

# On valuation deviations and their geometry

David Owen Horace Cutler  
Department of Mathematics, Tufts University,  
Medford, MA 02155  
Email: david.cutler@tufts.edu

Mel Deaton  
Department of Mathematics, Johns Hopkins University,  
Baltimore, MD 21218  
Email: rdeaton3@jh.edu

## Abstract

We introduce two valuation-based deviations on convex bodies. Using a construction that allows us to associate to these deviations “intrinsic” pseudometrics, we establish various results which capture information about the underlying valuation in terms of the geometry of their induced deviations.

## 1 Introduction

In the study of convex geometry, various notions by which to assign a “distance” between convex bodies are considered. An interesting class of examples is given by the *intrinsic volume deviations*  $\{\Delta_i\}_{i=1}^n$ , defined by

$$\Delta_i(K, L) := V_i(K) + V_i(L) - 2V_i(K \cap L) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}_n^n. \quad (1)$$

Here  $V_i$  is the  $i$ -th intrinsic volume, and  $\mathcal{K}_n^n$  is the space of compact, convex subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with affine dimension  $n$  (i.e. with nonempty interior). In the case  $i = n$ , (1) reduces to the well-studied symmetric difference metric

$$\Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, L) := \text{Vol}(K) + \text{Vol}(L) - 2\text{Vol}(K \cap L) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}_n^n.$$

The study of special cases of these deviations is classical (see [10], [15]), though the generality of (1) is more recent and was introduced in the study of approximation of convex bodies by polytopes (see [4]).

Another seemingly distinct facet of convex geometry deals with the study of set functions modeled on the intrinsic volumes, known as *valuations* (see 2.1). Within the class  $\text{Val}$  of continuous, translation-invariant valuations one can imitate the construction in (1): indeed, given  $\phi \in \text{Val}$  we introduce in Definition 2.2 the corresponding  *$\phi$  meet-deviation*

$$\Delta_\phi(K, L) := \phi(K) + \phi(L) - 2\phi(K \cap L), \quad K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n,$$

and in Definition 2.4 the  *$\phi$  join-deviation*

$$\rho_\phi(K, L) := 2\phi(K \cup L) - \phi(K) - \phi(L), \quad K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n,$$

where  $K \cup L$  is the convex hull of  $K \cup L$ . When  $\phi$  is an intrinsic volume,  $\Delta_\phi$  reduces exactly to an intrinsic volume deviation.

Both  $\Delta_\phi$  and  $\rho_\phi$  are symmetric by construction, and under a mild monotonicity assumption on  $\phi$  they are also nonnegative. If  $\phi$  is further required to be  $k$ -strictly monotone, in the sense that

$$K \subsetneq L \implies \phi(K) < \phi(L), \quad K, L \in \mathcal{K}_k^n \cup \{\emptyset\},$$

then  $\Delta_\phi$  and  $\rho_\phi$  distinguish points of  $\mathcal{K}_k^n$ ; see Proposition 2.3. In this context it is reasonable to regard  $\Delta_\phi$  (and similarly  $\rho_\phi$ ) as *semimetrics* on  $\mathcal{K}_k^n$ .

As in the case of the intrinsic volume deviations, neither  $\Delta_\phi$  nor  $\rho_\phi$  is expected to satisfy a triangle inequality. Nevertheless, following a construction of Xia for quasimetric spaces [16], we can still analyze their geometry by considering their induced intrinsic pseudometrics  $\bar{\Delta}_\phi$  and  $\bar{\rho}_\phi$  (Definition 2.11).

Our first main result describes exactly when the intrinsic pseudometric  $\bar{\Delta}_\phi$  is dominated by the original deviation  $\Delta_\phi$  on  $\mathcal{K}_k^n$ , which is the natural intrinsicness condition in the absence of a triangle inequality. In particular, we show:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\phi \in \text{Val}$  be  $k$ -strictly monotone and write its McMullen decomposition*

$$\phi = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i,$$

*with each  $\phi_i \in \text{Val}$   $i$ -homogeneous. Then*

$$\bar{\Delta}_\phi(K, L) \leq \Delta_\phi(K, L) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}_k^n$$

*if and only if  $\phi$  has no 1-homogeneous component, i.e.  $\phi_1 \equiv 0$ .*

This result directly expresses information about the underlying valuation  $\phi$  in terms of the geometry of  $\Delta_\phi$ .

Our second main result concerns the extreme homogeneous cases. We establish:

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $\phi \in \text{Val}$  be  $k$ -strictly monotone. If  $\phi$  is 1-homogeneous, then*

$$\bar{\Delta}_\phi(K, L) = \rho_\phi(K, L) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}_1^n,$$

*where  $\rho_\phi$  is a metric in this case. In a dual fashion, if  $n > 1$  and  $\phi$  is  $n$ -homogeneous, then*

$$\bar{\rho}_\phi(K, L) = \Delta_\phi(K, L) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}_n^n,$$

*where  $\Delta_\phi$  is a metric in this case.*

These results make the relationship between  $\Delta_\phi$  and  $\rho_\phi$  explicit in the typical cases in which one is a metric.

We additionally confirm that  $\rho_\phi$  is intrinsic (in the normal metric-geometric sense) in the 1-homogeneous case, and indeed show it turns  $\mathcal{K}^n$  into a geodesic space:

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $\phi$  be  $k$ -strictly monotone. If  $\phi$  is 1-homogeneous, then  $(\mathcal{K}^n, \rho_\phi)$  is a length space that admits a shortest path  $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathcal{K}^n$  between any given  $K$  and  $L$  in  $\mathcal{K}^n$ .*

Finally, we perform a similar verification that  $\Delta_\phi$  is intrinsic in the  $n$ -homogeneous case (i.e. that the symmetric difference metric is intrinsic), and characterize when it admits shortest paths:

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_n^n$  for any  $n$ . Then there is continuous  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_n^n$  such that*

$$\gamma(0) = K, \gamma(1) = L \quad \text{and} \quad L(\gamma) = \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, L)$$

*if and only if there exists a “bridging body”  $M \in \mathcal{K}_n^n$  such that*

$$K \cap L \subseteq M \subseteq K \cup L \quad (\text{a.e.}) \quad \text{and} \quad M \cap K, \quad M \cap L \in \mathcal{K}_n^n.$$

*In particular, there is never a geodesic segment joining disjoint bodies  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n$ , and thus  $(\mathcal{K}^n, \Delta)$  is never a geodesic space for any  $n$ .*

Our results, taken together, establish a means by which to study a large class of valuations through metric geometry, as do they confirm an intimate, dual relationship between  $\Delta_\phi$  and  $\rho_\phi$ .

## 1.1 Organization of the paper

In Section 2 we recount the relevant preliminaries and give our basic definitions. Section 3 contains the lemmas and proofs needed to establish Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, and Section 4 deals with Theorems 1.3 and 1.4.

## 2 Preliminaries and definitions

### 2.1 Valuations

We use  $\mathcal{K}^n$  to denote the space of nonempty, compact, and convex subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Recall a *valuation* is a function  $\phi : \mathcal{K}^n \rightarrow G$  satisfying

$$\phi(K \cup L) + \phi(K \cap L) = \phi(K) + \phi(L) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n, \quad (2)$$

where  $(G, +)$  is an abelian monoid. For our purposes we will take  $G = \mathbb{R}$  and extend the domain of such a  $\phi$  by assigning  $\phi(\emptyset) = 0$ .

The union  $K \cup L$  is not always convex, so the left side of (2) is *a priori* not always defined. Nonetheless, if  $\phi$  is continuous, an application of Groemer's extension theorem (see [14] Theorem 6.2.5) shows  $\phi$  satisfies (2) on the convex ring  $U(\mathcal{K}^n)$ , where

$$U(\mathcal{K}^n) = \left\{ \bigcup_{i=1}^N K_i : K_i \in \mathcal{K}^n, \{1, \dots, N\} \subseteq \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

Here by continuity we mean continuity with respect to the *Hausdorff distance*  $d_{\mathcal{H}}$  on  $\mathcal{K}^n$ . Remember that

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}(K, L) := \inf\{\delta > 0 : K \subseteq L + \delta B \quad \text{and} \quad L \subseteq K + \delta B\} \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n,$$

where  $B$  is the closed unit ball and  $+$  is the Minkowski sum. Alternatively, we have

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}(K, L) = \|h_K - h_L\|_{\infty} \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n,$$

the right side denoting the  $L^{\infty}$ -distance between *support functions*  $h_K$  and  $h_L$  on  $S^{n-1}$ . We will assume some considerable knowledge of the properties of support functions, all of which is contained in [14].

One checks that  $d_{\mathcal{H}}$  is a metric on  $\mathcal{K}^n$ , and so we decree a valuation  $\phi$  to be *continuous* if for fixed  $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$  and a sequence  $(K_i) \subseteq \mathcal{K}^n$ ,

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}(K_i, K) \rightarrow 0 \quad \implies \quad |\phi(K_i) - \phi(K)| \rightarrow 0.$$

We will also want our valuations to be invariant under translations. Of course, a valuation  $\phi$  is *translation-invariant* if for all  $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  we have

$$\phi(K + \{x\}) = \phi(K).$$

We will use the notation  $\text{Val}$  to denote the space of all continuous, translation-invariant valuations. We note now a key result for studying  $\text{Val}$ .

**Proposition 2.1** (McMullen's decomposition, [2] Corollary 1.1.7). *Let  $\phi \in \text{Val}$ . Then*

$$\phi(K) = \sum_{i=0}^n \phi_i(K) \quad \text{for all } K \in \mathcal{K}^n,$$

for some  $\phi_i \in \text{Val}$ ,  $\phi_i$  *i-homogeneous*, i.e.

$$\phi_i(tK) = t^i \phi_i(K) \quad \text{for all } K \in \mathcal{K}^n, t \geq 0.$$

We define now the principal object of our study.

