

On the volume product of planar polar convex
bodies — lower estimates with stability

K. J. Böröczky*
Alfréd Rényi Mathematical Institute,
Hungarian Academy of Sciences,
H-1364 Budapest, Pf. 127, HUNGARY, and
Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Barcelona Tech., SPAIN
boroczky.karoly@renyi.mta.hu

<http://www.renyi.hu/~carlos>

E. Makai, Jr.**

Alfréd Rényi Mathematical Institute,
Hungarian Academy of Sciences,
H-1364 Budapest, Pf. 127, HUNGARY

makai.endre@renyi.mta.hu

<http://www.renyi.hu/~makai>

M. Meyer***

Équipe d'Analyse et de Mathématiques Appliquées,
Université de Marne-la-Vallée, Cité Descartes,
5, boulevard Descartes, Champs-sur-Marne,
77454 Marne-la-Vallée Cedex 2, FRANCE

mathieu.meyer@univ-mlv.fr

<http://umr-math.univ-mlv.fr>

S. Reisner****

Department of Mathematics, University of Haifa,
Haifa 31905, ISRAEL

reisner@math.haifa.ac.il

<http://math.haifa.ac.il/reisner>

April 5, 2013

Abstract

*Research (partially) supported by Hungarian National Foundation for Scientific Research, grant nos. K68398, K75016, FP7 IEF grant GEOSUMSETS. **Research (par-

Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be an o -symmetric convex body, and K^* its polar body. Then we have $|K| \cdot |K^*| \geq 8$, with equality if and only if K is a parallelogram. ($|\cdot|$ denotes volume). If $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a convex body, with $o \in \text{int } K$, then $|K| \cdot |K^*| \geq 27/4$, with equality if and only if K is a triangle and o is its centroid. If $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a convex body, then we have $|K| \cdot |[(K - K)/2]^*| \geq 6$, with equality if and only if K is a triangle. These theorems are due to Mahler and Reisner, Mahler and Meyer, and to Eggleston, respectively. We show an analogous theorem: if K has n -fold rotational symmetry about o , then $|K| \cdot |K^*| \geq n^2 \sin^2(\pi/n)$, with equality if and only if K is a regular n -gon of centre o . We will also give stability variants of these four inequalities, both for the body, and for the centre of polarity. For this we use the Banach-Mazur distance (from parallelograms, or triangles), or its analogue with similar copies rather than affine transforms (from regular n -gons), respectively. The stability variants are sharp, up to constant factors. We extend the inequality $|K| \cdot |K^*| \geq n^2 \sin^2(\pi/n)$ to bodies with $o \in \text{int } K$, which contain, and are contained in, two regular n -gons, the vertices of the contained n -gon being incident to the sides of the containing n -gon. Our key lemma is a stability estimate for the area product of two sectors of convex bodies polar to each other. To several of our statements we give several proofs; in particular, we give a new proof for the theorem of Mahler-Reisner.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary: 52A40. Secondary: 52A38, 52A10

Keywords and phrases: volume product in the plane, lower estimates, stability, Banach-Mazur distance, Santaló point, reverse Blaschke-Santaló inequality, Blaschke-Santaló inequality

RUNNING AUTHORS: K. J. Böröczky, E. Makai, Jr., M. Meyer, S. Reisner

RUNNING TITLE: Volume product of planar convex bodies

tially) supported by Hungarian National Foundation for Scientific Research, grant nos. K68398, K75016, K81146. ***The research has been partially supported by the France-Israel Research Network Program in Mathematics. ****The research has been partially supported by the France-Israel Research Network Program in Mathematics, and Discrete and Convex Geometry, Marie Curie Host Fellowships for Transfer of Knowledge, MTKD-CT-2004-014333. Part of the work was done when S. Reisner visited Rényi Institute in the summer of 2008. He is indebted to the Institute for the hospitality and the excellent research conditions.

1 Notations

We write o for the origin, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ for the scalar product, $\|\cdot\|$ for the Euclidean norm, $[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ for the convex hull of $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$, and $|\cdot|$ for the volume (area in \mathbb{R}^2). We write $\text{vert}(\cdot)$, $\text{int}(\cdot)$, $\partial(\cdot)$, for the vertex set of a convex polytope, or interior, or boundary of a set in \mathbb{R}^d .

A convex body in \mathbb{R}^d is a compact convex set with non-empty interior. If $o \in \text{int} K$, then its polar (w.r.t. the unit sphere with centre o) is

$$K^* = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \forall y \in K \ \langle x, y \rangle \leq 1\}.$$

If $A : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a non-singular linear map, then $(AK)^* = (A^{-1})^*K^*$, where $(A^{-1})^*$ is the transpose of the inverse of A . It is known (Santaló [69], or Meyer-Pajor [55]), that there exists a unique point $s(K) \in \text{int} K$, called *Santaló point of K* , such that

$$|(K - s(K))^*| = \min \{|(K - z)^*| : z \in \text{int} K\}.$$

Additionally, the origin is the centroid of $(K - s(K))^*$. The uniqueness and the affine invariance of the Santaló point yields that $s(K) = o$ if K is o -symmetric, or if $d = 2$ and K has n -fold symmetry about o for some $n \geq 3$.

For convex bodies $K, L \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the *Banach-Mazur distance* $\delta_{BM}(K, L)$ is $\min \{\lambda_2/\lambda_1 \mid \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in (0, \infty), \exists \text{ affinity } A, \exists x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \lambda_1 A(K) \subset L \subset \lambda_2 A(K) + x\}$. If we allow for A only similarities, then we obtain the definition of $\delta_{BM}^s(K, L)$. (Clearly, $\delta_{BM}(K, L) \leq \delta_{BM}^s(K, L)$. If both K, L are o -symmetric, or $d = 2$ and both have n -fold rotational symmetry about o , with $n \geq 3$ an integer, then in the definition of $\delta_{BM}(K, L)$, or $\delta_{BM}^s(K, L)$, we may assume $x = o$.) We will write T, P, R_n for a triangle, parallelogram, or regular n -gon, respectively.

We write $\kappa_d = \pi^{d/2}/\Gamma(d/2 + 1)$ for the volume of the unit ball in the d -dimensional Euclidean space.

2 Introduction

Generalities. Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a convex body, with $o \in \text{int} K$. Blaschke [8] was the first who considered the so called *volume product* $|K| \cdot |K^*|$ of the body K , and proved that for $d \leq 3$, and o the barycentre of K , its maximum is attained, e.g., if K is an ellipsoid. He was motivated by the investigation

of the affine geometry of convex bodies, e.g., of the so called *affine surface area* (a definition cf. in [43], or [11]), that is intimately related to the volume product (cf. [43], [11]). The volume product is invariant under non-singular linear transformations, cf. [43], p. 109. The investigation of the question of the lower estimate of the volume product was initiated by Mahler [44], [45]. He had in view applications in the geometry of numbers (i.e., investigation of the relation of convex, or more generally, of star-bodies, and lattices, i.e., non-singular linear images of \mathbb{Z}^d in \mathbb{R}^d). The volume product, in particular, for o -symmetric K , is a basic quantity, that later has arisen in several branches of mathematics, cf. later in this introduction.

Lower bound, o -symmetric case. For a while we suppose that K is o -symmetric. Mahler [45], for $d \geq 2$, conjectured for the volume product the lower bound $4^d/d! = d^{-d}(4e + o(1))^d$, and proved the lower bound $4^d/(d!)^2$. It is usually credited to Saint Raymond [68] that this conjectured lower bound is attained not only for parallelotopes and cross-polytopes. However, this had already been observed by Guggenheimer [30] some years earlier, where the way of obtaining all examples of [68] had already been described. These examples are the following. Beginning with $[-1, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}$, we define inductively convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^d , from examples in lower dimensions: if $d = d_1 + d_2$ is an arbitrary decomposition of d as a sum of positive integers d_1, d_2 , then for the already defined bodies in \mathbb{R}^{d_i} we take either their Minkowski sum, or the convex hull of their union. The Banach spaces with these unit balls are called *Hansen-Lima spaces*, and their unit balls are called *Hansen-Lima bodies*. They are called also *Hanner bodies*. Since they were introduced already by Hammer [31] in 1956, while Hansen-Lima [32] dates to 1981, it would be more correct to call them *Hanner-Hansen-Lima spaces, and bodies*. Also the well known book of Grünbaum on polytopes [29] calls these bodies *Hanner polytopes*. Moreover, [31] and [32] proved two characterizations of these convex bodies K : (1) (a Helly type property): K is o -symmetric, and if three translates of K pairwise intersect, then their intersection is not empty. (2): K is an o -symmetric convex polytope, and for any two disjoint faces (of any dimensions $\leq d - 1$), say, K_1, K_2 , of K , there are two distinct parallel supporting hyperplanes Π_1 and Π_2 of K , such that $K_1 \subset \Pi_1$, and $K_2 \subset \Pi_2$. [68] conjectured that the volume product attains its minimum exactly for the Hanner-Hansen-Lima bodies. (However, the claim of [30] that its author settled the 3-dimensional case is incorrect.)

Mahler [44] proved *the sharp lower bound* $|K| \cdot |K^*| \geq 8$ for $d = 2$ and K o -symmetric. Moreover, [44] showed that, for K a polygon, the lower bound

is attained, for the o -symmetric case, if and only if K is a parallelogram.

The above lower estimate of [45] for \mathbb{R}^d , for the o -symmetric case, was sharpened to $2^d \kappa_d / (d! d^d)^{1/2}$ by Dvoretzky-Rogers [16], and to $\kappa_d^2 / d^{d/2}$ by Bambah [4]. Then it has become clear that the volume product is very important in functional analysis, where it is just the product of the volumes of the unit balls of a finite dimensional Banach space and its dual. This has importance in the so called local theory of Banach spaces, i.e., the asymptotic study of finite dimensional Banach spaces, of high dimension, cf. Pisier's book [62]. A number of other geometric characteristics of these Banach spaces have a connection to the volume product. Therefore functional analysts became strongly interested in the subject, which resulted in ever better *lower estimates*, namely $d^{-d} (\log d)^{-d} \cdot \text{const}^d$ by Gordon-Reisner [27] and later by Kuperberg, G. [39], and to $d^{-d} \cdot \text{const}^d$ by Bourgain-Milman [14] (with an unspecified constant). Quite recently $(\pi/4)^{d-1} 4^d / d! = d^{-d} (e\pi + o(1))^d$ was proved by Kuperberg, G. [40]. Observe that the quotient of Kuperberg G.'s estimate and the conjectured minimum is $(\pi/4 + o(1))^d$. The paper Nazarov [59] proved the bit weaker estimate $(4^d / d!) (\pi/4)^{3d}$, using an unexpected connection of the volume product problem to the theory of functions of several complex variables.

A class of o -symmetric convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^d , for which the lower bound $4^d / d!$ is known, is the class of (non-singular) linear images of convex bodies symmetric with respect to all coordinate hyperplanes (also called *unconditional convex bodies*), cf. Saint Raymond [68]. The equality cases were proved by Meyer [52] and Reisner [65] — these are just the Hanner-Hansen-Lima bodies. The combinatorial aspect of the proof was later studied by Bollobás-Reader-Radcliffe [9]. Actually [68] proved this inequality for a larger class of o -symmetric convex bodies. These are the ones, for which the associated norm satisfies the following. There exists a base, such that for the coordinates x_1, \dots, x_d w.r.t. this base, the projections $(x_1, \dots, x_d) \rightarrow (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_d)$, where $1 \leq i \leq d$, are contractions. Moreover, [68] also extended his inequality, for unconditional convex bodies, in the following way. Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer, let an unconditional norm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathbb{R}^k be given (i.e., the unit ball is unconditional), and let $d_1, \dots, d_k \geq 1$ be integers. Let $K_i \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$ be o -symmetric convex bodies, which are the unit balls of norms $\|\cdot\|_i$. We consider $\prod_{i=1}^k \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$, with the norm $\|(\|x_i\|_i)\|$ (where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$), where we consider $\|\cdot\|_i$ as fixed, and $\|\cdot\|$ as variable. Then the volume product of the unit ball of this norm attains its minimum, e.g., for the cases, when $\|(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k)\|$ equals $\sum_i |\lambda_i|$, or $\max_i |\lambda_i|$.

Mahler's conjecture in the o -symmetric case, together with the conjecture about the equality cases, is also proved for convex polytopes with (at most) $2d + 2$ vertices or facets, for $d \leq 8$, cf. Lopez-Reisner [42].

Mahler's conjecture is also proved for zonoids K in \mathbb{R}^d (i.e., limits in the Hausdorff-metric of finite sums of segments), with centre at o , and with $\text{int } K \neq \emptyset$. This is due to Reisner [63], [64], and in these papers it is also proved that the lower bound for zonoids is attained if and only if K is a parallelotope, with centre at o . Later, a simpler proof was given by Gordon-Meyer-Reisner [26]. Observe that this settles the case of equality for o -symmetric convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^2 , since each such body is a zonoid. Both [63], [64] use the connection of the volume product problem with stochastic geometry (geometric probability), as is done also later in Böröczky, K. J.-Hug [12], in another context. A variety of other connections to geometric probability are contained in Thompson's book [73], in particular in Ch. VI. [63] also gave an analogue of the last mentioned Saint Raymond's theorem: if each K_i , there considered, is either a zonoid, or the polar of a zonoid, then $|K| \cdot |K^| \geq 4^d/d!$. Reisner [65] clarified the equality cases in the last mentioned Saint Raymond's theorem ([68]): this is the case if and only if $\|\cdot\|$ is a norm of a Hanner-Hansen-Lima space.*

Barthe-Fradelizi in the paper [6] proved that *if K is a convex body and P is a regular convex polytope in \mathbb{R}^d such that the origin is the centroid of P , and K has all the symmetries of P — thus the origin is also their common Santaló point — then $|K| \cdot |K^*| \geq |P| \cdot |P^*|$, with equality if and only if K is a dilate of P or of P^* . Its particular case for $d = 2$ is given in a bit stronger form in our Corollary 4; however, we have as well a stability variant of our Corollary 4, in our Theorem 5. [6] has some generalizations of the above cited inequality as well. Let $d = d_1 + \dots + d_k$ be a decomposition of d into positive integers. Let us have in \mathbb{R}^d a convex body K , whose symmetry group $\mathcal{O}(K)$ (i.e., the group of congruences mapping K onto K) contains the group $\mathcal{O}(P_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{O}(P_k)$, where each P_i is either a regular convex polytope or a ball in \mathbb{R}^{d_i} , of centre o . Then we have $V(K)V(K^*) \geq V(P_1 \times \dots \times P_k)V((P_1 \times \dots \times P_k)^*)$. Here the equality cases are not clarified. However, there are a lot of equality cases: for each i , we may take P_i or P_i^* , and may construct from these inductively new bodies, like in case of the Hanner-Hansen-Lima bodies. We remark that our §4 has a considerable overlap with [6].*

Upper bound, o -symmetric case. *In the o -symmetric case, the sharp upper bound is $\kappa_d^2 = d^{-d}(2e\pi + o(1))^d$, and it is attained if and only if K is an o -symmetric ellipsoid, which is due to Blaschke [8] ($d \leq 3$) and Santaló*

[69] (for general d), with the equality case proved by Saint Raymond [68]. Ball [2] and Meyer-Pajor [54] pointed out that a proof of the inequality can be given by Steiner symmetrization: namely that *Steiner symmetrization does not decrease* $|K| \cdot |K^*|$. A number of simplifications of these proofs has appeared.

Fradelizi-Meyer [21] also considers the upper estimate for the volume product for measures other than the Lebesgue measure.

