arXiv:1607.08125v1 [math.MG] 27 Jul 2016

Hunting for reduced polytopes

Bernardo González Merino[*†] Thomas Jahn[‡]
Gerd Wachsmuth[§]

July 28, 2016

By correcting an example by Polyanskii, we show that there exist reduced polytopes in three-dimensional Euclidean space. This partially answers the question posed by Lassak [10] on the existence of reduced polytopes in d-dimensional Euclidean space for $d \geq 3$.

Keywords: polytope, reducedness
MSC(2010): 52B10

1 Introduction

Constant width bodies, i.e., convex bodies for which parallel supporting hyperplanes have constant distance, have a long and rich history in mathematics [5]. Due to Meissner [20], constant width bodies in Euclidean space can be characterized by *diametrical completeness*, that is, the property of not being properly contained in a set of the same diameter. Constant width bodies also belong to a related class of *reduced* convex bodies introduced by Heil [8]. This means that constant width bodies do not properly contain a convex body of same minimum width. Remarkably, the classes of reduced bodies and constant width bodies do not coincide, as a regular triangle in the Euclidean plane shows.
Reduced bodies are extremal in remarkable inequalities for prescribed minimum width, as in Steinhagen's inequality [5] (minimum inradius), or others that surprisingly still remain unsolved, namely, Pál's problem [21] (minimum volume). While the regular simplex (and any of its reduced subsets) is extremal for Steinhagen's, it is extremal only in the planar case for Pál's problem. The reason is that while the regular triangle is reduced,

[*]TU Munich, Zentrum Mathematik, bg.merino@tum.de
[†]The first author is partially supported by Consejería de Industria, Turismo, Empresa e Innovación de la CARM through Fundación Séneca, Agencia de Ciencia y Tecnología de la Región de Murcia, Programa de Formación Postdoctoral de Personal Investigador 19769/PD/15 and project 19901/GERM/15, Programme in Support of Excellence Groups of the Región de Murcia, and by MINECO project reference MTM2015-63699-P, Spain.
[‡]TU Chemnitz, Faculty of Mathematics, thomas.jahn@mathematik.tu-chemnitz.de
[§]TU Chemnitz, Faculty of Mathematics, gerd.wachsmuth@mathematik.tu-chemnitz.de

this is no longer the case for the regular simplex in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 3$. Indeed, Heil conjectured [8] that a certain reduced subset of the regular simplex is extremal for Pál's problem. Heil also observed that some reduced body has to be extreme for Pál's problem when replacing volume by quermassintegral. The existence of reduced polytopes, and the fact that smooth reduced sets are of constant width (cf. [8]), opens the door to conjecture some of them as minimizers. In full generality, any non-decreasing-inclusion functional of convex bodies with prescribed minimum width, attains its minimum at some reduced body. Pál's problem restricted to constant width sets is the well-known Blaschke-Lebesgue problem, cf. [5], solved only in the planar case, where the Reuleaux triangle is the minimizer of the area, and Meissner's bodies are conjectured to be extremal in the three-dimensional space, see [15, pp. 216, 217] for an extended discussion. Note that Pál's problem has also been investigated in other geometrical settings such as Minkowskian planes [1] or spherical geometry, cf. [4, pp. 96, 97] and [17].
Reduced bodies in the Euclidean space have been extensively studied in [10, 11, 15], and the concept of reducedness has been translated to finite-dimensional normed spaces [13, 14, 16]. In reference to the existence of reduced polygons in the Euclidean plane, Lassak [10] posed the question whether there exist reduced polytopes in Euclidean d-space for $d \geq 3$. Several authors addressed the search for reduced polytopes in finite-dimensional normed spaces [2, 3, 12, 18, 19]. For Euclidean space starting from dimension 3 several classes of polytopes such as

