

Semialgebraic Convex Bodies

Von der Fakultät für Mathematik und Informatik
der Universität Leipzig
angenommene

D I S S E R T A T I O N

zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades

DOCTOR RERUM NATURALIUM
(Dr.rer.nat.)

im Fachgebiet
Mathematik
vorgelegt

von M.Sc. Chiara Meroni
geboren am 22.01.1996 in Gorizia (Italien)

Abstract

In this thesis we study problems that lie at the intersection of convex geometry and algebraic geometry. The main objects of interest are semialgebraic convex bodies: convex, compact, semialgebraic subsets of a Euclidean space. The study of their algebraic boundary allows to approach questions in convexity using algebraic tools.

We initiate the study of zonoids from this point of view, introducing the family of discotopes: Minkowski sums of finitely many discs. The focus lies on dimension and degree of a specific component of the algebraic boundary.

Many areas of convex geometry investigate objects that are defined starting from a convex body. Our goal is to understand how semialgebraic geometry behaves with respect to these constructions. We examine the operations of fiber bodies of convex bodies and intersection bodies of polytopes. The first one does not preserve semialgebraicity, whereas the intersection body of a polytope is semialgebraic.

Understanding the boundary of a convex hull is a difficult task in general. However, algebraic geometry gives the answer in the case of convex hulls of varieties. We dig into the case of surfaces in four-dimensional space, characterizing the components of the algebraic boundary for convex hulls of Del Pezzo and Bordiga surfaces.

Finally, we present an application of the theory to a convex body that arises in quantum physics: the set of quantum correlations. It is a semialgebraic convex body, a spectrahedral shadow, whose geometry has also concrete consequences in quantum cryptography. We give a detailed description of many different aspects.

Authorship

Parts of this thesis revolve around results that arose from joint work with other researchers.

Chapter 1 is written by myself.

Chapter 2 is partly based on the joint article [GM21] with Fulvio Gesmundo. My coauthor and I contributed equally to all mathematical exposition and results. The article is going to appear in *Le Matematiche*.

Chapter 3 is based on two works. The first section relies on the joint article [MM21] with Léo Mathis. My coauthor's analytical approach combined to my algebraic approach produced the results here presented. The article is going to appear in *Discrete & Computational Geometry*.

The second section is devoted to the joint article [BBMS22b] with Katalin Berlow, Marie-Charlotte Brandenburg and Isabelle Shankar. My coauthors and I contributed equally to the main results, such as Theorem 3.2.5, Theorem 3.2.9, and Theorem 3.2.14. My contribution is mostly from the point of view of real and complex algebraic geometry. I also developed Proposition 3.2.13 and the examples, taking care of visualization aspects. This article is published in *Beiträge zur Algebra und Geometrie / Contributions to Algebra and Geometry*, together with the Corrigendum [BBMS22a]. These minor corrections have been incorporated in the thesis.

Chapter 4 is also divided in two sections. The first one is based on an ongoing project, joint with Kristian Ranestad and Rainer Sinn. The results came out from continuous discussions among the three authors.

I developed the second section of this chapter, which is inspired by some conversations with Carlos Améndola, Darrick Lee, Anna-Laura Sattelberger and Bernd Sturmfels.

Chapter 5 is based on the joint article [LMS⁺21] with Thinh P. Le, Bernd Sturmfels, Reinhard F. Werner, and Timo Ziegler. It is a work in the field of quantum physics, in which B. Sturmfels and I contributed with the mathematical aspects. In particular, we spelled out the algebraic features of the set of quantum correlations, summarized in Theorems 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.1.3, and developed the original Section 5.3.2.

*To grandma Pia,
who showed me how
strong a woman can be.*

Contents

List of Symbols	10
Introduction	14
1. Background	18
1.1. Basics of convex geometry	18
1.1.1. Face structure	19
1.1.2. Duality in convex geometry	21
1.1.3. Functions and convex bodies	24
1.2. Varieties and convex bodies	25
1.2.1. The algebraic boundary	29
1.2.2. More dualities	31
2. Zonoids	35
2.1. The Zonoid Problem	36
2.1.1. Discotopes	38
2.1.2. The faces of a zonoid	39
2.2. The geometry of discotopes	40
2.2.1. Joins of quadrics	41
2.2.2. Exposed points of the discotope	44
2.2.3. Two-dimensional discs	47
2.2.4. Conclusions	53
3. Constructions with convex bodies	56
3.1. Fiber convex bodies	57
3.1.1. Puffed polytopes	62
3.1.2. Curved convex bodies	65
3.1.3. Fiber zonoids	68
3.2. Intersection bodies of polytopes	72
3.2.1. The role of the origin	76
3.2.2. Algebraic boundary and degree bound	77
3.2.3. The cube	82
3.2.4. Conclusions	85

4. The algebra of convex hulls	86
4.1. Surfaces in fourspace	86
4.1.1. Del Pezzo	88
4.1.2. Bordiga	94
4.2. Curves and volumes	103
5. Convex bodies in quantum physics	108
5.1. Introduction	108
5.1.1. Background from physics	109
5.1.2. A view from mathematics	111
5.1.3. Short review of previous work	113
5.2. Description of the correlation body	114
5.2.1. Boundary, faces, and extreme points	117
5.2.2. Semialgebraic description	120
5.3. Description of the dual body	124
5.3.1. The duality transform	124
5.3.2. The normal cycle	128
5.3.3. Support function	130
5.4. Geometric aspects of quantum key distribution	131
5.5. Proofs	132
5.5.1. Proof of Theorem 5.1.1	133
5.5.2. Self-duality	139
5.5.3. Further boundary properties	139
5.6. Conclusions	144
Bibliography	146

List of Symbols

Background

$\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$	The fields of natural, rational, real and complex numbers
(f_1, \dots, f_k)	The ideal generated by the functions f_1, \dots, f_k
$[x, y]$	The line segment with extrema x and y
$\text{cl } A$	The Euclidean closure of the set A
$\mathbf{CN}(K)$	The conormal variety of the convex body K
$\mathbf{CN}_{\text{bireg}}(K)$	The biregular locus of the conormal variety of K
$\text{conv } A, \text{co } A$	The convex hull and the conic hull of A
$\deg V$	The degree of V
\dim, codim	The dimension and codimension
$\text{dist}_H(K_1, K_2)$	Hausdorff distance between K_1 and K_2
$\text{Exp}(K)$	The set of exposed points of the convex body K
$\text{Ext}(K)$	The set of extreme points of the convex body K
$\text{Ext}_a K$	The Zariski closure of the set of extreme points of K
$\text{graph}(f)$	The graph of the function f
$\text{GL}(\mathbb{R}^d)$	The general linear group of \mathbb{R}^d
$\text{int } A$	The interior of the set A
$\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$	The set of convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^d
λK	The dialation of the convex body K by a factor of λ
$\langle A \rangle$	The linear span of A
$\langle x, y \rangle$	The standard Euclidean scalar product of $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$
$\mathcal{V}(I)$	The variety of the ideal I
$T_x X$	The embedded tangent space to X at x

$\mathcal{P}(K)$	The family of (open) patches of K
\max, \min	The maximum and the minimum
∇f	The gradient of the function f
$\mathbf{N}(K)$	The normal cycle of the convex body K
∂A	The topological boundary of the set A
$\partial_a A$	The algebraic boundary of the set A
$\mathbb{P}^d, (\mathbb{P}^d)^*$	The complex projective space of dimension d , and its dual
ρ_A	The radial function of the starshaped set A
sgn	The sign
$\succ (\succeq) 0$	Positive (semi)definite
B^d	The unit ball of \mathbb{R}^d
e_1, \dots, e_d	The standard basis vectors of \mathbb{R}^d
$f(P)$	The f -vector of the polytope P
h_K	The support function of the convex body K
K°	The convex body dual to K
K^u	The face of K exposed by u
$K_1 + K_2$	Minkowski sum of K_1 and K_2
M^t	The transpose of the matrix M
$N_K(x), N_K(F)$	The normal cone to a point x or a face F
S^{d-1}	The unit sphere of \mathbb{R}^d
u^\perp	The orthogonal complement of $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$
X^*	The variety dual to $X \subset \mathbb{P}^d$

Zonoids

\mathcal{B}	A set of linearly independent vectors
$\mathcal{D} (\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{B}})$	A discotope (associated to \mathfrak{B})
\mathcal{D}^∂	The image of $\prod \partial D_j$ under Σ
$\mathcal{O}_X, K_X, \mathcal{I}_X$	The structure, canonical, and ideal sheaves of X
\mathcal{S}	The purely nonlinear part of a discotope
$\operatorname{crit} f$	The critical locus of the map f
$\det M$	The determinant of the matrix M

\mathfrak{B}	A family of sets \mathcal{B}
$\mathbb{E}\lambda$	The expectation of the random variable λ
\mathbf{N}	The type of a discotope
Σ	The addition map
$A_{\mathcal{B}}$	The linear map sending $e_i \mapsto b_i \in \mathcal{B}$
$D_{\mathcal{B}}$	The generalized disc, image of B^n under $A_{\mathcal{B}}$
$J(X, Y)$	The join of the projective varieties $X, Y \subset \mathbb{P}^d$

Fiber bodies

γ	A measurable section of π
$d\xi\psi$	The differential of ψ at ξ
$\text{MS}_{\pi}(K_1, \dots, K_N)$	The mixed fiber body of the convex bodies K_1, \dots, K_N
π	The orthogonal projection of $V \oplus W$ onto V
ΠK	The projection body of the convex body K
$\text{puff}_i(P)$	The i -th puffed of the polytope P
$\Sigma_{\pi} K$	The fiber body of K with respect to π
C^k	The regularity of a function or manifold, k times differentiable
$J_{\psi}(\xi)$	The Jacobian of ψ at ξ
V, W	Orthogonal spaces isomorphic to \mathbb{R}^n and \mathbb{R}^m respectively
$V_+(K)$	The shadow volume of the convex body K

Intersection bodies

\mathcal{H}	A central hyperplane arrangement
$\text{vol}(K)$	The Euclidean volume of K
$C^{(d)}$	The cube $[-1, 1]^d$
IK	The intersection body of the convex body K
$Z(P)$	The zonotope associated to the polytope P

Algebra of convex hulls

x	A parametrized curve in \mathbb{R}^d
$\mathbf{Gr}(k+1, d+1)$	The Grassmannian of projective k -planes in \mathbb{P}^d
$\text{Bl}_{p_1, \dots, p_k} \mathbb{P}^2$	The blow up of \mathbb{P}^2 in k points
d, k, s, x	Kazarian and Vainsencher's parameters

$\pi^*(Q)$	The pullback of $Q \subset \mathbb{P}^2$
$\sigma^{(k)}$	The signature of order k
C_4	The Severi variety of plane rational quartics
D	A divisor
E_i	The exceptional divisor of $p_i \in \mathbb{P}^2$
L	The divisor class of a line in \mathbb{P}^2
$X^{[k]}$	The variety of hyperplanes tangent to X at k points
$X_{(\star)}^{[k]}$	The irreducible components of $X^{[k]}$ arising from case (\star)
\hat{Q}	The strict transform of $Q \subset \mathbb{P}^2$

Quantum Physics (These symbols are specific for Chapter 5)

(\mathcal{Q}_{nn}, mm)	The stratum of $\mathbf{N}(Q)$ with pairs of points of types (\mathcal{Q}_{nn}) , (\mathcal{Q}_{mm})
(\mathcal{Q}_{nn})	A type of boundary points, as in Proposition 5.2.4
$[\mathcal{Q}_{nn}]$	The Euclidean closure of (\mathcal{Q}_{nn})
\mathcal{C}	The cross-polytope in \mathbb{R}^4
\mathcal{N}	The cube $[-1, 1]^4$
ϕ_K	The support function of the convex body K
\mathcal{Q}	The set of quantum correlations in \mathbb{R}^4
$\mathcal{Q}_{(\star)}$	The set characterized by item (\star) in Theorem 5.1.1
ρ	A density operator
sin	The pushout map
$\text{tr}(M)$	The trace of the matrix M
A_i	Alice's Hermitian operators
B_j	Bob's Hermitian operators
M^*	The Hermitian transpose of the matrix M
$\text{rank } M$	The rank of the matrix M
CHSH	Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt inequality

Introduction

Convex Geometry has been classically studied from a mostly analytical point of view. To convex sets, one can associate appropriate functions and volumes, study regularity and inequalities, in the interplay between functional analysis, harmonic analysis, and probability. On the other hand, polyhedra are naturally connected to combinatorics, linear algebra, and linear programming, creating interactions among the different communities. This has been the starting point for the development of Convex Algebraic Geometry, which moved from linear to semidefinite optimization. In this context, semialgebraic convex bodies naturally arise from the cone of positive semidefinite matrices. They are the feasible regions of semidefinite programming and have been therefore investigated in this perspective. We will expand on some of these concepts in the introductions to the individual chapters that follow. At the beginning of each chapter, we give an overview of the state of the art of the precise problem that we want to study, and summarize our main results.

In this work we focus on semialgebraic convex bodies as objects in their own right. These are convex sets that are boolean combinations of polynomial inequalities. We aim at taking a further step toward the connection between convex geometry and algebraic geometry. The idea is to associate to a convex body a variety from which we can read information about the convex body itself. The starting point is therefore the real vector space where the convex body lives. Then, one moves to the complex space, the natural setting for an affine variety. Finally, we need to go back to the convex body. Hence, we move back and forth between the complex and real field, sometimes also projective space, trying to understand which aspects are preserved during the process and what is otherwise not relevant for convexity.

The central complex algebraic variety in this thesis is the algebraic boundary. It is the smallest algebraic variety containing the topological boundary of a given convex body. This process is fascinating: at first sight, in this way we just added a lot of points to our beautiful initial convex body. But sometimes one needs to make things more complicated in order to understand them better. It is the case here, since the new object we are dealing with is now an algebraic variety. Hence, one can combine tools from real and complex algebraic geometry in order to isolate suitable aspects of such a variety. Irreducible components, dimension, and degree of the algebraic boundary provide information about the convex body itself. The transition from polytopes to semialgebraic convex bodies corresponds to the transition from linear to nonlinear algebra. In this context we are able to preserve some of the finiteness properties that make polytopes so useful and appreciated.

This thesis revisits various analytical problems from convex geometry, in an algebraic key. The recurrent theme is to understand how the algebraic boundary can be used to shed new light on these questions. For instance, we approach for the first time the study

of zonoids using complex and projective algebraic geometry, in the context of the famous Zonoid Problem. Then, we study the behaviour of semialgebraicity for two important constructions in convex geometry. On one hand there are fiber bodies, that generalize fiber polytopes, and involve Minkowski integrals: they do not preserve the property of being semialgebraic. On the other hand, we examine intersection bodies, starshaped sets defined via some volume computation. We prove that the intersection body of a polytope is semialgebraic. All these notions and results are enriched with concrete examples, carried out with symbolic computations. Another instance from convex geometry that shows the power of the algebraic approach concerns convex hulls of varieties. We are going to dig deep into the case of surfaces in fourspace. The last chapter is an example of a semialgebraic convex body arising in applications. In the case at hand, we are in the realm of quantum physics and we provide a detailed description of the semialgebraic convex body of quantum correlations, its algebraic boundary, and many other properties connected to convexity.

A crucial feature of the thesis is visualization. The author's intuition in mathematics frequently derives from examples and drawings. These are thus the methods that are used here to introduce new notions and objects; they will hopefully help the reader in the comprehension and make the thesis more enjoyable. In order to compute examples, we rely on mathematical software, mainly **Macaulay2**, **Mathematica**, **Julia** and **SageMath**. Most codes are available in the online repository for mathematical research data MathRepo [FG22] at <https://mathrepo.mis.mpg.de>.

Each chapter begins with some comments about the state of the art of the topic. The structure is the following. In Chapter 1 we introduce basic concepts from convex geometry and fix some notation. Some recurring examples will be used to present concretely all the new notions. Afterwards, we will transition from a more analytical point of view to an algebraic approach. This will require the discussion of some fundamental tools in complex and real algebraic geometry. Here we will then define the algebraic boundary of a convex body and examine its properties. These will be the bare bones of the thesis.

Chapter 2 focuses on particular convex bodies, called zonoids. We give their definition and enumerate their peculiar properties and questions. The beauty and the strength of problems regarding zonoids is that they can be studied from many different perspectives. Classically, mathematicians took advantage of measure theory; more recently, probabilistic methods have been exploited. We approach here the study of zonoids using algebraic geometry. For this purpose, we restrict to the family of discotopes, strictly contained in the set of all semialgebraic zonoids. The goal is to characterize their algebraic boundary, in the spirit of the Zonoid Problem. We end up looking at joins of quadrics in some cases, and at determinantal varieties in other case. This chapter is based on [GM21].

In Chapter 3 we deal with two constructions concerning convex bodies. Fiber bodies are a generalization of the classical notion of fiber polytopes. They are a Minkowski integral of the fibers of a convex body with respect to a certain projection. We analyze basic properties, such as strict convexity, and then dig deeper in the case of three specific classes of convex bodies. One of the examples computed in this section, which is the fiber body of a discotope, establishes that semialgebraicity is not preserved by the construction of the fiber body. The second half of the chapter is devoted to intersection bodies. They are connected to the volume of hyperplane sections of a convex body. Popular among the community of convex geometry, for volume inequalities and valuation theory, intersection bodies still lack an actual geometric comprehension. We prove here that the intersection body of a polytope is semialgebraic. We compute its algebraic boundary, and give upper bounds for the degree of such a variety. The two sections of this chapter are strongly based

on [MM21] and [BBMS22b] respectively.

Chapter 4 concerns convex hulls. Understanding the boundary of a convex hull is a hard task in general. However, algebraic geometry provides formulae for the algebraic boundary of the convex hull of a variety. We focus on the case of surfaces in fourspace, which are neither curves nor hypersurfaces. In particular, we list the components that contribute to the boundary and their degrees, for Del Pezzo and Bordiga surfaces. This is a work-in-progress with Kristian Ranestad and Rainer Sinn. In the last section of the chapter, we discuss formulae for the volume of the convex hull of curves that are not necessarily algebraic varieties. This shows how algebraic methods can be used also to study convex bodies that are not semialgebraic.

Finally, Chapter 5 presents an application in the world of quantum physics. One of the fundamental objects of this theory is the set of quantum correlations, which is a semialgebraic convex body. We meticulously study it. We provide the support function, classify all its boundary points, and prove that up to an affine transformation it is self-dual. The understanding of the correlation body has concrete applications for instance in the field of quantum cryptography. This chapter is strongly based on [LMS⁺21].

Acknowledgements

This thesis cannot begin without me thanking my amazing advisors Rainer Sinn and Bernd Sturmfels. Rainer, thank you for helping me with my math questions, for understanding me and translating other people's statements into my language. It was exciting and very interesting to work with you. Bernd, I am honoured that you believed in me and that I had the chance to join your big math family. I am so grateful for the time that you dedicated to me, and for all the things that you taught me, from actual math to life lessons.

I would also like to thank some non-official mentors that I have been lucky to have. First of all, Antonio Lerario, who introduced me to the world of math research, and is still a person I know I can count on, for both math and life doubts. I always admired your enthusiasm and how you are able to share it with your students. Special thanks also to Daniele Agostini, who never had to help me, but constantly did. Thank you for your support, for being always available and for trying to teach me some crazy algebraic geometry. You know I also enjoyed our non-spoken deal of stealing each other's snacks from the office.

A big part of my research happened thanks to the interactions with my coauthors. I learned a lot from everyone of them and I want to thank them for sharing that knowledge with me. In particular, I would like to thank Léo Mathis, who got me interested in these magic convex bodies called zonoids and gave me useful feedbacks on the thesis. I also wish to thank Fulvio Gesmundo, who spent a lot of time teaching me his math; I am happy I managed to intrigue you with convex geometry.

The Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences has been a great, dynamic, challenging, inspiring place to work. I am grateful to all the administrative staff, to the computer group, that I bothered with many silly questions, and to the wonderful Saskia Gutzschebauch for making my life at the institute much easier than what it could have been. Many exceptional mathematicians (and people) have walked the MPI corridors these past two years and I enjoyed talking to every one of them. In particular, I want to mention and thank Paul Breiding, Christiane Görgen, Michael Joswig, Aida Maraj, Leonid Monin, Alessandro Neri, Bogdan Raita, Kristian Ranestad, Kemal Rose, Pierpaola Santarsiero, Anna-Laura Sattelberger, Elima Shehu, and Rosa Winter. One of the best parts of the

day was chatting while having coffee in the library, and for that I also need to thank Onofrio and the whole crew from the A-B sections. There are, on the other hand, people who could not choose whether to spend time with me or not: my office mates Rida, who has been standing me for four years, and Tobias. Thank you for answering all my silly questions like ‘what is the derivative of cosine?’

I could not be more grateful to the following special people with whom I spent so many fruitful days and nights. Claudia, it is too ambitious to summarize in one sentence all the reasons why I want to thank you. You have always been there for me, in the best and worst moments, and you played a crucial role in my personal growth during the past two years. I am proud of you and I hope that some day we will manage to reunite.

Fabio, I am glad you joined this funny group of mathematicians. Thank you for your sympathy and for all your sounds (I cannot find a better way to describe them).

Javi, my favourite spanish espeaking person! Your positivity and kindness, as well as our ping-pong breaks, really improved many of my days. I am also happy about your decision to learn how to cook paella; I will always be available to ‘sacrifice’ myself for tasting it.

Marie, my twin! Despite the infinitely many things that we have in common, we are quite different personalities. However, I always found in you a supportive friend, ready to listen to me and to give me useful opinions. Also, I had so much fun working with you!

Mima, thanks a lot for the many professional and life suggestions you gave me. I am glad we managed to organize many interesting hikes, group outings and tasty dinners!

Simon, it is insane how many new experiences I tried in these two years because of you: wakeboarding, skiing, booking random flights and ending up in Dublin,... Thank you for sharing you endless energy and enthusiasm with me (together with lots of complaints about bratwurst and food in general) and for being an inspiration.

I also want to thank my math siblings overseas: Charles, Yassine, Yelena, and Yulia. I enjoyed your visits in Leipzig and the fresh air you brought here!

Another reason why I feel lucky is because of the support that my old friends from the master’s, Mara, Camillo, and Riccardo, keep giving me. I know that I can always count on you. Mara, even though we were super busy and did not meet as much as I hoped, it has been very nice to know that I had a dear friend just one hour away from me.

I want to thank my family for believing in me and in this crazy adventure research is, and for constantly encouraging me to pursue the paths that I choose. It has been fun to show you around in Leipzig and I am glad you liked this beautiful city. Many thanks also to my larger family of cousins, uncles and aunts, Cattarin, Ortolan, and Pinatti for checking in how I was doing and if I was turning into a German.

There are many other people whose presence in my life made the difference during the last few years. Alessandra, Chiara&Silvia, Lorenzo, Marko, Martina, Rossella, even though we do not talk as often as we used to, I know that when I need it, you are there for me. I hope you know that also the converse holds true. Special thanks go to Tommi, who puts up with me almost every day, and to Vale, who wakes me up every morning with a phone call, sharing news, gossips, and complaints.

Finally, a place in my heart is devoted to Leipzig. Despite the pandemic and all its effects, I fell in love with this city and the people here. The atmosphere is simply amazing and very inspiring, and contributed to the beautiful experience my PhD has been.

Chapter 1

Background

In this chapter we will start by introducing basic notions in convex geometry, that will be useful in later chapters. For extended discussions and proofs we refer to Schneider's book [Sch13] and Barvinok's book [Bar02]. The second section is devoted to review relevant definitions and results regarding semialgebraic convex bodies, based mainly on [Sin15]. We will also recall some machineries from real, complex and projective algebraic geometry.

1.1. Basics of convex geometry

To start talking about convex geometry, we shall introduce the notion of convex set. Throughout the thesis we will always work in a Euclidean space, therefore we give all the definitions in this setting, even though some would make sense also in more generality. A set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is said to be *convex* if for every pair of points $x, y \in A$ the whole segment between them is contained in A . More precisely, given two points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the segment between them is the set of all their convex combinations, namely

$$[x, y] = \{\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y \mid \alpha \in [0, 1]\}.$$

The *dimension* of a convex set A is meant to be its dimension as topological space. Equivalently, it is the (vector space) dimension of the affine span of A . When $0 \in A$ in particular, we have $\dim A = \dim \langle A \rangle$, where $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denotes the linear span. We will focus here on a specific class of convex sets.

Definition 1.1.1. A set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is called a *convex body* if it is a convex compact non-empty set. We denote the family of convex bodies of \mathbb{R}^d by $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

The intersection of convex sets is convex; the intersection of convex bodies is a convex body. Convexity is a very geometric, visual, intuitive condition and it is indeed easy to construct examples or counterexamples of convex sets and convex bodies. A ball is a convex body, a circle is not convex, a halfspace is convex but not a convex body. In \mathbb{R} a set is convex if and only if it is a line segment. Since not every set is convex, we need an operation to 'convexify': this is the *convex hull*. The convex hull of $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is the smallest convex set containing A , or alternatively it is the set of all convex combinations of points of A ; in formula

$$\text{conv } A = \left\{ \alpha_1 x_1 + \dots + \alpha_n x_n \mid x_1, \dots, x_n \in A, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in [0, 1], \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 1 \right\}.$$

In particular, if $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is compact, then $\text{conv } A$ is a convex body. An important family of convex bodies can be defined using the notion of convex hull.

Definition 1.1.2. A *polytope* is the convex hull of finitely many points.

Polytopes appear in an extraordinary number of mathematical areas and have applications that go in many directions, from optimization, to life sciences, to physics (we will have a glimpse of this in Chapter 5). This suggests that the literature on polytopes is huge and here we will just introduce few basic concepts that are relevant for later chapters. For an accurate introduction on this subject, proofs and exercises, we refer to Ziegler's book [Zie95]. Another object, intimately related to polytopes is the following.

Definition 1.1.3. Let $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathbb{R}$. The set

$$\left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \langle a_i, x \rangle \geq b_i \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, n \right\},$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the standard scalar product on \mathbb{R}^d , is a *polyhedron*.

Polyhedra are intersections of halfspaces, hence they are convex. The following is known as Weyl-Minkowski's Theorem, also called the 'Main theorem for polytopes' by Ziegler.

Theorem 1.1.4. A subset $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a polytope if and only if it is a bounded polyhedron.

This result provides two equivalent, dual (in a sense that will be made precise later) characterizations of a polytope. Definition 1.1.2 is called the *v*-representation of a polytope (the name will be clear later), whereas its description as a bounded polyhedron is the *h*-representation, since we are intersecting halfspaces defined by the hyperplanes. It is very useful to work with both definitions for proving statements. There are also other equivalent characterizations of a polytope, see [Zie95, Theorem 2.15]. The family of polytopes is closed with respect to many operations: the intersection of two polytopes is a polytope, the projection of a polytope is a polytope, the convex hull of polytopes is a polytope. There are other important operations allowed on $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$:

- dilation: $\lambda K = \{\lambda x \mid x \in K\}$, for $\lambda \geq 0$, $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,
- Minkowski sum: $K_1 + K_2 = \{x_1 + x_2 \mid x_i \in K_i \text{ for } i = 1, 2\}$, for $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Both the family of polytopes and $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are closed with respect to these operations. Combining them, we can turn the set of convex bodies into a metric space. One possible and very standard way is to use the *Hausdorff distance*. Given two convex bodies K_1, K_2 in \mathbb{R}^d , define their Hausdorff distance to be

$$\text{dist}_H(K_1, K_2) = \min\{\lambda \mid K_1 \subset K_2 + \lambda B^d \text{ and } K_2 \subset K_1 + \lambda B^d\}$$

where B^d is the unit d -dimensional ball. This distance turns $(\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d), \text{dist}_H)$ into a complete metric space [Sch13, Theorems 1.8.3, 1.8.6]. We are now allowed to talk about density and limits, and whenever we will discuss a metric property of a convex body, even if not specified, we will always refer to the Hausdorff metric. A first remark is that polytopes are dense in $\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Therefore, given any convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a polytope $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\text{dist}_H(K, P) \leq \varepsilon$ [Sch13, Theorem 1.8.16].

1.1.1. Face structure

What do people study about convex bodies? One of the (many!) possible answers is: the boundary. It is also one of the main focus points of this thesis. If $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote its *topological boundary* by ∂A . We want to establish a systematic way to describe the boundary of a convex body. This can be done for instance via the notion of faces.

Definition 1.1.5. A convex subset $F \subset K$ of a convex body is a *face* if $x, y \in K$ and $\frac{x+y}{2} \in F$ implies $x, y \in F$. If $F = \{x\}$, it is called *extreme point*; if $\dim F = 1$, it is called *edge*; if $\dim F = \dim K - 1$, it is called *facet*.

In particular, a point $x \in K$ is extreme if for every convex combination $x = \alpha y + (1-\alpha)z$ with $y, z \in K$, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, then $y = z = x$. The union of all the faces of a convex body is its topological boundary. If all the boundary points are extreme points, then we say that K is *strictly convex*. In this case there are no segments contained in ∂K , or equivalently ∂K has strictly positive curvature at all points. We can refine the notion of face as follows. Throughout the whole thesis, we use the scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ to identify the Euclidean space and its dual. Nevertheless, we will try to be consistent with the notation, using x, y, z, \dots for the original space and u, v, w, \dots for the dual.

Definition 1.1.6. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and let $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The *face of K exposed by u* is

$$K^u = \{x \in K \mid \langle u, x \rangle \geq \langle u, y \rangle \text{ for all } y \in K\}.$$

We will also say that u exposes K^u . If a point $\{x\}$ is an exposed face of K , it is called *exposed point*.

Such a vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ corresponds, via the standard scalar product, to a linear functional $u \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^*$, that with abuse of notation we denote again by u . In this language, K^u is the set of points of K where the linear functional u attains its maximum over K . Geometrically, an exposed face arises as the intersection of K with a *separating* (or supporting) *hyperplane*: it is a hyperplane H such that K is contained in one of the two (closed) halfspaces identified by H , and satisfying $H \cap K \neq \emptyset$. Such a hyperplane is parallel to u^\perp , the orthogonal complement of u . Notice that an exposed face is a face, but a face need not to be exposed. Polytopes are a special case: all faces are exposed and every face is the convex hull of finitely many points, hence a polytope again. The conclusion is that polytopes have finitely many faces, that we can store in the *f-vector* (f_0, \dots, f_{d-1}) . The $f_i(P)$ is the number of i -th dimensional faces of P .

In general, we will denote the set of extreme points of a convex body K by $\text{Ext}(K)$ and the set of its exposed points by $\text{Exp}(K)$. The set of extreme points contains the set of exposed points, but it is not much bigger: every extreme point is a limit (in the Euclidean topology) of exposed points [Sch13, Theorem 1.4.7].

Example 1.1.7. Consider the convex body in Figure 1.1, namely

$$K = \text{conv} \left\{ \{(x \pm 1)^2 + y^2 = 1\} \cup \{(0, -2)\} \right\}.$$

The four points $(\pm 1, 1), (\pm \frac{8}{5}, -\frac{4}{5})$ are extreme but not exposed. They belong to one of the facets exposed by the vectors $(0, 1), (\pm 3, -4)$. The set of exposed points is the union of two (open) arcs and a point, whereas the extreme points are

$$\text{Ext}(K) = \text{Exp}(K) \cup \left\{ (\pm 1, 1), \left(\pm \frac{8}{5}, -\frac{4}{5} \right) \right\}.$$

K is not strictly convex since there are three segments contained in the boundary: they are the facets of K . ♦

In a way, the extreme points contain all the information regarding a convex body. This is made precise by a result obtained by Krein and Milman, proved in more generality in [KM40], which is also known as Minkowski's Theorem.

Theorem 1.1.8. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then K is the convex hull of the set of its extreme points. In formula, $K = \text{conv}(\text{Ext}(K))$.




Figure 1.1: The convex hull of two circles and a point. The four black dots are extreme, non-exposed points.

Notice that taking the convex hull of the extreme points is the best we can do: for every subset $A \subsetneq \text{Ext}(K)$ we have that $\text{conv } A \subsetneq K$.

The counterparts of the faces of a convex body are the normal cones. A convex cone is a convex set $C \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that if $x \in C$ then $\lambda x \in C$ for all $\lambda \geq 0$. In particular, a cone is unbounded, hence it is not a convex body. Also in this case, we can turn any set A into a cone by considering its *conic hull* $\text{co } A$, which is defined to be the smallest convex cone containing A .

Given a point $x \in K$, the *normal cone* to $x \in K$ is the convex cone

$$\mathsf{N}_K(x) = \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \langle u, x \rangle \geq \langle u, y \rangle \text{ for all } y \in K \right\}.$$

This is the set of all vectors that expose a face of K containing x , so it also makes sense to consider the normal cone $\mathsf{N}_K(F)$ to a face F of K . The correspondence $F \mapsto \mathsf{N}_K(F)$ is an inclusion-reversing map. By the linearity of the scalar product, normal cones are convex cones, but their dimension can vary.

Definition 1.1.9. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a full dimensional convex body. An extreme point $x \in \partial K$ is a *vertex* if $\dim \mathsf{N}_K(x) = d$.

If the convex body is a polytope $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, then the normal cone to a face F has dimension $d - \dim F$, so all the extreme points are vertices. This justifies the letter ‘*v*’ in the term *v*-representation of Definition 1.1.2. In this case, the collection of all normal cones is a complete fan [Zie95, Definition 7.1], called the *normal fan* of P .

In Example 1.1.7 the normal cone at $x = (0, -2)$ is the two-dimensional set

$$\mathsf{N}_K(x) = \text{co} \left\{ \left(\pm \frac{8}{5}, -\frac{4}{5} \right) \right\},$$

hence x is a vertex of K . At all the other points of ∂K the normal cone is a ray. Notice that the two vectors $(\pm \frac{8}{5}, -\frac{4}{5})$ already appeared in our example, and it is not a coincidence. In order to comprehend such a structure we should define an object that encodes information about K , its normal cones and its exposed faces.

1.1.2. Duality in convex geometry

In this section we introduce the first constructions with convex bodies, a theme that will come back in Section 3. The general philosophy consists in manipulating a convex body K in order to create a new object (another convex body for instance) and study the relations among the former and the latter.




Figure 1.2: Left: the L^6 unit ball. Right: the $L^{\frac{6}{5}}$ unit ball.

Definition 1.1.10. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The *dual* (or polar) convex body of K is

$$K^\circ = \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \langle u, x \rangle \leq 1 \text{ for all } x \in K \right\}.$$

Formally, the dual body would live in the dual space $(\mathbb{R}^d)^*$ that we are identifying with \mathbb{R}^d . Note that in the literature there are different definitions of the dual body: here we are using the convention with *outer* normal vectors. Directly from the definition, one can prove that this duality is an inclusion-reversing operation on convex bodies and that it almost commutes with linear transformations: given $g \in \mathrm{GL}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we have that $(g \cdot K)^\circ = g^{-t} \cdot K^\circ$. Another immediate observation is that K° is always a convex set that contains the origin. This leads to the Bidual (or Bipolar) Theorem.

Theorem 1.1.11. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $0 \in K$. Then $K^{\circ\circ} = K$.

More in general $K^{\circ\circ} = \mathrm{conv}(K \cup 0)$. We will usually use the expression ‘dual body’ instead of ‘polar’ in order to emphasize that there is a duality relation. Moreover, this object is linked to other notions of duality, as we will discuss in Section 1.2. The following example gives us a glimpse of that.

Example 1.1.12. Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be the L^p unit ball of \mathbb{R}^d . It is a convex body. Using Hölder’s inequality one can prove that its dual body is the L^q unit ball, where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. Figure 1.2 shows the case $d = 2$, $p = 6$, $q = \frac{6}{5}$. ◆

The polytopal case is again special [Zie95, Section 2.3]: the dual body of a polytope is a polytope itself. In particular, the v -representation of P becomes the h -representation of P° , and conversely. We highlight this with an example.

Example 1.1.13. Let $P = [-1, 1]^4$ be the four-dimensional cube centered at the origin. Its dual polytope is

$$P^\circ = \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \langle u, v \rangle \leq 1 \text{ for all vertices } v \in P \right\}.$$

The vertices of P° are the eight points $(\pm 1, 0, 0, 0), (0, \pm 1, 0, 0), (0, 0, \pm 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, \pm 1)$, which are exactly the vectors that give the linear inequalities in the definition of P (i.e., they are the a_i ’s of Definition 1.1.3). ◆

The construction of the dual convex body induces an analogous notion on faces. Let F be a face of K ; define its *dual face* F° to be the set of linear functionals that attain their maximum over K at F . If the origin lies in the interior of K , one has

$$F^\circ = \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \langle u, x \rangle = 1 \text{ for all } x \in F \right\}.$$

The dual face is always an exposed face by definition, and we can also recover all the exposed faces in this way. We make it precise by the following statement: a version of biduality for faces.

Corollary 1.1.14. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with the origin in its interior. Let F be an exposed face of K . Then $F^{\circ\circ} = F$.

When the convex body is a polytope P , all faces are exposed and the dual face to F is just the intersection of $\mathbf{N}_P(F)$ with the hyperplane $\langle u, x \rangle = 1$. Hence, we always have

$$\dim F + \dim F^\circ = d - 1. \quad (1.1.1)$$

In particular, vertices of P correspond to facets of P° , edges of P correspond to faces of P° of dimension $d - 2$, and so on. We can translate this observation in terms of the f -vector: $f_i(P) = f_{d-1-i}(P^\circ)$ for a full dimensional polytope $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Equation (1.1.1) does not hold for more general convex bodies. For instance, consider the L^6 unit ball displayed in Figure 1.2, left. Since it is strictly convex, all the points in its boundary are faces. In this case, all faces are actually exposed and they are always exposed by a unique vector. So we have that $\dim F + \dim F^\circ = 0 < 1$ for every face.

The normal cycle. The definition of the polar suggests to look at the *incidence relation* between points $x \in K$ and $u \in K^\circ$ for which the inequality $\langle u, x \rangle \leq 1$ is tight. The resulting set is called normal cycle [Fed59].

Definition 1.1.15. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with the origin in its interior. The *normal cycle* of K is defined as

$$\mathbf{N}(K) = \{ (x, u) \in \partial K \times \partial K^\circ \mid \langle x, u \rangle = 1 \}.$$

This integrates K and K° into a single structure, but it is useful far beyond this role. Fixing x to range over a face $F \subset \partial K$ leaves u to range over the exposed face F° of K° .

Let us look at the two extreme cases of convex sets: first, we have strictly convex sets with smooth boundary, whose only faces are exposed points. Here, $\mathbf{N}(K)$ is the graph of a homeomorphic identification of ∂K with ∂K° . On the other hand, let P be a polytope. Then, for every k -dimensional face F the set $F \times F^\circ \subset \mathbf{N}(P)$ is a polytope of dimension $k + (d - k - 1) = d - 1$.

Example 1.1.16. Consider the four-dimensional cube $P = [-1, 1]^4$ from Example 1.1.3 and its dual polytope P° . Their f -vectors are $(16, 32, 24, 8)$ and $(8, 24, 32, 16)$ respectively. The common (up to relabeling the coordinates) normal cycle $\mathbf{N}(P) = \mathbf{N}(P^\circ)$ consists of 80 strata (this word will be made precise later, for now just think of them as pieces, building blocks), one for each of the $16 + 32 + 24 + 8$ pairs (F, F°) , where $F \subset \partial P$ and $F^\circ \subset \partial P^\circ$ are faces of complement dimension. For instance, if $\dim(F) = 1$ then F° is a triangle and $F \times F^\circ$ is a triangular prism. \blacklozenge

The power of the normal cycle lies in the uniform treatment covering the whole range of convex bodies from polytopes to smooth. Indeed, for any compact convex d -dimensional set K containing the origin in its interior, $\mathbf{N}(K)$ is always a $(d - 1)$ -dimensional (Lipschitz Legendrian) submanifold of \mathbb{R}^{2d} [Fu14]. Moreover, the map $K \mapsto \mathbf{N}(K)$ is continuous in the Hausdorff metric for sets. This makes the normal cycle a remarkably stable structure under approximations either by smooth manifolds or by polytopes.

The normal cycle plays the role of the normal bundle for more general geometric objects. It was defined by Federer [Fed59] for sets of positive reach. These include convex bodies but also much crazier sets. It is an important tool from geometric measure theory, used for defining curvature measures [Win82, Zäh86]. This is related to the classic result

of Steiner, who noted that the volume of the Minkowski sum of a convex body with a ball of radius r , is a polynomial in r , whose coefficients called intrinsic volumes relate to curvature. More broadly, the study of the normal cycle is connected to the Weyl Principle. Namely, when is a geometric quantity associated to an embedded object computable from the geometric structure of the object itself, independently from the embedding? For the intrinsic volumes the naïve answer is that the Weyl Principle holds for those sets that admit a normal cycle. On the applications side, stable polyhedral approximations of the normal cycle are needed in visualization, computer graphics and computational anatomy (see [CSM03, RG17, SLC⁺19]). Recently, the normal cycle has also emerged as a key player in convex algebraic geometry [CKLS19, PSW21] as we will see in Section 1.2.

1.1.3. Functions and convex bodies

One of the reasons why polytopes are popular is that they have finite descriptions, as we highlighted for instance with the v and the h -representations. As soon as one moves away from polytopes, these finiteness properties are not true any more. Therefore, one needs to find other efficient ways to describe a convex body. This can be done using functions (for details see [Sch13, Section 1.7]).

Definition 1.1.17. The *support function* of a convex body K is $h_K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$h_K(u) = \max \{ \langle u, x \rangle \mid x \in K \}. \quad (1.1.2)$$

As the name suggests, it is related to the supporting hyperplanes of K . In particular, the value of $h_K(u)$ is the (signed) distance to the origin of the supporting hyperplane with outer normal vector u . This implies that $\langle u, x \rangle \leq h_K(u)$ for every $x \in K$. We also get an alternative description of the exposed faces of K :

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

Playing with the definition, one finds out that the support function is sublinear, i.e., $h_K(\lambda u) = \lambda h_K(u)$ for all $\lambda \geq 0$, and $h_K(u+v) \leq h_K(u) + h_K(v)$. In fact, all sublinear functions are support functions, as stated in the following, which is [Sch13, Theorem 1.7.1].

Theorem 1.1.18. Let $h : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a sublinear function. Then there exists a unique convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $h_K = h$.

Therefore, a convex body is uniquely identified by its support function. Endowing the space of convex bodies with the Hausdorff metric, we can think of the support function as $h : \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and it is a continuous function in both arguments [Sch13, Lemma 1.8.12]. Also, we can use it to express the Hausdorff distance between two convex bodies [Sch13, Lemma 1.8.14]:

$$\text{dist}_H(K_1, K_2) = \sup_{u \in S^{d-1}} |h_{K_1}(u) - h_{K_2}(u)|.$$

We summarize further properties of the support function in the following proposition.

Proposition 1.1.19. Let $K, K' \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with respective support functions $h_K, h_{K'}$. Then

- (i) $h_{\lambda K} = \lambda h_K$;
- (ii) $h_{K+K'} = h_K + h_{K'}$;

- (iii) If $T : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ is a linear map then $h_{TK} = h_K \circ T^t$;
- (iv) h_K is differentiable at $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ if and only if the point x realizing the maximum in (1.1.2) is unique. In that case $x = K^u = \nabla h_K(u)$, where ∇h_K denotes the gradient of h_K .

Recognizing a convex body from its support function is not always easy, but there are some cases in which it is possible. The convex body K is a polytope if and only if h_K is piecewise linear; in particular, $h_K(\cdot) = \langle \cdot, x \rangle$ if and only if $K = \{x\}$. The support function of the ball of radius r centered at the origin is $h_{rB^d}(u) = r\|u\|$. Another function that will be useful later in Section 3.2 is the radial function.

Definition 1.1.20. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ containing the origin. Its *radial function* is $\rho_K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\rho_K(x) = \max\{\lambda \geq 0 \mid \lambda x \in K\}. \quad (1.1.3)$$

Radial functions are actually meaningful for a larger class of sets: the starshaped sets. A set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is *starshaped* if there exists $x_0 \in A$ such that for all $x \in K$ we have $[x_0, x] \subset A$. Convex sets are starshaped with respect to any of their points. We assume from now on, when talking about starshaped sets, that they are starshaped with respect to the origin, i.e., $x_0 = 0$. Then, compact starshaped sets have an associated radial function as defined in (1.1.3). This function satisfies $\rho_K(\lambda x) = \frac{1}{\lambda}\rho_K(x)$ for all $\lambda > 0$, hence it is enough to define it on the unit sphere. Given the radial function ρ , we can recover the associated starshaped set A and its topological boundary (when the origin lies in the interior of A):

$$A = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \rho(x) \geq 1 \right\}, \quad \partial A = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \rho(x) = 1 \right\}.$$

Let K be a convex body with the origin in its interior. Its support and radial functions are related to each other via duality, namely

$$h_K(u) = \frac{1}{\rho_{K^\circ}(u)}, \quad \rho_K(u) = \frac{1}{h_{K^\circ}(u)}.$$

As a consequence, we can describe the boundary of the dual body K° as the set of points $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $h_K(u) = 1$.

1.2. Varieties and convex bodies

We begin this section by introducing some relevant concepts from semialgebraic geometry. The main reference for the theory is [BCR13].

A subset $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a *basic closed* (respectively open) *semialgebraic set* if it can be written as

$$A = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid f_1(x) \geq 0, \dots, f_n(x) \geq 0 \right\}$$

(respectively $A = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid f_1(x) > 0, \dots, f_n(x) > 0 \right\}$)

for some polynomials $f_1, \dots, f_n \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_d]$. Basic closed (respectively open) semialgebraic sets are closed (respectively open) in the Euclidean topology of \mathbb{R}^d .

Definition 1.2.1. A *semialgebraic* set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a finite boolean combination of basic (closed or open) semialgebraic sets.

By a finite boolean combination we mean finitely many unions, intersections and complements. Semialgebraic sets satisfy many nice properties; at the core of most of their proofs there is the fact that semialgebraic sets are stable under projections, as stated in the following projection theorem [BCR13, Theorem 2.2.1].

Theorem 1.2.2. Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a semialgebraic set and consider the projection $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ onto the first d coordinates. Then $\pi(A)$ is a semialgebraic set.

The first consequences of this result are that the interior $\text{int } A$ and the Euclidean closure $\text{cl } A$ of a semialgebraic set A are semialgebraic. Hence, the topological boundary of a semialgebraic set is semialgebraic.

It might be convenient sometimes to translate the notion of semialgebraic sets into the language of logic. It allows to define the analogous of semialgebraic sets for more general real closed fields. In this context, a semialgebraic set is described via a quantifier free first-order formula. A (slightly stronger) version of the projection theorem in this setting is known as the Quantifier Elimination Theorem. Since the thesis focuses only on semialgebraic subsets of Euclidean spaces, we will not expand on the general case, but the curious reader can find the details in [BCR13, Chapter 5].

Having a definition of a property of a set, often leads to the introduction of an analogous property of functions, via their graph. In this way we can introduce the concept of a semialgebraic function.

Definition 1.2.3. A map $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ is a *semialgebraic function* if $\text{graph}(f) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^k$ is a semialgebraic set.

By the projection theorem, the image of a semialgebraic set under a semialgebraic function is a semialgebraic set. Moreover, semialgebraic functions are stable under composition and inverse. Polynomials are semialgebraic functions, but also wilder maps as the square root or the absolute value are.

Another useful consequence of the projection theorem, which provides a stratification of a semialgebraic set, is the Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition, often abbreviated as CAD. It follows from this technical result [BCR13, Theorem 2.3.1].

Theorem 1.2.4. Let $f_1, \dots, f_n \in \mathbb{R}[x, y] = \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_d, y]$ be polynomials in $d+1$ variables. Then, there exists a partition

$$\mathbb{R}^d = S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_k$$

of \mathbb{R}^d into a finite number of semialgebraic sets S_1, \dots, S_k and for all $i = 1, \dots, k$ there are finitely many continuous semialgebraic functions $\xi_{i,1} < \dots < \xi_{i,\ell_i} : S_i \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with the following properties:

- (i) for every $x \in S_i$, the set $\{\xi_{i,1}, \dots, \xi_{i,\ell_i}\}$ coincides with the set of roots of those polynomials $f_j(x, y)$ that are not identically zero at x ;
- (ii) the polynomials f_1, \dots, f_n have constant sign on each $\text{graph}(\xi_{i,j})$ and on every band $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \mid \xi_{i,j}(x) < y < \xi_{i,j+1}(x)\}$, where $j = 0, \dots, \ell_{i+1}$ with the convention that $\xi_{i,0} = -\infty$ and $\xi_{i,\ell_{i+1}} = +\infty$.

Then, given a semialgebraic set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ we say that a cylindrical algebraic decomposition of A , with respect to the projection $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, is a partition of \mathbb{R}^d as in Theorem 1.2.4 such that A can be written as a union of graphs and bands.

Corollary 1.2.5. Every semialgebraic set admits a CAD.

Iterating this process with subsequent projections $\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ gives a *stratification* of a semialgebraic set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. We can in fact write A as a disjoint union of

semialgebraic sets S_i , called *(open) strata*, that are semialgebraically homeomorphic to the unit ball B^n for some $n \geq 0$ [BCR13, Theorem 2.3.6]. One can refine such a stratification adding different requirements: for instance it is possible to find a decomposition such that the closure of each stratum is a union of strata. Clearly, this construction is very much non-unique: it depends on the projections and on the choices of the semialgebraic functions. Since the content of the theorem above is quite technical, we illustrate a CAD in the following example. Implementations can be found for instance in **Mathematica** [WR].

Example 1.2.6. Let K be the set from Example 1.1.7. This is a semialgebraic subset of \mathbb{R}^2 since we can write it as the set of points $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that

$$(x - 1)^2 + y^2 \leq 1 \quad \text{or} \quad (x + 1)^2 + y^2 \leq 1 \quad \text{or} \\ \{y \leq 1, 4y \geq 3x - 8, 4y \geq -3x - 8, y \leq 3x + 4, y \leq -3x + 4\}.$$

The projection onto the y axis induces a CAD of K as $\mathbf{S}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathbf{S}_{13}$ where the strata are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}_1 &= \{(0, -2)\}, \\ \mathbf{S}_2 &= \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid y \in (-2, -\frac{4}{5}), 3x = -4y - 8\}, \\ \mathbf{S}_3 &= \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid y \in (-2, -\frac{4}{5}), -4y - 8 < 3x < 4y + 8\}, \\ \mathbf{S}_4 &= \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid y \in (-2, -\frac{4}{5}), 3x = 4y + 8\}, \\ \mathbf{S}_5 &= \{(-\frac{8}{5}, -\frac{4}{5})\}, \quad \mathbf{S}_6 = \{(x, -\frac{4}{5}) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid -\frac{8}{5} < x < \frac{8}{5}\}, \quad \mathbf{S}_7 = \{(\frac{8}{5}, -\frac{4}{5})\}, \\ \mathbf{S}_8 &= \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid y \in (-\frac{4}{5}, 1), x = -\sqrt{1 - y^2} - 1\}, \\ \mathbf{S}_9 &= \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid y \in (-\frac{4}{5}, 1), -\sqrt{1 - y^2} - 1 < x < \sqrt{1 - y^2} + 1\}, \\ \mathbf{S}_{10} &= \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid y \in (-\frac{4}{5}, 1), x = \sqrt{1 - y^2} + 1\}, \\ \mathbf{S}_{11} &= \{(-1, 1)\}, \quad \mathbf{S}_{12} = \{(x, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid -1 < x < 1\}, \quad \mathbf{S}_{13} = \{(1, 1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We visualize them in Figure 1.3 with the corresponding colors. ♦




Figure 1.3: The cylindrical algebraic decomposition of K from Example 1.2.6.

Now that we know what a semialgebraic set is, we are ready to define the main characters of this thesis: semialgebraic convex bodies.

Definition 1.2.7. A set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a *semialgebraic convex body* if it is a semialgebraic set and a convex body.

Examples are polytopes, since they arise as the intersection of finitely many half-spaces, but also more ‘curved’ objects such as those shown in Figures 1.1 and 1.2. We collect in the following proposition some basic properties of semialgebraic convex bodies that highlight the good behaviour of semialgebraicity with respect to the notions in convexity that we introduced in Section 1.1.

Proposition 1.2.8. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then the following are equivalent:

- (i) K is semialgebraic;
- (ii) the support function h_K is a semialgebraic function;
- (iii) the radial function ρ_K is a semialgebraic function;
- (iv) any face $F \subset K$ is a semialgebraic convex body;
- (v) the set of extreme points $\text{Ext}(K)$ is a semialgebraic set;
- (vi) assuming that $0 \in \text{int } K$, the dual body K° is a semialgebraic convex body.

Moreover, the Minkowski sum of two semialgebraic convex bodies is a semialgebraic convex body, and the convex hull of a compact semialgebraic set is a semialgebraic convex body.

Proof. All the statements are a direct consequence of quantifier elimination (Theorem 1.2.2), since all these objects can be written as first-order formulae over \mathbb{R} . \square

Thus, the family of semialgebraic convex bodies is closed with respect to many fundamental operations and constructions in convex geometry. Not all convex bodies are semialgebraic. For instance, the set

$$K = \text{conv}\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x \in [0, 1], y = e^x\}$$

cannot be written as a finite boolean combination of polynomial inequalities. However, if we restrict to the class of semialgebraic convex bodies, it is possible to generalize some of the nice properties of polytopes and recover their finiteness. Indeed, by definition we have a finite description of a semialgebraic convex body. We will see later that one can partition (a dense subset of) the boundary of K into finitely many open sets, that resemble the faces of a polytope.

Spectrahedra. There are many ways in which one can generalize polytopes. A natural option, that goes in the direction of optimization, is the following [MS21, Section 12.1]. Let us begin by rewriting the definition of polytopes in a slightly different way:

$$P = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid M_0 + M_1 x_1 + \dots + M_d x_d \succcurlyeq 0 \right\}$$

where the M_i 's are $n \times n$ diagonal matrices and $\succcurlyeq 0$ means positive semidefinite. A symmetric matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is positive semidefinite if $x^T M x \geq 0$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and the set of symmetric positive semidefinite $n \times n$ matrices is a convex cone that we will denote by \mathcal{S}_+^n . From this point of view, a polytope is a particular linear cut of this cone.

Definition 1.2.9. A *spectrahedron* $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is the intersection of \mathcal{S}_+^n with an affine linear space, embedded in \mathbb{R}^d , namely

$$K = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid M_0 + M_1 x_1 + \dots + M_d x_d \succcurlyeq 0 \right\}$$

for some $M_i \in \mathcal{S}_+^n$.

If linear programming optimizes linear functionals over polytopes, semidefinite programming does it over spectrahedra [BPT13]. This was the starting point for the investigation of these objects, from the point of view of convex optimization. The condition that a matrix with linear polynomial entries is positive semidefinite, is the intersection of finitely many polynomials inequalities, hence spectrahedra are basic closed semialgebraic convex sets. Just like polytopes, all the faces of a spectrahedron are exposed. However, they do not behave as well as polytopes: the class of spectrahedra is not closed under projection and duality. To solve this problem, one needs to consider the larger family of spectrahedral shadows [Sch18b], i.e., images of spectrahedra under projections.

Example 1.2.10. A classical non-trivial example of a spectrahedron is the *elliptope* [LP95]

$$K = \left\{ (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x & y \\ x & 1 & z \\ y & z & 1 \end{bmatrix} \succcurlyeq 0 \right\}. \quad (1.2.1)$$

The boundary ∂K consists of six edges and a surface of extreme points. Among the extreme points we find four vertices, namely $(1, 1, 1), (1, -1, -1), (-1, 1, -1), (-1, -1, 1)$; the edges of ∂K are the line segments connecting the vertices (see Figure 5.7). ♦

Spectrahedra are also connected to the theory of hyperbolic polynomials, sums of squares, and moment problems [BPT13].

1.2.1. The algebraic boundary

The goal of this section is to do a transition from geometry to algebra: we start with a convex body, and we associate to it a complex algebraic variety. Prior to this, we recall few notions from algebraic geometry, to fix the notation. For a friendly introduction to the subject, we refer to [MS21]; for more details, see [CLO15].

A (affine) *variety* is the set of common solutions of some polynomial equations: given $f_1, \dots, f_n \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_d]$ the associated variety is

$$\mathcal{V}(f_1, \dots, f_n) = \{x \in \mathbb{C}^d \mid f_1(x) = \dots = f_n(x) = 0\}.$$

The set of zeros does not change if we consider, instead of the polynomials, the ideal they generate. If I is generated by f_1, \dots, f_n , in symbols $I = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$, then its variety is $\mathcal{V}(I) = \mathcal{V}(f_1, \dots, f_n)$. When I can be generated by one (non-constant) polynomial f , we say that $\mathcal{V}(I) = \mathcal{V}(f)$ is a *hypersurface*. A variety is called *irreducible* if it cannot be written as a union of proper subvarieties:

$$\mathcal{V}(I) = \mathcal{V}(J_1) \cup \mathcal{V}(J_2) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathcal{V}(I) = \mathcal{V}(J_1) \text{ or } \mathcal{V}(I) = \mathcal{V}(J_2).$$

If a polynomial f is irreducible, the hypersurface $\mathcal{V}(f)$ is irreducible itself. If f is not irreducible, we can factorize it into irreducible factors as $f(x) = f_1(x) \cdot \dots \cdot f_n(x)$ and the varieties $\mathcal{V}(f_i)$ are the *irreducible components* of $\mathcal{V}(f)$. In terms of ideals, a variety $\mathcal{V}(I)$ being irreducible corresponds to I being prime. The analogue of the factorization of a polynomial is given here by the *primary decomposition* of the ideal I .

Varieties form a basis of closed sets for a topology, called the *Zariski topology*. Since we will be interested later in the \mathbb{R} story, we will often consider just varieties defined by polynomials with real coefficients; they define the \mathbb{R} -Zariski topology. It is much coarser than the Euclidean topology. We will denote by \overline{A} the closure of the set A with respect to the (\mathbb{R}) -Zariski topology. In this setting, we can make sense of a word very much

appreciated by algebraic geometers: generic. Something is said to be generic, or to hold for the generic element of \mathbb{C}^d if it is not true for points in a proper subset which is closed with respect to the Zariski topology.

Two important invariants of varieties are their dimension (or codimension) and degree. Consider the variety $\mathcal{V}(I) \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ and some generic hyperplanes H_i . There exists a well defined k such that $\mathcal{V}(I) \cap H_1 \cap \dots \cap H_k$ is a finite number of points. Informally, such a k is the *codimension* of $\mathcal{V}(I)$, $d - k$ is its *dimension* and the cardinality of $\mathcal{V}(I) \cap H_1 \cap \dots \cap H_k$ is its *degree*.

Definition 1.2.11. The *algebraic boundary* of $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, denoted by $\partial_a K \subset \mathbb{C}^d$, is the closure of the topological boundary with respect to the (\mathbb{R} -)Zariski topology. In other words, it is the smallest variety containing ∂K .

This definition provides the connection between convex geometry and algebraic geometry. We have a convex body K , a concrete geometrical object, and we associate to it a variety $\partial_a K$ and thus an ideal. Now we can use tools from commutative algebra, real and complex algebraic geometry, to study such a variety (its dimension, degree, irreducibility), in order to get information about K itself. For instance, we can deduce whether K is a semialgebraic convex body from its algebraic boundary. The following result is [Sin15, Proposition 2.9].

Theorem 1.2.12. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be full dimensional. Then K is a semialgebraic convex body if and only if its algebraic boundary $\partial_a K$ is a hypersurface.