Lower bound, general case. As an application to the original volume product problem, Meyer-Reisner [56] gives the following statement. *If all non-empty intersections of K with horizontal hyperplanes are positive homothets of a given $(d - 1)$ -dimensional convex body L , and these intersections have their Santaló points (taken in their affine hull) on a line, then $|K| \cdot |K - s(K)| / (|L| \cdot |L - s(L)|)$ attains its minimum $(d + 1)^{d+1} / d^{d+2}$ (that is independent of L), if and only if K is a cone, with base a translate of L . (Examples of such bodies are bodies rotationally symmetric about the x_d -axis.)*

Mahler [44] proved the sharp lower bound $|K| \cdot |K^*| \geq 27/4$, for $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ a convex body, with $o \in \text{int } K$. Moreover, [44] showed that, for K a polygon, the lower bound is attained, for the case $o \in \text{int } K$, if and only if K is a triangle with barycentre at o . Later Meyer [53] showed that for the case $d = 2$ and $o \in \text{int } K$, the lower bound is attained only for triangles, with barycentre at o . A simpler proof of this is contained in Meyer-Reisner [57], Theorem 15.

For the case $o \in \text{int } K$, Mahler [45] conjectured that $|K| \cdot |K^*| \geq (d + 1)^{d+1} / (d!)^2 \sim \text{const} \cdot d^{-d} e^{2d}$, where equality stands only for a simplex with barycentre at o . The lower bound $(d + 1)^{d+1} / (d^d (d!)^2)$ is due to Mahler [46], that was sharpened to $\kappa_d^2 / (d!)^2$ by Bambah [4], to $\text{const}^d \cdot d^{-d}$ by Bourgain-Milman [14] (with an unspecified constant), while $(\pi / (2e))^{d-1} (d + 1)^{d+1} / (d!)^2$ has been recently proved by Kuperberg, G. [40]. Observe that the quotient of this estimate and the conjectured minimum is $(\pi / (2e) + o(1))^d$. *Mahler's conjecture, for the asymmetric case, together with the conjecture about the equality cases, is proved for convex polytopes with at most $d + 3$ vertices or facets, cf. Meyer-Reisner [57], Theorem 10.*

Observe that, for bodies K having all symmetries of a regular simplex, the Barthe-Fradelizi result, from [6], above cited, implies Mahler's conjecture, in the asymmetric case, together with the cases of equality. [6] contains also the following. *Let us have in \mathbb{R}^d a convex body K , such that the group of*

affinities preserving K contains not necessarily orthogonal symmetries w.r.t. affine hyperplanes H_1, \dots, H_m , where $\cap_{i=1}^m H_i$ is a one-point set. Then we have $|K| \cdot |(K - s(K))^*| \geq (d+1)^{d+1}/(d!)^2$, with equality if and only if K is a simplex. In other words, for these bodies Mahler's conjecture, in the asymmetric case, about the lower bound of the volume product is true.

Cf. also, e.g., the recent papers Hug [33], Klartag-Milman [38], Campi-Gronchi [15], Meyer-Reisner [57], Fradelizi-Meyer [21], Fradelizi-Meyer [22], Fradelizi-Meyer [23], Böröczky, K. J. [11], Lin, Youjiang and Leng, Gangsong [41], Böröczky, K. J.-Hug [12], Fradelizi-Gordon-Meyer-Reisner [20], Fradelizi-Meyer [24], and the references therein.

Upper bound, general case. One has for $|K| \cdot |[K - s(K)]^*|$ the upper estimate κ_d^2 , with equality if and only if K is an ellipsoid, cf. Blaschke [8], Santaló [69] for the inequality, and Petty [61], Meyer-Pajor [55] for the cases of equality. Again, [55] used for the proof, among others, Steiner's symmetrization, but in a more involved manner, than in the o -symmetric case. Recently Artstein-Avidan-Klartag-Milman [1] and Meyer-Reisner [57] showed that Steiner symmetrization proves the Blaschke-Santaló inequality, namely that *Steiner symmetrization does not decrease* $|K| \cdot |(K - s(K))^*|$ (the case when K is o -symmetric, was cited above). [57] proved in this way also the case of equality. Actually the same upper estimate κ_d^2 holds for $|K| \cdot |[K - b(K)]^*|$, where $b(K)$ is the barycentre of K , and again with equality if and only if K is an ellipsoid, cf. [43], p. 165. Actually, if $s(K)$, or $b(K)$, is o , then $b(K^*)$, or $s(K^*)$, is o , respectively, cf. [43], p. 165, which explains the symmetric role of the Santaló point, and the barycentre.

A general reference to these problems, and their connections to other affine inequalities for convex bodies, is Lutwak [43]. A more recent survey on the volume product is Thompson [74].

Eggleston-Zhang type problems. For another generalization of the volume product, from the o -symmetric case to the general case, Eggleston [17] proved the following. *If $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a convex body, then $|K| \cdot |(K - K)/2|^* \geq 6$, with equality if and only if K is a triangle.*

A generalization of this to \mathbb{R}^d , however not for polar bodies, but for polars of projection bodies, was given by Zhang [75]: his inequality is $|K|^{d-1} \cdot |(\Pi K)^*| \geq \binom{2d}{d} d^{-d}$, with equality if and only if K is a simplex. (The projection body ΠK of a convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is the o -symmetric convex body — actually a zonoid — whose support function at a point $u \in S^{d-1}$ is given as the $(d-1)$ -volume of the orthogonal projection of K to the linear subspace orthogonal to u . Observe that for $d = 2$ the bodies ΠK and $K - K$

can be obtained from each other by a rotation through $\pi/2$ about the origin, hence their polars have equal areas.) Böröczky, K. J. [10], Theorem 3 proved an almost sharp stability version of this inequality: *for S a simplex, $|K|^{d-1} \cdot |(\Pi K)^*| \leq \binom{2d}{d} d^{-d} (1 + \varepsilon)$ implies $\delta_{BM}(K, S) \leq 1 + \text{const}_d \cdot \varepsilon^{1/d}$, while the actual error term cannot be less than $\text{const}_d \cdot \varepsilon^{1/(d-1)}$ ([10], Example 19), which quantity is conjectured to be the exact order of the error term.*

For the original question about the lower estimate of $|K| \cdot |[K - K]/2]^*$, for $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ a convex body, the sharp lower bound is conjectured to be $(d + 1)2^d/d! \sim 2^d e^d d^{-d} (1 + o(1))^d$, with equality for K a simplex, cf. [47]. (A calculation, that for K a simplex we have equality, is given in [51].) This quantity occurs in a number of problems of the theory of packings and coverings, and more generally in density estimates of systems of convex sets (for the non-symmetric case seemingly even more than the original volume product), cf. e.g., [47], [48], [50] Theorem 5.2, Remark 5.3. Since $|K| \cdot |[K - K]/2]^* = [|K|/|(K - K)/2|] \cdot |(K - K)/2| \cdot |[K - K]/2]^*$, Kuperberg G.'s result and the *difference body inequality* (i.e., $|K - K|/|K| \leq \binom{2d}{d}$), cf. Rogers-Shephard [67]) imply $|K| \cdot |[K - K]/2]^* \geq (\pi/4)^{d-1} 8^d / (d! \binom{2d}{d}) \sim d^{-d} (e\pi/2)^d (1 + o(1))^d$. Observe that the quotient of this value and the conjectured value is $(\pi/4 + o(1))^d$.

Florian's inequalities. A question of another character was treated by Florian in [18] and [19]. He investigated *convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^2 , contained in the unit circle about o* , and showed the *sharp estimate $|K| + |K^*| \geq 6$, attained for a square inscribed to the unit circle*. He gave as well a stability result in a more special case. See references to earlier results of this type as well in [18] and [19].

Local and global stability results. *A stability version of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality, for $d \geq 3$, is proved by Böröczky, K. J. [11] (stability meant for the Banach-Mazur distance). For $d = 2$ the same is done in Ball-Böröczky, K. J. [3], Böröczky, K. J.-Makai, Jr. [13].*

After essentially finishing our paper we were informed from the paper Nazarov-Petrov-Ryabogin-Zvavitch [60] about the following theorem. *For $d \geq 2$ an integer there exist $\varepsilon_d > 0$ and $c_d > 0$ with the following properties. If the Banach-Mazur distance of an o -symmetric convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ from the class of parallelotopes is $1 + \varepsilon \in (1, 1 + \varepsilon_d]$, then the volume product $|K| \cdot |K^*|$ is at least $[4^d/d!](1 + c_d\varepsilon)$. Here the order of the error term is optimal.* Together with the paper Böröczky, K. J.-Hug [12] (which calls the attention to the fact that, although [60] states its theorem in the form that

parallelotopes are strict local minima, the proof in [60] actually gives this stronger, namely, stability variant, cited above; cf. [60], §4), this gives the following. *For the case of o -symmetric zonoids K in \mathbb{R}^d , with $\text{int } K \neq \emptyset$, in particular, for o -symmetric convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^2 , we have global stability of the parallelotopes, i.e., the above inequality, without a restriction of the form $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_d$. For \mathbb{R}^2 , this is our Theorem 1, without the specification of the coefficient of ε in the lower estimate. Once more, *the order of the error term is optimal.**

Since optimality of the order of the above two error terms was not proved in [60] or [12], we show it. Of course, it suffices to deal with the case of o -symmetric zonoids only, for which we give the following example. For $d = 2$ we take $[-1, 1]^2$, and cut off small isosceles right triangles of legs ε at each vertex. For $d \geq 3$ we take the product of this example with $[-1, 1]^{d-2}$. Thus we obtain an o -symmetric zonoid, K , say. Then $|K| \cdot |K^*| = (4^d/d!)(1 + c_1\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2))$, for some $c_1 > 0$. Clearly $\delta_{BM}(K, [-1, 1]^d) \leq 1 + c_2\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2)$, for some $c_2 > 0$. Now we estimate $\delta_{BM}(K, [-1, 1]^d) = \delta_{BM}(K^*, \text{conv}\{\pm e_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq d\})$ from below, by $1 + c_3\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2)$, for some $c_3 > 0$ (the e_i 's are the standard unit vectors). Thus, we have to consider cross-polytopes C_i contained in K^* , and C_o containing K^* , with centres at o . Of course, it suffices to show

$$|C_i|/|K^*| \leq 1 - c_4\varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2), \quad \text{for some } c_4 > 0. \quad (1)$$

We may assume that $\text{vert } C_i \subset \text{vert } K^*$. Here $\text{vert } K^*$ consists of $\pm e_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq d$, and still four vertices, close to $(\pm e_1 \pm e_2)/2$. If for some $i \geq 3$ we have $\pm e_i \notin C_i$, then $|C_i| = 0$. If $\pm e_1, \pm e_2 \in C_i$, then (1) holds. Otherwise, e.g., $\pm(1/2, 1/2) \in \text{vert } C_i$, and either e.g. $\pm e_1 \in \text{vert } C_i$, or $\pm(1/2, -1/2) \in \text{vert } C_i$; in both cases $|C_i|/|K^*| = 1/2 + O(\varepsilon)$. So (1) is shown.

In a still more recent paper, namely Kim-Reisner [36], there is proved the asymmetric variant of the theorem of Nazarov-Petrov-Ryabogin-Zvavitch [60]. *For $d \geq 2$ an integer there exist $\varepsilon'_d > 0$ and $c'_d > 0$ with the following properties. If the Banach-Mazur distance of a convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, with $o \in \text{int } K$, from the class of simplices is $1 + \varepsilon \in (1, 1 + \varepsilon'_d]$, then the volume product $|K| \cdot |K^*|$ is at least $[(d+1)^{d+1}/(d!)^2](1 + c'_d\varepsilon)$. Again, also here the order of the error term is optimal. (An example is obtained from a regular simplex of edge length 1, and barycentre o , with small regular simplices of edge lengths ε cut off at each vertex. The argument showing optimality of the order of the error term is like above.)*

For general information about stability versions of geometric inequalities cf. Groemer [28].

Functional variants. Also variants of the volume product problem have been treated. E.g., *functional forms of the inverse Blaschke-Santaló inequality* (i.e., of the lower estimate of the volume product), cf. Meyer-Reisner [56] (which states in p. 219 that a special case of its Theorem is the Mahler-Meyer theorem), *functional forms of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality*, cf. Fradelizi-Meyer [21] (which states in pp. 386-387, 393-394 that its results imply the Blaschke-Santaló theorem — with the equality case for o -symmetry) and Artstein-Avidan-Klartag-Milman [1] (which states in p. 37 that its results imply the Blaschke-Santaló theorem, with the case of equality — however, this holds, strictly speaking, only in the o -symmetric case, cf. this introduction, the second paragraph following this paragraph).

Functional variants are of different natures. E.g., the case of “*fractional dimension*”, cf. Fradelizi-Meyer, [24]. Also, convex bodies can be generalized to *log-concave functions*, i.e., functions $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, whose logarithm is concave. To a convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, with $o \in \text{int } K$, one has to associate the log-concave function $\exp(-\|x\|_K^2/2)$, where $\|\cdot\|_K$ is the asymmetric norm with unit ball K . Then $V(K) = \text{const}_d \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) dx$, so here the integral on the right hand side is the proper substitute of $V(K)$. Moreover, the polarity between K and K^* goes over to the following. If we take the negative logarithms of two log-concave functions f and f^* , then they are the Legendre transforms of each other. The *Legendre transform* of a function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$ is $\mathcal{L}\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty]$, where

$$(\mathcal{L}\varphi)(y) := \sup\{\langle x, y \rangle - \varphi(x) \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}.$$

Thus, the subject of investigation is

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) dx \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f^*(x) dx,$$

where one supposes

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) dx \in (0, \infty).$$

Cf. the nice expositions in Artstein-Avidan-Klartag-Milman [1] and Klartag-Milman [38]. A straightforward calculation shows that this product of integrals is invariant under non-singular linear substitutions of the variable x

(analogously as for the volume product of convex bodies), and under taking positive multiples of the function f .

Unfortunately, translations of convex bodies have no (good) generalizations to log-concave functions. Thus, in place of a translation $K \mapsto K - x$, where $x \in \text{int } K$, one considers an arbitrary translate of the function f (i.e., $x \mapsto f(x - x_0)$). Then *one proves the sharp upper bound $(2\pi)^d$ for a suitable translate of the original function f , cf. Artstein-Avidan, Klartag, Milman [1], Klartag-Milman [38]. Here, for even functions f , one may choose $x_0 = o$ (as for o -symmetric bodies one may consider $(K - o)^*$, see §1), and, more generally, in the general case one can choose for x_0 the barycentre $\int xf(x)dx / \int f(x)dx$ of f (as for general convex bodies K one may consider $[K - b(K)]^*$, see above in this introduction) cf. [1]. Of course, this does not concern the question of the lower bound (as it is a minimum problem), but, in case of the upper bound, only the o -symmetric case of the volume product problem generalizes this way to even log-concave functions. (Observe that to translates of convex bodies there do not correspond translates of the respective functions. Already for $d = 1$, with unit ball $[-1, 1]$, to translates of $[-1, 1]$, by some $c \in (-1, 1)$, there correspond the functions $\exp[-x^2 / (2(1 + \text{sg } x \cdot c)^2)]$, whose graphs have no vertical axis of symmetry, while translates of the corresponding function have them. This shows that this functional variant of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality generalizes the case of convex bodies only in the o -symmetric case.)*

For the upper bound, in the even case, the functional variant (i.e., $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f dx \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^ dx \leq (2\pi)^d$, cf., Ball [2], [1], Fradelizi-Meyer [21]) immediately implies the o -symmetric case of the volume product problem: namely, the extremal even functions (up to constant factors) are ones derived from o -symmetric convex bodies, more exactly, from o -symmetric ellipsoids.*

For the lower bound, the functional variant, i.e., $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f dx \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^ dx \geq (\pi/(2e) + o(1))^d$ for the case of even functions, and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f dx \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^* dx \geq (\pi/(4e) + o(1))^d$ for the case of general functions, are proved in Fradelizi-Meyer [22], Theorem 7. (We remark that [22] Theorem 7 gave only the lower bound const^d , using Bourgain-Milman's theorem, [14]. However, if we rather use the currently best lower bounds for the o -symmetric, and the general cases, due to Kuperberg, G., [40], both cited above, then, by the proof of [22] Theorem 7, we obtain the above given lower estimates.)*

The conjectured minima, for the even, or the general case, are 4^d , or e^d , respectively, cf. Fradelizi-Meyer [23]. The minimizing functions are

conjectured to be, in a suitable system of coordinates, with the origin at o , the following ones, cf. [23], Conjectures (1'), (2') (in the general case this is stated there not so explicitly). For the even case, $f(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \text{const} \cdot e^{-\|(x_1, \dots, x_k)\|_{K_1}} \chi_{K_2}(x_{k+1}, \dots, x_d)$, where $0 \leq k \leq d$, and $K_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ and $K_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-k}$ are Hanner-Hansen-Lima bodies, and χ denotes characteristic function. (The constant factor was missing in [23].) For the general case, $f(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \text{const} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^d e^{-x_i} \chi_{[-1, \infty)}(x_i)$. (We remark that [23] considered actually the class of all translates of a function, and considered the infimum of the product $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f dx \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^* dx$ on this class. However, a straightforward calculation gives that the minimum of this product on the class of all translates of the function $\text{const} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^d e^{-x_i} \chi_{[-1, \infty)}(x_i)$ is attained, when we translate this function with the 0 vector.) Still we note that the quotients of the above lower estimates and the conjectured minima are $(\pi/(8e) + o(1))^d$, in the even case, and $(\pi/(4e^2) + o(1))^d$, in the general case.

