

# A Characterization of Functional Affine Surface Areas

Fernanda M. Baêta

## Abstract

A characterization of valuations on the space of convex Lipschitz functions whose domain is a polytope in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is obtained. It is shown that every upper semicontinuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation can be written as a linear combination of a constant term, the volume of the domain, and a functional affine surface area. In addition, dual statements for finite-valued convex functions are established.

## 1 Introduction and Statement of the Main Result

Let  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a convex body (i.e., a non-empty compact convex set) and denote by  $\text{bd } K$  its topological boundary. By a theorem of Aleksandrov (see [1]), for almost every point  $x \in \text{bd } K$  with respect to the  $(n-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure  $\mathcal{H}^{n-1}$ , there exists a paraboloid that osculates  $\text{bd } K$  at  $x$ . By Schütt and Werner [47], the *affine surface area* of a general (not necessarily smooth) convex body is defined by

$$\Omega(K) = \int_{\text{bd } K} \kappa(x)^{\frac{1}{n+1}} d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x),$$

where the (generalized) Gaussian curvature  $\kappa(x)$  of  $\text{bd } K$  at such a point  $x$  is taken as the Gaussian curvature of the corresponding osculating paraboloid. For smooth convex surfaces, this definition coincides with the classical one (see [9]).

The affine surface area  $\Omega(\cdot)$  is defined for every  $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ , where  $\mathcal{K}^n$  denotes the space of convex bodies equipped with the topology induced by the Hausdorff metric. Lutwak [35] showed that  $\Omega(\cdot)$  is upper semicontinuous, that is, if  $K_m \rightarrow K$  in the Hausdorff metric, then

$$\Omega(K) \geq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \Omega(K_m).$$

Moreover,  $\Omega(\cdot)$  is *equi-affine invariant*, i.e., invariant under volume-preserving affine maps, and a valuation (see [46]). More precisely, a functional  $\Phi : \mathcal{K}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called a *valuation* if

$$\Phi(K \cup L) + \Phi(K \cap L) = \Phi(K) + \Phi(L)$$

whenever  $K, L$  and  $K \cup L$  belong to  $\mathcal{K}^n$ .

One of the most famous results on valuations is the Hadwiger characterization theorem, which classifies all continuous and rigid motion invariant valuations on the space  $\mathcal{K}^n$  (see [25]). Specifically, it states that any such valuation can be expressed as a linear combination of the intrinsic volumes  $V_0, V_1, \dots, V_n$ , which include the  $n$ -dimensional volume  $V_n$ , the Euler characteristic  $V_0$ , and the surface area  $2V_{n-1}$ . A complete characterization of affine surface area is due to Ludwig and Reitzner, representing an equi-affine analog of Hadwiger's theorem.

---

Institut für Diskrete Mathematik und Geometrie, Technische Universität Wien, Wiedner Haupt-Strasse 8-10/1046, 1040 Wien, Austria. Email: fernanda.baeta@tuwien.ac.at

2020 AMS subject classification: 52B45, 26B25, 52A41, 52A27.

**Theorem 1** ([30, 33]). A functional  $\Phi : \mathcal{K}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is an upper semicontinuous and equi-affine invariant valuation if and only if there exist constants  $c_0, c_1$  and  $c_2 \geq 0$  such that

$$\Phi(K) = c_0 V_0(K) + c_1 V_n(K) + c_2 \Omega(K)$$

for every  $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ .

Ludwig and Reitzner [34] further posed the problem of classifying all valuations on the space  $\mathcal{K}_0^n$  of convex bodies containing the origin in their interiors, which are invariant under volume-preserving linear transformations. They showed that any valuation  $\Phi : \mathcal{K}_0^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that is upper semicontinuous, invariant under volume preserving linear transformations, and vanishes on polytopes can be represented as

$$\Phi(K) = \int_{\text{bd } K} \zeta(\kappa_0(x)) \, d\mu_K(x),$$

where  $d\mu_K(x) = \langle x, n(x) \rangle \, d\mathcal{H}^{n-1}(x)$  is the cone measure on  $\text{bd } K$ ,  $n(x)$  is the exterior unit normal vector to  $K$  at  $x \in \text{bd } K$ , and

$$\kappa_0(x) = \frac{\kappa(x)}{\langle x, n(x) \rangle^{n+1}}.$$

Here,  $\zeta$  belongs to the set

$$\text{Conc}([0, \infty)) = \left\{ \zeta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty) \mid \zeta \text{ is concave, } \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \zeta(t) = 0, \text{ and } \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \zeta(t)/t = 0 \right\} \quad (1)$$

(see [31, 34]), and  $\langle x, y \rangle$  denotes the standard inner product of  $x$  and  $y$ , either in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  or  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  depending on the context. A complete answer to Ludwig and Reitzner's problem in the upper semicontinuous case was later provided by Haberl and Parapatits (see [24]). Further characterizations of valuations with interesting invariance properties were obtained, for example, in [2, 22, 23, 25, 26, 32, 36, 37]. For results on the affine surface area of convex bodies, we refer to [33, 35, 47]; see also the recent survey [48].

One important direction of generalization is the extension of valuations from convex bodies to convex functions, which has attracted significant attention in recent years; see, for instance, [12–15]. Further developments and characterizations can be found in [16, 17, 27, 28, 41], and more recently in [38–40]. Denote by  $\text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  the space of lower semicontinuous, convex, and proper functions (i.e., not identically  $\infty$ ) defined on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and let

$$\text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}) = \{v : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid v \text{ is convex}\}$$

be the space of finite-valued convex functions on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . A functional  $Z : \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called a *valuation* if

$$Z(u \wedge v) + Z(u \vee v) = Z(u) + Z(v)$$

for every  $u, v \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  such that also  $u \wedge v, u \vee v \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , where  $u \wedge v$  and  $u \vee v$  denote the pointwise minimum and maximum of  $u, v \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , respectively.

For  $\text{epi}(v) \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  the epi-graph of a convex function  $v : U \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $U$  is an open bounded convex set, the affine surface area of  $\text{epi}(v)$  is given by

$$\Omega_{\text{func}}(v) = \int_U (\det D^2 v(x))^{\frac{1}{n+2}} \, dx,$$

where  $D^2 v(x)$  denotes the Hessian matrix of  $v$  at  $x$  and  $D^2 v(x) = 0$  if  $v$  is not twice differentiable at  $x$  (see [49]). According to Aleksandrov's theorem [1], a convex function  $v : U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is twice differentiable almost everywhere. In particular, the Hessian  $D^2 v(x)$  exists for almost every  $x \in U$ . For further definitions of functional affine surface area, see, for example, [3, 10, 29, 45].

The set of points where the function  $u \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  takes finite values is called the (effective) *domain* of  $u$ , denoted by

$$\text{dom } u = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid u(x) < \infty\},$$

and for a set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ , we denote its interior by  $\text{int}(A)$ . We consider the subspace of  $\text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ,

$$\text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n) = \{u \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n) \mid \text{dom } u \text{ is compact, } u \text{ is Lipschitz on } \text{int}(\text{dom } u)\},$$

that is, the set of functions  $u \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  with compact domain that are Lipschitz on the interior of their domain. In particular, if the interior of  $\text{dom } u$  is empty, then  $u$  is not required to be Lipschitz. The functional  $\Omega_{\text{func}}(\cdot)$  is a valuation, and it satisfies the following properties

- (i)  $\text{SL}_n(\mathbb{R})$  *invariance*, i.e.,  $\Omega_{\text{func}}(u \circ \varphi) = \Omega_{\text{func}}(u)$  for every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $\varphi \in \text{SL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ ;
- (ii) *translation invariance*, i.e.,  $\Omega_{\text{func}}(u \circ \tau) = \Omega_{\text{func}}(u)$  for every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and translation  $\tau$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ;
- (iii) *vertical translation invariance*, i.e.,  $\Omega_{\text{func}}(u + c) = \Omega_{\text{func}}(u)$  for every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and every constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ ;
- (iv) *dual translation invariance*, i.e.,  $\Omega_{\text{func}}(u + l) = \Omega_{\text{func}}(u)$  for every every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and every linear function  $l$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

A valuation  $Z : \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with properties (i) and (ii) is called an *equi-affine invariant valuation*. If  $Z$  is both vertically and dually translation invariant, we say that  $Z$  is *dually epi-translation invariant*.

We equip the set  $\text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  with the following notion of convergence: We say that  $u_k \in \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is  $\tau$ -convergent to  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , written  $u_k \xrightarrow{\tau} u$ , if

- (i) for every sequence  $x_k \rightarrow x$ , we have

$$u(x) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_k(x_k);$$

- (ii) there exists a sequence  $x_k$  that converges to  $x$  such that

$$u(x) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_k(x_k);$$

- (iii) the Lipschitz constants of  $u_k$  on the interior of the  $\text{dom } u_k$  are uniformly bounded by some constant  $M > 0$  independent of  $k$ .

This notion of convergence was also considered in [6, 7]. A related formulation of condition (iii) was first considered in [18, 19], in the context of real-valued Lipschitz continuous maps on the unit sphere  $S^{n-1}$ . The convergence given by conditions (i) and (ii) is called *epi-convergence* (for more details see [43]).

We say that  $Z : \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous if, for every sequence  $u_k$  in  $\text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  that is  $\tau$ -convergent to  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ,

$$Z(u) \geq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} Z(u_k).$$

The function  $t \mapsto t^{\frac{1}{n+2}}$  for  $t \geq 0$  belongs to the set  $\text{Conc}([0, \infty))$  defined in (1). Moreover, the restriction of  $\Omega_{\text{func}}(\cdot)$  to  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, as proved in [7, Theorem 1]. We consider the following subset of  $\text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ,

$$\text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n) = \{u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \mid \text{dom } u \text{ is a polytope}\}.$$

Our goal is to prove a functional version of Theorem 1, thereby obtaining a characterization of the more general functional affine surface area

$$Z(u) = \int_{\text{dom } u} \zeta(\det D^2 u(x)) \, dx \quad (2)$$

for  $\zeta \in \text{Conc}([0, \infty))$  and  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . This functional version is naturally related to the geometric version in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ , since the epi-graph of a convex function  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is a convex subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ . To the best of our knowledge, Theorem 2 provides the first characterization of upper semicontinuous valuations on the space of convex functions in arbitrary dimension  $n$ . The one-dimensional case was established previously (see [6]), and our result extends this to the general setting.

**Theorem 2.** *A functional  $Z : \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation if and only if there are constants  $c_0, c_1 \in \mathbb{R}$  and a function  $\zeta \in \text{Conc}([0, \infty))$  such that*

$$Z(u) = c_0 + c_1 V_n(\text{dom } u) + \int_{\text{dom } u} \zeta(\det D^2 u(x)) \, dx \quad (3)$$

for every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

By [7, Theorem 1] and [6, Lemma 12], the functional (2) defines an equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation that is finite and  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous for all  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . However, [7, Example 1] shows that (2) is not finite for every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and every  $\zeta \in \text{Conc}([0, \infty))$  if the Lipschitz condition in  $\text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is omitted. Furthermore, by [6, Lemma 6 and Lemma 9], the volume of the domain is a  $\tau$ -continuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation. It is worth noting, however, that there exist sequences of functions with compact domains that epi-converge to a function with a compact domain, yet the volume of the domain is not continuous with respect to epi-convergence (see also [7, Example 1]). Therefore, the functional on the right-hand side of (3) is a  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation. We expect that additional  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuations exist on  $\text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  which vanish on  $\text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

Note that the integral (2) is not continuous, as it vanishes on piecewise affine functions. As a consequence of Theorem 2, we obtain the following result.

**Corollary 3.** *A functional  $Z : \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a  $\tau$ -continuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation if and only if there are constants  $c_0, c_1 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that*

$$Z(u) = c_0 + c_1 V_n(\text{dom } u)$$

for every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

Note that this result is established in  $\text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , since every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  can be approximated by functions of  $\text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $Z$  is  $\tau$ -continuous.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall basic results and properties from convex geometry, the Monge–Ampère measure, the Legendre transform, and infimal convolution. Section 3 is devoted to the dual space of  $\text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  via the Legendre transform, where we derive the dual theorem corresponding to Theorem 2 and the dual corollary corresponding to Corollary 3. Finally, in Section 4, we present the proof of Theorem 2, which relies on several intermediate results also established in this section.

## 2 Background

In this section, we collect several tools and basic results that will be used throughout the paper, including definitions, properties of convex functions, and classical results.

## 2.1 Preliminaries

Following [43], a function  $u \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is called *piecewise affine* if  $\text{dom } u$  can be written as the union of finitely many polyhedral sets, relative to each of which  $u(x)$  is affine. A set  $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is said to be *polyhedral* if it can be expressed as the intersection of finitely many closed halfspaces. We denote by  $\text{Conv}_{\text{p.a.}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  the set of all piecewise affine functions. By [6, Lemma 14], we obtain the following result.

**Lemma 4.** *For every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , there exists a sequence  $u_k \in \text{Conv}_{\text{p.a.}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  that is  $\tau$ -convergent to  $u$ .*

We say that  $Z : \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is *simple* if  $Z(u) = 0$  for every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  such that  $\text{dom } u$  is not full-dimensional. Let  $\mathcal{P}^n$  denote the set of polytopes in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . The following result from [6, Lemma 13] will be used in the proof of Theorem 2.

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $Z : \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a simple,  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation. Then there exists a constant  $d \in \mathbb{R}$  such that*

$$Z(I_P) = d V_n(P)$$

for every polytope  $P \in \mathcal{P}^n$ .

Strictly speaking, Lemma 13 in [6] was stated for  $\text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , while here we consider the subspace of functions with polytopal domains. However, the statement remains valid in this setting.

We say that a valuation  $\Phi : \mathcal{P}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is *simple* if  $\Phi(P) = 0$  for every polytope  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  of dimension at most  $n - 1$ . See [37, Theorem 14.1] and the references therein for the following well-known result.

**Theorem 6.** *Let  $\Phi$  be a translation invariant, non-negative, simple valuation on  $\mathcal{P}^n$ . Then there exists a non-negative constant  $d \in \mathbb{R}$  such that*

$$\Phi(P) = d V_n(P)$$

for every polytope  $P \in \mathcal{P}^n$ .

To prove Proposition 23 in Section 4, we will use the following version of the Vitali covering theorem. A collection of sets  $\mathcal{C}$  is called a *Vitali class* for  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with respect to  $V_n$  if, for each  $x \in B$  and  $\delta > 0$ , there exists a  $U \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $x \in U$  and  $0 < V_n(U) \leq \delta$ . We say that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a *regular family* for  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with respect to  $V_n$  if there exists a constant  $d > 0$  such that  $\text{diam}(U)^n \leq d V_n(U)$  for every set  $U \in \mathcal{C}$ , where  $\text{diam}$  denotes the diameter.

**Theorem 7** ([20], Theorem 1.10). *Let  $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a bounded set, and let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a regular family of closed sets for  $B$  with respect to  $V_n$  that is a Vitali covering for  $B$ . Then, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a finite collection of pairwise disjoint sets  $U_1, \dots, U_m \in \mathcal{C}$  such that*

$$V_n\left(B \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^m U_i\right) < \varepsilon.$$

We denote by  $\text{conv}(A)$  the convex hull of a set  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , that is, the smallest convex set containing  $A$ . For functions  $f, g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ , we set

$$\{f \neq g\} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f(x) \neq g(x)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{f = g\} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f(x) = g(x)\}.$$

A family  $\mathcal{P}$  of pairwise disjoint non-empty subsets of  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is called a *partition* of  $A$  if the union of all sets in  $\mathcal{P}$  equals  $A$ .

The following theorem provides a concrete characterization of epi-convergence, showing its equivalence with a more familiar notion of convergence.

**Theorem 8** ([43], Theorem 7.17). Let  $u_k$  be a sequence in  $\text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  that epi-converges to  $u \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . If  $\text{dom } u$  has non-empty interior, the following are equivalents

- (1)  $u_k$  epi-converges to  $u$ ;
- (2)  $u_k$  converges uniformly to  $u$  on every compact set  $C$  that does not contain a boundary point of  $\text{dom } u$ .

## 2.2 Monge–Ampère measure

For every  $u \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , the *subdifferential* of  $u$  at  $x \in \text{dom } u$  is defined by

$$\partial u(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid u(z) \geq u(x) + \langle y, z - x \rangle \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{R}^n\},$$

and we set  $\partial u(x) = \emptyset$  for  $x \notin \text{dom } u$ . For a convex function  $u : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ , differentiability at a point  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is equivalent to the subdifferential of  $u$  at  $x$  being a singleton. Moreover,  $L$  is the Lipschitz constant of  $u \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  in the interior of its domain if and only if  $\|y\| \leq L$  for every  $y \in \partial u(x)$ , where  $\|y\| = \sqrt{\langle y, y \rangle}$  is the usual Euclidean norm of  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $x \in \text{int}(\text{dom } u)$  (see, e.g., [8, Theorem 3.61]).

Let  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a convex body and  $w \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . We define the function  $w \dot{+} I_K : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$(w \dot{+} I_K)(y) = \begin{cases} w(y), & y \in K, \\ \sup\{\ell(y) \mid \ell \text{ is affine, } \ell \leq w \text{ on } K, \ell(x) = w(x) \text{ for some } x \in \text{bd } K\}, & y \notin K. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

By construction,  $w \dot{+} I_K$  is convex on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , agrees with  $w$  on  $K$ , and is the maximal convex extension of  $w|_K$  obtained by extending  $w$  via its supporting affine hyperplanes at boundary points.

One natural class of functions in  $\text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is formed by the *indicator functions* of convex bodies  $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$

$$I_K(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x \in K, \\ \infty, & x \notin K. \end{cases}$$

By formula (2.4) in [44], the subdifferential of  $I_K$  at each boundary point  $x$  of  $K$  is the normal cone of  $K$  at  $x$ , which is given by

$$N_K(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle y, z - x \rangle \leq 0 \text{ for all } z \in K\}.$$

In particular, there are functions that are Lipschitz continuous in the interior of their domains but whose subdifferentials are unbounded at boundary points. For example,  $\partial I_{[0,1]}(1) = [0, \infty)$ .

