

ON THE L_p MINKOWSKI PROBLEM FOR POLYTOPES

DANIEL HUG, ERWIN LUTWAK, DEANE YANG, AND GAOYONG ZHANG

ABSTRACT. Two new approaches are presented to establish the existence of polytopal solutions to the discrete-data L_p Minkowski problem for all $p > 1$.

As observed by Schneider [21], the Brunn-Minkowski theory springs from joining the notion of ordinary volume in Euclidean d -space, \mathbb{R}^d , with that of *Minkowski combinations* of convex bodies.

One of the cornerstones of the Brunn-Minkowski theory is the classical Minkowski problem. For polytopes the problem asks for the necessary and sufficient conditions on a set of unit vectors $u_1, \dots, u_n \in S^{d-1}$ and a set of real numbers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n > 0$ that guarantee the existence of a polytope, P , in \mathbb{R}^d with n facets whose outer unit normals are u_1, \dots, u_n and such that the facet whose outer unit normal is u_i has *area* (i.e., $(d-1)$ -dimensional volume) α_i . This problem was completely solved by Minkowski himself (see Schneider [21] for reference): If the unit vectors do not lie on a closed hemisphere of S^{d-1} , then a solution exists if and only if

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \alpha_i u_i = 0.$$

In addition, the solution is unique up to a translation.

In the middle of the last century, Firey (see Schneider [21] for references) extended the notion of a Minkowski combination of convex bodies and for each real $p > 1$ defined what are now called *Firey-Minkowski L_p combinations* of convex bodies. A decade ago, in [11], Firey-Minkowski L_p combinations were combined with volume and the result was an embryonic L_p Brunn-Minkowski theory — often called the Brunn-Minkowski-Firey theory. During the past decade various elements of the L_p Brunn-Minkowski theory have attracted increased attention (see e.g. [3], [4], [5], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19], [22], [23], [24], [25], [26], [27]).

A central problem within the L_p Brunn-Minkowski theory is the L_p Minkowski problem. A solution to the L_p Minkowski problem when the *data* is even was given in [11]. This solution turned out to be a critical ingredient in the recently established L_p affine Sobolev inequality [17].

Suppose the real index p is fixed. The L_p Minkowski problem for polytopes asks for the necessary and sufficient conditions on a set of unit vectors $u_1, \dots, u_n \in S^{d-1}$ and a set of real numbers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n > 0$ that guarantee the existence of a polytope, P , in \mathbb{R}^d containing the origin in its interior with n facets whose outer unit normals are $u_1, \dots, u_n \in S^{d-1}$ and such that if the facet with outer unit normal u_i has area a_i and distance from the origin h_i , then for all i ,

$$h_i^{1-p} a_i = \alpha_i.$$

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 52A40.

Research supported, in part, by NSF Grant DMS-0104363.

Obviously, the case $p = 1$ is the classical problem. For $p > 1$ uniqueness was established in [11]. The L_p Minkowski problem for polytopes is the *discrete-data* case of the general L_p Minkowski problem (described below).

In the discrete *even-data* case of the problem, outer unit normals $u_1, u_{-1}, \dots, u_m, u_{-m}$ are given in antipodal pairs, where $u_{-i} = -u_i$, and $\alpha_{-i} = \alpha_i$. With the exception of the case $p = d$, existence (and uniqueness) for the even problem was established in [11] for all cases where the unit vectors do not lie in a closed hemisphere of S^{d-1} . A *normalized* version (discussed below) of the problem was proposed and completely solved for $p > 1$ and even data in [18]. For $d = 2$, the important case $p = 0$ of the discrete-data L_p Minkowski problem was dealt with by Stancu [24], [25].

A solution to the L_p Minkowski problem for $p > d$ was given by Guan and Lin [8] and independently by Chou and Wang [5]. The work of Chou and Wang [5] goes further and solves the problem for polytopes for all $p > 1$.

The works of Guan and Lin [8] and Chou and Wang [5] focus on existence and regularity for the L_p Minkowski problem. Both works make use of the machinery of the theory of PDE's. The classical Minkowski problem has proven to be of interest to those working in both discrete and computational geometry. It is likely that the L_p extension of the problem will in time prove to be of interest to those working in these fields as well. An approach accessible to researchers in convex, discrete, and computational geometry appears to be desirable. This article presents two such approaches.

We begin by recalling the formulation of the L_p Minkowski problem in full generality. For a convex body K let $h_K = h(K, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote the *support function* of K ; i.e., for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let $h_K(x) = \max_{y \in K} \langle x, y \rangle$, where $\langle x, y \rangle$ is the standard inner product of x and y in \mathbb{R}^d . We shall use $V(K)$ to denote d -dimensional volume of a convex body K in \mathbb{R}^d .

The *surface area measure*, $S(K, \cdot)$, of the convex body K is a Borel measure on the unit sphere, S^{d-1} , such that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{V(K + \varepsilon Q) - V(K)}{\varepsilon} = \int_{S^{d-1}} h_Q(u) S(K, du),$$

for each convex body Q . Here $K + \varepsilon Q$ is the *Minkowski combination* defined by

$$h(K + \varepsilon Q, \cdot) = h(K, \cdot) + \varepsilon h(Q, \cdot).$$

Existence of the surface area measure was shown by Aleksandrov and Fenchel and Jessen (see Schneider [21]).

The classical Minkowski problem asks for necessary and sufficient conditions for a Borel measure μ on S^{d-1} (called the *data*) to be the surface area measure of a convex body K . The solution as obtained by Aleksandrov and Fenchel and Jessen (see Schneider [21]) is: Corresponding to each Borel measure μ on S^{d-1} that is not concentrated on a closed hemisphere of S^{d-1} , there is a convex body K such that

$$S(K, \cdot) = \mu$$

if and only if

$$\int_{S^{d-1}} u \, d\mu(u) = 0.$$

The uniqueness of K (up to translation) is a direct consequence of the *Minkowski mixed-volume inequality* (see Schneider [21]) which states that for convex bodies K, L ,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{V(K + \varepsilon Q) - V(K)}{\varepsilon} \geq dV(K)^{(d-1)/d}V(L)^{1/d},$$

with equality if and only if K is a dilate of L (after a suitable translation).