In the case of unconditional functions (i.e., $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = f(|x_1|, \dots, |x_n|)$), the sharp lower bound, namely 4^d , is known, cf. Fradelizi-Meyer [22], [23], with the case of equality characterized in Fradelizi-Gordon-Meyer-Reisner [20]: these are just the above given conjectured extremal functions for the o -symmetric case. Observe that this includes the case $d = 1$, even functions.

For general functions, Fradelizi-Meyer [23] proved the conjectured lower bound e^d for functions f being translates of functions g , that vanish outside $[0, \infty)^d$, and are monotonically non-increasing in each variable on $[0, \infty)^d$. They characterized the case of equality: these are just those of the above given conjectured extremal functions for the general case, that verify the hypotheses of their theorem. Also for $d = 1$, for general f , one has the sharp lower bound e , cf. Fradelizi-Meyer [23], who also determined the cases of equality: these are just the above given conjectured extremal functions for the general case.

Still we note that the conjectures in \mathbb{R}^d about the lower bound for the functional variant, for the even, or the general case (i.e., 4^d , or e^d), would imply the conjectures about the lower bound for the volume product, in the o -symmetric case, or in the case $o \in \text{int } K$, in \mathbb{R}^d , or \mathbb{R}^{d-1} (that is, $4^d/d!$, or $d^d/[(d-1)!]^2$), respectively, cf. [23]. However, *the conjecture about the lower bound for the functional variant, for the even, or the general case, for all d , is equivalent to the conjecture of Mahler-Guggenheimer-Saint Raymond, or of Mahler, for all d , respectively, cf. [23].*

Miscellaneous (added 5. April 2013) [71] and [66] proved that the volume product $|(K - s(K))^*| \cdot |K|$, or $|K^*| \cdot |K|$ can be (locally) minimal

only if the generalized Gauss curvature of K is a.e. 0, for the general, or o -symmetric case, respectively. [35] proved the following: if K is o -symmetric, and $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -close to some Hanner-Hansen-Lima body, in Banach-Mazur distance (for suitable $\varepsilon > 0$), then Mahler's conjecture holds for K , and there is also a stability variant of this statement. [37] proved a stability variant of the statement that among unconditional bodies Mahler's conjecture is true. They also proved the following: among o -symmetric convex bodies, $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -close to unconditional convex bodies, in Banach-Mazur distance (for suitable $\varepsilon > 0$), the minimum of the volume product is attained exactly for the Hanner-Hansen-Lima bodies, and they proved also a certain stability variant of this statement. [5] proved a stability variant of functional forms of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality. [25] also proved a version of the Bourgain-Milman theorem. A small survey is given in [49].

3 Main statements

For stability versions of the Mahler-Reisner, Mahler-Meyer, and Eggleston theorems, we prove the following theorems.

As mentioned in the introduction, the following theorem was obtained also, independently, by Böröczky, K. J.-Hug [12], even for zonoids in \mathbb{R}^d (the constants in [12] are unspecified, and stability of the centre of polarity is not investigated in [12]).

Theorem 1 *Let K be a centrally symmetric convex body in \mathbb{R}^2 with $o \in \text{int } K$ and P a parallelogram, and*

$$|K| \cdot |K^*| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot 8, \quad \text{with } \varepsilon > 0.$$

Then $\delta_{BM}(K, P) \leq 1 + 200\varepsilon$. Moreover, let $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\lambda_i > 0$, and let P be a parallelogram such that $\lambda_1 P + x \subset K \subset \lambda_2 P + x$, and $\lambda_2/\lambda_1 \leq 1 + 200\varepsilon < 2$. Then, in the Euclidean norm, for which $[(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2]P$ is a square of diameter 1, we have that the distance of the centre of $[(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2]P + x$ from o is at most $336 \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon}$.

Theorem 2 *Let K be a convex body in \mathbb{R}^2 with $o \in \text{int } K$ and T a triangle, and*

$$|K| \cdot |K^*| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot 27/4, \quad \text{with } \varepsilon > 0.$$

Then $\delta_{BM}(K, T) \leq 1 + 900\varepsilon$. Moreover, let $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\lambda_i > 0$, and let T be a triangle such that $\lambda_1 T + x \subset K \subset \lambda_2 T + x$, and $\lambda_2/\lambda_1 \leq 1 + 900\varepsilon < 4$. Then, in the Euclidean norm, for which $[(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2]T$ is a regular triangle of side 1, we have that the distance of the centre of $[(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2]T + x$ from o is at most $917 \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon}$.

We note that, for R_n a regular n -gon with centre o ,

$$|R_n| \cdot |R_n^*| = (n/2) \sin(2\pi/n) \cdot n \tan(\pi/n) = n^2 \sin^2(\pi/n).$$

We prove the following generalization of the Mahler-Reisner and Mahler-Meyer theorems.

Theorem 3 *Let K_i and K_o be regular n -gons, $n \geq 3$, and let each vertex of K_i lie on a side of K_o , and hence K_i and K_o have a common centroid z . If $K_i \subset K \subset K_o$ for a planar convex body K with $o \in \text{int } K$, then*

$$|K| \cdot |K^*| \geq n^2 \sin^2(\pi/n),$$

with equality if and only if $o = z$, and either $K = K_i$, or $K = K_o$.

Let us show how Theorem 3 yields the Mahler-Reisner and Mahler-Meyer theorems. For the o -symmetric case, one considers an (o -symmetric) parallelogram P of maximal area contained in K . Applying a linear map, we may assume that P is a square. Now the Mahler-Reisner theorem follows as $K \subset Q$ for the square Q satisfying that the midpoints of its sides are the vertices of P .

For the Mahler-Meyer theorem, let T be a triangle of maximal area contained in K . Applying a linear map, we may assume that T is regular, and let S be the regular triangle satisfying that the midpoints of the sides of S are the vertices of T . Since $K \subset S$, Theorem 3 yields the Mahler-Meyer theorem.

Another consequence of Theorem 3 is the following.

Corollary 4 *If a convex body K in \mathbb{R}^2 has n -fold rotational symmetry about o , where $n \geq 3$, then*

$$|K| \cdot |K^*| \geq n^2 \sin^2(\pi/n),$$

with equality if and only if K is a regular n -gon.

To prove Corollary 4 based on Theorem 3, one just chooses a point $x \in \partial K$ that is the farthest from o , and K_i is the inscribed regular n -gon, of centre o , such that x is one of its vertices, and K_o is the regular n -gon such that the midpoints of the sides of K_o are the vertices of K_i .

Theorem 5 *Let $n \geq 3$ be an integer, let K be an n -fold rotationally symmetric convex body in \mathbb{R}^2 with $o \in \text{int } K$ and R_n a regular n -gon, and let*

$$|K| \cdot |K^*| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot n^2 \sin^2(\pi/n), \quad \text{with } \varepsilon > 0.$$

Then $\delta_{BM}^s(K, R_n) \leq 1 + 18\varepsilon$. Moreover, let $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\lambda_i > 0$, and let R_n be a regular n -gon such that $\lambda_1 R_n + x \subset K \subset \lambda_2 R_n + x$, and $\lambda_2/\lambda_1 \leq 1 + 18\varepsilon < 1/\cos(\pi/n) \leq 2$. Then, in the Euclidean norm, for which $[(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2]R_n$ is a regular n -gon of diameter 1, we have that the distance of the centre of $[(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2]R_n + x$ from o is at most $263 \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon}$.

The following theorem proves the conjecture mentioned in §2, concerning the exact error term in the stability variant of the Zhang projection body inequality, for the planar case.

Theorem 6 *Let K be a convex body in \mathbb{R}^2 with*

$$|K| \cdot |((K - K)/2)^*| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot 6, \quad \text{with } \varepsilon > 0.$$

Then $\delta_{BM}(K, T) \leq 1 + 87\varepsilon$.

Remark. In Theorems 1, 2 we restricted ourselves to the case $\lambda_2/\lambda_1 < 2$, or, $\lambda_2/\lambda_1 < 4$, respectively. This we did since $\lambda_2/\lambda_1 = 2$, or $\lambda_2/\lambda_1 = 4$ is no restriction at all for the body K . Namely, if $K_i \subset K$ is an o -symmetric inscribed parallelogram of maximal area (for K o -symmetric), or an inscribed triangle of maximal area (for $o \in \text{int } K$), then $K \subset K_o$, where K_o is a parallelogram, or triangle, with side midpoints at the vertices of K_i . If K' is a parallelogram, or triangle, with side midpoints at the vertices of K_o , then K_i and K' are homothetic, with homothety ratio 2, or 4, respectively, and $K_i \subset K \subset K_o \subset K'$. (For Theorem 5 the analogous inequality would be $\lambda_2/\lambda_1 \leq 1/\cos^2(\pi/n) < 4$, but this does not suffice to prove (17), in the proof of Theorem 5, with positive right hand side.)

Example. 1. We show that the stability statements in Theorems 1, 2, 5, 6, concerning the bodies, are of the exact order of magnitude. For this,

let the regular n -gon R_n be inscribed in the unit circle U about o , and let us define K_n as the convex polygon with vertices the vertices of R_n , and $1 + \varepsilon$ times the side-midpoints of R_n , where $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/\cos(\pi/n)]$ (thus $K_n \subset U$). Then $|K_n| \cdot |(K_n)^*| = n^2 \sin^2(\pi/n) + n^2 \sin^2(\pi/n) \cdot (\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2 \cot^2(\pi/n)) / (1 + \varepsilon)$. Letting $n = 3$, we have $|K_3| \cdot |(K_3 - K_3)/2)^*| = 6 \cdot (9 + 15\varepsilon + 3\varepsilon^2 - 3\varepsilon^3) / (3 + \varepsilon)^2$. Clearly, $\delta_{BM}^s(R_n, K_n) \leq 1 + \varepsilon$. On the other hand, for suitable A and x , we have $\lambda_1 AR_n \subset K_n \subset \lambda_2 AR_n + x$ and $\delta_{BM}(R_n, K_n)^2 = (\lambda_2/\lambda_1)^2 \geq |K_n|/|\lambda_1 AR_n| \geq (1 + \varepsilon)|R_n|/|R_n|$ (at the last step we have used that $\lambda_1 AR_n \subset U$ is a convex n -gon, hence $|\lambda_1 AR_n| \leq |R_n|$, similarly as in the end of the introduction, at the proof of the optimality of the order of the error term). Hence, $\delta_{BM}(R_n, K_n) \geq \sqrt{1 + \varepsilon}$. (For Theorems 1, 2 we use the cases $n = 4, 3$.)

2. For the stability of the centre of polarity (for Theorems 1, 2, 5), we proceed analogously to [36], Proposition 2. An example is a regular n -gon K of centre o , and diameter 1 (with $\lambda_i = 1$). We use the well-known formula (11) from the proof of Lemma 11, which comes in the sequel, for $d = 2$. The inradius of K is at least $1/(2\sqrt{3})$. We let $\|x\| \leq 1/(4\sqrt{3})$, and estimate $(\partial/\partial x_2)^2|(K - x)^*|$ from above by replacing, in the inequality in (11), $h_K(u)$ by $1/(2\sqrt{3})$, and then $(1 - \langle u, x \rangle)^{-4}$ by $(1/(4\sqrt{3}))^{-4}$. Then, using still $\int_{S^1} u_2^2 du = \pi$, we get

$$(\partial/\partial x_2)|(K - x)^*| = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (\partial/\partial x_2)^2|(K - x)^*| \leq 2^8 \cdot 3^3 \cdot \pi.$$

By $\text{diam } K = 1$ we have $|K| \leq \pi/4$. Thus we get $(\partial/\partial x_2)^2(|K| \cdot |(K - x)^*|) \leq 2^6 \cdot 3^3 \cdot \pi^2$, and the analogues of these formulas hold for the first and second directional derivatives in any direction. Thus, for $|K| \cdot |(K - x)^*| \geq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot n^2 \sin^2(\pi/n)$, we have

$$\varepsilon \cdot 27/4 \leq \varepsilon \cdot n^2 \sin^2(\pi/n) \leq |K| \cdot |(K - x)^*| - |K| \cdot |K^*| \leq 2^5 \cdot 3^3 \cdot \pi^2 \|x\|^2,$$

hence, for any x — i.e., without the restriction $\|x\| \leq 1/(4\sqrt{3})$ — we have

$$\|x\| \geq \sqrt{\varepsilon} \cdot \sqrt{2}/(16\pi) \quad \text{or} \quad \|x\| \geq 1/(4\sqrt{3}).$$

Then the first one of these inequalities holds, if $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$, where $\sqrt{\varepsilon_0} \cdot \sqrt{2}/(16\pi) = 1/(4\sqrt{3})$, i.e., for $\varepsilon_0 = 8\pi^2/3$. ■

In a forthcoming paper, by the first two named authors of this paper, we will show that, for convex n -gons K , the product $|K| \cdot |[K - s(K)]^*|$ is maximal

exactly for the affine regular n -gons. We remark that the o -symmetric case of this statement is obtained, independently, also by Tabachnikov, in a more general form, namely for star-polygons, [72], Theorem 2. Moreover, the general case is obtained independently, also by the last two named authors of this paper; see [58]. Further, in the above mentioned forthcoming paper, we will give stability estimates for the Blaschke-Santaló inequality in the plane, for the o -symmetric case. Here the deviation from the ellipses will be measured by the quotient of the areas of the convex body, and the maximal area inscribed/minimal area circumscribed ellipse of the convex body, and the order of the error term will be optimal. If any of these ellipses is the unit circle about o , then even the arithmetic mean of the areas of the body and the polar body is at most π .

4 Proof of Theorem 3

First we prove a lower bound for the volume product in sectors. The idea of giving lower bounds in sectors separately, and then using the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality, is due to Saint Raymond [68], proof of Théorème 28. There it is also noted that this approach settles the two-dimensional o -symmetric case. Our proofs of our Theorems 1, 2, 3, 5 all use this idea.

The particular case $u = u^* = (0, 1)$, and $v = v^* = (1, 0)$ of our following lemma reduces to the two-dimensional case of [68], Théorème 28.

Lemma 7 *Let K be a planar convex body with $o \in \text{int } K$. Let, for some linearly independent $u, v \in \partial K$, and linearly independent $u^*, v^* \in \partial K^*$, the supporting lines to K with exterior normals u^* and v^* intersect K , e.g., at u and v , respectively, and intersect each other at $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$, where $[p, o] \cap [u, v] \neq \emptyset$. Furthermore, let the supporting lines to K^* with exterior normals u and v intersect K^* , e.g., at u^* and v^* , respectively, and intersect each other at $p^* \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $[p^*, o] \cap [u^*, v^*] \neq \emptyset$. Then, for $C = K \cap [o, u, v, p]$ and $C^* = K^* \cap [o, u^*, v^*, p^*]$, we have*

$$|C| \cdot |C^*| \geq |[o, u, v, p]| \cdot |[o, u^*, v^*]| = |[o, u, v]| \cdot |[o, u^*, v^*, p^*]|,$$

with equality if and only if either $C = [o, u, v]$ or $C = [o, u, v, p]$.

