ON A CONJECTURAL SYMMETRIC VERSION OF EHRHARD'S INEQUALITY

GALYNA V. LIVSHYTS

Date: March 21, 2021.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 52.
Key words and phrases. Gaussian measure, Ehrhard inequality, Convex bodies, symmetry, Brunn-Minkowski inequality, Brascamp-Lieb inequality, Poincaré inequality, equality case characterization, torsional rigidity, energy minimization, log-concave measures.

Abstract. As one of the results of this manuscript, we show that for any log-concave measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, any pair of symmetric convex sets K and L, and any $\lambda \in [0,1]$,

$$\mu((1-\lambda)K + \lambda L)^{c_n} \geq (1-\lambda)\mu(K)^{c_n} + \lambda \mu(L)^{c_n},$$

where $c_n \geq n^{-4-o(1)}$. This constitutes progress towards the Dimensional Brunn-Minkowski conjecture (see Gardner, Zvavitch [45], Colesanti, L, Marsiglietti [27]). Moreover, our bound improves for various special classes of log-concave measures.

However, most of the paper is dedicated to studying sharp estimates in the case of the standard Gaussian measure γ. We formulate a plausible conjecture for the optimal Ehrhard-type inequality for convex symmetric sets with respect to the Gaussian measure. Namely, letting $J_{k-1}(s) = \int_0^s t^{k-1} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt$ and $c_{k-1} = J_{k-1}(+\infty)$, we conjecture that the function $F : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$, given by

$$F(a) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} 1_{a \in E_k} \cdot (\beta_k J_{k-1}^{-1}(c_{k-1} a) + \alpha_k)$$

(with some choice of a decomposition $[0,1] = \cup_i E_i$ and coefficients α_i, β_i) satisfies, for all symmetric convex sets K and L, and any $\lambda \in [0,1]$,

$$F\left(\gamma(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L)\right) \geq \lambda F\left(\gamma(K)\right) + (1-\lambda) F\left(\gamma(L)\right).$$

We explain that this conjecture is "the most optimistic possible", and is equivalent to the fact that for any symmetric convex set K, its *Gaussian concavity power* $p^s(K,\gamma)$ is greater than or equal to $p_s(RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}, \gamma)$, for some $k \in \{1,...,n\}$. We call the sets $RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ *round k-cylinders*; they also appear as the conjectured Gaussian isoperimetric minimizers for symmetric sets, see Heilman [50]. The Gaussian concavity power of a convex set is defined as

$$p_s(K,\gamma) := \limsup_{\epsilon \to 0} \left\{ p : \forall L \in \mathcal{K}_s,\, \gamma((1-\epsilon)K + \epsilon L)^p \geq (1-\epsilon)\gamma(K)^p + \epsilon \gamma(L)^p \right\}.$$

In this manuscript, we make progress towards this question, and show that for any symmetric convex set K in $\mathbb{R}^n$,

$$p_s(K,\gamma) \geq Q(\mathbb{E}|X|^2, \mathbb{E}|X|^4, \mathbb{E}\|X\|_K^2, r(K)),$$

where Q is a certain rational function of degree 2, the expectation is taken with respect to the restriction of the Gaussian measure onto K, and $r(K)$ is the in-radius of K. *Moreover, the equality holds if and only if* $K = RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ *for some* $R > 0$ *and* $k = 1, ..., n$. The result follows via a combination of some novel estimates, the $L2$ method (previously studied by several authors, notably Kolesnikov, Milman [58], [59], [60], [61], the author [62], Hosle [53], Colesanti [23], Marsiglietti [27], Eskenazis, Moschidis [40]), and the analysis of the Gaussian torsional rigidity.

As an auxiliary result on the way to the equality case characterization, we characterize the equality cases in the "convex set version" of the Brascamp-Lieb inequality, and moreover, obtain a quantitative stability version in the case of the standard Gaussian measure; this may be of independent interest. All the equality case characterizations rely on the careful analysis of the smooth case, the stability versions via trace theory, and local approximation arguments.

In addition, we provide a non-sharp estimate for a function F whose composition with $\gamma(K)$ is concave in the Minkowski sense for all symmetric convex sets.

Contents

1. Introduction 3
2. Preliminaries, and some new trace estimates for convex sets 11
2.1. The Brascamp-Lieb inequality 11
2.2. Symmetrizations and Ehrhard's principle 12
2.3. Some background from Sobolev space theory 13
2.4. Trace theory and convexity 15
2.5. Crash course on classical existence theorems with emphasis on our specific needs 18
2.6. Preliminaries from Asymptotic Analysis 21
3. The concavity coefficient, isoperimetry and the related discussion. 24
3.1. The concavity coefficient of a convex set 24
3.2. Concavity powers 26
3.3. Analyzing the Conjecture 1 and its isoperimetric implications 27
3.4. The concavity powers of round k-cylinders 34
3.5. The equivalence of the Conjectures 1 and 2 34
3.6. Estimates via the L2-method 35
3.7. Connections to the Latała-Oleszkiewicz S-inequality and a new related question 37
3.8. Inequalities of the type of Minkowski's first 39
4. General bounds for Poincare constants of restrictions. 41
5. Equality cases in the Brascamp-Lieb inequality: Proof of Theorem 1.4. 45
6. On the Gaussian torsional rigidity 52
6.1. Torsional rigidity: general discussion 52
6.2. Isoperimetric inequalities for the Gaussian torsional rigidity 57
6.3. Some lower bounds for torsional rigidity 62
7. The Gaussian case, Theorems A and 1.5. 65
7.1. The key estimate. 66
7.2. Proof of the inequality of the Theorem 7.3. 68
7.3. Stability in the key estimate 69
7.4. Proof of the equality cases in Theorem 7.3. 70
7.5. Some more corollaries of Theorem 7.3 and proof of the Theorem 1.5. 71
7.6. A remark about a more flexible estimate 72
8. On some upgrades of the Gaussian Brascamp-Lieb inequality. 74
8.1. Non-symmetric case 74
8.2. Symmetric case 79
9. General log-concave measures: proof of Theorems B, 1.6 and 1.7. 86
9.1. Proof of Theorem B 87
9.2. Proof of the Theorems 1.6 and 1.7. 89
10. Proof of Theorem 1.8. 91
References 92

1. Introduction

Consider the standard Gaussian measure γ on the n-dimensional euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$, that is, the measure with density $d\gamma(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}^n} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}}$. We shall use notation

$$\psi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{x} e^{-\frac{s^2}{2}} ds,$$

for the cdf of the 1-dimensional Gaussian measure.

One of the beautiful and useful geometric properties of the Gaussian measure is the Ehrhard inequality [36], [37], extended by Borell [14] to general sets: for a pair of closed Borel-measurable sets K and L and for $\lambda \in [0,1]$,

$$\psi^{-1}\left(\gamma(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L)\right) \geq \lambda \psi^{-1}\left(\gamma(K)\right) + (1-\lambda)\psi^{-1}\left(\gamma(L)\right). \tag{1}$$

See also Bobkov [8] for a celebrated related inequality, as well as Latała [70], van Handel [93], Shenfeld [92] (for the equality cases), Neeman, Paouris [85], Ivanisvili [54], Paouris, Valettas [87] for alternative proofs, generalizations, applications, and further discussions.

The Gaussian isoperimetric inequality, proved by Borell [12] and Sudakov-Tsirelson [94]), states that for every $a \in [0,1]$, the half-space H_a with $\gamma(H_a) = a$ has the smallest Gaussian perimeter among all measurable sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of Gaussian measure a. It is well-known that the Ehrhard inequality implies the Gaussian isoperimetric inequality (see e.g. Latała [71] or Section 3.3 below).

The analogue of the isoperimetric problem for the Gaussian measure in the case of symmetric sets was asked by Barthe [2] and O'Donell [86], conjectured by Morgan and studied by Heilman [50]: it is believed that for every $a \in [0,1]$ there is $k \in \{1,...,n\}$ such that for every Borel-measurable set K with $\gamma(K) = a$, one has either $\gamma^+(\partial K) \geq \gamma^+(\partial C_k(a))$ or $\gamma^+(\partial K) \geq \gamma^+(\partial C_k(1-a))$, where $C_k(a) = RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ is a *round k-cylinder* such that $\gamma(C_k(a)) = a$. See Heilman [50], [51] for more details, and partial progress on this quesiton. Bachiesi and Julin [4] showed that when $\gamma(K) \in [\alpha, 1]$ for a sufficiently large $\alpha > 0$, one has $\gamma^+(\partial K) \geq \gamma^+(\partial C_1(a))$; in other words, the Gaussian perimeter is minimized on symmetric strips whenever the Gaussian measure of a set is sufficiently large.

One might wonder what is an "optimal" function $F : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$, for which the inequality

$$F\left(\gamma(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L)\right) \geq \lambda F\left(\gamma(K)\right) + (1-\lambda)F\left(\gamma(L)\right) \tag{2}$$

holds for all symmetric convex sets K and L? One should be able to improve upon $F = \psi^{-1}$ since the Ehrhard inequality is never sharp for symmetric sets [92]. An initial naive guess may be that $F = \varphi^{-1}$ could work, where $\varphi(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-t}^{t} e^{-\frac{s^2}{2}} ds$, – "the symmetric version" of the Gaussian cdf. However, it was pointed to the author by Liran Rotem (after a discussion) a few years ago, that a numerical computation

shows that this naive conjecture fails. Later, the author have discussed this with several other experts and learned that others had also done a similar simulation, reaching the same conclusion. In fact, one may notice that $F = \varphi^{-1}$ certainly fails (2) on the entire $[0,1]$, because if it didn't, that would imply that the strips are Gaussian isoperimetric minimizers among symmetric convex sets of any measure (more details of this implication shall be discussed in Section 3), and this is not the case.

A less naive attempt to put forward a conjecture for an F satisfying (2) could be

$$F(a) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} 1_{a \in I_k} \cdot (J_{k-1}^{-1}(c_{k-1}a) + a_k), \tag{3}$$

where I_k is the sub-interval of $[0,1]$ where the surface area of the k-round cylinder $C_k(a)$ is minimal (over all choices of k). Here

$$J_{k-1}(R) = \int_0^R s^{k-1} e^{-\frac{s^2}{2}} ds = \int_0^R g_{k-1}(s) ds,$$

$c_{k-1} = J_{k-1}(+\infty)$, and a_k are chosen in such a way that F is continuous (and then automatically continuously differentiable, due to the properties of the special functions involved). Note the geometric meaning of the function $J_{k-1}^{-1}(c_{k-1}a)$: it is the radius of the $k-$round cylinder of measure a, i.e. $\gamma\left(J_{k-1}^{-1}(c_{k-1}a)B_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}\right) = a$. However, unfortunately, this function does not satisfy (2) for symmetric convex sets, as shall be shown in Section 3.

On the bright side, one may explicitly conjecture "the optimal" plausible function satisfying (2), which is somewhat similar to (3).

Conjecture 1. *With the above notation for c_p, g_p, J_p, the function*

$$F(a) = \int_0^a \exp\left(\int_{C_0}^t \min_{k=1,\ldots,n} \left(\frac{c_{k-1}(-k+1+J_{k-1}^{-1}(c_{k-1}s)^2)}{g_k \circ J_{k-1}^{-1}(c_{k-1}s)} \right) ds \right) dt$$

satisfies (2) for all symmetric convex sets. Here the choice of $C_0 \in (0,1)$ is arbitrary.

Equivalently, there exists a collection of disjoint sets $E_k \subset [0,1]$, $k = 1, ..., n$, such that $[0,1] = \cup_{k=1}^n E_k$, and there exist coefficients $\alpha_k, \beta_k \in \mathbb{R}$, such that the function

$$F(a) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} 1_{a \in E_k} \cdot (\beta_k J_{k-1}^{-1}(c_{k-1}a) + \alpha_k)$$

satisfies (2) for all symmetric convex sets, and is of class C^2 and increasing.

Moreover, the equality in (2) occurs if and only if there exists a $k \in \{1, ..., n\}$ such that $K = C_k(a_1)$ and $L = C_k(a_2)$, for some $a_1, a_1 \in E_k$.

The fact that the statements are indeed equivalent shall be explained in Section 3.

We believe that the above conjecture is indeed plausible; we shall also explain in Section 3 that this conjecture is, in a sense, "the most optimistic possible".

Remark 1.1. *The sets E_k in the conjecture above are such that for $a \in E_k$, the function $\left(\log \frac{1}{s_k(a)}\right)'$ is minimal among all k, where we denote $s_k(a) = \gamma^+(\partial C_k(a))$. It is worth emphasizing that the sets E_k are not the same as the intervals I_k (which were defined so that for each $a \in I_k$, the function $s_k(a)$ is minimal, among all k.)*

We shall now move to discussing how we managed to guess Conjecture 1, and state progress towards it. For a convex set K and a measure μ, we define

$$p_s(K,\mu) := \limsup_{\epsilon \to 0} \left\{p : \forall L \in \mathcal{K}_s,\ \mu((1-\epsilon)K + \epsilon L)^p \geq (1-\epsilon)\mu(K)^p + \epsilon \mu(L)^p\right\}.$$

Here $\mathcal{K}_s$ stands for the set of symmetric convex sets. We shall focus on the case when μ is the standard Gaussian measure γ. We make the following

Conjecture 2. *Pick $a \in [0,1]$ and suppose K is a symmetric convex set with $\gamma(K) = a$. Then*

$$p_s(K,\gamma) \geq \min_{k=1,...,n} p_s(C_k(a),\gamma),$$

with equality if and only if $K = C_k(a)$ for some (appropriate) $k = 1,...,n$ (recall that we use notation $C_k(a)$ for round k-cylinders $RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ of measure a.)

In Section 3, we shall see that

Proposition 1.2. *Conjecture 1 and Conjecture 2 are equivalent.*

In view of the Proposition 1.2, it is of interest to study lower estimates for $p_s(K,\gamma)$. We shall show the following sharp estimate (see Section 7 for the precise formulation):

Theorem A. *For any symmetric convex set K in $\mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$p_s(K,\gamma) \geq Q(\mathbb{E}|X|^2, \mathbb{E}|X|^4, \mathbb{E}\|X\|_K^2, r(K)),$$

where Q is a certain rational function of degree 2, the expectation is taken with respect to the restriction of the Gaussian measure onto K, and $r(K)$ is the in-radius of K.

Moreover, the equality holds if and only if $K = RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ for some $R > 0$ and $k = 1,...,n$.

The key feature of the Theorem A is *the equality case characterization.* To further emphasize it, we outline separately the exact value of $p_s(K,\gamma)$ for the case when K is a round $k-$cylinder.

Proposition 1.3 (Case of cylinders). *When $K = RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$, with $\gamma(K) = a$, for some $a \in [0,1]$, and for $k = 1, ..., n$, we have*

$$p_s(K,\gamma) = 1 - \frac{c_{k-1} a (k - 1 - J_{k-1}^{-1}(c_{k-1}a)^2)}{g_k \circ J_{k-1}^{-1}(c_{k-1}a)}.$$

There is nothing special in searching for F in the form $F(a) = a^{p(a)}$ for the function F from (2), of course. In Section 3, we shall see some other equivalent formulations of Conjecture 1.

Most of this manuscript is dedicated to proving Theorem A. In addition to several novel estimates and ideas, our method is based on the reduction of the question to infinitesimal version, previously explored by Colesanti, Hug, Saorin-Gomez, [23], [24], [25], L, Marsiglietti, [27], [28], and on the $L2$ method, studied by Kolesnikov, Milman, [58], [59], [60], [61] (these works include an important advancement – the new proof of the Brunn-Minkowski inequality via the L2-method), L [62], [63], Hosle [53], Milman [82]. Some of the estimates also involve optimizing quadratic inequalities, see a remarkable work of Eskenazis, Moschidis [40], or Remark 2.2 from Hosle, Kolesnikov, L [53]. Another key component of the proof involves the sharp lower estimate for the *Gaussian torsional rigidity* (more details in Section 6). The equality case characterization is done via careful analysis of the smooth case in several inequalities, several qualitative stability estimates obtained via the trace inequalities for convex sets (see subsection 2.4), and delicate approximation arguments. The stability version for the torsional energy lower bound from Section 6 may be of independent interest.

In addition, one of the steps on the way to the equality case characterization in Theorem A is the stability in the "convex set version" of the Brascamp-Lieb inequality [16]: this celebrated inequality states that for any convex set K in $\mathbb{R}^n$, any locally Lipschitz function $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and any strictly convex function $V : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, letting $d\mu(x) = e^{-V(x)}dx$, we have

$$\mu(K) \int_K f^2 d\mu - \left(\int_K f d\mu \right)^2 \leq \mu(K) \int_K \langle (\nabla^2 V)^{-1} \nabla f, \nabla f \rangle d\mu.$$

In Section 5, we will show

Theorem 1.4 (Equality case characterization in the "convex set version of" the Brascamp-Lieb inequality, and the quantitative stability in the Gaussian case). *we state two results:*

(1) *Let μ be a log-concave measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with C^2 positive density e^{-V}, and suppose $\nabla^2 V > 0$. Then for any convex set K and any function $f \in W^{1,2}(K) \cap C^1(K)$, we have, as per Brascamp and Lieb* [16]*,*

$$\mu(K) \int_K f^2 d\mu - \left(\int_K f d\mu \right)^2 \leq \mu(K) \int_K \langle (\nabla^2 V)^{-1} \nabla f, \nabla f \rangle d\mu;$$

Moreover, the equality occurs if one of the two things happen:

- $f = C$ *for some constant* $C \in \mathbb{R}$;
- *there exists a rotation* U *such that*
  a) $UK = L \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ *for some* $k = 1, ..., n$ *and a* $k-$*dimensional convex set* L;
  b) $f \circ U = \langle \nabla V, \theta \rangle + C$, *for some vector* $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ *and some constant* $C \in \mathbb{R}$.

(2) *Moreover, if* $\mu = \gamma$ *(the standard Gaussian measure), and a convex set* K *contains* rB_2^n, *then assuming that for* $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\gamma(K)\int_K f^2 d\gamma - \left(\int_K f d\gamma\right)^2 \geq \gamma(K)\int_K \langle (\nabla^2 V)^{-1}\nabla f, \nabla f\rangle d\gamma - \epsilon,$$

we conclude that there exists a vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *(possibly zero), which depends only on* K *and* f, *such that*

- $\int_{\partial K}\langle \theta, n_x\rangle^2 d\gamma_{\partial K} \leq \frac{(n+1)\epsilon}{r}$;
- $\|f - \langle \nabla V, \theta\rangle - \frac{1}{\gamma(K)}\int_K f d\gamma\|_{L^1(K,\gamma)} \leq \sqrt{\gamma(K)}\left(\sqrt{n\epsilon} + \sqrt[4]{n\epsilon}\right).$

A related question was posed by Brandolini, Chiacchio, Henrot, Trombetti [7]. See Section 5 for the history and important past results in the case of the Gaussian measure. Part (2) of Theorem 1.4 will be used directly in the proof of Theorem A, while part (1) is just auxiliary. The quantitative stability works especially well in the Gaussian case thanks to nicer trace-type estimates for convex sets (see subsection 2.4 and particularly Theorem 2.10). In Section 5 we will also deduce stability for general log-concave measures, but it is weaker in general, comparing to the case of the standard Gaussian measure.

In Section 8, we will discuss the equality case characterization in a "symmetric upgrade" of the Gaussian Brascamp-Lieb inequality (by a symmetric upgrade we mean something more involved than the classical result of Cordero-Erasquin, Fradelizi and Maurey [29], which itself would not have vast equality cases). In Section 8 we will also discuss some curious upgrades of the Gaussian Brascamp-Lieb inequality for non-symmetric sets, and draw some connections with the Ehrhard inequality.

Next, we will show an estimate somewhat weaker than Conjecture 1.

Theorem 1.5. *The function*

$$F(a) = \int_0^a \exp\left(\int_{C_0}^t \left(\frac{\varphi^{-1}(s)^2}{2e^2n^2s} + \frac{1}{ns - \frac{1}{c_{n-1}}J_{n+1}\circ J_{n-1}^{-1}(c_{n-1}s)} - \frac{1}{s}\right)ds\right)dt$$

satisfies

$$F\left(\gamma(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L)\right) \geq \lambda F\left(\gamma(K)\right) + (1-\lambda)F\left(\gamma(L)\right),$$

for all convex symmetric sets K *and* L *and every* $\lambda \in [0,1]$.

As a corollary of Theorem 1.5 we will show Proposition 3.23 – a Gaussian version of Minkowski's first inequality: for any pair of symmetric convex sets K and L,

$$\gamma(K+tL)'|_{t=0} \geq \left(1 - \frac{\mathbb{E}X^2}{n}\right) \gamma(K)^{1-\frac{1}{n-\mathbb{E}X^2}} \gamma(L)^{\frac{1}{n-\mathbb{E}X^2}},$$

where the expected value is taken with respect to the restriction of the Gaussian measure γ onto K.

In addition to all of the above, we will discuss some estimates for log-concave measures which are non-Gaussian. Recall that a measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is called log-concave if for all Borel sets K, L, and for any $\lambda \in [0,1]$,

$$\mu(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L) \geq \mu(K)^{\lambda} \mu(L)^{1-\lambda} \tag{4}$$

In accordance with Borell's result [13], if a measure μ has density $e^{-V(x)}$, where $V(x)$ is a convex function on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with non-empty support, then μ is log-concave. Examples of log-concave measures include Lebesgue volume $|\cdot|$ and the Gaussian measure γ.

A notable partial case of Borell's theorem is the Brunn-Minkowski inequality, proved in the full generality by Lusternik [80]:

$$|\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L| \geq |K|^{\lambda} |L|^{1-\lambda}, \tag{5}$$

which holds for all Borel-measurable sets K, L and any $\lambda \in [0,1]$. Furthermore, due to the $n-$homogeneity of Lebesgue measure, (5) self-improves to an a-priori stronger form

$$|\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L|^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \lambda |K|^{\frac{1}{n}} + (1-\lambda)|L|^{\frac{1}{n}}. \tag{6}$$

See an extensive survey by Gardner [44] on the subject for more information.

Gardner and Zvavitch [45] and Colesanti, L, Marsiglietti [29] conjectured that any even log-concave measure μ enjoys the inequality

$$\mu(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \lambda \mu(K)^{\frac{1}{n}} + (1-\lambda)\mu(L)^{\frac{1}{n}}, \tag{7}$$

for any pair of convex symmetric sets K and L.

L, Marsiglietti, Nayar and Zvavitch [76] showed that this conjecture follows from the celebrated Log-Brunn-Minkowski conjecture of Böröczky, Lutwak, Yang, Zhang [15]; a combination of this result with the results of Saroglou [89], [90], confirms (7) for unconditional convex bodies and unconditional log-concave measures. For rotation-invariant measures, this conjecture was verified locally near any ball by Colesanti, L, Marsiglietti [27]. Kolesnikov, L [62] developed an approach to this question, building up on the past works of Kolesnikov and Milman [58], [59], [57], [61], as well as [27], and showed that in the case of the Gaussian measure, for convex sets containing the origin, the desired inequality holds with power $1/2n$; this is curious because earlier, Nayar and Tkocz [83] showed that only the assumption

of the sets containing the origin is not sufficient for the inequality to hold with a power as strong as $1/n$. Remarkably, Eskenazis and Moschidis showed that for the Gaussian measure γ and symmetric convex sets K and L, the inequality (7) does hold.

For a log-concave measure μ and $a \in \mathbb{R}^+$, let $p(\mu, a)$ be the largest real number such that for all convex sets K and L with $\mu(K) \geq a$ and $\mu(L) \geq a$, and every $\lambda \in [0,1]$ one has

$$\mu(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L)^{p(\mu,a)} \geq \lambda \mu(K)^{p(\mu,a)} + (1-\lambda)\mu(L)^{p(\mu,a)}.$$

Analogously, we define $p_s(\mu, a)$ as the largest number such that for all convex *symmetric* sets K and L with $\mu(K) \geq a$ and $\mu(L) \geq a$, and every $\lambda \in [0,1]$ one has

$$\mu(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L)^{p_s(\mu,a)} \geq \lambda \mu(K)^{p_s(\mu,a)} + (1-\lambda)\mu(L)^{p_s(\mu,a)}.$$

By log-concavity, $p_s(a, \mu) = \inf_{K:\, \mu(K)=a} p_s(K, \mu)$, where the concavity power $p_s(K, \mu)$ was defined above (see Section 3 for more details.)

We shall study the behavior of $p_s(\mu, a)$ for log-concave measures. First, we obtain a lower estimate for $p_s(\mu, a)$ for all even log-concave measures, which constitutes progress towards the dimensional Brunn-Minkowski conjecture:

Theorem B. *For each $n \geq 1$ there exists a number $c_n > 0$ such that for any log-concave measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, for all symmetric convex sets K and L, and any $\lambda \in [0,1]$, one has*

$$\mu(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L)^{c_n} \geq \lambda \mu(K)^{c_n} + (1-\lambda)\mu(L)^{c_n},$$

Namely, we get $c_n = n^{-4-o(1)}$, where $o(1)$ is a positive number which tends to zero as $n \to \infty$, and is bounded from above by an absolute constant.

In two particular cases, we show tighter bounds. Our first improvement builds up, among other things, on the work of Barthe and Klartag [3]:

Theorem 1.6. *Let $p \in [1,2]$ and let $d\mu(x) = C_{n,p} e^{-\frac{\|x\|_p}{p}} dx$. Then for all symmetric convex sets K and L and any $\lambda \in [0,1]$, one has*

$$\mu(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L)^{A(n,p)} \geq \lambda \mu(K)^{A(n,p)} + (1-\lambda)\mu(L)^{A(n,p)},$$

where

$$A(n,p) = \frac{c(p)}{n(\log n)^{\frac{2-p}{p}}},$$

and $c(p) > 0$ is an absolute constant independent of the dimension.

In another particular case of a class of "exponential rotation-invariant measures", we obtain:

Theorem 1.7. *Let $d\mu(x) = C_{n,p} e^{-\frac{|x|^p}{p}} dx$ and $p \geq 1$. Then for all symmetric convex sets K and L and any $\lambda \in [0,1]$, one has*

$$\mu(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L)^{C(p)n^{-2-0(1)}} \geq \lambda \mu(K)^{C(p)n^{-2-o(1)}} + (1-\lambda)\mu(L)^{C(p)n^{-2-o(1)}},$$

where $C(p)$ depends only on p, and $o(1)$ is a positive number which tends to zero as $n \to \infty$, and is bounded from above by an absolute constant.

Furthermore, in the case when $p \in [1,2]$, the power in the inequality above could be taken to be $Cn^{-1-o(1)}$ in place of $Cn^{-2-o(1)}$.

In the case of Lebesgue measure λ, the quantity $p_s(\lambda, a)$ does not depend on a, and the question of lower bounding $p_s(\lambda, a)$ is equivalent to bounding from below $\inf_{a \in \mathbb{R}} p(\mu, a)$. However, without homogeneity, a universal bound for $\inf_a p(\mu, a)$ may not reflect the correct rate, and may not be applicable to study isoperimetric type questions. For example, in the case of the Gaussian measure γ, the Ehrhard's inequality implies that $p(\gamma, a) \to_{a \to 1} \infty$, and in particular, $p_s(\gamma, a) \to_{a \to 1} \infty$.

The convergence $p_s(\mu, a) \to \infty$ cannot be the case for all log-concave measures, because for Lebesgue measure λ, $p(\lambda, a) = p_s(\lambda, a) = \frac{1}{n}$ for every $a \in \mathbb{R}$; same goes to the restriction of the Lebesgue measure to a convex set. However, the phenomenon $p_s(\mu, a) \to \infty$ is interesting, and we shall now discuss another situation when it holds. In the absence of Ehrhard's inequality, for no measure other than the Gaussian, can such a conclusion be readily drawn.

Recall that a measure μ with density e^{-V} is called *uniformly strictly log-concave* if $\nabla^2 V \geq k_1 \mathrm{Id}$, for some $k_1 > 0$. We shall show

Theorem 1.8. *Let μ be a uniformly strictly log-concave measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with an even density. Then $p_s(\mu, a) \to_{a \to 1} \infty$.*

In Section 2 we discuss preliminaries from PDE, Sobolev space theory, rearrangements, asymptotic analysis, and other relevant topics; notably, in subsection 2.4 we will derive useful trace inequalities for convex sets. In Section 3 we discuss Conjecture 1, its isoperimetric implications and relation to the S-inequality [73], connections to Conjecture 2, prove Proposition 1.3, survey results of Kolesnikov and Milman [58] regarding the $L2$ estimates, and perform other preparations. In Section 4 we show an upper bound on the Poincare constant of a restriction of an isotropic log-concave measure to a symmetric convex subset (which is needed to deduce a qualitative estimate, and also the rotation-invariant version of it is needed for Theorem 1.7). In Section 5 we prove Theorem 1.4 (the equality case characterization of the Brascamp-Lieb inequality and the universal stability in the Gaussian case). In Section 6 we discuss energy minimization for the standard Gaussian measure, explore various bounds and properties of torsional rigidity. In Section 7 we prove Theorem A as well as Theorem 1.5 and some of its consequences; in fact, in Section 7 we shall state a more general result Theorem 7.3, which we strongly believe is of

independent interest. In Section 8 we will discuss upgrades on the Brascamp-Lieb inequality, draw some connections with the Ehrhard inequality, and utilize our work from Section 7 in order to characterize the equality cases in the "enchanted symmetric version" of the Brascamp-Lieb inequality. In Section 9 we discuss general log-concave measures and prove Theorems B, 1.6 and 1.7. In Section 10 we prove Theorem 1.8.

The reader interested only in the aforementioned theorems may skip Subsection 6.2 and Section 8. The reader interested only in the inequality parts of Theorems A and 1.5 (but not the equality case characterizations) may skip also Section 5. The reader interested only in the non-Gaussian results may read only Sections 2, 3, 4, 9, and 10.

Acknowledgement. The author is very grateful to Benjamin Jaye for many fruitful conversations and useful references to various PDE results concerning existence and convergence, not to mention his help with a computer simulation and creating the pictures from Section 3, all of which was in-disposable. The author is grateful to Alexander Kolesnikov for teaching her a lot of mathematics, and also for pointing out to her that Proposition 7.4 could be extended to Proposition 10.1. The author also thanks Ramon van Handel for a nice discussion about Ehrhard's inequality. The author is grateful to Alexandros Eskenazis for bringing to her attention Remark 33 from [39], which has led to the formulation of the Remark 9.8.

The author is supported by the NSF CAREER DMS-1753260. The author worked on this project while being a Research Fellow at the program in Probability, Geometry, and Computation in High Dimensions at the Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing. The paper was completed while the author was in residence at the Hausdorff Institute of Mathematics at the program in The Interplay between High-Dimensional Geometry and Probability.

2. Preliminaries, and some new trace estimates for convex sets

2.1. **The Brascamp-Lieb inequality.** Recall that the Brascamp-Lieb inequality says that for any locally Lipschitz function $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and any convex function $V : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f^2 d\mu - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f d\mu\right)^2 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \langle (\nabla^2 V)^{-1} \nabla f, \nabla f \rangle d\mu, \tag{8}$$

where $d\mu(x) = e^{-V(x)}dx$. Note that the integral on the right hand side makes sense in the almost everywhere sense. The function e^{-V} is called log-concave when V is convex. See Brascamp, Lieb [16], or e.g. Bobkov, Ledoux [10].

Recall that a set K is called convex if together with every pair of points it contains the interval connecting them, and recall that the characteristic function of a convex

set is log-concave. As a consequence of (8), for any convex body K,

$$\mu(K)\int_K f^2 d\mu - \left(\int_K f d\mu\right)^2 \leq \mu(K)\int_K \langle (\nabla^2 V)^{-1}\nabla f, \nabla f\rangle d\mu. \tag{9}$$

In the case of the standard Gaussian measure γ, this becomes, for any convex set K,

$$\gamma(K)\int_K f^2 d\gamma - \left(\int_K f d\gamma\right)^2 \leq \gamma(K)\int_K |\nabla f|^2 d\gamma. \tag{10}$$

Furthermore, Cordero-Erasquin, Fradelizi and Maurey showed [29] that for symmetric convex sets and even f,

$$\gamma(K)\int_K f^2 d\gamma - \left(\int_K f d\gamma\right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\gamma(K)\int_K |\nabla f|^2 d\gamma. \tag{11}$$

In Sections 5 and 8, we shall explore this and related inequalities in detail.

