda)F \circ \mu(K) = 0, \text{ for } \lambda \in [0, 1].$$

Differentiating in λ yields

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} F \circ \mu(\lambda L + (1 - \lambda)K) = F \circ \mu(L) - F \circ \mu(K).$$

Using the chain rule and evaluating at $\lambda = 0$ yields

$$F'(\mu(K)) \frac{d}{d\lambda} \mu([\lambda h_L + (1 - \lambda)h_K]) \Big|_{\lambda=0} = F \circ \mu(L) - F \circ \mu(K).$$

Where we used that $(1 - \lambda)K + \lambda L$ is the Wulff shape of the function $\lambda h_L + (1 - \lambda)h_K$. But notice that

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} \mu([\lambda h_L + (1 - \lambda)h_K]) \Big|_{\lambda=0} = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_L(u) - h_K(u)) dS_{\mu, K}(u),$$

from Lemma 2.7, with $f = h_L - h_K$. Since we have that $\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_L(u) - h_K(u)) dS_{\mu, K}(u) = \mu(K, L) - \mu(K, K)$ from Equation 17, we have equality in Minkowski's inequality, Theorem 2.3. Conversely, suppose we have equality in Theorem 2.3. Then, by running the argument backwards, this implies that

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} F \circ \mu(\lambda L + (1 - \lambda)K) \Big|_{\lambda=0} = F \circ \mu(L) - F \circ \mu(K).$$

Next, let $f(t) = F(\mu((1 - t)K + tL))$, which is either concave or convex by hypothesis, and denote the linear function $g(t) = (1 - t)F(\mu(K)) + tF(\mu(L))$. We have that $f(0) = g(0)$ and $f(1) = g(1)$.

However, we have also shown that $f'(0) = g'(0)$. From the concavity of f or $-f$, it follows that $f = g$ on $[0, 1]$. \square

We now work to establish Minkowski's existence theorem, that is resolve Question 1 for a certain class of measures. We shall first establish uniqueness.

Proposition 2.12. *Let $\mu \in \Lambda$ be F -concave such that F is differentiable. Suppose $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ such that*

$$dS_{\mu, K} = dS_{\mu, L}.$$

Then

$$\frac{F(\mu(L)) - F(\mu(K))}{F'(\mu(K))} \leq \frac{F(\mu(L)) - F(\mu(K))}{F'(\mu(L))}.$$

Proof. From Theorem 2.3, one has that

$$\mu(K, L) - \mu(K, K) \geq \frac{F(\mu(L)) - F(\mu(K))}{F'(\mu(K))}.$$

From the symmetry of the expression, we also have

$$\mu(L, K) - \mu(L, L) \geq \frac{F(\mu(K)) - F(\mu(L))}{F'(\mu(L))}.$$

Inserting the integral representation from Equation 17, we then have

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_L(u) - h_K(u)) dS_{\mu, K}(u) \geq \frac{F(\mu(L)) - F(\mu(K))}{F'(\mu(K))}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} (h_K(u) - h_L(u)) dS_{\mu, L}(u) \geq \frac{F(\mu(K)) - F(\mu(L))}{F'(\mu(L))}.$$

Multiplying the second expression by -1 and using that $dS_{\mu, K}(u) = dS_{\mu, L}(u)$ by hypothesis yields the result. \square

Remark 2.13. *If $\mu(K) = \mu(L)$ and $dS_{\mu, K} = dS_{\mu, L}$, we obtain equality in Minkowski's inequality. Thus, by Corollary 2.11, we have equality in Equation 10.*

We next provide an example of dropping the assumption $\mu(K) = \mu(L)$ by instead putting restriction on the function F .

Lemma 2.14. *Let $\mu \in \Lambda$ be F -concave such that F is differentiable and there exists some $a \geq 0$ such that, for every $b, c \in [a, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n))$ one has $(F(b) - F(c))(F'(b) - F'(c)) \geq 0$, $F'(b)F'(c) > 0$, and $F'(b) \neq F'(c)$. Suppose $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ such that*

$$dS_{\mu, K} = dS_{\mu, L}.$$

If $\mu(K), \mu(L) \geq a$, then $\mu(K) = \mu(L)$ and there is equality in Equation 10.

Proof. From Proposition 2.12 we can write

$$\frac{F(\mu(L)) - F(\mu(K))}{F'(\mu(K))} \leq \frac{F(\mu(L)) - F(\mu(K))}{F'(\mu(L))};$$

this yields upon re-arrangement that $(F(\mu(L)) - F(\mu(K)))(F'(\mu(L)) - F'(\mu(K))) \leq 0$, since $F'(\mu(K))F'(\mu(L)) > 0$. However, by hypothesis, we also have

$(F(\mu(L)) - F(\mu(K)))(F'(\mu(L)) - F'(\mu(K))) \geq 0$. Hence, we have equality, and so $F(\mu(K)) = F(\mu(L))$ which means $\mu(K) = \mu(L)$. Furthermore, equality is obtained in Minkowski's inequality, and so, by Corollary 2.11, we then have equality in Equation 10 \square

Example 2.15. In Lemma 2.14, the following satisfy the requirements of F :

- (1) F is an increasing, strictly convex function on $[a, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n))$.
- (2) F is a decreasing, strictly concave function on $[a, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

Using Lemma 2.14, we immediately obtain a result for the standard Gaussian measure on \mathbb{R}^n . Notice that the function $\Phi^{-1}(x)$ from Ehrhard's inequality, Equation 11, is strictly increasing on $[0, 1]$, as $\frac{d\Phi^{-1}(x)}{dx} = \sqrt{2\pi}e^{\frac{(\Phi^{-1}(x))^2}{2}}$. Furthermore, one has $\frac{d^2\Phi^{-1}(x)}{dx^2} = 2\pi\Phi^{-1}(x)e^{(\Phi^{-1}(x))^2}$; therefore $(\Phi^{-1})'(x)$ is strictly increasing on $[1/2, 1]$, that is $\Phi^{-1}(x)$ is convex on $[1/2, 1]$. By Item 1 in Example 2.15, the hypotheses of Lemma 2.14 are satisfied. Notice the equality conditions of Equation 11 are $K = L$. Thus, we obtain the result of Huang, Xi and Zhao [39] from Lemma 2.14, with $F(x) = \Phi^{-1}(x)$, the Ehrhard function.

Theorem 2.16. Suppose $K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n$ such that $\gamma_n(K), \gamma_n(L) \geq 1/2$ and

$$dS_{\gamma_n, K} = dS_{\gamma_n, L}.$$

Then, one has $K = L$.

We now wish to state uniqueness for p -concave, α -homogeneous measures, $\alpha > 0$. However, unfortunately the function $F(x) = x^p$ is increasing for all $p > 0$ but $F'(x)$ is decreasing for $p < 1$, and therefore for such p we cannot appeal to Lemma 2.14.

Proposition 2.17. Let $\mu \in \Lambda$ be even, α -homogeneous, $\alpha > 0$, and p -concave. Suppose $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ satisfy

$$dS_{\mu, K}(u) = dS_{\mu, L}(u).$$

Then,

$$\mu(K) - \mu(L) \geq \frac{\mu^p(K) - \mu^p(L)}{\alpha p \mu^{p-1}(L)}.$$

Proof. From Equation 14, we can write

$$\alpha\mu(K) = \alpha \int_0^1 \mu(tK, K) dt = \mu(K, K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_K(u) dS_{\mu, K}(u) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_K(u) dS_{\mu, L}(u) = \mu(L, K).$$

The result is immediate from Minkowski's inequality, Theorem 2.3. \square

We now provide an instance where we obtain that the two convex bodies must coincide.

Lemma 2.18. Let $\mu \in \Lambda$ be even, α -homogeneous, $\alpha > 0$, and $p = 1/\alpha$ -concave. Suppose $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ satisfy

$$dS_{\mu, K}(u) = dS_{\mu, L}(u).$$

Then, $\mu(K) = \mu(L)$ and $K = aL + b$ μ -almost everywhere for some $a \in \mathbb{R}, b \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.17, with $p\alpha = 1$, we have from the symmetry of the result that

$$\left(\frac{\mu(K)}{\mu(L)}\right)^{1-p} \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \geq \left(\frac{\mu(K)}{\mu(L)}\right)^{1-p},$$

so $\mu(K) = \mu(L)$ and we have equality in Minkowski's inequality, Theorem 2.3. Thus, by Corollary 2.11 there is equality in Equation 10. By Proposition 2.2, $K = aL + b$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$. \square

Remark 2.19. In Lemma 2.18, if K and L are centered, then $b = 0$, where a convex body is centered if the vector $\int_K x dx$ is the origin. Since Lemma 2.18 concludes with $\mu(K) = \mu(L)$, we also have $|a| = 1$. Thus, if K and L are centered, then one has $K = L$ up to a reflection.

In general, for $p\alpha < 1$, the conclusion of Lemma 2.18 fails to hold. However, suppose μ is an α -homogeneous measure such that $\alpha \geq n$. Then, we have that μ being α -homogeneous implies ϕ , the density of μ , is $r = \alpha - n \geq 0$ -homogeneous. Furthermore, if μ is p -concave, then from the Borell classification of concave functions [6], one has ϕ is $s = \frac{p}{1-pn}$ concave. Since $p \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \leq \frac{1}{n}$, ϕ has a positive concavity. The following proposition from [57] will be of great use:

Proposition 2.20 (Proposition 0.5. in [57]). *For $s > 0$ and $r > 0$, let $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be s -concave and r -homogeneous. Then, g is also $1/r$ -concave.*

We have ϕ is $1/r$ -concave, which yields μ is $1/(n+r) = 1/\alpha$ -concave. Thus, if μ is p -concave and α -homogeneous, $\alpha \geq n$, then μ is also $1/\alpha$ -concave. In this instance, using Theorem 2.3 for an α -homogeneous measure with $F(x) = x^{1/\alpha}$ yields a result similar to Equation 3:

$$(20) \quad \mu(K, L) \geq \alpha \mu(K)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \mu(L)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}.$$

This was first obtained by Milman and Rotem in [65], who stated it in the form of a function that is r -homogeneous, $1/r$ -concave, that generates a measure that is $q = \frac{1}{n+r}$ -concave and $(n+r)$ -homogeneous. The two formulations are equivalent via Borell's classification, with $\alpha = n+r$. We conclude by stating the following.

Theorem 2.21. *Let $\mu \in \Lambda$ be even, α -homogeneous, p -concave, where either $\alpha \geq n$ and $p > 0$, or $\alpha < n$ but $p = \frac{1}{\alpha}$. Suppose symmetric $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ satisfy*

$$dS_{\mu, K}(u) = dS_{\mu, L}(u).$$

Then, $K = L$.

Proof. If $\alpha < n$, then μ is $1/\alpha$ -concave by hypothesis. If $\alpha \geq n$, then, from Proposition 2.20, μ is also $1/\alpha$ -concave. In either case, we can apply Lemma 2.18. \square

Theorem 2.21 was first obtained by Livshyts in [57] using Proposition 2.20 and then Equation 20. Having discussed uniqueness, we are now ready to establish Minkowski's existence theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We follow a technique from [33], which, in turn, is a variation of a technique used by Chou and Wang, [14]. Let $\beta \in (0, \infty)$ so that $\mu \in \Lambda'$, and define the following functional on the set of even functions in $C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$:

$$(21) \quad \psi_{\nu, \beta}(f) = \frac{n}{\beta} \mu([f])^{\frac{\beta}{n}} - \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) d\nu(u).$$

Notice that, for an even, positive function $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, $[f]$ is a symmetric convex body, and $h_{[f]}(u) \leq f(u)$ for all $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. We also see that, since $[h_{[f]}] = [f]$, one obtains

$$\psi_{\nu, \beta}(h_{[f]}) = \frac{n}{\beta} \mu([f])^{\frac{\beta}{n}} - \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{[f]}(u) d\nu(u) \geq \frac{n}{\beta} \mu([f])^{\frac{\beta}{n}} - \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) d\nu(u) = \psi_{\nu, \beta}(f).$$

Thus, a maximiser of ψ is the support function of a symmetric convex body. We first show that the convex body associated with a maximiser satisfies the claim, and then show the existence of the maximiser. Among the $\beta \in (0, \infty)$ so that $\mu \in \Lambda'$, fix one of them and let h_{K_β} be the associated maximiser of $\psi_{\nu, \beta}$; thus K_β is symmetric. For even $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, pick δ small enough so that, for $|t| < \delta$, the function $h_t(u) = h_{K_\beta}(u) + tf(u)$ is positive for all $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Viewing $\psi_{\nu, \beta}(h_t)$ as a function of one variable in t , we must have that $\psi_{\nu, \beta}(h_t)$ has an extremum at $t = 0$, and so

$$\left. \frac{d\psi_{\nu, \beta}(h_t)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = 0.$$

On the other hand, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left. \frac{d\psi_{\nu, \beta}(h_t)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = \mu(K_\beta)^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1} \left. \frac{d}{dt} \mu([h_t]) \right|_{t=0} - \left. \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_t(u) d\nu(u) \right|_{t=0} \\ &= \mu(K_\beta)^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) dS_{\mu, K_\beta}(u) - \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) d\nu(u), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from Equation 17. Re-arranging, we then see

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) d\nu(u) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) \left[\mu(K_\beta)^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1} dS_{\mu, K_\beta}(u) \right].$$

Since continuous functions are dense in $L^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, the above is true for all even $f \in L^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. We then have via the Riesz Representation theorem that

$$d\nu(u) = \mu(K_\beta)^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1} dS_{\mu, K_\beta}(u),$$

as required. We now work towards the existence of a maximiser. We will first consider dilates of the unit ball. Begin by defining the function

$$(22) \quad q_\beta(\nu, r) := \psi_{\nu, \beta}(h_{rB_2^n}) = \frac{n}{\beta} \mu(rB_2^n)^{\frac{\beta}{n}} - r\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}),$$

From the condition that $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu(rB_2^n)^{\frac{\beta}{n}}}{r} = 0$, one has that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} q_\beta(\nu, r) = -\infty.$$

Since $\mu \in \Lambda$, there exists some r_0^* such that $q_\beta(\nu, r) < 0$ for $r > r_0^*$. From the condition that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(rB_2^n)^{\frac{\beta}{n}}}{r} = \infty$, we have r_0^* is strictly greater than zero, i.e. there exists some r_0 such that $q_\beta(\nu, r) > 0$ for $r \in (0, r_0)$. Since $q_\beta(\nu, r)$ may oscillate in sign on the interval $[r_0, r_0^*]$, we set $R_0 = \sup\{r \in \mathbb{R}^+ : q_\beta(\nu, r) > 0\}$, which is finite by the existence of r_0^* . So we have shown there exist convex bodies where $\psi_{\nu, \beta}$ is positive. We now show that it suffices to look for the maximiser contained in a (fixed) ball of some radius. Observe that the map, for $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$,

$$\theta \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle \theta, u \rangle| d\nu(u)$$

is strictly positive, since ν is not concentrated on any hemisphere. Since ν is finite, we can find a constant C_ν such that

$$\frac{1}{\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle \theta, u \rangle| d\nu(u) \geq C_\nu > 0.$$

Furthermore, one has that $C_\nu \leq 1$ since $|\langle \theta, u \rangle| \leq 1$.