An important Radon measure associated with a convex function  $v : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the *Monge–Ampère measure*, defined by

$$\text{MA}(v; B) = V_n(\partial v(B)),$$

for any Borel set  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ , where

$$\partial v(B) = \bigcup_{x \in B} \partial v(x).$$

The notion of Monge–Ampère measure is fundamental in the definition of weak or generalized solutions of the Monge–Ampère equation (see, e.g., [21, 50]).

### 2.3 Legendre transform

For a convex function  $u \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , the function

$$u^*(x) = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} (\langle x, y \rangle - u(y)), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

is called the *Legendre transform* (or *convex conjugate*) of  $u$ . By [4, Theorem 1.4.1], we have  $u^{**} = u$ . Note that convex conjugation is continuous with respect to epi-convergence,

$$u_k \text{ is epi-convergent to } u \Leftrightarrow u_k^* \text{ is epi-convergent to } u^* \quad (5)$$

for  $u_k, u \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  (see [43, Theorem 11.43]).

Let  $u \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\varphi \in \text{SL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ , and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Denote by  $\tau_y(x) = x + y$  the translation by  $y$  and by  $l_y(x) = \langle x, y \rangle$  the linear function associated with  $y$ . A straightforward computation yields

- (1)  $(u + c)^*(x) = u^*(x) - c$ ;
- (2)  $(u \circ \varphi)^*(x) = (u^* \circ \varphi^{-t})(x)$ ;
- (3)  $(u \circ \tau_y^{-1})^*(x) = u^*(x) + \langle x, y \rangle$ ;
- (4)  $(u + l_y)^*(x) = u^* \circ \tau_y^{-1}(x)$ .

Furthermore, if  $u, v \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  are such that  $u \wedge v \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , then  $u^* \wedge v^* \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , and

$$(u \wedge v)^* = u^* \vee v^*, \quad (u \vee v)^* = u^* \wedge v^* \quad (6)$$

(see, e.g., [14, Lemma 3.4 and Proposition 3.5]).

By [43, Theorem 11.14],  $u \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is piecewise affine if and only if  $u^* \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$  is also piecewise affine.

### 2.4 Infimal convolution

For any two convex functions  $u, v : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ , the *infimal convolution*  $u \square v$  is defined by

$$(u \square v)(x) = \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} (u(y) + v(x - y)), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (7)$$

The epi-graph of  $u$  is the non-empty, closed, convex set

$$\text{epi}(u) = \{(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \mid u(x) \leq t\}.$$

Geometrically, the infimal convolution corresponds to Minkowski sum of epi-graphs,

$$\text{epi}(u \square v) = \text{epi}(u) + \text{epi}(v).$$

In particular, adding a smooth function to one whose graph contains corners produces a smooth function.

By [11, Proposition 2.1 and Proposition 2.6], for every  $u, v \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , we have

$$\text{dom}(u \square v) = \text{dom } u + \text{dom } v, \quad u \square v \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

and the following relation holds

$$(u \square v)^* = u^* + v^*. \quad (8)$$



A particularly important example is the *Moreau envelope*, defined for  $\lambda > 0$  and  $u \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  by

$$u_\lambda = u \square \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\cdot\|^2$$

(see, e.g., [5, 43]). By [5, Proposition 12.15], the infimum in (7) that defines  $u_\lambda$  is uniquely attained. Moreover, by [43, Theorem 1.25],  $u_\lambda$  epi-converges to  $u$  as  $\lambda \nearrow \infty$ , and by [43, Theorem 2.26], the Moreau envelope  $u_\lambda$  is convex and continuously differentiable.

We will work with a variant of the Moreau envelope that preserves both the compactness and the polytopal structure of the domain. Let  $\lambda, \mu > 0$ , and denote  $C = [-1, 1]^n$ . For  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , define

$$u_{\lambda, \mu} = u \square \left( \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 + \mathbf{I}_{\mu C} \right). \quad (9)$$

Note that  $u_{\lambda, \mu}(x) = u_\lambda(x)$  for  $x \in \text{dom } u + \mu C$ , and  $u_{\lambda, \mu}(x) = \infty$  otherwise. So, in particular,  $u_{\lambda, \mu} \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

Now let  $q(x) = \frac{\|x\|^2}{2}$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . This quadratic function is the unique function satisfying  $q^* = q$ , see, for example, [43, Example 11.11]. Furthermore,

$$q(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i^2}{2} = \sum_{i=1}^n q_i(x),$$

where  $q_i(x) = \frac{x_i^2}{2}$  and  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ . Thus, by (8),

$$q = q^* = \left( \sum_{i=1}^n q_i \right)^* = q_1^* \square \dots \square q_n^*$$

and consequently,

$$u_{\lambda, \mu} = u \square \frac{\lambda}{2} (\|\cdot\|^2 + \mathbf{I}_{\mu C}) = u \square \lambda (q_1^* \square \dots \square q_n^* + \mathbf{I}_{\mu C}).$$

For each  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , where  $e_1, \dots, e_n$  are the canonical basis vectors of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , we compute

$$q_i^*(x) = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left( \langle x, y \rangle - \frac{1}{2} y_i^2 \right) = \begin{cases} \sup_{y_i \in \mathbb{R}} (x_i y_i - \frac{1}{2} y_i^2), & \text{if } x = x_i e_i, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

A straightforward calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} & q_1^* \square \dots \square q_n^* + \mathbf{I}_{\mu C} \\ &= (q_1 + \mathbf{I}_{[-\mu, \mu] \times \{0\}^{n-1}}) \square (q_2 + \mathbf{I}_{\{0\} \times [-\mu, \mu] \times \{0\}^{n-2}}) \square \dots \square (q_n + \mathbf{I}_{\{0\}^{n-1} \times [-\mu, \mu]}), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$u_{\lambda, \mu} = u \square \lambda [(q_1 + \mathbf{I}_{[-\mu, \mu] \times \{0\}^{n-1}}) \square (q_2 + \mathbf{I}_{\{0\} \times [-\mu, \mu] \times \{0\}^{n-2}}) \square \dots \square (q_n + \mathbf{I}_{\{0\}^{n-1} \times [-\mu, \mu]})]. \quad (10)$$

A classical construction associates to each convex body  $K \in \mathcal{K}^{n+1}$  a convex function with compact domain in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  via

$$\lfloor K \rfloor(x) = \inf_{(x, t) \in K} t$$



(see, for example, [28]). Conversely, for a convex function  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , one can associate the convex body

$$K^u = \text{epi}(u - M_u) \cap R_{\mathbb{R}^n}(\text{epi}(u - M_u)) + M_u e_{n+1} \quad (11)$$

where  $M_u = \max_{\{u < \infty\}} u(x)$  and  $R_{\mathbb{R}^n}$  denotes reflection with respect to  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

A set  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  is called a *zonotope* if  $S = J_1 + \dots + J_m$  for some line segments  $J_1, \dots, J_m$ , with respect to Minkowski sum. If a convex body  $T \in \mathcal{K}^{n+1}$  can be approximated in the Hausdorff metric by zonotopes, then  $T$  is called a *zonoid*. By [44, Corollary 3.5.7], every centrally symmetric convex body in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  is a zonoid.

Consider the function  $v(x) = \frac{x^2}{2} + I_{[-\mu, \mu]}(x)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mu > 0$ , and let  $K^v$  be the convex body associated with  $v$  as in (11). It is straightforward to check that  $K^v$  is a centrally symmetric convex body in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , hence a zonoid. Therefore, there exist line segments  $J_1^k, \dots, J_{m_k}^k \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  such that  $S_k = J_1^k + \dots + J_{m_k}^k$  converges to  $K^v$  in the Hausdorff metric as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

Let  $\lfloor J_i^k \rfloor$  denote the convex functions associated with these segments  $J_i^k$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m_k$ , and set  $w^k = \lfloor J_1^k \rfloor \square \dots \square \lfloor J_{m_k}^k \rfloor \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R})$ . Each  $\lfloor J_i^k \rfloor$  is affine on its domain and is one-dimensional, i.e., depends on a single variable. Moreover, the functions  $w^k$  are uniformly Lipschitz with constant at most  $2\mu$ , since each segment  $J_i^k$  lies inside the convex body  $K^v$ , whose boundary has slope at most  $2\mu$ . By definition of the epi-sum,

$$w^k = \lfloor J_1^k \rfloor \square \dots \square \lfloor J_{m_k}^k \rfloor \text{ is } \tau\text{-convergent to } v \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (12)$$

Using this approximation together with (10), we conclude that there exists a sequence of functions  $w_{m_k}^k$ , as in (12), such that

$$u \square \lambda w_{m_k}^k \xrightarrow{\tau} u_{\lambda, \mu} \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (13)$$

By (8), we have

$$(u_{\lambda, \mu})^* = \left( u \square \left( \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 + I_{\mu C} \right) \right)^* = \left( u^* + \left( \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 + I_{\mu C} \right)^* \right).$$

Since  $\frac{\lambda}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 + I_{\mu C}$  epi-converges to  $I_{\{0\}}$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ , it follows from (5) that  $(\frac{\lambda}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 + I_{\mu C})^*$  epi-converges to the constant function  $l \equiv 0$ . Consequently,  $(u_{\lambda, \mu})^*$  epi-converges to  $u^*$ , which is equivalent to  $u_{\lambda, \mu}$  epi-converging to  $u$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$  with  $\mu > 0$ . However,  $u_{\lambda, \mu}$  is not  $\tau$ -convergent to  $u$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ , since the Lipschitz constants are not uniformly bounded. To address this, instead of letting  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ , we fix  $\lambda > 0$  and let  $\mu \rightarrow 0$ . In this case,  $\frac{\lambda}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 + I_{\mu C}$  also epi-converges to  $I_{\{0\}}$ , and in particular,  $u_{\lambda, \mu}$  is  $\tau$ -convergent to  $u$  as  $\mu \rightarrow 0$ .

**Lemma 9.** *Let  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and let  $\lambda, \mu > 0$ . Then, for every  $x_0 \in \text{dom } u_{\lambda, \mu}$ , where  $u_{\lambda, \mu}$  is defined by (9), there exists  $y_0 \in \text{dom } u$  at which the infimum in the definition of  $u_{\lambda, \mu}(x_0)$  is attained, and there exists a quadratic function  $q_{x_0} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by*

$$q_{x_0}(x) = u(y_0) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|x - y_0\|^2$$

*such that  $q_{x_0}(x_0) = u_{\lambda, \mu}(x_0)$  and  $q_{x_0}(x) \geq u_{\lambda, \mu}(x)$  for all  $x \in y_0 + \mu C \subset \text{dom } u_{\lambda, \mu}$ . In particular,  $x_0 \in y_0 + \mu C$ .*

*Proof.* By definition,

$$u_{\lambda, \mu}(x) = \inf_{\substack{y \in \text{dom } u \\ x - y \in \mu C}} \left( u(y) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|x - y\|^2 \right), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Since  $x_0 \in \text{dom } u_{\lambda, \mu}$ , the set

$$S_{x_0} = \{y \in \text{dom } u \mid x_0 - y \in \mu C\}$$

is compact, and the function  $y \mapsto u(y) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\|x_0 - y\|^2$  is lower semicontinuous. Hence the infimum is attained, i.e., there exists  $y_0 \in S_{x_0}$  such that

$$u_{\lambda,\mu}(x_0) = u(y_0) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\|x_0 - y_0\|^2.$$

Define the quadratic function

$$q_{x_0}(x) = u(y_0) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\|x - y_0\|^2, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Then  $q_{x_0}(x_0) = u_{\lambda,\mu}(x_0)$ . Moreover, for any  $x$  such that  $x - y_0 \in \mu C$ , that is,  $x \in y_0 + \mu C$ , we have

$$u_{\lambda,\mu}(x) = \inf_{\substack{y \in \text{dom } u \\ x - y \in \mu C}} \left( u(y) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\|x - y\|^2 \right) \leq u(y_0) + \frac{\lambda}{2}\|x - y_0\|^2 = q_{x_0}(x).$$

Therefore,

$$q_{x_0}(x) \geq u_{\lambda,\mu}(x)$$

for all  $x \in y_0 + \mu C$ . Moreover, since  $x_0 - y_0 \in \mu C$ , we have  $x_0 \in y_0 + \mu C$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

### 3 Dual Results

Let  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  be a non-empty, closed convex set with support function  $h_K : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  defined by

$$h_K(x, t) = \sup_{(y, y_{n+1}) \in K} \langle (x, t), (y, y_{n+1}) \rangle$$

for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Note that  $h_K(\cdot, -1) \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$ , and for any  $u \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , we have

$$u^*(y) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \langle (y, -1), (x, u(x)) \rangle = h_{\text{epi}(u)}(y, -1). \quad (14)$$

For a convex function  $u$  with compact domain and  $K = K^u$  as in (11), we obtain

$$h_K(\cdot, -1) = h_{\text{epi}(u)}(\cdot, -1). \quad (15)$$

In particular, if  $\text{dom } u$  is a polytope, then the projection of  $K$  onto  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is also a polytope.

Define

$$\text{Conv}_{\text{MA},h}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}) = \{h_K(\cdot, -1) \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}) \mid K \in \mathcal{K}^{n+1}, \text{supp}(\text{MA}(h_K(\cdot, -1); \cdot)) \text{ is compact}\},$$

where  $\text{supp}$  denotes the support of a measure. We also consider the subset

$$\text{Conv}_{\text{MA},p}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}) = \{h_K(\cdot, -1) \in \text{Conv}_{\text{MA},h}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}) \mid \text{the projection of } K \text{ onto } \mathbb{R}^n \text{ is a polytope}\}.$$

We say that a sequence  $v_k \in \text{Conv}_{\text{MA},h}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$  is  $\tau^*$ -convergent to  $v \in \text{Conv}_{\text{MA},h}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$  if the following conditions hold

- (i)  $v_k$  epi-converges to  $v$ ;
- (ii) there exists a compact set  $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $\text{supp}(\text{MA}(v_k; \cdot)), \text{supp}(\text{MA}(v; \cdot)) \subseteq C$  for every  $k$ .

(cf. [7]). This definition also applies to  $\text{Conv}_{\text{MA},p}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$ . The terminology  $\tau^*$ -convergence is motivated by the duality between the sets  $\text{Conv}_{\text{MA},h}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$  and  $\text{Conv}_{\text{Id}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , established via the Legendre transform, as follows.

**Lemma 10** ([7], Lemma 3). *A sequence  $u_k$  in  $\text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is  $\tau$ -convergent to  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  if and only if  $u_k^*$  and  $u^*$  belong to  $\text{Conv}_{\text{MA,h}}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$  and  $u_k^*$  is  $\tau^*$ -convergent to  $u^*$ .*

By Lemma 10, together with (14) and (15), we conclude that a sequence  $u_k$  in  $\text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is  $\tau$ -convergent to  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  if and only if  $u_k^*$  and  $u^*$  belong to  $\text{Conv}_{\text{MA,p}}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$  and  $u_k^*$  is  $\tau^*$ -convergent to  $u^*$ .

Using [42, Corollary 23.5.1], we have

$$p \in \partial v(x) \iff x \in \partial v^*(p), \quad (16)$$

for  $v \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$ . Moreover, by [21, Lemma A.29], we obtain the following result.

**Lemma 11.** *Let  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a bounded open convex set, let  $u : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a convex function, and let  $u^* : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  denote its Legendre transform. Then*

$$\partial u^*(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset \bar{D},$$

where  $\bar{D}$  denotes the closure of  $D$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

Let  $v \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$  and  $p \in \text{dom } v^*$ . By [21, Lemma A.22], the set  $\partial v(C)$  is compact for every compact set  $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , and by [43, Theorem 11.8],  $v^*$  has bounded domain. If  $p \notin \partial v(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , then  $p \notin \partial v(x)$  for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . By (16), this implies

$$x \notin \partial v^*(p) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

that is,  $\partial v^*(p)$  is empty. Hence  $p$  lies on the boundary of  $\text{dom } v^*$ . Therefore, by Lemma 11,

$$V_n(\text{dom } v^*) = V_n(\partial v(\mathbb{R}^n)) + V_n(\text{dom } v^* \setminus \partial v(\mathbb{R}^n)) = V_n(\partial v(\mathbb{R}^n)) = \text{MA}(v; \mathbb{R}^n) \quad (17)$$

for every  $v \in \text{Conv}_{\text{MA,h}}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$ .

In [6, Lemma 9], it is shown that the map  $v^* \mapsto V_n(\text{dom } v^*)$  is  $\tau$ -continuous, i.e., if  $v_k^* \in \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is  $\tau$ -convergent to  $v^* \in \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , then  $V_n(\text{dom } v_k^*) \rightarrow V_n(\text{dom } v^*)$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . This result is proved using Painlevé–Kuratowski convergence of the sets  $\text{dom } v^*$ . Alternatively, it follows from (17). Indeed, let  $v_k^*$  be a sequence in  $\text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  that is  $\tau$ -convergent to  $v^* \in \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . By Lemma 10, there exists a compact set  $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  such that

$$\text{MA}(v_k; \mathbb{R}^n) = \text{MA}(v_k; C) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{MA}(v; \mathbb{R}^n) = \text{MA}(v; C),$$

and such that  $v_k \in \text{Conv}_{\text{MA,h}}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$  is  $\tau^*$ -convergent to  $v \in \text{Conv}_{\text{MA,h}}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$ . In particular,  $v_k$  epi-converges to  $v$ , which implies that  $\text{MA}(v_k; \cdot)$  converges weakly to  $\text{MA}(v; \cdot)$  (see [21, Proposition 2.6]). That is,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \beta(x) \, d\text{MA}(v_k; x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \beta(x) \, d\text{MA}(v; x)$$

for every  $\beta \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , the space of continuous functions with compact support on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Choosing  $\beta \in C_c(\mathbb{R}^n)$  equal to 1 on  $C$ , we deduce that  $\text{MA}(v_k; \mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \text{MA}(v; \mathbb{R}^n)$ . By (17), this implies that  $V_n(\text{dom } v_k^*) \rightarrow V_n(\text{dom } v^*)$  as  $v_k^* \xrightarrow{\tau} v^*$ .

