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Abstract

Extending the celebrated results of Alexandrov (1958) and Korevaar–Ros (1988) for smooth sets, as well as the results of Schneider (1979) and the first author (1999) for arbitrary convex bodies, we obtain for the first time the characterization of the isoperimetric sets of a uniformly convex smooth finite-dimensional normed space (i.e. Wulff shapes) in the non-smooth and non-convex setting, based on the natural geometric condition involving the curvature measures. More specifically we show, under a natural mean-convexity assumption, that finite unions of disjoint Wulff shapes are the only sets of positive reach $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with finite and positive volume such that, for some $k \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$, the $k$-th generalized curvature measure $\Theta^k_\phi(A, \cdot)$, which is defined on the unit normal bundle of $A$ with respect to the relative geometry induced by $\phi$, is proportional to $\Theta^n_\phi(A, \cdot)$. If $k = n - 1$ the conclusion holds for all sets of positive reach with finite and positive volume. We also prove a related sharp result about the removability of the singularities. This result is based on the extension of the notion of a normal boundary point, originally introduced by Busemann and Feller (1936) for arbitrary convex bodies, to sets of positive reach.

These results are new even in the Euclidean space.

Several auxiliary and related results are also proved, which are of independent interest. They include the extension of the classical Steiner–Weyl tube formula to arbitrary closed sets in a finite dimensional uniformly convex normed vector space and a general formula for the derivative of the localized volume function, which extends and complements recent results of Chambolle–Lussardi–Villa (2021).
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The following result is fundamental in the geometry of submanifolds: if a smooth hypersurface in a Euclidean space encloses a bounded domain and one of its mean curvature functions is constant, then it is a Euclidean sphere. We refer to this statement as the soap bubble theorem. We remark that we are considering only hypersurfaces that enclose a domain (i.e. they are embedded); otherwise (i.e. for immersed hypersurfaces) it is well known that such a uniqueness result is in general true only in very special situations; see [Hop83] and [Wen86]. The aforementioned result was proved by Alexandrov for the mean curvature function in [Ale58] and by Korevaar and Ros for the higher-order mean curvature functions in [Ros88] and [Ros87]. Several other proofs were found earlier under various additional hypotheses (e.g. convexity, star-shapedness, mean convexity type assumptions) starting from the pioneering work of Jellett in [Jel53] in the nineteenth century; see [Hsi54] (and references therein). An analogous result is true for hypersurfaces embedded in finite dimensional uniformly convex normed spaces, provided that we replace the Euclidean mean curvature functions and the Euclidean sphere by their anisotropic counterparts (in particular the role of the sphere is played by the Wulff shape); see [HLMG09].

A key feature of all the results mentioned so far is that they hold for smooth hypersurfaces. In fact, since these results are about hypersurfaces with constant mean curvature functions, the smoothness hypothesis may appear to be natural and somehow unavoidable. However, considering different but equivalent points of view, it turns out that the soap bubble theorem is only part of a more general and more natural problem that does not require any a-priori smoothness assumption. There are at least two standard ways to adjust the soap bubble theorem: via the variational approach based on the notion of a critical point of the isoperimetric functional, and via the integral-geometric approach based on the notion of curvature measures.

Let us first briefly describe the variational approach. A standard computation shows that if a smooth hypersurface with constant mean curvature encloses a bounded domain $\Omega$, then $\Omega$ is a critical point of the Euclidean isoperimetric functional among all sets of finite perimeter. Therefore, the Alexandrov theorem can be equivalently stated saying that a critical point of the isoperimetric functional is a sphere, provided it has a smooth boundary. The same is true for the anisotropic counterpart studied in [HLMG09], by considering the anisotropic isoperimetric functional. From this point of view the assumption of smoothness appears to be a possibly convenient condition rather than a necessary restriction. In fact, one can ask whether it is true that all critical points of the Euclidean isoperimetric functional are Euclidean balls. It should be remarked that the regularity theory in geometric measure theory does not imply that a critical point is automatically smooth. Hence, in the non-smooth framework the problem genuinely involves hypersurfaces which a priori may have severe singularities. A positive resolution of this type of problem is given in [DM19] for the Euclidean case and in [DRKS20] in an anisotropic setting, under some additional hypotheses.

We now focus on the integral-geometric approach, which is the one adopted in the present work. The Weyl tube formula asserts that for all sufficiently small radii $\rho > 0$ the volume of a tubular neighbourhood $C_\rho$ around a domain $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with $C^2$-boundary $\partial C$ is a polynomial function in $\rho$; in other words,

$$L^{n+1}(C_\rho \setminus C) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \frac{c_{n-i}}{i+1} \rho^{i+1} \quad \text{for all sufficiently small } \rho > 0.$$  

The coefficients $c_k$ can be obtained integrating over $\partial C$ (or, equivalently, over the unit normal bundle of $C$) the $(n-k)$-th mean curvature function of $\partial C$ (with respect to the exterior normal map) for $k \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$. In the special case of smooth convex domains, this formula has already been found in the nineteenth century by Steiner. Now if $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, then the $k$-th curvature measure of $C$ is defined as the Borel measure obtained by integrating over a given Borel subset of $\partial C$ the $(n-k)$-th mean curvature function of $\partial C$. It has been Federer’s fundamental discovery in [Fed59] that
the existence of the curvature measures and the validity of the polynomial Weyl tube formula are independent of the smoothness hypothesis. In the same seminal paper, Federer laid the foundation of a theory of sets of positive reach, a class that includes all convex bodies, all embedded $C^2$-submanifolds and much more; indeed the boundary of a domain with positive reach need not even be a topological manifold; see the example described at the end of this section. The soap bubble theorem can be equivalently stated saying that if $C$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary such that one of the curvature measures of $C$ is a multiple of the area measure associated to the boundary of $C$, then $C$ is a Euclidean ball. At this point the most compelling problem is to establish a corresponding uniqueness result without any smoothness hypothesis. In fact, this is a classical task in convex geometry. For an arbitrary convex body and for the $0$-th mean curvature measure, Diskant accomplished this task and even establishing a sharp stability result in [Dis68]. A decade later, Schneider [Sch79] resolved the problem for all curvature measures associated with a general convex body (see also [Sch14 Theorem 8.5.7]). Different approaches to prove and generalize Schneider’s theorem were found by Kohlmann in [Koh98a] and [Koh98b]. The extension to the anisotropic setting of the results of Schneider and Kohlmann can be found in [Hu99]. On the other hand, as far as we are aware of, no results are available for arbitrary sets of positive reach, and the question in the non-convex and non-smooth setting has remained unanswered. The main goal of this paper is to address this problem in full generality. Our main theorems, Theorem 6.1.5, Theorem 6.1.10 and Theorem 6.1.13 extend Alexandrov’s theorem to all sets of positive reach and extend its higher-order version, considered by Korevaar and Ros in the smooth setting, to sets of positive reach under a natural mean convexity hypothesis. Actually we treat this problem directly in the more general setting of uniformly convex finite-dimensional normed spaces, hence generalizing also the main result in [HLMG09] to arbitrary sets of positive reach.

A central notion of this paper are the generalized curvature measures of a set of positive reach in the relative (Minkowski) geometry induced by a uniformly convex $C^2$-norm $\phi$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. If $\phi$ is the Euclidean norm, then Federer’s tube formula for sets of positive reach allows to introduce the Euclidean curvature measures (see [Fed69] and [Za95]). On the other hand, for non-Euclidean norms a general tube formula for non-smooth and non-convex sets was missing so far. In the recent paper [CdlL16], an attempt to obtain an anisotropic tube formula for arbitrary sets of positive reach has been impeded by difficulties to obtain Lipschitz estimates for the nearest point projection (which in the Euclidean setting were established by Federer in [Fed69]; see the comments after Theorem 1.1 in [CdlL16, p. 472]). Given this premise, the first task in this paper is to lay the foundation of the theory of curvature measures in the anisotropic setting for sets of positive reach and, more generally, for arbitrary closed sets. For this purpose, let $\delta_A^\phi$ and $\nu_A^\phi$ be the distance function and the Cahn–Hoffman map of $A$ with respect to the metric induced by the conjugate norm $\phi^*$ of $\phi$ (see equations (10) and (11) below). Then we define the $\phi$-unit normal bundle $N^\phi(A)$ of $A$ by

$$N^\phi(A) = \{(a, \eta) : a \in A, \eta \in \partial W^\phi, \delta^\phi_A(a + r\eta) = r \text{ for some } r > 0\},$$

where $W^\phi = \{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \phi^*(\eta) \leq 1\}$ is called the Wulff shape of $\phi$. In general, $\nu_A^\phi$ is a multivalued map and $N^\phi(A)$ is a countably $(\mathcal{H}^n, n)$ rectifiable subset of $A \times \partial W^\phi$. Employing recent results on the Lipschitz and differentiability properties of $\nu_A^\phi$ provided in [KS21], we introduce the $\phi$-principal curvatures

$$-\infty < \kappa_{A,1}^\phi(a, \eta) \leq \ldots \leq \kappa_{A,n}^\phi(a, \eta) \leq +\infty$$

of $A$ at $\mathcal{H}^n$ a.e. $(a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A)$, analogously to the smooth or convex case: if $\chi_{A,1}^\phi \leq \ldots \leq \chi_{A,n}^\phi$ denote the eigenvalues of $D\nu_A^\phi$, then we define

$$\kappa_{A,i}^\phi(a, \eta) = \frac{\chi_{A,i}^\phi(a + r\eta)}{1 - r\chi_{A,i}^\phi(a + r\eta)} \in (-\infty, +\infty],$$

where the right-hand side is independent of $r$, if $r > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small, depending on $(a, \eta)$. We denote by $\hat{N}^\phi(A)$ the set of points $(a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A)$ where the principal curvatures exist (hence $\mathcal{H}^n(N^\phi(A) \setminus \hat{N}^\phi(A)) = 0$) and define $\hat{N}^\phi_0(A)$ to be the set of all $(a, \eta) \in \hat{N}^\phi(A)$ such that $\kappa_{A,1}^\phi(a, \eta) < \infty$ and $\kappa_{A,d+1}^\phi(a, \eta) = +\infty$. In particular, $\hat{N}^\phi_0(A)$ is the set of all $(a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A)$ such that the $\phi$-principal curvatures of $A$ at $(a, \eta)$ are finite. The $i$-th $\phi$-mean curvature function $H_{A,i}^\phi(a, \eta)$ of $A$ at $\mathcal{H}^n$ a.e. $(a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A)$ is defined by taking certain combinations of the elementary...
symmetric functions of the φ-principal curvatures (if A is a smooth submanifold, then we recover classical definitions); see Definition \[5.11\] As a consequence of Theorem \[5.16\] the volume of the tubular neighbourhood \(B^n(\varphi) \setminus A = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : 0 < \delta^n(x) \leq \rho \} \) of an arbitrary compact set \(A\) can be expressed by the formula

\[
\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(B^n(\varphi) \setminus A) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{1}{j+1} \int_{N^\phi(A)} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J_{A,j}^\phi(a,\eta) \inf\{\rho, r_{A,j}^\phi(a,\eta)\}^{j+1} H_{A,j}^\phi(a,\eta) d\mathcal{H}^n(a,\eta).
\]

Here \(r_{A,j}^\phi\) is the reach-function of \(A\) (see \[13\]), \(J_{A,j}^\phi\) is a Jacobian-type function encoding the tangential properties of the normal bundle (see Definition \[3.17\]) and \(n^\phi\) is the Euclidean exterior unit-normal of \(N^\phi\) (see \[7\]). For an arbitrary compact set \(A\), the right side of the tube formula is in general not a polynomial function in \(\rho\) (the volume growth is sub-polynomial) and the mean curvature functions \(H_{A,j}^\phi\) are in general not integrable on \(N^\phi(A)\) (even if the integral is well defined due to the power of the reach-function under the integral). On the other hand, if the \(\phi\)-reach of \(A\) (see Definition \[5.1\]) is greater than or equal to some positive threshold \(\rho_0 > 0\), then \(r_{A,j}^\phi(a,\eta) \geq \rho_0\) for every \((a,\eta) \in N^\phi(A)\) and we obtain a polynomial-type formula

\[
\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(B^n(\varphi) \setminus A) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{\rho^{j+1}}{j+1} \int_{N^\phi(A)} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J_{A,j}^\phi(a,\eta) H_{A,j}^\phi(a,\eta) d\mathcal{H}^n(a,\eta)
\]

for \(\rho \in (0,\rho_0]\). Noting that the functions \(J_{A,j}^\phi, H_{A,j}^\phi\) are integrable on \(N^\phi(A)\) if \(A\) has positive reach, we define the \(m\)-th generalized \(\phi\)-curvature measure of \(A\) as the signed Radon measure supported on \(N^\phi(A)\) given by

\[
\Theta_m^\phi(A, B) = \int_{N^\phi(A) \cap B} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J_{A,n-m}^\phi(a,\eta) H_{A,n-m}^\phi(a,\eta) d\mathcal{H}^n(a,\eta)
\]

for every bounded Borel set \(B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\) and \(m \in \{0,\ldots,n\}\). If \(\phi\) is the Euclidean norm, these measures coincide with the classical generalized curvature measures for sets of positive reach (up to the normalization); see \[26\]. Moreover, if \(\phi\) is the Euclidean norm, then the curvature functions and the tube formula from Section \[3\] agree with those in \[1\]. However, our approach here is substantially different from the one in \[1\]. In fact, in \[1\] the Euclidean principal curvatures of an arbitrary closed set are introduced by means of an approximation with sets of positive reach (see Stacho’s approximation Lemma in \[1\], Lemma 2.3) and \[79\]. Observe that such an approximation argument is not available in the anisotropic case, since there is no fully fledged theory of sets with positive reach ready to be used in the current more general framework (see the discussion above on \[8\]).

An important consequence of the tube formula for arbitrary closed sets (see also Theorem \[4.18\]) is the sharp integral-geometric inequality in Theorem \[3.20\] for which equality is attained only by disjoint unions of finitely many rescaled and translated Wulff shapes. Theorem \[3.20\] generalizes the geometric inequality known as the Heintze–Karcher inequality for sufficiently smooth sets (see \[87\] and \[91\]) to arbitrary closed sets under a natural (weak) mean convexity assumption. For sufficiently smooth sets \(C\), the Heintze–Karcher inequality provides an upper bound for the volume of \(C\) by the integral average over the boundary of \(C\) of the reciprocal of the mean curvature function of \(C\). For convex bodies (compact convex sets with non-empty interiors) this inequality was proved in \[96\] (in the Euclidean case) and in \[99\] (in the anisotropic framework). The general version for arbitrary closed sets given in Theorem \[3.20\] will be specialized to sets of positive reach in Theorem \[5.15\] and this result is one of the pillars for the subsequent soap bubble theorems.

In Section \[3\] we also provide a detailed analysis of the curvature functions of an arbitrary closed set \(A\) in relation to the dimension of the fibers of the \(\phi\)-unit normal bundle \(N^\phi(A)\) of \(A\). This analysis allows us to obtain the general disintegration formula stated in Theorem \[5.24\] which in the present generality is new even in the special Euclidean case (see \[8\], Theorem 5.5) for sets with positive reach and \[99\] Theorems 1.56 and 1.57 for convex bodies.

As another consequence of the tube formula, we obtain differentiability properties of the parallel volume function in Section \[3\]. In Theorem \[5.3\] we determine the left and right derivatives of the localized volume function of the tubular neighbourhood around a closed set \(A\) with respect to \(\phi\).
and provide a novel necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of the two-sided derivative. Although this result is not needed in the proof of the soap bubble theorems, we have decided to include it here since it is of interest in itself. Indeed the derivative of the volume function has been the subject of several investigations; see [Sta76], [HLW04], [HLW06], [RW10] and [CLV21]. The most recent contribution [CLV21] Theorem 5.2 treats arbitrary and possibly asymmetric norms and establishes formulae for the left and the right derivative of the volume function in terms of \emph{area-integrals} on the boundary of the tubular neighbourhood of a compact set. Theorem 5.2 in [CLV21] can be compared with the third equality in (5.5) and in (5.6) (notice, however, that the results in [CLV21] are not localized). On the other hand, the main novelty of our results are the formulae for the left and the right derivatives of the localized volume function in terms of \emph{curvature integrals} on the \(\phi\)-unit normal bundle of \(A\). As a consequence, our result establishes the relation between the (localized) area integrals on the boundary of the tubular neighbourhood of \(A\) with the corresponding (localized) curvature integrals on the \(\phi\)-unit normal bundle of \(A\).

In Section 5 we generalize the classical notion of a normal boundary point of a convex body (see [Sch14] and [Sch15] and the references therein) to arbitrary sets of positive reach. It is well known that the boundary of a convex body \(C\) is locally the epigraph of a convex function around each of its boundary points. Employing the classical theorem of Alexandrov on the twice differentiability of convex functions, one can see that the normal boundary points are precisely those boundary points where the locally representing function is twice differentiable. Consequently, the notion of a pointwise second fundamental form and pointwise defined mean curvature functions can be introduced at each such boundary point. Some authors refer to the normal boundary points as \emph{Alexandrov points}, and for this reason we denote the set of these points by \(\mathcal{A}(C)\). If \(\mathbf{p} : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\), \(\mathbf{p}(a,\eta) = a\) for \((a,\eta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\), is the projection onto the first coordinate, it is known that for an arbitrary convex body \(C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\) it holds that

\[
\mathcal{A}(C) = \mathbf{p}(\tilde{N}_n^\phi(C)).
\]

Moreover, the pointwise defined mean curvature functions of \(C\), associated with the pointwise second fundamental form, coincide with the mean curvature functions defined on \(\tilde{N}_n^\phi(C)\); see [Hu99, Lemma 3.1] and [Hu99]. We extend these results to arbitrary sets of positive reach in an arbitrary uniformly convex normed space. A key difference to the case of convex bodies is that the boundary of a set \(C\) of positive reach is in general not graphical around each of its points. Therefore we define \(\partial^0 C\) as the set of points \(a \in \partial C\) where the fibre \(N(C,a)\) of the Euclidean unit normal bundle of \(C\) contains only one vector (the same set is obtained if \(\partial^0 C\) is defined with respect to the fibres of \(N^\phi(C)\) and a general norm \(\phi\)). In Theorem 5.7 we show that a set of positive reach \(C\) is locally the epigraph of a semiconvex function around each point \(a \in \partial^0 C\) and we prove that this function is twice differentiable at \(a\) if and only if \(\kappa_i^\phi(C,a,\eta) < \infty\) for \(i = 1,\ldots,n\), where \(N^\phi(C,a) = \{\eta\}\). This result opens the way to introduce the notion of an Alexandrov point for a set of positive reach: these are all points of \(\partial^0 A\) where the semiconvex function locally representing \(A\) is twice differentiable. We denote the set of all Alexandrov points of \(C\) by \(\mathcal{A}(C)\) and, as in the convex case, each Alexandrov point entails pointwise curvature information that we express by the mean curvature functions \(h_{C,k}^\phi\), for \(k \in \{0,\ldots,n\}\); see Definition 5.8. We prove that

\[
\mathcal{A}(C) = \mathbf{p}(\tilde{N}_n^\phi(C)) \cap \partial^0 C
\]

and

\[
h_{C,k}^\phi(a) = H_{C,k}^\phi(a,\eta) \text{ for every } a \in \mathcal{A}(C) \text{ and } N^\phi(C,a) = \{\eta\};
\]

see Theorem 5.10. In the remaining part of Section 5 employing the geometric inequality for closed sets from Theorem 3.20 we derive a version of the Heintze–Karcher inequality for sets of positive reach in Theorem 5.11. As a consequence, we obtain Theorem 5.10 which states that the only sets \(C\) of positive reach with finite and positive volume such that

\[
h_{C,1}^\phi(a) \geq \frac{n \mathcal{P}^\phi(C)}{(n + 1) \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(C)} \frac{1}{\mathcal{P}^\phi(C)} \text{ for } \mathcal{H}^n \text{ a.e. } a \in \mathcal{A}(C),
\]

are finite unions of rescaled and translated Wulff shapes of radius \(\left(\frac{n + 1}{n} \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(C)\right) \mathcal{P}^\phi(C) \). Here \(\mathcal{P}^\phi(C)\) is the \(\phi\)-perimeter of \(C\), namely

\[
\mathcal{P}^\phi(C) = \int_{\partial^0 C} \phi(n(C,a)) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a),
\]
Then C is the reduced boundary of C and n(C, ·) is the measure-theoretic Euclidean unit normal of C (notice that a set of positive reach has always locally finite perimeter, see Lemma 2.10). One can easily see that the lower bound in (1) is sharp by considering convex bodies obtained as unions of congruent spherical caps; see Remark 5.17. A key feature of these results is that they provide information on the global geometry of a set C of positive reach requiring only assumptions on points in ∂C. This is quite surprising in view of the fact that there exist sets C of positive reach with finite volume and non-empty interior such that Hn(∂C \ ∂C) > 0 (an explicit example is obtained by taking the function f in the example described at the end of this introduction such that {f = 0} has positive L1-measure). Theorem 5.10 plays a key role for the soap bubble theorems in Section 6 but is also of independent interest.

A special case of our first soap bubble theorem (Theorem 6.15) can be stated as follows. In view of condition (2), we point out that while the Radon measures Θj(C, ·) for j = 0, . . . , n − 1 and a set C ⊂ Rn+1 of positive reach, are signed in general, the measure Θ0(C, ·) is always non-negative. The hypothesis in (2), as well as the hypothesis in (3) and (4) of the subsequent theorems, is the natural generalization of the hypothesis of “k-convexity” for smooth domains (see [CW13] and references therein) to the singular setting of the present paper. If C is a convex body in Rn+1, then all generalized curvature measures Θj(C, ·) are non-negative. In fact, a set C ⊂ Rn+1 of positive reach is convex if and only if Θj(C, ·) ≥ 0 for all j = 0, . . . , n − 1.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let k ∈ {1, . . . , n}, λ ∈ R \ {0} and let C ⊂ Rn+1 be a set of positive reach with positive and finite volume. Assume that

\[
Θ_{n-k}(C, ·) = \lambda Θ_{n-k}(C, ·).
\]

Then C is a finite union of rescaled and translated Wulff shapes of radius \(\frac{(n+1)C^{n+1}(C)}{\partial C(C)}\).

If k = 1 then the conclusion holds for every set of positive reach with finite and positive volume and for every λ ∈ R.

For the proof of this theorem, we first establish an anisotropic extension of the Minkowski–Hsiung formulae for arbitrary sets of positive reach, which is provided in Theorem 6.8 and adds to several previous versions available in the literature (see [Koh94, Theorem 3.4], [Fu98, Corollary 3.4], [Hu99, Theorem 6.8] and adds to several previous versions available in the literature (see [Koh94, Theorem 3.4], [Fu98, Corollary 3.4], [Hu99, Theorem 6.8]). It is interesting to notice that the hypothesis in (2) is preserved for limits of sequences of smooth sets satisfying a positive lower bound on the reach; see Lemma 6.12 and Corollary 6.13.

Henceforth Theorem 1.1 might be helpful to study global geometric properties of limits of smooth almost k-th mean convex sets. We remark that if C is a smooth set, then the hypothesis in (2) is redundant, because the existence of an elliptic point in combination with the continuity of the principal curvatures guarantees the non-negativity hypothesis in (2). This is a classical argument outlined in [Ros87]. In the general situation of Theorem 1.1 we do not have any continuity for the curvature functions and it is unclear whether the hypothesis in (2) can be relaxed further.

If the assumption (2) is strengthened to include also the condition that Θ0(C, ·) is a non-negative measure, then we obtain the following version of Theorem 1.1 which is a special case of Theorem 6.10. In the statement of the result, we use the ϕ-curvature measures Cϕj(C, ·), j ∈ {0, . . . , n}, of C, which are the Radon measures on Rn+1 that are obtained as the image measures of the generalized curvature measures Θj(C, ·) under the projection map p, that is, Cϕj(C, ·) = Θϕj(C, · × ∂Wϕ).

**Theorem 1.2.** Let k ∈ {1, . . . , n}, λ > 0 and let C ⊂ Rn+1 be a set of positive reach with positive and finite volume. Assume that

\[
Θ_{n-k}(C, ·) = \lambda C_{n-k}(C, ·).
\]

Then C is a finite union of rescaled and translated Wulff shapes of radius \(\frac{(n+1)C^{n+1}(C)}{\partial C(C)}\).
Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 can be seen as measure-theoretic versions of the soap bubble theorem. Employing the notion of pointwise curvature in Alexandrov points, we obtain the following differential-geometric version (which is recalled as Theorem 6.18 in Section 6).

**Theorem 1.3.** Suppose that $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\emptyset \neq C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a set of positive reach with positive and finite volume such that $\mathcal{H}^n(\partial C \setminus \partial^\ast C) = 0$. If $k = 1$ we allow $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume that

\[
 h_{C,i}^\phi(a) \geq 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, k - 1 \quad \text{and for } \mathcal{H}^n \text{ a.e. } a \in \mathcal{A}(C) \quad \text{and} \quad h_{C,k}^\phi(a) = \lambda \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^n \text{ a.e. } a \in \mathcal{A}(C).
\]

Then $C$ is a finite union of rescaled and translated Wulff shapes of radius $\frac{(n+1)\mathcal{C}_{n+1}^n(C)}{\mathcal{P}(C)}$, provided that $\mathcal{H}^{n-k}[p(\tilde{N}^\phi(N_n^\phi(C)))] = 0$.

The hypothesis $\mathcal{H}^n(\partial C \setminus \partial^\ast C) = 0$ is equivalent to require that $\mathcal{P}(C) = \mathcal{H}^n(\partial C)$, where $\mathcal{P}(C) = \mathcal{H}^n(\partial^\ast C)$ is the Euclidean perimeter of $C$; see Theorem 5.10. Hence the condition $\mathcal{P}(C) = \mathcal{H}^n(\partial C)$ is an alternative way to say in a geometric-measure theoretic sense that $\partial C$ encloses $C$. As mentioned in the first paragraph of this introduction, this is a fundamental prerequisite to obtain soap bubbles in arbitrary dimension and without any topological assumptions, from the hypothesis that one of the mean curvature functions is constant. The hypothesis $\mathcal{H}^n(\partial C \setminus \partial^\ast C) = 0$ implies that $\mathcal{H}^n$ a.e. $a \in \mathcal{P}(\tilde{N}_n^\phi(C))$ is an Alexandrov point (see again Theorem 5.10). Based on the disjoint decomposition

\[
 p(\tilde{N}^\phi(C)) = p(\tilde{N}_n^\phi(C)) \cup p(\tilde{N}_{n+1}^\phi(C)) \quad \text{and} \quad p(\tilde{N}_n^\phi(C)) \cap p(\tilde{N}_{n+1}^\phi(C)) = \emptyset,
\]

provided in Theorem 5.6, the set $p(\tilde{N}^\phi(C)) \cup p(\tilde{N}_{n+1}^\phi(C))$ can be seen as the set of singular points of $\partial C$.

Consequently, the hypothesis $\mathcal{H}^{n-k}[p(\tilde{N}^\phi(C) \setminus \tilde{N}_n^\phi(C))] = 0$ is (in general) a sharp assumption on the smallness of the singular set. For $k = 1$ the example of the union of two congruent spherical caps shows that the condition on the Hausdorff measure cannot be relaxed. On the other hand, for $k = n$ the examples of peaked spheres (see [GHM13] and [FLW19, Section 2 and Theorem 15]), including as a special case a set resembling an American football [FLW19, Section 4], demonstrate that the condition on the Hausdorff measure is sharp. (The construction of corresponding examples for $1 < k < n$ seems to be an interesting problem.) In this sense, Theorem 1.3 can also be seen as a result on removable singularities.

We remark that the class of sets of positive reach (with finite and positive volume) satisfying the assumption $\mathcal{H}^n(\partial C \setminus \partial^\ast C) = 0$ not only includes all sets that can be locally represented as epigraphs of siconvex functions (in a particular all convex bodies), see Lemma 6.20 but it includes many other examples of sets whose boundaries are not topological manifolds. One such example can be constructed by reflecting around the $x$-axis in $\mathbb{R}^2$ the set $\{(x, f(x)) : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$, where $f : [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}$ is a non-negative smooth function such that $f(a) = f(b) = 0$, $\lim_{x \to a^+} f(x) = +\infty$, $\lim_{x \to b^-} f(x) = -\infty$ and $\{f = 0\}$ is a Cantor set of $\mathcal{L}^1$-measure zero (in this case $\partial C \setminus \partial^\ast C = \{f = 0\}$).

The present work is mainly motivated by classical problems in differential geometry and the calculus of variations. However, local Steiner formulas and differentials of basic geometric functionals of convex bodies, as considered here for more general classes of sets, also play a crucial role in the Brunn–Minkowski theory [Sch14] and its applications. These formulas naturally lead to the curvature measures, which are a major topic of the current investigation, but also to surface area measures, quermassintegrals, and to $L_p$, Orlicz and dual versions of these fundamental functionals and measures. We refer to the seminal work by Huang, Lutwak, Yang and Zhang [HLYZ16], where several new measures are introduced and connections to classical geometric measures are explored. In [HLYZ16] then all these measures are combined in the investigation of associated Minkowski problems, which have received much attention in recent years (see, e.g., [BLYZ13], [BLYZ13], [BHP18], [HLYZ18], [LYZ18], [BLZ19], [GHX19], [GHX20]).

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Notation and basic facts

In general, but with few exceptions explained below, we follow the notation and terminology of [Fed69] (see [Fed69, pp. 669-676]). In particular we adopt the terminology from [Fed69, 3.2.14] when dealing
with rectifiable sets.

If $X$ is a topological space and $S \subseteq X$, then we denote with $\text{int}(S)$ the interior part of $S$, with $\partial S$ the topological boundary of $S$ and with $\text{clo}(S)$ the closure of $S$; moreover the characteristic function of $S$ is $1_S$. If $Q \subseteq X \times Y$ and $S \subseteq X$, we define $Q|S = \{(x,y) \in Q : x \in S\}$. We denote by $\bullet$ a fixed scalar product on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and by $|\cdot|$ its associated norm. We denote with $S^n$ the unit sphere, i.e. $S^n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : |x| = 1\}$. The maps $p: \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $q: \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ are the projection onto the first and the second component respectively, i.e. $p(x,y) = x$ and $q(x,y) = y$.

If $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}^p$, then we denote by $\text{Tan}(S,a)$ and $\text{Nor}(S,a)$ the tangent and normal cone of $S$ at $a$ (see [Fed69, 3.1.21]). Always following [Fed69] we use the symbol $\text{Tan}^m(\mathcal{H}^m \cup S,a)$ for the cone of all $(\mathcal{H}^m \cup S,m)$ approximate tangent vectors at $a$ (see [Fed69, 3.2.16]). For an $(\mathcal{H}^m, m)$ rectifiable and $\mathcal{H}^m$ measurable set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$, the cone $\text{Tan}^m(\mathcal{H}^m \cup S,a)$ is an $m$-dimensional linear subspace for $\mathcal{H}^m$ a.e. $a \in S$. Each Lipschitz function $f: \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}^q$ has at $\mathcal{H}^m$ almost all points of $a \in S$ an $(\mathcal{H}^m \cup S,m)$ approximate differential $\text{ap} \text{Tan}^m(\mathcal{H}^m \cup S,a) \to \mathbb{R}^q$ (see [Fed69, 3.2.16, 3.2.19]).

If this approximate differential exists, for $k \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ we define the $(\mathcal{H}^m \cup S,m)$ approximate $k$-th Jacobian of $f$ as

$$
ap J_k^S f(a) = \|\bigwedge_k \text{ap} \text{D} f(a)\| = \sup\{|\bigwedge_k \text{ap} \text{D} f(a)(\xi)| : \xi \in \bigwedge_k \text{Tan}^m(\mathcal{H}^m \cup S,a), |\xi| = 1\},$$

where $\bigwedge_k \text{D} f(a): \bigwedge_k \text{Tan}^m(\mathcal{H}^m \cup S,a) \to \bigwedge_k \mathbb{R}^q$ is the linear map induced by $\text{ap} \text{D} f(a)$ (see [Fed69, 1.3.1]). The norms $|\cdot|$ on the right-side of (5) denote the norm induced on $\bigwedge_k \text{Tan}^m(\mathcal{H}^m \cup S,a)$ and $\bigwedge_k \mathbb{R}^q$ by the inner products of $\text{Tan}^m(\mathcal{H}^m \cup S,a)$ and $\mathbb{R}^q$, respectively (see [Fed69, 1.7.5, 1.7.6]). The approximate Jacobian of a Lipschitz map will be repeatedly used in this paper in applying the following version of Federer’s coarea formula for Lipschitz maps on rectifiable sets, for which we refer to [Fed78] pp. 300–301.