Suppose $p > 1$ is fixed and K is a convex body that contains the origin in its interior. The L_p surface area measure, $S_p(K, \cdot)$, of K is a Borel measure on S^{d-1} such that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{V(K +_p \varepsilon \cdot Q) - V(K)}{\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{p} \int_{S^{d-1}} h_Q^p(u) S_p(K, du),$$

for each convex body Q that contains the origin in its interior. Here $K +_p \varepsilon \cdot Q$ is the *Minkowski-Firey L_p combination* defined by

$$h(K +_p \varepsilon \cdot Q, \cdot)^p = h(K, \cdot)^p + \varepsilon h(Q, \cdot)^p.$$

Existence of the L_p surface area measure was shown in [11] where it was also shown that

$$S_p(K, \cdot) = h_K^{1-p} S(K, \cdot).$$

It is easily seen that the surface area measure of a convex body (and hence also all the L_p surface area measures) cannot be concentrated on a closed hemisphere of S^{d-1} .

It turns out that if P is a polytope with outer unit facet normals u_1, \dots, u_n , then $\{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ is the support of the measure $S(P, \cdot)$ and $S(P, \{u_i\}) = a_i$ where as before a_i denotes the area of the facet of P whose outer unit normal is u_i . Thus, if P contains the origin in its interior,

$$S_p(P, \{u_i\}) = h_i^{1-p} a_i,$$

where as before $h_i = h(P, u_i)$.

The L_p Minkowski problem asks for necessary and sufficient conditions for a Borel measure μ on S^{d-1} (called the *data* for the problem) to be the L_p surface area measure of a convex body K ; i.e., given a Borel measure μ on S^{d-1} that is not concentrated on a closed hemisphere of S^{d-1} , what are the necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a convex body K that contains the origin in its interior such that

$$S_p(K, \cdot) = \mu$$

or equivalently,

$$h_K^{1-p} S(K, \cdot) = \mu.$$

The problem is of interest for all real p .

For $p > 1$, but $p \neq d$, the uniqueness of K is a direct consequence of the *L_p Minkowski mixed-volume inequality* (established in [11]) which states that if $p > 1$ then for convex bodies K, L , that contain the origin in their interior

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{V(K +_p \varepsilon \cdot Q) - V(K)}{\varepsilon} \geq \frac{d}{p} V(K)^{(d-p)/d} V(L)^{p/d},$$

with equality if and only if K is a dilate of L .

In [11] it was shown that if μ is an *even* Borel measure (i.e., assumes the same values on antipodal Borel sets) that is not concentrated on a great subsphere of S^{d-1} , then for each $p > 1$, there exists a unique convex body K_p , that is symmetric about the origin such that

$$S_p(K_p, \cdot) = \mu,$$

provided $p \neq d$. The L_p Minkowski problem as originally formulated cannot be solved for all even measures when $p = d$. The following *normalized* version of the L_p Minkowski problem was formulated in [18]: What are the necessary and sufficient conditions on a Borel measure μ to guarantee the existence of a convex body K_p^* , containing the origin in its interior, such that

$$\frac{1}{V(K_p^*)} S_p(K_p^*, \cdot) = \mu?$$

For all real $p \neq d$ the two versions of the problems are equivalent in that

$$K_p = V(K_p^*)^{1/(p-d)} K_p^*$$

or equivalently

$$K_p^* = V(K_p)^{-1/p} K_p.$$

It was shown in [18] that the normalized L_p Minkowski problem has a solution for all $p > 1$ if the data measure is even (again assuming the measure is not concentrated on a subsphere of S^{d-1}).

It is the aim of this note to present two alternate approaches to the Minkowski problem which show that when the data is a discrete measure, the normalized version of the L_p Minkowski problem always has a solution (assuming, as usual, that the measure is not concentrated on a closed hemisphere of S^{d-1}). It is important to emphasize that all of our results for $p > d$ were first obtained by Guan and Lin [8] and independently by Chou and Wang [5], and our results for $p > 1$, were first obtained by Chou and Wang [5]. The sole aim of our work is to present approaches easily accessible to the convex, discrete, and computational geometry community.

1. RESULTS

Let \mathcal{K}^d denote the space of compact convex subsets of \mathbb{R}^d with nonempty interiors, and let \mathcal{P}^d denote the subset of convex polytopes. The members of \mathcal{K}^d are called *convex bodies*. We write \mathcal{K}_0^d for the set of convex bodies which contain the origin as an interior point, and put $\mathcal{P}_0^d := \mathcal{P}^d \cap \mathcal{K}_0^d$.

For $K \in \mathcal{K}^d$, let $F(K, u)$ denote the *support set* of K with exterior unit normal vector u , i.e. $F(K, u) = \{x \in K : \langle x, u \rangle = h(K, u)\}$. The $(d-1)$ -dimensional support sets of a polytope $P \in \mathcal{P}^d$ are called the *facets* of P . If $P \in \mathcal{P}^d$ has facets $F(P, u_i)$ with areas a_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, then $S(P, \cdot)$ is the discrete measure

$$S(P, \cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \delta_{u_i}$$

with (finite) support $\{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ and $S(P, \{u_i\}) = a_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$; here δ_{u_i} denotes the probability measure with unit point mass at u_i .

Just as the L_p surface area measure of a convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^d$ satisfies

$$S_p(K, \cdot) = h(K, \cdot)^{1-p} S(K, \cdot),$$

the normalized L_p surface area measure of K is defined by

$$S_p^*(K, \cdot) := \frac{h(K, \cdot)^{1-p}}{V(K)} S(K, \cdot).$$

A convex body K is uniquely determined by its L_p surface area measure if $p > 1$ and $p \neq d$ (for $p = d$ one has uniqueness up to a dilatation), uniqueness holds for the normalized L_p surface area measure and all $p > 1$.