Fix a symmetric $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$. Since K is a star body, $\rho_K(\theta)$ is continuous, and so there exists some $\theta_K \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ such that $\rho_K(\theta_K)$ is maximal. One has that the line segment $[-\rho_K(\theta_K)\theta_K, \rho_K(\theta_K)\theta_K]$ is completely contained in K , and yet K is contained in the ball of radius $\rho_K(\theta_K)$. Furthermore, from convexity, one has $h_K(u) \geq \langle \rho_K(\theta_K)\theta_K, u \rangle$ for all $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, and so from the symmetry of K one has $h_K(u) \geq \rho_K(\theta_K)|\langle \theta_K, u \rangle|$.

We can now directly compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\nu, \beta}(h_K) &\leq \frac{n}{\beta} \mu(K)^{\frac{\beta}{n}} - \rho_K(\theta_K) \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle \theta_K, u \rangle| d\nu(u) \\ &< \frac{n}{\beta} \mu(K)^{\frac{\beta}{n}} - \rho_K(\theta_K) C_{\nu} \nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \leq \frac{n}{\beta} \mu(\rho_K(\theta_K) B_2^n)^{\frac{\beta}{n}} - \rho_K(\theta_K) C_{\nu} \nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \\ &= q_{\beta}(C_{\nu} \nu, \rho_K(\theta_K)). \end{aligned}$$

Repeating the above analysis on $q_{\beta}(C_{\nu} \nu, \rho_K(\theta_K))$, there exists $r_1^*, r_1 > 0$ such that $q_{\beta}(C_{\nu} \nu, r) < 0$ for $r > r_1^*$ and $q_{\beta}(C_{\nu} \nu, r) > 0$ for $r < r_1$. We then set $R = \sup\{r \in \mathbb{R}^+ : q_{\beta}(C_{\nu} \nu, r) > 0\}$, which is finite by the existence of r_1^* ; we remark that, since $q_{\beta}(C_{\nu} \nu, r)$ dominates $q_{\beta}(\nu, r)$, one has $0 < r_0 \leq R_0 \leq R < \infty$. It follows that R is the largest possible radius where

$$\psi_{\nu, \beta}(h_K) > 0 \rightarrow K \subset RB_2^n.$$

Thus, we can restrict our search for the maximiser to the set

$$\mathcal{F} = \{K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n : K = -K, K \subset RB_2^n\}.$$

We have that $\sup\{\psi_{\nu, \beta}(h_K) : K \in \mathcal{F}\} > 0$ by the construction of R . Let $\{K_i\} \subset \mathcal{K}_0^n$ be a sequence of convex bodies so that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \psi_{\nu, \beta}(h_{K_i}) = \sup\{\psi_{\nu, \beta}(h_K) : K \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Via Blaschke selection, there exists some $K_{\beta} \in \mathcal{F}$ and a sub-sequence $\{K_{i_j}\} \subset \{K_i\}$ such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \psi_{\nu, \beta}(h_{K_{i_j}}) = \psi_{\nu, \beta}(h_{K_{\beta}})$, and so $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{i_j} = K_{\beta}$ with respect to the Hausdorff metric. By construction, $\psi_{\nu, \beta}(f) \leq \psi_{\nu, \beta}(h_{K_{\beta}})$ for all $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, and hence by our previous analysis, K_{β} is symmetric and a maximiser. Finally, we see that, from the definition of \mathcal{F} ,

$$\frac{n}{\beta} \mu(K_{\beta})^{\frac{\beta}{n}} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n}{\beta} \mu(K_{i_j})^{\frac{\beta}{n}} \geq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \psi_{\nu, \beta}(h_{K_{i_j}}) > 0,$$

and so K_{β} has non-empty interior, and is thus a convex body in the proper sense. \square

Remark 2.22. *The following weaker version of Theorem 1.1 holds: Let $\mu \in \Lambda$ be even. Next, let ν be a finite, even Borel measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} that is not concentrated on any hemisphere, such that μ, ν and some $\beta \in (0, \infty)$ satisfy the following relations:*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu(rB_2^n)^{\frac{\beta}{n}}}{r} < \nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$$

and there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that, for every $r \in (0, \delta)$ one has

$$\frac{\mu(rB_2^n)^{\frac{\beta}{n}}}{r} \geq \nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}).$$

Then, there exists a symmetric convex body K such that

$$d\nu(u) = \mu(K)^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1} dS_{\mu, K}(u).$$

We now show an example on how one cannot expect to remove the constant $\mu(K)^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}$ in general.

Example 2.23. Let $t > 0$, and let $d\nu(u) = tdu$. Then for $t > 0$ large enough, there does not exist a $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ satisfying

$$d\nu(u) = dS_{\gamma_n, K}(u).$$

Indeed, $S_{\gamma_n, K}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ is bounded above by $4n^{\frac{1}{4}}$ [3, 67], but $\nu(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ can be made arbitrarily large.

We next provide an example where the constant $\mu(K)^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}$ can be removed; we shall show the case of $\mu \in \Lambda$ where μ is α -homogeneous, $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$.

Lemma 2.24. Let $\mu \in \Lambda$ be even, α -homogeneous, $\alpha > 0$, $\alpha \neq 1$. Suppose ν is a finite, even measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} not concentrated on any hemisphere. Then, there exists a symmetric $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ such that

$$d\nu = dS_{\mu, K}.$$

Proof. From the homogeneity we obtain that

$$\frac{\mu(rB_2^n)^{\frac{\beta}{n}}}{r} = \mu(B_2^n)r^{\frac{\beta\alpha}{n}-1}.$$

Thus, we must have $\beta < \frac{n}{\alpha}$ for μ to be in Λ' . Set, for example, $\beta = \frac{n}{2\alpha}$. Hence, by Theorem 1.1, there exists a symmetric convex body \tilde{K} such that

$$d\nu(u) = \mu(\tilde{K})^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1} dS_{\mu, \tilde{K}}(u).$$

We have that $dS_{\mu, L}(u)$ is $(\alpha - 1)$ -homogeneous (in the argument L) for $L \in \mathcal{K}^n$. Indeed, it suffices to show for L of class C_+^2 . Then, one has that $t^{n-1}dS_L(u) = dS_{tL}(u)$ for $t > 0$. Thus, we obtain, using that $n_{tL}^{-1}(u) = tn_L^{-1}(u)$ and the $(\alpha - n)$ -homogeneity of ϕ ,

$$dS_{\mu, tL}(u) = \phi(n_{tL}^{-1}(u)) dS_{tL}(u) = t^{n-1}t^{\alpha-n}\phi(n_L^{-1}(u)) dS_L(u) = t^{\alpha-1}dS_{\mu, L}(u).$$

Next, let A be such that

$$A^{\alpha-1} = \mu(\tilde{K})^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1},$$

that is $A = \mu(\tilde{K})^{\frac{\beta-n}{n(\alpha-1)}}$. Set $K = A\tilde{K}$. We directly compute:

$$d\nu(u) = A^{\alpha-1}dS_{\mu, \tilde{K}}(u) = dS_{\mu, A\tilde{K}}(u) = dS_{\mu, K}(u),$$

as claimed. \square

Remark 2.25. For a measure that is 1-homogeneous, the surface area measure $dS_{\mu, L}(u)$ is 0-homogeneous; therefore, the above schema fails, and this case remains open.

Combining existence and uniqueness, we can extend the result of Livshyts [57]:

Theorem 2.26. Let $\mu \in \Lambda$ be even, p -concave, and α -homogeneous so that $\alpha \neq 1$ and either $\alpha \geq n$, $p > 0$ or $\alpha < n$ but $p = \frac{1}{\alpha}$. Suppose ν is a finite, even measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} not concentrated on any hemisphere. Then, there exists a unique symmetric $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ such that

$$d\nu = dS_{\mu, K}.$$

Proof. From Lemma 2.24, we know there exists a symmetric $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ such that $d\nu = dS_{\mu, K}$. Suppose there exists another symmetric $L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ such that $d\nu = dS_{\mu, L}$. Then $dS_{\mu, L} = dS_{\mu, K}$, and so $K = L$ from Lemma 2.18. \square

We conclude this section by remarking that it was brought to our attention by Zvavitch that some of the above endeavours have been previously done specifically for the Gaussian measure γ_n in [39]. In particular, Theorem 2.16 is presented following the same calculations as Lemma 2.14. Lemma 2.7 and Theorem 1.1 also appear specifically for the Gaussian measure, but both proofs presented in [39] use the measure's specific properties. Therefore, despite both referencing the same technique from [33], the proofs presented in [39] seemingly do not generalize directly to what is presented here.

3. CLASSIFICATION RESULTS FOR MEASURE-DEPENDENT PROJECTION BODIES

We begin this section with a discussion of the cosine transform.

Definition 3.1. *Let $f \in L^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. Then, the cosine transform of f is given by*

$$\mathcal{C}(f)(\theta) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle \theta, u \rangle| f(u) du.$$

For a signed Borel measure ν on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , the cosine transform of ν is given by

$$\mathcal{C}(d\nu)(\theta) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle \theta, u \rangle| d\nu.$$

The cosine transform also has a well-known uniqueness property, which we list in the following lemma. We denote f^+ to be the even part of f , that is

$$f^+(x) = \frac{f(x) + f(-x)}{2}.$$

Lemma 3.2 (Funk-Hecke Theorem for the Cosine Transform, [32]). *Suppose F_1, F_2 are two bounded, integrable functions or two signed measures on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . One has that*

$$\mathcal{C}(F_1)(\theta) = \mathcal{C}(F_2)(\theta)$$

for every $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ if, and only if, $F_1^+(u) = F_2^+(u)$ for almost all $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$.

The cosine transform is intimately related with the Fourier transform. The following can be found in [46, 43, 44, 45]. The set \mathcal{S} denotes the Schwarz class of functions, that is the class of functions that are infinitely differentiable, rapidly decreasing and go from $\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. A function $f \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ acts on \mathcal{S} via integration: for $\psi \in \mathcal{S}$ one has $\langle f, \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{S}} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(y)\psi(y)dy$. The Fourier transform of f , denoted \widehat{f} , is the function defined via

$$\langle \widehat{f}, \widehat{\psi} \rangle_{\mathcal{S}} = (2\pi)^n \langle f, \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{S}}$$

for every $\psi \in \mathcal{S}$, where $\widehat{\psi}$ is the standard Fourier transform of ψ . For ν a Borel measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , one has the $(-n-1)$ -homogeneous extension of ν , ν_e to be defined as

$$\langle d\nu_e, \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{S}} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \langle r^{-2}, \psi(r\xi) \rangle_{\mathcal{S}} d\nu(\xi),$$

where, if $0 \notin \text{supp}(\psi)$,

$$\langle r^{-2}, \psi(r\xi) \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} r^{-2} \psi(r\xi) dr.$$

If the density of ν is $g \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, then the $(-n-1)$ -homogeneous extension of g is, by slightly abusing notation, $g(x) = |x|^{-n-1}g(x/|x|)$. In this instance, the Fourier transform of $d\nu_e$ is the Fourier

transform of g . Throughout the remainder of this paper, the Fourier transform of a measure or a function on the sphere will always be understood as the Fourier transform of the $(-n-1)$ -homogeneous extension. We now state a well known lemma, a modern proof of which can be found in [46].

Lemma 3.3 (Fourier transform). *Let g be an even continuous function on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . Then, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, define*

$$h(x) := \mathcal{C}(g)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle x, \theta \rangle| g(\theta) d\theta.$$

Then, one has $\widehat{h}(\theta) = -4(2\pi)^{n-1}g(\theta)$ for every $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$.

One obtains the following immediate corollary [44].

Corollary 3.4 (Fourier Transform of Measures). *Consider a measure ν on Borel sets of \mathbb{S}^{n-1} with density g . Then, the Fourier transform of g is given by*

$$(23) \quad \widehat{g}(\theta) = -\frac{\pi}{2}\mathcal{C}(g)(\theta) = -\frac{\pi}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle \theta, u \rangle| g(u) du.$$

We conclude our discussion by stating a Parseval Formula on the sphere, proven by Koldobsky, Ryabogin, and Zvavitch [44].

