

BOUNDING THE DIAMETER-WIDTH RATIO USING CONTAINMENT INEQUALITIES OF MEANS OF CONVEX BODIES

KATHERINA VON DICTER AND MIA RUNGE

ABSTRACT. We completely describe the region of possible values of the diameter-width ratio for planar pseudo-complete sets in dependence of the Minkowski asymmetry. In order to do this, we focus on the containment inequalities of $K \cap (-K)$ and $\frac{K-K}{2}$ for a Minkowski centered convex compact set K , i.e. we define $\tau(K)$ to be the smallest possible factor to cover $K \cap (-K)$ by a rescaling of $\frac{K-K}{2}$ and give the region of the possible values of $\tau(K)$ in the planar case in dependence of the Minkowski asymmetry of K .

1. INTRODUCTION AND NOTATION

We denote the family of *convex bodies* (full-dimensional compact convex sets) by \mathcal{K}^n . Any set $A \in \mathcal{K}^n$ fulfilling $A = t - A$ for some $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is called *symmetric* and *0-symmetric* if $t = 0$. The family of 0-symmetric bodies is denoted by \mathcal{K}_0^n . We write $K \subset_t C$, if there exists $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$, such that $K \subset C + t$. For $K, C \in \mathcal{K}^n$ the *circumradius* and the *inradius* of K w.r.t. C are defined as $R(K, C) := \inf\{\rho > 0 : K \subset_t \rho C\}$ and $r(K, C) := \sup\{\rho > 0 : \rho C \subset_t K\}$, while the *width* and the *diameter* are defined as $w(K, C) := 2r(K - K, C - C)$ and $D(K, C) := 2R(K - K, C - C)$. We say K is of *constant width* w.r.t. C , if $D(K, C) = w(K, C)$, while K is *complete* w.r.t. C if $D(K', C) > D(K, C)$ for every $K' \supsetneq K$.

Bodies of constant width and completeness have been studied in numerous works, including [12] (in euclidean spaces); [10, 11, 15] (in general Minkowski spaces). Constant width always implies completeness and in some cases, for instance, when C is the euclidean ball or a planar set, completeness and constant width always coincide. Such gauges C are called *perfect*. However, for every $n \geq 3$ there exist (symmetric) $C \in \mathcal{K}^n$ such that completeness and constant width do not always coincide [10]. Characterizing perfect gauges is still a major open question in convex geometry (see e.g. [10, 15]). More recently in [17], it is shown that for any $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ complete with respect to $C \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ holds $\frac{D(K, C)}{w(K, C)} \leq \frac{n+1}{2}$ and that this bound is sharp, if n is odd and K a simplex. This upper bound is improved in [3] by means of the *Minkowski asymmetry* of K . It is defined as

$$s(K) := \inf\{\rho > 0 : K - c \subset \rho(c - K), \ c \in \mathbb{R}^n\},$$

and a *Minkowski center* of K is any $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $K - c \subset s(K)(c - K)$ [5]. If 0 is a Minkowski center, we say K is *Minkowski centered*. Note that $s(K) \in [1, n]$ for $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$; $s(K) = 1$ if and only if K is symmetric, and $s(K) = n$ if and only if K is a simplex [13].

Key words and phrases. Convex sets, Symmetrizations, Symmetry Measures, Completeness, Geometric inequalities, Diameter, Width, Complete Systems of Inequalities .

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 52A40, 52A10.

The improved bound is given as $\frac{D(K,C)}{w(K,C)} \leq \frac{s(K)+1}{2}$. Also sharpness for $n > 2$ odd and any prescribed $s(K) \in [1, n]$ and for $n > 2$ even and any $s(K) \in [1, n-1]$ is shown.

We say that $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an *incenter* of K with respect to C if $c + r(K, C)C \subset K$. In [15] it is shown that all complete bodies satisfy $R(K, C) + r(K, C) = D(K, C)$, while in [5] that the latter condition is equivalent to $\frac{K-K}{2} \subset \frac{D(K,C)}{2}C \subset \frac{s(K)+1}{2}(K-c) \cap -(K-c)$ for every incenter c of K . This is especially valuable if one understands it as a necessary condition for the gauges C such that a given body K may be complete w.r.t. C (keeping in mind that constant width is equivalent to $\frac{K-K}{2} = \frac{D(K,C)}{2}C$ if C is 0-symmetric). We call $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ that satisfies $r(K, C) + R(K, C) = D(K, C)$ to be *pseudo-complete* w.r.t. C .

We now present the main result of this work. Let $\varphi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ denote the *golden ratio* and

$$c(s) := \begin{cases} 1 & s \leq \varphi, \\ \frac{(s^2+1)^2}{(s^2-1)(s^2+2s-1+2\sqrt{s(s^2-1)})} & \varphi < s \leq \hat{s}, \\ \frac{2(s^2-2s-1)}{(s-3)(s+1)} & \hat{s} < s \leq 2, \end{cases}$$

where $\hat{s} \approx 1.8536$ is such that $\frac{(\hat{s}^2+1)^2}{(\hat{s}^2-1)(\hat{s}^2+2\hat{s}-1+2\sqrt{\hat{s}(\hat{s}^2-1)})} = \frac{2(\hat{s}^2-2\hat{s}-1)}{(\hat{s}-3)(\hat{s}+1)}$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^2$, $C \in \mathcal{K}_0^2$ and K be pseudo-complete w.r.t. C . Then*

$$\frac{D(K,C)}{w(K,C)} \leq \frac{s(K)+1}{2} c(s(K)) \leq \frac{\varphi+1}{2} \approx 1.31,$$

$\frac{D(K,C)}{w(K,C)} = \frac{\varphi+1}{2}$ holds if and only if $L(K) = \mathbb{GH} := \text{conv} \left(\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \pm 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \pm 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix} \right\} \right)$ is the *golden house* and L is some linear transformation.

Moreover, for every pair (ρ, s) with $1 \leq s \leq 2$ and $1 \leq \rho \leq \frac{s+1}{2}c(s)$, there exists some Minkowski centered K , s.t. $s(K) = s$, and a convex body C , s.t. K is pseudo-complete w.r.t. C and $\frac{D(K,C)}{w(K,C)} = \rho$ (c.f. Figure 1).

For $K \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$ it is reasonable to inquire $K \cap (-K) = K = \text{conv}(K \cup (-K))$, a condition satisfied only when 0 acts as the center of symmetry for K . For this reason in the following we fix the center of the convex body K to be the Minkowski center. Furthermore, if K is not 0-symmetric, $K \cap (-K)$ can become arbitrarily small.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is heavily based on the containment inequalities of $K \cap (-K)$ and $\frac{K-K}{2}$ for a Minkowski centered convex compact set K .

We define $\tau(K) > 0$ such that

$$K \cap (-K) \subset^{\text{opt}} \tau(K) \left(\frac{K-K}{2} \right).$$

We describe the possible τ values of K in dependence of its asymmetry (c.f. Figure 10). This result will be the biggest milestone for showing Theorem 1.1.




FIGURE 1. Region of all possible values for the diameter-width ratio for pseudo complete sets K in dependence of their Minkowski asymmetry $s(K)$: $\frac{D(K,C)}{w(K,C)} \geq 1$ (blue); $\frac{D(K,C)}{w(K,C)} \leq \frac{s(K)+1}{2}c(s(K))$ (red, green and orange, resp.).

Theorem 1.2. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^2$ be Minkowski centered. Then*

$$\frac{2}{s(K) + 1} \leq \tau(K) \leq c(s(K)).$$

Moreover, for every pair (τ, s) , such that $1 \leq s \leq 2$ and $\frac{2}{s+1} \leq \tau \leq c(s)$, there exists a Minkowski centered $K_{s,\tau} \in \mathcal{K}^2$, such that $s(K_{s,\tau}) = s$ and $\tau(K_{s,\tau}) = \tau$.

2. DEFINITIONS AND PROPOSITIONS

For any $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ let $X + Y = \{x + y : x \in X, y \in Y\}$ be the *Minkowski sum* of X , Y and $\rho X = \{\rho x : x \in X\}$ the *ρ -dilatation* of X , and abbreviate $(-1)X$ by $-X$. For any $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ let $\text{conv}(X)$, $\text{pos}(X)$, $\text{lin}(X)$, and $\text{aff}(X)$ denote the *convex hull*, the *positive hull*, the *linear hull*, and the *affine hull* of X , respectively. A *segment* is the convex hull of $\{x, y\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, which we abbreviate by $[x, y]$. With u^1, \dots, u^n we denote the *standard unit vectors* of \mathbb{R}^n . For every $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ let $\text{bd}(X)$ and $\text{int}(X)$ denote the *boundary* and *interior* of X , respectively. Let us denote the *Euclidean norm* of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by $\|x\|$, the *Euclidean unit ball* by $\mathbb{B}_2 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\| \leq 1\}$. In generalized Minkowski spaces the norm is replaced by a *gauge function*, i.e. a function of the type $\|\cdot\|_C : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $\|x\|_C = \inf\{\rho \geq 0 : x \in \rho C\}$ with a (not necessarily symmetric) gauge body $C \in \mathcal{K}^n$ satisfying $0 \in \text{int}(C)$. In case $u^1, \dots, u^{n+1} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are affinely independent, we say that $\text{conv}(\{u^1, \dots, u^{n+1}\})$ is an *n -simplex*. For any $a \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$, let $H_{a,\rho}^{\leq} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : a^T x \leq \rho\}$ denote a *halfspace* with its boundary being the *hyperplane* $H_{a,\rho}^{\leq} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : a^T x = \rho\}$. Analogously, we define $H_{a,\rho}^{\geq}, H_{a,\rho}^{<}, H_{a,\rho}^{>}$. We say that the halfspace $H_{a,\rho}^{\leq}$ *supports* $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ in $q \in K$, if $K \subset H_{a,\rho}^{\leq}$ and $q \in H_{a,\rho}^{\leq}$. We denote the set of all *extreme points* of K by $\text{ext}(K)$. For any $K, C \in \mathcal{K}^n$ we say K is *optimally contained* in C , and denote it by $K \subset^{\text{opt}} C$, if $K \subset C$ and $K \not\subset_t \rho C$ for any $\rho \in [0, 1)$.

We start off with a very basic but useful fact.