If K is not semialgebraic, then $\partial_a K = \mathbb{R}^d$ hence it is not interesting. To avoid heavy notation, we will use the same symbol for the algebraic boundary and its real part: when we refer to the real part, we will simply write $\partial_a K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. Let us go back to the examples that we encountered so far and comment on the various algebraic boundaries. For a polytope P the algebraic boundary $\partial_a P$ is a union of finitely many hyperplanes, the ones that define its facets. Hence, it is a reducible variety with degree equal to $f_{d-1}(P)$. The algebraic boundary of the convex body K from Example 1.1.7 has five irreducible components, two quadrics and three lines:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_a K = & \mathcal{V}((x+1)^2 + y^2 - 1) \cup \mathcal{V}((x-1)^2 + y^2 - 1) \\ & \cup \mathcal{V}(y-1) \cup \mathcal{V}(3x-4y-10) \cup \mathcal{V}(3x+4y+10).\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, Example 1.1.12 illustrates a semialgebraic convex body whose algebraic boundary is irreducible: $\partial_a K = \mathcal{V}(x^6 + y^6 - 1)$. Its dual body is semialgebraic by Proposition 1.2.8 (vi). Its algebraic boundary is an irreducible variety of degree 30:

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathcal{V}(x^{30} + 5x^{24}y^6 + 10x^{18}y^{12} + 10x^{12}y^{18} + 5x^6y^{24} + y^{30} - 5x^{24} \\ & + 605x^{18}y^6 - 1905x^{12}y^{12} + 605x^6y^{18} - 5y^{24} + 10x^{18} + 1905x^{12}y^6 \\ & + 1905x^6y^{12} + 10y^{18} - 10x^{12} + 605x^6y^6 - 10y^{12} + 5x^6 + 5y^6 - 1).\end{aligned}$$

We can write both K and K° as the locus where the associated polynomial is less or equal than zero. This is not always the case, even for convex bodies with irreducible algebraic boundary. Indeed, let us move to Example 1.2.10. The algebraic boundary of the ellipope is the zero locus of the cubic polynomial

$$f = 2xyz - x^2 - y^2 - z^2 + 1 \tag{1.2.2}$$

and the points of the ellipope satisfy $f \geq 0$. However, not all $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $f(x, y, z) \geq 0$ belong to the ellipope; in fact, the locus where f is non-negative includes




Figure 1.4: The real part of the algebraic boundary of the ellotope.

also four unbounded ‘ears’, as shown in Figure 1.4. For spectrahedra there is in fact a general rule for computing the algebraic boundary: it is the zero locus of the determinant of the defining matrix. For instance (1.2.2) is the determinant of the matrix that appears in the definition of the ellotope, in (1.2.1).

Remark 1.2.13. The algebraic boundary does not determine the convex body. Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a full dimensional semialgebraic convex body. Then the real part of $\partial_a K$ cuts the space into finitely many regions: the connected components of $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \partial_a K$. The convex body K is thus the union of some of these components, but in general there can be multiple choices. For example, let

$$\partial_a K = \mathcal{V}(x^2 + y^2 - 1) \cup \mathcal{V}(x) \subset \mathbb{C}^2.$$

Then there are two possible choices for K : it is either the half unit ball with $x \geq 0$ or the half unit ball with $x \leq 0$.

1.2.2. More dualities

We now go back to the notion of dual body and we analyze it from the point of view of the algebraic boundary. The results that we present here appear in [Sin14, Sin15], with particular emphasis on the relation between the boundary of K and K° . For computational aspects and a comparison of different notions of duality in convex geometry, algebraic geometry and optimization, see [RS10].

The transition from convex geometry to algebraic geometry is marked by some crucial steps and objects:

1. Convex geometry: a convex body;
2. Real algebraic geometry: a semialgebraic convex body;
3. Complex algebraic geometry: the algebraic boundary;
4. Projective geometry: the algebraic boundary in terms of dual varieties.

The present section will be devoted to the inspection of point 4. We start by introducing dual varieties. Recall that the complex projective space \mathbb{P}^d is the quotient $\mathbb{C}^{d+1}/\{0\} \sim$, where $x \sim y$ if and only if there exists $\lambda \neq 0$ such that $x = \lambda y$. We denote a point in projective space by $[x_0, \dots, x_d] \in \mathbb{P}^d$. Here one can define *projective varieties* to be the zero locus of *homogeneous* polynomials, that are precisely those polynomials whose zero locus is preserved by \sim . We can move between affine and projective varieties by homogenizing

or dehomogenizing polynomials and ideals. As for affine varieties, we have the notion of Zariski topology in \mathbb{P}^d and irreducibility, smoothness, dimension and degree of a projective variety. For rigorous definitions and results we refer to [CLO15, Chapter 8].

Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^d$ be a variety and denote by X_{reg} the subset of smooth points of X . A point $u \in (\mathbb{P}^d)^*$ is said to be *tangent* to X at $x \in X_{\text{reg}}$ if the associated hyperplane u^\perp , i.e., $\{[x_0, \dots, x_d] \in \mathbb{P}^d \mid u_0 x_0 + \dots + u_d x_d = 0\}$, contains $T_x X$, the embedded tangent space to X at x .

Definition 1.2.14. The *conormal variety* of X , denoted by $\mathbf{CN}(X)$, is the Zariski closure of the set

$$\{(x, u) \in \mathbb{P}^d \times (\mathbb{P}^d)^* \mid x \in X_{\text{reg}}, T_x X \subset u^\perp\}.$$

If X is irreducible, then $\mathbf{CN}(X)$ is irreducible as well and has dimension $d - 1$. Informally, the conormal variety is the Zariski closure of the conormal bundle, by looking at the projection of \mathbf{CN} onto the first factor. On the other hand, the projection π_2 onto the second factor gives the dual variety.

Definition 1.2.15. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^d$ be a projective variety. Its *dual variety* X^* is the Zariski closure of the set of hyperplanes tangent to X . In formula, $X^* = \overline{\pi_2(\mathbf{CN}(X))} \subset (\mathbb{P}^d)^*$.

We collect some useful properties of dual varieties in the following proposition.

Proposition 1.2.16. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^d$ be a projective variety. Then

- (i) $\dim X^* \leq d - 1$;
- (ii) if X is a smooth hypersurface of degree δ , then $\deg X^* = \delta(\delta - 1)^{d-1}$;
- (iii) biduality: if X is irreducible, then $X^{**} = X$.

Remark 1.2.17. Throughout the thesis, we will usually talk about the dual variety of an affine variety $\mathcal{V}(I) \subset \mathbb{C}^d$. With this terminology we mean the following. Consider first the projective closure X of $\mathcal{V}(I)$, that is, the projective variety associated to the homogenization of the ideal I . We do this by identifying \mathbb{C}^d with the affine chart $\{[x_0, \dots, x_d] \in \mathbb{P}^d \mid x_0 = 1\}$. Then, compute the dual variety $X^* \subset (\mathbb{P}^d)^*$ and restrict it back to $\{u_0 = -1\}$. This is an affine variety $\mathcal{V}(I)^*$ that we will call the dual variety to $\mathcal{V}(I)$. The minus sign in the chart of the dual space is a consequence of the convention that we chose, to use outer normal vectors for the dual body.

Going back to convexity, we want to understand how the notions of dual convex body and dual variety combine. In order to deal with dual convex bodies, we make the assumption that $0 \in \text{int } K$ in the rest of the section. Krein-Milman Theorem 1.1.8 essentially says that, among boundary points, ‘it is enough’ to look at the extreme points of a convex body. In analogy, the next results will show that extreme points are sufficient also to describe the algebraic boundary. Denote by $\text{Ext}_a K$ the Zariski closure of the extreme points of the convex body K . Contrary to the algebraic boundary, this variety is not always a hypersurface, but it is a subvariety of $\partial_a K$. The following result is the affine version of [Sin15, Proposition 3.1, Theorem 3.3, Corollary 3.5].

Theorem 1.2.18. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be full dimensional with the origin in its interior. Then

$$(\text{Ext}_a K)^* \subset \partial_a K^\circ \quad \text{and} \quad (\partial_a K)^* \subset \text{Ext}_a K^\circ.$$

Moreover, $(\partial_a K)^* = \text{Ext}_a K^\circ$.

For polytopes, $(\partial_a P)^*$ is a union of finitely many points, namely the vertices of P° . Also the opposite is true: $(\text{Ext}_a P^\circ)^* = \text{vertices}(P^\circ)^* = \partial_a P$, so we can recover the algebraic

boundary of P . Similarly, consider the convex body K from Example 1.1.12. In this case $\text{Ext}_a K = \partial_a K = (\partial_a K^\circ)^* = (\text{Ext}_a K^\circ)^*$. So in general, we would like to apply a biduality argument to the equation in Theorem 1.2.18. Unfortunately, this cannot be done, since the algebraic boundary is not always irreducible. The variety $(\text{Ext}_a K^\circ)^*$ might miss some component of $\partial_a K$, as shown in the following example.

Example 1.2.19. Let K be the convex body from Example 1.1.7, displayed in Figure 1.1. Its dual body K° is shown in Figure 1.5. Its algebraic boundary is the union of three irreducible components:

$$\mathcal{V}(-y^2 + 2x + 1), \quad \mathcal{V}(-y^2 - 2x + 1), \quad \mathcal{V}(-2y - 1).$$

The Zariski closure of the extreme points of K° is the union of the two parabolas only.




Figure 1.5: The convex body K° from Example 1.2.19. It is the dual body of K from Example 1.1.7, Figure 1.1.

Hence $(\text{Ext}_a K^\circ)^* = \mathcal{V}((x \pm 1)^2 + y^2 - 1) \subsetneq \partial_a K$. ♦

Patches. We have seen in Section 1.1 that polytopes have always finitely many faces. They can be recorded via the f -vector, and give rise to many interesting problems in combinatorics. As soon as one leaves the family of polytopes, convex bodies have infinitely many faces. However, in the case of a semialgebraic convex body K , we can group together some of the faces in finitely many *patches*, to mimic the f -vector and describe ∂K as the union of finitely many pieces. In order for the patches to have ‘nice’ properties, the definition is unfortunately quite technical. It first appeared in [CKLS19] and it was then developed in detail in [PSW21].

Given a projective variety $X \subset \mathbb{P}^d$, let the *biregular locus* of its conormal variety be the open submanifold

$$\mathbf{CN}_{\text{bireg}}(X) = \left\{ (x, u) \in \mathbb{P}^d \times (\mathbb{P}^d)^* \mid x \in X_{\text{reg}}, u \in (X^*)_{\text{reg}} \right\}.$$

There are two natural projections $\pi_1 : \mathbf{CN}_{\text{bireg}}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^d$ and $\pi_2 : \mathbf{CN}_{\text{bireg}}(X) \rightarrow (\mathbb{P}^d)^*$. By [PSW21, Theorem 1.7], if $0 \in \text{int } K$, the normal cycle $\mathbf{N}(K)$ is a compact semialgebraic set of pure dimension $d - 1$. We can (and will) here view it as a subset of $\mathbb{P}^d \times (\mathbb{P}^d)^*$, via the embedding of $\mathbb{R}^d \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ in \mathbb{P}^d as in Remark 1.2.17.

Definition 1.2.20. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be full dimensional with the origin in its interior and denote by $X \subset \mathbb{P}^d$ the projective closure of $\partial_a K$. Let Y be an irreducible component of X . A *patch* of K (over Y) is a connected component of the semialgebraic subset of $\mathbf{N}(K) \cap \mathbf{CN}_{\text{bireg}}(Y) \subset \mathbb{P}^d \times (\mathbb{P}^d)^*$ consisting of pairs (x, u) such that x is not contained in any irreducible component of X other than Y .

A *closed patch* $\text{cl}(\mathsf{P})$ is intended to be the Euclidean closure of a patch P of K . Following [PSW21], we will denote the family of patches of K as $\mathcal{P}(K)$. This is a finite set. The assumptions in Definition 1.2.20 are essential to avoid pathological cases, as pointed out via many examples in [PSW21]. The following results are the affine versions of [PSW21, Lemma 2.11, Theorem 2.15].

Lemma 1.2.21. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be full dimensional with the origin in its interior, then

$$\partial K = \bigcup_{\mathsf{P} \in \mathcal{P}(K)} \pi_1(\text{cl}(\mathsf{P})).$$

Theorem 1.2.22. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be full dimensional with $0 \in \text{int } K$, and let P be a patch of K over an irreducible component Y of the projective closure of $\partial_a K$. Then

- (i) P is of pure projective dimension $d - 1$;
- (ii) $\pi_1(\mathsf{P})$ is open in ∂K and of pure projective dimension $d - 1$;
- (iii) $\pi_2(\mathsf{P})$ is an open semialgebraic subset of the real points of Y_{reg}^* . In particular it is of pure dimension $\dim Y^*$;
- (iv) given $u \in K^\circ$, let H be the hyperplane supporting K with outer normal u . Then the dimension of the face K^u is $d - \dim Y^*$, for all $u \in \pi_2(\mathsf{P})$. Furthermore, $\pi_1(\mathsf{P}) \cap H$ is Zariski dense in K^u , for all $u \in \pi_2(\mathsf{P})$;
- (v) in the situation of (iv), the union of $\pi_1(\mathsf{P}) \cap H$ over all patches P of K over Y is dense in K^u in the Euclidean topology.

Besides technicalities, the message is that the patches cover the topological boundary ∂K and that the faces of K that are grouped in the same patch have the same dimension. Moreover, the faces belonging to the same (closed) patch satisfy some continuity in the Hausdorff topology [PSW21, Lemma 2.19].

Example 1.2.23. We go back again to Example 1.1.7 and analyze the patches of K . The set $\mathcal{P}(K)$ consists of five patches: two open arcs

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{P}_1 &= \left\{ (x, y) \in (-2, -1) \times \left(-\frac{4}{5}, 1 \right) \mid (x + 1)^2 + y^2 = 1 \right\}, \\ \mathsf{P}_2 &= \left\{ (x, y) \in (1, 2) \times \left(-\frac{4}{5}, 1 \right) \mid (x - 1)^2 + y^2 = 1 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and three open line segments

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{P}_3 &= \left\{ (x, y) \in (-1, 1) \times \{1\} \right\}, \\ \mathsf{P}_4 &= \left\{ (x, y) \in \left(-\frac{8}{5}, 0 \right) \times \left(-2, -\frac{4}{5} \right) \mid 3x + 4y + 10 = 0 \right\}, \\ \mathsf{P}_5 &= \left\{ (x, y) \in \left(0, \frac{8}{5} \right) \times \left(-2, -\frac{4}{5} \right) \mid 3x - 4y - 10 = 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, there are two patches of 0-dimensional faces and three patches of 1-dimensional faces. They cover ∂K except for five points: the intersection points of two irreducible components of the algebraic boundary, excluded from the patches by definition. As predicted, we can recover the whole topological boundary by taking the closure of the P_i 's. ♦

Chapter 2

Zonoids

Zonoids are limits, in the Hausdorff metric, of zonotopes [Bol69]. The latter are finite Minkowski sums of line segments. They are relatively well-understood: for instance, it is known that a polytope is a zonotope if and only if all its 2-dimensional faces are (translates of) centrally symmetric polygons [Bol69,Sch70]. This lies in the context of the *Zonoid Problem*, introduced in [Bol71], but already appearing in [Bla23]: this problem consists in determining whether a given convex body is a zonoid. These special convex sets play an important role in convex geometry, measure theory, functional analysis and random geometry [Bol69,SW83,Vit91,GW93]. More recently, connections to enumerative geometry and real intersection theory were drawn [BL16], which led to the introduction of the zonoid algebra in [BBLM22] as a probabilistic version of cohomology. A simple geometric characterization of zonoids seems hopeless, and in full generality even the decidability of the Zonoid Problem is not understood.

In this thesis, we approach the problem for the first time from the point of view of algebraic geometry. Restricting to the subclass of semialgebraic convex bodies would potentially make the problem easier. For instance, in the algebraic setting, the rigidity of the Zariski topology implies that global properties can be checked locally. *Discotopes* form a special subclass of semialgebraic zonoids, discussed in [GM21]. They were introduced in [AS16] for the combinatorial study of matroids associated to subspace arrangements. They appeared in the context of convex geometry in [MM21], which will be analyzed in Section 3.1. Discotopes are a first possible generalization of zonotopes, still amenable to be studied with tools from algebra, geometry and combinatorics. They are finite Minkowski sums of higher dimensional discs: from this point of view, zonotopes correspond to the special case of 1-dimensional discs.

We introduce zonoids in Section 2.1, exploit some basic properties and characterizations to connect them to measure theory and probability. Section 2.1.1 presents the formal definition of discotopes. We then focus on the facial structure of zonoids and in particular discotopes, in Section 2.1.2. Section 2.2 focuses on the algebraic boundary of discotopes. We introduce a particular subvariety \mathcal{S} of their algebraic boundary in Definition 2.2.1, central in the rest of the chapter. Section 2.2.1 provides a full characterization of \mathcal{S} in a special range. Section 2.2.2, and in particular Theorem 2.2.5, describes its role in the geometry of the exposed points of the discotope. In Section 2.2.3, we study discotopes that are Minkowski sums of 2-dimensional discs; we prove in Theorem 2.2.13 that in this case \mathcal{S} is an irreducible hypersurface and provide an upper bound for its degree. As a by-product of this result, we prove (Lemma 2.2.15) that certain non-generic linear sections of the classical determinantal variety are irreducible and of the expected dimension.

We conclude the section with an important example, the dice, which presents peculiar birational properties. Finally, in Section 2.2.4, we propose some open problems and conjectures: in particular, Conjecture 2.2.22 predicts that the variety \mathcal{S} is irreducible under minimal assumptions.

2.1. The Zonoid Problem

One of the operations that we can use on the space of convex bodies is the Minkowski sum. We thus fix some points $z_{1,1}, z_{1,2}, \dots, z_{n,1}, z_{n,2} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and consider

$$Z = \sum_{i=1}^n [z_{i,1}, z_{i,2}].$$

This object, namely the Minkowski sum of finitely many line segments, is called *zonotope*. If $z_{i,1} = -z_{i,2}$ for all i , then Z is said to be *centered*, and given any zonotope we can always translate it to make it centered. Since we are interested in the geometry of such a convex body, we can restrict to study centered zonotopes. Therefore, from now on, we will drop the word ‘centered’ for simplicity. Zonotopes are in particular polytopes that satisfy $Z = -Z$, i.e., they are *centrally symmetric* polytopes centered at the origin. There is in fact a neat procedure to check if a given polytope is a zonotope.

Theorem 2.1.1. A polytope P is a zonotope if and only if all the two-dimensional faces of P are centrally symmetric polygons.

In particular, all two-dimensional centrally symmetric polytopes are zonotopes. This is not true in higher dimension: the octahedron $P \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is centrally symmetric, but its two-dimensional faces are triangles. Hence it is not a zonotope.

Definition 2.1.2. A *zonoid* is a limit, in the Hausdorff topology, of zonotopes.

We can interpret zonoids as an infinite Minkowski sum of line segments, or as those convex bodies that can be approximated by zonotopes. In particular, zonoids are centrally symmetric convex bodies. In order for a zonoid to be a polytope, it must be a zonotope. Regarding operations and constructions that we introduced in the first chapter, the family of zonoids is closed under Minkowski sum and scalar multiplication. On the other hand, the dual body of a zonoid is not necessarily a zonoid, even for zonotopes.

Example 2.1.3. Let $P = [-1, 1]^4$ be the four-dimensional cube centered at the origin. Let P° be its dual polytope, as in Example 1.1.13. The cube P is a zonotope, indeed

$$\begin{aligned} P = & [(-1, 0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0)] + [(0, -1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0)] \\ & + [(0, 0, -1, 0), (0, 0, 1, 0)] + [(0, 0, 0, -1), (0, 0, 0, 1)]. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, all the 32 two-dimensional faces of P° are triangles, hence they are not centrally symmetric, hence P° is not a zonotope. \blacklozenge

Example of zonoids that are not polytopes are the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^d and L^p balls in \mathbb{R}^2 and also in \mathbb{R}^d when $d \geq 3$ and $2 \leq p \leq \infty$ [Bol69, Theorem 6.6]. However, not all zonoids are semialgebraic, as we will see in Section 3.1.3, Figure 3.5.

Remark 2.1.4. In Definition 2.1.2, it is not necessary that the zonotopes are centered. With this condition we actually obtain centered zonoids. Otherwise, we would get more general convex bodies that up to translation are centered zonoids. As for the case of zonotopes, we are interested in the geometry of these objects, that does not depend on

translations. Hence, from now on we will restrict to the family of centered zonoids, and we will drop the word ‘centered’ for simplicity.

Central in the literature on zonoids is the study of the following inclusion:

$$\{ \text{zonoids} \} \subset \{ \text{centrally symmetric convex bodies} \}.$$

This inclusion becomes an equality in \mathbb{R}^2 : all planar centrally symmetric convex bodies are zonoids. However, the inclusion is strict in \mathbb{R}^d for $d > 2$. More precisely, zonoids are nowhere dense in the set of centrally symmetric convex bodies [Sch13, Corollary 3.5.7]. So a natural question arises:

How to recognize a zonoid?

More precisely, given a centrally symmetric convex body, how can we check whether it is a zonoid or not? Theorem 2.1.1 gives the answer to the question in the case when the given convex body is a polytope. In the general case, this question is known as the *Zonoid Problem*. It is a very hard problem for many reasons. As shown in [Wei77], being a zonoid is not a local property. Indeed, for every convex body K , and every point p of its boundary ∂K , there exists a zonoid whose support function coincides with the support function of K in a neighborhood of p . Moreover, in [Wei82], it was shown that being a zonoid is not a property characterized by projections: there exist convex bodies which are not zonoids but such that all their projections are zonoids. Also restricting to smaller subclasses of zonoids is not a big improvement: the zonoid problem is open even in the simplest non-trivial case of semialgebraic convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^3 , see e.g. [Stu21, Problem 12]. However, a positive result is given in [LM22], where the authors prove the tameness of particular classes of semialgebraic zonoids. More precisely, they study the set of zonoids defined by $\{p(x) \geq 0\}$ as a subset of the set of convex bodies with an analogous definition, where p is a polynomial of a given degree and number of unknowns. Theorem 1 in [LM22] states that this family of zonoids is definable over a certain o-minimal structure.

If geometrically we do not really know what zonoids look like, from a more analytic point of view there are some ways to characterize zonoids. These identify their support functions. We outline two possible directions here, one connected to measures in the sphere and the other with a probabilistic flavour.

Theorem 2.1.5. A convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a zonoid if and only if its support function can be written as

$$h_K(u) = \int_{S^{d-1}} |\langle u, x \rangle| d\rho(x)$$

where ρ is an even measure on S^{d-1} .

By a measure on the sphere we mean a real-valued σ -additive nonnegative function on the σ -algebra of Borel sets of the sphere. It is even if it is invariant under reflections with respect to the origin. In the setting of Theorem 2.1.5, which is [Sch13, Theorem 3.5.3], ρ is sometimes called the *generating measure* of K . It can be also proved that there is a one to one correspondence between zonoids and their generating measures [Sch13, Theorem 3.5.4]. For instance, the generating measure of a zonotope is concentrated in finitely many points. At the opposite side, a uniform ρ is the generating function of a ball.

Richard Vitale on the other hand in [Vit91] characterizes zonoids using random vectors. Let $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a random vector and assume that $\mathbb{E}\|X\|$ is finite, then the function

$$u \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}|\langle u, X \rangle| \tag{2.1.1}$$

takes values in \mathbb{R} , and it is sublinear. The following is [Vit91, Theorem 3.1].

Theorem 2.1.6. A convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a zonoid if and only if there exists a random vector $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\mathbb{E}\|X\| < \infty$ such that $h_K(u)$ is given by (2.1.1).

We will sometimes call such a zonoid the *Vitale zonoid* associated to the random vector X , and denote it by $K(X)$. It is easy to see that different random vectors can be associated to the same zonoid. Indeed, let λ be a random variable with $\mathbb{E}|\lambda| = 1$. Then $K(X) = K(\lambda X)$, provided that λ and X are independent [BBLM22, Lemma 2.7]. For the zonotope $Z = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2}[-z_i, z_i]$, consider the random vector X that takes value nz_i with probability $1/n$; then $K(X) = Z$. In the case in which X is a centered Gaussian vector, $K(X)$ is a ball. For details we refer to [BBLM22]. In that work the authors introduce the *zonoid algebra* via the definition of the wedge product of zonoids. This allows to generalize Vitale's formula for the expectation of the absolute value of the determinant of a random matrix, in terms of mixed volumes. As the authors point out, the fact that the characterization given by Theorem 2.1.6 does not give a one to one correspondence is not a disadvantage, but a feature.

2.1.1. Discotopes

Since semialgebraic zonoids are already complicated, we restrict now to a subclass of objects called *discotopes*. If a zonotope is a Minkowski sum of one-dimensional discs, a discotope is the Minkowski sum of discs, with no requirements on their dimension. This allows to generalize the well understood family of zonotopes in a way that preserves some combinatorial properties.

Fix $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \leq d$, and let $\mathcal{B} := \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ be a set of linearly independent vectors of \mathbb{R}^d . Denote by $A_{\mathcal{B}} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ the linear map mapping the i -th standard basis element e_i of \mathbb{R}^n to b_i . The *generalized disc* $D_{\mathcal{B}}$ is the image of the unit ball B^n under $A_{\mathcal{B}}$. Throughout this chapter, generalized discs are simply called discs.

The topological boundary $\partial D_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a real algebraic hypersurface in the linear span $\langle \mathcal{B} \rangle$: its ideal is defined by $d - n$ linear forms determining $\langle \mathcal{B} \rangle$ and a single inhomogeneous quadric $q_{\mathcal{B}} - 1$, where $q_{\mathcal{B}}$ is the quadratic form associated to the matrix $(A_{\mathcal{B}})(A_{\mathcal{B}})^T$. In particular, generalized discs are semialgebraic sets.

Remark 2.1.7. For every d and every choice of \mathcal{B} , the generalized disc $D_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a zonoid. This is immediate from the fact that linear images of zonoids are zonoids [Bol69, Lemma 1.4]. In particular for $d = 1$, generalized discs are all the compact segments centered at the origin; for higher d , generalized discs are ellipsoids centered at the origin.

Definition 2.1.8. Given generalized discs $D_{\mathcal{B}_1}, \dots, D_{\mathcal{B}_N}$ in \mathbb{R}^d , the *discotope* $\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ associated to $\mathfrak{B} = \{\mathcal{B}_j \mid j = 1, \dots, N\}$ is their Minkowski sum

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{B}} = D_{\mathcal{B}_1} + \cdots + D_{\mathcal{B}_N}.$$

Write $D_i := D_{\mathcal{B}_i}$ if no confusion arises. Let N_m be the number of discs of dimension m among D_1, \dots, D_N . The *type* of the discotope $\mathcal{D}_{\mathfrak{B}}$ is the vector $\mathbf{N} = (N_1, \dots, N_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$. Note that $N = \sum_{m=1}^d N_m$.

Usually, we will be interested in the case where the sets \mathcal{B}_j are chosen generically. More precisely, we say that a property holds for the *generic discotope* of type \mathbf{N} if the sets \mathfrak{B} for which it does not hold form a proper Zariski closed subset of the set of all possible \mathcal{B}_j .

In the case $\mathbf{N} = (N, 0, \dots, 0)$, all the generalized discs are segments centered at the origin: the associated discotope is a zonotope centered at the origin [Zie95, Section 7.3]. The case $\mathbf{N} = (0, N, 0)$ of discotopes in \mathbb{R}^3 was studied in [MM21] in the context of fiber

convex bodies, as we will see in Section 3.1. In [AS16], discs of higher dimensions were considered, suitably rescaled so that their volume is normalized.

Discotopes can be realized as the image of the addition map restricted to the product of the discs. More precisely, define Σ to be the (complex) *addition map*

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma : (\mathbb{C}^d)^N &\rightarrow \mathbb{C}^d \\ (\xi_j)_{j=1,\dots,N} &\mapsto \sum \xi_j.\end{aligned}$$

Then, the discotope \mathcal{D} associated to \mathfrak{B} is the image of $\prod_j D_j \subseteq (\mathbb{R}^d)^N$ under Σ . In particular, the projection theorem for semialgebraic sets, Theorem 1.2.2, guarantees that \mathcal{D} is semialgebraic.

Since Minkowski sums of zonoids are zonoids, every discotope is a zonoid. In particular, discotopes form a class of semialgebraic zonoids and one may wonder whether all semialgebraic zonoids arise in this way. This is not the case. An example of a semialgebraic zonoid which is not a discotope is the unit ball of the L^4 -norm $\{x_1^4 + x_2^4 \leq 1\}$ in \mathbb{R}^2 : indeed, there is no discotope in \mathbb{R}^2 whose boundary is an irreducible curve of degree 4, see Remark 2.2.18. We point out that a discotope is full dimensional if and only if $\sum_{j=1}^N \langle \mathcal{B}_j \rangle = \mathbb{R}^d$. In particular, a necessary condition for this to happen is that $\sum_{m=1}^d m N_m \geq d$. For a generic discotope this condition is also sufficient. We always assume that \mathcal{D} is full dimensional: this is not restrictive as one can always restrict the analysis to the linear span $H = \sum_{j=1}^N \langle \mathcal{B}_j \rangle = \langle \mathcal{D} \rangle$.

2.1.2. The faces of a zonoid

In the case of zonoids, as Bolker points out [Bol69], there is a nice recipe to construct a face. Indeed, given a zonoid K every proper face $F \subset K$ is a zonoid of lower dimension which is a summand of K , i.e., there exists another zonoid K' such that $K = K' + F$.

We can examine this relation in more details for discotopes. Consider the discotope $\mathcal{D} = D_1 + \dots + D_N$. For every disc D_j , let $C_j = S^{d-1} \cap \langle D_j \rangle^\perp$, that is the unit sphere of dimension $d - \dim D_j - 1$ consisting of directions orthogonal to D_j . Let $\mathcal{U} = S^{d-1} \setminus \left(\bigcup_j C_j \right)$, which is Zariski open in S^{d-1} . If $u \in \mathcal{U}$, then for every disc D_j the face D_j^u exposed by u is a single point.

As a consequence, if $u \in \mathcal{U}$, then the face of the discotope \mathcal{D}^u consists of a single point. To see this, let $p = \sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j \in \mathcal{D}^u$ be a point of the face exposed by u . Then

$$h_{\mathcal{D}}(u) = \langle u, p \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^N \langle u, \xi_j \rangle > \sum_{j=1}^N \langle u, \tilde{\xi}_j \rangle$$

for any other $\tilde{\xi}_j \in D_j$. Therefore $\mathcal{D}^u = \{p\}$ and hence p is an exposed point of \mathcal{D} .

On the other hand if $u \notin \mathcal{U}$, let $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$ be the maximal subset of indices such that $u \in \bigcap_{j \in J} C_j$; then u^\perp contains $\sum_{j \in J} \langle \mathcal{B}_j \rangle$. In this case the face of \mathcal{D} exposed by u is (a properly translated copy of) a smaller discotope \mathcal{D}' , given by the Minkowski sum of the discs D_j for $j \in J$. In general, the exposed faces of \mathcal{D} of dimension k are given by

$$\sum_{j \in J} D_j + \sum_{i \notin J} \{p_i\}$$

where $p_i \in \partial D_i$ are suitable points and J is such that $\dim(\sum_{j \in J} \langle \mathcal{B}_j \rangle) = k$.

Remark 2.1.9. A discotope \mathcal{D} of type $\mathbf{N} = (N_1, \dots, N_d)$ is the Minkowski sum of a zonotope \mathcal{Z} given by N_1 segments and a discotope \mathcal{D}' of type $(0, N_2, \dots, N_d)$:

$$\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{Z} + \mathcal{D}'.$$

Since the convex hull of a Minkowski sum equals the Minkowski sum of convex hulls, the discotope \mathcal{D} is the convex hull of copies of \mathcal{D}' placed at the vertices of \mathcal{Z} . As a consequence, many of the geometric properties of \mathcal{D} only depend on analogous properties of \mathcal{D}' . For instance, the algebraic study of extreme points of \mathcal{D} can be reduced to the one of extreme points of \mathcal{D}' . This can be visualized in the following example.

Example 2.1.10. Let D_1, D_2, D_3 be the discs in \mathbb{R}^3 defined by

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &= \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) : x_3 = 0, -1 \leq x_1 = x_2 \leq 1\}, \\ D_2 &= \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) : x_1 = 0, x_2^2 + x_3^2 \leq 1\}, \\ D_3 &= \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) : x_2 = 0, x_1^2 + x_3^2 \leq 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the associated discotope $\mathcal{D} = D_1 + D_2 + D_3$, shown in Figure 2.1, left. Faces of dimension 0, 1 and 2 are represented in red, green and blue, respectively. The red points are exposed and arise as $\xi_1 + \xi_2 + \xi_3$, for certain $\xi_i \in \partial D_i$. Every green segment arises as $D_1 + \xi_2 + \xi_3$, for certain $\xi_i \in \partial D_i$. The four blue discs (only two of which are visible) come in pairs: two are obtained as $\xi_1 + D_2 + \xi_3$ and the other two as $\xi_1 + \xi_2 + D_3$, for certain $\xi_i \in \partial D_i$. As observed in Remark 2.1.9, $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{Z} + \mathcal{D}'$ where $\mathcal{Z} = D_1$ is a zonotope




Figure 2.1: Left: a discotope of type $\mathbf{N} = (1, 2, 0)$. Right: a discotope of type $\mathbf{N} = (0, 2, 0)$. Faces of dimension 0 are in red, faces of dimension 1 are in green and faces of dimension 2 are in blue.

and $\mathcal{D}' = D_2 + D_3$ is a discotope with $N_1 = 0$, shown in Figure 2.1, right. The algebraic boundary $\partial_a \mathcal{D}'$ consists of five irreducible components: four planes and the quartic surface

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{V}(x_1^4 - 2x_1^2x_2^2 + x_2^4 + 2x_1^2x_3^2 + 2x_2^2x_3^2 + x_3^4 - 4x_3^2).$$

The latter is the Zariski closure of the set of extreme points of \mathcal{D}' , namely $\text{Ext}_a \mathcal{D}'$. Instead, $\text{Ext}_a \mathcal{D}$ is the union of two copies of \mathcal{S} , translated by the extrema of the segment D_1 , i.e., the vectors $\pm(1, 1, 0)$. \blacklozenge

2.2. The geometry of discotopes

In this section, we investigate the algebraic boundary of discotopes. In order to do that, we introduce a complex algebraic variety associated to a discotope, called its purely nonlinear part, which will be the main object of study in the rest of the chapter.

Definition 2.2.1. Let $\mathcal{D}^\partial = \Sigma(\prod_j \partial D_j) \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. The *purely nonlinear part* of \mathcal{D} is

$$\mathcal{S} = \overline{\mathcal{D}^\partial \cap \partial \mathcal{D}},$$

the Zariski closure of $\mathcal{D}^\partial \cap \partial \mathcal{D}$ in \mathbb{C}^d .

By definition if $p \in \text{Ext } \mathcal{D}$, then $p \in \mathcal{S}$. Therefore, by the Krein–Milman Theorem [Bar02, Section II.3], we have $\mathcal{D} = \text{conv}(\mathcal{S} \cap \partial \mathcal{D})$. In particular, \mathcal{S} carries all the information regarding the extreme points of \mathcal{D} . In general, the variety \mathcal{S} may have several irreducible components, possibly of different dimension. In fact, it is a priori not clear whether \mathcal{S} coincides with $\text{Ext}_a \mathcal{D}$. We will prove some results in this direction in Section 2.2.2. In particular, Corollary 2.2.11 guarantees that when the discs are chosen generically, \mathcal{S} has dimension $d - 1$ (possibly with lower dimensional components) in \mathbb{C}^d if and only if the following non-degeneracy condition holds:

$$\sum_{m=1}^d (m-1)N_m \geq d-1. \quad (2.2.1)$$

Notice that this condition implies the non-degeneracy condition $\sum_1^d mN_m \geq d$ for the discotope, and it is immediately satisfied if $N_d \geq 1$.

Remark 2.2.2. In the special case of discotopes of type $\mathbf{N} = (0, \dots, 0, N)$, all the boundary points of \mathcal{D} are exposed and therefore \mathcal{S} coincides with $\text{Ext}_a \mathcal{D}$. Further, $\partial \mathcal{D}$ is smooth (see, e.g., [BJ17]), which guarantees that \mathcal{S} is irreducible: indeed, if it was reducible, any two irreducible components would intersect on $\partial \mathcal{D}$, in contradiction to its smoothness. Figure 2.2 shows a discotope \mathcal{D} obtained as the sum of three ellipses in \mathbb{R}^2 . The topological boundary $\partial \mathcal{D}$ is smooth and coincides with one of the connected components of the real locus of $\partial_a \mathcal{D}$. These properties are further discussed in Section 2.2.3.




Figure 2.2: A discotope of type $\mathbf{N} = (0, 3)$. Its algebraic boundary is an irreducible curve of degree 24. The dashed curves represent the real points of the algebraic boundary that are not part of the topological boundary of \mathcal{D} .

2.2.1. Joins of quadrics

If (2.2.1) holds with the reverse inequality, then we characterize the purely nonlinear part \mathcal{S} as an affine version of the geometric join of the quadrics $\partial_a D_i$. The theory is developed classically in the projective setting, see, e.g., [Rus16, Chapter 1] and [FOV99]. In this section we translate some of these projective notions to the affine space and apply them to \mathcal{S} .

Given two (complex) projective varieties $X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{P}^d$, their join is the projective variety $J(X, Y) = \{p \in \langle x, y \rangle : x \in X, y \in Y\}$. We are concerned with the properties of the join summarized in the following lemma, which is a consequence of [Har92, Example 18.17].

Lemma 2.2.3. Let $X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{P}^d$ be irreducible varieties. Then $J(X, Y)$ is irreducible. If $X \cap Y = \emptyset$ then $\dim J(X, Y) = \dim X + \dim Y + 1$. Furthermore, if $\dim X + \dim Y + 1 < d$, then $\deg(J(X, Y)) = \deg(X) \deg(Y)$.

We prove an affine version of Lemma 2.2.3, which will be useful to prove Theorem 2.2.5 below. Regard the affine space \mathbb{C}^d as an affine open subset of \mathbb{P}^d : for an affine variety $X \subseteq \mathbb{C}^d$, write $\overline{X} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^d$ for its projective closure and $X_\infty = \overline{X} \setminus X$ for its *hyperplane cut at infinity*. Given two affine varieties $X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{C}^d$, we say that X, Y do not intersect at infinity if $X_\infty \cap Y_\infty = \emptyset$. For two varieties $X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{C}^d$, write $\Sigma(X \times Y) = \overline{X + Y}$ for the Zariski closure of their Minkowski sum: this can be regarded as an affine version of the geometric join.

Proposition 2.2.4. Let $X, Y \subseteq \mathbb{C}^d$ be irreducible affine varieties, not intersecting at infinity and such that $\dim X + \dim Y < d$. Then the variety $\Sigma(X \times Y)$ is irreducible, with $\dim \Sigma(X \times Y) = \dim X + \dim Y$ and $\deg \Sigma(X \times Y) = \deg(X) \deg(Y)$.

Proof. $\Sigma(X \times Y)$ is the closure of the image of the addition map $\Sigma : X \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^d$ defined by $\Sigma(x, y) = x + y$. Since X, Y are irreducible, $\Sigma(X \times Y)$ is irreducible as well. Let Z, Z' be two 1-dimensional vector spaces and consider $\mathbb{P}^{d+1} = \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^d \oplus Z \oplus Z')$ with homogeneous coordinates x_1, \dots, x_d, z, z' . Reembed X, Y in \mathbb{P}^{d+1} as follows:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} X & \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{d+1} & Y \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{d+1} \\ x & \mapsto (x, 1, 0), & y \mapsto (y, 0, 1); \end{array}$$

denote by $\overline{X}, \overline{Y}$ the closures (in the Zariski topology of \mathbb{P}^{d+1}) of the two images.

Observe that $\overline{X}, \overline{Y}$ are disjoint. Indeed, if $p \in \overline{X} \cap \overline{Y}$, then in coordinates one has $z(p) = z'(p) = 0$; hence p belongs to the intersection $X_\infty \cap Y_\infty$ of the two hyperplane cuts at infinity, which is empty by hypothesis. Therefore $\overline{X} \cap \overline{Y} = \emptyset$. By Lemma 2.2.3, the join $J(\overline{X}, \overline{Y})$ is irreducible, with $\dim J(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) = \dim \overline{X} + \dim \overline{Y} + 1$. Moreover, since $\dim \overline{X} + \dim \overline{Y} + 1 < d + 1$, we obtain $\deg J(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) = \deg(\overline{X}) \deg(\overline{Y})$.

Now, one can check explicitly in coordinates that

$$\Sigma(X \times Y) = J(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) \cap \{z = z' \neq 0\};$$

in other words, $\Sigma(X \times Y)$ is an affine chart of the hyperplane section $\{z = z'\}$ of $J(\overline{X}, \overline{Y})$. Note that $J(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) \cap \{z = z'\}$ is irreducible. To see this, observe that in the affine chart $\{z \neq 0\}$ it coincides with $\Sigma(X \times Y)$ which is irreducible; therefore other irreducible components would be supported at $z = z' = 0$. However, there is no line $L = \langle x, y \rangle$ with $x \in \overline{X}$ and $y \in \overline{Y}$ such that $L \cap \{z = z' = 0\} \neq \emptyset$, unless $x \in X_\infty$ or $y \in Y_\infty$. This shows that $J(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) \cap \{z = z' = 0\} = J(X_\infty, Y_\infty)$. Since

$$\dim J(X_\infty, Y_\infty) \leq \dim X_\infty + \dim Y_\infty + 1 = \dim J(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) - 2,$$

$J(X_\infty, Y_\infty)$ is not an irreducible component of a hyperplane section of $J(\overline{X}, \overline{Y})$. This proves that $J(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) \cap \{z = z'\}$ is irreducible, hence its affine chart on $\{z = z' \neq 0\}$ is irreducible as well. We conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \Sigma(X \times Y) &= \dim J(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) - 1 = \dim X + \dim Y, \\ \deg \Sigma(X \times Y) &= \deg J(\overline{X}, \overline{Y}) = \deg(X) \deg(Y). \end{aligned}$$

□

Applying Proposition 2.2.4 iteratively to the boundaries of the discs defining the discotope, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 2.2.5. Let $\mathbf{N} = (0, N_2, \dots, N_d) \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$ be such that $\sum_{m=1}^d (m-1)N_m \leq d-1$. Let \mathcal{D} be a generic discotope in \mathbb{R}^d of type \mathbf{N} . Then \mathcal{S} is irreducible of degree 2^N , where $N = \sum N_m$ is the number of discs defining \mathcal{D} .

Proof. Let D_1, \dots, D_N be the discs defining the discotope and let $d_i = \dim \langle D_i \rangle$; in particular $\dim \partial_a D_i = d_i - 1$. For $n = 1, \dots, N$, let

$$X_n = \Sigma \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \partial_a D_i \right).$$

First notice $X_N = \mathcal{S}$. The inclusion $\mathcal{S} \subseteq X_N$ is clear by the definition of \mathcal{S} . For the other inclusion, we show that there is a (real) Euclidean open subset $U \subseteq \prod \partial D_i$ such that $\Sigma(U) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$; passing to the Zariski closure we obtain the equality. Consider $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N) \in \prod \partial D_i$, and for every i write $T_{\xi_i} \partial D_i$ for the (real) tangent space at ξ_i ; note $\dim T_{\xi_i} \partial D_i = d_i - 1$, hence $\langle T_{\xi_i} \partial D_i : i = 1, \dots, N \rangle$ is a proper linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^d . Let $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a unit vector such that the hyperplane u^\perp contains $\langle T_{\xi_i} \partial D_i : i = 1, \dots, N \rangle$. Up to replacing ξ_i with $-\xi_i$, assume $\langle u, \xi_i \rangle \geq 0$. Let $p = \Sigma(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \xi_1 + \dots + \xi_N$. By definition $p \in X_N$; moreover $p \in \partial \mathcal{D}$, because

$$\langle u, p \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N \langle u, \xi_i \rangle \geq \sum_{i=1}^N \langle u, \tilde{\xi}_i \rangle = \langle u, \tilde{p} \rangle$$

for any other point $\tilde{p} = \tilde{\xi}_1 + \dots + \tilde{\xi}_N$ of the discotope. This shows that p belongs to the face of \mathcal{D} exposed by u , and in particular to the boundary of \mathcal{D} . Therefore $p \in \mathcal{S}$. We conclude that $X_N = \mathcal{S}$.

Next, we show that for every n , X_{n-1} and $\partial_a D_n$ have no intersection at infinity, for a generic choice of the discs. Having empty intersection at infinity is an open condition on the parameter space of the embeddings of the discs; hence, in order to show that there is no intersection at infinity for a generic choice of embeddings, it suffices to exhibit a choice for which this property is verified.

By assumption, $\sum_1^N (d_i - 1) \leq d - 1$; let $\delta = \max\{0, (\sum_1^N d_i) - d\}$ and notice $\delta \leq N - 1$. Then, one can choose the embeddings of D_1, \dots, D_N so that the following properties hold:

- if $n = 1, \dots, \delta + 1$, then $\dim(\langle D_1, \dots, D_{n-1} \rangle \cap \langle D_n \rangle) = \dim(\langle D_{n-1} \rangle \cap \langle D_n \rangle) = 1$,
- if $n = \delta + 2, \dots, N$, then $\langle D_1, \dots, D_{n-1} \rangle \cap \langle D_n \rangle = 0$.

With this choice of embeddings, we show that for every n , X_{n-1} and $\partial_a D_n$ have no intersection at infinity. Write $X_{n-1,\infty}$ and $\partial_a D_{n,\infty}$ for the two components at infinity; they are subvarieties of the projective space $\mathbb{P}(\langle D_1, \dots, D_n \rangle)$. Their intersection is a subvariety of $\mathbb{P}(\langle D_1, \dots, D_{n-1} \rangle) \cap \mathbb{P}(\langle D_n \rangle) = \mathbb{P}(\langle D_{n-1} \rangle \cap \langle D_n \rangle)$. If $n \leq \delta + 1$, $\mathbb{P}(\langle D_{n-1} \rangle \cap \langle D_n \rangle)$ is a single point, and such point does not belong to $\partial_a D_{n,\infty}$; if $n \geq \delta + 2$, then $\mathbb{P}(\langle D_{n-1} \rangle \cap \langle D_n \rangle)$ is empty. This proves the claim.

Finally, we use induction on n to show that $\dim X_n = \sum_{i=1}^n (d_i - 1)$ and $\deg X_n = 2^n$. The statement is clear for $n = 1$. Assume $n \geq 2$. We have $X_n = \Sigma(X_{n-1} \times \partial_a D_n)$. Since X_{n-1} and $\partial_a D_n$ do not intersect at infinity, Proposition 2.2.4 applies, hence

$$\begin{aligned} \dim X_n &= \dim X_{n-1} + \dim \partial_a D_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (d_i - 1) + (d_n - 1) = \sum_{i=1}^n (d_i - 1), \\ \deg X_n &= \deg X_{n-1} \cdot \deg \partial_a D_n = 2^{n-1} \cdot 2 = 2^n. \end{aligned}$$

For $n = N$, we obtain the desired result for \mathcal{S} . □

Example 2.2.6. Consider the following discs in \mathbb{R}^6 :

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &= \{(x_1, \dots, x_6) : x_3 = x_4 = x_5 = x_6 = 0, x_1^2 + x_2^2 \leq 1\}, \\ D_2 &= \{(x_1, \dots, x_6) : x_1 = x_2 = x_5 = x_6 = 0, x_3^2 + x_4^2 \leq 1\}, \\ D_3 &= \{(x_1, \dots, x_6) : x_1 - x_3 = x_2 = x_4 = 0, (x_1 + x_3)^2 + x_5^2 + x_6^2 \leq 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{D} = D_1 + D_2 + D_3$. This discotope is full dimensional but the condition (2.2.1) holds with reverse inequality: indeed, $1 + 1 + 2 < 5$. Thus, by Theorem 2.2.5, the purely nonlinear part $\mathcal{S} = \overline{\partial_a D_1 + \partial_a D_2 + \partial_a D_3}$ is irreducible, of codimension 2 and degree 8. Its ideal is generated by one cubic and three quartic polynomials:

$$\begin{aligned} &4x_1^2x_3 + 4x_2^2x_3 - 4x_1x_3^2 - 4x_1x_4^2 + x_1x_5^2 - x_3x_5^2 + x_1x_6^2 - x_3x_6^2 + 3x_1 - 3x_3, \\ &16x_3^4 + 32x_3^2x_4^2 + 16x_4^4 + 8x_3^2x_5^2 - 8x_4^2x_5^2 + x_5^4 + 8x_3^2x_6^2 - 8x_4^2x_6^2 + 2x_5^2x_6^2 + x_6^4 - 40x_3^2 - 24x_4^2 + 6x_5^2 + 6x_6^2 + 9, \\ &16x_1^4 + 32x_1^2x_2^2 + 16x_2^4 + 8x_1^2x_5^2 - 8x_2^2x_5^2 + x_5^4 + 8x_1^2x_6^2 - 8x_2^2x_6^2 + 2x_5^2x_6^2 + x_6^4 - 40x_1^2 - 24x_2^2 + 6x_5^2 + 6x_6^2 + 9, \\ &16x_1^2x_3^2 + 16x_2^2x_3^2 + 16x_1^2x_4^2 + 16x_2^2x_4^2 - 4x_1^2x_5^2 - 4x_2^2x_5^2 - 4x_3^2x_5^2 - 4x_4^2x_5^2 - 4x_1^2x_6^2 - 4x_2^2x_6^2 - 4x_3^2x_6^2 - 4x_4^2x_6^2 + \\ &x_5^4 + 2x_5^2x_6^2 + x_6^4 + 16x_1x_3x_5^2 + 16x_1x_3x_6^2 - 12x_1^2 - 12x_2^2 - 16x_1x_3 - 12x_3^2 - 12x_4^2 + 6x_5^2 + 6x_6^2 + 9. \end{aligned}$$

◆

2.2.2. Exposed points of the discotope

In the rest of the chapter, we assume that (2.2.1) is satisfied. Recall that all extreme points of \mathcal{D} , hence all its exposed points, are contained in \mathcal{S} . In this section, we prove that they form a full dimensional subset of the boundary of the discotope; in particular, at least one irreducible component of \mathcal{S} of dimension $d - 1$ is the Zariski closure of a subset of exposed points. Further, we prove that exposed points are generically exposed by a unique vector in S^{d-1} . First, we give a general result which will be useful in the following.

Lemma 2.2.7. Let K_1, \dots, K_N be convex bodies in \mathbb{R}^d . Consider $p = p_1 + \dots + p_N \in \partial K$ where K is the Minkowski sum of the K_i 's, and assume that p_i is a smooth point of ∂K_i for every $i = 1, \dots, N$. Fix $u \in S^{d-1}$. Then $T_{p_i}\partial K_i \subseteq u^\perp$ for every i if and only if p belongs to the face of K exposed by u .

Proof. Assume $T_{p_i}\partial K_i \subseteq u^\perp$ for every i for some $u \in S^{d-1}$. Then one of these vectors u satisfies $p_i \in K_i^u$ for every i . As a consequence, $p \in K^u$. Conversely, let $p \in K^u$. Therefore, $h_K(u) = \langle p, u \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^N \langle p_i, u \rangle$ and for every i and for every $\tilde{p}_i \in D_i$,

$$\langle p_i, u \rangle \geq \langle \tilde{p}_i, u \rangle.$$

Hence $h_{D_i}(u) = \langle p_i, u \rangle$. There are two possible situations: either $u \perp \langle D_i \rangle$, or p_i is exposed by u . In both cases it is clear that $T_{p_i}\partial K_i \subseteq u^\perp$. □

Proposition 2.2.8. Let $\Sigma : \prod_{i=1}^N \partial_a D_i \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^d$ be the restriction of the addition map to the algebraic boundaries of N generic discs in \mathbb{R}^d . Assume that (2.2.1) holds with strict inequality. Then

$$\Sigma^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \text{crit}(\Sigma).$$

Here $\text{crit}(\Sigma)$ denotes the critical locus, that is the variety of points $\xi \in \prod \partial_a D_i$ where the differential $d_\xi \Sigma$ does not have full rank.

Proof. Since (2.2.1) holds with strict inequality, for a generic $\xi \in \prod \partial_a D_i$ the differential $d_\xi \Sigma$ is surjective. By density, it is enough to check that $d_\xi \Sigma$ is not surjective at the real points of $\Sigma^{-1}(\mathcal{S})$. For every $\xi \in \prod \partial D_i$, the image of the differential $d_\xi \Sigma$ is the sum $T_{\xi_1} \partial D_1 + \dots + T_{\xi_N} \partial D_N$. If $\Sigma(\xi)$ belongs to the face \mathcal{D}^u , then by Lemma 2.2.7 $T_{\xi_i} \partial D_i \subseteq u^\perp$ for every i . In particular the differential is not surjective, hence ξ is a critical point of Σ . Passing to the Zariski closure, we obtain $\Sigma^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \text{crit}(\Sigma)$. \square

The next result identifies a region of $\partial \mathcal{D}$ of points exposed by a unique vector of S^{d-1} .

Lemma 2.2.9. Let \mathcal{D} be a generic discotope such that condition (2.2.1) is satisfied. Let $p \in \mathcal{D}^\partial \cap \partial \mathcal{D}$. The following are equivalent:

- there exists a unique $u \in S^{d-1}$ such that $p \in \mathcal{D}^u$;
- $p = \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_i$ for some $\xi_i \in \partial D_i$ such that $\text{codim} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N T_{\xi_i} \partial D_i \right) = 1$.

Let Ω be the set of points that satisfy either (hence both) these conditions; then Ω is non-empty and Euclidean open in $\mathcal{D}^\partial \cap \partial \mathcal{D}$.

Proof. The equivalence of the two conditions follows from Lemma 2.2.7. To show that Ω is non-empty, we construct a point in the following way. Consider a vector $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and let $p = \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_i = \mathcal{D}^u$. For the sake of notation, write $T_{\xi_i} = T_{\xi_i} \partial D_i$. Suppose that $L_\xi = T_{\xi_1} + \dots + T_{\xi_N}$ is a subspace of codimension $c \geq 2$. Since $u \in \mathcal{U}$, for every i we have $\langle D_i \rangle \not\subseteq L_\xi$. Condition (2.2.1) implies that $T_{\xi_1} \cap (T_{\xi_2} + \dots + T_{\xi_N}) = L' \neq \{0\}$, up to relabeling the discs. Let L'' be a complement of L' in T_{ξ_1} , so that

$$L' + L'' = T_{\xi_1} \quad \text{and} \quad L' \cap L'' = \{0\}.$$

Consider the set of points $\tilde{\xi}_1 \in \partial D_1$ such that $T_{\tilde{\xi}_1} \supseteq L''$ and let $\tilde{\xi} = (\tilde{\xi}_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_N)$. For a generic choice of such $\tilde{\xi}_1$ there exists $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $L_{\tilde{\xi}} \subseteq \tilde{u}^\perp$. Therefore the point $\tilde{p} = \tilde{\xi}_1 + \xi_2 + \dots + \xi_N$ is an exposed point of \mathcal{D} . Moreover, if $\tilde{\xi}_1 \neq \pm \xi_1$ then $\text{codim } L_{\tilde{\xi}} \leq c-1$. Repeating this argument one constructs a point ξ such that $\text{codim}(T_{\xi_1} + \dots + T_{\xi_N}) = 1$. The latter is a Zariski open condition, hence Ω is Euclidean open in $\mathcal{D}^\partial \cap \partial \mathcal{D}$. \square

Recall from Proposition 1.1.19 (iv), that the support function is differentiable at $u \in S^{d-1}$ if and only if the face K^u is a unique point; this point coincides with $\nabla h_K(u)$. In particular, $h_{\mathcal{D}}$ is differentiable at all points of \mathcal{U} . This will be useful in the next result, to prove that the set of exposed points of \mathcal{D} is full dimensional in its boundary.

Proposition 2.2.10. In the hypotheses of Lemma 2.2.9, there exists an open dense subset \mathcal{U}' of \mathcal{U} such that $\nabla h_{\mathcal{D}}|_{\mathcal{U}'}$ is one to one.

Proof. Fix $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and denote by p_u the point of the discotope exposed by u . Let $\xi_i \in \partial D_i$ be the unique point of the i -th disc such that $h_{D_i}(u) = \langle \xi_i, u \rangle$; then $p_u = \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_i$. The tangent space $T_{\xi_i} \partial D_i = u^\perp \cap \langle \mathcal{B}_i \rangle$ is a $(\dim D_i - 1)$ -dimensional subspace of u^\perp . Because of the non-degeneracy condition (2.2.1), there exists a Euclidean open and dense subset \mathcal{U}' of \mathcal{U} such that for all $u \in \mathcal{U}'$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N T_{\xi_i} \partial D_i = u^\perp. \tag{2.2.2}$$

If $u \in \mathcal{U}'$ then the support function of the discotope is smooth in a neighborhood of u , because $h_{\mathcal{D}}(u) = \sum h_{D_i}(u)$ and the h_{D_i} 's are smooth in a neighborhood of u . Hence we

have the following map

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla h_{\mathcal{D}}|_{\mathcal{U}'} : \mathcal{U}' &\rightarrow \partial \mathcal{D} \\ u &\mapsto \nabla h_{\mathcal{D}}(u) = p_u.\end{aligned}$$

Its image lies inside Ω because of (2.2.2). Since these are exactly the points exposed by only one direction, $\nabla h_{\mathcal{D}}|_{\mathcal{U}'}$ is one to one. \square

From Proposition 2.2.10, we see that $\nabla h_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{U}')$ is a set of exposed points which is open in $\partial \mathcal{D}$; in particular it has dimension $d - 1$. Moreover, $\nabla h_{\mathcal{D}}$ defines a diffeomorphism between \mathcal{U}' and its image, therefore $\nabla h_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{U}')$ consists of smooth points of $\partial_a \mathcal{D}$. A consequence of this is that the Zariski closure of the exposed points (or equivalently of the extreme points) contains at least one irreducible component of \mathcal{S} of dimension $d - 1$. This leads to the following result.

Corollary 2.2.11. Let \mathcal{D} be a generic discotope such that the non-degeneracy condition (2.2.1) holds. Then \mathcal{S} has at least one irreducible component of dimension $d - 1$ and this is an irreducible component of the algebraic boundary $\partial_a \mathcal{D}$.

In general, it is not clear whether \mathcal{S} has multiple irreducible components, possibly even of different dimension. Indeed, the set $\mathcal{D}^\partial = \Sigma(\prod_j \partial D_j)$, introduced in Definition 2.2.1, may intersect positive dimensional faces of \mathcal{D} . This might produce lower dimensional components of \mathcal{S} . We expect this not to be the case, as stated in Conjecture 2.2.22.

We conclude this section pointing out that in general some boundary points of \mathcal{D} can be exposed by more than one vector. These can be identified by the following condition. Set $L_i = \langle D_i \rangle$, so that L_1, \dots, L_N are N generic linear subspaces of \mathbb{R}^d . Consider the hyperplanes $H = u^\perp \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ for $u \in \mathcal{U}$; hence $\dim(H \cap L_i) = \dim L_i - 1$ for every i . A point $p = \mathcal{D}^u$ is exposed by more than one vector if and only if H satisfies

$$\dim((H \cap L_1) + \dots + (H \cap L_N)) \leq d - 2. \quad (2.2.3)$$

Indeed, when (2.2.3) holds, there exists a linear subspace V of dimension at least one such that $H = (H \cap L_1) + \dots + (H \cap L_N) + V$. By perturbing V we obtain a family of hyperplanes that expose the point p . The condition (2.2.3) can be formulated in terms of a degeneracy property of an associated polymatroid, but a full characterization seems difficult in general. We point out that such a configuration of linear spaces is connected to objects that are relevant in coding theory. If the dimension in (2.2.3) is $d - 1$ for all hyperplanes H , the set $\{L_1, \dots, L_N\}$ is called a *hyperplane generating set* (see [FS14] for a study of the case where $\dim L_i = 2$ for all i). They have been used in [DGMP11], where they are called ‘strong generating sets’, to construct saturating sets in a field extension, which correspond geometrically to covering codes. In [ABN22], the authors call them ‘cutting blocking sets’ and prove that they correspond to minimal linear codes, i.e., those codes whose codewords are all minimal with respect to the inclusion of their supports.