Again for a polytope $P \in \mathcal{P}_0^d$ with outer unit facet normals u_1, \dots, u_n and facet areas $a_1, \dots, a_n > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, the discrete measures $S_p(P, \cdot)$ and $S_p^*(P, \cdot)$ are given by

$$S_p(P, \cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^n h(P, u_i)^{1-p} a_i \delta_{u_i}$$

and

$$S_p^*(P, \cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{h(P, u_i)^{1-p}}{V(P)} a_i \delta_{u_i}.$$

In the case of a discrete measure $\mu = \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \delta_{u_j}$ with unit vectors u_1, \dots, u_n not contained in a closed hemisphere and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n > 0$, any solution of the L_p Minkowski problem for the data μ is necessarily a polytope with facet normals u_1, \dots, u_n (cf. [21, Theorem 4.6.4]). The main step in our approach to the L_p Minkowski problem for general measures and general convex bodies is to solve first the L_p Minkowski problem for discrete measures and polytopes.

Theorem 1.1. *Let vectors $u_1, \dots, u_n \in S^{d-1}$ that are not contained in a closed hemisphere and real numbers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n > 0$ be given. Then, for any $p > 1$, there exists a unique polytope $P \in \mathcal{P}_0^d$ such that*

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \delta_{u_j} = \frac{h(P, \cdot)^{1-p}}{V(P)} S(P, \cdot).$$

From Theorem 1.1, we deduce the corresponding result for the L_p Minkowski problem involving discrete measures and polytopes.

Theorem 1.2. *Let vectors $u_1, \dots, u_n \in S^{d-1}$ that are not contained in a closed hemisphere and real numbers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n > 0$ be given. Then, for any $p > 1$ with $p \neq d$, there exists a unique polytope $P \in \mathcal{P}_0^d$ such that*

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \delta_{u_j} = h(P, \cdot)^{1-p} S(P, \cdot).$$

The extension of Theorem 1.1 to general measures will be obtained by approximation with discrete measures. For each approximating discrete measure, we get a polytope as the solution of the discrete L_p Minkowski problem. Then we show that a subsequence of these polytopes converges. However, the limit body may have the origin in its boundary. For this reason we are forced to slightly modify the original problem. For $p \geq d$, we finally show by an additional argument that the original problem is solved as well.

Theorem 1.3. *Let μ be a Borel measure on S^{d-1} whose support is not contained in a closed hemisphere of S^{d-1} . Then, for any $p > 1$, there exists a unique convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}^d$ with $0 \in K$ such that*

$$V(K)h(K, \cdot)^{p-1}\mu = S(K, \cdot);$$

moreover, $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^d$ if $p \geq d$.

Theorem 1.4. *Let μ be a Borel measure on S^{d-1} whose support is not contained in a closed hemisphere of S^{d-1} . Then, for any $p > 1$ with $p \neq d$, there exists a unique convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}^d$ with $0 \in K$ such that*

$$h(K, \cdot)^{p-1} \mu = S(K, \cdot);$$

moreover, $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^d$ if $p > d$.

2. VOLUME AND DIAMETER BOUNDS

The following three lemmas will be applied in two different ways. On the one hand, we will need them for our first treatment of the L_p Minkowski problem for discrete measures and polytopes which is based on Aleksandrov's mapping lemma (cf. [1]). Here the lemmas are applied in the very special situation where all convex bodies are polytopes containing the origin in their interiors and with the same set of outer unit facet normals and where all measures are discrete with common finite support. Except for Lemma 2.1, the proofs of the lemmas in this special case will not be simpler than the ones in the general case. Therefore we present them in the general framework. Then again Lemmas 2.1 – 2.3 will be required for the solution of the L_p Minkowski problem in the case of general convex bodies via an approximation argument.

The next lemma provides a uniqueness result which will be used to establish the injectivity of an auxiliary map (cf. Lemma 3.1) in our first proof of Theorem 1.1. It also yields the uniqueness assertions of Theorems 1.1 and 1.3. Moreover, an estimate established in the course of the proof of Lemma 2.1 will be employed in the proof of Lemma 2.2.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $K, K' \in \mathcal{K}^d$ be convex bodies with $0 \in K, K'$. Assume that μ is a Borel measure on S^{d-1} such that $V(K)h(K, \cdot)^{p-1} \mu = S(K, \cdot)$ and $V(K')h(K', \cdot)^{p-1} \mu = S(K', \cdot)$. Then $K = K'$.*

PROOF. Let $L \in \mathcal{K}^d$ with $0 \in L$. Define $\Omega := \{u \in S^{d-1} : h(K, u) > 0\}$ and $\Omega^c := S^{d-1} \setminus \Omega$. Then Hölder's inequality and the assumption $p > 1$ yield that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{d} \int_{S^{d-1}} h(L, u)^p \mu(du) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} &\geq \left(\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{h(L, u)}{h(K, u)} \right)^p \frac{h(K, u) S(K, du)}{dV(K)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\geq \int_{\Omega} \frac{h(L, u)}{h(K, u)} \frac{h(K, u) S(K, du)}{dV(K)} \\ &= \frac{V_1(K, L)}{V(K)}, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

since

$$\frac{1}{d} \int_{\Omega} h(K, u) S(K, du) = \frac{1}{d} \int_{S^{d-1}} h(K, u) S(K, du) = V(K)$$

and

$$S(K, \Omega^c) = V(K) \int_{\Omega^c} h(K, u)^{p-1} \mu(du) = 0.$$

For $L = K$ or $L = K'$ the left-hand side of (1) is equal to 1. Hence (1) and Minkowski's inequality (see [21, Theorem 6.2.1]) imply that