Lemma 2.1. *Let the plane \mathbb{R}^2 be split into six areas by three pairwise different lines passing through the origin and each of the points p_1, p_2, p_3 be contained in a different of those areas, any two which are non-consecutive. Then $0 \in \text{conv}(\{p^1, p^2, p^3\})$.*

Proof. Assume that $0 \notin \text{conv}(\{p^1, p^2, p^3\})$. We can separate $\{0\}$ and $\text{conv}(\{p^1, p^2, p^3\})$, thus there exists $a \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $a^T p^i < 0$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. But since $H_{(a,0)}^{\leq}$ can only intersect at most four of the six areas, this contradicts the fact that $p^i, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, are contained in non-consecutive areas. \square

We recall the characterization of the optimal containment under homothety in terms of the touching conditions [6, Theorem 2.3].

Proposition 2.2. *Let $K, C \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $K \subset C$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $K \subset^{\text{opt}} C$
- (ii) *There exist $k \in \{2, \dots, n+1\}$, $p^j \in K \cap \text{bd}(C)$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, and a^j outer normals of supporting halfspaces of K and C at p^j , such that $0 \in \text{conv}(\{a^1, \dots, a^k\})$.*

In the planar case Theorem 2.2 implies the following corollary (c.f. [1, Corollary 8]).

Corollary 2.3. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^2$ with $s(K) > 1$. Then K is Minkowski centered if and only if there exist $p^1, p^2, p^3 \in \text{bd}(K) \cap (-\frac{1}{s(K)}K)$ and $a^i, i = 1, 2, 3$, outer normals of supporting halfspaces of K in p^i , such that $0 \in \text{int}(\text{conv}(\{p^1, p^2, p^3\}))$ and $0 \in \text{conv}(\{a^1, a^2, a^3\})$.*

Proof. There exist two or three such touching points in $\text{bd}(C) \cap (-\frac{1}{s(C)}\text{bd}(C))$ as described in Theorem 2.2. If it were only two it would follow that $s(C) = 1$. Now let S be the intersection of the three supporting hyperplanes at the touching points $\{p^1, p^2, p^3\}$. In addition, parallel hyperplanes support $-\frac{1}{s(C)}C$ at the opposing points $-\frac{1}{s(C)}p^i$. Thus, $\text{conv}(\{p^1, p^2, p^3\})$ is contained in the symmetric hexagon $S \cap (-S)$. The lines through opposing vertices of this hexagon form a situation as in Theorem 2.1 and therefore $0 \in \text{conv}(\{p^1, p^2, p^3\})$. Since $0 \in \text{bd}(\text{conv}(\{p^1, p^2, p^3\}))$ would imply $s(C) = 1$, we obtain $0 \in \text{int}(\text{conv}(\{p^1, p^2, p^3\}))$. \square

Let $\alpha(K) := R(K \cap (-K), \text{conv}(K \cup (-K)))$ and recall [2, Lemma 2.2, Corollary 2.3].

Proposition 2.4. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ be Minkowski centered and let L be a regular linear transformation. Then $\alpha(K) = \alpha(L(K))$ and $\tau(K) = \tau(L(K))$.*

We recall another result from [1] based on Theorem 2.4 about the equality cases for the upper bound in the inequality $\alpha(K) \leq 1$ in the planar case.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^2$ be Minkowski centered such that $\alpha(K) = 1$ or $\tau(K) = 1$. Then $s(K) \leq \varphi$. Moreover, if $s(K) = \varphi$, there exists a linear transformation L such that $L(K) = \mathbb{GH} = \text{conv}\left(\left\{\begin{pmatrix} \pm 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \pm 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix}\right\}\right)$ is the golden house.*

For $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ Minkowski centered we call any $p \in \text{bd}(K) \cap \text{bd}\left(-\frac{1}{s(K)}K\right)$ an *asymmetry point* of K , and any triple of asymmetry points, with the properties as stated in Theorem 2.3, to be *well-spread*. For $K \in \mathcal{K}^2$ we call $z^1, z^2 \in \text{bd}(K) \cap \text{bd}(-K)$ *consecutive*, if there exists no point $z \in \text{bd}(K) \cap \text{bd}(-K) \cap \text{int}(\text{pos}\{z^1, z^2\})$.

While the first two statements of the following proposition combine [3, Theorem 1.2] and [3, Lemma 3.1], the third one is added here for the sake of completeness.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^2$ be Minkowski centered with $s(K) \geq \varphi$ and let $z^1, z^2, z^3 \in \text{bd}(K) \cap \text{bd}(-K)$ be such that z^1, z^2 and z^2, z^3 are consecutive. Then the following holds:*

- (i) *the set $\text{bd}(K) \cap \text{bd}(-K)$ consists of exactly 6 points,*
- (ii) *there exists either an asymmetry point of K or of $-K$ in $\text{pos}\{z^1, z^2\}$,*
- (iii) *if there is an asymmetry point of K in $\text{pos}\{z^1, z^2\}$, there is no asymmetry point of K in $\text{pos}\{z^2, z^3\}$.*

Proof of Theorem 2.6 (iii). Let $z^1, z^2, z^3 \in \text{bd}(K) \cap \text{bd}(-K)$ be consecutive and $p^1 \in \text{pos}\{z^1, z^2\}$, $p^2 \in \text{pos}\{z^2, z^3\}$ be two asymmetry points.

Assume we have three consecutive points $z^1, z^2, z^3 \in \text{bd}(K) \cap \text{bd}(-K)$ such that $p^1 \in \text{pos}\{z^2, z^3\}$, $p^2 \in \text{pos}\{z^1, z^2\}$ are asymmetry points of K . Since $sp^1, sp^2 \in \text{bd}(-K)$, for $x \in \text{pos}\{p^1, p^2\}$ holds $\|x\|_K \geq \|x\|_{-K}$. But since $z^2 \in \text{bd}(-K) \cap \text{bd}(K) \in \text{pos}\{p^1, p^2\}$, there is a hyperplane supporting both K and $-K$ at z^2 .

This implies $\alpha(K) = 1$ because z^2 is contained in both the boundary of $\text{conv}(K \cup (-K))$ and $K \cap (-K)$ and therefore $s(K) \leq \varphi$. If $\alpha(K) = 1$ and $s(K) = \varphi$, we know by Theorem 2.5 that K is a linear transformation of the golden house for which the claim holds. By Theorem 2.1, the asymmetry points are also well-spread. \square

3. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2 which describes the containment factor between the minimum $K \cap (-K)$ and the arithmetic mean $\frac{K-K}{2}$ of a planar Minkowski-centered convex body K . We begin with a technical lemma which shows that we can transform a general K with $s(K) > \varphi$ into a heptagon with the same asymmetry and larger or equal τ -value.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^2$ be Minkowski centered with $s(K) > \varphi$. Then there exist a point $p \in \text{bd}(K) \cap \text{bd}(-K)$ and $p^1, p^2, p^3 \in \mathbb{R}^2$, such that*

$$\bar{K} = \text{conv}(\{\pm p, p^2, p^3, -s(K)p^1, -s(K)p^2, -s(K)p^3\})$$

is Minkowski centered, $p^1, p^2, p^3 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ form a triple of well-spread asymmetry points of \bar{K} , $p^1 = -\gamma d^1$ for some $0 < \gamma < 1$, where $d^1 = \text{aff}(\{-p, p^3\}) \cap \text{aff}(\{p, p^2\})$, and the following properties are fulfilled:

- (i) $s(\bar{K}) = s(K)$,
- (ii) $\tau(\bar{K}) \geq \tau(K)$, and

$$(iii) \ p \in \text{bd}(\bar{K} \cap (-\bar{K})) \cap \tau(\bar{K})\text{bd}\left(\frac{\bar{K}-\bar{K}}{2}\right).$$

Proof. The proof is split into two parts. The goal is to transform a general convex set K into a convex body with an "simpler shape" while keeping the asymmetry and preserving the needed properties. In *a*) we show that we can cut off everything except the intersection $K \cap (-K)$ and the asymmetry points $-sp^i$, $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, without changing the asymmetry or decreasing the value of τ . In *b*), we further transform the convex body into a certain heptagon.

a) We show that there exist a triple of well-spread asymmetry points of K p^1, p^2, p^3 , such that

$$(1) \quad K' := \text{conv}((K \cap (-K)) \cup \{-s(K)p^1, -s(K)p^2, -s(K)p^3\})$$

is Minkowski centered with

- (i) $s(K') = s(K)$,
- (ii) $\tau(K') \geq \tau(K)$, and
- (iii) there exists $p \in \text{bd}(K' \cap (-K')) \cap \tau(K')\text{bd}\left(\frac{K'-K'}{2}\right)$ with $p \in \text{bd}(K') \cap \text{bd}(-K')$.

Let $s := s(K)$. Since $s > \varphi$, by Theorem 2.6 $\text{bd}(K) \cap \text{bd}(-K)$ consists of exactly 6 points and there exist consecutive points $z^{i,i+1}, z^{i,i+2} \in \text{bd}(K) \cap \text{bd}(-K)$ with $-p^i \in \text{pos}\{z^{i,i+1}, z^{i,i+2}\}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ for well-spread asymmetry points p^1, p^2, p^3 of K . Indices are to be understood modulo 3.

We show the properties (i)-(iii) for the set K' .

Note that $s(K') = s(K)$. This can be easily seen from the fact that $\frac{1}{s}(K \cap (-K)) \subset -K'$ and $\{-p^1, -p^2, -p^3\} \subset (K \cap (-K)) \subset -K'$. The points p^1, p^2, p^3 are still well-spread asymmetry points of K' . Note that the boundary of $-K'$ does not intersect the segments $[p^i, z^{i,j}]$, $i = 1, 2, 3, j = i+1, i+2$, in the boundary of K' . Otherwise, we would have more than six intersection points between the boundaries of K' and $-K'$, contradicting Theorem 2.6.

Observe that $K' \cap (-K') = K \cap (-K)$ together with $K' \subset K$ implies $\tau(K') \geq \tau(K)$.

Note that the arithmetic mean $\frac{K'-K'}{2}$ is the convex hull of all midpoints between one extreme point of K' and one of $-K'$.

We define $p \in \text{bd}(K) \cap \text{bd}(-K) \cap \text{pos}(\{-p^3, p^2\})$. Then 0 and $-sp^3$ belong to different halfspaces w.r.t. the hyperplane $\text{aff}(\{p, sp^2\})$. Indeed, if this would be not the case, this hyperplane would support both $K' \cap (-K')$ and $\text{conv}(K' \cup (-K'))$, implying $\alpha(K') = 1$, which contradicts $s(K') > \varphi$. A similar statement holds for all $\pm sp^i$.