Example 2.2.12. In the case $N = 2$, points exposed by more than one vector always occur. Let $d_1 = \dim D_1$, $d_2 = \dim D_2$. By the non-degeneracy condition (2.2.1), $d_1 + d_2 \geq d + 1$. Let $L_i = \langle D_i \rangle$; by genericity $\dim(L_1 \cap L_2) = d_1 + d_2 - d$. For a hyperplane H such that $\dim(L_i \cap H) = d_i - 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dim((L_1 \cap H) + (L_2 \cap H)) &= \\ (d_1 - 1) + (d_2 - 1) - \dim(L_1 \cap L_2 \cap H) &= \begin{cases} d - 2 & \text{if } L_1 \cap L_2 \subseteq H, \\ d - 1 & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, a point $p \in \mathcal{D}$ exposed by a hyperplane H such that $L_1 \cap L_2 \not\subseteq H$, is exposed only by such hyperplane. On the other hand, if p is exposed by a hyperplane H with $L_1 \cap L_2 \subseteq H$, then there is a cone of hyperplanes \tilde{H} with $L_1 \cap L_2 \subseteq \tilde{H}$ exposing p as well. The case $d = 3$, $d_1 = d_2 = 2$ is shown in Figure 2.1, right. This discotope \mathcal{D}' is defined in Example 2.1.10; in this case $L_1 \cap L_2$ is the vertical x_3 -axis. The plane $\{x_3 = 0\}$ is partitioned into four 2-dimensional cones and every u in the interior of the same cone exposes the same point. These four points are the pairwise intersection of two adjacent blue discs. \blacklozenge

2.2.3. Two-dimensional discs

In this section, we consider discotopes $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ of type $(0, N, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{N}^d$, that are realized as sum of 2-dimensional discs, as in Figure 2.3. If $N \leq d - 1$, the variety \mathcal{S} is




Figure 2.3: The dice, a discotope of type $(0, 3, 0)$.

described by Theorem 2.2.5. Thus assume that $N \geq d - 1$, which ensures that $\dim \mathcal{S} = d - 1$. We will prove that the purely nonlinear part \mathcal{S} is irreducible, hence it is the Zariski closure of the extreme points of \mathcal{D} . In addition, we will provide an upper bound for the degree of this component of the algebraic boundary.

Theorem 2.2.13. Let \mathcal{D} be a generic discotope of type $(0, N, 0, \dots, 0)$ in \mathbb{R}^d , with $N \geq d - 1$. Let \mathcal{S} be the purely nonlinear part of \mathcal{D} . Then \mathcal{S} is irreducible, and coincides with $\text{Ext}_a \mathcal{D}$. Moreover,

$$\deg(\mathcal{S}) \leq 2^N \cdot \binom{N}{d-1}.$$

Let D_1, \dots, D_N be 2-dimensional discs in \mathbb{R}^d in general position. For every index $j = 1, \dots, N$, consider the (complexification of the) embedding $A_j : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^d$ defining the generalized disc D_j ; let $\mathcal{B}_j = \{b_1^{(j)}, b_2^{(j)}\}$ be the associated basis of the image of A_j . Then, the product $\prod_{j=1}^N \partial_a D_j$ is the image of the restriction of $A = A_1 \times \dots \times A_N$ to $\prod\{c_j^2 + s_j^2 = 1\} \subseteq (\mathbb{C}^2)^N$. Here (c_j, s_j) are the coordinates on the j -th copy of \mathbb{C}^2 . Consider the addition map

$$\Sigma : \partial_a D_1 \times \dots \times \partial_a D_N \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^d.$$

The critical locus of the restriction of $\Sigma \circ A$ is the variety defined by the ideal

$$I = \Delta + (c_1^2 + s_1^2 - 1, \dots, c_N^2 + s_N^2 - 1) \subseteq \mathbb{C}[c_1, s_1, \dots, c_N, s_N] \quad (2.2.4)$$

where Δ is the ideal of the $d \times d$ minors of the $N \times d$ matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} b_2^{(1)} c_1 - b_1^{(1)} s_1 \\ \vdots \\ b_2^{(N)} c_N - b_1^{(N)} s_N \end{pmatrix}.$$

This is the (transpose of the) matrix representing the differential of the restriction of $\Sigma \circ A$. Since A is a linear embedding, $\text{crit } \Sigma$ is irreducible if and only if $\text{crit}(\Sigma \circ A)$ is irreducible, and their degrees coincide.

We will prove the irreducibility of $\text{crit } \Sigma$ and compute its degree by first studying the variety $\mathcal{V}(\Delta)$. We show that it is irreducible and that its degree coincides with the one of the classical determinantal variety of $N \times d$ matrices of submaximal rank. This is a consequence of Lemma 2.2.15, which provides a more general result on special linear sections of the determinantal variety. This topic is object of classical study, see [Eis88], [Eis05, Section 6B]. However, those results rely on a specific condition, called 1-genericity, which is not satisfied in our setting. We state the following version of Bertini's Theorem for projective varieties, which can be obtained from [Jou80, Theorem 6.3] applied to the special case of quasi-projective varieties.

Lemma 2.2.14. Let X be an irreducible projective variety. Let \mathcal{L} be a line bundle on X defining a map $\Phi : X \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{h_0(\mathcal{L})-1}$ such that $\dim \Phi(X) \geq s+1$. Let $D_1, \dots, D_s \in |\mathcal{L}|$ be generic elements of the linear system defined by \mathcal{L} . Let $Y = D_1 \cap \dots \cap D_s$ and let B be the base locus of \mathcal{L} . Then $\overline{Y \setminus B}$ is irreducible of codimension s in X .

Proof. The proof follows from [Jou80, Theorem 6.3 (4)] applied to the quasi-projective variety $\tilde{X} = X \setminus B$ and the morphism $\Phi|_{\tilde{X}}$. \square

Informally, this result guarantees that the intersection of generic divisors is irreducible and of the expected codimension outside of the base locus of the line bundle. We use Lemma 2.2.14 to prove that certain non-generic linear sections of the classical determinantal variety are irreducible and of the expected dimension. Let $\text{Mat}_{n \times m}$ denote the (complex) vector space of $n \times m$ matrices and let

$$\mathcal{M}_r^{n \times m} = \{A \in \mathbb{P}\text{Mat}_{n \times m} : \text{rank}(A) \leq r\}$$

be the r -th determinantal variety. Use coordinates x_{ij} on $\text{Mat}_{n \times m}$, where x_{ij} is the entry at row i and column j .

Lemma 2.2.15. Let $m, n, r \geq 2$ be integers with $r < m, n$. Let s be an integer $1 \leq s < r$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $\ell_1^{(i)}, \dots, \ell_s^{(i)}$ be generic linear forms on $\text{Mat}_{n \times m}$ only involving the variables $\{x_{ij} : j = 1, \dots, m\}$ of the i -th row. Let

$$\mathcal{Y}_r^{n \times m} = \mathcal{M}_r^{n \times m} \cap \left\{ A \in \mathbb{P}\text{Mat}_{n \times m} : \ell_p^{(i)}(A) = 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n, p = 1, \dots, s \right\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{Y}_r^{n \times m}$ is irreducible and of codimension ns in $\mathcal{M}_r^{n \times m}$.

Proof. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, let

$$\Gamma_i = \{A \in \mathbb{P}\text{Mat}_{n \times m} : a_{ij} = 0 \text{ for all } j = 1, \dots, m\}$$

be the linear subspace of matrices having zero i -th row. Let $\Gamma = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \Gamma_i$. For $t = 0, \dots, n$, consider the following variety

$$\mathcal{Y}^{(t)} = \mathcal{M}_r^{n \times m} \cap \left\{ A \in \mathbb{P}\text{Mat}_{n \times m} : \ell_p^{(i)}(A) = 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, t, p = 1, \dots, s \right\};$$

we have $\mathcal{M}_r^{n \times m} = \mathcal{Y}^{(0)} \supseteq \mathcal{Y}^{(1)} \supseteq \dots \supseteq \mathcal{Y}^{(n)} = \mathcal{Y}_r^{n \times m}$.

Let $\Phi_i : \mathbb{P}\text{Mat}_{n \times m} \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^{m-1}$ be the projection on the i -th row; Φ_i is a rational map, whose indeterminacy locus is Γ_i . Let $\mathcal{L}_i = \Phi_i^*\mathcal{O}(1)$ be the pullback of the hyperplane bundle on \mathbb{P}^{m-1} : global sections of \mathcal{L}_i are linear forms only involving the variables of the i -th row; in particular the base locus of \mathcal{L}_i is exactly Γ_i . For a fixed n , we use induction on t to show that $\mathcal{Y}^{(t)}$ is irreducible up to components contained in Γ , in the sense that $\mathcal{Y}^{(t)} \setminus \Gamma$ is irreducible.

If $t = 0$, then $\mathcal{Y}^{(t)} = \mathcal{M}_r^{n \times m}$ is irreducible. If $t \geq 1$, then $\mathcal{Y}^{(t)}$ is the intersection of s divisors $D_1, \dots, D_s \in |\mathcal{L}_i|_{\mathcal{Y}^{(t-1)}}|$ on $\mathcal{Y}^{(t-1)}$, where $D_p = \{\ell_p^{(t)} = 0\}$ and $\mathcal{L}_i|_{\mathcal{Y}^{(t-1)}}$ is the restriction of \mathcal{L}_i to $\mathcal{Y}^{(t-1)}$. By the induction hypothesis, $\mathcal{Y}^{(t-1)}$ is a union of irreducible components, only one of which is not contained in Γ . In order to apply Lemma 2.2.14, we need $\dim \Phi_t(\mathcal{Y}^{(t-1)}) \geq s+1$. In fact we show that $\Phi_t(\mathcal{Y}^{(t-1)}) = \mathbb{P}^{m-1}$.

If $t \leq r$, this is clear because for every choice of the first t rows, the corresponding matrix can be completed to a rank r matrix. If $t > r$, notice that every r -dimensional subspace $E \subset \mathbb{C}^m$ can be realized as the span of the first $t-1$ rows of a matrix in $\mathcal{Y}^{(t-1)}$. Since $s < r$, for every $i = 1, \dots, t-1$ the intersection of E with the subspace of \mathbb{C}^m cut out by the linear forms $\ell_1^{(i)}, \dots, \ell_s^{(i)}$ is non-trivial. Consider the matrix $A \in \mathcal{Y}^{(t-1)}$ whose i -th row is a generic element of this intersection for $i < t$, and suitably completed to a rank r matrix. By the genericity of the linear forms the span of the first $t-1$ rows of A is exactly E . Fix now $v \in \mathbb{C}^m$ and let E be an r -dimensional subspace containing v . The associated matrix A constructed above can be chosen so that the t -th row coincides with v . In this way, $\Phi_t(A) = v$ and $\dim \Phi_t(\mathcal{Y}^{(t-1)}) = m-1 \geq s+1$ follows.

Therefore, Lemma 2.2.14 applies and we obtain that $\mathcal{Y}^{(t)}$ is irreducible up to components contained in the base locus of \mathcal{L}_i , that is $\Gamma_i \subseteq \Gamma$. This proves the desired property for $\mathcal{Y}^{(t)}$ and, in particular, shows that $\mathcal{Y}_r^{n \times m}$ is irreducible up to components contained in Γ . For every t , let $Y^{(t)}$ be the component of $\mathcal{Y}^{(t)}$ not contained in Γ . In particular, $Y^{(t)}$ is not contained in the base locus of $\mathcal{L}_i|_{Y^{(t-1)}}$; therefore, by Lemma 2.2.14, it has the expected codimension. This provides $\text{codim}_{\mathcal{M}_r^{n \times m}}(Y^{(t)}) = ts$.

Finally, we prove that in fact $\mathcal{Y}_r^{n \times m}$ does not have components contained in Γ , thus it is irreducible. This is proved by induction on n . The base case of the induction is $n = r$. In this case $\mathcal{M}_r^{n \times m}$ is the whole space $\mathbb{P}\text{Mat}_{r \times m}$ and $\mathcal{Y}_r^{n \times m}$ is the transverse intersection of ns linear spaces. Therefore it is irreducible.

Let $n > r$. Suppose by contradiction that $\mathcal{Y}_r^{n \times m}$ has at least one component, denoted by C , contained in Γ . Then $C \subseteq \Gamma_i$ for some i ; without loss of generality, suppose that $i = n$. Identify the space $\text{Mat}_{(n-1) \times m}$ with the subspace of $\text{Mat}_{n \times m}$ having the n -th row equal to 0. Under this identification, the component C is contained in $\mathcal{Y}_r^{(n-1) \times m}$, therefore $\dim C \leq \dim \mathcal{Y}_r^{(n-1) \times m}$. By the induction hypothesis, $\mathcal{Y}_r^{(n-1) \times m}$ is irreducible, so it coincides with its only component not contained in Γ and in particular it has the expected codimension in $\mathcal{M}_r^{(n-1) \times m}$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \dim C &\leq \dim \mathcal{Y}_r^{(n-1) \times m} = \dim \mathcal{M}_r^{(n-1) \times m} - (n-1)s \\ &= r((n-1) + m - r) - (n-1)s \\ &= r(n+m-r) - ns - (r-s) = \dim \mathcal{M}_r^{n \times m} - ns - (r-s). \end{aligned}$$

This implies $\text{codim}_{\mathcal{M}_r^{n \times m}}(C) > ns$ in contradiction to the fact that $\mathcal{Y}_r^{n \times m}$ is cut out by ns equations in $\mathcal{M}_r^{n \times m}$. We conclude that $\mathcal{Y}_r^{n \times m}$ has no components contained in Γ ; thus it is irreducible. \square

Remark 2.2.16. In Lemma 2.2.15, it is not necessary to have the same number of linear relations on every row. The same argument applies if, on the i -th row, one has s_i linear relations, with $s_i < r$ for every i . Then $\mathcal{Y}_r^{n \times m}$ is irreducible of codimension $\sum s_i$ in $\mathcal{M}_r^{n \times m}$.

Lemma 2.2.15 shows that linear sections of the determinantal variety only involving a single row are *generic enough* in the sense that they preserve irreducibility and have the expected dimension. We apply Lemma 2.2.15 to the variety $\mathcal{V}(\Delta)$: in this case $r = d - 1$ and $s = d - 2$.

Proposition 2.2.17. The variety $\text{crit}(\Sigma)$ is irreducible. It has dimension $d - 1$, and degree $2^N \binom{N}{d-1}$.

Proof. Since $A = A_1 \times \dots \times A_N$ is a linear embedding, it suffices to prove the statement for $\text{crit}(\Sigma \circ A)$, that is the variety defined by the ideal I in (2.2.4). By Lemma 2.2.15, the variety $\mathcal{V}(\Delta) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^2 \times \dots \times \mathbb{C}^2$ is irreducible of dimension $N + d - 1$. Consider its closure in $\mathbb{P}^2 \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^2$, where the j -th copy of \mathbb{P}^2 has homogeneous coordinates $[c_j, s_j, z_j]$. For every $j = 1, \dots, N$, the polynomial $c_j^2 + s_j^2 - 1$ on \mathbb{C}^2 defines a homogeneous quadric $\{c_j^2 + s_j^2 - z_j^2 = 0\}$ on \mathbb{P}^2 . This gives a generic element of $|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(2)|$, which pulls back to a generic element $Q_j \in |\mathcal{O}_{(\mathbb{P}^2)^N}(0, \dots, 0, 2, 0, \dots, 0)|$. Recursively applying Lemma 2.2.14, for every j we have that $\mathcal{V}(\Delta) \cap Q_1 \cap \dots \cap Q_j$ is irreducible of dimension $N - j + d - 1$. For $j = N$, we obtain the irreducibility of $\mathcal{V}(\Delta) \cap Q_1 \cap \dots \cap Q_N$.

As a consequence, $\text{crit}(\Sigma \circ A) = \mathcal{V}(I)$ is irreducible of dimension $d - 1$. In particular, the intersection of the determinantal variety $\mathcal{V}(\Delta)$ with the quadrics is dimensionally transverse. Moreover, $\mathcal{V}(\Delta)$ is arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay, see e.g. [ACGH85, Chapter 2]. Therefore [EH16, Corollary 2.5] guarantees

$$\deg(\text{crit}(\Sigma \circ A)) = \deg(\mathcal{V}(\Delta)) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^N \deg(\partial_a D_i) = \binom{N}{d-1} \cdot 2^N.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2.2.13. The irreducibility of $\text{crit}(\Sigma)$ implies the irreducibility of its image under the addition map Σ , that is the purely nonlinear part \mathcal{S} . By the linearity of Σ , we obtain an upper bound on the degree of \mathcal{S} :

$$\deg(\mathcal{S}) \leq 2^N \cdot \binom{N}{d-1}.$$

From the discussion in Section 2.2.2, the set of extreme points of \mathcal{D} is contained in \mathcal{S} and contains a Zariski dense subset of (at least) one of the components of \mathcal{S} . By irreducibility, we conclude the proof. □

We end this section with some observations in the case of discotopes of type $\mathbf{N} = (0, N)$ in \mathbb{R}^2 . In this case, we have $\partial_a \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{S}$, which is an irreducible curve of degree $2^N \cdot N$. The real points of $\text{crit} \Sigma$ come naturally in 2^{N-1} connected components, described as follows. Given a line $\ell \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ through the origin, there are exactly two points $\pm p_i$ on each ellipse ∂D_i such that $T_{\pm p_i} \partial D_i$ is parallel to ℓ . The choice of these signs (up to a global sign) determines locally a parametrization of the real points of $\text{crit} \Sigma$, which has 2^{N-1} connected components. After the projection to \mathbb{R}^2 , many components of the real points of $\text{crit} \Sigma$ can be mapped to the same connected component of the real points of \mathcal{S} . This can be visualized in the example in Figure 2.2, where the red curve \mathcal{S} is union of $2^2 = 4$ subsets homeomorphic to circles: these are the images of the 4 connected components of $\text{crit} \Sigma$. Exactly one of them is the topological boundary of \mathcal{D} .

Furthermore the degree of the map $\Sigma : \text{crit}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is odd. By a density argument, this can be computed by considering the fiber over a generic point $p \in \partial\mathcal{D}$. The fiber contains a single real point (ξ_1, \dots, ξ_N) where $\xi_j \in \partial D_j$ is the unique point exposed by the vector $u \in S^1$ which exposes p ; the non-real points of $\Sigma^{-1}(p)$ come in pairs of complex conjugates, therefore there is an even number of them. We conclude that the fiber $\Sigma^{-1}(p)$ consists of an odd number of points, hence the degree of Σ is odd.

Remark 2.2.18. In the case $d = 2$ the degree of the critical locus of Σ is $2^N \cdot N$ and the degree of the map $\Sigma : \text{crit} \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is odd. Write $N = 2^\kappa \cdot M$, with M odd. Then $\deg(\mathcal{S})$ is necessarily an odd multiple of $2^N \cdot 2^\kappa$. A consequence of this is that the unit ball of the L^4 -norm $\{x_1^4 + x_2^4 \leq 1\}$ is not a discotope. If it was a discotope, it would be of type $(0, N)$ for some $N \geq 2$. But this discussion shows that no curve of degree 4 is the boundary of a discotope of type $(0, N)$ in \mathbb{R}^2 .

Example 2.2.19 (The dice). We provide an extended analysis of the algebro-geometric features of the surface $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^3$ for a specific discotope of type $\mathbf{N} = (0, 3, 0)$. Notice that, up to changing coordinates, the generic case of a discotope of type $\mathbf{N} = (0, 3, 0)$ can be reduced to the case where the three generalized discs of interest lie in the three coordinate hyperplanes. We further restrict to the case of three unit discs:

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &= \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) : x_1 = 0; x_2^2 + x_3^2 \leq 1\}, \\ D_2 &= \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) : x_2 = 0; x_1^2 + x_3^2 \leq 1\}, \\ D_3 &= \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) : x_3 = 0; x_1^2 + x_2^2 \leq 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ be the resulting discotope shown in Figure 2.3, that we call *dice*, and let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^3$ be its purely nonlinear part. By a direct computation, or by Theorem 2.2.13, \mathcal{S} is an irreducible surface of degree 24. Its defining polynomial $F_{\mathcal{S}}$ is

$$x_1^{24} + 4x_1^{22}x_2^2 + 2x_1^{20}x_2^4 + \dots + 728x_3^4 - 160x_1^2 - 160x_2^2 - 160x_3^2 + 16,$$

which is made of $91 + 78 + 66 + 55 + 45 + 36 + 28 + 21 + 15 + 10 + 6 + 3 + 1 = 455$ monomials, here distinguished by their degree. Because of the symmetries of the problem, all the monomials appearing in $F_{\mathcal{S}}$ are squares. Since \mathcal{S} is the image of a polynomial map, $F_{\mathcal{S}}$ can be computed via elimination theory [CLO15, Section 4.4, Theorem 3]. More precisely, consider the ideal

$$J = I + \left((x_1, x_2, x_3) - \sum_{i=1}^3 b_1^{(i)} c_i + b_2^{(i)} s_i \right) \subset \mathbb{C}[x_i, c_i, s_i : i = 1, 2, 3]$$

where $b_1^{(1)} = b_2^{(3)} = (0, 1, 0)$, $b_1^{(2)} = b_2^{(1)} = (0, 0, 1)$, $b_1^{(3)} = b_2^{(2)} = (1, 0, 0)$ and I is the ideal in (2.2.4). Then $F_{\mathcal{S}}$ is the unique (up to scaling) generator of $J \cap \mathbb{C}[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ and it can be computed using a computer algebra software, e.g., **Macaulay2** [GS].

One can verify that the surface \mathcal{S} is singular in codimension 1. The singular locus is highly reducible and has degree 294. Our next goal is to construct a desingularization of \mathcal{S} . Consider the rational parametrization of the (complex) circle $\psi : t \mapsto (\frac{1-t^2}{1+t^2}, \frac{2t}{1-t^2})$. Let $\Sigma \circ (\psi_1 \times \psi_2 \times \psi_3)$ be the composition of the addition map with the parametrization of

the three circles $\partial_a D_i$; explicitly

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} & \xrightarrow{\psi_1 \times \psi_2 \times \psi_3} & \mathbb{C}^3 \\ (t_1, t_2, t_3) & \mapsto & \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \frac{1-t_2^2}{1+t_1^2} \\ \frac{2t_1}{1+t_1^2} \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{c} \frac{2t_2}{1+t_2^2} \\ 0 \\ \frac{1-t_2^2}{1+t_2^2} \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{c} \frac{1-t_3^2}{1+t_3^2} \\ \frac{2t_3}{1+t_3^2} \\ 0 \end{array} \right) \right) \\ & & \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{c} y_1 \\ y_2 \\ y_3 \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{c} z_1 \\ z_2 \\ z_3 \end{array} \right) \right) \mapsto \left(\begin{array}{c} x_1 + y_1 + z_1 \\ x_2 + y_2 + z_2 \\ x_3 + y_3 + z_3 \end{array} \right). \end{array}$$

The differential of the composition is given by

$$M(t_1, t_2, t_3) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1-t_2^2}{1+t_2^2} & \frac{-2t_3}{1-t_3^2} \\ \frac{-2t_1}{1+t_1^2} & 0 & \frac{1-t_3^2}{1+t_3^2} \\ \frac{1-t_1^2}{1+t_1^2} & \frac{-2t_2}{1+t_2^2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

so that the critical locus is the hypersurface in \mathbb{C}^3 determined by the vanishing of

$$\det(M(t_1, t_2, t_3)) = \frac{1}{(1+t_1^2)(1+t_2^2)(1+t_3^2)} [(1-t_1^2)(1-t_2^2)(1-t_3^2) - 8t_1 t_2 t_3]. \quad (2.2.5)$$

The map $\Sigma \circ (\psi_1 \times \psi_2 \times \psi_3)$ extends to a regular map $\phi : \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^3$; from (2.2.5), we obtain that the critical locus of this extension is the surface $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ of multidegree $(2, 2, 2)$ defined by the equation

$$(u_1^2 - t_1^2)(u_2^2 - t_2^2)(u_3^2 - t_3^2) - 8u_1 u_2 u_3 t_1 t_2 t_3 = 0,$$

where $[u_i, t_i]$ are homogeneous coordinates on the i -th copy of \mathbb{P}^1 .

Theorem 2.2.20. The surface $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ is a smooth K3 surface. The map ϕ is a birational equivalence between $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ and \mathcal{S} . In particular $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ is a desingularization of \mathcal{S} .

Proof. The smoothness and the irreducibility of $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ are verified by a direct calculation. It is a classical fact that a smooth divisor of multidegree $(2, 2, 2)$ in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ is a K3 surface. For completeness, we give an explicit proof. Let $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}$ and $K_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}$ be the structure and the canonical sheaves of $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$, respectively. We verify the two conditions $K_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}$ and $h^1(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}) = 0$, characterizing a K3 surface.

First, we prove $K_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}$. This follows from the classical adjunction formula, see, e.g., [EH16, Proposition 1.33]. Since $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ is a smooth divisor of multidegree $(2, 2, 2)$, we have

$$K_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}} = (K_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}(2, 2, 2))|_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}} = (\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}(-2, -2, -2) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}(2, 2, 2))|_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}} = \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}.$$

In order to show $h^1(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}) = 0$, consider the restriction exact sequence of $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$:

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ is a smooth divisor of multidegree $(2, 2, 2)$, we have $\mathcal{I}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}(-2, -2, -2)$; passing to the long exact sequence in cohomology, we have

$$\cdots \rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}) \rightarrow H^1(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}) \rightarrow H^2(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}(-2, -2, -2)) \rightarrow \cdots$$

By Künneth's formula, $h^1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}) = 0$. Since $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}(-2, -2, -2) = K_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}$, by Serre duality we obtain $h^2(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}(-2, -2, -2)) = h^1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}) = 0$. We conclude $h^1(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}) = 0$. This shows that $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ is a K3 surface.

It remains to show that $\phi : \tilde{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ is a birational equivalence. This follows again by a direct calculation and by linearity of the addition map. Indeed, the set of critical points of the addition map $\Sigma : \partial_a D_1 \times \partial_a D_2 \times \partial_a D_3 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^3$ is clearly birational to $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$. Moreover, Theorem 2.2.13 implies that this set, regarded as a subvariety of $\mathbb{C}^9 = \mathbb{C}^3 \times \mathbb{C}^3 \times \mathbb{C}^3$, is a surface of degree 24. Since $\Sigma : \mathbb{C}^9 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^3$ is linear, the degree of the image of (the birational copy of) $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ is at most 24; moreover, if equality holds, then Σ is generically one-to-one [Mum95, Theorem 5.11] and it defines a birational equivalence between the critical locus and its image. Since $\deg(\mathcal{S}) = 24$, we conclude. \square

The subdivision of \mathbb{R}^3 into its eight orthants induces a subdivision of the boundary of the dice, hence of $\text{Ext } \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{S} \cap \partial \mathcal{D}$. Each of these eight regions can be parametrized by the corresponding arcs on two of the three ∂D_i 's. Let $p \in \mathcal{S} \cap \partial \mathcal{D}$ be written as $p = \xi_1 + \xi_2 + \xi_3$, with $\xi_i \in \partial D_i$. We parametrize the boundaries of the discs via angles $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial D_1 &= \{(0, 0, 1) \cos \theta_1 + (0, 1, 0) \sin \theta_1 : \theta_1 \in [0, 2\pi]\}, \\ \partial D_2 &= \{(1, 0, 0) \cos \theta_2 + (0, 0, 1) \sin \theta_2 : \theta_2 \in [0, 2\pi]\}, \\ \partial D_3 &= \{(0, 1, 0) \cos \theta_3 + (1, 0, 0) \sin \theta_3 : \theta_3 \in [0, 2\pi]\}.\end{aligned}$$

Then the coordinates of ξ_3 can be expressed as algebraic functions of the coordinates of ξ_1 and ξ_2 . More precisely, from the equation of the determinant (2.2.5), we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\cos \theta_3 &= \pm \frac{|\sin \theta_1 \sin \theta_2|}{\sqrt{\cos^2 \theta_1 \cos^2 \theta_2 + \sin^2 \theta_1 \sin^2 \theta_2}}, \\ \sin \theta_3 &= \pm \frac{|\cos \theta_1 \cos \theta_2|}{\sqrt{\cos^2 \theta_1 \cos^2 \theta_2 + \sin^2 \theta_1 \sin^2 \theta_2}}.\end{aligned}\tag{2.2.6}$$

If $(\theta_1, \theta_2) = (k\frac{\pi}{2}, (k+1)\frac{\pi}{2}) \times (l\frac{\pi}{2}, (l+1)\frac{\pi}{2})$, there are exactly two possible choices of the signs in (2.2.6) such that $\xi_1 + \xi_2 + \xi_3 \in \mathcal{S}$. This subdivides the real points of \mathcal{S} into $32 = 4 \cdot 4 \cdot 2$ regions. Exactly eight of these regions cover $\mathcal{S} \cap \partial \mathcal{D}$ and they are identified by the condition that ξ_1, ξ_2, ξ_3 belong to the same (closed) orthant. \blacklozenge




Figure 2.4: Parametrization of $\mathcal{S} \cap \partial \mathcal{D}$ with two of the three circles. Given a pair of generic (grey) points on the pink and green circle, there is a unique (white) point on the yellow circle, such that their sum is an extreme exposed point of \mathcal{D} (black).

2.2.4. Conclusions

We summarize our main results concerning the purely nonlinear part of a generic discotope.

- \mathcal{S} coincides with $\text{Ext}_a \mathcal{D}$ for the following types:

- ▶ $\mathbf{N} = (0, N, 0, \dots, 0)$ with $N \geq d - 1$;
- ▶ $\mathbf{N} = (0, \dots, 0, N)$.
- \mathcal{S} is irreducible in the following cases:
 - ▶ when (2.2.1) holds with the reverse inequality, in which case $\deg(\mathcal{S}) = 2^N$;
 - ▶ $\mathbf{N} = (0, N, 0, \dots, 0)$ with $N \geq d - 1$, in which case $\deg(\mathcal{S}) \leq 2^N \cdot \binom{N}{d-1}$;
 - ▶ $\mathbf{N} = (0, \dots, 0, N)$.

In this section, we discuss some open problems, and observations directed toward future work. A first question one should address regards an analogue of Theorem 2.2.13 when discs of dimension higher than two are involved. We present an example to explain some of the difficulties.

Example 2.2.21. Let $D_1 = \{x_4 = 0, x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 = 1\}$, $D_2 = \{x_1 = 0, x_2^2 + x_3^2 + x_4^2 = 1\}$ be two 3-discs in \mathbb{R}^4 and let $\mathcal{D} = D_1 + D_2$. This discotope is full dimensional and $\dim \mathcal{S} = 3$. The ideal of the critical locus of the addition map can be computed via a determinantal method similar to the one discussed in Section 2.2.3. We obtain the equation of \mathcal{S} ,

$$x_1^4 + 2x_1^2x_2^2 + x_2^4 + 2x_1^2x_3^2 + 2x_2^2x_3^2 + x_3^4 - 2x_1^2x_4^2 + 2x_2^2x_4^2 + 2x_3^2x_4^2 + x_4^4 - 4x_2^2 - 4x_3^2 = 0,$$

which is irreducible of degree 4. The boundary $\partial\mathcal{D}$ contains translates of the 3-dimensional discs: two translated copies of D_1 at $x_4 = \pm 1$ and two translated copies of D_2 at $x_1 = \pm 1$. The four points of their pairwise intersections are the only ones exposed by more than one vector: these points are $(1, 0, 0, 1), (-1, 0, 0, 1), (-1, 0, 0, -1), (1, 0, 0, -1)$. They are, respectively, exposed by the cones

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &= \{x_2 = x_3 = 0, x_1 > 0, x_4 > 0\}, \\ C_2 &= \{x_2 = x_3 = 0, x_1 < 0, x_4 > 0\}, \\ C_3 &= \{x_2 = x_3 = 0, x_1 < 0, x_4 < 0\}, \\ C_4 &= \{x_2 = x_3 = 0, x_1 > 0, x_4 < 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that for every i and for every $u \in C_i$, the hyperplane u^\perp contains $\langle D_1 \rangle \cap \langle D_2 \rangle$, as observed in Example 2.2.12. ◆

We point out that the determinantal method mentioned above to obtain the equation of \mathcal{S} is not as straightforward as in the case of 2-dimensional discs. Implicitly, this method relies on a parametrization of the tangent bundle of the product $\partial_a D_1 \times \dots \times \partial_a D_N$, in order to impose that the differential of the addition map has submaximal rank. For higher dimensional spheres this parametrization cannot be global since their tangent bundles are not trivial, unlike the case of the circle. Nevertheless, in the cases where it can be computed explicitly, the hypersurface \mathcal{S} is irreducible, hence it coincides with $\text{Ext}_a \mathcal{D}$. We propose the following:

Conjecture 2.2.22. Let $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a generic discotope of type $(0, N_2, \dots, N_d)$. Then the purely nonlinear part \mathcal{S} is irreducible.

Theorem 2.2.5 proves the conjecture if (2.2.1) holds with the reverse inequality. Remark 2.2.2 proves the statement in the case $(0, \dots, 0, N)$, and Theorem 2.2.13 in the case $(0, N, 0, \dots, 0)$. In general, we expect the critical locus of Σ to be already irreducible, and the addition map Σ to be a birational equivalence between $\text{crit } \Sigma$ and \mathcal{S} . Were this true, in the case of 2-dimensional discs, the upper bound in Theorem 2.2.13 would be an equality. For higher dimensional discs, even under the assumption that the critical locus

is irreducible, computing its degree is non-trivial and it would be interesting to address it via the classical Giambelli-Thom-Porteous construction, applied to the product of the tangent bundles of the spheres $\partial_a D_i$.

The geometric features highlighted in this chapter can be used as necessary conditions for a convex body to be a discotope: for instance, there are restrictions for the degrees of $\text{Ext}_a \mathcal{D}$. An important future step would be to understand a characterization of discotopes among zonoids or more generally among convex bodies, in the spirit of the zonoid problem. We identify two problems in this direction.

Problem 2.2.23. Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a convex body and $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be an n -dimensional (generalized) disc. Determine whether D is a Minkowski summand of K , in the sense that there exists a convex body $K' \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $K = K' + D$.

Problem 2.2.23 is understood in the case where D is a disc of dimension 1, namely a segment [Bol69, Lemma 3.4]. We state the next problem in a probabilistic language.

Problem 2.2.24. Characterize the set of random vectors of \mathbb{R}^d whose associated Vitale zonoid is a full dimensional discotope in \mathbb{R}^d .

Finally, we expect discotopes not to be spectrahedra, except possibly for small special cases, for instance when $N = 1$. However, they are *spectrahedral shadows* [Sch18b] since they are defined as Minkowski sums of spectrahedra. We already observed that \mathcal{D} is the convex hull of the semialgebraic set $\mathcal{S} \cap \partial\mathcal{D}$. We propose the following conjecture, which is verified in the cases that we can compute explicitly.

Conjecture 2.2.25. The discotope \mathcal{D} is the convex hull of the real points of \mathcal{S} .

This would provide examples of real algebraic varieties whose convex hull is a spectrahedral shadow. This topic has been studied for instance in [Sch18a, RS10] and is related to the Helton–Nie conjecture [HN10]. Such questions draw connections between discotopes and the world of convex algebraic geometry, optimization and semidefinite programming.

Chapter 3

Constructions with convex bodies

Many areas of convex geometry investigate objects that are defined starting from a convex body. The goal is to describe relations between the original set and the new one. We consider here two particular constructions: fiber convex bodies and intersection bodies.

If K is a convex body in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} and $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow V$ is the orthogonal projection onto a subspace $V \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ of dimension n , the *fiber body* of K with respect to π is the average of the fibers of K under this projection:

$$\Sigma_\pi K = \int_{\pi(K)} (K \cap \pi^{-1}(x)) dx. \quad (3.0.1)$$

This expression is known as a Minkowski integral, and it will be made more rigorous in Proposition 3.1.6.

The notion of fiber bodies was introduced for polytopes by Billera and Sturmfels in [BS92]. It has been investigated in many different contexts, from combinatorics such as in [ADRS00] to algebraic geometry and even tropical geometry in the direction of polynomial systems [EK08, Est08, SY08]. Notably, recent studies concern the particular case of monotone path polytopes [BL21]. We focus here on the fiber bodies of convex bodies that are not polytopes. This construction was introduced and studied by Esterov in [Est08]. We state some general properties and then devote three subsections to the analysis of the fiber body of three particular classes of convex bodies.

Section 3.1.1 concerns puffed polytopes, the affine version of derivative cones, which gives a link to the theory of hyperbolic polynomials. They are convex bodies that are obtained from polytopes by taking the ‘derivative’ of their algebraic boundary (see Definition 3.1.12). Propositions 3.1.17, 3.1.18 and 3.1.19 describe the strict convexity of the fiber body of a puffed polytope. As a concrete example, we study the case of the ellotope.

In Section 3.1.2 we investigate the class of curved convex bodies. Namely, we consider convex bodies whose boundary is a C^2 hypersurface with a strictly positive curvature. In that case Theorem 3.1.24 gives an explicit formula for the support function of $\Sigma_\pi K$, directly in terms of the support function of K . This is an improvement of equation (3.1.2) which involves the support function of the fibers of K . We give an example in which the support function of the fiber body is easily computed using Theorem 3.1.24.

Finally, we go back to the case of zonoids. We prove that the fiber body of a zonoid is a zonoid, and give an explicit formula to compute it in Theorem 3.1.31. We then exhibit an example of a discotope, the dice, that has a fiber body which is not semialgebraic. Hence, semialgebraicity is not preserved by the operation of computing the fiber body.

Section 3.2 focuses on *intersection bodies* of polytopes, from the perspective of real algebraic geometry. Originally, intersection bodies were defined by Lutwak [Lut88] in the context of convex geometry. In view of the notion of $(d-1)$ -dimensional cross-section measures and the related concepts of associated bodies (such as intersection bodies, cross-section bodies, and projection bodies), intersection bodies play an essential role in geometric tomography (see [Gar06, Chapter 8] and [Mar94, Section 2.3]). In particular, we mention here the Busemann-Petty problem which asks if one can compare the volumes of two convex bodies by comparing the volumes of their sections [Gar94a, Gar94b, GKS99, Kol98, Zha99b]. Moreover, Ludwig showed that the unique non-trivial $\mathrm{GL}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -covariant star-body-valued valuation on convex polytopes corresponds to taking the intersection body of the dual polytope [Lud06]. Due to such results, the knowledge on properties of intersection bodies interestingly contributes also to the (still not systematized) theory of starshaped sets, see [HHMM20, Section 17].

We study here intersection bodies of polytopes from a geometric and algebraic perspective. It is known that in \mathbb{R}^2 , the intersection body of a centrally symmetric polytope centered at the origin is the same polytope rotated by $\pi/2$ and dilated by a factor of 2 (see e.g. [Gar06, Theorem 8.1.4]). Moreover, if K is a full-dimensional convex body in \mathbb{R}^d centered at the origin, then so is its intersection body [Gar06, Chapter 8.1]. But what do these objects look like in general? In \mathbb{R}^d , with $d \geq 3$, they cannot be polytopes [Cam99, Zha99a] and they may not even be convex. In fact, for every convex body K , there exists a translate of K such that its intersection body is not convex [Gar06, Theorem 8.1.8]. This happens because of the important role played by the origin in this construction.

Our main contribution is Theorem 3.2.9, which states that the intersection body of a polytope is a semialgebraic set. The proof relies on two key facts. First, the volume of a polytope can be computed using determinants. Second, the combinatorial type of the intersection of a polytope with a hyperplane is fixed for each region of a certain central hyperplane arrangement. We first prove the semialgebraicity of the intersection body of polytopes containing the origin, and we generalize the result to arbitrary polytopes in Section 3.2.1. An implementation is available at <https://mathrepo.mis.mpg.de/intersection-bodies>. In Section 3.2.2, we describe the algebraic boundary of the intersection body, which is a hypersurface consisting of several irreducible components, each corresponding to a region of the aforementioned hyperplane arrangement. Theorem 3.2.14 gives a bound on the degree of the irreducible components. Section 3.2.3 focuses on the intersection body of the d -cube centered at the origin.

3.1. Fiber convex bodies

Consider the Euclidean vector space \mathbb{R}^{n+m} endowed with the standard Euclidean structure and let $V \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ be a subspace of dimension n . Denote by W its orthogonal complement, such that $\mathbb{R}^{n+m} = V \oplus W$. Let $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow V$ be the orthogonal projection onto V . We continue to canonically identify the Euclidean space with its dual. If $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ then we write K_x for the orthogonal projection onto W of the fiber of $\pi|_K$ over x , namely

$$K_x := \{y \in W \mid (x, y) \in K\}.$$

Definition 3.1.1. A map $\gamma : \pi(K) \rightarrow W$ such that $\gamma(x) \in K_x$ for all $x \in \pi(K)$ is called a *section* of π . When there is no ambiguity, we will simply say that γ is a *section*.

Using this notion we are able to define our object of study. Notice that the word *measurable* is always intended with respect to the Borel σ -algebra.

Definition 3.1.2. The *fiber body* of K with respect to the projection π is the convex body

$$\Sigma_\pi K := \left\{ \int_{\pi(K)} \gamma(x) dx \mid \gamma : \pi(K) \rightarrow W \text{ measurable section} \right\} \in \mathcal{K}(W).$$

Here dx refers to the integration with respect to the n -dimensional Lebesgue measure on V . We say that a section γ represents $y \in \Sigma_\pi K$ if $y = \int_{\pi(K)} \gamma(x) dx$.

Remark 3.1.3. Note that, with this definition, if $\pi(K)$ is of dimension $< n$, then its fiber body is $\Sigma_\pi K = \{0\}$.

The notion of fiber bodies, that can be found for example in [Est08] under the name *Minkowski integral*, extends the classical construction of fiber polytopes [BS92], up to a constant. Here, we choose to omit the normalization $\frac{1}{\text{vol}(\pi(K))}$ in front of the integral used by Billera and Sturmfels in order to make apparent the *degree* of the map Σ_π seen in (3.1.1). This degree becomes clear with the notion of *mixed fiber body*, see [Est08, Theorem 1.2].

Proposition 3.1.4. For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $\Sigma_\pi(\lambda K) = \lambda \cdot |\lambda|^n \cdot \Sigma_\pi K$. In particular if $\lambda \geq 0$

$$\Sigma_\pi(\lambda K) = \lambda^{n+1} \Sigma_\pi K. \quad (3.1.1)$$

Proof. If $\lambda = 0$ then it is clear that the fiber body of $\{0\}$ is $\{0\}$. Suppose now that $\lambda \neq 0$ and let $\gamma : \pi(K) \rightarrow W$ be a section. We can define another section $\tilde{\gamma} : \pi(\lambda K) \rightarrow W$ by $\tilde{\gamma}(x) := \lambda \gamma(\frac{x}{\lambda})$. Using the change of variables $y = x/\lambda$, we get that

$$\int_{\lambda\pi(K)} \tilde{\gamma}(x) dx = \lambda |\lambda|^n \int_{\pi(K)} \gamma(y) dy.$$

This proves that $\Sigma_\pi \lambda K \subseteq \lambda |\lambda|^n \Sigma_\pi K$. Repeating the same argument for λ^{-1} instead of λ , the other inclusion follows. \square

Corollary 3.1.5. If K is centrally symmetric then so is $\Sigma_\pi K$.

Proof. Apply the previous proposition with $\lambda = -1$ to get $\Sigma_\pi((-1)K) = (-1)\Sigma_\pi K$. If K is centrally symmetric with respect to the origin, then $(-1)K = K$ and the result follows. The general case is obtained by a translation. \square

As a consequence of the definition, it is possible to deduce a formula for the support function of the fiber body. This is the rigorous version of equation (3.0.1).

Proposition 3.1.6. For any $u \in W$ we have

$$h_{\Sigma_\pi K}(u) = \int_{\pi(K)} h_{K_x}(u) dx. \quad (3.1.2)$$

Proof. By definition

$$h_{\Sigma_\pi K}(u) = \sup \left\{ \int_{\pi(K)} \langle u, \gamma(x) \rangle dx \mid \gamma \text{ measurable section} \right\} \leq \int_{\pi(K)} h_{K_x}(u) dx.$$

To obtain the equality, it is enough to show that there exists a measurable section $\gamma_u : \pi(K) \rightarrow W$ with the following property: for all $x \in \pi(K)$ the point $\gamma_u(x)$ maximizes the linear form $\langle u, \cdot \rangle$ on K_x . In other words for all $x \in \pi(K)$, $\langle u, \gamma_u(x) \rangle = h_{K_x}(u)$. This is due to [Aum65, Proposition 2.1]. \square

A similar result can be shown for the exposed faces of the fiber body. Recall that K^u denotes the face of K exposed by the vector u . Moreover, if $\mathcal{U} = \{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$ is an ordered family of vectors of \mathbb{R}^{n+m} , we write

$$K^\mathcal{U} := (\cdots (K^{u_1})^{u_2} \cdots)^{u_k}.$$

We show that the exposed face of the fiber body is, in some sense, the fiber body of the exposed faces.

Lemma 3.1.7. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$ be an ordered family of linearly independent vectors of W , take $y \in \Sigma_\pi K$ and let $\gamma : \pi(K) \rightarrow W$ be a section that represents y . Then $y \in (\Sigma_\pi K)^\mathcal{U}$ if and only if $\gamma(x) \in (K_x)^\mathcal{U}$ for almost all $x \in \pi(K)$. In particular,

$$(\Sigma_\pi K)^\mathcal{U} = \left\{ \int_{\pi(K)} \gamma(x) dx \mid \gamma \text{ section such that } \gamma(x) \in (K_x)^\mathcal{U} \text{ for all } x \right\}. \quad (3.1.3)$$

Proof. Suppose first that $\mathcal{U} = \{u\}$. Assume that $\gamma(x)$ is not in $(K_x)^u$ for all x in a set of non-zero measure $\mathcal{O} \subset \pi(K)$. Then there exists a measurable function $\xi : \pi(K) \rightarrow W$ with $\langle u, \xi \rangle \geq 0$ and $\langle u, \xi(x) \rangle > 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{O}$, such that $\tilde{\gamma} := \gamma + \xi$ is a section (for example you can take $\tilde{\gamma}(x)$ to be the nearest point on K_x of $\gamma(x) + u$). Let $\tilde{y} := \int_{\pi(K)} \tilde{\gamma}$. Then $\langle u, \tilde{y} \rangle = \langle u, y \rangle + \int_{\pi(K)} \langle u, \xi \rangle > \langle u, y \rangle$. Thus y does not belong to the face $(\Sigma_\pi K)^u$.

Suppose now that y is not in the face $(\Sigma_\pi K)^u$. Hence, there exists $\tilde{y} \in \Sigma_\pi K$ such that $\langle u, \tilde{y} \rangle > \langle u, y \rangle$. Let $\tilde{\gamma}$ be a section that represents \tilde{y} . Then, $\int_{\pi(K)} \langle u, \tilde{\gamma} \rangle > \int_{\pi(K)} \langle u, \gamma \rangle$. This implies the existence of a set $\mathcal{O} \subset \pi(K)$ of non-zero measure such that, for all $x \in \mathcal{O}$, we have $\langle u, \tilde{\gamma}(x) \rangle > \langle u, \gamma(x) \rangle$. Thus $\gamma(x)$ does not belong to the face $(K_x)^u$ for all $x \in \mathcal{O}$.

In the case $\mathcal{U} = \{u_1, \dots, u_{k+1}\}$ we can apply inductively the same argument. Replace $\Sigma_\pi K$ by $(\Sigma_\pi K)^{\{u_1, \dots, u_k\}}$ and u by u_{k+1} , and use the representation of $(\Sigma_\pi K)^{\{u_1, \dots, u_k\}}$ given by (3.1.3). \square

Using the same strategy as in Proposition 3.1.6, we can deduce that, for every $u, v \in W$,

$$h_{(\Sigma_\pi K)^u}(v) = \int_{\pi(K)} h_{(K_x)^u}(v) dx. \quad (3.1.4)$$

The following result shows that the fiber body behaves well under the action of the group $\mathrm{GL}(V) \oplus \mathrm{GL}(W)$ as a subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$.

Proposition 3.1.8. Let $g_n \in \mathrm{GL}(V)$, $g_m \in \mathrm{GL}(W)$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$. Then

$$\Sigma_\pi((g_n \oplus g_m)(K)) = |\det(g_n)| \cdot g_m(\Sigma_\pi K).$$

Proof. This is a quite straightforward consequence of the definitions. After observing that

$$((g_n \oplus g_m)(K))_x = g_m(K_{g_n^{-1}(x)})$$

and $\pi((g_n \oplus g_m)(K)) = g_n \pi(K)$, use equation (3.1.2) together with the change of variables $x \mapsto g_n^{-1}x$. By Proposition 1.1.19 (iii), $h_{g_m K_x}(u) = h_{K_x}(g_m^t u)$, so the thesis follows. \square

Regularity of the sections. By definition, a point y of the fiber body $\Sigma_\pi K$ is the integral $y = \int_{\pi(K)} \gamma(x) dx$ of a *measurable* section γ . Thus γ can be modified on a set of measure zero without changing the point y , i.e., y only depends on the L^1 class of γ . It is natural to ask what our favourite representative in this L^1 class will be and how




Figure 3.1: The convex body of Example 3.1.9. In its boundary there are 2 green half discs, 2 red triangles and 4 blue cones.

regular can it be. In the case where K is a polytope, γ can always be chosen continuous. However if K is not a polytope and if y belongs to the boundary of $\Sigma_\pi K$, a continuous representative may not exist, as we point out in Example 3.1.9. This is due to the fact that in general the map $x \mapsto K_x$ is only upper semicontinuous, see [Kho12, Section 6].

Example 3.1.9. We construct here a fiber body with points that cannot be represented by a continuous section. Consider the function $f : S^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$f(x, y) = \begin{cases} 0 & x < 0 \\ 1 & x \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

and let $K := \text{conv}(\text{graph}(f)) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, displayed in Figure 3.1. This is a semialgebraic convex body, whose boundary may be subdivided in 8 patches: two half-discs lying on the planes $\{z = 0\}$ and $\{z = 1\}$, two triangles with vertices $(-1, 0, 0), (0, \pm 1, 1)$ and $(1, 0, 1), (0, \pm 1, 0)$ respectively, four cones with vertices $(0, \pm 1, 0), (0, \pm 1, 1)$. Let $\pi : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the projection on the first coordinate $\pi(x, y, z) = x$. Then the point $p \in \Sigma_\pi K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ maximizing the linear form associated to $(y, z) = (1, 0)$ must have only non-continuous sections. This can be proved using the representation of a face given by (3.1.3). \blacklozenge

We prove that most of the points of the fiber body have a continuous representative.

Proposition 3.1.10. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ and let $\Sigma_\pi K$ be its fiber body. The set of its points that can be represented by a continuous section is convex and dense. In particular, all interior points of $\Sigma_\pi K$ can be represented by a continuous section.

Proof. Consider the set

$$C = \left\{ \int_{\pi(K)} \gamma(x) dx \mid \gamma : \pi(K) \rightarrow K \text{ continuous section} \right\}$$

that is clearly contained in the fiber body $\Sigma_\pi K$. It is convex: take $a, b \in C$ represented by continuous sections $\alpha, \beta : \pi(K) \rightarrow K$ respectively. Then any convex combination can be written as $c = ta + (1-t)b = \int_{\pi(K)} (t\alpha(x) + (1-t)\beta(x)) dx$. Since $t\alpha + (1-t)\beta$ is a continuous section for any $t \in [0, 1]$, C is convex.

We now need to prove that the set C is also dense in $\Sigma_\pi K$. Let γ be a measurable section; by definition it is a measurable function $\gamma : \pi(K) \rightarrow W$, such that $\gamma(x) \in K_x$ for all $x \in \pi(K)$. For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a continuous function $g : \pi(K) \rightarrow W$ with $\|\gamma - g\|_{L^1} < \varepsilon$; this is not necessarily a section of K , since a priori $g(x)$ can be outside K_x .

Hence, define $\tilde{\gamma} : \pi(K) \rightarrow W$ such that

$$\tilde{\gamma}(x) = p(K_x, g(x))$$

where $p(A, a)$ is the nearest point map at a with respect to the convex set A . By [Sch13, Lemma 1.8.11] the map $\tilde{\gamma}$ is continuous and by definition, we have $\text{graph}(\tilde{\gamma}) \subset K$. Therefore $\int_{\pi(K)} \tilde{\gamma} \in C$. Moreover, we have that

$$\|\gamma - \tilde{\gamma}\|_{L^1} \leq \|\gamma - g\|_{L^1} < \varepsilon$$

hence the density is proved. As a consequence we get that $\text{int } \Sigma_\pi K \subseteq C \subseteq \Sigma_\pi K$ so all the interior points of the fiber body have a continuous representative. \square

To our knowledge, the minimal regularity of the sections needed to represent all points is not known.

Strict convexity. In the case where K^u consists of only one point we say that K is *strictly convex in direction u* . If convex body is strictly convex in every direction, then it is strictly convex. We now investigate this property for fiber bodies.

Proposition 3.1.11. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ and fix $u \in W$. The following are equivalent:

- (i) $\Sigma_\pi K$ is strictly convex in direction u ;
- (ii) almost all the fibers K_x are strictly convex in direction u .

Proof. By Proposition 1.1.19 (iv), a convex body is strictly convex in direction u if and only if its support function is C^1 at u . Therefore, if almost all the fibers K_x are strictly convex in u then, the convex body being compact, the support function of the fiber body $h_{\Sigma_\pi K}(u) = \int_{\pi(K)} h_{K_x}(u) dx$ is C^1 at u , i.e., $\Sigma_\pi K$ is strictly convex in that direction.

Now suppose that $\Sigma_\pi K$ is strictly convex in direction u , i.e., $(\Sigma_\pi K)^u$ consists of just one point y . This means that the support function of this face is linear and it is given by $\langle y, \cdot \rangle$. We now prove that the support function of K_x^u is linear for almost all x , and this will conclude the proof. Equation (3.1.4) implies that

$$h_{(\Sigma_\pi K)^u} = \int_{\pi(K)} h_{K_x^u} dx = \langle y, \cdot \rangle.$$

For any two vectors v_1, v_2 , we have

$$\langle y, v_1 + v_2 \rangle = \int_{\pi(K)} h_{K_x^u}(v_1 + v_2) dx \leq \int_{\pi(K)} h_{K_x^u}(v_1) dx + \int_{\pi(K)} h_{K_x^u}(v_2) dx = \langle y, v_1 \rangle + \langle y, v_2 \rangle.$$

Thus the inequality in the middle is an equality. Since $h_{K_x^u}(v_1 + v_2) \leq h_{K_x^u}(v_1) + h_{K_x^u}(v_2)$, we get that this is an equality for almost all x , i.e., the support function of K_x^u is linear for almost every $x \in \pi(K)$. Therefore almost all the fibers are strictly convex. \square

Example 3.1.20 provides a convex body, the ellotope K , and a projection such that the fiber body is strictly convex, but two fibers $K_{\pm 1}$ are segments, hence not strictly convex.

3.1.1. Puffed polytopes

In this section we introduce a particular class of convex bodies arising from polytopes. A known concept in the context of hyperbolic polynomials and hyperbolicity cones is that of the *derivative cone*; see [Ren06] or [San13]. Since we are dealing with compact objects, we will repeat the same construction in affine coordinates, i.e., for polytopes instead of polyhedral cones.

Let P be a full dimensional polytope in \mathbb{R}^d , containing the origin, with N facets given by affine equations $l_1(x_1, \dots, x_d) = a_1, \dots, l_N(x_1, \dots, x_d) = a_N$. Consider the polynomial

$$p(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \prod_{i=1}^N (l_i(x_1, \dots, x_d) - a_i). \quad (3.1.5)$$

Its zero locus is the algebraic boundary of P . Consider the homogenization of p , that is $\tilde{p}(x_1, \dots, x_d, w) = \prod_{i=1}^N (l_i(x_1, \dots, x_d) - a_i w)$. It is the algebraic boundary of a polyhedral cone and it is hyperbolic with respect to the direction $(0, \dots, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. Then for all $i < N$ the polynomial

$$\left(\frac{\partial^i}{\partial w^i} \tilde{p} \right) (x_1, \dots, x_d, 1) \quad (3.1.6)$$

is the algebraic boundary of a convex set containing the origin, see [San13].

Definition 3.1.12. Let Z_i be the zero locus of (3.1.6) in \mathbb{R}^d . The i -th puffed P is the closure of the connected component of the origin in $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus Z_i$. We denote it by $\text{puff}_i(P)$.

In particular the puffed polytopes are always spectrahedra [Brä12, Corollary 1.3]. As the name suggests, the puffed polytopes $\text{puff}_i(P)$ are fat, inflated versions of the polytope P and in fact contain P . On the other hand, despite the definition involving a derivation, the operation of ‘taking the puffed’ does not behave as a derivative. In particular, it does not commute with the Minkowski sum, that is, in general for polytopes P_1, P_2 :

$$\text{puff}_1(P_1 + P_2) \neq \text{puff}_1(P_1) + \text{puff}_1(P_2).$$

To show this with, we build a counterexample in dimension $N = 2$.

Example 3.1.13. Consider the squares $P_1 = \text{conv}\{(\pm 1, \pm 1)\}$, $P_2 = \text{conv}\{(0, \pm 1), (\pm 1, 0)\}$. The first puffed square is a ball with radius half of the diagonal, so $\text{puff}_1(P_1)$ has radius $\sqrt{2}$ and $\text{puff}_1(P_2)$ has radius 1. Therefore $\text{puff}_1(P_1) + \text{puff}_1(P_2)$ is a ball centered at the origin of radius $1 + \sqrt{2}$. On the other hand $P_1 + P_2$ is an octagon. Its associated polynomial in equation (3.1.5) is

$$p(x, y) = ((x+y)^2 - 9)((x-y)^2 - 9)(x^2 - 4)(y^2 - 4).$$

Via the procedure explained above we obtain the boundary of this puffed octagon as the zero locus of the following irreducible polynomial

$$2x^6 + 7x^4y^2 + 7x^2y^4 + 2y^6 - 88x^4 - 193x^2y^2 - 88y^4 + 918x^2 + 918y^2 - 2592.$$

This is a curve with three real connected components, shown in violet in Figure 3.2. The puffed octagon is not a ball, hence $\text{puff}_1(P_1) + \text{puff}_1(P_2) \neq \text{puff}_1(P_1 + P_2)$. \blacklozenge

Strict convexity of the puffed polytopes. Our aim is to study the strict convexity of the fiber body of a puffed polytope. To do so, we shall at first say something more about




Figure 3.2: The octagon, orange; the algebraic boundary of its puffed octagon, red.

the boundary structure of a puffed polytope itself. In particular, we will see that the appropriate quantity to consider is the *multiplicity* of the faces, that is, their multiplicity as zeroes of the polynomial defining the algebraic boundary. Indeed, a face $F \subset P$ will be part of the boundary of $\text{puff}_i(P)$ for all i less or equal than the multiplicity of F .

Lemma 3.1.14. Let $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a full dimensional polytope. Then all faces F of P of dimension $k < d - i$ are contained in the boundary of $\text{puff}_i(P)$.