$$1 \geq \frac{V_1(K, K')}{V(K)} \geq \left(\frac{V(K')}{V(K)} \right)^{\frac{1}{d}},$$

and therefore $V(K) \geq V(K')$. By symmetry, we also have $V(K) = V(K')$, and thus $K = K' + t$ for some $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The assumption and the translation invariance of the surface area measure now yield that

$$\int_U [h(K' + t, u)^{p-1} - h(K', u)^{p-1}] \mu(du) = 0$$

for all Borel sets $U \subset S^{d-1}$. In particular, we may choose $U_t := \{u \in S^{d-1} : \langle t, u \rangle > 0\}$. If $t \neq 0$, then U_t is an open hemisphere. Since the support of μ is not contained in $S^{d-1} \setminus U_t$, we thus get

$$\int_{U_t} [(h(K', u) + \langle t, u \rangle)^{p-1} - h(K', u)^{p-1}] \mu(du) > 0.$$

This shows that necessarily $t = 0$. □

In the following two lemmas we provide a priori bounds for the volume and the diameter of solutions of the L_p Minkowski problem.

Lemma 2.2. *Let μ be a positive Borel measure on S^{d-1} , and let $K \in \mathcal{K}^d$ with $0 \in K$ satisfy $V(K)h(K, \cdot)^{p-1}\mu = S(K, \cdot)$. Then*

$$V(K) \geq \kappa_d \left(\frac{d}{\mu(S^{d-1})} \right)^{\frac{d}{p}}.$$

PROOF. Apply (1) with $L = B^d$ and use Minkowski's inequality (i.e. the isoperimetric inequality in this case) to get

$$\left(\frac{1}{d} \mu(S^{d-1}) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \geq \left(\frac{\kappa_d}{V(K)} \right)^{\frac{1}{d}},$$

which is equivalent to the assertion of the lemma. □

Subsequently, we set $\alpha_+ := \max\{0, \alpha\}$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $B^d(0, r)$ denote the ball with center 0 and radius $r \geq 0$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let μ and K be given as in Lemma 2.2. Assume that for some constant $c_0 > 0$,*

$$\int_{S^{d-1}} \langle u, v \rangle_+^p \mu(du) \geq \frac{d}{c_0^p} \quad \text{for all } v \in S^{d-1}.$$

Then $K \subset B^d(0, c_0)$.

PROOF. Define $R := \max\{h(K, v) : v \in S^{d-1}\}$ and choose $v_0 \in S^{d-1}$ so that $R = h(K, v_0)$. Then $R[0, v_0] \subset K$, and thus $R\langle u, v_0 \rangle_+ \leq h(K, u)$ for $u \in S^{d-1}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{R^p}{c_0^p} &\leq R^p \frac{1}{d} \int_{S^{d-1}} \langle u, v_0 \rangle_+^p \mu(du) \leq \frac{1}{d} \int_{S^{d-1}} h(K, u)^p \mu(du) \\ &= \frac{1}{d} \int_{S^{d-1}} h(K, u) h(K, u)^{p-1} \mu(du) \\ &= \frac{1}{dV(K)} \int_{S^{d-1}} h(K, u) S(K, du) = 1, \end{aligned}$$

which gives $R \leq c_0$. □

3. THE L_p MINKOWSKI PROBLEM FOR POLYTOPES

In this section, we will describe two different approaches to Theorem 1.1. The first proof is based on the following auxiliary result, which is a minor modification of Aleksandrov's mapping lemma. We include the proof for the sake of completeness. Note that Aleksandrov used his mapping lemma to solve the classical Minkowski problem for polytopes.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be nonempty open sets, let B be connected, and let $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$ be an injective, continuous map. Assume that any sequence $(x^i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ in A with $\varphi(x^i) \rightarrow b \in B$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ has a convergent subsequence. Then φ is surjective.*

PROOF. Since $\varphi(A) \subset B$ is nonempty, it is sufficient to show that $\varphi(A)$ is open and closed in B .

Let $b^i \in \varphi(A)$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, with $b^i \rightarrow b \in B$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ be given. Then there are $x^i \in A$ such that $\varphi(x^i) = b^i$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. By assumption, there is a subsequence $(x^{i_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $x^{i_j} \rightarrow x \in A$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Since φ is continuous, $\varphi(x^{i_j}) \rightarrow \varphi(x)$ and therefore $b = \varphi(x)$. Hence $\varphi(A)$ is closed in B .

Since A is open in \mathbb{R}^n and φ is continuous and injective, $\varphi(A)$ is open in B by the theorem of the invariance of domain (cf. [20, Theorem 36.5] or [6, Theorem 4.3]). \square

In the following, we write $H_{u,t}^- := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle y, u \rangle \leq t\}$ for the halfspace with (exterior) normal vector $u \in S^{d-1}$ and distance $t \geq 0$ from the origin.

For our first proof of Theorem 1.1, we can assume that the given vectors u_1, \dots, u_n are pairwise distinct and not contained in a closed hemisphere. Let \mathbb{R}_+^n be the set of all $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with positive components. For $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, we define the (compact, convex) polytope

$$P(x) := \bigcap_{j=1}^n H_{u_j, x_j}^-.$$

The compactness of $P(x)$ is implied by the assumption that u_1, \dots, u_n are not contained in a closed hemisphere. Since $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, 0 is an interior point of $P(x)$. Further, we remark that $x \mapsto P(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, is continuous with respect to the Hausdorff metric (cf. [21, p. 57]). We put $B := \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and define

$$A := \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n : S(P(x), \{u_j\}) > 0 \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, n\}.$$

Note that if $x \in A$, then $x_j = h(P(x), u_j)$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Clearly, A, B are nonempty open subsets of \mathbb{R}^n and B is connected. Next we define the map $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$ by $\varphi(x) := b = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ with

$$b_j := \frac{h(P(x), u_j)^{1-p}}{V(P(x))} S(P(x), \{u_j\}) = S_p^*(P(x), \{u_j\}), \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

We will show that φ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 3.1 to conclude that φ is surjective. The map φ is well-defined and continuous. The continuity of φ follows from the continuity of the volume and the support function and from the weak continuity of the surface area measure, since $x \mapsto P(x)$ is continuous as well. Next we check that φ is injective. Let $x, y \in A$ be such that $\varphi(x) = \varphi(y)$. Then Lemma 2.1 yields that $P(x) = P(y)$. Hence, by the definition of A , $x_j = h(P(x), u_j) = h(P(y), u_j) = y_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$, and thus $x = y$.