Note also that 0 and p belong to the same halfspace w.r.t. $\text{aff}(\{-sp^3, sp^2\})$. Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{bd}\left(\frac{K'-K'}{2}\right) \cap \text{pos}\left(\left\{-sp^3, \frac{-sp^3 + sp^2}{2}\right\}\right) = \\ \left\{\frac{x - sp^3}{2}, x \in \text{bd}(K') \cap \text{pos}(\{-sp^3, p\})\right\} \cup \left[\frac{-sp^3 + p}{2}, \frac{-sp^3 + sp^2}{2}\right]. \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 2. Construction from Theorem 3.2: K (black), $-K$ (gray), $K', -K'$ (yellow), $\text{bd}\left(\frac{K' - K'}{2}\right)$ (red (segments) and green (possibly arcs)).

Note that the boundary of $\frac{K' - K'}{2}$ has a similar structure in any other positive hull of this type and it consists of segments and arcs as shown in Figure 2.

For any $v \in \text{bd}(K' \cap (-K'))$ we define $\rho(v) > 0$ such that

$$\rho(v)v \in \text{bd}\left(\frac{K' - K'}{2}\right).$$

Since by [3, Theorem 1.3] $\frac{K' - K'}{2} \subset^{\text{opt}} \frac{s+1}{2} K' \cap (-K')$, we have $\rho(v) \leq \frac{s+1}{2}$ for all $v \in \text{bd}(K' \cap (-K'))$.

Observe that

$$(\tau(K'))^{-1} = \min_{v \in \text{bd}(K' \cap (-K'))} \rho(v).$$

We now show that for any $v \in \text{bd}(K' \cap (-K')) \cap \text{pos}(\{-sp^3, \frac{-sp^3 + sp^2}{2}\})$

$$\rho(v) \geq \rho(p).$$

By construction, $\rho(p)p \in [\frac{-sp^3 + p}{2}, \frac{-sp^3 + sp^2}{2}] \cup [\frac{sp^2 + p}{2}, \frac{-sp^3 + sp^2}{2}]$. Consider first $v \in \text{bd}(K' \cap (-K')) \cap \text{pos}(\{\frac{-sp^3 + p}{2}, \frac{-sp^3 + sp^2}{2}\})$. Observe that the hyperplane $\text{aff}(\{sp^2, p\})$ supports $K' \cap (-K')$ in p , and that $\rho(v)v \in [\frac{-sp^3 + p}{2}, \frac{-sp^3 + sp^2}{2}]$, which is a segment parallel to $\text{aff}(\{sp^2, p\})$. Thus, taking $\rho^* \geq 1$ such that $\rho^*p \in \text{aff}(\{\frac{-sp^3 + p}{2}, \frac{-sp^3 + sp^2}{2}\})$, we see that

$$\rho(v) \geq \rho^* \geq \rho(p).$$

Now let us consider $v \in \text{bd}(K' \cap (-K')) \cap \text{pos}(\{\frac{-sp^3 + p}{2}, -sp^3\})$. We define $v^1, v^2 \in \text{bd}(K' \cap (-K'))$ such that $\rho(v^1)v^1 = \frac{-sp^3 + p}{2}$, $\rho(v^2)v^2 = \frac{-sp^3 + v^1}{2}$ and $H_1^- := \text{aff}(\{v^1, p\})$. Note that $\rho(v^1) \geq \rho(p)$, $\rho(-p^3) = \frac{s+1}{2} \geq \rho(p)$, and the segment $[\rho(v^2)v^2, \rho(v^1)v^1]$ is parallel to H_1^- . Denoting by H_1^{\leq} the halfspace containing the origin defined by H_1^- , we have

$$\text{bd}(K' \cap (-K')) \cap \text{pos}(\{v^1, -sp^3\}) \subset H_1^{\leq} \quad \text{and} \quad [\rho(v^2)v^2, \rho(v^1)v^1] \subset \frac{K' - K'}{2}.$$

Thus, for any $v \in \text{bd}(K' \cap (-K')) \cap \text{pos}(\{v^1, v^2\})$ holds $\rho(v) \geq \rho(v^1)$.




FIGURE 3. Construction used in the proof of Part a)(iii) of Theorem 3.1:
 $\text{bd}(-K')$ (red), $\frac{K'-K'}{2}$ (brown).

Since in every step the cone is "cut in half", we can repeat the argument from above iteratively. Thus, by replacing in the next iteration p, v^1 with v^1, v^2 and so on, one can show that for any $v \in \text{bd}(K' \cap (-K')) \cap \text{pos}(\{-sp^3, p\})$ holds $\rho(v) \geq \rho(p)$. Thus, one of the intersection points $z^{i,j}$ has the smallest distance to the boundary of $\frac{K'-K'}{2}$ and there exists $p \in \text{bd}(K' \cap (-K')) \cap \tau(K')\text{bd}\left(\frac{K'-K'}{2}\right)$ with $p \in \text{bd}(K') \cap \text{bd}(-K')$, as desired.

- b) We proceed with the following transformations, defining successively the bodies K'_i , $1 \leq i \leq 4$ and showing in each step the desired properties of those sets.

For any $v \in \text{bd}(K'_i \cap (-K'_i))$ we define $\rho_i(v) > 0$ such that

$$\rho_i(v)v \in \text{bd}\left(\frac{K'_i - K'_i}{2}\right), \quad 1 \leq i \leq 4.$$

Step 1: Let $\gamma_i \leq 1$ be such that $\gamma_i p^i \in [z^{i+1,i}, -z^{i+2,i}]$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Replace K' by

$$K'_1 = \text{conv}\left(\{-\gamma_i s p^i, z^{i,i+1}, z^{i,i+2} : i = 1, 2, 3\}\right),$$

as in Figure 4.

We show that for K'_1 holds

- (i) $s(K'_1) = s(K')$,
- (ii) $\tau(K'_1) \geq \tau(K')$, and
- (iii) there exists $p \in (\text{bd}(K'_1) \cap \text{bd}(-K'_1)) \cap \tau(K'_1)\text{bd}\left(\frac{K'_1 - K'_1}{2}\right)$.

On the one hand, observe for $i = 1, 2, 3$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{s}K'_1 \cap \text{pos}(\{z^{i,i+1}, z^{i,i+2}\}) &= \text{conv}\left(\left\{0, -\gamma_i p^i, \frac{1}{s}z^{i,i+1}, \frac{1}{s}z^{i,i+2}\right\}\right) \\ &\subset \text{conv}(\{0, z^{i,i+1}, z^{i,i+2}\}) \\ &= -K'_1 \cap \text{pos}(\{z^{i,i+1}, z^{i,i+2}\}), \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 4. Construction used in the proof of Part b) Step 1 of Theorem 3.1: we replace $-sp^i$ by $-s\gamma_i p^i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and obtain K'_1 (black), $-K'_1$ (grey) and $\frac{K'_1 - K'_1}{2}$ (green).

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{s}K'_1 \cap \text{pos}(\{-z^{i,i+1}, -z^{i,i+2}\}) &= \text{conv}\left(\left\{0, -\frac{1}{s}z^{i,i+1}, -\frac{1}{s}z^{i,i+2}\right\}\right) \\ &\subset \text{conv}(\{0, -z^{i,i+1}, -z^{i,i+2}\}) \\ &\subset -K'_1 \cap \text{pos}(\{-z^{i,i+1}, -z^{i,i+2}\}), \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\frac{1}{s}K'_1 \subset -K'_1$. Since also $\gamma_i p^i, -s\gamma_i p^i \in \text{bd}(K'_1)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, the set $\{\gamma_1 p^1, \gamma_2 p^2, \gamma_3 p^3\}$ forms a triple of well spread asymmetry points and we see that K'_1 is Minkowski centered with $s(K'_1) = s(K') = s$.

The direction in which $\tau(K'_1)$ is attained might have changed compared to K' but since K'_1 has a similar structure as K' , by Part a) there exists $p \in \text{bd}(K'_1 \cap (-K'_1)) \cap \tau(K'_1)\text{bd}\left(\frac{K'_1 - K'_1}{2}\right)$ with $p \in \text{bd}(K'_1) \cap \text{bd}(-K'_1)$. Observe that since

$$\rho_1(z^{3,2})z^{3,2} \in \left[\frac{-\gamma_3 s p^3 + z^{3,2}}{2}, \frac{-\gamma_3 s p^3 + \gamma_2 s p^2}{2}\right] \cup \left[\frac{\gamma_2 s p^2 + z^{3,2}}{2}, \frac{-\gamma_3 s p^3 + \gamma_2 s p^2}{2}\right],$$

we have $\rho_1(z^{3,2}) \leq \rho(z^{3,2})$. Similarly, one can show that for all $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $j = i+1, i+2$ we have $\rho_1(z^{i,j}) \leq \rho(z^{i,j})$ and therefore,

$$\tau(K'_1) \geq \tau(K').$$

Let us assume w.l.o.g. from now on that $p = z^{3,2}$.

Step 2: Let \hat{p}^2, \hat{p}^3 be defined such that $-\hat{p}^3 \in [z^{3,1}, p]$, $\hat{p}^2 \in [z^{1,2}, p]$ and $-s\hat{p}^2, -s\hat{p}^3 \in \text{aff}(\{z^{2,1}, z^{3,1}\})$. This means that we move the points $-s\gamma_3 p^3, s\gamma_2 p^2$ parallel to the segments $[z^{3,1}, p]$ and $[z^{1,2}, p]$.

Replace K'_1 by

$$K'_2 = \text{conv}(\{-s\gamma_1 p^1, -s\hat{p}^2, -s\hat{p}^3, z^{i,i+1}, z^{i,i+2} : i = 1, 2, 3\}),$$

see Figure 5.

We show that for K'_2 holds

- (i) $s(K'_2) = s(K'_1)$,
- (ii) $\tau(K'_2) \geq \tau(K'_1)$, and
- (iii) $p \in \text{bd}(K'_2 \cap (-K'_2)) \cap \tau(K'_2) \text{bd}\left(\frac{K'_2 - K'_1}{2}\right)$.

Since $-\hat{p}^3 \in [z^{3,1}, z^{3,2}]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{s}K'_2 \cap \text{pos}(\{z^{3,1}, z^{3,2}\}) &= \text{conv}\left(\left\{0, -\hat{p}^3, \frac{1}{s}z^{3,1}, \frac{1}{s}z^{3,2}\right\}\right) \\ &\subset \text{conv}(\{0, z^{3,1}, z^{3,2}\}) \\ &= -K'_2 \cap \text{pos}(\{z^{3,1}, z^{3,2}\}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{s}K'_2 \cap \text{pos}(\{z^{1,2}, z^{3,2}\}) \subset -K'_2 \cap \text{pos}(\{z^{1,2}, z^{3,2}\}).$$

Thus, we conclude $-\frac{1}{s}K'_2 \subset K'_2$. The points $\gamma_1 p^1, \hat{p}^2, \hat{p}^3$ form a well-spread triple of asymmetry points of K'_2 by Theorem 2.1, which implies that $s(K'_2) = s$.