Proof. Let F be a k -face of P ; it is contained in the zero set of the polynomial (3.1.5). Moreover F arises as the intersection of at least $d - k$ facets, thus its points are zeros of multiplicity at least $d - k$. Hence, if $d - k > i$ then the face F is still in the zero set of (3.1.6), i.e., it belongs to the boundary of $\text{puff}_i(P)$. \square

The other direction is not always true: there may be k -faces of P , with $k \geq d - i$, whose points are zeros of (3.1.6) of multiplicity higher than i , and hence faces of $\text{puff}_i(P)$. However, there are two cases in which this is not possible.

Lemma 3.1.15. Let $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a full dimensional polytope.

- $i = 1$: the flat faces of $\text{puff}_1(P)$ are exactly the faces of dimension $k < d - 1$;
- $i = 2$: the flat faces of $\text{puff}_2(P)$ are exactly the faces of dimension $k < d - 2$.

Proof. The first point is clear because the facets are the only zeroes of multiplicity one. The second point follows from the so called ‘diamond property’ of polytopes [Zie95], which implies that the multiplicity of the faces of dimension $d - 2$ is exactly 2. \square

Remark 3.1.16. By [Ren06, Proposition 24] we deduce that the flat faces of a puffed polytope must be faces of the polytope itself. The remaining points in the boundary of $\text{puff}_i(P)$ are exposed points.

Using this result we can deduce conditions for the strict convexity of the fiber body of a puffed polytope.

Proposition 3.1.17 (Fiber 1st puffed polytope). Let $P \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ be a full dimensional polytope, $n \geq 1$, $m \geq 2$, and take any projection $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. The fiber puffed polytope $\Sigma_\pi(\text{puff}_1(P))$ is strictly convex if and only if $m = 2$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.1.15, the flat faces in the boundary of $\text{puff}_1(P)$ are the faces of P of dimension $k < n + m - 1$. Suppose first that $m > 2$ and let F be a $(n + m - 2)$ -face of P . Take a point p in the relative interior of F and let $x_p := \pi(p)$. Then the dimension of $F \cap \pi^{-1}(x_p)$ is at least $m - 2 \geq 1$; we can also assume without loss of generality that

$$1 \leq \dim(F \cap \pi^{-1}(x_p)) < n + m - 2. \quad (3.1.7)$$

Furthermore there is a whole neighborhood U of x_p such that condition (3.1.7) holds, so for every $x \in U$ the convex body $(\text{puff}_1(P))_x$ is not strictly convex. By Proposition 3.1.11 then $\Sigma_\pi(\text{puff}_1(P))$ is not strictly convex. Suppose now that $m = 2$ and fix a flat face F of $\text{puff}_1(P)$. Its dimension is less or equal than n , so $(F \cap \pi^{-1}(x_p))$ is either one point or a face of positive dimension. In the latter case $\dim \pi(F) \leq n - 1$, i.e., it is a set of measure zero in $\pi(\text{puff}_1(P))$. Because there are only finitely many flat faces, we can conclude that almost all the fibers are strictly convex and thus by Proposition 3.1.11, $\Sigma_\pi(\text{puff}_1(P))$ is strictly convex. \square

A similar result holds for the fiber second puffed polytope, using Lemma 3.1.15.

Proposition 3.1.18 (Fiber 2nd puffed polytope). Let $P \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ be a full dimensional polytope, $n \geq 1$, $m \geq 2$, and take any projection $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. The fiber puffed polytope $\Sigma_\pi(\text{puff}_2(P))$ is strictly convex if and only if $m \leq 3$, i.e., $m = 2$ or 3.

Proof. We can use the previous strategy again. If $m > 3$, there always exists a face of $\text{puff}_2(P)$ of dimension $n + m - 3$ whose non-empty intersection with fibers of π has dimension at least 1 and strictly less than $n + m - 3$. In this case we get a fiber body which is not strictly convex. On the other hand, when $m = 2$ or 3 the intersection of the fibers and the flat faces has positive dimension only on a measure zero subset of \mathbb{R}^n , hence almost all the fibers are strictly convex and the thesis follows. \square

Can we generalize this result for the i -th puffed polytope? In general no, and the reason is precisely that a k -face may be contained in more than $(n + m - k)$ facets, when $k < n + m - 2$. Those polytopes P for which this does not happen are called *simple polytopes*. Thus, with the same proof as above we obtain the following.

Proposition 3.1.19 (Fiber i -th puffed simple polytope). Let $P \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ be a full dimensional simple polytope, $n \geq 1$, $m \geq 2$, and take any projection $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. The fiber puffed polytope $\Sigma_\pi(\text{puff}_i(P))$ is strictly convex if and only if $m \leq i + 1$.

In the case where P is not simple, one has to take into account the multiplicity of each face of dimension $k \geq n + m - i$, in order to understand if they are or not part of the boundary of $\text{puff}_i(P)$.

Example 3.1.20. Let P be the tetrahedron in \mathbb{R}^3 realized as

$$\text{conv}\{(1, 1, 1), (1, -1, -1), (-1, 1, -1), (-1, -1, 1)\}.$$

The first puffed tetrahedron (for the rest of the paragraph we will omit the term ‘first’) is the ellipotope K from Example 1.2.10. Let π be the projection on the first coordinate: $\pi(x, y, z) = x$. The fibers of the ellipotope at x for $x \in (-1, 1)$ are the ellipses defined by

$$K_x = \left\{ (y, z) \mid \left(\frac{y - xz}{\sqrt{1 - x^2}} \right)^2 + z^2 \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Introducing the matrix

$$M_x := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} & \frac{-x}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$




Figure 3.3: Left: the four green parabolas meet in the four black points on the boundary of the fiber elliptope, that lie on the diagonals $y = z$ and $y = -z$. Right: sandwiched fiber bodies. The blue rhombus is the fiber tetrahedron $\Sigma_\pi P$; the green convex body is the fiber elliptope $\Sigma_\pi K$; the grey square is the fiber cube $\Sigma_\pi([-1, 1]^3)$.

it turns out that $K_x = \{(y, z) \mid \|M_x(y, z)\|^2 \leq 1\} = (M_x)^{-1}B^2$, where B^2 is the unit 2-disc. We obtain

$$h_{K_x}(u, v) = h_{B^2}\left((M_x)^{-t}(u, v)\right) = \|(M_x)^{-t}(u, v)\| = \sqrt{u^2 + v^2 + 2xuv}.$$

By (3.1.2) we need to compute the integral of h_{K_x} between $x = -1$ and $x = 1$ to obtain the support function of the fiber body of the ellipope. We get

$$h_{\Sigma_\pi K}(u, v) = \frac{1}{3uv}(|u + v|^3 - |u - v|^3).$$

Hence the fiber body is semialgebraic and its algebraic boundary is the zero locus of the parabolas $3y^2 + 8z - 16$, $3y^2 - 8z - 16$, $8y + 3z^2 - 16$, $8y - 3z^2 + 16$, in Figure 3.3, left.

As anticipated in Proposition 3.1.17 the fiber ellipope is strictly convex. Notice that the ellipope is naturally sandwiched between two polytopes (see also Chapter 5 and in particular Figure 5.7): the tetrahedron P and the cube $[-1, 1]^3$. Therefore, as a natural consequence of the definition, the same chain of inclusions works also for their fiber bodies:

$$\Sigma_\pi P \subset \Sigma_\pi K \subset \Sigma_\pi([-1, 1]^3)$$

as shown in Figure 3.3, right. ♦

Remark 3.1.21. From this example it is clear that the operation of ‘taking the fiber body’ does not commute with the operation of ‘taking the puffed polytope’. In fact the puffed polytope of the blue square in Figure 3.3, right, is not the green convex body bounded by the four parabolas: it is the disc $y^2 + z^2 \leq 4$.

3.1.2. Curved convex bodies

In this section we examine the case where the boundary of the convex body K is highly regular. We prove Theorem 3.1.24 which is a formula to compute the support function of the fiber body directly in terms of the support function of K , without having to compute those of the fibers.

Definition 3.1.22. We say that a convex body K is *curved* if its support function h_K is C^2 and the gradient ∇h_K restricted to the sphere is a C^1 diffeomorphism with ∂K .

In that case K is full dimensional, strictly convex, and its boundary is a C^2 hyper-surface. Such convex bodies are treated in [Sch13, Section 2.5], where they are said to

be ‘of class C_+^2 ’. If $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ is a curved convex body and $v \in S^{n+m-1}$, then the differential $d_v \nabla h_K$ is a symmetric positive definite automorphism of v^\perp . The following gives an expression for the exposed points of the fiber body. This is to be compared with the case of polytopes which is given in [EK08, Lemma 11].

Lemma 3.1.23. If K is a curved convex body and $u \in W$ with $\|u\| = 1$, then

$$\nabla h_{\Sigma_\pi K}(u) = \int_V \nabla h_K(u + \xi) \cdot J_{\psi_u}(\xi) d\xi$$

where $\psi_u : V \rightarrow V$ is given by $\psi_u(\xi) = (\pi \circ \nabla h_K)(u + \xi)$ and $J_{\psi_u}(\xi)$ denotes its Jacobian (i.e. the determinant of its differential) at the point ξ .

Proof. From (3.1.3) we have that $\nabla h_{\Sigma_\pi K}(u) = \int_{\pi(K)} \gamma_u(x) dx$, where $\gamma_u(x) = \nabla h_{K_x}(u)$. Assume that $x = \psi_u(\xi)$, as defined in the statement, is a change of variables. We get $\gamma_u(x) = (\gamma_u \circ \pi \circ \nabla h_K)(u + \xi) = \nabla h_K(u + \xi)$ and the result follows.

It remains to prove that it is a change of variables. Note that $\nabla h_K(u + \xi) = \nabla h_K(v)$ where $v = \frac{u + \xi}{\|u + \xi\|} \in S^{n+m-1}$. The differential of the map $\xi \mapsto v$ maps V to $(V + \mathbb{R}u) \cap v^\perp$. Moreover ∇h_K restricted to the sphere is a C^1 diffeomorphism by assumption. Thus it only remains to prove that its differential $d_v \nabla h_K$ sends $(V + \mathbb{R}u) \cap v^\perp$ to a subspace that does not intersect $\ker(\pi|_{v^\perp})$. To see this, note that $\ker(\pi|_{v^\perp})^\perp = (V + \mathbb{R}u) \cap v^\perp$. Moreover $\langle w, d_v \nabla h_K \cdot w \rangle = 0$ if and only if $w = 0$. Thus, if $w \in \ker(\pi|_{v^\perp})^\perp$ and $w \neq 0$, then $\pi(d_v \nabla h_K \cdot w) \neq 0$. Putting everything together, this proves that $d_\xi \psi_u$ has no kernel, which is what we wanted. \square

As a direct consequence we derive a formula for the support function.

Theorem 3.1.24. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ be a curved convex body. Then the support function of its fiber body is

$$h_{\Sigma_\pi K}(u) = \int_V \langle u, \nabla h_K(u + \xi) \rangle \cdot J_{\psi_u}(\xi) d\xi \quad (3.1.8)$$

for all $u \in W$, where $\psi_u : V \rightarrow V$ is given by $\psi_u(\xi) = (\pi \circ \nabla h_K)(u + \xi)$ and $J_{\psi_u}(\xi)$ denotes its Jacobian at the point ξ .

Proof. Apply the previous lemma to $h_{\Sigma_\pi K}(u) = \langle u, \nabla h_{\Sigma_\pi K}(u) \rangle$. \square

Example 3.1.25. In [Sch13, note 6 of Section 3.5] Schneider exhibits an example of a one parameter family of semialgebraic centrally symmetric convex bodies that are not zonoids. Their support function is polynomial when restricted to the sphere. We will show how in that case Theorem 3.1.24 makes the computation of the fiber body relatively easy.

Schneider’s polynomial body is the convex body $K_\alpha \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ whose support function is given by

$$h_{K_\alpha}(u) = \|u\| \left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \left(\frac{3(u_3)^2}{\|u\|^2} - 1 \right) \right)$$

for $\alpha \in [-8/20, -5/20]$. Let $\pi := \langle e_1, \cdot \rangle : \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the projection onto the first coordinate. We want to apply Theorem 3.1.24 to compute the support function of $\Sigma_\pi K_\alpha$. For the gradient we obtain:

$$\nabla h_{K_\alpha}(u) = \frac{1}{2\|u\|^3} \begin{pmatrix} -u_1 ((u_1)^2(\alpha - 2) + (u_2)^2(\alpha - 2) + 2(u_3)^2(2\alpha - 1)) \\ -u_2 ((u_1)^2(\alpha - 2) + (u_2)^2(\alpha - 2) + 2(u_3)^2(2\alpha - 1)) \\ \frac{u_3}{\|u\|^2} ((u_1)^2(5\alpha + 2) + (u_2)^2(5\alpha + 2) + 2(u_3)^2(2\alpha + 1)) \end{pmatrix}.$$

For $u = (0, u_2, u_3)$, the Jacobian is $J_{\psi_u}(t) = \frac{d}{dt}(\pi \circ \nabla h_{K_\alpha}(t, u_2, u_3))$, which gives

$$J_{\psi_u}(t) = \frac{t^2(-(u_2)^2(\alpha - 2) + (u_3)^2(5\alpha + 2)) - \|u\|^2((u_2)^2(\alpha - 2) + 2(u_3)^2(2\alpha - 1))}{2(t^2 + \|u\|^2)^{\frac{5}{2}}}.$$

Substituting in (3.1.8), we integrate $\langle u, \nabla h_{K_\alpha}(t, u_2, u_3) \rangle \cdot J_{\psi_u}(t)$ and get the support function of the fiber body (see Figure 3.4) which is again polynomial: $h_{\Sigma_{\pi K_\alpha}}(u)$ equals

$$\frac{\pi}{64\|u\|^3} \left(8(\alpha - 2)(u_2)^4 - 8(\alpha^2 + 2\alpha - 8)(u_2)^2(u_3)^2 + (-25\alpha^2 + 16\alpha + 32)(u_3)^4 \right).$$




Figure 3.4: The fiber bodies of Schneider's polynomial bodies for $\alpha = -i/20$ with $i = 5, 6$ and 7

◆

Assume that the support function h_K is *algebraic*, i.e., it is a root of some polynomial equation. Then the integrand in Lemma 3.1.23 and in Theorem 3.1.24 is also algebraic. Indeed, it is simply $\nabla h_K(u + \xi)$ times the Jacobian of ψ_u , which is a composition of algebraic functions. We can generalize this concept in the direction of D -modules (see [Zei90], or [SS19] for a text with a view towards applied nonlinear algebra). One can define what it means for a D -ideal of the Weyl algebra $D = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_d]\langle \partial_1, \dots, \partial_d \rangle$ to be *holonomic*. Let I be a D -ideal and consider the initial ideal $in_v(I)$ where the weight $v \in \mathbb{C}^{2d}$ has d zeros followed by d ones. The *characteristic variety* $\text{Char}(I)$ is the vanishing locus of $in_v(I)$ in \mathbb{C}^{2d} . By [SKK73], every irreducible component of $\text{Char}(I)$ has dimension at least d . The D -ideal I is said to be holonomic when $\dim \text{Char}(I) = d$.

Then a function f is *holonomic* if its annihilator

$$\text{Ann}(f) = \{P \in D \mid P \bullet f = 0\},$$

is a holonomic D -ideal, where \bullet is the application of the differential operator P to the function f . For instance, algebraic functions are holonomic. A property which is relevant in our framework is that holonomicity is preserved by integration. We say that a convex body K is *holonomic* if its support function h_K is holonomic. In this setting, the fiber body satisfies the following property.

Corollary 3.1.26. If K is a curved holonomic convex body, then its fiber body is holonomic.

Proof. We prove that the integrand in Theorem 3.1.24 is a holonomic function of u and ξ . Then the result follows from the fact that the integral of a holonomic function is holonomic [SS19, Proposition 2.11]. If h_K is holonomic then $\nabla h_K(u + \xi)$ is a holonomic function of u and ξ , as well as its scalar product with u . It remains to prove that the Jacobian of ψ_u is holonomic. But ψ_u is the projection of a holonomic function and thus holonomic, so the result follows. □

3.1.3. Fiber zonoids

We now show that the fiber body of a zonoid is a zonoid and give a formula to compute it in Theorem 3.1.31. Let us first introduce some of the tools used by Esterov in [Est08]. For any $u \in W$ let $T_u = \mathbb{1}_V \oplus \langle u, \cdot \rangle : V \oplus W \rightarrow V \oplus \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 3.1.27. Let $K \in \mathcal{K}(V \oplus \mathbb{R})$ and let π be the orthogonal projection onto V . The *shadow volume* $V_+(K)$ of K is defined to be the integral of the maximal function on $\pi(K) \subset V$ such that its graph is contained in K , i.e.,

$$V_+(K) = \int_{\pi(K)} \varphi(x) dx,$$

where $\varphi(x) = \sup \{t \mid (x, t) \in K\}$. In particular, if $-K = K$ then the shadow volume is $V_+(K) = \frac{1}{2} \text{vol}_{n+1}(K)$.

The shadow volume can then be used to express the support function of the fiber body.

Lemma 3.1.28. For $u \in W$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$, we have

$$h_{\Sigma_\pi K}(u) = V_+(T_u(K)).$$

In particular, if $-K = K$

$$h_{\Sigma_\pi K}(u) = \frac{1}{2} \text{vol}_{n+1}(T_u(K)). \quad (3.1.9)$$

Proof. We also denote by $\pi : V \oplus \mathbb{R} \rightarrow V$ the projection onto V . The shadow volume is the integral over $\pi(T_u(K)) = \pi(K)$ of the function $\varphi(x) = \sup \{t \mid (x, t) \in T_u(K)\} = \sup \{\langle u, y \rangle \mid (x, y) \in K\} = h_{K_x}(u)$. Thus the result follows from Proposition 3.1.6. \square

Remark 3.1.29. Note that if $m = 2$ then T_u is the projection onto the hyperplane spanned by V and u . In that case (3.1.9) is the formula for the support function of the *projection body* ΠK of K at gu , where g is a rotation by $\pi/2$ in W , see [Sch13, Section 10.9]. In that case, $\Sigma_\pi K$ is the projection of ΠK onto W rotated by $\pi/2$.

We will show that the mixed fiber body of zonoids comes from a multilinear map defined directly on the vector spaces.

Definition 3.1.30. We define the following (completely skew-symmetric) multilinear map:

$$\begin{aligned} F_\pi : (V \oplus W)^{n+1} &\rightarrow W \\ ((x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_{n+1}, y_{n+1})) &\mapsto \frac{1}{(n+1)!} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} (-1)^{n+1-i} (x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{x}_i \wedge \dots \wedge x_{n+1}) y_i \end{aligned}$$

where $x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \hat{x}_i \wedge \dots \wedge x_{n+1}$ denotes the determinant of the chosen vectors, omitting x_i .

We are now able to prove the main result of this section, here stated in the probabilistic language of Vitale zonoids, as in Theorem 2.1.6.

Theorem 3.1.31. The fiber body of a zonoid is a zonoid. Moreover, if $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ is a random vector such that $\mathbb{E}\|X\| < \infty$ and $K = K(X)$ is the associated Vitale zonoid, then

$$\Sigma_\pi K = K(F_\pi(X_1, \dots, X_{n+1}))$$

where $X_1, \dots, X_{n+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ are i.i.d. copies of X . In other words, the support function of the fiber body $\Sigma_\pi K$ is given for all $u \in W$ by

$$h_{\Sigma_\pi K}(u) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}|\langle u, Y \rangle| \quad (3.1.10)$$

where $Y \in W$ is the random vector defined by $Y = F_\pi(X_1, \dots, X_{n+1})$.

Proof. Denote $K = K(X)$ and let $u \in W$. Note that by (2.1.1) and Proposition 1.1.19 (iii), $T_u(K) = K(T_u(X_1))$. Thus by (3.1.9) and [Vit91, Theorem 3.2] we get

$$h_{\Sigma_\pi K}(u) = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{vol}(K(T_u(X))) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{(n+1)!} \mathbb{E}|T_u(X_1) \wedge \dots \wedge T_u(X_{n+1})| \quad (3.1.11)$$

where $X_1, \dots, X_{n+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ are independent identically distributed copies of X . Let us write $X_i := (\alpha_i, \beta_i)$ with $\alpha_i \in V$ and $\beta_i \in W$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |T_u(X_1) \wedge \dots \wedge T_u(X_{n+1})| &= |(\alpha_1, \langle u, \beta_1 \rangle) \wedge \dots \wedge (\alpha_{n+1}, \langle u, \beta_{n+1} \rangle)| \\ &= \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} (-1)^{n+1-i} (\alpha_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \widehat{\alpha_i} \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_{n+1}) \langle u, \beta_i \rangle \right| \\ &= |\langle u, (n+1)! F_\pi((\alpha_1, \beta_1), \dots, (\alpha_{n+1}, \beta_{n+1})) \rangle|. \end{aligned}$$

Reintroducing this in (3.1.11), we obtain (3.1.10). \square

This allows to generalize [BS92, Theorem 4.1] for all zonotopes.

Corollary 3.1.32. Given $z_1, \dots, z_N \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$, the fiber body of the zonotope $\sum_{i=1}^N [-z_i, z_i]$ is the zonotope given by

$$\Sigma_\pi \left(\sum_{i=1}^N [-z_i, z_i] \right) = (n+1)! \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_{n+1} \leq N} [-F_\pi(z_{i_1}, \dots, z_{i_{n+1}}), F_\pi(z_{i_1}, \dots, z_{i_{n+1}})]. \quad (3.1.12)$$

Proof. We apply Theorem 3.1.31 to the discrete random vector X , that is equal to Nz_i with probability $1/N$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. In this case one can check from (2.1.1) that the Vitale zonoid $K(X)$ is precisely the zonotope $\sum_{i=1}^N [-z_i, z_i]$, and the result follows from (3.1.10). \square

An implementation of formula (3.1.12) for OSCAR 0.8.2-DEV [OSC22] and SageMath 9.2 [Sag21] is available at <https://mathrepo.mis.mpg.de/FiberZonotopes>.

Esterov shows in [Est08] that the map $\Sigma_\pi : \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m}) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(W)$ comes from another map, which is (Minkowski) multilinear in each variable: the so called *mixed fiber body*. The following is [Est08, Theorem 1.2].

Proposition 3.1.33. There is a unique symmetric multilinear map

$$M\Sigma_\pi : (\mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m}))^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(W)$$

such that for all $K \in \mathcal{K}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$, we have $M\Sigma_\pi(K, \dots, K) = \Sigma_\pi(K)$.

Once its existence is proved, one can see that the mixed fiber body $M\Sigma_\pi(K_1, \dots, K_{n+1})$ is the coefficient of $t_1 \dots t_{n+1}$ in the expansion of $\Sigma_\pi(t_1 K_1 + \dots + t_{n+1} K_{n+1})$, up to a factor of $(n+1)!$. Using this *polarization formula*, one can deduce from Theorem 3.1.31 a similar statement for the mixed fiber body of zonoids.

Proposition 3.1.34. The mixed fiber body of zonoids is a zonoid. Moreover, if the random vectors $X_1, \dots, X_{n+1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ are independent (not necessarily identically distributed) and such that $\mathbb{E}\|X_i\|$ is finite, and if $K_i = K(X_i)$ are the associated Vitale zonoids, then

$$M\Sigma_\pi(K_1, \dots, K_{n+1}) = K(F_\pi(X_1, \dots, X_{n+1})).$$

Proof. Let us show the case of $n + 1 = 2$ variables. The general case is done in a similar way. Let $\tilde{X} := 2t_1\alpha X_1 + 2t_2(1-\alpha)X_2$ where α is a Bernoulli random variable of parameter $1/2$ independent of X_1 and X_2 . Using (2.1.1), one can check that $K(\tilde{X}) = t_1K_1 + t_2K_2$. Now let Y_1 (respectively Y_2) be an i.i.d. copy of X_1 (respectively X_2) independent of all the other variables. Define $\tilde{Y} := 2t_1\beta Y_1 + 2t_2(1-\beta)Y_2$ where β is a Bernoulli random variable of parameter $1/2$ independent of all the other variables. By Theorem 3.1.31 we have that $\Sigma_\pi(t_1K_1 + t_2K_2) = K(F_\pi(\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}))$. By (2.1.1), using the independence assumptions, it can be deduced that the following holds for all $t_1, t_2 \geq 0$

$$h_{K(F_\pi(\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}))} = t_1^2 h_{\Sigma_\pi K_1} + t_2^2 h_{\Sigma_\pi K_2} + t_1 t_2 (h_{K(F_\pi(X_1, Y_2))} + h_{K(F_\pi(Y_1, X_2))}).$$

The claim follows from the fact that $K(F_\pi(X_1, Y_2)) = K(F_\pi(Y_1, X_2)) = K(F_\pi(X_1, X_2))$. \square

Example 3.1.35. Consider the dice \mathcal{D} from Example 2.2.19. Its boundary consists of 7 patches: 6 two-dimensional discs of radius 1, lying in the center of the facets of the cube $[-2, 2]^3$, and an irreducible surface.

Let $\pi := \langle e_1, \cdot \rangle : \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Even in this simple example the fibers of the dice under this projection can be tricky to describe. However, using the formula for zonoids one can compute explicitly the fiber body (see Figure 3.5) as explained in the next proposition. \diamond




Figure 3.5: The fiber body of the dice.

Proposition 3.1.36. In the setting of Example 3.1.35, with respect to the projection π onto the first coordinate, the fiber body of the dice \mathcal{D} is

$$\Sigma_\pi(\mathcal{D}) = D_1 + \frac{\pi}{4} \left([(0, -1, 0), (0, 1, 0)] + [(0, 0, -1), (0, 0, 1)] \right) + \frac{1}{2} \Lambda$$

where Λ is the convex body whose support function is given by

$$h_\Lambda(u_2, u_3) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\pi \sqrt{\cos(\theta)^2 (u_2)^2 + \sin(\theta)^2 (u_3)^2} d\theta.$$

Proof. First of all let us note that by expanding the mixed fiber body $M\Sigma_\pi(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D})$ we have

$$\Sigma_\pi(\mathcal{D}) = \Sigma_\pi(D_1) + \Sigma_\pi(D_2) + \Sigma_\pi(D_3) + 2(M\Sigma_\pi(D_1, D_2) + M\Sigma_\pi(D_1, D_3) + M\Sigma_\pi(D_2, D_3)).$$

Using the notation introduced for discotopes, given a generalized disc $D_{\{b_1, b_2\}}$, define the random vector $\sigma(\theta) := (\cos(\theta)b_1 + \sin(\theta)b_2)$ with $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$ uniformly distributed. Then

$$D_{\{b_1, b_2\}} = \pi \cdot K(\sigma(\theta)) \tag{3.1.13}$$

In other words we can write the support function as

$$h_{\{b_1, b_2\}}(u) = \sqrt{\langle u, b_1 \rangle^2 + \langle u, b_2 \rangle^2} = \frac{\pi}{2} \mathbb{E}|\langle u, \sigma(\theta) \rangle|. \quad (3.1.14)$$

Let $\sigma_1(\theta) := (0, \cos(\theta), \sin(\theta))$, $\sigma_2(\theta) := (\cos(\theta), 0, \sin(\theta))$ and $\sigma_3(\theta) := (\cos(\theta), \sin(\theta), 0)$ in such a way that $h_{D_i}(u) = \frac{\pi}{2} \mathbb{E}|\langle u, \sigma_i(\theta) \rangle|$. We then want to use Theorem 3.1.31 and Proposition 3.1.34 to compute all the summands of the expansion of $\Sigma_\pi(\mathcal{D})$.

Using (3.1.13), we have that $M\Sigma_\pi(D_i, D_j) = \pi^2 K(F_\pi(\sigma_i(\theta), \sigma_j(\phi)))$ with $\theta, \phi \in [0, 2\pi]$ uniform and independent. In our case, $F_\pi(x, y) = (x_1 y_2 - y_1 x_2, x_1 y_3 - y_1 x_3)/2$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F_\pi(\sigma_1(\theta), \sigma_1(\phi)) &= 0, \\ F_\pi(\sigma_2(\theta), \sigma_2(\phi)) &= \frac{1}{2}(0, \sin(\phi - \theta)), \quad F_\pi(\sigma_3(\theta), \sigma_3(\phi)) = \frac{1}{2}(\sin(\phi - \theta), 0), \\ F_\pi(\sigma_1(\theta), \sigma_2(\phi)) &= -\frac{\cos(\phi)}{2}(\cos(\theta), \sin(\theta)), \quad F_\pi(\sigma_1(\theta), \sigma_3(\phi)) = -\frac{\cos(\phi)}{2}(\cos(\theta), \sin(\theta)), \\ F_\pi(\sigma_2(\theta), \sigma_3(\phi)) &= \frac{1}{2}(\cos(\theta) \sin(\phi), \sin(\theta) \cos(\phi)). \end{aligned}$$

Computing the support function $h_{\pi^2 K(F_\pi(\sigma_i(\theta), \sigma_j(\phi)))} = \frac{\pi^2}{2} \mathbb{E}|\langle u, F_\pi(\sigma_i(\theta), \sigma_j(\phi)) \rangle|$ and using that $\mathbb{E}|\cos(\phi)| = 2/\pi$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_\pi(D_1) &= 0, \quad \Sigma_\pi(D_2) = \frac{\pi}{4} [(0, -1, 0), (0, 1, 0)], \quad \Sigma_\pi(D_3) = \frac{\pi}{4} [(0, 0, -1), (0, 0, 1)], \\ M\Sigma_\pi(D_1, D_2) &= M\Sigma_\pi(D_1, D_3) = \frac{1}{4} D_1 \end{aligned}$$

It only remains to compute $M\Sigma_\pi(D_2, D_3)$. We have

$$h_{M\Sigma_\pi(D_2, D_3)}(u) = \frac{\pi^2}{8} \mathbb{E}|\langle u, F_\pi(\sigma_2(\theta), \sigma_3(\phi)) \rangle| = \frac{\pi^2}{16} \mathbb{E}|u_2 \cos(\theta) \sin(\phi) + u_3 \sin(\theta) \cos(\phi)|.$$

We use then the independence of θ and ϕ and (3.1.14) to find

$$h_{M\Sigma_\pi(D_2, D_3)}(u) = \frac{\pi}{8} \mathbb{E} \sqrt{\cos(\theta)^2 (u_2)^2 + \sin(\theta)^2 (u_3)^2} = \frac{1}{4} h_\Lambda(u)$$

Putting back together everything we obtain the result. \square

Remark 3.1.37. It is worth noticing that the convex body Λ also appears, up to a multiple, in [BL16, Section 5.1] where it is called $D(2)$, with no apparent link to fiber bodies. In the case where $u_2 \neq 0$ we have

$$h_\Lambda(u) = |u_2| E \left(\sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{u_3}{u_2} \right)^2} \right)$$

where $E(s) = \int_0^{\pi/2} \sqrt{1 - s^2 \sin(\theta)^2} d\theta$ is the complete elliptic integral of the second kind. This function is not semialgebraic thus the example of the dice shows that the fiber body of a semialgebraic convex body is not necessarily semialgebraic. However, E is holonomic. This suggests that the curved assumption in Corollary 3.1.26 may not be needed.

3.2. Intersection bodies of polytopes

If for fiber bodies it was natural to look at the support function, here we are going to deal with the radial function. Regarding the notation, in this section only we will use ‘ x ’ for a point in \mathbb{R}^d and ‘ u ’ for a point in S^{d-1} (and not for the dual space, as usual).

Definition 3.2.1. Let K be a convex body in \mathbb{R}^d . Its *intersection body* is the starshaped set IK with radial function (restricted to the sphere)

$$\rho_{IK}(u) = \text{vol}_{d-1}(K \cap u^\perp)$$

for $u \in S^{d-1}$, where vol_i is the i -dimensional Euclidean volume, for $i \leq d$.

We focus here on the study of intersection bodies of polytopes, and begin our investigation by considering polytopes which contain the origin. If the origin belongs to the interior of the polytope P , then ρ_P is continuous and hence ρ_{IP} is also continuous [Gar06]. Otherwise we may have some points of discontinuity which correspond to unit vectors u such that u^\perp contains a facet of P ; there are finitely many such directions. The intersection body is well defined, but there may arise subtleties when dealing with the boundary. However, we will see later (in Remark 3.2.10) that for our purposes everything works out.

Example 3.2.2. We will use the cube as an ongoing example to illustrate the key concepts. Let P be the 3-dimensional cube $[-1, 1]^3 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$. If we intersect P with hyperplanes $(x, y, z)^\perp$, for $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, we can observe that there are two possible combinatorial types (for the definition see [Zie95, Section 2.2]) for $P \cap (x, y, z)^\perp$: it is either a parallelogram or a hexagon, as displayed in Figure 3.6. There are finitely many regions of \mathbb{R}^3 for which the




Figure 3.6: The two combinatorial types of hyperplane sections of the 3-cube.

combinatorial type stays the same (as stated more precisely in Lemma 3.2.3). Using this we can parametrize the area of the parallelogram or hexagon with respect to the vector (x, y, z) to construct the radial function of IP . Indeed, as will be shown in the proof of Theorem 3.2.5, this can be equivalently written to provide a semialgebraic description of the intersection body. In particular, if the intersection $P \cap (x, y, z)^\perp$ is a square, then the radial function in a neighborhood of (x, y, z) will be a constant term over a coordinate variable, e.g. $\frac{4}{z}$. On the other hand, when the intersection is a hexagon, the radial function is a degree two polynomial over xyz . The intersection body is convex as promised by the theory and displayed in Figure 3.9, left. We continue the analysis in Example 3.2.11. ♦

Lemma 3.2.3. Let P be a full-dimensional polytope in \mathbb{R}^d . Then there exists a central hyperplane arrangement \mathcal{H} in \mathbb{R}^d whose maximal open chambers C satisfy the following property. For all $x \in C$, the hyperplane x^\perp intersects a fixed set of edges of P and the polytopes $Q = P \cap x^\perp$ are of the same combinatorial type.

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ and consider $Q = P \cap x^\perp$. The vertices of Q are the points of intersection of x^\perp with the edges of P . Perturbing x continuously, the intersecting edges (and thus the combinatorial type) remain the same, unless the hyperplane x^\perp passes through a vertex v of P . This happens if and only if $\langle x, v \rangle = 0$ and thus the set of normal vectors of such hyperplanes is given by $v^\perp = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \langle x, v \rangle = 0\}$. Taking the union over all vertices yields the central hyperplane arrangement

$$\mathcal{H} = \{v^\perp \mid v \text{ is a vertex of } P \text{ and } v \text{ is not the origin}\}.$$

Then each open region C of $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathcal{H}$ is a convex cone. C contains points x such that x^\perp intersects a fixed set of edges of P . Hence, the combinatorial type of the polytope $Q = P \cap x^\perp$, with $x \in C$ is independent of x . \square

The proof of Lemma 3.2.3 implies that the number of regions we are interested in is the number of chambers of the central hyperplane arrangement \mathcal{H} . Denote by m the cardinality of the set $\{v \text{ is a vertex of } P\}/\sim$, where $v \sim w$ if $v = \pm w$. There is an upper bound for the number of chambers of \mathcal{H} :

$$\sum_{j=0}^d \binom{m}{j}$$

which is the number of chambers of a generic arrangement [Sta07, Prop. 2.4].

Remark 3.2.4. We note that there are several ways to view the hyperplane arrangement \mathcal{H} in Lemma 3.2.3. For example, since the vertices of P are the normal vectors to the facets of the dual polytope P° , we can describe \mathcal{H} as the collection of linear hyperplanes which are parallel to facets of P° . We also note that \mathcal{H} induces a fan Σ , which is the normal fan of a zonotope whose edge directions are orthogonal to the hyperplanes of \mathcal{H} :

$$Z(P) = \sum_{v \text{ is a vertex of } P} [-v, v].$$

We will call this object the *zonotope associated to P* . As will be clarified later in Remark 3.2.17, the dual body of $Z(P)$ plays an important role in the visualization and the combinatorics of the intersection body IP .

Theorem 3.2.5. Let $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a full-dimensional polytope containing the origin. Then IP , the intersection body of P , is semialgebraic.

Proof. Fix a region $U = C \cap S^{d-1}$ for an open cone C from Lemma 3.2.3. For every $u \in U$ the hyperplane u^\perp intersects P in the same set of edges. Let v be a vertex of $Q = P \cap u^\perp$. Then there is an edge $[a, b]$ of P such that $v = [a, b] \cap u^\perp$. This implies that $v = \lambda a + (1 - \lambda)b$ for some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and $\langle v, u \rangle = 0$. From this we get that

$$\lambda = \frac{\langle b, u \rangle}{\langle b - a, u \rangle}$$

which implies that

$$v = \frac{\langle b, u \rangle}{\langle b - a, u \rangle}(a - b) + b = \frac{\langle b, u \rangle a - \langle a, u \rangle b}{\langle b - a, u \rangle}.$$

In this way we express v as a function of u (for fixed a and b). Let v_1, \dots, v_n be the vertices of Q and let $[a_i, b_i]$ be the corresponding edges of P .

We now consider the following triangulation of Q : first, triangulate each facet of Q that does not contain the origin, without adding new vertices (this can always be done, e.g., by a regular subdivision using a generic lifting function, see [LRS10, Prop. 2.2.4]). For each $(d-2)$ -dimensional simplex Δ in this triangulation, consider the $(d-1)$ -dimensional simplex $\text{conv}(\Delta, 0)$ with the origin. These constitute a triangulation $T = \{\Delta_j : j \in J\}$ of Q , in which the origin is a vertex of every simplex.

Restricting to U , the radial function of the intersection body IP in direction u is the volume of Q , and hence given by

$$\rho_{IP}(u) = \text{vol}(Q) = \sum_{j \in J} \text{vol}(\Delta_j).$$

We can thus compute $\rho_{IP}(u)$ as

$$\rho_{IP}(u) = \sum_{j \in J} \frac{1}{(d-1)!} |\det(M_j(u))|,$$

where

$$M_j(u) = \begin{bmatrix} v_{i_1}(u) \\ v_{i_2}(u) \\ \vdots \\ v_{i_{d-1}}(u) \\ u \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\langle b_{i_1}, u \rangle a_{i_1} - \langle a_{i_1}, u \rangle b_{i_1}}{\langle b_{i_1} - a_{i_1}, u \rangle} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\langle b_{i_{d-1}}, u \rangle a_{i_{d-1}} - \langle a_{i_{d-1}}, u \rangle b_{i_{d-1}}}{\langle b_{i_{d-1}} - a_{i_{d-1}}, u \rangle} \\ u \end{bmatrix}$$

and the row vectors $\{v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_{d-1}}\}$ (along with the origin) are vertices of the simplex Δ_j of the triangulation. Therefore, we obtain an expression $\rho_{IP}(u) = \frac{p(u)}{q(u)}$ for some polynomials $p, q \in \mathbb{R}[u_1, \dots, u_d]$ without common factors, for $u \in U$. With the same procedure applied to all regions $U_i = C_i \cap S^{d-1}$, for C_i as in Lemma 3.2.3, we obtain an expression for $\rho|_{S^{d-1}}$ that is continuous and piecewise a quotient of two polynomials p_i, q_i . It follows from the definition of the radial function that

$$IP = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \rho_{IP}(x) \geq 1 \right\} = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \frac{1}{\|x\|} \rho_{IP}\left(\frac{x}{\|x\|}\right) \geq 1 \right\}.$$

Notice that for every $j \in J$ we have the following equality:

$$\det\left(M_j\left(\frac{x}{\|x\|}\right)\right) = \det \begin{bmatrix} v_{i_1}\left(\frac{x}{\|x\|}\right) \\ \vdots \\ v_{i_{d-1}}\left(\frac{x}{\|x\|}\right) \\ \frac{x}{\|x\|} \end{bmatrix} = \det \begin{bmatrix} v_{i_1}(x) \\ \vdots \\ v_{i_{d-1}}(x) \\ \frac{x}{\|x\|} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{\|x\|} \det(M_j(x))$$

and therefore, if $\frac{x}{\|x\|} \in U$,

$$\rho_{IP}\left(\frac{x}{\|x\|}\right) = \sum_{j \in J} \frac{1}{(d-1)!} \left| \det\left(M_j\left(\frac{x}{\|x\|}\right)\right) \right| = \frac{1}{\|x\|} \sum_{j \in J} \frac{1}{(d-1)!} |\det(M_j(x))| = \frac{p(x)}{\|x\| q(x)}.$$

By Proposition 1.2.8, since the radial function is a semialgebraic map, the intersection body is also semialgebraic. More explicitly, let I be the set of indices i such that $\rho_{IP}|_{U_i} \neq 0$.

Then we can write the intersection body as

$$\begin{aligned} IP &= \bigcup_{i \in I} \left\{ x \in \text{cl}(C_i) \mid \frac{1}{\|x\|^2} \cdot \frac{p_i(x)}{q_i(x)} \geq 1 \right\} \\ &= \bigcup_{i \in I} \left\{ x \in \text{cl}(C_i) \mid \|x\|^2 q_i(x) - p_i(x) \leq 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

This expression gives a semialgebraic description of IP . \square

Example 3.2.6. Let P be the regular icosahedron in \mathbb{R}^3 , whose 12 vertices are all the even permutations of $(0, \pm\frac{1}{2}, \pm(\frac{1}{4}\sqrt{5} + \frac{1}{4}))$. The associated hyperplane arrangement has $32 = 12 + 20$ chambers. The first type of chambers is spanned by five rays and the radial function of IP is given by a quotient of a quartic and a quintic, defined over $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})$. In the remaining twenty chambers ρ_{IP} is a quintic over a sextic, again with coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})$. This intersection body is the convex set shown in Figure 3.7. We will continue




Figure 3.7: The intersection body of the icosahedron.

the analysis of IP in Example 3.2.18. \diamond

The theory of intersection bodies assures that the intersection body of a centrally symmetric convex body is again a centrally symmetric convex body, as it happens in Examples 3.2.2 and 3.2.6. On the other hand, given any polytope P (indeed this holds more generally for any convex body) there exists a translation of P such that IP is not convex. This is the content of the next example.

Example 3.2.7. Let P be the cube $[-1, 1]^3 + (1, 1, 1)$, so that the origin is a vertex of P . The hyperplane arrangement associated to P divides the space in 32 chambers. In two of them the radial function is 0. In six regions the radial function has the following shape (up to permutation of the coordinates and sign):

$$\rho(x, y, z) = \frac{4}{z}.$$

There are then $18 = 6 + 12$ regions in which the radial function looks like

$$\rho(x, y, z) = \frac{2x}{yz} \quad \text{or} \quad \rho(x, y, z) = \frac{2(x + 2z)}{yz}.$$

In the remaining six regions we have functions such as

$$\rho(x, y, z) = \frac{2(x^2 + 2xy + y^2 + 2xz + z^2)}{xyz}.$$

Figure 3.8 shows two different points of view of IP , which is in particular not convex. \diamond




Figure 3.8: The intersection body of the cube in Example 3.2.7 from two different points of view.

3.2.1. The role of the origin

The proof of Theorem 3.2.5 relies on the fact that the origin is in the polytope. However, if the origin is not contained in P , we can still find a semialgebraic description of IP by adjusting how we compute the volume of $P \cap u^\perp$. The remainder of this section will be dedicated to proving this.

Lemma 3.2.8. Let $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a full-dimensional polytope, and let \mathcal{F} be the set of its facets. Let p be a point outside of P . For each face $F \in \mathcal{F}$, let \hat{F} denote the set $\text{conv}(F \cup \{p\})$. Then the following equality holds:

$$\text{vol}(P) = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \text{sgn}(F) \text{vol}(\hat{F})$$

where $\text{sgn}(F)$ is 1 if P and p belong to the same halfspace defined by F , and -1 otherwise.

Proof. Let $\hat{P} = \text{conv}(P \cup \{p\})$ and denote by \mathcal{F}_p^+ the set of facets F of P for which the halfspace defined by F containing P also contains p , possibly on its boundary. Let $\mathcal{F}_p^- = \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}_p^+$. First we will show that $\hat{P} = \bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}_p^+} \hat{F}$. The inclusion $\bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}_p^+} \hat{F} \subseteq \hat{P}$ follows immediately from convexity. To see the opposite direction, let $q \in \hat{P}$ and consider r to be the ray starting at p and going through q . Either r intersects P only along its boundary, or there are some intersection points also in the interior of P . In the first case $r \cap P \subset F$ and so $q \in \hat{F}$ for some face F , that by convexity must be in \mathcal{F}_p^+ . On the other hand, if the ray r intersects the interior of the polytope P , denote by a the farthest among the intersection points:

$$\|a - p\| = \max\{\|\alpha - p\| \mid \alpha \in P \cap r\}.$$

Let F_a be a facet containing a . Then, q is contained in the convex hull of $F_a \cup \{p\}$, that is \hat{F}_a . From the definition of a it follows that the halfspace defined by F_a containing p must also contain P , so $F_a \in \mathcal{F}_p^+$ and our statement holds.

Next, we will show that $\bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}_p^-} \hat{F} = \text{cl}(\hat{P} \setminus P)$. The pyramid \hat{F} is contained in the closed halfspace defined by F which contains p . By the definition of \mathcal{F}_p^- this halfspace does not contain P , thus $\hat{F} \cap P = F$. Also, $\hat{F} \subseteq \hat{P}$ so we have that $\hat{F} \subseteq \text{cl}(\hat{P} \setminus P)$ and hence $\bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}_p^-} \hat{F} \subseteq \text{cl}(\hat{P} \setminus P)$. Conversely, let $q \in \text{cl}(\hat{P} \setminus P)$. If $q = p$ we are done, so assume $q \neq p$. Then, $q = \lambda p + (1 - \lambda)b$ for some $b \in P$, $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Let a be the point at which the segment from p to b first intersects the boundary of P , i.e.,

$$\|a - p\| = \min\{\|\alpha - p\| \mid \alpha \in P, \alpha = tp + (1 - t)b \text{ for } t \in [0, 1]\}.$$

Then by construction there exists a facet $F_a \in \mathcal{F}_p^-$ containing a , such that $q \in \hat{F}_a$. Thus

$$\text{vol}(\bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}_p^+} \hat{F}) = \text{vol}(\hat{P}) = \text{vol}(\hat{P} \setminus P) + \text{vol}(P) = \text{vol}(\bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}_p^-} \hat{F}) + \text{vol}(P).$$

If $F_1 \neq F_2$ and $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}_p^+$ or $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}_p^-$, then the volume of $\hat{F}_1 \cap \hat{F}_2$ is zero. Therefore

$$\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_p^+} \text{vol}(\hat{F}) = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}_p^-} \text{vol}(\hat{F}) + \text{vol}(P)$$

and the claim follows. \square

Theorem 3.2.9. Let $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a full-dimensional polytope. Then IP , the intersection body of P , is semialgebraic.

Proof. What remains to be shown is that IP is semialgebraic in the case when the origin is not contained in P , and hence it is not contained in any of its sections $Q = P \cap u^\perp$. From Lemma 3.2.8, with $p = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have that

$$\text{vol}(Q) = \sum_{F \text{ facet of } Q} \text{sgn}(F) \text{vol}(\hat{F})$$

where \hat{F} is the convex hull of F and the origin. Let $T_F = \{\Delta_j : j \in J_F\}$ be a triangulation of F . We can calculate as in the proof of Theorem 3.2.5

$$\text{vol}(\hat{F}) = \sum_{j \in J_F} \frac{1}{(d-1)!} |\det M_j|$$

where M_j is the matrix whose rows are the vertices of the simplex $\Delta_j \in T_F$ and u . We then follow the remainder of the proof of Theorem 3.2.5 to see that the intersection body IP is semialgebraic. \square

The proofs from Theorems 3.2.5 and 3.2.9 lead to an algorithm to compute the radial function of the intersection body of a polytope. This algorithm has as input the polytope P and as output a list of pairs $\{C, \rho|_C\}$ where C is a chamber of the hyperplane arrangement associated to P and $\rho|_C$ is the radial function of IP in C . An implementation of these algorithms for **SageMath** 9.2 [Sag21] and **Oscar** 0.7.1-DEV [OSC22] is available at <https://mathrepo.mis.mpg.de/intersection-bodies>.

3.2.2. Algebraic boundary and degree bound

Knowing the radial function of a convex body K implies knowing its boundary. In fact, when $0 \in \text{int } K$ then $x \in \partial K$ if and only if $\rho_K(x) = 1$ (see Remark 3.2.10 for the other cases). Therefore, using the same notation as in the proof of Theorem 3.2.5, we can observe that the algebraic boundary of the intersection body of a polytope is contained in the union of the varieties $\mathcal{V}(\|x\|^2 q_i(x) - p_i(x))$. Indeed, we actually know more: as will be proved in Proposition 3.2.13, the p_i 's are divisible by the polynomial $\|x\|^2$, and hence

$$\partial_a IP = \bigcup_{i \in I} \mathcal{V}\left(q_i(x) - \frac{p_i(x)}{\|x\|^2}\right)$$

because of the assumption made in the proof of Theorem 3.2.5 that p_i, q_i do not have common components. That is, these are exactly the irreducible components of $\partial_a IP$.

Remark 3.2.10. As anticipated above, there may be difficulties when computing the boundary of IP in the case where the origin is not in the interior of the polytope P . In particular, x is a discontinuity point of the radial function of IP if and only if x^\perp contains a facet of P . Therefore ρ_{IP} has discontinuity points if and only if the origin lies in the union of the affine linear spans of the facets of P . In this case, there are finitely many rays where the radial function is discontinuous and they belong to $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus (\cup_{i \in I} C_i)$, i.e., to the hyperplane arrangement \mathcal{H} . If $d = 2$, these rays disconnect the space, and this implies that we loose part of the (algebraic) boundary of IP : to the set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \rho_{IP}(x) = 1\}$ we need to add segments from the origin to the boundary points in the direction of these rays. However, in higher dimensions the discontinuity rays do not disconnect \mathbb{R}^d so $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \rho_{IP}(x) = 1\}$ approaches the region where the radial function is zero continuously except for these finitely many directions. Therefore there are no extra components of $\partial_a IP$ for $d > 2$.

Example 3.2.11 (Continuation of Example 3.2.2, Figure 3.9, left). Starting from the radial function of the intersection body of the 3-cube P , we can recover the equations of its algebraic boundary. The Euclidean boundary of this convex body is divided in 14 patches. Among them, 6 arise as the intersection of a convex cone spanned by 4 rays with a hyperplane: they constitute facets of IP . For example the facet exposed by the vector $(1, 0, 0)$ is the intersection of $z = 4$ with the convex cone

$$\text{cl}(C_1) = \text{co}\{(1, 0, 1), (-1, 0, 1), (0, 1, 1), (0, -1, 1)\}.$$

In other words, the variety $\mathcal{V}(z - 4)$ is one of the irreducible components of $\partial_a IP$. The remaining 8 patches are spanned by 3 rays each, and the polynomial that defines the boundary of IP is a cubic, such as

$$2xyz - 2x^2 - 4xy - 2y^2 - 4xz + 4yz - 2z^2$$

in the region

$$\text{cl}(C_2) = \text{co}\{(0, 1, 1), (-1, 1, 0), (-1, 0, 1)\}.$$

These cubics are in fact, up to a change of coordinates, the algebraic boundary of an ellotope. Hence $\partial_a IP$ is the union of 14 irreducible components, six of degree 1 and eight of degree 3. \blacklozenge

Remark 3.2.12. It is tempting to think that each region of Lemma 3.2.3 corresponds to a patch, as in Definition 1.2.20. Indeed, this happens for the centered 3-cube in Example 3.2.11. On the other hand, if $P = [-1, 1]^3 + (0, 0, 1)$ there are 4 regions that define the same patch of the algebraic boundary of IP . Therefore there is, unfortunately, no one-to-one correspondence between regions and patches.

Proposition 3.2.13. Using the notation of Lemma 3.2.3 and Theorem 3.2.9, consider a chamber C of \mathcal{H} and let $Q = P \cap u^\perp$ for some $u \in U = C \cap S^{d-1}$. Then the polynomial $\|x\|^2 = x_1^2 + \dots + x_d^2$ divides $p(x)$ and

$$\deg \left(q(x) - \frac{p(x)}{\|x\|^2} \right) \leq f_0(Q).$$

Proof. For the fixed region C , let T be a triangulation of Q with simplices indexed by J . Then the volume of Q is given by

$$\frac{p(x)}{q(x)} = \frac{1}{(d-1)!} \sum_{j \in J} |\det(M_j(x))|$$

where M_j is the matrix as in the proof of Theorem 3.2.5. Notice that for each $M = M_j$, we can rewrite the determinant to factor out a denominator (we also write $\Delta = \Delta_j$):

$$\begin{aligned} \det(M(x)) &= \sum_{\sigma \in S_d} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^d M_{i\sigma(i)} \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in S_d} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) x_{\sigma(d)} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \frac{\langle b_i, u \rangle a_{i\sigma(i)} - \langle a_i, u \rangle b_{i\sigma(i)}}{\langle b_i - a_i, u \rangle} \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \frac{1}{\langle b_i - a_i, u \rangle} \sum_{\sigma \in S_d} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) x_{\sigma(d)} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} (\langle b_i, u \rangle a_{i\sigma(i)} - \langle a_i, u \rangle b_{i\sigma(i)}) \\ &= \left(\prod_{\substack{v_i \in \Delta \\ \text{vertex}}} \frac{1}{\langle b_i - a_i, x \rangle} \right) \cdot \det(\hat{M}(x)) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\hat{M}(x) = \begin{bmatrix} & & \vdots & \\ \langle b_i, x \rangle a_i - \langle a_i, x \rangle b_i & & & \\ & & \vdots & \\ & & & x \end{bmatrix}$$

and the determinant of $\hat{M}(x)$ is a polynomial of degree d in the x_i 's. Note that if we multiply $\hat{M}(x) \cdot x$, then we obtain the vector $(0, \dots, 0, x_1^2 + \dots + x_d^2)$. Hence if $x_1^2 + \dots + x_d^2 = 0$, then $\hat{M}(x) \cdot x = 0$, i.e., the kernel of $\hat{M}(x)$ is non-trivial and thus $\det \hat{M}(x) = 0$. This implies the containment of the complex varieties $\mathcal{V}(\|x\|^2) \subseteq \mathcal{V}(\det \hat{M}(x))$ and therefore the polynomial $x_1^2 + \dots + x_d^2$ divides the polynomial $\det \hat{M}(x)$. When we sum over all the simplices in the triangulation T we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} q(x) &= (d-1)! \left(\prod_{\substack{v_i \in \Delta_j \\ \text{vertex}}} \frac{1}{\langle b_i - a_i, x \rangle} \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{\substack{v_i \notin \Delta_j \\ \text{vertex}}} \frac{1}{\langle b_i - a_i, x \rangle} \right) \\ &= \prod_{\substack{v_i \in Q \\ \text{vertex}}} \frac{1}{\langle b_i - a_i, x \rangle} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$p(x) = \sum_{j \in J} \left(|\det(\hat{M}_j(x))| \cdot \prod_{\substack{v_i \notin \Delta_j \\ \text{vertex}}} \frac{1}{\langle b_i - a_i, x \rangle} \right).$$

Hence $\deg q \leq f_0(Q)$ and $\deg p \leq f_0(Q) + 1$, so the claim follows. \square

Notice that for the generic choice of the vertices of P , the bound in Proposition 3.2.13 is attained, because p and q will not have common factors (see also Example 3.2.16).

Theorem 3.2.14. Let $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a full-dimensional polytope with $f_1(P)$ edges. Then the degrees of the irreducible components of $\partial_a IP$ are bounded from above by

$$f_1(P) - (d-1).$$

Proof. We want to prove that $f_0(Q) \leq f_1(P) - (d-1)$, for every $Q = P \cap u^\perp$, $u \in S^{d-1} \setminus \mathcal{H}$. By definition, every vertex of Q is a point lying on an edge of P , so trivially $f_0(Q) \leq f_1(P)$. We want to argue now that it is impossible to intersect more than $f_1(P) - (d-1)$ edges of P with our hyperplane $H = u^\perp$. If the origin is one of the vertices of P , then all the edges that have the origin as a vertex give rise only to one vertex of Q : the origin itself. There are at least d such edges, because P is full-dimensional, and so $f_0(Q) \leq f_1(P) - (d-1)$.

Suppose now that the origin is not a vertex of P , then H does not contain vertices of P . It divides \mathbb{R}^d in two half spaces H_+ and H_- , and so it divides the vertices of P in two families of k vertices in H_+ and ℓ vertices in H_- . Either k or ℓ are equal to 1, or they are both greater than one. In the first case let us assume without loss of generality that $k = 1$, i.e., there is only one vertex v_+ in H_+ . Then pick one vector v_- in H_- : because P is a full-dimensional polytope, there are at least d edges of P with v_- as a vertex. Only one of them may connect v_- to v_+ and therefore the other $d-1$ edges must lie in H_- . This gives $f_0(Q) \leq f_1(P) - (d-1)$.

On the other hand, let us assume that $k, \ell \geq 2$. Then there is at least one edge in H_+ and one edge in H_- . If $d = 3$, then these are the $d-1$ edges that do not intersect the hyperplane. For $d > 3$ we proceed as follows. Suppose that H intersects a facet F of P . Then it cannot intersect all the facets of F , otherwise we would get $F \subset H$ which contradicts the fact that H does not intersect vertices of P . So there exists a ridge F' of P that does not intersect the hyperplane; it has dimension $d-2 \geq 2$ and therefore it has at least $d-1$ edges. Hence

$$f_0(Q) \leq f_1(P) - (d-1).$$

□

Corollary 3.2.15. In the hypotheses of Theorem 3.2.14, if P is centrally symmetric and centered at the origin, then we can improve the bound with

$$\frac{1}{2} (f_1(P) - (d-1)).$$

Proof. We already know that for each chamber C_i from Lemma 3.2.3, the degree of the corresponding irreducible component is bounded by the degree of the polynomial q_i . This follows from the construction of p_i and q_i in the proof of Theorem 3.2.5. Specifically, the determinant which gives p_i/q_i comes with the product of $d-1$ rational functions, with linear numerators and denominators, and one linear term. Thus $\deg p_i = \deg q_i + 1$ which implies that $\deg \frac{p_i}{\|x\|^2} < \deg q_i$. By definition these polynomials q_i 's are obtained as the least common multiple of objects with shape

$$\prod_{\substack{v_k \in \Delta_j \\ \text{vertex}}} \frac{1}{\langle b_k - a_k, x \rangle}.$$

If P is centrally symmetric, so is Q , and therefore we have a vertex belonging to the edge $[a_k, b_k]$ and also a vertex belonging to the edge $[-a_k, -b_k]$. When computing the least common multiple, these two vertices produce the same factor, up to a sign, and therefore they count as the same linear factor of q_i . Hence, for every i

$$\deg q_i(x) \leq \frac{f_0(Q)}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2} (f_1(P) - (d-1)).$$

□

Example 3.2.16. Let $P = \text{conv}\{(-1, -1, -1), (-1, 1, 1), (1, -1, 1), (1, 1, -1)\}$ be a tetrahedron in \mathbb{R}^3 . The associated hyperplane arrangement coincides with the one associated to the cube in Example 3.2.11, so it has 14 chambers that come in two families. The first one consists of cones spanned by four rays, such as $\text{cl}(C_1)$ (see Example 3.2.11). The polynomial that defines the boundary of IP in this region is a quartic, namely

$$q_2(x, y, z) - \frac{p_2(x, y, z)}{\|(x, y, z)\|^2} = (x + z)(x - z)(y + z)(y - z) - 2(x^2 + y^2 - z^2)z.$$

On the other hand the cones of the second family are spanned by three rays: here the section of P is a triangle and the equation of the boundary if IP is a cubic. An example is the cone $\text{cl}(C_2)$ with the polynomial

$$q_1(x, y, z) - \frac{p_1(x, y, z)}{\|(x, y, z)\|^2} = (x - y)(x - z)(y + z) + (x - y - z)^2.$$

Note that this region furnishes an example in which the bounds given in Proposition 3.2.13 and Theorem 3.2.14 are attained. \blacklozenge




Figure 3.9: Left: the intersection body of the cube in Example 3.2.11. Right: the intersection body of the tetrahedron in Example 3.2.16. Center: the dual body of the zonotope $Z(P)$ associated to both the cube and the tetrahedron. Such a polytope reveals the structure of the boundary divided into regions of these two intersection bodies.