Now let $x^i \in A$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, be given. Assume that $b^i := \varphi(x^i) \rightarrow b \in B$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ and put $\mu_i := S_p^*(P(x^i), \cdot)$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Since

$$\mu_i(S^{d-1}) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_i(\{u_j\}) = \sum_{j=1}^n b_j^i \rightarrow \sum_{j=1}^n b_j$$

as $i \rightarrow \infty$, we get that $\mu_i(S^{d-1}) \leq c_1 < \infty$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, by Lemma 2.2 there is a constant $c_2 > 0$ such that, for $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(2) \quad V(P(x^i)) \geq c_2 > 0.$$

For the discrete measure $\mu := \sum_{j=1}^n b_j \delta_{u_j}$ we have $\mu_i \rightarrow \mu$ weakly as $i \rightarrow \infty$. The functions f_i, f defined by

$$f_i(v) := \int_{S^{d-1}} \langle u, v \rangle_+^p \mu_i(dv), \quad f(v) := \int_{S^{d-1}} \langle u, v \rangle_+^p \mu(dv),$$

$v \in S^{d-1}$, are continuous and positive since the support of μ_i, μ is not contained in a closed hemisphere. Since f_i converges uniformly to f as $i \rightarrow \infty$ and the sphere is compact, there is a constant $c_3 > 0$ such that $f_i(v) \geq c_3$ for all $v \in S^{d-1}$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Lemma 2.3 now implies that there is a constant c_4 such that, for $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(3) \quad P(x^i) \subset B^d(0, c_4).$$

By (3) there exists a convergent subsequence of $P(x^i)$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$. To simplify the notation, we assume that $P(x^i) \rightarrow P \in \mathcal{P}^d$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Note that by (2) P has indeed nonempty interior. Clearly, $0 \in P$ and the facets of P are among the support sets $F(P, u_1), \dots, F(P, u_n)$ of P with normal vectors u_1, \dots, u_n . We next show that $0 \in \text{int}(P)$. For this, assume that 0 is a boundary point of P . Then there is a facet $F(P, u_j)$ of P with $0 \in F(P, u_j)$ and $S(P, \{u_j\}) > 0$, and therefore $h(P, u_j) = 0$. But then $h(P(x^i), u_j) \rightarrow 0$ and $S(P(x^i), \{u_j\}) \not\rightarrow 0$, as $i \rightarrow \infty$. In view of (3) this implies that

$$b_j^i = V(P(x^i))^{-1} \frac{S(P(x^i), \{u_j\})}{h(P(x^i), u_j)^{p-1}} \rightarrow \infty$$

as $i \rightarrow \infty$, a contradiction.

Since $0 \in \text{int}(P)$, we get that $h(P(x^i), u_j) \not\rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, for $j = 1, \dots, n$, and therefore also $S(P(x^i), \{u_j\}) \not\rightarrow 0$; here we also use (2) and $b_j^i \rightarrow b_j \neq 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. This finally shows that $S(P, \{u_j\}) > 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$.

Thus we conclude that $P = P(x)$ for $x := (h(P, u_1), \dots, h(P, u_n)) \in A$ and $x^i \rightarrow x$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

Now Lemma 3.1 shows that φ is surjective, which implies the existence assertion of the theorem. Uniqueness has already been established in Lemma 2.1. \square

We now give a second, variational proof of Theorem 1.1. An obvious advantage of this approach is that it may be turned into a nonlinear reconstruction algorithm for retrieving a convex polytope from its L_p surface area measure. The main difficulty consists in showing that the solution of an auxiliary optimization problem is a convex polytope which contains the origin in its interior.

The following lemma is probably well known. It will be used to verify that a convex polytope which is defined as the solution of an auxiliary optimization problem is indeed the solution of the L_p Minkowski problem stated in Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $u_1, \dots, u_n \in S^{d-1}$ be pairwise distinct vectors which are not contained in a closed hemisphere. For $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, let $P(x) := \bigcap_{i=1}^n H_{u_i, x_i}^-$ and $\tilde{V}(x) := V(P(x))$. Then \tilde{V} is of class C^1 and $\partial_i \tilde{V}(x) = S(P(x), \{u_i\})$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

PROOF. The second assertion can be checked by a direct argument. Alternatively, it can be obtained as a very special case of Theorem 6.5.3 in [21]. Here one has to choose $\Omega = \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$, a positive, continuous function $f : S^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $f(u_j) = x_j$, and a continuous function $g_i : S^{d-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $g_i(u_j) = \delta_{ij}$, for $j = 1, \dots, n$. The first assertion then follows, since $x \mapsto S(P(x), \{u_i\})$ is continuous on \mathbb{R}_+^n (cf. the first proof of Theorem 1.1). \square

We start with the second proof of Theorem 1.1. Again we can assume that u_1, \dots, u_n are pairwise distinct unit vectors not contained in a closed hemisphere. Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n > 0$ be fixed. We denote by \mathbb{R}_*^n the set of all $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with nonnegative components. Then we define the compact set

$$M := \{x \in \mathbb{R}_*^n : \phi(x) = 1\},$$

where

$$\phi(x) := \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i x_i^p.$$

For $x \in M$, we again write $P(x)$ for the convex polytope defined by

$$P(x) := \bigcap_{i=1}^n H_{u_i, x_i}^-.$$

Clearly, for any $x \in M$, $0 \in P(x)$ and $P(x)$ has at most n facets whose outer unit normals are from the set $\{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$. Moreover, $h(P(x), u_i) \leq x_i$ with equality if $S(P(x), \{u_i\}) > 0$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Since M is compact and the function $x \mapsto V(P(x)) =: \tilde{V}(x)$, $x \in M$, is continuous, there is a point $z \in M$ such that $\tilde{V}(x) \leq \tilde{V}(z)$ for all $x \in M$. We will prove that $P(z)$ is the required polytope.