Finally, let  $v \in \text{Conv}_{\text{MA,h}}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$  and  $\zeta \in \text{Conc}([0, \infty))$ . Then, as shown for example in [7, equation (11)], we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \zeta(\det D^2 v(x)) \, dx = \int_{\text{dom } v^*} \tilde{\zeta}(\det D^2 v^*(x)) \, dx, \quad (18)$$

where  $\tilde{\zeta} = \zeta(1/t) t$  for  $t > 0$ , and  $\tilde{\zeta} \in \text{Conc}([0, \infty))$ .

We now conclude that the functional  $Z^* : \text{Conv}_{\text{MA,p}}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by  $Z^*(v) = Z(v^*)$  is a  $\tau^*$ -upper semicontinuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation if and only if  $Z : \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation. Combining this with (17), (18), (6), and Lemma 10, we deduce the following result from Theorem 2.

**Theorem 12.** *A functional  $Z : \text{Conv}_{\text{MA},p}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a  $\tau^*$ -upper semicontinuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation if and only if there are constants  $c_0, c_1 \in \mathbb{R}$  and a function  $\zeta \in \text{Conc}([0, \infty))$  such that*

$$Z(v) = c_0 + c_1 \text{MA}(v; \mathbb{R}^n) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \zeta(\det D^2 v(x)) \, dx$$

for every  $v \in \text{Conv}_{\text{MA},p}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$ .

We obtain the following result from Theorem 12, or equivalently, by duality from Corollary 3.

**Corollary 13.** *A functional  $Z : \text{Conv}_{\text{MA},h}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a  $\tau^*$ -continuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation if and only if there are constants  $c_0, c_1 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that*

$$Z(v) = c_0 + c_1 \text{MA}(v; \mathbb{R}^n),$$

for every  $v \in \text{Conv}_{\text{MA},h}(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R})$ .

Since Theorem 2 and Theorem 12 are equivalent, it suffices to prove Theorem 2.

## 4 Proof of Theorem 2

It is sufficient to prove the necessity part of the theorem, namely, that if  $Z : \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation, then there exist constants  $c_0, c_1$  and a function  $\zeta \in \text{Conc}([0, \infty))$  such that  $Z$  is given by (3). We will adapt elements from the proof of [33].

Let  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Since  $Z$  is translation invariant, we have  $Z(I_{\{x_0\}}) = c_0$  for every  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . For  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , define

$$Z_0(u) = Z(u) - c_0.$$

Then  $Z_0$  is a  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation that vanishes on indicator functions of singletons, i.e.,  $Z_0(I_{\{x_0\}}) = 0$  for every  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Thus, it suffices to prove the following proposition.

**Proposition 14.** *Let  $Z : \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation that vanishes on indicator functions of singletons. Then there exist a constant  $c_1$  and a function  $\zeta \in \text{Conc}([0, \infty))$  such that*

$$Z(u) = c_1 V_n(\text{dom } u) + \int_{\text{dom } u} \zeta(\det D^2 u(x)) \, dx$$

for every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

To prove Proposition 14, we proceed by induction on the dimension  $n$ . For  $n = 1$ , by [6, Theorem 2], there exist a constant  $d$  and a function  $\gamma \in \text{Conc}([0, \infty))$  such that

$$Z(u) = d V_1(\text{dom } u) + \int_{\text{dom } u} \gamma(u''(x)) \, dx$$

for every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R})$ . Thus, Proposition 14 holds for  $n = 1$ .

Assume that Proposition 14 holds in dimension  $n - 1$ , i.e., for every  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation  $\tilde{Z} : \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^{n-1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which vanishes on indicator functions of singletons, there exist a constant  $d$  and a function  $\gamma \in \text{Conc}([0, \infty))$  such that

$$\tilde{Z}(u) = d V_{n-1}(\text{dom } u) + \int_{\text{dom } u} \gamma(\det_{n-1} D^2 u(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})) \, dx_1 \dots dx_{n-1} \quad (19)$$

for every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})$ . Here,  $(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$  are coordinates in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ , and  $dx_1 \dots dx_{n-1}$  denotes the  $(n-1)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure. The term  $\det_{n-1} D^2 u$  is the determinant of the Hessian of  $u$  restricted to  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ , where the function is defined. For simplicity, we will often denote  $(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$  and  $dx_1 \dots dx_{n-1}$  collectively by  $x$  and  $dx$ , respectively.

Using (19), we show that  $Z$  is *simple*.

**Lemma 15.** *Let  $Z$  be as in Proposition 14. Then  $Z$  is simple.*

*Proof.* Let  $H \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a hyperplane and denote by  $\mathcal{P}(H)$  the set of polytopes contained in  $H$ . Consider the restriction

$$\text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(H) = \{u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \mid \text{dom } u \in \mathcal{P}(H)\},$$

and define  $\tilde{Z} = Z|_{\mathcal{F}}$ . Identifying  $H \simeq \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ , we obtain that  $\tilde{Z}$  is a  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation on  $\text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})$  which vanishes on indicator functions of singletons and is invariant under affine transformations of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . By the induction assumption (19),

$$Z(u) = \tilde{Z}(u) = d V_{n-1}(\text{dom } u) + \int_{\text{dom } u} \gamma(\det_{n-1} D^2 u(x)) dx \quad (20)$$

for every  $u \in \mathcal{F}$  with some  $\gamma \in \text{Conc}([0, \infty))$  and constant  $d \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Let  $\varphi_t$  be the affine transformation which scales by  $t > 0$  in  $H$  and by  $1/t^{n-1}$  in the direction orthogonal to  $H$ . By equi-affine invariance of  $Z$ ,

$$Z(u \circ \varphi_t) = Z(u).$$

Applying (20) to  $u \circ \varphi_t$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Z(u) &= d V_{n-1}(\varphi_t^{-1}(\text{dom } u)) + \int_{\varphi_t^{-1}(\text{dom } u)} \gamma(\det_{n-1} D^2 u \circ \varphi_t(x)) dx \\ &= \frac{d}{t^{n-1}} V_{n-1}(\text{dom } u) + \int_{\varphi_t^{-1}(\text{dom } u)} \gamma\left(t^{2(n-1)} \det_{n-1} D^2 u(\varphi_t(x))\right) dx \\ &= \frac{d}{t^{n-1}} V_{n-1}(\text{dom } u) + \frac{1}{t^{n-1}} \int_{\text{dom } u} \gamma\left(t^{2(n-1)} \det_{n-1} D^2 u(x)\right) dx \\ &= d V_{n-1}(\text{dom } u) + \int_{\text{dom } u} \gamma(\det_{n-1} D^2 u(x)) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{t^{n-1}} V_{n-1}(\text{dom } u) + \frac{1}{t^{n-1}} \int_{\text{dom } u} \gamma\left(t^{2(n-1)} \det_{n-1} D^2 u(x)\right) dx \\ = d V_{n-1}(\text{dom } u) + \int_{\text{dom } u} \gamma(\det_{n-1} D^2 u(x)) dx \quad (21) \end{aligned}$$

for every  $t > 0$  and  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(H)$ .

Taking  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(H)$  with  $\det_{n-1} D^2 u(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in \text{dom } u$  and  $V_{n-1}(\text{dom } u) > 0$ , this gives

$$\frac{d}{t^{n-1}} V_{n-1}(\text{dom } u) = d V_{n-1}(\text{dom } u)$$

for every  $t > 0$ , since  $\gamma(0) = 0$ . This immediately implies that  $d = 0$ . With  $d = 0$ , (21) implies that  $\gamma(t^2) = \gamma(1) t$ , that is,  $\gamma \equiv c\sqrt{\cdot}$  for some constant  $c \geq 0$ . Finally, consider a sequence

$$u_k(x) = kx_1^2 + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} x_i^2 + \mathbf{I}_{[0,1]^{n-1} \times \{0\}}(x), \quad k \in \mathbb{N},$$

which epi-converges to

$$u(x) = \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} x_i^2 + \mathbf{I}_{\{0\} \times [0,1]^{n-2} \times \{0\}}(x).$$

Since  $\text{dom } u_k$  and  $\text{dom } u$  are not full-dimensional,  $u_k$  is  $\tau$ -convergent to  $u$ . Since  $Z$  is  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, we get

$$0 \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} Z(u_k) = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} c \sqrt{2^{n-1}k} \leq Z(u) = 0,$$

and hence  $c \equiv 0$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

By Lemma 5, there exists a constant  $c_1 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $Z(\mathbf{I}_P) = c_1 V_n(P)$  for every polytope  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ . Moreover, by [6, Lemma 6 and Lemma 9], the functional

$$u \mapsto V_n(\text{dom } u), \quad u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

shares the same properties as  $Z$ , with the additional property of being  $\tau$ -continuous. Therefore,

$$Z_1(u) = Z(u) - c_1 V_n(\text{dom } u) \tag{22}$$

defines a  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, simple, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation that vanishes on indicator functions of polytopes in  $\text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . From now on, unless stated otherwise, we use the notation  $Z_1$  to denote this specific valuation with the above properties.

We now show that  $Z_1$  also vanishes on another class of functions. Following [33], recall that a convex body in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is called a *cylinder set* if it can be written as the Minkowski sum of an at most  $(n-1)$ -dimensional convex body  $K$  and a closed line segment  $J$ . We define an analogous notion for convex functions. We say that a function  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is a *cylinder function* if there exist  $w \in \text{Conv}_{\text{ld}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , a closed interval  $J \subset \mathbb{R}$ , and an affine function  $v$  such that

$$u = w \square (v + \mathbf{I}_J),$$

where  $\text{dom } w$  is a convex body of dimension at most  $(n-1)$ .

**Lemma 16.** *We have  $Z_1(u) = 0$  for every cylinder function  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  be a cylinder function. Thus, there exist  $w \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , a closed interval  $J \subset \mathbb{R}$ , and an affine function  $v$  such that

$$u = w \square (v + \mathbf{I}_J),$$

where  $\text{dom } w$  is a convex body of dimension at most  $n-1$ .

Since  $Z$  is equi-affine and dually translation invariant, we may assume that  $\text{dom } w \subset H$ , where  $H$  is a hyperplane containing the origin, and that the interval  $J$  lies in the line  $L$ . We consider only segments  $J$  lying in  $L$ . Set

$$\text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(H) = \{w \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \mid \text{dom } w \subset \mathcal{P}(H)\}.$$

Fix  $w \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(H)$ . By the translation invariance of  $Z$ , the value of

$$Z_1(w \square (v + \mathbf{I}_J))$$

remains unchanged if the closed line segment  $J$  is translated along the line, since the epi-sum corresponds to the Minkowski sum of the epi-graphs. Consequently,  $Z_1(w \square (v + \mathbf{I}_J))$  depends only on the length of  $J$ , not on its position in  $L$ . Define

$$g_w(s) = Z_1(w \square (v + \mathbf{I}_J)), \quad s = V_1(J).$$

Let  $J_1$  and  $J_2$  be line segments in  $L$ , whose relative interiors are disjoint, and suppose that their intersection consists of the origin such that  $v(0) = 0$ . Set  $s_1 = V_1(J_1)$  and  $s_2 = V_1(J_2)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}(w \square (v + I_{J_1})) \wedge (w \square (v + I_{J_2})) &= w \square (v + I_{J_1 \cup J_2}) \\ (w \square (v + I_{J_1})) \vee (w \square (v + I_{J_2})) &= w.\end{aligned}$$

Since  $Z_1$  is a translation invariant and simple valuation, we get

$$Z_1(w \square (v + I_{J_1 \cup J_2})) = Z_1(w \square (v + I_{J_1})) + Z_1(w \square (v + I_{J_2})),$$

which yields

$$g_w(s_1 + s_2) = g_w(s_1) + g_w(s_2).$$

Thus,  $g_w$  is an upper semicontinuous solution of Cauchy's functional equation. Hence, there exists a real-valued function  $w \mapsto Y(w)$  such that

$$g_w(s) = Y(w) s,$$

and therefore

$$Z_1(w \square (v + I_J)) = Y(w) V_1(J)$$

for every  $w \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(H)$  and every line segment  $J$  in  $L$ . Note that  $Y$  is defined on  $\text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(H)$ , and it is a  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation that vanishes on indicator functions of polytopes. By the induction assumption (19) for  $\text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^{n-1})$ , we obtain

$$Y(w) = \int_P \gamma(\det_{n-1} D^2 u(x)) dx,$$

which implies

$$Z_1(w \square (v + I_J)) = V_1(J) \int_P \gamma(\det_{n-1} D^2 u(x)) dx, \quad (23)$$

for every  $u + I_P \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(H)$ , every line segment  $J$  in  $L$ , and some suitable  $\gamma \in \text{Conc}([0, \infty))$ .

As in the proof of Lemma 15, choose equi-affine invariant transformations  $\varphi_t$  that dilate by a factor of  $t > 0$  in the direction of  $H$  and by a factor of  $1/t^{n-1}$  in the direction of  $J$ . Then

$$(w \square (v + I_J)) \circ \varphi_t$$

is a translate of the function  $(u \circ \varphi_t + I_{\frac{1}{t}P}) \square (v \circ \varphi_t + I_{t^{n-1}J})$ . From the equi-affine invariance of  $Z_1$  and (23), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}Z_1((u \circ \varphi_t + I_{\frac{1}{t}P}) \square (v \circ \varphi_t + I_{t^{n-1}J})) &= V_1(J) \int_P \gamma(t^{2(n-1)} \det_{n-1} D^2 u(x)) dx \\ &= Z_1(w \square (v + I_J)) \\ &= V_1(J) \int_P \gamma(\det_{n-1} D^2 u(x)) dx.\end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\gamma(t^{2(n-1)}) = \gamma(t)$  for every  $t > 0$ . Since  $\gamma \in \text{Conc}([0, \infty))$ , we conclude that  $\gamma \equiv 0$ .  $\square$

By Lemma 15, Lemma 16, and the definition of  $Z_1$  (see (22)), it is sufficient to prove the following particular case in order to complete the inductive proof of Proposition 14.

**Proposition 17.** *Let  $Z : \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation that vanishes on indicator functions of polytopes and cylinders functions. Then there is a function  $\zeta \in \text{Conc}([0, \infty))$  such that*

$$Z(u) = \int_{\text{dom } u} \zeta(\det D^2 u(x)) dx$$

for every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .



From now on, let  $Z$  denote a valuation with the same properties as in Proposition 17. To prove the proposition, we first establish a series of preparatory results and constructions; once these are in place, the full argument follows naturally.

Using the facts that  $Z$  vanishes on indicator functions of polytopes, is dually epi-translation invariant, and is a  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous valuation, we obtain

$$Z(u) \geq 0 \quad (24)$$

for every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

Given  $a > 0$ , define the function  $\Phi_a : \mathcal{P}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\Phi_a(P) = Z(aq + \text{I}_P),$$

where

$$q(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (25)$$

By (24), the functional  $\Phi_a$  is non-negative. Moreover, since  $Z$  is a simple valuation on  $\text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , it follows that  $\Phi_a$  is a simple valuation on  $\mathcal{P}^n$ . Let  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and consider the translation function  $\tau_y(x) = x + y$ . Note that

$$q \circ \tau_y^{-1}(x) = q(x) + \left(\frac{1}{2}\|y\|^2 - \langle x, y \rangle\right),$$

for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and that  $w_y(x) = \frac{1}{2}\|y\|^2 - \langle x, y \rangle$  is an affine function. Since  $Z$  is translation and dually epi-translation invariant, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Z(aq + \text{I}_P) &= Z((aq + \text{I}_P) \circ \tau_y^{-1}) \\ &= Z(aq + aw_y + \text{I}_{P+y}) \\ &= Z(aq + \text{I}_{P+y}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for every  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$\Phi_a(P + y) = Z(aq + \text{I}_{P+y}) = Z(aq + \text{I}_P) = \Phi_a(P).$$

This shows that  $\Phi_a$  is translation invariant.

By Theorem 6, there exists a non-negative constant  $d = d(a) \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\Phi_a(P) = d V_n(P),$$

and consequently,

$$Z(aq + \text{I}_P) = d V_n(P) \quad (26)$$

for every polytope  $P \in \mathcal{P}^n$ . In particular, (26) implies

$$\frac{Z(aq + \text{I}_{P_1})}{V_n(P_1)} = \frac{Z(aq + \text{I}_{P_2})}{V_n(P_2)} \quad (27)$$

for all polytopes  $P_1, P_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with positive volume.

Define the function  $\zeta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\zeta(a) = \frac{Z(aq + \text{I}_C)}{V_n(C)}, \quad (28)$$

where  $a \geq 0$  and  $C = [-1, 1]^n$ . By (27), we then have

$$Z(aq + \text{I}_P) = \zeta(a) V_n(P),$$

for every polytope  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and every  $a \geq 0$ .

For a general quadratic function

$$\tilde{q}(x) = \frac{1}{2}\langle x, Ax \rangle + l(x) + c,$$

where  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is symmetric and positive semidefinite,  $\det A = a \geq 0$ ,  $l : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a linear function, and  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , it follows that

$$Z(\tilde{q} + \mathbf{I}_P) = \zeta(a)V_n(P), \quad (29)$$

for every polytope  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , since  $Z$  is an equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation.

Throughout the text,  $q$  denotes the quadratic function defined in (25), and  $C = [-1, 1]^n$  denotes the unit cube centered at the origin with side length 2.