- polytopes in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $d+2$ vertices, $d+2$ facets, or more vertices than facets [3, Corollary 7],
- centrally symmetric polytopes [14, Claim 2],
- simple polytopes, i.e., polytopes in $\mathbb{R}^d$ where each vertex is incident to d edges (like polytopal prisms, for instance) [3, Corollary 8],
- pyramids with polytopal base [2, Theorem 1], and in particular simplices [18, 19],
- polytopes in $\mathbb{R}^3$ which have a vertex v with a strictly antipodal facet F (see Definition 2.1) such that the edges and facets incident to v are strictly antipodal to the edges and vertices of F, respectively, see [22, Theorem 2],

were proved to be *not* reduced. The theoretical results on reduced polytopes in $\mathbb{R}^3$ in the mentioned preprint [22] by Polyanskii are accompanied with an unfortunately erroneous example, as we will show in Section 3. The purpose of the present article is to fix Polyanskii's polytope and to present a reduced polytope in three-dimensional Euclidean space in Section 4. The validity of our example can be checked using the algorithm provided in Section 5.

2 Notation and basic results

Throughout this paper, we work in d-dimensional Euclidean space, that is, the vector space $\mathbb{R}^d$ equipped with the inner product $\langle x \,|\, y \rangle := \sum_{i=1}^{d} x_i y_i$ and the norm $\|x\| := \sqrt{\langle x \,|\, x \rangle}$,

where $x=(x_1,\ldots,x_d)$ and $y=(y_1,\ldots,y_d)$ denote two points in $\mathbb{R}^d$. A subset $K\subseteq\mathbb{R}^d$ is said to be *convex* if the line segment

$$[x,y]:=\{\lambda x+(1-\lambda)y\,:\,0\leq\lambda\leq 1\} \tag{1}$$

is contained in K for all choices of $x,y\in K$. Convex compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$ having non-empty interior are called *convex bodies*. The smallest convex superset of $K\subseteq\mathbb{R}^d$ is called its *convex hull* $\mathrm{co}(K)$, whereas the smallest affine subspace of $\mathbb{R}^d$ containing K is denoted by $\mathrm{aff}(K)$, the *affine hull* of K. The *affine dimension* $\dim(K)$ of K is the dimension of its affine hull. The *support function* $h(K,\cdot):\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}$ of K is defined by

$$h(K,u):=\sup\{\langle u\,|\,x\rangle\,:\,x\in K\}. \tag{2}$$

For $u\in\mathbb{R}^d\setminus\{0\}$, the hyperplane $H(K,u):=\left\{x\in\mathbb{R}^d\,:\,\langle u\,|\,x\rangle=h(K,u)\right\}$ is a *supporting hyperplane* of K. The *width* of K in direction $u\in\mathbb{R}^d$, defined by

$$w(K,u):=h(K,-u)+h(K,u) \tag{3}$$

equals the distance of the supporting hyperplanes $H(K,\pm u)$ multiplied by $\|u\|$. The *minimum width* of K is $\omega(K):=\inf\{w(K,u)\,:\,\|u\|=1\}$. A *polytope* is the convex hull of finitely many points. The boundary of a polytope consists of *faces*, i.e., intersections of the polytope with its supporting hyperplanes. We shall refer to faces of affine dimension 0, 1, and $d-1$ as *vertices*, *edges*, and *facets*, respectively. Faces of polytopes are lower-dimensional polytopes and shall be denoted by the list of their vertices. (A face which is denoted in this way can be reconstructed by taking the convex hull of its vertices.) By definition, attainment of the minimal width of a polytope P is related to a binary relation on faces of P called *strict antipodality*, see [2].

Definition 2.1. Let $P\subseteq\mathbb{R}^d$ be a polytope. Distinct faces F_1, F_2 of P are said to be *strictly antipodal* if there exists a direction $u\in\mathbb{R}^d$, $\|u\|=1$, such that $H(P,u)\cap P=F_1$ and $H(P,-u)\cap P=F_2$.

Gritzmann and Klee [7, (1.9)] formulated a necessary condition on strictly antipodal pairs whose distance equals the minimum width.

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose that $P\subseteq\mathbb{R}^d$ is a polytope with non-empty interior, and that F_1 and F_2 are a strictly antipodal pair of faces of P whose distance is equal to $\omega(P)$. Then,*

$$\dim(F_1+F_2)=d-1, \tag{4}$$

with $\dim(F_1)=\dim(F_2)=d-1$ *when P is centrally symmetric.*

By $\rho(F_1,F_2)$ we shall denote the Euclidean distance of a strictly antipodal facets F_1, F_2 of P which, additionally, satisfy (4).
The following definition by Heil [8] is central to the present investigation.