**Lemma 2.1** (Federer). If $W$ is an $(\mathcal{H}^m, m)$ rectifiable $\mathcal{H}^m$ measurable subset of $\mathbb{R}^p$, $f: W \to \mathbb{R}^q$ is a Lipschitzian map, $k \in \{0, \ldots, m\}$ and $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ is a countable union of Borel subsets of $\mathbb{R}^q$ with finite $\mathcal{H}^k$ measure, then

$$\int_{W \cap f^{-1}(S)} \phi(x) \text{ap} J_k^W f(x) d\mathcal{H}^m(x) = \int_S \int_{W \cap f^{-1}\{y\}} \phi(x) d\mathcal{H}^{m-k}(x) d\mathcal{H}^k(y)$$

for every $\mathcal{H}^m$ measurable function $\phi: W \to [0, \infty]$.

Following Federer [Fed69, page 15] we denote with $\Lambda(n,m)$ the set of all increasing maps from $\{1, \ldots, m\}$ into $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. We now introduce the $k$-th elementary symmetric functions. For $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, we define

$$S_k(x) := \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda(n,k)} x_{\lambda(1)} \cdots x_{\lambda(k)},$$

Then

$$\Gamma_k^0 := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : S_1(x) > 0, \ldots, S_k(x) > 0\}$$

is an open convex cone whose closure is the (pointed) closed convex cone

$$\Gamma_k := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : S_1(x) \geq 0, \ldots, S_k(x) \geq 0\}$$

with apex 0 (see [TW99, Section 2, page 582] or [Sal99, Proposition 1.3.2]).

For a vector $x$ with positive components the following lemma is well known. In the following more general form, it is in fact harder to find an explicit reference.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. If $x \in \Gamma_k$, then

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} S_i(x) \\ \vdash \end{array} \right) 
\geq \left(\begin{array}{c} S_j(x) \\ \vdash \end{array} \right)$$

for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq k$. 

\[8\]
Proof. See [Sal99, Proposition 1.3.3 (4)]. We indicate an alternative argument here. First, Newton’s inequality holds for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, as shown in [Ros97]. Let $S_0(x) := 1$ and $E_r(x) := S_r(x)/(r^2)$ for $r = 0, \ldots, k$. If $x \in \Gamma_k$, then the asserted inequalities can be obtained (as usually) by repeated application of Newton’s inequality $E_t(x)E_{t+2}(x) \leq E_t(x)^2$ via

$$
\prod_{t=0}^{r-1} (E_t(x)E_{t+2}(x))^{t+1} \leq \prod_{t=1}^{r} E_t(x)^{2t} \quad \text{for } r \in \{1, \ldots, k - 1\}.
$$

Since $\Gamma_k$ is the closure of the open convex cone $\Gamma_k^\circ$, the assertion for $x \in \Gamma_k$ follows by an obvious approximation argument.

### 2.2 Multivalued maps

A map $T$ defined on a set $X$ is called $Y$-multivalued, if $T(x)$ is a subset of $Y$ for every $x \in X$. If $T(x)$ is a singleton, with a little abuse of notation we denote with $T(x)$ the unique element of the set $T(x) \subseteq Y$. Suppose that $(X, \| \cdot \|)$ and $(Y, \| \cdot \|)$ are finite-dimensional normed vectorspaces and $T$ is a $Y$-multivalued map such that $T(x) \neq \emptyset$ for every $x \in X$.

1. We say that $T$ is weakly continuous at $x \in X$ if and only if for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $y \in X$ and $\|y - x\| < \delta$, then

$$
T(y) \subseteq T(x) + \{v \in Y : \|v\| < \epsilon\};
$$

if, additionally, $T(x)$ is a singleton, then we say that $T$ is continuous at $x$.

2. We say that $T$ is strongly differentiable at $x \in X$ if and only if $T(x)$ is a singleton and there exists a linear map $L : X \to Y$ such that for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $y \in X$, $\|y - x\| < \delta$ and $w \in T(y)$, then

$$
\|w - T(x) - L(y - x)\| \leq \epsilon \|y - x\|;
$$

cf. [KS24, Definition 2.28]. The linear map $L$ is unique (cf. [KS24, Remark 2.29]) and we denote it by $dT(x)$. Moreover we denote by $dmm dT$ the set of points $x \in X$ at which $T$ is strongly differentiable. In the following, we simply write “differentiable” when we actually mean “strongly differentiable”.

The following general fact on the Borel measurability of the differential of a multivalued map will be useful.

**Lemma 2.3.** Let $(X, \| \cdot \|)$ and $(Y, \| \cdot \|)$ be finite-dimensional normed vectorspaces, and let $T$ be a $Y$-multivalued weakly continuous map such that $T(x) \neq \emptyset$ for $x \in X$.

Then \{x \in X : T(x) is a singleton\} and $dmm dT$ are Borel subsets of $X$ and $dT : dmm dT \to \text{Hom}(X,Y)$ is Borel measurable.

**Proof.** We define $U = \{x \in X : T(x) is a singleton\}$ and the function $\text{diam} : 2^Y \setminus \{\emptyset\} \to [0, \infty]$ by $\text{diam} S = \sup\{\|y_1 - y_2\| : y_1, y_2 \in S\}$ for every $S \in 2^Y \setminus \{\emptyset\}$. Noting that $\text{diam} \circ T : X \to [0, +\infty]$ is upper semicontinuous, we conclude that $U = \{x \in X : \text{diam}(T(x)) = 0\}$ is a Borel subset of $X$.

For positive integers $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ we define

$$
C_{ij} = \left\{(x,L) \in U \times \text{Hom}(X,Y) : \|w - T(x) - L(h)\| \leq \frac{1}{i} \|h\| \quad \text{for } \|h\| < \frac{1}{j} \quad \text{and } w \in T(x + h)\right\}.
$$

We prove that $C_{ij}$ is relatively closed in $U \times \text{Hom}(X,Y)$. By contradiction assume that $C_{ij}$ is not closed. Then there exists $(x_0, L_0) \in (U \times \text{Hom}(X,Y)) \setminus C_{ij}$ and a sequence $(x_k, L_k) \in C_{ij}$ converging to $(x_0, L_0)$. Hence that there exist $h_0 \in X$ with $\|h_0\| < \frac{1}{j}$ and $w_0 \in T(x_0 + h_0)$ such that

$$
\|w_0 - T(x_0) - L_0(h_0)\| > \frac{1}{i} \|h_0\|.
$$
We define $h_k = x_0 + h_0 - x_k$ for $k \geq 1$ and select $k_0 \geq 1$ so that $\|h_k\| < \gamma$ for $k \geq k_0$. Since $(x_k, L_k) \in C_{ij}$, $x_0 + h_0 = x_k + h_k$ and $w_0 \in T(x_k + h_k)$ for $k \geq 1$, we infer that

$$\|w_0 - T(x_k) - L_k(h_k)\| \leq \frac{1}{k}\|h_k\| \quad \text{for } k \geq k_0.$$ 

Noting that $T(x_k) \to T(x_0)$ and $h_k \to h_0$ as $k \to \infty$, we deduce that

$$\|w_0 - T(x_0) - L_0(h_0)\| \leq \frac{1}{k_0}\|h_0\|,$$

and we obtain a contradiction.

Let $G := \{(x, D T(x)) : x \in \text{dmm} D T\}$ and $\pi_X : X \times \text{Hom}(X, Y) \to X$, $\pi_X(x, T) = x$ for every $(x, T) \in X \times \text{Hom}(X, Y)$. Noting that

$$G = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} C_{ij},$$

we infer that $G$ is a Borel subset of $U \times \text{Hom}(X, Y)$. Since $\pi_X|G$ is injective, we obtain from [Fed69, 2.2.10, bottom of page 67] that $\{x \in \text{dmm} D T : D T(x) \in B\} = \pi_X(G \cap (X \times B))$ is a Borel set in $X$ if $B \subseteq \text{Hom}(X, Y)$ is a Borel set, which implies the remaining assertions.

\[ \square \]

Remark 2.4. The case of single-valued continuous functions is treated in [Fed69, page 211] with a similar proof.

The following elementary lemma will be useful in Section 5.

**Lemma 2.5.** Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$ be open, let $F : U \to \mathbb{R}^k$ be differentiable at $a \in U$, and assume that $D F(a) : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^k$ is invertible. Let $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$ be open with $x = F(a) \in V$ and assume that $G : V \to \mathbb{R}^k$ is Lipschitz. Further, assume that $F(U) \subseteq V$ and $G \circ F = \text{Id}_U$. Then $G$ is differentiable at $x$ and $D G(x) = D F(a)^{-1}$.

**Proof.** Let $v \in \mathbb{R}^k$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there is some $\delta > 0$ such that if $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $0 < |t| < \delta$, then $a + tv \in U$ and

$$\left| \frac{F(a + tv) - F(a)}{t} - D F(a)(v) \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\text{Lip}(G)}.$$ 

Then we obtain

$$\left| \frac{G(x + t D F(a)(v)) - G(x)}{t} - v \right| = \left| \frac{G(F(a) + t D F(a)(v)) - G(F(a))}{t} - \frac{G(F(a + tv)) - G(F(a))}{t} \right| \leq \text{Lip}(G) \cdot \left| \frac{F(a + tv) - F(a)}{t} - D F(a)(v) \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$ 

Since $D F(a) : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^k$ is invertible, this shows that if $w \in \mathbb{R}^k$, then

$$\lim_{t \to 0} \left| \frac{G(x + tw) - G(x)}{t} - D F(a)^{-1}(w) \right| = 0,$$

and hence $G$ is differentiable at $x$ with $D G(x) = D F(a)^{-1}$. \[ \square \]

### 2.3 Norms and Wulff shapes.

Let $\phi$ be a norm on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. We say that $\phi$ is a $C^k$-norm if and only if $\phi \in C^k(\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\})$. We say that $\phi$ is uniformly convex if and only if there exists a constant $\gamma > 0$ (ellipticity constant) such that the function $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \ni u \mapsto \phi(u) - \gamma |u|$ is convex. If $\phi$ is a uniformly convex $C^2$-norm then

$$D^2 \phi(u)(v, v) \geq \gamma |v|^2$$
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for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with $|u| = 1$ and for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ perpendicular to $u$. In the following, a compact convex set with non-empty interior will be called a convex body. The symmetric (with respect to the origin $o$) convex body $B = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \phi(x) \leq 1\}$ is the unit ball or gauge body associated with $\phi$. Conversely, the gauge function (norm) of $B$ is just $\phi$, i.e.,

$$g(B, x) := g_B(x) := \|x\|_B := \min\{\lambda \geq 0 : x \in \lambda B\} = \phi(x).$$

For a compact convex set $\emptyset \neq K \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, we write $h_K = h(K, \cdot)$ for its support function, which is defined by $h(K, x) := h_K(x) := \max\{x \cdot z : z \in K\}$, and we denote by $K^o := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : x \cdot y \leq 1 \text{ for } y \in K\}$ the polar body of $K$. Note that $K^o$ is again a convex body if the origin $o$ is an interior point of $K$. Hence we have

$$\phi = g_B = h_{B^o}$$

(see [Sch14, Section 1.7.2, page 53]).

For any norm $\phi$ we denote by $\phi^*$ the conjugate norm of $\phi$ which is defined by $\phi^*(u) = \sup\{v \cdot u : \phi(v) = 1\}$ for $u \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Then we also have

$$\phi^* = h_B = g_{B^o}.$$  

It is well known that if $\phi$ is a uniformly convex $C^2$-norm then $\phi^*$ is a uniformly convex $C^2$-norm. In geometric terms, this is equivalent to the property that $B$ and $B^o$ both have a boundary of class $C^2$ and positive Gauss curvature everywhere ($\phi^*$ can be regarded as a $C^2$ function). In particular, the spherical image map (Gauss map) $u_B : \partial B \to S^n$ is a diffeomorphism of class $C^1$ whose inverse is given by the restriction of $\nabla h_B$ to $S^n$. We refer to [DRKS20, Lemma 2.32] for this and other basic facts on $\phi$ and $\phi^*$ and to [Sch14, Section 2.5] for the relations between smoothness properties of $B$ and $B^o$. These facts will be tacitly used throughout the paper.

We define the Wulff shape (or Wulff crystal) of $\phi$ as

$$W^\phi = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \phi^*(x) \leq 1\} = B^o.$$ 

Hence, if $\phi$ is a uniformly convex $C^2$-norm, then the Wulff shape of $\phi$ is a uniformly convex set with $C^2$ boundary. In this case the exterior unit normal (spherical image) map of $W^\phi$ is the map

$$n^\phi : \partial W^\phi \to S^n;$$

we remark (see [DRKS20, 2.32] or [Sch14, Section 2.5]) that $n^\phi = u_{B^o}$ is a $C^1$-diffeomorphism onto $S^n$ and

$$\nabla \phi(n^\phi(x)) = x \quad \text{for } x \in \partial W^\phi, \quad n^\phi(\nabla \phi(u)) = u \quad \text{for } u \in S^n.$$  

(8)

Since $D(\nabla \phi)(u) \cdot u = 0$ for $u \in S^n$, we notice that

$$\Tan(S^n, u) = D(\nabla \phi)(u)[\Tan(S^n, u)] = \Tan(\partial W^\phi, \nabla \phi(u)).$$

Moreover, we have $\phi(n^\phi(x)) = n^\phi(x) \cdot x$ for $x \in \partial W^\phi$. We also point out (cf. [DRKS20, Lemma 2.32(f)]) that the compositions of the gradient maps $\nabla \phi : R^{n+1} \setminus \{0\} \to \partial B^o$ and $\nabla \phi^* : R^{n+1} \setminus \{0\} \to \partial B$ satisfy the relations

$$\nabla \phi^* \circ \nabla \phi|_{\partial B} = \Id_{\partial B} \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla \phi \circ \nabla \phi^*|_{\partial B^o} = \Id_{\partial B^o}.$$  

(9)

### 2.4 Distance function and normal bundle

**Warning.** In this paper we occasionally refer to [KS21]. However, notice that in this paper we use the same symbols with a different meaning (the roles of $\phi$ and $\phi^*$ are changed). Hence the definitions below have to be compared carefully with those given in [KS21 Sections 1 and 2].
Next we introduce the map \( R \phi \) of bodies that from (9). It follows from [DRKS20, Lemma 2.32] or from (12) and basic properties of strictly convex fact). It is well known that \( \{ \phi \} \) is a Lipschitz map; moreover it is a classical fact that \( -\delta_A^\phi \) is semiconvex on \( R^{n+1}\backslash B^\phi(A, r) \) for \( r > 0 \); (cf. [KS21] Lemma 2.41(b) and the references therein).

The nearest \( \phi \)-projection \( \xi_A^\phi : R^{n+1} \to 2^A \) is the \( A \)-multivalued map defined by

\[
\xi_A^\phi(x) = \{ c \in A : \delta_A^\phi(x) = \phi^*(x - c) \} \quad \text{for } x \in R^{n+1}.
\]

This is a weakly continuous map by [KS21] Lemma 2.41(f). By \( \text{Unp}^\phi(A) \) we denote the set of all \( x \in R^{n+1} \backslash A \) such that there exists a unique point \( c \in A \) with \( \phi^*(x - c) = \delta_A^\phi(x) \), i.e., \( \text{Unp}^\phi(A) = \{ x \in R^{n+1} \backslash A : \mathcal{H}^n(\xi^\phi_A(x)) = 1 \} \). For \( x \in \text{Unp}^\phi(A) \) we simply write \( \xi^\phi_A(x) = c \) if \( \xi^\phi_A(x) = \{ c \} \). Notice that \( \text{Unp}^\phi(A) \) is a Borel subset of \( R^{n+1} \) by Lemma 2.23 (see [HL00] Lemma 3.12 for a more general fact). It is well known that \( R^{n+1} \backslash (A \cup \text{Unp}^\phi(A)) \) equals the set of points in \( R^{n+1} \backslash A \) where \( \delta_A^\phi \) is not differentiable (cf. [KS21] Lemma 2.41(c)). Moreover, \( R^{n+1} \backslash (A \cup \text{Unp}^\phi(A)) \) can be covered outside a set of \( \mathcal{H}^n \) measure zero by a countable union of \( n \)-dimensional graphs of \( C^2 \)-functions; for the proof of this result one can proceed as in the Euclidean case which is treated in [Haj22].

The \( \phi \)-Cahn–Hoffman map of \( A \) is the \( \partial W^\phi \)-multivalued function \( \nu^\phi_A : R^{n+1} \backslash A \to 2^{\partial W^\phi} \) defined by

\[
\nu^\phi_A(x) = \delta^\phi_A(x)^{-1}(x - \xi^\phi_A(x)) \quad \text{for } x \in R^{n+1} \backslash A.
\]

Next we introduce the map \( \psi^\phi_A : R^{n+1} \backslash A \to 2^{A} \times 2^{\partial W^\phi} \) by

\[
\psi^\phi_A(x) = (\xi^\phi_A(x), \nu^\phi_A(x)) \quad \text{for } x \in R^{n+1} \backslash A.
\]

Recall the relations

\[
\nabla \delta^\phi_A(x) = \nabla \phi^*(x - \xi^\phi_A(x)) \in \partial W^\phi \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla \phi(\nabla \delta^\phi_A(x)) = \nu^\phi_A(x) \in \partial W^\phi
\]

for \( x \in \text{Unp}^\phi(A) \), cf. [KS21] Lemma 2.41(c) (but recall that the notation and in particular the roles of \( \phi \) and \( \phi^* \) are changed in comparison with [Kah21]). The equivalence of these two relations follows from [SSD20] Lemma 2.32 or from [Haj22] and basic properties of strictly convex bodies that \( \nu^\phi_A(x) \cdot \nabla \delta^\phi_A(x) = \phi(\nabla \delta^\phi_A(x)) = 1 \) for \( x \in \text{Unp}^\phi(A) \).

The \( \phi \)-unit normal bundle of \( A \) is defined by

\[
N^\phi(A) = \{(x, \eta) \in A \times \partial W^\phi : \delta^\phi_A(x + r\eta) = r \text{ for some } r > 0 \} = \{ \psi^\phi_A(z) : z \in \text{Unp}^\phi(A) \},
\]

and we set

\[
N^\phi(A, x) = \{ \eta \in \partial W^\phi : (x, \eta) \in N^\phi(A) \} \quad \text{for } x \in A.
\]

We recall (cf. [DRKS20] Lemma 5.2) that \( N^\phi(A) \) is a Borel subset of \( R^{n+1} \times R^{n+1} \) and it can be covered up to a set of \( \mathcal{H}^n \) measure zero by a countable union of \( n \)-dimensional graphs of \( C^1 \)-functions; moreover we have

\[
N^\phi(A) = \{(a, \nabla \phi(u)) : (a, u) \in N(A) \}.
\]

The \( \phi \)-reach function of \( A \) is the upper semicontinuous (see [KS21] Lemma 2.35] function \( r^\phi_A : N^\phi(A) \to [0, +\infty] \) given by

\[
r^\phi_A(a, \eta) = \sup \{ s > 0 : \delta^\phi_A(a + s\eta) = s \} \quad \text{for } (a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A),
\]
and the $\phi$-cut locus of $A$ is given by

$$\text{Cut}^\phi(A) = \{ a + r^\phi_A(a, \eta) : (a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A) \}.$$  

The strict convexity of $\phi$ implies that $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus (A \cup \text{Unp}^\phi(A)) \subseteq \text{Cut}^\phi(A)$; see Lemma 2.41 (c) and Remark 4.1 in [KS21], as well as further references given there. Moreover $\text{Cut}^\phi(A)$ is always contained in the closure of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus (A \cup \text{Unp}^\phi(A))$; cf. [Fr07, Theorem 3B]. We recall that (cf. [DRKS20, Remark 5.10])

$$\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(\text{Cut}^\phi(A)) = 0.$$  

On the other hand, the closure of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus (A \cup \text{Unp}^\phi(A))$ might have non-empty interior even if $A$ is the closure of the complement of a convex body with $C^{1,1}$-boundary (see [San21] for this and other critical examples). If $A$ is convex, then $\text{Cut}^\phi(A) = \emptyset$. A related function which will be useful in the sequel is defined by

$$\rho^\phi_A(x) = \sup\{ s \geq 0 : \delta^\phi_A(a + s(x - a)) = s\delta^\phi_A(x) \} \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A \text{ and } a \in \xi^\phi_A(x).$$

This definition does not depend on the choice of $a \in \xi^\phi_A(x)$ and the function $\rho^\phi_A : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A \to [1, +\infty)$ is upper semicontinuous; cf. [KS21, Lemma 2.33]. Notice that $\{ x : \rho^\phi_A(x) > 1 \} \subseteq \text{Unp}^\phi(A)$ (see Lemma 2.33 and Remark 4.1 in [KS21]) and

$$r^\phi_A(a, \eta) = r\rho^\phi_A(a + r\eta) \quad \text{for } (a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A) \text{ and } 0 < r < r^\phi_A(a, \eta),$$  

as shown in [KS21, Lemma 2.35].

The following two results from [KS21], which we recall here for the ease of the reader, plays an important role in the next section. The norm $\rho$ is always assumed to be uniformly convex and $C^2$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \{0\}$.

**Theorem 2.6** (cf. [KS21, Corollary 3.10]). Let $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be closed, $1 < \lambda < \infty$, $0 < s < t < \infty$, and

$$A_{\lambda, s, t} = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A : \rho^\phi_A(x) \geq \lambda, s \leq \delta^\phi_A(x) \leq t \}.$$  

Then $\xi^\phi_A | A_{\lambda, s, t}$ is Lipschitz continuous.

Before we can state the next result we need to recall from [KS21] the reach-type function $r^\phi_A : N^\phi(A) \to [0, +\infty]$ defined by

$$r^\phi_A(a, \eta) = \sup \left\{ \sigma r : \sigma > 1, 0 < r < r^\phi_A(a, \eta), \lim_{\rho \to 0+} \frac{\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(A_\sigma \cap B(a + r\eta, \rho))}{\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(B(a + r\eta, \rho))} = 1 \right\} \cup \{0\},$$

where $A_\sigma = \{ \rho^\phi_A \geq \sigma \}$. Notice that $r^\phi_A(a, \eta) \leq r^\phi_A(a, \eta)$ for every $(a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A)$; see [KS21, Remark 4.10]. This function plays a central role in [KS21] in the study of the structure of the set $\text{dmn} D\nu^\phi_A$ which coincides with the set of twice differentiability points of $\delta^\phi_A$ by [KS21, Lemma 2.41(c)].

**Theorem 2.7** (cf. [KS21, Theorem 1.5]). If $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a closed set, then

$$\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus (A \cup \text{dmn} D\nu^\phi_A)) = 0$$

and

$$\{ a + r\eta : 0 < r < r^\phi_A(a, \eta) \} \subseteq \text{dmn}(D\nu^\phi_A) \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^n \text{ almost all } (a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A).$$

The function $r^\phi_A$ is Borel measurable. Moreover, if $a + s\eta \in \text{dmn} D\nu^\phi_A$ for some $s \in (0, r^\phi_A(a, \eta))$, then $a + r\eta \in \text{dmn} D\nu^\phi_A$ for all $r \in (0, r^\phi_A(a, \eta))$. Finally,

$$r^\phi_A(a, \eta) = r^\phi_A(a, \eta) \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^n \text{ a.e. } (a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A).$$
Lemma 2.8. Suppose $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a closed set, $\xi : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is an arbitrary function such that $\xi(y) \in \xi^A_\lambda(y)$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and
\[ u(y) = \frac{\nabla \delta^\phi(y - \xi(y))}{|\nabla \delta^\phi(y - \xi(y))|} \quad \text{for } y \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A. \]

For $x \in \text{dnn } D \nu_A^\phi$, $r = \delta_A^\phi(x)$ and $T = \tan(S^\phi(A, r), x)$ the following statements hold.

(a) $\rho_A^\phi(x) > 1$, $\text{im } D \nu_A^\phi(x) \subseteq T$ and $D \nu_A^\phi(x)(\nu_A^\phi(x)) = 0$.

(b) The maps $D(\nabla \phi)(u(x))T$ and $D u(x)|T$ are self-adjoint (with respect to the underlying scalar product) automorphisms of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

\[ D \nu_A^\phi(x) = D(\nabla \phi)(u(x)) \circ D u(x) \quad \text{and} \quad D u(x)(\tau_1) \cdot \tau_2 = \frac{D^2 \delta_A^\phi(x)(\tau_1, \tau_2)}{|\nabla \delta_A^\phi(x)(x)|} \quad \text{for } \tau_1, \tau_2 \in T. \]

(c) There is a basis $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n$ of $T$ of eigenvectors of $D \nu_A^\phi(x)|T$ and the corresponding eigenvalues $\chi_1 \leq \ldots \leq \chi_n$ of $D \nu_A^\phi(x)$ are real numbers such that
\[ \frac{1}{(1 - \rho_A^\phi(x))r} \leq \chi_i \leq \frac{1}{r}. \] (17)

2.5 Boundaries and perimeter

Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $a \in A$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $u \in S^n$ and $r > 0$, we define the open halfspace through $x$ with (inner and outer, respectively) normal $u$ by $H^+(x, u) := \{ z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : (z - x) \cdot u > 0 \}$ and $H^-(x, u) := \{ z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : (z - x) \cdot u < 0 \}$. Following [Fed69] Section 4.5.5], we say that a vector $u \in S^n$ is an exterior normal of $A$ at $a$ if
\[ \lim_{r \to 0^+} \frac{\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(H^+(a, u) \cap U(a, r) \cap A)}{r^{n+1}} = 0 \]
and
\[ \lim_{r \to 0^+} \frac{\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(H^-(a, u) \cap U(a, r) \setminus A)}{r^{n+1}} = 0. \]

Clearly, in this definition $U(a, r)$ can be replaced by $B(a, r)$ and the open halfspaces can be replaced by the corresponding closed halfspaces. Recall also from [Fed69] Section 4.5.5] that if $u$ and $v$ are exterior unit normals of $A$ at $a$, then $u = v$. The set of points where the exterior normal of $A$ exists is denoted by $\partial^\phi A$, we define $n(A, \cdot) : \partial^\phi A \to S^n$ to be the Euclidean exterior normal map of $A$. We extend this definition by $n(A, x) = 0$ for $x \notin \partial^\phi A$. Notice the equality $n(W^\phi, \cdot) = n^\phi$ on $\partial W^\phi$.

For an $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}$ measurable set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ one can also consider the essential boundary $\partial^* A$; see [AFP00] Definition 3.60]. Recalling the notions of approximate discontinuity set $S_n$ and approximate jump set $J_n$ of a function $u \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$, see [AFP00] Definitions 3.63 and 3.67, we notice that if $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is an $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}$ measurable set, then $\partial^* A = S_1 A$ and $\partial^m A = J_1 A$, and it follows from [AFP00] Proposition 3.64] and [AFP00 Proposition 3.69] that $\partial^m A$ and $\partial^* A$ are Borel subsets of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, $n(A, \cdot)$ is a Borel function and
\[ \partial^m A \subseteq \partial^* A. \]

Employing an argument similar to [San19] Lemma 5.1], one can still prove that if $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is an arbitrary set, then $\partial^m A$ is a Borel subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $n(A, \cdot)$ is a Borel function.

We recall that an $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}$ measurable subset $A$ of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a set of locally finite perimeter in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ if the characteristic function $1_A$ is a function of locally bounded first variation (see [AFP00] Chapter 3]). If $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a set of finite perimeter, we denote with $\mathcal{F} A$ the reduced boundary of $A$ (see [AFP00] 3.54]). An important result of De Giorgi, see [AFP00] Theorem 3.59], implies that
\[ \mathcal{F} A \subseteq \partial^m A. \]
A result of Federer (see [AFP00 Theorem 3.61]) yields that if $A$ is a set of locally finite perimeter, then
\[
\mathcal{H}^n(\partial^* A \setminus \mathcal{F} A) = 0. \quad (18)
\]
Another result of Federer (see [Fed69 Theorem 4.5.11]) implies that if $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $\mathcal{H}^n(K \cap \partial A) < \infty$ for every compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, then $A$ is a set of locally finite perimeter.

**Definition 2.9.** Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a Borel set with locally finite perimeter, and let $\phi$ be a uniformly convex $C^2$-norm on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. The $\phi$-perimeter of $A$ is the Radon measure $\mathcal{P}^\phi(A, \cdot)$ supported in $\partial A$ such that
\[
\mathcal{P}^\phi(A, S) = \int_{S \cap \partial^m A} \phi(n(A, x)) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(x) \quad \text{for Borel sets } S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}.
\]
The total measure is denoted by $\mathcal{P}^\phi(A, \mathbb{R}^{n+1}) = \mathcal{P}^\phi(A, \partial^m A) = \mathcal{P}^\phi(A) \in [0, \infty]$.

Clearly, we have $\mathcal{P}^\phi(A) > 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{H}^n(\partial^m A) > 0$.

The following lemma will be needed in Section 6. We refer to this section and the references provided there, for the definition and the basic facts concerning sets of positive reach.

**Lemma 2.10.** (a) If $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a Borel set of locally finite perimeter such that $0 < \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(A) < \infty$, then $\mathcal{H}^n(FA) > 0$.

(b) If $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a set of positive reach, then $\mathcal{H}^n(K \cap \partial A) < \infty$ for every compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, and consequently $A$ is a set of locally finite perimeter.

**Proof.** Noting [AFP00 Theorem 3.59] and [AFP00 Theorem 3.36], the statement in (a) directly follows from the isoperimetric inequality in [AFP00 Theorem 3.46].

We now prove (b). We fix $0 < r < \text{reach}(A)$ and note that $S(A, r)$ is a closed $C^1$-hypersurface and $\xi := \xi_A[S(A, r)$ is a Lipschitz map with $\xi(S(A, r)) = \partial A$. Since $\partial A \cap B(0, s) \subseteq \xi(\xi^{-1}(\partial A \cap B(0, s)))$ and $\xi^{-1}(\partial A \cap B(0, s)) \subseteq (S(A, r) \cap B(0, s + r))$ for $s > 0$, we infer that
\[
\mathcal{H}^n(B(0, s) \cap \partial A) \leq \text{Lip}(\xi) \mathcal{H}^n(S(A, r) \cap B(0, s + r)) \quad \text{for } s > 0.
\]
The right-hand side is evidently finite, since $S(A, r) \cap B(0, s + r)$ is a compact subset of the closed $C^1$-hypersurface $S(A, r)$.

It will be sometimes useful to consider another notion of boundary: if $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a closed set, then we define the *viscosity boundary* of $A$ by
\[
\partial^v A = \{a \in \partial A : \mathcal{H}^0(N(A, a) = 1) \}.
\]
This is precisely the set of boundary points $a \in \partial A$ for which there is a unique (outer unit normal) vector $u \in S^n$ with $(a, u) \in N(A)$. For $s > 0$ we also define $\partial^v A$ to be the set of points $a \in \partial^v A$ such that there exists a closed Euclidean ball $B$ of radius $s$ such that $B \subseteq A$ and $a \in \partial B$. We set
\[
\partial^v A = \bigcup_{s>0} \partial^v A.
\]

**Remark 2.11.** We notice that $\partial^v A \subseteq \partial^m A \cap p(N(A)) \subseteq \partial^v A$ and
\[
N(A, a) = \{n(A, a)\} \quad \text{for } a \in \partial^m A \cap p(N(A)).
\]
Moreover, $N(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}\setminus \text{int}(A), a) = \{-n(A, a)\}$ for every $a \in \partial^v A$. Finally, if $s > 0$ then $\partial^v A$ is a closed subset of $\partial A$ and $B(a - sn(A, a), s) \subseteq A$ for every $a \in \partial^v A$.