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $\phi \in \text{Val}$ . We define the  $\phi$  meet-deviation  $\Delta_\phi$  by

$$\Delta_\phi(K, L) = \phi(K) + \phi(L) - 2\phi(K \cap L) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n.$$

Of course, when  $\phi$  is an intrinsic volume, this definition reduces to an intrinsic volume deviation studied in [4]. Of course,  $\Delta_\phi$  is symmetric. We will want it to be nonnegative as well; this is the case if  $\phi \geq 0$  and  $\phi$  is *monotone*, i.e.

$$K \subseteq L \implies \phi(K) \leq \phi(L) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n. \quad (3)$$

Monotonicity of  $\phi$  has monotonicity of the  $\phi_i$  in its McMullen decomposition (see [3] Theorem 2.12). If we have the stronger

$$K \subsetneq L \implies \phi(K) < \phi(L) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}_k^n \cup \{\emptyset\}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{K}_k^n$  is the subspace of  $\mathcal{K}^n$  of sets with affine dimension at least  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we say  $\phi$  is *k-strictly monotone*. Our convention will be that  $\phi_0 \equiv 0$  for strictly monotone  $\phi$ ; indeed  $\phi_0$  in this setting is always a constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  on  $\mathcal{K}^n$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_\phi(K, L) &= \phi(K) + \phi(L) - 2\phi(K \cap L) \\ &= (\phi(K) - c) + (\phi(L) - c) - 2(\phi(K \cap L) - c) \\ &= \Delta_{\phi - \phi_0}(K, L) \end{aligned}$$

so long as  $K \cap L$  is nonempty. In this sense  $\Delta_\phi$  and  $\Delta_{\phi - \phi_0}$  are (locally) indistinguishable, so we will just always take  $\phi_0 \equiv 0$ .

Note here then that (4) is truly stronger than (3). Indeed, if  $\phi \in \text{Val}$  is *k-strictly monotone*, given  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n$  with  $K \subsetneq L$  we have for  $\varepsilon > 0$  that

$$K + \varepsilon B \subsetneq L + \varepsilon B.$$

As  $K + \varepsilon B, L + \varepsilon B \in \mathcal{K}_n^n \subseteq \mathcal{K}_k^n$  then, we get

$$\phi(K + \varepsilon B) < \phi(L + \varepsilon B).$$

Taking  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  then has  $\phi(K) \leq \phi(L)$  by the continuity of  $\phi$ . A similar argument shows we have  $\phi \geq 0$  on  $\mathcal{K}^n$  for strictly monotone  $\phi$ . Strict monotonicity will also be the right condition for  $\Delta_\phi$  to distinguish points, as we note now.

**Proposition 2.3.** Let  $\phi \in \text{Val}$  be *k-strictly monotone*. Then  $\Delta_\phi$  distinguishes points in  $\mathcal{K}_k^n$ , i.e.

$$\Delta_\phi(K, L) = 0 \implies K = L \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}_k^n.$$

*Proof.* Let  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_k^n$  with  $\Delta_\phi(K, L) = 0$ . We have

$$0 = \Delta_\phi(K, L) = \phi(K) + \phi(L) - 2\phi(K \cap L) = [\phi(K) - \phi(K \cap L)] + [\phi(L) - \phi(K \cap L)]. \quad (5)$$

Strict monotonicity forces  $\phi(K), \phi(L) > 0$ , so (5) cannot hold if  $K \cap L = \emptyset$ . Moreover, if  $K \cap L \in \mathcal{K}_k^n$ , strict monotonicity has  $K = K \cap L = L$ .

Say then  $K \cap L$  is nonempty, of lower affine dimension than  $k$ , and (5) still holds. We of course then have  $d_{\mathcal{H}}(K, K \cap L) > 0$ , so take  $\delta > 0$  with

$$\delta < d_{\mathcal{H}}(K, K \cap L).$$

By the definition of the Hausdorff distance then

$$M_\delta := [(K \cap L) + \delta B] \cap K \subsetneq K$$

where  $M_\delta \in \mathcal{K}_k^n$ . We get  $\phi(K \cap L) \leq \phi(M_\delta)$  by monotonicity and  $\phi(M_\delta) < \phi(K)$  by strict monotonicity. Thus

$$0 = \phi(K) - \phi(K \cap L) \geq \phi(K) - \phi(M_\delta),$$

but this has  $\phi(K) \leq \phi(M_\delta)$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

It is perhaps natural then with this result to ask if  $\Delta_\phi$  will generally satisfy a triangle inequality. The answer will be essentially *no* (see [4] Lemma 24), as monotonicity of  $\phi$  on  $\mathcal{K}^n$  does not imply its extension to  $U(\mathcal{K}^n)$  is monotone. However, if nontrivial  $\phi \in \text{Val}$  is  $n$ -homogeneous and nonnegative, then

$$\Delta_\phi(K, L) = c [\text{Vol}(K) + \text{Vol}(L) - 2\text{Vol}(K \cap L)] \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n$$

and some  $c > 0$  due to a result of Hadwiger (see [13] Theorem 3.4). In this case  $\Delta_\phi$  is just a scaled version of the symmetric difference metric studied by Groemer in [10], which we will return to later.

Before moving on, we mention a “dual” construction to  $\Delta_\phi$ , which will be useful to consider.

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $\phi \in \text{Val}$ . We define the  $\phi$  join-deviation  $\rho_\phi$  by

$$\rho_\phi(K, L) = 2\phi(K \dot{\cup} L) - \phi(K) - \phi(L) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n,$$

where  $K \dot{\cup} L$  is the convex hull of  $K \cup L$ .

Effectively the same observations for  $\Delta_\phi$  hold for  $\rho_\phi$ , except it will have a triangle inequality essentially only when  $\phi \in \text{Val}$  is 1-homogeneous and monotone. Swapping  $\phi$  here for an intrinsic volume gives a construction considered by Florian in [8], and a particular  $\rho_\phi$  is studied in [1].

In the case of either Definition 2.2 or 2.4, our working premise will be that  $\phi \in \text{Val}$  is  $k$ -strictly monotone. We note some examples of such valuations.

**Example 2.5.** The Lebesgue measure  $\text{Vol}$  is  $n$ -strictly monotone, as can be argued elementarily (see Figure 1).




Figure 1: A diagonal hyperplane slices a cap of positive area from  $L$  while avoiding  $K$ ; the cap lies in  $L \setminus K$ .

**Example 2.6.** For  $n \geq 2$ , the intrinsic volume  $V_{n-1}$  is  $n$ -strictly monotone. This is the same as surface area being  $n$ -strictly monotone (see [5] Lemma 2.4).

**Example 2.7.** The intrinsic volume  $V_1$  is 1-strictly monotone.

Of course, the sum of a  $k$ -strictly monotone valuation and a nonnegative, (nominally) monotone valuation will still be  $k$ -strictly monotone, so these valuations are fairly prevalent. We quickly prove the claim of Example 2.7, as it will be informative. For this, note the following result.

**Proposition 2.8** (Firey's characterization [7]). *Let  $\phi \in \text{Val}$  be monotone and 1-homogeneous. Then there exists  $G_1, \dots, G_{n-1} \in \mathcal{K}^n$  such that*

$$\phi(K) = V(K, G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}) = \frac{1}{n} \int_{S^{n-1}} h_K(u) dS(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}; u),$$

where  $V$  is the mixed volume and  $dS(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}; u)$  is the mixed area measure of  $G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}$  on  $S^{n-1}$ .

From this proposition it is clear that knowing whether a 1-homogeneous, monotone  $\phi \in \text{Val}$  is 1-strictly monotone is essentially knowing when for fixed  $G_1, \dots, G_{n-1} \in \mathcal{K}^n$  we have

$$K \subseteq L \quad \text{and} \quad V(K, G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}) = V(L, G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}). \quad (6)$$

This is the Minkowski monotonicity problem, which is open in general (see e.g. [11]). Nonetheless, useful special cases are known: if  $G_1 = B$  and  $G_2, \dots, G_{n-1}$  are smooth, (6) holds if and only if  $K = L$  (see [12] Theorems 1.2-1.3). Applying [14] Theorem 5.1.8 shows that this in case

$$\phi(K) = V(K, G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}) \quad (7)$$

is 1-strictly monotone. In  $n \geq 2$ ,  $V_1$  is precisely (7) with  $B = G_1 = \dots = G_{n-1}$ , so this proves the observation of Example 2.7 in tandem with the claim of Example 2.5.

It will actually be that *all* of the intrinsic volumes  $V_i$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  will be  $n$ -strictly monotone, though this fact requires some more advanced techniques to prove. We note this fact as a lemma.

**Lemma 2.9.** *For  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , the intrinsic volume  $V_i$  is  $n$ -strictly monotone.*

*Proof.* We have the Kubota-type formula representation

$$V_i(K) = \binom{n}{i} \frac{\kappa_n}{\kappa_i \kappa_{n-i}} \int_{G_{n,i}} \text{Vol}_i(K|\xi) d\mu_i(\xi) \quad \text{for all } K \in \mathcal{K}_n^n, \quad i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}. \quad (8)$$

Here

- (i)  $\kappa_i$  is the volume of the closed unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^i$ ,
- (ii)  $\text{Vol}_i$  denotes the  $i$ -dimensional volume,
- (iii)  $G_{n,i}$  is the Grassmannian of all  $i$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,
- (iv)  $\mu_i$  is the uniquely determined Haar probability measure on  $G_{n,i}$ , and
- (v)  $K|\xi$  denotes orthogonal projection of  $K$  onto  $\xi \in G_{n,i}$ .

