Integral functionals verifying a Brunn-Minkowski type inequality

Andrea Colesanti in collaboration with Daniel Hug and Eugenia Saorín–Gomez

Asymptotic Geometric Analysis and Convexity

Toronto, 13–17 September 2010

▶ K^n = family of convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^n ,

- $ightharpoonup \mathcal{K}^n$ = family of convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^n ,
- ▶ $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$.

- $ightharpoonup \mathcal{K}^n = \text{family of convex bodies in } \mathbb{R}^n,$
- $\blacktriangleright \ f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}).$

$$\mathcal{M}: \mathcal{K}^n \to \mathbb{R}$$
,

- $ightharpoonup \mathcal{K}^n$ = family of convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^n ,
- $\blacktriangleright f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}).$

$$\mathcal{M}: \mathcal{K}^n \to \mathbb{R}$$
,

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) \, dS(K, x) \,, \tag{1}$$

- $ightharpoonup \mathcal{K}^n$ = family of convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^n ,
- $ightharpoonup f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}).$

$$\mathcal{M}:\mathcal{K}^n\to\mathbb{R}$$
,

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) \, dS(K, x), \qquad (1)$$

$${\cal M}$$
 is $\left\{egin{array}{l} {\sf continuous,} \\ \end{array}
ight.$

- $ightharpoonup \mathcal{K}^n$ = family of convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^n ,
- $\blacktriangleright f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}).$

$$\mathcal{M}:\mathcal{K}^n\to\mathbb{R}$$
,

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) \, dS(K, x), \qquad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{M}$$
 is
$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{continuous,} \\ \text{translation invariant,} \end{array} \right.$$

- $ightharpoonup \mathcal{K}^n$ = family of convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^n ,
- $\blacktriangleright f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}).$

$$\mathcal{M}: \mathcal{K}^n \to \mathbb{R}$$
,

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) \, dS(K, x) \,, \tag{1}$$

- ▶ \mathcal{K}^n = family of convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^n ,
- $ightharpoonup f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}).$

$$\mathcal{M}:\mathcal{K}^n\to\mathbb{R}$$
,

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) \, dS(K, x), \qquad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{M} \text{ is } \begin{cases} \text{continuous,} \\ \text{translation invariant,} \\ (n-1) - \text{homogeneous,} \\ \text{a valuation.} \end{cases}$$
 (2)

- ▶ \mathcal{K}^n = family of convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^n ,
- ▶ $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$.

$$\mathcal{M}:\mathcal{K}^n\to\mathbb{R}$$
,

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) \, dS(K, x) \,, \tag{1}$$

where $S(K, \cdot)$ is the area measure of K.

$$\mathcal{M} \text{ is } \begin{cases} \text{continuous,} \\ \text{translation invariant,} \\ (n-1) - \text{homogeneous,} \\ \text{a valuation.} \end{cases}$$
 (2)

By a result of McMullen (1980), $(1) \Leftrightarrow (2)$.

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) \, dS(K, x)$$

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) \, dS(K, x)$$

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) \, dS(K, x)$$

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = V(nL, K, ..., K), \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{K}^n.$$

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) \, dS(K, x)$$

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = V(nL, K, \dots, K), \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{K}^n.$$

In this case ${\mathcal M}$ has many additional properties. Among them we mention that:

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) \, dS(K, x)$$

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = V(nL, K, \dots, K), \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{K}^n.$$

In this case ${\mathcal M}$ has many additional properties. Among them we mention that:

M is non-negative;

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) \, dS(K, x)$$

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = V(nL, K, \dots, K), \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{K}^n.$$

In this case ${\mathcal M}$ has many additional properties. Among them we mention that:

- M is non-negative;
- M verifies an inequality of Brunn-Minkowski type:

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) \, dS(K, x)$$

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = V(nL, K, \dots, K), \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{K}^n.$$

In this case ${\mathcal M}$ has many additional properties. Among them we mention that:

- M is non-negative;
- M verifies an inequality of Brunn-Minkowski type:

$$\left[\mathcal{M}((1-t) \mathcal{K}_0 + t \mathcal{K}_1) \right]^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \geq (1-t) \left[\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{K}_0) \right]^{\frac{1}{n-1}} + t \left[\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{K}_1) \right]^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \, ,$$
 for every $\mathcal{K}_0, \mathcal{K}_1 \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $t \in [0,1]$.