Remark 3.2.17. Remark 3.2.4, together with Proposition 3.2.13, implies that the structure of the irreducible components of the algebraic boundary of IP is strongly connected with the face lattice of the dual of the zonotope $Z(P)$. More precisely, in the generic case, the lattice of intersection of the irreducible components of $\partial_a IP$ is isomorphic to the face lattice of the dual polytope $Z(P)^\circ$. Thus, a classification of ‘combinatorial types’ of such intersection bodies is analogous to the classification of zonotopes / hyperplane arrangements. It is however worth noting, that the same zonotope can be associated to two polytopes P_1 and P_2 which are not combinatorially equivalent. One example of this instance is a pair of polytopes such that $P_1 = \text{conv}(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ and $P_2 = \text{conv}(\pm v_1, \dots, \pm v_n)$, as can be seen in Figure 3.9 for the cube and the tetrahedron. To have a better overview over the structure of the boundary of IP , one strategy is to use the Schlegel diagram [Zie95, Chapter 5] of $Z(P)^\circ$. We label each maximal cell by the degree of the polynomial that defines the corresponding irreducible component of $\partial_a IP$, as can be seen in Figures 3.10, 3.11.

Example 3.2.18 (Continuation of Example 3.2.6, Figure 3.7). Let P be the regular icosahedron. In the 12 regions which are spanned by five rays, the polynomial that defines the




Figure 3.10: The Schlegel diagram of $Z(P)^\circ$, in the case where P is the icosahedron from Example 3.2.18. The labels represent the degrees of the polynomials of $\partial_a IP$.

boundary of IP has degree 5 and it looks like

$$((\sqrt{5}x + \sqrt{5}y - x + y)^2 - 4z^2)((\sqrt{5}x + x + 2y)^2 - (\sqrt{5}z - z)^2)y + \\ 8\sqrt{5}x^3y + 68\sqrt{5}x^2y^2 + 72\sqrt{5}xy^3 + 20\sqrt{5}y^4 - 40\sqrt{5}xyz^2 - 20\sqrt{5}y^2z^2 + 4\sqrt{5}z^4 + \\ 8x^3y + 164x^2y^2 + 168xy^3 + 44y^4 - 8x^2z^2 - 72xyz^2 - 44y^2z^2 + 12z^4.$$

In the other 20 regions spanned by three rays, ∂IP is the zero set of a sextic polynomial with the following shape

$$((\sqrt{5}x + x + 2y)^2 - (\sqrt{5}z - z)^2)((\sqrt{5}y - 2x - y)^2 - (\sqrt{5}z - z)^2)xy + 20\sqrt{5}x^4y - \\ 20\sqrt{5}x^2y^3 - 4\sqrt{5}xy^4 + 4\sqrt{5}y^5 - 4\sqrt{5}x^3z^2 - 60\sqrt{5}x^2yz^2 - 12\sqrt{5}xy^2z^2 + 12\sqrt{5}xz^4 + 44x^4y - \\ 8x^3y^2 - 44x^2y^3 + 12xy^4 + 12y^5 - 12x^3z^2 - 156x^2yz^2 - 60xy^2z^2 - 8y^3z^2 + 28xz^4.$$

We visualize the structure of these pieces using the Schlegel diagram in Figure 3.10, where the numbers correspond to the degree of the polynomials, as noted in Remark 3.2.17. ♦

Using this technique we are then able to visualize the boundary of intersection bodies of 4-dimensional polytopes via the Schlegel diagram of $Z(P)^\circ$.

Example 3.2.19. Let $P = \text{conv}\{(1, 1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0), (0, -1, 0, 0), (0, 0, -1, 0), (0, 0, 0, -1)\}$. The boundary of its intersection body IP is subdivided in 16 regions. In four of them the equation is given by a polynomial of degree 3, whereas in the remaining twelve regions the polynomial has degree 5. In Figure 3.11 we show the Schlegel diagram of

$$Z(P)^\circ = \text{conv}\{\pm(1/2, -1/2, 0, 0), \pm(1, 0, 0, 0), \pm(0, 0, 1, 0), \pm(0, 0, 0, 1)\}$$

with a number associated to each maximal cell which represents the degree of the polynomial in the corresponding region of ∂IP . ♦

3.2.3. The cube

In this section we study the intersection body of the d -dimensional cube $C^{(d)} = [-1, 1]^d$, with a special emphasis on the linear components of its algebraic boundary.

Proposition 3.2.20. The algebraic boundary of the intersection body of the d -dimensional cube $C^{(d)}$ has at least $2d$ linear components. These components correspond to the $2d$ open regions from Lemma 3.2.3 which contain the standard basis vectors and their negatives.




Figure 3.11: The Schlegel diagram of $Z(P)^\circ$ from Example 3.2.19. There are four cells whose corresponding polynomial in $\partial_a IP$ has degree 3, including the outer facet; the others correspond to polynomials of degree 5.

Proof. We show the claim for the first standard basis vector e_1 . The argument for the other vectors $\pm e_i, i = 1, \dots, d$ is analogous. Let C be the region from Lemma 3.2.3 which contains e_1 and consider $U = C \cap S^{d-1}$. For any $u \in U$, the polytope $C^{(d)} \cap u^\perp$ is combinatorially equivalent to $C^{(d-1)}$. Hence we can compute the (signed) volume,

$$\text{vol}(C^{(d)} \cap u^\perp) = \det \begin{bmatrix} v^{(1)} - v^{(0)} \\ \vdots \\ v^{(d-1)} - v^{(0)} \\ u \end{bmatrix},$$

where $v^{(0)}$ is an arbitrarily chosen vertex of $C^{(d)} \cap u^\perp$ and the remaining $v^{(i)}$ are vertices of $C^{(d)} \cap u^\perp$ adjacent to $v^{(0)}$. Next, we observe that for any vertex v of $C^{(d)} \cap u^\perp$ which lies on the edge $[a, b]$ of $C^{(d)}$, v is the vector

$$v = \left(-\frac{1}{u_1} \sum_{j=2}^d a_j u_j, a_2, \dots, a_d \right).$$

This follows from the formulation of v in the proof of Theorem 3.2.5 and the fact that $b_1 = -a_1$ and $b_i = a_i$ for $i = 2, \dots, d$. Combining this with the determinant above gives the following expression for the radial function restricted to U :

$$\rho(u) = \frac{1}{u_1} \det \begin{bmatrix} -\sum_{j=2}^d (a_j^{(1)} - a_j^{(0)}) u_j & a_2^{(1)} - a_2^{(0)} & \cdots & a_d^{(1)} - a_d^{(0)} \\ -\sum_{j=2}^d (a_j^{(2)} - a_j^{(0)}) u_j & a_2^{(2)} - a_2^{(0)} & \cdots & a_d^{(2)} - a_d^{(0)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ -\sum_{j=2}^d (a_j^{(d)} - a_j^{(0)}) u_j & a_2^{(d)} - a_2^{(0)} & \cdots & a_d^{(d)} - a_d^{(0)} \\ u_1^2 & u_2 & \cdots & u_d \end{bmatrix},$$

where we assume the determinant is nonnegative, else we multiply by -1 . Expanding the determinant along the bottom row of the matrix yields

$$\rho(u) = \frac{1}{u_1} \left(u_1^2 \det \begin{bmatrix} a_2^{(1)} - a_2^{(0)} & \cdots & a_d^{(1)} - a_d^{(0)} \\ a_2^{(2)} - a_2^{(0)} & \cdots & a_d^{(2)} - a_d^{(0)} \\ \vdots & & \\ a_2^{(d)} - a_2^{(0)} & \cdots & a_d^{(d)} - a_d^{(0)} \end{bmatrix} + \gamma(u_2, \dots, u_n) \right),$$

where $\gamma(u_2, \dots, u_d)$ is a polynomial consisting of the quadratic terms in the remaining u_i 's. Note that since γ does not contain the variable u_1 and ρ is divisible by the quadric $u_1^2 + \dots + u_d^2$ by Proposition 3.2.13, it follows that

$$\rho(u) = \frac{u_1^2 + \dots + u_d^2}{u_1} \det \begin{bmatrix} a_2^{(1)} - a_2^{(0)} & \dots & a_d^{(1)} - a_d^{(0)} \\ a_2^{(2)} - a_2^{(0)} & \dots & a_d^{(2)} - a_d^{(0)} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ a_2^{(d)} - a_2^{(0)} & \dots & a_d^{(d)} - a_d^{(0)} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.2.1)$$

Let A be the $(d-1) \times (d-1)$ -matrix appearing in (3.2.1). Then the irreducible component of the algebraic boundary on the corresponding region C is described by the linear equation $x_1 = |\det A|$. \square

Note that for an arbitrary polytope P of dimension at least 3, the irreducible components of the algebraic boundary $\partial_a IP$ cannot all be linear. It is implied by the fact that in this setting the intersection body of a convex body is not a polytope. It is thus worth noting that the intersection body of the cube has some linear components. We now investigate the nonlinear pieces of $\partial_a IC^{(4)}$.

Example 3.2.21. Let P be the 4-dimensional cube $[-1, 1]^4$ and IP be its intersection body. The associated hyperplane arrangement has $8 + 32 + 64 = 104$ chambers. The first 8 are spanned by 6 rays and the boundary here is linear, i.e., it is a 3-dimensional cube. For example, the linear face exposed by $(w, x, y, z) = (1, 0, 0, 0)$ is cut out by the hyperplane $w = 8$. The second family of chambers is made of cones with 5 extreme rays, where the boundary is defined by a cubic equation with shape

$$3xyz - 3w^2 - 6x^2 - 12xy - 6y^2 - 12xz + 12yz - 6z^2.$$

Finally, a quartic such as

$$\begin{aligned} 4wxyz - w^3 - 3w^2x - 3wx^2 - x^3 - 3w^2y - 6wxy - 3x^2y - 3wy^2 - 3xy^2 \\ - y^3 - 3w^2z - 6wxz - 3x^2z + 18wyz - 6xyz - 3y^2z - 3wz^2 - 3xz^2 - 3yz^2 - z^3 \end{aligned}$$

defines the boundary of the intersection body in the remaining 64 cones spanned by 4 rays. \blacklozenge

Proposition 3.2.20 gives a lower bound on the number of linear components of the algebraic boundary of $IC^{(d)}$. We conjecture that for any $d \in \mathbb{N}$, the algebraic boundary of the intersection body of the d -dimensional cube centered at the origin has exactly $2d$ linear components. Computational results for $d \leq 5$ support this conjecture, as displayed in Table 3.1. It shows the number of irreducible components of $\partial_a IC^{(d)}$ sorted by the degree of the component, for $d = 2, 3, 4, 5$. The first two columns are the dimension of the polytope, and the number of chambers of the respective hyperplane arrangement \mathcal{H} . The third column is the degree bound from Corollary 3.2.15. The remaining columns show the number of regions whose equation in the algebraic boundary have degree \deg , for $\deg = 1, \dots, 5$.

It is worth noting that the highest degree attained in these examples is equal to the dimension of the respective cube. In particular, the degree bound for centrally symmetric polytopes, as given in Corollary 3.2.15 is not attained in any of the cases for $d \geq 3$. Finally, note that the number of regions grows exponentially in d , and thus for $d \geq 3$, the number of nonlinear components exceeds the number of linear components.

dimension	# chambers	degree bound	deg = 1	2	3	4	5
2	4	1	4	0	0	0	0
3	14	5	6	0	8	0	0
4	104	14	8	0	32	64	0
5	1882	38	10	0	80	320	1472

Table 3.1: Number of irreducible components of the algebraic boundary of the intersection body of the d -cube, listed by degree.

3.2.4. Conclusions

The intersection body IP of a polytope P is a semialgebraic starshaped set. One of the questions that arise naturally asks when IP is convex. This is automatic when the polytope is centrally symmetric centered at the origin. However, convexity is achieved also in other cases. For instance, when $P = [-1, 1]^3 + (0, 0, 1)$ as in Remark 3.2.12, then IP is convex. Indeed, by construction one can verify that the radial function of P is half the radial function of the centered polytope $P' = [-1, 1]^2 \times [-2, 2]$. So $IP = \frac{1}{2}IP'$, and they are convex.

It is possible to argue that if the origin is outside P or lies on a face of P of codimension bigger than 1, then IP is not convex. Then what are the position of the origin that make the intersection body of a given polytope convex? More precisely, it would be interested to understand how IP behaves with respect to translations of P , and what is the topology of the set

$$\mathcal{C}(P) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid I(P + x) \text{ is convex}\}.$$

Conjecture 3.2.22. Let $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a polytope. Then $\mathcal{C}(P)$ is a finite set.

In fact, if P is the 3-dimensional cube, then $\mathcal{C}(P)$ is made of seven points: the center of symmetry of the cube and the centers of the 6 facets.

Intersection bodies have many siblings in convex geometry. Most of them are also not well understood from a geometric point of view. To name a few, there are for instance k -intersection bodies [Kol99] and (p -)cross-section bodies [Mar94, GG99]. How do polytopes behave with respect to these constructions? The intuition is that semialgebraicity should hold also in these cases.

What is not true in general is that the intersection body of a semialgebraic convex body K is semialgebraic (see [Ges22]). An interesting direction would be to understand which kind of set IK is. As for fiber bodies in Corollary 3.1.26, the key ingredient might be holonomicity. This would allow to still have some control on the radial function, also in terms of examples and exact computation.

Chapter 4

The algebra of convex hulls

Understanding the boundary of a convex hull is a difficult task in general. However, algebraic geometry gives the answer in the case of convex hulls of varieties. More precisely, let $X \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ be a complex algebraic variety with a compact real part. We write $\text{conv } X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ for the convex hull of the real part of X . By Proposition 1.2.8, $\text{conv } X$ is a semialgebraic convex body. When X is smooth, [RS11, Theorem 1.1] provides all the irreducible components of $\partial_a(\text{conv } X)$. The special case of algebraic curves and surfaces in the three-dimensional space is the content of [RS12]. In Section 4.1, we focus on two families of surfaces in a four-dimensional space: Del Pezzo and Bordiga surfaces. Theorem 4.1.4 describes the algebraic boundary of the convex hull of a Del Pezzo surface: it is the union of two quadratic hypersurfaces. The Bordiga case is more intricate. Theorem 4.1.14 gives a bound on the degree of $\partial_a \text{conv } X$ when X is a Bordiga surface.

Convex hulls in Section 4.2 have a different flavour. They are convex hulls of *paths*, i.e., piecewise smooth parametrized curves in \mathbb{R}^d . Even though we do not assume that the curves are algebraic, we can use some tools from algebra to give formulae for the volume of the convex hulls. This draws connections to the theory of *signatures* and, in the special case of log-curves, to Feynman integrals and polylogarithms.

4.1. Surfaces in fourspace

In the affine three-dimensional space all proper subvarieties are either points, curves, or hypersurfaces. This is the base of our geometric intuition, also for varieties in higher-dimensional spaces. We therefore have a good idea of what a curve or a hypersurface in \mathbb{R}^d should look like, and which properties it does satisfy. The 0-dimensional case of points is very special and is its own field, the theory of polytopes. Surfaces in the four-dimensional space are the first instance of a variety which does not have dimension or codimension 1. This makes them an interesting object to study. In particular, we want to investigate the geometry of their convex hulls.

We begin by describing the general framework. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^d$ be a projective variety, not contained in any hyperplane. Fix an integer $k \leq d$. Define $X^{[k]}$ as the Zariski closure of the set

$$\{u \in (\mathbb{P}^d)^* \mid u^\perp \text{ is tangent to } X \text{ at } k \text{ linearly independent points}\} \subset (\mathbb{P}^d)^*$$

of hyperplanes tangent to our variety in (at least) k points. So these k points are singularities in the intersection $u^\perp \cap X$. Here $\text{conv } X$ denotes the convex hull of the real points

of $X \cap \{x_0 = 0\}$. Then by [RS11, Theorem 1.1]

$$\partial_a(\text{conv } X) \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^d \left(X^{[k]} \right)^*. \quad (4.1.1)$$

There are various ways in which one can improve the inclusion in (4.1.1). For instance, since $\partial_a(\text{conv } X)$ is a hypersurface, we can get rid of the irreducible components of $\left(X^{[k]} \right)^*$ that have higher codimension. A necessary condition (based on Terracini's Lemma, see [RS11, Section 1]) to be a hypersurface is then that the k -th secant variety of X has at most codimension 1, i.e., that $k \geq \lceil \frac{n}{\dim X + 1} \rceil$. Another issue could be that some of the components in the right hand side of (4.1.1) do not have real points. In this case they do not contribute to the algebraic boundary for sure. The aim of this section is to understand which are the relevant components of the algebraic boundary in the particular case of surfaces in fourspace. The approach consists in analyzing generic surfaces of fixed degree and sectional genus. Since we want to compute convex hulls, we need surfaces with a compact real locus, and this can happen only if $\deg X$ is even. Degree 2 surfaces are embeddings of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ in $\mathbb{P}^3 \subset \mathbb{P}^4$, therefore they have been already investigated in [RS11, Section 2.3]. The first interesting degree is then 4; here we find two families of surfaces: Veronese and Del Pezzo. A Veronese surface has sectional genus 0 and it is the generic projection onto \mathbb{P}^4 of the image of the Veronese map $\nu_2(\mathbb{P}^2) \subset \mathbb{P}^5$. A Del Pezzo surface has sectional genus 1 and it is the complete intersection of two quadrics or, equivalently, the blow up of \mathbb{P}^2 in five generic points. In degree 6 we find Bordiga and K3 surfaces, with sectional genus 3 and 4 respectively. Bordiga surfaces are the blow up of \mathbb{P}^2 in ten generic points, whereas K3 surfaces in fourspace are the complete intersection of a quadric and a cubic hypersurface. Then the classification continues, but we are going to focus just on these low degrees.

Using [Vai95] or [Kaz03], we can compute the degrees of the varieties $X^{[k]}$, as shown in Table 4.1. Indeed, the two papers provide formulae to compute the number of singular curves on a surface, having a certain type of singularities. A general fact is that $X^{[1]}$ is the

surface	$\deg X^{[1]}$	$\deg X^{[2]}$	$\deg X^{[3]}$	$\deg X^{[4]}$
Veronese	3	0	-32	480
Del Pezzo	12	26	40	40
Bordiga	27	235	875	1761
K3	42	672	5460	25650

Table 4.1: The degrees of the $X^{[k]}$'s for low degree surfaces in \mathbb{P}^4 .

dual variety X^* , therefore by the biduality theorem (Proposition 1.2.16 (iii)), $\left(X^{[1]} \right)^* = X$ is not a hypersurface in our cases. The values of k for which $X^{[k]}$ might be relevant for us, are thus $k = 2, 3, 4$. The Veronese variety is peculiar: in this case the hypotheses for Kazarian and Vainsencher's formulae are not satisfied, hence one needs to find another way to compute the degrees of the varieties $X^{[k]}$. K3 surfaces are the only irrational surfaces, among those that we are considering. This makes them special, and there is a whole literature regarding their $X^{[k]}$'s (see for instance [BLC21]). Hence, we focus here on the Del Pezzo and the Bordiga cases. The strategy is to partition the numbers in Table 4.1

with one summand for each irreducible component. We then investigate each irreducible component separately, in order to determine what will be relevant after dualization. In this setting, since we are dealing with blow ups of the plane, studying the family of hyperplanes tangent to X at a certain number of points, translates into studying the family of curves in \mathbb{P}^2 passing through p_1, \dots, p_5 , and having some singularities.

Kazarian and Vainsencher's numbers. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a surface and consider a linear system $|D|$ of divisors on X . Then [Kaz03, Section 10] and [Vai95, Section 5] provide the recipes for computing the number of singular curves in the linear system $|D|$ with prescribed singularities, and going through the correct number of point, in such a way that the answer is finite. For instance, consider the surface $X = \mathbb{P}^2$ and suppose we want to compute the number of rational quartics in X , so that $D = 4L$. Plane quartics constitute a \mathbb{P}^{14} . In order for the quartics to be rational, they need to have generically three nodes: these are our prescribed singularities. Each node condition drops the dimension of this variety by 1, so the variety of rational quartics has codimension 3 in \mathbb{P}^{14} . We want to compute the degree of such variety, so we need to impose 11 linear conditions, namely that these curves pass through 11 points in \mathbb{P}^2 in general position. We obtain in this way a finite set, whose cardinality is computed by Kazarian and Vainsencher's formulae. Vainsencher computes singular curves with a certain number of nodes, whereas Kazarian allows also other types of singularities. In particular, A_1 denotes a node and A_2 denotes a cusp. These are our cases of interest. We will mainly talk about Kazarian's formulae, to avoid jumping between one paper and the other when we need to count cusps. There are four parameters to be considered

$$\begin{aligned} d &= D \cdot D, & k &= D \cdot K_X, \\ s &= K_X \cdot K_X, & x &= \chi(X), \end{aligned} \tag{4.1.2}$$

where K_X is the canonical divisor on X and χ denotes the Euler characteristic. Here ' \cdot ' denotes the intersection product of two divisors, defined on the Picard group $\text{Pic}(X)$ of the surface S [Bea96, Chapter 1]. Then, by plugging such quantities in [Kaz03, Theorem 10.1] one gets the desired numbers. Table 4.2 computes (4.1.2) for the Del Pezzo and Bordiga surfaces. Using these numbers one can get the degrees in Table 4.1:

$$\deg X^{[k]} = N_{A_1^k},$$

using the notation of [Kaz03, Theorem 10.1] in which $N_{A_1^k}$ is the number of singular curves of $|D|$ with k nodes.

surface	D	K_X	d	k	s	x
Del Pezzo	$3\hat{L} - \sum_{i=1}^5 E_i$	$-3\hat{L} + \sum_{i=1}^5 E_i$	4	-4	4	8
Bordiga	$4\hat{L} - \sum_{i=1}^{10} E_i$	$-3\hat{L} + \sum_{i=1}^{10} E_i$	6	-2	-1	13

Table 4.2: The quantities required for Kazarian's formulae.

4.1.1. Del Pezzo

In this section we study the case in which $X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ is a Del Pezzo surface. This type of surfaces arises as a complete intersection of two quadric threefolds. Alternatively, X can

be realized as the blow up $\text{Bl}_{p_1, \dots, p_5} \mathbb{P}^2$ of five points in the projective plane, such that no three points lie on a line [Dol12, Proposition 8.1.25]. Such a surface can then be embedded in \mathbb{P}^4 via the divisor $D = 3\hat{L} - \sum_{i=1}^5 E_i$, where L is the class of a line in \mathbb{P}^2 , \hat{L} is its strict transform and E_i is the exceptional divisor corresponding to p_i (see [Dol12, Chapter 8] for more). This point of view will be used also in the next sections, so we explain the idea in more detail. The space of plane cubics through five generic points is a 4-dimensional projective space. We fix a basis $\{q_0, \dots, q_4\} \subset \mathbb{C}[x_0, x_1, x_2]_3$ for such a space. Then, we have the following map induced by D :

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi : \mathbb{P}^2 &\dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^4 \\ x &\mapsto [q_0(x), \dots, q_4(x)].\end{aligned}$$

The base locus coincides with the five points p_1, \dots, p_5 . The Del Pezzo surface X is the closure of the image of φ . Hence, φ is birational to X . Let us now consider the blow up of \mathbb{P}^2 in the p_i 's. We have the following:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Bl}_{p_1, \dots, p_5} \mathbb{P}^2 & & \\ \downarrow \pi & \searrow \widetilde{\varphi} & \\ \mathbb{P}^2 & \dashrightarrow & X \subset \mathbb{P}^4 \end{array}$$

Here $\widetilde{\varphi}$ is an isomorphism between the blow up and X . Notice that the image of an exceptional line $E_i \subset \text{Bl}_{p_1, \dots, p_5} \mathbb{P}^2$ is again a line in \mathbb{P}^4 , that with some abuse of notation we will keep calling E_i . Consider a hyperplane u^\perp in \mathbb{P}^4 , identified by a vector u , namely

$$u^\perp = \{[x_0, \dots, x_4] \in \mathbb{P}^4 \mid u_0 x_0 + \dots + u_4 x_4 = 0\}.$$

Such a hyperplane identifies two curves in two different spaces. On one hand we have the hyperplane section $C_u = u^\perp \cap X$ in \mathbb{P}^4 , a curve in \mathbb{P}^4 . On the other hand we have the cubic $Q_u = \{y \in \mathbb{P}^2 \mid q_u(y) = u_0 q_0(y) + \dots + u_4 q_4(y) = 0\}$ in \mathbb{P}^2 which is the pullback of the hyperplane section via φ . We denote the class of C_u (as a divisor on X) by $u^\perp \cdot X$. Then, if \widehat{Q}_u is the strict transform of Q_u , the following relation in $\text{Pic}(\text{Bl}_{p_1, \dots, p_5} \mathbb{P}^2)$ holds:

$$\pi^*(Q_u) = \widehat{Q}_u + \sum_{i=1}^5 (\text{mult}_{p_i} Q_u - 1) E_i = \widetilde{\varphi}^*(u^\perp \cdot X). \quad (4.1.3)$$

Informally, this means that we can compare singularities of C_u and Q_u . Also, $E_i \subset C_u$ if and only if $\text{mult}_{p_i} Q_u \geq 2$. For instance $E_1 \subset C_u$, i.e., $E_1 \subset u^\perp$, if and only if Q_u is singular at p_1 . By the genericity assumption on the p_i 's, such a singularity is a node. Therefore, instead of studying hyperplanes tangent to X at a certain number of points, we can focus on curves in \mathbb{P}^2 passing through p_1, \dots, p_5 , with some prescribed singularities. Using this point of view, we want to analyze the components of the varieties $X^{[k]} \subset (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$ whose duals are hypersurfaces. First, we discuss the various components. The findings in the cases $k = 2, 3, 4$ are summarized in Propositions 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3. We collect all of them later in Theorem 4.1.4.

The components for $k=2$

Points of $X^{[2]} \subset (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$ are hyperplanes in \mathbb{P}^4 tangent to X at 2 points. Every such $u \in X^{[2]}$ identifies a plane cubic curve Q_u as explained above, such that $\pi^*(Q_u)$ has 2 singular points. We will see that the family of these curves is two-dimensional, as expected, so

that $X^{[2]}$ is a surface. There are four configurations of plane cubics through p_1, \dots, p_5 in which $\pi^*(Q_u)$ has 2 nodes. The only partitions of 2 into parts 1 and 2 are $2 = 1 \cdot 2$ and $2 = 2 \cdot 1$. The first partition (meaning a node at a base point) leads to case (A), whereas the second partition (meaning two nodes in \mathbb{P}^2 outside of the base locus) results in cases (B), (C), and (D). We describe them in detail in the following paragraphs. By *conic* we always mean a smooth quadric in \mathbb{P}^2 .




Figure 4.1: Irreducible cubic curve through five fixed points, with a node at p_i .

(A): irreducible cubic. Requiring that a plane cubic curve has two nodes implies that it is reducible. Otherwise, the intersection of the cubic with the line through the two nodes would contradict Bézout's Theorem. Therefore, the only way to get two singularities on $\pi^*(Q_u)$ from an irreducible cubic Q_u is to put a node at one of the p_i 's, see Figure 4.1. This implies that C_u , up to isomorphism, is the union of \widehat{Q}_u and one of the exceptional lines. Having a node at a fixed point is a linear condition on the coefficients of the cubic. In each of the five cases, corresponding to the choice of one of the p_i 's, we get a \mathbb{P}^2 of such cubics, therefore the contribution of these components to the degree of $X^{[2]}$ is $5 \cdot 1 = 5$.

(B): conic + line. The first possible way for a reducible plane cubic to have two nodes, is to force the conic to go through the five points and take any line, see Figure 4.2, left. There is just one way to do so, since there is only one conic through five points. Hence, the irreducible component of $X^{[2]}$ whose points identify this type of plane cubics, is a \mathbb{P}^2 .




Figure 4.2: Left: conic through five points and a line. Center: a conic through three points and a line through two points. Right: a conic through four points and a line through one point.

(C): conic + line. Another possibility is to fix the line instead of the conic. Choose two of the five points (this can be done in $\binom{5}{2} = 10$ ways), force the line to go through them, and take any conic through the remaining three points (Figure 4.2, center). Again, for every choice of the two points, the associated component of $X^{[2]}$ is a $\mathbb{P}^2 \subset (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$, hence the sum of their degrees is $10 \cdot 1 = 10$.

(D): conic + line. The last possible case is imposing that the conic goes through four points and the line through one, as in Figure 4.2, right. This can be done in 5 different ways, and every time we get a copy of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Therefore, the degree of this type of components is $5 \cdot 2 = 10$.

This case distinction is exhaustive: There are no other ways for $\pi^*(Q_u)$ to have two singularities. In fact, if Q_u is irreducible, then it is forced to have just one singularity by Bézout's theorem, and this is our case (A). On the other hand, if Q_u is reducible, it can be either the union of a conic and a line, or the union of three lines. In the first case, the intersection of conic and line makes two nodes, as required. Since the union of the irreducible components has to contain the 5 points p_1, \dots, p_5 and the line can contain at most 2, the conic can contain 5, 4, or 3 of them. These are precisely the cases (B), (C), (D). Finally, if Q_u is the union of three lines, then it must have at least three nodes. Therefore this case does not contribute to $X^{[2]}$. Summing up over all the irreducible components that we have just described, we get that $\deg X^{[2]} = 5 + 1 + 10 + 10 = 26$ as already predicted in Table 4.1.

We now determine for which of these irreducible components, the dual varieties are hypersurfaces: this does not happen when the component is $\mathbb{P}^2 \subset (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$. Therefore, the only relevant case is (D). The dual of a smooth quadric hypersurface, for us $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ naturally embedded in a $\mathbb{P}^3 \subset \mathbb{P}^4$, has degree 2 [EH16, Proposition 2.9]. Hence, dualizing these $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, we get the union of the five singular quadrics of the pencil defined by X . More precisely, being X the complete intersection of two quadratic hypersurfaces $V_0, V_\infty \subset \mathbb{P}^4$, we can construct the associated pencil that they generate:

$$\mathcal{L} = \{\lambda V_0 + \mu V_\infty \mid [\lambda, \mu] \in \mathbb{P}^1\}.$$

Every element of \mathcal{L} is a quadric in \mathbb{P}^4 , which is therefore represented by a 5×5 matrix with linear homogeneous entries in $[\lambda, \mu]$. The determinant of this matrix has five zeros, which are generically isolated. These values of $[\lambda, \mu]$ define the five singular quadrics V_1, \dots, V_5 of the pencil \mathcal{L} . To see that these constitute $(X_{(D)}^{[2]})^*$ (that is to say the dual varieties for each irreducible component of $X^{[2]}$ for which Q_u is a curve of type (D) for a generic point u on this component), note that $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ is contained in a \mathbb{P}^3 inside \mathbb{P}^4 . Hence, its dual variety is a cone of degree 2 containing X : this is by definition one of the V_i 's. Therefore,

$$\deg (X_{(D)}^{[2]})^* = 10.$$

The five singular quadrics, by genericity, are defined by matrices with signatures $(4, 0, 1)$, $(3, 1, 1)$, $(2, 2, 1)$, $(1, 3, 1)$, $(0, 4, 1)$ where the vector (p, n, z) indicates that the matrix has p positive eigenvalues, n negative eigenvalues, and z zero eigenvalues. The real locus of the $(4, 0, 1)$, $(0, 4, 1)$ quadrics is not a hypersurface, therefore these cannot be part of the algebraic boundary of $\text{conv } X$. The quadric $(2, 2, 1)$ is a cone over an hyperboloid in \mathbb{P}^3 which has negative Gaussian curvature at every point, and therefore a positive and a negative principal curvatures. However, the principal curvatures at a point in the

boundary of a convex body must be, when defined, nonnegative [Sch13, Section 2.5]. Hence, this quadric cannot bound a convex set. Thus, exactly two of the five singular quadrics contribute to $\partial_a \text{conv } X$.

Proposition 4.1.1. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a generic Del Pezzo surface, arising as the complete intersection of two generic quadratic hypersurfaces V_0, V_∞ . Then, $X^{[2]} \subset (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$ is the union of 21 irreducible components, 16 of which are copies of \mathbb{P}^2 . The remaining 5 are the singular quadrics in the pencil generated by V_0, V_∞ . Therefore, $\deg X^{[2]} = 26$.

The dual variety $(X^{[2]})^* \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ is the union of 16 copies of \mathbb{P}^1 and 5 quadratic hypersurfaces. Therefore, the degree of the top-dimensional components is 10. Among all the 21 components of $(X^{[2]})^*$, only two quadrics contribute to the algebraic boundary of $\text{conv } X$.

The components for k=3

The points of $X^{[3]} \subset (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$ are hyperplanes in \mathbb{P}^4 tangent to X at 3 points. Every such $u \in X^{[3]}$ identifies a plane cubic curve Q_u such that $\pi^*(Q_u)$ has 3 singular points. We will see that the family of these curves is one-dimensional, as expected, so that $X^{[3]}$ is a curve. We distinguish two cases in which a plane cubic curve Q_u gives $\pi^*(Q_u)$ with 3 singular points. The possible partitions of 3 are $3 = 1 \cdot 2 + 1 \cdot 1$ and $3 = 3 \cdot 1$. The first partition imposes a node at a base point (case (A)). The other partition is realized in case (B).




Figure 4.3: Left: a conic through five points and a line through one point: they intersect at p_i . Center: a conic through four points and a line through two points: they intersect at p_i . Right: three lines through five points.

(A): a node at p_i . The first possibility is to impose that Q_u has a node at one of the p_i 's. This makes two singularities in $\pi^*(Q_u)$. So we need that Q_u has one additional node somewhere in \mathbb{P}^2 . This makes it reducible, as in Figure 4.3, left or center. The curve of $u \in (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$, that identify plane curves Q_u of this type, has degree 5 for any choice of the node p_i . The curve in $(\mathbb{P}^4)^*$ is indeed the union of five lines $\mathbb{P}^1 \subset (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$. One of them arises by fixing the conic through p_1, \dots, p_5 and moving the line through p_i ; the other four arise by fixing the line through p_i and another point p_j ($j \neq i$). In total, the degree of these components sums to $5 \cdot 5 = 25$. To compute the degree 5 we can also use Kazarian's formulae for the case

$$D = 3\hat{L} - 2E_i - \sum_{k \neq i} E_k \quad K_X = -3\hat{L} + \sum_{i=1}^5 E_i$$

which implies, in Kazarian's notation, that $d = 1, k = -3, s = 4, x = 8$. Substituting these quantities in the expression for N_{A_1} gives 5.

(B): three lines. The other possibility is that the cubic splits into three lines. We fix two pairs of points and take the two lines through them; the third line goes through the last point (see Figure 4.3, right). There are $5 \cdot \frac{1}{2} \binom{4}{2} = 15$ ways in which one can choose the roles of the five points on the three lines. Each choice makes a \mathbb{P}^1 , so these components contribute with degree $15 \cdot 1 = 15$.

These cases exhaust all the possibilities for $k = 3$. In fact, the plane cubic Q_u must be reducible since it needs to be singular in at least two points in \mathbb{P}^2 . The union of a conic and a line makes two singularities in the plane, so $\pi^*(Q_u)$ has three singularities only if one of the two nodes of Q_u is at one of the 5 points p_i . We can then either fix a conic through five points and let the line pass through one of them, or fix the line through two points and let the conic pass through four (both case (A)). The other possible reducible case is that Q_u is a union of three lines. This makes exactly three nodes in the plane. Since any line can contain at most 2 of the points p_i , the only partition of these points is $5 = 2 + 2 + 1$ which means that two lines are uniquely determined by the choice of points that they contain and the last one moves in the pencil of lines through the remaining point (case (B)).

Proposition 4.1.2. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a generic Del Pezzo surface. Then $X^{[3]} \subset (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$ is the union of 40 lines $\mathbb{P}^1 \subset (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$. Therefore, $\deg X^{[3]} = 40$.

The dual variety $(X^{[3]})^* \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ is the union of 40 projective planes $\mathbb{P}^2 \subset \mathbb{P}^4$. They do not contribute to the algebraic boundary of $\text{conv } X$.

The components for k=4

The variety $X^{[4]}$ is a union of points u such that $\pi^*(Q_u)$ has 4 singularities. This implies that the plane cubic Q_u must be reducible, as before ($k = 3$). In particular, there are two ways in which this can happen: the cubic has a smooth conic as an irreducible component or it is the union of three lines. The possible partitions are $4 = 2 \cdot 2$ (case (A)), $4 = 1 \cdot 2 + 2 \cdot 1$ (case (B)), and $4 = 4 \cdot 1$ (not realizable).




Figure 4.4: Left: a conic through five points and a line through two points. Right: three lines through five points, two of them intersecting at p_i .

(A): conic + line. If Q_u is the union of a conic and a line, the only way for obtaining four singularities on C_u is that the 2 intersection points of the two components are among the base points p_1, \dots, p_5 , as in Figure 4.4 on the left. So the conic must pass through all five points and is therefore unique. This leaves $\binom{5}{2}$ choices for the line which is uniquely determined by any two points p_i, p_j . These choices give therefore give 10 points of $X^{[4]}$.

(B): three lines. Consider cubics that split into three lines. Since they determine only three intersection points in \mathbb{P}^2 , two of these lines must intersect in one of the base points p_i , as in Figure 4.4 on the right. To count them, we can first choose the point containing two lines and then choose the two points that determine the line that does not go through our first choice. Then all three lines are determined so that this gives precisely $5 \cdot \binom{4}{2} = 30$ points in $X^{[4]}$.

There are no other possible configurations of plane cubics Q_u such that their pullback $\pi^*(Q_u)$ has four singularities. Indeed, the cubic must be reducible again, so that it is either a conic and a line, or three lines. The conic and the line intersect in two points, hence these are forced to be two of the p_i 's, in order for $\pi^*(Q_u)$ to have four singularities. Then the conic is forced to pass also through the remaining three points, so it is fixed. In the case of three lines, two lines are forced to go through two of the base points p_i each. The remaining line must go through the fifth point; to obtain in the end 4 singularities, this line must also intersect one of the other two lines in one of the p_i . These are therefore the only possibilities and they are the two cases discussed above.

Hence, $X^{[4]}$ is the union of 40 points, which make in the primal space the union of forty hyperplanes. However, none of them is a separating hyperplane. Pick $u \in \mathbb{P}^4$. Since Q_u is a cubic, it must have real points. The locus of real points divides $\mathbb{R}^2 \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ into regions where the dehomogenized linear function $\langle u, \cdot \rangle$ has different signs. Since the points of $\mathbb{R}^2 \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ (except the base points p_i) belong to X after the blow up, the linear form u^\perp cannot be a supporting hyperplane to X and thus cannot be part of the algebraic boundary.

Proposition 4.1.3. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a generic Del Pezzo surface. Then $X^{[4]} \subset (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$ is the union of 40 points. Therefore, $(X^{[4]})^* \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ is the union of 40 hyperplanes. They do not contribute to the algebraic boundary of $\text{conv } X$.

We can summarize all the discussions above in the following theorem, which describes the algebraic boundary of a generic Del Pezzo surface in \mathbb{P}^4 .

Theorem 4.1.4. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a generic Del Pezzo surface, arising as the complete intersection of two generic quadrics V_0, V_∞ . Denote by V_1, V_2 the two singular quadrics of the pencil generated by V_0, V_∞ , having signature $(3, 1, 1), (1, 3, 1)$. Then

$$\partial_a(\text{conv } X) = V_1 \cup V_2.$$

Notice the big improvement that we obtained with this case-by-case analysis: from Table 4.1 we had a variety of degree $12 + 26 + 40 + 40$ in \mathbb{P}^4 to be dualized in order to find the algebraic boundary of X . In the end, taking into account real and convex aspects, only 4 of those 118 degrees, equivalently 2 of those 113 irreducible components, are relevant.

4.1.2. Bordiga

The surface X considered in the current section is named after Giovanni Bordiga. It can be realized as the blow up $\text{Bl}_{p_1, \dots, p_{10}} \mathbb{P}^2$ of ten generic points in the projective plane, embedded in \mathbb{P}^4 via the divisor $D = 4\bar{L} - \sum_{i=1}^{10} E_i$. Equivalently, it can be defined as the zero locus of the 3×3 minors of a 3×4 matrix with homogeneous linear entries in five variables [Dol12, Theorem 9.3.5]. For more details on the geometry of this surface we refer to [Bor87, Dol12].

This situation is similar to the Del Pezzo case: we fix a basis $\{q_0, \dots, q_4\} \subset \mathbb{C}[x_0, x_1, x_2]_4$ for the space of plane quartics through p_1, \dots, p_{10} . With this choice of bases, the rational

map $\varphi : \mathbb{P}^2 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^4$ induced by D maps $x \in \mathbb{P}^2$ to $(q_0(x) : \dots : q_4(x))$. Its base locus coincides with the ten points p_1, \dots, p_{10} . The Bordiga surface X is the closure of the image of φ . Then, φ is birational on X and we have the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Bl}_{p_1, \dots, p_{10}} \mathbb{P}^2 & & \\ \downarrow \pi & \searrow \widetilde{\varphi} & \\ \mathbb{P}^2 & \dashrightarrow^{\varphi} & X \subset \mathbb{P}^4 \end{array}$$

Here $\widetilde{\varphi}$ is an isomorphism between the blow up and X . Notice that the image of an exceptional line $E_i \subset \text{Bl}_{p_1, \dots, p_{10}} \mathbb{P}^2$ is again a line in \mathbb{P}^4 . As for the Del Pezzo case in Section 4.1.1, a hyperplane u^\perp identifies two curves: the hyperplane section $C_u = u^\perp \cap X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ and its pull-back $Q_u = \phi^*(C_u)$, a plane quartic; we can compare their singularities via (4.1.3). Our goal is to analyze the irreducible components of the varieties $X^{[k]}$ by looking at the plane curves Q_u that correspond to points $u \in X^{[k]}$. Since the aim is to describe $\partial_a(\text{conv } X)$, we only care about the components whose dual varieties are potentially hypersurfaces. The results in the cases $k = 2, 3, 4$ are summarized in Propositions 4.1.5, 4.1.12, 4.1.13. We collect all of them later in Theorem 4.1.4.

Since a node at a base point corresponds to two singularities of C_u , whereas a node outside the base locus gives one singularity of C_u , our following case analysis for $X^{[k]}$ is again based on partitions of k into parts that are restricted to be 1 or 2. Since the pull-back Q_u of a hyperplane section of a Bordiga surface is a plane quartic of arithmetic genus 3, the case analysis is more involved compared to the case of the Del Pezzo surfaces in Section 4.1.1, for which the pull-back is a plane cubic of arithmetic genus 1.

The components for $k=2$

We first describe $X^{[2]}$ which is, as expected, a surface in $(\mathbb{P}^4)^*$. Its points come from plane quartics Q_u , such that $\pi^*(Q_u)$ has two nodes. There are two families of plane quartics for which this happens corresponding to the two partitions $2 = 1 \cdot 2$ (case (A)) and $2 = 2 \cdot 1$ (case (B)).

(A): a node at p_i . Assume that the plane quartic Q_u has one node at one of the p_i 's. This is a linear condition on its coefficients, hence the set of corresponding $u \in (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$ is the union of 10 copies of projective planes $\mathbb{P}^2 \subset (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$, one for each choice of the node at p_1, \dots, p_{10} .

(B): two nodes in \mathbb{P}^2 . Assume that Q_u has two nodes somewhere in \mathbb{P}^2 . Using Kazarian's formulae for $D = 4L$, $K_{\mathbb{P}^2} = -3L$, i.e., $d = 16$, $k = -12$, $s = 9$, $x = 3$, we find that this surface has degree 225. It remains an open problem to compute $\deg(X_{(B)}^{[2]})^*$. Numerical evidence (using `HomotopyContinuation.jl`) suggests that this number is again 225.

These are all the possible cases in which a curve $\pi^*(Q_u)$ can have two singularities, for a plane quartic Q_u . If Q_u is irreducible, then it can have either a node at one of the fixed points p_i , or two nodes in the plane. As soon as the curve becomes reducible, it has at least three singularities, hence it is not relevant for $X^{[2]}$.

Proposition 4.1.5. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a generic Bordiga surface. Then $X^{[2]} \subset (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$ is the union of 10 copies of \mathbb{P}^2 and the surface $X_{(B)}^{[2]}$. Therefore, $\deg X^{[2]} = 235$.

The dual variety $(X^{[2]})^* \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ is the union of 10 copies of \mathbb{P}^1 and $(X_{(B)}^{[2]})^*$. The only component that possibly contributes to the algebraic boundary of $\text{conv } X$ is $(X_{(B)}^{[2]})^*$.

The components for k=3

The curve $X^{[3]}$ is the closure of the set of quartics Q_u such that $\pi^*(Q_u)$ has three nodes. The relevant partitions are $3 = 1 \cdot 2 + 1 \cdot 1$ (case (C)) and $3 = 3 \cdot 1$ (cases (A), (B)). We first discuss the reducible cases. The quartic cannot be the union of two conics since they intersect in 4 points and are therefore not generic points of irreducible components of $X^{[3]}$.

(A): cubic + line. There are two possible configurations for a reducible plane quartic Q_u through ten fixed points to have three nodes. Firstly, we have the one-dimensional family of curves Q_u that are the union of a line through two of the ten points with a cubic through the remaining eight. These are all linear conditions on the coefficients of Q_u , hence each choice of the pair of points that fixes the line, produces a projective line $\mathbb{P}^1 \subset (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$. There are $\binom{10}{2} = 45$ such irreducible components of $X^{[3]}$.

The second possibility arises when the curves Q_u are obtained by fixing the cubic through nine points, and taking its union with a line through the remaining point. Also in this case we get a projective line $\mathbb{P}^1 \subset (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$ for each of the 10 choices of the pencil of lines through a base point p_i .

Therefore, these components contribute $45 + 10$ degrees to $X^{[3]}$. However, they are all projective lines, so their duals are projective planes which have codimension 2. So they are not part of the algebraic boundary of $\text{conv } X$.

(B): rational quartics. Assume Q_u is a plane quartic with three nodes; the genus-degree formula implies that Q_u is rational. The (Zariski closure of the) family of the corresponding u 's is then a Severi variety. The condition that the Q_u 's must go through p_1, \dots, p_{10} makes it a curve, that we denote by C_4 , to be consistent with the notation in [Pan97]. Its degree is classically known to be 620 [KM94]. This number can be also computed using Kazarian's formulae. Let $D = 4L$, $K_{\mathbb{P}^2} = -3L$; then the degree of the curve of plane quartics with four nodes is $N_{A_1^4} = 675$. However, 55 degrees come from case (A), so we have to subtract them and we get the correct number 620.

We will now compute the degree of the hypersurface dual to this curve of degree 620. This curve was studied extensively by Pandharipande: C_4 is an irreducible curve of arithmetic genus 5447 and geometric genus 725, which were computed (and denoted as g_4 and \tilde{g}_4 respectively) in [Pan97, Section 3]. We reduce the computation of the degree of this dual variety to the Riemann-Hurwitz formula with the following well-known observation.

Proposition 4.1.6. Let $C \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be an irreducible curve and let \mathcal{T} be its tangent developable (that is the Zariski closure of the union of all tangent lines to C at smooth points). Then the degree of \mathcal{T} and the degree of the dual variety C^* agree.

Proof. The tangent developable \mathcal{T} of C is a surface in \mathbb{P}^n . Its degree is obtained by intersecting it with a generic subspace $U \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ of codimension 2. On the other hand, C^* is a hypersurface and its degree is computed by intersecting it with a generic line $L \subset (\mathbb{P}^n)^*$. A generic subspace $U \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ of codimension 2 is dual to a generic line $L \subset (\mathbb{P}^n)^*$. An intersection point of L with C^* corresponds to a hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ that is tangent to C at a smooth point x . Since this hyperplane H moves in the pencil of hyperplanes containing $L^* = U$, the tangent line to C at x intersects U . Conversely, an intersection point x of U

with the tangent developable \mathcal{T} of C gives rise to a tangent hyperplane H to C , namely the span of U and the tangent line to C , on which x lies. So this H is an intersection point of L with C^* . This one-to-one correspondence between intersection points of U with \mathcal{T} and intersection points of L with C^* shows the claim that $\deg(\mathcal{T}) = \deg(C^*)$. \square

Remark 4.1.7. In fact, both varieties correspond to curves that are dual to each other: Namely \mathcal{T} gives rise to a curve in $\mathbf{Gr}(2, n+1)$ and C^* to a curve in $\mathbf{Gr}(n-1, n+1)$ and they are dual with respect to the natural pairing $\mathbf{Gr}(2, n+1) \cong \mathbf{Gr}(n-1, n+1)$.

So now we compute $\deg \mathcal{T}$ via the Riemann-Hurwitz formula: consider the projection of C_4 from a generic projective plane to \mathbb{P}^1 ; each tangent line that intersects the chosen plane gives a ramification point of the projection. The degree of the projection is $\deg C_4 = 620$. Pandharipande's work provides an accurate description of the singularities of C_4 . From that, we deduce that the ramification points of the map arise either from points of C_4 at which the tangent line intersects the given plane, or as projections of the cusps of C_4 . The cusps of this curve correspond exactly to plane quartics Q_u with two nodes and a cusp [Pan97, Lemma 3]. There are $N_{A_1^2 A_2} = 2304$ curves with that property that go through p_1, \dots, p_{10} . We now put together all these information in the Riemann-Hurwitz formula:

$$2 \cdot 725 - 2 = 620 \cdot (-2) + (2304 + \deg \mathcal{T}),$$

from which we obtain that $\deg C_4^* = \deg \mathcal{T} = 384$.

(C): a node at p_i . To $X^{[3]}$ belong also those points u such that Q_u has a node at p_i , for a fixed i , and another node in the plane. Every choice of p_i gives rise to an irreducible component. Using Kazarian's fomrulae with

$$D = 4\hat{L} - 2E_i - \sum_{j \neq i} E_j, \quad K_X = -3\hat{L} + \sum_{j=1}^{10} E_j, \quad (4.1.4)$$

on $\mathrm{Bl}_{p_1, \dots, p_{10}} \mathbb{P}^2$, i.e., with parameters $d = 3, k = -1, s = -1, x = 13$, we find that the degree of each of these components is $N_{A_1} = 20$. Therefore, the total contribution of case (C) to $\deg X^{[3]}$ is $20 \cdot 10 = 200$. We discuss in the next section the dual varieties of these curves.

The duals of case (C)

We describe in this section the singularities of the ten irreducible components of $X^{[3]}$ arising from case (C). From the analysis of the singularities we will deduce the degree of their dual varieties. Let $Y \subset (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$ be the Zariski closure of the points u corresponding to plane quartics Q_u with a node at p_1 and another node somewhere in \mathbb{P}^2 . The goal is to prove the following statement.

Theorem 4.1.8. A point $u \in Y$ is a node if and only if Q_u has a node at p_1 and two other nodes in \mathbb{P}^2 . A point $u \in Y$ is a cusp if and only if Q_u has a node at p_1 and a cusp in \mathbb{P}^2 . These are all singularities of Y .

It will be convenient to change the point of view and introduce an appropriate incidence variety. Let us first define the ambient space. Notice that the curve $\pi^*(Q_u)$ always contains the exceptional line E_1 , since Q_u has a node at p_1 . Hence, the u 's that belong to Y must satisfy $u^\perp \supset E_1$. This condition on the points cuts out a projective plane in $(\mathbb{P}^4)^*$ that we

denote by \mathcal{H}_{E_1} . Therefore, Y is a plane curve in $\mathcal{H}_{E_1} \subset (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$. Consider the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \{(x, u) \in X \times \mathcal{H}_{E_1} \mid x \in C_u\}, \\ & \{(x, u) \in X \times \mathcal{H}_{E_1} \mid x \in \text{sing } C_u\}. \end{aligned}$$

In fact, all $x \in E_1$ belong to the first set and some possibly to the second one. We are not interested in those points so we remove them:

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \{(x, u) \in X \times \mathcal{H}_{E_1} \mid x \notin E_1, x \in C_u\}, \\ J &= \{(x, u) \in X \times \mathcal{H}_{E_1} \mid x \notin E_1, x \in \text{sing } C_u\}. \end{aligned}$$

We denote by π_1 the projection onto X and by π_2 the projection onto \mathcal{H}_{E_1} .

Lemma 4.1.9. Every fiber of $\pi_1|_J$ is exactly one point. The set J is a curve, i.e., it has dimension 1. The generic point (x, u) of J is such that the corresponding curve Q_u has a node at p_1 and a node at $\varphi^{-1}(x)$.

Proof. Consider the projection $\pi_1 : J \rightarrow X$. A point (x, u) belongs to J if and only if $x \notin E_1$ and the tangent space $T_x X$ is contained in the hyperplane u^\perp . We want to study the intersection $T_x X \cap E_1$: it can be empty, a point $\{p_x\}$, or the whole line E_1 . In fact, the case ‘empty’ is not allowed since $T_x X$ and E_1 are contained in u^\perp . Also the case $T_x X \cap E_1 = E_1$ cannot happen. Indeed, suppose by contradiction that $E_1 \subset T_x X$. Then, there is a one-dimensional family of points $\tilde{u} \in \mathcal{H}_{E_1}$ such that $(x, \tilde{u}) \in J$. Fix two of them: u and \tilde{u} . As previously noticed, the associated quartics Q_u and $Q_{\tilde{u}}$ pass through p_1, \dots, p_{10}, x , with singularities at p_1 and at x . Then, by [Ful08, Section 3.3], the intersection points, counted with multiplicities, are

$$\deg(Q_u \cdot Q_{\tilde{u}}) \geq 9 + 4 + 4 = 17$$

which exceeds Bézout’s number, and therefore the two quartics must be reducible, with a common component. However, there is no one-dimensional family of reducible quartics in the plane, with a common component, passing through eleven points, two of which nodes. Hence, $T_x X \cap E_1 \neq E_1$. So the only possibility left is that $T_x X \cap E_1 = p_x$. This implies that given $x \in \pi_1(J)$ there exists a unique $u \in \mathcal{H}_{E_1}$ such that $(x, u) \in J$.

We focus now on the dimension of J . The projection π_2 has finite fibers, since the curves C_u have finitely many singularities. A point $u \in \mathcal{H}_{E_1}$ belongs to the image of π_2 when the corresponding plane quartic Q_u has two singular points: p_1 and x . However, the generic quartic through p_1, \dots, p_{10} with a node at p_1 does not have other singularities. Hence, the condition that Q_u has an additional singularity cuts out a curve in the plane \mathcal{H}_{E_1} . Therefore,

$$\dim J = \dim \pi_2(J) = 1.$$

Let $(x, u) \in J$. By definition, the curve C_u contains the line E_1 and has a singularity at x . This happens if and only if the quartic Q_u has a singularity at p_1 and a singularity at x . Because the points p_i are generic, this requirement gives a one-dimensional family of possibilities only in the case in which both p_1 and x are nodes. The other cases, when x is a cusp or when there is a third node in the plane (see Theorem 4.1.8), arise only for finitely many curves Q_u , and can be actually counted using Kazarian’s formulae. \square

We now move towards the understanding of I .

Lemma 4.1.10. The set I is a smooth fiber bundle over $\pi_1(I)$ whose fibers are projective lines \mathbb{P}^1 .

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that $E_1 = \langle e_4, e_5 \rangle$, where e_i denotes the standard i -th basis vector of \mathbb{C}^5 . We identify vectors in \mathbb{C}^5 and \mathbb{P}^4 . Fix $x = [x_0, \dots, x_4] \in X \setminus E_1$. The fiber of the projection $\pi_1 : I \rightarrow X$ at x consists of those $u \in \mathcal{H}_{E_1}$ such that $\langle u, x \rangle = 0$. Consider the matrix

$$M_x = \begin{bmatrix} x_0 & x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & x_4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

and notice that $\pi_1^{-1}(x) = \ker M_x$. Assuming $x_0 \neq 0$ we can choose $[x_1, -x_0, 0, 0, 0]$ and $[x_2, 0, -x_0, 0, 0]$ as generators of the kernel and write

$$\pi_1^{-1}(x) = \left\{ [\lambda x_1 + \mu x_2, -\lambda x_0, -\mu x_0, 0, 0] \in \mathbb{P}^4 \mid [\lambda, \mu] \in \mathbb{P}^1 \right\}.$$

This gives a trivialization of I as fiber bundle over $X \setminus E_1$, with fiber \mathbb{P}^1 . The open sets over which one can trivialize it are $(X \setminus E_1) \cap \{x_i \neq 0\}$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$.

Moreover, I is cut out by the equation $\langle u, x \rangle = 0$ inside the product $X \times \mathcal{H}_{E_1}$. Since the gradient of the linear form $\langle u, x \rangle$ is never zero, I is smooth. \square

For the previous result we analyzed I with respect to the first projection onto the Bordiga surface. Now, we want to focus on the second projection $\pi_2 : I \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{E_1}$.

Proposition 4.1.11. J is the ramification locus of the map $\pi_2 : I \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{E_1}$.

Proof. Let us work in a more abstract setting. Since X is a smooth surface we can consider local coordinates $(y_1, y_2) \in U \subset X$ on an affine chart U around any point $x \in X$ (with $(0, 0)$ corresponding to x). With some abuse of notation we will use the same name for our objects when they are global or when they are expressed in local coordinates. The space of hyperplanes containing E_1 induces a linear system on X by intersection. We choose local coordinates (t_1, t_2) on \mathcal{H}_{E_1} such that this linear system is given by regular functions

$$\{f(y_1, y_2) + t_1 g(y_1, y_2) + t_2 h(y_1, y_2) \mid (t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2\}$$

on X . By making the affine chart U smaller, if necessary, f, g, h are polynomials. The threefold I then becomes

$$\{((y_1, y_2), (t_1, t_2)) \mid f(y_1, y_2) + t_1 g(y_1, y_2) + t_2 h(y_1, y_2) = 0\}.$$

Inside I , the points of J are such that the curve $\{f(y_1, y_2) + t_1 g(y_1, y_2) + t_2 h(y_1, y_2) = 0\}$ is singular. Assume, without loss of generality, that $((0, 0), (0, 0)) \in I$. Hence $f(0, 0) = 0$ and we can also assume $g(0, 0) = 0$, up to rescaling t_1, t_2 . This implies that $h(0, 0) \neq 0$. The tangent space of I at $((0, 0), (0, 0))$ is

$$\begin{aligned} T_{((0,0),(0,0))} I &= \ker \nabla(f(y_1, y_2) + t_1 g(y_1, y_2) + t_2 h(y_1, y_2))|_{((0,0),(0,0))} \\ &= \{(a, b, c, d) \mid af_{y_1}(0, 0) + bf_{y_2}(0, 0) + dh(0, 0) = 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we denote by f_{y_i} the partial derivative of f with respect to y_i . The projection π_2 maps a point $((y_1, y_2), (t_1, t_2))$ to (t_1, t_2) , hence its differential at the level of tangent spaces maps (a, b, c, d) to (c, d) . This map is surjective if and only if $f_{y_1}(0, 0) = f_{y_2}(0, 0) = 0$, i.e., exactly when $(0, 0)$ is a singularity of the curve $C = \{f(y_1, y_2) = 0\}$. By definition, these are the points of J . \square

The Zariski closure of the image of J under π_2 is the irreducible component Y of $X^{[3]}$ that we are interested in. Let us analyze the closure operation. Consider $u \in Y \setminus \pi_2(J)$. Then $\pi^*(Q_u)$ cannot have three or more singularities on E_1 . Indeed, p_1 would then be a (at least) triple point of Q_u . Since p_1, \dots, p_{10} are chosen generically, by a dimension count having a triple point at p_1 is impossible, as shown by an explicit example where the appropriate matrix has indeed full rank. So Q_u is a plane quartic with one node at p_1 . It is a smooth point of Y . Hence, in order to study the singularities of Y , we can restrict to analyze the points of $\pi_2(J)$. Again by a dimension count and the genericity of the p_i 's, Y can only have double points. By Zariski's Main Theorem [Har77, Chapter III, Corollary 11.4], they come in two flavours: either they are the image under π_2 of a singularity of J , or they are the image of points whose tangent space is not transversal to the kernel of the projection. We prove now Theorem 4.1.8.