Fix  $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$  then. Following Lemma 2.3 in [17], if  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_n^n$  are such that  $K \subsetneq L$ , there exists a  $\mu_i$ -measurable subset  $G \subseteq G_{n,i}$  such that  $\mu_i(G) > 0$  and

$$\text{Vol}_i(K|\xi) < \text{Vol}_i(L|\xi) \quad \text{for all } \xi \in G. \quad (9)$$

As projection respects inclusion and  $\text{Vol}_i$  is itself (nominally) monotone, using (9) in tandem with (8) will get  $V_i(K) < V_i(L)$ . We of course also know  $V_n(K) < V_n(L)$ , as was seen in 2.5.

To finish then, we just note that  $V_i$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  is positive on  $\mathcal{K}_n^n$ , but this obvious given say [14] Theorem 5.1.8. It follows then  $V_i$  is  $n$ -strictly monotone.  $\square$

Lemma 2.9 establishes all of the previously mentioned intrinsic volume deviations fit into our framework. We are in a position now to develop the metric-geometric notions we will require.

## 2.2 (Semi-)metric geometry

We consider the problem of adapting some metric-geometric definitions to be applicable to the study of semimetrics. By a *semimetric* we mean a function  $\delta : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for some set  $X$  satisfying all the metric axioms except (possibly) the triangle inequality (see Figure 2).




Figure 2: With respect to a semimetric, one side of a triangle (i.e. the distance between two vertices) may be strictly greater than the sum of the lengths of the other sides.

The lack of a triangle inequality creates both topological (see [6]) and geometric issues; the former creates some ambiguity with regards to what a continuous map into  $X$  is, and the latter will lose us the properties of length of a rectifiable curve in a metric space we want.

To circumvent these issues then, we appropriate and lightly generalize a construction of Xia [16] for a quasimetric space, a special case of a semimetric space. For this, consider a semimetric space  $(X, \delta)$ .

**Definition 2.10.** Let  $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow X$  a map. We say  $\gamma$  is an  $(N)$ -piecewise metric continuous curve with respect to  $\delta$  if there is a partition  $\{p_i\}_{i=0}^N$  of  $[a, b]$  such that

- (i)  $\delta$  is a metric when restricted to each  $\gamma([p_{i-1}, p_i])$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , and
- (ii)  $\gamma|_{[p_{i-1}, p_i]}$  is continuous with respect to the metric topology on  $\gamma([p_{i-1}, p_i])$ .

Take such a  $\gamma$ . As each  $\gamma|_{[p_{i-1}, p_i]}$  is a bona fide continuous curve into a metric space, it is reasonable to define its length. In particular, we write

$$L(\gamma|_{[p_{i-1}, p_i]}) := \sup \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^M \delta(\gamma(q_{j-1}), \gamma(q_j)) : \{q_j\}_{j=0}^M \text{ is a partition of } [p_{i-1}, p_i] \right\} \quad (10)$$

when this supremum exists. If this supremum exists for all  $\gamma|_{[p_{i-1}, p_i]}$ , we call  $\gamma$   $(\delta)$ -rectifiable and define its *length*

$$L(\gamma) := \sum_{i=1}^N L(\gamma|_{[p_{i-1}, p_i]}). \quad (11)$$

$L(\gamma)$  is well-defined as two partitions that present  $\gamma$  can be refined to their union, where we can utilize additivity of length in a metric space to show the two lengths must correspond (see Figure 3).




Figure 3: Two partitions  $P, Q$  of  $[0, 1]$  find a mutual refinement in their union. Additivity of length in a metric space then forces the length computed over  $P$  and  $Q$  to correspond with it computed over  $P \cup Q$ .

As this notion of length comes from the sum of metric “lengths”, it will inherit some useful properties of length in a metric space. Indeed, one checks it will be both invariant under (strictly-increasing, linear) reparametrization and additive under concatenation.

We can generalize then here the notion of the induced intrinsic metric.

**Definition 2.11.** Assume any  $x, y \in X$  may be joined by a  $\delta$ -rectifiable piecewise metric continuous curve. We define the induced intrinsic pseudometric  $\bar{\delta}$  by

$$\bar{\delta}(x, y) := \inf\{L(\gamma) : \gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow X \text{ is rectifiable with } \gamma(a) = x, \gamma(b) = y\} \text{ for all } x, y \in X.$$

That  $\bar{\delta}$  is nonnegative and symmetric is readily apparent. We demonstrate then the triangle inequality: let  $x, y, z \in X$ , and consider rectifiable paths  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  with the former joining  $x$  and  $z$  and the latter  $y$  and  $z$ . The concatenation  $\gamma_1 * \gamma_2$  then joins  $x$  and  $y$  with

$$L(\gamma_1 * \gamma_2) = L(\gamma_1) + L(\gamma_2)$$

given the definition in (11). We get then

$$\bar{\delta}(x, y) \leq L(\gamma_1) + L(\gamma_2),$$

and so taking infima then gets

$$\bar{\delta}(x, y) \leq \bar{\delta}(x, z) + \bar{\delta}(z, y)$$

as desired.

We may wonder if  $\bar{\delta}$  distinguishes points; the answer is in general *no*, as we do not necessarily have the bound  $\delta \leq \bar{\delta}$  given that  $\delta$  need not satisfy a triangle inequality (see Figure 4). We thus label  $\bar{\delta}$  a *pseudometric*.




Figure 4: The distance between endpoints compared to a rectifiable path in a semimetric space. The length of the path may be strictly smaller than the endpoint distance, i.e. it may provide a “shortcut”.

We will regardless be interested in cases when  $\bar{\delta} \leq \delta$ , which will effectively be our notion of intrinsicness. Expecting say  $\delta = \bar{\delta}$  will be a bad premise, as this will force  $\delta$  to be a metric and thus lose us generality we’ve delicately cultivated.



### 3 Primary results

In this section we prove our primary results. We work on  $\mathcal{K}_k^n$  for some  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and take  $\Delta_\phi$  to be  $(k)$ -strictly monotone. To begin, we prove some useful lemmas.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_k^n$  with  $K \subseteq L$  (resp.  $L \subseteq K$ ). Write*

$$K_t := (1-t)K + tL \in \mathcal{K}_k^n \quad \text{for } t \in [0, 1].$$

*Then for  $t, s$  with  $0 \leq t \leq s \leq 1$  we have  $K_t \subseteq K_s$  (resp.  $K_s \subseteq K_t$ , see Figure 5). If we have  $K \subsetneq L$  (resp.  $L \subsetneq K$ ), we have  $K_t \subsetneq K_s$  for  $t < s$  (resp.  $K_s \subsetneq K_t$ ).*




Figure 5: Convex interpolation between nested  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_k^n$  both stays in  $\mathcal{K}_k^n$  and is monotone with respect to set inclusion.

*Proof.* Take  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_k^n$  with  $K \subseteq L$ . Note first that for each  $t \in [0, 1]$ , the affine dimension of  $K_t$  is bounded below by the minimum of the affine dimensions of  $K$  and  $L$ , so we have each  $K_t \in \mathcal{K}_k^n$ .

For  $t, s$  with  $0 \leq t < s \leq 1$  then note we have

$$(1-t)h_K + th_L \leq (1-s)h_K + sh_L$$

as  $h_K \leq h_L$  everywhere on  $S^{n-1}$ , so  $K_t \subseteq K_s$ .

If we have exactly  $K \subsetneq L$ , that would be that there exists  $u \in S^{n-1}$  with  $h_K(u) < h_L(u)$ . There

$$(1-t)h_K(u) + th_L(u) < (1-s)h_K(u) + sh_L(u),$$

where combining this with the previous inequality has  $K_t \subsetneq K_s$ . The desired result for  $L \subseteq K$  follows similarly.  $\square$

This proposition helps provide an important lemma for us.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_k^n$  such that  $K \subseteq L$  (or  $L \subseteq K$ ). Then  $\Delta_\phi$  and  $\rho_\phi$  restrict to a metric on the set*

$$S_{K,L} := \{K_t : t \in [0, 1]\}$$

*where the notation  $K_t$  is as in Proposition 3.1. In particular, if  $\{M_i\}_{i=0}^N \subseteq \mathcal{K}_k^n$  is a finite sequence of sets with*

$$M_{i-1} \subseteq M_i \quad \text{or} \quad M_i \subseteq M_{i-1} \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \quad (12)$$

*and  $\gamma_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_k^n$  are paths given by  $t \mapsto (1-t)M_{i-1} + tM_i$ , then the path  $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_k^n$  formed via concatenation of the  $\gamma_i$  is piecewise metric continuous in the sense of Definition 2.10. Its length is*

$$\sum_{i=1}^N |\phi(M_{i-1}) - \phi(M_i)|$$

*with respect to both  $\Delta_\phi$  and  $\rho_\phi$ .*

*Proof.* For the sake of brevity we specify to  $\Delta_\phi$ , though all the following analysis goes through the exact same for  $\rho_\phi$ .

Let then  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_k^n$  with say  $K \subseteq L$ .  $\Delta_\phi$  is already a semimetric on  $\mathcal{K}_k^n$  by Proposition 2.3, so we need just show it satisfies a triangle inequality on  $S_{K,L}$ . By Proposition 3.1 we have

$$K_t \subseteq K_s \quad \text{or} \quad K_s \subseteq K_t \quad \text{for all } t, s \in [0, 1].$$

In the former case  $\Delta_\phi(K_t, K_s) = \phi(K_s) - \phi(K_t)$ , and in the latter  $\Delta_\phi(K_t, K_s) = \phi(K_t) - \phi(K_s)$ . By monotonicity then we have

$$\Delta_\phi(K_t, K_s) = |\phi(K_t) - \phi(K_s)| \quad \text{for all } t, s \in [0, 1].$$

The desired triangle inequality thus follows from applying the triangle inequality for the absolute value. Say then we  $\{M_i\}_{i=0}^N$  as in (9), with the associated  $\gamma_i$  (see Figure 6).




Figure 6: An example in the context of (12) with  $M_0$  (light gray),  $M_1$  (gray) and  $M_2$  (black).  $M_0, M_2 \subsetneq M_1$ .  $\gamma_1$  “grows” from  $M_0$  to  $M_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  “shrinks” from  $M_1$  to  $M_2$ .