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) \, dS(K, x)$$

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = V(nL, K, \dots, K), \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{K}^n.$$

In this case ${\mathcal M}$ has many additional properties. Among them we mention that:

- M is non-negative;
- ▶ M verifies an inequality of Brunn–Minkowski type:

$$\left[\mathcal{M}((1-t)K_0+tK_1)\right]^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \geq (1-t)\left[\mathcal{M}(K_0)\right]^{\frac{1}{n-1}} + t\left[\mathcal{M}(K_1)\right]^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \;,$$
 for every $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $t \in [0,1]$.

Note that in dimension two \mathcal{M} is *linear* and the Brunn–Minkowski inequality becomes an equality, for every choice of f.



Let $n \ge 3$. Assume that the functional

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) \, dS(K, x),$$

with $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$,

Let $n \geq 3$. Assume that the functional

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) \, dS(K, x) \,,$$

with $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, verifies $\mathcal{M} \geq 0$ and

$$[\mathcal{M}((1-t)K_0+tK_1)]^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \geq (1-t)[\mathcal{M}(K_0)]^{\frac{1}{n-1}} + t[\mathcal{M}(K_1)]^{\frac{1}{n-1}} ,$$

for every $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $t \in [0, 1]$.

Let $n \geq 3$. Assume that the functional

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) \, dS(K, x) \,,$$

with $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, verifies $\mathcal{M} \geq 0$ and

$$\left[\mathcal{M}((1-t)K_0+tK_1)\right]^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \geq (1-t)\left[\mathcal{M}(K_0)\right]^{\frac{1}{n-1}} + t\left[\mathcal{M}(K_1)\right]^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \;,$$

for every $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $t \in [0, 1]$.

Then what can be said about f?

Let $n \geq 3$. Assume that the functional

$$\mathcal{M}(K) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) \, dS(K, x) \,,$$

with $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$, verifies $\mathcal{M} \geq 0$ and

$$\left[\mathcal{M}((1-t)K_0+tK_1)\right]^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \geq (1-t)\left[\mathcal{M}(K_0)\right]^{\frac{1}{n-1}} + t\left[\mathcal{M}(K_1)\right]^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \;,$$

for every $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $t \in [0, 1]$.

Then what can be said about f? In particular, does it follow that f is a support function?

Theorem A. Let $n \ge 3$. Assume that $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ is <u>even</u>

Theorem A. Let $n \geq 3$. Assume that $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ is <u>even</u> and the functional

$$\mathcal{M}: K \longrightarrow \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) dS(K,x),$$

is non-negative

Theorem A. Let $n \ge 3$. Assume that $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ is <u>even</u> and the functional

$$\mathcal{M}: K \longrightarrow \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) dS(K, x),$$

is non-negative and verifies

$$[\mathcal{M}((1-t)K_0+tK_1)]^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \geq (1-t)[\mathcal{M}(K_0)]^{\frac{1}{n-1}}+t[\mathcal{M}(K_1)]^{\frac{1}{n-1}}$$
,

for every $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $t \in [0, 1]$.

Theorem A. Let $n \ge 3$. Assume that $f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$ is <u>even</u> and the functional

$$\mathcal{M}: K \longrightarrow \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) dS(K,x),$$

is non-negative and verifies

$$\left[\mathcal{M}((1-t)K_0+tK_1)\right]^{rac{1}{n-1}} \geq (1-t)\left[\mathcal{M}(K_0)\right]^{rac{1}{n-1}} + t\left[\mathcal{M}(K_1)\right]^{rac{1}{n-1}} \; ,$$

for every $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $t \in [0,1]$. Then there exists a convex body L such that f is the support function of L.

▶ f even implies \mathcal{M} symmetric: $\mathcal{M}(K) = \mathcal{M}(-K)$, $\forall K$.

▶ f even implies \mathcal{M} symmetric: $\mathcal{M}(K) = \mathcal{M}(-K)$, $\forall K$. Viceversa, \mathcal{M} symmetric implies

$$f = f_e + \Lambda$$
,

where f_e is even and Λ is the restriction of a linear function to \mathbb{S}^{n-1} .