Proof of Theorem 4.1.8. Recall that singularities of Q_u correspond to singularities of the curve $C_u = u^\perp \cap X$. We choose local coordinates on X and \mathcal{H}_{E_1} as in Proposition 4.1.11 such that $C = C_u \cap U = \{f(y_1, y_2) = 0\}$ and such that C is singular at $(0, 0)$. We start with the claim regarding cusps. Here we have our incidence curve locally defined by

$$J = \left\{ ((y_1, y_2), (t_1, t_2)) \text{ such that } \begin{array}{l} f(y_1, y_2) + t_1 g(y_1, y_2) + t_2 h(y_1, y_2) = 0 \\ f_{y_1}(y_1, y_2) + t_1 g_{y_1}(y_1, y_2) + t_2 h_{y_1}(y_1, y_2) = 0 \\ f_{y_2}(y_1, y_2) + t_1 g_{y_2}(y_1, y_2) + t_2 h_{y_2}(y_1, y_2) = 0 \end{array} \right\}.$$

With the same assumptions as before we write the tangent space at $((0, 0), (0, 0)) \in J$ as

$$T_{((0,0),(0,0))} J = \ker \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & h(0,0) \\ f_{y_1 y_1}(0,0) & f_{y_1 y_2}(0,0) & g_{y_1}(0,0) & h_{y_1}(0,0) \\ f_{y_2 y_1}(0,0) & f_{y_2 y_2}(0,0) & g_{y_2}(0,0) & h_{y_2}(0,0) \end{bmatrix}$$

since $(0, 0)$ is a singular point for $C = \{f(y_1, y_2) = 0\}$, then $f_{y_1}(0, 0) = f_{y_2}(0, 0) = 0$, and $g(0, 0) = 0$. Note that if the point $((0, 0), (0, 0))$ is singular for J , then in particular the Hessian matrix of f , denoted Hf , must have rank one, i.e., $(0, 0)$ must be a cusp of C .

Let us begin by assuming that the point $(0, 0) \in Y$ is a cusp. Then π_2^{-1} is either a singular point of J , or the tangent line at the smooth point $((0, 0), (0, 0))$ is not transversal to the kernel of $d\pi_2$. In the first case we just observed that $(0, 0) \in C$ must be a cusp. Consider the second case. The non-transversality condition of tangent line and kernel means that $T_{((0,0),(0,0))} J \subset \{(a, b, 0, 0) \mid a, b \in \mathbb{C}\}$. Hence, the equation of the tangent line is given by

$$Hf(0, 0) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} = 0.$$

The latter has non-trivial solution if and only if $Hf(0, 0)$ is degenerate, which implies that $(0, 0)$ is a cusp of C .

On the other hand, suppose that $(0, 0)$ is a cusp of C . Without loss of generality we can assume that locally it is given by the equation $y_1^2 = y_2^3$. Hence, the tangent space to J at $((0, 0), (0, 0))$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} T_{((0,0),(0,0))} J &= \ker \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & h(0,0) \\ 1 & 0 & g_{y_1}(0,0) & h_{y_1}(0,0) \\ 0 & 0 & g_{y_2}(0,0) & h_{y_2}(0,0) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \{(a, b, c, d) \mid d = 0, a + c g_{y_1}(0,0) = 0, c g_{y_2}(0,0) = 0\} \end{aligned}$$

There are two possible cases. If $g_{y_2}(0, 0) \neq 0$ then $c = 0$. Therefore, the point $((0, 0), (0, 0))$ is smooth and its tangent line is contained in the kernel of $d\pi_2$, so $(0, 0)$ is a cusp for Y . If on the other hand $g_{y_2}(0, 0) = 0$, then the tangent space is $\{(c g_{y_1}(0, 0), b, -c, 0) \mid b, c \in \mathbb{C}\}$. In this case we have a singular point of J . The image of the differential is the line $\{d = 0\}$, hence $(0, 0) \in Y$ cannot be a node: it is a cusp.

We now move to the statement regarding nodes. We do not need local coordinates for this so we go back to the notation $(x, u) \in J$. If a point $u \in \mathcal{H}_{E_1}$ is a node of Y , then $\pi_2^{-1} = \{(x, u), (\tilde{x}, u)\}$ for some $x \neq \tilde{x} \in X$. Otherwise, we would get a cusp. Therefore the associated quartic $Q_u \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ has a node at p_1 , a node at x and a node at \tilde{x} . Conversely, if Q_u has a node at p_1 , a node at x and a node at \tilde{x} , with $x \neq \tilde{x}$, by genericity of the choice of the p_i 's, the tangents lines at x, \tilde{x} are transversal. Hence, $u \in Y$ must be a node. \square

This result implies that we can count the singularities of Y by counting plane quartics Q_u that are more singular. More precisely the number of nodes of Y is the number of plane quartics with a node at p_1 and two other nodes on \mathbb{P}^2 ; the number of cusps of Y is the number of plane quartics with a node at p_1 and a cusp somewhere in \mathbb{P}^2 . They are Kazarian's numbers $N_{A_1^2} = 114$ and $N_{A_2} = 48$ respectively for the case (4.1.4). Since Y is a plane curve inside $(\mathbb{P}^4)^*$, its dual variety $Y^* \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ is a cone over the plane curve dual to Y . Plücker formulae then tell us that the degree of Y^* is 8. In conclusion, the case (C) of $X^{[3]}$ contributes to the degree of the duals with $8 \cdot 10 = 80$.

We are now done with the case $k = 3$. Indeed, assume that the quartic Q_u is irreducible. Then it can have three nodes somewhere in \mathbb{P}^2 , that make three nodes also on $\pi^*(Q_u)$. Otherwise, we can impose that Q_u has a node at one of the fixed points p_i , and another node in the plane, so that the pullback has three singularities. There are no other options for irreducible quartics. If Q_u is reducible, we have different cases. Assume that it is the union of a cubic and a line; then this makes three singularities. If Q_u is the union of two conics, or one conic and two lines, or four lines, then there are too many singularities. So this case is not of interest for $k = 3$. So all the possible cases have been discussed above.

Proposition 4.1.12. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a generic Bordiga surface. Then $X^{[3]} \subset (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$ is the union of 66 irreducible components. Among them, 55 are copies of \mathbb{P}^1 , one is the Severi variety of degree 620 and the remaining 10 are cones over plane curves of degree 20. Therefore, $\deg X^{[3]} = 675$.

The dual variety $(X^{[3]})^* \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ is the union of 55 copies of \mathbb{P}^2 , an irreducible variety of degree 384 and 10 irreducible varieties of degree 8. Only the last two types of components can contribute to the algebraic boundary of $\text{conv } X$, with total degree 464.

The components for k=4

We are left to compute the cardinality of $X^{[4]}$, whose points correspond to plane quartics Q_u such that $\pi^*(Q_u)$ has 4 nodes. The partitions are $4 = 2 \cdot 2$ (case (C)), $4 = 1 \cdot 2 + 2 \cdot 1$ (case (B)), and $4 = 4 \cdot 1$ (case (A)).

(A): four nodes in \mathbb{P}^2 . Assume that Q_u is a plane quartic with four nodes. Then it must be reducible and two configurations are possible: the union of two conics through 5 points each, or the union of a singular cubic through eight points and a line through the other two. In the first situation we get $\frac{1}{2} \cdot \binom{10}{5} = 126$ quartics. In the second one, whenever we choose 8 points, there are 12 singular plane cubics through them. The number 12 can be understood as the degree of the discriminant of cubics, or it can be computed with

Kazarian's formulae for $D = 3L$, $K_{\mathbb{P}^2} = -3$ on \mathbb{P}^2 , i.e., $d = 9, k = -9, s = 9, x = 3$. Hence we have $\binom{10}{8} \cdot 12 = 540$ such quartics Q_u .

In total, this case contributes 666 points of $X^{[4]}$, in agreement with Kazarian's number $N_{A_1^4}$ for the system of plane quartics with four nodes.

(B): a node at p_i . Consider plane quartics with a node at one of the p_i 's and other two nodes somewhere in \mathbb{P}^2 . Once we fix p_i , we can count this number as $N_{A_1^2}$ for

$$D = 4\hat{L} - 2E_i - \sum_{j \neq i} E_j, \quad K_X = -3\hat{L} + \sum_{j=1}^{10} E_j,$$

i.e., with parameters $d = 3, k = -1, s = -1, x = 13$. We get $N_{A_1^2} = 114$ using Kazarian's formulae, thus this case contributes with $10 \cdot 114 = 1140$ points to $X^{[4]}$.

(C): two nodes at p_i, p_j . Assume the plane quartic Q_u has a node at p_i and a node at p_j . There is only one choice for such a curve. Therefore, this case contributes with as many points as the choices of i, j , i.e., $\binom{10}{2} = 45$.

Note that in case (B) we also count case (C) twice. Indeed, the number 114 counts quartics on the Bordiga surface coming from a curve with a node at p_i , and two more nodes outside E_i . A curve $\pi^*(Q_u)$ of case (C), where Q_u has nodes at p_i, p_j , belongs to case (B) twice: one time for p_i and one for p_j . In total, we have $\#X^{[4]} = 666 + (1140 - 90) + 45 = 1761$, as predicted in Table 4.1. As for the Del Pezzo case, the 540 hyperplanes u^\perp corresponding to case (A), where Q_u is the union of a line and a cubic, cannot separate $\text{conv } X$. Hence, only 1221 of the hyperplanes in $(X^{[4]})^*$ can show up in the algebraic boundary of $\text{conv } X$.

There are no other possible ways to obtain four singularities on $\pi^*(Q_u)$. If Q_u is irreducible, then it must have one or two nodes the p_i 's and two or one other node in the plane, respectively; four nodes in \mathbb{P}^2 would make it reducible. If Q_u is reducible, then there are two cases: either it is the union of a cubic with a line, in which case one of the intersection points must be a p_i , or it is the union of two conics. The configuration with a conic and two lines or the one with four lines produce too many singularities, so we do not consider them.

Proposition 4.1.13. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a generic Bordiga surface. Then $X^{[4]} \subset (\mathbb{P}^4)^*$ is the union of 1761 points. Therefore, $(X^{[4]})^* \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ is the union of 1761 hyperplanes. Among them, only 1221 can possibly contribute to the algebraic boundary of $\text{conv } X$.

The following statement summarizes the whole discussion on the Bordiga case. By the symbol $X_{(\star),(\star\star)}^{[k]}$ we mean the union of $X_{(\star)}^{[k]}$ and $X_{(\star\star)}^{[k]}$; the same notation holds for more than two subscripts.

Theorem 4.1.14. Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ be a smooth Bordiga surface. Then

$$\partial_a(\text{conv } X) \subset \left(X_{(B)}^{[2]}\right)^* \cup \left(X_{(B),(C)}^{[3]}\right)^* \cup \left(X_{(A)\text{conics},(B),(C)}^{[4]}\right)^*$$

and this gives an upper bound on the degree of the algebraic boundary as

$$\deg \partial_a(\text{conv } X) \leq \deg \left(X_{(B)}^{[2]}\right)^* + 1685.$$

A question that remains open for the Bordiga surfaces is whether all the varieties that can contribute to $\partial_a(\text{conv } X)$ actually do so. We are currently working on this problem, trying to construct explicit examples that realize these features. This step represent in fact a transition from algebraic geometry to semialgebraic geometry, taking into account the convexity.

4.2. Curves and volumes

Not all convex bodies are semialgebraic, but sometimes algebra can help also in understanding wilder objects. The purpose of this section is to explore this idea. It is based on a discussion with Carlos Améndola, Darrick Lee, Anna-Laura Sattelberger and Bernd Sturmfels. This project is at an initial stage, therefore there will be more ideas than actual results. We begin with definitions, that are then analyzed via a specific example. Then, we discuss methods for computing the volume of the convex hull of a curve, connecting different topics. We also illustrate some conjectures.

Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a piecewise smooth path. We identify \mathbf{x} with its image in \mathbb{R}^d . The following is the definition of a ‘ d -order curve’ from [Stu87] or analogously the definition of ‘comonotone curve’ from [Mot57]. The second definition is ‘totally positive torsion’ from [PIM22].

Definition 4.2.1. Let $\mathbf{x} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be curve. It is said to be *cyclic* if no $d + 1$ points of \mathbf{x} belong to a hyperplane.

Definition 4.2.2. Let $\mathbf{x} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a curve with regularity C^d . It is said to have *totally positive torsion* if all the leading principal minors of the matrix

$$T(t) = [\mathbf{x}'(t), \mathbf{x}''(t), \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(d)}(t)]$$

are positive for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Here $\mathbf{x}'(t)$ denotes the first derivative of \mathbf{x} evaluated at t .

Example 4.2.3. Fix three real numbers $a > b > c > 0$ and consider the associated logarithmic curve, or in short log-curve, parametrized by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x} : [0, 1] &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \\ t &\mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \log(1 + at) \\ \log(1 + bt) \\ \log(1 + ct) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

We prove that log-curves are cyclic and have totally positive torsion. For the cyclicity, consider $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 < t_3 < t_4 \leq 1$ and take the associated points $\mathbf{x}(t_i) \in C$. We need to prove that the following 4×4 matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}(t_1) & \mathbf{x}(t_2) & \mathbf{x}(t_3) & \mathbf{x}(t_4) \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

is not singular. Suppose by contradiction that it is singular. Hence, there exist real numbers α, β, γ such that

$$\alpha \log(1 + at_i) + \beta \log(1 + bt_i) + \gamma \log(1 + ct_i) = 1 \quad (4.2.1)$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, 4$. Let us study then the function

$$f(t) = \alpha \log(1 + at) + \beta \log(1 + bt) + \gamma \log(1 + ct) - 1.$$

Equation (4.2.1) implies that f has at least four distinct roots in the interval $[0, 1]$, where it is differentiable. However,

$$\begin{aligned} f'(t) = \frac{1}{(1+at)(1+bt)(1+ct)} & \left((ab\alpha + abc\beta + abc\gamma)t^2 \right. \\ & \left. + (ab\alpha + aca\alpha + ab\beta + bc\beta + ac\gamma + bc\gamma)t + a\alpha + b\beta + c\gamma \right) \end{aligned}$$

hence f' has at most two roots in \mathbb{R} . This implies that f has at most three roots in the interval $[0, 1]$, which gives a contradiction, since $t_i \neq t_j$ for $i \neq j$. Therefore, no four points belong to any hyperplane, hence \mathbf{x} is a cyclic curve.

We can check that log-curves have totally positive torsion, if $a > b > c > 0$. Indeed,

$$T(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{a}{1+at} & -\frac{a^2}{(1+at)^2} & \frac{2a^3}{(1+at)^3} \\ \frac{b}{1+bt} & -\frac{b^2}{(1+bt)^2} & \frac{2b^3}{(1+bt)^3} \\ \frac{c}{1+ct} & -\frac{c^2}{(1+ct)^2} & \frac{2c^3}{(1+ct)^3} \end{bmatrix}$$

and the leading principal minors are

$$\frac{a}{1+at}, \quad \frac{ab(a-b)}{(1+at)^2(1+bt)^2}, \quad \frac{2abc(a-b)(a-c)(b-c)}{(1+at)^3(1+bt)^3(1+ct)^3} \quad (4.2.2)$$

which are always positive, thanks to our condition that $a > b > c > 0$. However, a change of coordinates corresponding to the choice $0 < a < b < c$, changes the sign of the second and third minors in (4.2.2). This other curve would not have totally positive torsion. ♦

So how are the two definitions connected? [PIM22, Corollary 2.7] proves that a curve with totally positive torsion is cyclic. However, from Example 4.2.3 we can deduce that being cyclic is more general. In fact, the log curve that satisfies $0 < a < b < c$ is cyclic but it does not have totally positive torsion.

The curve that inspires both definitions is actually the moment curve, given by

$$\mathbf{x} = (t, t^2, \dots, t^d). \quad (4.2.3)$$

which is cyclic and has totally positive torsion. It also satisfies another property: given any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and any k -tuples $V = \{\mathbf{x}(t_1), \dots, \mathbf{x}(t_k)\}$ of points on \mathbf{x} , these are all vertices of their convex hull, namely

$$f_0(\text{conv } V) = k.$$

It can be proved that any cyclic curve also satisfies the same property, essentially by Carathéodory's theorem [Bar02, Theorem 2.3], and that the convex hull of any k points on the curve is a cyclic polytope [Stu87]. However, the converse is not true, as the following examples shows.

Example 4.2.4. Consider the curve parametrized by $(\sin(3\pi t), \cos(3\pi t), t) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. The hyperplane $(1, 0, 0)^\perp$ intersects the curve in four points, for $t = 0, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}, 1$, so \mathbf{x} is not cyclic. On the other hand, for every point of the curve we can construct a hyperplane tangent to the curve at that point and such that all other points of \mathbf{x} are strictly contained in a halfspace. This is a separating hyperplane for $\text{conv } \mathbf{x}$ and its existence implies that the convex hull of any k points of \mathbf{x} will have all those points as vertices. ♦

Cyclicity and totally positive torsion have different implications that we are going to examine. Our object of interest is the convex body $K = \text{conv } \mathbf{x}$, in general not semialgebraic, and its volume. The following is [PIM22, Corollary 2.7].

Theorem 4.2.5. Let $\mathbf{x} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be a curve with totally positive torsion and let $K = \text{conv } \mathbf{x}$. If $d = 2\ell$, then the volume of K is given by

$$\frac{(-1)^{\frac{\ell(\ell-1)}{2}}}{d!} \int_{0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_\ell \leq 1} \det [\mathbf{x}(t_1) - \mathbf{x}(0), \dots, \mathbf{x}(t_\ell) - \mathbf{x}(0), \mathbf{x}'(t_1), \dots, \mathbf{x}'(t_\ell)] dt.$$

If $d = 2\ell + 1$, then the volume of K is given by

$$\frac{(-1)^{\frac{\ell(\ell-1)}{2}}}{d!} \int_{0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_\ell \leq 1} \det [\mathbf{x}(1) - \mathbf{x}(0), \mathbf{x}(t_1) - \mathbf{x}(0), \dots, \mathbf{x}(t_\ell) - \mathbf{x}(0), \mathbf{x}'(t_1), \dots, \mathbf{x}'(t_\ell)] dt.$$

We point out a consequence of Theorem 4.2.5. If the curve \mathbf{x} is in addition parametrized by polynomials with rational coefficients, then the volume of $\text{conv } \mathbf{x}$ is a rational number.

Example 4.2.6. We continue to study the log-curves from Example 4.2.3. Let K be the convex hull of a log-curve. Theorem 4.2.5 implies that

$$\text{vol } K = \frac{1}{6} \int_0^1 \det [\mathbf{x}(1) - \mathbf{x}(0), \mathbf{x}(t) - \mathbf{x}(0), \mathbf{x}'(t)] dt.$$

We can manipulate this expression as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \det [\mathbf{x}(1) - \mathbf{x}(0), \mathbf{x}(t_3) - \mathbf{x}(0), \mathbf{x}'(t_3)] &= \det [\mathbf{x}(1) - \mathbf{x}(t_3), \mathbf{x}(t_3) - \mathbf{x}(0), \mathbf{x}'(t_3)] \\ &= -\det [\mathbf{x}(t_3) - \mathbf{x}(0), \mathbf{x}(1) - \mathbf{x}(t_3), \mathbf{x}'(t_3)] \\ &= -\int_{t_3}^1 \int_0^{t_3} \det [\mathbf{x}'(t_1), \mathbf{x}'(t_2), \mathbf{x}'(t_3)] dt_1 dt_2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vol } K &= -\frac{1}{6} \int_0^1 \int_{t_3}^1 \int_0^{t_3} \det [\mathbf{x}'(t_1), \mathbf{x}'(t_2), \mathbf{x}'(t_3)] dt \\ &= \frac{1}{6} \int_0^1 \int_0^{t_3} \int_0^{t_2} \det [\mathbf{x}'(t_1), \mathbf{x}'(t_2), \mathbf{x}'(t_3)] dt. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2.4}$$

Expanding the determinant, it turns out that the volume of K is an alternating sum of integrals that look like

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^{t_3} \int_0^{t_2} \frac{a}{1+at_1} \cdot \frac{b}{1+bt_2} \cdot \frac{c}{1+ct_3} dt.$$

up to permutations of the t_i 's. This gives a connection to Feynman integrals and to the theory of polylogarithms. Remarkably, the expression (4.2.4) matches the left hand side of (36) in [AFS19], in accordance with [AFS19, Remark 5.8]. We explore this relation in the following paragraph. ♦

Signatures To a parametrized curve, one can associate a family of tensors called *signatures*. Assume $\mathbf{x} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is piecewise smooth (this strong regularity assumption is not necessary, but we do not want to focus on that aspect here), and take $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The k -th signature tensor $\sigma^{(k)}$ of \mathbf{x} is of order k and has format $d \times d \times \dots \times d$. Its entries are given by the iterated integrals

$$\sigma_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^{(k)} = \int_0^1 \int_0^{t_k} \cdots \int_0^{t_2} x'_{i_1}(t_1) \cdots x'_{i_k}(t_k) dt$$

where the integral is performed over the standard k -simplex. We will be mostly interested in the alternating sum of signatures. In fact, in [AFS19, Remark 5.8], the authors comment on a connection of signatures to volumes of convex hulls, following [DR19, Lemma 3.29]. The volume of the convex hull of the moment curve (4.2.3) is a signed sum of signatures. Diehl and Reizenstein also claim the same should be true more in general, ‘if the curve satisfies some kind of monotonicity’. Indeed, for curves with totally positive torsion, one can rewrite the formulae in Theorem 4.2.5 in terms of signatures. Remarkably, these volume formulae for convex hulls can be also rewritten in terms of only the first and second signature tensors. Essentially, the computation reduces to some signed areas and a length of a segment. We do not present the precise statement, since the proof still lacks some details, but we go back to our guiding example to give an intuition of the procedure.

Example 4.2.7. By expanding the determinant in (4.2.4), one recognises the entries of the third signature tensor:

$$\text{vol } K = \sigma_{1,2,3}^{(3)} - \sigma_{1,3,2}^{(3)} - \sigma_{2,1,3}^{(3)} + \sigma_{2,3,1}^{(3)} + \sigma_{3,1,2}^{(3)} - \sigma_{3,2,1}^{(3)}.$$

This can actually be rewritten as

$$\text{vol } K = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sigma_1^{(1)} (\sigma_{2,3}^{(2)} - \sigma_{3,2}^{(2)}) + \sigma_2^{(1)} (\sigma_{3,1}^{(2)} - \sigma_{1,3}^{(2)}) + \sigma_3^{(1)} (\sigma_{1,2}^{(2)} - \sigma_{2,1}^{(2)}) \right).$$

It can be proved that this expression in terms of signatures is invariant under an action of the group of rotations, hence we can assume without loss of generality that both $\mathbf{x}(0)$ and $\mathbf{x}(1)$ belong to the first coordinate axis. This makes $\sigma_2^{(1)} = \sigma_3^{(1)} = 0$, therefore

$$\text{vol } K = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_1^{(1)} (\sigma_{2,3}^{(2)} - \sigma_{3,2}^{(2)}). \quad (4.2.5)$$

◆

In order to get the formula in (4.2.5) for the volume of the log-curve, we only used the fact that it has totally positive torsion. Thus, the volume of a curve in \mathbb{R}^3 with this property satisfies (4.2.5). This equation has a very geometric interpretation. Once the curve has initial and end point on the first coordinate axis, the number $\sigma_1^{(1)}$ is simply the length of the segment between $\mathbf{x}(0)$ and $\mathbf{x}(1)$. The other factor $\frac{1}{2}(\sigma_{2,3}^{(2)} - \sigma_{3,2}^{(2)})$ is the signed area of the projection of \mathbf{x} onto the (x_2, x_3) -plane.

What are the minimal assumptions that we have to make on \mathbf{x} in order for the formulae in Theorem 4.2.5 to hold? We know experimentally that having totally positive torsion is not a necessary condition. Indeed, the curve \mathbf{x} shown in Figure 4.5 is parametrized by

$$t \mapsto (e^t \cos(2\pi t)(1-t) + t, e^t \sin(2\pi t), t)$$

so it does not have totally positive torsion. However, one can check numerically that the volume of its convex hull can be computed as in Theorem 4.2.5 or equivalently by (4.2.5). This implies that the ‘totally positive torsion’ assumption is a strong requirement. We suggest an analysis of the convexity of the curve, inspired by the following result.

Lemma 4.2.8. Let $\mathbf{x} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a cyclic curve. Then the convex body $K = \text{conv } \mathbf{x}$ does not have k -faces for $k \geq \frac{d+1}{2}$.

Proof. Assume by contradiction that there exists a k -face F of K with $k \geq \frac{d+1}{2}$. Then, the hyperplane H supporting the face F intersects \mathbf{x} in at least $\frac{d+1}{2} + 1$ points. At most 2 such points are the extrema of the curve, whereas the remaining points satisfy the




Figure 4.5: A cartoon explaining the procedure for the volume computation of a cyclic curve in \mathbb{R}^3 . Left: the curve, appropriately rotated in such a way that the extrema lie on a vertical axis. Right: the projection of the curve in the (x_2, x_3) -plane. The volume of the convex hull of the curve is given by the product of the distance between the extrema in the left image, and the signed area of the plane curve in the right image.

condition that their tangents to the curve are contained in H . By perturbing H so that it is transversal to all the tangents, we can construct another hyperplane H' that intersects \mathbf{x} in at least $2\left(\frac{d-1}{2}\right) + 2 = d+1$ points. This contradicts the cyclicity assumption. \square

In particular, we can improve the statement in the three-dimensional space and get a complete characterization of the boundary of the convex hull of a cyclic curve. The argument consists in applying Lemma 4.2.8 and repeating a similar reasoning also for the faces in which the extrema of the curve are not involved.

Corollary 4.2.9. Let $\mathbf{x} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a cyclic curve. The boundary of $K = \text{conv } \mathbf{x}$ is the union of two cones over \mathbf{x} with vertices $\mathbf{x}(0)$ and $\mathbf{x}(1)$ respectively.

Hence, the cyclicity of a curve gives us information about its convex hull. Additionally, if \mathbf{x} is cyclic, by Carathéodory's theorem all the points of the curve are extreme points of its convex hull, i.e., $\mathbf{x} = \text{Ext}(\text{conv } \mathbf{x})$, and the convex hull is full-dimensional. The converse is not true: there exist curves satisfying $\mathbf{x} = \text{Ext}(\text{conv } \mathbf{x})$, or more in general $\mathbf{x} \subset \partial(\text{conv } \mathbf{x})$, with a full dimensional convex hull, that are not cyclic. An example is provided by the curves $\mathbf{x}(t) = (\sin(2\pi t), \cos(2\pi t), \cos(2k\pi t))$, for integers $k \geq 2$. However, for these curves the volume formula in Theorem 4.2.5 does not work. We therefore propose the following problem.

Problem 4.2.10. Find the property (\star) such that the following statement holds true. Let $\mathbf{x} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a parametrized curve and let $K = \text{conv } \mathbf{x}$. The volume of K can be computed using the formulae in Theorem 4.2.5 if and only if \mathbf{x} satisfies property (\star) .

Notice that rewriting the formulae in Theorem 4.2.5 using signatures would potentially allow to require less regularity of \mathbf{x} , since they can be defined in more general frameworks.

Chapter 5

Convex bodies in quantum physics

This chapter is dedicated to the study of a specific convex body in \mathbb{R}^4 , which arises from quantum physics. We present here an almost integral version of the paper [LMS⁺21]. It began as a project of T.P.Le and R.F.Werner, aimed at a better understanding of self-testing. T.Ziegler joined as a Masters student. B. Sturmfels and the author of this thesis contributed with the mathematical aspects. The main character of the article is the set of quantum correlations $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^4$. This is a full-dimensional semialgebraic convex body, sandwiched between two polytopes: $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{N}$. We point out that \mathcal{N} is the polytope P from Example 1.1.13. The presentation below starts with a brief introduction to quantum correlations. This is followed by a mathematical discussion, where the main results are stated, and by a summary of previous work. Section 5.2 offers a more extended description of the correlation body \mathcal{Q} , from basic visualization and overall properties to a detailed classification of boundary points. In Section 5.3 we focus on the dual body and its connection to \mathcal{Q} . We also investigate their common normal cycle. In these descriptive sections we give no proofs. Proofs are collected in Section 5.5. Every statement of a proposition or theorem begins with a clickable pointer such as (\rightarrow Section 5.5) to the subsection containing the proof. An exception to this rule are statements that are clear from the context, and merely summarize a narrative just given. The proof section is organized in logical order, and should be readable from beginning to end without forward references. This order differs from the narrative in Sections 5.2, 5.3, and also from the theorems in Section 5.1.2.

The notation used in this chapter will sometimes differ from the one used in the previous chapters. We decided to leave it as it is in order to avoid conflicts with standard conventions in quantum physics and to keep it as intuitive as possible. We point out here some of the differences. The coordinates of \mathbb{R}^4 will be usually denoted by $(c_{11}, c_{12}, c_{21}, c_{22})$, whereas $(f_{11}, f_{12}, f_{21}, f_{22})$ will denote a point of the dual space $(\mathbb{R}^4)^*$. Angle brackets will be used for the expectation of a random variable, and ‘.’ for the standard Euclidean scalar product. The support function of a convex body K will be represented by ϕ_K in what follows. In any case, every new notation will be properly introduced when needed.

5.1. Introduction

The quantum correlation set is a fundamental object in quantum information theory. The key point is that some correlations predicted by quantum theory cannot be modeled within classical probability. In this situation it is natural to ask: where exactly lies the boundary




Figure 5.1: A correlation experiment: Alice chooses setting i and Bob setting j . The outcomes of A_i and B_j are ± 1 . One measures the correlation c_{ij} of these outcomes.

between the classical and the quantum? What other correlations or quantum states exhibit the same features? In a correlation setting, N parties share some quantum state, so that each party can choose from M different measurements, each of which can have K different outcomes. So what exactly is the set of correlation data that can arise from either classical probability or quantum? This is a hard problem even for fairly small N, M, K . The singlet state has the minimal set of parameters $NMK = 222$. Here, characterizations have been known since Tsirelson's seminal work [Tsi87], particularly in the ‘zero-marginals’ case $222|0$, defined by the property that each outcome by itself, without considering the results of other parties, is equidistributed. This is the scenario that we indicate by the adjective ‘minimal’. We provide an overview of the literature below in Section 5.1.3. Known results are scattered. The connections between different characterizations are rarely given, the overall structure of the boundary is not analyzed, and no attempts at a full geometric understanding or visualization are made. Moreover, the self-duality of the body seems to have escaped notice altogether. All this will be provided in the present chapter, along with self-contained proofs of all assertions.

5.1.1. Background from physics

In a correlation experiment, several parties carry out measurements on a shared quantum system. We consider $N = 2$ causally disconnected parties, conventionally called Alice and Bob. Each of them chooses from $M = 2$ possible measurements, labeled $i, j = 1, 2$, with $K = 2$ possible outcomes, labeled ± 1 (see Figure 5.1). Thus there are four experiments, labeled by the pairs (i, j) of choices for Alice and Bob. The correlation $c_{ij} \in [-1, 1]$ is the probability of equal outcomes minus that of different outcomes. Equivalently, c_{ij} is the expectation of the product of the outcomes, when these are labeled as ± 1 . The c_{ij} are not sufficient to reconstruct the full statistics. That would give an 8-dimensional convex body, whose coordinates are the marginals for single outcomes, plus one correlation for every pair (i, j) . This count incorporates the no-signalling condition, namely that the marginals do not depend on the setting chosen at the other site. Restricting to the 4-tuples $c = (c_{11}, c_{12}, c_{21}, c_{22})$ corresponds to a *projection* of the 8-dimensional body. We can realize this projection geometrically by taking the equal weight mixture of the given model with one in which all outcomes are flipped to their negatives. This operation changes the sign of the marginals, but not of the correlations c_{ij} . Therefore, we can alternatively think of the 4-dimensional body as that *section* of the 8-dimensional body, in which the marginals are set equal to zero. This explains why we call our scenario in the 4-dimensional c -space the zero marginals case.

We are interested in the set \mathcal{Q} of correlations $c = (c_{11}, c_{12}, c_{21}, c_{22})$ that are consistent with quantum theory. Quantum systems are described in some separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} over \mathbb{C} . The source is given by a positive Hermitian operator ρ acting on \mathcal{H} . It satisfies $\text{tr}(\rho) = 1$ and is called the *density operator*. The measurements are characterized by Hermitian operators A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 on \mathcal{H} that satisfy the hypotheses

$$[A_i, B_j] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad -\mathbb{1} \leq A_i, B_j \leq \mathbb{1} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i, j \leq 2. \quad (5.1.1)$$

If $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^m$ then A_i and B_j are Hermitian $m \times m$ matrices and $\mathbb{1}$ is the identity matrix. Condition (5.1.1) says that A_i commutes with B_j and that the eigenvalues of all these matrices are in $[-1, 1]$. The commutation condition represents the hypothesis that the two parties are causally disconnected, i.e., all measurements by Alice can be executed jointly with those of Bob. In contrast, the commutators $[A_1, A_2]$ and $[B_1, B_2]$ are usually nonzero, i.e., the two measurement choices of each party individually are not commensurate.

The correlations are computed from the operators above by taking traces:

$$c_{ij} = \text{tr}(\rho A_i B_j) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i, j \leq 2. \quad (5.1.2)$$

The *correlation body* \mathcal{Q} consists of all points c in $[-1, 1]^4$ that admit such a representation.

There is an analogous set \mathcal{C} in classical probability theory, where the A_i and B_j are ± 1 -valued random variables, with joint probability distribution ρ . Writing \mathbb{E} for expectations, the formula is

$$c_{ij} = \mathbb{E}(A_i B_j) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i, j \leq 2. \quad (5.1.3)$$

The classical set \mathcal{C} consists of all points c in $[-1, 1]^4$ that admit such a representation.

We note that (5.1.3) is the special case of (5.1.2) when all A_i and B_j commute. All matrices can then be taken to be diagonal, and the diagonal entries of ρ form a probability distribution. Hence $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$.

The whole point of our correlation body is that the reverse inclusion is false. A prominent example is

$$c = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1, 1, 1, -1) \in \mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{C}. \quad (5.1.4)$$

It is easy to build a quantum representation, and this has been realized experimentally to very high precision. So the realizability of this c is a well-confirmed experimental fact. On the other hand, c cannot be classical, because the Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt version of John Bell's inequality holds for all $c \in \mathcal{C}$:

$$\text{CHSH}(c) : \quad \frac{1}{2}(c_{11} + c_{12} + c_{21} - c_{22}) \leq 1. \quad (5.1.5)$$

The point c in (5.1.4) is not classical because the left hand side of (5.1.5) equals $\sqrt{2}$, and this exceeds 1. This is a remarkable result, the basis of an experimentum crucis ruling out a whole mode of describing Nature.

The experiments put quantum theory to a sharp test: the value $\sqrt{2}$ is an upper bound for all quantum correlations. If a value significantly larger than $\sqrt{2}$ had been found, then this would refute the quantum way of describing Nature, in just the same way as classical theories are excluded by a violation of Bell's CHSH inequality. This inequality and all linear inequalities bounding \mathcal{Q} are called *Tsirelson inequalities*.

Tsirelson's bound has led to speculations about super-quantum correlations in families of theories ('generalized probabilistic theories'), and to the desire to view the quantum case in a larger context. The only constraint then would be that Alice choosing a measurement device makes no detectable difference for the probabilities of outcomes seen by Bob alone,

i.e., without comparing outcomes with Alice. This is the *no signalling set* of correlations, denoted by \mathcal{N} . It satisfies $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{N}$. Since in this paper we ignore marginals seen by only one partner, the remaining constraint is that c lies in the cube, so $\mathcal{N} = [-1, 1]^4$.

When N, M, K are larger than 2, 2, 2, computing optimal bounds for \mathcal{Q} is a hard problem. One source of difficulty is that there are multiple definitions of \mathcal{Q} , depending on how the separation of parties is required to be encoded in a tensor product structure, or just commutativity between Alice and Bob. This is known as Tsirelson's problem [Fri12, JNP⁺11], and was recently resolved in [JNV⁺21]. However, it does not arise in the 222 case. Another source of difficulty is that no bound on the Hilbert space dimension can be assumed. Restricting the dimension to be finite, in general, gives a set that is not closed, so some limiting correlations require infinite dimension [Slo19]. Again this subtlety does not occur in the minimal case. The minimal case considered in this paper is the only one for which a sharp characterization has been achieved. This is the principal reason for undertaking the detailed geometric study that is to follow.

A crucial property for quantum key distribution is that a maximal violation of the CHSH inequality can be achieved in an essentially unique way. Thus, by just verifying such correlations, without any knowledge about the construction of the devices, one can reconstruct ρ, A_i, B_j up to trivial enlargements. This property is called *self-testing*. It implies that any further system will be uncorrelated, so an eavesdropping third party could never learn anything about the data collected by Alice and Bob. We explain the cryptographic background in Section 5.4.

5.1.2. A view from mathematics

The correlation body \mathcal{Q} is compact and convex. Compactness is not obvious but follows from Theorem 5.1.1. For convexity, let $c, \tilde{c} \in \mathcal{Q}$ have realizations (5.1.2) by matrices of size m and \tilde{m} . Any convex combination $\lambda c + (1 - \lambda)\tilde{c}$ is realized by block matrices of size $m + \tilde{m}$, namely $\lambda\rho \oplus (1 - \lambda)\tilde{\rho}$, $A_i \oplus \tilde{A}_i$ and $B_j \oplus \tilde{B}_j$. By contrast, if we were to fix m then compactness is easy to see but convexity generally fails. For instance, fixing $m = 1$, the image under (5.1.2) is the set of 2×2 matrices of rank ≤ 1 with each entry in $[-1, +1]$.

The body \mathcal{Q} lies between two polytopes. First, \mathcal{Q} is contained in the 4-dimensional cube $\mathcal{N} = [-1, 1]^4$, which has 16 vertices, 32 edges, 24 ridges and 8 facets. Second, \mathcal{Q} contains the classical set \mathcal{C} , which is also a polytope. Namely, \mathcal{C} is the *demicube*, which is the convex hull of the eight even vertices of \mathcal{N} . The 4-dimensional demicube \mathcal{C} is combinatorially dual to the cube \mathcal{N} (see Example 1.1.13). It coincides with the cross-polytope [Zie95, Example 0.4], so it has 8 vertices, 24 edges, 32 ridges and 16 facets. This census of the faces of \mathcal{C} is of direct relevance for our description of the boundary of the convex body \mathcal{Q} , to be given in Proposition 5.2.4.

The correlation body \mathcal{Q} is semialgebraic: it can be described by a boolean combination of polynomial inequalities. Here a phenomenon arises that is unfamiliar from polytope theory. It is not sufficient to use a conjunction of polynomial inequalities. In other words, \mathcal{Q} is not a basic semialgebraic set. Moreover, while both polynomials g and h in the description below are needed, only h is determined by \mathcal{Q} , as the unique algebraic description of a part of the boundary, while there is some freedom of choice for g .

A main source of convex semialgebraic sets is the cone of positive semidefinite matrices. Quantum theory is entirely based on this cone. Its states, observables, and channels are all defined in terms of it. In fact, the set \mathcal{Q} arises from a spectrahedron by projection, and it is thus in the class of spectrahedral shadows.

Each of the themes described in the previous paragraphs can be used to characterize the set \mathcal{Q} . This leads to six descriptions that look different at first glance. We summarize these in the following theorem.

Theorem 5.1.1. (\rightarrow Section 5.5.1) The following items describe the same subset \mathcal{Q} in \mathbb{R}^4 :

- (a) The set of quantum correlations c , as defined in Section 5.1.1, i.e., the c_{ij} from (5.1.2) satisfying (5.1.1).
- (b) The convex hull of $\{(\cos \alpha, \cos \beta, \cos \gamma, \cos \delta) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \mid \alpha + \beta + \gamma + \delta \equiv 0 \pmod{2\pi}\}$.
- (c) The image of the demicube \mathcal{C} under the homeomorphism $\sin : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ mapping c to $\sin(\frac{\pi}{2}c_{ij})_{1 \leq i,j \leq 2}$.
- (d) The semialgebraic set $\{c \in \mathcal{N} \mid g(c) \geq 0 \text{ or } h(c) \geq 0\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} g(c) &= 2 - (c_{11}^2 + c_{12}^2 + c_{21}^2 + c_{22}^2) + 2c_{11}c_{12}c_{21}c_{22} \\ h(c) &= 4(1 - c_{11}^2)(1 - c_{12}^2)(1 - c_{21}^2)(1 - c_{22}^2) - g(c)^2. \end{aligned}$$

- (e) The spectrahedral shadow consisting of all points $(c_{11}, c_{12}, c_{21}, c_{22}) \in \mathbb{R}^4$ such that

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & u & c_{11} & c_{12} \\ u & 1 & c_{21} & c_{22} \\ c_{11} & c_{21} & 1 & v \\ c_{12} & c_{22} & v & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

is positive semidefinite for some choice of $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$.

- (f) The scalar products of pairs of unit vectors a_i, b_j in Euclidean space: $c_{ij} = \langle a_i, b_j \rangle$ for $i, j = 1, 2$.

One way to describe a convex body is by the maxima of all linear functionals. As we discussed in Section 1.1.3, this is the support function, denoted by

$$\phi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f) = \sup\{\langle f, c \rangle \mid c \in \mathcal{Q}\}.$$

Here $f \in \mathbb{R}^4$ and ‘ $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ ’ denotes the scalar product in \mathbb{R}^4 . The following theorem gives an explicit formula.

Theorem 5.1.2. (\rightarrow Section 5.5.3) Consider the following expressions in four variables $f = (f_{11}, f_{12}, f_{21}, f_{22})$:

$$\begin{aligned} k(f) &= (f_{11}f_{22} - f_{12}f_{21})(f_{11}f_{12} - f_{21}f_{22})(f_{11}f_{21} - f_{12}f_{22}) \\ p(f) &= f_{11}f_{12}f_{21}f_{22} \\ \phi_C(f) &= \max\{|f_{11} + f_{12} + f_{21} + f_{22}|, |f_{11} + f_{12} - f_{21} - f_{22}|, \\ &\quad |f_{11} - f_{12} + f_{21} - f_{22}|, |f_{11} + f_{12} - f_{21} - f_{22}|\} \\ m(f) &= \left(\min_{i,j} |f_{ij}|\right) \left(\sum_{i,j} |f_{ij}|^{-1}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The support function of the correlation body \mathcal{Q} equals

$$\phi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{k(f)}{p(f)}} & \text{if } p(f) < 0 \text{ and } m(f) > 2, \\ \phi_C(f) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5.1.8)$$

The case distinction in (5.1.8) is between the ‘classical’ case and the ‘quantum’ case. Indeed, as the notation suggests, the piecewise linear expression $\phi_{\mathcal{C}}$ in Theorem 5.1.2 is the support function of the cross-polytope \mathcal{C} . Hence $\phi_{\mathcal{C}}$ represents inequalities for classical correlations. On the other hand, in first case of (5.1.8), the maximizers are non-classical correlations, and for fixed f the maximizer is unique (see Proposition 5.3.5).

Consider the sequence of inclusions $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{N}$ we discussed above. Then we have an analogous chain for the dual bodies: $\mathcal{N}^\circ \subset \mathcal{Q}^\circ \subset \mathcal{C}^\circ$. Here \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{N}° are cross-polytopes, while \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{C}° are 4-cubes. However, even stronger statements are true: \mathcal{C} is affinely isomorphic to \mathcal{N}° , and \mathcal{N} is affinely isomorphic to \mathcal{C}° . Moreover, these isomorphisms extend to the middle term in the inclusion $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{N}$, which means that the correlation body \mathcal{Q} is *self-dual*:

Theorem 5.1.3. (→Section 5.5.2) There exists an orthogonal transformation H such that

$$\mathcal{C}^\circ = \frac{1}{2}H\mathcal{N}, \quad \mathcal{N}^\circ = \frac{1}{2}H\mathcal{C} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Q}^\circ = \frac{1}{2}H\mathcal{Q}.$$

The proofs of the three theorems are presented in Section 5.5. While proving that they agree, we write $\mathcal{Q}_{(a)}, \mathcal{Q}_{(b)}, \mathcal{Q}_{(c)}, \mathcal{Q}_{(d)}, \mathcal{Q}_{(e)}, \mathcal{Q}_{(f)}$ for the six sets in Theorem 5.1.1. All objects and assertions are explained in detail in Section 5.2. along with lots of additional information. For instance, Proposition 5.2.4 describes the stratification of the boundary of \mathcal{Q} into patches. Readers might start with Figures 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4.

5.1.3. Short review of previous work

The correlation body \mathcal{Q} first came into focus in Tsirelson’s work [Tsi80]. That paper gives no proofs, but some of them were supplied in [Tsi87]. This includes the characterization $\mathcal{Q}_{(a)} = \mathcal{Q}_{(f)}$ in the more general 2M2|0 case ([Tsi80, Theorem 1] = [Tsi87, Theorem 2.1]). Thereby the study of \mathcal{Q} , whose definition also allows infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces, is reduced to a finite dimensional problem. A semialgebraic description for the 222|0 case is given in [Tsi87, Theorem 2.2], along with an expression for the support function [Tsi87, Theorem 2.2]. This is our Theorem 5.1.2. Tsirelson calls these results ‘elementary’ consequences of (f), and does not provide a proof. He also thought about issues not covered in our review, like the full 222 case, multipartite scenarios ($N > 2$) [Tsi87, Section 5], and violations of CHSH inequalities by position and momentum ([Tsi87], see also [KW10]).

The spectrahedral shadow $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$ first appeared in Landau’s work [Lan88] as a relaxation of the correlation body. That the relaxation is tight follows from Tsirelson’s theorem [Tsi80]. Landau also gave a nearly semialgebraic characterization of \mathcal{Q} (see (5.2.6) below), which only misses the semialgebraic standard form by containing a square root. He almost achieved the description (d).

The pushout (c) was found by Masanes [Mas03], who stated that it identifies \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{Q} . He also considered the cosine-parametrized manifold of correlations in (b). The pushout was used implicitly in [NPA08, WWS16], in the form of a characterization of \mathcal{Q} by linear inequalities applied to the inverse pushout. However, it was not pointed out that the linear inequalities just characterize \mathcal{C} . Of course, spectrahedral shadows are used as outer approximants to \mathcal{Q} in the semidefinite hierarchies [DLTW08, NPA08]. This is an important technique for higher NMK, even though one gets the convex body exactly only in the minimal case.

A covering of the set of extreme points $\text{Ext } \mathcal{Q}$, which results in the cosine parametrization (b) and its analogue in the N22|0-case, were found in [WW01], see also [Mas05]. The

exact identification of the set of extreme points was found much later in [LVC19, WWS16]. The minimal case is an important example in many applications such as quantum nonlocality [BCP⁺14, GKW⁺18] and quantum cryptography [SGP⁺21, TSG⁺21].

5.2. Description of the correlation body

The convex body \mathcal{Q} has dimension four. Our aim is to describe it in every detail. Naturally, the geometric description will strain our 3-dimensional intuition. As always, the solution is to build the geometric intuitions on analytic notions, such as sections, projections, affine submanifolds, extreme points, and faces, which have clear definitions, but also on low-dimensional instances on which intuitions can be grounded. In the case at hand, the dimension gap is not too large, and we will see that some three-dimensional sections faithfully display important features of the four-dimensional body. We will also point out where this becomes too misleading. One general cautionary remark is that extreme points of a section usually fail to be extremal in the higher-dimensional body.

This section is divided into subsections, which are organized by geometric features, from overall properties to the classification of boundary points and their explicit description, to the dual inequalities, and finally the quantum realizations. This is different from the logical ordering in a proof. A complete set of proofs will be given only later in Section 5.5, which is accordingly organized in logical progression.

Gallery. We visualize the 4-dimensional body \mathcal{Q} by showing 3-dimensional sections. Some of these will be at the same time projections. For example, the zero marginal case arises from the full marginal case either by ignoring the marginals (a projection) or by taking the subset with zero marginals (a section by a linear subspace). Such sections/projections often arise by averaging over a symmetry group [VW01].




Figure 5.2: The Alice-Bob symmetric subsets of correlations ($c_{12} = c_{21}$). Left: the cube \mathcal{N} with black edges, and the octahedron \mathcal{C} with blue edges. It has two kinds of facets: CHSH-facets (yellow) \mathcal{N} -facets (gray). Right: the correlation body \mathcal{Q} . Its boundary consists of a strictly convex surface of exposed extreme points, together with \mathcal{N} -faces extending those of \mathcal{C} , whose boundaries are outlined in red. The arrow points to the CHSH point $c = (1, 1, 1, -1)/\sqrt{2}$.

We begin in Figure 5.2 with correlations that are symmetric under exchanging Alice and Bob, i.e., $c_{12} = c_{21}$. The projection onto this hyperplane is given by the map $(c_{11}, c_{12}, c_{21}, c_{22}) \mapsto (c_{11}, c_{22}, (c_{12} + c_{21})/2)$. The corresponding sections of the polytopes \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{C} are a cube and an octahedron, respectively. The extreme points of the section




Figure 5.3: Parallel sections $c_{11} = t$ through the body \mathcal{Q} , for $t = -1, -0.8, 0, 0.8, 1$.

of \mathcal{C} are not all extremal in four dimensions: The point $(1, 1, 0)$, where two parabolas meet in Figure 5.2, has $c_{12} = c_{21} = 0$. It is not extremal in \mathcal{C} . But it is the midpoint between the extreme points $(1, 1, -1, 1)$ and $(1, -1, 1, 1)$ of \mathcal{C} , which lie outside the section shown. The nonlinear boundary in Figure 5.2, right, is a quartic surface, obtained by setting $c_{12} = c_{21}$ in the sextic $h(c)$ and cancelling a factor $(c_{11} - c_{22})^2$. These geometric features have 4-dimensional counterparts, to be described later. In Figure 5.3 we show the sections parallel to the facets of the cube \mathcal{N} . These are obtained by fixing the value of one coordinate, say c_{11} , at a number t in the interval $[-1, 1]$. This family of pictures gives a full description of \mathcal{Q} . The corresponding projections are non-informative: they are equal to the full 3-cube. The special sections $c_{11} = \pm 1$ are facets of \mathcal{Q} : they are ellipotes (see Example 1.2.10).

Other cutting directions, which can be expected to have an interesting symmetry are sections orthogonal to the main diagonals of \mathcal{N} . Like the vertices, they come in two kinds, either connecting two classical correlations or connecting two PR-boxes. In Figure 5.4 we show, on the left, a cut very close to the hyperplane $c_{11} + c_{12} + c_{21} + c_{22} = 0$, which is orthogonal to the diagonal connecting the classical point $(1, 1, 1, 1)$ and its antipode. On the right in Figure 5.4, we see the cut given by $c_{11} + c_{12} + c_{21} - c_{22} = 0$.




Figure 5.4: Sections through \mathcal{Q} perpendicular to a long diagonal of the cube \mathcal{N} . Left: diagonal connecting two classical correlations. Our cut on is thus slightly off-center, otherwise we would get the full octahedron. Right: diagonal connecting two PR-boxes.

Enclosing and enclosed polytopes. The cube \mathcal{N} consists of the points c such that $-1 \leq c_{ij} \leq 1$. It has $2^4 = 16$ vertices, namely the points in $\{-1, 1\}^4$. The classical distributions are the mixtures of uncorrelated c , i.e., $c_{ij} = a_i b_j$ for some $a_i, b_j \in [-1, 1]$. A classical correlation is extremal when $a_i, b_j = \pm 1$. Hence, the extreme points of \mathcal{C} are also extreme points of \mathcal{N} , but which? This is decided by a sign: for a classical extreme point we have $c_{11}c_{12}c_{21}c_{22} = a_1^2 b_1^2 a_2^2 b_2^2 = +1$. So the classical extreme points of \mathcal{C} are just the 8 even vertices of \mathcal{N} . The odd vertices are the so-called Popescu-Rohrlich (PR-)box

correlations. They have neither classical nor quantum realizations: in (5.1.5) they satisfy $\text{CHSH}(c) = 2$, which clearly exceeds the quantum maximum.

The 16 facets of the demicube \mathcal{C} come in two classes. These are distinguished by how they sit inside the cube \mathcal{N} . A facet in the first class extends to a facet of \mathcal{N} . It is the intersection of \mathcal{C} with a hyperplane like $c_{11} = 1$. There are eight such facets, which we call \mathcal{N} -facets of \mathcal{C} . The more interesting kind is called a *CHSH-facet*, because it saturates a Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt inequality (5.1.5). There are eight such inequalities: any odd number of minus signs can multiply the four correlations.

All of this can be seen also in the 3-dimensional cut along the hyperplane $c_{12} = c_{21}$ shown on the left in Figure 5.2. The two polytopes are the intersection of \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{N} with this hyperplane. The CHSH-facets and the \mathcal{N} -facets are marked in different colors. Other slices of \mathcal{C} (blue frame) and \mathcal{N} (black frame) are shown in Figures 5.3 and 5.4. The cut through the origin, orthogonal to the long diagonal connecting classical vertices (approximately as in the left panel in Figure 5.4) has the intersections with \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{C} equal to the same octahedron. Since $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{N}$, this cut also makes our convex body \mathcal{Q} look like a polytope.

Of course, in every cut we see the inclusions $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{N}$. More precisely, the \mathcal{N} -facets of \mathcal{C} extend to facets of \mathcal{Q} , which we also call \mathcal{N} -facets. This is typically a strict extension. The CHSH-facets are no longer faces of \mathcal{Q} . Instead, they become the basis of a bulging part of \mathcal{Q} , above which we find a single vertex of \mathcal{N} . In fact, this is a feature of any body between \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{N} . We record this fact in the following proposition, which helps with keeping track of the parts of \mathcal{Q} .

Proposition 5.2.1. (→Section 5.5.3) Every non-classical correlation $c \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \mathcal{C}$ violates exactly one of the eight CHSH-inequalities.

A feature which will play a major role later, and is characteristic of the minimal case, is the *duality* between the polytopes \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{N} . We saw this in Theorem 5.1.3, and it will be considered in detail in Section 5.3.

Pushout. The connection between the boundary structures of \mathcal{Q} and \mathcal{C} can be raised from a qualitative observation to a precise mathematical statement. There is a natural homeomorphism between the convex bodies. To this end, we define a transformation $\sin : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ of the cube, which we call the **pushout** operation:

$$(\sin c)_{ij} = \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}c_{ij}\right). \quad (5.2.1)$$

This is the coordinatewise application of a suitably scaled sine function. Since the sine maps the interval $[-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ bijectively and continuously onto $[-1, 1]$, we see that **sin** is bijective, continuous and has a continuous inverse. This is relevant because of the following astonishingly simple characterization of \mathcal{Q} .

Proposition 5.2.2. (→Section 5.5.1) $\sin \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{Q}$.

As a connection between convex bodies this is quite strange: the sine is neither convex nor concave on $[-\pi/2, \pi/2]$, so the **sin** transformation applied to a convex set normally does not give a convex set. Moreover, the **sin** function is transcendental but both sets have an algebraic description. So why does this work? What is the general principle? The pushout property is inherited by the sections in Figure 5.2 and by the \mathcal{N} -facets because the hyperplanes $\{c_{12} = c_{21}\}$ and $\{c_{11} = -1\}$ are invariant under **sin**. It also connects \mathcal{C} -sections and \mathcal{Q} -sections in Figure 5.3 when the fixed c_{11} -coordinate is appropriately transformed. The closest we can come to a general principle is related to the fact

that the pushout of the tetrahedron is the ellipope. This fact also underlines the cosine parametrization in Proposition 5.2.5. The threefolds of extreme points are parametrized by angles satisfying a linear constraint. A similar connection arises between two families of curves inside the 3-cube, on one hand Lissajous knots, i.e., cosine-parametrized closed rational curves, and, on the other, billiard knots, i.e., closed piecewise linear curves bouncing from the boundaries by specular reflection; see [JP98], [KPS17, Figure 3]. Another feature can be understood from the pushout characterization: at the edges of a polytope extending all the way to the boundary we get a rounded surface with continuous tangents. This is explained in Figure 5.5.




Figure 5.5: The 2-dimensional version of the pushout map in (5.2.1). The rectangle on the left gets mapped to the ellipse on the right. The yellow semicircle shows that convexity is generally not preserved.

Symmetry. The symmetry group of the regular 4-cube $\mathcal{N} = [-1, 1]^4$ is the *hyperoctahedral group* B_4 . This group has order $384 = 2^4 \times 4!$. All of these symmetries are given by rotations and reflections in \mathbb{R}^4 . Each symmetry either preserves the parity of the vertices of \mathcal{N} , or it swaps the eight even vertices and the eight odd vertices. The symmetry group G of the demicube \mathcal{C} is an index two subgroup of B_4 . It consists of symmetries of \mathcal{N} that preserve the parity. It follows from Proposition 5.2.2, and the fact that the pushout map commutes with coordinate permutations and sign changes, that \mathcal{Q} has the same symmetry group G as \mathcal{C} .

Proposition 5.2.3. The common symmetry group of \mathcal{Q} and \mathcal{C} has order 192. It is the semidirect product $G = (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^3 \rtimes S_4$, where S_4 is the symmetric group on four elements. The first factor swaps labels.

It is noteworthy that this group is larger than one would expect from the definition of \mathcal{Q} . Indeed, some obvious symmetries arise from changing the conventions for describing the correlations: Which party is called Alice, which is Bob? Which outcome is $+1$ or -1 , and which settings get the labels 1 or 2? Changing any of these conventions defines a transformation that clearly leaves each of the correlation sets invariant. The resulting group is visualized in Figure 5.6, and acts on the tuples $(c_{11}, c_{12}, c_{21}, c_{22})$ by sign changes (first row) and permutations (second row) giving only 64 transformations. Not all sign changes can be obtained, only even ones, and the permutations cannot break pairs of diagonally opposing pairs in the square form in which we arranged the c_{ij} . As the additional ‘non-trivial’ transformation needed to generate the group given in Proposition 5.2.3, one can take the swap $(c_{11}, c_{12}, c_{21}, c_{22}) \mapsto (c_{12}, c_{11}, c_{21}, c_{22})$.

5.2.1. Boundary, faces, and extreme points

Since the pushout is a homeomorphism, it identifies the boundary of \mathcal{Q} with the boundary of \mathcal{C} . The facets of the demicube \mathcal{C} thus provide a partition of the boundary of the




Figure 5.6: Symmetries that preserve the definition of quantum correlations. First row: sign patterns. Second row: permutations arising from a swap of partners or relabeling. The symmetry group G of \mathcal{Q} , as described in Proposition 5.2.3, is larger.

correlation body \mathcal{Q} . However, the image of a facet may now become curved, making interior points of the facet extremal in \mathcal{Q} . This happens exactly for the CHSH-facets of \mathcal{C} , as the following proposition shows. We are going to list the interiors of faces because the boundaries already belong to another face. By ‘interior’ we mean the relative interior, i.e., the interior in the affine span of the face. We denote by $\text{Ext } K$ the extreme points of a convex body K .

Proposition 5.2.4. (\rightarrow Section 5.5.3) The convex body \mathcal{Q} is the disjoint union of the following semialgebraic sets:

(\mathcal{Q}_{cx}) 8 **classical exposed points** $c \in \text{Ext } \mathcal{C}$.