As shown in Part a), we only need to consider the points in $\text{bd}(K'_2) \cap \text{bd}(-K'_2)$. We know that

$$\rho_2(z^{3,1})z^{3,1} \in \left[\frac{-s\hat{p}^3 + z^{3,1}}{2}, \frac{-s\hat{p}^3 + s\gamma_1 p^1}{2}\right] \cup \left[\frac{s\gamma_1 p^1 + z^{3,1}}{2}, \frac{-s\hat{p}^3 + s\gamma_1 p^1}{2}\right]$$

and

$$\rho_1(z^{3,1})z^{3,1} \in \left[\frac{-s\gamma_3 p^3 + z^{3,1}}{2}, \frac{-s\gamma_3 p^3 + s\gamma_1 p^1}{2}\right] \cup \left[\frac{s\gamma_1 p^1 + z^{3,1}}{2}, \frac{-s\gamma_3 p^3 + s\gamma_1 p^1}{2}\right].$$

Let $H_2^- = \text{aff}\left(\left\{\frac{s\gamma_1 p^1 + z^{3,1}}{2}, \frac{-s\hat{p}^3 + s\gamma_1 p^1}{2}\right\}\right)$, $H_3^- = \text{aff}\left(\left\{\frac{-s\hat{p}^3 + z^{3,1}}{2}, \frac{-s\hat{p}^3 + s\gamma_1 p^1}{2}\right\}\right)$ and $H_4^- = \text{aff}\left(\left\{\frac{-s\gamma_3 p^3 + z^{3,1}}{2}, \frac{-s\gamma_3 p^3 + s\gamma_1 p^1}{2}\right\}\right)$ (see Figure 5). Let H_k^\leq , $k = 2, 3, 4$ denote the halfspace containing the origin.

Since $H_2^- = \frac{s\gamma_1 + 1}{2} \text{aff}(z^{3,1}, -s\hat{p}^3)$ and the hyperplanes H_3^-, H_4^- are parallel to $[z^{3,1}, s\gamma_1 p^1]$,

$$\frac{-s\gamma_3 p^3 + z^{3,1}}{2}, \frac{-s\hat{p}^3 + s\gamma_1 p^1}{2}, \frac{s\gamma_1 p^1 + z^{3,1}}{2} \in H_2^\leq \cap H_3^\leq,$$

which implies

$$\rho_2(z^{3,1}) \geq \rho_1(z^{3,1}).$$

Analogously, we obtain $\rho_2(z^{1,2}) \geq \rho_1(z^{1,2})$.

Since $\rho_2(z^{2,1}) = \rho_2(z^{1,2}), \rho_1(z^{2,1}) = \rho_1(z^{1,2})$, $\rho_2(z^{1,3}) = \rho_2(z^{3,1})$, and $\rho_1(z^{1,3}) = \rho_1(z^{3,1})$, we have

$$\rho_2(z^{2,1}) \geq \rho_1(z^{2,1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_2(z^{1,3}) \geq \rho_1(z^{1,3}).$$

Next, we know

$$\rho_2(p)p \in \left[\frac{-s\hat{p}^3 + p}{2}, \frac{-s\hat{p}^3 + s\hat{p}^2}{2} \right] \cup \left[\frac{s\hat{p}^2 + p}{2}, \frac{-s\hat{p}^3 + s\hat{p}^2}{2} \right].$$

Similarly to before, we see that $\left[\frac{-s\hat{p}^3 + p}{2}, \frac{-s\hat{p}^3 + s\hat{p}^2}{2} \right] \cup \left[\frac{s\hat{p}^2 + p}{2}, \frac{-s\hat{p}^3 + s\hat{p}^2}{2} \right]$ is contained in the half-spaces containing the origin defined by $\text{aff} \left(\left\{ \frac{-s\gamma_3 p^3 + p}{2}, \frac{-s\gamma_3 p^3 + s\gamma_2 p^2}{2} \right\} \right)$ and $\text{aff} \left(\left\{ \frac{s\gamma_2 p^2 + p}{2}, \frac{-s\gamma_3 p^3 + s\gamma_2 p^2}{2} \right\} \right)$.

Hence, one can show that $\rho_2(\pm p) \leq \rho_1(\pm p)$ and

$$\rho_2^{-1}(p) = \tau(K'_2) \geq \tau(K'_1).$$




FIGURE 5. Construction used in the proof of Part b) Step 2 of Theorem 3.1: we replace $-s\gamma_3 p^3$ by $-s\hat{p}^3$ and $s\gamma_2 p^2$ by $s\hat{p}^2$. Parts of the boundaries of $\frac{K_1-K_1}{2}$ (green) and $\frac{K_2-K_2}{2}$ (orange) are shown.

For better readability, let us denote $\gamma_1 p^1$, \hat{p}^2 and \hat{p}^3 by p^1 , p^2 and p^3 , respectively.

Step 3: Replace K'_2 by

$$K'_3 = \text{conv} \left(\{-sp^1, -sp^2, -sp^3, p^2, p^3, \pm p\} \right),$$

see Figure 6. We show that for K'_3 holds

- (i) $s(K'_3) = s(K'_2)$,
- (ii) $\tau(K'_3) \geq \tau(K'_2)$, and
- (iii) $p \in (\text{bd}(K'_3) \cap \text{bd}(-K'_3)) \cap \tau(K'_3) \text{bd} \left(\frac{K'_3 - K'_3}{2} \right)$.




FIGURE 6. Construction used in the proof of Part b) Step 3 of Theorem 3.1:
We obtain K'_3 (black) and $-K'_3$ (grey).

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{s}K'_3 \cap \text{pos}(\{-sp^2, -sp^3\}) &= \text{conv}(\{0, -p^2, -p^3\}) \\ &\subset \text{conv}(\{0, -p^2, -p^3, sp^1\}) \\ &= -K'_3 \cap \text{pos}(\{-sp^2, -sp^3\}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{s}K'_3 \cap \text{pos}(\{sp^2, -sp^3\}) &= \frac{1}{s}K'_2 \cap \text{pos}(\{sp^2, -sp^3\}), \\ -K'_3 \cap \text{pos}(\{sp^2, -sp^3\}) &= -K'_2 \cap \text{pos}(\{sp^2, -sp^3\}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we conclude $-\frac{1}{s}K'_3 \subset K'_3$.

The points p^1, p^2, p^3 also form a well-spread triple of asymmetry points of K'_3 , which implies $s(K'_3) = s$.

We denote $\bar{z}^{i,j} \in (\text{bd}(K'_3) \cap \text{bd}(-K'_3))$, $i, j = 1, 2, 3$.

Then by Part a) there exists $\bar{p} \in (\text{bd}(K'_3) \cap \text{bd}(-K'_3)) \cap \tau(K'_3)\text{bd}\left(\frac{K'_3 - K'_3}{2}\right)$.




FIGURE 7. Construction used in the proof of Part b) Step 3 of Theorem 3.1.

We see that $\rho_3(\bar{z}^{3,1}) \geq \rho_2(z^{3,1})$.

Next we show

$$\rho_3(\bar{z}^{i,j}) \geq \rho_2(z^{i,j}), \quad \text{for } i, j = 1, 2, 3 \quad \text{such that } z^{i,j} \neq \pm p.$$

Observe that it suffices to show

$$\rho_3(\bar{z}^{3,1}) \geq \rho_2(z^{3,1}),$$

the argument for $z^{2,1}$ follows analogously.

Indeed, $\bar{z}^{3,1} \in [-sp^2, -sp^3]$, $\text{aff}(\{\frac{sp^1 + \bar{z}^{3,1}}{2}, \frac{sp^1 + z^{3,1}}{2}\})$ is parallel to $\text{aff}(\{\bar{z}^{3,1}, z^{3,1}\})$, and thus, also parallel to $\text{aff}(\{\rho_3(\bar{z}^{3,1})\bar{z}^{3,1}, \rho_3(z^{3,1})z^{3,1}\})$ (see Figure 7). The distance between $\frac{z^{3,1} - sp^3}{2}$ and $\frac{\bar{z}^{3,1} - sp^3}{2}$ is smaller than the distance between $\rho_3(\bar{z}^{3,1})z^{3,1}$ and $\rho_3(\bar{z}^{3,1})\bar{z}^{3,1}$. This implies $\rho_3(\bar{z}^{3,1}) \geq \rho_2(z^{3,1})$, see Figure 7.

Furthermore, $p \in (\text{bd}(K'_3) \cap \text{bd}(-K'_3)) \cap \tau(K'_3)\text{bd}(\frac{K'_3 - K'_3}{2})$, thus,

$$\tau(K'_3) = \tau(K'_2).$$

Step 4: We define $d^1 := \text{aff}(\{-p, p^3\}) \cap \text{aff}(\{p, p^2\})$ and $p_*^1 \in \text{aff}(\{-sp^2, -sp^3\})$, such that $sp_*^1 = \gamma(-d^1)$ for some $\gamma \leq \frac{1}{s}$. Replace K'_3 by

$$K'_4 = \text{conv}(\{-sp_*^1, -sp^2, -sp^3, p^2, p^3, \pm p\}).$$

We show that for K'_4 holds

- (i) $s(K'_4) = s(K'_3)$,
- (ii) $\tau(K'_4) = \tau(K'_3)$, and
- (iii) $p \in \text{bd}((K'_4) \cap (-K'_4)) \cap \tau(K'_4)\text{bd}(\frac{K'_4 - K'_4}{2})$.

As before, note that $-\frac{1}{s}K'_4 \subset K'_4$ and p_*^1, p^2, p^3 form a well-spread triple of asymmetry points of K'_4 , which implies that $s(K'_4) = s$.