The following lemma (or rather the consequence of it discussed in Remark 2.12) will be relevant in the special case of sets with positive reach in Section 5.3 (see Remark 5.13).
Lemma 2.12. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a closed set and $x, y \in \partial A$. Let $0 < r < s/2$. Suppose that $u, v \in S^n$ are such that

$$B(x - ru, r) \subseteq A, \quad U(x + su, s) \cap A = \emptyset, \quad B(y - rv, r) \subseteq A, \quad U(y + sv, s) \cap A = \emptyset.$$ 

Then

$$|u - v| \leq \max\left\{ \frac{2(s - 2r)}{r(s - r)}, \sqrt{\frac{2}{r(s - r)}} \right\} |x - y|.$$ 

Proof. Since $y \in A$, we have $y \notin U(x + su, s)$, hence $|y - x - su|^2 \geq s^2$, which yields $|x - y|^2 + s^2 - 2s(x - x) \cdot u \geq s^2$
or

$$(y - x) \cdot u \leq \frac{|y - x|^2}{2s}, \quad (19)$$

By symmetry, we also have

$$(x - y) \cdot v \leq \frac{|x - y|^2}{2s}. \quad (20)$$

Noting that $x - ru + rv \in B(x - ru, r) \subseteq A$, we conclude from (20) that

$$(x - ru + rv - y) \cdot v \leq \frac{|x - y + r(v - u)|^2}{2s}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2s}|x - y| + \frac{r^2}{2s}|u - v|^2 + \frac{r}{s}(x - y) \cdot (v - u).$$

Exchanging $x$ and $y$ (and using (19)), we also get

$$(y - rv + ru - x) \cdot u \leq \frac{1}{2s}|x - y|^2 + \frac{r^2}{2s}|u - v|^2 + \frac{r}{s}(y - x) \cdot (u - v).$$

Now we sum the last two inequalities to obtain

$$(x - y) \cdot (v - u) + r|v - u|^2 \leq \frac{1}{s}|x - y|^2 + \frac{r^2}{s}|u - v|^2 + \frac{2r}{s}(x - y) \cdot (v - u),$$

and we infer

$$r \left(1 - \frac{r}{s}\right)|u - v|^2 \leq \frac{1}{s}|x - y|^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2r}{s}\right)|x - y||u - v|. \quad (21)$$

If $\frac{1}{s}|x - y|^2 \leq (1 - \frac{2r}{s})|x - y||u - v|$, then

$$|u - v|^2 \leq \frac{2(s - 2r)}{r(s - r)}|x - y||u - v|.$$ 

If $\frac{1}{s}|x - y|^2 \geq (1 - \frac{2r}{s})|x - y||u - v|$, then

$$|u - v|^2 \leq \frac{2}{r(s - r)}|x - y|^2,$$

which yields the asserted upper bound. \hfill \Box

Remark 2.13. For convex bodies, Lemma {2.12} is provided in [Hu99 Lemma 1.28] (see also [Hu96 Lemma 2.1] for a less explicit statement and the literature cited there). In this special case, it can be seen from (21) that the Lipschitz constant is bounded from above by $1/r$ (with $s = \infty$).

Remark 2.14. For a closed set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $r, s > 0$, let $X_{r,s}(A)$ denote the set of all $a \in \partial A$ such that $B(a - ru, r) \subseteq A$ and $U(a + su, s) \cap A = \emptyset$ for some $u \in S^n$. Then $X_{r,s}(A) \subset \partial A^n$, for any $a \in X_{r,s}(A)$ the unit vector $u$ is equal to $n(A, a)$ (and uniquely determined) and $\{n(A, a)\} = N(A, a) \cap S^n$. If $0 < r \leq s/4$, then Lemma {2.12} yields that $n(A, )|X_{r,s}(A)$ is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant bounded from above by $3/r$, since

$$\frac{2(s - 2r)}{r(s - r)} \leq \frac{2s}{r(s - s/4)} = \frac{2s}{r} \leq \frac{81}{3r} = \frac{81}{3} < \frac{3}{r}$$

and

$$\sqrt{\frac{2}{r(s - r)}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{r(s - s/4)}} = \sqrt{\frac{2s}{3r^2}} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{1}{r} < \frac{2}{r}.$$
3 A Steiner-type formula for arbitrary closed sets

Throughout this section, we assume that $\phi$ is a uniformly convex $C^2$-norm. Recalling Theorem 2.7 we start by introducing the following definition.

3.1 Normal bundle and curvatures

We start introducing the principal curvature of the level sets $S^\phi(A,r)$ of the distance function $\delta_A^\phi$ taking the eigenvalues of the normal vector field $\nu_A^\phi$ defined in equation (11).

Definition 3.1. Suppose $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is closed, $x \in \text{dmn}(D\nu_A^\phi)$ and $r = \delta_A^\phi(x)$. Then the eigenvalues (counted with their algebraic multiplicities) of $D\nu_A^\phi(x)|\text{Tan}(S^\phi(A,r),x)$ are denoted by

$$\chi_{A,i}^\phi(x) \leq \ldots \leq \chi_{A,n}^\phi(x).$$

Lemma 3.2. The set $\text{dmn}(D\nu_A^\phi) \subseteq \text{Unp}^\phi(A)$ is a Borel subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and the functions $\chi_{A,i}^\phi : \text{dmn}(D\nu_A^\phi) \to \mathbb{R}$ are Borel functions for $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be the set of all $\phi \in \text{Hom}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ with real eigenvalues. For each $\phi \in \mathcal{X}$ we define $\lambda_0(\phi) \leq \ldots \leq \lambda_n(\phi)$ to be the eigenvalues of $\phi$ counted with their algebraic multiplicity, and then we define the map $\lambda : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ by

$$\lambda(\phi) = (\lambda_0(\phi), \ldots, \lambda_n(\phi)) \quad \text{for } \phi \in \mathcal{X}.$$ 

We observe that $\mathcal{X}$ is a Borel set and $\lambda$ is a continuous map by [HM87, Theorem A]. Moreover we notice that $\text{dmn}(D\nu_A^\phi) = \text{dmn}(D\xi_A^\phi)$ and that this is a Borel subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ by Lemma 2.3. For each $x \in \text{dmn}(D\xi_A^\phi)$, we have $D\xi_A^\phi(x)(\nu_A^\phi(x)) = 0$ and $\delta_A^\phi(x) \cdot \nu_A^\phi(x) = x - \xi_A^\phi(x)$, hence

$$\lambda_0(D\xi_A^\phi(x)) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_i(D\xi_A^\phi(x)) = 1 - \delta_A^\phi(x)\chi_{A,n+1-i}^\phi(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n,$$

where also [17] was used. Since the map $D\xi_A^\phi : \text{dmn}(D\xi_A^\phi) \to \mathcal{X}$ is a Borel function, we obtain the assertion. □

Remark 3.3 (cf. [KS2] Lemmas 2.41 and 2.44). Suppose $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is closed, $x \in \text{Unp}^\phi(A)$, $r = \delta_A^\phi(x)$, $0 < t < 1$ and $y = \xi_A^\phi(x) + t\nu_A^\phi(x) = \xi_A^\phi(x) + t(x - \xi_A^\phi(x))$. Then $y \in \text{Unp}^\phi(A)$,

$$\text{Tan}(S^\phi(A,r),x) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : v \cdot \nabla \delta_A^\phi(x) = 0\},$$

$$\nabla \delta_A^\phi(x) = \nabla \delta_A^\phi(y) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Tan}(S^\phi(A,r),x) = \text{Tan}(S^\phi(A,tr),y).$$

Remark 3.4. For $(a,\eta) \in N^\phi(A)$ and $0 < r < r^\phi_A(a,\eta)$ we have

$$\text{Tan}(S^\phi(A,r),a + r\eta) = \text{Tan}(\partial\mathcal{W}^\phi,\eta).$$

Setting $u = \nabla \delta_A^\phi(a+r\eta)$, this assertion follows from Remark 3.3 noting that (see [9] and [12])

$$\nabla \phi(u) = \nabla \phi(\nabla \delta_A^\phi(a+r\eta)) = \eta, \quad n^\phi(\eta) = u.$$

Lemma 3.5. Suppose $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a closed set, $(a,\eta) \in N^\phi(A)$, $0 < r < s < r^\phi_A(a,\eta)$ so that $a + r\eta, a + s \eta \in \text{dmn} D\nu_A^\phi$ and $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n \in \text{Tan}(\partial\mathcal{W}^\phi,\eta)$.

Then $D\nu_A^\phi(a+r\eta)\tau_i = \chi_{A,i}^\phi(a+r\eta)\tau_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ if and only if $D\nu_A^\phi(a+s\eta)\tau_i = \chi_{A,i}^\phi(a+s\eta)\tau_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, in which case it holds that

$$\frac{\chi_{A,i}^\phi(a+r\eta)}{1 - r\chi_{A,i}^\phi(a+r\eta)} = \frac{\chi_{A,i}^\phi(a+s\eta)}{1 - s\chi_{A,i}^\phi(a+s\eta)} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n.$$
Proof. We define \( x = a + r \eta \), \( y = a + s \eta \) and \( t = \frac{r}{s} \in (0, 1) \). We notice that \( \xi^\phi_A \) is differentiable at \( y \) and

\[
D \xi^\phi_A(y) \mid \text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi, \eta) = \text{Id}_{\text{tan}(\partial W^\phi, \eta)} - s D \xi^\phi_A(y) \mid \text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi, \eta).
\]

Let \( \xi : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A \to A \) be such that \( \xi(z) \in \xi^\phi_A(z) \) for \( z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A \). Then define \( \nu : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A \to \partial W^\phi \) by \( \nu(z) = \delta_A^\phi(z)^{-1}(z - \xi(z)) \) for \( z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A \). It follows from the strict convexity of \( \phi \) (see [KS21, Remark 2.17]) that

\[
\nu(\xi(z) + t(z - \xi(z))) = \nu(z) \quad \text{for } z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A.
\]

Differentiating this equality in \( y \), we obtain

\[
D \nu(x) \circ [D \xi(y) + t(\text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} - D \xi(y))] = D \nu(y).
\]

Assume now that \( D \nu(y) \tau_i = \lambda^\phi_{A,i}(y) \tau_i \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \). Then

\[
D \xi^\phi_A(y) \tau_i = \tau_i - s \cdot D \nu^\phi_A(y) \tau_i = (1 - s \lambda^\phi_{A,i}(y)) \tau_i,
\]

and hence we get

\[
\lambda^\phi_{A,i}(y) \tau_i = [1 - (s - r) \lambda^\phi_{A,i}(y)] D \nu(x) \tau_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n.
\]

Note that by (10) we have \( \rho^\phi_A(y) s - s > r - s \), and hence by the lower bound in (17) we get

\[
1 + (r - s) \lambda^\phi_{A,i}(y) \geq 1 + (r - s) \frac{1}{1 - \rho^\phi_A(y)s} = 1 - \frac{r - s}{\rho^\phi_A(y)s - s} > 0,
\]

that is, \( 1 - (s - r) \lambda^\phi_{A,i}(y) > 0 \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \). We conclude that

\[
D \nu(x) \tau_i = \lambda^\phi_{A,i}(x) \tau_i, \quad \lambda^\phi_{A,i}(x) = \frac{\lambda^\phi_{A,i}(y)}{1 - (s - r) \lambda^\phi_{A,i}(y)}
\]

and

\[
\frac{\lambda^\phi_{A,i}(x)}{1 - r \lambda^\phi_{A,i}(x)} = \frac{\lambda^\phi_{A,i}(y)}{1 - s \lambda^\phi_{A,i}(y)}
\]

for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \) (where this common ratio may be infinite).

The last paragraph shows in particular that \( D \nu(x) \mid \text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi, \eta) \) and \( D \nu(y) \mid \text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi, \eta) \) have the same number \( k \) of distinct eigenvalues. Denoting by \( N_1(x), \ldots, N_k(x) \) and \( N_1(y), \ldots, N_k(y) \) the eigenspaces of \( D \nu(x) \mid \text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi, \eta) \) and \( D \nu(y) \mid \text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi, \eta) \) respectively, we can also derive from the last paragraph the inclusions \( N_i(y) \subseteq N_i(x) \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, k \). Since

\[
N_1(y) \oplus \cdots \oplus N_k(y) = \text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi, \eta) = N_1(x) \oplus \cdots \oplus N_k(x),
\]

we conclude that \( N_i(y) = N_i(x) \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \) and the proof is completed. \( \square \)

Definition 3.6. Suppose \( \emptyset \neq A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) is closed. We define

\[
\hat{N}^\phi(A) = \{(a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A) : a + r \eta \in \text{dmm}(D \nu_A^\phi) \text{ for some } r \in (0, \rho^\phi_A(a, \eta))\}
\]

and

\[
\kappa^\phi_{A,i}(a, \eta) = \frac{\lambda^\phi_{A,i}(a + r \eta)}{1 - r \lambda^\phi_{A,i}(a + r \eta)} \in (-\infty, \infty]
\]

for \( (a, \eta) \in \hat{N}^\phi(A) \), \( 0 < r < \rho^\phi_A(a, \eta) \) with \( a + r \eta \in \text{dmm} D \nu_A^\phi \) and \( i = 1, \ldots, n \). The numbers \( \kappa^\phi_{A,i}(a, \eta) \), \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \), are called anisotropic (with respect to \( \phi \)) generalized curvatures of \( A \) at \( (a, \eta) \) or generalized \( \phi \)-curvatures of \( A \) at \( (a, \eta) \).
Remark 3.7. Lemma 3.5 demonstrates that the definition of $\kappa^\phi_{A,i}(a,\eta)$ does not depend on the choice of $r$ and Theorem 2.7 implies that $H^n(\tilde{N}^\phi(A) \setminus N^\phi(A)) = 0$. Moreover, Theorem 2.7 ensures that all points of the open segment $\{a + r\eta : 0 < r < r^\phi_a(a,\eta)\}$ are points of differentiability of $\nu^\phi_A$ for every $(a,\eta) \in \tilde{N}^\phi(A)$; in other words,

$$\tilde{N}^\phi(A) = \{(a,\eta) \in N^\phi(A) : r^\phi_a(a,\eta) > 0, a + r\eta \in \text{dmm } \nu^\phi_A \text{ for every } r \in (0, r^\phi_a(a,\eta))\}.$$ 

Combining Lemma 3.2 and Theorem 2.7 it follows that $\tilde{N}^\phi(A)$ is a Borel subset of $N^\phi(A)$. Moreover by Lemma 3.2 we deduce that the functions $\kappa^\phi_{A,i}$ are Borel measurable. Since the eigenvalues $\chi^\phi_{A,i}(a+r\eta)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, are arranged in increasing order, we also have $-\infty < \kappa^\phi_{A,i}(a,\eta) \leq \ldots \leq \kappa^\phi_{A,n}(a,\eta) \leq \infty$.

**Remark 3.8.** Using (16), Theorem 2.7 Lemma 2.8 (a), (17) and Definition 3.6, we obtain that

$$-\frac{1}{r^\phi_a(a,\eta)} \leq \kappa^\phi_{A,i}(a,\eta) \leq +\infty$$

for $(a,\eta) \in \tilde{N}^\phi(A)$ and $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

**Lemma 3.9.** Let $\emptyset \neq A \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be closed. Suppose $\tau_i : \tilde{N}^\phi(A) \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, are defined so that $\tau_1(a,\eta), \ldots, \tau_n(a,\eta)$ form a basis of $\text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi, \eta)$ with

$$D \nu^\phi_A(a + r\eta)(\tau_i(a,\eta)) = \chi^\phi_{A,i}(a + r\eta) \tau_i(a,\eta) \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n \text{ and } 0 < r < r^\phi_a(a,\eta). \quad (22)$$

Let $\zeta_i : \tilde{N}^\phi(A) \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, be defined so that

$$\zeta_i(a,\eta) = \begin{cases} (\tau_i(a,\eta), \kappa^\phi_{A,i}(a,\eta) \tau_i(a,\eta)), & \text{if } \kappa^\phi_{A,i}(a,\eta) < \infty, \\ (0, \tau_i(a,\eta)), & \text{if } \kappa^\phi_{A,i}(a,\eta) = +\infty. \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

Let $W \subset N^\phi(A)$ be an $H^n$ measurable set with $H^n(W) < \infty$. Then, for $H^n$ almost all $(a,\eta) \in W$, the set $\text{Tan}^n(\mathbb{H}^n \cup W, (a,\eta))$ is an $n$-dimensional linear subspace and $\zeta_1(a,\eta), \ldots, \zeta_n(a,\eta)$ form a basis of $\text{Tan}^n(\mathbb{H}^n \cup W, (a,\eta))$. Moreover,

$$\text{ap } J^n_W p(a,\eta) = \frac{[\tau_1(a,\eta) \wedge \ldots \wedge \tau_n(a,\eta)]}{[\zeta_1(a,\eta) \wedge \ldots \wedge \zeta_n(a,\eta)]} 1_{\tilde{N}^\phi(A)}(a,\eta)$$

for $H^n$ almost all $(a,\eta) \in W$.

**Proof.** Assume that $W \subset N^\phi(A)$ is $H^n$ measurable with $H^n(W) < \infty$ and $\lambda > 1$. For $r > 0$ we define

$$W_r = \{(a,\eta) \in W : r^\phi_a(a,\eta) = r^\phi_a(a,\eta) \geq \lambda r\},$$

which is an $H^n$ measurable subset of $W$. Furthermore, we denote by $W_r^*$ the set of all $(a,\eta) \in W_r$ such that $\text{Tan}^n(\mathbb{H}^n \cup W_r, (a,\eta))$ is an $n$-dimensional linear subspace and $\text{Tan}(\mathbb{H}^n \cup W_r, (a,\eta)) = \text{Tan}^n(\mathbb{H}^n \cup W_r, (a,\eta))$. It follows from [Fed69] 3.2.19 that $H^n(W_r \setminus W_r^*) = 0$. Moreover, by the coarea formula there exists $J \subset (0, \infty)$ with $H^1(J) = 0$ such that $H^n(\mathbb{H}^n \cup W_r \setminus \text{Unp}^\phi(A)) = 0$ for $r \notin J$.

We fix $r > 0$, $r \notin J$, and define

$$M_r = \{(a,\eta) : (a,\eta) \in W_r\}.$$ 

It follows from (16) that $M_r \subset \{x \in S^\phi(A, r) : \rho^\phi_A(x) \geq \lambda\}$ (see also (18)); moreover, $M_r$ is $H^n$ measurable. By Theorem 2.7 the function $\psi^\phi_A(M_r) = W_r$ and $(\psi^\phi_A(M_r))^{-1}(a,\eta) = a + r\eta$ for $(a,\eta) \in W_r$. We denote by $M^*_r$ the set of all $x \in M_r$ such that $\text{Tan}(S^\phi(A, r), x)$ is an $n$-dimensional linear subspace and $\text{Tan}^n(\mathbb{H}^n \cup M^*_r, x) = \text{Tan}^n(S^\phi(A, r), x)$. It follows from Remark 5.5 and [Fed69] 3.2.19 that $H^n(M_r \setminus M^*_r) = 0$. We conclude that

$$H^n(W_r \setminus (W_r^* \cap \psi^\phi_A(M_r^*)) = 0.$$
Further, if \((a, \eta) \in (W_s^* \cap \psi^\phi_\mathcal{A}(M_s^*)) \cap \tilde{N}^\phi(A)\) it follows from \cite[Lemma B.2]{San20} and Remark 3.4 that \(\{\tau_1(a, \eta), \ldots, \tau_n(a, \eta)\}\) is a basis of \(\text{Tan}(S^\phi(A, r), a + r\eta)\),

\[
D \psi^\phi_A(a + r\eta)[\text{Tan}(S^\phi(A, r), a + r\eta)] = \text{Tan}^\phi(\mathcal{H}^n \cup W, (a, \eta))
\]

and

\[
D \psi^\phi_A(a + r\eta)(\tau_i(a, \eta)) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{1 + r\kappa^\phi_{A,i}(a, \eta)} \xi_i(a, \eta), & \text{if } \kappa^\phi_{A,i}(a, \eta) < \infty, \\
\xi_i(a, \eta), & \text{if } \kappa^\phi_{A,i}(a, \eta) = \infty.
\end{cases}
\]

This proves that \(\{\xi_1(a, \eta), \ldots, \xi_n(a, \eta)\}\) is a basis of \(\text{Tan}^\phi(\mathcal{H}^n \cup W, (a, \eta))\) for \(\mathcal{H}^n\) a.e. \((a, \eta) \in W_r\) and for every \(r \notin J\).

Since \(W \setminus \bigcup_{r > 0} W_r\) has \(\mathcal{H}^n\) measure zero and \(W_r \subseteq W_s\) for \(0 < s < r\), there exists a sequence \(r_1 \searrow 0, r_i \notin J\), so that \(W \setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty W_{r_n}\) has \(\mathcal{H}^n\) measure zero, which completes the proof. \(\square\)

**Remark 3.10.** The existence of a basis \(\tau_1(a, \eta), \ldots, \tau_n(a, \eta)\) of \(\text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi, \eta)\) such that \(\mathcal{B}_\eta\) is satisfied is based on Lemma 2.8 (c).

We now provide an alternative but equivalent description which leads to some additional information that will be useful in the proof of Theorem 3.27. Let \((a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}^\phi(A), r \in (0, \kappa^\phi_{A}(a, \eta))\) and \(x = a + r\eta\). Let \(u : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A \rightarrow S^n\) be the map defined in Lemma 2.8 and notice that \(u(x) = n^\phi(\eta)\). Hence we have \(\text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi, \eta) = u(x)^\perp = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : z \cdot u(x) = 0\}\). We define a symmetric bilinear form (i.e. an inner product)

\[
B_\eta : \text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi, \eta) \times \text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi, \eta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}
\]

setting

\[
B_\eta(\tau, \sigma) = D n^\phi(\eta)(\tau) \cdot \sigma = [D(\nabla \phi)(u(x))]u(x)^\perp^{-1}(\tau) \cdot \sigma
\]

for \(\tau, \sigma \in \text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi, \eta) = u(x)^\perp\). Using Lemma 2.8(b), we see that

\[
B_\eta(D \nu^\phi_A(x)(\tau), \sigma) = D u(x)(\tau) \cdot \sigma = \tau \cdot D u(x)(\sigma) = B_\eta(\tau, D \nu^\phi_A(x)(\sigma)) \text{ for } \tau, \sigma \in u(x)^\perp.
\]

This shows that \(D \nu^\phi_A(x)|u(x)^\perp\) is self-adjoint with respect to \(B_\eta\). Hence there is an orthonormal basis \(\tau_1(a, \eta), \ldots, \tau_n(a, \eta)\) of \(u(x)^\perp\) with respect to \(B_\eta\) consisting of eigenvectors of \(D \nu^\phi_A(x)\). Henceforth we can assume that \(\tau_1(a, \eta), \ldots, \tau_n(a, \eta)\) are chosen in this way.

We now consider the natural extension of the inner product \(B_\eta\) to the product space \(\text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi, \eta) \times \text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi, \eta) = n^\phi(\eta)^\perp \times n^\phi(\eta)^\perp\) given by

\[
\overline{B}_\eta((\tau_1, \sigma_1), (\tau_2, \sigma_2)) = B_\eta(\tau_1, \sigma_1) + B_\eta(\tau_2, \sigma_2)
\]

for \((\tau_1, \sigma_1), (\tau_2, \sigma_2) \in \text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi, \eta) \times \text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi, \eta)\) and for every \(\eta \in \partial W^\phi\). With respect to this inner product, the linearly independent vectors \(\xi_1(a, \eta), \ldots, \xi_n(a, \eta)\) from \(23\) are pairwise orthogonal. Let \(|\cdot|_\eta\) denote the norm induced by \(\overline{B}_\eta\) on \(\bigwedge_m(n^\phi(\eta)^\perp \times n^\phi(\eta)^\perp)\), for \(m \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\). Then using continuity and compactness one can show that

\[
0 < c := \inf \{ |\cdot| : A \in \bigwedge_m(n^\phi(\eta)^\perp \times n^\phi(\eta)^\perp), |A| = 1, \eta \in \partial W^\phi, m \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\}
\]

\[
\leq \sup \{ |\cdot|_\eta : A \in \bigwedge_m(n^\phi(\eta)^\perp \times n^\phi(\eta)^\perp), |A| = 1, \eta \in \partial W^\phi, m \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\} =: C < \infty.
\]

Thus we obtain the inequality

\[
|\xi_1(a, \eta) \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_n(a, \eta)| \leq \frac{1}{C} |\xi_1(a, \eta) \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_n(a, \eta)|_\eta
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{C} |\xi_1(a, \eta) \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_m(a, \eta)|_\eta \cdot |\xi_{m+1}(a, \eta) \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_n(a, \eta)|_\eta
\]

\[
\geq \frac{1}{C^2} |\xi_1(a, \eta) \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_m(a, \eta)|_\eta \cdot |\xi_{m+1}(a, \eta) \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_n(a, \eta)|_\eta,
\]

which will be used in the proof of Theorem 3.27.
In the following, it will be useful to distinguish how many of the generalized curvatures are finite for a given \((a, \eta) \in \mathcal{N}^\phi(A)\).

**Definition 3.11.** Let \(\emptyset \neq A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\) be closed. We define

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_d^\phi(A) = \{(a, \eta) \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}^\phi(A) : \kappa_{A,d}(a, \eta) < \infty, \kappa_{A,d+1}(a, \eta) = \infty\} \quad \text{for} \quad d \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\},
\]

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_1^\phi(A) = \{(a, \eta) \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}^\phi(A) : \kappa_{A,1}(a, \eta) = \infty\}
\]

and

\[
\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^\phi(A) = \{(a, \eta) \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}^\phi(A) : \kappa_{A,n}(a, \eta) < \infty\}.
\]

For \(a \in A\) we set \(\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^\phi(A, a) = \{\eta : (a, \eta) \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}^\phi(A)\}\). Moreover, for \(j \in \{0, \ldots, n\}\) we define the map 

\[
E_{A,j}^\phi : \tilde{\mathcal{N}}^\phi(A) \to \mathbb{R}
\]

by

\[
E_{A,j}^\phi(a, \eta) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda(d,j)} \kappa_{A,\lambda(1)}^\phi(a, \eta) \cdots \kappa_{A,\lambda(j)}^\phi(a, \eta), & \text{if } (a, \eta) \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_d^\phi(A) \text{ and } d \geq j, \\
0, & \text{if } (a, \eta) \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_d^\phi(A) \text{ and } d < j,
\end{array} \right.
\]

and for \(j = 0\) this means that \(E_{A,0}^\phi \equiv 1\). Finally, for \(r \in \{0, \ldots, n\}\) we define the \(r\)-th \(\phi\)-mean curvature of \(A\) as

\[
H_{A,r}^\phi = \sum_{j=0}^{r} E_{A,j}^\phi \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{j,n-r}(A)} = \sum_{i=0}^{r} E_{A,r-i}^\phi \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{n-j}(A)}.
\]

**Remark 3.12.** The sets \(\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_d^\phi(A)\) and functions \(H_{A,r}^\phi\) introduced in Definition 3.11 are Borel measurable (see Remark 3.7). In particular, by definition we have \(H_{A,0}^\phi = \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^\phi(A)}\).

The next result will be used repeatedly in Section 6, in the special case of sets with positive reach. We prepare it by recalling a fact from linear algebra, which can be easily deduced from the standard spectral theorem (cf. [DRKS20, Remark 2.25]).

**Remark 3.13.** Suppose \(X\) is an \(n\)-dimensional Hilbert space, \(M_1, M_2 \in \text{Hom}(X, X)\) are self-adjoint and \(M_1\) is positive definite. Then there exist \(C \in \text{Hom}(X, X)\) self-adjoint and positive definite, \(n\) real numbers \(\lambda_1 \leq \ldots \leq \lambda_n\) and an orthonormal basis \(v_1, \ldots, v_n\) of \(X\) such that \(C \circ C = M_1\) and

\[
(M_1 \circ M_2)(C(v_i)) = \lambda_i C(v_i) \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n.
\]

**Lemma 3.14.** For every closed set \(\emptyset \neq A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\) the following statements hold.

(a) Suppose \(s, r > 0, x \in \text{dmm}(D\nu_A^\phi) \cap S^\phi(A, r)\) and \(V\) is an open neighbourhood of \(x\) in \(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}\) such that \(U^\phi(x - su_A^\phi(x), s) \cap S^\phi(A, r) \cap V = \emptyset\). Then

\[
\chi_{A,i}^\phi(x) \leq \frac{1}{s} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n.
\]

(b) If \((a, \eta) \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}^\phi(A), a \in \partial^c \Sigma A\) and \(r > 0\) such that \(U^\phi(a - r\eta, r) \subseteq \text{int} A\), then \((a, \eta) \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}^\phi(A)\) and

\[
\kappa_{A,n}(a, \eta, r) \leq \frac{1}{r}.
\]

(c) Suppose \(a \in A^{(n)} \cap \partial^c A, (a, \eta) \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}^\phi(A), W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\) is an open set with \(a \in W\) and \(f : W \cap (a + \eta^\perp) \to \mathbb{R}\) is a function such that \(f(a) = 0\), \(f\) is continuous at \(a\) and \(\text{graph}(f) \subseteq A\). Then \((a, \eta) \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}^\phi(A)\).

**Proof.** \((a)\) Choose a function \(\xi : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\) with \(\xi(y) \in \xi_A^\phi(y)\) for every \(y \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\) and define

\[
u(y) = \frac{\nabla \phi^*(y - \xi(y))}{|\nabla \phi^*(y - \xi(y))|} \quad \text{for } y \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A.
\]
Note that (12) and Remark 3.3 yield \( u(x) = \frac{\nabla \delta^\phi(x)}{\|\nabla \delta^\phi(x)\|} \). Define the linear subspace \( T = \text{Tan}(S^\phi(A, r), x) \) and the open convex set \( U = U^\phi(x - su^\phi_A(x), s) \). Since \( x \in \text{dmm}(D \nu^\phi_A) \), recalling [KS21] Lemma 2.44, we deduce that \( u(x) \perp T = \text{Tan}(\partial U, x) \) and there exist a relatively open subset \( W \) of \( x + T \) with \( x \in W \) and a continuous function \( f : W \to \mathbb{R} \) that is pointwise twice differentiable at \( x \) such that \( f(x) = 0 \), \( D f(x) = 0 \),

\[
\{b - f(b)u(x) : b \in W\} \subseteq S^\phi(A, r) \cap V \quad \text{and} \quad D^2 f(x) = \frac{1}{\|\nabla \delta^\phi(x)\|} D^2 \delta^\phi_A(x)(T \times T).
\]

Let \( g : W \to \mathbb{R} \) be the smooth function such that \( g(x) = 0 \), \( Dg(x) = 0 \) and \( \{b - g(b)u(x) : b \in W\} \subseteq \partial U \). Since \( u(x) \cdot \nabla \delta^\phi_A(x) = |\nabla \delta^\phi_A(x)|^{-1} > 0 \) and \( U \cap S^\phi(A, r) \cap V = \varnothing \), we infer that \( f(b) \leq g(b) \) for \( b \in W \). Let \( v : \partial U \to S^\phi \) be the exterior unit normal of \( \partial U \) and notice that \( v(x) = u(x) \). From [KS21] Lemma 2.45 and Lemma 2.8 2b) we infer that

\[
D u(x)(\tau) \cdot \tau = D^2 f(x)(\tau, \tau) \leq D^2 g(x)(\tau, \tau) = D v(x)(\tau) \cdot \tau
\]

for \( \tau \in T \). Recalling again Lemma 2.8 2b), we can apply Remark 3.3 with the automorphisms \( M_1 = D(\nabla \phi)(u(x))|T \) and \( M_2 = D u(x)|T \) on \( T \) (and the induced scalar product of \( \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \)) to infer the existence of a selfadjoint linear map \( C : T \to T \) and an orthonormal basis \( \tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n \) of \( T \) such that \( D(\nabla \phi)(u(x))|T = C \circ C \) and \( C(\tau_1), \ldots, C(\tau_n) \) is a basis of eigenvectors of \( D \nu^\phi_A(x)|T \), i.e. \( D \nu^\phi_A(x)(C(\tau_i)) = \chi^\phi_{A,i}(C(\tau_i)) \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \). Employing [DRKS20] Lemma 2.33, we notice that

\[
s^{-1}|C(\tau)|^2 = (C^{-1} \circ D(\nabla \phi \circ v)(x) \circ C)(\tau) \cdot \tau = (C^{-1} \circ D(\nabla \phi \circ v)(x) \circ D v(x) \circ C)(\tau) \cdot \tau
\]

\[
= (C \circ D v(x) \circ C)(\tau) \cdot \tau = D v(x)(C(\tau)) \cdot \tau
\]

\[
\geq D u(x)(C(\tau)) \cdot C(\tau) = C^{-1} \circ D(\nabla \phi \circ u)(x) \circ C(\tau) \cdot \tau
\]

\[
= (C^{-1} \circ D \nu^\phi_A(x)(C(\tau)) \cdot \tau
\]

for \( \tau \in T \). Evaluating this inequality at \( \tau = \tau_i \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \) we obtain the conclusion.