Remark. We may assume $C \neq [o, u, v]$. Then, for $p = \lambda u + \mu v$ and $\lambda, \mu > 0$, we have $\lambda + \mu > 1$ and $p^* = \mu u^* + \lambda v^*$. We choose a coordinate

system, assuming

$$u = (1, 0), \text{ and } v = (0, 1).$$

Then

$$p = (\lambda, \mu), \quad p^* = (1, 1), \quad u^* = (1, (1 - \lambda)/\mu), \quad v^* = ((1 - \mu)/\lambda, 1),$$

and

$$\begin{cases} |[o, u, v, p]| \cdot |[o, u^*, v^*]| = |[o, u, v]| \cdot |[o, u^*, v^*, p^*]| = \\ (\lambda + \mu)(\lambda + \mu - 1)/(4\lambda\mu) = (2 - \langle u, v^* \rangle - \langle u^*, v \rangle)/4. \end{cases}$$

First we show that Mahler's original proofs ([44]) yield our lemma, except the case of equality.

First proof. We exclude $C = [o, u, v], [o, u, v, p]$. Let $k \geq 0$ be an integer, and let us suppose that both C and C^* are polygons, such that the total number of their vertices in $\text{int}[u, v, p]$, or $\text{int}[u^*, v^*, p^*]$, respectively, is at most k . (This case suffices to prove the inequality.) Let C, C^* realize the minimum under these hypotheses. If e.g. C has a vertex $c \in \text{int}[u, v, p]$, then we can move c a bit, parallel to the diagonal connecting its neighbours, hence keeping $|C|$ fixed. Then, for C^* , the polar side line will rotate about some of its points. Since the lines of the neighbours of this side intersect outside this side line, by some small rotation $|C^*|$ strictly decreases, a contradiction. Hence we have a situation as for $k = 0$.

If $k = 0$, then C has a vertex c , e.g. in $\text{relint}[u, p]$, and then $C = [o, u, v, c]$, since else C^* would have a vertex in $\text{int}[u^*, v^*, p^*]$. Then $c = (\alpha\lambda + 1 - \alpha, \alpha\mu)$, where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, and $|C| \cdot |C^*| = (1/4)(1 + (\lambda + \mu - 1)\alpha) \cdot [1 - (1 - \lambda/\mu) - ((1 - \mu)/\lambda - 1)(1 - \alpha\lambda)/(1 - \alpha + \alpha\mu)]$. The fact that this is at least $(\lambda + \mu)(\lambda + \mu - 1)/(4\lambda\mu)$ can be written, after multiplying with the product of the denominators (each of them being positive), and rearranging (using the program package GAP [70]), as $\lambda(\lambda + \mu - 1)^2 \cdot \alpha(1 - \alpha) \geq 0$. ■

The second proof follows the lines of Meyer [52], proof of Théorème I. 2 (more exactly, its two-dimensional case, that gives our lemma for $u = u^* = (0, 1)$, and $v = v^* = (1, 0)$).

Second proof. We have

$$1 = \langle u^*, u \rangle = \langle u^*, p \rangle = \langle v^*, p \rangle = \langle v^*, v \rangle = \langle u, p^* \rangle = \langle v, p^* \rangle.$$

For $x \in K \cap [p, u, v]$, the sum of the heights of the triangles $[o, u, v]$ and $[x, u, v]$, belonging to their common side $[u, v]$, is $\langle p^*, x \rangle / \|p^*\|$. Thus the vectors $w := [\|u^* - v^*\| / (2\|p\|)]p$ and $w^* := [\|u - v\| / (2\|p^*\|)]p^*$ satisfy

$$|C| \geq |[o, u, v, x]| = \langle w^*, x \rangle \text{ for } x \in K \cap [u, v, p], \text{ and} \quad (2)$$

$$|C^*| \geq |[o, u^*, v^*, x^*]| = \langle w, x^* \rangle \text{ for } x^* \in K^* \cap [u^*, v^*, p^*]. \quad (3)$$

Since $\langle w^*, p \rangle = |[o, u, v, p]| \geq |C|$, and $\langle w^*, x \rangle < \langle w^*, u \rangle$ for $x \in K \setminus [p, u, v]$, we have $\tilde{w}^* := |C|^{-1}w^* \in K^* \cap [u^*, v^*, p^*]$, and analogously $\tilde{w} := |C^*|^{-1}w \in K \cap [u, v, p]$. It follows by applying (2) to $x = \tilde{w}$, that

$$\begin{cases} |C| \cdot |C^*| \geq \langle w^*, |C^*|\tilde{w} \rangle = \langle w^*, w \rangle = \\ \langle w^*, p \rangle \cdot \|u^* - v^*\| / (2\|p\|) = |[o, u, v, p]| \cdot |[o, u^*, v^*]|. \end{cases}$$

We also have $\langle w^*, w \rangle = |[o, u, v]| \cdot |[o, u^*, v^*, p^*]|$ by the remark following the statement of this Lemma, hence we have equality in the Lemma if $C = [o, u, v]$ or $C^* = [o, u, v, p]$.

Assume that equality holds in Lemma 7. It follows by (2) and (3) that

$$C = [o, u, v, \tilde{w}] \text{ and } C^* = [o, u^*, v^*, \tilde{w}^*].$$

In particular C^* has vertices a^* and b^* satisfying

$$\langle a^*, u \rangle = \langle a^*, \tilde{w} \rangle = 1 \text{ and } \langle b^*, v \rangle = \langle b^*, \tilde{w} \rangle = 1.$$

Checking the vertices of C^* , we have only two choices. Either $a^* = u^*$ and $b^* = v^*$, and hence $C = [o, u, v, p]$, or $a^* = b^* = \tilde{w}^*$, and hence $C = [o, u, v]$. \blacksquare

The third proof will use an idea of Behrend, [7], proof of (77), pp. 739-740, and of (112), pp. 746-747. Its idea, intuitively, is the following. ‘‘If C is close to $[o, u, v]$, then C^* is close to $[o, u^*, v^*, p^*]$, hence $|C^*|$ will be a lot greater than $|[o, u^*, v^*]|$. On the other hand, if C is close to $[o, u, v, p]$, then $|C|$ will be a lot greater than $|[o, u, v]|$.’’

Third proof. Using the notations of the second proof, we have

$$|C| \geq |[o, u, v, x]|,$$

where now x is a point of $C \cap [u, v, p]$, that is farthest from $(p^*)^{-1}(1)$, which line passes through u, v . Then there is a supporting line $(x^*)^{-1}(1)$ at x to K , parallel to $(p^*)^{-1}(1)$. Then

$$|C^*| \geq |[o, u^*, v^*, x^*]|,$$

so,

$$|C| \cdot |C^*| \geq |[o, u, v, x]| \cdot |[o, u^*, v^*, x^*]|.$$

Observe that, if x varies in $[u, v, p]$, then $|[o, u, v, x]|$ is proportional to $\text{dist}(o, (x^*)^{-1}(1)) = 1/\|x^*\|$. Simultaneously, x^* varies in $[o, p^*] \cap [u^*, v^*, p^*]$, hence $|[o, u^*, v^*, x^*]|$ is proportional to $\|x^*\|$. Hence, $|[o, u, v, x]| \cdot |[o, u^*, v^*, x^*]|$ does not depend on x , so has the same value, as for $x \in [u, v]$, and for $x = p$.

For the case of equality we have $C = [o, u, v, x]$ and $C^* = [o, u^*, v^*, x^*]$. We exclude $x \in [u, v]$ and $x = p$. Then x^* varies in $\text{relint}(C^* \cap [o, p^*])$, and we get a contradiction as in the second proof. ■

Proof of Theorem 3. We may assume that o is the Santaló point of K . First we show that $o \in \text{int } K_i$.

We note that as the origin is the centroid of K^* , there exists no line l , with $o \in l$, and bounding the half planes l^- and l^+ , such that the reflected image of $K \cap l^-$ through the line l is strictly contained in $K \cap l^+$. If $n \geq 4$ then the angles of a regular n -gon are at least $\pi/2$, thus $o \in \text{int } K_i$ by the property of the Santaló point above.

If $n = 3$ then we may assume that K is not a parallelogram. In this case for each triangle S cut off by a side s of K_i from K_o , there is a linear transformation A such that the reflected image of $A(S)$ through the line $A(s)$ is strictly contained in $A(K_i)$ (here we use that K is not a parallelogram). Therefore the property of the Santaló point above, applied to $A(K)$, yields $o \in \text{int } K_i$.

When indexing the vertices of an n -gon, we identify vertices with indices j and $j \pm n$. Let x_1, \dots, x_n , and y_1, \dots, y_n denote the vertices of K_i and K_o in counterclockwise order, and x_1^*, \dots, x_n^* , and y_1^*, \dots, y_n^* denote the vertices of K_i^* and K_o^* , respectively, so that, for $j = 1, \dots, n$, we have $x_j \in [y_j, y_{j+1}]$, and

$$1 = \langle x_j^*, x_{j-1} \rangle = \langle x_j^*, x_j \rangle = \langle y_j^*, y_{j+1} \rangle = \langle y_j^*, y_j \rangle.$$

In particular, $y_j^* \in [x_j^*, x_{j+1}^*]$. For $j = 1, \dots, n$, let $C_j = K \cap [o, x_{j-1}, x_j, y_j]$ and $C_j^* = K^* \cap [o, y_{j-1}^*, y_j^*, x_j^*]$. Therefore Lemma 7 yields that

$$|C_j| \cdot |C_j^*| \geq |[o, x_{j-1}, x_j, y_j]| \cdot |[o, y_{j-1}^*, y_j^*]|, \quad (4)$$

with equality if and only if $C_j = [o, x_{j-1}, x_j, y_j]$ or $C_j = [o, x_{j-1}, x_j]$.

By the n -fold rotational symmetry of K_i and K_o about their common centre, there exist common distances $a = \|x_{j-1} - y_j\|$ and $b = \|x_j - y_j\|$ for

$j = 1, \dots, n$, and hence $a + b$ is the side length of K_o . Since the distance of o from the line $y_j y_{j+1}$ is $d_j := \|y_j^*\|^{-1}$, for $j = 1, \dots, n$, it follows that

$$|C_j| \cdot |C_j^*| = \frac{(ad_{j-1} + bd_j) \sin(2\pi/n)}{4d_{j-1}d_j}.$$

Additionally, we have

$$\frac{n(a+b)^2}{4 \tan(\pi/n)} = |K_o| = \frac{(a+b)(d_1 + \dots + d_n)}{2}.$$

We deduce by repeated applications of the inequality between the (weighted) arithmetic and geometric means, that

$$|K| \cdot |K^*| = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |C_j| \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |C_j^*| \right) \geq n^2 \left(\prod_{j=1}^n (|C_j| \cdot |C_j^*|) \right)^{1/n} \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{n^2 \sin(2\pi/n)}{4} \left(\prod_{j=1}^n \frac{ad_{j-1} + bd_j}{d_{j-1}d_j} \right)^{1/n} \\ &\geq \frac{n^2(a+b) \sin(2\pi/n)}{4} \left(\prod_{j=1}^n d_j \right)^{-1/n} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$$\geq \frac{n^3(a+b) \sin(2\pi/n)}{4 \sum_{j=1}^n d_j} = \frac{n^2 \sin(2\pi/n) \tan(\pi/n)}{2}. \quad (7)$$

Assume that equality holds in Theorem 3. It follows by (6) and (7) that all d_j are equal, thus o is the common centre of K_i and K_o . Further, all C_j have the same area by (5). Therefore the equality conditions in (4) imply that either $K = K_i$ or $K = K_o$. ■

Remark. In the particular case of Lemma 7, when C is an n -th part of a convex body K with n -fold rotational symmetry about o , we could have referred in the first proof to [57], to the so called “shadow movement” (although this is more involved than the elementary proof of Mahler used above). That is, we have an ln -gon $K = x_1 \dots x_{ln}$ (where $l \geq 2$), having n -fold rotational symmetry about o . The movement of the vertices $x_2, x_{2+l}, \dots, x_{2+(n-1)l}$, parallel to the diagonals $x_1 x_3$, etc., preserving the rotational symmetry, and giving a polygon K' , of course does not determine a shadow movement. However,

we can move only x_2 , in the above way, and this determines a shadow movement, giving a polygon K'' . (More exactly: only the points of $[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ are moved, in the direction of x_1x_3 . At this motion, the points of any chord, parallel to x_1x_3 , are moved with the same velocity, so that at any moment the moved chords constitute a triangle with vertices x_1, x_3 , and the translate of x_2). Then $|K| = |K'| = |K''|$, and $|(K')^*| = |K^*| + n(|(K'')^*| - |K^*|)$, so $|(K')^*|$ is a linear function of $|(K'')^*|$. Moreover, K'' and K are not affinely equivalent (consider the barycentres of the subpolygons with vertices each l 'th vertex of K'', K).

5 Proofs of the stability theorems

The main result in this section is the following stability version of Lemma 7.

Lemma 8 *Let $C, C^*, u, u^*, v, v^*, p, p^*$ be as in Lemma 7, and let $p = \lambda u + \mu v$ for $\lambda, \mu > 0$. If*

$$|C| \cdot |C^*| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) |[o, u, v, p]| \cdot |[o, u^*, v^*]|,$$

for positive $\varepsilon < \min\{\lambda, \mu\}/(\lambda + \mu)$, then for $\gamma := 3[(\lambda + \mu)/(\min\{\lambda, \mu\})](1 + \sqrt{\lambda + \mu})$,

$$\begin{cases} \text{either } C \subset (1 + \gamma\varepsilon)[o, u, v], \\ \text{or } (1 + \gamma\varepsilon)^{-1}[o, u, v, p] \subset C, \text{ that is } C^* \subset (1 + \gamma\varepsilon)[o, u^*, v^*]. \end{cases}$$

First proof. We may assume $C \neq [o, u, v]$. We use the notations from the Remark after Lemma 7, and from the second proof of Lemma 7. We have $\tilde{w} = tp$ and $\tilde{w}^* = sp^*$ for some $t, s \in (0, 1]$. Since $\langle \tilde{w}, \tilde{w}^* \rangle \leq 1$, we have

$$ts(\lambda + \mu) \leq 1. \tag{8}$$

Further, for $\tilde{u}^* := (1, (1 - t\lambda)/(t\mu))$ and $\tilde{v}^* := ((1 - t\mu)/(t\lambda), 1)$, we have

$$1 = \langle \tilde{u}^*, u \rangle = \langle \tilde{u}^*, \tilde{w} \rangle = \langle \tilde{v}^*, v \rangle = \langle \tilde{v}^*, \tilde{w} \rangle.$$

It follows by the second proof of Lemma 7, using the notations \tilde{w}, \tilde{w}^* introduced there, that

$$[o, u, v, \tilde{w}] \subset C \text{ and } |C| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) |[o, u, v, \tilde{w}]|, \text{ and} \tag{9}$$

$$[o, u^*, v^*, \tilde{w}^*] \subset C^* \text{ and } |C^*| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) |[o, u^*, v^*, \tilde{w}^*]|. \tag{10}$$

It follows that if $\langle \tilde{u}^*, x \rangle \geq \langle \tilde{u}^*, u \rangle = 1$ for $x \in C$ then

$$|[x, u, \tilde{w}]| \leq \varepsilon \cdot |[o, u, v, \tilde{w}]| = \varepsilon \cdot [(\lambda + \mu)/\mu] \cdot |[o, u, \tilde{w}]|,$$

and hence $\langle \tilde{u}^*, x \rangle \leq 1 + \varepsilon \cdot (\lambda + \mu)/\mu$. For $\tilde{\gamma} := (\lambda + \mu)/\min\{\lambda, \mu\}$, we deduce that $C \subset (1 + \tilde{\gamma} \cdot \varepsilon)[o, u, v, \tilde{w}]$, and hence $[o, u^*, \tilde{u}^*, v^*, \tilde{v}^*, \tilde{w}^*] \subset (1 + \tilde{\gamma} \cdot \varepsilon)C^*$ by polarity, and analogously $C^* \subset (1 + \tilde{\gamma} \cdot \varepsilon)[o, u^*, v^*, \tilde{w}^*]$. Since $\varepsilon < \tilde{\gamma}^{-1}$, we deduce

$$[o, u^*, \tilde{u}^*, v^*, \tilde{v}^*, \tilde{w}^*] \subset (1 + \tilde{\gamma} \cdot \varepsilon)^2[o, u^*, v^*, \tilde{w}^*] \subset (1 + 3\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \varepsilon)[o, u^*, v^*, \tilde{w}^*].$$

For $a := (\lambda - s\lambda, s\lambda + \mu - 1)$, we have $\langle a, v^* \rangle = \langle a, \tilde{w}^* \rangle = s(\lambda + \mu - 1)$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + 3\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \varepsilon &\geq \frac{\langle a, \tilde{v}^* \rangle}{\langle a, v^* \rangle} = \frac{ts(\lambda + \mu - 1) + (1 - s)(1 - t)}{ts(\lambda + \mu - 1)} \\ &= 1 + \left(\frac{1}{s} - 1\right) \left(\frac{1}{t} - 1\right) \frac{1}{\lambda + \mu - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows by (8) that

$$\text{either } 1/s \geq \sqrt{\lambda + \mu}, \text{ or } 1/t \geq \sqrt{\lambda + \mu}.$$

In the first case, $3\tilde{\gamma} \cdot (\lambda + \mu - 1)/(\sqrt{\lambda + \mu} - 1) = \gamma$ yields $1/t \leq 1 + \gamma\varepsilon$, and hence $(1 + \gamma\varepsilon)^{-1}[o, u, v, p] \subset C$. On the other hand, if $1/t \geq \sqrt{\lambda + \mu}$, then a similar argument leads to $(1 + \gamma\varepsilon)^{-1}[o, u^*, v^*, p^*] \subset C^*$, and hence $C \subset (1 + \gamma\varepsilon)[o, u, v]$. ■

The second proof of Lemma 8, where however the constant γ will be different, and which iterates the construction in the proof of Behrend ([7], proof of (77), pp. 739-740, and of (112), pp. 746-747) will be broken up into two parts.