Lemma 3.5. *Let $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ be symmetric and C_+^2 , so that $dS_K = f_K du$. Then, one has*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \widehat{h}_L(\theta) \widehat{f}_K(\theta) d\theta = (2\pi)^n \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(\theta) f_K(\theta) d\theta.$$

We now begin the classification of $\Pi_\mu K$, that is the convex body whose support function is given by, for $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$, $\mu \in \Lambda$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$:

$$h_{\Pi_\mu K}(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle u, \theta \rangle| dS_{\mu, K}(u),$$

and $\Pi K = \Pi_\lambda K$, where λ is the Lebesgue measure. Suppose K is of the class C_+^2 . From the definition of the cosine transform, Definition 3.1, we see that we can write, if $dS_K(u) = f_K(u) du$,

$$(24) \quad h_{\Pi_\mu K}(\theta) = \mathcal{C}((\phi \circ n_K^{-1}) f_K)(\theta).$$

We next state the (well known, say in [25]) classification results for ΠK , in order to then classify the projection bodies $\Pi_\mu K$. Fix $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$. It is not true in general that if $L \in \mathcal{K}^n$, then $\Pi K = \Pi L$ implies $K = L$. Hence, one defines the *projective class* of K , denoted $\mathcal{P}K$ to be the set of convex bodies such that $L \in \mathcal{P}K \leftrightarrow \Pi L = \Pi K$. The *Blaschke body* of K , denoted ∇K , is defined [25, 59, 70] as the symmetric convex body whose surface area measure is given by

$$dS_{\nabla K}(\theta) = \frac{1}{2}(dS_K(\theta) + dS_{-K}(\theta)).$$

One has that ∇K exists, via Minkowski's Existence Theorem, and that $\text{Vol}_n(\nabla K) \geq \text{Vol}_n(K)$, with equality if, and only if, K is symmetric. Indeed, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Vol}_n(\nabla K) &= \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{\nabla K}(u) dS_{\nabla K}(u) = \frac{1}{2n} \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{\nabla K}(u) dS_K(u) + \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{\nabla K}(u) dS_{-K}(u) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{\nabla K}(u) dS_K(u) = V(K, \nabla K). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, applying Minkowski's inequality yields $\text{Vol}_n(\nabla K)^n = V(K, \nabla K)^n \geq \text{Vol}_n(K)^{n-1} \text{Vol}_n(\nabla K)$. Re-arranging yields the result. We see from direct substitution that $\Pi(\nabla K) = \Pi K$. We collect these classical results in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ with projective class $\mathcal{P}K$. Then, there exists a unique convex body in $\mathcal{P}K$, ∇K , that is symmetric. Furthermore, ∇K is the largest with respect to volume.*

Projection bodies also admit a Fourier classification. In Corollary 3.4, consider the case of $d\nu(u) = dS_K(u)$ and K being of the class C_+^2 . If one takes $g(u) = f_K(u)$, which is the density of the surface area measure of K , or curvature function, one obtains

$$\widehat{f}_K(\theta) = -\pi h_{\Pi K}(\theta).$$

Furthermore, one has that a symmetric convex body L is a projection body if, and only if, $\widehat{h}_L(\theta) \leq 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Indeed, if L is additionally of class C_+^2 , then, from Lemma 3.3, one has that, if $L = \Pi K$ for some $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$, then $\widehat{h}_{\Pi K} = -(2\pi)^{n-1} f_K(u) \leq 0$ for all $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$; conversely, one has $-\widehat{h}_L(\theta) \geq 0$, and so via the Minkowski existence theorem, we can write $-\widehat{h}_L(\theta) = (2\pi)^{n-1} f_K(\theta)$ for some K , and so $L = \Pi K$. For L a projection body that is not of class C_+^2 , $\widehat{h}_L(\theta)$ may be understood as a distribution. The uniform approximation of convex bodies by C_+^2 bodies in theorem of Grinberg and Zhang [31, Theorem 5.4] has an additional component, that if the body being approximated is a projection body, then so too are the C_+^2 bodies in the approximating sequence. The claim then follows from the uniform convergence. We will use this fact and the cosine transform to obtain the following classification lemma, which can easily be shown using the above discussion, the definition of a projection body and Minkowski's Existence Theorem, e.g. in [45]:

Lemma 3.7 (Proposition 1 in [45]). *A convex body $L \in \mathcal{K}^n$ is a projection body if, and only if, there exists a finite Borel measure ν on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} such that, for every even, non-negative $g \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, one has*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u) g(u) du = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \mathcal{C}(g)(u) d\nu.$$

Definition 3.8 (Measure Dependent Projective Classes). *Suppose $\mu \in \Lambda$. Then, for $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$, the projective class of K with respect to μ is the subset of \mathcal{K}^n denoted by $\mathcal{P}_\mu K$. That is, $L \in \mathcal{P}_\mu K \leftrightarrow \Pi_\mu L = \Pi_\mu K$.*

From here, we define measure dependent Blaschke bodies.

Definition 3.9. *For $\mu \in \Lambda$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$, the μ -Blaschke body $\nabla_\mu K$ of K is the convex body whose μ -surface area measure is given by*

$$dS_{\mu, \nabla_\mu K}(u) = \frac{1}{2} (dS_{\mu, K}(u) + dS_{\mu, -K}(u)).$$

For general $\mu \in \Lambda$, $\nabla_\mu K$ may not be well-defined, that is, it is not necessarily true that $dS_{\mu, \nabla_\mu K}(u)$ is the μ -surface area measure of a convex body. If $\nabla_\mu K$ is well-defined, then via direct substitution, we get $\Pi_\mu K = \Pi_\mu \nabla_\mu K$, and hence $\nabla_\mu K \in \mathcal{P}_\mu K$. Also, $\nabla_\mu K$ is symmetric, and so $h_{\nabla_\mu K}(-u) = h_{\nabla_\mu K}(u)$.

Proposition 3.10. *Consider $\mu \in \Lambda$ such that μ is p -concave and α -homogeneous. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ have projective class $\mathcal{P}_\mu K$. Then, there exists a convex body in $\mathcal{P}_\mu K$, $\nabla_\mu K$, that is symmetric. Furthermore, $\nabla_\mu K$ is the largest with respect to the μ -measure in the following sense: If $\alpha \geq n$ and*

$p > 0$ or if $\alpha < n$ but $p\alpha = 1$, then $\nabla_\mu K$ is unique and $\mu(\nabla_\mu K) \geq \mu(K)$ with equality if, and only if, K is symmetric and μ is even.

Proof. Fix some $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$. From the extension of Minkowski's existence theorem, Theorem 2.21, $\nabla_\mu K$ is well-defined for μ α -homogeneous, p -concave, $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$, but, if $\alpha < n$ and $\alpha p < 1$, $\nabla_\mu K$ is not necessarily unique. From Equation 17, we see that, using $dS_{\mu, -K}(u) = dS_{\mu, K}(-u)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(K, \nabla_\mu K) &= \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{\nabla_\mu K}(u) dS_{\mu, K}(u) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{\nabla_\mu K}(u) dS_{\mu, K}(u) + \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{\nabla_\mu K}(u) dS_{\mu, K}(u) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{\nabla_\mu K}(u) dS_{\mu, K}(u) + \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{\nabla_\mu K}(-u) dS_{\mu, K}(-u) \right) \\ &= \mu(\nabla_\mu K, \nabla_\mu K). \end{aligned}$$

Using Minkowski's inequality for general measures, that is Lemma 2.3, then yields

$$\mu(\nabla_\mu K, \nabla_\mu K) = \mu(K, \nabla_\mu K) \geq \mu(K, K) + \frac{\mu(\nabla_\mu K)^p - \mu(K)^p}{p\mu(K)^{p-1}}.$$

Multiplying both sides by $t^{\alpha-1}$ and integrating over $t \in [0, 1]$ then yields

$$\mu(\nabla_\mu K) \geq \mu(K) + \frac{\mu(\nabla_\mu K)^p - \mu(K)^p}{\alpha p \mu(K)^{p-1}}.$$

Re-arranging then yields that

$$(1 - \alpha p)\mu(K)^p + \alpha p \mu(K)^{p-1} \mu(\nabla_\mu K) \geq \mu(\nabla_\mu K)^p.$$

If $\alpha p = 1$, then one has $\mu(\nabla_\mu K) \geq \mu(K)$ with equality if, and only if, K is symmetric, from Proposition 2.2 and Corollary 2.11. In the case where $\alpha \geq n$, we can use Equation 20 to obtain the same result. \square

For $\mu \in \Lambda'$, one could define the Blaschke body in the following way.

Definition 3.11. Let $\mu \in \Lambda'$ with associated $\beta > 0$ and fix $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$. The β - μ -Blaschke body $\nabla_{\mu, \beta} K$ of K is the convex body whose μ -surface area measure is given by

$$(25) \quad \mu(\nabla_{\mu, \beta} K)^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1} dS_{\mu, \nabla_{\mu, \beta} K}(u) = \frac{\mu(K)^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}}{2} (dS_{\mu, K}(u) + dS_{\mu, K}(-u));$$

from Theorem 1.1, $\nabla_{\mu, \beta} K$ exists.

We see that we lose uniqueness of the Blaschke body in such a case (as for many measures, if they satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1 for some $\beta > 0$, then they satisfy the hypotheses for β' near β as well). One would like to show that $\nabla_{\mu, \beta} K$ is the "largest" convex body in some sense of $\mathcal{P}_\mu K$. Unlike in the proof of Proposition 3.10, using Lemma 2.3 in the case of F -concave μ for some differentiable F does not yield the result. However, we can remark that, if there exists a $\beta^* \in (0, \infty)$ so that the β^* - μ -Blaschke body $\nabla_{\mu, \beta^*} K$ defined in Equation 25 satisfies

$$\mu(\nabla_{\mu, \beta^*} K) = \mu(K),$$

then, Lemma 2.3 yields

$$\mu(\nabla_{\mu, \beta^*} K, \nabla_{\mu, \beta^*} K) \geq \mu(K, K).$$

Just like in the case of projection bodies, the Fourier transform of the support function measure dependent projection bodies is related to the surface area measure. Suppose K is a convex body of class C_+^2 , and denote $\phi_K(u) := f_K(u)\phi(n_K^{-1}(u))$. Then, Lemma 3.3 states that

$$(26) \quad \widehat{h_{\Pi_\mu K}}(\theta) = -(2\pi)^{n-1}\phi_K(\theta).$$

Also, setting $d\nu(u) = \phi(n_K^{-1}(u))dS_K(u)$, i.e. $g(u) = \phi_K(u)$, in Corollary 3.4 yields

$$\widehat{\phi}_K(\theta) = -\pi h_{\Pi_\mu K}(\theta).$$

We conclude this section by comparing the projection bodies $\Pi_\mu K$ with another generalization of projection bodies to the measure theoretic setting. In [57], an alternative generalization of a projection body for a symmetric convex body K and even measure $\mu \in \Lambda$ was introduced as the convex body whose support function is given by

$$P_{\mu,K}(\theta) := n \int_0^1 h_{\Pi_\mu tK}(\theta) dt = \frac{n}{2} \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle u, \theta \rangle| dS_{\mu,tK}(u) dt,$$

and, furthermore, the following Shephard problem was then solved for the case when μ was α -homogeneous, $\alpha \geq n$, and p -concave, with $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ symmetric such that L is a projection body:

$$P_{\mu,K}(\theta) \leq P_{\mu,L}(\theta) \forall \theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \longrightarrow \mu(K) \leq \mu(L).$$

The schema used to solve the above Shephard problem in [57] was to first suppose that

$$h_{\Pi_\mu tK}(\theta) \leq h_{\Pi_\mu tL}(\theta)$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Then, it was shown this implies that $\mu(tK, L) \leq \mu(tL, L)$; by integrating over $(0, 1)$ in the appropriate places, one obtains

$$P_{\mu,K}(\theta) \leq P_{\mu,L}(\theta) \forall \theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \longrightarrow \int_0^1 \mu(tK, L) dt \leq \mu(L).$$

From the fact that $\mu^{1-q}(K)\mu(L)^q \leq \int_0^1 \mu(tK, L) dt$ for an appropriately chosen $q < 1$ via Proposition 2.20, the solution was obtained. To relate $\Pi_\mu K$ and the convex body given by $P_{\mu,K}(\theta)$, we see that we must alter $h_{\Pi_\mu K}(\theta)$ into $h_{\Pi_\mu tK}(\theta)$ and then integrate over $(0, 1)$. However, such a transformation alters μ . Indeed, suppose K is of class C_+^2 and write:

$$\begin{aligned} t^{n-1}h_{\Pi_\mu K}(\theta) &= \frac{t^{n-1}}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle u, \theta \rangle| \phi(n_K^{-1}(u)) dS_K(u) dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle u, \theta \rangle| \phi(t^{-1}n_{tK}^{-1}(u)) dS_{tK}(u) dt = h_{\Pi_\mu tK}(\theta) \end{aligned}$$

where μ' is the measure with density $\phi(t^{-1}x)$. Thus, in general it is not possible to do such a transformation. However, if μ is also α -homogeneous, like in [57], then $\phi(t^{-1}n_{tK}^{-1}(u)) = t^{n-\alpha}\phi(n_{tK}^{-1}(u))$ and so $t^{\alpha-1}h_{\Pi_\mu K}(\theta) = h_{\Pi_\mu tK}(\theta)$. Integrating both sides over $(0, 1)$ then yields $h_{\Pi_\mu K}(\theta) = \frac{\alpha}{n}P_{\mu,K}(\theta)$. Hence, this relation allows us to obtain the results of the Shephard problem for $P_{\mu,K}(\theta)$ listed above as a particular case of the isomorphic Shephard problems discussed in the next section.

4. SHEPHARD PROBLEMS FOR MEASURE DEPENDENT PROJECTION BODIES

In this section, we discuss Shephard problems for $\Pi_\mu K$, that is various solutions to Question 2. We remind the reader that by Shephard problem, we mean given even $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$ and fixed symmetric $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$, we wish to find an optimal quantity \mathcal{A} such that $\mu(K) \leq \mathcal{A}\nu(L)$ under the hypothesis

$$h_{\Pi_\mu K}(\theta) \leq h_{\Pi_\nu L}(\theta)$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. We will not assume that L is a projection body; we will give instances where the quantity \mathcal{A} can be made independent of the measures ν and μ and the convex bodies L and K . In the case where $\mu = \nu$ and L is a projection body, we recover the result of [57], itself an extension of the classical solution in the instance of volume, where the quantity $\mathcal{A} = 1$ in this case.