▶ f even implies \mathcal{M} symmetric: $\mathcal{M}(K) = \mathcal{M}(-K)$, $\forall K$. Viceversa, \mathcal{M} symmetric implies

$$f = f_e + \Lambda$$
,

where f_e is even and Λ is the restriction of a linear function to \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . Since

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \Lambda(x) \, dS(K,x) = 0 \,, \quad \forall \, K \in \mathcal{K}^n \,,$$

▶ f even implies \mathcal{M} symmetric: $\mathcal{M}(K) = \mathcal{M}(-K)$, $\forall K$. Viceversa, \mathcal{M} symmetric implies

$$f = f_e + \Lambda$$
,

where f_e is even and Λ is the restriction of a linear function to \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . Since

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \Lambda(x) \, dS(K,x) = 0 \,, \quad \forall \, K \in \mathcal{K}^n \,,$$

if \mathcal{M} is symmetric, then f may assumed to be even.

▶ f even implies \mathcal{M} symmetric: $\mathcal{M}(K) = \mathcal{M}(-K)$, $\forall K$. Viceversa, \mathcal{M} symmetric implies

$$f = f_e + \Lambda$$
,

where f_e is even and Λ is the restriction of a linear function to \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . Since

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \Lambda(x) \, dS(K, x) = 0 \,, \quad \forall \, K \in \mathcal{K}^n \,,$$

if \mathcal{M} is symmetric, then f may assumed to be even.

▶ In Theorem A, the Brunn–Minkowski inequality in its standard form can be replaced by the weaker version

$$\mathcal{M}((1-t)K_0+tK_1) \geq \min\left\{\mathcal{M}(K_0), \mathcal{M}(K_1)\right\}\,,$$

for every $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $t \in [0, 1]$.



▶ f even implies \mathcal{M} symmetric: $\mathcal{M}(K) = \mathcal{M}(-K)$, $\forall K$. Viceversa, \mathcal{M} symmetric implies

$$f = f_e + \Lambda$$
,

where f_e is even and Λ is the restriction of a linear function to \mathbb{S}^{n-1} . Since

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \Lambda(x) \, dS(K, x) = 0 \,, \quad \forall \, K \in \mathcal{K}^n \,,$$

if \mathcal{M} is symmetric, then f may assumed to be even.

▶ In Theorem A, the Brunn–Minkowski inequality in its standard form can be replaced by the weaker version

$$\mathcal{M}((1-t)K_0+tK_1) \geq \min\left\{\mathcal{M}(K_0), \mathcal{M}(K_1)\right\}\,,$$

for every $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $t \in [0, 1]$. This allows to remove the assumption $\mathcal{M} \geq 0$.



$$\Phi: \mathcal{K}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

be a continuous, translation invariant, symmetric and (n-1)-homogeneous valuation.

$$\Phi: \mathcal{K}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

be a continuous, translation invariant, symmetric and (n-1)-homogeneous valuation. Assume that

$$\Phi((1-t)K_0 + tK_1) \ge \min \{\Phi(K_0), \Phi(K_1)\}, \qquad (3)$$

for every $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $t \in [0, 1]$.

$$\Phi: \mathcal{K}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

be a continuous, translation invariant, symmetric and (n-1)-homogeneous valuation. Assume that

$$\Phi((1-t)K_0 + tK_1) \ge \min \{\Phi(K_0), \Phi(K_1)\}, \qquad (3)$$

for every $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $t \in [0,1]$. Then there exists $L \in \mathcal{K}^n$ such that

$$\Phi(K) = V(L, K, \dots, K), \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{K}^n.$$



$$\Phi: \mathcal{K}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

be a continuous, translation invariant, symmetric and (n-1)-homogeneous valuation. Assume that

$$\Phi((1-t)K_0 + tK_1) \ge \min \{\Phi(K_0), \Phi(K_1)\},$$
 (3)

for every $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $t \in [0,1]$. Then there exists $L \in \mathcal{K}^n$ such that

$$\Phi(K) = V(L, K, \dots, K), \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{K}^n.$$

As proved by McMullen (1990), the same result holds, without symmetry assumption, if (3) is replaced by monotonicity w.r.t. inclusion.

Theorem B. Let $n \ge 3$. Assume that

$$f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \cap W^{2,2}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}),$$

Theorem B. Let $n \ge 3$. Assume that

$$f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \cap W^{2,2}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$$
,

and the functional

$$\mathcal{M}: K \longrightarrow \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) dS(K,x),$$

verifies

$$\mathcal{M}((1-t) \textit{K}_0 + t \textit{K}_1) \geq \min \left\{ \mathcal{M}(\textit{K}_0), \mathcal{M}(\textit{K}_1) \right\} \,,$$

for every $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $t \in [0, 1]$.