(\mathcal{Q}_{ce}) 24 **exposed edges**, i.e., the interiors of line segments that connect pairs of classical exposed points.

(\mathcal{Q}_{nx}) 32 surfaces of **non-exposed extreme points**.

Each is the pushout of a triangle in $\partial \mathcal{C}$, which is the intersection of an \mathcal{N} -facet and a CHSH-facet.

(\mathcal{Q}_{qx}) 8 threefolds of **exposed extreme points**.

Each threefold is the curved pushout of the interior of a CHSH-facet of \mathcal{C} , which is a tetrahedron.

(\mathcal{Q}_{ei}) 8 **elliptopes**’ interiors, i.e., the interiors of the facets that arise from \mathcal{N} -facets of \mathcal{C} , as in Figure 5.2.

(\mathcal{Q}_{in}) The interior of \mathcal{Q} .

The stratification of \mathcal{Q} shown in Proposition 5.2.4 mirrors the stratification of the demicube \mathcal{C} into relatively open faces. Indeed, the numbers seen in Proposition 5.2.4 count the faces of various dimension of \mathcal{C} . Namely the f-vector of \mathcal{C} equals $(8, 24, 32, 8+8, 1)$. The Euclidean closures of sets of type (\mathcal{Q}) are said to be *of type* $[\mathcal{Q}]$. Types $[\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qx}}]$ and $[\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ei}}]$ suffice to cover the boundary. Going back to Definition 1.2.20, our body \mathcal{Q} has 16 patches, eight of type $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qx}})$ and eight of type $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ei}})$.

The difference between the types $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qx}})$ and $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ei}})$ will be important for what follows. It also relates to the two types of *maximal non-trivial faces* of \mathcal{Q} . The only two types are the singletons in $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qx}})$, and the \mathcal{N} -facets $[\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ei}}]$. These maximal faces are also exposed. Exposedness properties will be discussed later in their natural context: duality. An intuitive geometric understanding of the non-exposedness of type $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{nx}})$ can be gained from considering the pushout mechanism: this converts the junction between a CHSH-facet and an \mathcal{N} -facet of \mathcal{C} to a junction with matching tangents. The prototype for this is shown in Figure 5.5. The red ellipse is tangent to the boundary of the square at the four points of intersection. For $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{nx}})$ -points the same happens in higher dimension.




Figure 5.7: Every facet of \mathcal{Q} is an ellotope. Points of type $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{cx}})$ are vertices of the blue tetrahedron; $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ce}})$ gives blue edges, $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{nx}})$ is the orange surface. Extreme points of the ellotope are not exposed in \mathbb{R}^4 . Type $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ei}})$ comprise the interior.

Since the $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qx}})$ extreme points will be discussed in more detail later, let us briefly describe the $[\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ei}}]$ facets. These ellotopes are visualized in Figure 5.7, an enlarged version of the first panel in Figure 5.3. Since the pushout map restricts to \mathcal{N} -facets, it is the pushout of the \mathcal{C} -like tetrahedron that forms its skeleton. Indeed, the edges of \mathcal{C} are marked by two of the c_{ij} being ± 1 , and the other two equal up to a sign. This condition is invariant under pushout, so the edges of \mathcal{C} are invariant as sets, but not pointwise fixed, and become exactly the $[\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ce}}]$ -edges of \mathcal{Q} .

How do all these pieces fit together? Once again this is readily answered by looking at the pushout identification of \mathcal{Q} with \mathcal{C} . Consider the bicoloring of the facets of the cross-polytope \mathcal{C} . The two colors distinguish CHSH and \mathcal{N} types. Only tetrahedra of different types intersect in a surface, and each surface $[\mathcal{Q}_{\text{nx}}]$ is the intersection of a $[\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qx}}]$ and a $[\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ei}}]$ -set. The triangular surfaces $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{nx}})$ are thus faithfully portrayed in Figure 5.7. The intersection of two $[\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qx}}]$ -surfaces is lower dimensional: if they are not disjoint opposites, they intersect in a straight edge $[\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ce}}]$.

Curved tetrahedra. Proposition 5.2.4 allows us to turn an affine parametrization of a CHSH-face into a trigonometric parametrization of a curved tetrahedron $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qx}})$. For later purposes, we find cosines a bit more convenient than sines.

Proposition 5.2.5. (→Section 5.5.1) The threefolds $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qx}})$ of exposed extreme points on \mathcal{Q} are parametrized by

$$\begin{aligned} c = (c_{11}, c_{12}, c_{21}, c_{22}) &= (\cos \alpha, \cos \beta, \cos \gamma, \cos \delta) \quad \text{where} \\ \alpha + \beta + \gamma + \delta &= 0 \pmod{2\pi} \quad \text{and} \\ \Delta = \sin \alpha \cdot \sin \beta \cdot \sin \gamma \cdot \sin \delta &< 0. \end{aligned}$$

The angle parameters can be taken as the triples (α, β, γ) , with $\delta = -(\alpha + \beta + \gamma)$. In this 3-space, the sign of Δ marks a partition into two kinds of subsets: on the one hand, we have the curved tetrahedra with $\Delta < 0$ considered in Proposition 5.2.5. A prototype which contains the CHSH-point $(\pi/4, \pi/4, \pi/4)$ is given by $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \alpha + \beta + \gamma \in (0, \pi)$.

On the other hand, consider the angles with $\Delta > 0$. Adding multiples of π to any of α, β, γ (and hence implicitly to δ) corresponds to an even sign change on the c_{ij} , and hence a symmetry of \mathcal{Q} . Therefore, it suffices to consider the cube $(0, \pi)^3$. In this cube

only $\sin \delta$ can be negative, so $\Delta > 0$ means $\alpha + \beta + \gamma \in (\pi, 2\pi)$. By taking cosines, these points end up in the interior of \mathcal{Q} . Finally, note that the angle parameters (α, β, γ) with $\Delta = 0$ correspond to further boundary elements from Proposition 5.2.4, as follows. The symmetries also help to reduce each of the classes in the following boundary version of the parametrization to a single case, which is readily checked.

Proposition 5.2.6. (\rightarrow Section 5.5.3) In the cosine parametrization of Proposition 5.2.5, taking $\Delta = 0$ parametrizes further boundary strata of lower dimension. Specifically, we get points of type

(Q_{cx}) if and only if $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ are all multiples of π ,

(Q_{ce}) if and only if exactly two of these angles are multiples of π , and

(Q_{nx}) if and only if exactly one of these angles is a multiple of π .

Remark 5.2.7. A special feature of the minimal 222 case is that there exists a parametrized family of quantum models, that realizes all points described in Proposition 5.2.5. Using the notation introduced in Section 5.1.1, we set $m = 4$ and $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^4$. Algebraically, a quantum state is a positive semidefinite 4×4 matrix ρ with trace 1. As density operator, we take the rank one matrix with entries $\rho_{\alpha\beta} = \Psi_\alpha \Psi_\beta$, defined by the unit vector

$$\Psi = \left(0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, 0 \right)^T.$$

The measurements of the two parties are represented by these real symmetric 4×4 matrices:

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\alpha) & 0 & \sin(\alpha) & 0 \\ 0 & \cos(\alpha) & 0 & \sin(\alpha) \\ \sin(\alpha) & 0 & -\cos(\alpha) & 0 \\ 0 & \sin(\alpha) & 0 & -\cos(\alpha) \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\gamma) & 0 & -\sin(\gamma) & 0 \\ 0 & \cos(\gamma) & 0 & -\sin(\gamma) \\ -\sin(\gamma) & 0 & -\cos(\gamma) & 0 \\ 0 & -\sin(\gamma) & 0 & -\cos(\gamma) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -\cos(\alpha+\beta) & -\sin(\alpha+\beta) & 0 & 0 \\ -\sin(\alpha+\beta) & \cos(\alpha+\beta) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\cos(\alpha+\beta) & -\sin(\alpha+\beta) \\ 0 & 0 & -\sin(\alpha+\beta) & \cos(\alpha+\beta) \end{pmatrix}.$$

These matrices satisfy the hypotheses stated in (5.1.1). Then, the four correlations c_{ij} in (5.1.2) parametrized by $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)$ as in Proposition 5.2.5, even without the inequality constraint on Δ , satisfy $c_{ij} = \text{tr}(\rho A_i B_j)$. This is a formal identity, for all $1 \leq i, j \leq 2$, and can be checked using computer algebra, e.g., Macaulay2 [GS].

5.2.2. Semialgebraic description

One possibility to decide quickly, for a given $c \in \mathbb{R}^4$, whether $c \in \mathcal{Q}$, is to apply the inverse pushout map, and to check whether the result lies in \mathcal{C} . This involves a transcendental function, and requires the checking of 16 linear inequalities. Here we consider an alternative, which only requires checking the positivity of two polynomials in c . In other words, we will describe our body \mathcal{Q} as a semialgebraic set.

There is a standard method to obtain relevant polynomials from the parametrization given in Proposition 5.2.5. Namely, one represents each angle variable η by the point $(\cos \eta, \sin \eta)$ on the unit circle, i.e., one introduces new variables s_{ij} with $c_{ij}^2 + s_{ij}^2 = 1$, and expresses the constraint on the sum of angles by trigonometrically expanding. Then one eliminates the s_{ij} -variables. Computer algebra systems, such as Mathematica [WR] or Macaulay2 [GS] handle such tasks routinely and, in this instance, in no time. The

result is the identity $h(c) = 0$ with h the sextic polynomial in (5.2.5) below. But also the condition $\Delta < 0$ has to be transcribed, for which we use the following polynomial g , which on $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qx}})$ satisfies $g(c) = \Delta$.

$$g(c) = 2 - (c_{11}^2 + c_{12}^2 + c_{21}^2 + c_{22}^2) + 2c_{11}c_{12}c_{21}c_{22}. \quad (5.2.3)$$

$$h(c) = 4(1 - c_{11}^2)(1 - c_{12}^2)(1 - c_{21}^2)(1 - c_{22}^2) - g(c)^2 \quad (5.2.4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= 4(c_{11}c_{22} - c_{12}c_{21})(c_{11}c_{21} - c_{12}c_{22})(c_{11}c_{12} - c_{21}c_{22}) - \\ &\quad - (c_{11} + c_{12} - c_{21} - c_{22})(c_{11} - c_{12} + c_{21} - c_{22})(c_{11} - c_{12} - c_{21} + c_{22})(c_{11} + c_{12} + c_{21} + c_{22}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.2.5)$$

We wrote two formulae for h , because (5.2.4) shows that h is invariant under the full symmetry group in Proposition 5.2.3, and (5.2.5) clarifies that the degree of h is six and not eight, as suggested by (5.2.4). Then we have:

Proposition 5.2.8. (\rightarrow Section 5.5.1) A point c in the cube \mathcal{N} lies in \mathcal{Q} if and only if $h(c) \geq 0$ or $g(c) \geq 0$.

While the polynomial h is an intrinsic feature of \mathcal{Q} , there is some freedom in the choice of g . Indeed h , together with the linear polynomials $1 \pm c_{ij}$, describes the algebraic boundary of \mathcal{Q} . This threefold has unbounded pieces outside the cube \mathcal{N} , but taking its convex hull after the intersection with \mathcal{N} gives exactly \mathcal{Q} . This is visualized in Figure 5.8, left, which shows the surface $\{h(c) = 0\}$ in the 3-space $\{c_{12} - c_{21} = 0\}$. The unbounded pieces arise because the algebraic elimination process works just as well in the complex domain. So the circle $c^2 + s^2 = 1$, as a complex variety, also contains real points with imaginary s , corresponding to angles $\alpha = ir$ or $\alpha = \pi + ir$ with $r \in \mathbb{R}$, and hence $\cos \alpha = \pm \cosh r$ in Proposition 5.2.5.




Figure 5.8: Hyperplane $\{c_{12} = c_{21}\}$. Left: the quartic surface $\{(c_{11} - c_{22})^{-2} h = 0\}$. Right: the quartic surface $\{g = 0\}$. The two surfaces intersect transversally in the red parabolas shown in the boundary of the cube.

What is the role of the second polynomial g ? This polynomial is needed to make Proposition 5.2.8 true. Figure 5.8, left, shows the zero set of h , so h is negative on the outside of the yellow surface. This extends well into the cube, where $c \in \mathcal{Q}$, and even $c \in \mathcal{C}$, e.g., near the origin. Hence, ‘ $c \in \mathcal{N}$ and $h(c) \geq 0$ ’ would produce many false negatives. The disjunction with $g(c) \geq 0$ captures the convex hull of the threefold inside the cube \mathcal{N} . The surface defined by g in the hyperplane $\{c_{12} - c_{21} = 0\}$ is shown in Figure 5.8, right. Figure 5.9 is a two-dimensional representation that shows the geometry of the relevant intersections.




Figure 5.9: A slice that illustrates how the two surfaces in Figure 5.8 intersect. The convex hull of the orange curve represents \mathcal{Q} . The disjunction $h(c) \geq 0$ or $g(c) \geq 0$ describes \mathcal{Q} : it is not a basic semialgebraic set.

We remark that more compact forms than the characterization by two polynomials can be given, if we allow the use of absolute values or roots. Such conditions can be converted to polynomial expressions. However, they typically generate a case distinction, hence some overhead in the logical part of a semialgebraic description. For example, by taking a root in (5.2.4) and combining with Proposition 5.2.8, we can see that $c \in \mathcal{Q}$ is equivalent to $c \in \mathcal{N}$ together with the single inequality

$$g(c) \geq -2\sqrt{(1 - c_{11}^2)(1 - c_{12}^2)(1 - c_{21}^2)(1 - c_{22}^2)}.$$

The following reformulation, due to Landau [Lan88], is not invariant under the full symmetry group of \mathcal{Q} :

$$\sqrt{(1 - c_{11}^2)(1 - c_{12}^2)} + \sqrt{(1 - c_{21}^2)(1 - c_{22}^2)} \geq |c_{11}c_{12} - c_{21}c_{22}|. \quad (5.2.6)$$

Note that these inequalities must be combined with the hypothesis $c \in \mathcal{N}$. This excludes unbounded solutions with a product of two negative factors under the square root.

Spectrahedral shadow. For any quantum correlations, given by a density operator ρ and observables A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 , and complex numbers ξ_1, \dots, ξ_4 , we consider the operator $X = \xi_1 A_1 + \xi_2 A_2 + \xi_3 B_1 + \xi_4 B_2$. Since X^*X is positive semidefinite, we conclude that $\text{tr}(\rho X^*X) = \sum_{\nu, \mu=1}^4 \overline{\xi_\nu} C_{\nu\mu} \xi_\mu \geq 0$, where we introduced the 4×4 matrix

$$C = (C_{\nu\mu}) = \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & u & c_{11} & c_{12} \\ \bar{u} & d_2 & c_{21} & c_{22} \\ c_{11} & c_{21} & d_3 & v \\ c_{12} & c_{22} & \bar{v} & d_4 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.2.7)$$

The entries other than c_{ij} are

$$u = \text{tr}(\rho A_1 A_2), \quad v = \text{tr}(\rho B_1 B_2), \quad \text{and} \quad d_1 = \text{tr}(\rho A_1^2) \geq 0, \text{ etc.}$$

The positivity stated above is $C \succcurlyeq 0$, our notation for C being positive semidefinite. The existence of u, v and d_i with $d_i^2 \leq 1$ making $C \succcurlyeq 0$ is thus a necessary condition for $c \in \mathcal{Q}$. This is the bottom level of the semidefinite hierarchy [NPA08] for quantum correlations. In the case at hand, the necessary condition is also sufficient. We can further assume that u and v are real and that the diagonal entries are all 1.

Proposition 5.2.9. (→Section 5.5.1) A point c lies in the convex body \mathcal{Q} if and only if there exist numbers $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $C \succcurlyeq 0$ in (5.2.7) with $d_1 = d_2 = d_3 = d_4 = 1$.

Hence, \mathcal{Q} is characterized by a semidefinite matrix completion problem. This is essentially the completion problem for the 4-cycle, as discussed in [MS21, Example 12.16]. Our boundary polynomial $h(c)$ is obtained from the degree eight polynomial given there by setting the diagonal entries to be 1. The matrix inequality $C \succcurlyeq 0$ defines a spectrahedron in \mathbb{R}^6 . Eliminating the matrix entries u and v specifies a projection $\mathbb{R}^6 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$. The correlation body \mathcal{Q} is the image of the spectrahedron $\{C \succcurlyeq 0\}$ under this projection. Thus, Proposition 5.2.9 furnishes an explicit realization of \mathcal{Q} as a spectrahedral shadow.




Figure 5.10: Non-uniqueness of the matrix completion problem for a family of correlations $c = tc_{\text{CHSH}} + (1-t)c_{\text{center}}$ with $c_{\text{center}} = (-1, 0, 0, 0)$, along the line segment from the center of an ellotope facet (top) to the CHSH-point (bottom). The horizontal cuts for fixed t (black meshes) represent the pairs (u, v) that make (5.2.7) positive semidefinite. The figure is a quartic spectrahedron [ORSV15].

The fiber over any interior point under our projection $\{C \succcurlyeq 0\} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ is a spectrahedron in the (u, v) -plane. Figure 5.10 shows the union of these 2-dimensional fibers over a line that cuts through \mathcal{Q} . The fiber over any boundary point is a single point. In other words, the matrix completion problem has a unique solution C for $c \in \partial\mathcal{Q}$. We record the ranks of these matrices C for the various families in Proposition 5.2.4.

Proposition 5.2.10. (\rightarrow Lemma 5.5.5 and Section 5.5.3)

- (1) The matrix completion problem has a unique solution (u, v) if and only if $c \in \partial\mathcal{Q}$.
- (2) The resulting unique matrix C has rank 1 if c is of type $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{cx}})$, it has rank 2 for types $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ce}})$, $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{nx}})$ and $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qx}})$, and it has rank 3 for type $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ei}})$.
- (3) The point c is in the interior $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{in}})$ if and only if there exists some completion with rank $C = 4$.

We close with one remark regarding item (3). It is not true that *all* the completions C of a given interior point $c \in (\mathcal{Q}_{\text{in}})$ have rank 4. For instance, the midpoint $c = 0$ clearly allows $C = \mathbb{1}$, but also the extension with $u = v = 1$, which is the direct sum of two rank 1 operators, and hence has rank 2.

Volume. The volume of \mathcal{Q} is a fundamental geometric invariant. It could be understood as the probability of quantum correlations in an ensemble, for which $c \in \mathcal{N}$ is distributed according to the Lebesgue measure. This ensemble of generalized probabilistic theories has no operational meaning, so the volume has no direct physical relevance. However, the probabilistic interpretation suggests a way to compute it stochastically: the semialgebraic description gives us a fast way to decide whether $c \in \mathcal{Q}$, for points c in a random ensemble with each c_{ij} independent and equidistributed in $[-1, 1]$. A run of 10^6 samples led to

$$\frac{\text{vol}(\mathcal{Q})}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{N})} \approx 0.925898.$$

On account of \sqrt{N} -fluctuations, this can be expected to be accurate to within three digits.

On the other hand, we can compute the volume exactly, by integrating the pushout over \mathcal{C} . Since the pushout acts coordinatewise, the Jacobi matrix is diagonal and the functional determinant is readily determined. The resulting trigonometric integrals can be solved, giving the overall result

$$\frac{\text{vol}(\mathcal{Q})}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{N})} = \frac{3\pi^2}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{16} \approx 0.9252754126.$$

For the surface area, we get the volume of the \mathcal{N} -faces as the well-known ellipope volume $\pi^2/2$ [JN98]. For the volume of the curved tetrahedra we did not find a closed expression. Testing the numerical value for being a simple fraction times a low power of π by continued fraction expansion also did not seem to give a simple expression. The (Q_{nx}) boundaries are directly expressed by the surface area of the ellipope. This area is known to be 5π , by a direct calculation found on math.stackexchange.com.

5.3. Description of the dual body

We could ask all the questions we studied so far about the three bodies $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{N}$ also about their duals (see Section 1.1.2). For the duals the inclusions are reversed, so $\mathcal{N}^\circ \subset \mathcal{Q}^\circ \subset \mathcal{C}^\circ$. The big surprise, which is a rather special feature of the minimal case, is that this dual chain of inclusions is essentially *the same* as the original chain. We will spell this out in detail. For now it just means the good news that much of the work is already done.

5.3.1. The duality transform

We first noticed the duality in the polytopes $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{N}$ from the observation that their f-vectors are reversals of each other. Strengthening this to an isomorphism $\mathcal{C} \cong \mathcal{N}^\circ$ goes as follows. We start from the inequalities describing \mathcal{N} . These come from the 8 vertices of \mathcal{N}° , which are

$$\pm(1, 0, 0, 0), \quad \pm(0, 1, 0, 0), \quad \pm(0, 0, 1, 0), \quad \pm(0, 0, 0, 1). \quad (5.3.1)$$

They have to be identified with the vertices of \mathcal{C} , i.e., the 8 even vertices of \mathcal{N} . They are

$$\pm(1, 1, 1, 1), \quad \pm(1, -1, 1, -1), \quad \pm(1, 1, -1, -1), \quad \pm(1, -1, -1, 1). \quad (5.3.2)$$

The following transformation H maps the points in (5.3.1) to those in (5.3.2). So we get $\mathcal{C} = 2H\mathcal{N}^\circ$ with

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.3.3)$$

Here we included the factor $1/2$ so that $H^2 = \mathbf{1}$. Since $H^* = H$, this matrix is then also unitary, i.e., a Hadamard matrix [TZ06] (note different conventions for the normalization of such matrices though). This makes it easy to write down the consequences of $\mathcal{C} = 2H\mathcal{N}^\circ$ from dualization or multiplication with H :

$$\mathcal{N}^\circ = \frac{1}{2}H\mathcal{C} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C}^\circ = \frac{1}{2}H\mathcal{N}.$$




Figure 5.11: Dual bodies in the Alice-Bob symmetric sections shown in Figure 5.2. Left: \mathcal{C}° (blue cube frame) and \mathcal{N}° (black octahedron). The marked vertices of \mathcal{C}° correspond to the facets of \mathcal{C} in Figure 5.2. Right: \mathcal{Q}° , which is an affine transformation of \mathcal{Q} in Figure 5.2. This expresses the self-duality.

To visualize this duality, consider the left panel of Figure 5.11. Since the section with the hyperplane $\{c_{12} = c_{21}\}$ is also a projection, and duality swaps projection and intersection operations, this 3-dimensional picture faithfully represents the 4-dimensional duality relations. The outer blue frame represents \mathcal{C}° , the dual of the inner frame in Figure 5.2, left. It is a cube whose vertices correspond to the facets of \mathcal{C} . They can thus correspond either to a CHSH-facet (marked in yellow) or to a \mathcal{N} -facet (marked in black). Overall, the figure looks like a rotation of its counterpart in Figure 5.2. In 4 dimensions the required H is exactly an orthogonal reflection. In the 3-dimensional section it is still a submatrix of a rotation, and looks like a rotation because human 3D perception is highly capable of ignoring uneven affine stretching.

The right panel in Figure 5.11 shows the pertinent section of the dual body \mathcal{Q}° . We can draw it using the parametrized points f from Proposition 5.3.2. This mimics the right panel of Figure 5.2, by the same transformation as the one used for the polytopes. Indeed, this is true exactly, also for the full 4-dimensional body:

Proposition 5.3.1. (\rightarrow Section 5.5.2) $\mathcal{Q}^\circ = \frac{1}{2}H\mathcal{Q}$.

This is Theorem 5.1.3, but with the matrix H spelled out. The linear transformation H is far from unique. Indeed, if S_1, S_2 are matrices representing any of the symmetries from Proposition 5.2.3, then so are their transposes. Hence $H' = S_1HS_2$, again a Hadamard matrix, also maps the inclusion chain to its dual. Note that $S \mapsto S' = HSH^{-1}$ is an automorphism of the symmetry group which changes the semidirect product decomposition, so multiplication by an even number of signs can become a permutation and conversely.

In the terminology of axiomatic quantum mechanics, this form of self-duality of a convex set is called ‘weak self-duality’ [BGW13], as opposed to stronger forms with a canonical isomorphism between the set and its dual, that is characteristic for Jordan algebra state spaces and in particular the quantum state space. Can one strengthen Proposition 5.3.1 in that direction? Indeed, we already have a canonical mapping taking each point c of a $(\mathcal{Q}, \mathbf{x})$ patch to the unique maximizer f , via Propositions 5.2.5 and 5.3.2. By multiplying H with a symmetry of \mathcal{Q} we can achieve that it takes the patch of c to the patch of f , but can we do it for all patches simultaneously? The answer is no: a map with that property would have to commute with all symmetries. Since our representation of the group G on \mathbb{R}^4 is irreducible, we would conclude that H is a multiple of the identity.

Another context of interest are normed spaces: since $-\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}$, our convex body \mathcal{Q} is the unit ball of a norm in \mathbb{R}^4 and the dual normed space has unit ball \mathcal{Q}° . So we have an example of a normed space that is isomorphic to its dual, a subject studied more generally, e.g., in [Yan11].

Parametrized extreme points of \mathcal{Q}° . The boundary patches (\mathcal{Q}_{qx}) of exposed extreme points have a unique maximizing functional $f \in \mathcal{Q}^\circ$. The parametrization by angles can be taken over directly.

Proposition 5.3.2. (\rightarrow Section 5.5.3) Let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ and c satisfy the conditions of Proposition 5.2.5. Define

$$f = (f_{11}, f_{12}, f_{21}, f_{22}) = \frac{1}{K} \left(\frac{1}{\sin \alpha}, \frac{1}{\sin \beta}, \frac{1}{\sin \gamma}, \frac{1}{\sin \delta} \right), \quad (5.3.4)$$

where $K = \cot \alpha + \cot \beta + \cot \gamma + \cot \delta$. Then $\langle f, c' \rangle \leq 1$ for all $c' \in \mathcal{Q}$ with equality if and only if $c' = c$. Moreover, the vector f is uniquely determined by this property.

Applying the duality transform to the point f in (5.3.4) gives again a point $2Hf \in \mathcal{Q}$ of type (\mathcal{Q}_{qx}) , which in turn can be parametrized by angles. The resulting map Φ from one tetrahedron of angles to another expresses the duality of boundary points.

For a concrete computation let T be the tetrahedron defined by $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, -\delta = \alpha + \beta + \gamma \in (0, \pi)$. Write $c(\theta)$ and $f(\theta)$ for the images in Propositions 5.2.5 and 5.3.2. We obtain a self-map $\Phi : T \rightarrow T$ with the property

$$2H f(\theta) = c(\Phi(\theta)).$$

By definition, this map will commute with the permutations of vertices of T , which extend to symmetries of \mathcal{Q} . By self-duality it is also its own inverse. This map is visualized in Figure 5.12.

By symmetry, these properties uniquely fix the map also for other (\mathcal{Q}_{qx}) -patches. When doing this concretely, one has to observe that whereas the association of f with the unique maximizer c is a property of \mathcal{Q} , the concrete parametrization of the tetrahedra involves a convention, and depends on the choice of self-duality operator H .




Figure 5.12: The map Φ from the tetrahedron T to itself: the triangular meshes on the left are mapped to the surfaces on the right. The figure on the right has been truncated so that the image surfaces can be seen. Since Φ^2 is the identity, the diagrams can also be read from right to left.

The map Φ is continuous and even analytic on the open tetrahedron. But it does not have a continuous extension to the closure of the tetrahedron. Indeed, a glance at (5.3.4)

shows that when one of the angles in θ goes to zero, and the others to values not in $\{0, \pi\}$, the image $\Phi(\theta)$ approaches the opposite vertex. Hence the whole open part of the bottom face on the left panel goes to a single point. This is evident from Figure 5.12 in the form that most of the triangles in the evenly spaced triangulation close to the base triangle end up close to the top vertex. Similarly, when θ approaches a point on the edge, the limit of $\Phi(\theta)$ depends on the direction from which the edge is approached.

Dualized descriptions. We can now apply the duality transform to each of the previous subsections to get analogues for \mathcal{Q}° of all the statements made about \mathcal{Q} . There is no simple analogue of the pushout. The cosine parametrization of the curved tetrahedra was already given an analogue in Proposition 5.3.2 (not via duality transform).

Consider the polynomials (5.2.3) and (5.2.5) of the semialgebraic description. Since the condition $f = (f_{11}, f_{12}, f_{21}, f_{22}) \in \mathcal{Q}^\circ$ is equivalent to $2Hf \in \mathcal{Q}$, we need to consider these polynomials after substituting $c \mapsto 2Hf$. Note that such a substitution takes polynomials which are invariant under the symmetry group to polynomials with the same property. Moreover, by linearity of the substitution, homogeneous polynomials of some degree go to homogeneous polynomials of the same degree. This gives some constraints on the number of polynomials we need to consider. The invariant polynomials of degree two are proportional to $|c|^2 = c_{11}^2 + c_{12}^2 + c_{21}^2 + c_{22}^2$, and since H is orthogonal, this goes to itself under substitution. Among the quartics we need to consider the product $p(c) = c_{11}c_{12}c_{21}c_{22}$ that already appeared in Theorem 5.1.2. Under substitution it becomes

$$q(f) = (f_{11} + f_{12} + f_{21} + f_{22})(f_{11} - f_{12} + f_{21} - f_{22})(f_{11} + f_{12} - f_{21} - f_{22})(f_{11} - f_{12} - f_{21} + f_{22}).$$

This is the quartic part in (5.2.5). The sextic part of h is the polynomial k from Theorem 5.1.2. This is self-dual in the sense that $k(2Hf) = 64k(f)$. With these building blocks, the polynomials describing \mathcal{Q} and \mathcal{Q}° are

$$\begin{aligned} h(c) &= 4k(c) - q(c), & h^\circ(f) &= \frac{1}{256} h(2Hf) = k(f) - p(f), \\ g(c) &= 2 - |c|^2 + 2p(c), & g^\circ(f) &= \frac{1}{2} g(2Hf) = 1 - 2|f|^2 + q(f). \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.5}$$

We conclude that $f \in \mathcal{Q}^\circ$ if and only if $2Hf \in \mathcal{N}$ and ($g^\circ(f) \geq 0$ or $h^\circ(f) \geq 0$).

Describing \mathcal{Q}° as a spectrahedral shadow is done in general by the dual semidefinite hierarchy [DLTW08]. Indeed, the dual of a spectrahedral shadow is again of this form [BPT12, Remark 5.43]. This holds because the operations of linear section and projection change roles under dualization, and the semidefinite cone is anyhow self-dual. In terms of matrix completion problems, where the primal matrix has unspecified entries (a subspace constraint), the dual matrix has zeros (resulting from the dual projection). In the case at hand, the unspecified entries u, v in C become zeros in the dual matrix, which we call F . The condition that the diagonal entries of C are 1 dualizes to constraint on the trace of F . This gives:

Proposition 5.3.3. (→Section 5.5.2) A point $f = (f_{11}, f_{12}, f_{21}, f_{22})$ lies in the dual body \mathcal{Q}° if and only if there exist positive real numbers p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 with $\sum_{i=1}^4 p_i = 2$ such that

$$F = \begin{pmatrix} p_1 & 0 & -f_{11} & -f_{12} \\ 0 & p_2 & -f_{21} & -f_{22} \\ -f_{11} & -f_{12} & p_3 & 0 \\ -f_{21} & -f_{22} & 0 & p_4 \end{pmatrix} \succcurlyeq 0. \tag{5.3.6}$$

Moreover, there exists a completion satisfying the above constraints, and additionally $p_1 + p_2 = p_3 + p_4 = 1$. This condition is automatically satisfied for all boundary points.

Indeed, one checks that $\text{tr } CF = 2 - 2\langle f, c \rangle$ holds for C from (5.2.7), so $\text{tr } CF \geq 0$ is equivalent to $\langle f, c \rangle \leq 1$.

5.3.2. The normal cycle

Our goal is to describe the normal cycle $\mathbf{N}(\mathcal{Q})$ (cf. Definition 1.1.15) of the correlation body \mathcal{Q} and its closure $\overline{\mathbf{N}(\mathcal{Q})} \subset \mathbb{C}^8$ in the Zariski topology. We describe a stratification of $\mathbf{N}(\mathcal{Q})$ that mirrors the stratification of \mathcal{Q} in Proposition 5.2.4. The symbol $(\mathcal{Q}_{nn,mm})$ will represent the set of points (c, f) in $\mathbf{N}(\mathcal{Q})$ such that $c \in (\mathcal{Q}_{nn})$ and $f \in (\mathcal{Q}_{mm})$, for the families from Proposition 5.2.4.

Proposition 5.3.4. The normal cycle $\mathbf{N}(\mathcal{Q})$ is divided into $24 = 8 + 8 + 8$ strata of dimension 3 whose types are $(\mathcal{Q}_{qx,qx})$, $(\mathcal{Q}_{ei,cx})$, $(\mathcal{Q}_{cx,ei})$. These threefolds are separated by $88 = 32 + 32 + 24$ surfaces $(\mathcal{Q}_{nx,cx})$, $(\mathcal{Q}_{cx,nx})$, $(\mathcal{Q}_{ce,ce})$. The eight strata of type $(\mathcal{Q}_{qx,qx})$ belong to the same irreducible component of the algebraic normal cycle $\overline{\mathbf{N}(\mathcal{Q})}$, so the radical ideal of $\overline{\mathbf{N}(\mathcal{Q})}$ is the intersection of $17 = 1 + 8 + 8$ prime ideals.

All these features are made more explicit in Table 5.1. The labels refer to the strata of $\partial\mathcal{Q}$ (cf. Proposition 5.2.4).

c is a point of type	(\mathcal{Q}_{qx})	(\mathcal{Q}_{cx})	(\mathcal{Q}_{ei})	(\mathcal{Q}_{ce})	(\mathcal{Q}_{nx})
$\{c\}^\circ$ is a face of type	$\{f\}, f \in (\mathcal{Q}_{qx})$	$[\mathcal{Q}_{ei}]$	(\mathcal{Q}_{cx})	$[\mathcal{Q}_{ce}]$	(\mathcal{Q}_{cx})
$\{c\}^{\circ\circ}$ is a face of type	$\{c\}$	$\{c\}$	$[\mathcal{Q}_{ei}]$	$[\mathcal{Q}_{ce}]$	$[\mathcal{Q}_{ei}]$
$\dim\{c\}^{\circ\circ}$	0	0	3	1	3
dim of face generated by c	0	0	3	1	0
$\dim\{c\}^\circ$	0	3	0	1	0
dim of manifold of such faces	3	0	0	0	2
sum of these dimensions	3	3	3	2	2
number of open strata in $\mathbf{N}(\mathcal{Q})$	8	8	8	24	32
irreducible components in $\overline{\mathbf{N}(\mathcal{Q})}$	1	8	8	0	0

Table 5.1: Classification of boundary points $c \in \partial\mathcal{Q}$, in the notation of Proposition 5.2.4, and what they correspond to in the normal cycle $\mathbf{N}(\mathcal{Q})$. The first three columns give the full-dimensional strata of $\mathbf{N}(\mathcal{Q})$. The last two columns are two of the three strata of dimension 2. The fact that the stratum $(\mathcal{Q}_{cx,nx})$ does not appear here reflects the non-exposed nature of (\mathcal{Q}_{nx}) .

We now briefly discuss the strata (\mathcal{Q}_{ce}) and (\mathcal{Q}_{nx}) in the fourth and fifth column of Table 5.1. These are surfaces in the threefold $\mathbf{N}(\mathcal{Q})$. Points c on the surfaces (\mathcal{Q}_{nx}) are supported only by the linear functional that supports the entire ellotope, which is $\{c\}^{\circ\circ}$. Hence there are 32 surfaces $(\mathcal{Q}_{nx,cx})$ in $\mathbf{N}(\mathcal{Q})$. Dually, we also get 32 surfaces of type $(\mathcal{Q}_{cx,nx})$. These do not appear in Table 5.1 because the faces of type (\mathcal{Q}_{nx}) are not exposed and thus cannot be realized as $\{f\}^\circ$. This feature is highlighted by the jump in the dimension of $\{c\}^{\circ\circ}$ for $c \in (\mathcal{Q}_{nx})$. All 64 surfaces arise as the intersection of the closure of $(\mathcal{Q}_{qx,qx})$ with the closure of a stratum $(\mathcal{Q}_{ei,cx})$ or $(\mathcal{Q}_{cx,ei})$. Each intersection produces four such surfaces.

The exposed edges (\mathcal{Q}_{ce}) of \mathcal{Q} are supported by one-dimensional families of normal directions. These are the exposed edges (\mathcal{Q}_{ce}) on \mathcal{Q}° . We therefore have 24 squares of type $(\mathcal{Q}_{ce,ce})$ in $\mathbf{N}(\mathcal{Q})$. Each square separates two 3-dimensional strata of type $(\mathcal{Q}_{ei,cx})$

and (Q_{cx}, ei) . In addition to the 64 curved triangles of type $(Q_{nx,cx})$ or $(Q_{cx,nx})$, this accounts for all 2-dimensional cells in our stratification of $\mathbf{N}(Q)$.

The 3-dimensional strata of $\mathbf{N}(Q)$ give the irreducible components of the algebraic normal cycle $\overline{\mathbf{N}(Q)}$. We begin with the most nonlinear stratum, denoted $(Q_{qx,qx})$. This stratum is characterized by Propositions 5.2.5 and 5.3.2. It is parametrized by angles $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ that add up to 0 modulo 2π , and it consists of pairs (c, f) where c satisfies (5.2.2) and f satisfies (5.3.4). Its Zariski closure is an irreducible threefold in \mathbb{C}^8 . Its prime ideal is generated by 17 polynomials. The first three of these 17 generators are familiar:

$$\begin{aligned}\ell &= c_{11}f_{11} + c_{12}f_{12} + c_{21}f_{21} + c_{22}f_{22} - 1, \\ h &= 4(c_{11}c_{22} - c_{12}c_{21})(c_{11}c_{21} - c_{12}c_{22})(c_{11}c_{12} - c_{21}c_{22}) \\ &\quad - (c_{11} + c_{12} - c_{21} - c_{22})(c_{11} - c_{12} + c_{21} - c_{22})(c_{11} - c_{12} - c_{21} + c_{22})(c_{11} + c_{12} + c_{21} + c_{22}), \\ h^\circ &= f_{11}f_{12}f_{21}f_{22} - (f_{11}f_{22} - f_{12}f_{21})(f_{11}f_{21} - f_{12}f_{22})(f_{11}f_{12} - f_{21}f_{22}).\end{aligned}$$

The remaining 14 generators of our prime ideal are the following polynomials:

$$\begin{aligned}&c_{11}^2f_{11}^2 - c_{22}^2f_{22}^2 - f_{11}^2 + f_{22}^2, \\ &c_{21}f_{11}f_{12}f_{21} + c_{22}f_{11}f_{12}f_{22} + c_{11}f_{11}f_{21}f_{22} + c_{12}f_{12}f_{21}f_{22}, \\ &c_{11}^2f_{11}f_{12} - c_{21}^2f_{12}f_{22} - c_{12}c_{21}f_{12}f_{22} + c_{11}c_{22}f_{12}f_{22} - f_{11}f_{12} + f_{21}f_{22}, \\ &c_{11}^2f_{11}f_{21} - c_{12}^2f_{12}f_{22} - c_{12}c_{21}f_{21}f_{22} + c_{11}c_{22}f_{21}f_{22} - f_{11}f_{21} + f_{12}f_{22}, \\ &c_{12}^2f_{11}f_{12} - c_{21}^2f_{21}f_{22} - c_{11}c_{21}f_{11}f_{22} + c_{12}c_{22}f_{11}f_{22} - f_{11}f_{12} + f_{21}f_{22}, \\ &c_{12}^2f_{12}f_{21} - c_{11}^2f_{11}f_{22} - c_{11}c_{21}f_{21}f_{22} + c_{12}c_{22}f_{21}f_{22} - f_{12}f_{21} + f_{11}f_{22}, \\ &c_{21}^2f_{11}f_{21} - c_{12}^2f_{12}f_{22} - c_{11}c_{12}f_{11}f_{22} + c_{21}c_{22}f_{11}f_{22} - f_{11}f_{21} + f_{12}f_{22}, \\ &c_{21}^2f_{12}f_{21} - c_{11}^2f_{11}f_{22} - c_{11}c_{12}f_{12}f_{22} + c_{21}c_{22}f_{12}f_{22} - f_{12}f_{21} + f_{11}f_{22}, \\ &(c_{11}c_{12}^2 + c_{11}c_{21}^2 + c_{11}c_{22}^2 - 2c_{12}c_{21}c_{22})f_{11} + c_{12}^3f_{12} + c_{21}^3f_{21} + c_{22}^3f_{22} - 1, \\ &c_{11}c_{12}f_{12}f_{21} - c_{21}c_{22}f_{12}f_{21} + c_{12}c_{21}f_{21}f_{22} - c_{11}c_{22}f_{21}f_{22} + c_{12}^2f_{12}f_{22} - c_{22}^2f_{12}f_{22}, \\ &c_{12}c_{21}f_{11}f_{21} - c_{11}c_{22}f_{11}f_{21} + c_{11}c_{21}f_{11}f_{22} - c_{12}c_{22}f_{11}f_{22} + c_{21}^2f_{21}f_{22} - c_{22}^2f_{21}f_{22}, \\ &c_{12}c_{21}f_{11}f_{12} - c_{11}c_{22}f_{11}f_{12} + c_{11}c_{12}f_{11}f_{22} - c_{21}c_{22}f_{11}f_{22} + c_{12}^2f_{12}f_{22} - c_{22}^2f_{12}f_{22}, \\ &(c_{12}^3 - c_{11}^2c_{12} - c_{12}c_{21}^2 - c_{12}c_{22}^2 + 2c_{11}c_{21}c_{22})f_{12} - (c_{22}^3 - c_{11}^2c_{22} - c_{12}^2c_{22} - c_{21}^2c_{22} + 2c_{11}c_{12}c_{21})f_{22}, \\ &(c_{21}^3 - c_{11}^2c_{21} - c_{12}^2c_{21} - c_{21}c_{22}^2 + 2c_{11}c_{12}c_{22})f_{21} - (c_{22}^3 - c_{11}^2c_{22} - c_{12}^2c_{22} - c_{21}^2c_{22} + 2c_{11}c_{12}c_{21})f_{22}.\end{aligned}$$

This list was generated by **Macaulay2** [GS] as follows. We start from a list of polynomials that cuts out $\overline{\mathbf{N}(Q)}$ as a subset of \mathbb{C}^8 . That list consists of ℓ, h, h° and the twelve 2×2 minors of the two matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_{11} & c_{12} & c_{21} & c_{22} \\ \partial h^\circ / \partial f_{11} & \partial h^\circ / \partial f_{12} & \partial h^\circ / \partial f_{21} & \partial h^\circ / \partial f_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} f_{11} & f_{12} & f_{21} & f_{22} \\ \partial h / \partial c_{11} & \partial h / \partial c_{12} & \partial h / \partial c_{21} & \partial h / \partial c_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The respective rows are linearly dependent for any pair (c, f) of supporting linear functions. The resulting ideal has the desired prime ideal as its radical, by Hilbert's Nullstellensatz. We computed that radical.

We now describe the other components of the variety $\overline{\mathbf{N}(Q)}$. The eight strata $(Q_{ei,cx})$ consist of points (c, f) where one of the entries of f is ± 1 and the others are 0. This linear functional f exposes one of the elliptopes in ∂Q . For example, consider $f = (1, 0, 0, 0)$. The prime ideal of this component is

$$(f_{11} - 1, f_{12}, f_{21}, f_{22}, c_{11} - 1).$$

The corresponding stratum in the semialgebraic set $\mathbf{N}(Q)$ satisfies the additional inequality

$$c_{12}^2 + c_{21}^2 + c_{22}^2 - 2c_{12}c_{21}c_{22} \leq 1. \tag{5.3.7}$$

The boundary of the ellotope, seen inside $\mathbf{N}(\mathcal{Q})$, separates $(\mathcal{Q}_{ei,cx})$ from the nonlinear stratum $(\mathcal{Q}_{qx,qx})$.

By duality, there are also eight strata $(\mathcal{Q}_{cx,ei})$ in the normal cycle $\mathbf{N}(\mathcal{Q})$. Now, the ellotopes appear in the f -coordinates and c is one of the 8 classical extreme points (\mathcal{Q}_{cx}) . These are obtained by exchanging the roles of f and c , using the linear transformation H . The ideal of one of the components $(\mathcal{Q}_{cx,ei})$ is

$$(c_{11} - 1, c_{12} - 1, c_{21} - 1, c_{22} - 1, f_{11} + f_{12} + f_{21} + f_{22} - 1).$$

The semialgebraic description of this stratum is obtained by setting $c = 2Hf$ in the cubic inequality (5.3.7).

5.3.3. Support function

In the sequel we study the support function $\phi_{\mathcal{Q}}$. Notice that by self-duality, it is closely related to the radial function of \mathcal{Q}° (cf. Section 1.1.3). Since the set \mathcal{Q} has two markedly different kinds of boundary points, the support function requires a binary distinction concerning a functional f : will $\max_{c \in \mathcal{Q}} \langle f, c \rangle$ be attained at a classical point or at an exposed extreme point? The answer is the same for all multiples of f , including $-f$, so we are really asking about the projective geometry of the boundary points of \mathcal{Q}° . Once we know the nature of the maximizer, however, the computation of ϕ is straightforward. In the first case, it is the maximum of an affine functional over the 8 vertices of \mathcal{C} . Namely, $\phi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f) = \phi_{\mathcal{C}}(f)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{\mathcal{C}}(f) &= \max\{\langle f, c \rangle \mid c \in \text{Ext } \mathcal{C}\} \\ &= \max\{|f_{11}+f_{12}+f_{21}+f_{22}|, |f_{11}+f_{12}-f_{21}-f_{22}|, \\ &\quad |f_{11}-f_{12}+f_{21}-f_{22}|, |f_{11}-f_{12}-f_{21}+f_{22}|\} \\ &= \|2Hf\|_\infty, \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.8}$$

In the second line, we grouped the maxima over a pair of antipodal classical extreme points by writing an absolute value. In the third equality, $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ denotes the maximum norm on \mathbb{R}^4 . This case applies exactly when the ray $\mathbb{R}f$ intersects the boundary of \mathcal{Q}° in an \mathcal{N} -facet.

The other possibility is that the ray intersects the boundary in a curved tetrahedron. In this case we think of $\phi_{\mathcal{Q}}$ as the inverse of the radial function of \mathcal{Q}° . We need to determine the intersection point of the ray spanned by $\{f\}$ with $\partial\mathcal{Q}^\circ$. This point is in the zero set of h° . The equation $h^\circ(\lambda f) = 0$ in (5.3.5) is readily solved for λ , using the splitting of h° into homogeneous parts. We get $\lambda^6 k(f) - \lambda^4 p(f) = 0$, so in this case λ equals

$$\tilde{\phi}(f) = \sqrt{\frac{k(f)}{p(f)}}. \tag{5.3.9}$$

This function is homogeneous of degree 1, as required. The above heuristics is made precise in the following proposition, which extends Theorem 5.1.2:

Proposition 5.3.5. (\rightarrow Section 5.5.3) For any $f \in \mathbb{R}^4 \setminus \{0\}$, the following are equivalent:

- (1) The ray $\{\lambda f\}$ intersects the boundary of \mathcal{Q}° in a point of type (\mathcal{Q}_{qx}) .
- (2) Some point $c \in \mathcal{Q}$ maximizing $\langle f, c \rangle$ is of type (\mathcal{Q}_{qx}) .

(3) We have $p(f) < 0$ and

$$m(f) = \min_{i,j=1,2} |f_{ij}| \left(\sum_{i,j=1,2} |f_{ij}|^{-1} \right) > 2.$$

(4) We have $p(f) < 0$ and $\tilde{m}(f) < 0$, where

$$\tilde{m}(f) = \left(\frac{1}{f_{11}} + \frac{1}{f_{12}} + \frac{1}{f_{21}} + \frac{1}{f_{22}} \right) \left(\frac{1}{f_{11}} + \frac{1}{f_{12}} - \frac{1}{f_{21}} - \frac{1}{f_{22}} \right) \left(\frac{1}{f_{11}} - \frac{1}{f_{12}} + \frac{1}{f_{21}} - \frac{1}{f_{22}} \right) \left(\frac{1}{f_{11}} - \frac{1}{f_{12}} - \frac{1}{f_{21}} + \frac{1}{f_{22}} \right)$$

(5) Perform a symmetry transformation (even number of sign changes) so that the maximum in (5.3.8) of $\langle f, c \rangle$ over \mathcal{C} is attained at the extreme point $c = (1, 1, 1, 1)$, i.e., $\phi_c(f) = f_{11} + f_{12} + f_{21} + f_{22}$. Then

$$f_{11}f_{12}f_{21} + f_{11}f_{12}f_{22} + f_{11}f_{21}f_{22} + f_{12}f_{21}f_{22} < 0. \quad (5.3.10)$$

In this case, the support function of \mathcal{Q} is given by $\phi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f) = \tilde{\phi}(f)$ from (5.3.9), otherwise $\phi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f) = \phi_c(f)$ from (5.3.8).

In the domain described by Proposition 5.3.5, the maximizer of $\phi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f)$ is a unique exposed point $c^* \in \mathcal{Q}$. An explicit formula $f \mapsto c^*$ would correspond to solving for c given f in the system of 17 polynomials defining the stratum (\mathcal{Q}_{q_x}, q_x) in $\overline{\mathbf{N}(\mathcal{Q})}$. In terms of the angle parametrization of boundary pieces, it is essentially the self-dual counterpart of the map Φ sketched in Figure 5.12.

5.4. Geometric aspects of quantum key distribution

Quantum key distribution (QKD) is an important task in quantum information technology [BB14]. It furnishes the main practical reason for studying the body \mathcal{Q} . Here we discuss geometric features that are fundamental for that task. The goal of QKD is for two distant parties, Alice and Bob, to utilize quantum correlations for generating a key which is guaranteed to be secret from any eavesdropper, here called Eve. Eve is only assumed to be constrained by the laws of quantum mechanics, but otherwise enjoys every possible freedom. In particular, she is allowed to manipulate the correlated systems on which the scheme is based, the quantum channels by which they are transmitted, and even the measurement devices. She also gets a copy of the communications exchanged between Alice and Bob. However, she can only read these but not change them. One must also assume that once the data collection starts, Eve cannot reach into Alice's and Bob's lab and access their measurement settings or outcomes. Indeed, if Eve could do that, she would not even need to bother with the whole quantum setup, or she could play a trivial woman-in-the-middle attack, and secrecy would be obviously impossible. So the rules of the game force her to gain at least some information from the quantum systems. According to the laws of quantum mechanics, this introduces a disturbance detectable by Alice and Bob. When they do detect such deviations from the expected statistics the key distribution has failed. Eve can always achieve that, but this is counted as a failure for her, because she will also not learn any secrets.

We want to show here that the minimal setup in this paper is already sufficient to support QKD. Moreover, the main security argument is based directly on the geometry of \mathcal{Q} . In undisturbed operation the setup leads to some correlations $c \in \mathcal{Q}$. Alice and Bob will use a random sample of their particles to verify this via the public classical channel,

and will abort the process if they find significant deviations from c . We claim that QKD is possible whenever c is a *non-classical extreme point* (cf. [FFW11])

Suppose Alice and Bob test their correlations and find them to be $c \in \text{Ext } \mathcal{Q}$. What could Eve know about their measurement results? Let ε be a random variable that summarizes her findings. The conditional correlation c_ε is the 2×2 matrix that pertains to those cases where Eve found ε . We have $c_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{Q}$ since Eve is constrained by quantum mechanics. Combining the data with the probabilities p_ε for observing ε , we get $c = \sum_\varepsilon p_\varepsilon c_\varepsilon$. But since c is extremal, all c_ε that appear with nonzero probability must be equal to c . That is the same as saying that ε is statistically independent of Alice's and Bob's information. So while Eve knows ε , she learns nothing about c .

Note, however, that the argument applies equally to classical extreme points. Only, in that case the extreme points are completely deterministic. In the case of deterministic agreement probabilities indeed factorize, say $c_{ij} = a_i b_j$. With $c_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$ and $a_i, b_j \in \{0, 1\}$, this factorization would be $1 \cdot 1 = 1$ or $0 \cdot 0 = 0$. Of course, this is utterly useless for drawing a secret key. So what Alice and Bob use to generate the key are the non-trivial correlations that may be present in *non-classical* extreme points. Any non-classical correlation is fine for that purpose, since this may be further distilled into perfect agreement.

The full analysis of QKD takes not only error correction into account, but also the overhead of statistically verifying that the given source is really described by c . This necessarily involves errors, and the experimental implementation will have additional errors of its own. The analysis, done carefully also for c sufficiently close to $\text{Ext } \mathcal{Q}$, results not in a blanket statement that Eve will know ‘nothing’, but in a quantitative bound on how much she might know in the worst case. So, in addition to error correction (getting the keys to be really the same) one needs ‘privacy amplification’, a process that had already been studied in purely classical settings [BBCM95] prior to the advent of QKD. The traditional information theoretic view focuses on rates in the asymptotic regime, i.e., for a large number of exchanged raw key bits. This systematically neglects the overhead of reliably estimating c . This can be considerable in real, and therefore finite, runs. A usable QKD security proof always has to include the finite key analysis, and all imperfections. This is far beyond the current work, and we refer to [SBV⁺21, TSB⁺20]. To connect with the literature, we emphasize that here we have described ‘device independent’ QKD, for which the experimental entrance ticket is a ‘loophole free’ Bell test, which has been achieved only recently [G⁺15, HB⁺15]. The quality of these experiments is still not in the range where the data collection could be done in the lifetime of a lab. Nevertheless, recent advances on the theoretical side [SBV⁺21, TSG⁺21, TSB⁺20] have brought this into feasible range. On the other hand, systems not realizing the ideal of device independence are already commercially available (see [Wik21, Section 3.2]).

5.5. Proofs

In this section we prove all theorems and propositions seen so far in this chapter. Since many results in our paper have appeared previously in the literature, we could give many proofs by citation. However, we aim to make our text self-contained. Where the pedestrian argument, tailored to the case at hand, can be understood as an example of a more general theory, we provide this background as well. As a help for monitoring the logical flow we included some summaries of what has been shown up to some point. These are formatted like the definitions and propositions throughout the paper, and numbered consecutively.

There are, of course, many ways to organize the proofs. We now briefly describe our

overall strategy and the structure of Section 5.5. We begin in Section 5.5.1 with the equivalences of Theorem 5.1.1, centered around the matrix completion problem. Self-duality (Theorem 5.1.3) follows in Section 5.5.2. On this path we already gain some information about the boundary, which is extended to the detailed classification of boundary points in Section 5.5.3. The study of boundary points is perhaps a bit more detailed than necessary, since it uses a local criterion for excluding certain points from the extreme boundary of the convex hull of a variety. This technique might be helpful more generally. We conclude the section with the computation of the support function (Proposition 5.3.5), which proved to be more subtle than expected, even with a full understanding of the boundary.

5.5.1. Proof of Theorem 5.1.1

For the sake of this proof let us denote by $\mathcal{Q}_{(x)} \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ the set characterized by item (x) in Theorem 5.1.1. We have to show that these are all equal. The backbone of the proof is the following chain:

$$\mathcal{Q}_{(a)} \subset \mathcal{Q}_{(e)} = \mathcal{Q}_{(d)} = \mathcal{Q}_{(b)} \subset \mathcal{Q}_{(a)}$$

together with separate arguments for $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)} = \mathcal{Q}_{(f)}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{(b)} = \mathcal{Q}_{(c)}$. The main work will be getting the solution set $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$ of the matrix completion problem in great detail. The boundary information coming out of that, in particular for rank $C = 2$, will then be used to get the further equivalences and finally go back to $\mathcal{Q}_{(a)}$.

Making matrix completion real. The inclusion $\mathcal{Q}_{(a)} \subset \mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$ is an important step, because the definition of $\mathcal{Q}_{(a)}$ admits infinite Hilbert space dimension, while $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$ only allows finite dimension. This reduction step works for more parties, settings, and outcomes, as well, which is the whole point of the semidefinite hierarchies [DLTW08, NPA08]. But outside the minimal scenario the inclusion is strict.

We saw the inclusion $\mathcal{Q}_{(a)} \subset \mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$ in Section 5.2.2. From the quantum model we naturally get a positive definite matrix with some unknown complex entries, and diagonal not equal to 1. These assumptions are part of the description of $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$, however. In order to prove $\mathcal{Q}_{(a)} \subset \mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$, we thus have to make sure that the additional assumptions do not make $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$ smaller. This is the content of Proposition 5.2.9.

Proof of 5.2.9. Consider a matrix $C \succcurlyeq 0$ of the form (5.2.7) with diagonal entries $d_i \leq 1$. We also fix the matrix $C' = \Re C$, the entrywise real part of C . Then since the complex conjugate of a positive semidefinite matrix is again semidefinite, $C' \succcurlyeq 0$. Add to this the matrix with diagonal entries $1 - d_i$ to get C'' . Then $C'' \succcurlyeq C' \succcurlyeq 0$ is a matrix with the same off-diagonal c_{ij} , but in the standard form with u, v real and $d_i = 1$. \square

Solving the real completion problem. In this and the following two paragraphs, we proceed to actually solve the matrix completion problem defining $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$, i.e., decide which c 's permit real values u, v that make the following matrix positive semidefinite:

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & u & c_{11} & c_{12} \\ u & 1 & c_{21} & c_{22} \\ c_{11} & c_{21} & 1 & v \\ c_{12} & c_{22} & v & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.5.1)$$

The solution uses Sylvester's criterion. We use the standard notation C_I for the principal submatrix selecting the rows and the columns specified by the indices in I , and

$m_I = \det C_I$ for the corresponding principal minor. Sylvester's necessary and sufficient criterion for $C \succcurlyeq 0$ is that $m_I \geq 0$ for all $2^n - 1$ index sets I . For $C \succ 0$ it suffices to have $m_1, m_{12}, m_{123}, m_{1234} > 0$. The positivity of principal 2×2 -minors gives $c_{ij}^2 \leq 1$ or equivalently $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ as a necessary condition. Consider next the principal 3×3 -minors

$$C_{123} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & u & c_{11} \\ u & 1 & c_{21} \\ c_{11} & c_{21} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \succcurlyeq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad C_{124} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & u & c_{12} \\ u & 1 & c_{22} \\ c_{12} & c_{22} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \succcurlyeq 0. \quad (5.5.2)$$

These do not involve v , and they give a condition for u . We show that (5.5.2) is all we need to consider:

Lemma 5.5.1. Suppose that, for some $u \in \mathbb{R}$, the matrices in (5.5.2) are positive semidefinite. Then one can find v such that in (5.5.1) we have $C \succcurlyeq 0$, i.e., $c \in \mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$.

Proof. We invoke a general result on semidefinite matrix completion [GJSW84, Theorem 7]. Consider the graph G whose edges represent the given entries of a partial matrix




Figure 5.13: The black graph is the 4-cycle associated to $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$ with vertices 1, 3, 2, 4 starting from the upper-left corner. It is not chordal. On the other hand, adding the orange edge, which corresponds to assuming the existence of u satisfying (5.5.2), makes it chordal.

whose completion we seek. The necessary conditions for completnability are that for those subsets of vertices, where all matrix entries are specified (called ‘cliques’ of G), the corresponding submatrices are positive semidefinite. Then, if the graph is *chordal* (meaning any cycle of length ≥ 4 allows a shortcut), this condition is also sufficient. Moreover, this holds for both strict positive definiteness and semidefiniteness. In the case at hand, the graph given for $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$ is a 4-cycle shown in Figure 5.13. Assuming the existence of u with $C_{123}, C_{124} \succcurlyeq 0$ adds a diagonal, making the graph chordal. Hence no further condition needs to be considered. \square

Lemma 5.5.1 eliminates v and leaves us with the nonnegativity of the following three principal minors:

$$\begin{aligned} m_{12} &= 1 - u^2 & (A) \\ m_{123} &= 1 - c_{11}^2 - c_{21}^2 + 2c_{11}c_{21}u - u^2 & (B) \\ m_{124} &= 1 - c_{12}^2 - c_{22}^2 + 2c_{12}c_{22}u - u^2 & (C) \end{aligned} \quad (5.5.3)$$

We have $c \in \mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$ if and only if these are simultaneously satisfied for the same u . By Helly’s Theorem in \mathbb{R}^1 , the three positivity intervals have a common point if and only if they intersect pairwise. Hence we can consider pairwise intersections. The maximum of the parabola in (B) is

$$\max_u m_{123} = (1 - c_{11}^2)(1 - c_{21}^2) = m_{13}m_{23} \geq 0,$$

attained at $u = c_{11}c_{21} \in [-1, 1]$, so its positivity interval intersects that of (A), and similarly for the pair (A, C). Hence only the pair (B, C) needs to be considered. We conclude as follows.