Our approach will use standard Fourier techniques. It suffices to consider the case when K and L are of class C_+^2 , yielding $dS_K(u) = f_K(u)du$ and similarly for L ; the general case follows by approximation. We next recall the Banach-Mazur distance [2]: for $M \in \mathcal{K}^n$, one has $d_{BM}(L, M) = \inf\{d > 0 : \exists T \in GL_n : L \subset TM \subset dL\}$. From here, we can define

$$d_\Pi(L) = \inf\{d_{BM}(L, M) : M \text{ is a projection body}\}.$$

The Theorem of Fritz John ([2, 25]) states that given a symmetric $L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ there exists an ellipsoid \mathcal{E} such that $\mathcal{E} \subset L \subset \sqrt{n}\mathcal{E}$. Hence, we have from John's theorem that $1 \leq d_\Pi(L) \leq \sqrt{n}$, since L is symmetric and symmetric ellipsoids are projection bodies (and so $d_\Pi(L)$ is well defined). One also has that the linear image of a projection body is a projection body: for $T \in GL(n)$ and $M \in \mathcal{K}^n$, one has, where T^{-t} denotes the inverse transpose of T , $T\Pi M = |\det T|\Pi(T^{-t}M) = \Pi(|\det T|^{\frac{1}{n-1}}T^{-t}M)$ [25, 54].

Remark 4.1. *The unit ball B_2^n is a projection body, and so $d_\Pi(L) \leq d_{BM}(L, B_2^n)$. It was shown in [56, 75] that, if L is the unit ball of a subspace of L_q , $q > 2$, then $d_{BM}(L, B_2^n) \leq n^{1/2-1/q}$. So throughout this section, the estimate $d_\Pi(L) \leq n^{1/2-1/q}$ can be made in this instance.*

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$ be even with the densities ϕ and ψ respectively. Suppose we have symmetric, $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ such that*

$$h_{\Pi_\mu K}(\theta) \leq h_{\Pi_\nu L}(\theta)$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Then, one has that $\mu(K, L) \leq d_\Pi(L)\nu(L, L)$.

Proof. Begin by approximating L by some projection body M in the sense that

$$M \subset L \subset d_\Pi(L)M.$$

By approximation, we may also assume K and L are of class C_+^2 . Then, our hypotheses are equivalent to

$$\mathcal{C}((\phi \circ n_K^{-1}) f_K)(\theta) \leq \mathcal{C}((\psi \circ n_L^{-1}) f_L)(\theta).$$

Integrating both sides of the above with respect to the Borel measure associated with h_M from Lemma 3.7 yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_M(u) \phi(n_K^{-1}(u)) f_K(u) du \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_M(u) \psi(n_L^{-1}(u)) f_L(u) du.$$

Using the conditions on M , we have

$$(27) \quad \frac{1}{d_\Pi(L)} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u) \phi(n_K^{-1}(u)) f_K(u) du \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u) \psi(n_L^{-1}(u)) f_L(u) du,$$

which yields, according to the definition of mixed measures, Equation 17,

$$\mu(K, L) \leq d_{\Pi}(L)\nu(L, L).$$

□

We obtain a simplification when imposing homogeneity conditions on μ and ν .

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$ be even measures such that ν is β -homogeneous, $\beta > 0$. If $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ are symmetric such that*

$$h_{\Pi\mu K}(\theta) \leq h_{\Pi\nu L}(\theta)$$

for every $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, then, $\mu(K, L) \leq \beta d_{\Pi}(L)\nu(L)$.

Proof. From Lemma 4.2, we have that

$$\mu(K, L) \leq d_{\Pi}(L)\nu(L, L).$$

Since ν is β -homogeneous, it follows that the mixed measure of ν is $(\beta - 1)$ -homogeneous in the first variable. Thus, the inequality

$$t^{\beta-1}\mu(K, L) \leq t^{\beta-1}d_{\Pi}(L)\nu(L, L)$$

yields

$$(28) \quad t^{\beta-1}\mu(K, L) \leq d_{\Pi}(L)\nu(tL, L).$$

Integrating both sides of Equation 28 over $(0, 1)$ yields the result. □

We see that the result in Lemma 4.3 is in some sense sharp. Indeed, consider first the case when $\mu = \nu = \lambda$. Then, Lemma 4.3 yields

$$V(K, L) = \frac{1}{n} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u) dS_K(u) \leq d_{\Pi}(L)\text{Vol}_n(L),$$

or, taking the n th power of both sides and using Minkowski's inequality:

$$\text{Vol}_n(K)^{n-1}\text{Vol}_n(L) \leq d_{\Pi}^n(L)\text{Vol}_n^n(L).$$

Consequently, we have

$$\text{Vol}_n(K) \leq d_{\Pi}^{\frac{n}{n-1}}(L)\text{Vol}_n(L).$$

For $n \geq 3$, consider the estimate from John's Theorem $d_{\Pi}(L) \leq \sqrt{n}$ to obtain

$$(29) \quad \text{Vol}_n(K) \leq n^{\frac{n}{2n-2}}\text{Vol}_n(L) = n^{1/2}n^{\frac{1}{2n-2}}\text{Vol}_n(L) \leq 3^{1/4}n^{1/2}\text{Vol}_n(L),$$

where we used that $n^{\frac{1}{2n-2}}$ is monotonically decreasing (to 1) as a function of n . We see that Equation 29 is asymptotically sharp due to the result from Ball [4]. We further remark that if $n = 2$ or $n \geq 3$ and L is a projection body, then $d_{\Pi}(L) = 1$ and so we obtain the classical solution to the Shephard problem:

$$\text{Vol}_n(K) \leq \text{Vol}_n(L).$$

We consider solutions to Question 2 for two different measures. We first investigate how to relate $\mu(K)$ and $\mu(L)$ under concavity assumptions on μ , and assume μ and ν have some homogeneity.

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$ such that μ is p -concave and α -homogeneous, and ν is β -homogeneous, $\alpha, \beta > 0$. Let K and L be symmetric convex bodies such that*

$$h_{\Pi, \mu K}(\theta) \leq h_{\Pi, \nu L}(\theta)$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Then, one has that

$$\mu(K) \leq \left[d_{\Pi}(L) \beta p \frac{\nu(L)}{\mu(L)} + \frac{\mu(K)(1 - \alpha p)}{\mu(L)} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-p}} \mu(L).$$

In particular, when $\alpha p = 1$:

$$\mu(K) \leq \left(\frac{\beta \nu(L)}{\alpha \mu(L)} d_{\Pi}(L) \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} \mu(L).$$

Proof. From Lemma 4.3 we have that $\mu(K, L) \leq \beta d_{\Pi}(L) \nu(L)$. Using the extended Minkowski inequality from Lemma 2.3 for $F(t) = t^p$, then yields

$$\mu(K, K) + \frac{\mu(L)^p - \mu(K)^p}{p \mu(K)^{p-1}} \leq \beta d_{\Pi}(L) \nu(L).$$

Multiplying through by $t^{\alpha-1}$ and integrating over $(0, 1)$ yields

$$\mu(K) + \frac{\mu(L)^p - \mu(K)^p}{\alpha p \mu(K)^{p-1}} \leq \frac{\beta}{\alpha} d_{\Pi}(L) \nu(L).$$

Upon re-arranging, we obtain

$$(30) \quad \mu(L)^p \leq d_{\Pi}(L) \beta p \mu(K)^{p-1} \nu(L) + (1 - \alpha p) \mu(K)^p.$$

When $p = 1/\alpha$, we obtain

$$\mu(L)^p \leq \frac{\beta d_{\Pi}(L)}{\alpha} \mu(K)^{p-1} \nu(L).$$

Upon re-arranging, we then have

$$\mu(K) \leq \left(\frac{\beta \nu(L)}{\alpha \mu(L)} d_{\Pi}(L) \right)^{\frac{1}{1-p}} \mu(L).$$

Using that $(1 - p) = (\alpha - 1)/\alpha$ yields the result. For the general case of $p\alpha \leq 1$, we return to Equation 30 and re-arrange to obtain

$$\left(\frac{\mu(L)}{\mu(K)} \right)^{p-1} \leq d_{\Pi}(L) \beta p \frac{\nu(L)}{\mu(L)} + \frac{\mu(K)}{\mu(L)} (1 - \alpha p).$$

Since $p \in (0, 1/n]$, one has that $p < 1$ and we obtain

$$\mu(L) \left[d_{\Pi}(L) \beta p \frac{\nu(L)}{\mu(L)} + \frac{\mu(K)(1 - \alpha p)}{\mu(L)} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-p}} \geq \mu(K).$$

□

Clearly, the general result in Proposition 4.4 is less than ideal. From this, we are motivated to restrict our measures under consideration. Recall that, if the homogeneity of α is greater than n , μ is also $1/\alpha$ -concave from Proposition 2.20. This is a large class of measures, and in some sense the measures that "behave similarly to volume." Using Minkowski's inequality in the form of Equation 20 then allows us to state an updated version of Proposition 4.4.

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$ where μ is p -concave and α -homogeneous, such that either $\alpha \geq n$ and $p > 0$ or $\alpha < n$ but $p = \frac{1}{\alpha}$, and ν is β -homogeneous, $\beta > 0$. Let K and L be symmetric convex bodies such that*

$$h_{\Pi_\mu K}(\theta) \leq h_{\Pi_\nu L}(\theta)$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Then, one has that $\mu(K) \leq \mathcal{B}\mu(L)$, where

$$\mathcal{B} = \left(\frac{\beta\nu(L)}{\alpha\mu(L)} d_{\Pi}(L) \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}.$$

Proof. From Lemma 4.3 we have that $\frac{1}{\alpha}\mu(K, L) \leq \frac{\beta}{\alpha}d_{\Pi}(L)\nu(L)$. If $\alpha < n$, then we have μ is $1/\alpha$ -concave by hypothesis. If $\alpha \geq n$, then, from Proposition 2.20, μ is still $1/\alpha$ -concave. In either case, one has that

$$\frac{1}{\alpha}\mu(K, L) \geq \mu(K)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha}}\mu(L)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}.$$

Inserting into the above and re-arranging yields $\left(\frac{\mu(K)}{\mu(L)}\right)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \leq \frac{\beta}{\alpha}d_{\Pi}(L)\frac{\nu(L)}{\mu(L)}$. Which then yields the result. \square

We can now prove Theorem 1.2 from the introduction, which relates $\mu(K)$ and $\nu(L)$ when μ is α homogeneous and $1/\alpha$ -concave.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. If $\alpha < n$, then we have μ is $1/\alpha$ -concave by hypothesis. If $\alpha \geq n$, then, from Proposition 2.20, μ is still $1/\alpha$ -concave. In either case, from by Lemma 4.5, one has $\mu(K) \leq \mathcal{B}\mu(L)$, where $\mathcal{B} = \left(\frac{\beta\nu(L)}{\alpha\mu(L)}d_{\Pi}(L)\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}$. If one writes $\mathcal{B} = \left(\frac{\beta\mu(K)}{\alpha\mu(L)}\frac{\nu(L)}{\mu(K)}d_{\Pi}(L)\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}$ and re-arranges the resultant inequality to isolate $\frac{\nu(L)}{\mu(K)}$, one obtains that $\mu(K) \leq \frac{\beta}{\alpha}\mathcal{A}_K d_{\Pi}(L)\nu(L)$. If one instead writes $\mu(L) = \left(\frac{\nu(L)}{\mu(L)}\right)^{-1}\nu(L)$ on the right-hand side of the inequality, one immediately obtains $\mu(K) \leq \frac{\beta}{\alpha}\mathcal{A}_L d_{\Pi}(L)\nu(L)$. \square

When $\mu = \nu$, we obtain the following immediate corollary of Theorem 1.2.

Corollary 4.6. *Let K and L be symmetric convex bodies. Furthermore, suppose $\mu \in \Lambda$ is p -concave and α -homogeneous, $\alpha > 0$, such that either $\alpha \geq n$ and $p > 0$ or $\alpha < n$ but $p = \frac{1}{\alpha}$, and*

$$h_{\Pi_\mu K}(\theta) \leq h_{\Pi_\mu L}(\theta)$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Then, one has that

$$\mu(K) \leq d_{\Pi}^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}(L)\mu(L).$$

Also, if L is a projection body then: $\mu(K) \leq \mu(L)$.

We now consider the case when μ is a F -concave measure.

Theorem 4.7. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$ be even measures such that μ is α -homogeneous, $\alpha > 1$, and ν is β -homogeneous. Suppose that μ is F -concave where F is a differentiable almost everywhere function satisfying $\frac{1}{zF'(z)}, \frac{F(z)}{zF'(z)} \in L_{loc}^1([0, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n)])$. If $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ such that*

$$h_{\Pi_\mu K}(\theta) \leq h_{\Pi_\nu L}(\theta)$$

for every $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, then, there exists a quantity \mathcal{Z} and a quantity \mathcal{L} such that $\mu(K) \leq \mathcal{Z}\nu(L) + \mathcal{L}$, where

$$(31) \quad \mathcal{Z} = \frac{\beta d_{\Pi}(L)}{\alpha - 1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^{\mu(K)} \frac{F(z)}{zF'(z)} dz - \frac{F(\mu(L))}{\alpha} \int_0^{\mu(K)} \frac{dz}{zF'(z)}.$$

Furthermore, the \mathcal{Z} can be made independent of L if the bound $\mathcal{Z} \leq \frac{\beta\sqrt{n}}{\alpha-1}$ is taken.