Lemma 9 *Under the hypotheses of Lemma 7, and with $p = \lambda u + \mu v$, for $\lambda, \mu > 0$, we have*

$$|C| \cdot |C^*| \geq f(\lambda, \mu) + g(\lambda, \mu)\alpha(1 - \alpha),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f(\lambda, \mu) &:= (\lambda + \mu)(\lambda + \mu - 1)/(4\lambda\mu), \\ g(\lambda, \mu) &:= (1/4) \cdot (\lambda + \mu - 1)^2 \cdot \min\{1/[\mu(1 + \lambda/4 + \mu)], 1/[\lambda(1 + \lambda + \mu/4)], 1/(\lambda\mu)\}, \\ \alpha &:= \max\{|[u, v, x]|/|[u, v, p]| \mid x \in C \cap [u, v, p]\} \in [0, 1]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Again we use the notations from the Remark after Lemma 7.

We may suppose $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Let $x = (x_1, x_2) \in C \setminus [o, u, v]$ realize $\alpha = \max |[u, v, x]|/|[u, v, p]|$. We write $C_i := [o, u, v, x]$, and $C_o := \{(\xi, \eta) \in [o, u, v, p] \mid \xi + \eta \leq x_1 + x_2\}$. Then $C_i \subset C \subset C_o$. Let x divide the chord of $[o, u, v, p]$, parallel to the line uv , and containing x in the ratio $\beta : (1 - \beta)$, where $\beta \in [0, 1]$, and where the part of the chord with ratio β has an endpoint in $[u, p]$.

We iterate this construction. Let $y, z \in C$, and $\bar{y}, \bar{z} \in C_o$ lie on the other sides of the lines ux, vx than o , and let them realize $\max |[u, x, y]|$, or $\max |[v, x, z]|$ and $\max |[u, x, \bar{y}]|$, or $\max |[v, x, \bar{z}]|$ under these conditions, respectively. We define $\gamma := |[u, x, y]|/|[u, x, \bar{y}]| \in [0, 1]$ and $\delta := |[v, x, z]|/|[v, x, \bar{z}]| \in [0, 1]$. Let $C'_i := C_i \cup [u, x, y] \cup [v, x, z]$, and let C'_o be the intersection of C_o and the support half-planes of C at y, z , with boundaries parallel to the lines ux, vx . Then $C_i \subset C'_i \subset C \subset C'_o \subset C_o$. So for their polars (in the angular domain u^*ov^*) we have $(C_o)^* \subset (C'_o)^* \subset C^*$. Hence,

$$\begin{cases} |C| \cdot |C^*| \geq |C'_i| \cdot |(C'_o)^*| \geq \\ |C_i| \cdot |(C_o)^*| + |C'_i \setminus C_i| \cdot |(C_o)^*| + |C_i| \cdot |(C'_o)^* \setminus (C_o)^*| = \\ |C_i| \cdot |(C_o)^*| + (|T_y| + |T_z|) \cdot |(C_o)^*| + |C_i| \cdot (|(T^*)_y| + |(T^*)_z|). \end{cases}$$

Here $T_y := [u, x, y]$ and $T_z := [v, x, z]$, and the triangles $(T^*)_y$ and $(T^*)_z$ have as their vertices the polars of the three first, or three last consecutive side lines of C'_o in the open angular domain u^*ov^* , taken in the positive orientation, respectively.

First we estimate $|T_y| \cdot |(C_o)^*| + |C_i| \cdot |(T^*)_y|$ from below. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |C_i| &= [1 + (\lambda + \mu - 1)\alpha]/2, \\ |(C_o)^*| &= (1/2) \cdot [1/(1 + (\lambda + \mu - 1)\alpha)] \cdot (\lambda + \mu)(\lambda + \mu - 1)/(\lambda\mu), \\ |T_y| &= \gamma\beta((\lambda + \mu - 1)/2)\alpha(1 - \alpha). \end{aligned}$$

By using the program package GAP [70],

$$\begin{cases} |(T^*)_y| = (1/2) \cdot (\lambda + \mu - 1)^2 \cdot (1 - \gamma)\beta\alpha(1 - \alpha)/ \\ [\mu \cdot [1 + (\lambda + \mu - 1)\alpha] \cdot [\beta(1 - \alpha - \gamma\alpha + \gamma\alpha^2) + \\ \gamma\beta\alpha(1 - \alpha)\lambda + \alpha(1 + \gamma\beta - \gamma\alpha\beta)\mu]]. \end{cases}$$

Here the denominator is a product of three factors, all being positive. (For the third factor observe that the coefficients of λ , or μ are non-negative or

positive, respectively, and the constant term is minimal for $\gamma = 1$, and is then non-negative.) The second factor of the denominator will cancel with $|C_i|$, and its third factor will be estimated from above as follows. The coefficients of λ , or μ , in it, are estimated from above by setting $\beta = \gamma = 1$, and the constant term is estimated from above by setting $\gamma = 0$, and $\beta = 1$. Thus we obtain the upper estimates $\alpha(1 - \alpha)$, or $\alpha(2 - \alpha)$, or $1 - \alpha$, respectively. These can be further estimated from above by $1/4$, or 1 , or 1 , respectively.

Hence, minimizing for $\gamma \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{cases} |T_y| \cdot |(C_o)^*| + |C_i| \cdot |(T^*)_y| \geq \\ (1/4) \cdot ((\lambda + \mu - 1)^2/\mu) \cdot \min \{1/(1 + \lambda/4 + \mu), 1/\lambda\} \cdot \beta\alpha(1 - \alpha) \end{cases}$$

(the first term being estimated from below by setting $\alpha = 1$ in the denominator of the second factor of $|(C_o)^*|$). Changing the roles of λ, μ , of $\beta, 1 - \beta$, and of γ, δ , we obtain similarly

$$\begin{cases} |T_z| \cdot |(C_o)^*| + |C_i| \cdot |(T^*)_z| \geq \\ (1/4) \cdot ((\lambda + \mu - 1)^2/\lambda) \cdot \min \{1/(1 + \lambda + \mu/4), 1/\mu\} \cdot (1 - \beta)\alpha(1 - \alpha). \end{cases}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{cases} |C| \cdot |C^*| \geq |C_i| \cdot |(C_o)^*| + (|T_y| + |T_z|) \cdot |(C_o)^*| + |C_i| \cdot (|(T^*)_y| + |(T^*)_z|) \\ \geq f(\lambda, \mu) + g(\lambda, \mu) \cdot \alpha(1 - \alpha). \end{cases}$$

■

Corollary 10 *Under the hypotheses of Lemma 9, let*

$$|C| \cdot |C^*| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot f(\lambda, \mu),$$

where $\varepsilon \in (0, g(\lambda, \mu)/(4f(\lambda, \mu)))$. Further let $\alpha_{\pm} := [1 \pm \sqrt{1 - (4f(\lambda, \mu)/g(\lambda, \mu))\varepsilon}]/2$ and let $\alpha_+ + (1 - \alpha_+) \min \{(1 - \lambda)/\mu, (1 - \mu)/\lambda\} > 0$. Then

$$\text{either } C \subset [1 + (\lambda + \mu - 1)\alpha_-] \cdot [o, u, v],$$

$$\text{or } C \supset [\alpha_+ + (1 - \alpha_+) \cdot \min \{(1 - \lambda)/\mu, (1 - \mu)/\lambda\}] \cdot [o, u, v, p].$$

Proof. We use the notations from the proof of Lemma 9.

By the hypotheses and Lemma 9, for α from Lemma 9, we have

$$f(\lambda, \mu) \cdot (1 + \varepsilon) \geq |C| \cdot |C^*| \geq f(\lambda, \mu) + g(\lambda, \mu)\alpha(1 - \alpha),$$

hence

$$\alpha^2 - \alpha + (f(\lambda, \mu)/g(\lambda, \mu))\varepsilon \geq 0,$$

i.e., $\alpha \leq \alpha_-$, or $\alpha \geq \alpha_+$, where $\alpha_{\pm} \in (0, \infty)$ and $\alpha_- < \alpha_+$.

Let $x \in C \cap [u, v, p]$, with $|[u, v, x]|$ maximal. Then C lies below the line $l := \{y \mid y \text{ lies above the line } uv, \text{ and } |[u, v, y]| = \alpha \cdot |[u, v, p]|\}$. If $\alpha \leq \alpha_-$, then C lies below the line l_- , defined analogously to l , but using α_- rather than α . If $\alpha \geq \alpha_+$, then $C \supset [o, u, v, x]$, hence $C \supset [o, u, v, \nu x]$, where νx lies on the line l_+ , defined analogously to l , but using α_+ rather than α . Hence C contains the quadrangle obtained from $[o, u, v, \nu x]$, by replacing its side lines $u(\nu x), v(\nu x)$ by lines through νx , parallel to up, vp . We further diminish this last quadrangle by translating its side lines parallel to up or vp so that they should contain the points of intersection of the sides vp or up with the line l_+ , respectively. The formulas in the corollary then follow by simple calculations. ■

Remark. It is probable that with more work one could sharpen the stability estimates in the second proof of Lemma 8, iterating further the construction of inscribed/circumscribed polygons (defining, in an analogous manner, some closer approximations $C_i \subset C'_i \subset C''_i \subset C \subset C'''_o \subset C''_o \subset C_o$, etc.). However, this way does not seem to be suitable to give estimates which are sharp, up to a quantity $o(\varepsilon)$.

The first inequality in the next lemma is related to [36], Proposition 1, but is formulated with constants according to our particular needs in this paper. The second inequality in our next lemma is related to an opposite inequality as in Proposition 2 of [36], but the idea of the proof is similar.

Lemma 11 *Let $d \geq 2$ be an integer, $K_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a convex body, and let $0 < \varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon_1(K_0) := \min \{1/2, 2^{-2d-1} (\kappa_{d-1}/(d\kappa_d^2)) \cdot |K_0|/(\text{diam } K_0)^d\}$. Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a convex body, and let $(1 - \varepsilon_1)K_0 + a \subset K \subset (1 + \varepsilon_1)K_0 + b$, where $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then*

$$\|s(K) - s(K_0)\| \leq c_1(K_0) \cdot \varepsilon_1,$$

where

$$c_1(K_0) := (\text{diam } K_0)^{(d+1)^2} |K_0|^{-d-2} \cdot d(d\kappa_d/\kappa_{d-1})^{d+2}.$$

If, moreover, $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ and $|K_0| \cdot |(K_0 - s(K_0))^*| \leq |K| \cdot (K - s(K))^*$ and $c \in \text{int } K$, and $|K| \cdot |(K - c)^*| \leq |K_0| \cdot |(K_0 - s(K_0))^*| + \varepsilon_2 \leq \kappa_d^2$, then

$$\|c - s(K_0)\| \leq c_1(K_0) \cdot \varepsilon_1 + c_2(K_0) \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon_2},$$

where

$$c_2(K_0) := \sqrt{(\text{diam } K_0)^{d+2}/|K_0|} \cdot \sqrt{2^{d+3}/((d+1)\kappa_d)}.$$

Proof. We will suppose that the point of homothety of $(1 - \varepsilon_1)K_0 + a$ and $(1 + \varepsilon_1)K_0 + b$, that is in the first body, is o (this does not change $K_0 - s(K_0)$, $K - s(K)$, $K - c$; namely, we consider c as “fixed to K ”). Thus $a = b = o$ can be supposed.

We have

$$\begin{cases} |(K - x)^*| = (1/d) \int_{S^{d-1}} (h_K(u) - \langle u, x \rangle)^{-d} du, \\ (\partial/\partial x_d)|(K - x)^*| = \int_{S^{d-1}} u_d (h_K(u) - \langle u, x \rangle)^{-d-1} du, \\ (\partial/\partial x_d)^2|(K - x)^*| = (d+1) \int_{S^{d-1}} u_d^2 (h_K(u) - \langle u, x \rangle)^{-d-2} du \\ \geq (d+1)(\text{diam } K)^{-d-2}\kappa_d, \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

where $u = (u_1, \dots, u_d)$, and h_K is the support function of K , and κ_d the volume of the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^d . The analogues of these formulas hold for the first and second directional derivatives in any direction.

First we estimate $\delta := \|s(K) - s(K_0)\|$ from above. We may assume that $s(K) - s(K_0) = (0, \dots, 0, \delta)$, where $\delta > 0$.

We begin by showing that $s(K) \in \text{int}((1 - \varepsilon_1)K_0)$, and even estimate $\text{dist}(s(K), \text{bd}[(1 - \varepsilon_1)K_0])$ from below. Let $\eta := \text{dist}(s(K), \text{bd } K) \leq \text{dist}(s(K), \text{bd}[(1 + \varepsilon_1)K_0])$. Then $(K - s(K))^*$ contains $(\text{diam } K)^{-1}B^d$, and a point at distance η^{-1} from o (with B^d the unit ball about o). Therefore

$$\kappa_d^2 \geq |K| \cdot |(K - s(K))^*| \geq |K| \cdot (\text{diam } K)^{-d+1} (\kappa_{d-1}/d) \eta^{-1}. \quad (12)$$

Hence, by $\varepsilon_1 \leq 1/2$,

$$\begin{cases} \eta_0 := 2^{-2d+1} (\kappa_{d-1}/(d\kappa_d^2)) \cdot |K_0|/[(\text{diam } K_0)^{d-1}] \leq \\ (\kappa_{d-1}/(d\kappa_d^2)) \cdot |K|/(\text{diam } K)^{d-1} \leq \eta \leq \\ \text{dist}(s(K), \text{bd}[(1 + \varepsilon_1)K_0]) \leq \\ \text{dist}(s(K), \text{bd}[(1 - \varepsilon_1)K_0 + 2\varepsilon_1 \cdot \text{diam } K_0 \cdot B^d]) \leq \end{cases}$$

Thus, for $\varepsilon_1 \leq \eta_0/(4 \cdot \text{diam } K_0)$,

$$s(K) \in \text{int} [(1 - \varepsilon_1)K_0] \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_0/2 \leq \text{dist} (s(K), \text{bd} [(1 - \varepsilon_1)K_0]) .$$

Then, using convexity of the function t^{-d-1} for $t > 0$, and (12) for K_0 , rather than K , we have

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 0 = \int_{S^{d-1}} u_d (h_K(u) - \langle u, s(K) \rangle)^{-d-1} du \geq \\ \int_{S^{d-1}} u_d [h_{K_0}(u) + \text{sg } u_d \cdot \varepsilon_1 h_{K_0}(u) - \langle u, s(K_0) \rangle - \delta u_d]^{-d-1} du \geq \\ \int_{S^{d-1}} u_d (h_{K_0}(u) - \langle u, s(K_0) \rangle)^{-d-1} du + \\ (d+1) \cdot \int_{S^{d-1}} u_d (\delta u_d - \varepsilon_1 \cdot \text{sg } u_d \cdot h_{K_0}(u)) \times \\ (h_{K_0}(u) - \langle u, s(K_0) \rangle)^{-d-2} du \geq \\ \delta(d+1)(\text{diam } K_0)^{-d-2} \int_{S^{d-1}} u_d^2 du - \\ \varepsilon_1(d+1) \cdot \text{diam } K_0 \cdot [(\kappa_{d-1}/(d\kappa_d^2)) |K_0| / \\ (\text{diam } K_0)^{-d+1}]^{-d-2} \int_{S^{d-1}} |u_d| du . \end{array} \right. \quad (13)$$

Here, $\int_{S^{d-1}} u_d^2 du = \kappa_d$, and $\int_{S^{d-1}} |u_d| du \leq \int_{S^{d-1}} du$, and comparing the first and last terms of (13), we get the first inequality of the Lemma.