2.2. **Symmetrizations and Ehrhard's principle.** Let us recall Ehrhard's rearrangement [36], the Gaussian analogue of the radial rearrangement. For a measurable set K, denote by H_K (sometimes also denoted K^*) the left half-space of the Gaussian measure equal to $\gamma(K)$. Namely,

$$H_K = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1 \leq \psi^{-1}(\gamma(K))\},$$

where

$$\psi(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^{t} e^{-\frac{s^2}{2}} ds.$$

Next, for a measurable function $u : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, consider its rearrangement u^* to be the function whose level sets are half-spaces, and have the same Gaussian measures as the level sets of u. Namely, $u^*(x) = t$ whenever $\psi(x_1) = \gamma(\{u \leq t\})$. In other words, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\{u^* \leq t\} = H_{\{u \leq t\}}.$$

The Lebesgue analogue of Ehrhard's symmetrization, called Schwartz (radial) rearrangement, is an indispensable tool in PDE, see, for instance Burchard [19], Lieb, Loss [75], Kesavan [56], or Vazquez [96]; see also Carlen, Kerce [21] for a nice discussion related to Ehrhard's symmetrization; see also Bogachev [11].

Let us recall Ehrhard's principle, which follows from the Gaussian isoperimetric inequality (for the proof, see, e.g. Carlen, Kerce [21] or Ehrhard [36].) It is the Gaussian analogue of the Polya-Szegö principle [88].

Lemma 2.1 (Ehrhard's principle)**.** *Let K be a Borel measurable set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let H_K be the left half-space of the same Gaussian measure as K. Let $u : K \to \mathbb{R}$ be a*

locally Lipschitz function and let u^* be its Ehrhard symmetral. Then for any convex increasing function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ we have

$$\int_K \varphi(|\nabla u|)d\gamma \geq \int_{H_K} \varphi(|\nabla u^*|)d\gamma.$$

Remark 2.2. *The case when $\varphi(t) = |t|$ is particularly straight-forward, so we outline it for the reader's convenience. By the co-area formula,*

$$\int_K |\nabla u| d\gamma = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma^+(\partial\{u < t\})dt.$$

By the Gaussian isoperimetric inequality [94], [12],

$$\gamma^+(\partial\{u < t\})dt \geq \gamma^+(\partial\{u^* < t\})dt,$$

and thus, $\int_K |\nabla u| d\gamma$ is greater than or equal to $\int_K |\nabla u^*| d\gamma$. The general statement also follows from this idea, but with a cleverer use of convexity, see [21].

2.3. **Some background from Sobolev space theory.** Consider an absolutely continuous measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with a locally-Lipschitz density $e^{-V(x)}$. We shall mostly consider the case when μ is log-concave, and V is a twice-differentiable convex function. We call V a potential of μ. By $C^p(\Omega)$ denote the space of p times differentiable functions on a domain Ω, whose p-th partial derivatives are continuous. By $Lip(K)$ denote the class of locally Lipschitz functions on K. Associated with μ, consider the operator $L : C^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \to C$,

$$Lu = \Delta u - \langle \nabla u, \nabla V \rangle.$$

Given a convex set K in $\mathbb{R}^n$, for a point $x \in \partial K$, we denote by n_x the outward unit normal at x; the vector-field n_x is uniquely defined almost everywhere on ∂K. We say that K is of class C^2 if its boundary is locally twice differentiable; in this case, n_x is well-defined for all $x \in \partial K$. For a C^2 convex set, consider the second fundamental form of K to be the matrix $\mathrm{II} = \frac{\mathrm{dn_x}}{\mathrm{dx}}$ (with a "plus" because the normal is outer) acting on the tangent space at x. The Gauss curvature at x is $det(\mathrm{II})$ and the mean curvature is $tr(\mathrm{II})$. Given a measure μ with potential V, define the $\mu-$associated mean curvature

$$H_\mu = tr(\mathrm{II}) - \langle \nabla \mathrm{V}, \mathrm{n_x} \rangle.$$

We say that K is strictly convex if II is non-singular everywhere on K. We say that K is uniformly strictly convex if $\det(\mathrm{II}) > \mathrm{c} > 0$ for some $c > 0$. We shall consider $L^p(\mu, K)$, the space of functions g such that $\int_K |g|^p d\mu < \infty$.

The operator Lu satisfies the following integration by parts identity whenever it makes sense (as follows immediately from the classical Divergence theorem):

$$\int_K vLu\, d\mu = -\int_K \langle \nabla v, \nabla u \rangle d\mu + \int_{\partial K} v \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle d\mu_{\partial K}.$$

Here by $\mu_{\partial K}$ we mean the measure $e^{-V(x)} dH_{n-1}(x)$, where H_{n-1} is the $(n-1)$-dimensional Hausdorff measure. The term $\langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle$ is called the normal derivative of u.

Fix a function $u \in L^1(\mu, K)$. We say that w_i is a weak i-the partial derivative of u, and use notation $w_i = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}$, if for every $v \in C^1(K)$ with $v|_{\partial K} = 0$, we have the following integration by parts identity

$$\int_K v w_i d\mu = -\int_K u \frac{\partial (v e^{-V})}{\partial x_i} dx.$$

Recall that the trace operator is a continuous linear operator

$$TR : W^{1,2}(K, \mu) \to L^2(\partial K, \mu)$$

such that for every $u \in C^1(K)$, continuous up to the boundary, we have

$$TR(u) = u|_{\partial K}.$$

We shall use informal notation $\int_{\partial K} u d\mu$ to mean $\int_{\partial K} TR(u) d\mu$. Similarly, we use notation $\int_{\partial K} \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle d\mu$ to mean $\int_{\partial K} \langle TR(\nabla u), n_x \rangle d\mu$, where $TR(\nabla u)$ is the vector formed by the trace functions of the weak first partial derivatives of u. We shall also use notation ∇, Δ and so on, to denote the appropriate quantities in the sense of weak derivatives.

Define the Sobolev space $W^{1,2}(K, \mu)$ to be the space of $L^2(K, \mu)$ functions whose all weak partial derivatives are in $L^2(K, \mu)$. We shall also consider the space

$$W_0^{1,2}(K, \mu) = W^{1,2}(K, \mu) \cap \{w : TR(w) = 0\}.$$

These spaces we consider equipped with the Sobolev norm

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,2}(K,\mu)} = \sqrt{c_1 \|u\|^2_{L^2(K,\mu)} + c_2 \sum_{i=1}^n \| \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} \|^2_{L^2(K,\mu)}}.$$

Next, let us recall the Lax-Milgram Lemma (see e.g. Evans [41]).

Lemma 2.3 (The Lax-Milgram Lemma)**.** *Let H be a Hilbert space with norm $\| \cdot \|$. Let Q be a symmetric bilinear form on H and l be a linear functional on H. Suppose that*

- *Q is continuous, i.e. $Q(f, g) \leq C_1 \|f\| \cdot \|g\|$.*
- *Q is coercive, i.e. $Q(f, f) \geq C_2 \|f\|^2$.*
- *l is continuous, i.e. $|l(f)| \leq C_3 \|f\|$.*

Then there exists a unique $h \in H$ such that for every $f \in H$ we have $Q(f, h) = l(f)$.

Lastly, let us recall a few basic facts about Poincare-type inequalities. For any bounded Lipschitz domain K and any finite absolutely-continuous measure μ, there

exists a constant $C_{poin}(K,\mu)$, which we call the Poincare constant, such that for every $F \in W^{1,2}(K,\mu)$ we have

$$Var(F) \leq C^2_{poin}(K,\mu)\mathbb{E}|\nabla F|^2. \tag{12}$$

Here and below, whenever K and μ are fixed, we use notation

$$Var(F) = \frac{1}{\mu(K)}\int_K F^2 d\mu - \left(\frac{1}{\mu(K)}\int_K F d\mu\right)^2,$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}F = \frac{1}{\mu(K)}\int_K F d\mu.$$

Similarly, for any bounded Lipschitz domain K and any finite absolutely-continuous measure μ, there exists a constant $C_D(K,\mu)$, which we call the Dirichlet-Poincare (or Sobolev) constant, such that for every $F \in W^{1,2}_0(K,\mu)$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}F^2 \leq C^2_D(K,\mu)\mathbb{E}|\nabla F|^2. \tag{13}$$

We refer to (12) as the Poincare inequality, and to (13) as the Dirichlet-Poincare or Sobolev inequality.

In the case of the standard Gaussian measure, one may infer that $C_{poin}(K,\gamma) \leq 1$ for any Lipschitz domain K. Indeed, in view of Ehrhard's principle, $C_{poin}(K,\gamma) \leq C_{poin}(H_K,\gamma)$, where H_K is the left half-space such that $\gamma(K) = \gamma(H_K)$. Thus it remains to show that $C_{poin}(H,\gamma) \leq 1$ for any half-space, and this follows from the Brascamp-Lieb inequality (9).

Similarly, it follows that

$$C_D(K,\gamma) < \infty \tag{14}$$

for any Lipschitz domain K such that K is not the whole space. We shall provide some quantitative estimates in Corollary 8.5.

Moreover, for any log-concave probability measure supported on the entire space, and a convex set K (possibly unbounded), we have

$$C_{poin}(K,\mu) < \infty; \tag{15}$$

this fact shall be outlined in Remark 4.6, since we did not find it in the literature.

2.4. **Trace theory and convexity.** Recall that the diameter of a convex body is the radius of the smallest ball which contains it. Next, the in-radius is the radius of the largest ball that is contained in the body.

Let us recall Gagliardo's trace theorem [43] (see also Grisvard [47] Theorem 1.5.10 or Ding [35]); we will rely on this result heavily throughout the paper. Recall that a domain $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is called Lipschitz if its boundary is locally a graph of a Lipschitz function.

Theorem 2.4 (Gagliardo's trace theorem)**.** *Let K be a Lipschitz domain. Let $g \in W^{1,2}(K,\lambda)$, where λ stands for the Lebesgue measure. Then*

$$\int_{\partial K} g^2(x) dH_{n-1}(x) \leq C \int_K (g^2(x) + |\nabla g|^2) dx,$$

where C depends only on K.

Here, as agreed, we use the notation which omits the trace operator, even though the integration is understood in the sense of the trace operator.

When K is convex, C depends only on the ratio of the in-radius and the diameter of K. We shall outline a simple proof of this fact.

Theorem 2.5 (explicit trace theorem for convex sets)**.** *Let K be a convex domain with an in-radius $r > 0$ and the diameter D. Let $g \in W^{1,2}(K)$. Then*

$$\int_{\partial K} g^2 dH_{n-1} \leq \frac{1}{r} \int_K (n+D) g^2 + D|\nabla g|^2 dx.$$

Proof. Suppose without loss of generality that the center of the ball inscribed into K is at the origin. Then $\langle x, n_x \rangle \geq r$, and we write, using a trick similar to the one that was used in Hosle, Kolesnikov, L [53], which in turn was inspired by the tricks in Kolesnikov, Milman [61]:

$$\int_{\partial K} g^2 dH_{n-1} \leq \frac{1}{r} \int_{\partial K} \langle x g^2, n_x \rangle dH_{n-1} = \frac{1}{r} \int_K div(x g^2) dx,$$

where in the last passage we integrated by parts. We write, for any $t > 0$,

$$div(x g^2) = n g^2 + 2 g \langle \nabla g, x \rangle \leq (n+t) g^2 + \frac{1}{t} \langle \nabla g, x \rangle^2.$$

Combining the above with the fact that the diameter of K is D, we have

$$\int_{\partial K} g^2 dH_{n-1} \leq \frac{1}{r} \int_K (n+t) g^2 + \frac{D^2}{t} |\nabla g|^2 dx.$$

Selecting (arbitrarily) $t = D$, we get the result. □

Remark 2.6. *In some particular situation one may prefer to select another value of t, but in general, we are not seeking tight trace estimates.*

Remark 2.7. *More generally, one may obtain estimates for $\int_{\partial K} |g|^p dH_{n-1}$, for other values of $p > 0$.*

As an immediate corollary, we get

Theorem 2.8 (Trace theorem for measures)**.** *Let K be a bounded Lipschitz domain. Let $g \in W^{1,2}(K,\mu)$, for a probability measure μ whose density is bounded and strictly*

positive on any compact set. Then

$$\int_{\partial K} g^2 d\mu_{\partial K} \leq C_1 \int_K (g^2 + |\nabla g|^2) d\mu,$$

where C depends only on K and μ. If K is convex, the constant C depends only on the diameter and the in-radius of K, the dimension n, and μ.

Proof. Indeed, by Theorem 2.5, we may let $C_1 = \frac{n+D}{r} \frac{max_{x\in\partial K} F(x)}{min_{x\in K} F(x)}$, where F is the density of μ; the expression is finite by our assumptions. □

Remark 2.9. *Of course, one may adapt the proof of Theorem 2.5 to any measure μ with density e^{-V}, and get that for any convex body K containing the ball $y_0 + rB_2^n$, and any $g \in W^{1,2}(K)$,*

$$\int_{\partial K} g^2 d\mu_{\partial K} \leq \frac{1}{r} \int_K ng^2 + 2g\langle \nabla g, x - y_0\rangle - g^2\langle x - y_0, \nabla V\rangle d\mu \leq C \int_K g^2 + |\nabla g|^2 d\mu.$$

However, even in the case of log-concave probability measures, the constant will in general depend on the diameter, the in-radius of K, and μ. Assuming, say, that μ is even, and K is symmetric, we get

$$\int_{\partial K} g^2 d\mu_{\partial K} \leq \frac{1}{r} \int_K (n + x^2) g^2 + |\nabla g|^2 d\mu.$$

But still, even if μ is isotropic, this is difficult to estimate in general for an unbounded convex set, unless we know some further information about the growth of our function g.

In some particular cases, however, the dependance may be nicer; below we shall outline one such important case.

Federer [42] introduced a notion of a *reach* of a domain K to be

$$reach(K) = \inf_{y\in\mathbb{R}^n} \sup\{r > 0 : rB_2^n + y \subset U_K\},$$

where U_K is the set of points in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that the distance from them to K is attained at a unique point. A version of Gagliardo's theorem for the Gaussian measure was obtained by Harrington, Raich [48], in which the boundedness assumption is replaced by the assumption that ∂K is C^2 and has positive reach.

Here, we show that in the case when K is convex and contains the origin, and γ is the standard Gaussian measure, the constant in the trace theorem does not depend on the diameter, and the estimate is valid for unbounded sets. This fact will be helpful in Sections 6 and 7, and leads to part (2) of Theorem 1.4.

Theorem 2.10 (Gaussian Trace Theorem for convex sets containing the origin)**.** *Let K be a convex domain such that $rB_2^n \subset K$, for some $r > 0$. Let $g \in W^{1,2}(K, \gamma)$,*

where γ is the Gaussian measure. Then

$$\int_{\partial K} g^2 d\gamma_{\partial K} \leq \frac{1}{r} \int_K (ng^2 + |\nabla g|^2) d\gamma.$$

Proof. Again, we use the estimate $\langle x, n_x \rangle \geq r$, incorporate the trick similar to the ones from [53], [61], and integrate by parts, to get

$$\int_{\partial K} g^2 d\gamma_{\partial K} \leq \frac{1}{r} \int_{\partial K} \langle g^2 x, n_x \rangle d\gamma_{\partial K} = \frac{1}{r} \int_K (div(g^2 x) - g^2 x^2) d\gamma.$$

Note that

$$div(g^2 x) = ng^2 + 2g\langle \nabla g, x \rangle \leq ng^2 + |\nabla g|^2 + g^2 x^2.$$

Combining the above yields the result. □

2.5. **Crash course on classical existence theorems with emphasis on our specific needs.** In this subsection, we formulate several existence results. Although they are classical and well known, we sketch the proofs, since for us, the specifics of the assumptions will matter, as we will be dealing with some delicate approximation arguments, and with *unbounded domains*.

We say that $u \in W^{1,2}(K, \mu)$ is a weak solution of the Poisson system with Neumann boundary condition, if

$$\begin{cases} Lu = F & on \ \ K \\ \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle = f & on \ \ \partial K, \end{cases}$$

whenever the identity

$$\int_K \langle \nabla v, \nabla u \rangle d\mu = \int_K vF \, d\mu + \int_{\partial K} vf d\mu_{\partial K}$$

holds for every $v \in W^{1,2}(K, \mu)$ (here the boundary integral is understood in the sense of the trace operator).

We say that $u \in W^{1,2}(K, \mu)$ is a weak solution of the Poisson system with Dirichlet boundary condition, if

$$\begin{cases} Lu = F & on \ \ K \\ u = f & on \ \ \partial K, \end{cases}$$

whenever the identity

$$\int_K \langle \nabla v, \nabla u \rangle d\mu = \int_K vF \, d\mu$$

holds for every $v \in W_0^{1,2}(K, \mu)$, and $TR(u) = f$.

Theorem 2.11 (Neumann boundary condition)**.** *Let K be a bounded Lipschitz domain and let μ be an absolutely-continuous probability measure with a locally-Lipschitz density. Let $F \in L^2(K,\mu) \cap Lip(K)$ and $f \in L^2(\mu, \partial K)$, such that*

$$\int_K F d\mu = \int_{\partial K} f d\mu_{\partial K}.$$

Then there exists a unique function $u \in W^{1,2}(K,\mu)$ which is a solution of

$$\begin{cases} Lu = F & on \ \ K \\ \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle = f & on \ \ \partial K. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore,
a) if μ is the standard Gaussian measure and K is convex, then the boundedness assumption is not required;
b) if $f = 0$, μ is a log-concave measure supported on the whole space, and K is a convex set, then the boundedness assumption is not required.

Moreover, if ∂K is C^2 and $f \in C^1(\partial K)$, then $u \in C^2(int(K)) \cap C^1(\bar{K})$.

Proof. Consider the bilinear form

$$Q(u,v) = \int_K \langle \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle d\mu,$$

and the linear functional

$$l(v) = -\int_K F v d\mu + \int_{\partial K} f v d\mu_{\partial K}.$$

By Cauchy's inequality, $Q(u,v) \leq C\|u\|_{W^{1,2}(K,\mu)} \cdot \|u\|_{W^{1,2}(K,\mu)}$, therefore Q is continuous. Without loss of generality, we may work in the space $W^{1,2}(K,\mu) \cap \{\int_K u d\mu = 0\}$ (if we pick $u + C$ in place of u, nothing changes). Then, by Poincare inequality (12), Q is coercive (where the coercivity constant depends on the Poincare constant). Lastly, we note that l is continuous by the Cauchy's inequality and the trace theorem 2.4. The existence follows by the Lax-Milgram lemma 2.3.

The "moreover" part follows by the standard regularity estimates, see e.g. Evans [41] or Kolesnikov, Milman [58].

The "furthermore a)" part follows by using Theorem 2.10 in place of Theorem 2.4. The "furthermore b)" part follows since one does not need to use Gagliardo's theorem if $f = 0$, and (15) guarantees that Q is coercive, without needing boundedness of the domain.

In order to show uniqueness, suppose by contradiction that there is two functions u and v which satisfy the system, and consider $h = u - v$. Then $Lh = 0$ on K and $\langle \nabla h, n_x \rangle = 0$ on ∂K which implies that $\int_K |\nabla h|^2 d\mu = 0$, and thus $h = 0$ in the sense of the space $W^{1,2}$, yielding that $u = v$. □

In a similar fashion, one may show the following existence result.

Theorem 2.12 (The $L + Id$ operator, Neumann boundary condition)**.** *Let K be a bounded convex domain. Let γ be the standard Gaussian measure. Let $F \in L^2(K,\gamma)$ and $f \in L^2(\partial K,\gamma)$. Then for any $s \leq 1$, there exists a function $u \in W^{1,2}(K,\gamma)$ which is a solution of*

$$\begin{cases} Lu + su = F & on \ \ K \\ \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle = f & on \ \ \partial K. \end{cases}$$

In case, additionally, K is symmetric and F and f are even, then the solution exists whenever $s \leq 2$.

Moreover, if ∂K is C^2 and $f \in C^1(\partial K)$, then $u \in C^2(int(K)) \cap C^1(\bar{K})$.

Proof. Consider the bilinear form

$$Q(u,v) = \int_K \langle \nabla u, \nabla v \rangle - suv \ d\gamma,$$

and the linear functional

$$l(v) = -\int_K Fv d\gamma + \int_{\partial K} fv d\gamma|_{\partial K}.$$

As before, l is continuous by the Cauchy's inequality and the Gagliardo's theorem 2.4. By Cauchy's inequality, Q is continuous. Without loss of generality, we may work in the space $W^{1,2}(K,\mu) \cap \{\int_K u d\mu = 0\}$: indeed, by switching F with $F + C_0$, where C_0 is fully determined by F and f, we get that $\int_K u d\gamma = 0$. Namely, for this we select

$$C_0 = \int_{\partial K} f d\gamma - \int_K F d\gamma.$$

Whenever K is not a cylinder (and, in particular, whenever K is bounded), $C_{poin}(K,\gamma) < 1$, as follows from Theorem 1.4 (the fact that $C_{poin}(K,\gamma) \leq 1$ we already explained above, but here the strict inequality matters). Therefore, by (12),

$$Q(u,u) = \int_K |\nabla u|^2 - su^2 \, d\gamma \geq (1 - sC^2_{poin}(K,\gamma)) \int_K |\nabla u|^2 \, d\gamma,$$

and thus Q is coercive, whenever $s \leq 1$. The existence follows by the Lax-Milgram lemma 2.3.

In the symmetric case, $C^2_{poin}(K,\gamma) < \frac{1}{2}$, whenever K is bounded. Therefore, the symmetric version follows in the same manner for any $s \leq 2$. The "moreover" part follows by the standard regularity estimates, see e.g. Evans [41] or Kolesnikov, Milman [58]. □

Lastly, we state existence and uniqueness results for the Dirichlet boundary condition, which will be relevant for us in Section 6 and onwards.

Theorem 2.13 (Dirichlet boundary condition)**.** *Let K be a bounded Lipschitz domain and let μ be an absolutely-continuous probability measure with a locally-Lipschitz density. Let $F \in L^2(K,\mu)$ and $f \in TR(W^{1,2}(K,\mu) \cap C^2(K))$. Then there exists a unique function $u \in W^{1,2}(K,\mu)$ which is a solution of*

$$\begin{cases} Lu = F & on \ \ K \\ u = f & on \ \ \partial K. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, in the case $f = 0$ and the Gaussian measure γ, the domain K may be unbounded.

Moreover, if ∂K is C^2 and $f \in C^2(\partial K)$, then $u \in C^2(int(K)) \cap C^1(\bar{K})$.

Proof. Let $v_0 \in TR(W^{1,2}(K,\mu) \cap C^2(K))$ be any function such that $TR(v_0) = f$. Then u is the desired solution if $u = w + v_0$, and w is the solution of the system

$$\begin{cases} Lw = G & on \ \ K \\ w = 0 & on \ \ \partial K, \end{cases}$$

with $G = F - Lv_0$. Consider the bilinear form

$$Q(w,v) = \int_K \langle \nabla w, \nabla v \rangle d\mu$$

and the linear functional

$$l(v) = -\int_K G v d\mu,$$

both acting on the space $W_0^{1,2}(K)$. By the Dirichlet-Poincare inequality (13), Q is coercive. Both Q and l are continuous by the choice of our space. The existence follows by the Lax-Milgram lemma 2.3. The "moreover" part follows by the standard regularity estimates, see e.g. Evans [41] or Kolesnikov, Milman [58].

For the "furthermore" part, recall (14), i.e. that $C_D(K,\gamma) < \infty$ for any Lipschitz domain K such that K is not the whole space (as shall be proven in Corollary 8.5).

In order to show uniqueness, suppose by contradiction that there is two functions u and v which satisfy the system, and consider $h = u - v$. Then $Lh = 0$ on K and $h|_{\partial K} = 0$, which implies that $\int_K |\nabla h|^2 d\mu = 0$, and thus $h = 0$ in the sense of the space $W^{1,2}$, yielding that $u = v$. □

2.6. **Preliminaries from Asymptotic Analysis.** We outline the following result which is well-known to experts.

Lemma 2.14. *Let μ be any rotation-invariant probability measure with an absolutely continuous density. Then*

- *For any $q > 0$, and any convex body K containing the origin,*
$$\int_K |x|^q d\mu(x) \geq \int_{B(K)} |x|^q d\mu(x),$$
- *For any $q < 0$, and any convex body K containing the origin,*
$$\int_K |x|^q d\mu(x) \leq \int_{B(K)} |x|^q d\mu(x),$$

where $B(K)$ is the Euclidean ball centered at the origin such that $\mu(B(K)) = \mu(K)$.

Proof. Let $d\mu(x) = e^{-\varphi(|x|)}$, for some convex function φ. Suppose $\mu(K) = \mu(RB_2^n)$. We write, by polar coordinates,

$$\int_K |x|^q d\mu(x) - \int_{RB_2^n} |x|^q d\mu(x) =$$
$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \left(\int_0^{\|\theta\|_K^{-1}} t^{n+q-1} e^{-\varphi(t)} dt - \int_0^R t^{n+q-1} e^{-\varphi(t)} dt \right) d\theta \geq$$
$$R^q \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \left(\int_0^{\|\theta\|_K^{-1}} t^{n-1} e^{-\varphi(t)} dt - \int_0^R t^{n-1} e^{-\varphi(t)} dt \right) d\theta = 0,$$

since $\mu(K) = \mu(RB_2^n)$. The second assertion follows in an analogous manner. □

The next lemma follows from computations e.g. in Livshyts [79]. We outline the proof for the reader's convenience.

Lemma 2.15. *For $p, q > 0$, for any $R > 0$,*
$$\frac{1}{\mu(RB_2^n)} \int_{RB_2^n} |x|^q e^{-\frac{|x|^p}{p}} dx \leq c(p,q) n^{\frac{q}{p}}.$$

Proof. Let us denote
$$J_k^p(R) = \int_0^R t^k e^{-\frac{t^p}{p}} dt.$$
Integrating in polar coordinates, we note that
$$\frac{1}{\mu(RB_2^n)} \int_{RB_2^n} |x|^q e^{-\frac{|x|^p}{p}} dx = \frac{J_{n+q-1}^p(R)}{J_{n-1}^p(R)}.$$
Denote also
$$g_k^p(t) = t^k e^{-\frac{t^p}{p}}.$$
It was shown in [79] via the Laplace method (see e.g. De Brujn [18]), that there exists a constant $C(p,q) > 0$ such that for every $R \geq C(p,q) n^{\frac{1}{p}}$,
$$\frac{J_{n+q-1}^p(R)}{g_{n+q}(n^{1/p})} \in [\frac{c_1}{\sqrt{n}}, \frac{c_2}{\sqrt{n}}],$$

for some $0 < c_1 < c_2$, possibly depending on p and q. Thus for $R \geq C(p,q)n^{\frac{1}{p}}$,

$$\frac{J^p_{n+q-1}(R)}{J^p_{n-1}(R)} \leq c'(p,q)n^{\frac{q}{p}}.$$

Therefore, the conclusion of the Lemma is verified when $R \geq C(p,q)n^{1/p}$.

In the complimentary case when $R \leq C(p,q)n^{1/p}$, we estimate

$$J^p_{n+q-1}(R) = \int_0^R t^{n+q-1}e^{-\frac{t^p}{p}}dt \leq R^q \int_0^R t^{n-1}e^{-\frac{t^p}{p}}dt = R^q J^p_{n-1}(R) \leq C'(p,q)n^{\frac{q}{p}}J^p_{n-1}(R),$$

and the Lemma follows. □

In the case $p = 2$, recall the notation

$$J_k(R) = \int_0^R t^k e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}}dt$$

and

$$g_k(t) = t^k e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}}.$$

We shall need several times the following

Lemma 2.16. *For every $R > 0$, and any integer $n \geq 1$, we have*

$$J_{n+3}(R) = (n+2)J_{n+1}(R) - g_{n+2}(R).$$

Proof. We integrate by parts

$$J_k(R) = \int_0^R t^k e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}}dt = -\frac{1}{k+1}R^{k+1}e^{-\frac{R^2}{2}} + \frac{1}{k+1}\int_0^R t^{k+2}e^{-\frac{R^2}{2}},$$

and arrive to the conclusion, letting $k = n+1$. □

We shall also need

Lemma 2.17. *Let γ be the standard Gaussian measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$. For any star-shaped set K in $\mathbb{R}^n$ containing the origin, and any $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{\gamma(K)}\int_K \langle x, \theta\rangle^2 d\gamma(x) \leq 1.$$

Moreover, the inequality is strict unless $K = \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proof. Consider the operator T^t_θ of dilation by a factor of t in the direction θ. Then for any $t \geq 1$ we have $\gamma(T^t_\theta K) \geq \gamma(K)$, and therefore,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\gamma(T^t_\theta K)|_{t=1} \geq 0.$$

The direct computation shows that this amounts to the statement of the Lemma. For the "moreover" part, note that the function $\gamma(T^t_\theta K)$ is strictly increasing in t unless $K = \mathbb{R}^n$. □

3. The concavity coefficient, isoperimetry and the related discussion.

3.1. **The concavity coefficient of a convex set.** Fix a convex set K in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with C^2 boundary, and consider a twice-differentiable function $\varphi : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$. Let $g : \partial K \to \mathbb{R}$ be given by $g(x) = \varphi(n_x)$. Recall that the support function $h_K : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ of a convex set K is the function

$$h_K(u) = \sup_{x \in K} \langle x, u \rangle.$$

Consider a collection of convex sets $\{K_t^g\}_{t \in [0,\epsilon]}$ with support functions

$$h_t(u) := h_{K_t^g}(u) = h_K(u) + t\varphi(u).$$

Note that the system K_t^g is well-defined for any strictly-convex set K, for a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. In the case that K is not strictly convex, the system K_t^g may still be well defined for many "admissible" functions g. For instance, it is well defined for $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ and any function g of the form $g(x) = \varphi(n_x)$, where

$$\varphi(u) = h_L(u) - h_K(u),$$

for any convex set L, since in this case, $K_t^g = (1-t)K + tL$, which is a convex set for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

One may show the following Lemma, previously discussed in Colesanti [23], Livshyts, Marsiglietti [27], Kolesnikov [62], Milman [57], and other related works.

Lemma 3.1. *Let μ be a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Fix convex sets K and L with C^2 boundary, and denote $K_t = (1-t)K + tL$. The twice-differentiable strictly increasing function $F : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies*

$$F\left((1-t)\mu(K) + t\mu(L)\right) \geq (1-t)F(\mu(K)) + tF(\mu(L)) \tag{16}$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$, if and only if for any $a \in [0, 1]$, letting t_a be such that $\mu(K_{t_a}) = a$,

$$\frac{F''(a)}{F'(a)} \leq -\frac{M_a''(0)}{M_a'(0)^2}, \tag{17}$$

where $M_a(s) = \mu(K_{t_a+s})$.

Proof. In the case when K and L have C^2 boundary, M_a is twice differentiable for all $a \in [0, 1]$. The inequality (16) amounts to the concavity of the function $F(\mu(K_t))$ on $[0, 1]$, which is equivalent to the fact that $F(\mu(K_t))|_t'' \leq 0$. The latter amounts to (17). □

For a convex set K, we say that a function $g : \partial K \to \mathbb{R}$ is admissible if there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ (possibly depending on g) such that K_ϵ^g is a well-defined convex set, and the function $M^g(t) = \mu(K_t^g)$ is continuously twice differentiable at $t = 0$. We use notation $Adm(K)$ for the set of such admissible g.

Motivated by Lemma 3.1, and following the notation of Kolesnikov and Milman [57], we denote, for a C^2-smooth convex set K and a measure μ,

$$G_\mu(K) := \inf_{g\in C^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})\cap Adm(K)} \left(-\frac{\mu(K_t^g)|''_{t=0}}{(\mu(K_t^g)|'_{t=0})^2}\right).$$

One may note that $G_\mu(K)$ is continuous on the set of convex sets, and thus for a non C^2 set K, we may define $G_\mu(K)$ by approximation. We shall call $G_\mu(K)$ *a concavity coefficient of* K.