Our above work has that  $\Delta_\phi$  restricts to a metric on the image of each  $\gamma_i$ . To show the concatenation  $\gamma$  is piecewise metric continuous then, we need show each  $\gamma_i$  is continuous. Fix some  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  then; we abuse notation by writing  $K = M_{i-1}, L = M_i$  and note

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\mathcal{H}}(K_t, K_s) &= \|h_{K_t} - h_{K_s}\|_\infty \\ &= \|(1-t)h_K + th_L - (1-s)h_K - sh_L\| \\ &= |s-t| \|h_K - h_L\|_\infty \\ &= |s-t| d_{\mathcal{H}}(K, L) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $t, s \in [0, 1]$ , i.e. that  $\gamma_i$  is  $d_{\mathcal{H}}(K, L)$ -Lipschitz with respect to Hausdorff distance. In particular for fixed  $t \in [0, 1]$  and sequence  $(t_n) \subseteq [0, 1]$  with  $t_n \rightarrow t$  as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$  we have

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}(K_{t_n}, K_t) \rightarrow 0,$$

and so

$$\Delta_\phi(K_{t_n}, K_t) = |\phi(K_{t_n}) - \phi(K_t)| \rightarrow 0$$

as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ , given the continuity of  $\phi$ . It follows every  $\gamma_i$  is continuous then, and so the concatenation  $\gamma$  of all  $\gamma_i$  will be piecewise metric continuous.

All that remains is to compute the length of  $\gamma$ , for which it suffices to compute the length of one  $\gamma_i$ . Using the same notation, say  $K \subseteq L$  and consider any partition  $\{p_j\}_{j=0}^M$  of  $[0, 1]$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^M \Delta_\phi(\gamma(p_{j-1}), \gamma(p_j)) &= \sum_{j=1}^M \phi(\gamma(p_{j-1})) + \phi(\gamma(p_j)) - 2(\gamma(p_{j-1}) \cap \gamma(p_j)) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^M \phi(\gamma(p_j)) - \phi(\gamma(p_{j-1})) && \text{(Proposition 3.1)} \\ &= \phi(L) - \phi(K) \end{aligned}$$

as the sum telescopes. If instead  $L \subseteq K$  this becomes  $\phi(K) - \phi(L)$ ; by monotonicity then, as our partition was the arbitrary, the length of  $\gamma_i$  is just

$$|\phi(K) - \phi(L)|,$$

from which it follows the length of  $\gamma$  is

$$\sum_{i=1}^N |\phi(M_{i-1}) - \phi(M_i)|,$$

as desired.  $\square$

**Remark 3.3.** Lemma 3.2 shows that there is always a  $\Delta_\phi$ -rectifiable path connecting  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_k^n$ ; indeed, we can interpolate

$$K \longrightarrow K \cup L \longrightarrow L. \quad (13)$$

Here the notation  $M \rightarrow N$  denotes the map on  $[0, 1]$  given by  $(1-t)M + tN$ , and writing say

$$M \rightarrow N \rightarrow O$$

denotes the concatenation of the maps  $M \rightarrow N$  and  $N \rightarrow O$ . The reader may notice then the length of the path defined in (13) will be exactly  $\rho_\phi(K, L)$ . Thus  $\bar{\Delta}_\phi$  is defined, with  $\bar{\Delta}_\phi \leq \rho_\phi$ .

It will be useful here now to note a desirable property of the “pieces” of a piecewise metric continuous path in  $\Delta_\phi$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** Let  $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_k^n$  where

- (i)  $\Delta_\phi$  is a metric on  $\gamma([a, b])$ , and
- (ii)  $\gamma$  is continuous with respect to the metric topology on  $\gamma([a, b])$ .

Then there exists a partition  $\{p_i\}_{i=0}^N$  of  $[a, b]$  such that

$$\gamma(p_{i-1}) \cap \gamma(p_i) \neq \emptyset \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, N\}.$$

*Proof.* For  $t \in [a, b]$ , write

$$\mathcal{N}(\gamma(t)) := \left\{ K \in \gamma([a, b]) : \Delta_\phi(K, \gamma(t)) < \frac{1}{2}\phi(\gamma(t)) \right\}.$$

Of course for each  $t \in [a, b]$  we have  $\phi(\gamma(t)) > 0$  by strict monotonicity, so  $\gamma(t) \in \mathcal{N}(\gamma(t))$ . Each  $\mathcal{N}(\gamma(t))$  is thus a nonempty open set.

Fix  $t \in [a, b]$  then and let  $K, L \in \mathcal{N}(\gamma(t))$ ; we claim that we have  $K \cap L \neq \emptyset$ . If  $K \cap L = \emptyset$ ,  $\phi(K \cap L) = 0$  and so

$$\phi(K) + \phi(L) = \Delta_\phi(K, L) \leq \Delta_\phi(K, \gamma(t)) + \Delta_\phi(L, \gamma(t)) < \phi(\gamma(t)). \quad (14)$$

Remark then we also have the estimate

$$|\phi(M) - \phi(N)| < \Delta_\phi(M, N) \quad \text{for all } M, N \in \mathcal{K}_k^n; \quad (15)$$

indeed say we have  $M, N \in \mathcal{K}_k^n$  and, without loss of generality,  $\phi(M) \geq \phi(N)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi(M) - \phi(N)| &= \phi(M) - \phi(N) \\ &\leq \phi(M) - \phi(N) + 2[\phi(N) - \phi(M \cap N)] \\ &= \Delta_\phi(M, N), \end{aligned}$$

where  $2[\phi(N) - \phi(M \cap N)] \geq 0$  as either  $M \cap N \neq \emptyset$  allowing us to apply monotonicity, or  $M \cap N = \emptyset$  and we get this from just  $\phi(N) > 0$ . Applying (15) then gets

$$\phi(\gamma(t)) - \phi(K) \leq |\phi(\gamma(t)) - \phi(K)| \leq \Delta_\phi(K, \gamma(t))$$

and thus

$$\phi(K) - \phi(\gamma(t)) \geq -\Delta_\phi(K, \gamma(t)) > -\frac{1}{2}\phi(\gamma(t))$$

with the same for  $K$  swapped for  $L$ . This is that  $\phi(K), \phi(L) > \frac{1}{2}\phi(\gamma(t))$  though, which contradicts (14). It must be then that  $K \cap L \neq \emptyset$ , as desired. Write then

$$U_t := \gamma^{-1}(\mathcal{N}(\gamma(t))) \quad \text{for all } t \in [a, b].$$

Each  $U_t$  is open in  $[a, b]$  as  $\gamma$  is continuous, as is each nonempty given  $t \in U_t$ . In particular, this has that the  $U_t$  provide an open cover of  $[a, b]$ .

We may apply Lebesgue's number lemma then: there is some  $\delta > 0$  such that for all subintervals  $[c, d] \subseteq [a, b]$ ,

$$d - c < \delta \implies [c, d] \in U_t \quad \text{for some } t \in [a, b].$$

Choose then a partition  $\{p_i\}_{i=0}^N$  of  $[a, b]$  with gap (i.e. the maximum of distances between successive partition points) less than  $\delta$ . Then for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  there is a  $t \in [a, b]$  where

$$[p_{i-1}, p_i] \subseteq U_t,$$

which is exactly that

$$\gamma([p_{i-1}, p_i]) \subseteq \mathcal{N}(\gamma(t)).$$

By our earlier work then, this clear has that  $\gamma(p_{i-1}) \cap \gamma(p_i) \neq \emptyset$ , as desired.  $\square$

The last ingredient we will require will be a useful geometric property of certain valuations  $\phi \in \text{Val}$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $\phi \in \text{Val}$  be  $k$ -strictly monotone and write its McMullen decomposition*

$$\phi = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i.$$

*If  $\phi_1 \equiv 0$ , then  $\phi_i$  admits "spheropolyhedrons" of prescribed length with arbitrary little value, i.e. for any  $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is  $r > 0$  such that*

$$\phi([p, q] + rB) < \varepsilon,$$

*where  $[p, q] := \text{conv}(\{p, q\})$ .*




Figure 7: A 2-dimensional spheropolyhedron, i.e. the Minkowski sum of a line segment and a dilate of the closed unit 2-ball  $B$ .

*Proof.* First note that strictly monotone valuations are finitely subadditive in the following sense: if  $\{K_i\}_{i=1}^N \subseteq \mathcal{K}_k^n$  is such that

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^j K_i \in \mathcal{K}_k^n \quad \text{for all } j \in \{1, \dots, N\},$$

then we have

$$\phi\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N K_i\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \phi(K_i). \quad (16)$$

The claim follows straightforwardly from induction; the base case is trivial, and assuming it holds for  $N - 1$  we see

$$\begin{aligned} \phi\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N K_i\right) &= \phi\left(K_N \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{N-1} K_i\right) \\ &= \phi(K_N) + \phi\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{N-1} K_i\right) - \phi\left(K_N \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^{N-1} K_i\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \phi(K_i), \end{aligned}$$

as strict monotonicity has  $\phi \geq 0$ .