We turn to the second inequality. We have

$$\|c - s(K_0)\| \leq \|c - s(K)\| + \|s(K) - s(K_0)\| \leq \|c - s(K)\| + c_1(K_0)\varepsilon_1 \quad (14)$$

and

$$|K| \cdot |(K - c)^*| \leq |K_0| \cdot |(K_0 - s(K_0))^*| + \varepsilon_2 \leq |K| \cdot |(K - s(K))^*| + \varepsilon_2 .$$

We use (11) on the line $s(K)c$, which gives

$$|K|(d+1)(\text{diam } K)^{-d-2} \kappa_d \cdot \|c - s(K)\|^2/2 \leq \varepsilon_2 . \quad (15)$$

(14) and (15) give the second inequality of the Lemma. ■

Proof of Theorem 5. 1. First we estimate $\delta_{BM}^s(K, R_n)$ from above. Here we may assume that o is the Santaló point of K , i.e., its centre of rotational symmetry. As explained in §3, there exist regular n -gons K_i and K_o centred at the origin, such that $K_i \subset K \subset K_o$, and the midpoints of the sides of K_o are the vertices of K_i . Assuming that the unit circular disc about o is the incircle of K_o , we have $K_o^* = K_i$. Now the radii from o to the vertices of K_i divide K_o into n congruent deltoids $\tilde{C}_1, \dots, \tilde{C}_n$ whose common vertex

is the origin. In particular, $\tilde{C}_j^* := \tilde{C}_j \cap K_i$ is the corresponding triangular sector of K_i , where $j = 1, \dots, n$. For the congruent sectors $C_j = \tilde{C}_j \cap K$ of K , and the congruent sectors $C_j^* = \tilde{C}_j \cap K^*$ of K^* , where $j = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$(1 + \varepsilon)n^2|\tilde{C}_1| \cdot |\tilde{C}_1^*| = (1 + \varepsilon)|K_i| \cdot |K_o| \geq |K| \cdot |K^*| = n^2|C_1| \cdot |C_1^*|.$$

We observe that $\tilde{C}_1^* = [o, u, v]$ and $\tilde{C}_1 = [o, u, v, p]$, where $p = \lambda u + \lambda v$ for $\lambda = [\cos(\pi/n)]^{-2}/2$, and

$$|C_1| \cdot |C_1^*| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)|[o, u, v, p]| \cdot |[o, u^*, v^*]|.$$

We deduce by Lemma 8 that either $C_1 \subset (1 + \gamma\varepsilon)\tilde{C}_1^*$, or $(1 + \gamma\varepsilon)^{-1}\tilde{C}_1 \subset C_1$, where $\gamma := 6(1 + \sqrt{2\lambda}) \leq 18$. Therefore the rotational symmetry yields that either $K \subset (1 + 18\varepsilon)K_i$, or $(1 + 18\varepsilon)^{-1}K_o \subset K$.

2. Now we turn to the proof of the stability of the centre of polarity. The point x is the point of homothety of $\lambda_1 R_n + x$ and $\lambda_2 R_n + x$, and $x \in \lambda_1 R_n + x$. We will suppose $x = o$; then $o \in R_n$. Simultaneously, we have to replace K^* with $(K - c)^*$, for some $c \in \text{int } K$ (“fixed to K ”). Let $K_{0,n} := [(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2]R_n$ (this will take over the role of K_0 from Lemma 11). Then $\lambda_1 R_n \subset K \subset \lambda_2 R_n$ and $\lambda_2/\lambda_1 \leq 1 + 18\varepsilon$ imply

$$\begin{cases} K_{0,n}(1 - 9\varepsilon) \subset K_{0,n}/[(1 + \lambda_2/\lambda_1)/2] \subset K \\ \subset K_{0,n}/[(1 + \lambda_1/\lambda_2)/2] \subset K_{0,n}(1 + 9\varepsilon). \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

Note that by hypothesis $\varepsilon < 1/18$, so here

$$1 - 9\varepsilon > 1/2 \quad (> 0). \quad (17)$$

Restricting Lemma 11 to $d = 2$, we have $\varepsilon_1(K_{0,n}) = [1/(32\pi^2)] \cdot |K_{0,n}| / (\text{diam } K_{0,n})^2$ and $c_1(K_{0,n}) = 2\pi^4 \cdot (\text{diam } K_{0,n})^9 |K_{0,n}|^{-4}$, and $c_2(K_{0,n}) = 4\sqrt{2/(3\pi)} \cdot (\text{diam } K_{0,n})^2 |K_{0,n}|^{-1/2}$. Here $\text{diam } K_{0,n} = 1$ (in the Euclidean norm mentioned in the Theorem), hence $\min_n |K_{0,n}|$ is attained for $n = 3$. So $\min_n \varepsilon_1(K_{0,n}) = \sqrt{3}/(128\pi^2)$, and $\max_n c_1(K_{0,n}) = 512\pi^4/9$, and $\max_n c_2(K_{0,n}) = 8\sqrt{2/\pi}3^{-3/4}$.

We apply Lemma 11 for $d = 2$, replacing there $\varepsilon_1(K_{0,n})$ by $\min_n \varepsilon_1(K_{0,n})$ and $c_1(K_{0,n})$ by $\max_n c_1(K_{0,n})$, and $c_2(K_{0,n})$ by $\max_n c_2(K_{0,n})$. By (16) we

may choose $\varepsilon_1 := 9\varepsilon$. Also, by the hypothesis of the theorem, ε_2 can be chosen so that $\varepsilon_2 \leq \pi^2\varepsilon$ ($\geq n^2 \sin^2(\pi/n)$). So

$$\|c - s(K_{0,n})\| \leq (512\pi^4/9) \cdot 9\varepsilon + 8\sqrt{2/\pi}3^{-3/4} \cdot \pi\sqrt{\varepsilon}, \quad (18)$$

for

$$0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon^* := [\sqrt{3}/(128\pi^2)]/9 = 0.0001523\dots < 1/18. \quad (19)$$

However, we will use (18) only for $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon^{**}$, for some $\varepsilon^{**} \in (0, \varepsilon^*]$, to be chosen later.

First let $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon^{**}$. Then (18) gives

$$\|c - s(K_{0,n})\| \leq \left(512\pi^4\sqrt{\varepsilon^{**}} + 8\sqrt{2\pi}3^{-3/4}\right) \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon}. \quad (20)$$

Second let $\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon^{**}$. Then we have $c \in \text{int } K \subset \lambda_2 R_n + x = \lambda_2 R_n$, and $s(K_{0,n}) \in K_{0,n} = [(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2]R_n \subset \lambda_2 R_n$ (the last inclusion following from $o \in R_n$). Hence, also using $\lambda_2/\lambda_1 \leq 2$, we have

$$\begin{cases} \|c - s(K_{0,n})\| \leq \text{diam}(\lambda_2 R_n) = \lambda_2/[(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2] \\ \leq 4/3 \leq [4/(3\sqrt{\varepsilon^{**}})] \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon}. \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

By (20) and (21), we have

$$\|c - s(K_{0,n})\| \leq \left(\max\{512\pi^4\sqrt{\varepsilon^{**}} + 8\sqrt{2\pi}3^{-3/4}, 4/(3\sqrt{\varepsilon^{**}})\}\right) \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon}. \quad (22)$$

Now we minimize the coefficient of $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ in (22), that is a function of ε^{**} . This minimum occurs when the two terms under the maximum sign are equal, that occurs for $\varepsilon^{**} = 0.0000258\dots$, and its value is $262.30682\dots$. (Observe that in fact $0 < \varepsilon^{**} < \varepsilon^*$). ■

For the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2, we need a simple stability version of the inequality between the arithmetic and geometric means. If $n \geq 2$ and $0 < a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_n$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{a_1 + \dots + a_n}{n \cdot (a_1 \cdot \dots \cdot a_n)^{1/n}} &= \frac{(\sqrt{a_n} - \sqrt{a_1})^2 + 2\sqrt{a_1 a_n} + \sum_{1 < j < n} a_j}{n \cdot (a_1 \cdot \dots \cdot a_n)^{1/n}} \\ &\geq \frac{(\sqrt{a_n} - \sqrt{a_1})^2 + n \cdot (a_1 \cdot \dots \cdot a_n)^{1/n}}{n \cdot (a_1 \cdot \dots \cdot a_n)^{1/n}} \\ &\geq 1 + \frac{1}{n} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{a_1}{a_n}}\right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{cases} \text{if } \varepsilon \geq 0 \text{ and } (a_1 + \dots + a_n)/[n \cdot (a_1 \cdot \dots \cdot a_n)^{1/n}] \leq 1 + \varepsilon, \\ \text{then } a_j/a_k \geq 1 - 2\sqrt{n\varepsilon} \text{ for any } 1 \leq j, k \leq n. \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

(It is easy to give the sharp version of this inequality. Fixing $a_2 + \dots + a_{n-1}$, the minimum occurs when $a_2 = \dots = a_{n-1}$; let their common value be $x \in [a_1, a_n]$. Then derivation w.r.t. x gives for the minimum that $x = (a_1 + a_n)/2$. However, the formula given above will be more convenient to apply.)

Proof of Theorem 1. 1. First we estimate $\delta_{BM}(K, P)$ from above. Here we may assume that o is the Santaló point of K , i.e., its centre of symmetry. As explained in §3, after Theorem 3, we may assume that $K_i \subset K \subset K_o$, where K_o and K_i are squares centered at o , the midpoints of the sides of K_o are the vertices of K_i , and the sides of K_o have length 2. In particular, K_i and K_o are polar to each other. It also follows that $\delta_{BM}(K, P) \leq 2$, and hence if $\varepsilon \geq 0.005$, then we are done. Therefore we assume that $\varepsilon < 0.005$.

Now, in a suitable coordinate system, K_o can be dissected into four unit squares $S_o^1 := [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$, $S_o^2 := [-1, 0] \times [0, 1]$, $-S_o^1$ and $-S_o^2$. We write $S_i^j = S_o^j \cap K_i$, and $C_j = S_o^j \cap K$ and $C_j^* = S_o^j \cap K^*$ for $j = 1, 2$, and hence Lemma 7 implies $|C_j| \cdot |C_j^*| \geq |S_i^j| \cdot |S_o^j|$ for $j = 1, 2$. We deduce by the hypothesis $|K| \cdot |K^*| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot 8$ and Lemma 7 that

$$\begin{cases} (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot |S_i^1| \cdot |S_o^1| \geq [(|C_1| + |C_2|)/2] \cdot [(|C_1^*| + |C_2^*|)/2] \\ \geq \sqrt{|C_1| \cdot |C_2| \cdot |C_1^*| \cdot |C_2^*|}, \text{ and } |C_j| \cdot |C_j^*| \geq |S_i^j| \cdot |S_o^j|. \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

In particular,

$$|C_j| \cdot |C_j^*| \leq (1 + \varepsilon)^2 \cdot |S_i^j| \cdot |S_o^j| \leq (1 + 2.005\varepsilon) \cdot |S_i^j| \cdot |S_o^j| \text{ for } j = 1, 2.$$

To apply Lemma 8, we have $\lambda = \mu = 1$ and $\gamma = 6(1 + \sqrt{2}) < 15$ both in the cases of C_1 and C_2 . Therefore, for each of $j = 1, 2$, either $C_j \subset (1 + \gamma \cdot 2.005\varepsilon)S_i^j$, or $(1 + \gamma \cdot 2.005\varepsilon)^{-1}S_o^j \subset C_j$. If both of C_1 and C_2 satisfy either the first or the second condition, then $\delta_{BM}(K, P) \leq 1 + 31\varepsilon$, and we are done. Therefore we suppose that $C_1 \subset (1 + \gamma \cdot 2.005\varepsilon)S_i^1$, and $(1 + \gamma \cdot 2.005\varepsilon)^{-1}S_o^2 \subset C_2$, and seek a contradiction. We have $|C_1| \leq (1 + \gamma \cdot 2.005\varepsilon)^2/2$, and since the diagonal of S_o^2 not containing o is a subset of C_2 , we also have $|C_2| \geq (1 + \gamma \cdot 2.005\varepsilon)^{-1}$. It follows by $\varepsilon < 0.005$ that $|C_1| < (1 - 2\sqrt{2\varepsilon})|C_2|$. On the other hand, (23) applied in (24) leads to $|C_1| \geq (1 - 2\sqrt{2\varepsilon})|C_2|$, a contradiction.

2. The stability of the centre of polarity is deduced from Lemma 11 like in Theorem 5, by supposing $x = 0$. Simultaneously, we have to replace K^* with $(K - c)^*$, for some $c \in \text{int } K$ (“fixed to K ”). Let $K_0 := [(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2]P$. Now $\varepsilon_1(K_0) = 1/(64\pi^2)$, and $c_1(K_0) = 64\sqrt{2}\pi^4$, and $c_2(K_0) = 16\sqrt{2/(3\pi)}$. We only note that by hypothesis $\varepsilon < 0.005$, and then we use the sharper estimate $\delta_{BM}(K, P) = \delta_{BM}(K, K_0) \leq 1 + 31\varepsilon$. Then, rather than (16) and (17), we have

$$\begin{cases} K_0(1 - (31/2)\varepsilon) \subset K_0/[(1 + \lambda_2/\lambda_1)/2] \subset K \\ \subset K_0/[(1 + \lambda_1/\lambda_2)/2] \subset K_0(1 + (31/2)\varepsilon), \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

for

$$1 - (31/2)\varepsilon > 1 - (31/2)/200 \quad (> 0). \quad (26)$$

By (25) we may choose $\varepsilon_1 := (31/2)\varepsilon$, and by hypothesis of the theorem we may choose $\varepsilon_2 := 8\varepsilon$.

Then we have, analogously to (18) and (19), that

$$\|c - s(K_{0,n})\| \leq (64\sqrt{2}\pi^4) \cdot (31/2)\varepsilon + 16\sqrt{2/(3\pi)} \cdot \sqrt{8}\sqrt{\varepsilon}, \quad (27)$$

for

$$0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon^* := [\varepsilon_1(K_0)]/(31/2) < 0.005. \quad (28)$$

Then, analogously to (18), (21) and (22), we have, also using $\lambda_2/\lambda_1 \leq 2$, that for $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon^{**}$ ($\leq \varepsilon^*$) we have

$$\|c - s(K_0)\| \leq \left(64\sqrt{2}\pi^4(31/2)\sqrt{\varepsilon^{**}} + 16\sqrt{2/(3\pi)}\sqrt{8} \right) \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon}, \quad (29)$$

and for $\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon^{**}$ we have

$$\|c - s(K_0)\| \leq [4/(3\sqrt{\varepsilon^{**}})] \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon}. \quad (30)$$

Hence, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\begin{cases} \|c - s(K_0)\| \leq \\ \left(\max \{ 64\sqrt{2}\pi^4(31/2)\sqrt{\varepsilon^{**}} + 16\sqrt{2/(3\pi)}\sqrt{8}, 4/(3\sqrt{\varepsilon^{**}}) \} \right) \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon}. \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

The optimal choice of ε^{**} is ε^* . The distance to be estimated from above is at most $335.10941\dots \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon}$. ■

Proof of Theorem 2. 1. First we estimate $\delta_{BM}(K, T)$ from above. We may assume that K is not a parallelogram, and o is the Santaló point of K . As it is explained in §3, after Theorem 3, we may assume that $K_i \subset K \subset K_o$, where K_i and K_o are regular triangles, and the midpoints of the sides of K_o are the vertices of K_i . It also follows that $\delta_{BM}(K, T) \leq 4$, and hence if $\varepsilon \geq 1/300$, then we are done. Therefore we assume that $\varepsilon < 1/300$.