(b) Choose \( 0 < s < \rho^\phi_{A}(a, \eta) \). We observe that \( S^\phi(A, a + \eta) \cap U^\phi(a - r \eta, r + s) = \varnothing \) and \( a + s \eta \in S^\phi(A, a) \cap \partial B^\phi(a - r \eta, r + s) \). Since \( a + s \eta \in \text{dmm} D \nu^\phi_A \) and \( \nu^\phi_A(a + s \eta) = \eta \), we can apply (a) with \( x \) and \( s \) replaced by \( a + s \eta \) and \( r + s \) respectively, to conclude that

\[
\chi^\phi_{A,n}(a + s \eta) \leq \frac{1}{r + s} \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa^\phi_{A,n}(a, \eta) = \frac{\chi^\phi_{A,n}(a + s \eta)}{1 - s \chi^\phi_{A,n}(a + s \eta)} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \frac{r + s}{r}} = \frac{1}{r} < +\infty.
\]

(c) We may assume that \( a = 0 \), and we denote by \( \pi \) the orthogonal projection onto \( \eta^\perp \). We notice that there is some \( s > 0 \) such that \( U^\phi(-s \eta, s) \cap A = \varnothing \). Then we choose \( 0 < r < \inf \{s, \rho^\phi_{A}(a, \eta)\} \) and we notice that \( U^\phi(r \eta, r) \cap A = \varnothing \). Set \( U_0 = \pi(U^\phi(-s \eta, s)) \) and let \( g : U_0 \to \mathbb{R} \) be the continuous function such that \( g(0) = 0 \),

\[
\{b + g(b)\eta : b \in U_0\} \subseteq \partial U^\phi(-s \eta, s) \quad \text{and} \quad U^\phi(-s \eta, s) \subseteq \{b + t \eta : t < g(b), b \in U_0\}.
\]

Since \( U^\phi(-s \eta, s) \cap A = \varnothing \) it follows from the continuity of \( f \) at 0 that there is \( \epsilon > 0 \) such that \( g(b) \leq \epsilon \) for every \( b \in \eta^\perp \) with \( |b| < \epsilon \). We can assume that \( W = \{b \in \eta^\perp : |b| < \epsilon\} \subseteq U_0 \). Since \( r \eta \in \text{dmm} D \nu^\phi_A \) it follows from [KS21] Lemma 2.44 that there exists an open neighbourhood \( V \) of \( r \eta \) in \( \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) such that \( S^\phi(A, r) \cap V \) is equal to the graph of a continuous function. Therefore we can choose \( V \) small enough so that \( \pi(V) \subseteq W \) and

\[
S^\phi(A, r) \cap V \subseteq \left\{ y : |(y - r \eta) \cdot \eta| < \frac{r}{4} \cdot |\eta|^2 \right\}.
\]

We claim that \( [(S^\phi(A, r) \cap V) - r \eta] \cap U^\phi(-s \eta, s) = \varnothing \). In fact, assume by contradiction that there is some \( z \in [(S^\phi(A, r) \cap V) - r \eta] \cap U^\phi(-s \eta, s) \). Then we obtain that

\[
|z \cdot \eta| < \frac{r}{4} \cdot |\eta|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{z \cdot \eta}{|\eta|^2} < g(\pi(z)) \leq f(\pi(z)) \leq \frac{r}{2} \cdot \frac{(z + r \eta) \cdot \eta}{|\eta|^2}.
\]
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It follows that $\pi(z) + f(\pi(z))\eta$ lies in the open segment joining $z$ with $z + r\eta$. Since $\pi(z) + f(\pi(z))\eta \in A$ and $z + r\eta \in S^0(A, r)$, it follows that $r = \delta^\phi_k(z + r\eta) < r$, which is a contradiction. Now we can use (a) to conclude that

$$\lambda^\phi_{A,n}(r\eta) \leq \frac{1}{s} \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa^\phi_{A,n}(a, \eta) \leq \frac{1}{s - r} < \infty.$$  

□

**Remark 3.15.** It follows from Lemma 3.13 that $(N^\phi(A)|\partial^j_t A) \setminus \tilde{N}^\phi(A) \subseteq N^\phi(A) \setminus \tilde{N}^\phi(A)$. In particular, 

$$\mathcal{H}^n((N^\phi(A)|\partial^j_t A) \setminus \tilde{N}^\phi(A)) = 0.$$

### 3.2 Steiner-type formula and disintegration of Lebesgue measure

The following result extends the Steiner-type formula from [H•00](see also the literature cited there such as [Sta79]) to the anisotropic setting.

**Theorem 3.16** (Steiner-type formula for closed sets). Let $\emptyset \neq A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a closed set, let $\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n$ and $\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_n$ be functions satisfying the hypotheses in Lemma 3.14 and let $J$ be the function defined on $\mathcal{H}^n$ almost all of $N^\phi(A)$ by

$$J(a, \eta) = \frac{[\tau_1(a, \eta) \wedge \ldots \wedge \tau_n(a, \eta)]}{[\zeta_1(a, \eta) \wedge \ldots \wedge \zeta_n(a, \eta)]} \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^n \text{ a.e. } (a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A).$$

Then the following statements hold.

(a) For $0 < s < \infty$ and $0 < t < s$ let

$$S^\phi_t = \{x \in S^\phi(A, t) : \rho_A^\phi(x) \geq s/t\} \quad \text{and} \quad N_s = \{(a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A) : r^\phi_A(a, \eta) \geq s\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{H}^n(N_s \cap (B \times \partial W^\phi))$, $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $\psi^\phi_A|S^\phi_t$ is a bi-lipschitzian homeomorphism with $\psi^\phi_A|S^\phi_t = N_s$ and $(\psi^\phi_A|S^\phi_t)^{-1}(a, \eta) = a + t\eta$ for each $(a, \eta) \in N_s$.

(b) If $\tau_1', \ldots, \tau'_n, \zeta_1', \ldots, \zeta'_n$ is another set of functions satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 3.14, then

$$J(a, \eta) = \frac{[\tau_1'(a, \eta) \wedge \ldots \wedge \tau'_n(a, \eta)]}{[\zeta_1'(a, \eta) \wedge \ldots \wedge \zeta'_n(a, \eta)]}$$

for $\mathcal{H}^n$ a.e. $(a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A)$. Moreover $J$ is $\mathcal{H}^n \setminus N^\phi(A)$ measurable.

(c) If $\rho > 0$ and $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is compact, then

$$\int_{N^\phi(A) \cap (B \times \partial W^\phi)} \inf\{\rho, r^\phi_A \}^{j+1} \cdot |J| \cdot \mathcal{H}^n_{A,j} d\mathcal{H}^n < \infty \quad (25)$$

for $j = 0, \ldots, n$ and

$$\int_{B^\phi(A, \rho) \setminus A} (\varphi \circ \psi^\phi_A) d\mathcal{L}^{n+1}$$

$$= \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{1}{j+1} \int_{N^\phi(A)} \varphi(a, \eta) \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J(a, \eta) \inf\{\rho, r^\phi_A(a, \eta)\}^{j+1} \mathcal{H}^n(\varphi(a, \eta) | T_{A,j} \mathcal{H}(a, \eta)) \quad (26)$$

for every bounded Borel function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}$ with compact support.

**Proof.** Fix $s > 0$ and a compact set $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. We define $B_t = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \delta^\phi_B(x) \leq t\}$ for $t > 0$. One can easily check that $\psi^\phi_A|S^\phi_t = N_s$, $\psi^\phi_A|S^\phi_t$ is injective and $(\psi^\phi_A|S^\phi_t)^{-1}(a, \eta) = a + t\eta$ for $(a, \eta) \in N_s$ and $0 < t < s$. Consequently $\psi^\phi_A|S^\phi_t$ is a bi-lipschitzian homeomorphism by Theorem 2.6 for $0 < t < s$. Moreover, we notice that

$$N_s \cap (B \times \partial W^\phi) \subseteq \psi^\phi_A(S^\phi_t \cap B_t) \subseteq \psi^\phi_A(S^\phi_t \cap B_s) \quad \text{for } 0 < t < s$$

for $0 < t < s$.
and infer that
\[ \mathcal{H}^n(\mathcal{N}_s \cap (B \times \partial \mathcal{W}^\rho)) \leq \text{Lip}(\phi_{A,i}^\rho|S^\rho_i) \mathcal{H}^n(S^\rho(A,t) \cap B_s) \quad \text{for } 0 < t < s. \] (27)

Using the coarea formula, we get
\[ \int_0^\infty \mathcal{H}^n(S^\rho(A,r) \cap B_s) \, dr = \int_{B_s} J_1 \delta_\rho(x) \, d\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(x) < \infty, \]
whence we infer that \( \mathcal{H}^n(S^\rho(A,r) \cap B_s) < \infty \) for \( \mathcal{L}^1 \) a.e. \( r > 0 \). Consequently, there exists some \( t \in (0,s) \) so that \( \mathcal{H}^n(S^\rho(A,t) \cap B_s) < \infty \), and hence (27) implies that
\[ \mathcal{H}^n(\mathcal{N}_s \cap (B \times \partial \mathcal{W}^\rho)) < \infty. \]

This proves (a).

For each \( 0 < s \leq s' \) we define \( f_s : \mathcal{N}_{s'} \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) by \( f_s(a,\eta) = a + s\eta \) for \( (a,\eta) \in \mathcal{N}_{s'} \). We apply Lemma 5.9 to compute
\[ \text{ap} J_n^N f_s(a,\eta) \cdot 1_{\mathcal{N}_s^\rho(A)}(a,\eta) = J(a,\eta)s^{n-d} \left( \prod_{j=1}^d (1 + s\kappa_{A,j}^\rho(a,\eta)) \right) 1_{\mathcal{N}_s^\rho(A)}(a,\eta) \] (28)
for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( (a,\eta) \in \mathcal{N}_s \). Since \( 1 + s\kappa_{A,j}^\rho(a,\eta) > 0 \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \) and for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( (a,\eta) \in \mathcal{N}_{2s} \) by Remark 5.8 we conclude that
\[ J(a,\eta) = \text{ap} J_n^N f_s(a,\eta) \sum_{d=0}^n s^{d-n} \left( \prod_{j=1}^d (1 + s\kappa_{A,j}^\rho(a,\eta)) \right)^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{N}_s^\rho(A)}(a,\eta) \]
for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( (a,\eta) \in \mathcal{N}_{2s} \) and for every \( s > 0 \). Noting that the right-hand side of the last equation does not depend on the choice of \( \tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n, \zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_n \) and defines an \( \mathcal{H}^n \times N^\rho(A) \)-measurable function, we obtain (b).

We fix \( \rho > 0 \). Then we define
\[ \delta(a,\eta) = \inf \{ \rho, r_{A,i}^\rho(a,\eta) \} \quad \text{for } (a,\eta) \in N^\rho(A), \]
\[ \Omega = \{(a,\eta,t) : (a,\eta) \in N^\rho(A), 0 < t < r_{A,i}^\rho(a,\eta) \} \]
and the bijective (locally) Lipschitz map
\[ f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus (A \cup \text{Cut}^\rho(A)), \quad f(a,\eta,t) = a + t\eta \quad \text{for } (a,\eta,t) \in \Omega. \]

We choose an arbitrary sequence \( s_i \to 0^+ \) and define
\[ \Omega_i = \{(a,\eta,t) : (a,\eta) \in \mathcal{N}_{s_i}, 0 < t < r_{A,i}^\rho(a,\eta) \} \quad \text{for } i \geq 1. \]

Notice that \( \Omega = \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty \Omega_i \),
\[ \text{Tan}^{n+1}(\mathcal{H}^{n+1} \times \Omega_i, (a,\eta,t)) = \text{Tan}^n(\mathcal{H}^n \times \mathcal{N}_{s_i}, (a,\eta)) \times \mathbb{R} \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^{n+1} \text{ a.e. } (a,\eta,t) \in \Omega_i \]
and \( \text{Tan}^n(\mathcal{H}^n \times \mathcal{N}_{s_i}, (a,\eta)) \) is an \( n \)-dimensional linear subspace for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( (a,\eta) \in \mathcal{N}_{s_i} \) by (Fed69, 3.2.19). We apply again Lemma 5.9 for \( \mathcal{H}^{n+1} \) a.e. \( (a,\eta,t) \in \Omega_i \) and for every \( i \geq 1 \), to compute
\[ 1_{\mathcal{N}_s^\rho(A)}(a,\eta) \cdot \text{ap} J_n^\Omega f(a,\eta,t) \]
\[ = 1_{\mathcal{N}_s^\rho(A)}(a,\eta) \cdot \frac{|\tau_1(a,\eta) \wedge \cdots \wedge \tau_n(a,\eta) \wedge \eta|}{|\xi_1(a,\eta) \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_n(a,\eta)|} s^{n-d} \left( \prod_{j=1}^d (1 + t\kappa_{A,j}^\rho(a,\eta)) \right), \]
\[ = 1_{\mathcal{N}_s^\rho(A)}(a,\eta) \cdot (\tau^\rho(\eta) \cdot \eta) \frac{|\tau_1(a,\eta) \wedge \cdots \wedge \tau_n(a,\eta) \wedge \eta^\rho(\eta)|}{|\xi_1(a,\eta) \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_n(a,\eta)|} s^{n-d} \left( \prod_{j=1}^d (1 + t\kappa_{A,j}^\rho(a,\eta)) \right) \]
\[= 1 \tilde{N}_d^\phi(A)(a, \eta) \cdot \phi(n^\phi(\eta))J(a, \eta)t^{n-d} \prod_{j=1}^d (1 + t\kappa_{A,j}^\phi(a, \eta)). \tag{29}\]

Note that

\[B^\phi(A, \rho) \setminus (A \cup \text{Cut}^\phi(A)) = f\{(a, \eta, t) \in \Omega : 0 < t \leq \rho\}\]

and recall that \(L^{n+1}(\text{Cut}^\phi(A)) = 0\). Let \(h : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to [0, \infty)\) be a Borel function. Then we employ the monotone convergence theorem, the coarea formula, Fubini’s theorem and \((29)\) to get

\[
\int_{B^\phi(A, \rho) \setminus A} h(x) dL^{n+1}(x) = \lim_{t \to \infty} \sum_{d=0}^{n+1} \int_{\tilde{N}_d^\phi(A)} \int_0^{\delta(a, \eta)} h(a + t\eta) \text{ap} J_{n+1}^\Omega f(a, \eta, t) \, dt \, dH^n(a, \eta) = \sum_{d=0}^n \int_{\tilde{N}_d^\phi(A)} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J(a, \eta) \left( \int_0^{\delta(a, \eta)} h(a + t\eta) t^{n-d} \prod_{j=1}^d (1 + t\kappa_{A,j}^\phi(a, \eta)) \, dt \right) \, dH^n(a, \eta). \tag{30}\]

We notice the equality

\[t^{n-d} \prod_{j=1}^d (1 + t\kappa_{A,j}^\phi(a, \eta)) = \sum_{j=0}^d t^{n-d+j} E_{A,j}^\phi(a, \eta) \tag{31}\]

for \((a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}_d^\phi(A)\) and \(t > 0\). If \(h(x) = (\varphi \circ \psi_A^\phi)(x)\) for every \(x \in \text{Unp}^\phi(A)\) for some Borel function \(\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to [0, \infty)\), then \(h(a + t\eta) = \varphi(a, \eta)\) for every \((a, \eta, t) \in \Omega\) and we obtain from \((30)\) and \((31)\) that

\[
\int_{B^\phi(A, \rho) \setminus A} (\varphi \circ \psi_A^\phi) dL^{n+1} = \sum_{d=0}^n \int_{\tilde{N}_d^\phi(A)} \varphi(a, \eta) \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J(a, \eta) \sum_{j=0}^d \frac{\delta(a, \eta)^{n-d+j+1}}{n-d+j+1} E_{A,j}^\phi(a, \eta) \, dH^n(a, \eta). \tag{32}\]

If \(B \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\) is a compact set, we can choose \(\varphi = 1_{B \times \partial W^\phi}\) in \((32)\) to infer that

\[
\int_{\tilde{N}_d^\phi(A) \cap (B \times \partial W^\phi)} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J(a, \eta) \sum_{j=0}^d \frac{\delta(a, \eta)^{n-d+j+1}}{n-d+j+1} E_{A,j}^\phi(a, \eta) \, dH^n(a, \eta) < \infty \tag{33}\]

for \(d = 0, \ldots, n\).

We now proceed as in [HLW04] to prove that for \(d = 0, \ldots, n\) and \(l = 0, \ldots, d\) there exists a constant \(c(l, d, n) > 0\) so that

\[
\sum_{j=0}^d \delta(a, \eta)^{n-d+j+1} E_{A,j}^\phi(a, \eta) \geq c(l, d, n) \delta(a, u)^{n-d+l+1} |E_{A,l}^\phi(a, \eta)| \geq 0 \tag{34}\]

for \((a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}_d^\phi(A)\). For \(i = 1, \ldots, d\) and \((a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}_d^\phi(A)\) we define \(\kappa^+_{A,i}(a, \eta) = \sup \{\kappa_{A,i}^\phi(a, \eta), 0\}\) and \(\kappa^-_{A,i}(a, \eta) = \inf \{\kappa_{A,i}^\phi(a, \eta), 0\}\). We set

\[E^+_j(a, \eta) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda(d,j)} \prod_{h=1}^j \kappa^+_{A,h}(a, \eta), \quad E^-_j(a, \eta) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda(d,j)} \prod_{h=1}^j \kappa^-_{A,h}(a, \eta)\]

for \((a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}_d^\phi(A)\) and \(j = 0, \ldots, d\) (notice \(E^+_{0} \equiv 1\) and \(E^-_{0} \equiv 1\)). We set \(k = n - d + 1\). For \((a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}_d^\phi(A)\) we observe that

\[E^\phi_{A,j}(a, \eta) = \sum_{l=0}^j E^-_{l}(a, \eta) E^+_j(a, \eta) \quad \text{for} \quad j = 0, \ldots, d\]
and, noting that $E_r^+(a,\eta)E_{r}^{-}(a,\eta) = 0$ for $s > d - l$ and $-1 \leq \delta(a,u)\kappa^j_{-}(a,\eta) \leq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$ by Remark 3.3 we employ [HLW04] Lemma 2.4 to conclude

$$
\sum_{j=0}^{d} \frac{\delta(a,\eta)^{k+j}}{k+j} E_{A,j}^\phi(a,\eta) = \sum_{j=0}^{d} \frac{\delta(a,\eta)^{k+j}}{k+j} E_{r}^-(a,\eta)E_{r}^{-}(a,\eta)
$$

$$
= \sum_{j=0}^{d} \frac{d-s}{k+l+s} \frac{\delta(a,\eta)^{k+l+s}}{k+l+s} E_{l}^{-(a,\eta)}E_{r}^{-(a,\eta)}
$$

$$
= \sum_{s=0}^{d} E_{s}^+(a,\eta)\delta(a,\eta)^{k+s} \left( \sum_{l=0}^{d} \frac{\delta(a,\eta)^{l}}{k+l+s} E_{l}^{-(a,\eta)} \right)
$$

$$
\geq \sum_{s=0}^{d} E_{s}^+(a,\eta)\delta(a,\eta)^{k+s}c(d,n,s),
$$

where $c(d,n,s)$ is a positive constant depending only on $s$, $d$, and $n$. Since

$$
\sup_{(a,\eta)\in \mathcal{N}_s^\phi(A)} \delta(a,\eta)^{l}\left| E_{l}^{-}(a,\eta) \right| \leq \left( \frac{d}{l} \right) \text{ for } l = 0, \ldots, d,
$$

we conclude that

$$
\sum_{j=0}^{d} \frac{\delta(a,\eta)^{k+j}}{k+j} E_{A,j}^{\phi}(a,\eta) \geq \sum_{s=0}^{d} E_{s}^{+(a,\eta)}\delta(a,\eta)^{k+s}c(d,n,s) \left( \frac{d}{l-s} \right)^{-1} \left| E_{l-s}^{-}(a,\eta) \right| \delta(a,\eta)^{l-s}
$$

$$
\geq \delta(a,\eta)^{k+s}c(l,d,n) \sum_{s=0}^{d} E_{s}^{+(a,\eta)}\left| E_{l-s}^{-}(a,\eta) \right|
$$

$$
\geq \delta(a,\eta)^{k+s}c(l,d,n)E_{A,l}^{\phi}(a,\eta)
$$

for $(a,\eta) \in \mathcal{N}_s^\phi(A)$ and $l = 0, \ldots, d$, where $c(l,d,n) = \min \{ c(d,n,s) \left( \frac{d}{l-s} \right)^{-1} : s = 0, \ldots, d \} > 0$.

Let $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a compact set. It follows from [33] and [31] that

$$
\int_{\mathcal{N}_s^\phi(\mathcal{A}) \cap (B \times \partial W^\phi)} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J(a,\eta) \delta(a,\eta)^{n-d+l+1} \left| E_{A,l}^{\phi}(a,\eta) \right| d\mathcal{H}^n(a,\eta) < \infty \quad (35)
$$

for $l = 0, \ldots, d$ and $d = 0, \ldots, n$. Since

$$
\sum_{i=0}^{n} \frac{\delta(a,\eta)^{i+1}}{i+1} \left| H_{A,i}^\phi(a,\eta) \right| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n} \frac{d(a,\eta)^{n-d+j+1}}{n-d+j+1} \left| E_{A,i}^{\phi}(a,\eta) \right| 1_{\mathcal{N}_d^\phi(\mathcal{A})}(a,\eta),
$$

where equality holds if the absolute values are omitted on both sides of this equation, we obtain [25] from [35]. In addition, we conclude from [32] that

$$
\int_{\mathcal{L}^{n+1}} (\varphi \circ \psi_A^\phi) d\mathcal{L}^{n+1}
$$

$$
= \int_{\mathcal{L}^{n+1}} \varphi(a,\eta) \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J(a,\eta) \sum_{r=0}^{n} \frac{\delta(a,\eta)^{r+1}}{r+1} H_{A,r}^\phi(a,\eta) d\mathcal{H}^n(a,\eta)
$$

$$
= \sum_{r=0}^{n} \frac{1}{r+1} \int_{\mathcal{L}^{n+1}} \varphi(a,\eta) \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J(a,\eta) \delta(a,\eta)^{r+1} H_{A,r}^\phi(a,\eta) d\mathcal{H}^n(a,\eta) \quad (36)
$$

for every bounded Borel function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}$ with compact support, where we use the integrability property in [25] to obtain the equality in [36].

It is convenient to introduce the following function.
Definition 3.17. For every non-empty closed set \( A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \), we denote by \( J_A^\phi \) the \( \mathcal{H}^n \backslash N^\phi(A) \)
measurable function \( J \) introduced in Theorem 3.16.

The arguments in the proof of Theorem 3.16 readily provide the following change-of-variable-type
formula. This formula plays a central role in the proof of Theorem 3.20.

**Theorem 3.18 (Disintegration of Lebesgue measure).** Let \( A \) be a closed set, and let \( h : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R} \)
be a non-negative Borel function. Then

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A} h(x) \, d\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(x) = \sum_{d=0}^{n} \int_{\tilde{N}_d^\phi(A)} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) \, J_A^\phi(a, \eta) \int_0^{\partial \mathcal{H}^n(a, \eta)} h(a + t \eta) \, t^{n-d} \prod_{j=1}^{d} (1 + t \kappa_{A,j}^\phi(a, \eta)) \, dt \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a, \eta).
\]

**Proof.** During the proof of Theorem 3.16 we have proved (see eq. (30)) that

\[
\int_{B^\phi(A, \rho) \setminus A} h(x) \, d\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(x) = \sum_{d=0}^{n} \int_{\tilde{N}_d^\phi(A)} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) \, J_A^\phi(a, \eta) \int_{\inf(\rho, r_{A,j}^\phi(a, \eta))}^{\rho} h(a + t \eta) \, t^{n-d} \prod_{j=1}^{d} (1 + t \kappa_{A,j}^\phi(a, \eta)) \, dt \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a, \eta)
\]

for every \( \rho > 0 \). The conclusion now follows letting \( \rho \to +\infty \).

\( \square \)

### 3.3 A Heintze–Karcher inequality for closed sets

The following theorem provides a very general version of a Heintze–Karcher inequality under minimal
assumptions on a closed set and its complement. Several consequences will be derived for sets with
positive reach in Section 6.

We start with a lemma.

**Lemma 3.19.** Suppose \( A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) is a closed set, \( s_0 > 0 \) and \( r_A^\phi(a, u) \geq s_0 \) for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( (a, u) \in N^\phi(A) \). Then \( \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \delta_A^\phi(x) < s_0 \} \subseteq \text{Unp}^\phi(A) \).

**Proof.** Let \( 0 < s < s_0 \). Define \( \Omega_s^* = \{ (a, \eta, t) : (a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A), 0 < t < \inf\{ s, r_A^\phi(a, \eta) \} \} \) and the bijective map

\[ f : \Omega_s^* \to \{ x : 0 < \delta_A^\phi(x) < s \} \setminus \text{Cut}^\phi(A), \quad f(a, \eta, t) = a + t \eta. \]

Moreover we define \( \Omega_s = \Omega_s^* \cap \{ (a, \eta, t) : r_A^\phi(a, \eta) \geq s_0 \} \) and we notice that the hypothesis implies

\( \mathcal{H}^{n+1}(\Omega_s^* \setminus \Omega_s) = 0 \).

Consequently \( \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(f(\Omega_s^*) \setminus f(\Omega_s)) = 0 \) and, recalling that \( \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(\text{Cut}^\phi(A)) = 0 \), we conclude that
\( f(\Omega_s) \) is dense in \( \{ x : 0 < \delta_A^\phi(x) < s \} \). We choose now \( x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) so that \( 0 < \delta_A^\phi(x) < s \) and a sequence \( (a_i, \eta_i, t_i) \in \Omega_s \) so that \( a_i + t_i \eta_i \to x \). Up to subsequences we can
assume that there exist \( a \in A, \eta \in \partial \mathcal{H}^n \) and \( 0 \leq t \leq s \) so that \( a_i \to a, \eta_i \to \eta \) and \( t_i \to t \). Therefore \( x = a + t \eta \) and

\[ 0 < \delta_A^\phi(x) = \lim_{i \to \infty} \delta_A^\phi(a_i + t_i \eta_i) = \lim_{i \to \infty} t_i = t. \]

It follows that \((a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A)\) and the upper semicontinuity of \( r_A^\phi \) implies that \( r_A^\phi(a, \eta) \geq s_0 > s \geq t \)
and \( x \in \text{Unp}^\phi(A) \). In conclusion, we have proved that \( \{ x : \delta_A^\phi(x) < s \} \subseteq \text{Unp}^\phi(A) \) for every \( 0 < s < s_0 \).

\( \square \)

**Theorem 3.20.** Let \( C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) be a closed set with \( 0 < \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(\text{int}(C)) < \infty \). Let \( K = \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \text{int}(C) \)
and assume that

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \kappa_{K,i}^\phi(a, \eta) \leq 0 \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^n \text{ a.e. } (a, \eta) \in N^\phi(K). \tag{37} \]
Then

\[ (n+1)\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(\text{int}(C)) \leq n \int_{\tilde{N}_n^\phi(K)} J^\phi_{K}(a,\eta) \frac{\phi(n^\phi(\eta))}{\mathcal{H}^n(a,\eta)} \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a,\eta). \]  

(38)

If equality holds in (38) and there exists \( q < \infty \) so that \( |H_{K,1}^\phi(a,\eta)| \leq q \) for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( (a,\eta) \in \tilde{N}_n^\phi(K) \), then there are \( N \in \mathbb{N}, c_1, \ldots, c_N \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) and \( \rho_1, \ldots, \rho_N \geq \frac{n}{\tilde{\nu}} \) such that

\[ \text{int}(C) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} \text{int}(c_i + \rho_i \nu^\phi), \quad \text{int}(c_i + \rho_i \nu^\phi) \cap \text{int}(c_j + \rho_j \nu^\phi) = \emptyset \quad \text{for} \ i \neq j. \]

**Proof.** Note that (37) implies that \( \mathcal{H}^n(N^\phi(K) \setminus \tilde{N}_n^\phi(K)) = 0. \)

For the proof we may assume that \( |H_{K,1}^\phi(a,\eta)| > 0 \) for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \((a,\eta) \in \tilde{N}_n^\phi(K) \), since otherwise the inequality (38) is obviously true (with strict inequality). By Remark 3.8 we infer that

\[ r_K^\phi(a,\eta) \leq -\frac{n}{H_{K,1}^\phi(a,\eta)} \quad \text{for} \ \mathcal{H}^n \text{ a.e. } (a,\eta) \in \tilde{N}_n^\phi(K) \]

and \( 1 + t r_K^\phi(a,\eta) > 0 \) for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \((a,\eta) \in \tilde{N}_n^\phi(K) \), \( 0 < t < r_K^\phi(a,\eta) \) and \( i = 1, \ldots, n. \) Employing the change of variable formula in Theorem 3.13 (with \( h \equiv 1 \)) and the classical arithmetic-geometric mean inequality, we can estimate

\[ \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(\text{int}(C)) = \int_{\tilde{N}_n^\phi(K)} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J^\phi_{K}(a,\eta) \int_0^{r_K^\phi(a,\eta)} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left( 1 + t r_{K,j}^\phi(a,\eta) \right) dt \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a,\eta) \]

\[ \leq \int_{\tilde{N}_n^\phi(K)} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J^\phi_{K}(a,\eta) \int_0^{r_K^\phi(a,\eta)} \left( 1 + \frac{t}{n} H_{K,1}^\phi(a,\eta) \right)^n dt \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a,\eta) \]

\[ \leq \int_{\tilde{N}_n^\phi(K)} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J^\phi_{K}(a,\eta) \int_0^{\frac{n}{H_{K,1}^\phi(a,\eta)}} \left( 1 + \frac{t}{n} H_{K,1}^\phi(a,\eta) \right)^n dt \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a,\eta) \]

\[ = \frac{n}{n+1} \int_{\tilde{N}_n^\phi(K)} J^\phi_{K}(a,\eta) \frac{\phi(n^\phi(\eta))}{H_{K,1}^\phi(a,\eta)} \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a,\eta). \]  

(39)

We discuss now the equality case. We assume that \( |H_{K,1}^\phi(a,\eta)| \leq q \) for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \((a,\eta) \in \tilde{N}_n^\phi(K) \). If (38) holds with equality, then the inequalities in the derivation of (39) become equalities. In particular, we deduce that

\[ r_K^\phi(a,\eta) = -\frac{n}{H_{K,1}^\phi(a,\eta)} \geq \frac{n}{q} \quad \text{for} \ \mathcal{H}^n \text{ a.e. } (a,\eta) \in \tilde{N}_n^\phi(K) \]  

(40)

and the condition

\[ k_{K,1}^\phi(a,\eta) = \ldots = k_{K,n}^\phi(a,\eta) \quad \text{for} \ \mathcal{H}^n \text{ a.e. } (a,\eta) \in \tilde{N}_n^\phi(K). \]  

(41)

Consequently, we infer from Lemma 3.11 that \( \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \delta^\phi_K(x) < \frac{n}{q} \} \subseteq \text{Unp}^\phi(K) \), which means that \( \text{reach}^\phi(K) \geq \frac{n}{q} \) (see Definition 3.1). We define \( E_r = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \delta^\phi_K(x) \geq r \} \) for \( r > 0 \) and notice that \( \partial E_r = S^\phi(K, r) \) for \( r > 0 \). We fix now \( 0 < r < \frac{n}{q} \). It follows that \( \partial E_r \) is a closed \( C^{1,1} \) hypersurface by [DRKS20 Corollary 5.8] and \( \chi_{K,1}^\phi, \ldots, \chi_{K,n}^\phi \) are the anisotropic principal curvatures of \( \partial E_r \) with respect to the anisotropic normal \( \nu^\phi_K \mid \partial E_r \) (which points towards \( C \)). It follows from (40) and (41) that

\[ \chi_{K,1}^\phi(x) = \ldots = \chi_{K,n}^\phi(x) = \frac{1}{r - \frac{n}{q}} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{n}{q}} = \left( \frac{q r - n}{q} \right)^{-1} \]

for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( x \in \partial E_r \); in particular, \( \chi_{K,i}^\phi(x) < 0 \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \) and \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( x \in \partial E_r \). Hence, an application of [DRKS20 Lemma 3.2] to each of the at most countably many connected components of \( \partial E_r \) shows that there exist at most countably many points \( c_1, c_2, \ldots \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) and numbers

\[ \text{with} \ M = \partial B_\rho^\phi(a, |\lambda|^{-1}) \text{ with } M = \partial B_\rho^\phi(a, |\lambda|^{-1}), \text{ which is what the proof shows.} \]
\( \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \ldots \geq \frac{n-ag}{q} \) so that
\[
E_r = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} (c_i + \lambda_i W^\phi) \quad \text{and} \quad (c_i + \lambda_i W^\phi) \cap (c_j + \lambda_j W^\phi) = \emptyset \quad \text{for } i \neq j,
\]
where \( N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{ \infty \} \). Since \( \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(\text{int}(C)) < \infty \), it follows that \( N < \infty \). If \( i \in \{1, \ldots, N\} \) and \( z \in \partial W^\phi \), we have
\[
\frac{\nabla \delta^\phi_K(c_i + \lambda_i z)}{|\nabla \delta^\phi_K(c_i + \lambda_i z)|} = -n^\phi(z)
\]
and, noting \([86] \) and \([129] \), we conclude
\[
z = \nabla \phi(n^\phi(z)) = -\nabla \phi(\nabla \delta^\phi_K(c_i + \lambda_i z)) = -\nu^\phi_K(c_i + \lambda_i z).
\]
For \( 0 \leq s < r \) we define the bilipschitz homeomorphism \( f_s : \partial E_r \to \partial E_r-s \) by \( f_s(x) = x - s \nu^\phi_K(x) \) for \( x \in \partial E_r \). Then we get
\[
f_s(c_i + \lambda_i \partial W^\phi) = c_i + (\lambda_i + s) \partial W^\phi \quad \text{for } i \geq 1, \quad \partial E_r-s = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} (c_i + (\lambda_i + s) \partial W^\phi)
\]
and
\[
(c_i + (\lambda_i + s) \partial W^\phi) \cap (c_j + (\lambda_j + s) \partial W^\phi) = \emptyset \quad \text{for } i \neq j.
\]
Consequently, for \( 0 \leq s < r \),
\[
E_{r-s} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} (c_i + (\lambda_i + s) W^\phi), \quad (c_i + (\lambda_i + s) W^\phi) \cap (c_j + (\lambda_j + s) W^\phi) = \emptyset \quad \text{for every } i \neq j.
\]
and the proof is complete. \( \square \)

### 3.4 A general disintegration formula

For the next definition we need to recall that if \( A \) is a closed set in \( \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) and \( a \in A \), then the set
\[
\text{Dis}(A, a) := \{ u \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \delta_A(a + u) = |u| \}
\]
is a closed convex set (see [Fed59] Theorem 4.8 (2) or [MS19]). If \( X \) is a convex set, then \( \dim X \) denotes the dimension of the affine hull of \( X \).