Definition 2.3. A convex body K is said to be *reduced* if we have $\omega(K')<\omega(K)$ for all convex bodies $K'\subsetneq K$.

Reduced polytopes can be characterized using vertex-facet distances, see [3, Theorem 4] and [12, Theorem 1] for the following result.

Theorem 2.4. *A polytope $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is reduced if and only if for every vertex v of P, there exists a strictly antipodal facet F of P such that the distance between v and* aff(F) *equals* $\omega(P)$.

Strongly related, there is also the following necessary condition on the orthogonal projection of a vertex onto one of its strictly antipodal facets at the correct distance, see [2, Lemma 2].

Theorem 2.5. *Assume that $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a reduced polytope. Then for every vertex v of P there exists a facet F of P such that $\{v\}$ is strictly antipodal to F, the orthogonal projection w of v onto* aff(F) *lies in the relative interior of F, and the distance from v to w is equal to* $\omega(P)$.

3 Untangling Polyanskii's polytope ...

In his recent arXiv preprint [22], Polyanskii claims that he has found a reduced polytope in three-dimensional Euclidean space. Unfortunately, his example is invalid. In this section, we revisit Polyanskii's polytope to find its flaw. The polytope P considered by Polyanskii is the convex hull of eight points $v_1 := (1,0,0)$, $v_2 := (-1,0,0)$, $v_3 := (0,1,t)$, $v_4 := (-0,-1,t)$, $v_5 := (0,x,s)$, $v_6 := (0,-x,s)$, $v_7 := (x,0,t-s)$, and $v_8 := (-x,0,t-s)$. For properly chosen parameters $t > s > 0$ and $x > 0$, the points $v_1,\dots,v_8$ are the vertices of P, see Figure 1 for an illustration. Note that P has the same combinatorial structure as Johnson's solid J_{84}.

There are two types of vertices: the four vertices $v_1,\dots,v_4$ are incident to four edges each, and the remaining four vertices $v_5,\dots,v_8$ belong to five edges each. By symmetry, it is sufficient to take one vertex of each group and specify which faces should be strictly antipodal and at distance $\omega(P)$ to the chosen vertices. Polyanskii decides to pair the vertices v_6 and v_4 up with the facets $v_1v_5v_7$ and $v_1v_2v_5$, respectively. Additionally, he also sets the distances between the skew edges v_1v_2 and v_3v_4, and between v_5v_7, v_6v_8 equal to the minimum width of P. Therefore, the parameter t will be this common distance. This yields the four equations formulated in the appendix of [22]. These equations may be manipulated as follows. From $t^2 = 2x^2$ and $t, x > 0$, we get

$$t = \sqrt{2}x. \tag{5}$$

This can be plugged into the equation $\frac{(s+tx)^2}{(s^2+x^2)} = 2x^2$ in order to write s as a function of x, namely

$$s = \frac{2\sqrt{2}x^2}{2x^2-1}. \tag{6}$$

Plugging (5) and (6) in

$$\frac{4(t+s(-2+x))^2x^2}{(-1+x)^2x^2+2s^2(2+(-2+x)x)-2st(2+(-1+x)x)+t^2(1+x^2)} = 2x^2, \tag{7}$$




Figure 1. Polyanskii's polytope with vertex numbers: oblique view (left), top view (middle), front view (right)

we obtain one equation with variable x. This equation is equivalent to the polynomial equation $-12x^6+24x^5+32x^4-80x^3+17x^2+18x+1=0$. Using the relevant solution of this equation, we obtain the parameters

$$x \approx 1.8475014230985, \qquad t \approx 2.6127615690495, \qquad s \approx 1.6569335444824.$$