We use the notation and ideas of the proof Theorem 3; in particular $o \in \text{int } K_i$. We may assume that the circumradius of K_i is 1, and hence $d_1 + d_2 + d_3 = 3$, and $a = b = \sqrt{3}$.

Since $|K| \cdot |K^*| \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \cdot |K_o| \cdot |K_o^*|$, and we used the inequality between arithmetic and geometric means for $|C_1|, |C_2|, |C_3|$ in (5), and for d_1, d_2, d_3 in the step from (6) to (7), for $j, k = 1, 2, 3$, we deduce by (23) that

$$|C_j|/|C_k| \geq 1 - 2\sqrt{3}\varepsilon \geq 4/5, \quad \text{and} \quad (32)$$

$$d_j/d_k \geq 1 - 2\sqrt{3}\varepsilon \geq 4/5. \quad (33)$$

Since $d_1 + d_2 + d_3 = 3$, we have

$$d_j \geq 3/(1 + 5/4 + 5/4) = 6/7, \quad \text{and} \quad (34)$$

$$d_j \leq 3/(1 + 4/5 + 4/5) = 15/13. \quad (35)$$

Like in the proof of Theorem 1, by hypothesis, and by Lemma 7,

$$\begin{cases} (1 + \varepsilon) \left(\prod_{j=1}^3 (|[o, x_{j-1}, x_j, y_j]| \cdot |[o, y_{j-1}^*, y_j^*]|) \right)^{1/3} \geq \\ \left(\prod_{j=1}^3 (|C_j| \cdot |C_j^*|) \right)^{1/3}, \quad \text{and} \end{cases}$$

$$|C_j| \cdot |C_j^*| \geq |[o, x_{j-1}, x_j, y_j]| \cdot |[o, y_{j-1}^*, y_j^*]|.$$

Hence, for each $j = 1, 2, 3$, we have

$$|C_j| \cdot |C_j^*| \leq (1 + 3.1\varepsilon) |[o, x_{j-1}, x_j, y_j]| \cdot |[o, y_{j-1}^*, y_j^*]|. \quad (36)$$

Let $j = 1, 2, 3$. To apply Lemma 8, we define $\lambda_j, \mu_j > 0$ by

$$y_j = \lambda_j x_{j-1} + \mu_j x_j.$$

Since $\lambda_j/\mu_j = |[o, x_j, y_j]|/|[o, x_{j-1}, y_j]| = d_j/d_{j-1}$, (33) implies

$$\frac{\lambda_j + \mu_j}{\min\{\lambda_j, \mu_j\}} \leq 1 + 5/4 = 9/4.$$

Now the distances of y_j , or o from the line through x_{j-1}, x_j are $3/2$, or $\|x_{j+1}^*\|^{-1} = 3/2 - d_{j+1} \geq 9/26$, by (35), respectively, and hence

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_j + \mu_j = \langle x_j^*, y_j \rangle = \langle x_j^*, x_j \rangle + \|x_j^*\| \cdot \langle \|x_j^*\|^{-1} x_j^*, y_j - x_j \rangle \\ \leq 1 + (3/2)/(9/26) = 16/3. \end{cases}$$

We define $\gamma_j := 3[(\lambda_j + \mu_j)/\min\{\lambda_j, \mu_j\}](1 + \sqrt{\lambda_j + \mu_j})$, and hence

$$3.1\gamma_j \leq 3.1 \cdot 3 \cdot (9/4) \cdot (1 + 4/\sqrt{3}) < 70.$$

In particular, it follows by Lemma 8 and (36) that

$$\text{either } (1 + 70\varepsilon)^{-1}[o, x_{j-1}, x_j, y_j] \subset C_j, \quad \text{or } C_j \subset (1 + 70\varepsilon)[o, x_{j-1}, x_j].$$

We note that $1 + 70\varepsilon \leq 5/4$ and $\|x_{j-1} - x_j\| = \sqrt{3}$. If $(1 + 70\varepsilon)^{-1}[o, x_{j-1}, x_j, y_j] \subset C_j$, then (35) yields

$$\begin{cases} |C_j| \geq |[o, x_{j-1}, x_j, (4/5)y_j]| = \\ (4/5) \cdot (\sqrt{3}/2) \cdot (3/2 - d_{j+1} + 3/2) \geq (2\sqrt{3}/5) \cdot 48/26 > 1.27. \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

On the other hand, if $C_j \subset (1 + 70\varepsilon)[o, x_{j-1}, x_j]$, then (34) yields

$$\begin{cases} |C_j| \leq (5/4)^2 \cdot |[o, x_{j-1}, x_j]| = (5/4)^2 \cdot (\sqrt{3}/2) \cdot (3/2 - d_{j+1}) \leq \\ (5/4)^2 \cdot (\sqrt{3}/2) \cdot (9/14) < 0.87. \end{cases} \quad (38)$$

Comparing (32), (37) and (38) shows that either $(1 + 70\varepsilon)^{-1}[o, x_{j-1}, x_j, y_j] \subset C_j$ for all $j = 1, 2, 3$, or $C_j \subset (1 + 70\varepsilon)[o, x_{j-1}, x_j]$ for all $j = 1, 2, 3$. Therefore either $(1 + 70\varepsilon)^{-1}K_o \subset K$, or $K \subset (1 + 70\varepsilon)K_i$, and hence the Banach-Mazur distance of K from the triangles is at most $1 + 70\varepsilon$.

2. The stability of the centre of polarity is deduced from Lemma 11 like in Theorem 5 and Theorem 2, by supposing $x = o$. Simultaneously, we have to replace K^* with $(K - c)^*$, for some $c \in \text{int } K$ (“fixed to K ”). Let $K_0 := [(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2]T$. Now $\varepsilon_1(K_0) = \sqrt{3}/(128\pi^2)$ and $c_1(K_0) = 512\pi^4/9$ and $c_2(K_0) = 8\sqrt{2}/(3\pi) \cdot 3^{-1/4}$. We only note that by hypothesis $\varepsilon < 1/300$, and then we use the sharper estimate $\delta_{BM}(K, T) = \delta_{BM}(K, K_0) \leq 1 + 70\varepsilon$. Then, rather than (16), (25) and (17), (26), we have

$$\begin{cases} K_0(1 - (70/2)\varepsilon) \subset K_0/[(1 + \lambda_2/\lambda_1)/2] \subset K \\ \subset K_0/[(1 + \lambda_1/\lambda_2)/2] \subset K_0(1 + (70/2)\varepsilon), \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

for

$$1 - (70/2)\varepsilon > 1 - (70/2)/300 \quad (> 0). \quad (40)$$

By (39) we may choose $\varepsilon_1 := (70/2)\varepsilon$, and by hypothesis of the theorem, we may choose $\varepsilon_2 := (27/4)\varepsilon$.

Then we have, analogously to (18), (27), and (19), (28) that

$$\|c - s(K_0)\| \leq (512\pi^4/9) \cdot (70/2)\varepsilon + 8\sqrt{2/(3\pi)} \cdot 3^{-1/4} \sqrt{27/4} \sqrt{\varepsilon}, \quad (41)$$

for

$$0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon^* := [\varepsilon_1(K_0)]/(70/2) < 1/300. \quad (42)$$

Then, analogously to (18), (27), and (21), (30), and (22), (31) we have, also using $\lambda_2/\lambda_1 \leq 4$, that for $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon^{**}$ ($\leq \varepsilon^*$) there holds

$$\|c - s(K_0)\| \leq \left((512\pi^4/9)(70/2)\sqrt{\varepsilon^{**}} + 8\sqrt{2/(3\pi)} \cdot 3^{-1/4} \sqrt{27/4} \right) \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon}, \quad (43)$$

and for $\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon^{**}$ we have

$$\|c - s(K_0)\| \leq \lambda_2/[(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2] \leq [8/(5\sqrt{\varepsilon^{**}})] \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon}. \quad (44)$$

Hence, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \|c - s(K_0)\| \leq \\ \left(\max \{ (512\pi^4/9)(70/2)\sqrt{\varepsilon^{**}} + 8\sqrt{2/(3\pi)}3^{-1/4} \sqrt{27/4}, 8/(5\sqrt{\varepsilon^{**}}) \} \right) \\ \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon}. \end{array} \right. \quad (45)$$

The optimal choice of ε^{**} is ε^* . The distance to be estimated from above is at most $916.69531\dots \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon}$. ■

We turn to the proof of Theorem 6. We proceed analogously as in Lemma 9 and Corollary 10. Again, the proof of Lemma 12 will use an idea of Behrend, [7], proof of (77), pp. 739-740, and of (112), pp. 746-747.

As in the proof of Theorem 2, we assume that $K_i \subset K \subset K_o$, where $K_o = [a, b, c]$ and $K_i = [a', b', c']$ are regular triangles, and $a' = (b + c)/2$, $b' = (c + a)/2$, $c' = (a + b)/2$. Now we assume $\|a - b\| = 2$. We let $\alpha_1 := \max \{ |[x, b', c']|/|[a, b', c']| \mid x \in K \cap [a, b', c'] \}$, and $\alpha_2 := \max \{ |[x, c', a']|/|[b, c', a']| \mid x \in K \cap [b, c', a'] \}$, and $\alpha_3 := \max \{ |[x, a', b']|/|[c, a', b']| \mid x \in K \cap [c, a', b'] \}$. Then $\alpha_i \in [0, 1]$, and we let $\alpha := (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3)/3 \in [0, 1]$.

Lemma 12 *With the above notations, we have*

$$|K| \cdot |[K - K]/2]^*| \geq 6 + (3/2)\alpha(1 - \alpha).$$

Proof. The supporting lines of K , parallel to and different from the side lines of K_o , contain points a'', b'', c'' of K , with a'' lying in the triangle $b'ac'$, etc. We let $K'_i := [a', c'', b', a'', c', b'']$, and let K'_o be the hexagon bounded by all supporting lines of K parallel to the sides of K_o . We have

$$K'_i \subset K \subset K'_o.$$

Hence,

$$|K| \cdot |[K - K]/2]^*| \geq |K'_i| \cdot |[K'_o - K_o]/2]^*|. \quad (46)$$

Here

$$|K'_i| = (\sqrt{3}/4)(1 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3), \quad (47)$$

$$\begin{cases} |[K'_o - K_o]/2]^*| = 2(4/\sqrt{3})^2[(1 + \alpha_1)^{-1}(1 + \alpha_2)^{-1} + \\ (1 + \alpha_2)^{-1}(1 + \alpha_3)^{-1} + (1 + \alpha_3)^{-1}(1 + \alpha_1)^{-1}] \sin(\pi/3)/2. \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

Now, (47), (48), and the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality imply

$$\begin{cases} |K'_i| \cdot |[K'_o - K_o]/2]^*| = 2(1 + 3\alpha)(3 + 3\alpha) \times \\ (1 + \alpha_1)^{-1}(1 + \alpha_2)^{-1}(1 + \alpha_3)^{-1} \geq 6(1 + 3\alpha)(1 + \alpha)^{-2}. \end{cases} \quad (49)$$

Taking in account (46), it suffices to show that the last quantity in (49) is at least

$$6 + (3/2)\alpha(1 - \alpha).$$

However, if we replace in the last expression $3/2$ by some $c \geq 0$, this claimed inequality becomes equivalent to

$$\alpha(1 - \alpha) (1 - (c/6)(1 + \alpha)^2) \geq 0,$$

that is (just) satisfied for $c = 3/2$. ■

Proof of Theorem 6. We will use the notations in Lemma 12 and its proof. By hypotheses and Lemma 12,

$$6 \cdot (1 + \varepsilon) \geq |K| \cdot |[K - K]/2]^*| \geq 6 + (3/2)\alpha(1 - \alpha),$$

hence

$$\alpha^2 - \alpha + 4\varepsilon \geq 0,$$

i.e., $\alpha \leq \alpha_-$, or $\alpha \geq \alpha_+$, where α_{\pm} are the roots of the last polynomial. They are real, with $\alpha_- < \alpha_+$, for

$$\varepsilon \in [0, 1/16],$$

which last inequality will be supposed preliminarily.

For $\alpha \leq \alpha_-$ we have

$$\delta_{BM}(K, T) \leq 1 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = 1 + 3\alpha_-. \quad (50)$$

Now let $\alpha \geq \alpha_+$. We proceed analogously, as in the proof of Corollary 10. We write $\beta_i := 1 - \alpha_i \in [0, 1]$, and $\beta := 1 - \alpha \in [0, 1]$. Then $\beta = (\sum \beta_i)/3 \leq \alpha_-$, hence $\beta_i \leq \sum \beta_i \leq 3\alpha_-$. We have $K \cap [a', b', c] \supset [a', b', c'']$. We diminish this last triangle by retaining its side line $a'b'$, and replacing its sides $[a', c'']$, $[b', c'']$ by sides containing c'' , and parallel to $[a', c]$, $[b', c]$. We further diminish this last triangle by retaining its side line $a'b'$, and translating its side lines parallel to $[a', c]$, $[b', c]$, so that they should contain $c''(b')$, $c''(a')$, where $[c''(a'), c''(b')] \ni c''$ is a chord of $[a', b', c]$ parallel to $[a', b']$, with $c''(a') \in [c, a']$ and $c''(b') \in [c, b']$. Of course this is only possible for $\beta_3 \leq 3\alpha_- \leq 1/2$; therefore we preliminarily suppose also

$$\alpha_- \leq 1/6, \quad \text{or, equivalently, } \varepsilon \in [0, 1/28.8] \quad (\subset [0, 1/16]).$$

In this case the vertex c''' of the last triangle opposite its side on $[a', b']$ depends only on β_3 : it lies on the angle bisector of the triangle $[a', c, b']$ at c , and $\|c''' - c\| = \beta_3\sqrt{3}$. Lastly we replace c''' by c'''' , which is constructed analogously as c''' , but replacing at the beginning β_3 by $3\alpha_- (\geq \beta_3)$. Analogously we define the points a'''' , b'''' . Then $[a''''', b''''', c'''''] \subset [a', c''''', b', a''''', c', b'''''] \subset K$, hence

$$\delta_{BM}(K, T) \leq 1/(1 - (9/2)\alpha_-). \quad (51)$$

Here we have $1 - (9/2)\alpha_- \geq 1/4$, i.e., $\alpha_- \leq 1/6$, thus $a''''', b''''', c''''' \notin \text{int}[a', b', c']$.

Now, (50) and (51) give

$$\begin{cases} \delta_{BM}(K, T) \leq \max\{1 + 3\alpha_-, 1/(1 - (9/2)\alpha_-)\} = \\ 1/(1 - (9/2)\alpha_-) = 1 + [(9/2)\alpha_-]/[1 - (9/2)\alpha_-] \leq \\ 1 + [(9/2)\alpha_-]/[1 - (9/2)(1/6)] = 1 + 18\alpha_-. \end{cases} \quad (52)$$

By convexity of the respective function,

$$\alpha_- = (1 - \sqrt{1 - 16\varepsilon})/2 \leq (24/5)\varepsilon, \quad \text{for } \varepsilon \in [0, 1/28.8]. \quad (53)$$

Thus, by (52) and (53),

$$\delta_{BM}(K, T) \leq 1 + 18\alpha_- \leq 1 + 86.4\varepsilon. \quad (54)$$

There remains the case $\varepsilon \geq 1/28.8$. Then

$$\delta_{BM}(K, T) \leq 4 \leq 1 + 86.4\varepsilon. \quad (55)$$

Lastly, (54) and (55) together prove the theorem. ■

6 A short proof of the inequality of Mahler-Reisner

Theorem 13 (Mahler-Reisner [44], [64]). *If K is an o -symmetric convex body in \mathbb{R}^2 , then*

$$|K| \cdot |K^*| \geq 8,$$

with equality if and only if K is a parallelogram.