Next, we show

$$\rho_3(\bar{z}^{1,2})\bar{z}^{1,2} = \frac{sp^2 - sp^1}{2}$$

for the $\bar{z}^{i,j}$ from the previous step. Since $\bar{z}^{1,2} \in \text{pos}(\{-sp^1, sp^2\})$, there exist $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$, such that

$$\bar{z}^{1,2} = \alpha(-sp^1) + \beta(sp^2) = \alpha(-sp^1) + s\beta(p^2).$$

Thus,

$$\frac{\|\bar{z}^{1,2} - p^2\|}{\| -sp^1 - \bar{z}^{1,2} \|} = \frac{\alpha}{s\beta}.$$

Since $p^2 = \text{lin}(\{sp^2\}) \cap \text{aff}(\{p^1, \bar{z}^{1,2}\})$, we have

$$\frac{\| -sp^1 - p^2 \|}{\| -sp^1 - \bar{z}^{1,2} \|} = 1 + \frac{\|\bar{z}^{1,2} - p^2\|}{\| -sp^1 - \bar{z}^{1,2} \|} = \frac{s - \frac{1}{s}}{s - 1},$$

i.e.,

$$\frac{\|\bar{z}^{1,2} - p^2\|}{\| -sp^1 - \bar{z}^{1,2} \|} = \frac{1}{s}.$$

Combining those two facts, we obtain

$$\frac{\alpha}{s\beta} = \frac{1}{s},$$

i.e., $\alpha = \beta$. This implies

$$\rho_3(\bar{z}^{1,2})\bar{z}^{1,2} = \frac{sp^2 - sp^1}{2}.$$

We denote by $z_*^{i,j}$ the points in $\text{bd}(K'_4) \cap \text{bd}(K'_4)$. Since K'_4 has a similar structure as K'_3 , we have

$$\rho_4(z_*^{1,2})\bar{z}^{1,2} = \frac{sp^2 - sp_*^1}{2}.$$

From the fact that $\text{aff}(\{-sp^1, -sp_*^1\})$ is parallel to $\text{aff}(\{\bar{z}^{1,2}, z_*^{1,2}, sp^2\})$ follows

$$\rho_4(z_*^{1,2}) = \rho_3(\bar{z}^{1,2}).$$

Similarly, one can show

$$\rho_3(\bar{z}^{1,3})\bar{z}^{1,3} = \frac{sp^3 - sp^1}{2}$$

and

$$\rho_4(z_*^{1,3}) = \rho_3(\bar{z}^{1,3}).$$

Since $\frac{K'_4 - K'_4}{2} \cap \text{pos}(\{-sp^3, sp^2\}) = \frac{K'_3 - K'_3}{2} \cap \text{pos}(\{-sp^3, sp^2\})$, we have

$$\rho_4(p) = \rho_3(p) = \tau^{-1}(K'_3).$$

Thus, we have shown that for any $v \in \text{ext}((K'_4) \cap (-K'_4))$ holds

$$\rho_4(v) = \rho_3(v).$$

Remembering that $\rho_3(p) = \tau^{-1}(K'_3)$, we finally obtain $\tau(K'_3) = \tau(K'_4)$ and

$$\rho_4(p) = \tau^{-1}(K'_4).$$

Since $p_*^1 = \gamma(-d^1)$, we have

$$\bar{K} = K'_4 = \text{conv}(\{\pm p, p^2, p^3, \gamma sd^1, -sp^2, -sp^3\}).$$

□

Lemma 3.2. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^2$ be Minkowski centered such that $s(K) > \varphi$. Then*

$$(2) \quad \tau(K) \leq c(s(K)).$$

Proof. Considering \bar{K} as in Theorem 3.1, we have $\tau(K) \leq \tau(\bar{K})$ and $s(K) = s(\bar{K})$. Hence, if \bar{K} fulfills (2), we have

$$\tau(K) \leq \tau(\bar{K}) \leq c(s(\bar{K})) = c(s(K)),$$

i.e., K also fulfills (2). Thus, it suffices to show (2) for \bar{K} . Since by [2, Theorem 1.7] $\frac{2}{s(K)+1} \leq \tau(K) \leq 1$ and $s \in [1, 2]$, we have $\tau \in [\frac{2}{3}, 1]$.

Now, for any fixed $\tau \in [\frac{2}{3}, 1]$ we determine the maximal $s = s(\tau)$, such that there exists a Minkowski centered $\bar{K} \in \mathcal{K}^2$ with $\tau(\bar{K}) = \tau$ and $s(\bar{K}) = s$.




FIGURE 8. Construction from Theorem 3.1: \bar{K} (yellow), $\frac{\bar{K}-\bar{K}}{2}$ (green).

We assume w.l.o.g. that $\text{aff}(\{sp^2, -sp^3\}) = H_{((\frac{1}{\alpha}, 1))}^-$ is orthogonal to $[-p, p]$ and define α to be such that

$$\frac{1}{\alpha}p \in \text{bd}(\text{conv}(\bar{K} \cup (-\bar{K}))).$$

Since $p \in \text{bd}(\bar{K}) \cap \text{bd}(-\bar{K})$ and $p \notin \text{conv}(\{\pm sp^1, \pm sp^2, \pm sp^3\}) = \text{bd}(\text{conv}(\bar{K} \cup (-\bar{K})))$, holds $\alpha \leq 1$. Then $p = (\frac{\alpha}{0})$ and following the notations from Theorem 3.1 we have

$$\frac{1}{\alpha}p \in [sp^2, -sp^3].$$

Hence, $sp^2 \in H_{((\frac{1}{0}),1)}^-$, $sp^3 \in H_{((-1),1)}^-$, and therefore the first coordinates of p^2 and p^3 are $\frac{1}{s}$ and $-\frac{1}{s}$, respectively. Thus, remembering that p^2, p^3 are located on the same side of $\text{aff}\{-p, p\}$, we may further assume that $p^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1/s \\ -\nu \end{pmatrix}$ and $p^3 = \begin{pmatrix} -1/s \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}$ for some $\nu \in (0, 1]$.

Now, we calculate the coordinates of d^1 as the intersection point of the lines $\text{aff}\{p, p^2\}$ and $\text{aff}\{-p, p^3\}$. We obtain that those coordinates satisfy the following system of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} d_2^1 &= \frac{s\nu}{s\alpha - 1} d_1^1 - \frac{s\alpha\nu}{s\alpha - 1}, \\ d_2^1 &= \frac{-s}{s\alpha - 1} d_1^1 - \frac{s\alpha}{s\alpha - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

Solving, gives us

$$d^1 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\alpha(\nu-1)}{\nu+1} \\ \frac{-2s\alpha\nu}{(s\alpha-1)(\nu+1)} \end{pmatrix},$$

and for γ such that $-\gamma d^1 \in [-sp^2, -sp^3]$ holds

$$\frac{1}{\gamma} = \frac{2\alpha}{(\nu+1)^2} \left(\frac{2\nu}{s\alpha-1} - \frac{(\nu-1)^2}{2} \right) \geq 0.$$

Let d^2 denote the intersection point of $H_{((-1),1)}^-$ and $\text{aff}(\{-p, p^3\})$. Hence, $d^2 = -p + \mu(-p - p^3) = \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \mu \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha + \frac{1}{s} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ for some $\mu > 0$ and we directly see that $d_2^2 = \mu$. Now, since we have $d_1^2 = -1$ we obtain $d_2^2 = \frac{s(1-\alpha)}{s\alpha-1}$. Then, we have

$$d^2 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ \frac{s(1-\alpha)}{s\alpha-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Similarly, let d^3 denote the intersection point of $H_{((\frac{1}{0}),1)}^-$ and $\text{aff}(\{p, p^2\})$. Hence, $d^3 = p + \mu(p - p^2) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \mu \begin{pmatrix} \alpha - \frac{1}{s} \\ a \end{pmatrix}$ for some $\mu > 0$. Now, since we have $d_1^3 = 1$ we obtain

$$d_2^3 = \frac{s\nu(1-\alpha)}{s\alpha-1}.$$

Then, we have

$$d^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{s\nu(1-\alpha)}{s\alpha-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $\nu \leq 1$, we also have

$$\tau^{-1}p = \begin{pmatrix} \tau^{-1}\alpha \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \left[\frac{sp^2 - sp^3}{2}, \frac{sp^2 + p}{2} \right] = \left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{s(1-\nu)}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1+\alpha}{2} \\ \frac{-s\nu}{2} \end{pmatrix} \right].$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\tau^{-1}\alpha &= 2\lambda + (1 - \lambda)(1 + \alpha), \\ 0 &= \lambda s(1 - \nu) + (1 - \lambda)(-s\nu) \end{aligned}$$

for some $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

From the second equation $\lambda = \nu$, and inserting this into the first, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\tau^{-1}\alpha &= 2\nu + (1 - \nu)(1 + \alpha) \\ (3) \quad \iff \quad \alpha &= \frac{1 + \nu}{2\tau^{-1} + \nu - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $2\tau^{-1} + \nu - 1 > 0$ and $\alpha \geq 0$.

Hence,

$$\frac{1}{\gamma} = \frac{2}{(\nu + 1)(2\tau^{-1} + \nu - 1)} \left(\frac{2\nu}{s \left(\frac{\nu+1}{2\tau^{-1}+\nu-1} \right) - 1} - \frac{(\nu - 1)^2}{2} \right).$$

Observe that from the convexity of \bar{K} we directly obtain

$$(4) \quad -sp^1 \in [0, d^1],$$

$$(5) \quad d^2 \in \left[-\frac{1}{\alpha}p, -sp^2 \right], \quad \text{and}$$

$$(6) \quad d^3 \in \left[\frac{1}{\alpha}p, -sp^3 \right],$$

which is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} s\gamma &\leq 1, \\ s\nu &\geq \frac{s(1 - \alpha)}{s\alpha - 1}, \quad \text{and} \\ s &\geq \frac{s\nu(1 - \alpha)}{s\alpha - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying (3), we see that $s \geq \frac{s\nu(1-\alpha)}{s\alpha-1}$ becomes equivalent to $\tau \geq \frac{2}{s+1}$, which by [2, Theorem 1.7] is always fulfilled, and thus (6) is always fulfilled and the system of inequalities form above can be rewritten as

$$(7) \quad \frac{2\tau^{-1} + \nu - 2}{\nu} \leq s \leq \frac{2}{(\nu + 1)(2\tau^{-1} + \nu - 1)} \left(\frac{2\nu}{s \left(\frac{\nu+1}{2\tau^{-1}+\nu-1} \right) - 1} - \frac{(\nu - 1)^2}{2} \right),$$

where the right hand side follows from the first and the left hand side from the second inequality.

We want to characterize the situation, in which s becomes maximal, under this condition.