Theorem B. Let $n \ge 3$. Assume that

$$f \in C(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) \cap W^{2,2}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})$$
,

and the functional

$$\mathcal{M}: K \longrightarrow \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x) dS(K,x),$$

verifies

$$\mathcal{M}((1-t)K_0+tK_1)\geq \min\left\{\mathcal{M}(K_0),\mathcal{M}(K_1)\right\}\,,$$

for every $K_0, K_1 \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $t \in [0,1]$. Then there exists a convex body L such that f is the support function of L.

▶ $K \in K^n$ of class C_+^2 ; h support function of K.

▶ $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ of class C_+^2 ; h support function of K.

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{K}) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f \det(h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij}) \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \, .$$

▶ $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ of class C_+^2 ; h support function of K.

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{K}) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f \det(h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij}) \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \, .$$

 $ightharpoonup \phi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}),$

▶ $K \in K^n$ of class C_+^2 ; h support function of K.

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{K}) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f \det(h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij}) \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \, .$$

 $lack \phi \in \mathcal{C}^{\infty}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}), \ s \in \mathbb{R}, \ |s| \ \text{sufficiently small};$

▶ $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ of class C_+^2 ; h support function of K.

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{K}) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f \det(h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij}) \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \, .$$

 $lack \phi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}), \ s \in \mathbb{R}, \ |s| \ \text{sufficiently small};$

$$h + s\phi$$

▶ $K \in K^n$ of class C_+^2 ; h support function of K.

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{K}) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f \det(h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij}) \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \, .$$

 $lack \phi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}), \ s \in \mathbb{R}, \ |s| \ {\sf sufficiently \ small};$

 $h + s\phi$ is the support function of a C_+^2 convex body K_s .

▶ $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ of class C_+^2 ; h support function of K.

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{K}) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f \det(h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij}) \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \, .$$

 $lack \phi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}), \ s \in \mathbb{R}, \ |s| \ \text{sufficiently small};$

 $h + s\phi$ is the support function of a C_+^2 convex body K_s .

$$s \longrightarrow g(s) = \mathcal{M}(K_s)$$
.



▶ $K \in K^n$ of class C_+^2 ; h support function of K.

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{K}) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f \det(h_{ij} + h\delta_{ij}) \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1} \, .$$

 $lack \phi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}), \ s \in \mathbb{R}, \ |s| \ \text{sufficiently small};$

 $h + s\phi$ is the support function of a C_+^2 convex body K_s .

$$s \longrightarrow g(s) = \mathcal{M}(K_s)$$
.

Brunn–Minkowski inequality for $\mathcal{M} \Rightarrow g^{1/(n-1)}$ concave.



$$\left. \frac{d^2}{ds^2} \left(g^{1/(n-1)} \right) \right|_{s=0} \leq 0.$$

$$\left. \frac{d^2}{ds^2} \left(g^{1/(n-1)} \right) \right|_{s=0} \leq 0.$$

$$\implies (n-1)g(0)g''(0) \le (n-2)(g'(0))^2. \tag{4}$$

$$\left. \frac{d^2}{ds^2} \left(g^{1/(n-1)} \right) \right|_{s=0} \le 0.$$

$$\implies (n-1)g(0)g''(0) \le (n-2)(g'(0))^2. \tag{4}$$

$$g(s) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f \det((h+s\phi)_{ij} + (h+s\phi)\delta_{ij}) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$$
.

$$\frac{d^2}{ds^2} \left(g^{1/(n-1)} \right) \Big|_{s=0} \le 0.$$

$$\implies (n-1)g(0)g''(0) \le (n-2)(g'(0))^2. \tag{4}$$

$$g(s) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f \det((h+s\phi)_{ij} + (h+s\phi)\delta_{ij}) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}.$$

▶ Starting from the last expression,
$$g(0)$$
, $g'(0)$ and $g''(0)$ can explicitly be computed, and replaced in (4);

$$\frac{d^2}{ds^2} \left(g^{1/(n-1)} \right) \Big|_{s=0} \le 0.$$

$$\implies (n-1)g(0)g''(0) \le (n-2)(g'(0))^2. \tag{4}$$

$$g(s) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f \det((h+s\phi)_{ij} + (h+s\phi)\delta_{ij}) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}.$$