Further, fix a class $\mathcal{F}$ of convex sets which is closed under Minkowski interpolations, and for each $K \in \mathcal{F}$ restrict the admissible class of functions $Adm(K)$ to those which interpolate within the class $\mathcal{F}$. Consider a function $G_{\mu,\mathcal{F}} : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$G_{\mu,\mathcal{F}}(a) = \inf_{K\in\mathcal{F}:\mu(K)=a} G_\mu(K).$$

We shall especially focus our attention on the particular case when $\mathcal{F}$ is the class of symmetric convex sets, and $g : \mathbb{S}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ are even functions. We denote

$$G^s_\mu(K) := \inf_{g\in C^2(\mathbb{S}^{n-1})\cap Adm(K):\, g(u)=g(-u)} \left(-\frac{\mu(K_t^g)|''_{t=0}}{(\mu(K_t^g)|'_{t=0})^2}\right),$$

and

$$G^s_\mu(a) = \inf_{K\in\mathcal{K}^{sym}:\mu(K)=a} G^s_\mu(K),$$

where $\mathcal{K}^{sym}$ stands for the collection of all symmetric convex sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

As an immediate corollary of Lemma 3.1 and an approximation argument, we get the following Proposition, which has appeared in various forms in [23], [27], [28], [58], [59], [60], [61], and others.

Proposition 3.2. *Fix a class $\mathcal{F}$ of convex sets K which is closed under Minkowski interpolations. Let μ be a log-concave measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose $F : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ is a strictly increasing continuously twice differentiable function. Then the inequality*

$$F(\mu((1-t)K + tL)) \geq (1-t)F(\mu(K)) + tF(\mu(L))$$

holds for all $t \in [0,1]$ and every pair $K, L \in \mathcal{F}$, if and only if for every $a \in [0,1]$,

$$\frac{F''(a)}{F'(a)} \leq G_{\mu,\mathcal{F}}(a).$$

Remark 3.3. *Letting $F(a) = \log a$ in Proposition 3.2 we see that*

$$G_{\mu,\mathcal{F}}(a) \geq -\frac{1}{a}$$

for any class $\mathcal{F}$ of convex sets, whenever μ is log-concave.

In other words, Proposition 3.2 implies that "the optimal" function F which satisfies (2) for some class $\mathcal{F}$ of convex sets, is given by

$$F(a) = \int_0^a exp\left(\int_{c_0}^t G_{\mu,\mathcal{F}}(s)ds\right) dt.$$

Here, the choice of the constant $c_0 \in (0,1)$ is arbitrary; we must select $c_0 > 0$ so that the corresponding integral converges. Note that the function given above is necessarily twice differentiable and strictly increasing.

3.2. **Concavity powers.** Recall that for a log-concave measure μ and $a \in [0,1]$ we let $p(\mu,a)$ be the largest real number such that for all convex sets K and L with $\mu(K) \geq a$ and $\mu(L) \geq a$, and every $\lambda \in [0,1]$ one has

$$\mu(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L)^{p(\mu,a)} \geq \lambda \mu(K)^{p(\mu,a)} + (1-\lambda)\mu(L)^{p(\mu,a)}.$$

Analogously, we define $p_s(\mu,a)$ as the largest number such that for all convex *symmetric* sets K and L with $\mu(K) \geq a$ and $\mu(L) \geq a$, and every $\lambda \in [0,1]$ one has

$$\mu(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L)^{p_s(\mu,a)} \geq \lambda \mu(K)^{p_s(\mu,a)} + (1-\lambda)\mu(L)^{p_s(\mu,a)}.$$

Further, for a convex set K we define

$$p_s(K,\mu) = \limsup_{\epsilon \to 0} \left\{p : \forall L \in \mathcal{K}_s^n,\ \mu((1-\epsilon)K + \epsilon L)^p \geq (1-\epsilon)\mu(K)^p + \epsilon \mu(L)^p\right\},$$

where $\mathcal{K}_s^n$ stands for the set of symmetric convex sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$. By log-concavity, we get

Lemma 3.4.

$$p_s(a,\mu) = \inf_{K:\, \mu(K) \geq a} p_s(K,\mu).$$

Proof. Note that for any pair of symmetric convex sets K and L,

$$\mu(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L)^p \geq \lambda \mu(K)^p + (1-\lambda)\mu(L)^p, \tag{18}$$

with $p = inf_\lambda p_s(K_\lambda, \mu)$, where we use notation $K_\lambda = \lambda K + (1-\lambda)L$.

In case $\mu(L) \geq a$ and $\mu(L) \geq a$, we have

$$\mu(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L) \geq \mu(K)^\lambda \mu(L)^{1-\lambda} \geq a.$$

Additionally, a convex combination of convex symmetric sets is a convex symmetric set. In other words, the class of convex symmetric sets with measure exceeding $a \in [0,1]$ is closed under Minkowski interpolation. Therefore, by (18), the Lemma follows. □

Remark 3.5. *The assumption of log-concavity of μ in the previous Lemma could be replaced with the assumption of quasi-concavity, that is,*

$$\mu\left((1-t)K + tL\right) \geq \min(\mu(K), \mu(L)).$$

Lastly, we notice the relation between the concavity powers and the concavity coefficient, which follows immediately from Proposition 3.2:

Lemma 3.6. *For a convex symmetric set K,*

$$G^s_\mu(K) = \frac{p_s(K,\mu)-1}{\mu(K)}.$$

Consequently, for any $a \in [0,1]$,

$$G^s_\mu(a) = \frac{p_s(\mu,a)-1}{a}.$$

We note also

Proposition 3.7. *Let*

$$F(a) = \int_0^a \exp\left(\int_{c_0}^s \frac{-1+p_s(\mu,t)}{t}dt\right)ds = \int_0^a \exp\left(\int_{c_0}^s G^s_\mu(t)dt\right)ds,$$

for an arbitrary $c_0 \in (0,1)$. Then for any pair of symmetric convex sets K, L in $\mathbb{R}^n$,

$$F(\mu(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L)) \geq \lambda F(\gamma(K)) + (1-\lambda)F(\gamma(L)).$$

Proof. By Propositions 3.16 and 3.17, the function $F(a)$ which satisfies

$$\frac{F''(a)}{F'(a)} = \frac{p^s(\mu,a)-1}{a} = G^s_\mu(a),$$

will also satisfy the conclusion. Solving the elementary ODE, we note that the function in the statement of the proposition does satisfy this equation. □

3.3. **Analyzing the Conjecture 1 and its isoperimetric implications.** We shall introduce some **Notation.**

- $\psi(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{-\infty}^t e^{-\frac{s^2}{2}}ds,\ t \in [0,\infty]$;
- $g_p(t) = t^p e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}},\ t \in [0,\infty]$;
- $J_p(R) = \int_0^R g_p(t)dt,\ R \in [0,\infty]$;
- $c_p = J_p(+\infty)$;
- $R_k(a) = J^{-1}_{k-1}(c_{k-1}a),\ a \in [0,1]$;
- $\varphi(t) = 2\psi(t) - 1 = R_1^{-1}(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{-t}^t e^{-\frac{s^2}{2}}ds,\ t \in [0,\infty]$;
- $s_k(a) = c^{-1}_{k-1}g_{k-1} \circ R_k(a),\ a \in [0,1]$;
- $\varphi_k(a) = \frac{c_{k-1}(R_k(a)^2-k+1)}{g_k \circ R_k(a)},\ a \in [0,1]$.

We consider also the convex set

$$C_k(a) = R_k(a)B_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k} \subset \mathbb{R}^n.$$

The geometric meaning of the function $R_k(a)$ is the radius of the k-round cylinder $C_k(a)$ of measure a, i.e. $\gamma(R_k(a)B_2^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}) = a$. Also, note that $s_k(a) = \gamma^+(\partial C_k(a))$. We notice the following relations:

$$R_k'(a) = \frac{c_{k-1}}{g_{k-1} \circ R_k(a)} = \frac{1}{s_k(a)}, \tag{19}$$

and

$$\varphi_k(a) = \left(\log \frac{1}{s_k(a)}\right)'. \tag{20}$$

By (19) and (20), and the change of variables $x = R_k(s)$, followed by the change of variables $y = R_k(t)$, the function

$$F(a) = \int_0^a \exp\left(\int_{C_0}^t \min_{k=1,\ldots,n} \varphi_k(s)ds\right) dt =$$

$$\int_0^a \exp\left(\int_{C_0}^t \min_{k=1,\ldots,n} \left(\frac{c_{k-1}(-k+1+J_{k-1}^{-1}(c_{k-1}s)^2)}{g_k \circ J_{k-1}^{-1}(c_{k-1}s)}\right) ds\right) dt \tag{21}$$

from the Conjecture 1, rewrites as

$$F(a) = \sum_{k=1}^n 1_{a \in E_k} \cdot (\beta_k R_k(a) + \alpha_k),$$

for some disjoint sets $E_k \subset [0,1]$, such that $[0,1] = \cup_{k=1}^n E_k$, and some coefficients $\alpha_k, \beta_k \in \mathbb{R}$. Namely, $E_k \subset [0,1]$ is chosen to be the set where $\varphi_k(a) = \min_{j=1,\ldots,n} \varphi_j(a)$.

We shall also need the following

Lemma 3.8 ("the strip wins eventually")**.** *There exists a constant $\alpha_1 \in [0,1]$ such that for every $a \geq \alpha_1$, one has*

$$\varphi_1(a) = \min_{k=1,\ldots,n} \varphi_k(a).$$

Proof. For $a \in [0,1]$, we shall analyze $\frac{d}{dk}\varphi_k(a)$, where $k \in (0,n]$. Note that nothing is stopping us from considering k in the interval, rather than just taking integer values. The Lemma will follow if we show that there exists a constant $\alpha_1 \in [0,1]$ such that for every $a \geq \alpha_1$, one has $\frac{d}{dk}\varphi_k(a) \geq 0$ for all $k \in (1,n]$.

Indeed, letting

$$I_{k-1}(R) = \int_0^\infty t^{k-1} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} \log t \, dt,$$

we note that

$$\frac{d}{dk} R_k(a) = \frac{a c'_{k-1}}{I_{k-1} \circ R_k(a)},$$

and hence

$$\frac{d}{dk}\varphi_k(a) = \left(c_{k-1} \frac{R_k^2(a) - k + 1}{g_k \circ R_k(a)} \right)'_k =$$

$$c'_{k-1} \frac{R_k^2(a) - k + 1}{g_k \circ R_k(a)} + c_{k-1} \frac{2R_k(a)}{g_k \circ R_k(a)} \cdot \frac{a c'_{k-1}}{I_{k-1} \circ R_k(a)} - c_{k-1} \frac{1}{g_k \circ R_k(a)} -$$

$$c_{k-1} \frac{R_k^2(a) - k + 1}{g_k \circ R_k(a)} \cdot \left(- \log R_k(a) + \left(R_k(a) - \frac{k-1}{R_k(a)} \right) \frac{a c'_{k-1}}{I_{k-1} \circ R_k(a)} \right).$$

Note that

$$c'_{k-1} = \int_0^\infty t^{k-1} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} \log t \, dt,$$

and $I_{k-1}(R) \to_{R\to\infty} c'_{k-1}$. Therefore, there exists an $\alpha_0 \in [0,1]$ such that for any $a \geq \alpha_0$, and any $k \in [1,n]$, we have $\frac{c'_{k-1}}{I_{k-1} \circ R_k(a)} \geq 0$, and thus multiplying by this factor does not change the sign of the above expression. Denote $R = R_k(a)$. The inequality $\frac{d}{dk}\varphi_k(a) \geq 0$ holds whenever

$$\frac{(R^2 - k + 1) I_{k-1}(R)}{c_{k-1}} - \frac{I_{k-1}(R)}{c'_{k-1}} + 2aR -$$

$$\frac{I_{k-1}(R)}{c'_{k-1}} (R^2 - k + 1) \log R + aR \left(R - \frac{k-1}{R} \right)^2 \geq 0.$$

In other words, when $a \geq \alpha_0$ and $k \in (1,n]$, and $R = R_k(a)$, there are $c_i(k) \in (A_n, B_n]$, $i \in \{1, ..., 5\}$, where the interval $(A_n, B_n]$ depends only on the dimension, such that the inequality $\frac{d}{dk}\varphi_k(a) \geq 0$ is equivalent to

$$aR^3 + c_1(k) R^2 \log R + c_2(k) R^2 + c_3(k) R + c_4(k) \log R + c_5(k) \geq 0.$$

Let R_0 be the smallest value of R which makes the above expression non-negative for all $k \in (1,n]$, provided that $a \geq \alpha_0$. Let $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_0$ be such a number in $[0,1]$ that $R_1(a) \geq R_0$; then $R_k(a) \geq R_0$ for all $k \geq 1$. We conclude that for all $a \in [\alpha_1, 1]$ and all $k \in (1,n]$ one has $\frac{d}{dk}\varphi_k(a) \geq 0$. This implies the Lemma. □

Here is a few pictures to illustrate Lemma 3.8.

The graphs of the functions $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, s_1, s_2$:



The situation with φ_1 and φ_2 at first:



The situation with φ_1 and φ_2 eventually:



The graph of $\varphi_1 - \varphi_2$:



The Ehrhard inequality implies the Gaussian isoperimetric inequality of Borell [12] and Sudakov-Tsirelson [94], which states that for every $a \in [0,1]$, among all measurable sets in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of Gaussian measure a, a half-space has the smallest Gaussian perimeter. Indeed, here is the argument that one may also find in Latała [71]: for

every Borel-measurable set K, and any $\lambda \in [0,1]$,

$$\gamma^+(\partial K) = \liminf_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{\gamma(K + \epsilon B_2^n) - \gamma(K)}{\epsilon} \geq$$

$$\liminf_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{\psi\left((1-\lambda)\psi^{-1}(\gamma(\frac{K}{1-\lambda})) + \lambda \psi^{-1}(\gamma(\frac{\epsilon}{\lambda} B_2^n))\right) - \gamma(K)}{\epsilon} =$$

$$\psi'(\psi^{-1}(\gamma(K))) \cdot \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{\psi^{-1}(\gamma(tK))}{t} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{\psi^{-1}(\gamma(K))^2}{2}} = \gamma^+(\partial H_K),$$

where H_K, as before, is the half-space of Gaussian measure $\gamma(K)$. We used here that

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{\psi^{-1}(\gamma(tK))}{t} = 1,$$

which follows from the facts that

$$\psi(t) = 1 - e^{-\frac{(t+o(t))^2}{2}};$$

$$\gamma(tB_2^n) = 1 - e^{-\frac{(t+o(t))^2}{2}},$$

where $o(t)$ is something that tends to infinity strictly slower than t.

In a similar fashion, we show that Conjecture 1 implies the sharp isoperimetric statement for symmetric convex sets of sufficiently large Gaussian measure. This fact is, in fact, known unconditionally, and was shown by Bachiesi and Julin [4]; we state the next proposition just for completeness.

Proposition 3.9. *Suppose the Conjecture 1 holds, at least for some interval $a \in [c', 1]$. Then there exists a constant $\alpha \in [0.94, 1]$ such that for any $a \geq \alpha$, and any symmetric convex set K with $\gamma(K) = a$, one has $\gamma^+(\partial K) \geq \gamma^+(\partial C_1(a))$, where $C_1(a)$ is a symmetric strip of measure a.*

Proof. Let $\alpha_1 \in [0,1]$ be such that for every $a \geq \alpha_1$, we have $\varphi_1(a) = \min_{k=1,\ldots,n} \varphi_k(a)$ (it exists by Lemma 3.8, and the numerical computation shows that it exceeds 0.94). Let us pick $C_0 = \alpha_1$ in the definition of F (21). Let $\alpha = \max(c', \alpha_1)$. By (19) and (20), we have, for all $a \geq \alpha$, that

$$F'(a) = \frac{s_1(C_0)}{s_1(a)}.$$

Further, we have, for a sufficiently large $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$F(\gamma(tB_2^n)) = \frac{\varphi^{-1}(\gamma(tB_2^n))}{2 s_1(C_0)}.$$

Note also that

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{\varphi^{-1}(\gamma(tK))}{2t} = 1,$$

which follows from the facts that

$$\varphi(t) = 1 - 2e^{-\frac{(t+o(t))^2}{2}};$$

$$\gamma(tB_2^n) = 1 - e^{-\frac{(t+o(t))^2}{2}},$$

where $o(t)$ is something that tends to infinity strictly slower than t. To summarize, we conclude that for $a \geq \alpha$,

$$\frac{1}{F'(a)} \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{F(\gamma(tB_2^n))}{t} = s_1(a) = \gamma^+(\partial C_1(a)).$$

Suppose that the Conjecture 1 holds, at least for some interval $[c', 1]$. Then for every convex symmetric set K with $\gamma(K) = a \in [\alpha, 1]$, we have

$$\gamma^+(\partial K) = \liminf_{\epsilon\to 0} \frac{\gamma(K + \epsilon B_2^n) - \gamma(K)}{\epsilon} \geq$$

$$\liminf_{\epsilon\to 0} \frac{F^{-1}\left((1-\lambda)F(\gamma(\frac{K}{1-\lambda})) + \lambda F(\gamma(\frac{\epsilon}{\lambda}B_2^n))\right) - \gamma(K)}{\epsilon} =$$

$$\frac{1}{F'(a)} \cdot \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{F(\gamma(tK))}{t} = \gamma^+(\partial C_K(a)),$$

and the proposition follows.

□

Remark 3.10. *One may not adapt the argument of Proposition 3.9 to obtain that the Conjecture 1 implies the Gaussian isoperimetry for symmetric convex sets on the entire* $[0, 1]$. *The fundamental reason for this is that the equality in the Conjecture 1 holds only for pairs of cylinders whose measures belong to certain intervals, and one may not let* t *tend to infinity, as in the proof of Proposition 3.9, and hope to have any sharp estimate. But one might hope that some local argument should help deduce the Gaussian isoperimetry for symmetric convex sets from the Conjecture 1.*

Remark 3.11 (One-dimensional case)**.** *We would like to add that Conjecture 1 holds in dimension 1, and is, in fact, always an equality. Indeed, when* $n = 1$, *we simply have* $F = \varphi^{-1}$. *For any pair of symmetric intervals* I_a *and* I_b *of Gaussian measures* a *and* b *respectively, we write* $I_a = [-\varphi^{-1}(a), \varphi^{-1}(a)]$ *and* $I_b = [-\varphi^{-1}(b), \varphi^{-1}(b)]$. *Then*

$$F(\gamma(\lambda I_a + (1-\lambda)I_b)) = F \circ \varphi(\lambda\varphi^{-1}(a) + (1-\lambda)\varphi^{-1}(b)) =$$

$$\lambda\varphi^{-1}(a) + (1-\lambda)\varphi^{-1}(b) = \lambda F(\gamma(I_a)) + (1-\lambda)F(\gamma(I_b)).$$

3.4. **The concavity powers of round k-cylinders.** In this subsection, we shall prove Proposition 1.3. It partly follows from *the inequality part* of our main result Theorem A, whose proof we defer until Section 7. Note that the *equality case characterization* in Theorem A follows, in part, from Proposition 1.3, but there is no vicious cycle. First, we outline

Lemma 3.12.

$$p_s\left(RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}\right) \leq 1 - \frac{J_{k-1}(R)}{g_k(R)}\left(k - 1 - R^2\right).$$

Proof. From the definition of p_s we deduce that $p_s\left(RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}\right)$ is smaller than the smallest non-negative number p such that the function $F(t) = \gamma(tB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k})^p$ is concave at $t = R$. Note that $F(t) = C_{n,k,p} J_{k-1}^p(t)$. Taking the second derivative of this function, we deduce the bound. □

Next, Lemma 2.16 yields immediately

Lemma 3.13. *When $K = RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$, for $k = 1, ..., n$, we have*

$$1 - \frac{J_{k-1}(R)}{g_k(R)}\left(k - 1 - R^2\right) = \frac{\mathbb{E}Y^2 - \mathbb{E}Y^4 + (\mathbb{E}Y^2)^2 + k}{(k - \mathbb{E}Y^2)^2},$$

where $Y = \sum_{i=1}^k X_i$, and the expectation is with respect to the Gaussian measure restricted onto K.

Proof of the Proposition 1.3. The inequality of Theorem A (see also Theorem 7.3) shows that

$$p_s(K, \gamma) \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}Y^2 - \mathbb{E}Y^4 + (\mathbb{E}Y^2)^2 + k}{(k - \mathbb{E}Y^2)^2},$$

where $Y = \sum_{i=1}^k X_i$ (as before). By Lemma 3.13, we get the lower bound

$$p_s(K, \gamma) \geq 1 - \frac{J_{k-1}(R)}{g_k(R)}\left(k - 1 - R^2\right),$$

which matches the corresponding upper bound from Lemma 3.12. □

3.5. **The equivalence of the Conjectures 1 and 2.** Finally, we outline

Proof of the Proposition 1.2 (the equivalence of Conjectures 1 and 2): Suppose first that Conjecture 1 holds. Then, by Proposition 3.2,

$$G_\gamma^s(a) \geq \min_{k=1,...,n} \frac{c_{k-1}(R_k(a)^2 - k + 1)}{g_k \circ R_k(a)}, \ a \in [0, 1],$$

which is equivalent, by Lemma 3.6 and Proposition 1.3, to the fact that

$$p_s(\gamma, a) \geq \min_{k=1,...,n} \left(\frac{a c_{k-1}(R_k(a)^2 - k + 1)}{g_k \circ R_k(a)} + 1 \right) = \min_{k=1,...,n} p_s(C_k(a), \gamma).$$

Therefore, Conjecture 2 holds. The converse implication follows in exact same manner. □

We are now finally ready to comment as to why the following function cannot satisfy (2) for all symmetric convex sets:

$$F(a) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} 1_{a\in I_k} \cdot (J_{k-1}^{-1}(c_{k-1}a) + a_k), \tag{22}$$

where I_k is the sub-interval of $[0,1]$ where the surface area of the k-round cylinder $C_k(a)$ is minimal (over all choices of k), where a_k are chosen in such a way that F is continuous. Indeed, if this function was to satisfy (2) for all symmetric convex sets, then, by Proposition 3.2 and Lemma 3.6, we would have

$$p_s(\gamma, a) \geq \sum_{k=1}^{n} 1_{a\in I_k} p_s(C_k(a), \gamma).$$

However, by definition of $p_s(\gamma, a)$,

$$p_s(\gamma, a) \leq \min_{k=1,\dots,} p_s(C_k(a), \gamma).$$

The two inequalities above are, in fact, incompatible: one may check using Mathematica (see the figures above), that for some $a \in [0,1]$, the strict inequality holds

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} 1_{a\in I_k} p_s(C_k(a), \gamma) > \min_{k=1,\dots,} p_s(C_k(a), \gamma).$$

In other words, unfortunately, the intervals where $p_s(C_k(a), \gamma)$ are minimal, are not the same as the intervals where $s_k(a)$ are minimal.

One may notice that if F from (22) was to satisfy (2) for all symmetric convex sets (which it doesn't, sadly), then it would imply that $C_k(a)$ minimizes Gaussian surface area among all symmetric convex sets of Gaussian measure a, via the argument similar to the proof of Proposition 3.9.

3.6. **Estimates via the L2-method.** In this section we survey the method of obtaining convexity inequalities, previously studied by Kolesnikov and Milman [58], [59], [68], [57], [61], as well as Livshyts [62], Hosle [53], and others.

Consider a log-concave measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with an even twice-differentiable density e^{-V}. Consider also the associated operator

$$Lu = \Delta u - \langle \nabla u, \nabla V \rangle.$$

We recall the notation $H_\mu = tr(\mathrm{II}) - \langle \nabla \mathrm{V}, \mathrm{n_x} \rangle$. The following Bochner-type identity was obtained by Kolesnikov and Milman. It is a particular case of Theorem 1.1 in [58] (note that $\mathrm{Ric}_\mu = \nabla^2 V$ in our case). This is a generalization of a classical result of R.C. Reilly.

Proposition 3.14 (Kolesnikov-Milman)**.** *Let μ be a log-concave measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with density e^{-V}, for some C^2 convex function V. Let $u \in C^2(K)$ and $\langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle \in C^1(\partial K)$. Then*

(23)

$$\int_K (Lu)^2 d\mu = \int_K \left(||\nabla^2 u||^2 + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle \right) d\mu + \int_{\partial K} (H_\mu \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle^2 - 2\langle \nabla_{\partial K} u, \nabla_{\partial K} \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle \rangle + \langle \mathrm{II} \nabla_{\partial K} u, \nabla_{\partial K} u \rangle) \, d\mu_{\partial K}(x).$$

Next, we shall use the following identities, building up on the work of Kolesnikov and Milman [58], as well as [27], [62].

Proposition 3.15. *Let K be a strictly convex body in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with C^2-smooth boundary. Consider a family of convex bodies K_t, with support functions $h_t(y) = h_K(y) + \varphi(y)$, for a fixed 1-homogeneous function $\varphi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Let $u \in C^2(K) \cap W^{1,2}(K)$ be such that $\langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle = \varphi(n_x)$, for all $x \in \partial K$. Let $M(t) = \mu(K_t)$. Then*

$$M'(0) = \int_{\partial K} f d\mu_{\partial K} = \int_K Lu d\mu;$$

$$M''(0) = \int_{\partial K} H_\mu f^2 - \langle \mathrm{II}^{-1} \nabla_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \mathrm{f}, \nabla_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \mathrm{f} \rangle \, \mathrm{d}\mu_{\partial \mathrm{K}} =$$

$$\int_K (Lu)^2 - \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 - \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle d\mu - Q(u),$$

where

$$Q(u) = \int_{\partial K} \langle (\mathrm{II})^{-1} \nabla_{\partial K} \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle, \ \nabla_{\partial K} \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle \rangle - 2\langle \nabla_{\partial K} u, \nabla_{\partial K} \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle \rangle + \langle \mathrm{II} \nabla_{\partial K} u, \nabla_{\partial K} u \rangle \, d\mu_{\partial K}(x) \geq 0.$$

Propositions 3.2 and 3.15 yield

Proposition 3.16. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a class of convex sets closed under Minkowski interpolation. Let $F : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ be a strictly increasing twice differentiable function such that for any $a \in [0,1]$, for any C^2-smooth $K \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mu(K) \geq a$, for every $f \in C^1(\partial K) \cap Adm(K)$ there exists a $u \in C^2(K) \cap W^{1,2}(K)$ with $\langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle = f$, and such that,*

$$\frac{F''(a)a}{F'(a)} \leq \frac{\int -(Lu)^2 + \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle + Q(u)}{\int (Lu)^2}.$$

Then for any pair of sets $K, L \in \mathcal{F}$, one has

$$F(\mu(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L)) \geq \lambda F(\gamma(K)) + (1-\lambda) F(\gamma(L)).$$

As a corollary, letting $F(t) = t^p$, and estimating $Q \geq 0$, we outline a result from [62], which built upon on Proposition 3.14.

Proposition 3.17 (KL [62])**.** *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a class of convex sets closed under Minkowski interpolation. Suppose for every C^2-smooth $K \in \mathcal{F}$, and any $f \in C^1(\partial K) \cap Adm(K)$ there exists a $u \in C^2(K) \cap W^{1,2}(K)$ with $\langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle = f(x)$ on $x \in \partial K$, and such that*

$$\frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle \geq p \left(\int Lu \right)^2 + Var(Lu).$$

Then for every pair of $K, L \in \mathcal{F}$ and any $\lambda \in [0,1]$, one has

$$\mu(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L)^p \geq \lambda \mu(K)^p + (1-\lambda)\mu(L)^p.$$

3.7. **Connections to the Latała-Oleszkiewicz S-inequality and a new related question.** Summarizing the previous sub-sections, we point out that

$$G^s_\gamma(C_k(a)) = \varphi_k(a),$$

and the Conjecture 1 is equivalent to showing that for every symmetric convex set K with $\gamma(K) = a$,

$$G^s_\gamma(K) \geq \min_{k=1,\dots,n} \varphi_k(a).$$

In other words, in view of the Propositions 3.15 and 3.2, Conjecture 1 states that for every strictly-smooth symmetric convex K with $\gamma(K) = a$, and for every even C^2-smooth function $f : \partial K \to \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\int_{\partial K} H_\gamma f^2 - \langle \mathrm{II}^{-1} \nabla_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \mathrm{f}, \nabla_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \mathrm{f} \rangle \, \mathrm{d}\gamma_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \leq - \min_{\mathrm{k}=1,\dots,\mathrm{n}} \varphi_{\mathrm{k}}(\mathrm{a}) \left(\int_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \mathrm{f} \mathrm{d}\gamma_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \right)^2. \tag{24}$$

We obtain

Proposition 3.18. *The Conjecture 1 entails that for every strictly-convex symmetric C^2-smooth body K with $\gamma(K) = a$,*

$$\int_{\partial K} tr(\mathrm{II}) \mathrm{d}\gamma_{\partial \mathrm{K}} + \int_{\mathrm{K}} \mathrm{x}^2 \mathrm{d}\gamma \leq \mathrm{na} - \min_{\mathrm{k}=1,\dots,\mathrm{n}} \varphi_{\mathrm{k}}(\mathrm{a}) \gamma^+(\partial \mathrm{K})^2,$$

and the equality is attained if and only if $K = RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ for some $k = 1, \dots, n$ and $R > 0$.

Proof. We plug $f = 1$ into (24), and recall that $H_\gamma = tr(\mathrm{II}) - \langle \mathrm{x}, \mathrm{n_x} \rangle$. It remains to integrate by parts

$$\int_{\partial K} \langle x, n_x \rangle d\gamma_{\partial K} = n\gamma(K) - \int_K x^2 d\gamma.$$

□

Remark 3.19. *We recall also the geometric meaning*

$$\int_{\partial K} \langle x, n_x \rangle d\gamma_{\partial K} = \gamma(tK)'_{t=1},$$

as may be verified directly.

Recall that the celebrated Latała-Oleszkiewicz S-inequality [73] states that for any convex symmetric set K in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and any $t \geq 1$, $\gamma(tK) \geq \gamma(tS_K)$, where S_K is the symmetric strip such that $\gamma(K) = \gamma(S_K)$. Equivalently, in view of Remark 3.19, $\int_K x^2 d\gamma \leq \int_{S_K} x^2 d\gamma$.

As a consequence of Propositions 3.9 and 3.18, we get

Proposition 3.20. *There exists an $\alpha \in [0,1]$ such that for every $a \in [\alpha, 1]$, the validity of the Conjecture 1 implies the S-inequality for all symmetric convex sets K with $\gamma(K) = a$.*

Proof. Suppose Conjecture 1 holds. By the Proposition 3.9, there exists $\alpha \in [0,1]$ such that for every $a \in [\alpha, 1]$, and every symmetric convex set K with $\gamma(K) = a$, one has

$$\gamma^+(\partial K) \geq \gamma^+(\partial S_K). \tag{25}$$

Next, note that for all $a \in [\alpha, 1]$, we have $\varphi_1(a) = \min_{k=1,\dots,n} \varphi_k(a)$, and also note that $\varphi_1(a) \geq 0$ on this sub-interval (recall Lemma 3.8 and the first figure depicting the graphs of the functions φ_1 and φ_2). Therefore, combining (25) with the Proposition 3.18, we have

$$\int_{\partial K} tr(\mathrm{II}) \mathrm{d}\gamma_{\partial \mathrm{K}} + \int_{\mathrm{K}} \mathrm{x}^2 \mathrm{d}\gamma \leq \mathrm{na} - \varphi_1(\mathrm{a})\gamma^+(\partial \mathrm{K})^2 \leq \mathrm{na} - \varphi_1(\mathrm{a})\gamma^+(\partial \mathrm{S_K})^2.$$

It remains to use the convexity of K and to say that $tr(\mathrm{II}) \geq 0$, to deduce the inequality

$$\int_K x^2 d\gamma \leq na - \varphi_1(a)\gamma^+(\partial S_K)^2.$$

In case K is a symmetric strip, the equality, in fact, occurs in the inequality above, and we get

$$\int_K x^2 d\gamma \leq \int_{S_K} x^2 d\gamma,$$

concluding the proof. □

Remark 3.21. *In a similar fashion, one may notice that the infinitesimal version of the Ehrhard inequality, derived by Kolesnikov and Milman* [60]*, which states that*

$$\int_{\partial K} H_\gamma f^2 - \langle \mathrm{II}^{-1} \nabla_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \mathrm{f}, \nabla_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \mathrm{f} \rangle \, \mathrm{d}\gamma_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \leq -\eta(\mathrm{a}) \left(\int_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \mathrm{f} \mathrm{d}\gamma_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \right)^2,$$

where

$$\eta(a) = \sqrt{2\pi} a \psi^{-1}(a) e^{\frac{\psi^{-1}(a)^2}{2}},$$

implies, for all convex sets K with $\gamma(K) \geq 0.5$, that

$$\int_K x^2 d\gamma \leq \int_{H_K} x^2 d\gamma,$$

where H_K is the half-space such that $\gamma(K) = \gamma(H_K)$. We will discuss the local version of Ehrhard's inequality in Subsection 8.1 a bit more.