The right-hand side inequality of (7) can be transformed into

$$s^2 - \frac{1}{\nu + 1} \left(\frac{4\tau^{-1}(\tau^{-1} + \nu - 1)}{2\tau^{-1} + \nu - 1} \right) s - 1 \leq 0.$$

Thus, we are interested in the bigger root of the quadratic polynomial, i.e., in

$$(8) \quad s = \frac{\frac{4\tau^{-1}(\tau^{-1} + \nu - 1)}{(\nu + 1)(2\tau^{-1} + \nu - 1)} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{4\tau^{-1}(\tau^{-1} + \nu - 1)}{(\nu + 1)(2\tau^{-1} + \nu - 1)} \right)^2 + 4}}{2} =: s(\tau, \nu).$$

Let $\nu^+(\tau) := 1 - \tau^{-1} + \sqrt{\tau^{-1}(2 - \tau^{-1})}$ and $B(\tau, \nu) := \frac{4\tau^{-1}(\tau^{-1} + \nu - 1)}{(\nu + 1)(2\tau^{-1} + \nu - 1)}$.

Since

$$(9) \quad \frac{d}{dB} \frac{B + \sqrt{B^2 + 4}}{2} = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{B}{\sqrt{B^2 + 4}} \right) > 0,$$

we see that if $B(\tau, \nu)$ is decreasing (increasing) in ν , then $s(\tau, \nu)$ is decreasing (increasing) in ν , respectively. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\nu} B(\tau, \nu) &= \frac{d}{d\nu} \frac{4\tau^{-1}(\tau^{-1} + \nu - 1)}{(\nu + 1)(2\tau^{-1} + \nu - 1)} \\ &= \frac{-4\tau^{-1}(\nu^2 + \nu(2\tau^{-1} - 2) + 2\tau^{-2} - 4\tau^{-1} + 1)}{(\nu + 1)^2(2\tau^{-1} + \nu - 1)^2} \\ &= \frac{-4\tau^{-1}(\nu - (1 - \tau^{-1} - \sqrt{\tau^{-1}(2 - \tau^{-1})}))(\nu - (1 - \tau^{-1} + \sqrt{\tau^{-1}(2 - \tau^{-1})}))}{(\nu + 1)^2(2\tau^{-1} + \nu - 1)^2} \end{aligned}$$

and since $1 - \tau^{-1} - \sqrt{\tau^{-1}(2 - \tau^{-1})} \leq 0$ and $1 - \tau^{-1} + \sqrt{\tau^{-1}(2 - \tau^{-1})} \in [0, 1]$ for $\tau \in [\frac{2}{3}, 1]$, $s(\tau, \nu)$ is increasing in $(0, \nu^+(\tau)]$, decreasing in $[\nu^+(\tau), 1]$ and attains its maximum at $\nu^+(\tau)$.

Inserting (8) into the left-hand-side inequality of (7), yields to

$$(10) \quad \nu \geq \sqrt{(\tau^{-1} - 1)(2\tau^{-1} - 1)} =: \nu^*(\tau).$$

Thus, in the case when $\nu^*(\tau) > \nu^+(\tau)$, the maximal asymmetry we can reach is $s(\tau, \nu^*(\tau))$, otherwise it is $s(\tau, \nu^+(\tau))$.

Thus, combining those two facts we see that the maximal asymmetry s we can reach in dependence of τ is

$$(11) \quad s_{\max}(\tau) := s(\tau, \max\{\nu^*(\tau), \nu^+(\tau)\}).$$

Let $\hat{\tau}$ be such that $\nu^*(\hat{\tau}) = \nu^+(\hat{\tau})$ and $\hat{s} := s(\hat{\tau}, \nu^+(\hat{\tau}))$. Note that $\hat{\tau} \approx 0.78$ and $\hat{s} \approx 1.85$.

Observe that in case, when $\tau \in [\hat{\tau}, 1]$, we have $s(\tau, \nu(\tau)) \leq \hat{s}$, i.e., $s_{\max}(\tau) = s(\tau, \nu^+(\tau))$ and thus,

$$(12) \quad \tau \leq \frac{(s^2 + 1)^2}{(s^2 - 1) \left(s^2 + 2s - 1 + 2\sqrt{s(s^2 - 1)} \right)},$$

while in case, when $\tau \in [\frac{2}{3}, \hat{\tau}]$, we have $s(\tau, \nu(\tau)) \geq \hat{s}$, i.e., $s_{\max}(\tau) = s(\tau, \nu^*(\tau))$, and thus,

$$(13) \quad \tau \leq \frac{2(s^2 - 2s - 1)}{(s - 3)(s + 1)}.$$

□

In the following we deal with the equality case of Theorem 3.2.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^2$ be Minkowski centered such that $s(K) > \varphi$ and $\tau(K) = c(s(K))$. Then, following the notations of Theorem 3.2,*

- (i) $\text{conv}(\{-s(K)p^2, -s(K)p^3, p, d^1, -p\}) \subset K \subset \text{conv}(\{-s(K)p^2, -s(K)p^3, d^3, d^1, d^2\})$,
when $\varphi < s(K) \leq \hat{s}$,
- (ii) $\text{conv}(\{-s(K)p^2, -s(K)p^3, p, d^1\}) \subset K \subset \text{conv}(\{-s(K)p^2, -s(K)p^3, d^3, d^1\})$, when $\hat{s} < s(K) < 2$, and
- (iii) $K = \text{conv}(\{-s(K)p^1, -s(K)p^2, -s(K)p^3\})$, when $s(K) = 2$.

Proof. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^2$ be Minkowski centered with $s(K) > \varphi$ and define \bar{K} as in Theorem 3.1 with $\tau(\bar{K}) = c(s(\bar{K}))$. By Theorem 3.2 we have the following:

For $\varphi < s(\bar{K}) \leq \hat{s}$ we have $\tau(\bar{K}) = c(s(\bar{K})) = \frac{(s(\bar{K})^2 + 1)^2}{(s(\bar{K})^2 - 1)(s(\bar{K})^2 + 2s(\bar{K}) - 1 + 2\sqrt{s(\bar{K})(s(\bar{K})^2 - 1)})}$, which implies equality in the right-hand-side inequality of (7), i.e., $d^1 = -s(\bar{K})p^1$, and

$$\bar{K} = \text{conv}(\{-s(\bar{K})p^2, -s(\bar{K})p^3, p, d^1, -p\}).$$

For $\hat{s} < s(\bar{K}) < 2$ we have $\tau(\bar{K}) = c(s(\bar{K})) = \frac{2(s(\bar{K})^2 - 2s(\bar{K}) - 1)}{(s(\bar{K}) - 3)(s(\bar{K}) + 1)}$. Observe that this implies equality in (10), and thus also in both inequalities of (7), i.e., $d^1 = -s(\bar{K})p^1$, $d^2 = -s(\bar{K})p^2$, and therefore, $\bar{K} = \text{conv}(\{-s(\bar{K})p^2, -s(\bar{K})p^3, p, d^1\})$.

For $s(\bar{K}) = 2$, in addition to $d^1 = -s(\bar{K})p^1$, $d^2 = -s(\bar{K})p^2$, we also have $d^3 = -s(\bar{K})p^3$ and \bar{K} becomes $\text{conv}(\{-s(\bar{K})p^1, -s(\bar{K})p^2, -s(\bar{K})p^3\})$.

Thus, we have

- (i) $\bar{K} = \text{conv}(\{-s(\bar{K})p^2, -s(\bar{K})p^3, p, d^1, -p\})$, when $\varphi < s(\bar{K}) \leq \hat{s}$,
- (ii) $\bar{K} = \text{conv}(\{-s(\bar{K})p^2, -s(\bar{K})p^3, p, d^1\})$, when $\hat{s} < s(\bar{K}) < 2$, and
- (iii) $\bar{K} = \text{conv}(\{-s(\bar{K})p^2, -s(\bar{K})p^3, d^1\})$, when $s(\bar{K}) = 2$.

Next, we show that the only Minkowski centered convex body K' of the form (1) with $s(K') > \varphi$ and $\tau(K') = c(s(K'))$ are still the same as in (i)-(iii) from above.

Notice that before Step 4 of Theorem 3.1b), both segments $[-sp^2, -p]$ and $[-sp^3, p]$ already belonged to $\text{bd}(K'_3)$ and $p^2 \in [p, -sp^1]$, $p^3 \in [-p, -sp^1]$, implying $[-p, -sp^1], [p, -sp^1] \subset \text{bd}(K'_3)$. Since we also had $p^1 \in [-sp^2, -sp^3]$, we conclude that before Step 4 K'_3 must also be as in (i)-(iii). For the same reasoning, we conclude that before Step 3 K'_2 could not be different.

If before Step 2 K'_1 would be different from (i)-(iii), this would mean that at least one of $-sp^3$, $-sp^2$ was modified during this step. This would imply

$$\tau^{-1}(K'_2) = \rho_2(p) < \rho_1(p) = \tau^{-1}(K'_1),$$

a contradiction. Thus, we conclude that before Step 2 K'_1 must have been as in (i)-(iii).

Now, if before Step 1 K' would be different from those in (i)-(iii), before this step at least one of $-sp^i$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ must have been equal to $-\gamma_i^{-1}sp^i$ with $\gamma_i < 1$.

Observe that since $p^2 \in [-p, -sp^1]$, $p^3 \in [p, -sp^1]$ and $p^1 \in [-sp^2, -sp^3]$, this could be only possible if all three points $-sp^i$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ have been scaled during this step. But in this case, $\tau(K') < \tau(K'_1)$, implying that even before Step 1 K' must have been as in (i)-(iii).

We check the shape of K before one applies transformation (1). Note that $s(K) = s(\bar{K})$.

If $\varphi < s(K) \leq \hat{s}$, the only possible freedom we have in choosing the original set K is to replace the linear boundary $[p, -sp^3]$, s.t. $\text{bd}(K) \cap \text{pos}(\{-sp^3, p\}) \subset \text{conv}(\{-sp^3, p, d^3\})$.

If $\hat{s} < s(K) < s$, possible freedom we have in choosing the original set K is to replace the linear boundaries $[p, -sp^3]$ and $[-p, -sp^2]$, s.t. $\text{bd}(K) \cap \text{pos}(\{-sp^3, p\}) \subset \text{conv}(\{-sp^3, p, d^3\})$ and $\text{bd}(K) \cap \text{pos}(\{-sp^2, -p\}) \subset \text{conv}(\{-sp^2, -p, d^2\})$, respectively.

Obviously, for $s(K) = 2$, K must be a triangle and there is no freedom left. \square

Now, we are ready to prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. In [2, Theorem 1.7] it is shown that $\frac{2}{s(K)+1} \leq \tau(K) \leq 1$.