In the proof of this theorem we use the results of [57], more exactly, the proof of their Theorem 15. Actually we will make only slight modifications in its proof.

Proof of Theorem 13. Like in [57], proof of their Theorem 15, we may suppose that a diameter of K (a segment of maximal length contained in K) is $[(-1, 0), (1, 0)]$, where $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ has a minimal volume product among 0-symmetric convex bodies. Let

$$K = \{(x, y) \mid x \in [-1, 1], -f(-x) \leq y \leq f(x)\},$$

where

$$\begin{cases} f(x) \text{ is a concave function on } [-1, 1], \text{ with} \\ f(-1) = f(1) = 0, \text{ and } f(x) > 0 \text{ for } x \in (-1, 1). \end{cases} \quad (56)$$

If the graph of f consists of two segments, we are done. If not, then, by Lemma 14 of [57], there are functions g, h , both satisfying (56) above, both not proportional to f , such that $f = (g + h)/2$.

Let $t \in [-1, 1]$. Let $f_t := f + t(h - g)/2$. Then the area of the convex body

$$K_t := \{(x, y) \mid x \in [-1, 1], -f_t(-x) \leq y \leq f_t(x)\}$$

is a linear function of t . By Theorem 1 of [57] the reciprocal of $\varphi(t) := |[K_t - s(K_t)]^*|$ is a convex function of t . Hence $\min \varphi$ is attained either for $t = -1$ or for $t = 1$. Since $K = K_0$ has minimum volume product, φ is constant. Then, by Proposition 7 of [57], K_1 is an affine image of K , by an affinity of the form $(x, y) \rightarrow (x, ux + vy + w)$. By [57], p. 140, Remark to Proposition 7, we have $h(x) = vf(x) + ux + w$. Putting here $x = \pm 1$, we see $u = w = 0$. Hence, h is proportional to f , a contradiction. ■

Acknowledgement. We express our thanks to the referee, whose careful reading of our paper, and remarks about our paper substantially improved the presentation of our paper. We also express our thanks to M. Kozachok and A. Magazinov for pointing out to us the paper of Hanner.

References

- [1] Artstein-Avidan, S., Klartag, B., Milman, V., The Santaló point of a function, and a functional form of the Santaló inequality, *Mathematika* **51** (2004), 33-48, MR **2007a**:52008
- [2] Ball, K. M., Isometric problems in l_p and sections of convex sets, PhD Thesis, Univ. of Cambridge, 1988
- [3] Ball, K. M., Böröczky, K. J. Stability of some versions of the Prékopa-Leindler inequality, *Monatshefte Math.* **163** (2011), 1-14, MR **2012b**:52015
- [4] Bambah, R. P., Polar reciprocal convex bodies, *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **51** (1955), 377-378, MR **16**,1145
- [5] Barthe, F., Böröczky, K. J., Fradelizi, M., Stability of the functional forms of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality, preprint
- [6] Barthe, F., Fradelizi, M., The volume product of convex bodies with many symmetries, *Amer. J. of Math.* **135** (2013), 1-37
- [7] Behrend, F., Über einige Affininvarianten konvexer Bereiche, *Math. Ann.* **113** (1937), 713-747, Zbl. **15**.367

- [8] Blaschke, W., Über affine Geometrie VII: Neue Extremeigenschaften von Ellipse und Ellipsoid, *Ber. über die Verhandl. der Königl. Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wiss. zu Leipzig, Math.-Phys. Klasse* **69** (1917), 306-318, Jahresberichte Fortschr. Math. **46**.1112
- [9] Bollobás, B., Leader, I., Radcliffe, A. J., Reverse Kleitman inequalities, *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)* **58** (1989), 153-168, MR **90f**:52017
- [10] Böröczky, K. J., The stability of the Rogers-Shephard inequality and of some related inequalities, *Adv. Math.* **190** (2005), 47-76, MR **2005i**:52013
- [11] Böröczky, K. J., Stability of the Blaschke-Santaló and the affine isoperimetric inequality, *Adv. Math.* **225** (2010), 1914-1928, MR **2011j**:52016
- [12] Böröczky, K. J., Hug, D., Stability of the reverse Blaschke-Santaló inequality for zonoids and applications, *Adv. Appl. Math.* **44** (2010), 309-328, MR **2011c**:52005
- [13] Böröczky, K. J., Makai, E. Jr., On the volume product of planar polar convex bodies — upper estimates: the polygonal case, and stability, in preparation
- [14] Bourgain, J., Milman, V., New volume ratio properties for convex symmetric bodies in R^n , *Invent. Math.* **88** (1987), 319-340, MR **88f**:52013
- [15] Campi, S., Gronchi, P., On volume product inequalities for convex sets, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **134** (2006), 2393-2402, MR **2007a**:52010
- [16] Dvoretzky, A., Rogers, C. A., Absolute and unconditional convergence in normed linear spaces, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. Wash.* **36** (1950), 192-197, MR **11**,525
- [17] Eggleston, H. G., Note on a conjecture of Santaló, *Mathematika* **8** (1961), 63-65, MR **24**#A1070

- [18] Florian, A., On the area sum of a convex set and its polar reciprocal, *Math. Pannonica* **7** (1996), 171-176, MR **97i**:52007
- [19] Florian, A., A stability theorem for the area sum of a convex polygon and its polar reciprocal, *Math. Pannonica* **9** (1998), 3-15, MR **2000c**:52010
- [20] Fradelizi, M., Gordon, Y., Meyer, M., Reisner, S., The case of equality for an inverse Santaló functional inequality, *Adv. Geom.* **10** (2010), 621-630, MR **2011j**:52017
- [21] Fradelizi, M., Meyer, M., Some functional forms of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality, *Math. Z.* **256** (2007), 379-395, MR **2008c**:52013
- [22] Fradelizi, M., Meyer, M., Increasing functions and inverse Santaló inequality for unconditional functions, *Positivity* **12** (2008), 407-420, MR **2009e**:26025
- [23] Fradelizi, M., Meyer, M., Some functional inverse Santaló inequalities, *Adv. Math.* **218** (2008), 1430-1452, MR **2009f**:26026
- [24] Fradelizi, M., Meyer, M., Functional inequalities related to Mahler's conjecture, *Monatsh. Math.* **159** (2010), 13-25, MR **2011a**:39041
- [25] Giannopoulos, A., Paouris, G., Vritsiou, B., The isotropic position and the reverse Santaló inequality, *Isr. J. Math.*, accepted
- [26] Gordon, Y., Meyer, M., Reisner, S., Zonoids with minimal volume product — a new proof, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **104** (1988), 273-276, MR **89i**:52015
- [27] Gordon, Y., Reisner, S., Some aspects of volume estimates to various parameters in Banach spaces, In: *Proc. Res. Workshop on Banach Space Theory* (Iowa City, Iowa, 1981), (Ed. Bor-Luh Lin), Univ. Iowa, Iowa City, IA, 1982, 23-53, MR **85g**:46020
- [28] Groemer, H., Stability of geometric inequalities, In: *Handbook of Convex Geometry* (eds. P. M. Gruber, J. M. Wills), North Holland, Amsterdam, 1993, 125-150, MR **94i**:52011

- [29] Grünbaum, B., *Convex polytopes*, With the cooperation of V. Klee, M. A. Perles, G. C. Shephard, Pure and Appl. Math., **16**, Wiley, Interscience, New York, 1967, MR **37**#2085, Second Ed., Prepared and with a preface by V. Kaibel, V. Klee, G. M. Ziegler, Graduate Texts in Math., **221**, Springer, New York, 2003, MR **2004b**:52001
- [30] Guggenheimer, H., Correction to “Polar reciprocal convex bodies”, Israel J. Math. **14** (1973), 309-316, *Israel J. Math.* **29** (1978), 312, MR **57**,7383
- [31] Hanner, O., Intersections of translates of convex bodies, *Math. Scand.* **4** (1956), 67-89, MR **18**,595b
- [32] Hansen, A. B.-Lima, Å., The structure of finite dimensional Banach spaces with the 3.2 intersection property, *Acta Math.* **146** (1981), 1-23, MR **82g**:46037
- [33] Hug, D., Contributions to affine surface area, *Manuscr. Math.* **91** (1996), 283-301, MR **98d**:52009
- [34] John, F., Extremum problems with inequalities as subsidiary conditions, In: *Studies and essays presented to R. Courant on his 60th birthday*, Interscience, New York, N. Y., 1948, 187-204, MR **10**,719
- [35] Kim, J., Minimal volume product near Hanner polytopes, <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1212.2544>
- [36] Kim, J., Reisner, S., Local minimality of the volume-product at the simplex, <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1001.0217v1>, *Mathematika* **57** (2011), 121-134, MR **2012a**:52023
- [37] Kim, J., Zvavitch, A., Stability of the reverse Blaschke-Santaló inequality for unconditional convex bodies, arxiv:1302.5719v1
- [38] Klartag, B., Milman, V. D., Geometry of log-concave functions and measures, *Geom. Dedicata* **112** (2005), 169-182, MR **2006d**:52004
- [39] Kuperberg. G., A low-technology estimate in convex geometry, *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, 1992 (9), 181-183, arXiv:math/9804023, MR **93h**:52010

- [40] Kuperberg. G., From the Mahler conjecture to Gauss linking integrals, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **18** (2008), 870-892, arXiv:math/0610.5904, MR **2009i**:52005
- [41] Lin, Youjiang, and Leng, Gangsong, Convex bodies with minimal volume product in \mathbb{R}^2 — a new proof, *Discrete Math.* **310** (2010), 3018-3025, MR **2012b**:52016
- [42] Lopez, M. A., Reisner, S., A special case of Mahler's conjecture, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **20** (1998), 163-177, MR **99h**:52009
- [43] Lutwak, E., Selected affine isoperimetric inequalities, In: *Handbook of Convex Geometry* (Eds. P. M. Gruber, J. M. Wills), North Holland, Amsterdam etc. 1993, 151-176, MR **94h**:52014
- [44] Mahler, K., Ein Minimalproblem für konvexe Polygone, *Mathematika B (Zutphen)* **7** (1938), 118-127, Zbl. **20**.50
- [45] Mahler, K., Ein Übertragungsprinzip für konvexe Körper, *Časopis Pěst. Mat. Fys.* **68** (1939), 93-102, MR **1**,202
- [46] Mahler, K., *Geometry of Numbers*, Univ. of Colorado, 1950
- [47] Makai, Jr., E., On the thinnest non-separable lattice of convex bodies, *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.* **13** (1978), 19-27, MR **1983a**:52016
- [48] Makai, Jr., E., Five-neighbour packing of convex plates, (Proc. Conf. Intuitive Geom., Siófok, 1985) *Coll. Math. Soc. J. Bolyai* **48**, *Intuitive Geom.* (Eds. K. Böröczky, G. Fejes Tóth), J. Bolyai Math. Soc., Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1987, 373-381, MR **88k**:52019
- [49] Makai, Jr., E., The recent status of the volume product problem, *Banach Center Publications*, accepted
- [50] Makai, Jr., E., Martini, H., The cross-section body, plane sections of convex bodies and approximation of convex bodies, I, *Geom. Dedicata* **63** (1996), 267-296, MR **99d**:52005
- [51] Makai, Jr., E., Martini, H., Any non-transilluminable lattice of balls in \mathbb{R}^4 has a density at least $25\pi^2/256$, in preparation

- [52] Meyer, M., Une caractérisation volumique de certains espaces normés de dimension finie, *Israel J. Math.* **55** (1986), 317-326, MR **88f**:52017
- [53] Meyer, M., Convex bodies with minimal volume product in \mathbb{R}^2 , *Monatsh. Math.* **112** (1991), 297-301, MR **92k**:52015
- [54] Meyer, M., Pajor, A., On Santaló's inequality, in: *Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis (1987-88)*, eds. J. Lindenstrauss and V. D. Milman, Lect. Notes in Math. 1376, Springer, Berlin, 1989, 261-263, MR **90h**:52012
- [55] Meyer, M., Pajor, A., On the Blaschke-Santaló inequality, *Arch. Math. (Basel)* **55** (1990), 82-93, MR **92b**:52013
- [56] Meyer, M., Reisner, S., Inequalities involving integrals of polar-conjugate concave functions, *Monatsh. Math.* **125** (1998), 219-227, MR **99c**:52004
- [57] Meyer, M., Reisner, S., Shadow systems and volumes of polar convex bodies, *Mathematika* **53** (2006), 129-148, arXiv:math/0606305, MR **2008d**:52010
- [58] Meyer, M., Reisner, S., On the volume product of polygons, *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg* **81** (2011), 93-100, MR **2812036**
- [59] Nazarov, F., The Hörmander proof of the Bourgain-Milman theorem, *Geometric Aspects of Funct. Anal.*, Lecture Notes in Math. **2050**, Springer, Heidelberg, 2012, 335-343 MR2985302
- [60] Nazarov, F., Petrov, F., Ryabogin, D., Zvavitch, A., A remark on the Mahler conjecture: local minimality of the unit cube, <http://arxiv.org/pdf/0905.0867v1>, *Duke Math. J.* **154** (2010), 419-430, MR **2012a**:52010
- [61] Petty, C. M., Affine isoperimetric problems, *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **440** (1985), 113-127, MR **87a**:52014
- [62] Pisier, G., *The Volume of Convex Bodies and Banach Space Geometry*, Cambridge Tracts in Math. **94**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1989, MR **91d**:52005

- [63] Reisner, S., Random polytopes and the volume-product of symmetric convex bodies, *Math. Scand.* **57** (1985), 386-392, MR **87g**:52011
- [64] Reisner, S., Zonoids with minimal volume product, *Math. Z.* **192** (1986), 339-346, MR **87g**:52022
- [65] Reisner, S., Minimal volume-product in Banach spaces with a 1-unconditional basis, *J. London Math. Soc. (2)* **36** (1987), 126-136, MR **88h**:46029
- [66] Reisner, S., Schütt, C., Werner, E., Mahler's conjecture and curvature, *Internat. Math. Res. Notices IMRN* (2012) (1), 1-16, MR2874925
- [67] Rogers, C. A., Shephard, G. C., Convex bodies associated with a given convex body, *J. London Math. Soc.* **33** (1958), 270-281, MR **21**#318
- [68] Saint Raymond, J., Sur le volume des corps convexes symétriques, *Sém. d'Initiation à l'Analyse 20^e Année*, 1980-1981, Exp. **11** (Univ. Paris VI, Paris, 1981), MR **84j**:46033
- [69] Santaló, L. A., An affine invariant for convex bodies of n -dimensional space (Spanish), *Portugal. Math.* **8** (1949), 155-161, MR **12**,526
- [70] Schönert, M. et al., *GAP — Groups, Algorithms and Programming*, Lehrstuhl D für Math., Rheinisch-Westfälische Hochschule, Aachen, 5th ed. (1995).
- [71] Stancu, A., Two volume product inequalities and applications, *Canad Math. Bull.* **52** (2009), 464-472, MR **2011b**:52011
- [72] Tabachnikov, S., Variations on R. Schwartz's inequality for the Schwarzian derivative, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **46** (2011), 724-742, MR 2846176
- [73] Thompson, A. C., *Minkowski Geometry*, *Encycl. of Math. and its Appls.*, **63**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1996, MR **97f**:52001

- [74] Thompson, A. C., Dualität, Volumenprodukt und Mahlersche Ungleichungen, *Math. Semesterberichte* **54** (2007), 141-153, Zbl **1155.52006**
- [75] Zhang, G. Y., Restricted chord projection and affine inequalities, *Geom. Dedicata* **39** (1991), 213-222, MR **92f:52017**