Next, we would like to discuss another implication of Proposition 3.18.

Proposition 3.22. *Suppose Conjecture 1 holds in $\mathbb{R}^2$, and suppose, further, the symmetric Gaussian isoperimetric conjecture of Morgan-Heilman [50] holds in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Then there exists an interval $[\alpha, \beta] \subset [0,1]$ such that for any $a \in [\alpha, \beta]$, and any symmetric convex set K with $\gamma(K) = a$, we have*

$$\int_{\partial K} tr(\mathrm{II}) \mathrm{d}\gamma_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \leq \int_{\partial \mathrm{B_K}} \mathrm{tr}(\mathrm{II}) \mathrm{d}\gamma_{\partial \mathrm{B_K}},$$

where B_K is the centered euclidean ball of Gaussian measure a.

Proof. Let $[\alpha, \beta]$ be such an interval where $0 \leq \varphi_2(a) \leq \varphi_1(a)$, and also $s_2(a) \leq s_1(a)$ (see the first figure above to see that $[0.5, 0.9] \subset [\alpha, \beta]$.) From Proposition 3.18 combined with Lemma 2.14, we see that

$$\int_{\partial K} tr(\mathrm{II}) \mathrm{d}\gamma_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \leq -\int_{\mathrm{B_K}} \mathrm{x}^2 \mathrm{d}\gamma + \mathrm{na} - \varphi_2(\mathrm{a})\gamma^+(\partial \mathrm{K})^2.$$

Since we assumed also that the symmetric Gaussian isoperimetric conjecture of Morgan-Heilman [50] holds in $\mathbb{R}^2$, we note that $\gamma^+(\partial K) \geq \gamma^+(\partial B_K)$ (in view of the assumption that a is such that $s_2(a) \leq s_1(a)$), and thus

$$\int_{\partial K} tr(\mathrm{II}) \mathrm{d}\gamma_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \leq -\int_{\mathrm{B_K}} \mathrm{x}^2 \mathrm{d}\gamma + \mathrm{na} - \varphi_2(\mathrm{a})\gamma^+(\partial \mathrm{B_K})^2.$$

When $K = B_K$, the equality is attained, and therefore the Proposition follows. □

Proposition 3.22 motivates us to ask

Question 1. *Let K be a symmetric convex set in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let B_K be the centered euclidean ball with $\gamma(B_K) = \gamma(K)$. Is it true that*

$$\int_{\partial K} tr(\mathrm{II}) \mathrm{d}\gamma_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \leq \int_{\partial \mathrm{B_K}} \mathrm{tr}(\mathrm{II}) \mathrm{d}\gamma_{\partial \mathrm{B_K}}?$$

3.8. **Inequalities of the type of Minkowski's first.** As an application of our estimates, we show the following analogue of Minkowski's first inequality (see Schneider [91]). For Lebesgue measure $|\cdot|$ it states that

$$V_1(K, L) \geq |K|^{\frac{n-1}{n}} |L|^{\frac{1}{n}},$$

where

$$V_1(K, L) = \frac{1}{n} \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{|K + \epsilon L| - |K|}{\epsilon}.$$

Recall also the Gaussian definition [77]:

$$\gamma_1(K,L) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{\gamma(K+\epsilon L) - \gamma(K)}{\epsilon} = \gamma(K+tL)'_{t=1}.$$

We show

Proposition 3.23 (Minkowski's first inequality for symmetric sets in Gauss space)**.** *For any pair of symmetric convex sets K and L,*

$$\gamma_1(K,L) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\mathbb{E}X^2}{n}\right) \gamma(K)^{1-\frac{1}{n-\mathbb{E}X^2}} \gamma(L)^{\frac{1}{n-\mathbb{E}X^2}},$$

where the expected value is taken with respect to the restriction of the Gaussian measure γ onto K.

Proof. For any symmetric convex L we have

$$\gamma_1(K,L) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{\gamma((1-\epsilon)K + \epsilon L) - \gamma((1-\epsilon)K)}{\epsilon} \geq$$

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{((1-\epsilon)\gamma(K)^p + \epsilon \gamma(L)^p)^{\frac{1}{p}} - \gamma((1-\epsilon)K)}{\epsilon},$$

with $p = \frac{1}{n-\mathbb{E}X^2}$. The above equals

$$\gamma(K) \left(-\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p} \left(\frac{\gamma(L)}{\gamma(K)} \right)^p + \frac{\gamma_1(K,K)}{\gamma(K)} \right).$$

One may note that

$$\gamma_1(K,K) = \int_{\partial K} \langle x, n_x \rangle d\gamma_{\partial K} = \gamma(K) \left(n - \mathbb{E}X^2 \right) = \frac{\gamma(K)}{p}.$$

The proposition follows. □

We outline the partial case of Proposition 3.23 which corresponds to the Gaussian surface area $\gamma^+(\partial K)$. Recall that

$$\gamma^+(\partial K) := \gamma_1(K, B_2^n) = \liminf_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{\gamma(K + \epsilon B_2^n) - \gamma(K)}{\epsilon}.$$

By a homogeneity argument, we get the following corollary of Proposition 3.23.

Corollary 3.24. *For a symmetric convex set K,*

$$\gamma^+(\partial K) \geq (n - \mathbb{E}X^2)\gamma(K)^{1-\frac{1}{n-\mathbb{E}X^2}} \inf_{R>0} \frac{\gamma(RB_2^n)^{\frac{1}{n-\mathbb{E}X^2}}}{R} \geq \frac{(n-\mathbb{E}X^2)\gamma(K)}{R(K)},$$

where the expected value is taken with respect to the restriction of the Gaussian measure γ onto K, and $R(K)$ is the radius of the ball which has the same Gaussian measure as K.

Remark 3.25. *Note that when $K = RB_2^n$, then the second (weaker) inequality is exactly an equality.*

4. General bounds for Poincare constants of restrictions.

In this section we discuss bounds on Poincare constants of restriction of isotropic log-concave measures to convex sets. The estimate relies on techniques from the theory of log-concave measures (see Klartag [64], [65], [66], V. D. Milman [68], E. Milman [67], Barthe [3]), and the recent significant progress on the KLS conjecture by Chen [32], which improved up on the past work of Lee, Vempala [72], both of these works building up on Eldan's stochastic localization scheme [38].

Recall that the Poincare constant of the restriction of measure μ onto a set K is the smallest number $C_{poin}(K,\mu) > 0$ such that for any function $f \in W^{1,2}(K,\gamma) \cap Lip(K)$,

$$\mu(K)\int_K f^2 d\mu - \left(\int_K f d\mu\right)^2 = C^2_{poin}(K,\mu)\mu(K)\int_K |\nabla f|^2 d\mu. \tag{26}$$

Recall that a measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is called isotropic if $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x d\mu = 0$ and $Cov(\mu) = (\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x_i x_j d\mu) = Id$. We show

Theorem 4.1. *Denote by $o(1)$ a number which tends to zero as n tends to infinity, and is bounded from above by an absolute constant.*

- *Let μ be a log-concave even isotropic probability measure. Then for any symmetric convex set K, $C_{poin}(\mu,K) \leq n^{1+o(1)}$.*
- *If, additionally, μ is rotation-invariant, then $C_{poin}(\mu,K) \leq n^{0.5+o(1)}$.*

In order to prove the theorem, we start by verifying the following lemma, which is believed to be well known to experts.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $d\mu(x) = e^{-V(x)}dx$ be an isotropic log-concave measure. Then for any $R > 0$, and any $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, one has*

$$\int_0^R t^{n+3} e^{-V(t\theta)} dt \leq Cn^4 \int_0^R t^{n-1} e^{-V(t\theta)} dt.$$

If, additionally, μ is rotation-invariant, then

$$\int_0^R t^{n+3} e^{-V(t\theta)} dt \leq Cn^2 \int_0^R t^{n-1} e^{-V(t\theta)} dt.$$

Here C stands for absolute constants, independent of the dimension, which may change line to line.

Proof. Let $t_0^\theta(k) \in \mathbb{R}$ be such a number that the function $g_k^\theta(t) = t^k e^{-V(t\theta)}$ is maximized at $t_0^\theta(k)$. That is, letting $V_\theta(t) = V(\theta t)$, we see that

$$V_\theta(t_0^\theta(k)) t_0^\theta(k) = k.$$

Let

$$J_k(\theta) := \int_0^\infty t^k e^{-V_\theta(t)} dt.$$

Then, as was shown by Klartag and Milman [68], (see also Livshyts [78]),

$$\frac{J_k(\theta)}{t_0^\theta(k) g_k^\theta(t_0^\theta(k))} \in [\frac{1}{k+1}, \frac{C}{\sqrt{k}}]. \tag{27}$$

Ball [5] showed that

$$|x| \left(J_{n+1}\left(\frac{x}{|x|}\right)\right)^{-\frac{1}{n+2}}$$

defines a norm on $\mathbb{R}^n$. A straightforward computation shows that the unit ball of this norm is an isotropic convex body, provided that μ is isotropic. Kannan, Lovasz and Simonovits [55] showed that any isotropic convex body is contained in a ball of radius at most Cn. Thus for any $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, $\left(J_{n+1}\left(\theta\right)\right)^{-\frac{1}{n+2}} \geq \frac{1}{Cn}$, or in other words,

$$J_{n+1}(\theta) \leq (Cn)^{n+2}. \tag{28}$$

In addition, one may show, for $c_1, c_2 > 0$, that

$$\frac{J_{n+c_1}(\theta)}{J_{n-c_2}(\theta)} \leq C' n^{c_1+c_2}; \tag{29}$$

this follows from the results of Klartag, Milman [68] or Livshyts [78]; alternatively, one may get it from the combination of (28) with the one-dimensional case of Theorem 3.5.11 from Artstein-Avidan, Giannopolous, Milman [1], applied with $d\mu = e^{-V_\theta(t)} 1_{\{t>0\}}$, $f = t$, $q = n + c_1$ and $p = n - c_2$.

Combining (28), (29), and the lower bound of (27), we get

$$t_0^\theta(n-1) g_{n+1}^\theta(t_0^\theta(n-1)) \leq (Cn)^{n+1}.$$

Since $V_\theta(t_0^\theta(n-1)) t_0^\theta(n-1) = n-1$, this means that

$$t_0^\theta(n-1) e^{-\frac{n-1}{n t_0^\theta(n-1)}} \leq C' n,$$

and therefore $t_0^\theta(n-1) \leq Cn$ (in view of the fact that $xe^{-a/x}$ is increasing in x).

Consequently, if $R < 5t_0^\theta$, we get

$$\int_0^R t^{n+3} e^{-V(t\theta)} dt \leq CR^4 \int_0^R t^{n-1} e^{-V(t\theta)} dt \leq Cn^4 \int_0^R t^{n-1} e^{-V(t\theta)} dt.$$

Next, it was shown e.g. by Klartag and Milman [68], (see also Livshyts [78]), that

$$\int_{5t_0^\theta}^\infty t^k e^{-V_\theta(t)} dt \leq e^{-Ck} J_k(\theta). \tag{30}$$

Therefore, if $R \geq 5t_0^\theta$, using (29) with $c_1 = 3, c_2 = 1$, and then using (30), we get

$$\int_0^R t^{n+3} e^{-V(t\theta)} dt \leq \int_0^\infty t^{n+3} e^{-V(t\theta)} dt \leq$$

$$Cn^4 \int_0^\infty t^{n-1} e^{-V(t\theta)} dt \leq C' n^4 \int_0^R t^{n-1} e^{-V(t\theta)} dt.$$

In summary, both when $R < 5t_0^\theta$ and $R \geq 5t_0^\theta$, we get the desired conclusion of the first part of the Lemma.

In the case when μ is rotation-invariant, its Ball's body is the isotropic ball, and therefore $t_0^\theta = (1 + o(1))\sqrt{n}$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$. Applying this bound throughout in place of (27), we get the second assertion. □

Proof of the Theorem 4.1. By the estimate of Chen [32] and the result of Lee and Vempala [72], which build up on Eldan's stochastic localization scheme [38],

$$C_{poin}(\mu, K) \leq n^{o(1)} \sqrt{\|Cov(\mu, K)\|_{op}},$$

where $Cov(\mu, K)$ is the covariance matrix of the restriction of μ on K. In the case when μ is even, one has

$$Cov(\mu, K)_{ij} = \frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K x_i x_j d\mu(x).$$

Note that

$$\|Cov(\mu, K)\|_{op} = \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |Cov(\mu, K)\theta| =$$

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K |x|^2 \langle x, \theta \rangle^2 d\mu(x)} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K |x|^4 d\mu(x)}.$$

It remains to write, using polar coordinates:

$$\int_K |x|^4 d\mu(x) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int_0^{\|\theta\|_K^{-1}} t^{n+3} e^{-V(t\theta)} dt d\theta \leq$$

$$Cn^4 \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \int_0^{\|\theta\|_K^{-1}} t^{n-1} e^{-V(t\theta)} dt d\theta = Cn^4 \mu(K),$$

where the estimate comes from Lemma 4.2.

Summarizing, we conclude that $C_{poin}(\mu, K) \leq n^{o(1)} (Cn^4)^{\frac{1}{4}} = Cn^{1+o(1)}$. In the case of rotation-invariant measures, we apply the second assertion of Lemma 4.2, to get the bound $n^{0.5+o(1)}$.□

Remark 4.3. *Note that Theorem 4.1 is sharp up to a factor of $n^{o(1)}$. Indeed, one may find an isotropic convex body L of diameter Cn, and the restriction of the Lebesgue measure on L onto the "thin" convex body K approximating its diameter has the Poincare constant of order n. Furthermore, in the case of rotation-invariant measures, the restriction of the Lebesgue measure on the isotropic ball onto its diameter has Poincare constant of order $\sqrt{n}$.*

We note that Theorem 4.1 implies the following fact, which might be known to experts:

Corollary 4.4. *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a symmetric convex set which is not the whole space. Let μ be any even log-concave measure with C^2 density supported on the whole space. Then $C_{poin}(K,\mu) < \infty$. Moreover, $C_{poin}(K,\mu)$ is bounded from above by a constant which only depends on μ and n, but not on K.*

Proof. Indeed, if T pushes μ forward to its isotropic position $\tilde{\mu}$, then

$$C_{poin}(K,\mu) = \|T\|_{op} C_{poin}(TK,\tilde{\mu}),$$

as can be seen from the definition of the Poincare constant together with the change of variables. By our assumptions, $\|T\|_{op} < \infty$, and by Theorem 4.1, $C_{poin}(TK,\tilde{\mu}) \leq n^{1+o(1)}$, thus the Corollary follows. □

Remark 4.5. *In the derivation of the Corollary above, it is important that the transformation T depends on μ but not K : indeed, unless K is bounded, there is no guarantee that one can bring the restriction of μ onto K into an isotropic position. For example, if K is a half-space and μ is Gaussian, no linear operator can make the restriction of μ onto K isotropic.*

Remark 4.6. *In fact, in the case when μ is not even, and K is not symmetric, the assertion of Corollary 4.4 still holds: $C_{poin}(K,\mu) < \infty$. Moreover, $C_{poin}(K,\mu)$ is bounded from above by a constant which only depends on μ and n, and the relative barycenter of K with respect to μ. Indeed, the key place where we used symmetry is*

$$\|Cov(\mu,K)\|_{op} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K |x|^4 d\mu(x)},$$

and in the non-symmetric case, this would be replaced with

$$\|Cov(\mu,K)\|_{op} = \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K |x-b|^2 \langle x-b,\theta\rangle^2 d\mu(x)} \leq$$

$$C(b) \sqrt{\frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K |x|^4 d\mu(x)} + C_1(b),$$

for some constants $C(b), C_1(b) \geq 0$ which only depend on $b = \frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K x d\mu(x)$, which, in turn, is a finite number.

We remark also that Lemma 4.2, which was formally obtained under the assumption of symmetry, also holds with the assumption of the origin selected as the barycenter of K with respect to μ: indeed, the Kannan, Lovasz and Simonovits [55] *bound for the diameter applies in this case, Ball's estimate* [5] *extends to non-symmetric case, one may argue that the maximum of the density of μ is no more than e^n larger than its value at the origin (see Klartag* [64]*), and everything else in the argument was one-dimensional.*

5. Equality cases in the Brascamp-Lieb inequality: Proof of Theorem 1.4.

In this subsection, we characterize the equality cases of the Brascamp-Leib inequality restricted to a convex set (9), that is

$$\mu(K) \int_K f^2 d\mu - \left(\int_K f d\mu \right)^2 \leq \mu(K) \int_K \langle (\nabla^2 V)^{-1} \nabla f, \nabla f \rangle d\mu.$$

In the case of the Gaussian measure, this was raised as a question by Brandolini, Chiacchio, Henrot, Trombetti [7]; the authors suspected, however, that a strip is the only equality case, which we explain to not be the case.

In case K is the whole space, and the measure γ is Gaussian, the equality cases were known before. Furthermore, related inequalities and their equality cases (under smoothness assumptions) were studied by Cheng and Zhou [33], and de Philippis and Figalli [34]; Courtade and Fathi [31] obtained a stability version in a related inequality; see also Chafai and Lehec [22], where these questions are surveyed, and it is shown that a measure with density $e^{-\frac{x^2}{2} - W}$, where W is a convex function, only gives equality in (9) taken with $V = \frac{x^2}{2}$, in case the density of μ has a Gaussian factor in some direction. The argument relies on the application of Caffarelli's contraction theorem [20].

In this section, the crucial question is *the shape* of the set K for which (9) turns into an equality. For the reader's benefit, we start with the equality case characterization in the Brascamp-Lieb inequality for smooth sets; in subsequent statements, the equality cases will be characterized in full, leading to the proof of the Theorem 1.4. The approximation argument in the non-smooth case is what presents most of the difficulties, and requires a careful treatment, especially in the non-Gaussian case. In the Gaussian case, we shall establish the quantitative stability estimate, stated in part (2) of Theorem 1.4.

Proposition 5.1 (Equality cases in the Brascamp-Lieb inequality – smooth case)**.** *Let μ be a log-concave measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with C^2 density e^{-V} supported on the whole*

$\mathbb{R}^n$, *and suppose* $\nabla^2 V > 0$. *Then for any convex set* K *with* C^2 *boundary and any function* $f \in W^{1,2}(K) \cap C^1(K)$ *we have*

$$\mu(K) \int_K f^2 d\mu - \left(\int_K f d\mu \right)^2 \leq \mu(K) \int_K \langle (\nabla^2 V)^{-1} \nabla f, \nabla f \rangle d\mu;$$

Moreover, the equality occurs either if one of the two things happen:

- $f = C$ *for some constant* $C \in \mathbb{R}$;
- *there exists a rotation* U *such that*
  a) $UK = L \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ *for some* $k = 1, ..., n$ *and a* $k-$*dimensional set* L;
  b) $f \circ U = \langle \nabla V, \theta \rangle + C$, *for some vector* $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ *and some constant* $C \in \mathbb{R}$;

Proof. We shall analyze "Hörmander's proof with the boundary" of the Brascamp-Lieb inequality, discovered by Kolesnikov and Milman [60]. See also Hörmander [52], or Cordero-Erasquin and Klartag [30] for an exposition of the boundary-free argument, which is simpler, but is not illuminating in terms of the equality cases.

Without loss of generality we may assume that $\int f = 0$ (otherwise we may pass to the function $f - \int f$). Consider the operator $Lu = \Delta u - \langle \nabla u, \nabla V \rangle$. Consider an arbitrary function $u \in W^{2,2}(K)$ such that $Lu = f$. Using integration by parts and Proposition 3.14, we write (79) with the general V :

$$\int_K f^2 d\mu = 2 \int_K f Lu d\mu - \int_K (Lu)^2 d\mu =$$

(31)

$$- 2 \int_K \langle \nabla f, \nabla u \rangle d\mu + 2 \int_{\partial K} f \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle d\mu_{\partial K} - \int_K \left(||\nabla^2 u||^2 + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle \right) d\mu +$$
$$- \int_{\partial K} (H_\mu \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle^2 - 2 \langle \nabla_{\partial K} u, \nabla_{\partial K} \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle \rangle + \langle \mathrm{II} \nabla_{\partial K} u, \nabla_{\partial K} u \rangle) \, d\mu_{\partial K}(x).$$

We assume that $\langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle = 0$: indeed, since $\int f = 0$, one may solve the equation $Lu = f$ with the zero Neumann boundary condition, as per the "moreover" and "furthermore b)" parts of Theorem 2.11. Then (31) becomes, after regrouping,

$$\int_K f^2 d\mu =$$

(32)

$$- \int_K \left(2 \langle \nabla f, \nabla u \rangle + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle \right) d\mu - \int_K \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 d\mu - \int_{\partial K} \langle \mathrm{II} \nabla_{\partial K} u, \nabla_{\partial K} u \rangle) \, d\mu_{\partial K}(x).$$

In order to prove (9), we combine (32) with the inequalities

$$\int_K \left(2\langle \nabla f, \nabla u\rangle + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u\rangle\right) d\mu \geq -\int_K \langle (\nabla^2 V)^{-1}\nabla f, \nabla f\rangle d\mu; \tag{33}$$

$$\int_K \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 d\mu \geq 0; \tag{34}$$

$$\int_{\partial K} \langle \mathrm{II}\nabla_{\partial K} u, \nabla_{\partial K} u\rangle) \, d\mu_{\partial K} \geq 0. \tag{35}$$

For the last inequality, convexity of K was used.

Suppose now that the equality holds. Then the equality must hold also in (33), (34) and (35). Suppose f is not a constant function. The equality in (34) holds whenever u is a linear function, i.e., for some vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $u = -\langle x, \theta\rangle + c$ and therefore $f = -L\langle x, \theta\rangle = \langle \nabla V, \theta\rangle$. Moreover, since $\langle \nabla u, n_x\rangle = 0$, the convex set K is such that all of its normal vectors belong to some $(n-1)-$dimensional subspace (unless $\theta = 0$, in which case $f = 0$). This means that K is a cylinder parallel to θ.

We note that $f = \langle \nabla V, \theta\rangle$ implies $\nabla f = \nabla^2 V \theta$, and therefore the equality in (33) also holds.

Lastly, note that $\nabla_{\partial K} u = -\theta$, and thus when K is a cylinder parallel to θ, the second fundamental form at θ is zero everywhere, and therefore

$$\int_{\partial K} \langle \mathrm{II}\nabla_{\partial K} u, \nabla_{\partial K} u\rangle \, d\mu_{\partial K} = \int_{\partial K} \langle \mathrm{II}\theta, \theta\rangle \, d\mu_{\partial K} = 0,$$

meaning that the equality holds also in (35). □

Remark 5.2. *In fact, the equality in (35) holds if and only if K is a cylinder, provided that the boundary of K is C^3, and e^{-V} is supported on the entire $\mathbb{R}^n$. Indeed, if for some vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, we have that for every $x \in \partial K$, the vector θ_x (the projection of θ onto T_x, the tangent space of K at x) satisfies $\langle \mathrm{II}\theta_{\mathrm{x}}, \theta_{\mathrm{x}}\rangle = 0$, then this means that*

$$\partial K = \{x \in \partial K : \langle n_x, \theta\rangle = 0\} \cup \{x \in \partial K : G_K(x) = 0\},$$

where $G_K(x) = \det \mathrm{II}(\mathrm{x})$ is the Gauss curvature of K at x. Note that everywhere on the set $A = \{x \in \partial K : \langle n_x, \theta\rangle = 0\}$, the Gauss curvature is also zero, since $\mathrm{II} = \mathrm{dn}_{\mathrm{x}} = 0$. Since the boundary of K is C^3, the Gauss curvature is continuous. Thus for all points on ∂K, the Gauss curvature is zero. A boundary of a convex set is a regular complete surface, and therefore, by the result of Pogorelov (unpublished), Hartman-Nirenberg [49] *and Massey* [81]*, K is a cylinder.*

For $k = (k_1, ..., k_n)$, where $k_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $B_k = \prod_{i=1}^n [k_i, k_i + 1]$. We shall make use of the decomposition $\mathbb{R}^n = \cup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}^n} B_k$.

We shall show

Proposition 5.3 (Stability in the Brascamp-Lieb inequality – smooth case)**.** *Let μ be a probability log-concave measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with C^2 density e^{-V} supported on the whole $\mathbb{R}^n$, and suppose $\nabla^2 V > 0$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Consider a convex set K with C^2 boundary and a function $f \in W^{1,2}(K) \cap C^1(K)$ such that*

$$\mu(K) \int_K f^2 d\mu - \left(\int_K f d\mu \right)^2 \geq \mu(K) \int_K \langle (\nabla^2 V)^{-1} \nabla f, \nabla f \rangle d\mu - \epsilon.$$

Then there exists a vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (possibly zero), which depends only on K and f, such that

- *If K is bounded, we have*

$$\int_{\partial K} \langle \theta, n_x \rangle^2 d\mu_{\partial K} \leq C_1(K,V)\epsilon, \tag{36}$$

where $C_1(K,V) > 0$ depends only on V and on the in-radius and the diameter of K; and

$$\| f - \langle \nabla V, \theta \rangle - \frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K f d\mu \|_{L^1(K,\mu)} \leq c(\epsilon), \tag{37}$$

where

$$c(\epsilon) \leq \sqrt{\mu(K)} \left(\sqrt{\frac{C_{poin}^2(K,\mu)+1}{2} n\epsilon} + \sqrt[4]{\epsilon \int |\nabla V|^2 d\mu|_K} \right).$$

Furthermore, for the standard Gaussian measure, we have

$$c(\epsilon) \leq \sqrt{\gamma(K)} \left(\sqrt{n\epsilon} + \sqrt[4]{n\epsilon} \right)$$

(regardless of K); if, additionally to $\mu = \gamma$, we have $rB_2^n \subset K$, then we have also

$$C_1(K,V) \leq \frac{n+1}{r}.$$

- *If K is not necessarily bounded, then for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, we have*

$$\int_{\partial K \cap B_k} \langle \theta, n_x \rangle^2 d\mu_{\partial K}(x) \leq C_1(k)\epsilon,$$

for some $C_1(k)$ which only depends on k, μ and K.

- *In addition, for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}^n$,*

$$\| f - \langle \nabla V, \theta \rangle - \frac{1}{\mu(K \cap B_k)} \int_{K \cap B_k} f d\mu \|_{L^1(K,\mu)} \leq c_k(\epsilon), \tag{38}$$

where

$$c_k(\epsilon) \leq \sqrt{\mu(K \cap B_k)} \left(\sqrt{\frac{C_{poin}^2(K \cap B_k,\mu)+1}{2} n\epsilon} + \sqrt[4]{\epsilon \int |\nabla V|^2 d\mu|_{K \cap B_k}} \right).$$

Proof. Similarly to Proposition 5.1, without loss of generality we may assume that $\int f = 0$ and consider the function $u \in W^{2,2}(K) \cap C^2(K)$ such that $Lu = f$ and $\langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle = 0$ on ∂K. Recall (32):

$$\int_K f^2 d\mu =$$

(39)

$$-\int_K \left(2\langle \nabla f, \nabla u\rangle + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u\rangle\right) d\mu - \int_K \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 d\mu - \int_{\partial K} \langle \mathrm{II} \nabla_{\partial K} u, \nabla_{\partial K} u\rangle \, d\mu_{\partial K}(x).$$

Combining (39) with

$$\int_K \left(2\langle \nabla f, \nabla u\rangle + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u\rangle\right) d\mu \geq -\int_K \langle (\nabla^2 V)^{-1} \nabla f, \nabla f\rangle d\mu,$$

and an application of convexity of K

$$\int_{\partial K} \langle \mathrm{II} \nabla_{\partial K} u, \nabla_{\partial K} u\rangle) \, d\mu_{\partial K} \geq 0,$$

we get

$$\int_K f^2 d\mu \leq \int_K \langle (\nabla^2 V)^{-1} \nabla f, \nabla f\rangle d\mu - \int_K \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 d\mu. \tag{40}$$

Under the assumption of the Proposition, this yields

$$\int_K \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 d\mu \leq \epsilon. \tag{41}$$

Therefore, there exists a vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$u = -\langle x, \theta\rangle + v$$

with $\int_K \nabla v d\mu = 0$ and $\int_K \|\nabla^2 v\|^2 d\mu \leq \epsilon$. By the Poincare inequality (12), this implies that $\int_K |\nabla v|^2 d\mu \leq C^2_{poin}(K, \mu)\epsilon$. Note also that

$$\langle \nabla v, n_x\rangle = \langle \nabla u, n_x\rangle + \langle \theta, n_x\rangle = \langle \theta, n_x\rangle.$$

First, to show (38), we note that $f - \langle \nabla V, \theta\rangle = Lu + L\langle x, \theta\rangle = Lv$, and write, using $(\Delta u)^2 \leq n\|\nabla^2 u\|^2$, for every $\alpha > 0$

$$\|f - \langle \nabla V, \theta\rangle\|_{L^1(K,\mu)} = \int_K |Lv| d\mu = \int_K |\Delta v - \langle \nabla v, \nabla V\rangle| d\mu \leq$$

$$\sqrt{\mu(K)} \left(\sqrt{n \int_K \|\nabla^2 v\|^2 d\mu} + \frac{\alpha}{2}\sqrt{\int_K |\nabla v|^2 d\mu} + \frac{1}{2\alpha}\sqrt{\int_K |\nabla V|^2 d\mu}\right) \leq$$

$$\sqrt{\mu(K)}\left(\sqrt{\frac{C^2_{poin}(K,\mu)+1}{2}n\epsilon}+\sqrt[4]{\epsilon\mathbb{E}|\nabla V|^2}\right),$$

where in the last passage we optimized in α. The conclusion follows if K is bounded. If K is not bounded, we consider $K\cap B_k$ instead, and the corresponding conclusion follows in the same manner.

Recall that in the Gaussian case, $C^2_{poin}(K,\mu)\leq 1$, and the "furthermore" estimate on $c(\epsilon)$ follows.

Next, to show (36) for a bounded set K, we apply the Trace Theorem 2.4 to all the partial derivatives of v, sum it up, and use the facts that $\int_K |\nabla v|^2 d\mu \leq C^2_{poin}(K,\mu)\epsilon$ and $\int_K \|\nabla v\|^2 d\mu \leq \epsilon$:

$$\int_{\partial K}|\langle \nabla v, n_x\rangle|^2 d\mu_{\partial K}\leq \int_{\partial K}|\nabla v|^2 d\mu_{\partial K}\leq$$

$$C'\int_K (|\nabla v|^2+\|\nabla v\|^2)d\mu \leq C'\cdot(C^2_{poin}(K,\mu)+1)\cdot\epsilon,$$

where C' only depends on the in-radius and the diameter of K, and on V. The inequality (36) follows if we remember that $\langle\theta, n_x\rangle = \langle\nabla v, n_x\rangle$.

Lastly, in the case when K is not bounded, given $k=(k_1,...,k_n)$, let $M_k = \partial K\cap B_k$,. Applying the Trace Theorem 2.4 on M_k, we get

$$\int_{M_k}\langle\theta,n_x\rangle^2 d\mu_{\partial K}=\int_{M_k}\langle\nabla v,n_x\rangle^2 d\mu_{\partial K}\leq$$

$$C_1(k)\int_{K\cap B_k}|\nabla v|^2+\|\nabla^2 v\|^2 d\gamma \leq C_1(k)(1+C^2_{poin}(K,\mu))\epsilon.$$

To get the "furthermore" estimate on $C_1(K,V)$ in the Gaussian case, apply Theorem 2.10 in place of Theorem 2.4. □

Finally, we are ready to prove Theorem 1.4.