If we compute the outer normal vectors of the facets $v_1v_6v_7$ and $v_1v_5v_7$, assume their orthogonality, and substitute s and t according to (5) and (6) again, we obtain the same polynomial equation $-12x^6+24x^5+32x^4-80x^3+17x^2+18x+1=0$. In other words, provided three of Polyanskii's distances are equal, the fourth distance equals the other three if and only if the orthogonal projections of the vertices $v_1,\dots,v_4$ onto their strictly antipodal faces lie on edges, i.e., not in the relative interior of any facet.
Hence Polyanskii's polytope is not reduced, see Theorem 2.5 again. Another evidence of this fact can be seen in the Polyanskii's list of pairs of skew edges whose distance is larger than the presumed minimal width. In this list, pairs of edges of type v_1v_7, v_3v_5 are missing, and these pairs are exactly those where the actual minimum width

$$\omega(P) \approx 2.5860823967186$$

of P is attained.

4 ...and pulling it apart

However, Polyanskii's polytope can be modified in order to obtain a reduced polytope. We do this by introducing a new parameter $h>0$ and replacing each of the four vertices of degree 5 in Polyanskii's polytope by a line segment of length $2h$. Consider the points

$$\begin{aligned}
&v_1 := (r,0,-t), && v_2 := (-r,0,-t), && v_3 := (0,r,t), && v_4 := (0,-r,t),\\
&v_5 := (h,x,s), && v_6 := (-h,x,s), && v_7 := (h,-x,s), && v_8 := (-h,-x,s),\\
&v_9 := (x,h,-s), && v_{10} := (x,-h,-s), && v_{11} := (-x,h,-s), && v_{12} := (-x,-h,-s).
\end{aligned}$$




Figure 2. Our example with vertex numbers: oblique view (left), top view (middle), front view (right)

Note that we slightly changed the meaning of the parameters t and s. For properly chosen parameters $t,x,s,h,r>0$ the points $v_1,\dots,v_{12}$ are the vertices of our polytope P. The combinatorial structure of our polytope is shown in Figure 2.
Our polytope possesses the same symmetry as Polyanskii's. Hence, it is again sufficient to control some of the facet-vertex and edge-edge distances. In fact, we are going to solve the equations

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(v_1,\, v_3 v_{11} v_{12} v_4) &= 1, & \rho(v_1 v_2,\, v_3 v_4) &= \delta_1, & \rho(v_1 v_9,\, v_4 v_8) &= \delta_3,\\ \rho(v_5,\, v_2 v_8 v_{12}) &= 1, & \rho(v_1 v_5,\, v_4 v_8) &= \delta_2, \end{aligned}$$

w.r.t. t,x,s,h,r. Here, $\delta_1,\delta_2,\delta_3\geq 1$ are suitably chosen. By introducing the normal vectors

$$\begin{aligned} &n_1 := (v_{11}-v_3)\times(v_{12}-v_3), \quad n_3 := (v_1-v_2)\times(v_3-v_4) = (0,0,4r^2), \quad n_5 := (v_1-v_9)\times(v_4-v_8),\\ &n_2 := (v_8-v_2)\times(v_{12}-v_2), \quad n_4 := (v_1-v_5)\times(v_4-v_8), \end{aligned}$$

where $u\times w$ denotes the usual cross product of the vectors $u,w\in\mathbb{R}^3$, these equations can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle n_1\,|\,v_1-v_3\rangle^2-\|n_1\|^2=0, \quad \langle n_3\,|\,v_3-v_1\rangle^2-\delta_1^2\|n_3\|^2=0, \quad \langle n_5\,|\,v_1-v_4\rangle^2-\delta_3^2\|n_5\|^2=0,\\ &\langle n_2\,|\,v_5-v_2\rangle^2-\|n_2\|^2=0, \quad \langle n_4\,|\,v_1-v_4\rangle^2-\delta_2^2\|n_4\|^2=0. \end{aligned}$$

Now, it is easy to see that the third equation (counting in columns) is equivalent to $2t=\delta_1$. Moreover, it is tedious to check that we can factor out h^2 in the first equation and $(h+r-x)^2$ in the fifth. Hence, we are going solve the four equations

$$\left.\begin{aligned} h^{-2}\big(\langle n_1\,|\,v_1-v_3\rangle^2-\ \ \|n_1\|^2\big)=0, \quad \langle n_2\,|\,v_5-v_2\rangle^2-\ \ \|n_2\|^2=0,\\ (h+r-x)^{-2}\big(\langle n_5\,|\,v_1-v_4\rangle^2-\delta_3^2\|n_5\|^2\big)=0, \quad \langle n_4\,|\,v_1-v_4\rangle^2-\delta_2^2\|n_4\|^2=0, \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{8}$$

under $t=\delta_1/2$ w.r.t. the remaining variables (x,s,h,r). Note that each left-hand side of the four equations in (8) are multivariate polynomials of degree at most 6 in the four unknowns (x,s,h,r).