Proof. From Lemma 4.3, we have that $\mu(K, L) \leq \beta d_{\Pi}(L)\nu(L)$, which then yields $\mu(tK, L) \leq \beta t^{\alpha-1} d_{\Pi}(L)\nu(L)$. Suppose μ is F -concave such that F is a differentiable almost everywhere function. Then, by Lemma 2.3 and Equation 28, we get

$$(32) \quad \mu(tK, K) + \frac{F(\mu(L)) - F(\mu(tK))}{tF'(\mu(tK))} \leq t^{\alpha-2} \beta d_{\Pi}(L)\nu(tL, L).$$

We will now integrate the inequality over $(0, 1)$. In particular, we obtain

$$\int_0^1 \mu(tK, K) dt = \mu(K) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^1 \beta t^{\alpha-2} d_{\Pi}(L)\nu(L) dt = \frac{\beta d_{\Pi}(L)}{\alpha - 1} \nu(L).$$

Notice that

$$\int_0^1 \frac{F(\mu(L))}{tF'(\mu(tK))} dt = \frac{F(\mu(L))}{\alpha} \int_0^{\mu(K)} \frac{dz}{zF'(z)},$$

and

$$\int_0^1 \frac{F(\mu(tK))}{tF'(\mu(tK))} dt = \int_0^1 \frac{F(t^{\alpha}\mu(K))}{tF'(t^{\alpha}\mu(K))} dt = \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^{\mu(K)} \frac{F(z)}{zF'(z)} dz.$$

Then, Equation 32 becomes

$$\mu(K) \leq \frac{\beta d_{\Pi}(L)}{\alpha - 1} \nu(L) + \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^{\mu(K)} \frac{F(z)}{zF'(z)} dz - \frac{F(\mu(L))}{\alpha} \int_0^{\mu(K)} \frac{dz}{zF'(z)},$$

and the claim follows. \square

By applying this result to the particular case of p -concave measures, we obtain an analog of Proposition 4.4 relating $\mu(K)$ and $\nu(L)$ that reduces to the result of Theorem 1.2 in the case when $\alpha p = 1$. This shows how \mathcal{L} contributes to the sharpness of the inequality in Theorem 4.7 and in general cannot be removed.

Corollary 4.8. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$ be measures such that μ is α -homogeneous, $\alpha > 1$, and p -concave and ν is β -homogeneous. Suppose $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ such that*

$$h_{\Pi\mu K}(\theta) \leq h_{\Pi\nu L}(\theta)$$

for every $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Then one has that $\mu(K) \leq \mathcal{Z}\nu(L)$ where

$$\mathcal{Z} = \left(\frac{\nu(L)}{\mu(L)} \right)^{\frac{p}{1-p}} \left(\frac{\alpha p \beta (1-p) d_{\Pi}(L)}{\alpha - 1} + \frac{(1 - \alpha p)(1 - p) \mu(K)}{\nu(L)} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-p}},$$

and, specifically, when $\alpha p = 1$ one has

$$\mathcal{Z} = \left(\frac{\nu(L)}{\mu(L)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha} d_{\Pi}(L) \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}.$$

Proof. In Theorem 4.7 set $F(z) = z^p$; we obtain that

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{\alpha p} \left(\mu(K) - \left(\frac{\mu(L)}{\mu(K)} \right)^p \frac{\mu(K)}{1-p} \right).$$

Multiplying the resultant inequality through by αp yields

$$\alpha p \mu(K) \leq \frac{\alpha p \beta d_{\Pi}(L)}{\alpha - 1} \nu(L) + \mu(K) - \left(\frac{\mu(L)}{\mu(K)} \right)^p \frac{\mu(K)}{1-p}.$$

Upon re-arrangement, we obtain

$$\mu(K)^{1-p} \leq \frac{1-p}{\mu(L)^p} \left(\frac{\alpha p \beta d_{\Pi}(L)}{\alpha - 1} \nu(L) + (1 - \alpha p) \mu(K) \right).$$

Writing $1 = \nu(L)^{1-p} \nu(L)^{p-1}$ yields

$$\mu(K)^{1-p} \leq \nu(L)^{1-p} \left(\frac{\nu(L)}{\mu(L)} \right)^p \left(\frac{\alpha p \beta (1-p) d_{\Pi}(L)}{\alpha - 1} + \frac{(1 - \alpha p)(1-p) \mu(K)}{\nu(L)} \right).$$

Taking the $(1-p)$ th root of both sides then yields

$$\mu(K) \leq \nu(L) \left(\frac{\nu(L)}{\mu(L)} \right)^{\frac{p}{1-p}} \left(\frac{\alpha p \beta (1-p) d_{\Pi}(L)}{\alpha - 1} + \frac{(1 - \alpha p)(1-p) \mu(K)}{\nu(L)} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-p}},$$

as claimed. Furthermore, suppose $\alpha p = 1$. Then, we see that $(1-p) = (\alpha - 1)/\alpha$ and we obtain

$$\mu(K) \leq \nu(L) \left(\frac{\nu(L)}{\mu(L)} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} \left(\frac{\beta}{\alpha} d_{\Pi}(L) \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}.$$

□

We would like to remove the quantities $\frac{\nu(L)}{\mu(L)}$, $\frac{\mu(K)}{\mu(L)}$ and $\frac{\mu(K)}{\nu(L)}$ in the above results. To avoid a preponderance of corollaries, we merely outline these in the following remark. We remind the reader that a symmetric convex body K is said to be in John position if its ellipsoid of maximal volume is the unit ball, i.e. $B_2^n \subset K \subset \sqrt{n} B_2^n$.

Remark 4.9. *The results of Proposition 4.4, Lemma 4.5, Theorems 1.2 and 4.7, and Corollary 4.8 can be made independent of the quantities $\frac{\nu(L)}{\mu(L)}$, $\frac{\mu(K)}{\mu(L)}$ and $\frac{\mu(K)}{\nu(L)}$ by making the following estimates:*

- (1) *If L is in John position, then $\frac{\nu(L)}{\mu(L)} \leq n^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \frac{\nu(B_2^n)}{\mu(B_2^n)}$.*
- (2) *If K and L are both in John position, one can take $\frac{\mu(K)}{\nu(L)} \leq n^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \frac{\mu(B_2^n)}{\nu(B_2^n)}$ and $\frac{\mu(K)}{\mu(L)} \leq n^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$.*

Furthermore, the question does not make sense for log-concave measures, e.g. the Gaussian measure, as one can find bodies such that $h_{\Pi_{\gamma_n} K}(\theta) \geq h_{\Pi_{\gamma_n} L}(\theta)$ and yet $\gamma_n(K) \leq \gamma_n(L)$, even in the case when K and L are projection bodies (in fact, one can consider dilates of the Euclidean ball). We conclude this section with stability results for the above isomorphic Shephard Problem, focusing on the case where ν is β -homogeneous, $\beta > 0$ and μ is $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ -homogeneous and $1/\alpha$ -concave. We will use a technique inspired by the stability results in [43].

Theorem 4.10 (Stability in Isomorphic Shephard). *Let $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$ be even such that ν is β -homogeneous, $\beta > 0$ and μ is $\alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)$ -homogeneous and $1/\alpha$ -concave. Fix $\epsilon \ll 1$ and consider symmetric $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ such that*

$$h_{\Pi_{\mu} K}(\theta) \leq h_{\Pi_{\nu} L}(\theta) - \epsilon.$$

Then,

$$\mu(K)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \leq \frac{\beta \nu(L)}{\alpha \mu(L)} d_{\Pi}(L) \mu(L)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} - C(\mu)\epsilon,$$

where $C(\mu)$ depends on μ only. In particular, if $\mu = \nu$, then

$$\mu(K)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \leq d_{\Pi}(L) \mu(L)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} - C(\mu)\epsilon.$$

Proof. By approximation, we may assume K and L are of class C_+^2 . Start by writing that $\epsilon = \frac{1}{\kappa_{n-1}} \mathcal{C}(\epsilon)(\theta)$, and therefore we can write our hypothesis as

$$\mathcal{C}((\phi \circ n_K^{-1}) f_K)(\theta) \leq \mathcal{C}((\psi \circ n_L^{-1}) f_L)(\theta) - \frac{1}{\kappa_{n-1}} \mathcal{C}(\epsilon)(\theta).$$

Approximating L by a projection body M in the sense that $M \subset L \subset d_{\Pi}(L)M$, and then integrating by the Borel measure associated with h_M from Lemma 3.7 yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_M(u) \phi(n_K^{-1}(u)) f_K(u) du \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_M(u) \psi(n_L^{-1}(u)) f_L(u) du - \frac{\epsilon}{\kappa_{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_M(u).$$

Using the conditions on M , we have

$$\frac{1}{d_{\Pi}(L)} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u) \phi(n_K^{-1}(u)) f_K(u) du \leq \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u) \psi(n_L^{-1}(u)) f_L(u) du - \frac{\epsilon}{\kappa_{n-1} d_{\Pi}(L)} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u).$$

Upon re-arrangement, this becomes

$$\mu(K, L) \leq d_{\Pi}(L) \nu(L, L) - \frac{\epsilon}{\kappa_{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u).$$

Using the homogeneity of ν , we have $\nu(L, L) = \beta \nu(L)$. We can also use Minkowski's inequality for α -homogeneous, $1/\alpha$ -concave measures in the form Equation 20 to obtain

$$\alpha \mu(K)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \mu(L)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \leq \beta d_{\Pi}(L) \nu(L) - \frac{\epsilon}{\kappa_{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u).$$

Upon re-arrangement, this can be written as

$$\mu(K)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} \leq \frac{\beta \nu(L)}{\alpha \mu(L)} d_{\Pi}(L) \mu(L)^{1-\frac{1}{\alpha}} - \frac{1}{\mu(L)^{1/\alpha} \alpha \kappa_{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u).$$

Next, let $P = \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \cap \text{supp}(\phi)$. Notice that from the definition of P , it depends on μ only. We can then write that

$$-\frac{1}{\mu(L)^{1/\alpha} \alpha \kappa_{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u) \leq -\frac{1}{\mu(L)^{1/\alpha} \alpha \kappa_{n-1}} \int_P h_L(u) = -\frac{1}{\mu(L)^{1/\alpha} \alpha \kappa_{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u) \chi_P(u).$$

By Theorem 2.26, there exists a symmetric convex body R such that $\frac{1}{\kappa_{n-1}} \chi_P(u) du = dS_{\mu, R}(u)$. Therefore, we obtain, by using again Equation 20, that

$$-\frac{1}{\mu(L)^{1/\alpha} \alpha \kappa_{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u) \leq -\frac{\epsilon}{\alpha \mu(L)^{1/\alpha}} \mu(R, L) \leq -\epsilon \mu(R)^{1-1/\alpha}.$$

Setting $C(\mu) = \mu(R)^{1-1/\alpha}$ yields the result. \square

5. APPLICATIONS TO CAPACITY

We begin this section by classifying projection bodies as the measure varies and the convex body is fixed. In order to complete this endeavour, we must discuss harmonic functions. All of the following concerning harmonic functions can be found in [23]. Let Ω be a connected, bounded domain. If Δ denotes the Laplacian operator, we say $u \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ is *harmonic* if $\Delta u = 0$ on Ω . It can be shown that a C^2 function u is harmonic if, and only if, u satisfies the *mean value property*: For every $B(x, r) \subset \Omega$, (where $B(x, r)$ is the ball of radius r centered at x) one has

$$(33) \quad u(x) = \frac{1}{r^n \kappa_n} \int_{B(x, r)} u(y) dy = \frac{1}{r^{n-1} n \kappa_n} \int_{\partial B(x, r)} u(y) dy.$$

We see from Equation 33 that the value on the boundary of a set determines the value in the interior of a set for a harmonic function; using this, one can easily show the following maximum principle: suppose $u, v \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ such that u and v are harmonic, if $u \leq v$ on $\partial\Omega$, then $u \leq v$ on Ω . Next, consider some $f \in C(\partial\Omega)$. Then, the following is *the Dirichlet problem* for Ω with boundary data f :

$$(34) \quad \begin{cases} \Delta u = 0 & \text{on } \Omega \\ u = f & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

If a solution exists, then it is unique; the conditions for existence are technical, but if Ω is bounded and convex, then the Dirichlet problem is solvable.

Definition 5.1. Fix a symmetric $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ and even $\mu \in \Lambda$ with density ϕ . Then, $\mathcal{P}_K \mu \subset \Lambda$ is the set of even Borel measures such that $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_K \mu \leftrightarrow \Pi_\mu K = \Pi_\nu K$.

In the case where K is of class C_+^2 , one has $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_K \mu$ with density ψ if, and only if,

$$\mathcal{C}((\phi \circ n_K^{-1}) dS_K)(\theta) = \mathcal{C}((\psi \circ n_K^{-1}) dS_K)(\theta)$$

for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Since K is symmetric and μ and ν are even, $\psi \circ n_K^{-1}$, $\phi \circ n_K^{-1}$ and f_K are even functions; we have, from the uniqueness theorem of the cosine transform, Lemma 3.2, that $(\phi \circ n_K^{-1})(\theta) = (\psi \circ n_K^{-1})(\theta)$ for almost all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. But, identifying $y \in \partial K$ with $n_K^{-1}(\theta)$ one has that $\phi = \psi$ for almost all $y \in \partial K$. However, equality on the boundary of K does not yield equality on all of K , for example $\psi(x) = \phi(x) \|x\|_K$. If $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_K \mu$, all we know is that $\nu_1(\partial K) = \nu_2(\partial K)$ and $\frac{d\nu_1}{dx} = \frac{d\nu_2}{dx}$ a.e on ∂K . If we further suppose that the densities of ν_1 and ν_2 are harmonic on $\text{int}(K)$, then this equality extends to all of K via the Dirichlet problem, Equation 34. We collect these results in the following theorem, where we see that harmonic measures play the role of the Blaschke body.

Theorem 5.2 (Harmonic). Let $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ be of class C_+^2 and $\mu \in \Lambda$ whose density is continuous on ∂K . Then there exists a unique Borel measure $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_K \mu$ such that the density of ν is harmonic on K .