First, we show that

$$(4) \quad 0 \in \text{int}(P(z)).$$

This will be proved by contradiction. Let $h_i := h(P(z), u_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Without loss of generality, assume that $h_1 = \dots = h_m = 0$ and $h_{m+1}, \dots, h_n > 0$ for some $1 \leq m < n$. Note that $m < n$ is implied by $\tilde{V}(z) > 0$. We will show that under this assumption there is some $z_t \in M$ such that $\tilde{V}(z_t) > \tilde{V}(z)$, which contradicts the definition of z . Pick a small $t > 0$ and consider

$$z_t := \left((z_1^p + t^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \dots, (z_m^p + t^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}, (z_{m+1}^p - \alpha t^p)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \dots, (z_n^p - \alpha t^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right),$$

where

$$\alpha := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i}{\sum_{i=m+1}^n \alpha_i}.$$

Since $0 < h_i \leq z_i$ for $m+1 \leq i \leq n$, we have $z_t \in M$ if $t > 0$ is sufficiently small.

Define

$$P_t := \bigcap_{i=1}^m H_{u_i, t}^- \cap \bigcap_{i=m+1}^n H_{u_i, (h_i^p - \alpha t^p)^{1/p}}^-$$

hence $P_0 = P(z)$, $P_t \subset P(z_t)$ and $0 \in \text{int}(P_t)$, if $t > 0$ is sufficiently small. We put

$$f_i := S(P(z), \{u_i\}) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_i(t) := S(P_t, \{u_i\}) - f_i,$$

and thus

$$dV(P_t) = t \sum_{i=1}^m (f_i + \Delta_i(t)) + \sum_{i=m+1}^n (h_i^p - \alpha t^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} (f_i + \Delta_i(t))$$

and

$$dV_1(P_t, P(z)) = 0 \sum_{i=1}^m (f_i + \Delta_i(t)) + \sum_{i=m+1}^n h_i (f_i + \Delta_i(t))$$

Since an interior point of $P(z)$ is also an interior point of P_t , if $t > 0$ is sufficiently small, it follows that $P_t \rightarrow P(z)$ as $t \rightarrow 0^+$ (cf. [21, p. 57]), and therefore $\Delta_i(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0^+$. From this and since at least one facet is supposed to contain the origin, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{V(P_t) - V_1(P_t, P(z))}{t} \\ &= \frac{1}{d} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{t-0}{t} (f_i + \Delta_i(t)) + \sum_{i=m+1}^n \frac{(h_i^p - \alpha t^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} - h_i}{t} (f_i + \Delta_i(t)) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^m f_i > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here the assumption $p > 1$ enters in a crucial way. By Minkowski's inequality and since $P(t) \rightarrow P(z)$ as $t \rightarrow 0^+$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{V(P_t) - V_1(P_t, P(z))}{t} &\leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{V(P_t) - V(P_t)^{1-\frac{1}{d}} V(P(z))^{\frac{1}{d}}}{t} \\ &= V(P(z))^{1-\frac{1}{d}} \liminf_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{V(P_t)^{\frac{1}{d}} - V(P(z))^{\frac{1}{d}}}{t}. \end{aligned}$$

But this shows that $V(P_t) > V(P(z))$ if $t > 0$ is sufficiently small. Since $P_t \subset P(z_t)$, the required contradiction follows.

From (4) it follows that

$$z \in M_+ := \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n : \phi(x) = 1\},$$

and $\tilde{V}(x) \leq \tilde{V}(z)$ for all $x \in M_+$. Hence, by the Lagrange multiplier rule there is some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\nabla \tilde{V}(z) = \lambda \nabla \phi(z).$$

The required differentiability of \tilde{V} is ensured by Lemma 3.2, and $\nabla \phi(z) \neq 0$ since $z \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n > 0$; moreover,

$$f_i = \lambda \frac{1}{d} \alpha_i p z_i^{p-1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

and thus $\lambda > 0$, since $f_i > 0$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. We deduce that $f_i > 0$ and therefore $h(P(z), u_i) = z_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Since $\phi(z) = 1$, we obtain that

$$dV(P(z)) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i z_i = \lambda p \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i z_i^p = \lambda p.$$

This shows that, for $i = 1, \dots, n$,

$$S(P(z), \{u_i\}) = f_i = \frac{d}{p} V(P(z)) \frac{p}{d} \alpha_i z_i^{p-1} = V(P(z)) h(P(z), u_i)^{p-1} \alpha_i > 0.$$

4. THE GENERAL CASE

We now provide a proof of Theorem 1.3. Let μ be a Borel measure on S^{d-1} whose support is not contained in a closed hemisphere. As in [21, pp. 392-3], one can construct a sequence of discrete measures μ_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}$, such that the support of μ_i is not contained in a closed hemisphere and $\mu_i \rightarrow \mu$ weakly as $i \rightarrow \infty$. By Theorem 1.1, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a polytope $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_0^d$ with

$$\mu_i = \frac{h(P_i, \cdot)^{1-p}}{V(P_i)} S(P_i, \cdot).$$

As in the proof of (3), we now obtain that the sequence P_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}$, is uniformly bounded. Hence we can assume that $P_i \rightarrow K \in \mathcal{K}^d$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ and $0 \in K$. In fact, since $\mu_i(S^{d-1}) \rightarrow \mu(S^{d-1})$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, we get as in the proof of (2) that $V(K) > 0$, and thus $K \in \mathcal{K}^d$.