**Definition 3.21.** Let \( \emptyset \\
\neq A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) be a closed set and \( i \in \{0, \ldots, n+1\} \). We define the \( i \)-th stratum of \( A \) as \( A^{(i)} = \{ a \in A : \dim \text{Dis}(A, a) = n+1-i \} \).

**Remark 3.22.** Evidently, we have \( A = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n+1} A^{(i)} \) and \( A^{(n+1)} = A \setminus p(N(A)) \). Noting that \( N(A, a) = \{ u/|u| \in S^n : u \in \text{Dis}(A, a) \setminus \{0\} \} \) for every \( a \in p(N(A)) \), we can easily deduce from [13] that
\[
A^{(i)} = \{ a \in A : 0 < \mathcal{H}^{n-i}(N^\phi(A, a)) < \infty \} \quad \text{for } i = 0, \ldots, n.
\]
We recall that \( A^{(i)} \) is a countably \( i \)-rectifiable Borel set which can be covered outside a set of \( \mathcal{H}^{i} \)-measure zero by a countable union of \( C^2 \)-submanifolds of dimension \( i \), for \( i = 0, \ldots, n \); see [MS19].

**Lemma 3.23.** If \( \emptyset \neq A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) is a closed set, \( m \in \{0, \ldots, n\} \) and \( S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) is a countable union of Borel subsets with finite \( \mathcal{H}^m \) measure, then
\[
\mathcal{H}^n((N^\phi(A)|A^{(j)}) \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^{j} \tilde{N}_i^\phi(A)) = 0 \quad \text{for } j = 0, \ldots, n \quad \text{(42)}
\]
and
\[
\mathcal{H}^n((N^\phi(A)|A^{(j)} \cap S) \setminus \bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1} \tilde{N}_i^\phi(A)) = 0 \quad \text{for } j > m \quad \text{(43)}
\]
Proof. Recall that $N_s = \{(a, \eta) \in \mathcal{N}(A) : r^\phi_{A,m}(a, \eta) \geq s\}$, for every $s > 0$, has finite $\mathcal{H}^n$ measure on each bounded set (see Theorem 3.16) and therefore is $(\mathcal{H}^n, n)$ rectifiable.

Fix $j \in \{0, \ldots, n - 1\}$ and notice that $\mathcal{H}^{j+1}(A^{(j)}) = 0$. Therefore we can apply Lemma 2.1 to conclude that

$$\int_{N_s \cap A^{(j)}} \text{ap} J_{j+1}^{N_s} p(a, \eta) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a, \eta) = \int_{A^{(j)}} \mathcal{H}^{n-j}(N_s \{a\}) \, d\mathcal{H}^{j+1}(a) = 0$$

for every $s > 0$. It follows that $\text{ap} J_{j+1}^{N_s} p(a, \eta) = 0$ for $\mathcal{H}^n$ a.e. $(a, \eta) \in N_s \cap A^{(j)}$ and $s > 0$. We infer from Lemma 3.39 that

$$\kappa_{A,j+1}(a, \eta) = +\infty \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^n \text{ a.e. } (a, \eta) \in N^\phi(a) | A^{(j)},$$

which is precisely the assertion in 43.

If $m = 0$, then $S$ is a countable set and $\mathcal{H}^n(N^\phi(A, a)) = 0$ for every $a \in A^{(j)}$ and for every $j \geq 1$. This implies 44 for $m = 0$. Fix now $j > m \geq 1$. Noting that $\mathcal{H}^{n-m}(N^\phi(A, a)) = 0$ for $a \in A^{(j)}$, we again apply the coarea formula in Lemma 2.1 to obtain

$$\int_{N_s \cap (S \cap A^{(j)})} \text{ap} J_{m}^{N_s} p(a, \eta) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a, \eta) = \int_{S \cap A^{(j)}} \mathcal{H}^{n-m}(N_s \{a\}) \, d\mathcal{H}^m(a) = 0$$

for $s > 0$. As above this implies that $\kappa_{A,m}(a, \eta) = +\infty$ for $\mathcal{H}^n$ a.e. $(a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A) | (A^{(j)} \cap S)$, which is equivalent to the assertion in 43.

\[\square\]

Remark 3.24. If $A, m$ and $S$ are as in Lemma 3.23 then

$$\mathcal{H}^{\phi}_{n-m}(a, \eta) = 1_{\tilde{N}^\phi_{m}(A)}(a, \eta) \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^n \text{ a.e. } (a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A) | A^{(m)},$$

$$\mathcal{H}^{\phi}_{m}(a, \eta) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^n \text{ a.e. } (a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A) | A^{(j)} \text{ and } j < m$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}^{\phi}_{n-m}(a, \eta) = 0 \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^n \text{ a.e. } (a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A) | (A^{(j)} \cap S) \text{ and } j > m.$$
and thus we infer that
\[ \mathcal{H}^m \left\{ x \in A^{(m)} : \mathcal{H}^{n-m}(N_a \cap (x)) > 0 \right\} = 0. \]

Furthermore, we have
\[ \{ x \in A^{(m)} : \mathcal{H}^{n-m}(N^\phi(A,x) \cap (P\{x\}) > 0 \} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{ x \in A^{(m)} : \mathcal{H}^{n-m}(N_a \cap (x)) \cap (P\{x\}) > 0 \} \]
for any positive sequence \( s_i \searrow 0 \). Since also \( \mathcal{H}^n(N^\phi(A,a) \cap \tilde{N}^\phi(A,a)) = 0 \) for \( a \in A^{(0)} \), we obtain that
\[ \mathcal{H}^m \left( \left\{ a \in A^{(m)} : \mathcal{H}^{n-m} \left( N^\phi(A,a) \cap \bigcup_{i=m}^{n} \tilde{N}^\phi_i(A,a) \right) > 0 \right\} \right) = 0 \] (44)
for \( m \in \{0, \ldots, n\} \). Now let \( m \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\} \). Since by Lemma 3.23 it holds that
\[ \mathcal{H}^m \left( (N^\phi(A)|A) \cap \bigcup_{i=m+1}^{n} \tilde{N}^\phi_i(A) \right) = 0, \]
an application of the coarea formula in Lemma 2.1 yields that
\[ \int_{A^{(m)}} \mathcal{H}^{n-m} \left( N_a \cap \bigcup_{i=m+1}^{n} \tilde{N}^\phi_i(A,x) \right) d\mathcal{H}^m(x) = 0 \]
for every \( s > 0 \), whence, as above, we infer
\[ \mathcal{H}^m \left( \left\{ a \in A^{(m)} : \mathcal{H}^{n-m} \left( N^\phi(A,a) \cap \bigcup_{i=m+1}^{n} \tilde{N}^\phi_i(A,a) \right) > 0 \right\} \right) = 0. \] (45)

Now the assertion follows from (44) and (45).

(c) Since \( p(N^\phi(A)) = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n} A^{(i)}, \mathcal{H}^n(A^{(j)}) = 0 \) for \( j \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\} \) and \( p[N^\phi(A) \cap \tilde{N}^\phi(A)] = p(N^\phi(A)) \cap \{ a : \mathcal{H}^0(N^\phi(A,a) \cap \tilde{N}^\phi_A(a)) > 0 \} \), we conclude that [c] directly follows from [b] with \( m = n \).

(d) The cone \( \{ tu : t > 0, u \in N(A,a) \} \) is convex for \( a \in p(N^\phi(A)) \). Consequently, we have \( N(A,a) = -N(A,a) \) for \( a \in A \) with \( \mathcal{H}^0(N(A,a)) = 2 \). Since \( \nabla \phi(N(A,a)) = N^\phi(A,a) \) for \( a \in p(N^\phi(A)) \), we conclude that \( N^\phi(A,a) = -N^\phi(A,a) \) for \( a \in A \) with \( \mathcal{H}^0(N^\phi(A,a)) = 2 \).

(e) Finally, let \( X \) be the set defined in [e]. Employing again the sets \( N_a \) as defined in Theorem 3.26 we notice that \( \text{ap} J_{n}^N \cdot p(a,u) > 0 \) for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( (a,u) \in \tilde{N}^\phi_n(A) \) and, by the coarea formula and [c], we get
\[ \int_{(N_n \cap \tilde{N}^\phi_n(A)|X)} \text{ap} J_{n}^N \cdot p(a,\eta) d\mathcal{H}^n(a,\eta) = 0 \]
for every \( s > 0 \). It follows that \( \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{N}^\phi_n(A)|X) = 0 \). Since by [a] and [d] we have that
\[ N^\phi(A)|X = (\tilde{N}^\phi_n(A)|X) \cup \{ (a,\eta) : (a,\eta) \in \tilde{N}^\phi_n(A)|X \}, \]
we obtain [e].

Remark 3.26. If \( A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) is a convex body (with non-empty interior), then \( \mathcal{H}^0(N^\phi(A,a)) = 1 \) for every \( a \in p(\tilde{N}^\phi_n(A)) \).

We now prove a very general disintegration formula. This result, which is of independent interest, plays a key role in the proof of Theorem 6.12 through Lemma 6.10 and the subsequent Lemma 6.17.

Theorem 3.27. Let \( \emptyset \neq A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) be a closed set and \( m \in \{0, \ldots, n\} \). Then there exists a positive real-valued \( \mathcal{H}^n \cap N^\phi(A) \) measurable function \( \rho^\phi_{A,m} \) on \( N^\phi(A) \) such that the following statements hold.
(a) \( 0 < \rho_{A,m}^\phi(a, \eta) \leq c \) for \( H^m \) a.e. \((a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A) \), where \( c \) depends only on \( \phi \) and \( n \).

(b) If \( m \in \{0, n\} \) or if \( \phi \) is the Euclidean norm, then \( \rho_{A,m}^\phi(a, \eta) = 1 \) for \( H^n \) a.e. \((a, \eta) \in N(A) \).

(c) For every Borel set \( B \subseteq R^{n+1} \) with \( \sigma \)-finite \( H^m \) measure it holds that

\[
H^\phi_{A,n-m}(a, \eta) 1_{N^\phi(A) \cap B}(a, \eta) = 1_{\tilde{N}^m_{A}(A)}(a, \eta) 1_{N^m(A)(A(m) \cap B)}(a, \eta)
\]  

(46)

for \( H^n \) a.e. \((a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A) \) and

\[
\int_{N^\phi(A) \cap B} 1_D(a, \eta) \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J^\phi_A(a, \eta) H^\phi_{A,n-m}(a, \eta) dH^n(a, \eta)
\]

= \[
\int_{B \cap A(m)} \int_{N^\phi(A, a)} 1_D(a, \eta) \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) \rho_{A,m}^\phi(a, \eta) dH^{n-m}(\eta) dH^m(\eta)
\]

for every Borel set \( D \subseteq R^{n+1} \times R^{n+1} \).

Proof. Since \( N^\phi(A) \cap B = \bigcup_{j=0}^m (N^\phi(A)(B \cap A(j))) \), the equality in (46) follows from Remark 3.24.

Since the case \( m = 0 \) is easy to check directly, we assume that \( m \geq 1 \) in the following.

Let \( \tau_i : \tilde{N}^\phi(A) \to R^{n+1} \) and \( \zeta_i : \tilde{N}^\phi(A) \to R^{n+1} \times R^{n+1} \) be the maps defined in Lemma 3.9 for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \). For \((a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}^\phi(A) \) we define \( T(a, \eta) \) to be the linear space generated by \( \zeta_1(a, \eta), \ldots, \zeta_n(a, \eta) \) and we notice that

\[
1 \geq \|p[T(a, \eta)]\|^m = \left\| \bigwedge_m (p[T(a, \eta)]) \right\| \\
\geq \left\| \bigwedge_m \left( \zeta_1(a, \eta) \wedge \ldots \wedge \zeta_m(a, \eta) \right) \right\| \left\| \right\| \zeta_1(a, \eta) \wedge \ldots \wedge \zeta_m(a, \eta) \right\| > 0
\]

(47)

for \((a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}^m_{A}(A) \). Therefore we define

\[
\rho_{A,m}^\phi(a, \eta) = \begin{cases} \frac{J^\phi_A(a, \eta)}{\|\bigwedge_m (p[T(a, \eta)])\|} & \text{for } (a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}^m_{m}(A), \\ 1 & \text{for } (a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A) \setminus \tilde{N}^m_{m}(A). \end{cases}
\]

Notice that \( \rho_{A,m}^\phi(a, \eta) = 1 \) for \( H^n \) a.e. \((a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A) \) by Lemma 3.9.

If \( m \in \{1, \ldots, n-1 \} \), we combine

\[
|\tau_1(a, \eta) \wedge \ldots \wedge \tau_m(a, \eta)| \leq |\tau_1(a, \eta) \wedge \ldots \wedge \tau_m(a, \eta)| \cdot |\tau_{m+1}(a, \eta) \wedge \ldots \wedge \tau_n(a, \eta)|
\]

(see [Fed69, 1.7.5]) with the estimate in (24) from Remark 3.10 to get

\[
\rho_{A,m}^\phi(a, \eta) \leq \frac{|\tau_1(a, \eta) \wedge \ldots \wedge \tau_m(a, \eta)|}{|\zeta_1(a, \eta) \wedge \ldots \wedge \zeta_m(a, \eta)|} \leq \frac{|\tau_{m+1}(a, \eta) \wedge \ldots \wedge \tau_n(a, \eta)|}{|\zeta_{m+1}(a, \eta) \wedge \ldots \wedge \zeta_n(a, \eta)|} \leq \frac{C}{c^2}
\]

for \((a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}^m_{A}(A) \), which provides the required finite upper bound with constants \( 0 < c < \infty \) depending only on \( n, \phi \).

Let \( N_s \) be the set defined in Theorem 3.16 for \( s > 0 \). By Lemma 3.9 we have \( \text{ap} J^N_{A,m} p(a, \eta) = \|\bigwedge_m (p[T(a, \eta)])\| \) for \( H^n \) a.e. \((a, \eta) \in N_s \), for \( s > 0 \). An application of the coarea formula shows that

\[
\int_{N_s \cap (B \cap A(m))} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J^\phi_A(a, \eta) 1_D(a, \eta) 1_{\tilde{N}^m_{A}(A)}(a, \eta) dH^n(a, \eta)
\]

= \[
\int_{B \cap A(m)} \int_{N_s \cap p^{-1}(a)} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) \rho_{A,m}^\phi(a, \eta) 1_{\tilde{N}^m_{A}(A)}(a, \eta) 1_D(a, \eta) dH^{n-m}(a, \eta) dH^m(a)
\]
for $s > 0$. Applying the monotone convergence theorem in combination with Lemma 3.2.5 (b) and (10), we obtain

$$\int_{N^o(A) \setminus B} 1_D(a, \eta) \phi(n_\lambda^o(\eta)) J^o_\lambda(a, \eta) H^o_{A, \eta} A_{\eta} \mu(a, \eta) dH^n(a, \eta)$$

$$= \int_{N^o(A) \setminus (B \cap A^m)} \phi(n_\lambda^o(\eta)) J^o_\lambda(a, \eta) 1_D(a, \eta) dH^n(a, \eta)$$

$$= \int_{B \cap A^m} \int_{N^o(A, a)} \phi(n_\lambda^o(\eta)) J^o_\lambda(a, \eta) 1_D(a, \eta) dH^{n-m}(a, \eta) dH^m(a)$$

Finally, suppose that $\phi$ is the Euclidean norm. Then $\{ \xi_m(1) \cap \ldots \cap \xi_m(m) : \lambda \in \Lambda(n, m) \}$ is an orthogonal basis of $\Lambda_m T(a, \eta)$ for every $(a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}(A)$. Fix now $(a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}_m(A)$ and $\xi \in \Lambda_m T(a, \eta)$ such that

$$|\xi| = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \xi = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda(n, m)} \lambda \xi_m(1) \cap \ldots \cap \xi_m(m) \mathbf{|} \xi_m(1) \cap \ldots \cap \xi_m(m) = 1.$$

It follows from the orthogonality that $|\xi| \leq 1$ for every $\lambda \in \Lambda(n, m)$. Therefore, denoting with $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda(n, m)$ the map such that $\lambda_0(i) = i$ for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, we notice that

$$\Lambda_m p(\xi) = c_{\lambda_0} \frac{\tau_1(a, \eta) \cap \ldots \cap \tau_m(a, \eta)}{|\xi_1(a, \eta) \cap \ldots \cap \xi_m(a, \eta)|},$$

and we infer in combination with (17) that

$$\|\Lambda_m(p T(a, \eta))\| = \frac{\tau_1(a, \eta) \cap \ldots \cap \tau_m(a, \eta)}{|\xi_1(a, \eta) \cap \ldots \cap \xi_m(a, \eta)|}.$$

We can now easily conclude that $\varrho^o_{A, m}(a, \eta) = 1$ for every $(a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}_m(A)$ is a suitable choice. □

4 Differentiability of the volume function

In this section, employing the Steiner-type formula from the previous section, we study the differentiability properties of the (localized) parallel volume function $V$ of an anisotropic tubular neighbourhood around an arbitrary compact (closed) set. In particular, we obtain an expression for the left and right derivative of $V$ in terms of the anisotropic curvatures of the compact set and we deduce a geometric characterization of the differentiability points of $V$. The results of this section extend [HLW04, eq. (4.5) and (4.6), Corollary 4.5] and complement some of the results in [CLV21], see also Remark 4.4 below and the preceding work [Sta76, RW10, WI19].

Remark 4.1. Notice that if $\rho > 0$, $y \in S^o(A, \rho)$ and $a \in \xi^o_A(x)$, that is, $a \in A$ and $\phi(y - a) = \delta^o_A(y)$, then

$$U^o(a, \rho) \cap S^o(A, \rho) = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad B^o(a, \rho) \subseteq B^o(A, \rho).$$

Hence we deduce that $p(N(B^o(A, \rho))) = \partial^o B^o(A, \rho) = \partial^o_\rho B^o(A, \rho)$ and the function $u$ defined in Theorem 4.3 satisfies $u(x) = n(B^o(A, \rho), x)$ for every $x \in \partial^o_\rho B^o(A, \rho)$.

The following auxiliary result is used in the proof of Theorem 4.3. At the same time it provides an interesting insight into the nature of the cut points in $\text{Cut}^o(A) \cap \text{Unp}^o(A)$. In fact, in this regard we recall that there are closed (compact) sets $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ such that $H^n[S^o(A, \rho) \setminus (\partial B^o(A, \rho) \cup \text{Unp}^o(A))] > 0$ for some $\rho > 0$; for instance, let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ be the union of two parallel lines (segments) at distance 2 and $\rho = 1$. In view of these simple examples, the second equation in (51) (which holds for every $\rho > 0$) is quite surprising since $\text{Cut}^o(A) \cap \text{Unp}^o(A)$ can be a much larger set than $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus (A \cup \text{Unp}^o(A))$. In fact, since $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus (A \cup \text{Unp}^o(A))$ is always an $n$-dimensional set (see section 2.3), it follows from the example in [BH08] that the set $\text{Cut}^o(A) \cap \text{Unp}^o(A)$ can be an $(n+1)$-dimensional set!
Lemma 4.2. Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a closed set and $\rho > 0$. Let $f_\rho : N^\phi(A) \cap \{r_A^\phi \geq \rho\} \to S^\phi(A, \rho)$ be defined by $f_\rho(a, \eta) = a + \rho \eta$. Then

$$f_\rho(N^\phi(A) \cap \{r_A^\phi \geq \rho\}) = S^\phi(A, \rho),$$  \hspace{1cm} (48) $$f_\rho(N^\phi(A) \cap \{r_A^\phi > \rho\}) = \partial^+_\eta B^\phi(A, \rho) \subseteq S^\phi(A, \rho) \cap Unp^\phi(A),$$  \hspace{1cm} (49) $$S^\phi(A, \rho) \cap Unp^\phi(A) \subseteq \partial B^\phi(A, \rho), \quad \mathcal{H}^n(S^\phi(A, \rho) \cap Unp^\phi(A) \setminus \partial^+_{\eta} B^\phi(A, \rho)) = 0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (50) $$\partial^+_{\eta} B^\phi(A, \rho) \cap \text{Cut}^\phi(A) = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}^n(S^\phi(A, \rho) \cap Unp^\phi(A) \cap \text{Cut}^\phi(A)) = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (51) 

Proof. We start with \[18\]. “$\subseteq$”: Let $(x, \eta) \in N^\phi(A) \cap \{r_A^\phi \geq \rho\}$. Then $\delta_A^\phi(x + t\eta) = \eta$ for $0 \leq t < \rho$, hence also for $t = \rho$ since $\delta_A^\phi$ is continuous. Thus, $f_\rho(x, \eta) \in S^\phi(A, \rho)$.

“$\supseteq$”: Let $z \in S^\phi(A, \rho)$, that is, $\delta_A^\phi(z) = \rho$ and there is some $x \in A$ with $\phi^*(z - x) = \rho$. Set $\eta = \rho^{-1}(z - x)$. Then $\xi_A^\phi(x + t\eta) = x$ for $0 \leq t < \rho$ by \[DRKS20\] Lemma 2.38 (g)]. It follows that $(x, \eta) \in N^\phi(A)$, $r_A^\phi(x, \eta) \geq \rho$ and $f_\rho(x, \eta) = z$.

Next we deal with \[19\]. Let $(x, \eta) \in N^\phi(A) \cap \{r_A^\phi > \rho\}$. Then $f_\rho(x, \eta) \in S^\phi(A, \rho)$ by \[18\]. Since $r_A^\phi(x, \eta) > \rho$ it follows from \[19\] that $\rho_A^\phi(x + \rho \rho) > 1$, and therefore also $f_\rho(x, \eta) = x + \rho \rho \in Unp^\phi(A)$. This yields $f_\rho(N^\phi(A) \cap \{r_A^\phi > \rho\}) \subseteq S^\phi(A, \rho) \cap Unp^\phi(A)$.

Now we show that $f_\rho(N^\phi(A) \cap \{r_A^\phi > \rho\}) = \partial^+_\eta B^\phi(A, \rho)$ by proving two inclusions. “$\subseteq$”: Let $(x, \eta) \in N^\phi(A) \cap \{r_A^\phi > \rho\}$. In view of Remark \[14\] it suffices to show that $x + \rho \rho \in \partial B^\phi(A, \rho)$. For this, choose $\rho \in (\rho, r_A^\phi(x, \eta))$. Then we have already shown that $x + \rho \rho \in S^\phi(A, \rho) \cap Unp^\phi(A)$ and clearly $\xi_A^\phi(x + \rho \rho) = x$. We now claim that $\xi_A^\phi(x + \rho \rho) = x + \rho \rho$, which will imply the required inclusion. Since

$$x + \rho \rho \in (x + \rho \rho + (-\rho - \rho)B^\phi) \cap B^\phi(A, \rho) \quad \text{and} \quad (x + \rho \rho + (-\rho - \rho) \text{int}(B^\circ)) \cap B^\phi(A, \rho) = \emptyset,$$

we get $x + \rho \rho \in \xi_A^\phi((x + \rho \rho) \cap \text{int}(B^\circ)) \cap B^\phi(A, \rho)$ and $\delta_A^\phi(x + \rho \rho) = -\rho > 0$. Let $z \in \xi_A^\phi((x + \rho \rho)$ be arbitrarily chosen. Then

$$z \in (x + \rho \rho + (-\rho - \rho)\partial B^\phi \cap (a + \rho \rho \partial B^\phi) \quad \text{for some } a \in A$$

and

$$(x + \rho \rho + (-\rho - \rho) \text{int}(B^\circ)) \cap (a + \rho \rho \text{int}(B^\circ)) = \emptyset.$$

Hence $z = a + \rho \rho \rho = x + \rho \rho + (-\rho - \rho)\partial B^\circ$. Then there is some $x \in A$ with

$$z \in x + \rho \rho \subseteq B^\phi(A, \rho) \quad \text{and} \quad z \in S^\phi(A, \rho).$$

Furthermore there are $y \not\in B^\phi(A, \rho)$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$z \in y + \epsilon B^\phi \quad \text{and} \quad (y + \epsilon \text{int}(B^\circ)) \cap B^\phi(A, \rho) = \emptyset.$$

This implies that $\delta_A^\phi(y) = \rho + \epsilon$. Moreover,

$$\rho + \epsilon = \phi^*(y - x) \geq \phi^*(y - z) + \phi^*(z - x) \leq \rho + \rho,$$

and hence $\phi^*(y - x) = \rho + \epsilon$, $\phi^*(y - z) = \epsilon$ and $\phi^*(z - x) = \rho$. Since $\phi^*$ is strictly convex, we also get $y - z = s(z - x)$ with some $s > 0$ and therefore $z = \frac{s}{1 + s}y + \frac{1}{1 + s}x$. We set $\eta = (\rho + \rho)^{-1}(y - x) \in \partial B^\phi$ and thus get $\delta_A^\phi(y) = \delta_A^\phi(x + (\rho + \rho)\eta) = \rho + \epsilon$. From \[DRKS20\] Lemma 2.38 (g)] we now conclude that $(x, \eta) \in N^\phi(A)$ and $r_A^\phi(x, \eta) \geq \rho + \epsilon > \rho$, which yields $z = f_\rho(x, \eta) \in f_\rho(N^\phi(A) \cap \{r_A^\phi > \rho\})$.

Now we turn to \[20\]. We fix an arbitrary $\rho > 0$ and $x \in S^\phi(A, \rho) \cap Unp^\phi(A)$. Recall that $\delta_A^\phi$ is semiconcave on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus B^\phi(A, s)$ for every $s > 0$ (see section \[2.4\]). Since $x \in S^\phi(A, \rho) \cap Unp^\phi(A)$,
the distance function $\delta^0_A$ is differentiable at $x$ with $0 \notin \{\nabla \delta^0_A(x)\} = \partial \delta^0_A(x)$, where we use that the generalized subgradient coincides with the subgradient from convex analysis for semiconvex functions (see [Fu85], Remark 1.4] and the references to [C90] given there). Hence we infer from [Fu85], Theorem 3.3 and Proposition 1.7] that there exist $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, $u \in S^0$ and a lipschitzian semiconvex function $f : x + u^\perp \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\text{epi}(f) \cap U_{\epsilon, \delta}(x, u) = B^\Phi(A, \rho) \cap U_{\epsilon, \delta}(x, u) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{graph}(f) \cap U_{\epsilon, \delta}(x, u) = S^\Phi(A, \rho) \cap U_{\epsilon, \delta}(x, u).$$

(One can easily see that $u = \nabla \delta^0_A(x)/|\nabla \delta^0_A(x)|$, but this is not relevant here). Since semiconvex functions are pointwise twice-differentiable almost everywhere by a classical theorem of Alexandrov, we conclude that for $H^n$ a.e. $y \in S^\Phi(A, \rho) \cap U_{\epsilon, \delta}(x, u)$ there exists an open ball $B \subseteq U_{\epsilon, \delta}(x, u)$ such that $B \cap B^\Phi(A, \rho) = \emptyset$ and $y \in \text{clos}(B) \cap B^\Phi(A, \rho)$. Therefore it follows from Remark [44] that

$$H^n(S^\Phi(A, \rho) \cap U_{\epsilon, \delta}(x, u) \setminus \partial^n_+ B^\Phi(A, \rho)) = 0.$$

Since $x$ is arbitrarily chosen in $S^\Phi(A, \rho) \cap \text{Unp}^\Phi(A)$, we obtain the assertions in [50].

The assertions in [51] follow immediately from what we have already shown. \qed

For a closed set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, a bounded Borel set $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times B^0$ and $\rho > 0$, we define

$$P^\Phi_\rho(A, D) = \{x \in \text{Unp}(A) \setminus A : \psi^\Phi_A(x) \in D, \delta^\Phi_A(x) \leq \rho \}$$

and

$$V(A, D; \rho) := \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(P^\Phi_\rho(A, D)).$$

Recall that $\mathcal{W}^\Phi = B^0$. If $\xi : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A \to \partial A$ and $\nu : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A \to \partial \mathcal{W}^\Phi$ are two Borel functions such that

$$\xi(x) \in \xi^\Phi_A(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \nu(x) \in \nu^\Phi_A(x),$$

then we also define

$$\overline{P}^\Phi_\rho(A, D) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A : (\xi(x), \nu(x)) \in D, \delta^\Phi_A(x) \leq \rho \}$$

and

$$\overline{V}(A, D; \rho) := \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(\overline{P}^\Phi_\rho(A, D)).$$

Clearly, we have $\overline{V}(A, D; \rho) = V(A, D; \rho)$. Furthermore, note that if $x \in S^\Phi(A, \rho) \cap \text{Unp}^\Phi(A) \setminus A$, then $\xi(x) = x - \rho \cdot \nu(x)$.