Let then  $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and write

$$H := [p, q] + B.$$

Take  $\delta \in (0, 1]$ . As  $\phi_1 \equiv 0$  we have

$$\phi(\delta H) = \sum_{i=2}^n \phi_i(\delta H) = \sum_{i=2}^n \delta^i \phi_i(H) \leq \delta^2 \sum_{i=2}^n \phi_i(H) = \delta^2 \phi(H).$$

Write  $C = \sum_{i=2}^n \phi_i(H)$  then. Consider

$$H_j := \bigcup_{i=0}^{j-1} \left( \left[ p + \frac{i(q-p)}{j}, p + \frac{(i+1)(q-p)}{j} \right] + \frac{1}{j} B \right) = [p, q] + \frac{1}{j} B.$$

Write  $I_i^j$  for each term in the union; we note each  $I_i^j$  is merely a translate of  $H$  dilated by  $\frac{1}{j}$ . By translation-invariance then

$$\phi(I_i^j) = \phi\left(\frac{1}{j} H\right) \leq \frac{1}{j^2} \phi(H).$$

Applying our established subadditivity then we have

$$\phi(H_j) = \phi\left(\bigcup_{i=0}^{j-1} I_i^j\right) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \phi(I_i^j) \leq \frac{1}{j^2} \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \phi(H) = \frac{1}{j} \phi(H),$$

where taking  $j \rightarrow +\infty$  gets the desired result.  $\square$

We are in a position now to prove our main theorems.

**Theorem 3.6** (Restatement of Theorem 1.1). *Let  $\phi \in \text{Val}$  be  $k$ -strictly monotone and write its McMullen decomposition*

$$\phi = \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i,$$

with each  $\phi_i \in \text{Val } i\text{-homogeneous}$ . Then

$$\overline{\Delta}_\phi(K, L) \leq \Delta_\phi(K, L) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}_k^n$$

if and only if  $\phi$  has no 1-homogeneous component, i.e.  $\phi_1 \equiv 0$ .

*Proof.* Throughout this proof, we will participate in some slight abuses of notation; we will reuse the indices  $i$  and  $k$ , but context should make it clear enough how we are using them.

We first establish the forward direction by means of the contrapositive, i.e. we assume  $\phi_1 \not\equiv 0$  and demonstrate there is some  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_k^n$  with

$$\overline{\Delta}_\phi(K, L) > \Delta_\phi(K, L).$$

Recall that by [3] Theorem 2.12,  $\phi_1$  is itself monotone. By Firey's characterization (Proposition 2.8) there are  $G_1, \dots, G_{n-1} \in \mathcal{K}^n$  such that

$$\phi_1(K) = \frac{1}{n} \int_{S^{n-1}} h_K(u) dS(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}; u) \quad \text{for all } K \in \mathcal{K}^n.$$

The assumption  $\phi_1 \not\equiv 0$  implies that the support of the mixed area measure  $S(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}; \cdot)$  is nonempty, so pick  $v \in \text{supp } S(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}; \cdot)$ .

Recall  $B \in \mathcal{K}_k^n$  denotes the closed unit ball. For  $t \geq 0$ , let  $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_k^n$  be any  $\Delta_\phi$ -rectifiable path joining  $B$  and the translate  $B + t\{v\}$ . Remember

$$L(\gamma) = \sum_{i=1}^N L(\gamma|_{[p_{i-1}, p_i]})$$

where  $\{p_i\}_{i=0}^N$  is a partition of  $[a, b]$  such that

- (i) the restriction of  $\Delta_\phi$  to the image of each  $\gamma|_{[p_{i-1}, p_i]}$  is a metric, and
- (ii) each  $\gamma|_{[p_{i-1}, p_i]}$  is continuous (with respect to the metric topology on image of  $\gamma|_{[p_{i-1}, p_i]}$ ).

We can thus apply Lemma 3.4 to each  $\gamma|_{[p_{i-1}, p_i]}$  to receive a partition  $\{q_j^i\}_{j=0}^{M_i}$  of  $[p_{i-1}, p_i]$  where

$$\gamma(q_{j-1}^i) \cap \gamma(q_j^i) \quad \text{for all } j \in \{1, \dots, M_i\}.$$

We get then

$$\begin{aligned} L(\gamma) &= \sum_{i=1}^N L(\gamma|_{[p_{i-1}, p_i]}) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{M_i} \Delta_\phi(\gamma(q_{j-1}^i), \gamma(q_j^i)). \end{aligned}$$

As  $q_0^i = q_{M_i-1}^{i-1}$ , the union  $\bigcup_{i=1}^N \{q_j^i\}_{j=0}^{M_i}$  is a partition of  $[a, b]$ , written  $\{r_k\}_{k=0}^K$ , where  $\gamma(r_{k-1}) \cap \gamma(r_k) \neq \emptyset$  for each  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ . We can rewrite the above inequality then as

$$L(\gamma) \geq \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_\phi(\gamma(r_{k-1}), \gamma(r_k)). \quad (17)$$

Again, as the  $\phi_i$  are themselves monotone,

$$\phi_i(\gamma(r_{k-1})) + \phi_i(\gamma(r_k)) - 2\phi_i(\gamma(r_{k-1}) \cap \gamma(r_k)) \geq 0$$

for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ . It follows

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_\phi(\gamma(r_{k-1}), \gamma(r_k)) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i(\gamma(r_{k-1})) + \phi_i(\gamma(r_k)) - 2\phi_i(\gamma(r_{k-1}) \cap \gamma(r_k)) \\ &\geq \phi_1(\gamma(r_{k-1})) + \phi_1(\gamma(r_k)) - 2\phi_1(\gamma(r_{k-1}) \cap \gamma(r_k)).\end{aligned}$$

We get then, combining this inequality with (17) and applying Firey's characterization, that

$$\begin{aligned}L(\gamma) &\geq \sum_{k=1}^K \Delta_\phi(\gamma(r_{k-1}), \gamma(r_k)) \\ &\geq \sum_{k=1}^K \phi_1(\gamma(r_{k-1})) + \phi_1(\gamma(r_k)) - 2\phi_1(\gamma(r_{k-1}) \cap \gamma(r_k)) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^K \left[ \int_{S^{n-1}} h_{\gamma(r_{k-1})}(u) + h_{\gamma(r_k)}(u) - h_{\gamma(r_{k-1}) \cap \gamma(r_k)}(u) dS(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}; u) \right] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^K \left[ \int_{S^{n-1}} h_{\gamma(r_{k-1})}(u) + h_{\gamma(r_k)}(u) - 2 \min\{h_{\gamma(r_{k-1})}(u), h_{\gamma(r_k)}(u)\} dS(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}; u) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \int_{S^{n-1}} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^K |h_{\gamma(r_{k-1})}(u) - h_{\gamma(r_k)}(u)| \right] dS(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}; u) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{n} \int_{S^{n-1}} |h_B(u) - h_{B+t\{v\}}(u)| dS(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}; u) \\ &= \frac{t}{n} \int_{S^{n-1}} |\langle u, v \rangle| dS(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}; u).\end{aligned}$$

As  $|\langle u, v \rangle|$  is positive in a neighborhood of  $v$  and  $v \in \text{supp } S(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}; \cdot)$  we have

$$\int_{S^{n-1}} |\langle u, v \rangle| dS(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}; u) > 0.$$

Pick  $t$  large enough then such that for some small  $\varepsilon > 0$

- (i)  $B$  and  $B + t\{v\}$  are disjoint, and
- (ii)  $\frac{t}{n} \int_{S^{n-1}} |\langle u, v \rangle| dS(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}; u) > 2\phi(B) + \varepsilon$ .

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}L(\gamma) &\geq \frac{t}{n} \int_{S^{n-1}} |\langle u, v \rangle| dS(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}; u) \\ &= 2\phi(B) + \varepsilon \\ &= \Delta_\phi(B, B + t\{v\}) + \varepsilon,\end{aligned}$$

for any  $\Delta_\phi$ -rectifiable  $\gamma$  joining  $B$  and  $B + t\{v\}$ . Taking an infimum gets

$$\overline{\Delta}_\phi(B, B + t\{v\}) \geq \Delta_\phi(B, B + t\{v\}) + \varepsilon,$$

which has

$$\overline{\Delta}_\phi(B, B + t\{v\}) > \Delta_\phi(B, B + t\{v\}),$$

as desired.

We turn now to the backwards direction, i.e. we assume  $\phi_1 \equiv 0$  and move to show

$$\overline{\Delta}_\phi(K, L) \leq \Delta_\phi(K, L) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}_k^n.$$

For this, take  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_k^n$  and let  $\varepsilon > 0$ ; we demonstrate the above by producing a  $\Delta_\phi$ -rectifiable curve  $\gamma$  such that

$$L(\gamma) \leq \Delta(K, L) + \varepsilon.$$

We proceed by cases on  $K \cap L$ .

(i) ( $K \cap L \in \mathcal{K}_k^n$ ) Following the notation of Remark 3.3, we can interpolate

$$K \longrightarrow K \cap L \longrightarrow L;$$

as  $K \cap L \in \mathcal{K}_k^n$ , this path is entirely within  $\mathcal{K}_k^n$  (see Figure 8). By Lemma 3.2, this path is  $\Delta_\phi$ -rectifiable and has length

$$\phi(K) - \phi(K \cap L) + [\phi(L) - \phi(K \cap L)] = \Delta_\phi(K, L).$$




Figure 8: An example of interpolation in case (i): two discs in  $\mathcal{K}_2^2$  have their intersection still in  $\mathcal{K}_2^2$ .

(ii) ( $K \cap L \notin \mathcal{K}_k^n$ ,  $\phi(K \cap L) > 0$ ) Akin to the strategy employed in the proof of Proposition 2.3, we “thicken” things, i.e. for  $\delta > 0$  we consider the interpolation

$$K \rightarrow K \cap ((K \cap L) + \delta B) \rightarrow (K \cap L) + \delta B \rightarrow L \cap ((K \cap L) + \delta B) \rightarrow L \quad (18)$$

which stays inside  $\mathcal{K}_k^n$  (see Figure 9). Again, Lemma 3.2 has this path is  $\Delta_\phi$ -rectifiable with length

$$\phi(K) + \phi(L) + 2[\phi((K \cap L) + \delta B) - \phi(K \cap ((K \cap L) + \delta B)) - \phi(L \cap ((K \cap L) + \delta B))]. \quad (19)$$




Figure 9: An example of the interpolation in case (ii): two rectangles  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_2^2$  meet on an edge with affine dimension 1.