Combining this with Theorem 3.2, we obtain

$$\frac{2}{s(K)+1} \leq \tau(K) \leq c(s(K)).$$

Now we show that for any $s \in [1, 2]$ and $\tau \in \left[\frac{2}{s+1}, c(s)\right]$, where

$$c(s) := \begin{cases} 1 & s \leq \varphi, \\ \frac{(s^2 + 1)^2}{(s^2 - 1)(s^2 + 2s - 1 + 2\sqrt{s(s^2 - 1)})} & \varphi < s \leq \hat{s}, \\ \frac{2(s^2 - 2s - 1)}{(s - 3)(s + 1)} & \hat{s} < s \leq 2. \end{cases}$$

there exists $K_{s,\tau} \in \mathcal{K}^2$, such that $s(K_{s,\tau}) = s$ and $\tau(K_{s,\tau}) = \tau$. In order to simplify the proof we split the region of possible (s, τ) into two parts: the first one being $s \in [1, 2]$ and $\tau \in \left[\frac{2}{s+1}, \min\left\{1, \frac{s}{s^2-1}\right\}\right]$, while the second being $s \in [\varphi, 2]$ and $\tau \in \left[\frac{s}{s^2-1}, c(s)\right]$.

Step 1: First, we show that for any $s \in [1, 2]$ and $\tau \in \left[\frac{2}{s+1}, \min\left\{1, \frac{s}{s^2-1}\right\}\right]$ there exists $K_{s,\tau} \in \mathcal{K}^2$, such that $s(K_{s,\tau}) = s$ and $\tau(K_{s,\tau}) = \tau$. Let $S = \text{conv}(\{p^1, p^2, p^3\})$ be a regular Minkowski centered triangle and $K_s := S \cap (-sS)$, $s \in [1, 2]$. By [2, Remark 4.1], K_s is Minkowski centered, $s(K_s) = s$ and $\tau(K_s) = \alpha(K_s) = \frac{2}{s+1}$. Let q^i , $i = 2, 3$, be the vertices




FIGURE 9. Transformation within the proof of Theorem 1.2: regular Minkowski centered triangle S and $-S$ (gray), $f(K_s, 1) = K_s = S \cap (-sS)$ before the transformations (Subfigure 6.1), the transformed set $f(K_s, \frac{1}{2})$ (Subfigure 6.2), the transformed set $f(K_s, 1)$ (Subfigure 6.3), the asymmetry points $-\frac{1}{2}p^1, -\frac{1}{s}q^2, -\frac{1}{s}q^3$ (big black dots) of $f(K_s, t)$, $t \in [0, 1]$.

of K_s , that are the intersection points of the edges of K_s with the normal vectors $\frac{s}{2}p^i$ and $-\frac{1}{2}p^1$, respectively. We define a continuous transformation $f : \{K_s : s \in [1, 2]\} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{K}^2$ with $s(f(K_s, t)) = s$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$, while $f(K_s, 0) = K_s$ and $\tau(f(K_s, 1)) = \min\left\{1, \frac{s}{s^2-1}\right\}$.

For $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, we continuously rotate the supporting lines that contain $\frac{s}{2}p^i$ around q^i , $i = 2, 3$, respectively, until the new edges are orthogonal to the edge containing $-\frac{1}{2}p^1$.

For $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, we rotate the lines that contain the edges of K_s , that contain $-\frac{1}{s}q^i$, $i = 1, 2$, around those points, respectively, until they intersect in $\frac{s}{2}p^1$.

It is easy to verify that at every point of this transformation, $-\frac{1}{s}K_s \subset^{\text{opt}} K_s$, with $-\frac{1}{2}p^1, -\frac{s}{2}q^2, -\frac{s}{2}q^3$ being a triple of well-spread asymmetry points. Hence, $s(f(K_s, t)) = s$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$ and $s \in [1, 2]$.

Now consider $f(K_s, 1)$. One can compute

$$f(K_s, 1) = \text{conv} \left(\left\{ \frac{s}{2}p^1, q^2, q^3, \left(\frac{\frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}(2s-1)}{-s^2+s+1} \right), \left(\frac{-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}(2s-1)}{-s^2+s+1} \right) \right\} \right).$$

Thus, for $s \in [0, \varphi]$, $H_{\left(\left(\frac{\pm 1}{0}\right), 1\right)}^{\pm}$ supports $f(K_s, 1)$ at $\left(\pm \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}(2s-1), 0\right)$, respectively. Therefore, by [1, Theorem 3], $\tau(f(K_s, 1)) = 1$, while for $s \in (\varphi, 2]$, the body $f(K_s, 1)$ is of the form K'_4 from the proof of Theorem 3.1 and τ is attained in the horizontal direction with $\tau(f(K_s, 1)) = \frac{s}{s^2-1}$.

Since the transformation is continuous, we conclude that

$$\{\tau(f(K_s, t)) : t \in [0, 1]\} = \left[\frac{2}{s+1}, \min\left\{1, \frac{s}{s^2-1}\right\} \right]$$

for every $s \in [1, 2]$, as desired.

Step 2: For the second part we show that for every $s \in [\varphi, 2]$ and $\tau \in \left[\frac{s}{s^2-1}, c(s)\right]$ there exists a Minkowski centered convex body K with $s(K) = s$, $\tau(K) = \tau$. Since $\frac{2}{s(K)+1} \leq \tau(K) \leq 1$ and $s \in [\varphi, 2]$, we have $\tau \in \left[\frac{2}{3}, 1\right]$. Moreover, $\tau = \frac{s}{s^2-1}$ rewrites as $s = \frac{1}{2\tau} + \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{4\tau^2}}$. Thus, the statement above is equivalent to showing that for every $\tau \in \left[\frac{2}{3}, 1\right]$ and $s \in \left[\frac{1}{2\tau} + \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{4\tau^2}}, s_{\max}(\tau)\right] = \left[\frac{1}{2\tau} + \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{4\tau^2}}, s(\tau, \max\{\nu^*(\tau), \nu^+(\tau)\})\right]$ there exists a Minkowski centered convex body K with $s(K) = s$ and $\tau(K) = \tau$.

Here we use the notations introduced in the proof of Theorem 3.2. Consider for every $\nu \in [\max\{\nu^+(\tau), \nu^*(\tau)\}, 1]$

$$(14) \quad K(\tau, \nu) := \text{conv} \left(\{-s(\tau, a)p^1, -s(\tau, \nu)p^3, p, -p, d^1\} \right).$$

We know by construction that $K(\tau, a)$ is Minkowski centered with asymmetry $s(\tau, a)$ and $\tau(K(\tau, \nu)) = \tau$. Since

$$s(\tau, [\max\{\nu^+(\tau), \nu^*(\tau)\}, 1]) = \left[\frac{1}{2\tau} + \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{4\tau^2}}, s_{\max}(\tau) \right],$$

we have shown that there exist bodies with the desired properties for every $\tau \in \left[\frac{2}{3}, 1\right]$. \square




FIGURE 10. Region of possible values for the parameter $\tau(K)$ for Minkowski centered $K \in \mathcal{K}^2$ (yellow): $\tau(K) \geq \frac{2}{s+1}$ (blue); $\tau(K) \leq c(s(K))$ (red, green and orange, resp.). The black dots are given by 0-symmetric $K \in \mathcal{K}^2$ ($s = 1$), the Golden House \mathbb{GH} ($s = \varphi$) and triangles ($s = 2$).

In [1, 2, 3] two additional means of convex bodies and their relations are considered. The harmonic mean of $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ is defined as $\left(\frac{K^\circ - K^\circ}{2}\right)^\circ$ and the maximum as $\text{conv}(K \cup (-K))$. Understanding their containment factors helps for instance, to prove new inequalities for diameter variants [7]. For $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ we define $\gamma(K) > 0$ such that

$$\left(\frac{K^\circ - K^\circ}{2}\right)^\circ \subset^{\text{opt}} \gamma(K) \text{conv}(K \cup (-K)).$$

As with $\alpha(K)$ and $\tau(K)$, $\gamma(K)$ does not only depend on the Minkowski asymmetry of K . Using polarity and Theorem 1.2, we are able to show the following.

Corollary 3.4. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^2$ be Minkowski centered. Then*

$$\frac{2}{s(K) + 1} \leq \gamma(K) \leq c(s(K)).$$

Moreover, for every pair (γ, s) , such that $1 \leq s \leq 2$ and $\frac{2}{s+1} \leq \gamma \leq c(s(K))$, there exists a Minkowski centered $K \in \mathcal{K}^2$, such that $s(K) = s$ and $\gamma(K) = \gamma$.

Proof of Theorem 3.4. We may assume w.l.o.g. $s(K) \neq 1$. Thus, by Theorem 2.3, there exists a triple of well-spread asymmetry points of K that contain zero in their convex hull. Thus, $K \subset^{\text{opt}} -s(K)K$ implies $-K^\circ \subset^{\text{opt}} s(K)K^\circ$, i.e., $s(K^\circ) = s(K)$ and K° is Minkowski-centered.

Now, on the one hand, polarising

$$K^\circ \cap (-K^\circ) \subset^{\text{opt}} \tau(K^\circ) \frac{K^\circ - K^\circ}{2},$$

we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\tau(K^\circ)} \left(\frac{K^\circ - K^\circ}{2} \right)^\circ \subset (K^\circ \cap (-K^\circ))^\circ = \text{conv}(K \cup (-K)),$$

and hence, $\gamma(K) \leq \tau(K^\circ)$. While on the other hand, polarising

$$\left(\frac{K^\circ - K^\circ}{2} \right)^\circ \subset^{\text{opt}} \gamma(K) \text{conv}(K \cup (-K))$$

implies $\gamma(K) \geq \tau(K^\circ)$. Thus, by Theorem 1.2,

$$\frac{2}{s(K) + 1} \leq \gamma(K) = \tau(K^\circ) \leq c(s(K^\circ)) = c(s(K)).$$

Finally, for the bodies $K_{s,\tau}$ described in Theorem 1.2, $s(K_{s,\tau}) = s$ and $\gamma(K_{s,\tau}^\circ) = \tau$, showing that for every pair (γ, s) , such that $1 \leq s \leq 2$ and $\frac{2}{s+1} \leq \gamma \leq c(s(K))$, there exists a Minkowski centered $K \in \mathcal{K}^2$, such that $s(K) = s$ and $\gamma(K) = \gamma$. \square

4. DIAMETER-WIDTH-RATIO FOR (PSEUDO-)COMPLETE SETS

We recall the characterization of pseudo-completeness from [5].