Proof of the Theorem 1.4. We shall focus on showing part (1), since part (2) follows from the Gaussian estimates in Proposition 5.3. Suppose K and f give equality in this inequality. For a large enough $R>0$, let $K_R = K\cap RB_2^n$. For an arbitrary $\delta>0$, consider a convex set K_δ^R with C^2 boundary, such that $\frac{1}{2}K^R\subset K_\delta^R\subset K^R$, such that $\mu(K\setminus K_\delta^R)\leq\delta$, and such that $d_{TV}(\gamma|_{\partial K^R},\gamma|_{\partial K_\delta^R})\leq\delta$. This is possible to do, for example, by selecting K_δ^R very close to K^R in the Hausdorff distance. Indeed, the relation between the measures follows in a straight-forward manner, while the total variation estimate follows since Lebesgue surface area measures converge weakly when bodies converge in Hausdorff distance (see Schneider [91]), and hence

the same holds for the surface area measures of bounded convex sets with respect to μ, in view of our assumptions.

Since $\mu(K \setminus K_\delta^R) \leq \delta$ and K gives an equality in the Brascamp-Lieb inequality, we see that there exists an $\epsilon(\delta) > 0$, possibly depending on δ, V and f, such that

$$\mu(K_\delta^R)\int_{K_\delta^R} f^2 d\mu - \left(\int_{K_\delta^R} f d\mu\right)^2 \geq \mu(K_\delta^R)\int_{K_\delta^R} \langle (\nabla^2 V)^{-1}\nabla f, \nabla f\rangle d\mu - \epsilon(\delta),$$

such that $\epsilon(\delta) \to_{\delta\to 0} 0$. By Proposition 5.3, denoting $C_{\delta,R} = \frac{1}{\mu(K_\delta^R)}\int_{K_\delta^R} f d\mu$, there exists a $\theta_{\delta,R} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (possibly zero, which depends only on K_δ^R and f), such that, for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}^n$,

$$\|f - \langle \nabla V, \theta_{\delta,R}\rangle - C_{\delta,R}\|_{L^1(K_\delta^R \cap B_k, \mu)} \leq c_1(\delta, k), \tag{42}$$

with $c_1(\delta, k)$ depending only on k, μ and possibly K, but not on R. Fix $k \in \mathbb{Z}^n$; in the following paragraph, all the parameters may depend on it. Note that $C_{\delta,R} \to_{R\to\infty} C = \frac{1}{\mu(K\cap B_k)}\int_{K\cap B_k} f d\mu$. By (42), there exists an $r > 0$, possibly depending on K, f and V, such that $\theta_\delta \in rB_2^n$ whenever $\epsilon(\delta) \in (0,1)$. Therefore, there exists a vector θ, such that $\theta_{\delta,R} \to_{\delta\to 0, R\to\infty} \theta$, where the convergence is understood in the sense of sub-sequences. Letting $\delta \to 0$, we arrive to the conclusion b) of the theorem.

Next, we recall that there exists a function $v = v_{\delta,R}$ on K_δ^R with $\int_{K_\delta^R} \nabla v d\gamma = 0$ and $\int_{K_\delta^R} \|\nabla^2 v\|^2 d\mu \leq \epsilon(\delta)$, and such that $\langle \nabla v, n_x\rangle = \langle \theta_{\epsilon,R}, n_x\rangle$ on ∂K_δ^R. For $k = (k_1, ..., k_n)$, where $k_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $M_k^{\delta,R} = \partial K_\delta^R \cap B_k$, and $M_k = \partial K \cap B_k$. Note that provided that δ is chosen small enough, and R is chosen large enough (depending on k), the set $K_R^\delta \cap B_k$ is close to $K \cap B_k$ in Hausdorff distance by $c(\delta, k)$, and the constant from the trace Theorem 2.4 for $K_R^\delta \cap B_k$ is the same, up to a factor of 2, as that of $K \cap B_k$, which in turn depends only on K, V and k, but not on δ or R. We get, using the Trace Theorem 2.4,

$$\int_{M_k^{\delta,R}} \langle \theta_{\delta,R}, n_x\rangle^2 d\mu_{\partial K} = \int_{M_k^{\delta,R}} \langle \nabla v, n_x\rangle^2 d\mu_{\partial K} \leq$$

$$C(k)\int_{K_\delta^R \cap B_k} |\nabla v|^2 + \|\nabla^2 v\|^2 d\mu \leq C(k)\int_{K_\delta^R} |\nabla v|^2 + \|\nabla^2 v\|^2 d\mu$$

$$C(k)(1 + C_{poin}^2(K, \mu))\epsilon,$$

where in the last passage we used the fact that $C_{poin}(K_\delta^R, \mu) \leq C_{poin}(K, \mu)$ and $\gamma(K_\delta^R) \geq c_0 > 0$, for some fixed constant $c_0 > 0$ that does not depend on δ, R, or k. Finally, for each fixed k, we let $\delta \to 0$ and $R \to \infty$, thereby insuring that $\epsilon(\delta) \to 0$, and we therefore get that $\langle \theta, n_x\rangle = 0$, with θ chosen above. In the last step we used also that the surface measure on $M_k^{\delta,R}$ tends to M_k weakly by construction.

Combining the assertion for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, we arrive to the conclusion of the Theorem 1.4. $\square$

Remark 5.4. *Note that in the Gaussian case, we have a stability estimate which works for unbounded sets, regardless of their diameter. Thus in the Gaussian case, the approximation argument is easier, and does not require considering the intersection with B_k.*

6. On the Gaussian torsional rigidity

In this section, the measure γ is fixed to be the standard Gaussian on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and for a convex set K we fix the notation

$$\int := \frac{1}{\gamma(K)} \int_K d\gamma.$$

6.1. **Torsional rigidity: general discussion.** For a convex domain K in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and a function $F \in L^2(K) \cap C(\bar{K})$, define the $F-$Gaussian torsional rigidity by

$$T_\gamma^F(K) := \sup_{v \in W^{1,2}(K,\gamma):\, v|_{\partial K} = 0} \frac{\left(\int Fv\right)^2}{\int |\nabla v|^2},$$

where the derivatives are understood in the weak sense, and the boundary value is understood in the sense of the trace operator, as per our convention.

In the case of Lebesgue measure and $F = 1$, this object has been studied heavily, see e.g. Polya, Szegö [88]. A rich theory involving isoperimetric inequalities related to the Lebesgue torsional rigidity has been developed in the past couple of centuries, see, for instance, Kohler-Jobin [69], Brasco [17], Colesanti, Fimiani [26]. In this section, we will see that the extension of this object to the Gaussian setting also has a variety of nice properties. We shall later require most of them for the proof of our main result Theorem A, as well as Theorem 1.5.

The following classical Lemma holds, in fact, in the most abstract setting, and for an arbitrary measure, but for simplicity, we state it for the Gaussian measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let K be a convex set and $F \in L^2(K,\gamma) \cap Lip(K)$. Then*

$$\sup_v \frac{\left(\int Fv\right)^2}{\int |\nabla v|^2} = \inf_u \int |\nabla u|^2,$$

where the infimum runs over all $W^{1,2}(K,\gamma)$ functions $u : K \to \mathbb{R}$ with $Lu = F$, and the supremum runs over all $W^{1,2}(K,\gamma)$ functions $v : K \to \mathbb{R}$ which vanish on ∂K.

Proof. Let $u : K \to \mathbb{R}$ be such that $Lu = F$. On one hand, note that for any $v \in W_0^{1,2}(K,\gamma)$, and any $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int |\nabla u - t\nabla v|^2 \geq 0,$$

and thus

$$\int |\nabla u|^2 \geq -2t \int \langle \nabla u, \nabla v\rangle - t^2 \int |\nabla v|^2 = 2t \int Fv - t^2 \int |\nabla v|^2.$$

Optimizing in t, we get

$$\int |\nabla u|^2 \geq \frac{\left(\int Fv\right)^2}{\int |\nabla v|^2}.$$

In the case when $Lv = F$, the right hand side above equals $\int |\nabla v|^2$, and therefore

$$\inf_u \int |\nabla u|^2 = \int |\nabla v_0|^2 = \frac{(\int Fv_0)^2}{\int |\nabla v_0|^2},$$

where $v_0 \in W_0^{1,2}(K,\gamma)$ is the unique function with $Lv_0 = F$ and vanishing on the boundary (see Theorem 2.13). The inequality above also yields that

$$\frac{(\int Fv_0)^2}{\int |\nabla v_0|^2} \geq \frac{(\int Fv)^2}{\int |\nabla v|^2},$$

for any function v vanishing on the boundary. Taking the supremum in the inequality above completes the proof. □

We shall need a stability estimate for the Lemma 6.1. Below we shall use notation

$$Var_{\gamma|_{\partial K}}(w) = \frac{1}{\gamma^+(\partial K)} \int_{\partial K} w^2 d\gamma|_{\partial K} - \left(\frac{1}{\gamma^+(\partial K)} \int_{\partial K} w d\gamma|_{\partial K}\right)^2.$$

Naturally, if the boundary variance $Var_{\gamma|_{\partial K}}(w)$ of a function w is small, then it is somewhat close to taking a constant value on the boundary of K. With this in mind, the following statement is a natural stability version for the Lemma 6.1:

Proposition 6.2. *Let K be a C^2 convex set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ of Gaussian measure $a \in (0,1)$, such that $rB_2^n \subset K$. Fix $F \in W^{1,2}(K,\gamma) \cap Lip(K)$, and let $u \in W^{1,2}(K,\gamma) \cap C^2(K)$ be such that $Lu = F$. Suppose that*

$$\frac{1}{\gamma(K)} \int_K |\nabla u|^2 d\gamma \leq T_\gamma^F(K) + \epsilon.$$

Then

$$Var_{\gamma|_{\partial K}}(u) \leq C(K)\epsilon,$$

where $C(K) = \frac{n+1}{r} a e^{\frac{\psi^{-1}(a)^2}{2}}$.

Proof. Let u_0 be the unique function such that $Lu_0 = F$ and $u_0|_{\partial K} = 0$ (see Theorem 2.13). Consider a function $v = u - u_0$. Then $Lv = 0$, by our assumptions. Thus, integrating by parts (strictly speaking, by the definition of the weak solution), we get

$$\int \langle \nabla v, \nabla u_0 \rangle = -\int u_0 Lv + \frac{1}{\gamma(K)} \int_{\partial K} u_0 \langle \nabla v, n_x \rangle d\gamma_{\partial K} = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\int |\nabla u|^2 = \int |\nabla u_0 - \nabla v|^2 = \int |\nabla u_0|^2 + \int |\nabla v|^2 = T_\gamma^F(K) + \int |\nabla v|^2.$$

By our assumptions, we therefore have

$$\int |\nabla v|^2 \leq \epsilon. \tag{43}$$

Next, by the Gaussian trace theorem 2.10, for any constant $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\int_{\partial K} (v - c_0)^2 d\gamma|_{\partial K} \leq \frac{1}{r} \int_K (n(v - c_0)^2 + |\nabla v|^2) d\gamma(x).$$

Letting $c_0 = \frac{1}{\gamma(K)} \int_K v d\gamma$, applying the Poincare inequality (10), and using (43), we see that the above is bounded from above by $\frac{(n+1)\epsilon}{r}$.

Note also that for any $c_0 \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$Var_{\gamma|_{\partial K}}(u) \leq \frac{1}{\gamma^+(\partial K)} \int_{\partial K} (v - c_0)^2 d\gamma|_{\partial K}.$$

We conclude that

$$Var_{\gamma|_{\partial K}}(u) \leq \frac{n+1}{r} \frac{\gamma(K)}{\gamma^+(\partial K)} \epsilon. \tag{44}$$

It remains to note that by the Gaussian isoperimetric inequality [12], [94],

$$\frac{\gamma(K)}{\gamma^+(\partial K)} \leq \sqrt{2\pi} \gamma(K) e^{\frac{\psi^{-1}(\gamma(K))^2}{2}}.$$

□

Next, we show the continuity property of the torsional rigidity.

Proposition 6.3. *Suppose K and L are bounded convex domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$, such that $\gamma(K \triangle L) \leq \epsilon$. Let $F \in L^2(K \cup L, \gamma) \cap C(\overline{K \cup L})$. Then*

$$|T^F(K) - T^F(L)| \leq c(\epsilon) \to_{\epsilon \to 0} 0,$$

where $C(\epsilon)$ depends only on K and L, and F.

Proof. Note first that it is enough to show that for any convex domains A and B such that $A \subset B$ and $\gamma(B \setminus A) \leq \epsilon$, we have $|T^F(A) - T^F(B)| \leq c(\epsilon)$.

Indeed, applying this fact with $A = K$ and $B = K \cap L$, we would get $|T^F(K) - T^F(K \cap L)| \leq c(\epsilon)$, and then, similarly, we could get $|T^F(L) - T^F(K \cap L)| \leq c(\epsilon)$, which would together yield $|T^F(K) - T^F(L)| \leq 2c(\epsilon)$.

Next, by the definition of torsional rigidity, if $A \subset B$, we have

$$T^F(A) \leq \frac{\gamma(B)}{\gamma(A)} T^F(B) = (1 + C^1\epsilon) T^F(B).$$

Therefore, it suffices to focus on the case when $A \subset B$, $\gamma(B \setminus A) \leq \epsilon$, and to show that $T^F(B) - T^F(A) \leq c(\epsilon)$. Let u be the function on A with $u|_{\partial A} = 0$ and $Lu = F$, and v be the function on B with $v|_{\partial B} = 0$ and $Lv = F$. Our aim is to show that

$$\frac{1}{\gamma(B)} \int_B |\nabla v|^2 d\gamma - \frac{1}{\gamma(A)} \int_A |\nabla u|^2 d\gamma \leq c(\epsilon).$$

In view of our assumption that $\gamma(B \setminus A) \leq \epsilon$, it suffices to show

$$\int_B |\nabla v|^2 d\gamma - \int_A |\nabla u|^2 d\gamma = \int_{B \setminus A} |\nabla v|^2 d\gamma + \int_A (|\nabla v|^2 - |\nabla u|^2) d\gamma \leq c(\epsilon). \tag{45}$$

Firstly, $\nabla v \in L^2(B)$, and therefore, by the Dominated Convergence Theorem,

$$\int_{B \setminus A} |\nabla v|^2 d\gamma \leq c'(\epsilon) \to_{\epsilon \to 0} 0.$$

Next, integrating by parts, and using $u|_{\partial A} = 0$, as well as $Lu = Lv = F$, we see

$$\int_A (|\nabla v|^2 - |\nabla u|^2) d\gamma = \int_{\partial A} v \langle \nabla (v - u), n_x \rangle d\gamma|_{\partial K}. \tag{46}$$

By the boundary regularity estimate Theorem 14.2 from Gilbarg, Trudinger [46], since A is convex, we have that $|\nabla u|$ is bounded on $\bar{A}$, and also $|\nabla v|$ is bounded on $\bar{B}$, and the bounds depend only on n and $\sup_A |u|$ (as well as $sup_B |v|$). Thus

$$\int_{\partial A} v \langle \nabla v, n_x \rangle d\gamma|_{\partial K} \leq C_2 \int_{\partial A} v^2 d\gamma|_{\partial K} \leq c(\epsilon). \tag{47}$$

By the trace theorem 2.4, applied with $K = B \setminus A$, using compactness, we see that

$$\int_{\partial A} v^2 d\gamma|_{\partial K} \leq C' \int_{B \setminus A} (v^2 + |\nabla v|^2) d\gamma \leq c_1(\epsilon),$$

where in the last passage we used that $\gamma(B \setminus A) \leq \epsilon$, and by the dominated convergence theorem. Thus (45) follows. □

Corollary 6.4. *For any convex body K, any continuous $F : K \to \mathbb{R}$, and any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a convex body $K_\epsilon \subset K$ with C^2 boundary, such that K_ϵ is $\epsilon-$close to K in Hausdorff distance, and $|T^F(K) - T^F(K_\epsilon)| \leq c(\epsilon)$, for some $c(\epsilon) \to_{\epsilon \to 0} 0$, which depends only on K.*

Proof. We select K_ϵ to be a C^2 δ-approximation of K from inside in Hausdorff distance, where $\delta < \epsilon$ is chosen sufficiently small so that $|T^F(K) - T^F(L)| \leq \epsilon$, which is possible to do by the previous proposition. The crucial observation here is that the constant C from Proposition 6.3 is uniformly bounded once δ is chosen small enough.

Indeed, it only depends on the in-radius of K_ϵ (which is the same as that of K, up to a factor of 2), and on the supremum of the solution u_ϵ of the equation $Lu_\epsilon = F$ on K_ϵ with the Dirichlet boundary condition (as per Theorem 2.10 and Theorem 14.2 from [46]). Letting $v = u - u_\epsilon$, where u is the solution of $Lu = F$ on K with the Dirichlet boundary condition, we see that $Lv = 0$ and $|v|_{\partial K_\epsilon}| \leq C(\epsilon) \to 0$, by continuity of v. This yields that $|v_\epsilon| < C(\epsilon)$ on K_ϵ, by the maximum principle. Thus indeed $|v_\epsilon| < C'$ on K_ϵ, with C' that only depends on K (and not K_ϵ). We conclude that the constant C from Proposition 6.3 is uniformly bounded once δ is chosen small enough, and the corollary follows. □

Lastly, we shall need

Lemma 6.5. *For any convex set K with non-empty interior, any continuous $F : K \to \mathbb{R}$, and any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an $R > 0$ such that*

$$|T^F(K) - T^F(K \cap RB_2^n)| \leq \epsilon.$$

Proof. Firstly, we note that

$$T^F(K \cap RB_2^n) \leq \frac{\gamma(K)}{\gamma(K \cap RB_2^n)} T^F(K),$$

and select R_1 to be large enough so that the above yields

$$T^F(K \cap R_1 B_2^n) - T^F(K) \leq \epsilon.$$

Next, let $v : K \to \mathbb{R}$ be the solution of $Lv = F$ and $v|_{\partial K} = 0$ and $v_R : K \to \mathbb{R}$ be the solution of $Lv_R = F$ and $v|_{\partial K_R} = 0$. Suppose $R > R_2$ for some $R_2 > 0$.

$$\gamma(K) \left(T^F(K) - T^F(K \cap RB_2^n) \right) \leq \int_{K \setminus R_2 B_2^n} |\nabla v|^2 d\gamma + \int_{K \cap R_2 B_2^n} |\nabla v|^2 - |\nabla v_R|^2 d\gamma.$$

Select R_2 to be large enough so that $\int_{K \setminus R_2 B_2^n} |\nabla v|^2 d\gamma \leq \epsilon$.

Finally, integrating by parts, we see

$$\int_{K \cap R_2 B_2^n} |\nabla v|^2 - |\nabla v_R|^2 d\gamma =$$

$$\int_{\partial K\cap R_2B_2^n}\langle\nabla v-\nabla v_R,n_x\rangle(v+v_R)d\gamma|_{\partial K}+\int_{K\cap R_2\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}\langle\nabla v-\nabla v_R,n_x\rangle(v+v_R)d\gamma|_{R\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}.$$

Since v and v_R take value 0 on $\partial K\cap RB_2^n$, and in view of the boundary regularity estimate Theorem 14.2 from Gilbarg, Trudinger [46] (which yields that $\langle\nabla v-\nabla v_R,n_x\rangle$ is bounded almost everywhere on $\partial K\cap R_2B_2^n$), we get that

$$\int_{\partial K\cap R_2B_2^n}\langle\nabla v-\nabla v_R,n_x\rangle(v+v_R)d\gamma|_{\partial K}=0.$$

Lastly, we write

$$\int_{K\cap R_2\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}\langle\nabla v-\nabla v_R,n_x\rangle(v+v_R)d\gamma|_{R\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}\leq$$

$$10\sqrt{\int_{K\cap R_2\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}|\nabla v|^2+|\nabla v_R|^2}\cdot\sqrt{\int_{K\cap R_2\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}v^2+v_R^2},$$

which can be made arbitrarily small in view of the fact that $v,v_R,|\nabla v|,|\nabla v_R|$ are all square integrable on K, provided that R_2 is selected appropriately. □

6.2. **Isoperimetric inequalities for the Gaussian torsional rigidity.** First, let us consider the case $F=1$ and use notation $T_\gamma(K)=T_\gamma^1(K)$. We notice an isoperimetric inequality for T_γ, analogous to the Saint-Venant theorem (see, e.g. Polya-Szegö [88] for the Lebesgue version):

Proposition 6.6 (Gaussian version of the Saint-Venant inequality)**.** *Fix $a\in[0,1]$ and let K be a convex set with $\gamma(K)=a$. Then*

$$T_\gamma(K)\leq T_\gamma(H_a),$$

where H_a is the half-space of Gaussian measure a.

Proof. Let v_0 vanish on the boundary of K, $Lv_0=1$, and let v_0^* be its Ehrhard symmetrization $v_0^*:H_a\to\mathbb{R}$. By the definition of the Ehrhard symmetrization, v_0^* also vanishes on the boundary of H_a, and $\int v_0^*=\int v_0$. By Lemma 2.1 (the Ehrhard principle),

$$\int_{H_a}|\nabla v_0^*|^2d\gamma\leq\int_K|\nabla v_0|^2d\gamma.$$

Thus, in view of Lemma 6.1,

$$T_\gamma(K)=\frac{\left(\int_K v_0d\gamma\right)^2}{\int_K|\nabla v_0|^2d\gamma}\leq\frac{\left(\int_{H_a}v_0^*d\gamma\right)^2}{\int_{H_a}|\nabla v_0^*|^2d\gamma}\leq T_\gamma(H_a).$$

□

In what follows, we shall discuss a generalization of the Proposition 6.6.

Let us first discuss a Gaussian analogue of Talenti's inequality. For some background on the usual (Lebesgue) Talenti's inequality [95], see also books by Vazquez [96] or Kesavan [56]. The following proposition was shown by Betta, Brock, Mercaldo, Posteraro [6], as was discovered by the author after this manuscript was written. We shall outline the proof for the reader's convenience.

Proposition 6.7 (Gaussian analogue of Talenti's inequality)**.** *Let $F \in L^2(K,\gamma)$, for some measurable set K in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and suppose $F \geq 0$. Let $u : K \to \mathbb{R}$ be the weak solution of the equation $Lu = -F$ on K with the Dirichlet boundary condition $u|_{\partial K} = 0$. Let $H_K = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1 \leq \psi^{-1}(\gamma(K))\}$ (the half-space of the same Gaussian measure as K), and let v on H_K be given by $Lv = -F^*$, with $v|_{\partial H_K} = 0$. Then $v \geq u^*$ everywhere on H_K.*

First, we formulate two lemmas.

Lemma 6.8. *Let $u : K \to \mathbb{R}$ be the weak solution of the equation $Lu = -F$ on K with the Dirichlet boundary condition $u|_{\partial K} = 0$, with $F \geq 0$. Then $u \geq 0$.*

Proof. This classical fact is a straight-forward consequence of the maximum principle, and we outline this simple argument for the reader's convenience, in the case when u is the strong solution (and the general case follows by approximation). Suppose $u(x) < 0$ at some point $x \in int(K)$. As $u \in C^2(K)$, and since $u|_{\partial K} = 0$, there exists a point $x_0 \in int(K)$ which is a local minima for u. Therefore, $\nabla^2 u(x_0) > 0$; additionally, $\nabla u(x_0) = 0$, and thus $Lu|_{x_0} = \Delta u|_{x_0}$. However, $Lu|_{x_0} \leq 0$ by our assumption that $Lu = -F$ for $F \geq 0$. In other words, $tr(\nabla^2 u)|_{x_0} \leq 0$, leading to the contradiction with the fact that $\nabla^2 u(x_0) > 0$. □

Next, we formulate the Gaussian analogue of the Hardy-Littlewood inequality. The reader may find the Lebesgue version, with an analogous proof, e.g. in Burchard [19].

Lemma 6.9 (Gaussian Hardy-Littlewood inequality)**.** *Let K be a measurable set and suppose $f, g : K \to \mathbb{R}$ are non-negative measurable functions in $L^2(\gamma, K)$. Then*

$$\int_K f g d\gamma(x) \leq \int_{H_K} f^* g^* d\gamma(x).$$

Proof. We write

$$\int_K f g d\gamma(x) = \int_K \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty 1_{\{f(x)>t\}} 1_{\{g(x)>t\}} dt ds d\gamma(x) =$$

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \gamma\left(\{f > s\} \cap \{g > t\}\right) ds dt,$$

and similarly,

$$\int_{H_K} f^* g^* d\gamma(x) = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \gamma\left(\{f^* > s\} \cap \{g^* > t\}\right) ds dt.$$

Thus it suffices to show that for any pair of measurable sets A and B,

$$\gamma(A \cap B) \leq \gamma(H_A \cap H_B).$$

Indeed, since H_A and H_B are hyperplanes, and one of them is contained in the other, we have

$$\gamma(H_A \cap H_B) = \min(\gamma(H_A), \gamma(H_B)) = \min(\gamma(A), \gamma(B)) \geq \gamma(A \cap B),$$

and the lemma follows. □

Proof of the Theorem 6.7. For every $t \geq 0$, integrating by parts, and using the assumption $Lu = -F$, we get

$$\int_{\{u>t\}} |\nabla u|^2 d\gamma = -\int_{\{u>t\}} uLu d\gamma + \int_{\partial\{u>t\}} u\langle \nabla u, n_x\rangle d\gamma_{\partial\{u>t\}} =$$

$$\int_{\{u>t\}} uF d\gamma + t\int_{\partial\{u>t\}} \langle \nabla u, n_x\rangle d\gamma_{\partial\{u>t\}} = \int_{\{u>t\}} uF d\gamma - t\int_{\{u>t\}} F d\gamma.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\{u>t\}} |\nabla u|^2 d\gamma = \frac{d}{dt}\left(\int_{\{u>t\}} uF d\gamma - t\int_{\{u>t\}} F d\gamma\right) =$$

$$t\int_{\partial\{u>t\}} F d\gamma_{\partial\{u>t\}} - \int_{\{u>t\}} F d\gamma - t\int_{\partial\{u>t\}} F d\gamma_{\partial\{u>t\}},$$

and we conclude that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\{u>t\}} |\nabla u|^2 d\gamma = -\int_{\{u>t\}} F d\gamma. \tag{48}$$

Next, by Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, for every $h > 0$,

$$\left(\frac{1}{h}\int_{u\in[t,t+h]} |\nabla u| d\gamma\right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{h}\int_{u\in[t,t+h]} d\gamma \cdot \frac{1}{h}\int_{u\in[t,t+h]} |\nabla u|^2 d\gamma,$$

and thus

$$\left(\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\{u>t\}} |\nabla u| d\gamma\right)^2 \leq -\phi_u'(t) \cdot \frac{d}{dt}\int_{\{u>t\}} |\nabla u|^2 d\gamma, \tag{49}$$

where

$$\phi_u(t) = P_\gamma(u < t) = P_\gamma(u^* < t).$$

Here P_γ stands for the probability with respect to the Gaussian measure, and the last equality follows from the properties of the Ehrhard rearrangement. Combining (48) and (49), we get

$$\left(\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\{u>t\}}|\nabla u|d\gamma\right)^2 \leq \phi_u'(t)\cdot\int_{\{u>t\}}Fd\gamma. \tag{50}$$

Next, by the co-area formula,

$$\int_{\{u>t\}}|\nabla u|d\gamma = \int_t^\infty \gamma^+(\partial\{u>s\})ds,$$

and therefore,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\{u>t\}}|\nabla u|d\gamma = -\gamma^+(\partial\{u>t\}). \tag{51}$$

Combining (50) and (51), we get

$$\gamma^+(\partial\{u>t\})^2 \leq \phi_u'(t)\cdot\int_{\{u>t\}}Fd\gamma. \tag{52}$$

Next, by the Gaussian isoperimetric inequality [94], [12],

$$\gamma^+(\partial\{u>t\}) \geq \gamma^+(\partial\{u^*>t\}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{\psi^{-1}\circ\phi_u(t)^2}{2}}. \tag{53}$$

Combining (52) and (53), we get

$$e^{\psi^{-1}\circ\phi_u(t)^2}\phi_u'(t) \geq \left(2\pi\int_{\{u>t\}}Fd\gamma\right)^{-1}. \tag{54}$$

Next, using Lemma 6.9 (the Gaussian Hardy-Littlewood inequality), with $f=F$ and $g=1_{\{u>t\}}$, we get

$$\int_{\{u>t\}}Fd\gamma \leq \int_{\{u^*>t\}}F^*d\gamma. \tag{55}$$

Combining (54) and (55), and using the fact that $\phi_{u^*}=\phi_u$, we conclude

$$e^{\psi^{-1}\circ\phi_{u^*}(t)^2}\phi_{u^*}'(t) \geq \left(2\pi\int_{\{u^*>t\}}F^*d\gamma\right)^{-1}. \tag{56}$$

Note that

$$\phi_{u^*}(t) = \psi\circ(u^*)^{-1}(t),$$

and thus

$$\phi_{u^*}'(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{\frac{(u^*)^{-1}(t)^2}{2}}((u^*)^{-1})_t'.$$

Let us also denote

$$g(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x} F^*(se_1)d\gamma(s).$$

Then (56) rewrites as

$$e^{\frac{(u^*)^{-1}(t)^2}{2}}((u^*)^{-1})'_t \cdot g \circ (u^*)^{-1}(t) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}. \tag{57}$$

Now, if K is a half-space and $F = F^*$, then we have an equality in (49) (since in that case, $u = u^*$ and $|\nabla u| = const$ on $\{u = t\}$); we have an equality in the isoperimetric inequality (53); lastly, we have an equality in (56). Therefore, we have an equality in (57) in this case. In other words, recalling our assumptions on v, we have

$$e^{\frac{v^{-1}(t)^2}{2}}(v^{-1})'_t \cdot g \circ v^{-1}(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}. \tag{58}$$

Let us denote by h such a function that

$$h'(x) = e^{\frac{x^2}{2}} g(x).$$

Combining (57) and (58), we see that for all $t \geq 0$,

$$(h \circ (u^*)^{-1})'_t \geq (h \circ v^{-1})'_t. \tag{59}$$

Note that by our Dirichlet boundary assumptions, $(u^*)^{-1}(0) = v^{-1}(0) = \psi^{-1}(\gamma(K))$. Combining this with (59), we get, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$h \circ (u^*)^{-1} \geq h \circ v^{-1}. \tag{60}$$

Since $h' \geq 0$, we see that h is a non-decreasing function, and therefore, (60) implies that for all $t \geq 0$,

$$(u^*)^{-1}(t) \geq v^{-1}(t), \tag{61}$$

and therefore, $u^* \leq v$.□

From Proposition 6.7, we deduce the following isoperimetric fact, which is a generalization of Proposition 6.6.