**Theorem 4.3.** Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a closed set, and let $\phi$ be a uniformly convex $C^2$-norm on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathcal{W}^\Phi$ be a bounded Borel set, and let $\xi : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A \to \partial A$ and $\nu : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A \to \partial \mathcal{W}^\Phi$ be Borel functions as in [52]. Define a Borel function $u : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A \to \mathbb{R}^n$ by $u(x) = (x, \nu(x))$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A$. Then, for every $\rho > 0$ the right derivative $V'_+(A, D; \rho)$ and the left derivative $V'_-(A, D; \rho)$ of $V$ at $\rho$ exist and are given by

$$V'_+(A, D; \rho) = \sum_{d=0}^{n} \int_{N^\Phi_A(\rho)} J^\Phi_A(a, \eta) \phi(n^\Phi(\eta)) dH^n(a, \eta)$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{n} \rho^i \int_{N^\Phi_A(\rho)} J^\Phi_A(a, \eta) H^\Phi_{A,i}(a, \eta) dH^n(a, \eta)$$

$$= \int_{\partial^+_{\mathcal{W}^\Phi}(A, \rho)} 1_D(\xi(x), \nu(x)) \phi(u(x)) dH^n(x)$$

and

$$V'_-(A, D; \rho) = \sum_{d=0}^{n} \int_{\overline{N^\Phi_A(\rho)}} J^\Phi_A(a, \eta) \phi(n^\Phi(\eta)) dH^n(a, \eta)$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{n} \rho^i \int_{\overline{N^\Phi_A(\rho)}} J^\Phi_A(a, \eta) H^\Phi_{A,i}(a, \eta) dH^n(a, \eta)$$

$$= \int_{\partial^-_{\mathcal{W}^\Phi}(A, \rho)} 1_D(\xi(x), \nu(x)) \phi(u(x)) dH^n(x)$$
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\[ \sum_{i=0}^{n} \rho^{i} \int_{N^{n}(A) \cap D \cap \{r_{A}^{n} \geq \rho \}} \phi(n^{\alpha}(\eta)) J_{A}^{\alpha}(a, \eta) H_{A,1}^{\alpha}(a, \eta) \, dH^{n}(a, \eta) \]

\[ = V_{+}'(A, D; \rho) + \int_{S^{n}(A, \rho) \setminus \text{Unp}^{n}(A)} (1_{D}(x - \rho \nu(x), \nu(x)) + 1_{D}(x + \rho \nu(x), -\nu(x)) \phi(u(x)) \, dH^{n}(x). \] (54)

Consequently, \( V(A, D; \cdot) \) is differentiable at \( \rho > 0 \) if

\[ \int_{N^{n}(A) \cap D \cap \{r_{A}^{n} = \rho \}} \phi(n^{\alpha}(\eta)) J_{A}^{\alpha}(a, \eta) H_{A,1}^{\alpha}(a, \eta) \, dH^{n}(a, \eta) = 0 \quad \text{for } i = 0, \ldots, n, \]

and this happens for all but countably many \( \rho \in (0, \infty) \).

Furthermore, \( V(A, D; \cdot) \) is differentiable at \( \rho > 0 \) if and only if

\[ \int_{S^{n}(A, \rho) \setminus \text{Unp}^{n}(A)} (1_{D}(x - \rho \nu(x), \nu(x)) + 1_{D}(x + \rho \nu(x), -\nu(x)) \phi(u(x)) \, dH^{n}(x). \]

In particular, \( V(A, (\mathbb{R}^{n+1})_{t}^\cdot; \cdot) \) is differentiable at \( \rho > 0 \) if and only if \( H^{n}(S^{\phi}(A, \rho) \setminus \text{Unp}^{n}(A)) = 0 \).

Proof. Note that if \((a, \eta) \in N^{\phi}(A) \) and \(0 < t < r_{A}^{\phi}(a, \eta)\), then \( a + t \eta \in \text{Unp}^{\phi}(A)\) and therefore \( \xi(a + t \eta) = \xi_{A}^{\phi}(a + t \eta) = a \) and \( \nu(a + t \eta) = \nu_{A}^{\phi}(a + t \eta) = \eta \). Therefore, choosing \( h(x) = 1_{D}(\xi(x), \nu(x)) \) in Theorem 5.13 we get that

\[ \nabla(A, D; \rho) \]

\[ = \sum_{d=0}^{n} \int_{\bar{N}_{A}^{\phi}(A) \cap D} \phi(n^{\alpha}(\eta)) J_{A}^{\alpha}(a, \eta) \left( \int_{0}^{\rho} 1 \{t < r_{A}^{\phi}(a, \eta)\} t^{n-d} \prod_{i=1}^{d} (1 + t \kappa_{A,1}^{\phi}(a, \eta)) \, dt \right) \, dH^{n}(a, \eta) \]

for \( \rho > 0 \). Since the integrand is non-negative, we can exchange the order of integration by Fubini theorem [Fed90, Theorem2.6.2] and obtain

\[ \nabla(A, D; \rho) \]

\[ = \int_{0}^{\rho} \left( \sum_{d=0}^{n} \int_{\bar{N}_{A}^{\phi}(A) \cap D \cap \{r_{A}^{\phi} > t\}} \phi(n^{\alpha}(\eta)) J_{A}^{\alpha}(a, \eta) t^{n-d} \prod_{i=1}^{d} (1 + t \kappa_{A,1}^{\phi}(a, \eta)) \, dH^{n}(a, \eta) \right) \, dt \]

for \( \rho > 0 \). For \( \rho > 0 \), we define

\[ g(\rho) = \sum_{d=0}^{n} \int_{\bar{N}_{A}^{\phi}(A) \cap D \cap \{r_{A}^{\phi} > \rho\}} \phi(n^{\alpha}(\eta)) J_{A}^{\alpha}(a, \eta) \rho^{n-d} \prod_{i=1}^{d} (1 + \rho \kappa_{A,1}^{\phi}(a, \eta)) \, dH^{n}(a, \eta) \]

and \( f_{\rho} : N_{\rho} \rightarrow S^{\phi}(A, \rho) \) by \( f_{\rho}(a, \eta) = a + \rho \eta \) (where \( N_{\rho} \) is defined as in Theorem 5.10). Since

\[ 1_{\{r_{A}^{\phi} > t\}}(a, \eta) \leq 1_{\{r_{A}^{\phi} > t\}}(a, \eta) \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow t \text{ for } (a, \eta) \in N^{\phi}(A), \]

an application of the dominated convergence theorem gives that \( \lim_{s \downarrow t} g(s) = g(t) \) for \( t > 0 \). Using the formula \( 5 \) in the proof of Theorem 5.10 we get

\[ g(t) = \int_{N^{n}(A) \cap D \cap \{r_{A}^{n} > t\}} \phi(n^{\alpha}(\eta)) \, dH^{n}(a, \eta) < \infty \] (55)

for \( t > 0 \). Now, noting that \( \nabla(A, D; \rho) = \int_{0}^{\rho} g(s) \, ds \), we readily obtain that

\[ \nabla_{+}(A, D; \rho) = g(\rho) \quad \text{for } \rho > 0. \] (56)

By Lemma 5.2 we have \( f_{\rho}(N^{\phi}(A) \cap \{r_{A}^{\phi} > \rho\}) = \partial_{+}^{\phi} B^{\phi}(A, \rho) \subseteq \text{Unp}^{\phi}(A) \cap S^{\phi}(A, \rho) \); moreover,

\[ q(f_{\rho}^{-1}(\{x\})) = \{\nu(x)\} = \{\nu_{\rho}^{\phi}(x)\} \quad \text{for } x \in \partial_{+}^{\phi} B^{\phi}(A, \rho). \] 
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Thus we conclude that
\[ g(\rho) = \int_{B^\phi(A, \rho)} 1_D(\xi(x), \nu(x)) \phi(u(x)) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(x) \quad \text{for } \rho > 0. \]

Now we deal with the left derivative. Since
\[ 1_{\{r^s_\rho > s\}} \searrow 1_{\{r^s_\rho \geq t\}} \quad \text{as } s \searrow t, \]
it follows again from the dominated convergence theorem that
\[ \lim_{s \uparrow t} g(s) = \sum_{d=0}^{n} \int_{\tilde{N}^\phi_0(A) \cap D \cap \{r^s_\rho \geq t\}} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J^\phi_0(A, \eta) t^{n-d} \prod_{i=1}^{d} (1 + t\kappa^\phi_{A,i}(a, \eta)) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a, \eta) \]
for \( t > 0 \). Hence we deduce again using the formula (28) in the proof of Theorem 3.16 that
\[ \nabla^-_-(A, D; \rho) = \sum_{d=0}^{n} \int_{\tilde{N}^\phi_0(A) \cap D \cap \{r^s_\rho \geq t\}} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J^\phi_0(A, \eta) \rho^{n-d} \prod_{i=1}^{d} (1 + \rho \kappa^\phi_{A,i}(a, \eta)) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a, \eta) \]
\[ = \int_{N^\phi(A) \cap D \cap \{r^s_\rho \geq t\}} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J^\phi_n f_\rho(a, u) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a, \eta) \]
\[ = \int_{N^\phi(A) \cap f_\rho^{-1}(\{x\})} 1_D(a, \eta) \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a, \eta) \]
where (43) and the coarea formula have been used in the last step.

If \( x \in S^\phi(A, \rho) \cap \text{Unp}^\phi(A) \), then there is a unique \( (a, \eta) \in N^\phi(A) \cap \{r^\phi_\rho \geq \rho \} \) with \( f_\rho(a, \eta) = x \), and we have \( \xi(x) = \xi^\phi_A(x) = a, \nu(x) = n^\phi_A(x) = \eta \) and \( u(x) = n^\phi(\eta) \). On the other hand, if \( x \in S^\phi(A, \rho) \backslash \text{Unp}^\phi(A) \), then \( \mathcal{H}^n(\{f_\rho^{-1}(\{x\})\}) > 1 \), and in addition we have
\[ q(f_\rho^{-1}(\{x\})) \subseteq N^\phi(S^\phi(A, \rho), x) \quad \text{for } x \in S^\phi(A, \rho). \]

Consequently, we deduce from Lemma 3.25 that
\[ q(f_\rho^{-1}(\{x\})) = \{\nu(x), -\nu(x)\} \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^n \text{ a.e. } x \in S^\phi(A, \rho) \backslash \text{Unp}^\phi(A). \]

Thus we conclude that
\[ \nabla^-_-(A, D; \rho) = \int_{S^\phi(A, \rho) \cap \text{Unp}^\phi(A)} 1_D(\xi(x), \nu(x)) \phi(u(x)) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(x) \]
\[ + \int_{S^\phi(A, \rho) \backslash \text{Unp}^\phi(A)} 1_D(x - \rho \nu(x), \nu(x)) \phi(n^\phi(\nu(x))) \]
\[ + 1_D(x + \rho \nu(x), -\nu(x)) \phi(n^\phi(-\nu(x))) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(x). \]

It follows from (49) and (50) that the first summand on the right side of the preceding equation equals \( \nabla_+(A, D; \rho) \). We now obtain the asserted representation of \( \nabla^-_-(A, D; \rho) \) by observing that \( n^\phi(\pm \nu(x)) = \pm u(x) \).

To check the second equality both in (43) and in (54) we notice that
\[ \sum_{d=0}^{n} \rho^{n-d} \prod_{i=1}^{d} (1 + \rho \kappa^\phi_{A,i}(a, \eta)) 1_{\tilde{N}^\phi_0(A)}(a, \eta) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \rho^i \mathcal{H}^\phi_{A,i}(a, \eta) \quad \text{for } (a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}^\phi(A) \]
and we use the integrability condition in (25) proved in Theorem 3.16 to interchange summation and integral.

Finally, for \( \epsilon > 0 \) and \( s > 0 \) the set
\[ I_{c,s} = \left\{ t \in [s, \infty) : \int_{N^\phi(A) \cap \{r^s_\rho = t\}} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J^\phi_0(A, \eta) \mathcal{H}^\phi_{A,i}(a, \eta) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a, u) \geq \epsilon \right\} \]
is finite by the integrability property in \cite{25}. This readily implies that
\[
\int_{N^\phi(A) \cap \{r_2^n = \rho\}} \phi(n_\phi(\eta)) J_\phi^u(a, \eta) H_{\phi, i}(a, \eta) dH^n(a, \eta) \neq 0
\]
for at most countably many different values of \( \rho \).

\[\square\]

**Remark 4.4.** The derivative of the volume function has been the subject of several investigations; see\cite{86, 87, 88, 89, 90} and \cite{91}.

In order to compare our characterization of the differentiability of the parallel volume function of a compact set (in the non-localized setting) with the one in \cite{91}, we introduce the following notation. If \( F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) is a measurable set, then we write \( F^1 \) for the set of all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) for which the \((n + 1)\)-dimensional density of \( F \) at \( x \) equals 1. Let \( A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) be compact and \( \rho > 0 \). Then it follows from (57) and (58) that
\[
H^n \left( [S^\phi(A, \rho) \setminus \text{Unp}^\phi(A)] \setminus B^\phi(A, \rho)^1 \right) = 0.
\]

On the other hand, we also have
\[
H^n \left( S^\phi(A, \rho) \cap B^\phi(A, \rho)^1 \cap \text{Unp}^\phi(A) \right) = H^n \left( S^\phi(A, \rho) \cap \text{Unp}^\phi(A) \setminus \partial^u_\nu B^\phi(A, \rho) \right) = 0,
\]
where we use (59) and the fact that \( B^\phi(A, \rho)^1 \cap \partial^u_\nu B^\phi(A, \rho) = \emptyset \). Thus we see that if \( \Delta \) denotes the symmetric difference operator for subsets of \( \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \), then
\[
H^n \left( [S^\phi(A, \rho) \cap B^\phi(A, \rho)^1] \Delta \text{Unp}^\phi(A) \right) = 0.
\]

More generally, our method allows us to study the differentiation of local parallel volumes in an anisotropic setting. Such a localization was suggested in an isotropic framework by results in \cite{91} (note however that \cite{91} Lemma 2.9 is not correct, which affects the proof of \cite{91} Proposition 2.10 for instance).

**Remark 4.5.** By the arguments in the proof of Theorem 4.1 it also follows that \( V^\prime_\phi(A, D; \cdot) \) is continuous from the right and \( V^\prime_\phi(A, D; \cdot) \) is continuous from the left.

\section{Alexandrov points of sets of positive reach}

Throughout this section, \( \phi \) is a uniformly convex \( C^2 \)-norm on \( \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) with corresponding gauge body \( B \). For \( \rho > 0 \) we set \( B^\phi(\rho) = \rho B^\phi = \rho \mathcal{W}^\phi \) and \( B^\phi = B^\phi = \mathcal{W}^\phi \). Recall that if \( \phi \) is the Euclidean norm, then the upper index \( \phi \) is omitted.

**Notation.** For \( a \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, u \in S^n \) and \( \varepsilon, \delta > 0 \) we define
\[
u = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : x \cdot u = 0 \},
\]
\[
U_{\varepsilon}(a, u) = \{ x \in a + \nu : |x - a| < \varepsilon \}, \quad U_{\varepsilon, \delta}(a, u) = \{ x + \lambda u : x \in U_{\varepsilon}(a, u), \lambda \in (-\delta, \delta) \}.
\]

If \( f : a + \nu \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) is a function (and \( u \) is a given orienting normal vector), we write
\[
\text{graph}(f) = \{ x - f(x) u : x \in a + \nu \} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{epi}(f) = \{ x - su : s \geq f(x), x \in a + \nu \} \quad (59)
\]
for the graph of \( f \) and the epigraph of \( f \) (with respect to \( u \)), respectively.

\subsection{Positive \( \phi \)-reach}

**Definition 5.1.** Let \( A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) be a closed set. The \( \phi \)-reach of \( A \) is defined as the non-negative number
\[
\text{reach}^\phi(A) = \sup \{ \rho \geq 0 : B^\phi(A, \rho) \subseteq \text{Unp}^\phi(A) \}.
\]

The set \( A \) is said to have positive \( \phi \)-reach if \( \text{reach}^\phi(A) > 0 \).
In the following, we say that a convex body $L \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ slides freely inside a convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ if for each $x \in \partial K$ there is some $t \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ such that $x \in L + t \subseteq K$ (see [Sch14 Section 3.2]). In particular, $L$ slides freely inside $K$ if and only if $L$ is a summand of $K$. It follows from [Sch14 Theorem 3.2.12] that if $L, K \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ are convex bodies of class $C^2$, then there is some $\rho > 0$ (depending on $L, K$) such that $\rho L$ slides freely inside $K$.

**Lemma 5.2.** Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a closed set. Let $\phi, \tilde{\phi}$ be uniformly convex $C^2$ norms on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ with corresponding gauge bodies $B, \tilde{B}$. Let $\rho > 0$ be such that $B^\phi(\rho) = \rho B^\phi$ slides freely inside $B^\tilde{\phi} = \tilde{B}$. If reach$^\phi(A) > r$, then reach$^\tilde{\phi}(A) > \rho r$.

**Proof.** Assume that reach$^\phi(A) > r$ and $B^\phi(\rho) = \rho B^\phi$ slides freely inside $B^\tilde{\phi} = \tilde{B}$. Then $sB^\phi$ slides freely inside $r\tilde{B}$ if $0 < s \leq \rho$. Aiming at a contradiction, we assume that there is some $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus A$ and there are $x_1, x_2 \in \partial A$ with $x_1 \neq x_2$ and such that $\{x_1, x_2\} \subseteq (z + s_0 B^\phi) \cap A$ and int$(z + s_0 B^\phi) \cap A = \emptyset$ for some $s_0 \in (0, \rho]$. Then $x_1 - z \in \partial(s_0 B^\phi)$ and $N(s_0 B^\phi, x_1 - z) = \{v_i\}$ for some unit vector $v_i$, for $i = 1, 2$ (since $B^\phi$ is smooth). In particular, we have $x_i - z = s_0 \nabla h_{B^\phi}(v_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Since $B^\phi$ is of class $C^2$ (and hence a Euclidean ball slides freely inside $B^\phi$), it follows that $-v_i \in N(A, x_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Since reach$^\tilde{\phi}(A) > r$, we conclude that

$$\langle x_i - r\nabla h_{B^\phi}(v_i) + r\tilde{B} \rangle \cap A = \{x_i\}. \quad (60)$$

Using first that $x_i - s_0 \nabla h_{B^\phi}(v_i) = z$ for $i = 1, 2$ and then that $s_0 B^\phi$ slides freely inside $r\tilde{B}$, we get

$$\{x_1, x_2\} \subseteq z + s_0 B^\phi \subseteq x_i - s_0 \nabla h_{B^\phi}(v_i) + s_0 B^\phi \subseteq x_i - r\nabla h_{B^\phi}(v_i) + r\tilde{B}.$$  

But then (60) yields

$$x_2 \in \langle x_1 - r\nabla h_{B^\phi}(v_i) + r\tilde{B} \rangle \cap A = \{x_1\},$$

a contradiction. \qed

**Remark 5.3.** Assume that $\phi, \psi$ are any two uniformly convex $C^2$-norms. Then reach$^\psi(A) > 0$ if and only if reach$^\phi(A) > 0$. We say that a closed set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a set of positive reach if reach$^\phi(A) > 0$, that is, if $A$ has positive reach with respect to the Euclidean norm. Hence, a set has positive reach if and only if it has positive $\phi$-reach for some (and then for any) uniformly convex $C^2$-norm $\phi$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.

**Remark 5.4.** The class of sets of positive reach as defined here is precisely the class of sets of positive reach introduced in [Ped59, Definition 4.1]. We recall from [Ped59, Theorem 4.8 (12)] that if $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a set of positive reach, then

$$N(A) = \{(a, u) : a \in A, u \in \text{Nor}(A, a), |u| = 1\}.$$  

Moreover it follows from Theorem 2.6 that $E_A^\phi \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : 0 < \delta_A^\phi(x) < \text{reach}^\phi(A)\}$ is a locally Lipschitz map and $\psi|S^\phi(A, r)$ is a locally bilipschitz homeomorphism onto $N^\phi(A)$ for $r \in (0, \text{reach}^\phi(A))$. In particular, $S^\phi(A, r)$ is a $C^{1,1}$ closed hypersurface for $r \in (0, \text{reach}^\phi(A))$ and $N^\phi(A)$ is a closed Lipschitz $n$-dimensional submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.

In the next section we exploit the fundamental connection between sets of positive reach and semiconvex functions. We will refer to the fundamental work [Fus85] (see also the cited references therein). Here we recall the notion of a semiconvex function.

**Definition 5.5.** Suppose $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$ is open and convex. Then a function $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called semiconvex if there exists $0 \leq \kappa < \infty$ such that the function $U \ni y \mapsto \kappa|y|^2 + f(y)$ is convex. We denote the generalized Clarke gradient of $f$ at $a \in U$ by $\partial f(a)$ (see [Fus85] or [CRY90]).

### 5.2 Alexandrov points and pointwise curvatures

The first main result of this section (see Theorem 5.6) states that for a set $A$ of positive reach the set $p(N^\phi(A))$ (which is the set of curvature points of $A$) can be partitioned as follows

$$p(\tilde{N}^\phi(A)) = p(\tilde{N}^\phi(A) \setminus \tilde{N}^\phi(\partial A)) \cup p(\tilde{N}^\phi(\partial A)) \quad (61)$$
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For a convex body this partition is well known, as \( p(\tilde{N}^\phi_n(A)) \) is the set of normal boundary points (also known as Alexandrov points); see [Schl14]. Notes for Sections 1.5 and 2.6, [Hu98] Lemma 3.1 and the literature cited there. The second goal of this section is to extend the notion of an Alexandrov point to sets of positive reach. This notion will play a central role in most of the subsequent rigidity statements; see for instance Theorems 5.13 and 5.17 in the next section.

**Theorem 5.6.** Let \( A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) be a closed set with \( \text{reach}(A) > 0 \).

If \( (a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}^\phi_n(A) \), \( u \in N(A, a) \) with \( \nabla \phi(u) = \eta \) and \( \nu \in S^n \smallsetminus u^\perp \), then the following statements hold.

(a) There exist \( \epsilon(\nu) > 0 \) and a function \( f_\nu : U_{\epsilon(\nu)}(a, \nu) \to \mathbb{R} \) which is differentiable at \( a \) and such that \( \text{graph}(f_\nu) \subseteq \partial A \).

(b) There exists a map \( \tilde{\eta} : U_{\epsilon(\nu)}(a, u) \to \partial W^\phi \) such that \( \tilde{\eta}(b) \in N^\phi(A, b + f_\nu(b)u) \) for every \( b \in U_{\epsilon(\nu)}(a, u) \), \( \eta(a) = \eta \), \( \tilde{\eta} \) is differentiable at \( a \) and the eigenvalues \( \lambda_i \leq \ldots \leq \lambda_n \), of \( D \tilde{\eta}(a) \) satisfy

\[
\lambda_i = \kappa^A_i(a, \eta) \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n.
\]

Moreover, \( p(\tilde{N}^\phi_n(A)) \cap p(N^\phi(A) \setminus \tilde{N}^\phi_n(A)) = \emptyset \).

**Proof.** \([a]\) Suppose \( a = 0 \) and \( 0 < r < \text{reach}^\phi(A) \). Fix \( \nu \in S^n \smallsetminus u^\perp \) and let \( \pi_\nu \) be the orthogonal projection onto \( u^\perp \). We consider the lipschitz function \( \psi_\nu : S^\phi(A, r) \to \nu^\perp \), \( \pi_\nu \circ \xi^\phi_n \). If \( H \) is the halfspace orthogonal to \( u \) which does not contain \( u \), we notice the inclusions

\[
D \xi^\phi_n(\eta)[\text{Tan}(S^\phi(A, r), \eta)] \subseteq \text{Tan}(\xi^\phi_n(S^\phi(A, r)), 0) \subseteq \text{Tan}(A, 0) \subseteq H.
\]

Since \( D \xi^\phi_n(\eta)[\text{Tan}(S^\phi(A, r), \eta)] \) is injective, we infer that

\[
\text{Tan}(S^\phi(A, r), \eta) = D \xi^\phi_n(\eta)[\text{Tan}(S^\phi(A, r), \eta)] = u^\perp
\]

and \( D \psi_\nu(\eta) \) is an isomorphism onto \( \nu^\perp \). Consequently, we can apply the (right-) inverse function theorem in [Sim00] to infer the existence of a constant \( \epsilon(\nu) > 0 \) and a map \( \varphi_\nu : U_{\epsilon(\nu)}(0, \nu) \to S^\phi(A, r) \) such that \( \varphi_\nu(0) = \eta \), \( \varphi_\nu \) is differentiable at \( 0 \) with \( D \varphi_\nu(0) = D \psi_\nu(\eta)^{-1} = D \xi^\phi_n(\eta)^{-1} \circ (\pi_\nu|u^\perp)^{-1} \) and \( \varphi_\nu(b) = b \) for every \( b \in U_{\epsilon(\nu)}(a, \nu) \). We define \( f_\nu : U_{\epsilon(\nu)}(a, \nu) \to \mathbb{R} \) by

\[
f_\nu(b) = \xi^\phi_n(\varphi_\nu(b)) \bullet \nu \quad \text{for } b \in U_{\epsilon(\nu)}(a, \nu)
\]

and we readily check that \( f_\nu(0) = 0 \), \( D f_\nu(0) = (\pi_\nu|u^\perp)^{-1} \bullet \nu \) and \( b + f_\nu(b)\nu = \xi^\phi_n(\varphi_\nu(b)) \in \partial A \) for every \( b \in U_{\epsilon(\nu)}(a, \nu) \).

\([b]\) We define \( \tilde{\eta} : U_{\epsilon(\nu)}(a, u) \to \partial W^\phi \) by

\[
\tilde{\eta}(b) = \frac{1}{r}(\varphi_\nu(b) - \xi^\phi_n(\varphi_\nu(b))) \quad \text{for } b \in U_{\epsilon(\nu)}(a, u)
\]

and notice that \( \tilde{\eta}(0) = \eta \) and \( \tilde{\eta}(b) \in N^\phi(A, b + f_\nu(b)u) \) for every \( b \in U_{\epsilon(\nu)}(a, u) \) and

\[
D \tilde{\eta}(0) = \frac{1}{r}(D \xi^\phi_n(\eta)^{-1}|u^\perp - 1_u^\perp).
\]

Noting that \( \{1 - r\kappa^A_i(a, \eta)\}^{-1} : i = 1, \ldots, n \} \) are the eigenvalues of \( D \xi^\phi_n(\eta)^{-1}|u^\perp \), we conclude that the eigenvalues of \( D \tilde{\eta}(0) \) satisfy the equation \( \lambda_i = \kappa^A_i(a, \eta) \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \).

Finally, since \( \nabla \phi(u) \bullet u = \phi(u) \neq 0 \) for \( u \in S^n \) (see [S]), the remaining assertion follows from part \([a]\) and Lemma 5.14. \( \square \)

A more refined description of a set of positive reach around the points of the viscosity boundary is given by the following result.
Theorem 5.7. Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a closed set with $\text{reach}(A) > 0$ and $a \in \partial^s A$. Assume that $N(A, a) = \{u\}$ for some $u \in S^n$. Then the following statements hold.

(a) There are $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ and a semiconvex lipschitz function $f : a + u^+ \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(a) = 0$, $f$ is differentiable at $a$ with $Df(a) = 0$ (and with respect to the orienting normal vector $u$)

$$\text{graph}(f) \cap U_{\varepsilon, \delta}(a, u) = \partial A \cap U_{\varepsilon, \delta}(a, u), \quad \text{epi}(f) \cap U_{\varepsilon, \delta}(a, u) = A \cap U_{\varepsilon, \delta}(a, u).$$

(b) $(a, \nabla \phi(u)) \in \tilde{N}_A^n(A)$ if and only if $f$ is pointwise twice differentiable at $a$. In this case, every map $\nu : a + u^+ \to S^n$ such that $\nu(b) \in N(\text{epi}(f), b - f(b)u)$ for every $b \in a + u^+$ is differentiable at $a$ and satisfies

$$D^2 f(a)(\tau_1, D(\nabla \phi)(u)(\tau_2)) = D(\nabla^2 \phi \nu)(a)(\tau_1) \bullet \tau_2 \quad \text{for } \tau_1, \tau_2 \in u^+.$$

Proof. Let $0 < r < \text{reach}(A)$. We start with (a). By [Fed69, Theorem 4.8 (12)] we have $\text{Tan}(A, a) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : v \bullet u \leq 0\}$. Then $C = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : v \bullet u \leq -\frac{1}{2}||v||\}$ defines a closed convex cone such that $C \subseteq \text{int}(\text{Tan}(A, a)) \cup \{0\}$. Lemma 3.5 in [RZ17] shows that there is some $s \in (0, r/2)$ such that

$$(a + C) \cap B(a, s) \subseteq A. \tag{63}$$

We consider the set

$$M_u = \{z \in \partial A : |u - n_z| < 1/4 \text{ for some } n_z \in \text{Nor}(A, z) \cap S^n\}.$$

It follows from [RZ17] Proposition 3.1 (iii) that there is some $s' \in (0, s)$ such that if $z \in \partial A \cap B(a, s')$, then $|u - n_z| < 1/4$ whenever $n_z \in \text{Nor}(A, z) \cap S^n$. The proof of [RZ17] Theorem 5.9 then shows that $\partial A \cap B(a, s') \subseteq M_u \cap B(a, s')$ is contained in the graph of a lipschitz semiconvex function $f : a + u^+ \to \mathbb{R}$ with $f(a) = 0$, and hence there are $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ such that (with respect to the orienting normal vector $u$)

$$\partial A \cap U_{\varepsilon, \delta}(a, u) \subseteq \text{graph}(f) \cap U_{\varepsilon, \delta}(a, u). \tag{64}$$

In order to verify the remaining assertions, we use [RZ17] Proposition 3.3 (see [Fed59] Theorem 4.18). Thus we get

$$A \cap B(a, r) \subseteq \left\{a + x + tu : t \leq \frac{1}{2}(|x|^2 + t^2), x \in u^+, t \in \mathbb{R}, |x + tu| \leq r\right\}$$

$$\subseteq \left\{a + x + tu : -r \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2}|x|^2, x \in u^+, t \in \mathbb{R}, |x| \leq r\right\}. \tag{65}$$

At this point the equalities in (62) follows from elementary topology by combining (63) and (65). Moreover, since $\text{Nor}(\text{epi}(f), a) = \text{Nor}(A, a) = \{tu : t \geq 0\}$, it follows from [Fu85] Remarks 1.4, Lemma 2.9 that the generalized Clarke gradient of $f$ at $a$ contains only 0 and $f$ is differentiable at $a$ with $Df(a) = 0$.

(b) Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the family of all maps $\nu : a + u^+ \to S^n$ such that $\nu(b) \in N(\text{epi}(f), b - f(b)u)$ for every $b \in a + u^+$, where $f$ is chosen according to (62) with respect to the orienting normal vector $u$. For every $\nu \in \mathcal{N}$ we define the function $g_\nu : U_\nu(a, u) \to u^+$ by

$$g_\nu(b) = \frac{\nu(b) - (\nu(b) \bullet u)u}{\nu(b) \bullet u} \quad \text{for } b \in U_\nu(a, u).$$

(Notice $\nu(b) \bullet u > 0$ for every $b \in U_\nu(a, u)$ since $f$ is lipschitz). Employing [Fu85] Lemma 2.9 we conclude that $g_\nu(b) \in \partial f(b)$ for every $b \in U_\nu(a, u)$. In particular, if we assume that $(a, \nabla \phi(u)) \in \tilde{N}_A^n(A)$, then it follows from Theorem 5.6 (b) that there exists at least one map $\nu_0 \in \mathcal{N}$ that is differentiable at $a$. Therefore $g_{\nu_0}$ is differentiable at $a$ and the classical theory of subgradients for (semi)convex functions (see [Ba79] or [KS21] Lemma 2.3.9) implies that $f$ is twice differentiable at $a$.