The strategy for proving Proposition 17 is as follows. First, we show that  $\zeta \in \text{Conc}([0, \infty))$  (see Lemma 20). Next, we establish the existence of a unique simple,  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation  $Z$  defined on  $\text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  that satisfies (28) for every  $a \geq 0$ , and that vanishes on indicator functions of polytopes and cylinder functions (see Proposition 21). Finally, we recall that for any  $\zeta \in \text{Conc}([0, \infty))$  and  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , the functional

$$Z_\zeta(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \zeta(\det D^2 u(x)) \, dx$$

is a simple,  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation that vanishes on indicator functions of polytopes and cylinder functions, and satisfies

$$Z_\zeta(aq + \mathbf{I}_P) = \zeta(a)V_n(P)$$

for every  $a \geq 0$  and every polytope  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ .

By (24), we then obtain the following result.

**Lemma 18.** *The function  $\zeta$  given by (28) is non-negative.*

We will use  $\text{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$  to denote the  $n \times n$  diagonal matrix with entries

$$x_{ij} = \begin{cases} a_i, & \text{if } i = j, \\ 0, & \text{if } i \neq j, \end{cases} \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n.$$

The properties of  $Z$  allow us to conclude that  $\zeta$  is concave.

**Lemma 19.** *The function  $\zeta$  given by (28) is concave.*

*Proof.* We begin with the case  $n = 2$  (see the case  $n = 1$  in [6, Lemma 17]). Let  $0 \leq s < a < r$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Consider the points

$$p_i = \left( t_1, -t_2 + \left( \frac{2t_2}{m} \right) i \right), \quad i = 0, \dots, m,$$

for  $t_1, t_2 > 0$ . Note that

$$p_0 = (t_1, -t_2), \quad p_m = (t_1, t_2),$$

and  $p_i \in [(t_1, -t_2), (t_1, t_2)]$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, m-1$ . In the two-dimensional case described above, let  $R = [-t_1, t_1] \times [-t_2, t_2]$  and

$$q^a(x_1, x_2) = ax_1^2 + x_2^2.$$

We approximate the piecewise quadratic function  $q^a + I_R$  by suitable piecewise quadratic functions as follows. Consider the functions

$$q_i^s(x_1, x_2) = ax_1^2 + \frac{s}{a}x_2^2 + 2\left(1 - \frac{s}{a}\right)\left(-t_2 + \left(\frac{2t_2}{m}\right)i\right)x_2 - \left(1 - \frac{s}{a}\right)\left(-t_2 + \left(\frac{2t_2}{m}\right)i\right)^2,$$

for every  $i = 0, \dots, m-1$ . Note that

$$q_i^s(p_i) = q^a(p_i), \nabla q_i^s(p_i) = \nabla q^a(p_i) \text{ and } (q_i^s + I_R)(x_1, x_2) \leq (q^a + I_R)(x_1, x_2) \text{ for all } (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Next, we look for functions of the form

$$q_i^r(x_1, x_2) = ax_1^2 + \frac{r}{a}x_2^2 + h_1^i x_1 + h_2^i x_2 + h_3^i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m,$$

such that

$$\begin{cases} q_i^r(\tilde{p}_{i-1,i}) &= q_{i-1}^s(\tilde{p}_{i-1,i}) \\ \nabla q_i^r(\tilde{p}_{i-1,i}) &= \nabla q_{i-1}^s(\tilde{p}_{i-1,i}) \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

for some  $\tilde{p}_{i-1,i} \in (p_{i-1}, p_i)$  and with  $(q_{i-1}^s + I_R)(x_1, x_2) \leq (q_i^r + I_R)(x_1, x_2)$  for all  $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , and

$$\begin{cases} q_i^r(\tilde{p}_{i,i}) &= q_i^s(\tilde{p}_{i,i}) \\ \nabla q_i^r(\tilde{p}_{i,i}) &= \nabla q_i^s(\tilde{p}_{i,i}) \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

for some  $\tilde{p}_{i,i} \in (\tilde{p}_{i-1,i}, p_i)$  and with  $(q_i^s + I_R)(x_1, x_2) \leq (q_i^r + I_R)(x_1, x_2)$  for all  $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ .

For simplicity, write  $\tilde{p}_{i-1,i} = (t_1, y_{i-1,i})$  and  $\tilde{p}_{i,i} = (t_1, y_{i,i})$ . From the second equation in (30), we have

$$\left(2at_2 + h_1^i, 2\frac{r}{a}y_{i-1,i} + h_2^i\right) = \left(2at_2, 2\frac{s}{a}y_{i-1,i} + 2\left(1 - \frac{s}{a}\right)\left(-t_2 + \left(\frac{2t_2}{m}\right)(i-1)\right)\right),$$

which implies  $h_1^i = 0$  and

$$y_{i-1,i} = \frac{h_2^i a}{2(s-r)} + \left(\frac{s-a}{s-r}\right)\left(-t_2 + \left(\frac{2t_2}{m}\right)(i-1)\right).$$

From the second equation in (31), it follows that

$$\left(2at_2 + h_1^i, 2\frac{r}{a}y_{i,i} + h_2^i\right) = \left(2at_2, 2\frac{s}{a}y_{i,i} + 2\left(1 - \frac{s}{a}\right)\left(-t_2 + \left(\frac{2t_2}{m}\right)i\right)\right),$$

which implies

$$y_{i,i} = \frac{h_2^i a}{2(s-r)} + \left(\frac{s-a}{s-r}\right)\left(-t_2 + \left(\frac{2t_2}{m}\right)i\right) = y_{i-1,i} + \left(\frac{s-a}{s-r}\right)\frac{2t_2}{m}.$$

Thus,

$$y_{i,i} - y_{i-1,i} = \left(\frac{s-a}{s-r}\right)\frac{2t_2}{m} \quad (32)$$

for every  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , i.e.,  $\|\tilde{p}_{i-1,i} - \tilde{p}_{i,i}\|$  is a constant that does not depend on  $i$ .

We now compute the distance between  $\tilde{p}_{i,i}$  and  $\tilde{p}_{i,i+1}$ . From the first equations in (30) and (31), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(r-s)}{a}y_{i-1,i}^2 + \left(h_2^i - 2\left(1 - \frac{s}{a}\right)\left(-t_2 + \left(\frac{2t_2}{m}\right)(i-1)\right)\right)y_{i-1,i} \\ + \left(1 - \frac{s}{a}\right)\left(-t_2 + \left(\frac{2t_2}{m}\right)(i-1)\right)^2 + h_3^i = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{(r-s)}{a} y_{i,i}^2 + \left( h_2^i - 2 \left( 1 - \frac{s}{a} \right) \left( -t_2 + \left( \frac{2t_2}{m} \right) i \right) \right) y_{i,i} + \left( 1 - \frac{s}{a} \right) \left( -t_2 + \left( \frac{2t_2}{m} \right) i \right)^2 + h_3^i = 0.$$

A straightforward computation yields

$$h_2^i \left( \frac{s-a}{s-r} \right) = 2 \frac{(s-a)}{a} \left( -t_2 + \left( \frac{2t_2}{m} \right) i \right) \left( 1 - \left( \frac{s-a}{s-r} \right) \right) + c,$$

for every  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , where  $c$  is a constant that does not depend on  $i$ . Consequently,

$$h_2^{i+1} - h_2^i = 2 \frac{(s-a)}{a} \left( \frac{2t_2}{m} \right) \left( \left( \frac{s-r}{s-a} \right) - 1 \right),$$

and

$$y_{i,i+1} - y_{i,i} = a \frac{h_2^{i+1} - h_2^i}{2(s-r)} = \frac{2t_2}{m} \left( 1 - \left( \frac{s-a}{s-r} \right) \right). \quad (33)$$

Consider the following sequence of functions

$$u_m = (q_0^s + \mathbf{I}_{[-t_1, t_1] \times [-t_2, y_{0,1}]}) \wedge (q_1^r + \mathbf{I}_{[-t_1, t_1] \times [y_{0,1}, y_{1,1}]}) \wedge (q_1^s + \mathbf{I}_{[-t_1, t_1] \times [y_{1,1}, y_{1,2}]}) \wedge \dots \wedge (q_m^r + \mathbf{I}_{[-t_1, t_1] \times [y_{m-1,m}, y_{m,m}]}) \wedge (q_m^s + \mathbf{I}_{[-t_1, t_1] \times [y_{m,m}, t_2]}).$$

Since  $y_{i,i} - y_{i-1,i}$  and  $y_{i,i} - y_{i,i-1}$  do not depend on  $i$ , and  $Z$  is simple and dually epi-translation invariant, we have

$$Z(u_m) = mZ(q_1^r + \mathbf{I}_{[-t_1, t_1] \times [y_{0,1}, y_{1,1}]}) + mZ(q_1^s + \mathbf{I}_{[-t_1, t_1] \times [y_{1,1}, y_{1,2}]})$$

and this, combined with (27), implies

$$\begin{aligned} Z(u_m) &= \frac{m2t_1(y_{1,1} - y_{0,1})}{2t_12t_2} Z(q_1^r + \mathbf{I}_R) + \frac{m2t_1(y_{1,2} - y_{1,1})}{2t_12t_2} Z(q_1^s + \mathbf{I}_R) \\ &= \frac{m2t_1}{2t_12t_2} \left( \frac{s-a}{s-r} \right) \left( \frac{2t_2}{m} \right) Z(q_1^r + \mathbf{I}_R) + \frac{m2t_1}{2t_12t_2} \left( 1 - \left( \frac{s-a}{s-r} \right) \right) \left( \frac{2t_2}{m} \right) Z(q_1^s + \mathbf{I}_R) \\ &= \left( \frac{s-a}{s-r} \right) Z(q_1^r + \mathbf{I}_R) + \left( 1 - \left( \frac{s-a}{s-r} \right) \right) Z(q_1^s + \mathbf{I}_R). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Note that  $Z(u_m)$  does not depend on  $m$ . To complete the proof that  $\zeta$  is concave in the planar case, we use the facts that  $u_m$  is  $\tau$ -convergent to  $q^a + \mathbf{I}_R$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , that  $Z$  is  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, and that (34) and (29) hold, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(2^2 a) V_2(R) &= Z(q^a + \mathbf{I}_R) \\ &\geq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} Z(u_m) \\ &= \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left( \left( \frac{s-a}{s-r} \right) Z(q_1^r + \mathbf{I}_R) + \left( 1 - \left( \frac{s-a}{s-r} \right) \right) Z(q_1^s + \mathbf{I}_R) \right) \\ &= V_2(R) \left( \left( \frac{s-a}{s-r} \right) \zeta(2^2 r) + \left( 1 - \left( \frac{s-a}{s-r} \right) \right) \zeta(2^2 s) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Setting  $\lambda = \frac{s-a}{s-r}$ , since  $0 \leq s < a < r$ , we have  $0 < \lambda < 1$  and

$$\zeta(2^2 \lambda r + 2^2 (1-\lambda) s) \geq \lambda \zeta(2^2 r) + (1-\lambda) \zeta(2^2 s).$$

Since  $r$  and  $s$  were arbitrarily chosen, we arrive at

$$\zeta(\lambda r + (1 - \lambda)s) \geq \lambda \zeta(r) + (1 - \lambda) \zeta(s)$$

for every  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ , i.e.,  $\zeta$  is concave.

To prove that  $\zeta$  is concave for  $n \geq 3$ , we extend the quadratic functions  $q^a, q_i^s$  and  $q_i^r$  so as to obtain quadratic functions on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ : the planar graphs remain unchanged, and in the directions of the  $x_j$ -axes,  $j = 3, \dots, n$ , we add semi-axes of length  $t_j$ . Thus,

$$q^a(x) = \langle x, \text{diag}(a, 1, \dots, 1)x \rangle,$$

the quadratic function  $q_i^s$  is given by

$$q_i^s(x) = \langle x, \text{diag}(a, a^{-1}s, 1, \dots, 1)x \rangle + 2 \left(1 - \frac{s}{a}\right) \left(-t_2 + \left(\frac{2t_2}{m}\right)i\right) x_2 - \left(1 - \frac{s}{a}\right) \left(-t_2 + \left(\frac{2t_2}{m}\right)i\right)^2,$$

where  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ , and the quadratic function  $q_i^r$  is a rotated copy of

$$\tilde{q}_i^r(x) = \langle x, \text{diag}(a, a^{-1}r, 1, \dots, 1)x \rangle.$$

Now,

$$p_i = \left(t_1, -t_2 + \left(\frac{2t_2}{m}\right)i, 1, \dots, 1\right),$$

for every  $i = 0, \dots, m$ , and  $R = [-t_1, t_1] \times \dots \times [-t_n, t_n]$ . We have

$$q_i^s(p_i) = q^a(p_i), \nabla q_i^s(p_i) = \nabla q^a(p_i) \text{ and } (q_i^s + \mathbf{I}_R)(x) \leq (q^a + \mathbf{I}_R)(x) \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

The epi-graphs of  $q_i^r + \mathbf{I}_R$  are contained in  $\text{epi}(q_{i-1}^s + \mathbf{I}_R)$  and in  $\text{epi}(q_i^s + \mathbf{I}_R)$ . They coincide with  $q_{i-1}^s$  along the hyperplane  $x_2 = 0$ , translated by  $\tilde{p}_{i-1,i}$ , and with  $q_i^s$  along the hyperplane  $x_2 = 0$ , translated by  $\tilde{p}_{i,i}$ . As before, write

$$\tilde{p}_{i-1,i} = (t_1, y_{i-1,1}, t_3, \dots, t_n), \tilde{p}_{i,i} = (t_1, y_{i,i}, t_3, \dots, t_n),$$

and define

$$u_m = (q_0^s + \mathbf{I}_{[-t_1, t_1] \times [-t_2, y_{0,1}] \times J}) \wedge (q_1^r + \mathbf{I}_{[-t_1, t_1] \times [y_{0,1}, y_{1,1}] \times J}) \wedge (q_1^s + \mathbf{I}_{[-t_1, t_1] \times [y_{1,1}, y_{1,2}] \times J}) \wedge \dots \wedge (q_m^r + \mathbf{I}_{[-t_1, t_1] \times [y_{m-1,m}, y_{m,m}] \times J}) \wedge (q_m^s + \mathbf{I}_{[-t_1, t_1] \times [y_{m,m}, t_2] \times J}),$$

where  $J = [-t_3, t_3] \times \dots \times [-t_n, t_n]$ .

As  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , the sequence  $u_m$  is  $\tau$ -convergent to  $q^a + \mathbf{I}_R$ . For the general case, we also have equations (32) and (33). Therefore, analogously to the two-dimensional case,

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(2^n a) V_n(R) &= Z(q^a + \mathbf{I}_R) \\ &\geq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} Z(u_m) \\ &= V_n(R) \left( \left( \frac{s-a}{s-r} \right) \zeta(2^n r) + \left( 1 - \left( \frac{s-a}{s-r} \right) \right) \zeta(2^n s) \right), \end{aligned}$$

and hence  $\zeta$  is a concave function.  $\square$

The previous lemmas establish key properties of  $\zeta$ . Building on these, we can further show that  $\zeta \in \text{Conc}([0, \infty))$ .

**Lemma 20.** *The function  $\zeta$  given by (28) belongs to  $\text{Conc}([0, \infty))$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 19,  $\zeta$  is concave. Note that  $a^{\frac{1}{n}}q + I_C \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is  $\tau$ -convergent to  $I_C$  as  $a \rightarrow 0$ . By Lemma 18, and using that  $Z$  vanishes on indicator functions, we get

$$0 \leq \limsup_{a \rightarrow 0} \zeta(a) = \limsup_{a \rightarrow 0} \frac{Z(a^{\frac{1}{n}}q + I_C)}{V_n(C)} \leq \frac{Z(I_C)}{V_n(C)} = 0.$$

Consider now the sequence of functions

$$u_k(x) = \langle x, \text{diag}(k2^{-n}, 1, \dots, 1)x \rangle$$

for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Note that  $u_k + I_{[0, 1/k] \times [0, 1]^{n-1}}$  is  $\tau$ -convergent to  $\langle \cdot, \text{diag}(0, 1, \dots, 1) \cdot \rangle + I_{\{0\} \times [0, 1]^{n-1}}$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $Z$  is a  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous and simple valuation, we obtain

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} Z(u_k + I_{[0, 1/k] \times [0, 1]^{n-1}}) = 0.$$

On the other hand, by formulas (27) and (29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z(u_k + I_{[0, 1/k] \times [0, 1]^{n-1}}) &= Z(\langle \cdot, \text{diag}(k2^{-n}, 1, \dots, 1) \cdot \rangle + I_{[0, 1/k] \times [0, 1]^{n-1}}) \\ &= \frac{Z(\langle \cdot, \text{diag}(k2^{-n}, 1, \dots, 1) \cdot \rangle + I_C)}{V_n(C)} \frac{1}{k} \\ &= \frac{\zeta(k)}{k}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\zeta(k)}{k} = 0.$$

This concludes the proof.  $\square$

Since we have already shown that  $\zeta \in \text{Conc}([0, \infty))$ , it remains to prove that  $\zeta$  uniquely determines  $Z$  in order to establish Proposition 17 and thereby Proposition 14. More precisely, by induction on the dimension  $n$ , this reduces to proving the following result.

**Proposition 21.** *For a given  $\zeta \in \text{Conc}([0, \infty))$ , there exists a unique functional*

$$Z : \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

*satisfying the following properties:*

- (i)  $Z$  is  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous;
- (ii)  $Z$  is a simple, equi-affine and dually epi-translation invariant valuation;
- (iii)  $Z$  vanishes on indicator functions of polytopes and cylinder functions;
- (iv)  $Z(aq + I_P) = \zeta(a)V_n(P)$  for every  $a \geq 0$  and polytope  $P$ , where  $q(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2$ .

A function  $w \in \text{Conv}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is called *piecewise linear-quadratic* if  $\text{dom } w$  can be expressed as the union of finitely many polyhedral sets, on each of which  $w$  has the form

$$w(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle x, Ax \rangle + \langle y, x \rangle + c, \quad x \in \text{dom } w,$$

for some  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and a symmetric positive semidefinite matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ .

Let  $P_{\text{l,q}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  denote the family of convex functions of the form

$$u = \bigwedge_{i=1}^m w_i,$$

where each  $w_i$  is either a piecewise linear-quadratic function or a cylinder function with polytopal domain. Since  $\zeta$  is defined by (29), and  $Z$  vanishes on indicator functions of polytopes, is dually epi-translation invariant, and vanishes on cylinder functions, the value of  $Z$  is determined for every  $u \in P_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Note that  $\text{Conv}_{p,a}(\mathbb{R}^n) \subset P_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and, since  $\text{Conv}_{p,a}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is dense in  $\text{Conv}_{lp}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  (see Lemma 4), every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{lp}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  can be approximated by elements of  $P_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . The  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuity of  $Z$  then implies that for any sequence  $u_k \in P_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  with  $u_k \xrightarrow{\tau} u$ , we have

$$Z(u) \geq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} Z(u_k). \quad (35)$$

To show that  $Z$  is uniquely determined by  $\zeta$  and thus prove Proposition 21, it suffices to construct, for every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{lp}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , a sequence  $u_k \in P_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  such that equality holds in (35), i.e.,

$$Z(u) = \sup \left\{ \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} Z(u_k) \mid u_k \in P_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n), u_k \xrightarrow{\tau} u \right\}. \quad (36)$$

We will show that it is enough to prove (36) for the special class of functions  $u_{\lambda,\mu}$  introduced in Subsection 2.4. For this, we require the following lemma.

**Lemma 22.** *Let  $u \in \text{Conv}_{lp}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and let  $v$  be an affine function on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . We have*

$$Z(u \square (v + I_J)) = Z(u),$$

where  $J \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is a closed line segment.

*Proof.* We begin by considering line segments  $J \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  in a fixed line  $L$ . Since  $Z$  is a translation invariant valuation,  $Z(u \square (v + I_J))$  depends only on the length  $s = V_1(J)$ . Thus, the function  $g_u : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  defined by

$$g_u(s) = Z(u \square (v + I_J)), \quad s = V_1(J),$$

is well-defined. As in the proof of Lemma 16, let  $J_1$  and  $J_2$  be line segments lying on the same line, with disjoint relative interiors, and suppose that their intersection consists of a single point  $p$  such that  $v(p) = 0$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} (u \square (v + I_{J_1})) \wedge (u \square (v + I_{J_2})) &= u \square (v + I_{J_1 \cup J_2}) \\ (u \square (v + I_{J_1})) \vee (u \square (v + I_{J_2})) &= u. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $s_1 = V_1(J_1)$  and  $s_2 = V_1(J_2)$ . Since  $Z$  is a valuation, it follows that

$$Z(u \square (v + I_{J_1 \cup J_2})) + Z(u) = Z(u \square (v + I_{J_1})) + Z(u \square (v + I_{J_2})),$$

which implies

$$g_u(s_1 + s_2) + g_u(0) = g_u(s_1) + g_u(s_2)$$

for every  $s_1, s_2 \geq 0$ . Hence,  $g_u(s) - g_u(0)$  satisfies Cauchy's functional equation and depends upper semicontinuously on  $s$ . Therefore, there exists a real-valued function  $u \mapsto Y(u)$  such that

$$g_u(s) = Y(u) s + g_u(0),$$

for every  $s \geq 0$ . In particular,

$$Z(u \square (v + I_J)) = Y(u) V_1(J) + Z(u) \quad (37)$$

holds for every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{lp}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , every affine function  $v$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and every closed line segment  $J \subset L$ .



For  $J$  sufficiently long in  $L$ , and by definition of the epi-sum, we can find closed half-spaces  $H_1^+$  and  $H_2^-$ , orthogonal to  $J$ , such that

$$u \square (v + I_J) + I_{(\text{dom } u + J) \cap H_1^+ \cap H_2^-}$$

is a non-degenerate cylinder function  $w \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Set  $J_1 = J \cap H_1^+$  and  $J_2 = J \cap H_2^-$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} Z(u \square (v + I_J)) \\ = Z(u \square (v + I_J) + I_{\text{dom}(u \square (v + I_J)) \cap H_1^+}) + Z(w) + Z(u \square (v + I_J) + I_{\text{dom}(u \square (v + I_J)) \cap H_2^-}). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $Z$  is a simple dually epi-translation invariant valuation that vanishes on cylinder functions,

$$Z(u \square (v + I_J)) = Z(u \square (v + I_{J_1 + J_2})).$$

Using this together with (37), we obtain

$$Y(u) V_1(J) = Y(u) V_1(J_1 + J_2) = Y(u) (V_1(J_1) + V_1(J_2)),$$

and, since  $V_1(J) > V_1(J_1) + V_1(J_2)$ , it follows that

$$Y(u) = 0.$$

Substituting into (37), we conclude that

$$Z(u \square (v + I_J)) = Z(u)$$

for every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , and thus the proof is complete.  $\square$

Let  $\lambda, \mu > 0$  and  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Recall from (9) that

$$u_{\lambda, \mu} = u \square \left( \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\cdot\|^2 + I_{\mu C} \right). \quad (38)$$

Let  $w_{m_k}^k$  be a sequence of functions satisfying (13), i.e.,  $w_{m_k}^k = \lfloor J_1^k \rfloor \square \cdots \square \lfloor J_{m_k}^k \rfloor$ . Then, by Lemma 22, we obtain

$$Z(u_{\lambda, \mu}) \geq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} Z(u \square \lambda w_{m_k}^k) = Z(u). \quad (39)$$

Now suppose, by contradiction, that (36) does not hold for some  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , i.e.,

$$Z(u) > \sup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \{ \limsup Z(v_k) : v_k \in P_{\text{l.q}}(\mathbb{R}^n), v_k \xrightarrow{\tau} u \}.$$

Then, by Theorem 8, there exist  $\rho > 0$  and  $\tilde{\mu} > 0$  such that

$$Z(u) > \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} Z(v_k) + \rho V_n(\text{dom } u) \quad (40)$$

for every sequence  $v_k \in P_{\text{l.q}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  whose Lipschitz constants in  $\text{int}(\text{dom } v_k)$  are uniformly bounded by some  $L > 0$ , and such that  $v_k$  converges uniformly to  $u$  on every compact set  $C$  that does not contain boundary points of  $\text{dom } u$  and also does not contain boundary points of  $\text{dom } u_{\lambda, \mu}$  for  $\mu \leq \tilde{\mu}$ .

Let  $v_{k, \mu} \in P_{\text{l.q}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  be such that  $v_{k, \mu} \xrightarrow{\tau} u_{\lambda, \mu}$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Then the Lipschitz constants of  $v_{k, \mu}$  are uniformly bounded and  $v_{k, \mu}$  epi-converges to  $u_{\lambda, \mu}$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . By Theorem 8,  $v_{k, \mu}$  converges uniformly to  $u_{\lambda, \mu}$  on every compact set that does not contain boundary points of  $\text{dom } u_{\lambda, \mu}$ . In particular, let  $D$  be a compact set such that does not contain boundary points of  $\text{dom } u_{\lambda, \mu}$  and

also does not contain boundary points of  $\text{dom } u$ . Since  $u_{\lambda,\mu}$  epi-converges to  $u$  as  $\mu \rightarrow 0$  and  $D$  does not contain boundary points of  $\text{dom } u$ , Theorem 8 implies that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$|u(x) - u_{\lambda,\mu}(x)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

for all  $\mu \leq \delta$  and  $x \in D$ . Similarly, since  $v_{k,\mu}$  converges uniformly to  $u_{\lambda,\mu}$  on  $D$ , there exists  $k_0 > 0$  such that

$$|u_{\lambda,\mu}(x) - v_{k,\mu}(x)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

for all  $k \geq k_0$  and  $x \in D$ . Taking  $\mu \leq \min\{\delta, \tilde{\mu}\}$  and  $k \geq k_0$ , we obtain

$$|u(x) - v_{k,\mu}(x)| \leq |u(x) - u_{\lambda,\mu}(x)| + |u_{\lambda,\mu}(x) - v_{k,\mu}(x)| < \varepsilon$$

for all  $x \in D$ . Thus,  $v_{k,\mu}$  converges uniformly to  $u$  on every compact set  $D$  that does not contain boundary points of  $\text{dom } u_{\lambda,\mu}$  and also does not contain boundary points of  $\text{dom } u$  for  $\mu \leq \tilde{\mu}$ . Then, by (39) and (40), we have

$$Z(u_{\lambda,\mu}) > \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} Z(v_{k,\mu}) + \rho V_n(\text{dom } u)$$

for every  $v_{k,\mu} \in P_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  with  $v_{k,\mu} \xrightarrow{\tau} u_{\lambda,\mu}$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , provided that  $\mu$  is sufficiently small. Since  $V_n$  depends continuously on the domain and  $\text{dom } u_{\lambda,\mu} = \text{dom } u + \mu C$ , it follows that

$$Z(u_{\lambda,\mu}) > \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} Z(v_{k,\mu}) + \frac{\rho}{2} V_n(\text{dom } u_{\lambda,\mu})$$

for sufficiently small  $\mu$  and every  $v_{k,\mu} \in P_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  with  $v_{k,\mu} \xrightarrow{\tau} u_{\lambda,\mu}$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . This shows that if (36) fails for some  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , then it also fails for  $u_{\lambda,\mu}$  for sufficiently small  $\mu > 0$ .

Thus, by proving the following proposition, we complete the proof of Proposition 21, and hence of Proposition 17.

**Proposition 23.** *For every  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $\lambda, \mu > 0$ , we have*

$$Z(u_{\lambda,\mu}) = \sup \left\{ \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} Z(v_k) \mid v_k \in P_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n), v_k \xrightarrow{\tau} u_{\lambda,\mu} \right\}.$$

For simplicity, we denote by  $u$  a function of the form

$$u = \tilde{u} \square \frac{\lambda}{2} (\|\cdot\|^2 + I_{\mu C}),$$

for some  $\lambda, \mu > 0$  and  $\tilde{u} \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Let  $l^i$  and  $l^c$  be piecewise affine functions on  $\text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  such that

$$l^c(x) < u(x) < l^i(x) \tag{41}$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . We will show that for every choice of such  $u$ ,  $l^i$ ,  $l^c$ , and every  $\rho > 0$ , one can construct a function  $v \in P_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  satisfying

$$\text{dom } l^i \subset \text{dom } v \subset \text{dom } l^c$$

and

$$Z(u) \leq Z(v) + \rho V_n(\text{dom } u) \quad \text{and} \quad l^c(x) \leq v(x) \leq l^i(x) \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{42}$$

This shows that for any given  $u$ , there exists  $v \in P_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  arbitrarily close to  $u$  such that  $Z(v)$  is nearly as large as  $Z(u)$ , thereby proving Proposition 23. From now on, we assume that (41) holds and that  $\rho > 0$ .

We note that the arguments leading to the construction of  $v$  are somewhat involved and require several technical steps. Let  $N \subset \text{dom } u$  denote the set of interior points where  $u$  is twice differentiable. By Aleksandrov's theorem [1], we have  $V_n(N) = V_n(\text{dom } u)$ . We now proceed to establish the preliminary results needed for the construction.

**Proposition 24.** Let  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , let  $x_0 \in N$  be such that  $\det D^2 u(x_0) > 0$ , let  $\rho > 0$ , and let  $l^i, l^c$  be the functions satisfying (41). Then there exist  $r(x_0) > 0$ , polytopes  $P_r(x_0)$  containing  $x_0$  in its interior, and functions  $v_r^{x_0} \in P_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  such that

$$Z(u + I_{P_r(x_0)}) \leq Z(v_r^{x_0} + I_{P_r(x_0)}) + \frac{\rho}{2} V_n(P_r(x_0)) \quad (43)$$

and

$$l^c(x) \leq v_r^{x_0}(x) \leq l^i(x) \quad (44)$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $0 < r \leq r(x_0)$ . Moreover, for  $0 < r \leq r(x_0)$ , the function  $v_r^{x_0}$  can be chosen so such that  $u$  and  $v_r^{x_0}$  share a common supporting hyperplane at  $x_0$ , and

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid v_r^{x_0}(x) \geq u(x)\} \subset P_r(x_0), \quad (45)$$

while the polytopes  $P_r(x_0)$  satisfy

$$\text{diam}(P_r(x_0))^n = n^{\frac{n}{2}} V_n(P_r(x_0)). \quad (46)$$

To prove Proposition 24, we compare  $u$  in a neighborhood of  $x_0$  relative to  $\text{dom } u$ , with a suitable restriction of the quadratic function  $v_r^{x_0} + I_{P_r(x_0)}$  that shares a common tangent hyperplane with  $u$  at  $x_0$ . We then show that  $Z(v_r^{x_0} + I_{P_r(x_0)})$  is nearly as large as  $Z(u + I_{P_r(x_0)})$ . However, if  $x_0 \in N$  is a point where  $\det D^2 u(x_0) = 0$ , we instead compare  $u$  with piecewise affine functions.

**Proposition 25.** Let  $u \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , let  $x_0 \in N$  be such that  $\det D^2 u(x_0) = 0$ , let  $\rho > 0$ , and let  $l^i, l^c$  be the functions satisfying (41). Then there exist  $r(x_0) > 0$  and polytopes  $P_r(x_0)$  containing  $x_0$  in its interior such that

$$Z(u + I_{P_r(x_0)}) \leq \frac{\rho}{2} V_n(P_r(x_0)) \quad (47)$$

and

$$l^c(x) \leq v_r^{x_0}(x) \leq l^i(x) \quad (48)$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $0 < r \leq r(x_0)$ , where

$$v_r^{x_0} = l_{x_0} \vee l^c, \quad (49)$$

and  $l_{x_0}$  is the affine function defining the tangent hyperplane to  $u$  at  $x_0$ , coinciding with  $u$  at  $x_0$ . Moreover, for  $0 < r \leq r(x_0)$ , the polytopes  $P_r(x_0)$  satisfy

$$\text{diam}(P_r(x_0))^n = n^{\frac{n}{2}} V_n(P_r(x_0)). \quad (50)$$

The following proposition establishes an “absolute continuity” property of  $Z$ . This relies on the fact that  $u = \tilde{u} \square \frac{\lambda}{2}(\|\cdot\|^2 + I_{\mu C})$  for some  $\tilde{u} \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and  $\lambda, \mu > 0$ , which implies that  $u$  satisfies the property stated in Lemma 9.

**Proposition 26.** Let  $u = \tilde{u} \square \frac{\lambda}{2}(\|\cdot\|^2 + I_{\mu C})$ , where  $\tilde{u} \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ ,  $\lambda > 0$ , and  $0 < \mu < 1$ . There is a constant  $c_{\lambda, \mu}$  depending on the dimension  $n$  and on  $\lambda, \mu$ , such that

$$Z(u + I_{\text{dom } u \cap P}) \leq c_{\lambda, \mu} V_n(\text{dom } u \cap P)$$

for every polytope  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ .

Our approach is to first establish Proposition 24, followed by Proposition 25, and then Proposition 26. Finally, using these propositions, we prove Proposition 23.

#### 4.1 Proof of Proposition 24

Let  $x_0 \in N$  be a point such that  $\det D^2 u(x_0) > 0$  and let  $\rho > 0$ . Because of the equi-affine and vertical translation invariance of  $Z$ , we may assume without loss of generality that

$$x_0 = 0, \quad u(0) = 0, \quad \nabla u(0) = 0, \quad D^2 u(0) = \lambda \operatorname{diag}(1, \dots, 1),$$

so that all eigenvalues of  $D^2 u(0)$  are equal to  $\lambda > 0$ . Let  $t \in (0, 1)$ . Consider quadratic functions  $q_{u,t}^i$  and  $q_{u,t}^c$  defined by

$$q_{u,t}^i(x) = (1+t)\lambda q(x), \quad q_{u,t}^c = (1-t)\lambda q(x),$$

where  $q$  is given by (25). Then

$$q_{u,t}^i(x_0) = u(x_0) = q_{x_0,t}^c(x_0),$$

and both  $q_{u,t}^i$  and  $q_{u,t}^c$  share the same tangent hyperplane as  $u$  at  $x_0$ . In a sufficiently small neighborhood  $V(x_0)$  of  $x_0$ , we have

$$(q_{u,t}^c + I_{V(x_0)})(x) \leq (u + I_{V(x_0)})(x) \leq (q_{u,t}^i + I_{V(x_0)})(x).$$

For simplicity of notation, we denote  $q_{u,t}^i$  by  $q_u$ .

Let  $t > 0$  be sufficiently small such that, if  $\zeta \neq 0$ , we have

$$4\sqrt{t} < 1 - \max \left\{ 0, \left( 1 - \frac{\rho}{4\zeta(2^n \lambda^n)} \right) \right\}^{1/n} \quad (51)$$

and

$$2\sqrt{t} < \left( 1 + \frac{\rho}{4\zeta(2^n \lambda^n)} \right)^{1/n} - 1. \quad (52)$$

Note that  $\rho > 0$  is fixed and does not depend on  $x_0$ , and that, by (51),  $0 < t < \frac{1}{16}$ .

Recall that  $C = [-1, 1]^n$ . Moreover,

$$\operatorname{diam}(C)^n = n^{\frac{n}{2}} V_n(C). \quad (53)$$

Note that for  $r > 0$  sufficiently small the polytope  $rC$  is contained in  $\operatorname{dom} u$  and, by construction,

$$(q_{u,t}^c + I_{rC})(x) \leq (u + I_{rC})(x) \leq (q_u + I_{rC})(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We aim to show that  $Z(q_u + I_{rC})$  is nearly as large as  $Z(u + I_{rC})$  for sufficiently small  $r > 0$ . Consider the convex hull

$$\operatorname{conv}(\operatorname{epi}(u + I_{rC}) \cup \operatorname{epi}(q_u + I_{rC})).$$

By (11), there exists a function in  $\operatorname{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  corresponding to this convex hull, which we will denote by

$$\operatorname{conv}(u + I_{rC}, q_u + I_{rC}),$$

and which differs from  $q_u + I_{rC}$  only near  $x_0$ . We will construct a convex function  $w_r$  using the part of  $\operatorname{conv}(u + I_{rC}, q_u + I_{rC})$ , where it does not coincide with  $q_u + I_{rC}$ , in such a way that  $w_r \xrightarrow{\tau} q_u + I_{rC}$  as  $r \rightarrow 0$ . Then, by the  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuity of  $Z$ , for sufficiently small  $r > 0$ ,  $Z(w_r)$  is close to  $Z(q_u + I_{rC})$ , and the construction ensures that  $Z(u + I_{rC})$  is also close to  $Z(q_u + I_{rC})$ . Finally, we will define  $v_r^{x_0} \in P_{\text{l.q}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  by taking  $(q_u + I_{rC})(x)$  for  $x \in rC$  and using affine and cylinder functions for  $x \notin rC$ . Having described the plan, we now proceed with the construction of  $w_r$ .