We have the obvious bound

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}(K \cap ((K \cap L) + \delta B), K \cap L) \leq \delta,$$

with the same for  $K$  swapped for  $L$ , as well as

$$d_{\mathcal{H}}((K \cap L) + \delta B, K \cap L) \leq \delta.$$



As  $\phi$  is continuous, we can take  $\delta$  small enough that then say

$$\begin{aligned} & \phi((K \cap L) + \delta B) - \phi(K \cap ((K \cap L) + \delta B)) \\ & \leq \phi((K \cap L) + \delta B) - \phi(K \cap L) + [\phi(K \cap ((K \cap L) + \delta B)) - \phi(K \cap L)] \\ & < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then using monotonicity we get that (19) is bounded above by

$$\phi(K) + \phi(L) - 2\phi(K \cap L) + \varepsilon = \Delta_\phi(K, L) + \varepsilon,$$

as desired.

(iii) ( $\phi(K \cap L) = 0$ ) Here we put Lemma 3.5 to use. Letting  $p \in K$  and  $q \in L$ , we take

$$H := [p, q] + \delta B \quad \text{such that} \quad \phi(H) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

for some sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$ . We interpolate

$$K \longrightarrow H \cap K \longrightarrow H \longrightarrow H \cap L \longrightarrow L,$$

and this interpolation stays in  $\mathcal{K}_k^n$ ; again, Lemma 3.2 has this has length

$$\phi(K) + \phi(L) + [2\phi(H) - 2\phi(H \cap K) - 2\phi(H \cap L)]. \quad (20)$$




Figure 10: An example of interpolation in case (iii): two disjoint discs in  $\mathcal{K}_2^2$  are bridged by a thin spheropolyhedral set.

But then (20) is dominated by

$$\phi(K) + \phi(L) + 2\phi(H) < \phi(K) + \phi(L) + \varepsilon = \Delta_\phi(K, L),$$

as desired.

These cases cover all possibilities for  $K \cap L$ , and so in every scenario we have given a  $\Delta_\phi$ -rectifiable joining  $K, L$  with

$$L(\gamma) \leq \Delta_\phi(K, L) + \varepsilon.$$

It of course then follows

$$\overline{\Delta}_\phi(K, L) \leq \Delta_\phi(K, L),$$

as desired. This supplies the backwards direction, and thus concludes the proof.  $\square$

Before we prove our second main result, we note the following proposition which will allow us to refine things a bit.

**Proposition 3.7.** *Suppose  $\phi_1, \phi_n \in \text{Val}$  are  $k$ -strictly monotone and 1- and  $n$ -homogeneous respectively. Then  $\phi_1$  is 1-strictly monotone and  $\phi_n$  is not  $k$ -strictly monotone for any  $k$  less than  $n$ .*

*Proof.* Note first 1-homogeneous valuations  $\phi_1 \in \text{Val}$  are Minkowski additive (see [9] Theorem 3.2), so for  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n$  with  $K \subsetneq L$  we have

$$\phi_1(K + \varepsilon B) < \phi_1(L + \varepsilon B) \implies \phi_1(K) + \varepsilon \phi_1(B) < \phi_1(L) + \varepsilon \phi_1(B) \implies \phi_1(K) < \phi_1(L),$$

as  $K + \varepsilon B, L + \varepsilon B \in \mathcal{K}_n^n \subseteq \mathcal{K}_k^n$ . Of course, every  $K \in \mathcal{K}_1^n$  also properly contains a translate of a dilate of itself, i.e. a  $\delta K + \{x\} \in \mathcal{K}_1^n$  for some  $\delta < 1, \{x\} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Thus

$$0 \leq \phi_1(\delta K + \{x\}) < \phi_1(K),$$

so  $\phi_1$  is indeed 1-strictly monotone.

For  $\phi_n$  then, recall  $\phi_n = c \text{Vol}$  for some  $c > 0$ . It follows  $\phi_n$  vanishes on sets of affine dimension less than  $n$ , so it cannot be  $k$ -strictly monotone for  $k$  less than  $n$ .  $\square$

We move then to our second result now.

**Theorem 3.8** (Restatement of Theorem 1.2). *Let  $\phi \in \text{Val}$  be  $k$ -strictly monotone. If  $\phi$  is 1-homogeneous, then*

$$\overline{\Delta}_\phi(K, L) = \rho_\phi(K, L) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}_1^n,$$

where  $\rho_\phi$  is a metric in this case. In a dual fashion, if  $\phi$  is  $n$ -homogeneous for  $n \neq 1$ , then

$$\overline{\rho}_\phi(K, L) = \Delta_\phi(K, L) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}_n^n,$$

where  $\Delta_\phi$  is a metric in this case.

*Proof.* We first consider the 1-homogeneous case. Let  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_1^n$ . Following the proof of the forward direction of Theorem 1.1, we note we have

$$\begin{aligned} L(\gamma) &\geq \int_{S^{n-1}} |h_K(u) - h_L(u)| dS(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}; u) \\ &= \int_{S^{n-1}} 2 \max\{h_K(u), h_L(u)\} - h_K(u) - h_L(u) dS(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}; u) \\ &= \int_{S^{n-1}} 2h_{K \dot{\cup} L}(u) - h_K(u) - h_L(u) dS(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}; u) \\ &= 2\phi(K \dot{\cup} L) - \phi(K) - \phi(L) \\ &= \rho_\phi(K, L) \end{aligned}$$

for any  $\Delta_\phi$ -rectifiable curve  $\gamma$  in  $\mathcal{K}_1^n$  joining  $K$  and  $L$ , given Firey's characterization. It follows then

$$\overline{\Delta}(K, L) \geq \rho_\phi(K, L).$$

We also have though that the length (with respect to  $\Delta_\phi$ ) of the interpolation

$$K \longrightarrow K \dot{\cup} L \longrightarrow L$$

is (by Lemma 3.2) exactly

$$2\phi(K \dot{\cup} L) - \phi(K) - \phi(L) = \rho_\phi(K, L),$$

so  $\overline{\Delta}(K, L) = \rho_\phi(K, L)$  as desired (see Figure 11).




Figure 11: Interpolation  $K \rightarrow K \tilde{\cup} L \rightarrow L$  for two discs  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_2^2$ .

$\rho_\phi$  is thus a metric in this case as it is a pseudometric *and* a semimetric, where the metric axioms are covered between those two definitions.

Consider the  $n$ -homogeneous case. As mentioned earlier then, we have

$$\phi = c \text{Vol} \quad \text{for some } c > 0.$$

In this case then,  $\Delta_\phi$  is merely a (positive) multiple of the symmetric difference metric, and thus a metric. We also get then the bound

$$\Delta_\phi(K, L) \leq \rho_\phi(K, L) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}_n^n \quad (21)$$

as

$$c[\text{Vol}(K) + \text{Vol}(L) - 2\text{Vol}(K \cap L)] = c[2\text{Vol}(K \cup L) - \text{Vol}(K) - \text{Vol}(L)] \leq c[2\text{Vol}(K \tilde{\cup} L) - \text{Vol}(K) - \text{Vol}(L)].$$

For  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_n^n$  then, let  $\gamma$  be a  $\rho_\phi$ -rectifiable curve joining  $K$  and  $L$ , composed of  $N$  metric continuous pieces  $\gamma_i$ . For any particular  $\gamma_i : [p_{i-1}, p_i] \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_n^n$ , if  $\{q_j\}_{j=0}^M$  is a partition of  $[p_{i-1}, p_i]$  we get

$$\Delta_\phi(\gamma(p_{i-1}), \gamma(p_i)) \leq \sum_{j=1}^M \Delta_\phi(\gamma(q_{j-1}), \gamma(q_j)) \leq \sum_{j=1}^M \rho_\phi(\gamma(q_{j-1}), \gamma(q_j)) \quad (22)$$

by (21) and the triangle inequality for  $\Delta_\phi$ . Summing the left and right sides of (22) then across all  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  and applying the triangle inequality once more gets

$$\Delta(K, L) \leq L(\gamma),$$

where  $L(\gamma)$  is the length of  $\gamma$  with respect to  $\rho_\phi$ . By the definition of infimum we get

$$\Delta(K, L) \leq \bar{\rho}_\phi(K, L).$$

Note then as  $\phi$  is  $n$ -homogeneous with  $n \neq 1$ , the proof of the backwards direction of Theorem 1.1 gives us a  $\Delta_\phi$ -rectifiable path  $\gamma$  with  $\Delta_\phi$ -length

$$L(\gamma) \leq \Delta_\phi(K, L) + \varepsilon$$

for given  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Lemma 3.2 has that this path is also  $\rho_\phi$ -rectifiable though, with  $\rho_\phi$ -length the same as its  $\Delta_\phi$  length. Taking  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  in the above expression then gets  $\bar{\rho}_\phi(K, L) \leq \Delta_\phi(K, L)$ , so

$$\bar{\rho}_\phi(K, L) = \Delta_\phi(K, L)$$

as desired. □

## 4 Existence of shortest paths

Let  $\phi \in \text{Val}$  be  $k$ -strictly monotone. When  $\phi$  is 1-homogeneous, Theorem 1.2 establishes that

$$\rho_\phi(K, L) = 2\phi(K \dot{\cup} L) - \phi(K) - \phi(L) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}_1^n$$

is a metric. Indeed, as  $\phi$  in this case will vanish on points,  $\rho_\phi$  will give a metric on the whole  $\mathcal{K}^n$ . Dually, when  $\phi$  is  $n$ -homogeneous, we have for some  $c > 0$  that

$$\Delta_\phi(K, L) = \phi(K) + \phi(L) - 2\phi(K \cap L) = c\Delta_{\text{Vol}} \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}_n^n$$

is a metric. We confirm in this section that these metrics are intrinsic in the normal sense and consider the problem of determining when they admit shortest paths.