Numerically, we used $\delta_1 = 1.1$, $\delta_2 = 1.003$ and $\delta_3 = 1.004$ and solved equations (8) by Newton's method starting with $(x_0, s_0, h_0, r_0) = (0.62, 0.13, 0.09, 0.35)$. This results in

$$t \approx 0.55, \qquad x \approx 0.6176490959800, \qquad s \approx 0.1351384931026,$$
$$h \approx 0.0984300252409, \qquad r \approx 0.3547183586709$$

and the numerical residuum in the four equations is below 10^{-15}. Using Kantorovich's theorem, see [9, Theorem XVIII.1.6], it is possible to prove that equations (8) possess an exact root in the neighborhood of our numerical solution.
Using these parameters, we can check that the remaining distances are

$$\rho(v_1 v_9 v_{10},\, v_{11} v_{12}) \approx 1.0433929735637, \qquad \rho(v_5 v_9,\, v_8 v_{12}) \approx 1.0126888049628.$$

Thus, the width of our polytope using these parameters is really 1.0, see Theorem 2.2. Consequently, our polytope is reduced by Theorem 2.4.
Since the Jacobian of the (left-hand sides of) equations (8) w.r.t. (x, s, h, r) is invertible at our point of interest, it follows from the implicit function theorem that we also obtain a solution for small changes of the parameters δ_1, δ_2 and δ_3. Hence, we obtain a whole family of reduced polytopes possessing three degrees of freedom.

5 Evaluating your catches

It is quite a delicate and tedious procedure to check the reducedness of a given polytope $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$. Hence, we present an algorithm based on Theorems 2.2 and 2.4. It consists of two steps:

1. Compute the width of P, compare Theorem 2.2.
2. Check whether each vertex has a strictly antipodal facet, compare Theorem 2.4.

An implementation in pseudocode is given in Algorithm 1. In step 4 of the algorithm, we denoted by $e_1 \times e_2$ a vector normal to the skew edges e_1 and e_2. Using Theorems 2.2 and 2.4, it is easy to check its correctness. A Matlab implementation is provided at zenodo, see [6].

6 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we presented the first—to our best knowledge—example of a reduced polytope in three-dimensional Euclidean space. As Polyanskii [22] has already pointed out, the existence of reduced polytopes in Euclidean space remains open starting from dimension four. Moreover, already finding a reduced polytope in three-dimensional space with different combinatorial structure than the one presented in Section 4 seems to be a non-trivial task. Finally, it has to be checked to which amount Polyanskii's negative result [22, Theorem 2] can be generalized to higher dimensions.

Algorithm 1 Algorithm for checking reducedness of polytopes in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

input: polytope $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$
set $w \leftarrow +\infty$
for all skew pairs of edges e_1 and e_2 of P **do**
    set $w \leftarrow \min\{w, w(e_1 \times e_2/\|e_1 \times e_2\|, P)\}$
end for
unmark all vertices of P
for all facets F of P **do**
    compute the strictly antipodal face $\hat{F}$
    set $\hat{w} \leftarrow \rho(F, \hat{F})$
    if $\hat{w} < w$ **then**
        unmark all vertices of P
        set $w \leftarrow \hat{w}$
    end if
    if $\hat{F}$ consists of a single vertex v **and** $\hat{w} = w$ **then**
        mark vertex v
    end if
end for
return Are all vertices of P marked?

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Horst Martini for encouraging us in the search of reduced polytopes, and René Brandenberg and Undine Leopold for fruitful discussions, and Alexandr Polyanskii for his ideas and his talk at the conference *Discrete Geometry Days*, which took place in Budapest, Hungary, in June 2016.