Throughout the text, we will use the notation  $[p_1, p_2]$  to denote the closed line segment with endpoints  $p_1$  and  $p_2$ .

**Lemma 27.** *Under the above hypotheses,*

$$Z(u + I_{rC}) \leq Z(q_u + I_{rC}) + \frac{\rho}{4} V_n(rC)$$

for all sufficiently small  $r > 0$ .

*Proof.* Assume, by contradiction, that for arbitrarily small  $r > 0$ ,

$$Z(u + I_{rC}) > Z(q_u + I_{rC}) + \frac{\rho}{4} V_n(rC). \quad (54)$$

**Claim 1.** For  $0 < r < 1$ , define

$$G_r = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \text{conv}(u + I_{rC}, q_u + I_C)(y) \neq (q_u + I_C)(y)\}.$$

Then

$$G_r \subset (1 + 2\sqrt{t}) rC. \quad (55)$$

*Proof:* Let  $p_1 = (y, y_{n+1})$ ,  $y_{n+1} \neq q_u(y)$ , and  $p_2 = (\bar{y}, q_u(\bar{y}))$  such that the segment  $[p_1, p_2]$  lies in the tangent hyperplane to  $q_u$  at  $\bar{y}$ . Write  $\bar{y} = (\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_n)$  and  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ . Then

$$y_{n+1} - (\bar{y}_1^2 + \dots + \bar{y}_n^2) = 2\langle (\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_n), (y_1 - \bar{y}_1, \dots, y_n - \bar{y}_n) \rangle,$$

which implies

$$\|y - \bar{y}\|_2^2 = \|y\|_2^2 - y_{n+1},$$

and for  $y_{n+1} = q_{u,t}^c(y)$ ,

$$\|y - \bar{y}\| = \sqrt{t\|y\|^2} = \sqrt{t}\|y\|. \quad (56)$$

Hence, we have the inclusion

$$\{\text{conv}(q_{u,t}^c(y) + I_{\{(y, q_{u,t}^c(y))\}}, q_u + I_C) \neq q_u + I_C\} \subset y + \frac{\sqrt{t}}{\sqrt{n}}\|y\| C. \quad (57)$$

Since  $q_{u,t}^c(y) \leq (u + I_{rC})(y)$ , combining (56) and (57) yields

$$\{\text{conv}((u + I_{rC})(y) + I_{\{(y, (u + I_{rC})(y))\}}, q_u + I_C) \neq q_u + I_C\} \subset y + \sqrt{t}(1 + 2\sqrt{t}) rC$$

for every  $y \in rC$ . Moreover, since  $y \in rC$  and by (51) we have  $t < \frac{1}{16}$ , this completes the proof of the claim. ■

Note that this claim states that  $\text{conv}(u + I_{rC}, q_u + I_C)$  differs from  $q_u + I_C$  only in a small neighborhood of  $x_0$  when  $r > 0$  is sufficiently small.

Let  $m_r$  be the maximal number of points  $y_1, \dots, y_{m_r} \in C$  for which the translates

$$y_i + (1 + 2\sqrt{t})rC \quad (58)$$

are pairwise disjoint and contained in  $C$ . In particular,

$$m_r \leq \frac{V_n(C)}{V_n((1 + 2\sqrt{t})rC)}.$$

Then

$$m_r V_n((1 + 2\sqrt{t})rC) \rightarrow V_n(C) \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0. \quad (59)$$

Let  $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and consider a quadratic function

$$\bar{q}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i x_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i x_i + \alpha,$$

where  $\gamma_i \geq 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $\beta_i \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ . Define the function  $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\phi(x, y) = (z + x, y + \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i z_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i z_i + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i z_i x_i) = (z + x, y + \ell_z(x)), \quad (60)$$

where

$$\ell_z(x) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i z_i x_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i z_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i z_i \quad (61)$$

is affine in  $x$ . Note that  $\phi(x, \bar{q}(x)) = (z + x, \bar{q}(z + x))$  defines a  $C^1$  map.

For each  $i = 1, \dots, m_r$ , define

$$g_i(x + y_i) = (u + I_{rC} + \ell_{y_i})(x),$$

where  $\ell_{y_i}$  is the affine function associated with  $y_i$  and  $q_u$ , as in (61). Next, define

$$w_r = \text{conv}(g_1, \dots, g_{m_r}, q_u + I_C),$$

where the convex hull is taken in terms of the epi-graphs, i.e.,

$$\text{epi}(w_r) = \text{conv}\left(\text{epi}(g_1) \cup \dots \cup \text{epi}(g_{m_r}) \cup \text{epi}(q_u + I_C)\right).$$

By construction,

$$w_r \xrightarrow{\tau} q_u + I_C$$

as  $r \rightarrow 0$ , and due to (55) and (58),

$$w_r(x + y_i) \leq (u + I_{rC} + \ell_{y_i})(x) \quad (62)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, m_r, x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and sufficiently small  $r > 0$ .

Next, we dissect

$$C \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{m_r} (y_i + rC)$$

into polytopes  $P_1, \dots, P_{k_r}$  whose interiors are disjoint from each  $y_i + rC$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m_r$ . It follows from (62) that the intersections  $(y_i + rC) \cap (y_j + rC)$  are empty for  $i \neq j$ .

Since  $Z$  is a simple, non-negative,  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, and dually epi-translation invariant valuation, we have  $\zeta((1+t)^n \lambda^n) \geq 0$ . Using formulas (27), (29), and by (54), (55), we obtain, for every  $\eta > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} Z(w_r) &= \sum_{i=1}^{m_r} Z(u + I_{rC} + \psi_{y_i}) + \sum_{j=1}^{k_r} Z(w_r + I_{P_j}) \\ &\geq m_r Z(u + I_{rC}) + \frac{Z(q_u + I_C)}{V_n(C)} (V_n(C) - m_r V_n((1 + 2\sqrt{t}) rC)) \\ &\geq Z(q_u + I_C) + m_r \left( Z(q_u + I_{rC}) + \frac{\rho}{4} V_n(rC) \right) - \zeta((1+t)^n \lambda^n) m_r (1 + 2\sqrt{t})^n V_n(rC) \\ &\geq Z(q_u + I_C) + m_r V_n(rC) \left( \frac{\rho}{4} - \zeta((1+t)^n \lambda^n) (1 + 2\sqrt{t})^n + \zeta((1+t)^n \lambda^n) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By (55), we have  $m_r V_n(rC) \leq m_r V_n(G_r)$ , and from (59) it follows that

$$m_r V_n(rC) = m_r V_n(rC) \rightarrow \frac{V_n(C)}{(1 + 2\sqrt{t})^n}$$

as  $r \rightarrow 0$ . Moreover, by (52),

$$2\sqrt{t} < \left(1 + \frac{\rho}{4\zeta(2^n \lambda^n)}\right)^{1/n} - 1,$$

which immediately gives

$$\frac{\rho}{4} - \zeta((1+t)^n \lambda^n)(1 + 2\sqrt{t})^n + \zeta((1+t)^n \lambda^n) > 0,$$

because  $t < 1$  and  $\zeta$  is non-decreasing. Since  $Z$  is  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous and  $w_r$  is  $\tau$ -convergent to  $q_u + I_C$  as  $r \rightarrow 0$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Z(q_u + I_C) &\geq \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} Z(w_r) \\ &\geq Z(q_u + I_C) + \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} m_r V_n(rC) \left( \frac{\rho}{4} - \zeta((1+t)^n \lambda^n)(1 + 2\sqrt{t})^n + \zeta((1+t)^n \lambda^n) \right) \\ &\geq Z(q_u + I_C) + \frac{V_n(C)}{(1 + 2\sqrt{t})^n} \left( \frac{\rho}{4} - \zeta((1+t)^n \lambda^n)(1 + 2\sqrt{t})^n + \zeta((1+t)^n \lambda^n) \right), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, we conclude that

$$Z(u + I_{rC}) \leq Z(q_u + I_{rC}) + \frac{\rho}{4} V_n(rC) \quad (63)$$

holds for sufficiently small  $r > 0$ .  $\square$

The goal is now to construct, for small  $r > 0$ , a function  $v_r \in P_{l,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  that coincides with  $q_u + I_{rC}$  on a smaller subset of  $rC$ , is composed outside this subset of affine and cylinder pieces, and agrees with  $u$  at a prescribed point of  $rC$ .

**Lemma 28.** *For sufficiently small  $r > 0$ , there exists  $v_r \in P_{l,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  such that*

$$(u + I_{rC})(x) \leq (v_r + I_{rC})(x) \leq (q_u + I_{rC})(x)$$

and

$$Z(u + I_{rC}) \leq Z(v_r + I_{rC}) + \frac{\rho}{2} V_n(rC). \quad (64)$$

*Proof.* We first prove that the tangential extension of  $q_u + I_{(1-4\sqrt{t})rC}$  (see (4)) coincides with  $u$  on a subset of  $rC$ .

**Claim 2.** For every  $r$ ,  $0 < r < 1$ , define

$$G_r = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid (q_u + I_{(1-4\sqrt{t})rC})(y) = u(y)\}.$$

Then

$$G_r \subset rC.$$



*Proof:* We proceed as in Claim 1 in Lemma 27. Let  $\bar{y} \in \text{bd}((1 - 4\sqrt{t})rC)$ , and let  $y \in \text{dom } u$  be such that the segment  $[(y, u(y)), (\bar{y}, q_u(\bar{y}))]$  lies in the tangent hyperplane to  $q_u$  at  $\bar{y}$ . Then by (56),

$$\|y - \bar{y}\| \leq \sqrt{t}\|y\|.$$

By assumption,  $\|\bar{y}\| \leq (1 - 4\sqrt{t})r\sqrt{n}$ , and the triangle inequality gives

$$\|y\| \leq \|y - \bar{y}\| + \|\bar{y}\| \leq \sqrt{t}\|y\| + (1 - 4\sqrt{t})r\sqrt{n}.$$

Rearranging, we obtain

$$\|y\| \leq \frac{(1 - 4\sqrt{t})r\sqrt{n}}{1 - \sqrt{t}},$$

and consequently

$$y \in \bar{y} + \sqrt{t} \frac{1 - 4\sqrt{t}}{1 - \sqrt{t}} \sqrt{n} \frac{1 + 2\sqrt{t}}{\sqrt{n}} rC.$$

Recalling that  $\bar{y} \in (1 - 4\sqrt{t})rC$ , and using the fact that  $8t - 2\sqrt{t} + 3 > 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , this completes the proof of the claim.  $\blacksquare$

Now define

$$v_r = (q_u + I_{(1-4\sqrt{t})rC}) \vee l^c, \quad (65)$$

where  $l^c$  is the piecewise affine function chosen in (41). Note that  $v_r \in P_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and since  $Z$  vanishes on cylinder functions, is dually epi-translation invariant and vanishes on indicator functions of polytopes,

$$Z(v_r) = Z(q_u + I_{(1-4\sqrt{t})rC}). \quad (66)$$

By (63), (27), (28) and using that  $Z$  is a simple valuation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} Z(u + I_{rC}) &\leq Z(q_u + I_{rC}) + \frac{\rho}{4} V_n(rC) \\ &= Z(q_u + I_{(1-4\sqrt{t})rC}) \frac{V_n(rC)}{V_n((1 - 4\sqrt{t})rC)} + \frac{\rho}{4} V_n(rC) \\ &= Z(q_u + I_{(1-4\sqrt{t})rC}) + \frac{\rho}{2} V_n(rC) \\ &\quad + V_n(rC) \left( \zeta((1+t)^n \lambda^n) - \frac{\rho}{4} - \zeta((1+t)^n \lambda^n)(1 - 4\sqrt{t})^n \right). \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

By (51), if  $\rho < 4\zeta(2^n \lambda^n)$ , we have

$$4\sqrt{t} < 1 - \left( 1 - \frac{\rho}{4\zeta(2^n \lambda^n)} \right)^{1/n},$$

which together with  $t < \frac{1}{16}$  implies that

$$\zeta((1+t)^n \lambda^n) - \frac{\rho}{4} - \zeta((1+t)^n \lambda^n)(1 - 4\sqrt{t})^n < 0. \quad (68)$$

On the other hand, if  $\rho \geq 4\zeta(2^n \lambda^n)$ , then  $1 - 4\sqrt{t} > 0$ , which again implies

$$\zeta((1+t)^n \lambda^n) - \frac{\rho}{4} - \zeta((1+t)^n \lambda^n)(1 - 4\sqrt{t})^n < 0. \quad (69)$$

Combining (66), (67), (68), and (69), we obtain

$$Z(u + I_{rC}) \leq Z(v_r) + \frac{\rho}{2} V_n(rC),$$

as desired.  $\square$

To complete the proof of Proposition 24, let  $r > 0$  be sufficiently small and define

$$P_r(x_0) = rC \quad \text{and} \quad v_r^{x_0} = v_r. \quad (70)$$

Note that  $v_r^{x_0} \in P_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , and

$$Z(u + I_{P_r(x_0)}) \leq Z(v_r^{x_0} + I_{P_r(x_0)}) + \frac{\rho}{2} V_n(P_r(x_0)).$$

Furthermore, by (65) and (70), and for  $r > 0$  chosen sufficiently small, we have

$$l^c(x) \leq v_r^{x_0}(x) \leq l^i(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

By (53), it follows that

$$\text{diam}(P_r(x_0))^n = n^{\frac{n}{2}} V_n(P_r(x_0)).$$

Therefore, there exists  $r(x_0) > 0$  such that (43), (44), (45), and (46) hold for all  $0 < r \leq r(x_0)$ .

## 4.2 Proof of Proposition 25

Let  $x_0 \in N$  be a point such that  $\det D^2 u(x_0) = 0$  and  $\rho > 0$ . As in the proof of Proposition 24, since  $Z$  is equi-affine and vertical translation invariant, we may assume without loss of generality that

$$x_0 = 0, \quad u(0) = 0, \quad \nabla u(0) = 0. \quad (71)$$

Since  $u$  is twice differentiable at  $x_0$ , by Taylor's expansion we can write, for  $x$  near  $x_0$ ,

$$u(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle Ax, x \rangle + o(\|x\|^2),$$

where  $A$  is a positive semidefinite matrix and  $\frac{o(\|x\|^2)}{\|x\|^2} \rightarrow 0$  as  $\|x\| \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $A$  is symmetric and positive semidefinite, there exist an orthogonal matrix  $U$  and a diagonal matrix  $D = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  with  $\lambda_i \geq 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , such that  $A = UDU^{-1}$ , and this implies that

$$\langle Ax, x \rangle = \langle Dx, x \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i^2.$$

Since  $\det A = 0$ , we have  $\det D = 0$ , which means that there exists  $k \geq 1$  such that, without loss of generality,  $\lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_k = 0$  and  $\lambda_{k+1}, \dots, \lambda_n > 0$ . Consequently, there is an equi-affine map  $\varphi$  such that

$$\lambda_1(u \circ \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(x_0))) = \dots = \lambda_k(u \circ \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(x_0))) = 0$$

and

$$\lambda_{k+1}(u \circ \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(x_0))) = \dots = \lambda_n(u \circ \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(x_0))) = 1.$$

Therefore, without loss of generality, due to the  $\text{SL}_n(\mathbb{R})$  invariance of  $Z$ , we may assume that  $A = \text{diag}(0, \dots, 0, 1, \dots, 1)$ , where the entry 0 appears  $k$  times.

Recall that

$$\text{diam}(C)^n = n^{\frac{n}{2}} V_n(C). \quad (72)$$

Next, consider the quadratic function

$$q_t(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k t x_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=k+1}^n (1+t) x_j^2$$

for  $t > 0$ . Since  $Z$  is non-negative, simple, and  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, and since  $q_t$  is  $\tau$ -convergent to  $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=k+1}^n x_j^2$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$ , we obtain

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} Z(q_t + \mathbf{I}_C) = 0.$$

Hence, for sufficiently small  $t$ ,

$$Z(q_t + \mathbf{I}_C) \leq \frac{\rho V_n(C)}{4(4n)^n}. \quad (73)$$

We assume that  $t$  is chosen to satisfy (73) and  $0 < t < 1$ . Our goal is to show that  $Z(u + \mathbf{I}_{rC})$  is not much larger than  $Z(q_t + \mathbf{I}_{rC})$  for  $r > 0$  sufficiently small.