To start, we recall the normal metric-geometric definitions.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space and take  $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow X$  to be a continuous path. We define the length of  $\gamma$  to be the quantity

$$L(\gamma) := \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N d_\phi(\gamma(p_{i-1}), \gamma(p_i)) : \{p_i\}_{i=0}^N \text{ is a partition of } [a, b] \right\}$$

when this supremum exists; in that case, we call  $\gamma$  rectifiable. Assuming every  $x$  and  $y$  in  $X$  may be joined by a rectifiable path, we define the induced intrinsic metric

$$\bar{d}(x, y) := \inf \{ L(\gamma) : \gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow X \text{ is rectifiable with } \gamma(a) = x, \gamma(b) = y \} \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X.$$

A rectifiable path  $\gamma$  joining  $x$  and  $y \in X$  is termed a shortest path if  $L(\gamma) = \bar{d}(x, y)$ . If  $\bar{d} = d$  we say the metric  $d$  is intrinsic and call  $(X, d)$  a length space.

We start our analysis in the 1-homogeneous case: recall we remarked in this setting that  $\rho_\phi$  is a generalization of a metric considered by Florian in [8]. Therein Florian introduces the metric

$$\rho_W(K, L) := 2W(K \dot{\cup} L) - W(K) - W(L) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n,$$

where  $W$  is mean width, i.e.

$$W(K) := \frac{2}{\omega_{n-1}} \int_{S^{n-1}} h_K(u) d\sigma(u) = \frac{1}{\omega_{n-1}} \int_{S^{n-1}} h_K(u) + h_K(-u) d\sigma(u) \quad \text{for all } K \in \mathcal{K}^n; \quad (23)$$

here  $\sigma$  is the surface area measure on  $S^{n-1}$  and  $\omega_{n-1} = \sigma(S^{n-1})$  (see Figure 12).




Figure 12: Width of a convex body  $K \in \mathcal{K}^2$  in a fixed direction  $u \in S^1$ . This width is exactly  $h_K(u) + h_K(-u)$ .

Of course, we note (23) shows  $W$  is just the intrinsic volume  $V_1$  up to a dimension-dependent constant.

Theorem 5 in [8] establishes that  $(\mathcal{K}^n, \rho_W)$  (and consequently  $(\mathcal{K}^n, \rho_{V_1})$ ) is a length space that admits a shortest path between any two given points. We now recover this for  $(\mathcal{K}^n, \rho_\phi)$ .

**Theorem 4.2** (Restatement of Theorem 1.3). *Let  $\phi$  be  $k$ -strictly monotone. If  $\phi$  is 1-homogeneous, then  $(\mathcal{K}^n, \rho_\phi)$  is a length space that admits a shortest path  $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathcal{K}^n$  between any given  $K$  and  $L$  in  $\mathcal{K}^n$ .*

*Proof.* Similar to the derivation given in Theorem 1.2, we note Firey's characterization gives us that

$$\rho_\phi(K, L) = \int_{S^{n-1}} |h_K(u) - h_L(u)| dS(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}; u) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n$$

for some fixed  $G_1, \dots, G_{n-1} \in \mathcal{K}^n$ . Fix  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n$  then and consider, similar to earlier,

$$K_t := (1-t)K + tL \quad \text{for } t \in [0, 1].$$

Using basic properties of support functions then we note for  $s, t \in [0, 1]$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\phi(K_t, K_s) &= \int_{S^{n-1}} |h_{K_t}(u) - h_{K_s}(u)| dS(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}) \\ &= \int_{S^{n-1}} |(1-t)h_K(u) + th_L(u) - [(1-s)h_K(u) + sh_L(u)]| \\ &= |t-s| \int_{S^{n-1}} |h_K(u) - h_L(u)| dS(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}; u) \\ &= |t-s| \rho_\phi(K, L). \end{aligned}$$

This of course has the path  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{K}^n$  by  $t \mapsto K_t$  is continuous with respect to  $\rho_\phi$ . Moreover, considering any partition  $\{p_i\}_{i=0}^N$  of  $[0, 1]$  we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \rho_\phi(K_{p_{i-1}}, K_{p_i}) = \sum_{i=1}^N |p_{i-1} - p_i| \rho_\phi(K, L) = \rho_\phi(K, L).$$

It follows then  $(\mathcal{K}^n, \rho_\phi)$  is a length space that admits shortest paths between any  $K$  and  $L$  in  $\mathcal{K}^n$ .  $\square$

Of course, this theorem and proof establishes that  $(\mathcal{K}^n, \rho_\phi)$  is a *geodesic space*, of which additional geometric questions can be asked. These questions will, however, escape the scope of this paper.

We turn then to the  $n$ -homogeneous case. To reiterate, in this case  $\Delta_\phi$  is merely a positive multiple of the *symmetric difference metric*

$$\Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, L) = \text{Vol}(K) + \text{Vol}(L) - 2\text{Vol}(K \cap L) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}_n^n,$$

and so we just need to consider the particular case of  $\Delta_{\text{Vol}}$ .

Certain geometric and topological properties of this metric are studied in [15]. Therein it is noted that the space  $(\mathcal{K}_n^n, \Delta_{\text{Vol}})$  is *convex*, i.e. there is  $M \in \mathcal{K}_n^n$  where

$$\Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, L) = \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, M) + \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(M, L)$$

for any given  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_n^n$ ,  $K, L$  and  $M$  distinct. However, as  $(\mathcal{K}_n^n, \Delta_{\text{Vol}})$  is clearly *not* complete as a metric space, convexity alone does not imply intrinsicness (see Figure 13).



Figure 13: The rational numbers  $\mathbb{Q}$ , equipped with the usual Euclidean metric, form a convex metric space that is not intrinsic: between any two distinct points there is no continuous path lying entirely in  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

Nevertheless, we note intrinsicness of  $\Delta_{\text{Vol}}$  in (and *only* in)  $n \geq 2$  follows immediately as a corollary of the proof of Theorem 1.1, as in that setting Vol lacks a 1-homogeneous part. Indeed we get

$$\Delta(K, L)_{\text{Vol}} \leq \bar{\Delta}_{\text{Vol}}(K, L) \leq \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, L) \quad \text{for all } K, L \in \mathcal{K}_n^n,$$

as  $\bar{\Delta}_{\text{Vol}}$  is just the normal intrinsic *metric* induced by  $\Delta_{\text{Vol}}$ : every piecewise metric continuous curve pastes together to give a continuous curve where the lengths add, and every nominally continuous curve is piecewise metric continuous.

That being said, in the proof of Theorem 1.1 we only showed the existence of a shortest path  $\gamma$ , i.e. a path joining  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_n^n$  with

$$L(\gamma) = \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, L),$$

when  $K \cap L \in \mathcal{K}_n^n$ . It is natural to ask if this is the only case in which we can find a shortest path, a question we answer now:

**Theorem 4.3** (Restatement of Theorem 1.4). *Let  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_n^n$  for any  $n$ . Then there is continuous  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_n^n$  such that*

$$\gamma(0) = K, \gamma(1) = L \quad \text{and} \quad L(\gamma) = \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, L)$$

*if and only if there exists a “bridging body”  $M \in \mathcal{K}_n^n$  such that*

$$K \cap L \subseteq M \subseteq K \cup L \quad (\text{a.e.}) \quad \text{and} \quad M \cap K, \quad M \cap L \in \mathcal{K}_n^n.$$

*In particular, there is never a geodesic segment joining disjoint bodies  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n$ , and thus  $(\mathcal{K}^n, \Delta)$  is never a geodesic space for any  $n$ .*

Before proving this theorem, we note some useful lemmas.

**Lemma 4.4.** *We have that for  $K, L, M \in \mathcal{K}_n^n$  that*

$$\Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, L) = \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, M) + \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(M, L)$$

*if and only if  $K \cap L \subseteq M$  and  $M \subseteq K \cup L$  up to (Lebesgue-)null sets.*

*Proof.* Note

$$\Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, M) + \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(M, L) - \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, L) = 2[\text{Vol}(M) + \text{Vol}(K \cap L) - \text{Vol}(K \cap M) - \text{Vol}(M \cap L)].$$

Applying the valuation property to the right-side of above equality shows it is just

$$2[\text{Vol}(M \cup (K \cap L)) - \text{Vol}(M \cap (K \cup L))],$$

which is zero if and only if

$$M \cap (K \cup L) = M \cup (K \cap L)$$

up to a null set, which clearly forces

$$K \cap L \subseteq M \subseteq K \cup L$$

up to null sets. □

We also have the estimate we demonstrated earlier in the proof of Lemma 3.4, which we write down separately here.

**Lemma 4.5.** *We have*

$$|\text{Vol}(K) - \text{Vol}(L)| \leq \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, L)$$

for all (Lebesgue-)measurable  $K, L \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $\text{Vol}(K), \text{Vol}(L) < \infty$ .

We are now in a position to prove the theorem.

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* Let  $K, L \in \mathcal{K}_n^n$ . We prove the backwards direction first, i.e. we assume we have  $M \in \mathcal{K}_n^n$  with

$$K \cap L \subseteq M \subseteq K \cup L \quad (\text{a.e.}) \quad \text{and} \quad M \cap K, \quad M \cap L \in \mathcal{K}_n^n,$$

and move to show there is a shortest path joining  $K$  and  $L$ . For this consider the path  $\gamma$  given by the interpolation

$$K \longrightarrow M \cap K \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow M \cap L \longrightarrow L.$$

By additivity of length in a metric space and the principle of Lemma 3.2 we see this  $\gamma$  has length

$$\Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, M) + \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(M, L) = \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, L),$$

as desired.