References

[1] G. Averkov, *On planar convex bodies of given Minkowskian thickness and least possible area*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **84** (2005), no. 2, pp. 183–192, doi: 10.1007/s00013-004-1152-6.

[2] G. Averkov and H. Martini, *On pyramids and reducedness*, Period. Math. Hungar. **57** (2008), no. 2, pp. 117–120, doi: 10.1007/s10998-008-8117-x.

[3] ———, *On reduced polytopes and antipodality*, Adv. Geom. **8** (2008), no. 4, pp. 615–626, doi: 10.1515/ADVGEOM.2008.037.

[4] K. Bezdek, *Lectures on Sphere Arrangements—The Discrete Geometric Side*, Fields Institute Monographs, Springer, New York, 2013.

[5] G.D. Chakerian and H. Groemer, *Convex bodies of constant width*, Convexity and Its Applications (P. M. Gruber and J. M. Wills, eds.), Birkhäuser, Basel, 1983, pp. 49–96, doi: 10.1007/978-3-0348-5858-8.

[6] B. González Merino, T. Jahn, and G. Wachsmuth, *Hunting for reduced polytopes: Evaluating your catches*, 2016, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.58491.

[7] P. Gritzmann and V. Klee, *Inner and outer j-radii of convex bodies in finite-dimensional normed spaces*, Discrete Comput. Geom. **7** (1992), no. 1, pp. 255–280, doi: 10.1007/BF02187841.

[8] E. Heil, *Kleinste konvexe Körper gegebener Dicke*, Preprint 453, TU Darmstadt, 1978.

[9] L.V. Kantorovich and G.P. Akilov, *Functional Analysis*, second ed., Pergamon Press, Oxford-Elmsford, N.Y., 1982, Translated from the Russian by Howard L. Silcock.

[10] M. Lassak, *Reduced convex bodies in the plane*, Israel J. Math. **70** (1990), no. 3, pp. 365–379, doi: 10.1007/BF02801470.

[11] ———, *On the smallest disk containing a planar reduced convex body*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **80** (2003), no. 5, pp. 553–560, doi: 10.1007/s00013-003-4618-z.

[12] ———, *Characterizations of reduced polytopes in finite-dimensional normed spaces*, Beiträge Algebra Geom. **47** (2006), no. 2, pp. 559–566.

[13] ———, *Approximation of bodies of constant width and reduced bodies in a normed plane*, J. Convex Anal. **19** (2012), no. 3, pp. 865–874.

[14] M. Lassak and H. Martini, *Reduced bodies in Minkowski space*, Acta Math. Hungar. **106** (2005), no. 1-2, pp. 17–26, doi: 10.1007/s10474-005-0002-8.

[15] ———, *Reduced convex bodies in Euclidean space—a survey*, Expo. Math. **29** (2011), no. 2, pp. 204–219, doi: 10.1016/j.exmath.2011.01.006.

[16] ———, *Reduced convex bodies in finite-dimensional normed spaces: a survey*, Results Math. **66** (2014), no. 3-4, pp. 405–426, doi: 10.1007/s00025-014-0384-4.

[17] M. Lassak and M. Musielak, *Reduced spherical convex bodies*, 2016, arxiv: 1607.00132v1.

[18] H. Martini and K.J. Swanepoel, *Non-planar simplices are not reduced*, Publ. Math. Debrecen **64** (2004), no. 1-2, pp. 101–106.

[19] H. Martini and W. Wenzel, *Tetrahedra are not reduced*, Appl. Math. Lett. **15** (2002), no. 7, pp. 881–884, doi: 10.1016/S0893-9659(02)00057-5.

[20] E. Meissner, *Über Punktmengen konstanter Breite*, Zürich. Naturf.-Ges. **56** (1911), pp. 42–50.

[21] J. Pál, *Ein Minimalproblem für Ovale*, Math. Ann. **83** (1921), pp. 311–319.

[22] A. Polyanskii, *On reduced polytopes*, 2016, arxiv: 1605.06791v1.