- ▶ Starting from the last expression, g(0), g'(0) and g''(0) can explicitly be computed, and replaced in (4);
- ▶ (4) becomes a functional inequality involving f, h and ϕ ;

$$\frac{d^2}{ds^2} \left(g^{1/(n-1)} \right) \Big|_{s=0} \le 0.$$

$$\implies (n-1)g(0)g''(0) \le (n-2)(g'(0))^2. \tag{4}$$

$$g(s) = \int_{S^{n-1}} f \det((h+s\phi)_{ij} + (h+s\phi)\delta_{ij}) d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}.$$

- ▶ Starting from the last expression, g(0), g'(0) and g''(0) can explicitly be computed, and replaced in (4);
- ▶ (4) becomes a functional inequality involving f, h and ϕ ;
- in particular, its validity for every choice of h and ϕ reveals to be a powerful condition, from which one can deduce that f is a support function.

ightharpoonup n = 3, f even and smooth.

- ightharpoonup n = 3, f even and smooth.
- ▶ Choose $h \equiv 1$ (i.e. K is the unit ball of \mathbb{R}^3);

- ightharpoonup n = 3, f even and smooth.
- ► Choose $h \equiv 1$ (i.e. K is the unit ball of \mathbb{R}^3); inequality (4) implies

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f \phi^2 d\mathcal{H}^2 \le \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \langle H \nabla \phi, \nabla \phi \rangle d\mathcal{H}^2, \qquad (5)$$

for every $\phi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{S}^2)$, supported in a hemisphere,

- ightharpoonup n = 3, f even and smooth.
- ▶ Choose $h \equiv 1$ (i.e. K is the unit ball of \mathbb{R}^3); inequality (4) implies

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f \phi^2 d\mathcal{H}^2 \le \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \langle H \nabla \phi, \nabla \phi \rangle d\mathcal{H}^2, \tag{5}$$

for every $\phi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{S}^2)$, supported in a hemisphere, where

$$H = \text{cofactor matrix of } (f_{ij} + f \delta_{ij}).$$

- ightharpoonup n = 3, f even and smooth.
- ► Choose $h \equiv 1$ (i.e. K is the unit ball of \mathbb{R}^3); inequality (4) implies

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f \phi^2 d\mathcal{H}^2 \le \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \langle H \nabla \phi, \nabla \phi \rangle d\mathcal{H}^2, \qquad (5)$$

for every $\phi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{S}^2)$, supported in a hemisphere, where

$$H = \text{cofactor matrix of } (f_{ij} + f \delta_{ij}).$$

▶ (5) forces $H \ge 0$ on \mathbb{S}^2 ;



- ightharpoonup n = 3, f even and smooth.
- ▶ Choose $h \equiv 1$ (i.e. K is the unit ball of \mathbb{R}^3); inequality (4) implies

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f \phi^2 d\mathcal{H}^2 \le \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \langle H \nabla \phi, \nabla \phi \rangle d\mathcal{H}^2, \qquad (5)$$

for every $\phi \in C^{\infty}(\mathbb{S}^2)$, supported in a hemisphere, where

$$H = \text{cofactor matrix of } (f_{ij} + f \delta_{ij}).$$

▶ (5) forces $H \ge 0$ on \mathbb{S}^2 ;

$$H \geq 0 \Rightarrow (f_{ij} + f \delta_{ij}) \geq 0$$
.



- ightharpoonup n = 3, f even and smooth.
- ▶ Choose $h \equiv 1$ (i.e. K is the unit ball of \mathbb{R}^3); inequality (4) implies

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^2} f \phi^2 d\mathcal{H}^2 \le \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} \langle H \nabla \phi, \nabla \phi \rangle d\mathcal{H}^2, \qquad (5)$$

for every $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^2)$, supported in a hemisphere, where

$$H = \text{cofactor matrix of } (f_{ij} + f \delta_{ij}).$$

▶ (5) forces $H \ge 0$ on \mathbb{S}^2 ;

$$H \geq 0 \Rightarrow (f_{ij} + f \delta_{ij}) \geq 0$$
.

► The last condition is equivalent to say that f is a support function.