For a continuous function $f \in C(S^{d-1})$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$(5) \quad \int_{S^{d-1}} f(u) V(P_i) h(P_i, u)^{p-1} \mu_i(du) = \int_{S^{d-1}} f(u) S(P_i, du).$$

Since $V(P_i) h(P_i, \cdot)^{p-1} \rightarrow V(K) h(K, \cdot)^{p-1}$ uniformly on S^{d-1} (note that $p-1 > 0$), and since $\mu_i \rightarrow \mu$ and $S(P_i, \cdot) \rightarrow S(K, \cdot)$ weakly, as $i \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain from (5) that

$$(6) \quad \int_{S^{d-1}} f(u) V(K) h(K, u)^{p-1} \mu(du) = \int_{S^{d-1}} f(u) S(K, du).$$

The existence assertion now follows, since (6) holds for any $f \in C(S^{d-1})$.

Uniqueness has been proved in Lemma 2.1.

Now we consider the case $p \geq d$. Assume that $K \in \mathcal{K}^d$ with $0 \in K$ satisfies $V(K) h(K, \cdot)^{p-1} \mu = S(K, \cdot)$, but $0 \in \partial K$. We will derive a contradiction by adapting an argument from [5].

Let $e \in S^{d-1}$ be such that ∂K can locally be represented as the graph of a convex function over $B_r := e^\perp \cap B^d(0, r)$, $r > 0$, and $K \subset H_{-e, 0}^-$ (cf. [2, Theorem 1.12]). Let μ_i and $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_0^d$ be constructed for μ as in the first part of the proof. In particular, $\mu_i(S^{d-1}) \leq c_5 < \infty$ and $0 \in \text{int}(P_i)$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and $P_i \rightarrow K$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ with respect to the Hausdorff metric. Then, for $i \geq i_0$, ∂P_i can locally be represented as the graph of a convex function g_i over B_r , and the Lipschitz constants of these functions are uniformly bounded by some constant L . We define $G_i(y) := y + g_i(y)e$ for $y \in B_r$, put $\alpha := p-1$ and write c_6, c_7, c_8 for constants

independent of i and r . Then, for $i \geq i_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} c_5 \geq \mu_i(S^{d-1}) &= \frac{1}{V(P_i)} \int_{S^{d-1}} h(P_i, u)^{-\alpha} S(P_i, du) \\ &\geq c_6 \int_{G_i(B_r)} \langle x, \sigma(P_i, x) \rangle^{-\alpha} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(dx), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{H}^{d-1} denotes the $(d-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure and $\sigma(P_i, x)$ is an exterior unit normal vector of P_i at $x \in \partial P_i$, which is uniquely determined for \mathcal{H}^{d-1} -almost all $x \in \partial P_i$. Using the area formula and the fact that

$$\sigma(P_i, G_i(y)) = (1 + |\nabla g_i(y)|^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\nabla g_i(y) - e),$$

for \mathcal{H}^{d-1} -almost all $y \in B_r$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} c_5 &\geq c_6 \int_{B_r} \langle G_i(y), \sigma(P_i, G_i(y)) \rangle^{-\alpha} \sqrt{1 + |\nabla g_i(y)|^2} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(dy) \\ &= c_6 \int_{B_r} (\langle y, \nabla g_i(y) \rangle - g_i(y))^{-\alpha} \sqrt{1 + |\nabla g_i(y)|^2}^{1-\alpha} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(dy) \\ &\geq c_7 \int_{B_r} (\langle y, \nabla g_i(y) \rangle - g_i(y))^{-\alpha} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(dy). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$0 < \langle y, \nabla g_i(y) \rangle - g_i(y) \leq 2L|y| + |g_i(0)|,$$

we further deduce that

$$c_5 \geq c_7 \int_{B_r} (2L|y| + |g_i(0)|)^{-\alpha} \mathcal{H}^{d-1}(dy) = c_8 \int_0^r (2Lt + |g_i(0)|)^{-\alpha} t^{d-2} dt.$$

Since $|g_i(0)| \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, we can extract a decreasing subsequence of $(|g_i(0)|)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Hence the monotone convergence theorem yields that

$$c_5 \geq c_8 \int_0^r (2Lt)^{-\alpha} t^{d-2} dt.$$

This leads to a contradiction if $\alpha \geq d-1$, since $r > 0$ can be arbitrarily small. \square

Example 4.1. We now give an example of a Borel measure μ on S^{d-1} whose support is not contained in a hemisphere such that 0 is a boundary point of the uniquely determined convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}^d$ for which $V(K)h(K, \cdot)^{p-1}\mu = S(K, \cdot)$. For $q > 1$ we define $g(x) := |x|^q$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ and

$$K := \{(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R} : t \geq g(x)\} \cap H_{e_d, 1}^-.$$

Clearly, $K \in \mathcal{K}^d$, $0 \in \partial K$ and ∂K is C^2 in a neighbourhood of 0 excluding 0. The given convex body satisfies $V(K)h(K, \cdot)^{p-1}\mu = S(K, \cdot)$ if

$$\mu := \frac{h(K, \cdot)^{1-p}}{V(K)} S(K, \cdot)$$

defines a finite measure on S^{d-1} and $S(K, \{-e_d\}) = 0$. Since indeed $S(K, \{-e_d\}) = 0$ and $h(K, u) > 0$ for $u \in S^{d-1} \setminus \{-e_d\}$, and since $S(K, \cdot)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the spherical Lebesgue measure (with density function f_K) in a spherical neighbourhood of