We next introduce capacity; the following can be found in [22]. The p -capacity of a bounded domain is defined as

$$(35) \quad \text{Cap}_p(\Omega) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla v|^p dx : v \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n), v(x) \geq 1 \forall x \in \Omega \right\}$$

where $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the set of functions from $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with compact support. In the case of $p = 2$, $\text{Cap}_2(\Omega)$ is the Newton capacity of Ω . The p -capacity of a set is related to the p -Dirichlet problem:

suppose u decays at infinity, i.e. $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} u(x) = 0$, and Ω is a bounded domain. Then, the p -Dirichlet problem is the following system:

$$(36) \quad \begin{cases} \operatorname{div}(|\nabla u|^{p-2} \nabla u) = 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega \\ u(x) = 1 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

The solution to the p -Dirichlet problem is called the p -capacitary function and satisfies $0 < u < 1$ and $|\nabla u| \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{\Omega}$. The solution to the p -Dirichlet problem generates a Borel measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} : let E be a Borel subset of \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . Then, the p -capacitary measure of Ω is given by [40, 16, 17, 13]:

$$\mu_p(\Omega, E) = \int_{n_{\Omega}^{-1}(E)} |\nabla u|^p d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}.$$

The Poincaré formula for p -capacity for $1 < p < n$ is given by [16]:

$$C_p(\Omega) = \frac{p-1}{n-p} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{\Omega}(\xi) d\mu_p(\Omega, \xi) = \frac{p-1}{n-p} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{\Omega}(\xi) |\nabla u(n_{\Omega}^{-1}(\xi))|^p dS_{\Omega}(\xi),$$

where the second equality holds if Ω is a strictly convex domain. And it is truly amazing that this is essentially the same formula for volume. In fact, if $\overline{\Omega}$ is a convex body, then the above is just $\tilde{\mu}(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\Omega})$ where $\tilde{\mu}$ is the measure whose density is given by $\frac{p-1}{n-p} |\nabla u(x)|^p$. There exists an analogue of mixed volume for capacity. Let Ω_0, Ω_1 be bounded convex domains in \mathbb{R}^n . The mixed p -capacity of Ω_0 and Ω_1 is given by

$$C_p(\Omega_0, \Omega_1) = \frac{p-1}{n-p} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_{\Omega_1}(\xi) d\mu_p(\Omega_0, \xi)$$

One has, $C_p(\Omega_0, \Omega_0) = C_p(\Omega_0)$. The following analogue of Minkowski's inequality for p -capacity in the context of bounded convex domains of class $C_+^{2,\alpha}$ (twice continuously differentiable with positive curvature and α -Hölder continuous) was shown in [16]:

Lemma 5.3 (Minkowski's Inequality for Capacity). *Suppose $1 < p < n$. Let Ω_0, Ω_1 be bounded convex domains in \mathbb{R}^n of class $C_+^{2,\alpha}$. Then*

$$C_p(\Omega_0, \Omega_1)^{n-p} \geq C_p(\Omega_0)^{n-p-1} C_p(\Omega_1)$$

with equality if and only if Ω_0, Ω_1 are homothetic.

Question 3. *Let $p, q \in (1, n)$. Consider convex bodies K and L that are of class $C_+^{2,\alpha}$. Let u be the p -harmonic solution to the p -Dirichlet problem for $\operatorname{int}(K)$ and v be the q -harmonic solution to the q -Dirichlet problem for $\operatorname{int}(L)$. Let μ be the measure with density $|\nabla u|^p$ and ν be the measure with density $|\nabla v|^q$; so, μ and ν agree with $\mu_p(K, \cdot)$ and $\mu_q(L, \cdot)$ respectively on the boundaries of K and L correspondingly (via the Gauss map). If*

$$h_{\Pi_{\mu}K}(\theta) \leq h_{\Pi_{\nu}L}(\theta),$$

does there exist a quantity $\mathcal{M} > 0$ such that $C_p(\operatorname{int}(K)) \leq \mathcal{M} C_p(\operatorname{int}(L))$?

Notice that integrating the inequality in Question 3 yields $\mu_p(\operatorname{int}(K), \mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \leq \mu_q(\operatorname{int}(L), \mathbb{S}^{n-1})$.

Theorem 5.4. *Under the notation and assumptions of Question 3, one has, if $p < n - 1$:*

$$C_p(\operatorname{int}(K)) \leq \left(\frac{p-1}{n-p} \frac{n-q}{q-1} d_{\Pi}(L) \right)^{\frac{n-p}{n-p-1}} \left(\frac{C_q(\operatorname{int}(L))}{C_p(\operatorname{int}(L))} \right)^{\frac{1}{n-p-1}} C_q(\operatorname{int}(L)),$$

and if $p \in (n-1, n)$:

$$C_q(\text{int}(L)) \leq \left(\frac{p-1}{n-p} \frac{n-q}{q-1} d_{\Pi}(L) \right)^{\frac{n-p}{p-(n-1)}} \left(\frac{C_q(\text{int}(L))}{C_p(\text{int}(L))} \right)^{\frac{1}{p-(n-1)}} C_p(\text{int}(K)).$$

In particular, if $p = q$ the constants simplify to $d_{\Pi}(L)$ raised to a power. If additionally L is a projection body, then we can conclude $C_p(\text{int}(K)) \leq C_p(\text{int}(L))$ if $p \in (1, n-1)$ and, surprisingly, $C_p(\text{int}(L)) \leq C_p(\text{int}(K))$ if $p \in (n-1, n)$.

Proof. From Lemma 4.2 we can state:

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u) |\nabla u(n_K^{-1}(u))|^p f_K(u) du \leq d_{\Pi}(L) \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u) |\nabla v(n_L^{-1}(u))|^q f_L(u) du.$$

Writing this in terms of mixed capacity, this is precisely

$$C_p(\text{int}(K), \text{int}(L)) \leq \frac{p-1}{n-p} \frac{n-q}{q-1} d_{\Pi}(L) C_q(\text{int}(L)).$$

Raising each side to the $n-p$ then yields

$$C_p(\text{int}(K), \text{int}(L))^{n-p} \leq \left(\frac{p-1}{n-p} \frac{n-q}{q-1} \right)^{n-p} d_{\Pi}^{n-p}(L) C_q(\text{int}(L))^{n-p}.$$

Applying Lemma 5.3 and raising both sides to appropriate powers then yields the claim. \square

Remark 5.5. The case $p = n-1$ does not follow from the above, as in this instance Lemma 5.3 reads $C_p(\text{int}(K), \text{int}(L)) \geq C_p(\text{int}(L))$, and so the mixed capacity seemingly does not carry enough information about K .

6. APPENDIX: L_q -MEASURE SURFACE AREA PROBLEM

In this section, we repeat much of Section 2, with the goal of defining L_q mixed measures and solving the L_q Minkowski problem for measures in Λ . The standard notation is to refer to everything that follows as L_p ; however, to avoid confusion with p -concavity, we will use the notation L_q . We recall that Firey's L_q -Minkowski Addition is the following: for $K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $q \geq 1$, one has that $\alpha \cdot_q K +_q \beta \cdot_q L = \alpha \cdot K +_q \beta \cdot L$ is the convex body whose support function is given by

$$h_{\alpha \cdot_q K +_q \beta \cdot_q L}^q(x) = \alpha h_K^q(x) + \beta h_L^q(x),$$

where the first notation emphasises the fact that K and L are dilated by $\alpha^{1/q}$ and $\beta^{1/q}$ respectively; we will use the second notation, which suppresses this fact. The L_q surface area measure of K is the Borel measure on the sphere that satisfies the following limit

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\text{Vol}_n(K +_q \epsilon \cdot B_2^n) - \text{Vol}_n(K)}{\epsilon} = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} dS_{K,q}(u).$$

As it turns out, one has that [76],

$$dS_{K,q}(u) = h_K^{1-q}(u) dS_K(u).$$

We first obtain the following set inclusion.

Proposition 6.1. *Suppose $q \geq q' \geq 1$. Then,*

$$(1-\lambda) \cdot K +_q \lambda \cdot L \supseteq (1-\lambda) \cdot K +_{q'} \lambda \cdot L \supseteq (1-\lambda)K + \lambda L.$$

Proof. Write

$$h_{(1-\lambda) \cdot K +_q \lambda \cdot L}^{q'}(x) = \left((1-\lambda)h_K^q(x) + \lambda h_L^q(x) \right)^{\frac{q'}{q}} = \left((1-\lambda)(h_K^{q'}(x))^{\frac{q}{q'}} + \lambda(h_L^{q'}(x))^{\frac{q}{q'}} \right)^{\frac{q'}{q}}.$$

Since $1 \geq \frac{q'}{q}$, we obtain from Jensen's inequality that

$$h_{(1-\lambda) \cdot K +_q \lambda \cdot L}^{q'}(x) \geq h_{(1-\lambda) \cdot K +_{q'} \lambda \cdot L}^{q'}(x),$$

and the claim follows. \square

Next, suppose $\mu \in \Lambda$ is F -concave, that is it satisfies Equation 10 for some invertible function F . Using Proposition 6.1, we obtain the following result.

Proposition 6.2. *Suppose μ is F -concave with respect to Minkowski addition on a class of compact Borel sets \mathcal{C} . Then, for $q \geq 1$, μ is also F -concave with respect to L_q -Minkowski addition, that is for $K, L \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, one has*

$$(37) \quad \mu((1-\lambda) \cdot K +_q \lambda \cdot L) \geq F^{-1}((1-\lambda)F(\mu(K)) + \lambda F(\mu(L))),$$

and equality implies equality in Equation 10.

We will now go over an important example using Proposition 6.1, the Gaussian measure:

Example 6.3. *Let K, L be Borel sets of \mathbb{R}^n , $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, and $q \geq 1$. Then, the Gaussian measure γ_n satisfies the following L_q -concavities:*

(1) *Ehrhard inequality* [19, 20, 55, 7]:

$$\Phi^{-1}(\gamma_n((1-\lambda) \cdot K +_q \lambda \cdot L)) \geq (1-\lambda)\Phi^{-1}(\gamma_n(K)) + \lambda\Phi^{-1}(\gamma_n(L)),$$

with equality if, and only if, $K = L$ or K and L are half-spaces, one nested in the other.

(2) *Log-concavity* [6, 10, 18]: *If K and L are closed convex sets with non-empty interior,*

$$\gamma_n((1-\lambda) \cdot K +_q \lambda \cdot L) \geq \gamma_n(K)^{1-\lambda} \gamma_n(L)^\lambda,$$

with equality if, and only if, $K = L$.

(3) *Gardner-Zvavitch inequality* [27, 66, 52, 21]: *If K and L are symmetric convex bodies:*

$$\gamma_n((1-\lambda) \cdot K +_q \lambda \cdot L)^{1/n} \geq (1-\lambda)\gamma_n(K)^{1/n} + \lambda\gamma_n(L)^{1/n},$$

with equality if, and only if, $K = L$.

For $\mu \in \Lambda$ with density ϕ , we define the L_q measure dependent surface area measure as

$$(38) \quad S_{\mu, K, q}(E) = \int_{n_K^{-1}(E) \cap \partial' K} \phi(x) h_K^{1-q}(n_K(x)) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x),$$

for every Borel $E \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. We will now work towards proving the following:

Theorem 6.4. *Fix $q \geq 1$. Let μ be an even Borel measure on the sphere such that $\mu \in \Lambda'$ for some $\beta > 0$. Suppose ν is a finite, even Borel measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} that is not concentrated on any hemisphere. Then, there exists a symmetric convex body K such that*

$$d\nu(u) = c_{\mu, K, q} dS_{\mu, K, q}(u); \quad c_{\mu, K, q} := \frac{1}{q} \mu(K)^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}.$$

Most of the proofs of what follows are similar to that in Section 2, and so we only outline the differences here. Like before, we first need the following lemma.

Lemma 6.5 (*L_q -First Variation of Radial Functions of Wulff Shapes*). *Fix $q \geq 1$. Consider a convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$, $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ and δ small enough such that*

$$h_t(u) = (h_K^q(u) + tf(u))^{1/q}$$

is positive for all $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ and $|t| < \delta$. Then, one has, for almost all $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ up to a set of spherical Lebesgue measure zero, that

$$\left. \frac{d\rho_{[h_t]}(u)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\rho_{[h_t]}(u) - \rho_K(u)}{t} = \frac{1}{q} \frac{f(n_K(r_K(u)))}{h_K^q(n_K(r_K(u)))} \rho_K(u),$$

and, furthermore, one has that there exists some $M > 0$ such that

$$|\rho_{[h_t]}(u) - \rho_K(u)| < M|t|$$

for all $|t| < \delta$.

Proof. If one takes the Taylor series expansion of $\log(h_t)$, $\log(h_t) = \log(h_K) + \frac{t}{q} \frac{f}{h_K^q} + o(t)$, one obtains that h_t is a logarithmic family of the pair $(h_K, \frac{1}{q} \frac{f}{h_K^q})$, and the claim follows from [38, Lemma 4.3]. \square

Lemma 6.6 (*Aleksandrov's L_q -Variational Formula For Arbitrary Measures*). *Let $\mu \in \Lambda$ with density ϕ . Then, for $q \geq 1$, $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$, one has that*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu([(h_K^q + tf)^{\frac{1}{q}}]) - \mu(K)}{t} = \frac{1}{q} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) dS_{\mu, K, q}(u).$$

Proof. Set $h_t^q = h_K^q + tf$ and use polar coordinates to write

$$\mu([h_t]) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int_0^{\rho_{[h_t]}(u)} \phi(ru) r^{n-1} dr du = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} F_t(u) du,$$

where $F_t(u) = \int_0^{\rho_{[h_t]}(u)} \phi(ru) r^{n-1} dr$. One has again that $\left. \frac{dF_t}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = F'_0$ exists by the Lebesgue differentiation theorem and also

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{F_t(u) - F_0(u)}{t} = \phi(r_K(u)) \frac{f(n_K(r_K(u)))}{h_K^q(n_K(r_K(u)))} \frac{\rho_K^n(u)}{q}.$$

for almost all $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ via Lemma 6.5. Using dominated convergence to differentiate underneath the integral sign yields the result. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.4. The proof is essentially the same as in Theorem 1.1. Suppose we have $\beta > 0$ so that $\mu \in \Lambda'$, and ν is an even Borel measure on the sphere not concentrated on any half-space. Next, define the following functional on the set of even continuous functions on the sphere

$$(39) \quad \Psi_{\nu, \beta}(f) = \frac{n}{\beta} \mu([f])^{\frac{\beta}{n}} - \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f^q(u) d\nu(u).$$

One can easily check that $\Psi_{\nu, \beta}(f) \leq \Psi_{\nu, \beta}(h_{[f]})$, and so we have again that the maximiser is the support function of a symmetric convex body. We now check that a maximiser satisfies the claim: consider

$h_t(u) = \left(h_{K_\beta}^q(u) + tf(u) \right)^{1/q}$, where K_β is the symmetric convex body whose support function is a maximiser of $\Psi_{\nu,\beta}$, f is an arbitrary, even function in $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, and δ is picked small enough so that, for $|t| < \delta$, h_t is positive for all $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$.