Corollary 6.10. *For any measurable K, and any square-integrable non-sign-changing $F : K \to \mathbb{R}$, we have $T^F(K) \leq T^{F^*}(H_K)$.*

Proof. Note that $T^F(K) = T^{-F}(K)$, and without loss of generality, suppose that $F \geq 0$. By Lemma 6.1,

$$T^F(K) = \int_K |\nabla u|^2 d\gamma = -\int_K uF d\gamma;$$

$$T^{F^*}(H_K) = \int_{H_K} |\nabla v|^2 d\gamma = -\int_{H_K} vF^* d\gamma,$$

where $Lu = F$, $u|_{\partial K} = 0$, and $Lv = F^*$, $v|_{\partial H_K} = 0$. By Lemma 6.8 (applied with $-u$ rather than u), we get $u \leq 0$ on K, and $v \leq 0$ on H_K. By Lemma 6.9 (the Gaussian Hardy-Littlewood inequality), applied with $f = -u$ and $g = F$,

$$-\int_K uF d\gamma \leq -\int_{H_K} u^* F^* d\gamma.$$

By Theorem 6.7, $-u^* \leq -v$ point-wise, and thus, in view of all of the above, $T^F(K) \leq T^{F^*}(H_K)$. □

6.3. **Some lower bounds for torsional rigidity.** In this subsection, we present several lower bounds for Gaussian torsional rigidity, and several of them will be important for us in Section 7. Recall the notation:

$$\varphi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-x}^{x} e^{-\frac{s^2}{2}} ds$$

and

$$J_{n-1}(R) = \int_0^R t^{n-1} e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt,$$

and also $c_{n-1} = J_{n-1}(\infty)$. We start by noticing

Lemma 6.11. *Let K be a convex symmetric set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and suppose $\gamma(K) \geq a$. Then the inradius of K, denoted $r(K)$, satisfies*

$$r(K) \geq 0.5\varphi^{-1}(a).$$

Proof. Indeed, suppose not. Consider the smallest symmetric strip S containing K. Then S also does not contain $0.5\varphi^{-1}(a)B_2^n$, and thus has width smaller than $\varphi^{-1}(a)$. But then the Gaussian measure of S is smaller then a, arriving to a contradiction. □

As an immediate consequence, we get

Lemma 6.12. *Let K be convex symmetric set with $\gamma(K) \geq a$, for $a \in [0, 1]$. Then*

$$T_\gamma(K) \geq \frac{J_{n-1}(0.4\varphi^{-1}(a))}{a c_{n-1}} T_\gamma(0.4\varphi^{-1}(a)B_2^n).$$

Proof. By Lemma 6.11, K contains a centered ball $0.5\varphi^{-1}(a)B_2^n$. The lemma thus follows by considering the function v on K with $Lv = 1$ on $0.4\varphi^{-1}(a)B_2^n$, and vanishing on $K \setminus 0.5\varphi^{-1}(a)B_2^n$ (which exists by Theorem 2.13), and the definition of torsional rigidity. □

We shall make use of the following bound:

Lemma 6.13. *Let K be convex symmetric body with $\gamma(K) = a$, for $a \in [0,1]$. Then*

$$T_\gamma(K) \geq \frac{\varphi^{-1}(a)^2}{4e^2 n^2}.$$

Furthermore,

$$T_\gamma(K) \geq \frac{\varphi^{-1}(a)^2}{4a^2} \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \gamma(tB_a)^2(1-t)^2,$$

where B_a is the centered euclidean ball of measure a.

Proof. Let $v : K \to \mathbb{R}$ be given by $v(x) = 1 - \|x\|_K$. It vanishes on the boundary of K, and thus

$$T_\gamma(K) \geq \frac{(\int v)^2}{\int |\nabla v|^2} = \frac{(1-\mathbb{E}\|X\|_K)^2}{\int |\nabla \|x\|_K|^2}.$$

Note that $\nabla\|x\|_K \in \partial K^o$, and $K^o \subset \frac{1}{r(K)} B_2^n$. Thus

$$|\nabla \|x\|_K| \leq \frac{1}{r(K)} \leq \frac{2}{\varphi^{-1}(a)},$$

where in the last passage we used Lemma 6.11. In addition, note that for any $t \in [0,1]$,

$$1 - \mathbb{E}\|X\|_K \geq \frac{\gamma(tK)(1-t)}{\gamma(K)} \geq t^n(1-t),$$

where in the last passage we used a rough lower bound of t^n for $\frac{\gamma(tK)}{\gamma(K)}$, which follows as γ is ray-decreasing. Plugging $t = \frac{n-1}{n}$, the statement follows from the estimates above.

To get the second bound, we use Lemma 2.14 in place of the bound $\gamma(tK) \geq t^n\gamma(K)$, which implies that for any $t \in [0,1]$, one has $\gamma(tK) \geq \gamma(tB_a)$, where B_a is the centered ball of measure a. □

In analogy with Lemma 6.13, we get the following fact, which will be crucial in the next section:

Lemma 6.14. *For any $F \in L^2(K)$,*

$$T_\gamma^F(K) \geq \frac{r(K)^2 \left(\mathbb{E}\left[F(1-\|X\|_K^2)\right]\right)^2}{4\mathbb{E}\|X\|_K^2},$$

where $r(K)$ is the in-radius of K. Furthermore, if $K = RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ is a round k-cylinder, and $F(x) = k - \sum_{i=1}^k x_i^2$, then we have an equality in the estimate above.

Proof. We use Lemma 6.1 to argue that for any $v \in W^{1,2}(K)$ with $v|_{\partial K} = 0$, one has

$$T_\gamma^F(K) \geq \frac{\left(\int Fv\right)^2}{\int |\nabla v|^2}.$$

We plug $v = 1 - \|x\|_K^2$ to get the bound

$$T_\gamma^F(K) \geq \frac{\left(\int F(1-\|x\|_K^2)\right)^2}{4\int \|x\|_K^2 |\nabla \|x\|_K|^2}. \tag{62}$$

It remains to recall that $\nabla\|x\|_K \in \partial K^o$, and $K^o \subset \frac{1}{r(K)} B_2^n$, and therefore

$$|\nabla \|x\|_K| \leq \frac{1}{r(K)}.$$

When $K = RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ and $F(x) = k - \sum_{i=1}^k x_i^2$, we have $c \cdot F = L(1 - \|x\|_K^2)$, and thus the equality holds in (62) by Lemma 6.1. In addition, in this case we have $|\nabla\|x\|_K| = \frac{1}{r(K)}$, and thus the equality must hold in the estimate of the Lemma. □

For completeness, we point out

Lemma 6.15. *Suppose the first Dirichlet eigenfunction of the restriction of the Gaussian measure on the symmetric convex set K is even. Then*

$$T_\gamma(K) \geq \frac{1}{\lambda_D(K)} - \frac{1}{\lambda_N(K)},$$

where $\lambda_D(K)$ is the first Dirichlet eigenvalue of L on K and $\lambda_N(K)$ is the second Neumann eigenvalue of L on K.

Proof. Let v be the function vanishing on the boundary of K with $Lv = -\lambda_D(K)v$. Note that for any $p > 0$,

$$T_\gamma(K) \geq \frac{(\int v^p)^2}{p^2 \int v^{2p-2}|\nabla v|^2}.$$

Observe that

$$p^2 \int v^{2p-2}|\nabla v|^2 = \frac{p^2}{2p-1} \int \langle \nabla v, \nabla v^{2p-1}\rangle = \frac{p^2 \lambda_D(K)}{2p-1} \int v^{2p},$$

and thus

$$T_\gamma(K) \geq \frac{2p-1}{p^2\lambda_D(K)} \frac{(\int v^p)^2}{\int v^{2p}}.$$

Note also that

$$\left(\int v^p\right)^2 \geq \int v^{2p} - \frac{1}{\lambda_N(K)} \int |\nabla v^p|^2 = \int v^{2p} \left(1 - \frac{p^2\lambda_D(K)}{(2p-1)\lambda_N(K)}\right),$$

where $\lambda_N(K)$ is the second Neumann eigenvalue. Thus we get

$$T_\gamma(K) \geq \frac{2p-1}{p^2\lambda_D(K)} - \frac{1}{\lambda_N(K)}.$$

Letting $p = 1$ we get the bound. □

Remark 6.16. *There is no guarantee that the bound in Lemma 6.15 is non-negative for every K, however in some cases it may be non-negative and useful.*

We conclude with some natural questions about the Gaussian torsional rigidity.

Question 2.
(1) *Over all convex sets of measure $a \in [0,1]$, which set minimizes $T_\gamma(K)$?*
(2) *Over all symmetric convex sets of measure $a \in [0,1]$, which set minimizes $T_\gamma(K)$?*
(3) *Over all symmetric convex sets of measure $a \in [0,1]$, which set maximizes $T_\gamma(K)$?*
(4) *Over all symmetric convex sets of measure $a \in [0,1]$, which set maximizes (minimizes) $T_\gamma^{n-x^2}(K)$?*

7. The Gaussian case, Theorems A and 1.5.

In this section we discuss estimates in the case of the standard Gaussian measure γ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, with density $\sqrt{2\pi}^{-n} e^{-x^2/2}$. We shall use the notation

$$\int := \frac{1}{\gamma(K)} \int_K d\gamma(K),$$

where K is a convex set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (in each instance it will be clear from the context which convex set is considered.)

Let us formulate the precise version of Theorem A:

Theorem 7.1. *For any symmetric convex set K in $\mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$p_s(K,\gamma) \geq$$

$$\sup_{\alpha\in\mathbb{R}} \frac{0.5\left(\mathbb{E}\|X\|_K^2\right)^{-1} r(K)^2 \left(\mathbb{E}(1-\|X\|_K^2)\cdot(\alpha-\mathbb{E}\|X\|_K^2)\right)^2 - \mathbb{E}\|X\|_K^4 + \left(\mathbb{E}\|X\|_K^2\right)^2}{(\alpha-\mathbb{E}\|X\|_K^2)^2}$$

$$+\frac{1}{n-\mathbb{E}X^2}.$$

Moreover, the equality holds if and only if $K = RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ for some $R>0$ and $k = 1,...,n$.

Remark 7.2. *A direct computation reveals that the optimal choice of α in Theorem 7.1 is*

$$\alpha = \frac{1+4r(K)^2\mathbb{E}\|X\|_K^2\left(\mathbb{E}\|X\|_K^2 - \mathbb{E}\|X\|_K^4\right)}{2r(K)^2\mathbb{E}\|X\|_K^2(1-\mathbb{E}\|X\|_K^2)}.$$

Theorem 7.1 is, in fact, a corollary of the following more general result, applied together with Lemma 6.14:

Theorem 7.3. *For any symmetric convex set K in $\mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$p_s(K,\gamma) \geq \sup_{F \in L^2(K,\gamma) \cap Lip(K):\, \int F = 1} \left(2T_\gamma^F(K) - Var(F)\right) + \frac{1}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2}.$$

Moreover, the equality holds if and only if $K = RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ for some $R > 0$ and $k = 1, ..., n$.

Here $\mathbb{E}$ and Var stand for the expectation and the variance with respect to the restriction of the standard Gaussian measure onto K.

Most of this section is dedicated to proving Theorem 7.3. Let us first deduce Theorem 7.1 from it.

Proof of the Theorem 7.1. Combining Theorem 7.3 and Lemma 6.14 applied with $F = \alpha - \|x\|_K^2$, we arrive to the inequality in the Theorem 7.1. The equality cases of Theorem 7.3 show that only round k-cylinders can be the equality cases in Theorem 7.1. Proposition 1.3 gives an expression for p_γ^s for round k-cylinders, and a direct computation shows that it coincides with the one given by Theorem 7.1. Alternatively, one may use the fact that round k-cylinders are the equality cases of Theorem 7.3, and also are equality cases of Lemma 6.14 (in view of the fact that $F = k - \sum_{i=1}^k x_i^2$ in this case), to conclude that they are, indeed, also the equality cases of Theorem 7.1. $\square$

7.1. **The key estimate.** We outline the following proposition, which substantially improves upon the estimate of Eskenazis and Moschidis [40]. For the reader's convenience, the following proposition is stated together with equality cases, even though so far, we assume smoothness. We shall get rid of the smoothness assumption later on. Recall the notation $\int = \frac{1}{\gamma(K)} \int_K d\gamma$.

Proposition 7.4. *For any symmetric convex set K in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with C^2-smooth boundary and any even $u \in W^{2,2}(K) \cap C^2(int\, K)$,*

$$\int \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 \geq \int |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{(\int Lu)^2}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2}.$$

Moreover, the equality holds if and only if either

- *$u = C_1 x^2 + C_2$, for some $C_1, C_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ or*
- *there exists a rotation R such that $RK = L \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$, for some $k-$dimensional symmetric convex set $L \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, and $u(Rx) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i x_i^2$, for some real numbers $\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n$, such that $\alpha_1 = ... = \alpha_{n-k}$.*

Proof. Let $u = v + t\frac{x^2}{2}$, for some $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\|\nabla^2 u\|^2 = \|\nabla^2 v\|^2 + 2t\Delta v + t^2 n = \|\nabla^2 v\|^2 + 2tLv + 2t\langle \nabla v, x\rangle + t^2 n. \tag{63}$$

Note also that

$$Lv = Lu - tL\frac{x^2}{2} = Lu - t(n - x^2). \tag{64}$$

Using that K is symmetric and u is even, and consequently $\int \nabla v = 0$, and applying the Gaussian Poincare inequality (10) to each of the $\frac{\partial v}{\partial x_i}$, $i = 1, ..., n$ we get

$$\int \|\nabla^2 v\|^2 \geq \int |\nabla v|^2. \tag{65}$$

Combining (66), (64), (65), and the fact that $\nabla u = \nabla v + tx$, we get

$$\int \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 \geq \int |\nabla v|^2 + 2t\langle \nabla v, x\rangle + t^2 n + 2tLu - 2t^2(n - x^2) = \int |\nabla u|^2 + 2tLu + t^2(x^2 - n) \tag{66}$$

Plugging the optimal $t = \frac{\int Lu}{n - \int x^2}$ yields

$$\int \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 \geq \int |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{(\int Lu)^2}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2},$$

arriving to the inequality of the Proposition.

In order to characterize the equality cases, suppose that the equality occurs. Then the equality occurs in (65), which means that the equality occurs in the Brascamp-Lieb inequality (8) for every $\frac{\partial v}{\partial x_i}$. By Proposition 5.1, either K is arbitrary and v is an affine function (which means, in view of symmetry, that v is a constant function), or K is a cylinder, and there exists a collection of vectors $\theta_1, ..., \theta_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (some of which may be zero), and constants $c_1, ..., c_n \in \mathbb{R}$, such that $\frac{\partial v}{\partial x_i} = \langle x, \theta_i\rangle + c_i$, and $\{t\theta_i : t \in \mathbb{R}\} \subset K$. Let us discuss this case by case.

Case 1. $v = C$, for some constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $u = C_1 x^2 + C_2$, for some $C_1, C_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, while K is arbitrary.

Case 2. Suppose $v = C + \langle x, \theta\rangle$, for some non-zero vector θ. Then $u = C + \langle x, \theta\rangle + C_1 x^2$, which can only be an even function if $\theta = 0$, bringing us back to the first case.

Case 3. Suppose K is a cylinder, and $\frac{\partial v}{\partial x_i} = \langle x, \theta_i\rangle + c_i$, and $\{t\theta_i : t \in \mathbb{R}\} \subset K$, for all $i = 1, ..., n$. Thus, since v is even, we have $v = \langle Ax, x\rangle + C$, where A is an $n \times n$ matrix such that $A^T e_i = \theta_i$, and therefore $span(A^T e_i) \subset K$. Therefore, there exists a rotation R such that $RK = L \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$, for some $k-$dimensional symmetric convex set $L \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, and $v(Rx) = \sum_{i=n-k+1}^n \beta_i x_i^2$, for some real numbers β_i. Recalling the relation between u and v, and since $x^2 = |Rx|^2$, we have $u(Rx) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i x_i^2$, for some real numbers $\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n$, such that $\alpha_1 = ... = \alpha_{n-k}$. □

7.2. **Proof of the inequality of the Theorem 7.3.** For the inequality part, we may assume, without loss of generality, that K is C^2-smooth. By the Proposition 3.17, it is enough to show that for any $f \in C^1(\partial K)$ there exists a $u \in C^2(K) \cap W^{1,2}(K)$ with $\langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle = f(x)$ on $x \in \partial K$, and such that

$$\frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 + |\nabla u|^2 \geq p_s(K,\gamma) \left(\int Lu \right)^2 + Var(Lu),$$

with $p_s(K,\gamma)$ satisfying the estimate of the Theorem. By Theorem 2.11, one may choose u to be the solution of $Lu = F$ on K, for some $F \in L^2(K,\gamma) \cap Lip(K)$, and $\langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle = f(x)$ on $x \in \partial K$, where $\int F = \frac{1}{\gamma(K)} \int_{\partial K} f d\gamma|_{\partial K}$. In the case when $\int_{\partial K} f d\gamma|_{\partial K} = 0$, we simply take $F = 0$, and thus the desired conclusion holds for an arbitrary value of $p_s(K,\gamma)$. Therefore, by homogeneity, we have

$$p_s(K,\gamma) \geq \sup_{F \in L^2(K,\gamma) \cap Lip(K): \int F \neq 0} \inf_{u: Lu = F} \frac{\int \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 + |\nabla u|^2 - Var(F)}{(\int F)^2}.$$

Thus, as a corollary of the Proposition 7.4, we get that for a C^2-smooth convex set K, and for any $F \in L^2(K,\gamma) \cap Lip(K)$ with $\int F \neq 0$,

$$p_s(K,\gamma) \geq \inf_{u \in C^2(intK) \cap W^{2,2}(K,\gamma): Lu = F} \frac{2 \int |\nabla u|^2 - Var(F)}{(\int F)^2} + \frac{1}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2}.$$

By Lemma 6.1, for any u with $Lu = F$, we have

$$\int |\nabla u|^2 \geq T_\gamma^F(K).$$

Without loss of generality, by homogeneity, we may restrict ourselves to the case $\int F = 1$. Thus the inequality of the theorem follows. □

In what follows, we shall characterize the equality cases for Theorem 7.3. Before we proceed with the formal argument, we outline a sketch of the equality case characterization in the smooth case, for the reader's convenience.

Remark 7.5 (equality case characterization in the smooth case)**.** *In order to characterize the equality cases among smooth convex sets, we notice that, firstly, u (as defined in subsection 7.2) must satisfy*

$$\int |\nabla u|^2 = T_\gamma^F(K), \tag{67}$$

and, secondly, the equality must occur in the Proposition 7.4. (We note also that assuming sufficient smoothness about L as well as K allows us to use elliptic regularity results, see e.g. Evans [41]*, which would ensure sufficient smoothness of u.) By Lemma 6.1, and in view of Theorem 2.13, the equation (67) is true when u is the unique function satisfying $Lu = F$ and taking a constant value on the boundary of*

K. From the equality case characterization in Proposition 7.4, we get the following cases.

Case 1. *$u = C_1\frac{x^2}{2} + C_2$. Then $F = C_1(n - x^2)$, and therefore, K is a euclidean ball: indeed, the only situation in which the function $u = C_1\frac{x^2}{2} + C_2$ takes a constant value on the boundary of K is when K a euclidean ball.*

Case 2. *There exists a rotation R such that $RK = L\times\mathbb{R}^{n-k}$, for some $k-$dimensional symmetric convex set $L \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, and $u(Rx) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i x_i^2$, for some real numbers $\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n$, such that $\alpha_1 = ... = \alpha_{n-k}$. Then the function $\alpha\sum_{i=1}^k x_i^2 + \sum_{i=n-k+1}^n \alpha_i x_i^2$ takes constant values on the boundary of $RK = L \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$, and this implies that the set L must be a $k-$dimensional euclidean ball.*

This shows that the only possible equality cases for Theorem 7.1 are k-round cylinders. The fact that they are, in fact, equality cases, is the statement of Proposition 1.3, which we already shown.

7.3. **Stability in the key estimate.** We deduce immediately from the stability result for the Gaussian case of the Brascamp-Lieb inequality Proposition 5.3:

Proposition 7.6. *Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Suppose that for a symmetric convex set K with C^2-smooth boundary and an even $u \in W^{2,2}(K) \cap C^2(K)$, we have*

$$\int \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 \leq \int |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{(\int Lu)^2}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2} + \epsilon.$$

Then either

- $\|u - C_1x^2 - C_2\|_{L_1(K,\gamma)} \leq \sqrt{\gamma(K)}\left(\sqrt{n\epsilon} + \sqrt[4]{n\epsilon}\right)$, *for some $C_1, C_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ or*
- *there exists a rotation R such that*

$$\|u(Rx) - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i x_i^2 - C_0\|_{L_1(K,\gamma)} \leq \sqrt{\gamma(K)}\left(\sqrt{n\epsilon} + \sqrt[4]{n\epsilon}\right),$$

for some real numbers $\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n$, such that $\alpha_1 = ... = \alpha_{n-k}$, and simultaneously, there exists a vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ such that

$$\int_{\partial K} \langle \theta, n_x\rangle^2 d\gamma_{\partial K} \leq \frac{(n+1)\epsilon}{r},$$

where r is the in-radius of K.

Proof. Indeed, by the assumption, we deduce that a near-equality must occur in (65), and the conclusion follows immediately from Proposition 5.3 (the stability in the Brascamp-Lieb inequality). □

In what follows, we outline an approximation argument, to get the equality cases in the class of arbitrary convex sets.

7.4. **Proof of the equality cases in Theorem 7.3.** Suppose the equality occurs in Theorem 7.3 for some convex set K. Namely, suppose that for some $F \in L^2(K,\gamma) \cap Lip(K)$ with $\int F = 1$,

$$p_s(K,\gamma) = 2T_\gamma^F(K) - Var(F) + \frac{1}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2}.$$

As before, for a large $R > 0$, let $K_R = K \cap RB_2^n$. For an arbitrary $\delta > 0$, consider a convex set K_δ^R with C^2 boundary, such that $\frac{1}{2}K^R \subset K_\delta^R \subset K^R$, such that K_δ^R is δ-close to K^R in Hausdorff distance, and such that $\gamma(K \setminus K_\delta^R) \leq \delta$. Note that our assumption implies that that $d_{TV}(\gamma|_{\partial K^R}, \gamma|_{\partial K_\delta^R}) \leq \delta$: indeed, this follows from the corresponding comparison in the Lebesgue case, which is outlined in Schneider [91].

Then, using Proposition 6.4 and Lemma 6.5, one may select the sequence of R and δ in such a way that the torsional rigidity $T_\gamma^F(K_\delta^R)$ converges to the torsional rigidity $T_\gamma^F(K)$. Using also the continuity of $p_s(K,\gamma)$ (which follows from the definition), and the continuity of $Var(F)$ and $\mathbb{E}X^2$, we get

$$p_s(K_\delta^R,\gamma) \leq 2T_\gamma^F(K) - Var(F) + \frac{1}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2} + \epsilon, \tag{68}$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$ that depends only on δ and R. Recall that by Proposition 3.17, there exists a $u_\epsilon \in W^{2,2}(K_\delta^R) \cap C^2(intK_\delta^R)$ with $Lu_\epsilon = F$ on K_δ^R such that

$$p_s(K_\delta^R,\gamma) \geq \int \|\nabla^2 u_\epsilon\|^2 + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2 - Var(F). \tag{69}$$

Using Lemma 6.1, we see that

$$\int \|\nabla^2 u_\epsilon\|^2 + |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2 \leq 2\int |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2 + \frac{1}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2} + \epsilon.$$

By Proposition 7.6, either

$$\|u_\epsilon - C'_\epsilon x^2 - C_\epsilon\|_{L_1(K_\delta^R,\gamma)} \leq c(\epsilon),$$

for $c(\epsilon) \to 0$ such that $c(\epsilon)$ only depends on ϵ and n, or there exists a rotation U^ϵ (which may depend on ϵ), such that

$$\|u_\epsilon(U^\epsilon x) - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i(\epsilon) x_i^2 - C_0(\epsilon)\|_{L_1(K_\delta^R,\gamma)} \leq c(\epsilon).$$

Here $\alpha_i(\epsilon)$ stand for some real numbers $\alpha_1(\epsilon), ..., \alpha_n(\epsilon)$, where $\alpha_1(\epsilon) = ... = \alpha_{n-k}(\epsilon)$; simultaneously, there exists a vector $\theta_\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ such that

$$\int_{\partial K_\delta^R} \langle \theta_\epsilon, n_x \rangle^2 d\gamma_{\partial K_\delta^R} \leq c''(\epsilon),$$

with $c''(\epsilon) \to_{\epsilon \to 0} 0$, depending only on n and the in-radius of K_δ^R, which in turn is bounded from below regardless of the values of δ and R by our construction.

Recall that $d_{TV}(\gamma|_{\partial K^R}, \gamma|_{\partial K^R_\delta}) \leq \delta$. We let $\epsilon \to 0$ (while considering appropriate subsequences), to conclude that K^R_δ converges to K, $\theta_\epsilon \to \theta$, and therefore, u_ϵ converges weakly to a function $u \in W^{2,2}(K,\gamma)$, such that either $u(x) = \frac{\alpha x^2}{2} + C$, or $u(x) = \langle Ax, x\rangle + C$, for some positive-definite matrix A. Furthermore, whenever $\theta \in Ker(A)$, we have $\langle \theta, n_x\rangle = 0$ for almost all $x \in \partial K$. Therefore, K has to be a cylinder.

It remains to conclude that K is a "round" $k-$cylinder. Indeed, by Proposition 7.4,

$$p_s(K^R_\delta, \gamma) \geq 2\int |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2 - Var(F) + \frac{1}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2}.$$

Thus by (68),

$$\int_{K_\epsilon} |\nabla u_\epsilon|^2 \leq T^F_\gamma(K_\epsilon) + \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \tag{70}$$

By Proposition 6.2, (70) yields that

$$Var_{\gamma|_{\partial K}}(u_\epsilon) \leq c(\epsilon),$$

where $c(\epsilon) \to_{\epsilon\to 0}$ and depends only on n and r (which are fixed). Since $d_{TV}(\gamma|_{\partial K^R}, \gamma|_{\partial K^R_\delta}) \leq \delta$, we see, after letting $\delta \to 0$ and $R \to \infty$, that there exists a $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $u|_{\partial K} = C$. Recall that either $u(x) = \frac{\alpha x^2}{2} + C$, or $u(x) = \langle Ax, x\rangle + C$, for some positive-definite matrix A; the fact that $u|_{\partial K} = C$ thus implies that K is a round $k-$cylinder.

Finally, the fact that all round $k-$cylinders do appear as equality cases for Theorem 7.3 was shown in Proposition 1.3, and the proof is complete. □

7.5. **Some more corollaries of Theorem 7.3 and proof of the Theorem 1.5.** As another corollary of Theorem 7.3, we have

Corollary 7.7. *For any symmetric convex set K in $\mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$p_s(K,\gamma) \geq \sup_{J\subset\{1,\dots,n\}} \frac{2T^{\#J - x_J^2}_\gamma(K) - \mathbb{E}X_J^4 + (\mathbb{E}X_J^2)^2}{(\#J - \mathbb{E}X_J^2)^2} + \frac{1}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2},$$

where $X_J = Proj_{span(e_j)_{j\in J}} X$.

Moreover, the equality holds if and only if $K = RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ for some $R > 0$ and $k = 1, \dots, n$.

Proof. We let $F = \frac{\#J - x_J^2}{\#J - \int x_J^2}$ (as $\int F \neq 0$ by Lemma 2.17), and use Theorem 7.3. □

As another immediate corollary of Theorem 7.3, obtained from it by letting $F = 1$, we get

Corollary 7.8. *For any symmetric convex set K in $\mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$p_s(K,\gamma) \geq 2T_\gamma(K) + \frac{1}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2}.$$

Remark 7.9. *Theorem 2.12 allows us to define, for a strictly-convex smooth set K, the* poincare deficit

$$PD(K) = \inf_{v: Lv = -v} \frac{\mathbb{E}|\nabla v|^2 - \mathbb{E}v^2}{(\mathbb{E}v)^2} + 1,$$

where the expectation is with respect to the restriction of the Gaussian measure to K. This quantity can be viewed as an alternative to torsional rigidity. Analogously, we shall consider the "symmetric" Poincare deficit: for a symmetric strictly convex set K in $\mathbb{R}^n$, consider

$$PD_2(K) = \inf_{v: Lv = -2v} \frac{\mathbb{E}|\nabla v|^2 - 2\mathbb{E}v^2}{(\mathbb{E}v)^2} + 2.$$

Our proof also yields, in fact,

$$p_s(K,\gamma) \geq 2PD_2(K) + \frac{1}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2}.$$

Proof of the Theorem 1.5. Finally, we proceed with the proof of Theorem 1.5. By Lemma 3.4 and Corollary 7.8, it suffices to show that

$$\inf_{K: \mu(K) \geq a} \left(2T_\gamma(K) + \frac{1}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2} \right) \geq \frac{\varphi^{-1}(a)^2}{2e^2 n^2} + \frac{1}{n - \frac{1}{c_{n-1}a} J_{n+1} \circ J_{n-1}^{-1}(c_{n-1}a)}$$

By Lemma 2.14,

$$\inf_{K:\, \gamma(K) = a} \frac{1}{\gamma(K)} \int_K x^2 d\gamma(x) = \frac{1}{a} \int_{B_a} x^2 d\gamma(x),$$

where B_a is the euclidean ball of Gaussian measure a. Integration by polar coordinates shows that

$$\frac{1}{a} \int_{B_a} x^2 d\gamma(x) = \frac{1}{c_{n-1}a} J_{n+1} \circ J_{n-1}^{-1}(c_{n-1}a).$$

Combining this with Lemma 6.13 (which provides a lower bound for $T_\gamma(K)$), we arrive to the conclusion $\square$.

7.6. **A remark about a more flexible estimate.** As before, use the notation

$$\int := \frac{1}{\gamma(K)} \int_K d\gamma(x),$$

where K is a symmetric convex body in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and γ is the standard Gaussian measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let C_{poin} be the Poincare constant of the restriction of γ on K.

Lemma 7.10. *For any C^2 even function $u : K \to \mathbb{R}$, and any $\lambda \in [0, \frac{1}{C^2_{poin}(\gamma,K)}]$ we have*

$$\int \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 + |\nabla u|^2 \geq (\lambda+1) T_\gamma^{F_\lambda}(K) + \frac{(\int Lu)^2}{n - \frac{3\lambda-1}{\lambda+1}\mathbb{E}X^2},$$

where the expectation is taken with respect to the restriction of the Gaussian measure on K, and

$$F_\lambda = Lu - (n - x^2)\frac{\lambda-1}{\lambda+1}\frac{\int Lu}{n - \frac{3\lambda-1}{\lambda+1}\mathbb{E}X^2}.$$

Proof. Let

$$u = v + t\frac{x^2}{2}.$$

Then, since v is even,

$$\int \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 + |\nabla u|^2 \geq \int \|\nabla^2 v\|^2 + 2t\Delta v + t^2 n + |\nabla v + tx|^2 \geq \lambda \int \|\nabla v\|^2 + 2t\Delta v + t^2 n + |\nabla v + tx|^2,$$

where in the last passage, the inequality is true for any $\lambda \in [0, C^{-2}_{poin}(\gamma, K)]$, because of the Poincare inequality. Next, we write, as before,

$$\Delta v = Lu - L\frac{x^2}{2} + \langle x, \nabla v\rangle,$$

and estimate the above by

$$\int (\lambda+1)|\nabla v + \frac{2\lambda t}{\lambda+1}x|^2 + 2tLu + t^2(-n + \frac{3\lambda-1}{\lambda+1}x^2).$$

Lastly, we plug the optimal

$$t_0 = -\frac{\int Lu}{n - \frac{3\lambda-1}{\lambda+1}\mathbb{E}X^2},$$

and get that

$$\int \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 + |\nabla u|^2 \geq (\lambda+1) \int |\nabla u + t_0\frac{\lambda-1}{\lambda+1}x|^2 + \frac{(\int Lu)^2}{n - \frac{3\lambda-1}{\lambda+1}\mathbb{E}X^2}.$$

It remains to note, by Lemma 6.1,

$$\int |\nabla u + t_0\frac{\lambda-1}{\lambda+1}x|^2 \geq T_\gamma^{F_\lambda}(K).$$

□

8. On some upgrades of the Gaussian Brascamp-Lieb inequality.

In this section, the measure is taken to be Gaussian, a convex set K is fixed, and $\mathbb{E}$ stands for the expected value with respect to the restriction of the Gaussian measure onto K, and similarly, Var and Cov stand for the variance and covariance.