Suppose $f$ is twice differentiable at $a$, $a = 0$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{N}$. Then the aforementioned theory of subgradients for (semi)convex functions implies that $\nu$ is differentiable at 0 with $D\nu(0) \bullet \nu(0) = 0$ and

$$D\nu(0)(\tau_1) \bullet \tau_2 = Dg_\nu(0)(\tau_1) \bullet \tau_2 = D^2 f(0)(\tau_1, \tau_2) \tag{66}$$
for \( \tau_1, \tau_2 \in u^\perp \) and for every \( \nu \in \mathcal{N} \). It follows that
\[
D(\nabla \phi \circ \nu)(0)(\tau_1) \bullet \tau_2 = D\nu(0)(\tau_1) \bullet D(\nabla \phi)(u)(\tau_2) = D^2 f(0)(\tau_1, D(\nabla \phi)(u)(\tau_2))
\]
for \( \tau_1, \tau_2 \in u^\perp \). Now we choose \( r, r' > 0 \) so that \( 0 < r' < r < r + \epsilon < \text{reach}(A) \) and we define \( J = (r - \epsilon', r + \epsilon') \), \( \eta = \nabla \phi \circ \nu \) and the function \( F : U_\epsilon(0, u) \times J \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) by
\[
F(b, t) = b - f(b)u + t\eta(b) \quad \text{for } b \in U_\epsilon(0, u) \times J.
\]
Then \( F \) is differentiable at \((0, r)\) and, noting that \( U(\text{reach}^\phi(A)\eta(0), \text{reach}^\phi(A)) \cap \text{epi}(f) \cap U_{r, \delta}(0, u) = \emptyset \), we conclude from (66), employing the same comparison-of-curvatures argument as the one used in the proof of Lemma 3.14, that all eigenvalues of \( D\eta(0) \) are smaller or equal than \( \text{reach}^\phi(A)^{-1} \). Consequently \( D F(a, r) \) is invertible. Let \( \pi : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to u^\perp \) be the orthogonal projection onto \( u^\perp \). Since the function \( G : (\delta^\phi_A)^{-1}(J) \to u^\perp \times \mathbb{R} \), defined by \( G(x) = (\pi(\xi^\phi_A(x)), \delta^\phi_A(x)) \) for \( x \in (\delta^\phi_A)^{-1}(J) \), is Lipschitzian and satisfies
\[
F(U_\epsilon(0, u) \times J) \subseteq (\delta^\phi_A)^{-1}(J) \quad \text{and} \quad G \circ F = 1_{U_\epsilon(0, u) \times J},
\]
it follows from Lemma 2.13 that \( G \) and consequently \( \xi^\phi_A \) is differentiable at \( ru \). Since \( r^\phi_A(0, \nabla \phi(u)) \geq \text{reach}^\phi(A) > r \) by (KSS21) Lemma 4.16, we infer that \( \xi^\phi_A \) is differentiable at \( s\nabla \phi(u) \) for every \( 0 < s < r^\phi_A(0, \nabla \phi(u)) \). Therefore \( (0, \nabla \phi(u)) \in \tilde{N}^\phi(A) \). Since \( f \) is twice differentiable at \( 0 \), it follows that \( 0 \in \partial^\phi_u A \) and \( (0, \nabla \phi(u)) \in \tilde{N}^\phi(A) \) by Lemma 3.14(b). \( \square \)

Subsequently, we prefer to write \( C \) for a set of positive reach. Theorem 5.7 motivates the following definition.

**Definition 5.8.** Suppose \( C \) is a set of positive reach, \( a \in \partial^\nu C \), \( N(C, a) = \{u\} \) and \( f : a + u^\perp \to \mathbb{R} \) is a semiconvex function locally representing \( C \) as in Theorem 5.7. Then \( a \) is said to be an **Alexandrov point** of \( C \) if \( f \) is twice differentiable at \( a \). Moreover, if \( \phi \) is a uniformly convex \( C^2 \)-norm and \( k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \), then the **pointwise** \( k \)-**th** **\( \phi \)-mean curvature** of \( C \) at \( a \) is defined by
\[
h^\phi_{C, k}(a) = S_k(D(\nabla \phi \circ \nu)(a)),
\]
where \( \nu : a + u^\perp \to S^n \) is a map differentiable at \( a \) such that \( \nu(b) \in N(\text{epi}(f), b - f(b)u) \) for \( b \in a + u^\perp \) and \( S_k(D(\nabla \phi \circ \nu)(a)) \) is the \( k \)-th elementary symmetric function of the eigenvalues (counted with multiplicities) of the endomorphism \( D(\nabla \phi \circ \nu)(a) \) on \( u^\perp \).

We denote the set of Alexandrov points of \( C \) by \( \mathcal{A}(C) \).

**Remark 5.9.** If \( C \) is a convex body, then this notion of an Alexandrov point coincides with the classical notion of a normal boundary point of \( C \); see [Sch14, Notes for Sections 1.5 and 2.6] for further background information.

**Theorem 5.10.** Suppose \( C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) is a set of positive reach and \( \phi \) is a uniformly convex \( C^2 \)-norm. Then the following statements hold.

(a) \( \mathcal{A}(C) = p(\tilde{N}^\phi_C(C)) \cap \partial^\nu C = p(\tilde{N}^\phi_C) \cap \partial^\nu C \) and
\[
H^\phi_{C, k}(a, \eta) = h^\phi_{C, k}(a) \quad \text{for } a \in \mathcal{A}(C) \text{ and } N^\phi(C, a) = \{\eta\}.
\]

(b) \( \mathcal{H}^\nu(\partial^\nu C \setminus \mathcal{A}(C)) = 0 \) and
\[
\mathcal{P}^\phi(C) = \int_{\partial^\nu C} \phi(\mathbf{n}(C, a)) \, d\mathcal{H}^\nu(a) = \int_{N^\phi(C) \cap \partial^\nu C} \Phi_C(a, \eta) \phi(\mathbf{n}(\eta)) \, d\mathcal{H}^\nu(a, \eta).
\]

(c) If \( \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(C) < \infty \) then
\[
\text{int}(C) \neq \emptyset \iff \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(C) > 0 \iff \mathcal{H}^\nu(\partial^\nu C) > 0.
\]

(d) \( \mathcal{H}^\nu[p(\tilde{N}^\phi_C(C)) \setminus \mathcal{A}(C)] = 0 \) if and only if \( \mathcal{H}^\nu(\partial^\nu C \setminus \partial^\nu C) = 0 \).
Proof. The assertions in (a) follow from Theorem 5.6, Theorem 5.7, and Lemma 5.14. Using (a) we infer
\[ \partial^o C \setminus \mathcal{A}(C) = \partial^o C \setminus p(\tilde{N}_n^\phi(C)) \subseteq p(N^\phi(C)) \setminus p(\tilde{N}_n^\phi(C)) \leq p(\tilde{N}_n^\phi(C) \setminus \tilde{N}_n^\phi(C)), \]
whence we obtain \( \mathcal{H}^n(\partial^o C \setminus \mathcal{A}(C)) = 0 \) from Lemma 5.25 (c). Since \( \partial C = p(N^\phi(C)) \) we obtain the first equality in (67) from Remark 2.11 and the second equality by comparing Remark 3.9 and the coarea formula.

We prove (c). Clearly, \( \text{int}(C) \neq \emptyset \) implies \( \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(C) > 0 \). Let us assume \( \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(C) > 0 \). Then it follows from Lemma 2.10 that \( \mathcal{H}^n(\partial^o C) > 0 \). Since \( \partial^o C \subsetneq \partial^o C \subsetneq \partial^o C \) by Remark 2.11 and \( \mathcal{H}^n(\partial^o C \setminus \partial^o C) = 0 \), it follows that \( \mathcal{H}^n(\partial^o C) > 0 \). It is again clear that \( \mathcal{H}^n(\partial^o C) > 0 \) implies \( \text{int}(C) \neq \emptyset \).

Finally, it follows by (a) that
\[ \mathcal{H}^n(\partial^o C \setminus p(\tilde{N}_n^\phi(C))) \leq [\partial C \setminus p(\tilde{N}_n^\phi(C))] \subseteq p(\tilde{N}_n^\phi(C)) \setminus \mathcal{A}(C) \]
and, since \( \mathcal{H}^n(\partial^o C \setminus p(\tilde{N}_n^\phi(C))) = 0 \) by Lemma 5.25 (c), we obtain that \( \mathcal{H}^n(\partial^o C \setminus p(\tilde{N}_n^\phi(C))) = 0 \) implies that \( \mathcal{H}^n(\partial^o C \setminus \partial^o C) = 0 \). On the other hand, if \( \mathcal{H}^n(\partial^o C \setminus \partial^o C) = 0 \), then Lemma 5.25 (c) implies again that \( \mathcal{H}^n(\partial^o C \setminus \partial^o C) = 0 \), and hence \( \mathcal{H}^n(\partial^o C \setminus \mathcal{A}(C)) = 0 \) follows from part (a).

Remark 5.11. Suppose \( C \) is a closed convex set with \( \text{int}(C) \neq \emptyset \). Then \( C^{(n)} \setminus \partial^o C = \partial^o \emptyset \) and, recalling that \( p(\tilde{N}_n^\phi(C)) \subseteq C^{(n)} \) by Lemma 5.25 (a), we infer from Theorem 5.10 that
\[ \mathcal{A}(C) = p(\tilde{N}_n^\phi(C)). \]

### 5.3 Lower-bounded pointwise mean curvature and bubbling

After some preparations, we will deduce the Heintze-Karcher inequality for sets of positive reach from the more general version for arbitrary closed sets.

**Lemma 5.12.** Suppose \( C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) is a set of positive reach with \( \text{int}(C) \neq \emptyset \), \( K = \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \text{int}(C) \) and
\[ \iota : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \]
is the linear map defined by \( \iota(a, \eta) = (a, -\eta) \) for \( (a, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \).

Then the following statements hold.

(a) \( p(N^\phi(K)) = \partial^o C = \partial^o K \) and \( N^\phi(K, a) = \{ -\nabla(\phi(n(C, a)) \} = N^\phi(C, a) \) for \( a \in p(N^\phi(K)) \).

(b) \( \tilde{N}_n^\phi(K) = \tilde{N}_n^\phi(K) \) and \( \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{N}_n^\phi(K) \setminus S) = 0 \) for every \( S \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) with \( \mathcal{H}^n(S) = 0 \).

(c) \( \kappa_{K, i}^\phi(a, \eta) = \kappa_{C, n+1-i}^\phi(a, -\eta) \) for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( (a, \eta) \in N^\phi(K) \) and \( i = 1, \ldots, n \).

(d) \( H_{C, 1}^\phi(a, \eta) = -H_{C, 1}^\phi(a, -\eta) \) for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( (a, \eta) \in N^\phi(K) \).

(e) \( J_{K}^\phi(a, \eta) = \alpha J_{n}^{N^\phi(K)}(\iota(a, \eta)) J_{C}^\phi(a, -\eta) \) for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( (a, \eta) \in N^\phi(K) \).

**Proof.** The statement in (a) readily follows from Remark 2.11.

For the statement in (b) we combine (a) and Lemma 5.11 (b) to infer that \( \tilde{N}_n^\phi(K) = \tilde{N}_n^\phi(K) \). Moreover, if \( \mathcal{H}^n(S) = 0 \), then we can combine Lemma 2.14 (first applied on \( N_s \) for some \( s > 0 \)) with Lemma 5.3 to see that
\[ \int_{\tilde{N}_n^\phi(K) \setminus S} \alpha J_{n}^{N^\phi(K)}(a, u) d\mathcal{H}^n(a, u) = 0 \]
and \( \alpha J_{n}^{N^\phi(K)}(a, u) > 0 \) for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( (a, u) \in \tilde{N}_n^\phi(K) \). We conclude that \( \mathcal{H}^n(\tilde{N}_n^\phi(K) \setminus S) = 0 \) provided that \( \mathcal{H}^n(S) = 0 \). Since \( \mathcal{H}^n(N^\phi(K) \setminus \tilde{N}_n^\phi(K)) = 0 \), we obtain (b).
Next we prove (c). We define the open set \( U = \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : 0 < \delta^\phi_K(y) < \text{reach}^\phi(C) \} \). For \( 0 < \lambda \leq 1, y \in U \) and \( a \in \xi^\phi_K(y) \) we notice that

\[
a + \lambda \delta^\phi_K(y) \frac{a - y}{\delta^\phi_K(y)} = (1 + \lambda)a - \lambda y,
\]

\[
N^\phi(K, a) = \left\{ \frac{y - a}{\delta^\phi_K(y)} \right\}, \quad N^\phi(C, a) = \left\{ \frac{a - y}{\delta^\phi_K(y)} \right\},
\]

\[
\nu^\phi_C((1 + \lambda)a - \lambda y) = \frac{a - y}{\delta^\phi_K(y)}, \quad -\nu^\phi_C((1 + \lambda)a - \lambda y) \in \nu^\phi_K(y).
\]

We infer that

\[
\nu^\phi_K(y) = \left\{ -\nu^\phi_C((1 + \lambda)a - \lambda y) : a \in \xi^\phi_K(y) \right\} \quad \text{for } y \in U \text{ and } 0 < \lambda \leq 1. \tag{68}
\]

Define \( S = p((N^\phi(K)) \setminus \tilde{N}^\phi(C)) \) and notice that \( \mathcal{H}^\alpha(S) = 0 \) by Remark 5.7. It follows from (b) that \( \mathcal{H}^\alpha(N^\phi(K)) = 0 \). Fix now \((a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}^\phi_n(K) \) with \( a \notin S \) and \( 0 < r < \inf \{ r^\phi_K(a, \eta), \text{reach}^\phi(C) \} \) and, noting that \( 1 - r\chi^\phi_{K,i}(a + r\eta) > 0 \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \), we select \( 0 < \lambda \leq 1 \) so that

\[
\chi^\phi_{K,i}(a + r\eta) < \frac{1}{(1 + \lambda)r} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n.
\]

Since \( a \notin S \), then \((a, -\eta) \in \tilde{N}^\phi(C) \) and \( \nu^\phi_C \) is differentiable at \( a - t\eta \) for every \( 0 < t < \text{reach}^\phi(C) \). Since \( a + r\eta \in U \) and \( \nu^\phi_C \) is differentiable at \((1 + \lambda)a - \lambda(a + r\eta) = a - \lambda r\eta \), we differentiate at \( a + r\eta \) the equality in (68), and thus we get

\[
D \nu^\phi_K(a + r\eta) = -D \nu^\phi_C(a - \lambda r\eta) \circ ((1 + \lambda) D \xi^\phi_K(a + r\eta) - \text{Id}_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}}).
\]

If \( \tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n \) form a basis of \( \text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi, \eta) \) such that \( D \nu^\phi_K(a + r\eta)(\tau_i) = \chi^\phi_{K,i}(a + r\eta)\tau_i \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \), then we infer

\[
D \nu^\phi_C(a - \lambda r\eta)(\tau_i) = \frac{\chi^\phi_{K,i}(a + r\eta)}{(1 + \lambda)r\chi^\phi_{K,i}(a + r\eta) - 1} \tau_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, n.
\]

Note that \( \text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi_{1, -\eta}) = \text{Tan}(\partial W^\phi_{1, \eta}) \) and recall that \( (1 + \lambda)r\chi^\phi_{K,i}(a + r\eta) - 1 < 0 \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \). Hence, we conclude that

\[
\chi^\phi_{C,n+1-i}(a - \lambda r\eta) = \frac{\chi^\phi_{C,n+1-i}(a + r\eta)}{(1 + \lambda)r\chi^\phi_{C,n+1-i}(a + r\eta) - 1}
\]

for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \). Therefore,

\[
\kappa^\phi_{C,n+1-i}(a, -\eta) = \frac{\chi^\phi_{C,n+1-i}(a - \lambda r\eta)}{1 - \lambda r\chi^\phi_{C,n+1-i}(a - \lambda r\eta)} = \frac{\chi^\phi_{K,i}(a + r\eta)}{r\chi^\phi_{K,i}(a + r\eta) - 1} = -\kappa^\phi_{K,i}(a, \eta)
\]

for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \).

To prove (d) we use (b) and (e) which yields that

\[
H^\phi_{K,1}(a, \eta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \kappa^\phi_{K,i}(a, \eta) = - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \kappa^\phi_{C,i}(a, -\eta) = -H^\phi_{C,1}(a, -\eta)
\]

for \( \mathcal{H}^\alpha \) a.e. \((a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}^\phi(C) \).

Finally, we prove (e) Let \( \tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n, \zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_n \) be \( \mathcal{H}^\alpha \setminus N^\phi(K) \)-measurable functions satisfying the hypothesis of Lemma 3.9. Noting (b) and Lemma 3.5, we observe that the proof of (c) shows that

\[
D \nu^\phi_C(a - t\eta)(\tau_i(a, \eta)) = \nu^\phi_{C,n+1-i}(a - t\eta)\tau_i(a, \eta)
\]

for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \).
for $\mathcal{H}^n$ a.e. $(a,u) \in N^\phi(K)$ and $0 < t < \text{reach}^\phi(C)$. Since $\kappa_{C,i}^\phi(a,-\eta) < \infty$ for $\mathcal{H}^n$ a.e. $(a,\eta) \in N^\phi(K)$ by [b] and [c] we infer that

$$J_{\mathcal{C},i}^\phi(a,-\eta) = \frac{|\tau_i(a,\eta) \wedge \ldots \wedge \tau_n(a,\eta)|}{|\iota(\zeta_i(a,\eta)) \wedge \ldots \wedge \iota(\zeta_n(a,\eta))|}$$

for $\mathcal{H}^n$ a.e. $(a,\eta) \in N^\phi(K)$. Since

$$\text{ap} J_{\mathcal{N}^\phi(K),i}^\phi(a,\eta) = \frac{|\iota(\zeta_i(a,\eta)) \wedge \ldots \wedge \iota(\zeta_n(a,\eta))|}{|\zeta_i(a,\eta) \wedge \ldots \zeta_n(a,\eta)|},$$

the equation in [b] follows. \hfill \Box

**Remark 5.13.** The second statement in Lemma 5.12[b] can also be obtained as follows. Let $0 < s < \text{reach}(C)$. From [a] we get

$$N^\phi(K)|S = \bigcup_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \{ (x,-\nabla \phi(a(C,x))) : x \in S \cap X_{\phi,s}(C) \}.$$  

The assertion now follows from Remark 2.14.

**Remark 5.14.** We also outline an alternative argument for Lemma 5.12[c]. First, we obtain that for $\mathcal{H}^n$ a.e. $(a,\eta) \in \tilde{N}^\phi_n(K)$ also $(a,-\eta) \in \tilde{N}^\phi(C)$ and

$$T = \text{Tan}^n(\mathcal{H}^n \cup \tilde{N}^\phi_n(K),(a,\eta)) = \text{lin}\{\zeta_1^K(a,\eta),\ldots,\zeta_n^K(a,\eta)\} = \text{lin}\{\zeta_1^C(a,\eta),\ldots,\zeta_n^C(a,\eta)\},$$

where

$$\zeta_i^K(a,\eta) = \left(\tau_i^K(a,\eta),\kappa_{K,i}^\phi(a,\eta)\tau_i^K(a,\eta)\right) \quad \text{for } i = 1,\ldots,n,$$

the linearly independent vectors $\tau_1^K(a,\eta),\ldots,\tau_n^K(a,\eta)$ span an $n$-dimensional linear subspace $V$ of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $\kappa_{K,i}^\phi(a,\eta) \in \mathbb{R}$, and where

$$\zeta_i^C(a,\eta) = \begin{cases} \left(\tau_i^C(a,-\eta),-\kappa_{C,i}^\phi(a,-\eta)\tau_i^C(a,-\eta)\right), & \text{if } \kappa_{C,i}^\phi(a,\eta) < \infty, \\ \left(0,-\kappa_{C,i}^\phi(a,-\eta)\tau_i^C(a,-\eta)\right), & \text{if } \kappa_{C,i}^\phi(a,\eta) = \infty, \end{cases}$$

with linearly independent vectors $\tau_1^C(a,-\eta),\ldots,\tau_n^C(a,-\eta)$ which span an $n$-dimensional linear subspace $V'$ of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.

Since the number of curvatures which are infinite equals the dimension of the kernel of the image of the linear map $p^T$, a comparison of the two representations of $T$ shows that $\kappa_{C,i}^\phi(a,\eta) < \infty$ for $i = 1,\ldots,n$. Hence $V = V'$ and $p^T$ is an injective linear map. Therefore the linear map $L : V \to V$ with $L = q \circ p^T$ is well defined and its eigenvalues are $\kappa_{K,i}^\phi(a,\eta)$ with corresponding eigenvectors $\tau_i^K(a,\eta)$, but also $-\kappa_{C,i}^\phi(a,-\eta)$ with corresponding eigenvectors $\tau_i^C(a,-\eta)$ for $i = 1,\ldots,n$. This implies the assertion.

We can now state the Heintze–Karcher inequality for sets of positive reach in the following form. Recall that $\mathcal{H}^n(\partial^s C \setminus \mathcal{A}(C)) = 0$ by Theorem 5.10

**Theorem 5.15.** Suppose $\emptyset \neq C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a set of positive reach with finite volume and assume that

$$h^\phi_{C,1}(a) \geq 0 \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^n \text{ a.e. } a \in \mathcal{A}(C).$$

Then

$$(n+1)\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(C) \leq n \int_{\partial^s C} \phi(n(C,a)) \frac{h^\phi_{C,1}(a)}{h^\phi_{C,1}(a)} d\mathcal{H}^n(a). \quad (69)$$

If $\text{int}(C) \neq \emptyset$, equality holds in (69) and there exists $q < \infty$ so that $h^\phi_{C,1}(a) \leq q$ for $\mathcal{H}^n$ a.e. $a \in \mathcal{A}(C)$, then there are $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $c_1,\ldots,c_N \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $\rho_1,\ldots,\rho_N \geq \frac{n}{q}$ such that

$$\text{int}(C) = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \text{int}(c_i + \rho_i \mathcal{W}^\phi), \quad \text{dist}^\phi(c_i + \rho_i \mathcal{W}^\phi, c_j + \rho_j \mathcal{W}^\phi) \geq 2 \text{reach}^\phi(C) \quad \text{for } i \neq j.$$  
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Proof. We assume \( \text{int}(C) \neq \emptyset \) (otherwise there is nothing to prove) and we define \( K = \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \text{int}(C) \). Note that \( \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(\partial C) = 0 \) and \( \iota(N^\phi(K)) = N^\phi(C)|\partial C \). By Lemma 5.12 and the assumption, we infer that
\[
H^\phi_{K,1}(a,\eta) = -H^\phi_{C,1}(a,-\eta) \leq 0 \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^n \text{ a.e. } (a,\eta) \in N^\phi(K).
\]

Therefore, applying Theorem 5.21, Lemma 3.12 and the coarea formula, we obtain
\[
(n+1)\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(C) \leq n \int_{N^\phi(K)} J^\phi_K(a,\eta) \frac{\phi(n^\phi(\eta))}{|H^\phi_{K,1}(a,\eta)|} \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a,\eta)
\]
\[
= n \int_{N^\phi(K)} \text{ap} J_n^\phi(K) i(a,\eta) J^\phi_C(a,-\eta) \frac{\phi(n^\phi(\eta))}{H^\phi_{C,1}(a,-\eta)} \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a,\eta)
\]
\[
= n \int_{N^\phi(C)|\partial^\mathcal{C} C} J^\phi_C(a,\eta) \frac{\phi(n^\phi(\eta))}{H^\phi_{C,1}(a,\eta)} \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a,\eta).
\]

Since \( \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) = \phi(n^\phi(\nabla \phi(n(C,a)))) = \phi(n(C,a)) \) for \( (a,\eta) \in N^\phi(C)|\partial^\mathcal{C} C \), recalling Remark 3.15 and Theorem 5.10, we apply coarea formula in combination with Lemma 5.9 to obtain
\[
\int_{N^\phi(C)|\partial^\mathcal{C} C} J^\phi_C(a,\eta) \frac{\phi(n^\phi(\eta))}{H^\phi_{C,1}(a,\eta)} \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a,\eta) = \int_{\partial^\mathcal{C} C} \frac{\phi(n(C,a))}{h^\phi_{C,1}(a)} \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a),
\]
which yields the first part of the assertion of the theorem.

Assume now that \( h^\phi_{C,1}(a) \leq q \) for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( a \in \mathcal{A}(C) \) and \( \text{int}(C) \neq \emptyset \). Combining Theorem 5.10 with Lemma 5.12 we get that
\[
-H^\phi_{K,1}(a,\eta) = H^\phi_{C,1}(a,-\eta) = h^\phi_{C,1}(a) \leq q \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^n \text{ a.e. } (a,\eta) \in N^\phi(K).
\]

Therefore if the equality holds in (70) then the conclusion follows from the characterization provided by Theorem 5.20.

From Theorem 5.15 we obtain a geometric rigidity result for a set \( C \) of positive reach with positive and finite volume under the assumption of a sharp lower bound on the pointwise \( \phi \) mean-curvature at almost all points in \( \partial^\mathcal{C} C \). For the set \( C \) in the next theorem we notice that \( \mathcal{P}^\phi(C) > 0 \) and \( \text{int}(C) \neq \emptyset \) by Theorem 5.10.

**Theorem 5.16.** Suppose \( C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) is a set of positive reach with finite and positive volume and define \( \rho = \frac{n+1}{\mathcal{P}^\phi(C)} \). Assume that
\[
h^\phi_{C,1}(a) \geq \frac{n}{\rho} \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^n \text{ a.e. } a \in \mathcal{A}(C).
\]

Then there exist \( N \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( c_1, \ldots, c_N \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) such that
\[
\text{int}(C) = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \text{int}(c_i + \rho W^\phi), \quad \text{dist}^\phi(c_i + \rho W^\phi, c_j + \rho W^\phi) \geq 2 \text{reach}^\phi(C) \quad \text{for } i \neq j.
\]

Proof. Notice that there is at least one point \( a \in \partial^\mathcal{C} C \) with \( h^\phi_{C,1}(a) < \infty \), hence we obtain \( \rho > 0 \). Therefore \( 0 < \mathcal{P}^\phi(C) < \infty \).

For \( \epsilon > 0 \) we set
\[
Z_\epsilon = \left\{ a \in \mathcal{A}(C) : h^\phi_{C,1}(a) \geq (1 + \epsilon) \frac{n}{\rho} \right\}.
\]

We claim that \( \mathcal{H}^n(Z_\epsilon) = 0 \) for \( \epsilon > 0 \). Suppose that \( \mathcal{H}^n(Z_\epsilon) > 0 \) for some \( \epsilon > 0 \). Then we deduce
\[
n \int_{\partial^\mathcal{C} C \setminus Z_\epsilon} \frac{\phi(n(C,a))}{h^\phi_{C,1}(a)} \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a) = n \int_{\partial^\mathcal{C} C \setminus Z_\epsilon} \frac{\phi(n(C,a))}{h^\phi_{C,1}(a)} \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a) + n \int_{Z_\epsilon} \frac{\phi(n(C,a))}{h^\phi_{C,1}(a)} \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a)
\]
\[
\leq \rho \int_{\partial^\mathcal{C} C \setminus Z_\epsilon} \phi(n(C,a)) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a) + (1 + \epsilon)^{-1} \rho \int_{Z_\epsilon} \phi(n(C,a)) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a)
\]
\[
\leq \rho \int_{\partial^\mathcal{C} C \setminus Z_\epsilon} \phi(n(C,a)) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a) + (1 + \epsilon)^{-1} \rho \int_{Z_\epsilon} \phi(n(C,a)) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a)
\]
We conclude that 
\[ \langle \rho P^\phi(C) = (n + 1)L^{n+1}(C), \]
where we used (40) on \( \partial^\circ \mathcal{C}' \cup \mathcal{Z}_e \) and the lower bound for \( h^\phi_{C,1}(a) \) on \( \mathcal{Z}_e \). This contradicts the inequality in Theorem 5.15 and thus proves the claim.

Since \( H^n(\mathcal{Z}_e) = 0 \) for \( \epsilon > 0 \), we infer that
\[ h^\phi_{C,1}(a) = \frac{nP^\phi(C)}{(n + 1)L^{n+1}(C)} \]
for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( a \in \partial^\circ \mathcal{C}' \), whence we infer that
\[ n \int_{\partial^\circ \mathcal{C}'} \phi(n(C,a)) d\mathcal{H}^n(a) = (n + 1)L^{n+1}(C) \]
whence we infer that
\[ \mathcal{H}^n(\mathcal{Z}_e) = 0 \] for \( 0 < \epsilon < 1 \). Finally, we notice that the \( \mathcal{H}^n \) of positive reach. Let \( \mathcal{Z}_e \in \mathcal{G}(n+1, n) \) and \( \eta \in P^\circ \) with \( |\eta| = 1 \). For every \( 0 < \epsilon < 1 \) we define
\[ \Sigma^+_\epsilon = S^n \cap \{ x : x \cdot \eta \geq \epsilon \}, \quad \Sigma^-_\epsilon = S^n \cap \{ x : x \cdot \eta \leq -\epsilon \}, \]
\[ P^+_\epsilon = B(0,1) \cap \{ x : x \cdot \eta = \epsilon \}, \quad P^-_\epsilon = B(0,1) \cap \{ x : x \cdot \eta = -\epsilon \}, \]
and we denote by \( K^+_\epsilon \) and \( K^-_\epsilon \) the convex bodies enclosed by \( \Sigma^+_\epsilon \cup P^+_\epsilon \) and \( \Sigma^-_\epsilon \cup P^-_\epsilon \) respectively. Then we define
\[ K_\epsilon = \{ x - \epsilon \eta : x \in K^+_\epsilon \} \cup \{ x + \epsilon \eta : x \in K^-_\epsilon \}. \]
Let \( X(x) = x \) for every \( x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \). Since \( K^+_\epsilon \) is a set of finite perimeter, we denote by \( \eta_\epsilon \) the exterior unit normal and we compute by means of the divergence theorem (Fed69), Gauss–Green Theorem 4.5.6] (alternatively by noting that \( K_\epsilon = \text{conv}(\{o\} \cup \Sigma^+_\epsilon) \cup \text{conv}(\{o\} \cup P^-_\epsilon) \), where \text{conv} denotes the convex hull operator)
\[ (n + 1)L^{n+1}(K^+_\epsilon) = \int_{K^+_\epsilon} \text{div}X d\mathcal{L}^{n+1} \]
\[ = \int_{\Sigma^+_\epsilon \cup P^+_\epsilon} \eta_\epsilon(x) \cdot X(x) d\mathcal{H}^n(x) = \mathcal{H}^n(\Sigma^+_\epsilon) - \epsilon \mathcal{H}^n(P^+_\epsilon). \]
We conclude that
\[ \mathcal{H}^n(\partial K_\epsilon) = \frac{\mathcal{H}^n(\Sigma^+_\epsilon)}{(n + 1)L^{n+1}(K^+_\epsilon)} = 1 + \frac{\mathcal{H}^n(P^+_\epsilon)}{(n + 1)L^{n+1}(K^+_\epsilon)} > 1 \]
for \( 0 < \epsilon < 1 \). Finally, we notice that the \( k \)-th mean curvature of \( K_\epsilon \) equals \( \left( \frac{n}{k} \right) \) on the smooth part of \( \partial K_\epsilon \).

## 6 Curvature measures and soap bubbles

### 6.1 Curvature measures and Minkowski formulae

In the following, we write \( C \) for a non-empty set with positive reach in \( \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \). For sets with positive reach, the Steiner formula simplifies in the following way (also in the anisotropic setting).

**Theorem 6.1** (Anisotropic Steiner formula for sets of positive reach). Let \( \emptyset \neq C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) be a set of positive reach. Let \( \varphi : N^\phi(C) \to \mathbb{R} \) be a bounded Borel function with compact support. Then
\[ \int_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : 0 < \delta^\phi_{C}(x) \leq \rho} (\varphi \circ \psi^\phi_{C}) d\mathcal{L}^{n+1} = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \frac{P^{i+1}}{i+1} \int_{N^\phi(C)} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J^\phi_{C}(a, \eta) H^\phi_{C,i}(a, \eta) \varphi(a, u) d\mathcal{H}^n(a, \eta) \]
for \( 0 < \rho < \text{reach}^\phi(C) \).
Lemma 6.6. Let $\emptyset \neq C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a set of positive reach and $m \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$. The $m$-th generalized curvature measure of $C$ with respect to $\phi$ is the real-valued Radon measure $\Theta_m^\phi(C, \cdot)$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ such that

$$\Theta_m^\phi(C, B) = \frac{1}{n-m+1} \int_{N^\phi(C) \cap B} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J^\phi_C(a, \eta) H_{C,n-m}^\phi(a, \eta) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a, \eta)$$

for any bounded Borel subset $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Moreover, we set

$$V_m^\phi(C) = \Theta_m^\phi(C, N^\phi(C))$$

for $m \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$.

Remark 6.3. Let $C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a set of positive reach and $m \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$. The $m$-th curvature measure of $C$ with respect to $\phi$ is the real-valued Radon measure $C_m^\phi(C, \cdot)$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ such that

$$C_m^\phi(C, B) = \Theta_m^\phi(C, B \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1})$$

for any bounded Borel subset $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.