**Lemma 29.** *For  $r > 0$  sufficiently small,*

$$Z(u + \mathbf{I}_{rC}) \leq \frac{\rho}{2} V_n(rC).$$

*Proof.* Consider the quadratic function

$$\bar{q}_t(x) = \frac{t}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k x_i^2 + \frac{(1+t)}{2} \sum_{j=k+1}^n x_j^2.$$

**Claim.** There exists  $r_1 > 0$  such that for  $0 < r \leq r_1$ ,  $\{u + \mathbf{I}_{rC} = \bar{q}_t\} = \{x_0\}$ . Define

$$G_r = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \text{conv}(u + \mathbf{I}_{rC}, \bar{q}_t + \mathbf{I}_C)(y) \neq (\bar{q}_t + \mathbf{I}_C)(y)\}.$$

Then

$$G_r \subset 4nrC.$$

*Proof:* First, note that

$$\frac{t}{4} \sum_{i=1}^k x_i^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=k+1}^n x_j^2 \leq q_t(x) \leq \frac{3t}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k x_i^2 + \frac{(1+tn)}{2} \sum_{j=k+1}^n x_j^2. \quad (74)$$

Let  $(y, 0)$  be a point in  $\mathbb{R}^n = H(x_0, (\bar{q}_t + \mathbf{I}_C)(x_0))$ , the hyperplane tangent to  $\bar{q}_t$  at  $x_0$ . Denote by

$$\text{dist}((y, 0), \text{epi}(\bar{q}_t + \mathbf{I}_C)) = \inf \{ \| (y, 0) - (x, (\bar{q}_t + \mathbf{I}_C)(x)) \| : x \in C \}$$

the distance from  $(y, 0)$  to the epi-graph of  $\bar{q}_t + \mathbf{I}_C$ . Since  $\bar{q}_t$  is convex,

$$\text{dist}((y, 0), \text{epi}(\bar{q}_t + \mathbf{I}_C)) \geq \text{dist}((y, 0), H(y, \bar{q}_t(y))).$$

As the angle between  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $H(y, \bar{q}_t(y))$  tends to 0 as  $\|y\| \rightarrow 0$ , it follows that

$$\text{dist}((y, 0), H(y, \bar{q}_t(y))) \geq \frac{1}{2} \bar{q}_t(y)$$

for  $\|y\|$  sufficiently small. Hence,

$$\text{dist}((y, 0), H(y, \bar{q}_t(y))) \geq \frac{t}{8} \sum_{i=1}^k y_i^2 + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=k+1}^n y_j^2 \geq \frac{t}{8} \|y\|^2 \quad (75)$$

holds for  $\|y\|$  sufficiently small.

By (71), we can represent  $u$  in a neighborhood of the origin as

$$u(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=k+1}^n x_j^2 + o(\|x\|^2),$$

where  $\frac{o(\|x\|^2)}{\|x\|^2} \rightarrow 0$  as  $\|x\| \rightarrow 0$ . By convexity of  $u$ , there exists  $r_1 > 0$  such that

$$u(x) \geq \frac{(1-t)}{2} \sum_{j=k+1}^n x_j^2 \quad (76)$$

for  $\|x\| \leq r_1$ .

As in the proof of Claim 1 in Lemma 27, let  $y \in rC$  and let  $(\bar{y}, \bar{q}_t(\bar{y}))$  be such that  $[(y, (u + I_{rC})(y)), (\bar{y}, \bar{q}_t(\bar{y}))]$  lies in the hyperplane tangent to  $\bar{q}_t$  at  $\bar{y}$ . By (74), (76), and the inequality  $\text{dist}((y, (u + I_{rC})(y)), \text{epi}(\bar{q}_t + I_C)) \leq \bar{q}_t(y) - (u + I_{rC})(y)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}((y, (u + I_{rC})(y)), \text{epi}(\bar{q}_t + I_C)) &\leq \frac{3t}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k y_i^2 + \left( \frac{(1+tn)}{2} - \frac{(1-t)}{2} \right) \sum_{j=k+1}^n y_j^2 \\ &\leq \frac{(n+1)t}{2} \|y\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

Since  $[(y, (u + I_{rC})(y)), (\bar{y}, \bar{q}_t(\bar{y}))]$  is tangent to  $\bar{q}_t$  at  $\bar{y}$ , we can apply (75) to  $\bar{y}$  instead of  $x_0$ , and obtain

$$\text{dist}((y, (u + I_{rC})(y)), \text{epi}(\bar{q}_t + I_C)) \geq \frac{t}{8} \|y - \bar{y}\|^2. \quad (78)$$

Combining (77) and (78) with  $y \in rC$ , we deduce

$$\|y - \bar{y}\|^2 \leq \frac{8}{t} \text{dist}((y, (u + I_{rC})(y)), \text{epi}(\bar{q}_t + I_C)) \leq 4(n+1)nr^2.$$

By the previous inequality, we deduce that

$$\bar{y} \in y + 4\sqrt{n+1}rC \subset rC + 4\sqrt{n+1}rC = (1 + 4\sqrt{n+1})rC \subset 4nrC.$$

This completes the proof of the claim. ■

Let  $m_r$  be the maximal number of points  $y_1, \dots, y_{m_r} \in C$  such that the sets  $y_i + 8nrC$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m_r$ , form part of a partition of  $C$ . As before, we define

$$g_i(x + y_i) = (u + I_{rC} + \ell_{y_i})(x),$$

and

$$w_r = \text{conv}(g_1, \dots, g_{m_r}, \bar{q}_t + I_C),$$

where  $\ell_{y_i}$  are the affine functions given by (61) which satisfy (60). This construction implies that

$$w_r \xrightarrow{\tau} \bar{q}_t + I_C \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0.$$

Moreover,

$$m_r \leq \frac{V_n(C)}{V_n(8nrC)}$$

and

$$w_r(x + y_i) \leq (u + I_{rC} + \ell_{y_i})(x)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, m_r$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $r > 0$  sufficiently small. By construction, the intersection of  $y_i + rC$  and  $y_j + rC$  for  $i \neq j$  is either empty or at most an  $(n-1)$ -dimensional polytope. Since  $Z$  is

a non-negative, simple, and dually epi-translation invariant valuation, it follows that for every  $r > 0$  sufficiently small,

$$Z(w_r) \geq m_r Z(u + I_{rC}),$$

and using that  $Z$  is  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous, we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Z(\bar{q}_t + I_C) &\geq \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} Z(w_r) \\ &\geq \limsup_{r \rightarrow 0} \frac{V_n(C)}{V_n(8nrC)} Z(u + I_{rC}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for every  $\eta > 0$ ,

$$\frac{V_n(C)}{V_n(8nrC)} Z(u + I_{rC}) \leq Z(\bar{q}_t + I_C) + \eta,$$

that is,

$$Z(u + I_{rC}) \leq \frac{V_n(8nrC)}{V_n(C)} (Z(\bar{q}_t + I_C) + \eta)$$

for  $r > 0$  sufficiently small.

By (73), using that  $Z$  is dually-epi translation invariant and applying the Claim, we find

$$\begin{aligned} Z(u + I_{rC}) &\leq \frac{V_n(8nrC)}{V_n(C)} \left( \frac{\rho V_n(C)}{4(4n)^n} + \eta \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\rho}{4} V_n(rC) + \frac{\eta V_n(8nrC)}{V_n(C)} \\ &= V_n(rC) \left( \frac{\rho}{4} + \frac{\eta (8n)^n}{V_n(C)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing  $\eta = \frac{\rho V_n(C)}{4(8n)^n}$ , we obtain

$$Z(u + I_{rC}) \leq \frac{\rho}{2} V_n(rC) \tag{79}$$

for  $r > 0$  sufficiently small. □

To conclude the proof, let  $r > 0$  be sufficiently small and set

$$P_r(x_0) = rC.$$

Consider the following element of  $P_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$

$$v_r^{x_0} = l_{x_0} \vee l^c,$$

where  $l_{x_0}$  is the affine function parametrizing the tangent hyperplane to  $u$  at  $x_0$  and coinciding with  $u$  at this point, while  $l^c$  is the function chosen in (41). Clearly,

$$l^c(x) \leq v_r^{x_0}(x) \leq l^i(x)$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Since  $Z$  is  $SL_n(\mathbb{R})$  and dually epi-translation invariant, and vanishes on indicator functions of polytopes, combining these properties with (79) yields

$$Z(u + I_{P_r(x_0)}) \leq \frac{\rho}{2} V_n(P_r(x_0)),$$

for all sufficiently small  $r > 0$ . Moreover, by (72),

$$\text{diam}(P_r(x_0))^n = n^{\frac{n}{2}} V_n(P_r(x_0)).$$

Hence, there exists  $r(x_0) > 0$  such that (47), (48), (49), and (50) hold for every  $0 < r \leq r(x_0)$ .

### 4.3 Proof of Proposition 26

Let

$$u = \tilde{u} \square \frac{\lambda}{2} (\|\cdot\|^2 + \mathbf{I}_{\mu C}), \quad \tilde{u} \in \text{Conv}_{\text{lp}}(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad \lambda > 0, 1 > \mu > 0.$$

By Lemma 9, there exists  $y_0 \in \text{dom } \tilde{u}$  such that the quadratic function

$$q_{x_0}(x) = \tilde{u}(y_0) + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|x - y_0\|^2$$

has the property that its graph touches the graph of  $u$ , restricted to  $\text{dom } u$ , at the point  $(x_0, u(x_0))$  with  $x_0 \in \text{dom } u$ . Moreover,  $q_{x_0}(x) \geq u(x)$  for all  $x \in y_0 + \mu C$ , and also  $x_0 \in y_0 + \mu C$ . This implies that there exists a cube  $rC$  with sufficiently small  $0 < r < \mu$  and a point  $p_r \in \text{int}(\text{dom } u)$  such that  $x_0 \in p_r + rC \subset y_0 + \mu C$  and the epi-graph of  $q_{x_0} + \mathbf{I}_{\text{dom } u \cap (p_r + rC)}$  is contained in the epi-graph of  $u$ . If  $x_0 \in \text{int}(\text{dom } u)$ , we may simply take  $p_r = x_0$ . Otherwise, if  $x_0 \in \text{bd dom } u$ , then  $x_0 \in \text{bd}(p_r + rC)$ . This second condition holds because  $x_0 \in y_0 + \mu C$  and  $y_0 \in \text{dom } \tilde{u}$ , which for  $x_0 \in \text{bd dom } u$  implies that  $x_0 \in \text{bd}(y_0 + \mu C)$ .

Let  $\tau_{y_0}(x) = x - y_0$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Note that

$$q_\lambda(x) = q_{x_0} \circ \tau_{y_0}^{-1}(x) - \tilde{u}(y_0) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2.$$

Moreover,  $y_0 + \mu C \subset y_0 + C$ , which implies  $\tau_{y_0}(x_0) \in \tau_{y_0}(p_r + rC) \subset \tau_{y_0}(y_0 + C) = C$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume  $\tilde{u}(y_0) = 0$ .

Arguing similarly to Claim 1 of Lemma 27, we show that the function

$$\text{conv}(u \circ \tau_{y_0}^{-1} + \mathbf{I}_{\tau_{y_0}(\text{dom } u \cap (p_r + rC))}, q_\lambda + \mathbf{I}_C)$$

coincides with  $q_\lambda + \mathbf{I}_C$  outside a small neighborhood of  $\tau_{y_0}(x_0)$ . Set

$$v_r = u \circ \tau_{y_0}^{-1} + \mathbf{I}_{\tau_{y_0}(\text{dom } u \cap (p_r + rC))}, \quad r > 0.$$

**Claim.** For  $r > 0$  sufficiently small, define

$$G_r = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \text{conv}(v_r, q_\lambda + \mathbf{I}_C)(y) \neq (q_\lambda + \mathbf{I}_C)(y)\}.$$

Then

$$G_r \subset p_r + \tau_{y_0}(3\sqrt{n}rC).$$

*Proof:* Let  $y \in \tau_{y_0}(\text{dom } u \cap (p_r + rC))$  and let  $(\bar{y}, q_\lambda(\bar{y}))$  be such that  $[(\bar{y}, q_\lambda(\bar{y})), (y, v_r(y))]$  is tangent to  $q_\lambda$  at  $\bar{y}$ . This implies

$$\frac{2}{\lambda} v_r(y) + \|\bar{y}\|^2 - 2\langle \bar{y}, y \rangle = 0$$

and

$$\|y - \bar{y}\| = \sqrt{\|y\|^2 - \frac{2}{\lambda} v_r(y)}.$$

Moreover, since  $(y, v_r(y))$  lies between the affine function associated with a subgradient of  $v_r$  at  $\tau_{y_0}(x_0)$  (which agrees with the gradient of  $q_\lambda$  at  $\tau_{y_0}(x_0)$ ) and the epi-graph of  $q_\lambda$ , we have

$$\text{dist}((y, v_r(y)), \text{epi}(q_\lambda)) \leq \text{dist}(\{y\} \times \mathbb{R} \cap H(\tau_{y_0}(x_0), v_r(\tau_{y_0}(x_0))), (y, q_\lambda(y))) \leq \frac{\lambda}{2} \|y - \tau_{y_0}(x_0)\|^2.$$

Thus,

$$\|y - \bar{y}\| \leq \sqrt{\|y\|^2 - \frac{2}{\lambda} v_r(y)} \leq \sqrt{\|y\|^2 - \frac{2}{\lambda} \left( \frac{\lambda}{2} \|y\|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \|y - \tau_{y_0}(x_0)\|^2 \right)} = \|y - \tau_{y_0}(x_0)\|.$$

We conclude that

$$G_r \subset y + 2\sqrt{n}rC \subset p_r + \tau_{y_0}(rC) + 2\sqrt{n}rC \subset p_r + \tau_{y_0}(3\sqrt{n}rC).$$

■

We now construct convex functions  $w_r$  that are  $\tau$ -convergent to  $q_\lambda + I_C$ . Let  $m_r$  be the maximum number of points  $y_1, \dots, y_{m_r} \in C$  such that the sets

$$y_i + (p_r + \tau_{y_0}(3\sqrt{n}rC)) \cap C, \quad i = 1, \dots, m_r, \quad (80)$$

form part of a partition of  $C$ . Consider the affine functions  $\ell_{y_1}, \dots, \ell_{y_{m_r}}$ , given by (61), associated to  $y_i$  and  $q_\lambda$ , respectively. Define

$$g_i(y + y_i) = (v_r + \ell_{y_i})(y),$$

and

$$w_r = \text{conv} \left( g_1 + I_{(-y_1 + \tau_{y_0}(\text{dom } u \cap (p_r + rC)))}, \dots, g_{m_r} + I_{(-y_{m_r} + \tau_{y_0}(\text{dom } u \cap (p_r + rC)))}, q_\lambda + I_C \right).$$

Then  $w_r \xrightarrow{\tau} q_\lambda + I_C$  as  $r \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $Z$  is a  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous valuation, this implies that

$$Z(q_\lambda + I_C) \geq \frac{1}{2}Z(w_r) \quad (81)$$

for  $0 < r \leq r_1(\lambda)$  with some suitable  $r_1(\lambda) > 0$ .

By (80) and the Claim, we also have

$$w_r(y + y_i) \leq (v_r + \ell_{y_i})(y),$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, m_r$  and all  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Therefore, the intersection of  $-y_i + \tau_{y_0}((p_r + rC) \cap \text{dom } u)$  and  $-y_j + \tau_{y_0}((p_r + rC) \cap \text{dom } u)$  for  $i \neq j$  is either empty or an at most  $(n-1)$ -dimensional polytope. Since  $Z$  is a non-negative, simple, and dually epi-translation invariant valuation, we get

$$Z(w_r) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{m_r} Z(v_r + \ell_{y_i}) = m_r Z(v_r).$$

It follows from this and (81) that

$$Z(v_r) \leq \frac{2}{m_r} Z(q_\lambda + I_C).$$

Since  $m_r V_n((p_r + \tau_{y_0}(3\sqrt{n}rC)) \cap C) \rightarrow V_n(C)$  as  $r \rightarrow 0$ , there exists  $r_2 > 0$  such that

$$m_r V_n(3\sqrt{n}rC) \geq m_r V_n((p_r + \tau_{y_0}(3\sqrt{n}rC)) \cap C) \geq \frac{1}{2} V_n(C) \quad (82)$$

for  $0 < r \leq r_2$ . Hence,

$$Z(v_r) \leq 4(3r)^n (\sqrt{n})^n Z(q_\lambda + I_C). \quad (83)$$

Recall that  $\text{dom } u = Q + \mu C$ , where  $Q = \text{dom } \tilde{u} \in \mathcal{P}^n$  and  $\mu > 0$ . Then

$$\text{dom } u \cap (p_r + rC) = (Q + \mu C) \cap (p_r + rC).$$

Moreover, there are  $z_1 \in Q$  and  $z_2 \in C$  such that  $p_r = z_1 + \mu z_2$ , which implies

$$(z_1 + \mu C) \cap (z_1 + \mu z_2 + rC) \subset (Q + \mu C) \cap (z_1 + \mu z_2 + rC),$$



and consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
V_n(\text{dom } u \cap (p_r + rC)) &\geq V_n((z_1 + \mu C) \cap (z_1 + \mu z_2 + rC)) \\
&= V_n(\mu C \cap (\mu z_2 + rC)) \\
&\geq \frac{r^n}{2^n}
\end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

for  $0 < r \leq r_3(\mu)$ . Using this in (83), and the vertical and horizontal translation invariance of  $Z$ , and (29), we obtain

$$Z(u + I_{\text{dom } u \cap (p_r + rC)}) = Z(v_r) \leq 2^{3n+2}(\sqrt{n})^n Z(q_\lambda + I_C) V_n(\text{dom } u \cap (p_0 + rC)) \tag{85}$$

for  $0 < r < \min\{r_1(\lambda), r_2, r_3(\mu)\}$ .

Let  $x_0 \in \text{dom } u$  and let  $0 < r < \min\{r_1(\lambda), r_2, r_3(\mu)\}$  be such that (85) holds. For each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  define

$$v_{r,k} = u \circ \tau_{y_0}^{-1} + I_{\tau_{y_0}(\text{dom } u \cap (p_r + (1 + \frac{1}{k})rC))}.$$

By construction  $v_{r,k}$  is  $\tau$ -convergent to  $v_r$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . Since  $Z$  is  $\tau$ -upper semicontinuous we obtain

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} Z(v_{r,k}) \leq Z(v_r).$$

Hence, for any fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $k_0$  such that for all  $k \geq k_0$ ,

$$Z(v_{r,k}) \leq Z(v_r) + \varepsilon.$$

Combining this with the estimate previously obtained for  $Z(v_r)$  yields that for  $k$  large enough

$$\begin{aligned}
Z(u + I_{\text{dom } u \cap (p_r + (1 + \frac{1}{k})rC)}) &= Z(v_{r,k}) \\
&\leq Z(v_r) + 2^{3n+2}(\sqrt{n})^n Z(q_\lambda + I_C) V_n(\text{dom } u \cap (p_r + rC)) \\
&\leq 2^{3(n+1)}(\sqrt{n})^n Z(q_\lambda + I_C) V_n(\text{dom } u \cap (p_r + (1 + \frac{1}{k})rC)).
\end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

Note that  $x_0 \in \text{dom } u$  is an interior point of  $p_r + (1 + \frac{1}{k})rC$ , since the cube has been strictly enlarged from  $r$  to  $(1 + \frac{1}{k})r$ .