8.1. **Non-symmetric case.** We start by noticing the following "upgrade" on the Brascamp-Lieb inequality:

Lemma 8.1. *For any function $f \in W^{1,2}(K,\gamma) \cap Lip(K)$, and any $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$,*

$$\mathbb{E}f^2 \leq \mathbb{E}|\nabla f|^2 + \left(1 - \frac{\left(r_f(K) + \mathbb{E}\langle X,\theta\rangle\right)^2}{1 - Var(\langle X,\theta\rangle)}\right)(\mathbb{E}f)^2,$$

where

$$r_f(K) = \frac{\int_{\partial K} f\langle\theta, n_x\rangle d\gamma|_{\partial K}}{\gamma(K)\mathbb{E}f}.$$

Proof. Apply the Brascamp-Lieb inequality to $f + t\langle\theta, x\rangle$:

$$Var(f + t\langle\theta,x\rangle) \leq \mathbb{E}|\nabla f + t\theta|^2,$$

and plug the optimal

$$t = -\frac{Cov(f,\langle X,\theta\rangle) - \mathbb{E}\langle\nabla f,\theta\rangle}{1 - Var(\langle X,\theta\rangle)},$$

to get

$$Var(f) \leq \mathbb{E}|\nabla f|^2 - \frac{\left(Cov(f,\langle X,\theta\rangle) - \mathbb{E}\langle\nabla f,\theta\rangle\right)^2}{1 - Var(\langle X,\theta\rangle)}.$$

Integrating by parts, we see that

$$\frac{1}{\gamma(K)}\int_K f\langle x,\theta\rangle d\gamma = -\frac{1}{\gamma(K)}\int_K fL\langle x,\theta\rangle d\gamma = -r_f(K)\mathbb{E}f + \mathbb{E}\langle\nabla f,\theta\rangle,$$

which finishes the proof. □

Define

$$\eta_\theta(K) = \frac{1 - \mathbb{E}\langle X,\theta\rangle^2}{(\mathbb{E}\langle X,\theta\rangle)^2}.$$

Note that $\eta_\theta(K) \geq -1$ by the Brascamp-Lieb (9) inequality applied to $\langle x,\theta\rangle$; also, for convex sets containing the origin, $\eta_\theta(K) \geq 0$, as follows from Lemma 2.17.

We shall notice some immediate corollaries of Lemma 8.1.

Corollary 8.2. *For any function $f \in W^{1,2}(K,\gamma) \cap Lip(K)$, and any $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$,*

- *If* $r_f(K) = r_{\langle x,\theta\rangle}(K)$, *then*
$$\mathbb{E}f^2 + \eta_\theta(K)(\mathbb{E}f)^2 \leq \mathbb{E}|\nabla f|^2.$$
- *If* $\int_{\partial K} f\langle n_x, \theta\rangle d\gamma|_{\partial K} = 0$, *then*
$$\mathbb{E}f^2 - \frac{\eta_\theta(K)}{1+\eta_\theta(K)}(\mathbb{E}f)^2 \leq \mathbb{E}|\nabla f|^2.$$
- *In particular, if* $f|_{\partial K} = 0$, *then*
$$\mathbb{E}f^2 \leq \max(1, 1+\eta_\theta(K))\mathbb{E}|\nabla f|^2.$$

Proof. The first two assertions follow immediately, while the third assertion follows by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality $(\mathbb{E}f)^2 \leq \mathbb{E}f^2$, applied in the event that $\eta_\theta(K) \geq 0$ (we use also that $1 + \eta_\theta(K) \geq 0$.) □

Next, define
$$\eta(a) = \sqrt{2\pi}a\psi^{-1}(a)e^{\frac{\psi^{-1}(a)^2}{2}}.$$
Note that $\eta_\theta(H_{\theta,a}) = \eta(a)$, where $H_{\theta,a} = \{\langle x, \theta\rangle \leq \psi^{-1}(a)\}$. Note also that
$$\eta(a) \geq -1.$$
First, we formulate an immediate corollary of Corollary 8.2.

Corollary 8.3. *For any Borel-measurable set* K *and any function* $f \in W^{1,2}(K,\gamma) \cap Lip(K)$, *such that* $f|_{\partial K} = 0$, *we have*
$$\mathbb{E}f^2 - \frac{\eta(a)}{1+\eta(a)}(\mathbb{E}f)^2 \leq \mathbb{E}|\nabla f|^2. \tag{71}$$
Consequently, if $f|_{\partial K} = 0$, *we have*
$$\mathbb{E}f^2 \leq \max(1, 1+\eta(a))\mathbb{E}|\nabla f|^2,$$
and in particular, $C_D(K,\gamma) < \infty$ *unless* $K = \mathbb{R}^n$; *note also that* $C_D(K,\gamma) \leq 1$ *whenever* $\gamma(K) \leq 0.5$.

Proof. Note that Ehrhard's symmetrization preserves Dirichlet boundary condition. By Ehrhard's principle, the worst constant $C(a)$ in the inequality (71), among the sets K of Gaussian measure a, is attained when K is a half-space $H_{a,\theta} = \{x : \langle x, \theta\rangle \leq \psi^{-1}(a)\}$, and f is constant on all hyperplanes parallel to its boundary. By the second assertion of Corollary 8.5, we have
$$C(a) \geq \frac{\eta_\theta(H_{a,\theta})}{1+\eta_\theta(H_{a,\theta})} = \frac{\eta(a)}{1+\eta(a)},$$
where the last passage is a direct computation. □

We can also get another curious general estimate, which shall follow from the following Lemma:

Lemma 8.4. *For any convex set K of Gaussian measure a, and any $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, we have $\eta_\theta(K) \geq \eta(a)$. In other words,*

$$\mathbb{E}\langle X, \theta\rangle^2 + \eta(a)(\mathbb{E}\langle X, \theta\rangle)^2 \leq 1.$$

Combining Lemma 8.4 with the first assertion of Corollary 8.2, we get

Corollary 8.5. *For any convex set K and any function $f \in W^{1,2}(K,\gamma) \cap Lip(K)$, such that for some $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, we have $\int_{\partial K} f\langle n_x, \theta\rangle d\gamma|_{\partial K} = \frac{1-\mathbb{E}\langle X,\theta\rangle^2}{\gamma(K)\mathbb{E}\langle X,\theta\rangle}\mathbb{E}f$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}f^2 + \eta(a)(\mathbb{E}f)^2 \leq \mathbb{E}|\nabla f|^2.$$

The rest of this subsection is devoted to the discussion of Lemma 8.4. First, we present a quick proof of it.

Proof of Lemma 8.4 via Ehrhard's inequality. Kolesnikov and Milman [60] showed that Ehrhard's inequality implies, for any function $f \in C^2(\partial K) \cap L^2(\partial K)$,

$$\int_{\partial K} H_\gamma f^2 - \langle \mathrm{II}^{-1}\nabla_{\partial \mathrm{K}}\mathrm{f}, \nabla_{\partial \mathrm{K}}\mathrm{f}\rangle \, \mathrm{d}\gamma|_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \leq -\eta(\mathrm{a}) \left(\int_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \mathrm{f}\mathrm{d}\gamma|_{\partial \mathrm{K}}\right)^2; \tag{72}$$

See Proposition 3.16 in the case when $F = \psi^{-1}$, which explains the implication. We plug $f = \langle \theta, n_x\rangle$, and use the fact that $\nabla_{\partial K}\langle \theta, n_x\rangle = \mathrm{II}\theta$. We integrate by parts (retracing back the steps done in Kolesnikov-Milman [58], subsection 2.2, where the generalized Reilly identity was derived from an earlier version of the Bochner-Lichnerowicz-Weitzenbock formula [74]), and this finishes the proof of Lemma 8.4. □

Let us now explain a proof of Lemma 8.4 which does not rely on Ehrhard's inequality. We start by noticing

Lemma 8.6. *Suppose a continuously differentiable function $F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is increasing. Let G be given by $G'(t) = F(t)e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}}$. Then $G \circ \psi^{-1}$ is convex on $[0,1]$.*

Proof. We note that

$$(G \circ \psi^{-1})|_t'' = 2\pi(G''(s) + G'(s)s)e^{s^2},$$

where $s = \psi^{-1}(t)$. In case that $G'(t) = F(t)e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}}$, and F is increasing, we have

$$G''(s) + G'(s)s = e^{-\frac{s^2}{2}}(F(s)s - sF(s) + F'(s)) \geq 0,$$

finishing the proof. □

We deduce

Proposition 8.7. *Let $F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be an increasing function. Then for any convex set K,*

$$\int_K F(x_1)d\gamma \geq \int_{H_K} F(x_1)d\gamma,$$

where H_K is the "left" half-space of the same Gaussian measure as K, orthogonal to e_1.

Proof. For $x \in e_1^{\perp}$, denote by $I_x = K \cap \{x + te_1\}$. Parametrize $\gamma_1(I_x) = a_x$ and

$$I_x = [\psi^{-1}(\alpha_x), \psi^{-1}(\alpha_x + a_x)].$$

Then we write

$$\int_K F(x_1)d\gamma(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{I_x} F(t)e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt\, d\gamma_{n-1}(x) =$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \left(G \circ \psi^{-1}(\alpha_x + a_x) - G \circ \psi^{-1}(\alpha_x)\right) d\gamma_{n-1}(x),$$

where G is the antiderivative of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} F e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}}$. By Lemma 8.6, the function $G \circ \psi^{-1}$ is convex, and therefore

$$G \circ \psi^{-1}(\alpha_x + a_x) - G \circ \psi^{-1}(\alpha_x) \geq G \circ \psi^{-1}(a_x) - G \circ \psi^{-1}(0). \tag{73}$$

Again by convexity of $G \circ \psi^{-1}$ together with Jensen's inequality, we see that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \left(G \circ \psi^{-1}(a_x) - G \circ \psi^{-1}(0)\right) d\gamma_{n-1}(x) \geq G \circ \psi^{-1}(a) - G \circ \psi^{-1}(0), \tag{74}$$

where

$$a = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} a_x d\gamma_{n-1}(x) = \gamma(K).$$

The combination of the inequalities (73) and (74) finishes the proof, together with the fact that

$$G \circ \psi^{-1}(a) - G \circ \psi^{-1}(0) = \int_{H(K)} F(x_1)d\gamma.$$

□

As a consequence, we get

Lemma 8.8. *For any convex set K,*

$$\int_K \langle x, \theta\rangle d\gamma \geq \int_{H_\theta(K)} \langle x, \theta\rangle d\gamma,$$

where $H_\theta(K) = \{\langle x, \theta\rangle \leq \psi^{-1}(\gamma(K))\}$. Therefore,

$$\left(\int_K \langle x, \theta\rangle d\gamma\right)^2 \leq \left(\int_{H_\theta(K)} \langle x, \theta\rangle d\gamma\right)^2.$$

Proof. The Lemma follows from the Proposition 8.7, applied with $F = t$. For the second assertion, note that for any θ, we have $\int_{H_\theta(K)} \langle x, \theta \rangle d\gamma \leq 0$. Thus if $\int_K \langle x, \theta \rangle d\gamma \leq 0$, the conclusion follows, and otherwise, just switch to $-\theta$ in place of θ. □

Remark 8.9. *Also, Lemma 8.8 follows from the fact that the norm of the barycenter b_K of a set K is maximized on a half-space – see Bobkov* [9]*, Neemann* [84]*. Indeed,*

$$(\mathbb{E}\langle X, \theta \rangle)^2 = \langle b_K, \theta \rangle^2 \leq |b_K|^2 \leq |b_{H_\theta(K)}|^2,$$

where choosing θ collinear to the barycenter finishes the proof of Lemma 8.8.

Next, we outline the second ingredient for Lemma 8.4:

Lemma 8.10. *For any convex set K, using the same notation as before,*

$$\int_K \langle x, \theta \rangle^2 d\gamma \leq \int_{H_\theta(K)} \langle x, \theta \rangle^2 d\gamma.$$

In order to show Lemma 8.10, we start with the following variant of the Hardy-Littlewood Lemma (which we already explored in Lemma 6.9):

Lemma 8.11 (another twist on a one-dimensional Hardy-Littlewood principle)**.** *Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a connected set and suppose $f : K \to \mathbb{R}$ is a non-negative measurable function in $L^2(\gamma, K)$ with connected level sets. Then*

$$\int_K f x^2 d\gamma_1(x) \leq \int_{H_K} f^* x^2 d\gamma_1(x).$$

Proof. We write

$$\int_K f x^2 d\gamma(x) = \int_K \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty 1_{\{f(x) > t\}} 1_{\{x^2 > t\}} dt ds d\gamma_1(x) =$$

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \gamma_1 \left(\{f > s\} \cap \{x^2 > t\} \right) ds dt,$$

and similarly,

$$\int_{H_K} f^* x^2 d\gamma(x) = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \gamma \left(\{f^* > s\} \cap \{x^2 > t\} \right) ds dt.$$

Thus it suffices to notice that for any connected set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ and any symmetric interval $S = \{|x| \leq \alpha\}$,

$$\gamma(A \cap S) \geq \gamma(H_A \cap S),$$

where we use notation $H_A = (-\infty, \psi^{-1}(\gamma_1(A))]$. □

As a consequence, we get

Proof of Lemma 8.10. Without loss of generality let $\theta = e_1$. Let

$$f(t) = \gamma_{n-1}(K \cap \{x_1 = t\}).$$

Then, by Fubbini's theorem, $\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(s)d\gamma_1(s) = \gamma(K)$. Since K is convex, the function f is log-concave, and, in particular, it has connected level sets. Thus, by Lemma 8.11,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)x^2 d\gamma_1(x) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} f^*(x)x^2 d\gamma_1(x),$$

meaning that

$$\int_K x_1^2 d\gamma \leq \int_{H_K} x_1^2 d\gamma,$$

where, as before H_K is a left half-space of measure $\gamma(K)$. □

Finally, we outline

Proof of Lemma 8.4. The Lemma follows immediately from the Lemmas 8.8 and 8.10. □

Remark 8.12. *It would be interesting to find the proof of Lemma 8.4 which does not rely on symmetrizations. Since Lemma 8.8 already does not rely on them, it would suffice to find a proof of Lemma 8.10 which does not use the symmetrization technique. In the case when K is fully contained in a half-space whose boundary contains the origin, one may use Proposition 8.7 with $F = -t^2$ (which is increasing in this case), to deduce Lemma 8.10. Also, if K is such that $\gamma_1(K \cap \{y + te_1\}) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, an elementary argument similar to Lemma 8.11 gives Lemma 8.10. But it is not clear to the author how to deduce Lemma 8.10 without using Ehrhard's symmetrizations.*

8.2. **Symmetric case.** For a symmetric convex set, we notice

Proposition 8.13. *For a symmetric convex set K and a function $f \in W^{1,2}(K,\gamma) \cap Lip(K)$, we have*

$$\int_K f^2 d\gamma - \frac{C(K)}{\gamma(K)}\left(\int_K f d\gamma\right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\int_K |\nabla f|^2 d\gamma,$$

where

$$C(K) = 1 - \frac{(s_f(K)-1)^2(n - \mathbb{E}X^2)^2}{2\mathbb{E}X^2 - Var(X^2)} \leq 1.$$

Here

$$s_f(K) = \frac{\int_{\partial K} f\langle x, n_x\rangle d\gamma_{\partial K}}{\gamma(K)(n - \mathbb{E}X^2)\mathbb{E}f}.$$

Moreover, the equality holds if and only if either

- *$f = C_1 x^2 + C_2$, for some $C_1, C_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ or*
- *there exists a rotation R such that $RK = L \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$, for some $k-$dimensional symmetric convex set $L \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, and $f(Rx) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i x_i^2$, for some real numbers $\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n$, such that $\alpha_1 = ... = \alpha_{n-k}$.*

We shall state an immediate corollary.

Corollary 8.14. *For a symmetric convex set K and a function $f \in W^{1,2}(K) \cap C^2(K)$ such that $\int_{\partial K} f \langle x, n_x \rangle d\gamma_{\partial K} = 0$ (in particular, for any f such that $f|_{\partial K} = 0$), we have*

$$\int_K f^2 d\mu + \frac{\beta(K)}{\mu(K)} \left(\int_K f d\mu \right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_K |\nabla f|^2 d\mu,$$

where

$$\beta(K) = \frac{n^2 - 2(n+1)\mathbb{E}X^2 + \mathbb{E}X^4}{2\mathbb{E}X^2 - Var(X^2)}.$$

Moreover, the equality holds if and only if either

- *$f = C_1 x^2 + C_2$, for some $C_1, C_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ or*
- *there exists a rotation R such that $RK = L \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$, for some $k-$dimensional symmetric convex set $L \subset \mathbb{R}^k$, and $f(Rx) = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i x_i^2$, for some real numbers $\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n$, such that $\alpha_1 = ... = \alpha_{n-k}$.*

Remark 8.15. *Recall that for all symmetric convex sets,*

$$\mathbb{E}X^4 \leq (\mathbb{E}X^2)^2 + 2\mathbb{E}X^2,$$

as was shown by Cordero-Erasquin, Fradelizi and Maurey [29]. *Therefore, $\beta(K) \geq -1$.*

We note also, by virtue of the Cauchy inequality $(\mathbb{E}f)^2 \leq \mathbb{E}f^2$, and by Corollary 8.14, and since $\beta(K) \geq -1$:

Corollary 8.16. *Let K be a symmetric convex set in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then for every any even function $f \in W^{1,2}(K, \gamma) \cap C^1(K)$ such that $f|_{\partial K} = 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}f^2 \leq \frac{1}{2(1 + \beta(K))} \mathbb{E}|\nabla f|^2.$$

This corollary gives another specific quantitative bound in the Dirichlet-Poincare inequality in the particular case of symmetric convex sets.

Proving the inequality part of Proposition 8.13 is quite easy: note that the Brascamp-Lieb inequality (11) holds for a function $f + t\frac{x^2}{2}$, optimize in t to plug

$$t = -\frac{(s_f(K) - 1)(n - \mathbb{E}X^2)}{2\mathbb{E}X^2 - Var(X^2)},$$

and obtain the desired inequality. However, in order to characterize the equality cases, we outline a slightly different argument, and will make use of the work we have already done in the previous section.

Define

$$\alpha(K) := \frac{n(n-1) - (2n+1)\mathbb{E}X^2 + \mathbb{E}X^4}{(n - \mathbb{E}X^2)^2}. \tag{75}$$

For example, note, by Lemma 2.16, that

$$\alpha(RB_2^n) = \frac{J_{n-1}(R)(n-1-R^2)}{g_n(R)} = -\varphi_n(R)\gamma(RB_2^n).$$

In particular, $\alpha(RB_2^n) \geq 0$ whenever $R \leq \sqrt{n-1}$. Also, $\alpha(RB_2^n) \to_{R\to\infty} -\infty$. One may also notice that $\alpha(H) = -\psi^{-1}(a)^3 e^{-\frac{\psi^{-1}(a)^2}{2}}$ whenever H is a half-space of measure a, and thus $\alpha(H) \geq 0$ whenever $a \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

More generally, note that

$$\frac{1}{\gamma(RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1})}\alpha(RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}) = -G_\gamma(RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}) =$$

$$\frac{1 - p_\gamma^s(RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1})}{\gamma(RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1})} = -\varphi_k(R),$$

in the notation of Section 3.

Remark 8.17. *In fact, our Conjecture 1 yields that for any $a \in [0,1]$ there is a $k \in \{1,...,n\}$ such that for every convex symmetric set K of Gaussian measure a, one has $\alpha(K) \leq \alpha(RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1})$, where $\gamma(RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}) = \gamma(K) = a$. Recall that we use notation $C_k(a) = RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ when $\gamma(RB_2^k \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}) = a$.*

Indeed, our conjecture would yield that for any symmetric convex set K of measure a, and for any $f \in W^{1,2}(\partial K) \cap C^1(\partial K)$,

$$\int_{\partial K} \mathrm{IIf}^2 - \langle \mathrm{II}^{-1}\nabla_{\partial \mathrm{K}}\mathrm{f}, \nabla_{\partial \mathrm{K}}\mathrm{f}\rangle \leq \mathrm{C(a)} \left(\int_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \mathrm{f}\right)^2,$$

where $C(a) = \max_{k=1,...,n} \alpha(C_k(a))$. It remains to observe that for $f = \langle x, n_x\rangle$, we have

$$\alpha(K) = \frac{\int_{\partial K} \mathrm{IIf}^2 - \langle \mathrm{II}^{-1}\nabla_{\partial \mathrm{K}}\mathrm{f}, \nabla_{\partial \mathrm{K}}\mathrm{f}\rangle}{(\int_{\partial K} f)^2}.$$

We notice a weaker upper-bound on α :

Proposition 8.18. *For any symmetric convex set K, $\alpha(K) \leq 1$.*

Proof. With some algebra, our aim rewrites as:

$$\mathbb{E}X^4 - (\mathbb{E}X^2)^2 - \mathbb{E}X^2 - n \leq 0. \tag{76}$$

Recall the result of Cordero-Erasquin, Fradelizi and Maurey [29], cited earlier as (11), which states that for all symmetric convex sets,

$$\mathbb{E}X^4 \leq (\mathbb{E}X^2)^2 + 2\mathbb{E}X^2.$$

In addition, by Lemma 5.1 from [62], for every convex set containing the origin (in particular, a symmetric one), we have

$$\mathbb{E}X^2 \leq n.$$

The combination of the above inequalities confirms (76), and therefore the proposition is proven. □

Next, recall the boundary term from the Reilly-type identity of Kolesnikov and Milman (Proposition 3.14):

$$R(u) := \int_{\partial K} (H_\gamma \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle^2 - 2\langle \nabla_{\partial K} u, \nabla_{\partial K} \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle \rangle + \langle \mathrm{II} \nabla_{\partial K} u, \nabla_{\partial K} u \rangle)\, d\gamma_{\partial K}(x).$$

We shall outline

Lemma 8.19. *For any C^2 convex set K, and any $u : K \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle = \langle x, n_x \rangle$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{\gamma(K)} R\,(u) \geq \alpha(K)(n - \mathbb{E}X^2)^2.$$

Proof. First, we somewhat retrace back the steps done in Kolesnikov-Milman [58] (subsection 2.2), where the aforementioned generalized Reilly identity was derived from an earlier version of the Bochner-Lichnerowicz-Weitzenbock formula [74], and outline that

$$\int_{\partial K} H_\gamma \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle^2 d\gamma_{\partial K}(x) = -\int_{\partial K} \langle \nabla u, x \rangle \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle d\gamma_{\partial K}(x) +$$

$$\int_{\partial K} \langle \nabla \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle, \nabla u \rangle d\gamma_{\partial K}(x) + \int_{\partial K} \Delta_{\partial K}(u) \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle d\gamma_{\partial K}(x), \tag{77}$$

where $\Delta_{\partial K}$ is the boundary Laplacian.

In the case when $u = \frac{x^2}{2}$, we have $\Delta_{\partial K}(u) = n - 1$ and

$$\nabla \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle = \mathrm{II} x, \tag{78}$$

since $\mathrm{II} = dn_x$ (with a "plus" because n_x is the outer unit normal). Thus

$$\int_{\partial K} H_\gamma \langle \nabla x, n_x \rangle^2 = -\int_{\partial K} x^2 \langle x, n_x \rangle d\gamma_{\partial K}(x) +$$

$$\int_{\partial K} \langle \mathrm{II} x, x \rangle d\gamma_{\partial K}(x) + (n-1) \int_{\partial K} \langle x, n_x \rangle d\gamma_{\partial K}(x),$$

and hence, using (78) again, we get

$$R\left(\frac{x^2}{2}\right) = -\int_{\partial K} x^2\langle x, n_x\rangle d\gamma_{\partial K}(x) + (n-1)\int_{\partial K}\langle x, n_x\rangle d\gamma_{\partial K}(x).$$

Integration by parts shows that the above equals

$$\gamma(K)\left(n(n-1) - (2n+1)\mathbb{E}X^2 + \mathbb{E}X^4\right) = \gamma(K)\alpha(K)(n - \mathbb{E}X^2)^2.$$

Next, suppose $u : K \to \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\langle \nabla u, n_x\rangle = \langle x, n_x\rangle$. Then $u = \frac{x^2}{2} + v$, for some $v : K \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\langle \nabla v, n_x\rangle = 0$. It remains to note that by (77) and (78), we have

$$R\left(\frac{x^2}{2} + v\right) = R\left(\frac{x^2}{2}\right) + \int_{\partial K}\langle \mathrm{II}\nabla \mathrm{v}, \nabla \mathrm{v}\rangle \mathrm{d}\gamma|_{\partial \mathrm{K}} \geq \mathrm{R}\left(\frac{\mathrm{x}^2}{2}\right),$$

where in the last passage, convexity was used. □

Next, we formulate

Proposition 8.20. *For any bounded C^2-smooth symmetric convex body K and any even function $f \in W^{1,2}(K,\gamma) \cap C^1(K)$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E}f^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}|\nabla f|^2 + \frac{2\mathbb{E}f\int_{\partial K} f\langle x, n_x\rangle d\gamma_{\partial K}}{\gamma(K)(n - \mathbb{E}X^2)} - \left(\alpha(K) + \frac{1}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2}\right)(\mathbb{E}f)^2.$$

Moreover, if

$$\mathbb{E}f^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}|\nabla f|^2 + \frac{2\mathbb{E}f\int_{\partial K} f\langle x, n_x\rangle d\gamma_{\partial K}}{\gamma(K)(n - \mathbb{E}X^2)} - \left(\alpha(K) + \frac{1}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2}\right)(\mathbb{E}f)^2 - \epsilon,$$

then either

- $\|f - C_1x^2 - C_2\|_{L_1(K,\gamma)} \leq C(\epsilon)$, *for some* $C_1, C_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ *or*
- *there exists a rotation R such that*

$$\|f(Rx) - \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i x_i^2 - C_0\|_{L_1(K,\gamma)} \leq C'(\epsilon),$$

for some real numbers $\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n$, such that $\alpha_1 = ... = \alpha_{n-k}$, and simultaneously, there exists a vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ such that

$$\int_{\partial K}\langle \theta, n_x\rangle^2 d\gamma_{\partial K} \leq C''(\epsilon),$$

where $C(\epsilon), C'(\epsilon), C''(\epsilon) \to_{\epsilon\to 0} 0$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that K and f are smooth enough to satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 2.11, and therefore, there exists a function $u \in W^{2,2}(K,\gamma) \cap C^2(K)$ such that $Lu = f$ and

$$\langle \nabla u, n_x\rangle = t\langle x, n_x\rangle,$$

where $t = \frac{\mathbb{E}f}{n-\mathbb{E}X^2}$. Here we used the fact that

$$\frac{1}{\gamma(K)} \int_{\partial K} \langle x, n_x \rangle d\gamma_{\partial K}(x) = n - \mathbb{E}X^2.$$

Then we integrate by parts and use Proposition 3.14, to get

$$\int_K f^2 d\gamma = 2 \int_K f L u d\mu - \int_K (Lu)^2 d\gamma =$$

(79)

$$- 2 \int_K \langle \nabla f, \nabla u \rangle d\gamma + 2 \int_{\partial K} f \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle d\gamma_{\partial K} - \int_K \left(||\nabla^2 u||^2 + |\nabla u|^2 \right) d\gamma - R(u).$$

Using Lemma 8.19, as well as

$$\int_K 2\langle \nabla f, \nabla u \rangle + 2|\nabla u|^2 d\gamma \geq -\frac{1}{2} \int_K |\nabla f|^2 d\gamma, \tag{80}$$

and Proposition 3.17, which asserts that

$$\int_K \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 d\gamma \geq \int_K |\nabla u|^2 d\gamma + \frac{(\int Lu)^2}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2},$$

we conclude

$$\int_K f^2 d\gamma \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_K |\nabla f|^2 d\gamma + +2t \int_{\partial K} f \langle x, n_x \rangle d\gamma_{\partial K} - t^2 \alpha(K) \gamma(K) (n - \mathbb{E}X^2)^2. \tag{81}$$

It remains to recall that $t = \frac{\mathbb{E}f}{n-\mathbb{E}X^2}$, to get that

$$\mathbb{E}f^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}|\nabla f|^2 + \frac{2\mathbb{E}f \int_{\partial K} f \langle x, n_x \rangle d\gamma_{\partial K}}{\gamma(K)(n - \mathbb{E}X^2)} - \left(\alpha(K) + \frac{1}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2} \right) (\mathbb{E}f)^2.$$

The stability estimate follows directly from Proposition 7.6, in view of our set up. □

Next, we shall obtain a strengthening of Proposition 8.20.

Proposition 8.21 (Strong form of Proposition 8.20)**.** *For any bounded C^2-smooth symmetric convex body K and any even function $f \in W^{1,2}(K, \gamma) \cap C^1(K)$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E}f^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}|\nabla f|^2 - (\mathbb{E}f)^2 \left(\frac{(s_f(K) - 1)^2}{1 - \alpha(K) - \frac{1}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2}} - 1 \right).$$

Moreover, if

$$\mathbb{E}f^2 \geq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}|\nabla f|^2 - (\mathbb{E}f)^2 \left(\frac{(s_f(K) - 1)^2}{1 - \alpha(K) - \frac{1}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2}} - 1 \right) - \epsilon,$$

then either

- $\|f - C_1 x^2 - C_2\|_{L_1(K,\gamma)} \leq C(\epsilon)$, *for some* $C_1, C_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ *or*

- *there exists a rotation R such that*

$$\|f(Rx) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i x_i^2 - C_0\|_{L_1(K,\gamma)} \leq C'(\epsilon),$$

for some real numbers $\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_n$, such that $\alpha_1 = ... = \alpha_{n-k}$, and simultaneously, there exists a vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ such that

$$\int_{\partial K} \langle \theta, n_x \rangle^2 d\gamma_{\partial K}(x) \leq C''(\epsilon),$$

where $C(\epsilon), C'(\epsilon), C''(\epsilon) \to_{\epsilon \to 0} 0$.

Proof. By Proposition 8.20, for an arbitrary $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have, for any convex body K containing the origin and any function $f \in W^{1,2}(K,\gamma) \cap C^1(K)$,

$$\mathbb{E}(f+t)^2 \leq \mathbb{E}|\nabla f|^2 + \frac{2(\mathbb{E}f + t)\int_{\partial K}(f+t)\langle x, n_x\rangle d\gamma_{\partial K}}{\gamma(K)(n - \mathbb{E}X^2)} - \left(\alpha(K) + \frac{1}{n - \mathbb{E}X^2}\right)(\mathbb{E}f + t)^2.$$

Plugging the optimal

$$t = \frac{\mathbb{E}f(\alpha(K) + \frac{1}{n-\mathbb{E}X^2} - s_f(K))}{1 - \left(\alpha(K) + \frac{1}{n-\mathbb{E}X^2}\right)(K)},$$

we get the first part of the statement. The stability follows from Proposition 8.20, possibly with changing constants.

□

Proof of Proposition 8.13. The proposition follows directly from the Proposition 8.21 using the approximation argument, exactly as in Section 7. □

Remark 8.22. *In a similar fashion to Lemma 8.19, one may notice that*

$$\frac{1}{\gamma(K)} R(\langle x, \theta\rangle) = \mathbb{E}\langle X, \theta\rangle^2 - |\theta|^2,$$

for any vector θ. Indeed, we note that for every $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\nabla \langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle = \mathrm{II}\theta, \tag{82}$$

and $\Delta_{\partial K}\langle x, \theta\rangle = 0$. Hence

$$R(\langle x, \theta\rangle) = -\int_{\partial K} \langle x, \theta\rangle \langle \theta, n_x\rangle d\gamma_{\partial K}(x) = -|\theta|^2\gamma(K) - \int_K \langle x, \theta\rangle L\langle x, \theta\rangle,$$

and the claim follows from integration by parts.

Therefore, one may also derive Lemma 8.1 in a similar fashion as its symmetric version.

9. General log-concave measures: proof of Theorems B, 1.6 and 1.7.

We start with the following Proposition, which will be the key ingredient for all three theorems B, 1.6 and 1.7.