Viewing $\Psi_{\nu,\beta}(h_t)$ as a function of one variable in t , we must have that $\Psi_{\nu,\beta}(h_t)$ has an extremum at $t = 0$, and so

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left. \frac{d\Psi_{\nu,\beta}(h_t)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = \mu(K_\beta)^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1} \frac{d}{dt} (\mu([h_t]))_{t=0} - \left. \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_t^q(u) d\nu(u) \right|_{t=0} \\ &= \frac{\mu(K_\beta)^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}}{q} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) dS_{\mu,K_\beta,q}(u) - \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) d\nu(u), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from Lemma 6.6. Re-arranging, we then see

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) d\nu(u) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(u) \left[\frac{\mu(K_\beta)^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1}}{q} dS_{\mu,K_\beta,q}(u) \right].$$

Since continuous functions are dense in $L^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, the above is true for all even $f \in L^1(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$. We then have via the Riesz Representation theorem that

$$d\nu(u) = \frac{1}{q} \mu(K_\beta)^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1} dS_{\mu,K_\beta,q}(u),$$

as required. The rest of the proof is the same, up to minor adjustments due to the differences between Equations 21 and 39. \square

Corollary 6.7. *Fix $q \geq 1$. Let $\mu \in \Lambda$ be even, α -homogeneous, $\alpha > 0$, $\alpha \neq q$. Suppose ν is a finite, even measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} not concentrated on any hemisphere. Then, there exists a symmetric $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ such that*

$$d\nu = dS_{\mu,K,q}.$$

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as Lemma 2.24, except we remark that $dS_{\mu,L,q}(u)$ is $(\alpha - q)$ -homogeneous (in the argument L) for $L \in \mathcal{K}^n$. Indeed, for L of class C_+^2 , one has that $dS_{tL,q}(u) = h_{tL}^{1-q}(u) dS_{tL}(u) = t^{n-q} h_L^{1-q}(u) dS_L(u) = t^{n-q} dS_{L,q}(u)$ for $t > 0$. Thus, we obtain, using that $n_{tL}^{-1}(u) = t n_L^{-1}(u)$ and the $(\alpha - n)$ -homogeneity of ϕ ,

$$dS_{\mu,tL,q}(u) = \phi(n_{tL}^{-1}(u)) dS_{tL,q}(u) = t^{n-q} t^{\alpha-n} \phi(n_L^{-1}(u)) dS_{L,q}(u) = t^{\alpha-q} dS_{\mu,L,q}(u).$$

Thus, in the proof of Lemma 2.24, we instead let A be the solution to

$$A^{\alpha-q} = \frac{1}{q} \mu(\tilde{K})^{\frac{\beta}{n}-1},$$

and the rest of the proof is the same. \square

From Lemma 6.6, we can define the following. Which, to the best of our knowledge, has not been previously defined in the literature.

Definition 6.8. *Let $\mu \in \Lambda$ with density ϕ , and suppose $K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n$. Then, the L_q -mixed measure of K and L is given by, using Lemma 6.6,*

$$\mu_q(K, L) := \liminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu(K +_q \epsilon \cdot L) - \mu(K)}{\epsilon} = \frac{1}{q} \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} h_L(u)^q dS_{\mu,K,q}(u).$$

Notice that $\mu_q(K, K) = \frac{1}{q}\mu(K, K)$. Also, if μ is α -homogeneous, then $\mu_q(K, K) = \frac{\alpha}{q}\mu(K)$. As an element of Λ , we denote the Lebesgue measure as λ . So, we have that $\text{Vol}_n(K) = \frac{q}{n}\lambda_q(K, K)$. We now attempt to show an L_q -Minkowski's Inequality for L_q -mixed measures.

Theorem 6.9. *Fix $q \geq 1$. Let μ be a Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^n , such that μ is F -concave and F is differentiable, with respect to a class of Borel sets \mathcal{C} . Then, for every $K, L \in \mathcal{C}$, one has that:*

$$\mu_q(K, L) \geq \mu_q(K, K) + \frac{F(\mu(L)) - F(\mu(K))}{F'(\mu(K))}.$$

Proof. The proof is same as in Theorem 2.3 except one sets $K_\lambda = \frac{K}{(1-\lambda)^{1/q}}$ to write $\mu(K +_q \lambda \cdot L) = \mu((1-\lambda) \cdot K_\lambda +_q \lambda \cdot L)$. When taking the derivative, use that $\left. \frac{d\mu(K_\lambda)}{d\lambda} \right|_{\lambda=0} = \frac{1}{q}\mu(K, K) = \mu_q(K, K)$. \square

Corollary 6.10 (L_q -Minkowski's Inequality - Concavity link). *Fix $q \geq 1$. Let $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ and suppose $\mu \in \Lambda$ such that μ is F -concave and F is differentiable. Then,*

$$\mu_q(K, L) = \mu_q(K, K) + \frac{F(\mu(L)) - F(\mu(K))}{F'(\mu(K))},$$

if, and only if, there is equality in Equation 37.

We next list results for p -concave measures. We shall use the following, which was shown by Roysdon and Xing [73].

Proposition 6.11 (Brunn-Minkowski inequality for p -concave measures with respect to L_q addition). *Let $\mu \in \Lambda$ be p -concave with respect to Minkowski addition, then, for $q \geq 1$, it is pq -concave, with respect to L_q Minkowski addition i.e.*

$$(40) \quad \mu((1-\lambda) \cdot A +_q \lambda \cdot B)^{pq} \geq (1-\lambda)\mu(A)^{pq} + \lambda\mu(B)^{pq}.$$

If $q > 1$, then equality holds if, and only if, $A = aB$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Furthermore, if μ is not homogeneous, then $a = 1$.

Corollary 6.12. *Fix $q \geq 1$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Suppose $\mu \in \Lambda$ is p -concave. Then, for K, L in the support of μ , one has:*

$$\mu_q(K, L) \geq \frac{1}{q}\mu(K, K) + \frac{1}{p} [\mu(L)^p \mu(K)^{1-p} - \mu(K)].$$

If μ is also α -homogeneous, $\alpha > 0$, then:

$$\mu_q(K, L) \geq \frac{1}{p} \left[\mu(K)^{1-p} \mu(L)^p - \left(1 - \frac{p\alpha}{q}\right) \mu(K) \right].$$

In either case, equality holds if, and only if, $K = aL + b$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, due to Proposition 2.2

We can also use Proposition 6.11 to replace p with qp and write:

$$\mu_q(K, L) \geq \frac{1}{q}\mu(K, K) + \frac{1}{pq} [\mu(K)^{1-pq} \mu(L)^{pq} - \mu(K)].$$

If μ is additionally α -homogeneous, $\alpha > 0$ we can write

$$\mu_q(K, L) \geq \frac{1}{pq} [\mu(K)^{1-pq} \mu(L)^{pq} - (1 - p\alpha)\mu(K)].$$

In either case, there is equality if, and only if, $K = aL$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$.

Finally, for μ α -homogeneous, $\alpha > 0$ that is either $1/\alpha$ -concave or $\frac{q}{\alpha}$ -concave, one has

$$\mu_q^\alpha(K, L) \geq \left(\frac{\alpha}{q}\right)^\alpha [\mu(K)^{\alpha-q} \mu(L)^q],$$

with equality if, and only if, $K = aL + b$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$; if $q > 1$ then β is the origin.

Using this, we obtain uniqueness for the L_q Measure dependent surface area measures.

Lemma 6.13. Fix $q \geq 1$. Let $\mu \in \Lambda$ be α -homogeneous and p -concave, where either $\alpha \geq n$ and $p > 0$ or $\alpha < n$ but $p \in \{\frac{q}{\alpha}, \frac{1}{\alpha}\}$. Then, if $dS_{\mu, K, q} = dS_{\mu, L, q}$, one has $K = L$.

Proof. If $\alpha \geq n$, then, from Proposition 2.20, μ is also $1/\alpha$ -concave. If $\alpha < n$, then $p \in \{\frac{q}{\alpha}, \frac{1}{\alpha}\}$ by hypothesis; in either case we obtain from Corollary 6.12 that $\frac{1}{q}\mu(K, K) = \mu_q(K, K) = \mu_q(L, K) \geq \frac{\alpha}{q} [\mu(L)^{1-\frac{q}{\alpha}} \mu(K)^{\frac{q}{\alpha}}]$. Multiplying by $t^{\alpha-1}$ and integrating over $(0, 1)$ then yields $\mu(K)^{1-\frac{q}{\alpha}} \geq \mu(L)^{1-\frac{q}{\alpha}}$.

From the symmetry of the expression, we also have that $\mu(L)^{1-\frac{q}{\alpha}} \geq \mu(K)^{1-\frac{q}{\alpha}}$. Therefore, $\mu(K) = \mu(L)$. Thus, $K = L$, from either Proposition 2.2 or Proposition 6.11. \square

Theorem 6.14. Fix $q \geq 1$. Let $\mu \in \Lambda$ be even, p -concave, and α -homogeneous so that $\alpha \neq q$ and either $\alpha \geq n$ and $p > 0$ or $\alpha < n$ but $p \in \{\frac{1}{\alpha}, \frac{q}{\alpha}\}$. Suppose ν is a finite, even measure on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} not concentrated on any hemisphere. Then, there exists a unique symmetric $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ such that

$$d\nu = dS_{\mu, K, q}.$$

We now work to extend the measures under consideration. The following have proofs that, up to minor adjustments, the same as Proposition 2.12, Remark 2.13 and Lemma 2.14, and are omitted.

Proposition 6.15. Fix $q \geq 1$. Let $\mu \in \Lambda$ be F -concave such that F is differentiable. Suppose $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ such that

$$dS_{\mu, K, q} = dS_{\mu, L, q}.$$

Then

$$\frac{F(\mu(L)) - F(\mu(K))}{F'(\mu(K))} \leq \frac{F(\mu(L)) - F(\mu(K))}{F'(\mu(L))}.$$

Remark 6.16. If $\mu(K) = \mu(L)$ and $dS_{\mu, K, q} = dS_{\mu, L, q}$, we obtain equality in Minkowski's inequality. Thus, by Corollary 6.10, we have equality in Equation 37.

Lemma 6.17. Fix $q \geq 1$. Let $\mu \in \Lambda$ be F -concave such that F is differentiable and there exists some $a \geq 0$ such that, for every $b, c \in [a, \mu(\mathbb{R}^n))$ one has $(F(b) - F(c))(F'(b) - F'(c)) \geq 0$, $F'(b)F'(c) > 0$, and $F'(b) \neq F'(c)$. Suppose $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ such that

$$dS_{\mu, K, q} = dS_{\mu, L, q}.$$

If $\mu(K), \mu(L) \geq a$, then $\mu(K) = \mu(L)$ and there is equality in Equation 37, which then yields equality in Equation 10.

We conclude by applying Lemma 6.17, with $F(x) = \Phi^{-1}(x)$, the Ehrhard function to obtain a result for the Gaussian measure.