For an arbitrary polytope  $P$ , let  $U$  be an open set such that

$$\text{dom } u \cap P \subset U, \tag{87}$$

and

$$V_n(U) \leq 2V_n(\text{dom } u \cap P). \tag{88}$$

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the family of closed cubes  $\bar{C} = \bar{C}(x, \bar{r})$  with center  $x \in \text{int}(\text{dom } u) \cap P$  and side length  $2\bar{r}$ , where  $\bar{r} = \left(1 + \frac{1}{k_x}\right)r$  and  $0 < r < \frac{1}{(1+2\sqrt{n})} \min\{r_1(\lambda), r_2, r_3(\mu)\}$  for some  $k_x \in \mathbb{N}$  such that (86) holds, and such that  $\text{dom } u \cap \bar{C} \subset U$ . Then the interiors of the cubes  $\bar{C}$  with  $\bar{C} \in \mathcal{C}$  form an open cover of  $\text{dom } u \cap P$ , since by the construction we know that every boundary point of  $\text{dom } u$  is contained as an interior point of some cube of the form  $x_r + \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right)rC$ . Since  $\text{dom } u \cap P$  is compact, we can select a finite subcover, denoted by  $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{C}$ . By a standard argument known as Vitali's Lemma (cf. [20, Lemma 1.9]), we may choose pairwise disjoint cubes  $\bar{C}(x_1, \bar{r}_1), \dots, \bar{C}(x_m, \bar{r}_m)$  from  $\mathcal{L}$  such that

$$\text{dom } u \cap P \subset D = \bigcup_{i=1}^m \bar{C}(x_i, (1 + 2\sqrt{n})\bar{r}_i).$$

Since  $Z$  is non-negative,

$$Z(u + \mathbf{I}_{\text{dom } u \cap D}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^m Z(u + \mathbf{I}_{\text{dom } u \cap \bar{C}(x_i, (1+2\sqrt{n})\bar{r}_i)}), \quad (89)$$

and by (86), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} Z(u + \mathbf{I}_{\text{dom } u \cap D}) &\leq 2^{3(n+1)}(\sqrt{n})^n(1+2\sqrt{n})^n Z(q_\lambda + \mathbf{I}_C) \sum_{i=1}^m V_n(\bar{r}_i C) \\ &= 2^{5n+4}(\sqrt{n})^n(1+2\sqrt{n})^n Z(q_\lambda + \mathbf{I}_C) \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\bar{r}_i}{2}\right)^n. \end{aligned}$$

Since the cubes  $\bar{C}(x_i, \bar{r}_i)$  are pairwise disjoint, we obtain by (84) that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\bar{r}_i}{2}\right)^n \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m V_n(\text{dom } u \cap \bar{C}(x_i, \bar{r}_i)).$$

and by (87) and (88) that

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m V_n(\text{dom } u \cap \bar{C}(x_i, \bar{r}_i)) \leq \frac{1}{2} V_n(U) \leq V_n(\text{dom } u \cap P),$$

Finally, recalling that  $\text{dom } u \cap P \subset D$  and that  $Z$  is non-negative, we complete the proof.

#### 4.4 Proof of Proposition 23

Using Proposition 24, Proposition 25, and Proposition 26, we now construct a function  $v \in P_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$  satisfying

$$Z(u) \leq Z(v) + \rho V_n(\text{dom } u)$$

and

$$l^c(x) \leq v(x) \leq l^i(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

As before, let  $N$  be the set of points in  $\text{int}(\text{dom } u)$  where  $u$  is twice differentiable, and let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the collection of sets  $P_r(x)$  for  $x \in N$  and  $0 < r \leq r(x)$ , where  $P_r(x)$  and  $r(x)$  are defined in Proposition 24 and Proposition 25. By (46) and (50), the collection  $\mathcal{L}$  forms a regular family for  $N$ , and this remains true if we restrict to those sets with  $V_n(P_r(x)) \leq \delta$  for some  $\delta > 0$ .

Now fix  $\eta > 0$  such that

$$\eta \leq \delta \quad \text{and} \quad \eta \leq \frac{\rho}{2c_{\lambda,\mu}} V_n(\text{dom } u),$$

where  $c_{\lambda,\mu}$  is given by Proposition 26. By Vitali's Theorem 7, there exist pairwise disjoint sets  $P_{r_1}(x_1), \dots, P_{r_m}(x_m) \in \mathcal{L}$  such that

$$V_n(\text{dom } u) - \sum_{i=1}^m V_n(P_{r_i}(x_i)) \leq \eta.$$

Let  $v_{r_1}^{x_1}, \dots, v_{r_m}^{x_m}$  be the functions from Proposition 24 and Proposition 25. By (45) and (49), it follows that for  $i \neq j$ , the functions  $v_{r_i}^{x_i}$  and  $v_{r_j}^{x_j}$  do not coincide at points where  $v_{r_i}^{x_i} > u$  and  $v_{r_j}^{x_j} > u$ . Thus, we can choose a piecewise affine function  $l$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  such that

$$l(x) \leq u(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \text{dom } u,$$

and such that, for every pair  $i \neq j$ , there exist polytopes  $\tilde{P}_i \subset \tilde{P}_{ij} \subset \text{dom } u$  with

$$v_{r_i}^{x_i} = l + \text{I}_{\text{dom } u} \text{ on } \text{bd } \tilde{P}_i, \quad v_{r_i}^{x_i} = v_{r_j}^{x_j} \text{ on } \text{bd } \tilde{P}_{ij}.$$

Here,  $\tilde{P}_i \subset \tilde{P}_{ij}$  ensures that  $v_{r_i}^{x_i}$  coincides with  $l + \text{I}_{\text{dom } u}$  before it coincides with  $v_{r_j}^{x_j}$ , which allows us to control the order of interactions and avoid undesired intersections between these functions.

We then define

$$v = \bigvee_{i=1}^m v_{r_i}^{x_i} \vee (l + \text{I}_{\text{dom } u}).$$

This construction ensures that  $v \in P_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , and (44) and (48) imply that  $l^c(x) \leq v(x) \leq l^i(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

Next, we partition

$$\text{dom } u \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^m P_{r_i}(x_i)$$

into polytopes  $Q_1, \dots, Q_k$  so that

$$\text{dom } u = \bigcup_{i=1}^m P_{r_i}(x_i) \cup \bigcup_{s=1}^k Q_s.$$

Since the elements  $P_{r_1}(x_1), \dots, P_{r_m}(x_m)$  of  $\mathcal{L}$  are pairwise disjoint, the intersection of any two distinct sets from the collection  $\{P_{r_i}(x_i)\}_i \cup \{Q_s\}_s$  is either empty or an at most  $(n-1)$ -dimensional polytope contained in the domain of  $u$ . Since  $Z$  is simple, we obtain

$$Z(u) = \sum_{i=1}^m Z(u + \text{I}_{P_{r_i}(x_i)}) + \sum_{s=1}^k Z(u + \text{I}_{\text{dom } u \cap Q_s}).$$

By construction, if  $x_i$  is a point where  $u$  is twice differentiable and  $\det D^2 u(x_i) = 0$ , then  $v_{r_i}^{x_i}$  is a piecewise affine function in  $P_{1,q}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . If instead  $\det D^2 u(x_i) > 0$ , then  $v_{r_i}^{x_i}$  consists of a quadratic function (whose epi-graph is contained in  $\text{epi}(u)$ ), together with pieces of cylinder and piecewise affine functions. Since  $Z$  vanishes on cylinder and piecewise affine functions,

$$Z(v + \text{I}_{P_{r_i}(x_i)}) = Z(v_{r_i}^{x_i} + \text{I}_{P_{r_i}(x_i)}).$$

Furthermore, since each  $v + \text{I}_{Q_s}$  is either a cylinder function or a piecewise affine function for  $s = 1, \dots, k$ , it follows that

$$Z(v) = \sum_{i=1}^m Z(v_{r_i}^{x_i} + \text{I}_{P_{r_i}(x_i)}).$$

Finally, applying Proposition 24, Proposition 25, and Proposition 26, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} Z(u) &= \sum_{i=1}^m Z(u + \text{I}_{P_{r_i}(x_i)}) + \sum_{s=1}^k Z(u + \text{I}_{\text{dom } u \cap Q_s}) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \left( Z(v_{r_i}^{x_i} + \text{I}_{P_{r_i}(x_i)}) + \frac{\rho}{2} V_n(P_{r_i}(x_i)) \right) + c_{\lambda, \mu} \sum_{s=1}^k V_n(\text{dom } u \cap Q_s) \\ &\leq Z(v) + \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\rho}{2} V_n(P_{r_i}(x_i)) + c_{\lambda, \mu} \eta \\ &\leq Z(v) + \frac{\rho}{2} V_n(\text{dom } u) + c_{\lambda, \mu} \frac{\rho}{2c_{\lambda, \mu}} V_n(\text{dom } u) \\ &= Z(v) + \rho V_n(\text{dom } u). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (42) holds, completing the proof of Proposition 23 and, consequently, Theorem 2.

## Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to Monika Ludwig for her invaluable help in discussions, for her careful reading of the manuscript, and for her insightful suggestions. This project was supported, in part, by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) Grant-DOI: 10.55776/P34446 and Grant-DOI: 10.55776/P37030. For open access purposes, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright license to any author-accepted manuscript version arising from this submission.

## References

- [1] A. D. Aleksandrov, *Almost everywhere existence of the second differential of a convex function and some properties of convex surfaces connected with it (in Russian)*, Uch. Zap. Leningrad. Gos. Univ., Math. Ser. **6** (1939), 3–35. [Page 1](#), [2](#), [24](#)
- [2] S. Alesker, *Continuous rotation invariant valuations on convex sets*, Ann. Math. **149** (1999), 977–1005. [Page 2](#)
- [3] S. Artstein-Avidan, B. Klartag, C. Schütt, and E. M. Werner, *Functional affine-isoperimetry and an inverse logarithmic Sobolev inequality*, J. Funct. Anal. **262** (2012), 4181–4204. [Page 2](#)
- [4] V. Balestro, H. Martini, and R. Teixeira, *Convexity from the Geometric Point of View*, Birkhäuser Cham, 2024. [Page 7](#)
- [5] H. H. Bauschke and P. L. Combettes, *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*, CMS Books in Mathematics, Springer, New York, 2011. [Page 8](#)
- [6] F. M. Baêta, *Upper semicontinuous valuations on convex functions of one variable*, 2025, arXiv: 2510.05796. [Page 3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [11](#), [12](#), [14](#), [17](#)
- [7] F. M. Baêta and M. Ludwig, *On the semicontinuity of functionals on function spaces*, 2025, arXiv:2509.17426. [Page 3](#), [4](#), [10](#), [11](#)
- [8] A. Beck, *First-order Methods in Optimization*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 2017. [Page 6](#)
- [9] W. Blaschke, *Differentialgeometrie II: Affine Differentialgeometrie*, Springer, Berlin, 1923. [Page 1](#)
- [10] U. Caglar, M. Fradelizi, O. Guédon, J. Lehec, C. Schütt, and E. Werner, *Functional versions of  $L_p$ -affine surface area and entropy inequalities*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2016), 1223–1250. [Page 2](#)
- [11] A. Colesanti and I. Fragalà, *The first variation of the total mass of log-concave functions and related inequalities*, Adv. Math. **244** (2013), 708–749. [Page 7](#)
- [12] A. Colesanti, M. Ludwig, and F. Mussnig, *Minkowski valuations on convex functions*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **56** (2017), Art. 162. [Page 2](#)
- [13] ———, *Valuations on convex functions*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2019), 2384–2410. [Page 2](#)
- [14] ———, *Hessian valuations*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **69** (2020), 1275–1315. [Page 2](#), [7](#)
- [15] ———, *A homogeneous decomposition theorem for valuations on convex functions*, J. Funct. Anal. **279** (2020), 108573. [Page 2](#)
- [16] ———, *The Hadwiger theorem on convex functions, IV: The Klain approach*, Adv. Math. **413** (2023), Art. 108832. [Page 2](#)

- [17] ———, *The Hadwiger theorem on convex functions, I*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **34** (2024), 1839–1898. [Page 2](#)
- [18] A. Colesanti, D. Pagnini, P. Tradacete, and I. Villanueva, *A class of invariant valuations on  $\text{Lip}(S^{n-1})$* , Adv. Math. **366** (2020), Art. 107069. [Page 3](#)
- [19] ———, *Continuous valuations on the space of Lipschitz functions on the sphere*, J. Funct. Anal. **280** (2021), Art. 108873. [Page 3](#)
- [20] K. Falconer, *The Geometry of Fractal Sets*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1985. [Page 5](#), [37](#)
- [21] A. Figalli, *The Monge–Ampère Equation and Its Applications*, Zürich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics, European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, Switzerland, 2017. [Page 6](#), [11](#)
- [22] C. Haberl, *Star body valued valuations*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **58** (2009), 2253–2276. [Page 2](#)
- [23] C. Haberl and M. Ludwig, *A characterization of  $L_p$  intersection bodies*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2006), no. 17, Art. ID 10548, 29 pp. [Page 2](#)
- [24] C. Haberl and L. Parapatits, *The centro-affine Hadwiger theorem*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **27** (2014), 685–705. [Page 2](#)
- [25] H. Hadwiger, *Vorlesungen über Inhalt, Oberfläche und Isoperimetrie*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin–Göttingen–Heidelberg, 1957. [Page 1](#), [2](#)
- [26] D. A. Klain and G.-C. Rota, *Introduction to Geometric Probability*, Lezioni Lincee, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997. [Page 2](#)
- [27] J. Knoerr, *The support of dually epi-translation invariant valuations on convex functions*, J. Funct. Anal. **281** (2021), Art. 109059. [Page 2](#)
- [28] J. Knoerr and J. Ulivelli, *From valuations on convex bodies to convex functions*, Math. Ann. **390** (2024), 5987–6011. [Page 2](#), [9](#)
- [29] B. Li, C. Schütt, and E. M. Werner, *Floating functions*, Isr. J. Math. **231** (2019), 181–210. [Page 2](#)
- [30] M. Ludwig, *A characterization of affine length and asymptotic approximation of convex discs*, Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg **69** (1999), 75–88. [Page 2](#)
- [31] ———, *On the semicontinuity of curvature*, Math. Nachr. **227** (2001), 99–108. [Page 2](#)
- [32] ———, *Geometric valuation theory*, European Congress of Mathematics, EMS Press, 2023, pp. 93–123. [Page 2](#)
- [33] M. Ludwig and M. Reitzner, *A characterization of affine surface area*, Adv. Math. **147** (1999), 138–172. [Page 2](#), [12](#), [14](#)
- [34] ———, *A classification of  $\text{SL}(n)$  invariant valuations*, Ann. Math. **172** (2010), 1223–1271. [Page 2](#)
- [35] E. Lutwak, *Extended affine surface area*, Adv. Math. **85** (1991), 39–68. [Page 1](#), [2](#)
- [36] P. McMullen, *Valuations and dissections*, Handbook of Convex Geometry, B, North-Holland, 1993, pp. 933–988. [Page 2](#)
- [37] P. McMullen and R. Schneider, *Valuations on convex bodies*, Convexity and its Applications, Birkhäuser, 1983, pp. 170–247. [Page 2](#), [5](#)

- [38] M. A. Mouamine, *Additive kinematic formulas for functional Minkowski vectors*, 2025, arXiv: 2508.07984. [Page 2](#)
- [39] M. A. Mouamine and F. Mussnig, *A Klain–Schneider theorem for vector-valued valuations on convex functions*, 2025, arXiv: 2503.07287. [Page 2](#)
- [40] ———, *The vectorial Hadwiger theorem on convex functions*, 2025, arXiv: 2504.04952. [Page 2](#)
- [41] F. Mussnig, *Volume, polar volume and euler characteristic for convex functions*, *Advances in Mathematics* **344** (2019), 340–373. [Page 2](#)
- [42] R. T. Rockafellar, *Convex Analysis*, Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1997. [Page 11](#)
- [43] R. T. Rockafellar and R. J.-B. Wets, *Variational Analysis*, 3rd ed., Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 317, Springer, 2009. [Page 3](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [11](#)
- [44] R. Schneider, *Convex Bodies: the Brunn-Minkowski Theory*, expanded ed., *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*, vol. 151, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014. [Page 6](#), [9](#)
- [45] C. Schütt, C. Thaele, N. Turchi, and E. M. Werner, *Weighted floating functions and weighted functional affine surface areas*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **378** (2025), 8593–8623. [Page 2](#)
- [46] C. Schütt, *On the affine surface area*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **118** (1993), 1213–1218. [Page 1](#)
- [47] C. Schütt and E. Werner, *The convex floating body*, *Math. Scand.* **66** (1990), 275–290. [Page 1](#), [2](#)
- [48] C. Schütt and E. M. Werner, *Affine Surface Area*, *Harmonic Analysis and Convexity*, *Adv. Anal. Geom.*, De Gruyter, Berlin, 2023, pp. 427–444. [Page 2](#)
- [49] N. S. Trudinger and X.-J. Wang, *The Bernstein problem for affine maximal hypersurfaces*, *Invent. Math.* **140** (2000), 399–422. [Page 2](#)
- [50] N. S. Trudinger and X.-J. Wang, *The Monge–Ampère equation and its geometric applications*, *Handbook of Geometric Analysis*. No. 1, *Adv. Lect. Math. (ALM)*, vol. 7, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2008, pp. 467–524. MR 2483373 [Page 6](#)