$-e_d$, it remains to show that $h(K, \cdot)^{1-p} f_K$ is integrable in a spherical neighbourhood of $-e_d$. For $r \in (0, 1)$ we put $B_r := B^d(0, r) \cap e_d^\perp$. Then we define

$$a(x) := (1 + |\nabla g(x)|^2)^{1/2}, \quad x \in B_r,$$

where $\nabla g(x) = q|x|^{q-2}x$. For $x \in B_r \setminus \{0\}$ and

$$u := \sigma(K, (x, g(x))) = a(x)^{-1}(\nabla g(x) - e_d),$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} h(K, u) &= \langle x + g(x)e_d, u \rangle = a(x)^{-1}(q-1)|x|^q, \\ f_K(u)^{-1} &= a(x)^{-(d+1)} \det(d^2 g(x)), \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$h(K, u)^{1-p} f_K(u) = (q-1)^{1-p} a(x)^{d+p} |x|^{q(1-p)} [\det(d^2 g(x))]^{-1}.$$

A direct computation shows that

$$\det(d^2 g(x)) = q^{d-1} (q-1) |x|^{(q-2)(d-1)},$$

and therefore

$$h(K, u)^{1-p} f_K(u) = q^{1-d} (q-1)^{-p} |x|^{-[(q-2)(d-1)+q(p-1)]} a(x)^{d+p}$$

For a given $p \in (1, d)$, we now choose

$$q := \frac{2(d-1)}{d+p-2} \in (1, 2),$$

and hence

$$h(K, u)^{1-p} f_K(u) = q^{1-d} (q-1)^{-p} a(x)^{d+p}.$$

Since $x \mapsto a(x)$ is bounded on B_r , the required integrability follows.

A more precise estimate shows that $h(K, \cdot)^{1-p} f_K$ is integrable whenever

$$q > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad p < \frac{d-1+q}{q}.$$

For $q = 2$, K is C^2 and has positive curvature at 0 and $h(K, \cdot)^{1-p} f_K$ is integrable for $1 < p < (d+1)/2$.

REFERENCES

- [1] A.D. Aleksandrov, *Konvexe Polyeder*, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, (Russian original: 1950), 1958.
- [2] H. Busemann, *Convex Surfaces*, Interscience, New York, 1958.
- [3] S. Campi, P. Gronchi, The L_p -Busemann-Petty centroid inequality, *Adv. Math.* **167** (2002), 128–141.
- [4] S. Campi, P. Gronchi, On the reverse L^p -Busemann-Petty centroid inequality, *Mathematika* (in press).
- [5] K.-S. Chou, X.-J. Wang, The L_p -Minkowski problem and the Minkowski problem in centroaffine geometry, Preprint, July 2003.
- [6] K. Deimling, *Nonlinear Functional Analysis*, Springer, Berlin, 1985.
- [7] R. J. Gardner, *Geometric Tomography*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [8] P. Guan, C.-S. Lin, *On equation $\det(u_{ij} + \delta_{ij}u) = u^p$ on S^n* , preprint.
- [9] D. Hug and R. Schneider, Stability results involving surface area measures of convex bodies, *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo* (2) Suppl. No. **70**, part II (2002), 21–51.
- [10] M. Ludwig, Ellipsoids and matrix valued valuations, *Duke Math J.* **119** (2003), 159–188.
- [11] E. Lutwak, The Brunn-Minkowski-Firey theory I: mixed volumes and the Minkowski problem, *J. Differential Geom.* **38** (1993), 131–150.
- [12] E. Lutwak, The Brunn-Minkowski-Firey theory II: Affine and geominimal surface areas, *Adv. Math.* **118** (1996), 244–294.

- [13] E. Lutwak, V. Oliker, On the regularity of solutions to a generalization of the Minkowski problem, *J. Differential Geom.* **41** (1995), 227–246.
- [14] E. Lutwak, D. Yang, and G. Zhang, A new ellipsoid associated with convex bodies, *Duke Math. J.* **104** (2000), 375–390.
- [15] E. Lutwak, D. Yang, and G. Zhang, L_p affine isoperimetric inequalities, *J. Differential Geom.* **56** (2000), 111–132.
- [16] E. Lutwak, D. Yang, and G. Zhang, The Cramer-Rao inequality for star bodies, *Duke Math. J.* **112** (2002), 59–81.
- [17] E. Lutwak, D. Yang, and G. Zhang, Sharp affine L_p Sobolev inequalities, *J. Differential Geom.* **62** (2002), 17–38.
- [18] E. Lutwak, D. Yang, and G. Zhang, On the L_p -Minkowski problem, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* (to appear), pp. 15.
- [19] M. Meyer, E. Werner, On the p -affine surface area, *Adv. Math.* **152** (2000), 288–313.
- [20] J.R. Munkres, *Elements of Algebraic Topology*, Addison-Wesley, Menlo Park, California, 1984.
- [21] R. Schneider, *Convex Bodies: the Brunn-Minkowski Theory*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications 44, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [22] C. Schütt, E. Werner, Polytopes with vertices chosen randomly from the boundary of a convex body *Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **1807** (2003), 241–422.
- [23] C. Schütt, E. Werner, Surface bodies and p -affine surface area, *Adv. Math.* (in press).
- [24] A. Stancu, The discrete planar L_0 -Minkowski problem, *Adv. Math.* **167** (2002), 160–174.
- [25] A. Stancu, On the number of solutions to the discrete two-dimensional L_0 -Minkowski problem, *Adv. Math.*, in press.
- [26] V. Umanskiy, On solvability of the two dimensional L_p -Minkowski problem, *Adv. Math.* (in press).
- [27] E. Werner, The p -affine surface area and geometric interpretations, *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo (IV International Conference in "Stochastic Geometry, Convex Bodies, Empirical Measures & Applications to Engineering Science, Tropea, 2001)* **70** (2002), 367–382.

MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, UNIVERSITÄT FREIBURG, ECKERSTR. 1, D-79104 FREIBURG, GERMANY

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, SIX METROTECH CENTER, BROOKLYN, NY 11201

E-mail address: daniel.hug@math.uni-freiburg.de

E-mail address: elutwak@poly.edu

E-mail address: dyang@poly.edu

E-mail address: gzhang@poly.edu