Theorem 6.18. Fix $q \geq 1$. Suppose $K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n$ such that $\gamma_n(K), \gamma_n(L) \geq 1/2$ and

$$dS_{\gamma_n, K, q} = dS_{\gamma_n, L, q}.$$

Then, one has $K = L$.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. D. Aleksandrov *Zur Theorie der gemischten Volumina von konvexen Körper, III: Die Erweiterung zweier Lehrsätze Minkowskis über die konvexen Polyeder auf beliebige konvexe Flächen*, (in Russian), *Mat. Sbornik N. S.* **3**(1938), 27 – 46. [2](#)
- [2] S. Artstein-Avidan, A. Giannopoulos and V. Milman, *Asymptotic geometric analysis, Part I*, Amer. Math. Soc., 2015. [25](#)
- [3] K. Ball *The reverse isoperimetric problem for Gaussian measure*, *Discrete Comput Geom* **10**, 411–420 (1993). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02573986>. [7](#), [19](#)
- [4] K. Ball, *Shadows of convex bodies*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **327** (1991), 891-901. [7](#), [26](#)
- [5] K. Ball, *Some remarks on the geometry of convex sets*, *Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis*, ed. by J.Lindenstrauss and V.D. Milman, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* 1317. Springer, Heidelberg, 1988, pp.224-31. [6](#)
- [6] C. Borell, *Convex Set Functions in d -space*, *Periodica Mathematica Hungaria*, **6** (1975), no. 2, 111-136. [5](#), [16](#), [35](#)
- [7] C. Borell, *The Ehrhard inequality*, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* **337** (2003), no. 10, 663–666. [9](#), [35](#)
- [8] J. K. Böröczky, E. Lutwak, D. Yang, and G. Zhang, *The log-Brunn-Minkowski inequality*, *Adv. Math.* **231** (2012), no. 3-4, 1974–1997. [4](#)
- [9] J. K. Böröczky, E. Lutwak, D. Yang, and G. Zhang, *The logarithmic Minkowski problem*, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **26** (2013), no. 3, 831–852. [4](#)
- [10] H. J. Brascamp and E. H. Lieb, *On extensions of the Brunn-Minkowski and Prékopa-Leindler theorems, including inequalities for log-concave functions, and with an application to the diffusion equation*, *J. Fun. Anal.*, **22** (1976), 366-389. [35](#)
- [11] J. Bourgain, *On the Busemann-Petty problem for perturbations of the ball*, *Geom. Functional Anal.* **1**(1991), 1 – 13. [6](#)
- [12] H. Busemann and C. Petty, *Problems on convex bodies*, *Math. Scand.*, **4** (1956), 88 – 94. [6](#)
- [13] L.A. Caffarelli, D. Jerison, and E.H. Lieb, *On the case of equality in the Brunn–Minkowski inequality for capacity*, *Adv. Math.* **117** (1996) 193–207. [33](#)
- [14] K.-S. and Z.-J. Wang, *The L_p -Minkowski problem and the Minkowski problem in centroaffine geometry*, *Adv. Math.* **205** (2006) 33-83. [4](#), [16](#)
- [15] A. Colesanti, G. V. Livshyts, and A. Marsiglietti, *On the stability of Brunn–Minkowski type inequalities*, *J. Func. Anal.*, **273** (3) (2017), 1120-1139, ISSN 0022-1236. [13](#)
- [16] A. Colesanti, K. Nyström, et. al, *The Hadamard variational formula and the Minkowski problem for p -capacity*, *Advances in Mathematics*, **285** (2015), 1511–1588. [33](#)
- [17] A. Colesanti and Paolo Salani, *The Brunn Minkowski p -capacity*, *Mathematische Annalen*, November (2003), DOI: 10.1007/s00208-003-0460-7 [33](#)
- [18] S. Dubuc, *Critères de convexité et inégalités intégrales*, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **27** (1) (1977) 135–165. [35](#)
- [19] A. Ehrhard, *Symétrisation dans l'espace de Gauss*, *Math. Scand.* **53** (1983), 281-301. [8](#), [35](#)
- [20] A. Ehrhard, *Éléments extrémaux pour les inégalités de Brunn-Minkowski gaussiennes*, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* **22**(1986),149-168. [8](#), [35](#)
- [21] A. Eskenazis and G. Moschidis *The dimensional Brunn-Minkowski inequality in Gauss space*, *J. Func. Anal.*, **280** (6) (2021), 108914. [35](#)
- [22] L. C. Evans and R. Gariepy, *Measure theory and fine properties of functions*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 1992. [32](#)
- [23] L. C. Evans *Partial Differential Equations*, 2nd edition, *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*, Amer. Math. Soc., 19 (2010). [32](#)
- [24] D.G. Larman and C.A. Rogers *The existence of a centrally symmetric convex body with central sections that are unexpectedly small*, *Mathematika*, **22**(1975), 164 – 75. [6](#)
- [25] R. Gardner, *Geometric Tomography* Second Edition, *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*, vol. 58, Cambridge University Press, (2006). [2](#), [3](#), [21](#), [25](#)
- [26] R. Gardner, *Intersection bodies and the Busemann-Petty problem*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **342**(1994), 435 – 45. [6](#)
- [27] R. Gardner and A. Zvavitch, *Gaussian Brunn-Minkowski-type inequalities*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **360** (2010), 5333-5353. [35](#)
- [28] R. Gardner, A. Koldobsky, and T. Schlumprecht, *An analytic solution to the Busemann-Petty problem on sections of convex bodies* *Annals of Mathematics*, (1999) 691-703. [6](#)

- [29] R. Gardner, A. Koldobsky, and T. Schlumprecht, *An analytic solution to the Busemann-Petty problem* Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences-Series I-Mathematics 328 (1), 29-34. [6](#)
- [30] A. A. Giannopoulos, *A note on a problem of H. Busemann and C.M. Petty concerning sections of symmetric convex bodies*, Mathematika, **37**, (1990), 239 – 44. [6](#)
- [31] E. Grinberg and G. Zhang, *Convolutions, Transforms, and Convex Bodies*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society, (3) 78 (1999), 77–115. [2](#), [22](#)
- [32] H. Groemer, *Geometric Applications of Fourier Series and Spherical Harmonics*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1996. [20](#)
- [33] C. Haberl, E. Lutwak, D. Yang and G. Zhang *The even Orlicz Minkowski problem*, Adv. Math. 224 (2010), 2485-2510. [4](#), [10](#), [16](#), [20](#)
- [34] C. Haberl and F. Schuster, *General L_p affine isoperimetric inequalities*, J. Differential Geom., in press. [4](#)
- [35] C. Haberl and F. Schuster, *Asymmetric affine L_p Sobolev inequalities*, J. Funct. Anal. 257 (2009) 641–658. [4](#)
- [36] J. Hosle, *On The Comparison of Measures of Convex Bodies Via Projections and Sections*, International Mathematics Research Notices, (2019). [5](#), [9](#)
- [37] J. Hosle, A. Kolesnikov and G. Livshyts *On the L_p -Brunn-Minkowski and dimensional Brunn-Minkowski conjectures for log-concave measures*, Journal of Geometric Analysis (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12220-020-00505-z>. [12](#)
- [38] Y. Huang, E. Lutwak, D. Yang, and G. Zhang, *Geometric measures in the dual Brunn-Minkowski theory and their associated Minkowski problems*, Acta Math., 216 (2016), 325-388. [10](#), [11](#), [36](#)
- [39] Y. Huang, D. Xi, and Y. Zhao, *The Minkowski problem in Gaussian probability space*, Advances in Mathematics, 385 (2021), 107769. [6](#), [15](#), [20](#)
- [40] D. Jerison, *The direct method in the calculus of variations for convex bodies*, Adv. Math. 122 (1996) 262–279. [33](#)
- [41] B. Klartag and A. Koldobsky, *An example related to the slicing inequality for general measures*, J. Funct. Anal. 274 (2018), 2089–2112. [5](#)
- [42] B. Klartag and G. Livshyts, *The lower bound for Koldobsky's slicing inequality via random rounding*, GAFA Seminar Notes, 2017-2019 Volume II, (2020), p. 43–63. [5](#)
- [43] A. Koldobsky, *Fourier Analysis in Convex Geometry*, Math. Surveys and Monographs, AMS, Providence RI 2005. [7](#), [20](#), [30](#)
- [44] A. Koldobsky, D. Ryabogin, and A. Zvavitch, *Fourier Analytic Methods in the Study of Projections and Sections of Convex Bodies*, Fourier Analysis and Convexity. Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis. Birkhäuser, Boston, MA. 2004 [7](#), [20](#), [21](#)
- [45] A. Koldobsky, D. Ryabogin, and A. Zvavitch, *Projections of convex bodies and the Fourier Transform*, Israel. J. Math. 139 (2004), p. 361-380. [20](#), [22](#)
- [46] A. Koldobsky, V. Yaskin, *The Interface between Convex Geometry and Harmonic Analysis*, CBMS Regional Conference Series, 108, American Mathematical Society, Providence RI, 2008. [7](#), [20](#), [21](#)
- [47] A. Koldobsky, *A hyperplane inequality for measures of convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^n , $n \leq 4$* , Discrete Comput. Geom. 47 (2012), 538–547. [5](#)
- [48] A. Koldobsky, *A \sqrt{n} estimate for measures of hyperplane sections of convex bodies*, Adv. Math. 254 (2014), 33–40. [5](#)
- [49] A. Koldobsky, *Slicing inequalities for measures on convex bodies*, Adv. Math. 283 (2015), 473–488. [5](#)
- [50] A. Koldobsky, G. Paouris and A. Zvavitch, *Measure comparison inequalities for convex bodies*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., to appear. [5](#)
- [51] A. Koldobsky and A. Zvavitch, *An isomorphic version of the Busemann-Petty problem for arbitrary measures*, Geom. Dedicata 174 (2015), 261–277. [6](#), [7](#)
- [52] A. Kolesnikov and G. Livshyts, *On the Gardner-Zvavitch conjecture: symmetry in the inequalities of Brunn-Minkowski type*, Adv. Math. 384 (2021). [13](#), [35](#)
- [53] A.V. Kolesnikov, E. Milman, *Poincaré and Brunn–Minkowski inequalities on the boundary of weighted Riemannian manifolds*, Amer. J. of Math. 140 (5) (2018), 1147-1185. [12](#)
- [54] D. Langharst, M. Roysdon and A. Zvavitch *General Measure Extensions of Projection Bodies*, submitted, arXiv:2106.13212. [6](#), [9](#), [25](#)
- [55] R. Latała, *A note on the Ehrhard inequality*, Studia Math. 118 (1996) 169–174. [8](#), [35](#)
- [56] D.R. Lewis, *Finite dimensional subspaces of L_p* , Studia Math. 63 (1978), 207-212. [25](#)

- [57] G. V. Livshyts *An extension of Minkowski's theorem and its applications to questions about projections for measures*, Adv. Math. **356**(2019). [5](#), [7](#), [9](#), [12](#), [13](#), [16](#), [19](#), [24](#), [25](#)
- [58] M. Ludwig, *Minkowski valuations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 357 (2005) 4191–4213. [4](#)
- [59] E. Lutwak, *Intersection Bodies and dual mixed volumes*, Advances in Math. **71**(1988), 232 – 61. [21](#)
- [60] E. Lutwak, *The Brunn–Minkowski–Firey theory. I. Mixed volumes and the Minkowski problem*, J. Differential Geom. 38 (1993) 131–150. [4](#)
- [61] E. Lutwak, *The Brunn–Minkowski–Firey theory. II. Affine and geominimal surface areas*, Adv. Math. 118 (1996) 244–294,. [4](#)
- [62] E. Lutwak, D. Yang, G. Zhang, *L_p affine isoperimetric inequalities*, J. Differential Geom. **56**(2000), 111 – 132. [4](#)
- [63] E. Lutwak, D. Yang, G. Zhang, *Orlicz projection bodies*, Adv. Math. 223 (2010) 220–242. [4](#)
- [64] E. Lutwak, D. Yang, G. Zhang, *Orlicz centroid bodies*, J. Differential Geom., in press. [4](#)
- [65] E. Milman, L. Rotem, *Complemented Brunn-Minkowski Inequalities and Isoperimetry for-homogeneous and Non-Homogeneous Measures*, Adv. Math. 262, 867 – 908, 2014. [8](#), [9](#), [16](#)
- [66] P. Nayar and T. Tkocz, *A Note on a Brunn-Minkowski Inequality for the Gaussian Measure*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 141 (2013), 4027–4030. [35](#)
- [67] F.L. Nazarov, *On the maximal perimeter of a convex set in R^n with respect to Gaussian measure*, Geometric Aspects of Funct. Anal. 1807 (2003) 169–187. [7](#), [19](#)
- [68] M. Papadimitrakis, *On the Busemann-Petty problem about convex, centrally symmetric bodies in R^n* , Mathematika **39**(1992), 258 – 66. [6](#)
- [69] C.M. Petty, *Isoperimetric Problems*, Proc. Conf. Convexity Combinat. Geom., University of Oklahoma. (1971), 26-41 [3](#)
- [70] C.M. Petty, *Projection Bodies*, Proc. Colloquim Convexity, Copenhagen, 1965, ed by W. Fenchel, Københavns Univ. Mat. Inst., Copenhagen, 1967, pp. 234-41. [3](#), [21](#)
- [71] C.A. Rogers and G.C. Shephard *The difference body of a convex body*, Arch. Math. 8 (1957): 220–233. [3](#)
- [72] M. Roysdon *Rogers-Shephard type inequalities for sections*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 487 (2020), no. 1, 123958, 22 pp. [5](#)
- [73] M. Roysdon and S. Xing, *On L_p -Brunn-Minkowski type and L_p -isoperimetric type inequalities for measures*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 374 (2021), no. 7, 5003–5036. [38](#)
- [74] C. Saroglou, I. Soprunov, and A. Zvavitch, *Wulff shapes and a characterization of simplices via a Bezout type inequality*, Adv. in Math. 357 (2019), 106789. [11](#)
- [75] G. Schechtman and A. Zvavitch, *Embedding subspaces of L_p into ℓ_N^p , $0 < p < 1$* , Math. Nachr. 227 (2001), 133-142. [25](#)
- [76] R. Schneider, *Convex Bodies: the Brunn-Minkowski Theory*, Second expanded ed., Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 151, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [8](#), [34](#)
- [77] R. Schneider *Zu einem problem von Shephard über die projektionen konveccer Körper*, Math. Z. 101 (1967), 71-82. [3](#)
- [78] G.C. Shephard *Shadow systems of convex bodies*, Israel. J. Maht **2**(1964), 229 – 36. [3](#)
- [79] G. Zhang, *Restricted chord projection and affine inequalities*, Geom. Dedicata, 39 (1991), 213-222. [3](#)
- [80] G. Zhang, *Intersection bodies and the four-dimensional Busemann-Petty problem*, Duke Math. J. **71**(1993), 233–40. [6](#)
- [81] G. Zhang *Intersection bodies and the Busemann-Petty inequalities in \mathbb{R}^4* , Annals of Math. **140**(1994), 331 – 46. [6](#)
- [82] A. Zvavitch, *Gaussian measure of sections of dilates and shifts of convex bodies*, Advances in Applied Mathematics, Vol. 41, (2008), 247-254. [5](#)
- [83] A. Zvavitch, *The Busemann-Petty problem for arbitrary measures*, Math. Ann. 331, no. 4 (2005), 867–887. [6](#)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, KENT STATE UNIVERSITY, KENT, OH 44242,
Email address: lkryvono@kent.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, KENT STATE UNIVERSITY, KENT, OH 44242,
Email address: dlanghar@kent.edu