Proposition 4.1. *Let $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $C \in \mathcal{K}_0^n$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *K is pseudo-complete w.r.t. C ,*
- (ii) *$(s(K) + 1)r(K, C) = r(K, C) + R(K, C) = \frac{s(K)+1}{s(K)}R(K, C) = D(K, C)$, and*
- (iii) *for every incenter c of K w.r.t. C we have*

$$\frac{s(K) + 1}{2s(K)}(-(K - c)) \subset \frac{K - K}{2} \subset \frac{1}{2}D(K, C)C \subset \frac{s(K) + 1}{2}(K - c)$$

is left-to-right optimal, which implies that c is also a circumcenter and a Minkowski center of K .

We show for the diameter-width ratio bound for pseudo-complete sets in the planar case.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We assume w.l.o.g. that $C \subset^{\text{opt}} K$. Thus, $r(K, C) = 1$ and by Theorem 4.1, K is Minkowski centered. Abbreviating $s := s(K)$ again, we obtain $D(K, C) = (s + 1)r(K, C) = s + 1$ and

$$\frac{K - K}{2} \subset \frac{D(K, C)}{2}C = \frac{s + 1}{2}C \subset \frac{s + 1}{2}K \cap (-K)$$

from Theorem 4.1. Thus, $C \subset K \cap (-K)$, which implies $w(K, C) \geq w(K, K \cap (-K))$ and since $w(K, K \cap (-K)) = w\left(\frac{K - K}{2}, K \cap (-K)\right) = 2r\left(\frac{K - K}{2}, K \cap (-K)\right)$ (see [19] for basic properties of the width)

$$(15) \quad \frac{D(K, C)}{w(K, C)} = \frac{s + 1}{w(K, C)} \leq \frac{s + 1}{2r\left(\frac{K - K}{2}, K \cap (-K)\right)} = \frac{s + 1}{2}\tau(K).$$

Since by Theorem 1.2 $\tau(K) \leq c(s(K))$, we obtain

$$\frac{D(K, C)}{w(K, C)} \leq \frac{s(K) + 1}{2}c(s(K)).$$

One can observe that

$$\frac{s + 1}{2}c(s) = \begin{cases} \frac{s + 1}{2} & s \leq \varphi, \\ \frac{(s^2 + 1)^2}{2(s - 1)(s^2 + 2s - 1 + 2\sqrt{s(s^2 - 1)})} & \varphi < s \leq \hat{s}, \\ \frac{s^2 - 2s - 1}{s - 3} & \hat{s} < s \leq 2 \end{cases}$$

attains its maximum if and only if $s = \varphi$. Indeed, $\frac{s+1}{2}$ is increasing for all s , while for $\varphi < s \leq \hat{s}$ holds that the derivative

$$\left(\frac{(s^2 + 1)^2}{2(s - 1)(s^2 + 2s - 1 + 2\sqrt{s(s^2 - 1)})} \right)' = \frac{(s^2 - 2s - 1)(s^2 + s - \sqrt{s(s^2 - 1)})}{2s(s + 1)(s - 1)^2} \leq 0$$

and for $\hat{s} < s \leq 2$ holds

$$\left(\frac{s^2 - 2s - 1}{s - 3} \right)' = \frac{s^2 - 6s + 7}{(s - 3)^2} \leq 0.$$

Thus,

$$\frac{D(K, C)}{w(K, C)} \leq \frac{\varphi + 1}{2} \approx 1.31.$$

Now let $\tilde{K}, \tilde{C} \in \mathcal{K}^2$ be Minkowski centered, such that \tilde{K} is pseudo-complete w.r.t. \tilde{C} and

$$\frac{D(\tilde{K}, \tilde{C})}{w(\tilde{K}, \tilde{C})} = \frac{\varphi + 1}{2}.$$

Then, as shown above, $s(\tilde{K}) = \varphi$ and we immediately see that $\tau(\tilde{K}) = 1$. By Theorem 2.4 this implies $\alpha(\tilde{K}) = 1$ and thus by [1, Theorem 1.1], there exists a linear transformation L such that $L(K) = \mathbb{GH}$. We may choose $\tilde{C} = \mathbb{GH} \cap (-\mathbb{GH})$ to make sure \tilde{K} is pseudo-complete w.r.t. \tilde{C} .

Combining the results, we obtain

$$\frac{D(K, C)}{w(K, C)} \leq \frac{s(K) + 1}{2} c(s(K)) \leq \frac{D(\mathbb{GH}, \mathbb{GH} \cap (-\mathbb{GH}))}{w(\mathbb{GH}, \mathbb{GH} \cap (-\mathbb{GH}))} = \frac{\varphi + 1}{2} \approx 1.31.$$

Finally, we show that for every pair (ρ, s) , with

$$1 \leq \rho \leq \frac{s+1}{2} c(s) = \begin{cases} \frac{s+1}{2} & s \leq \varphi, \\ \frac{(s^2+1)^2}{2(s-1)(s^2+2s-1+2\sqrt{s(s^2-1)})} & \varphi < s \leq \hat{s}, \\ \frac{s^2-2s-1}{s-3} & \hat{s} < s \leq 2, \end{cases}$$

there exists some Minkowski centered K , s.t. $s(K) = s$, and a set C , s.t. K is pseudo-complete w.r.t. C and $\frac{D(K, C)}{w(K, C)} = \rho$ (c.f. Figure 1).

To do so, let K_s be defined such that it is Minkowski centered, $s(K_s) = s \in [1, 2]$ and $\tau(K_s) = c(s)$. Then define $C_\lambda = (1 - \lambda) \left(\frac{K_s - K_s}{2} \right) + \lambda \frac{s+1}{2} (K_s \cap (-K_s))$ with $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. This way C_λ is a convex combination of $\frac{K_s - K_s}{2}$ and $\frac{s+1}{2} (K_s \cap (-K_s))$, and therefore K_s is pseudo-complete w.r.t. C_λ with $D(K_s, C_\lambda) = 2$ by Theorem 4.1.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} w(K_s, C_1) &= w\left(\frac{K_s - K_s}{2}, \frac{s+1}{2} K_s \cap (-K_s)\right) = \frac{2}{s+1} w\left(\frac{K_s - K_s}{2}, \frac{s+1}{2} K_s \cap (-K_s)\right) \\ &= \frac{4}{s+1} r\left(\frac{K_s - K_s}{2}, \frac{s+1}{2} K_s \cap (-K_s)\right) = \frac{4}{s+1} \frac{1}{\tau(K_s)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\frac{D(K_s, C_1)}{w(K_s, C_1)} = \frac{s+1}{2} \tau(K_s).$$

Moreover, since $\frac{D(K_s, C_0)}{w(K_s, C_0)} = 1$, we have

$$\left\{ \frac{D(K_s, C_\lambda)}{w(K_s, C_\lambda)}, 0 \leq \lambda \leq 1 \right\} = \left[1, \min \left\{ \frac{s+1}{2}, \frac{s+1}{2} c(s) \right\} \right].$$

□

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Brandenburg, K. von Dichter, B. González Merino, Relating Symmetrizations of Convex Bodies: Once More the Golden Ratio, *American Mathematical Monthly*, 129 (2022), no. 4, 1–11.
- [2] R. Brandenburg, K. von Dichter, B. González Merino, Tightening and reversing the arithmetic-harmonic mean inequality for symmetrizations of convex sets, *Communications in Contemporary Mathematics*, online ready (2022).
- [3] R. Brandenburg, K. von Dichter, B. González Merino, From inequalities relating symmetrizations of convex bodies to the Diameter-width ratio for complete and pseudo-complete convex sets, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11460* (2023).
- [4] R. Brandenburg, B. González Merino, A complete 3-dimensional Blaschke-Santaló diagram, *Math. Ineq. Appl.* 20 (2017), no. 2, 301–348.
- [5] R. Brandenburg, B. González Merino, The asymmetry of complete and constant width bodies in general normed spaces and the Jung constant, *Israel J. Math.* 218 (2017), no. 1, 489–510.
- [6] R. Brandenburg and S. König, No dimension-independent core-sets for containment under homothetics, *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 49 (2013), no 1, 3–21.
- [7] R. Brandenburg and M. Runge, Jung-type Inequalities and Blaschke-Santaló Diagrams for Different Diameter Variants, *Math. Inequal. Appl.*, 28 (2025), no. 4, 689–704.
- [8] P. Brändén, J. Huh, Lorentzian polynomials, *Annals of Mathematics*, 192 3 (2020), *arXiv:1902.03719*, doi:10.4007/annals.2020.192.3.4.
- [9] H. Brunn, Über Ovale und Eiflächen, Inaugural Dissertation, München (1887).
- [10] H. G. Eggleston. Measures of asymmetry of convex curves of constant width and restricted radii of curvature, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser.* **3** (1952), no. 2, 63–72.
- [11] H. G. Eggleston. Sets of constant width in finite dimensional Banach spaces, *Israel J. Math.* **3** (1965), 163–172.
- [12] H. Groemer, On complete convex bodies, *Geom. Dedicata*, 20 (1986), 319–334.
- [13] B. Grünbaum, Measures of symmetry for convex sets, *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.* 7 (1963), 233–270.
- [14] H. Martini, L. Montejano, D. Oliveros, *Bodies of Constant Width: An Introduction to Convex Geometry with Applications*, Birkhäuser, 2019.
- [15] J. P. Moreno, R. Schneider, Diametrically complete sets in Minkowski spaces, *Israel J. Math.*, 191 (2012), no.2, 701–720.
- [16] H. Minkowski, *Geometrie der Zahlen*, Leipzig: Teubner, 1896.
- [17] C. Richter, The ratios of diameter and width of reduced and of complete convex bodies in Minkowski spaces, *Beitr Algebra Geom*, 59 (2018), 211–220.
- [18] C. A. Rogers, G. C. Shephard, Convex bodies associated with a given convex body, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 1 (1958), no. 3, 270–281.
- [19] R. Schneider, *Convex bodies: the Brunn-Minkowski theory*, no. 151, Cambridge university press, 2014.
- [20] R. Schneider, Stability for some extremal properties of the simplex, *J. Geom.* 96 (2009), no. 1, 135–148.

Katherina von Dichter – Brandenburg University of Technology Cottbus-Senftenberg (BTU), Department of Mathematics, Germany.

katherina.vondichter@b-tu.de

Mia Runge – Technical University of Munich (TUM), School of Computation, Information and Technology, Department of Mathematics, Germany.

mia.runge@tum.de