Lemma 6.4. Suppose $C$ is a set of positive reach, $m \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$ and let $\nu : C^{(n)} \to S^n$ be a Borel map such that $\nu(a) \in N(C, a)$ for every $a \in C^{(n)}$. Let $\eta(a) = \nabla \phi(\nu(a))$. Then

$$(n-m+1)\Theta_m^\phi(C, B \cap \tilde{N}_n^\phi(C))$$

$$= \int_{A(C)} \mathbf{1}_B(a, \eta(a)) \phi(\nu(a)) h_{C,n-m}^\phi(a) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a)$$

$$+ \int_{C^{(n)} \setminus \phi^{-1}(C)} \phi(\nu(a)) (\mathbf{1}_B(a, \eta(a)) H_{C,n-m}^\phi(a, \eta(a)) + \mathbf{1}_B(a, -\eta(a)) H_{C,n-m}^\phi(a, -\eta(a))) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a)$$

for every Borel set $B \subset N^\phi(C)$.

Proof. Let $B \subset N^\phi(C)$ be a Borel set. Combining Lemma 3.9 and the coarea formula, we get

$$(n-m+1)\Theta_m^\phi(C, B \cap \tilde{N}_n^\phi(C)) = \int_{p(N^\phi(C) \cap N^\phi(C, a))} \mathbf{1}_B(a, \eta) \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) H_{C,n-m}^\phi(a, \eta) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(\eta) \, d\mathcal{H}^n(a).$$

Since $n^\phi(\nabla \phi(\nu(a))) = \nu(a)$ for $a \in C^{(n)}$, the argument is completed by applying Lemma 3.25(c) and Theorem 5.10 since $N^\phi(C, a) = \{\pm \nabla \phi(\nu(a))\}$ for $a \in C^{(n)} \setminus \partial^\circ C$. \qed

Remark 6.5. The Lebesgue decomposition of the curvature measure $C_m^\phi(C, \cdot)$ with respect to $\mathcal{H}^n \setminus \partial C$ is given by $\Theta_m^\phi(C, (\cdot \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1}) \cap \tilde{N}_n^\phi(C))$ (the absolutely continuous part) and $\Theta_m^\phi(C, (\cdot \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1}) \setminus \tilde{N}_n^\phi(C))$ (the singular part). It follows from Lemma 3.26(c) that these parts are indeed singular with respect to each other. For the absolutely continuous part, Lemma 6.4 yields an explicit description. In the case of convex bodies where $C^{(n)} \setminus \partial^\circ C = \emptyset$, a corresponding analysis can be found in [Hu98] in the isotropic framework.

The following lemma extends [Fa96] Lemma 2.1 from Euclidean curvature measures of convex bodies to generalized curvature measures with respect to a $C^2$-norm $\phi$ and sets with positive reach (compare also [CH00] Section 3). The non-negative Radon measure $|\Theta_m^\phi(C, \cdot)_\#(A \times \partial \mathcal{W}^\phi)|$ in the next lemma is the total variation of the real-valued Radon measure $\Theta_m^\phi(C, \cdot)_\#(A \times \partial \mathcal{W}^\phi)$; see [APP00] Definition 1.4.

Lemma 6.6. Let $\emptyset \neq C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a set of positive reach. Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a $\mathcal{H}^m$ measurable set and $m \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$. Then there is a non-negative constant $c$, depending only on $n, \phi$, such that

$$|\Theta_m^\phi(C, \cdot)_\#(A \times \partial \mathcal{W}^\phi)| \leq c \cdot \mathcal{H}^m(A).$$
Proof. For the proof, one can assume that $H^m(A) < \infty$. An application of Theorem 3.27 to the positive and the negative part of $\Theta_m^\phi(C, \cdot)_\ast (A \times \partial \mathcal{W}^\phi)$ then yields the assertion. \hfill \Box

The following lemma is now an immediate consequence of Lemma 6.6. We do not include the case $m = n$ in the statement of the lemma, since in this case the hypothesis is always satisfied by Lemma 8.29[5] and the conclusion holds essentially by definition; see Remark 3.12.

**Lemma 6.7.** Let $\emptyset \neq C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ be a set of positive reach. Let $m \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$ and assume that $H^m[p(\tilde{N}^\phi(C) \setminus \tilde{N}_n^\phi(C))] = 0.$ Then

\[(n-m+1) \cdot \Theta_m^\phi(C, B) = \int_{\tilde{N}_n^\phi(C) \cap B} \phi(n^\phi(\eta))J^\phi_C(a, \eta)H^\phi_{C,n-m}(a, \eta)\,dH^n(a, \eta)\]

for every Borel set $B \subseteq N^\phi(C)$. \hfill \Box

**Proof.** An application of Lemma 6.6 with $A = p(\tilde{N}^\phi(C) \setminus \tilde{N}_n^\phi(C))$ yields that

\[\Theta_m^\phi(C, \cdot)_\ast (p(\tilde{N}^\phi(C) \setminus \tilde{N}_n^\phi(C)) \times \partial \mathcal{W}^\phi) = 0,
\]

and hence $\Theta_m^\phi(C, B \cap \tilde{N}^\phi(C) \setminus \tilde{N}_n^\phi(C)) = 0$, which is the desired conclusion. \hfill \Box

We now prove the anisotropic Minkowski formulae for sets of positive reach. The case of convex bodies has been treated in a different way in [Hu99].

**Theorem 6.8.** If $\emptyset \neq C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a set of positive reach with finite volume and $r \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, then

\[\int_{N^\phi(C)} (n-r+1) \phi(n^\phi(\eta))J^\phi_C(a, \eta)H^\phi_{C,r-1}(a, \eta)\,dH^n(a, \eta)
\]

\[= r \int_{N^\phi(C)} [a \cdot n^\phi(\eta)]J^\phi_C(a, \eta)H^\phi_{C,r}(a, \eta)\,dH^n(a, \eta)\]

and

\[\int_{N^\phi(C)} a \cdot n^\phi(\eta)J^\phi_C(a, \eta)H^\phi_{C,0}(a, \eta)\,dH^n(a, \eta) = (n+1)L^{n+1}(C)\]

Proof. We set $u(x) = \frac{\nabla \phi_C(x)}{||\nabla \phi_C(x)||}$ for $x \in \text{Unp}^\phi(C)$ and notice that for $0 < \rho < \text{reach}^\phi(C)$ the set $B^\phi(C, \rho)$ is a domain with $C^{1,1}$-boundary $\partial B^\phi(C, \rho) = S^\phi(C, \rho)$ whose exterior unit normal is given by $u|\partial B^\phi(C, \rho)$. Moreover, for $0 < \rho < \text{reach}^\phi(C)$ the map $f_\rho : N^\phi(C) \to S^\phi(C, \rho)$ defined by

\[f_\rho(a, \eta) = a + \rho \eta \quad \text{for} \quad (a, \eta) \in N^\phi(C)\]

is a bi-lipschitz homeomorphism by Remark 5.3. We observe (see proof of Theorem 3.16) that

\[J^{N^\phi(C)}_n f_\rho(a, \eta) = J^\phi_C(a, \eta) \sum_{m=0}^n \rho^{n-m} H^\phi_{C,n-m}(a, \eta)\]

for $H^n$ a.e. $(a, \eta) \in N^\phi(C)$. We set

\[I_m(C) = \int_{N^\phi(C)} a \cdot n^\phi(\eta)J^\phi_C(a, \eta)H^\phi_{C,n-m}(a, \eta)\,dH^n(a, \eta) \quad \text{for} \quad m = 0, \ldots, n.\]

The divergence theorem and Remark 5.3 yield

\[(n+1)L^{n+1}(B^\phi(C, \rho)) = \int_{S^\phi(C, \rho)} x \cdot u(x)\,dH^n(x)
\]

\[= \int_{N^\phi(C)} [(a + \rho \eta) \cdot u(a + \rho \eta)] J^{N^\phi(C)}_n f_\rho(a, \eta)\,dH^n(a, \eta)\]
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\[ = \sum_{m=0}^{n} \rho^{n-m}I_m(C) + \sum_{m=0}^{n} (n-m+1)\rho^{n-m+1}V_m(C) \]
for \(0 < \rho < \text{reach}^\phi(C)\). Employing the Steiner formula \(6.11\) we get
\[ (n+1)L^{n+1}(B^\phi(C,\rho)) = (n+1)L^{n+1}(C) + (n+1)\sum_{m=0}^{n} \rho^{n-m+1}V_m(C) \]
for \(0 < \rho < \text{reach}^\phi(C)\). Hence, we infer
\[ \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} |I_m(C) - (m+1)V_{m+1}(C)|\rho^{n-m} + I_n(C) - (n+1)L^{n+1}(C) = 0 \]
for \(0 < \rho < \text{reach}^\phi(C)\). It follows that \(I_m(C) = (m+1)V_{m+1}(C)\) for \(m = 0, \ldots, n-1\) and in addition we have \(I_n(C) = (n+1)L^{n+1}(C)\).

### 6.2 The soap bubble theorem for sets of positive reach

The following notion of \(k\)-convexity generalizes the classical analogous notion used in the Euclidean setting to study isoperimetric-type inequalities for Quermassintegrals (see Theorem 4.13, Remark 4.14 and 6.10 and 6.11). Analogous concepts also arise in the context of elliptic differential operators (see Theorem 4.13, Remark 4.14 and 6.10). The references given there to earlier work for instance by Caffarelli, Nirenberg, Spruck ('85), Garding ('59), Ivochkina ('83, '85), Li ('90)).

**Definition 6.9.** Let \(\emptyset \neq C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\) be a set of positive reach with \(P^\phi(C) > 0\), and let \(r \in \{0, \ldots, n\}\). We say that \(C\) is \((r, \phi)\)-mean convex if
\[ H^\phi_{C,i}(a) \geq 0 \quad \text{for } H^a \text{ a.e. } a \in A(C) \text{ and } i = 1, \ldots, r-1 \quad (71) \]
and
\[ H^\phi_{C,r}(a, u) \geq 0 \quad \text{for } H^a \text{ a.e. } (a, u) \in N^\phi(C). \quad (72) \]

**Remark 6.10.** Suppose that \(\emptyset \neq C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\) is a set of positive reach with finite volume. Then \(P^\phi(C) > 0\) if and only if \(H^a(P^\phi(C)) > 0\) by Theorem 5.10. This in turn is equivalent to \(\text{int}(C) \neq \emptyset\).

**Remark 6.11.** The \((0, \phi)\)-mean convex sets are all sets of positive reach with non-empty interior, since by definition we have \(H^\phi_{C,0} = 1_{N^\phi(C)} \geq 0\). Moreover, if \(C\) is a set of positive reach and positive perimeter such that \(\Theta^\phi_{n-\phi}(C, \cdot)\) are non-negative measures for all \(k \in \{1, \ldots, r\}\), then \(C\) is \((r, \phi)\)-mean convex.

Before we can add another remark, we need some preparations. Let \(d^\phi_H\) denote the Hausdorff distance on the space of closed subsets of the metric space \((\mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \phi^\ast)\). We say that a sequence of closed sets \(C_i \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, i \in \mathbb{N}\), converges to a closed set \(C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\) as \(i \to \infty\) if \(d^\phi_H(C_i, C) \to 0\) as \(i \to \infty\), which is equivalent to the uniform convergence of \(\delta^\phi_{C_i}\) to \(\delta^\phi_C\) as \(i \to \infty\) on \(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}\) (see [2.85]). The following lemma is well known in the Euclidean setting (see Theorem 4.13, Remark 4.14 and Theorem 5.9 in [Fed59] and [RZ01], Section 3.1, pp. 7-9]).

**Lemma 6.12.** Let \(\emptyset \neq C_i \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\) for \(i \in \mathbb{N}\) be a sequence of closed sets converging to a closed set \(C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\). Suppose there is a constant \(\rho > 0\) such that \(\text{reach}^\phi(C_i) \geq \rho\) for all \(i \in \mathbb{N}\). Then \(\text{reach}^\phi(C) \geq \rho\). Hence for each \(k \in \{0, \ldots, n\}\) the Radon measures \(\Theta^\phi_{k}(C, \cdot)\) converge vaguely to the Radon measure \(\Theta^\phi_{k}(C, \cdot)\) as \(i \to \infty\).

**Proof.** Let \(\rho_1 \in (0, \rho)\). Under the assumptions of the lemma, we show that \(\text{reach}(C) \geq \rho_1\). Let \(x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus C\) with \(\delta^\phi_C(x) \leq \rho_1\). There is some \(i_1 \in \mathbb{N}\) such that \(i \geq i_1\) and \(0 < \delta^\phi_{C_i}(x) \leq \rho_2 < \rho\), where \(\rho_2 := \frac{1}{2}(\rho + \rho_1)\). Define \(x_i := \xi^\phi_{C_i}(x) + \rho_2 \cdot v^\phi_{C_i}(x)\), hence \(\delta^\phi_{C_i}(x_i) = \rho_2, \delta^\phi_{C_i}(x_i) = \delta^\phi_{C_i}(x)\) and \(U^\phi(x_i, \rho_2) \cap C_i = \emptyset\), since \(v^\phi_{C_i}(\xi^\phi_{C_i}(x), v^\phi_{C_i}(x)) \geq \text{reach}(C_i)\). By compactness, we can find an infinite subset \(I \subset \mathbb{N}\) such \(\xi^\phi_{C_i}(x_i) \to \xi \in \partial C, x_i \to z, \delta^\phi_C(z) = \rho_2, U^\phi(z, \rho_2) \cap C = \emptyset\) and \(x \in (\xi, z)\), where
\( I \ni i \to \infty \). But then clearly \( U^\phi(x, \rho_2) \cap C = \emptyset \), \( x \in \text{Unp}^\phi(C) \) and \( \xi = \xi^\phi_C(x) \). This proves the first assertion.

In view of Theorem 6.11 it is sufficient to show that if \( \varphi : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R} \) is a continuous function with compact support and \( t \in (0, \rho) \), then

\[
\int 1\{0 < \delta^\phi_C(x) \leq t\} \varphi(\xi^\phi_C(x), \nu^\phi_C(x)) \, d\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(x) \to \int 1\{0 < \delta^\phi_C(x) \leq t\} \varphi(\xi^\phi_C(x), \nu^\phi_C(x)) \, d\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(x)
\]
as \( i \to \infty \).

We consider an arbitrary point \( x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \). If \( 0 < \delta^\phi_C(x) < t \), then also \( 0 < \delta^\phi_C(x) < t \) if \( i \in \mathbb{N} \) is large enough. Moreover, \( \xi^\phi_C(x) \to \xi^\phi_C(x) \) and \( \nu^\phi_C(x) \to \nu^\phi_C(x) \) as \( i \to \infty \), which can be obtained by minor adjustments of the proof for [HL03] Lemma 2.2]. Therefore,

\[
1\{0 < \delta^\phi_C(x) \leq t\} \varphi(\xi^\phi_C(x), \nu^\phi_C(x)) \to 1\{0 < \delta^\phi_C(x) \leq t\} \varphi(\xi^\phi_C(x), \nu^\phi_C(x))
\]
as \( i \to \infty \).

If \( \delta^\phi_C(x) > t \), then also \( \delta^\phi_C(x) > t \) if \( i \in \mathbb{N} \) is large enough, hence (73) holds trivially. The same is true if \( x \in \text{int}(C) \) which implies that \( x \in C_i \) for all sufficiently large \( i \in \mathbb{N} \).

Since \( \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : \delta^\phi_C(x) = t\} \cup \partial C) = 0 \), the assertion follows from the dominated convergence theorem.

The preceding lemma implies that a non-negativity condition closely related to Definition 6.9 is stable with respect to converging sequences of sets of positive reach, as described in the following corollary.

**Corollary 6.13.** Let \( \rho > 0 \) be a fixed constant. Let \( \emptyset \neq C_i \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) for \( i \in \mathbb{N} \) be a sequence of closed sets with \( \text{reach}(C_i) \geq \rho > 0 \) converging to a closed set \( C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \). Then the following statements hold.

(a) If \( \Theta^\phi_k(C_j, \cdot) \geq 0 \) for all \( j \in \mathbb{N} \), then also \( \Theta^\phi_k(C, \cdot) \geq 0 \).

(b) If \( C_j \) is \( (r, \phi) \)-mean convex and smooth for all \( j \in \mathbb{N} \) (so that \( \Theta^\phi_{n-k}(C_j, \cdot) \geq 0 \) holds for \( k = 1, \ldots, r \)), then \( \Theta^\phi_{n-k}(C, \cdot) \geq 0 \) for \( k = 1, \ldots, r \); hence, \( C \) is \( (r, \phi) \)-mean convex.

A major ingredient for the proof of the Alexandrov theorem for sets with positive reach is the next lemma.

**Lemma 6.14.** Let \( \emptyset \neq C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) be a set of positive reach with finite and positive volume. Let \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( r \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) be such that

\[
\Theta^\phi_{n-r}(C, \cdot) = \lambda \Theta^\phi_n(C, \cdot).
\]

Then \( H^\phi_{C,r}(a, \eta) = 0 \) for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( (a, \eta) \in N^\phi(C) \setminus \tilde{N}_n^\phi(C) \) and

\[
H^\phi_{C,r}(a, \eta) = (r+1)\lambda = \frac{n-r+1}{(n+1)\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(C)} \nu^\phi_{n-r+1}(C) \quad \text{for } \mathcal{H}^n \text{ a.e. } (a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}_n^\phi(C).
\]

Furthermore, the following two statements hold.

(a) If \( \lambda \neq 0 \), \( r \geq 2 \) and \( C \) is \( (r-1, \phi) \)-mean convex, then

\[
\infty > \frac{h^\phi_{C,1}(a)}{(\mathcal{H}^n)^{1/2}} \geq \left( \frac{h^\phi_{C,2}(a)}{(\mathcal{H}^n)^{1/2}} \right)^{1/2} \geq \cdots \geq \left( \frac{h^\phi_{C,r}(a)}{(\mathcal{H}^n)^{1/2}} \right)^{1/2} \geq \frac{\mathcal{P}^\phi(C)}{(n+1)\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(C)}
\]

for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( a \in \partial^\phi C \).

(b) If \( r = 1 \), then \( H^\phi_{C,1}(a, \eta) \geq \frac{n\mathcal{P}^\phi(C)}{(n+1)\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(C)} \) for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( (a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}_n^\phi(C) \).
Proof. From the equality $\Theta_{n-r}(C, \cdot) = \lambda \Theta_n^\phi(C, \cdot)$ we get

$$
\int_{B \cap \tilde{N}^\phi_n(C)} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J_C^\phi(n, a, \eta) \left( \frac{1}{r+1} H_{C,r}^\phi(a, \eta) - \lambda \right) dH^n(a, \eta) \\
+ \frac{1}{r+1} \int_{(N^\phi(C) \setminus \tilde{N}^\phi_n(C)) \cap B} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J_C^\phi(n, a, \eta) H_{C,r}^\phi(a, \eta) dH^n(a, \eta) = 0
$$

for every bounded Borel set $B \subset N^\phi(C)$. Since $J_C^\phi(n, a, \eta) \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) > 0$ for $H^n$ a.e. $(a, \eta) \in N^\phi(C)$, we conclude that $H_{C,r}^\phi(a, \eta) = 0$ for $H^n$ a.e. $(a, \eta) \in N^\phi(C) \setminus \tilde{N}^\phi_n(C)$ and $H_{C,r}^\phi(a, \eta) = (r+1)\lambda$ for $H^n$ a.e. $(a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}^\phi_n(C)$. Noting that $H_{C,0}^\phi = 1_{\tilde{N}^\phi_n(C)}$ and employing Theorem 5.3 we derive

$$
(n - r + 1) \int_{N^\phi(C)} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J_C^\phi(n, a, \eta) H_{C,r-1}^\phi(a, \eta) dH^n(a, \eta)
$$

$$
= r \int_{N^\phi(C)} [a \cdot n^\phi(\eta)] J_C^\phi(n, a, \eta) H_{C,r}^\phi(a, \eta) dH^n(a, \eta)
$$

$$
= r(r + 1)\lambda \int_{\tilde{N}^\phi_n(C)} [a \cdot n^\phi(\eta)] J_C^\phi(n, a, \eta) dH^n(a, \eta)
$$

$$
= r(r + 1)\lambda (n + 1) \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(C),
$$

(75)

from which we infer that

$$
H_{C,r}^\phi(a, \eta) = \frac{n - r + 1}{(n + 1) \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(C)} \mathcal{V}^\phi_{n-1}(C) \quad \text{for } H^n \text{ a.e. } (a, \eta) \in \tilde{N}^\phi_n(C),
$$

(76)

since $\mathcal{L}^{n+1}(C) \in (0, \infty)$. In particular, using Theorem 5.10 we obtain

$$
h_{C,r}^\phi(a) = \frac{n - r + 1}{(n + 1) \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(C)} \mathcal{V}^\phi_{n-1}(C) \quad \text{for } H^n \text{ a.e. } a \in \partial^\circ C.
$$

Notice that the asserted conclusion for $r = 1$ already follows from (68), since $\mathcal{V}^\phi_n(C) \geq P^\phi(C)$.

We assume now $r \geq 2$, $\lambda \neq 0$ and that $C$ is $(r - 1, \delta)$-mean convex. The non-negativity property of $H_{C,r-1}^\phi$ in combination with (75) implies that $\lambda \geq 0$, that means $\lambda > 0$. Therefore $h_{C,r}^\phi(a) > 0$ is satisfied for $H^n$ a.e. $a \in \partial^\circ C$. Hence we can apply Lemma 2.2 to conclude that

$$
\left( h_{C,1}^\phi(a) \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \left( h_{C,r-1}^\phi(a) \right)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \geq \left( h_{C,r}^\phi(a) \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \left( \frac{r + 1}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}}\lambda
$$

(77)

for $H^n$ a.e. $a \in \partial^\circ C$. Using again that $H_{C,r-1}^\phi(a, \eta) \geq 0$ for $H^n$ a.e. $(a, \eta) \in N^\phi(C)$ and the lower bound for $H_{C,r-1}^\phi(a, \eta)$ from (77), we get

$$
(n - r + 1) \int_{N^\phi(C)} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J_C^\phi(n, a, \eta) H_{C,r-1}^\phi(a, \eta) dH^n(a, \eta)
$$

$$
\geq (n - r + 1) \int_{N^\phi(C) \setminus \partial^\circ C} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J_C^\phi(n, a, \eta) H_{C,r-1}^\phi(a, \eta) dH^n(a, \eta)
$$

$$
\geq (n - r + 1)[(r + 1)\lambda]^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \left( \int_{N^\phi(C) \setminus \partial^\circ C} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J_C^\phi(n, a, \eta) dH^n(a, \eta) \right)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}
$$

$$
= (n - r + 1)[(r + 1)\lambda]^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \left( \int_{N^\phi(C) \setminus \partial^\circ C} \phi(n^\phi(\eta)) J_C^\phi(n, a, \eta) dH^n(a, \eta) \right)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} P^\phi(C).
$$

(78)

Combining (68) and (69), noting that $(n - r + 1)\left( \begin{array}{c} n \\ r \end{array} \right)^{-1}\left( \begin{array}{c} n - 1 \\ r - 1 \end{array} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} = 1$ and recalling that $\lambda > 0$, we conclude

$$
\infty \geq [\lambda (r + 1)]^{\frac{1}{r}} \geq \frac{P^\phi(C)}{(n + 1) \mathcal{L}^{n+1}(C)} \left( \frac{n}{r} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}
$$

Now the remaining assertion follows from (77).
The Alexandrov theorem for sets of positive reach is now a corollary of our previous results.

**Theorem 6.15.** Let \( r \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \), \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \) and let \( C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) be an \((r - 1, \phi)\)-mean convex set with positive and finite volume. Define \( \Theta^\phi_n(C, \cdot) = \lambda \Theta^\phi_n(C, \cdot) \). Then there exist a finite natural number \( N \geq 1 \) and \( c_1, \ldots, c_N \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) such that

\[
\text{int}(C) = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \text{int}(c_i + \rho \mathcal{W}^\phi), \quad \text{dist}^\phi(c_i + \rho \mathcal{W}^\phi, c_j + \rho \mathcal{W}^\phi) \geq 2 \text{reach}^\phi(C) \quad \text{for } i \neq j.
\]

If \( r = 1 \), then the same conclusion is obtained for any \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \) and any set \( C \) of positive reach with positive and finite volume.

**Proof.** The assertion follows by a combination of Lemma 6.14 and Theorem 5.16. \( \square \)

We conclude this section discussing the validity of the hypothesis of Theorem 6.15 in terms of Alexandrov points and pointwise curvatures for a large subclass of sets of positive reach, namely those sets \( C \) for which \( \mathcal{H}^n(\partial C \setminus \partial^c C) = 0 \). This class includes all convex bodies, and more generally all closed sets that can be locally represented as the epigraph of a semiconvex function; see Lemma 6.20. But it includes much more; indeed, it is easy to construct sets of positive reach \( C \) for which \( \mathcal{H}^n(\partial C \setminus \partial^c C) = 0 \), but the boundary is not a topological manifold (see [RZ17] Example 7.12 or [ACV08] Example 1).

In Theorem 6.15 we deal with sets which are non-convex, hence it is natural to state the proportionality assumption \((79)\) on the \( r \)-th \( \phi \)-mean curvatures in terms of generalized curvature measures. However, under a slightly more restrictive mean convexity assumption we also get the following variant of Theorem 6.15 in which a corresponding assumption on the proportionality of a curvature measure is imposed in \((80)\). The proof is based on a modified version of Lemma 6.14 whose proof only requires minor adjustments (and uses \((61)\) in first part of the argument).

**Theorem 6.16.** Let \( r \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) and \( \lambda > 0 \). Let \( C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) be an \((r - 1, \phi)\)-mean convex set with positive and finite volume and such that \( \mathcal{H}^n_{C, r}(a, \eta) \geq 0 \) for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \((a, \eta) \in N^\phi(C)\). Define \( \rho = \frac{(n+1)C^{n+1}(C)}{p_\mathcal{W}^\phi(C)} \). Assume that

\[
\Theta^\phi_n(C, \cdot) = \lambda \Theta^\phi_n(C, \cdot).
\]

Then there exist a finite natural number \( N \geq 1 \) and \( c_1, \ldots, c_N \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) such that

\[
\text{int}(C) = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \text{int}(c_i + \rho \mathcal{W}^\phi), \quad \text{dist}^\phi(c_i + \rho \mathcal{W}^\phi, c_j + \rho \mathcal{W}^\phi) \geq 2 \text{reach}^\phi(C) \quad \text{for } i \neq j.
\]

The hypotheses in the next theorem should be seen in connection with the disjoint union displayed in \((61)\).

**Theorem 6.17.** If \( k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \), \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( \emptyset \neq C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) is a set of positive reach such that \( \mathcal{H}^n(\partial C \setminus \partial^c C) = 0 \) and \( \mathcal{P}^\phi(C) > 0 \), then the following two statements hold.

(a) If \( H^\phi_{C, k}(a) = \lambda \) for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( a \in \mathcal{A}(C) \) and \( \mathcal{H}^{n-k}[p(\mathcal{N}^\phi(C) \setminus \mathcal{N}^\phi_n(C))] = 0 \), then

\[
\Theta^\phi_{n-k}(C, \cdot) = \lambda \Theta^\phi_n(C, \cdot).
\]

(b) If \( H^\phi_{C, 1}(a) \geq 0, \ldots, H^\phi_{C, k-1}(a) \geq 0 \) for \( \mathcal{H}^n \) a.e. \( a \in \mathcal{A}(C) \) and \( \mathcal{H}^{n-k+1}[p(\mathcal{N}^\phi(C) \setminus \mathcal{N}^\phi_n(C))] = 0 \), then \( C \) is \((k - 1, \phi)\)-mean convex.
Proof. (a) Let $B \subseteq N^\phi(C)$ be a Borel set. Noting that $\Theta^\phi_n(C, B) = \Theta^\phi_n(C, B \cap \tilde{N}^\phi_n(C))$ by definition of $H^\phi_{C,0}$, we can use Lemma 6.4, Lemma 6.3 and Theorem 5.10 (a), (b) together with $\eta(a) = \nabla \phi(n(C, a))$ for $a \in \partial C$ to compute

$$
\Theta^\phi_{n-k}(C, B) = \Theta^\phi_{n-k}(C, B \cap \tilde{N}^\phi_n(C)) = \int_{\partial C} 1_B(a, \eta(a)) \phi(n(C, a)) h^\phi_{C,k}(a) dH^n(a) = \lambda \int_{\partial C} 1_B(a, \eta(a)) \phi(n(C, a)) dH^n(a) = \lambda \Theta^\phi_n(C, B).
$$

(b) Arguing as in (a) we can compute

$$
\Theta^\phi_{n-k+1}(C, B) = \Theta^\phi_{n-k+1}(C, B \cap \tilde{N}^\phi_n(C)) = \int_{\partial C} 1_B(a, \eta(a)) \phi(n(C, a)) h^\phi_{C,k-1}(a) dH^n(a) \geq 0
$$

for every Borel set $B \subseteq N^\phi(C)$. This means that $H^\phi_{C,k-1}(a, \eta) \geq 0$ for $H^n$ a.e. $(a, \eta) \in N^\phi(C)$ and consequently $C$ is $(\phi, k - 1)$-mean convex.

Now with the help of Theorem 6.17, the following result can be easily deduced as a special case of Theorem 6.14.

**Theorem 6.18.** Suppose $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\emptyset \neq C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a set of positive reach with finite and positive volume such that

1. $H^n(\partial C \setminus \partial^\circ C) = 0$ and $H^{n-k}[p(\tilde{N}^\phi(C) \cup \tilde{N}^\phi_n(C))] = 0$,
2. $h^\phi_{C,k}(a) = \lambda$ for $H^n$ a.e. $a \in A(C)$,
3. $h^\phi_{C,1}(a) \geq 0, \ldots, h^\phi_{C,k-1}(a) \geq 0$ for $H^n$ a.e. $a \in A(C)$.

Then the conclusion of Theorem 6.15 holds. If $k = 1$, then the same conclusion is true for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

**Remark 6.19.** Corollary 6.18 includes as very special cases the soap bubble theorems of Alexandrov ([Ale58]), Korevaar–Ros ([Ros87] and [Ros88]) and He-Li-Ma-Ge ([HLMG99]). In fact for connected and compact domains with $C^2$-boundary the hypothesis (c) of Corollary 6.18 can be easily deduced from the existence of an elliptic point, the continuity of the principal curvatures and the Garding theory on hyperbolic polynomials (see [Ros88] page 450) for further details). The continuity of the principal curvatures and the assumption of connectedness play a key role in this argument.

Recall the definition of epigraph from (59).

**Lemma 6.20.** Suppose $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a compact set such that for every $a \in \partial C$ there exists $u \in S^n$, $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ and a semiconvex function $f : a + u^+ \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
\text{epi}(f) \cap U_{\epsilon, \delta}(a, u) = C \cap U_{\epsilon, \delta}(a, u).
$$

(81)

Then $\text{reach}(C) > 0$ and $H^n(\partial C \setminus \partial^\circ C) = 0$.

Proof. For $a \in \partial C$, let $\epsilon(a), \delta(a) > 0$ and the local representation in terms of a semiconvex function $f_a$ be as in (34). By [Fu85] Theorem 2.3 we know that $\text{reach}(\text{epi}(f_a)) \geq r(a) > 0$. Define $\rho(a) = \frac{1}{2} \min\{\epsilon(a), \delta(a), r(a)\}$. Then we have $U(a, \rho(a)) \subseteq \text{Unp}(C)$ for every $a \in \partial C$. If $a \in \text{int}(C)$, then there is also a positive number $\rho(a)$ such that $U(a, \rho(a)) \subseteq \text{int}(C) \subseteq \text{Unp}(C)$. Since the sets $U(a, \rho(a))$, for $a \in C$, are an open cover of the compact set $C$, we get a finite number of points $a_1, \ldots, a_N \in C$ such that $C \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^N U(a_i, \frac{\rho(a_i)}{2})$. Then for $0 < \tau < \inf\{\frac{\rho(a_1)}{2}, \ldots, \frac{\rho(a_N)}{2}\}$, it holds that for every $c \in C$ there is some $a_i$ such that $U(c, \tau) \subseteq U(a_i, \rho(a_i)) \subseteq \text{Unp}(C)$. This shows that $\text{reach}(C) \geq \tau > 0$.

Note that $\partial C = p(N(C))$ (see e.g. [RZ19] Corollary 4.12(a))). Since $H^n(p(N(C, a)) \neq 2$ for $a \in \partial C$ due to (51), it follows from Lemma 6.23 (c) that $H^n(p(N(C)) \setminus \partial^\circ C) = 0$, which gives the remaining assertion. \qed
References