Proposition 9.1. *Let K be a symmetric convex set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let $u : K \to \mathbb{R}$ be an even function in $W^{2,2}(K) \cap C^2(K)$. Then for any convex symmetric $A \subset K$, one has*

$$\int_K \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 d\gamma \geq \frac{\mu(A)}{\mu(K)} \cdot \frac{(\frac{1}{\mu(A)} \int_A Lu \, d\mu)^2}{n + \frac{1}{\mu(A)} \int_A (C^2_{poin}(K,\mu)|\nabla V|^2 - 2\langle \nabla V, x\rangle) d\mu}.$$

Proof. We write $u = v + t\frac{x^2}{2}$, for some $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and note that

$$\|\nabla^2 u\|^2 = \|\nabla^2 v\|^2 + 2t\Delta v + t^2 n, \tag{83}$$

and

$$Lu = Lv + tL\frac{x^2}{2} = Lv + tn - t\langle x, \nabla V\rangle. \tag{84}$$

Consequently,

$$\Delta v = \langle \nabla V, \nabla v\rangle + Lu - tn + t\langle x, \nabla V\rangle. \tag{85}$$

Since u is even, we have that v is also even, and thus, by the symmetry of K and the evenness of μ, we have $\int \nabla v = 0$. Therefore, using (83), and applying the Poincare inequality (10) to ∇v, we get

$$\int_K \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 d\gamma = \int_K \|\nabla^2 v\|^2 + 2t\Delta v + t^2 n \, d\gamma \geq \int_K C^{-2}_{poin}(K,\mu)|\nabla v|^2 + 2t\Delta v + t^2 n \, d\gamma. \tag{86}$$

Plugging in (94) into (86), and completing the square, we get

$$\int_K \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 d\mu \geq \int_K -t^2 C^2_{poin}(K,\mu)|\nabla V|^2 + 2t(Lu - tn + t\langle x, \nabla V\rangle) + t^2 n \, d\mu. \tag{87}$$

Since $A \subset K$, and writing $\int = \frac{1}{\mu(A)} \int_A d\mu$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 d\mu \geq \frac{\mu(A)}{\mu(K)} \int -t^2 C^2_{poin}(K,\mu)|\nabla V|^2 + 2t(Lu - tn + t\langle x, \nabla V\rangle) + t^2 n. \tag{88}$$

Plugging the optimal

$$t = \frac{-\int Lu}{n + \int C^2_{poin}|\nabla V|^2 - 2\langle \nabla V, x\rangle},$$

and simplifying the expression, we conclude the proof. □

Remark 9.2. *Note that Proposition 9.1, applied with $K = A$ and $V = 0$, becomes*

$$\int_K \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 dx \geq \frac{1}{n|K|}\left(\int_K \Delta u\right)^2. \tag{89}$$

This estimate does not require symmetry or convexity of K, and simply follows point-wise $\|\nabla^2 u\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{n}(\Delta u)^2$, just because for any positive-definite matrix A one has $\|A\|_{HS}^2 \geq \frac{1}{n}tr(A)^2$. Kolesnikov and Milman [57] used this estimate to deduce the (usual) Brunn-Minkowski inequality for convex sets, by combining (89) with Proposition 3.17, and solving the equation $\Delta u = 1$ with an arbitrary Neumann boundary condition.

In summary, Proposition 9.1 gives the optimal bound in the case of Lebesgue measure. It also boils down to the tight bound of the Proposition 7.4 in the case of the standard Gaussian measure.

9.1. **Proof of Theorem B.** We shall need a couple of facts about isotropic log-concave measures. Firstly, combining Lemma 5.4 and Corollary 5.3 from Klartag [64], we note

Lemma 9.3 (Klartag [64], a combination of Lemma 5.4 and Corollary 5.3)**.** *If μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is an isotropic log-concave measure with density e^{-W}, then for a sufficiently large absolute constant $\alpha > 0$, the set*

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : W(x) \leq W(0) + \alpha n\}$$

a) has measure at least $1 - e^{-\alpha n/8}$;
b) contains the euclidean ball of radius 0.1*.*

Next, let us recall the following nice and useful Lemma 2.4 from Klartag, E. Milman [67], which we slightly modify by introducing another parameter λ, and thus outline the proof:

Lemma 9.4 (Klartag, E. Milman [67], a modification of Lemma 2.4)**.** *Let W be an even convex function on $\mathbb{R}^n$. For any $r, q > 0$ and any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, one has*

$$\nabla W\left((1-\lambda)\{W \leq q + W(0)\}\right) \subset \left(\frac{1-\lambda}{\lambda}q + r\right)\{W \leq r + W(0)\}^o.$$

Proof. Pick any $z \in \{W \leq r + W(0)\}$ and $x \in (1-\lambda)\{W \leq q + W(0)\}$. We write, in view of the fact that W is even and thus $W(x) - W(0) \geq 0$:

$$\langle \nabla W(x), \lambda z\rangle \leq W(x) - W(0) + \langle \nabla W(x), \lambda z\rangle \leq W(x + \lambda z) - W(0) \leq$$

$$(1-\lambda)\left(W\left(\frac{x}{1-\lambda}\right) - W(0)\right) + \lambda(W(z) - W(0)),$$

where in the last passage we used convexity. Dividing both sides by λ, and using the choice of x and z,

$$\langle \nabla W(x), z\rangle \leq \frac{1-\lambda}{\lambda} q + r,$$

which finishes the proof in view of the definition of duality. □

Next, combining Lemmas 9.3 and 9.4, we get

Corollary 9.5. *Let μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is an isotropic log-concave even measure with density e^{-W}. There exists a symmetric convex set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that*
a) $\mu(A) \geq 0.9$;
b) For any $x \in A$ we have $|\nabla W| \leq C_1 n^2$.
Here C, C_1 are absolute constants.

Proof. We let

$$A = \frac{n-1}{n}\{W(x) \leq W(0) + \alpha n\},$$

with $\alpha > 0$ chosen to be a sufficiently large constant. Then, since W is ray-decreasing,

$$\mu(A) \geq \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^n \mu\left(W(x) \leq W(0) + \alpha n\right) \geq 0.9,$$

where in the last step we use a) of Lemma 9.3. Thus a) follows from the a) of Lemma 9.3. Next, to get b), we apply Lemma 9.4 with $\lambda = \frac{1}{n}$, $q = r = \alpha n$, to get that

$$\nabla W(A) \subset C' n^2 \{W(x) \leq W(0) + \alpha n\}^o \subset C'' n^2 B_2^n,$$

which confirms b). □

Remark 9.6. *Furthermore, arguing along the lines of Section 4, one may show that the set A from Corollary 9.5 has the property that for any symmetric convex set K, we have $\mu(K \cap A) \geq 0.5\mu(K)$.*

Proof of the Theorem B. Note that for any linear operator T, and any pair of convex sets K and L, one has $T(K+L) = TK + TL$. Therefore, without loss of generality, we may assume that the measure $\mu|_K = \frac{1}{\mu(K)} 1_K(x) e^{-V(x)} dx$ is isotropic. Also, we may assume that K is a C^2-smooth strictly-convex bounded set. It suffices to show that $p_\mu^s(K) \geq n^{-4-o(1)}$ in this situation.

By the recent result of Chen [55] (which built up on the work of Lee-Vempala [72] and Eldan [38]), we have $C_{poin}(\mu, K) \leq o(1)$.

Using the fact that $\langle \nabla V, x\rangle \geq 0$ for any even convex function V, and applying the Proposition 9.1 with the set A from Corollary 9.5, we get, for any $u \in W^{2,2}(K)$,

$$\frac{1}{\gamma(K)} \int_K \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 d\mu \geq n^{-4-o(1)} \left(\frac{1}{\gamma(A)} \int_A Lu \, d\mu\right)^2. \tag{90}$$

Recall, by Theorem 2.11, that for any $f \in C^1(\partial K)$ there exists a $u \in C^2(K) \cap W^{1,2}(K)$ with $\langle \nabla u, n_x \rangle = f(x)$ on $x \in \partial K$, and such that $Lu = C$, with $C = \frac{\int_{\partial K} f d\mu|_{\partial K}}{\mu(K)}$. With this choice of Lu, we get from (90):

$$\frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u \rangle \geq p \left(\int Lu \right)^2 + Var(Lu)$$

for $p = n^{-4-o(1)}$. An application of Proposition 3.17 concludes the proof. □

9.2. **Proof of the Theorems 1.6 and 1.7.** Before proceeding with the proof of Theorem 1.6, we outline the following corollary of a result by Eskenazis, Nayar, Tkocz [39]. Recall that a function $f(x)$ is called unimodule if

$$f(x) = \int_0^\infty 1_{K_t}(x) d\nu(t),$$

for some measure ν on $[0, \infty)$ and some collection of convex symmetric sets K_t.

Lemma 9.7. *For any symmetric convex body K, any $p \in [1, 2]$ and for any $q > 0$, letting the probability measure $d\mu_p(x) = C_{n,p} e^{-\frac{\|x\|_p}{p}} dx$, we have*

$$\int_K \|x\|_q^q d\mu_p(x) \leq C(p, q) n \mu_p(K),$$

for some constant $C(p, q)$ which depends only on p and q.

Proof. Firstly, recall that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \|x\|_q^q d\mu_p(x) = C(p, q) n, \tag{91}$$

as follows from Fubbini's theorem together with the one-dimensional version of Lemma 2.15.

Eskenazis, Nayar, Tkocz [39] showed that for any pair of unimodule functions f and g,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-f} e^{-g} d\mu_p(x) \leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-f} d\mu_p(x) \right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-g} d\mu_p(x) \right).$$

As was noticed by Barthe and Klartag [3] via a classical trick, this implies that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f e^{-g} d\mu_p(x) \geq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f d\mu_p(x) \right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-g} d\mu_p(x) \right).$$

We plug the unimodule functions $f(x) = \|x\|_q^q$ and $g(x) = -\log 1_K(x)$ into the above inequality, use (91), and the lemma follows. □

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Without loss of generality, let K to be a symmetric C^2-smooth convex body. Consider the measure $d\mu_p(x) = C_{n,p}e^{-\frac{\|x\|_p}{p}}dx$, for $p \in [1,2]$. Note that in this case,

$$|\nabla V(x)|^2 = \|x\|_{2(p-1)}^{2(p-1)},$$

and

$$\langle \nabla V, x\rangle = \|x\|_p^p.$$

It follows from the result of Barthe and Klartag [3] that for any convex set K, the Poincare constant of the restriction of μ_p on K is bounded from above by $C(\log n)^{\frac{2-p}{2p}}$. Therefore, denoting $\frac{1}{\mu_p(K)}\int_K d\mu_p = \int$ (as before), we get, by Proposition 9.1:

$$\int \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 \geq \frac{(\int Lu)^2}{n + C\int (\log n)^{\frac{2-p}{p}}\|x\|_{2(p-1)}^{2(p-1)} - 2\|x\|_p^p}.$$

By Lemma 9.7,

$$\frac{1}{\mu_p(K)}\int_K \|x\|_{2(p-1)}^{2(p-1)} d\mu_p \leq C(p)n,$$

and thus

$$\int \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 \geq \frac{(\int Lu)^2}{Cn(\log n)^{\frac{2-p}{p}}}.$$

Recall, by Theorem 2.11, that for any $f \in C^1(\partial K)$ there exists a $u \in C^2(K) \cap W^{1,2}(K)$ with $\langle \nabla u, n_x\rangle = f(x)$ on $x \in \partial K$, and such that $Lu = C$, with $C = \frac{\int_{\partial K} f d\mu_p|_{\partial K}}{\mu_p(K)}$. With this choice of Lu, we get

$$\frac{1}{\mu(K)}\int_K \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u\rangle \geq p^s(K,\mu)\left(\int Lu\right)^2 + Var(Lu)$$

for $p^s(K,\mu) = \frac{1}{Cn(\log n)^{\frac{2-p}{p}}}$. An application of Proposition 3.17 concludes the proof. □

Lastly, we show **the proof of Theorem 1.7.** For $d\mu(x) = C_{n,p}e^{-\frac{|x|^p}{p}}dx$, we note that $V = \frac{|x|^p}{p} + C$, and thus $\nabla V = |x|^{p-2}x$. By Lemma 2.14, for $R > 0$ such that $\mu(RB_2^n) = \mu(K)$, we have

$$\int |x|^{2p-2} \leq \frac{1}{\mu(RB_2^n)}\int_{RB_2^n} |x|^{2p-2} d\mu \leq C(p)n^{\frac{2p-2}{p}},$$

where in the last passage we used Lemma 2.15.

Next, note that a scaling of $n^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}}$ brings μ to an isotropic position. Therefore, by Theorem 4.1,

$$C_{poin}(\mu, K) \leq n^{\frac{1}{2}+o(1)} \cdot n^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}} = n^{\frac{1}{p}+o(1)}. \tag{92}$$

Therefore, in this case, Proposition 9.1 combined with Theorem 4.1 yields

$$\int \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 \geq \frac{(\int Lu)^2}{n + n^{\frac{2}{p}+o(1)} \int |x|^{2p-2} - 2|x|^p} \geq n^{-2+o(1)} \left(\int Lu\right)^2.$$

The result now follows from the Proposition 3.17 in the same manner as before. □

Remark 9.8. *In the case when $p \in [1,2]$, Remark 33 from Eskenazis, Nayar, Tkocz* [39] *indicates that, similarly to the case of the product measures, for any pair of unimodule functions f and g,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-f} e^{-g} d\mu(x) \leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-f} d\mu(x)\right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-g} d\mu(x)\right),$$

with $d\mu(x) = C_{n,p} e^{-\frac{|x|^p}{p}} dx$. As was noted by Barthe and Klartag [3]*, this implies that for such μ, for any symmetric convex set, $C_{poin}(\tilde{\mu}, K) \leq c\psi_{KLS}$, where $\tilde{\mu}$ is the "isotropic dilate" of μ, and ψ_{KLS} is the KLS constant, which was later shown* [55] *(as we mentioned already) to be bounded by $n^{o(1)}$. In summary, in place of (92) (which followed from Theorem 4.1), we have*

$$C_{poin}(\mu, K) \leq n^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}+o(1)}.$$

This shows, with the same argument as above, that when $p \in [1,2]$ and $d\mu(x) = C_{n,p} e^{-\frac{|x|^p}{p}} dx$, one has, for all symmetric convex sets K and L and any $\lambda \in [0,1]$,

$$\mu(\lambda K + (1-\lambda)L)^{\frac{1}{n+o(1)}} \geq \lambda \mu(K)^{\frac{1}{n+o(1)}} + (1-\lambda)\mu(L)^{\frac{1}{n+o(1)}}.$$

10. Proof of Theorem 1.8.

Throughout the section, fix a symmetric convex body K and an even log-concave measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Recall the notation $\int = \frac{1}{\mu(K)} \int_K d\mu$.

Proposition 10.1. *Let $u \in W^{2,2}(K,\mu) \cap C^2(K)$ be an even function. Then*

$$\int tr\left(\nabla^2 u (\nabla^2 V)^{-1} \nabla^2 u\right) \geq \int |\nabla u|^2 + \frac{(\int Lu)^2}{\int LV}.$$

Proof. We write $u = v + tV$, for some $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$tr\left(\nabla^2 u (\nabla^2 V)^{-1} \nabla^2 u\right) = tr\left(\nabla^2 v (\nabla^2 V)^{-1} \nabla^2 v\right) + 2t\Delta v + t^2 \Delta V, \tag{93}$$

and $Lu = Lv + tLV$. Consequently,

$$\Delta v = \langle \nabla V, \nabla v \rangle + Lu - tLV. \tag{94}$$

Since u is even, we have that v is also even, and thus, by the symmetry of K and the evenness of μ, we have $\int \nabla v = 0$. Therefore, by (93), (94) and the Brascamp-Leib

inequality (8) applied to ∇v, we get

$$\int tr\left(\nabla^2 u(\nabla^2 V)^{-1}\nabla^2 u\right) \geq$$

$$\int |\nabla v|^2 + 2t(\langle \nabla V, \nabla v\rangle + Lu - tLV) + t^2\Delta V = \int |\nabla u|^2 + 2tLu - t^2 LV. \tag{95}$$

Plugging the optimal

$$t = \frac{\int Lu}{\int LV},$$

we get the estimate.

□

Proof of the Theorem 1.8. Suppose $\nabla^2 V \geq k_1 \mathrm{Id}$ on K. Then

$$tr\left(\nabla^2 u(\nabla^2 V)^{-1}\nabla^2 u\right) \leq \frac{\|\nabla^2 u\|^2}{k_1},$$

and therefore, by Proposition 10.1,

$$\int \|\nabla^2 u\|^2 + \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u\rangle \geq \int \langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u\rangle + \frac{k_1(\int Lu)^2}{\int LV}. \tag{96}$$

As V is convex, we have $\langle \nabla^2 V \nabla u, \nabla u\rangle \geq 0$, and therefore, (96) together with Proposition 3.17 implies

$$p_s(\mu, a) \geq \frac{k_1}{\inf_{K:\,\mu(K)\geq a}\left(\frac{1}{\mu(K)}\int_K LV d\mu\right)}.$$

Recall that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} LV d\mu = 0$ (as follows from the integration by parts), and therefore, by dominated convergence theorem, we get $p(\mu, a) \to_{a\to 1} \infty$. □

References

[1] S. Artstein-Avidan, A. Giannopoulos, V. D. Milman, *Asymptotic Geometric Analysis*, part I, (2015).

[2] F. Barthe, *An isoperimetric result for the Gaussian measure and unconditional sets,* Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society 33 (2001), 408-416.

[3] F. Barthe, B. Klartag, *Spectral gaps, symmetries and log-concave perturbations*, preprint.

[4] M. Barchiesi, V. Julin, *Symmetry of minimizers of a Gaussian isoperimetric problem,* Probab. Theory Relat. Fields 177, 217-256 (2020).

[5] K. Ball, *Logarithmically concave functions and sections of con- vex sets in* $\mathbb{R}^n$, Studia Math. 88, no. 1 (1988) 69-84.

[6] M. F. Betta, F. Brock, A. Mercaldo, R. Posteraro, *A comparison result related to Gauss measure*, Comptes Rendus Mathematique Volume 334, Issue 6, (2002), Pages 451-456.

[7] B. Brandolini, F. Chiacchio, A. Henrot, C. Trombetti, *An optimal Poincare-Wirtinger inequality in Gauss space,* Mathematical Research Letters, (2013), 20 (3), pp.449-457.

[8] S. Bobkov, *Extremal properties of half-spaces for log-concave distributions,* Ann. Probab. 24 (1996), no. 1, 35-48.
[9] S. Bobkov, *The size of singular component and shift inequalities*, The Annals of Probability 1999, Vol. 27, No. 1, 416-431.
[10] S. Bobkov, M. Ledoux, *From Brunn–Minkowski to Brascamp–Lieb and to logarithmic Sobolev inequalities*, Geom. Funct. Anal., Vol. 10, no. 5, (2000), 1028–1052.
[11] V. I. Bogachev, *Gaussian Measures*, Math. Surveys Monogr. 62, Amer. Math. Soc. (1998).
[12] C. Borell, *The Brunn-Minkowski inequality in Gauss spaces,* Invent. Math **30** (1975), 207-216.
[13] C. Borell, *Convex set functions in d-space,* Period. Math. Hungar., Vol. 6, no 2, (1975), 111–136.
[14] C. Borell, *The Ehrhard inequality,* C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris, 337:663666, 2003
[15] K.J. Böröczky, E. Lutwak, D. Yang, G. Zhang, *The log-Brunn–Minkowski-inequality*, Adv. Math., Vol. 231, no. 3-4, (2012), 1974–1997.
[16] H. Brascamp, E. Lieb, *On extensions of the Brunn–Minkowski and Prekopa–Leindler theorems, including inequalities for log-concave functions, and with an application to the diffusion equation*, J. Funct. Anal., Vol. 22, no.4 (1976) 366–389.
[17] L. Brasco, *On torsional rigidity and principal frequencies: an invitation to the Kohler-Jobin rearrangement technique*, ESAIM: COCV, (2013).
[18] G. De Brujn, *Asymptotic Methods in Analysis,* Dover, 2010, p. 200.
[19] A. Burchard, *A short course on rearrangement inequalities*, lecture notes, 2009.
[20] L. A. Caffarelli, *Monotonicity properties of optimal transportation and the FKG and related inequalities*, Comm. Math. Phys. 214(3), (2000), 547-56
[21] E. Carlen, C. Kerce, *On the cases of equality in Bobkov's inequality and Gaussian rearrangement,* Calc Var 13, 1-18 (2001).
[22] D. Chafai, J. Lehec, *On Poincare and logarithmic Sobolev inequalities for a class of singular Gibbs measures,* Geometric aspects of functional analysis. Israel seminar (GAFA) 2017-2019. Volume 1. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 2256, 219-246 (2020) Springer.
[23] A. Colesanti, *From the Brunn-Minkowski inequality to a class of Poincaré type inequalities,* Commun. Contemp. Math., Vol. 10, no. 5, (2008), 765–772.
[24] A. Colesanti, D. Hug, E. Saorin-Gomez, *A characterization of some mixed volumes via the Brunn-Minkowski inequality,* J. Geom. Anal., Vol.24, no. 2, (2012), 1–28.
[25] A. Colesanti, D. Hug, E. Saorin-Gomez, *Monotonicity and concavity of integral functionals involving area measures of convex bodies,* Commun. Contemp. Math., Vol. 19, no. 2, (2017), 1–26.
[26] A. Colesanti, M. Fimiani, *The Minkowski problem for torsional rigidity,* Indiana University Mathematical Journal, 59 (2010) n. 3, 1013-1039.
[27] A. Colesanti, G. Livshyts, A. Marsiglietti, *On the stability of Brunn–Minkowski type inequalities*, J. Funct. Anal., Vol. 273, no. 3, (2017), 1120–1139.
[28] A. Colesanti, G. Livshyts, *Uniqueness of a smooth convex body with a uniform cone volume measure in the neighborhood of a ball*, preprint.
[29] D. Cordero-Erausquin, M. Fradelizi, B. Maurey, *The (B) conjecture for the Gaussian measure of dilates of symmetric convex sets and related problems*, J. Funct. Anal., Vol. 214, no. 2, (2004), 410–427.
[30] D. Cordero-Erausquin, B. Klartag, *Interpolations, convexity and geometric inequalities*, Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis, Lecture Notes in Math. 2050, Springer (2012), 151–168.
[31] T. Courtade, M. Fathi, *Stability of the Bakry-Emery theorem on* $\mathbb{R}^n$, to appear in Journal of Functional Analysis.

[32] Y. Chen, *An Almost Constant Lower Bound of the Isoperimetric Coefficient in the KLS Conjecture*, to appear in GAFA.
[33] X. Cheng, D. Zhou, *Eigenvalues of the drifted Laplacian on complete metric measure spaces*, Commun. Contemp. Math. 19 (2017), no. 1, p. 1650001, 17.
[34] G. De Philippis, A. Figalli *Rigidity and stability of Caffarelli's log-concave perturbation theorem*, Nonlinear Anal. 154 (2017), p. 59-70.
[35] Z. Ding, *A proof of the trace theorem of Sobolev spaces on Lipschitz domains,* Proc. AMS, Volume 124, Number 2, February 1996.
[36] A. Ehrhard, *Symetrisation dans l'espace de Gauss,* Math. Scand. 53 (1983), 281-301.
[37] A. Ehrhard, *Elements extremaux pour les inegalites de Brunn-Minkowski Gaussiennes,* Ann. Inst. H. Poincare Probab. Statist., 22(2):149-168, 1986.
[38] R. Eldan, *Thin shell implies spectral gap via a stochastic localization scheme,* Geom. Funct. Anal., April 2013, Volume 23, Issue 2, pp 532-569 (2013).
[39] A. Eskenazis, P. Nayar, T. Tkocz, *Gaussian mixtures: entropy and geometric inequalities,* Ann. Probab., 46(5):2908-2945, 2018.
[40] A. Eskenazis, G. Moschidis, *The dimensional Brunn-Minkowski inequality in Gauss space,* preprint.
[41] L. Evans, *Partial Differential Equations*, AMS, Graduate Studies in Mathematics Vol. 19, (2010), 749 pp.
[42] H. Federer, *Curvature measures,* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 93:418-491, (1959).
[43] E. Gagliardo *Caratterizzazioni delle tracce sulla frontiera relative ad alcune classi di funzioni in n variabili*, Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico della Universita di Padova, Tome 27 (1957), pp. 284-305.
[44] R. Gardner, *The Brunn–Minkowski inequality,* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., Vol. 39, (2002), 355–405.
[45] R. Gardner, A. Zvavitch, *Gaussian Brunn–Minkowski-type inequalities,* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., Vol. 362, no. 10,(2010), 5333–5353.
[46] D. Gilbarg, N. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Diferential Equations of Second Order,* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, (1977).
[47] P. Grisvard, *Elliptic problems in nonsmooth domains*, (2011), 410pp.
[48] P. Harrington, A. Raich, *Sobolev spaces and elliptic theory on unbounded domains in* $\mathbb{R}^n$, Adv. Differential Equations, 19(7/8): 635-692, (2014).
[49] P. Hartman, L. Nirenberg, *On spherical image maps whose Jacobians do not change sign,* Amer. J. Math. 81 (1959), 901-920.
[50] S. Heilman, *Symmetric Convex Sets with Minimal Gaussian Surface Area,* to appear, American Journal of Mathematics.
[51] S. Heilman, *Symmetric Convex Sets with Minimal Gaussian Surface Area,* 2017 (lecture notes).
[52] L. Hörmander, *Notions of convexity*, Progress in Mathematics 127, Birkh`auser, Boston, 199.
[53] J. Hosle, A. V. Kolesnikov, G. V. Livshyts, *On the* L_p*-Brunn-Minkowski and dimensional Brunn-Minkowski conjectures for log-concave measures*, preprint.
[54] P. Ivanisvili, *Boundary value problem and the Ehrhard inequality,* Studia Mathematica 246 (3), (2019).
[55] R. Kannan, L. Lovasz, and M. Simonovits, *Isoperimetric problems for convex bodies and a localization lemma,* Discrete Comput. Geom., 13(3-4):541-559, (1995).
[56] S. Kesavan, *Symmetrization and Applications,* Series in Analysis, Volume 3, World Scientific, (2006), ISBN 981-256-733-X.

[57] A.V. Kolesnikov, E. Milman, *Riemannian metrics on convex sets with applications to Poincaré and log-Sobolev inequalities*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, Vol. 55, (2016), 1–36.
[58] A.V. Kolesnikov, E. Milman, *Brascamp–Lieb-Type Inequalities on Weighted Riemannian Manifolds with Boundary*, J. Geom. Anal., (2017), vol. 27, no. 2, 1680–1702.
[59] A.V. Kolesnikov, E. Milman, *Poincaré and Brunn–Minkowski inequalities on the boundary of weighted Riemannian manifolds*, (in press, Amer. J. of Math.)
[60] A. V. Kolesnikov, E. Milman, *Sharp Poincare-type inequality for the Gaussian measure on the boundary of convex sets*, In: Klartag B., Milman E. (eds) Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol 2169. Springer, Cham, (2017), 221–234.
[61] A. V. Kolesnikov, E. Milman, *Local L_p-Brunn-Minkowski inequalities for $p < 1$*, preprint.
[62] A. V. Kolesnikov, G. V. Livshyts, *On the Gardner-Zvavitch conjecture: symmetry in the inequalities of the Brunn-Minkowski type*, to appear in Advances in Math.
[63] A. V. Kolesnikov, G. V. Livshyts, *On the Local version of the Log-Brunn-Minkowski conjecture and some new related geometric inequalities*, preprint.
[64] B. Klartag, *A central limit theorem for convex sets*, Invent. Math., Vol. 168, (2007), 91–131.
[65] B. Klartag, *Power-law estimates for the central limit theorem for convex sets*, J. Funct. Anal., Vol. 245, (2007), 284–310.
[66] B. Klartag, *A Berry-Esseen type inequality for convex bodies with an unconditional basis.* Probab. Theory Related Fields, Vol. 145, no. 1-2, (2009), 1-33.
[67] B. Klartag, E. Milman, *Centroid bodies and the logarithmic Laplace transform - a unified approach*, J. Functional Analysis, Vol. 262, No. 1, (2012), 10–34.
[68] B. Klartag, V.D. Milman, *Geometry of log-concave functions and measures*, Geom. Dedicata 112 (2005) 169-182.
[69] M. T. Kohler-Jobin, *Une methode de comparaison isoperimetrique de fonctionnelles de domaines de la physique mathematique. I. Une demonstration de la conjecture isoperimetrique $P\lambda^2 \geq \pi j_0^4/2$ de Polya et Szegö*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys., 29 (1978), 757-766.
[70] R. Latała, *A note on the Ehrhard inequality,* Studia Math., 118:169-174, 1996.
[71] R. Latała, *On some inequalities for Gaussian measures*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Beijing, Vol. II, Higher Ed. Press, Beijing, 2002, pp. 813-822.
[72] Y. Lee, S. Vempala, *Eldan's Stochastic Localization and the KLS Hyperplane Conjecture: An Improved Lower Bound for Expansion*, https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.01507.
[73] R. Latała, K. Oleszkiewicz, *Gaussian measures of dilatations of convex symmetric sets,* Ann. Probab. (1999), 27, 1922-1938.
[74] A. Lichnerowicz, *Varietes riemanniennes a tenseur C non negatif,* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris S. A-B, 271:A650-A653, 197.
[75] E. H Lieb, M. Loss, *Analysis, Second Edition, Graduate studies in mathematics,* vol. 14, 2001, American Mathematical Society, Providence
[76] G. Livshyts, A. Marsiglietti, P. Nayar, A. Zvavitch, *On the Brunn-Minkowski inequality for general measures with applications to new isoperimetric-type inequalities*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., Vol. 369 (2017), 8725–8742.
[77] G. V. Livshyts, *An extension of Minkowski's theorem and its applications to questions about projections for measures,* Adv. Math., vol. 356, (2019).
[78] G. V. Livshyts, *Maximal Surface Area of a convex set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with respect to log concave rotation invariant measures,* GAFA Seminar Notes, 2116, (2014), 355-384.
[79] G. V. Livshyts, *Maximal surface area of a convex set in R^n with respect to exponential rotation invariant measures*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and applications, 404, (2013) 231-238.

[80] L. A. Lyusternik, *Die Brunn-Minkowskische Ungleichung für beliebige messbare Mengen,* C. R. Acad. Sci. URSS 8 (1935), 55-58.
[81] W. S. Massey, *Surfaces of Gaussian curvature zero in Euclidean 3-space*, Tohoku Math. J. (2) 14 (1962), 73-79.
[82] E. Milman, *A sharp centro-affine isospectral inequality of Szegö-Weinberger type and the L^p-Minkowski problem*, preprint.
[83] P. Nayar, T. Tkocz, *A Note on a Brunn-Minkowski Inequality for the Gaussian Measure*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. (2013), Vol. 141, no. 11, 4027–4030.
[84] J. Neeman, *Gaussian isoperimetry and related topics, lecture notes*, 2021, `http://www.him.uni-bonn.de/fileadmin/him/Lecture_Notes/01-isoperimetric.pdf`.
[85] J. Neeman, G. Paouris, *An interpolation proof of Ehrhard's inequality,* to appear in GAFA Lecture Notes.
[86] R. O'Donnell, *Open problems in analysis of boolean functions,* Preprint, arXiv:1204.6447v1, 2012.
[87] G. Paouris, P. Valettas, *A Gaussian small deviation inequality for convex functions,* Ann. Probab. 46 (2018), no. 3, 1441-1454.
[88] G. Polya, G. Szegö, *Isoperimetric Inequalities in Mathematical Physics,* (AM-27) Princeton University Press, (1951).
[89] C. Saroglou, *Remarks on the conjectured log-Brunn-Minkowski inequality*, Geom. Dedicata, (2015), Vol. 177, no. 1, 353–365.
[90] C. Saroglou, *More on logarithmic sums of convex bodies*, preprint, arXiv:1409.4346.
[91] R. Schneider, *Convex bodies: the Brunn-Minkowski theory, second expanded edition*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, (2013).
[92] Y. Shenfeld, R. van Handel, *The equality cases of the Ehrhard-Borell inequality,* Adv. Math. 331, 339-386 (2018).
[93] R. van Handel, *The Borell-Ehrhard game*, Probab. Theory Rel. Fields, 170:555-585, 2018.
[94] V. N. Sudakov and B. S. Tsirel'son, *Extremal properties of half-spaces for spherically invariant measures.* Problems in the theory of probability distributions, II. Zap. Nauch. Leningrad Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov **41** (1974), 14-24 (in Russian).
[95] G. Talenti, *Elliptic equations and rearrangements,* Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. (4), 3, 697-718, (1976).
[96] J.L. Vazquez, *The Porous Medium Equation, Mathematical Theory*, Oxford University Press (2007).

School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA
Email address: `glivshyts6@math.gatech.edu`