Assume then for the forwards direction that we have some continuous path  $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_n^n$  such that

$$L(\gamma) = \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, L).$$

Of course, note that in this position we have for each  $t \in [0, 1]$  that

$$\Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, L) \leq \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, \gamma(t)) + \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(\gamma(t), L) \leq L(\gamma) = \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, L), \quad (24)$$

so Lemma 4.4 forces

$$K \cap L \subseteq \gamma(t) \subseteq K \cup L \quad (\text{a.e.}) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, 1].$$

It suffices then to show there is some  $t^* \in [0, 1]$  such that

$$\text{Vol}(K \cap \gamma(t^*)) \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Vol}(L \cap \gamma(t^*)) \neq 0,$$

as then we just take  $M = \gamma(t^*)$ . Define then the functions  $w, z : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  via

$$\begin{aligned} w(t) &:= \text{Vol}(\gamma(t) \cap (K \setminus L)) \quad \text{and} \\ z(t) &:= \text{Vol}(\gamma(t) \cap (L \setminus K)). \end{aligned}$$

We will assume from this moment forward that  $\text{Vol}(K \setminus L), \text{Vol}(L \setminus K) > 0$ ; if say  $\text{Vol}(K \setminus L) = 0$ , then  $K \subseteq L$  up to a null set and so the choice  $M = K$  would suffice.

We first note then that the functions  $w$  and  $z$  are continuous; indeed, note for say some measurable  $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $\text{Vol}(F) < \infty$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{Vol}(\gamma(t) \cap F) - \text{Vol}(\gamma(s) \cap F)| &\leq \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(\gamma(t) \cap F, \gamma(s) \cap F) \\ &= \text{Vol}((\gamma(t) \Delta \gamma(s)) \cap F) \\ &\leq \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(\gamma(t), \gamma(s)) \end{aligned}$$

for each  $t, s \in [0, 1]$  by Lemma 4.5. The choices  $F = K \setminus L, L \setminus K$  show  $w$  and  $z$  to be continuous then, given the continuity of  $\gamma$ .

We claim then in addition that  $w$  is nonincreasing (resp.  $z$  is nondecreasing). To show this, we fix  $t \in [0, 1]$  and consider  $s \in [0, t]$ . Similar to (24) we have

$$\Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, \gamma(t)) = \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(K, \gamma(s)) + \Delta_{\text{Vol}}(\gamma(s), \gamma(t)),$$

and thus

$$K \cap \gamma(t) \subseteq \gamma(s) \subseteq K \cup \gamma(t) \quad (\text{a.e.}).$$

Intersecting each of these sets with  $K \setminus L$  then gives the inclusions

$$(K \setminus L) \cap \gamma(t) \subseteq (K \setminus L) \cap \gamma(s) \subseteq K \setminus L$$

up to null sets, where taking volumes and leveraging monotonicity gets exactly  $w(t) \leq w(s)$ . The desired result for  $z$  follows similarly.

To recap then, at this point we have continuous, nonincreasing  $w$  and continuous, nondecreasing  $z$  with:

$$\begin{aligned} w(0) &= \text{Vol}(K \setminus L) > 0, & w(1) &= 0, \\ z(0) &= 0, & z(1) &= \text{Vol}(L \setminus K) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

To proceed then, note that if  $\text{Vol}(K \cap L) > 0$ , then the choice  $M = K$  suffices for our purposes. We take  $\text{Vol}(K \cap L) = 0$  then, and assume for the sake of contradiction that no  $t \in [0, 1]$  has

$$\text{Vol}(\gamma(t) \cap K) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Vol}(\gamma(t) \cap L) > 0.$$

Define then

$$a := \sup\{t \in [0, 1] : w(t) > 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad b := \inf\{t \in [0, 1] : z(t) > 0\};$$

where both of the involved sets here are nonempty given the assumption  $\text{Vol}(K \setminus L), \text{Vol}(L \setminus K) > 0$ . We claim then  $a \leq b$ .

Indeed, if  $a > b$ , then for any  $\varepsilon < \frac{a-b}{2}$  there exist  $c_1, c_2 \in [0, 1]$  satisfying

$$c_1 > a - \varepsilon, w(c_1) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad c_2 < b + \varepsilon, z(c_2) > 0.$$

At the point  $c := \frac{a+b}{2}$  then we would get

$$0 < w(c_1) \leq w(c) \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < z(c_2) \leq z(c)$$

as  $w$  is nonincreasing and  $z$  is nondecreasing. This is a contradiction though as

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < w(c) &\leq \text{Vol}(\gamma(c) \cap K), \quad \text{and} \\ 0 < z(c) &\leq \text{Vol}(\gamma(c) \cap L) \end{aligned}$$

by monotonicity.

We have  $a \leq b$  then. As  $w(1) = z(0) = 0$  and  $w$  and  $z$  are continuous, we get  $w(a) = z(b) = 0$ . Furthermore, of course  $w(t) = 0$  for  $t \geq a$  and  $z(s) = 0$  for  $s \leq b$ . It follows then

$$w(a) = z(a) = 0,$$

which we can use to force  $\gamma(a) \subseteq K \cap L$ . Indeed, write for shorthand

$$S := K \cap L = (K \cup L) \setminus (K \Delta L) = (K \cup L) \setminus ((K \setminus L) \cup (L \setminus K)).$$

We get then that

$$\gamma(a) \setminus S = (\gamma(a) \cap (K \cup L)^c) \cup (\gamma(a) \cap (K \setminus L)) \cup (\gamma(a) \cap (L \setminus K)). \quad (25)$$



As  $\gamma(a) \subseteq K \cup L$  up to a null set then and  $w(a) = z(a) = 0$ , using subadditivity has that the volume of the right side of (25) is zero. Monotonicity then has  $\text{Vol}(\gamma(a) \setminus S) = 0$ , so we have

$$\gamma(a) \subseteq S \quad (\text{a.e.}).$$

However,  $\gamma(a) \in \mathcal{K}_n^n$ , i.e.  $\text{Vol}(\gamma(a)) > 0$ , so the above would then force  $\text{Vol}(K \cap L) > 0$ , a contradiction. It follows there must be some  $t^* \in [0, 1]$  with

$$\text{Vol}(\gamma(t^*) \cap K) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Vol}(\gamma(t^*) \cap L) > 0,$$

and so the desired result holds with  $M = \gamma(t^*)$ . □

## References

- [1] Ayo Aitokhuehi et al. “The Hausdorff distance and metrics on toric singularity types”. In: *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématiques* 204 (2025).
- [2] Semyon Alesker et al. *Integral geometry and valuations*. Springer, 2014.
- [3] Andreas Bernig and Joseph H. G. Fu. “Hermitian integral geometry”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* (2010). arXiv: 0801.0711 [math.DG]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/0801.0711>.
- [4] Florian Besau, Steven Hoehner, and Gil Kur. “Intrinsic and Dual Volume Deviations of Convex Bodies and Polytopes”. In: *International Mathematics Research Notices* 2021.22 (Dec. 2019), pp. 17456–17513. ISSN: 1687-0247. DOI: 10.1093/imrn/rnz277. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/imrn/rnz277>.
- [5] Giuseppe Buttazzo, Vincenzo Ferone, and Bernhard Kawohl. “Minimum Problems over Sets of Concave Functions and Related Questions”. In: *Mathematische Nachrichten* 173.1 (1995), pp. 71–89. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/mana.19951730106>. eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/mana.19951730106>. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/mana.19951730106>.
- [6] Katarzyna Chrzaszcz, Jacek Jachymski, and Filip Turoboś. “On characterizations and topology of regular semimetric spaces”. In: *Publicationes Mathematicae Debrecen* 93 (July 2018), pp. 87–105. DOI: 10.5486/PMD.2018.8049.
- [7] William J. Firey. “A functional characterization of certain mixed volumes”. In: *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 24 (Dec. 1976), pp. 274–281. DOI: 10.1007/BF02834758. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02834758>.
- [8] A. Florian. “On a metric for the class of compact convex sets”. In: *Geometriae Dedicata* 30 (1989), pp. 69–80. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:119651984>.
- [9] Paul Goodey and Wolfgang Weil. “Distributions and Valuations”. In: *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* s3-49.3 (Nov. 1984), pp. 504–516. ISSN: 0024-6115. DOI: 10.1112/plms/s3-49.3.504. eprint: <https://academic.oup.com/plms/article-pdf/s3-49/3/504/4474160/s3-49-3-504.pdf>. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1112/plms/s3-49.3.504>.

- [10] H. Groemer. "On the symmetric difference metric for convex bodies." eng. In: *Beiträge zur Algebra und Geometrie* 41.1 (2000), pp. 107–114. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/225705>.
- [11] Ramon van Handel and Shouda Wang. *On Minkowski's monotonicity problem*. 2025. arXiv: 2507.20082 [math.MG]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.20082>.
- [12] Daniel Hug and Paul A. Reichert. "The support of mixed area measures involving a new class of convex bodies". In: *Journal of Functional Analysis* 287.11 (2024), p. 110622. ISSN: 0022-1236. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2024.110622>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022123624003100>.
- [13] Daniel A. Klain. "A short proof of Hadwiger's characterization theorem". In: *Mathematika* 42.2 (1995), pp. 329–339. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1112/S0025579300014625>. eprint: <https://londmathsoc.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1112/S0025579300014625>. URL: <https://londmathsoc.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1112/S0025579300014625>.
- [14] Rolf Schneider. *Convex Bodies: The Brunn-Minkowski Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [15] G. C. Shephard and R. J. Webster. "Metrics for sets of convex bodies". In: *Mathematika* 12.1 (1965), pp. 73–88. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1112/S0025579300005179>. eprint: <https://londmathsoc.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1112/S0025579300005179>. URL: <https://londmathsoc.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1112/S0025579300005179>.
- [16] Qinglan Xia. "The geodesic problem in quasimetric spaces". In: *The Journal of Geometric Analysis* (2009). arXiv: 0807.3377 [math.MG]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/0807.3377>.
- [17] Du Zou and Ge Xiong. *A unified treatment for  $L_p$  Brunn-Minkowski type inequalities*. 2016. arXiv: 1607.07141 [math.MG]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.07141>.