Summary 5.5.2. If $c \in \mathcal{N}$, then $c \in \mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$ if and only if (B) and (C) are both non-negative for some $u \in \mathbb{R}$.

Joint positivity of two parabolas. We next examine the criterion in Summary 5.5.2 independently of the specific context. We do the quantifier elimination carefully, because the structure of the solution explains the disjunction in Theorem 5.1.1 (d). Thus at the end of this paragraph we will achieve the equality $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)} = \mathcal{Q}_{(a)}$.




Figure 5.14: The configurations of two parabolas $f_i(x) = b_i - (x - a_i)^2$ with $a_1 = 0$ and $a_2 = 1$. Top Left: parameter plane for (b_1, b_2) . Shaded: region where the intersection of the positivity ranges is non-empty. Points A,B,C: parameters for the other panels. Black parabola: line at which the intersection of the parabolas lies on the x -axis.

The configurations of two parabolas in the following lemma are shown in Figure 5.14. Both are given by quadratic polynomials $f(x) = b - (x - a)^2$ with the same negative quadratic term. The parameters are chosen so that $(x, y) = (a, b)$ is the location of the maximum. This function is positive in the interval $[a - \sqrt{b}, a + \sqrt{b}]$. The question is when for two such parabolas the positivity intervals overlap. It is clear that the problem is invariant under shifts (adding a constant to both a_1 and a_2), and $(a_1 - a_2)^2$ just sets a scale for the b 's. Hence we could choose $a_1 = 0$ and $a_2 = 1$. Figure 5.14 is drawn with this choice.

Lemma 5.5.3. Given two quadratic polynomials $f_i(x) = b_i - (x - a_i)^2$, $i = 1, 2$, the following are equivalent:

- (1) There exists a point $u \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f_1(u) \geq 0$ and $f_2(u) \geq 0$.
- (2) $b_1 \geq 0 \wedge b_2 \geq 0 \wedge [b_1 + b_2 - (a_1 - a_2)^2 \geq 0 \vee 4b_1b_2 - (b_1 + b_2 - (a_1 - a_2)^2)^2 \geq 0]$.

If one demands strict inequality then the following are also equivalent:

- (1') There exists a point $u \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f_1(u) > 0$ and $f_2(u) > 0$.
- (2') $b_1 > 0 \wedge b_2 > 0 \wedge [b_1 + b_2 - (a_1 - a_2)^2 \geq 0 \vee 4b_1b_2 - (b_1 + b_2 - (a_1 - a_2)^2)^2 > 0]$.

Proof. This is based on Figure 5.14. Clearly, both positivity ranges must be non-empty. So, unless $b_1, b_2 \geq 0$, there is nothing to prove. We can also trivially take care of the

cases with $a_1 = a_2$, because then the positivity intervals are contained in each other. The maximum of each parabola is in the positivity interval. So if $b_1 \geq (a_1 - a_2)^2$ the maximum of the second parabola is in the positivity range of the first, and so there is a non-empty intersection. Symmetrically, this holds for $b_2 \geq (a_1 - a_2)^2$. This gives two closed rectangles in the (b_1, b_2) -plane with non-empty intersection.

Next consider the intersection of the two parabolas. Their unique intersection point is

$$(x_s, f_i(x_s)) = \left(\frac{a_1 + a_2}{2} - \frac{b_1 - b_2}{2(a_1 - a_2)}, \frac{4b_1 b_2 - (b_1 + b_2 - (a_1 - a_2)^2)^2}{4(a_1 - a_2)^2} \right). \quad (5.5.4)$$

Now suppose $f_i(x_s) \geq 0$. Then x_s is in the intersection of the positivity ranges. The corresponding region, defined by the positivity of the numerator of $f_i(x_s)$ in (5.5.4) is the closed parabola in Figure 5.14. Hence we have non-zero intersection for the union of the two rectangles and the parabola in Figure 5.14. This can be simplified as the union of just two regions, namely the parabola and the region $\{b_1 + b_2 \geq (a_1 - a_2)^2\}$, which contains the two rectangles plus a triangle, which is contained in the parabola.

To complete the proof of the first part, we need to show that, for any point outside this region, the positivity ranges have empty intersection. This complement is defined by the conditions $0 \leq b_i < (a_1 - a_2)^2$ and $f_i(x_s) < 0$. Now the first condition implies $|b_1 - b_2| < (a_1 - a_2)^2$. Hence the second term for x_s in (5.5.4) is bounded by $|a_1 - a_2|/2$, so x_s lies between a_1 and a_2 . Therefore one of the maxima lies to the right of x_s and the other one lies on its left, and therefore the same holds for the positivity ranges of the parabolas. Since $x_s < 0$ the ranges do not intersect. This completes the proof of the first part. The primed statements characterize the interior of the parameter set, i.e., the region just described without the boundary points, for which $b_1 = 0$, or $b_2 = 0$ or $f_i(x_s) = 0$. \square

We now apply Lemma 5.5.3 to the quadratic polynomials (B),(C) in (5.5.3). The parameters are

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= c_{11}c_{21}, & a_2 &= c_{12}c_{22}, \\ b_1 &= (1 - c_{11}^2)(1 - c_{21}^2), & b_2 &= (1 - c_{12}^2)(1 - c_{22}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (5.5.5)$$

With this, the two polynomials in Lemma 5.5.3 (2) are g in (5.2.3) and h in (5.2.5). The combination of Summary 5.5.2 and Lemma 5.5.3 now establishes the equivalence of (d) and (e) in Theorem 5.1.1. We record this as follows:

Summary 5.5.4. $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)} = \mathcal{Q}_{(d)}$: for $c \in \mathbb{R}^4$, we have $c \in \mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$ if and only if $c \in \mathcal{N}$ and $(g(c) \geq 0 \text{ or } h(c) \geq 0)$. Furthermore, we have $c \in \text{int}(\mathcal{Q}_{(e)})$ if and only if $c \in \text{int}(\mathcal{N})$ and $(g(c) \geq 0 \text{ or } h(c) > 0)$.

Properties of the boundary and extreme points. Summary 5.5.4 characterizes membership in the spectrahedral shadow $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$. We now come to its boundary, beginning with an extended version of the first statement in Proposition 5.2.10.

Lemma 5.5.5. Given any point $c \in \mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$, the following three conditions are equivalent:

- (1) $c \in \partial\mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$.
- (2) The matrix completion problem for c has a unique solution (u, v) .
- (3) Either ($c \in \partial\mathcal{N}$ and $g(c) \geq 0$) or ($g(c) < 0$ and $\text{rank}(C) \leq 2$ for every completion C of c).

Proof. Suppose that c is in the interior of $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$. Then the fiber over c of the projection from the 6-dimensional spectrahedron $\{C \succcurlyeq 0\}$ onto the 4-dimensional body $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$ is two-dimensional. Hence (2) is false. Also, both conditions in (3) are false. The first condition fails because $\text{int}(\mathcal{Q}_{(e)}) \subseteq \text{int}(\mathcal{N})$ and the second condition fails because c has a preimage C that is positive definite and hence has rank 4.

It remains to show that (1) implies both (2) and (3). Let $c \in \partial\mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$. We have $g(c) \geq 0$ or $h(c) \geq 0$, by Lemma 5.5.3 (2) applied to (5.5.5). We distinguish two cases, namely $c \in \partial\mathcal{N}$ and $c \notin \partial\mathcal{N}$. If $c \in \partial\mathcal{N}$ then $c_{ij} = \pm 1$ for some i, j . Up to symmetry we may assume $c_{11} = -1$. From (5.2.4) we see that $h(c) = -g(c)^2$ and hence $g(c) \geq 0$, so (3) holds. For (2) we note that $m_{123}(u) = -(u + c_{21})^2$ and $m_{134}(v) = -(v + c_{12})^2$. Nonnegativity of principal minors requires $u = -c_{21}$ and $v = -c_{12}$, so the matrix completion is unique.

Now assume $c \notin \partial\mathcal{N}$. Then we have $h(c) = 0$, and this implies $g(c) < 0$, so that the parabolas from Lemma 5.5.3 have a unique point of intersection at level 0. This point is given either by $u = a_1 - \sqrt{b_1} = a_2 + \sqrt{b_2}$, or $u = a_2 - \sqrt{b_2} = a_1 + \sqrt{b_1}$. Analogously there is also a unique v . These unique choices u, v make all third order principal minors $m_{123}, m_{124}, m_{234}, m_{134}$ vanish. This means $\text{rank}(C) \leq 2$. Hence (2) and (3) hold in this case as well. \square

The next lemma shows how the trigonometric functions arise in the parametrization of the boundaries.

Lemma 5.5.6. Suppose that c is extremal in $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$, then

- (1) It must have a unique matrix completion with $\text{rank } C \leq 2$.
- (2) It must be of the form $c_{ij} = \langle a_i, b_j \rangle$ for unit vectors $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$,
- (3) It can be written as $c_{ij} = \cos(\alpha_i - \beta_j)$ for some $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. (1) Extreme points are always part of the boundary, hence the previous lemma applies. So by part (3) of the previous lemma, they either have $\text{rank } C \leq 2$ anyway, or else belong to a face of the cube \mathcal{N} . In the latter case, up to symmetry, we have $c_{22} = 1$. Then $C_{124} \succcurlyeq 0$ forces $u = c_{12}$, so the extendability is just the ellipope condition $\det C_{123} = 1 - c_{12}^2 c_{23}^2 c_{31}^2 - 2c_{12}c_{23}c_{31} \geq 0$. Since we are not just assuming c to be on the boundary, but even extremal, this inequality must be tight, and so we also get $\text{rank } C \leq 2$.

(2) By the spectral theorem, every positive semidefinite $d \times d$ matrix can be written as a Gram matrix, i.e., $C_{\alpha\beta} = \langle w_\alpha, w_\beta \rangle$ for vectors w_1, \dots, w_d in some Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^r . Here $r = \text{rank } C$ is the number of non-zero eigenvalues. In our case the diagonal matrix entries are 1, so these vectors are unit vectors. Moreover, the c_{ij} are themselves matrix elements of C , so we just need to rename the vectors according to whether the dimension belongs to Alice or to Bob, i.e., $a_1 = w_1$, $a_2 = w_2$, $b_1 = w_3$, and $b_2 = w_4$.

(3) Unit vectors in \mathbb{R}^2 lie on the unit circle, parametrized by angles. Scalar products between such vectors are the cosines of the enclosed angle. Setting $w_i = (\cos \alpha_i, \sin \alpha_i)$ for some $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$, we thus have

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cos(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) & \cos(\alpha_1 - \alpha_3) & \cos(\alpha_1 - \alpha_4) \\ \cos(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) & 1 & \cos(\alpha_2 - \alpha_3) & \cos(\alpha_2 - \alpha_4) \\ \cos(\alpha_1 - \alpha_3) & \cos(\alpha_2 - \alpha_3) & 1 & \cos(\alpha_3 - \alpha_4) \\ \cos(\alpha_1 - \alpha_4) & \cos(\alpha_2 - \alpha_4) & \cos(\alpha_3 - \alpha_4) & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.5.6)$$

Renaming according to the Alice/Bob distinction, i.e., $\alpha_3 = \beta_1$ and $\alpha_4 = \beta_2$, we conclude. \square

Part (2) of Lemma 5.5.6 says that $\text{Ext } \mathcal{Q}_{(e)} \subset \mathcal{Q}_{(f)}$, and part (3) that $\text{Ext } \mathcal{Q}_{(e)} \subset \mathcal{Q}_{(b)}$. Since $\mathcal{Q}_{(f)}$ is convex by a direct sum construction, and $\mathcal{Q}_{(b)}$ is anyhow defined to be convex, this also means that $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)} \subset \mathcal{Q}_{(f)}$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)} \subset \mathcal{Q}_{(b)}$. The first of these inclusions can be inverted trivially, because we can just set $u = \langle a_1, a_2 \rangle$ and $v = \langle b_1, b_2 \rangle$ to get a matrix completion from the unit vectors a_i, b_j . To revert the second inclusion, we have to combine Summary 5.5.4, the inclusion $\mathcal{Q}_{(a)} \subset \mathcal{Q}_{(e)}$ proved above, and the concrete quantum model from Remark 5.2.7, which realizes all cosine parametrized c , and thus shows $\mathcal{Q}_{(b)} \subset \mathcal{Q}_{(a)}$. Altogether this gives

Summary 5.5.7. $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)} = \mathcal{Q}_{(f)}$, $\mathcal{Q}_{(e)} = \mathcal{Q}_{(d)}$, and $\mathcal{Q}_{(a)} \subset \mathcal{Q}_{(e)} \subset \mathcal{Q}_{(b)} \subset \mathcal{Q}_{(a)}$, i.e., all these sets are equal.

This leaves only one part of Theorem 5.1.1, namely the equality with $\mathcal{Q}_{(c)}$. This will be shown in the next paragraph. Also, we have established one part of Proposition 5.2.5, the cosine parametrization, in a slightly different parametrization. The one used in Propositions 5.2.5 and 5.2.6 follows from the form (5.5.6) by setting

$$\alpha = \alpha_1 - \alpha_3, \quad \beta = \alpha_4 - \alpha_1, \quad \gamma = \alpha_3 - \alpha_2, \quad \delta = \alpha_2 - \alpha_4.$$

Note that the signs were chosen (not changing the respective cosine) in such a way that $\alpha + \beta + \gamma + \delta = 0$. This constraint reflects the fact that only differences $\alpha_i - \alpha_j$ matter. What we have not shown yet, however, is the criterion $\Delta < 0$ for a tuple of angles to give an extreme point. This will be done in Section 5.5.3.

The pushout characterization. The continuous map $t \mapsto \sin(\pi t/2)$ takes the interval $[-1, 1]$ to itself, and it has a continuous inverse. By applying this map coordinate-wise, we conclude that the pushout map in (5.2.1) is a homeomorphism from the cube $\mathcal{N} = [-1, 1]^4$ to itself. Here we shall establish Proposition 5.2.2, which states that $\mathcal{Q} = \mathbf{sin}(\mathcal{C})$. Note that in the literature of matrix completion, this is often presented as $\mathcal{Q} = \mathbf{cos}(\pi \text{MET}(K_{2,2}))$ which is obvious if one realizes that the metric polytope $\text{MET}(K_{2,2})$ of the complete bipartite graph $K_{2,2}$ is isomorphic to the classical polytope \mathcal{C} . See [Lau97].

Our strategy is to show this for the boundaries, i.e., $\mathbf{sin}(\partial\mathcal{C}) = \partial\mathcal{Q}$. Suppose that we know this, then notice that **sin** maps connected components of $\mathcal{N} \setminus \partial\mathcal{C}$ to connected components of $\mathcal{N} \setminus \partial\mathcal{Q}$. Since 0 is in both the classical polytope and the quantum set, and $\mathbf{sin}(0) = 0$, \mathcal{C} is precisely mapped to \mathcal{Q} . Hence equality of the boundaries is sufficient.

We examine the boundary of the demicube \mathcal{C} facet by facet. This task is greatly reduced by symmetry, given that **sin** commutes with all symmetry operations explained in Proposition 5.2.3. Only one CHSH face and one \mathcal{N} -face need to be considered. Consider first the CHSH facet $\{(x, y, z, w) \in [-1, 1]^4 : x + y + z - w = 2\}$. The images of the points on this facet under the pushout map **sin** are

$$\mathbf{sin}(x, y, z, w) = \left(\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}x\right), \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}y\right), \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}z\right), \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}w\right) \right) = (\cos \alpha, \cos \beta, \cos \gamma, \cos \delta),$$

where $\alpha = \pi(1-x)/2$, $\beta = \pi(1-y)/2$, $\gamma = \pi(1-z)/2$, $\delta = \pi(w-1)/2$. Therefore, we have $\alpha + \beta + \gamma + \delta = \pi - (x + y + z - w)\pi/2 = 0$. Moreover, the condition $x, y, z, w \in [-1, 1]$ implies that $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in [0, \pi]$ and $\delta \in [-\pi, 0]$. Then, $\Delta = \sin \alpha \sin \beta \sin \gamma \sin \delta \leq 0$. Hence we get exactly those parametrized patches (\mathcal{Q}_{qx}) from Proposition 5.2.5, for which $\alpha, \beta, \gamma > 0 > \delta$. The other seven patches (\mathcal{Q}_{qx}) are obtained by symmetry.

Next consider an \mathcal{N} -face of \mathcal{C} , say that defined by $w = 1$. The pushout map preserves this equation. We can now go through the same considerations as above, but in one dimension lower. The geometric statement is that the pushout of the tetrahedron equals

the ellipope (see Figure 5.7). This also follows from the fact that **sin** identifies their boundaries. We know this from the above discussion of the CHSH facets. Together with Summary 5.5.7 this completes the proof of Theorem 5.1.1.

5.5.2. Self-duality

Self-duality is a special feature of the pair $\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{Q}^\circ$. With the boundary information obtained so far one could try to derive self-duality extreme point by extreme point. Another possibility is to obtain it from the support and radial function. Here we use an approach based on the duality of the semidefinite matrices C and F , and their representations as Gram matrices. We begin with the characterization of the F matrices.

Proof of Proposition 5.3.3. The primal/dual characterization of spectrahedral shadows described briefly before the statement of Proposition 5.3.3 is a standard result, so we omit its proof and are left with the additional property $p_1 + p_2 = p_3 + p_4$. We can take $p_1 + p_2$ and $p_3 + p_4$ both non-zero, since otherwise we have the trivial case $f = 0, F = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{1}$.

Now observe that the matrix $F' = \Lambda F \Lambda$, where Λ is the diagonal matrix with diagonal $(\lambda, \lambda, \lambda^{-1}, \lambda^{-1})$, is also positive semidefinite and has the same off-diagonal block f_{ij} . The diagonal is changed to $(p'_1, p'_2, p'_3, p'_4) = (\lambda^2 p_1, \lambda^2 p_2, \lambda^{-2} p_3, \lambda^{-2} p_4)$. In order to satisfy the sum constraint we need $\lambda^2 = (p_3 + p_4)/(p_1 + p_2)$. Then $(F + F')/2$ is the desired extension with $p_1 + p_2 = p_3 + p_4$. This is different from F , if $\lambda^2 \neq 1$.

Finally, using a similar argument, we show that if the point f has a completion F for which the condition $p_1 + p_2 = p_3 + p_4 = 1$ does not hold, then f is not extreme. Using the diagonal matrix with $(\lambda_A, \lambda_A, \lambda_B, \lambda_B)$, and assuming, without loss of generality that $x = p_1 + p_2 - 1 > 0$, the normalization condition becomes $\lambda_A^2(1+x) + \lambda_B^2(1-x) = 2$. Then choosing both terms equal to 1 maximizes $\lambda_A \lambda_B = (1-x^2)^{-1/2} > 1$. We conclude that $f'_{ij} = \lambda_A \lambda_B f_{ij}$ is again in \mathcal{Q}° , so f is not a boundary point. \square

We now consider matrices C and F as Gram matrices of suitable vectors in a real Euclidean space. That is, we choose a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 from characterization (f) in Theorem 5.1.1, and similarly four vectors x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 whose scalar products give F , and such that $-f_{ij} = \langle x_i, y_j \rangle$. The conditions on these vectors for C to be of the form (5.5.1) and F to be of the form (5.3.6) with $p_1 + p_2 = 1$ are

$$\|a_1\| = \|a_2\| = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad x_1 \perp x_2, \quad \|x_1\|^2 + \|x_2\|^2 = 1,$$

and analogous conditions for b_j, y_j . The sets of vectors can be mapped to each other by

$$a_1 = x_1 + x_2, \quad a_2 = x_1 - x_2 \quad \text{and} \quad x_1 = (a_1 + a_2)/2, \quad x_2 = (a_1 - a_2)/2.$$

With the analogous relations for the b_j and y_j , we get a bijective correspondence between the allowed vectors. Expressing the relation by the Hadamard matrix $H_2 = 2^{-1/2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$ and inserting them into $c_{ij} = \langle a_i, b_j \rangle$, one relates the 4-vector $c = (c_{11}, c_{12}, c_{21}, c_{22})$ to the corresponding $f \in \mathbb{R}^4$ by $H = H_2 \otimes H_2$, i.e., (5.3.3). This proves Proposition 5.3.1 and Theorem 5.1.3.

5.5.3. Further boundary properties

The pushout characterization implies the disjoint union structure of Proposition 5.2.4, but we need to verify various geometric properties of strata mentioned in that proposition.

Classification of boundary points by rank. We now show the remainder of Proposition 5.2.9, the rank statements in Proposition 5.2.10, and the parametrization of boundary points in Proposition 5.2.6. Each of these propositions has items referring to different parts of the boundary. The proofs will be organized by these, but by the classification of 5.2.4. The ordering of these items was modified to give a better flow of the arguments. C will be a matrix completion for c .

(Qin) \Leftrightarrow $\text{rank } C$ may be 4.

Any interior point c can be written as a convex combination in which the origin $c = 0$ has positive weight. There exists a matrix completion C in which $\mathbb{1}$ has a positive weight, so C has full rank. Conversely, if C has rank 4, a small change of c translates to a small change of C , leaving the other matrix entries unchanged. As full rank positive matrices are open, this will not lead out of \mathcal{Q} . Hence c is an interior point.

(Qei) $\Leftrightarrow c \in \partial\mathcal{Q}$ and $\text{rank } C = 3$.

From now on all c will be in the boundary, and so by Lemma 5.5.5 c has a unique completion C . Whenever $|c_{ij}| = 1$ for a pair $\{i, j\}$, the i^{th} and the $(j+2)^{\text{th}}$ rows/columns are equal up to sign, so the rank is reduced by 1. Deleting one of these row/column pairs leaves a 3×3 correlation matrix, whose semidefiniteness describes the ellipope. This has full rank precisely in the interior.

(Qnx),(Qce) $\Leftrightarrow c \in \partial\mathcal{Q}$ exactly one, resp. two $|c_{ij}| = 1$.

From now on, we have $\text{rank } C \leq 2$, and so by Lemma 5.5.6 (3), the matrix C lies in the cosine-parametrized family shown in (5.5.6). If at least one $|c_{ij}|$ equals 1 then the point is in the boundary case of an ellipope. It is clear from the embedding of the ellipope into the cube that the non-classical points are exactly the ones that are not in another cube face. The edges lie in exactly 2 cube faces. This directly translates to the corresponding angles in the parametrization being multiples of π , as claimed in Proposition 5.2.5.

(Qcx) $\Leftrightarrow c \in \partial\mathcal{Q}$ $\text{rank } C = 1$

If three $|c_{ij}| = 1$, it must actually be four, and hence we have a classical extreme point. It is easy to see that this implies rank 1: up to symmetry this is the case $c_{ij} = 1$ for all $i, j = 1, 2$, which clearly has the rank 1 matrix $C_{ij} \equiv 1$ as a completion. For the converse, note that $\text{rank } C = 1$ and $C \succcurlyeq 0$ imply $C_{ij} = x_i x_j$ for some vector x , and $c_{ij} = x_i x_{j+2}$. If we now insist on the special form of C from Proposition 5.2.9, i.e., unit diagonal, we must have an extreme point just from the rank condition. However, we get even many interior rank 1 points, and $c \in \partial\mathcal{Q}$ needs to be imposed as well.

(Qqx) $\Leftrightarrow c \in \partial\mathcal{Q} \cap (\text{int } \mathcal{N}) \Leftrightarrow \Delta < 0$ in Proposition 5.2.5

From the semialgebraic description of \mathcal{Q} in Proposition 5.2.8 this type consists of the points $c \in \mathcal{N}$ with $h(c) = 0$ and $g(c) < 0$. But for the cosine parametrized correlations with $\delta = -(\alpha + \beta + \gamma)$ we get the identity

$$g(\cos \alpha, \cos \beta, \cos \gamma, \cos \delta) = 2\Delta.$$

This completes the proofs of Propositions 5.2.9, 5.2.10 and 5.2.6.

Exposing functionals.

Proof of Proposition 5.3.2. Since c is a boundary point, there exist some $f \in \mathcal{Q}^\circ$ such that $\langle f, c \rangle = \max\{\langle f', c \rangle \mid f' \in \mathcal{Q}^\circ\} = 1$; we fix such f . Thus $\langle f, c' \rangle$ has a global maximum at

$c' = c$, and therefore a local maximum on the surface $c_{ij} = \cos \theta_{ij}$ with $\sum_{ij} \theta_{ij} = 0$ where the θ_{ij} are the given angles.

We analyze this extremum problem by introducing a Lagrange multiplier λ . The critical equations are

$$0 = d\left(\sum_{ij} f_{ij} \cos(\theta_{ij}) + \lambda \theta_{ij}\right) = \sum_{ij} (-f_{ij} \sin(\theta_{ij}) + \lambda) d\theta_{ij}.$$

Because $\Delta < 0$, all $\sin(\theta_{ij}) \neq 0$, and $f_{ij} = \lambda / \sin(\theta_{ij})$. The multiplier is determined from $\langle f, c \rangle = 1$ to be $\lambda^{-1} = \sum_{ij} \cot \theta_{ij} \equiv K$. Hence a maximizing f is unique, and given by the required formula. \square

This proof utilizes our knowledge from other sources that such c are extremal. When computing the convex hull of a parametrized surface (as in [CKLS19]) this is the tricky part. We can compute the tangent hyperplane at every point of such a surface, but is the local extremum a global maximum? It is then natural to look first at the local criterion and to rule out saddle points. That is, by looking at the parametrization in second order Taylor approximation, we can determine whether the surface is locally on one side of the tangent plane. If not, the point can be omitted from the list of potential extreme points. We carried this out for the case at hand, and found that *all* points with $\Delta > 0$ are saddles.

From the self-duality of the convex body we deduce that $\{h = 0\}$ is a self-dual variety. For the study of \mathcal{Q} this is not only modified by intersecting with the cube, but also by eliminating the branch of the variety in the interior of \mathcal{Q} . Under dualization these operations are connected, i.e., the duals of the normalized tangents of interior points end up outside the dual body.

Unique CHSH violation. It is clear that each curved tetrahedron, being the pushout of a CHSH-face, violates exactly that CHSH inequality. That this is true for all non-classical correlations is an elementary fact that we have not used otherwise. Its self-dual version has likewise nothing to do with \mathcal{Q} , but only with the enclosing polytopes \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{N} . It states that for any non-trivial Bell inequality, i.e., for any affine inequality valid for all classical correlations ($f \in \mathcal{C}^\circ$), which is not true by virtue of positivity constraints alone ($f \notin \mathcal{N}^\circ$) there is a unique non-local box ($c \in \text{Ext } \mathcal{N}$) making this evident ($\langle f, c \rangle > 1$).

Proof of Proposition 5.2.1. The 8 CHSH inequalities are $\pm c_{11} \pm c_{12} \pm c_{21} \pm c_{22} \leq 2$, where the product of the signs is -1 . Given two distinct inequalities of this sort, the signs cannot be equal in all four places (then the inequalities would be the same), and also not in three places (because this would imply equality on the fourth place). Adding two violated inequalities thus gives $\pm 2c_{ij} \pm 2c_{kl} > 4$, which contradicts the inequality $|c_{ij}| \leq 1$ following from non-signalling. Hence at most one such inequality is violated for $c \in \mathcal{N}$. On the other hand, for $c \notin \mathcal{C}$ at least one is violated. \square

Face duality. We now consider the normal cycle and the duality relations of faces. Some claims about exposedness are already made in Proposition 5.2.4. These and the entries in Table 5.1 will now be treated in detail. As in Section 5.5.3, statements are grouped by boundary types. For points $\{c\}$ of each type we must identify the functionals $f \in \mathcal{Q}^\circ$ attaining the maximal value 1 at c , i.e., the face $\{c\}^\circ$. Note that the dual face operation

$$S^\circ = \{f \in \mathcal{Q}^\circ \mid \forall c \in S \subset \mathcal{Q}, \langle f, c \rangle = 1\}$$

also depends on the whole convex body in which this is taken (here: \mathcal{Q}). We will write $S^{\circ c}$ and $S^{\circ N}$ when we take orthogonal complements with regards to \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{N} respectively. Obviously, the operation is monotone in the sense that for $S \subset \mathcal{C}$ we have $S^{\circ N} \subset S^\circ \subset S^{\circ c}$.

$(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{cx}})^\circ = [\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ei}}] = (\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ei}}) \cup (\mathcal{Q}_{\text{nx}}) \cup (\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ce}}) \cup (\mathcal{Q}_{\text{cx}})$:

Consider a classical extreme point in $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{cx}})$; without loss of generality $c = (1, 1, 1, 1)$. Then $\{c\}^\circ \subset \{c\}^{\circ c}$, i.e., $\{c\}^\circ$ is a face contained in a facet of the cube \mathcal{C}° . This was our definition of an \mathcal{N} -face. Since these characterizations are taken over by self-duality, let us look at $2Hf$ for $f \in \{c\}^\circ$. The first component $(2Hf)_{11}$ is just $\langle f, c \rangle = 1$; the others (with maybe a sign added) are the scalar products of f with all the other classical points, which need to be ≤ 1 for $f \in \mathcal{Q}^\circ$. Hence $2Hf$ is indeed in the standard cube, with $(2Hf)_{11} = 1$. The condition $2Hf \in \mathcal{Q}$ singles out an ellipope satisfying the third order inequality, which in terms of f is the elementary symmetric polynomial appearing in (5.3.10), albeit with the opposite inequality. Note that $\{c\}^\circ$ is thus the closed ellipope $[\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ei}}]$, which also contains boundary points of type $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{cx}}), (\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ce}}), (\mathcal{Q}_{\text{nx}})$. Computing their complements, as we will do presently, will give faces including c .

$(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ei}})^\circ = (\mathcal{Q}_{\text{cx}})$:

Starting from an interior ellipope point c , self-duality gives us essentially the dual of the previous paragraph. More explicitly, set $c = (1, x, y, z)$ with $1 - x^2 - y^2 - z^2 + 2xyz \geq 0$, and $x^2, y^2, z^2 < 1$, to avoid edges and classical extreme points. For an interior point, the equality $\langle f, c \rangle = 1$ clearly extends from c to the face generated by this. Hence f must be $(1, 0, 0, 0)$, and $2Hf = (1, 1, 1, 1)$ is the classical extreme point from previous paragraph.

$(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{nx}})^\circ = (\mathcal{Q}_{\text{cx}})$:

More care is needed for ellipope boundary points, because, in principle, this could allow more freedom for f . We will use the local extremality in the sense of Proposition 5.3.2, with angles $\theta_{11} = 0$, and $\sin(\theta_{ij}) \neq 0$ for the other $(i, j) \neq (1, 1)$. Then the equation $f_{ij} \sin(\theta_{ij}) = \lambda$ implies $\lambda = 0 \cdot f_{11} = 0$; since the other sines are $\neq 0$, then once again the only possibility is $f = (1, 0, 0, 0)$. This shows that the $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{nx}})$ -points are indeed non-exposed extreme points as claimed in Proposition 5.2.4.

$(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ce}})^\circ = [\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ce}}] = (\mathcal{Q}_{\text{ce}}) \cup (\mathcal{Q}_{\text{cx}})$:

Now consider a point c on an edge, but not a vertex. This forces exactly two angles, say $\theta_{11} = \theta_{12}$, to be zero (cf. Proposition 5.2.6) and by the same reasoning used in the previous point, $\lambda = 0$, and $f_{21} = f_{22} = 0$. However, f_{11} and f_{12} remain unconstrained and merely have to add up to 1. Remarkable here is that we get a drop of expected dimension from \mathcal{C} , where the complement of an edge is a 2-dimensional face:

$$\{(1, 1, 0, 0)\}^{\circ c} = \left\{ ((1+x)/2, (1-x)/2, y/2, -y/2) \mid |x| + |y| \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Geometrically, 3-dimensional faces of \mathcal{C} containing this edge meet at an angle, whereas the corresponding ellipopes are tangent.

$(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qx}})^\circ = (\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qx}})$:

Here points go to points, as discussed in detail in Section 5.5.2.

Table 5.1 also gives the manifold dimensions of each boundary type. We have the family of type $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qx}})$ of dimension 3. All other types occur only in dimension zero.

Support function. As described in Section 5.3.3, we seek the criteria for a ray to hit the boundary of \mathcal{Q}° either in an exposed extreme point or in an \mathcal{N} -face. The problem becomes almost trivial, however, if we already know by which face the ray leaves the surrounding cube: then we just have to check whether the boundary point is inside or outside the ellipope, for which we have a convenient third order criterion. The following proof is based on the case distinction by cube faces. Since these are all connected by symmetries, it boils down to just considering one case.

Proof of Proposition 5.3.5. (1) \Leftrightarrow (2): The set of pairs $(c, f) \in \mathbf{N}(\mathcal{Q})$ such that both c and f are uniquely determined when the other is fixed is just the stratum $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qx}}, \text{qx})$. Hence, if f is of type $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qx}})$, so is c .

Reduction by symmetry:

Applying a symmetry to f , i.e., a permutation of the components or an even number of sign changes, clearly does not change the validity of (1), (2), (3), or (4), while (5) respects the symmetry by requiring the necessary transformation to be made first. Hence it suffices prove for f in a standard form achievable by symmetry transformation. Since all extreme points of \mathcal{C} are connected by symmetry we can assume, as required in (5) that a maximizer for $\langle f, c \rangle$ in $\text{Ext } \mathcal{C}$ is $c = (1, 1, 1, 1)$. Now suppose that two or more coordinates $f_{ij} < 0$. Then, by applying an even sign change to c we could increase $\langle f, c \rangle$. So our assumption actually rules out more than one negative sign. By the same argument, if there is a negative sign, this must be on an f_{ij} which minimizes $|f_{ij}|$. By a permutation we may assume that this element is f_{22} .

We can quickly handle the case that all $f_{ij} \geq 0$. Under these assumptions, we have that $\max\{\langle f, c \rangle \mid c \in \mathcal{C}\} = \sum_{ij} f_{ij} = \sum_{ij} |f_{ij}| = \max\{\langle f, c \rangle \mid c \in \mathcal{N}\}$. So the maximum over \mathcal{Q} is attained at a classical point, $p(f) \geq 0$ and the product in (5.3.10) cannot be < 0 , so all conditions evaluate to false. So we may assume that there is just one negative sign and sort the remaining f_{ij} . That is, from now on we take

$$f_{11} \geq f_{12} \geq f_{21} \geq |f_{22}| > 0 > f_{22}. \quad (5.5.7)$$

(1) \Leftrightarrow (5): We use the same classification of boundary points for \mathcal{Q} and \mathcal{Q}° via duality transform. So (1) means that $c = 2Hf$ is a multiple of a $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qx}})$ point. We know that the component with the largest absolute value is the first, $c_{11} = \sum_{ij} f_{ij}$. Thus the point where the ray $\mathbb{R}c$ intersects the boundary of \mathcal{N} is $(1, c_{12}/c_{11}, c_{21}/c_{11}, c_{22}/c_{11}) = (1, x, y, z)$. This is in an \mathcal{N} -facet of \mathcal{Q} if and only if $1 - x^2 - y^2 - z^2 + 2xyz \geq 0$. Otherwise, this intersection is already outside of \mathcal{Q} , and hence the ray intersects $\partial\mathcal{Q}$ at a $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qx}})$ point. So the necessary and sufficient condition for (1) is that the cubic is < 0 . Multiplying by c_{11}^3 , which we know to be positive, and rearranging the resulting homogeneous polynomial in the f_{ij} 's, gives condition (5).

(5) \Leftrightarrow (3): Under the above symmetry reduction we have

$$m(f) = (-f_{22}) \left(\frac{1}{f_{11}} + \frac{1}{f_{12}} + \frac{1}{f_{21}} - \frac{1}{f_{22}} \right) = 1 - \frac{f_{22}}{f_{11}} - \frac{f_{22}}{f_{12}} - \frac{f_{22}}{f_{21}}.$$

Subtracting 1 from both sides of the inequality $m(f) > 2$, and multiplying by $f_{11}f_{12}f_{21}$, gives (5).

(4) \Leftrightarrow (5): The first factor in $\tilde{m}(f)$ is the polynomial in (5.3.10), divided by $p(f)$. So while $p(f) < 0$, the positivity of this factor is equivalent to (4). We complete the proof by showing that under the symmetry reduction (5.5.7) the other three factors are always, respectively, positive, negative and positive. Indeed, in the second factor the f_{11} and f_{22} -terms together are positive, and so are the f_{12} and f_{21} -terms. Similarly, in the third factor

we group the f_{11}, f_{12} and the f_{21}, f_{22} -terms (both negative), and use the same grouping in the forth factor, giving two positive terms. \square

It is interesting to see what a purely algebraic approach as in [BPT12, Section 5.3] would say about the situation. First of all, the support function asks us to compute a maximum of a linear functional over a variety. Evaluating just the first order conditions, we get an expression for the maximum for each patch of $\partial\mathcal{Q}$. For the curved $(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{qx}})$ patches this will be just $\tilde{\phi}$. So we get little progress over the simple story told in Section 5.3.3. In many well-known problems of duality, we can simply take the maximum of the different branches of the algebraic function, i.e., the maximum of $\tilde{\phi}$ and $\phi_{\mathcal{C}}$. Suffice it to say that this fails, and one easily finds points where $\tilde{\phi}(f) > \phi_{\mathcal{C}}(f) = \phi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f)$. To get this to work, one must ensure that the associated maximizers are contained in the quantum set.

5.6. Conclusions

On one hand, there are some geometric aspects of \mathcal{Q} we did not discuss. On the other hand, many techniques might be useful for studying higher-dimensional correlation bodies. Let us briefly comment on possible research directions.

- *Constrained Hilbert space dimension*

In the 222|0 case, it happens to be sufficient to use a 4-dimensional Hilbert space to get all the extreme points of \mathcal{Q} , but no assumption like this is made in the definition of \mathcal{Q} . However, one can ask how such an assumption would change \mathcal{Q} . Let us denote by \mathcal{Q}_m the (warning: nonconvex!) set of quantum correlations that are obtainable by models as in Section 5.1.1 under the additional assumption $\dim \mathcal{H} = m$. We also write $\mathcal{C}_m \subset \mathcal{Q}_m$ for the corresponding set of classical correlations realized in a sample space of m points. We know that extreme points of the full bodies can be realized in fixed dimensions, so $\text{Ext } \mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{C}_1$ and $\text{Ext } \mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{Q}_4$. Thus Carathéodory's Theorem allows us to put a bound on the required m : since in an n -dimensional convex body every point is the convex combination of at most $n+1$ extreme points, and $n=4$, we conclude that $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{C}_5$ and $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{Q}_{20}$. The Carathéodory bound is typically tight only for polytopes, where most points require $n+1$ of the vertices for a convex representations. When there is a continuum of extreme points, that *Carathéodory number* is usually smaller. It can be proved that $\mathcal{Q}_m \subset \mathcal{C} \neq \mathcal{Q}$ for $m \leq 3$, and $\mathcal{Q}_m = \mathcal{Q}$ for $m \geq 4$. The analogous set \mathcal{C}_m for the cross-polytope \mathcal{C} is also interesting and worth further study: for instance, \mathcal{C}_1 is the subset of rank 1 matrices $c \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$.

- *The full 222 case, and the C^* -algebra generated by two projections*

In the 222 case, without the zero marginals condition, the correlation body \mathcal{Q} is a convex body in \mathbb{R}^8 . Here we can parametrize its extreme points by the product of spheres $\mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^3$, analogous to Proposition 5.2.5. A `Macaulay2` computation reveals that this variety has degree 40 and its prime ideal is generated by 28 polynomials whose degrees are 5, 6, 7 and 8. This may be a starting point for the analysis of the 222 case.

- *Duality*

The duality in Theorem 5.1.3 depends on the minimality assumption. Already the duality of just \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{C} requires at least the dimensions of these sets to coincide, which fails for $MK > 4$.

- *Algebra*

Algebraic methods are expected to apply once a reduction to finite dimension has been achieved by other means. We found them directly useful in the full 222 case, but there are also applications to the N22 and 2M2 cases. However, the complexity of algebraic characterizations can be expected to increase very rapidly.

- *Algebraic statistics*

Consider the ± 1 -valued random variables A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 satisfying (5.1.1). Their statistical model is the graphical model whose graph G is the 4-cycle with edges $A_1 - B_1, B_1 - A_2, A_2 - B_2, B_2 - A_1$. This is [GMS06, Example 4] up to relabeling. The sufficient statistics of this model are obtained by applying the linear map $A(G)$ in [GMS06, Example 4]. The image of this map is our classical polytope \mathcal{C} . In particular this map is a bijection between the model and \mathcal{C} and inverting it is called *maximum likelihood estimation* (MLE). We can recover also \mathcal{N} from this construction, and more in general such polytopes can be defined for any toric model. For an undirected graphical model G we have that $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{N}$ if and only if the graph is decomposable; the four-cycle model is the smallest non-decomposable model so we can deduce also from this argument that the inclusion is strict. It would be particularly interesting to examine the general 222 case through the lens of algebraic statistics.

Bibliography

- [ABN22] Gianira N. Alfarano, Martino Borello, and Alessandro Neri. A geometric characterization of minimal codes and their asymptotic performance. *Advances in Mathematics of Communications*, 16(1):115–133, 2022.
- [ACGH85] Enrico Arbarello, Maurizio Cornalba, Phillip A. Griffiths, and Joe D. Harris. *Geometry of Algebraic Curves. Vol. I*, volume 387 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer New York, NY, New York, 1985.
- [ADRS00] Christos A. Athanasiadis, Jesús A. De Loera, Victor Reiner, and Francisco Santos. Fiber polytopes for the projections between cyclic polytopes. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 21(1):19–47, 2000.
- [AFS19] Carlos Améndola, Peter Friz, and Bernd Sturmfels. Varieties of signature tensors. In *Forum of Mathematics, Sigma*, volume 7, page e10. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [AS16] Karim A. Adiprasito and Raman Sanyal. Whitney numbers of arrangements via measure concentration of intrinsic volumes. *arXiv:1606.09412*, 2016.
- [Aum65] Robert J. Aumann. Integrals of set-valued functions. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 12(1):1–12, 1965.
- [Bar02] Alexander Barvinok. *A course in convexity*, volume 54 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, 2002.
- [BB14] Charles H. Bennett and Gilles Brassard. Quantum cryptography: Public key distribution and coin tossing. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 560:7–11, 2014.
- [BBCM95] Charles H. Bennett, Gilles Brassard, Claude Crepeau, and Ueli M. Maurer. Generalized privacy amplification. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 41:1915–1923, 1995.
- [BBLM22] Paul Breiding, Peter Bürgisser, Antonio Lerario, and Léo Mathis. The zonoid algebra, generalized mixed volumes, and random determinants. *Advances in Mathematics*, 402:108361, 2022.
- [BBMS22a] Katalin Berlow, Marie-Charlotte Brandenburg, Chiara Meroni, and Isabelle Shankar. Correction to: Intersection bodies of polytopes. *Beiträge zur Algebra und Geometrie / Contributions to Algebra and Geometry*, 2022.
- [BBMS22b] Katalin Berlow, Marie-Charlotte Brandenburg, Chiara Meroni, and Isabelle Shankar. Intersection bodies of polytopes. *Beiträge zur Algebra und Geometrie / Contributions to Algebra and Geometry*, 2022.

- [BCP⁺14] Nicolas Brunner, Daniel Cavalcanti, Stefano Pironio, Valerio Scarani, and Stephanie Wehner. Bell nonlocality. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 86:419–478, 2014.
- [BCR13] Jacek Bochnak, Michel Coste, and Marie-Fran  oise Roy. *Real algebraic geometry*, volume 36. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [Bea96] Arnaud Beauville. *Complex Algebraic Surfaces*, volume 34 of *London Mathematical Society Student Texts*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 1996. Translated from the 1978 French original by R. Barlow, with assistance from N. I. Shepherd-Barron and M. Reid.
- [BGW13] Howard Barnum, Carl P. Gaebler, and Alexander Wilce. Ensemble steering, weak self-duality, and the structure of probabilistic theories. *Foundations of Physics*, 43:1411–1427, 2013.
- [BJ17] Igor Belegradek and Zixin Jiang. Smoothness of Minkowski sum and generic rotations. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 450:1229–1244, 2017.
- [BL16] Peter B  rgisser and Antonio Lerario. Probabilistic Schubert calculus. *Journal f  r die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal)*, 2020:1–58, 2016.
- [BL21] Alexander Black and Jes  s De Loera. Monotone paths on cross-polytopes. *arXiv:2102.01237*, 2021.
- [Bla23] Wilhelm Blaschke. *Vorlesungen  ber Differentialgeometrie und geometrische Grundlagen von Einsteins Relativit  tstheorie II*. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 1923.
- [BLC21] Andrea Bruno and Margherita Lelli-Chiesa. Irreducibility of Severi varieties on K3 surfaces. *arXiv:2112.09398*, 2021.
- [Bol69] Ethan D. Bolker. A class of convex bodies. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 145:323–345, 1969.
- [Bol71] Ethan D. Bolker. The zonoid problem. *American Mathematical Monthly*, 78(5):529–531, 1971.
- [Bor87] Giovanni B. Bordiga. *La superficie del 6° ordine con 10 rette, nello spazio R_4 e le sue proiezioni nello spazio ordinario*. Tipografia della Reale Accademia dei Lincei, 1887.
- [BPT12] Grigoriy Blekherman, Pablo Parrilo, and Rekha Thomas. *Semidefinite Optimization and Convex Algebraic Geometry*, volume 13 of *MOS-SIAM Series on Optimization*. SIAM, Philadelphia, 2012.
- [BPT13] Grigoriy Blekherman, Pablo A. Parrilo, and Rekha R. Thomas, editors. *Semidefinite Optimization and Convex Algebraic Geometry*, volume 13 of *MOS-SIAM Series on Optimization*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA; Mathematical Optimization Society, Philadelphia, PA, 2013.
- [Br  12] Petter Br  nd  n. Hyperbolicity cones of elementary symmetric polynomials are spectrahedral. *Optimization Letters*, 8(5):1773–1782, 2012.

- [BS92] Louis J. Billera and Bernd Sturmfels. Fiber polytopes. *Annals of Mathematics*, 135(3):527–549, 1992.
- [Cam99] Stefano Campi. Convex intersection bodies in three and four dimensions. *Mathematika*, 46(1):15–27, 1999.
- [CKLS19] Daniel Ciripoi, Nidhi Kaihnsa, Andreas Löhne, and Bernd Sturmfels. Computing convex hulls of trajectories. *Revista de la Unión Matemática Argentina*, 60(2):637–662, 2019.
- [CLO15] David A. Cox, John Little, and Donal O’Shea. *Ideals, varieties, and algorithms*. Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, fourth edition, 2015.
- [CSM03] David Cohen-Steiner and Jean-Marie Morvan. Restricted Delaunay triangulations and normal cycle. In *Proceedings of the nineteenth annual symposium on Computational geometry*, pages 312–321, 2003.
- [DGMP11] Alexander A. Davydov, Massimo Giulietti, Stefano Marcugini, and Fernanda Pambianco. Linear nonbinary covering codes and saturating sets in projective spaces. *Advances in Mathematics of Communications*, 5(1):119–147, 2011.
- [DLTW08] Andrew C Doherty, Yeong-Cherng Liang, Ben Toner, and Stephanie Wehner. The quantum moment problem and bounds on entangled multi-prover games. In *23rd Annual IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity*, pages 199–210. IEEE, 2008.
- [Dol12] Igor V. Dolgachev. *Classical Algebraic Geometry*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [DR19] Joscha Diehl and Jeremy Reizenstein. Invariants of multidimensional time series based on their iterated-integral signature. *Acta Applicandae Mathematicae*, 164(1):83–122, 2019.
- [EH16] David Eisenbud and Joe Harris. *3264 and All That - A Second Course in Algebraic Geometry*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [Eis88] David Eisenbud. Linear sections of determinantal varieties. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 110(3):541–575, 1988.
- [Eis05] David Eisenbud. *The geometry of syzygies*, volume 229 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005.
- [EK08] Alexander Esterov and Askold Khovanskii. Elimination theory and newton polytopes. *Functional Analysis and Other Mathematics*, 2(1):45–71, 2008.
- [Est08] Aleksandr Esterov. On the existence of mixed fiber bodies. *Moscow Mathematical Journal*, 8(3):433–442, 2008.
- [Fed59] Herbert Federer. Curvature measures. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 93(3):418–491, 1959.
- [FFW11] Titus Franz, Fabian Furrer, and Reinhard F. Werner. Extremal quantum correlations and cryptographic security. *Physical Review Letters*, 106:250502, 2011.
- [FG22] Claudia Fevola and Christiane Görgen. The Mathematical Research-Data Repository MathRepo. *Der Computeralgebra-Rundbrief*, 70, 2022.

- [FOV99] Hubert Flenner, Liam O’Carroll, and Wolfgang Vogel. *Joins and intersections*. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 1999.
- [Fri12] Tobias Fritz. Tsirelson’s problem and Kirchberg’s conjecture. *Reviews in Mathematical Physics*, 24(05):1250012, 2012.
- [FS14] Szabolcs L. Fancsali and Péter Sziklai. Lines in higgledy-piggledy arrangement. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 21(2):2.56, 2014.
- [Fu14] Joseph H. G. Fu. Algebraic integral geometry. In Eduardo Gallego and Gil Solanes, editors, *Integral geometry and valuations*, pages 47–112. Springer Basel, 2014.
- [Ful08] William Fulton. *Algebraic curves. An Introduction to Algebraic Geometry*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 2008. modified version of the 1969 text.
- [G⁺15] Marissa Giustina et al. Significant-loophole-free test of bell’s theorem with entangled photons. *Physical Review Letters*, 115:250401, 2015.
- [Gar94a] Richard J. Gardner. Intersection bodies and the Busemann-Petty problem. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 342(1):435–445, 1994.
- [Gar94b] Richard J. Gardner. A positive answer to the Busemann-Petty problem in three dimensions. *Annals of Mathematics. Second Series*, 140(2):435–447, 1994.
- [Gar06] Richard J. Gardner. *Geometric Tomography*, volume 58 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, New York, second edition, 2006.
- [Ges22] Fulvio Gesmundo. Examples of semialgebraic convex bodies with non-semialgebraic intersection body, 2022. Available at https://fulges.github.io/docs/Notes/Gesmundo_NonSemiAlgIntersectionBody.pdf.
- [GG99] Richard J. Gardner and Apostolos Giannopoulos. p-cross-section bodies. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 48:593–614, 1999.
- [GJSW84] Robert Grone, Charles R. Johnson, Eduardo M. Sá, and Henry Wolkowicz. Positive definite completions of partial hermitian matrices. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 58:109–124, 1984.
- [GKS99] Richard J. Gardner, Alexander Koldobsky, and Thomas Schlumprecht. An analytic solution to the Busemann-Petty problem on sections of convex bodies. *Annals of Mathematics. Second Series*, 149(2):691–703, 1999.
- [GKW⁺18] Koon Tong Goh, Jędrzej Kaniewski, Elie Wolfe, Tamás Vértesi, Xingyao Wu, Yu Cai, Yeong-Cherng Liang, and Valerio Scarani. Geometry of the set of quantum correlations. *Physical Review A*, 97:022104, 2018.
- [GM21] Fulvio Gesmundo and Chiara Meroni. The geometry of discotopes. *arXiv:2111.01241*, 2021. Le Matematiche: to appear.
- [GMS06] Dan Geiger, Christopher Meek, and Bernd Sturmfels. On the toric algebra of graphical models. *Annals of Statistics*, 34:1463–1492, 2006.
- [GS] Daniel R. Grayson and Michael E. Stillman. Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry. Available at <http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/>.

- [GW93] Paul Goodey and Wolfgang Weil. Zonoids and generalisations. In *Handbook of convex geometry*, pages 1297–1326. Elsevier, 1993.
- [Har77] Robin Hartshorne. *Algebraic geometry*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 52. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977.
- [Har92] Joe Harris. *Algebraic geometry. A first course*, volume 133 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1992.
- [HB⁺15] Bas Hensen, Hannes Bernien, et al. Loophole-free Bell inequality violation using electron spins separated by 1.3 kilometres. *Nature*, 526:682–686, 2015.
- [HHMM20] Guillermo Hansen, Irmina Herburt, Horst Martini, and Maria Moszyńska. Starshaped sets. *Aequationes Mathematicae*, 94(6):1001–1092, 2020.
- [HN10] J. William Helton and Jiawang Nie. Semidefinite representation of convex sets. *Mathematical Programming*, 122(1):21–64, 2010.
- [JN98] Charles R. Johnson and Geir Nævdal. The probability that a (partial) matrix is positive semidefinite. In I. Gohberg, R. Mennicken, and C. Tretter, editors, *Recent Progress in Operator Theory*, pages 171–182, Basel, 1998. Birkhäuser Basel.
- [JNP⁺11] Marius Junge, Miguel Navascués, Carlos Palazuelos, David Pérez-García, Volkher B. Scholz, and Reinhard F. Werner. Connes’ embedding problem and Tsirelson’s problem. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 52:012102, 2011.
- [JNV⁺21] Zhengfeng Ji, Anand Natarajan, Thomas Vidick, John Wright, and Henry Yuen. MIP*=RE. *Communications of the Association for Computing Machinery*, 64(11):131–138, 2021.
- [Jou80] Jean-Pierre Jouanolou. *Théoremes de Bertini et applications*, volume 37. Université Louis Pasteur, 1980.
- [JP98] Vaughan F. R. Jones and Józef H. Przytycki. Lissajous knots and billiard knots. *Banach Center Publications*, 42:145–163, 1998.
- [Kaz03] Maxim Kazarian. Multisingularities, cobordisms, and enumerative geometry. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 58(4):665–724, 2003.
- [Kho12] Askold Khovanskii. Completions of convex families of convex bodies. *Mathematical Notes*, 91(3):440–458, 2012.
- [KM40] Matk G. Krein and David P. Milman. On extreme points of regular convex sets. *Studia Mathematica*, 9:133–138, 1940.
- [KM94] Maxim Kontsevich and Yu Manin. Gromov-witten classes, quantum cohomology, and enumerative geometry. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 164(3):525–562, 1994.
- [Kol98] Alexander Koldobsky. Intersection bodies, positive definite distributions, and the Busemann-Petty problem. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 120(4):827–840, 1998.
- [Kol99] Alexander Koldobsky. A generalization of the busemann-petty problem on sections of convex bodies. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 110(1):75–91, 1999.

- [KPS17] Kaie Kubjas, Pablo A Parrilo, and Bernd Sturmfels. How to flatten a soccer ball. In *Homological and Computational Methods in Commutative Algebra*, volume 20 of *INdAM Ser.*, pages 141–162. Springer, 2017.
- [KW10] Jukka Kiukas and Reinhard F. Werner. Maximal violation of Bell inequalities by position measurements. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 51:072105, 2010.
- [Lan88] Lawrence J. Landau. Empirical two-point correlation functions. *Foundations of Physics*, 18:449–460, 1988.
- [Lau97] Monique Laurent. The real positive semidefinite completion problem for series-parallel graphs. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 252:347–366, 1997.
- [LM22] Antonio Lerario and Léo Mathis. On tameness of zonoids. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 282(4):109341, 2022.
- [LMS⁺21] Thinh P. Le, Chiara Meroni, Bernd Sturmfels, Reinhard F. Werner, and Timo Ziegler. Quantum correlations in the minimal scenario. *arXiv:2111.06270*, 2021.
- [LP95] Monique Laurent and Svatopluk Poljak. On a positive semidefinite relaxation of the cut polytope. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 223:439–461, 1995.
- [LRS10] Jesus De Loera, Joerg Rambau, and Francisco Santos. *Triangulations*. Springer-Verlag GmbH, August 2010.
- [Lud06] Monika Ludwig. Intersection bodies and valuations. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 128(6):1409–1428, 2006.
- [Lut88] Erwin Lutwak. Intersection bodies and dual mixed volumes. *Advances in Mathematics*, 71(2):232–261, 1988.
- [LVC19] Thinh P. Le, Antonios Varvitsiotis, and Yu Cai. Geometric structure of quantum correlators via semidefinite programming. *Physical Review A*, 99:052108, 2019.
- [Mar94] Horst Martini. Cross-sectional measures. In *Intuitive Geometry (Szeged, 1991)*, volume 63 of *Colloquia Mathematica Societatis János Bolyai*, pages 269–310. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1994.
- [Mas03] Lluis Masanes. Necessary and sufficient condition for quantum-generated correlations. *arXiv:quant-ph/0309137*, 2003.
- [Mas05] Lluis Masanes. Extremal quantum correlations for n parties with two dichotomic observables per site. *arXiv:quant-ph/0512100*, 2005.
- [MM21] Léo Mathis and Chiara Meroni. Fiber Convex Bodies. *arXiv:2105.12406*, 2021. Discrete & Computational Geometry: to appear.
- [Mot57] Theodore S. Motzkin. Comonotone curves and polyhedra. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 63:35, 1957.
- [MS21] Mateusz Michałek and Bernd Sturmfels. *Invitation to Nonlinear Algebra*, volume 211 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. AMS, 2021.
- [Mum95] David Mumford. *Algebraic geometry. I: Complex projective varieties*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995. Reprint of the 1976 edition in Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 221.

- [NPA08] Miguel Navascués, Stefano Pironio, and Antonio Acín. A convergent hierarchy of semidefinite programs characterizing the set of quantum correlations. *New Journal of Physics*, 10:073013, 2008.
- [ORSV15] John Ottem, Kristian Ranestad, Bernd Sturmfels, and Cynthia Vinzant. Quartic spectrahedra. *Mathematical Programming, Series B*, 151:585–612, 2015.
- [OSC22] Oscar – open source computer algebra research system, version 0.8.1-dev, 2022.
- [Pan97] Rahul Pandharipande. The canonical class of $M_{0,n}(\mathbb{P}^r, d)$ and enumerative geometry. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 1997(4):173–186, 1997.
- [PIM22] Jaume de Dios Pont, Paata Ivanisvili, and José Madrid. The convex hull of space curves with totally positive torsion. *arXiv:2201.12932*, 2022.
- [PSW21] Daniel Plaumann, Rainer Sinn, and Jannik L. Wesner. Families of faces and the normal cycle of a convex semi-algebraic set. *arXiv:2104.13306*, 2021.
- [Ren06] James Renegar. Hyperbolic programs, and their derivative relaxations. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 6:59–79, 2006.
- [RG17] Pierre Roussillon and Joan Alexis Glaunès. Surface matching using normal cycles. In *International Conference on Geometric Science of Information*, pages 73–80. Springer, 2017.
- [RS10] Philipp Rostalski and Bernd Sturmfels. Dualities in convex algebraic geometry. *Rendiconti di Mathematica*, 30:285–327, 2010.
- [RS11] Kristian Ranestad and Bernd Sturmfels. The convex hull of a variety. In Petter Brändén, Mikael Passare, and Mihai Putinar, editors, *Notions of Positivity and the Geometry of Polynomials*, pages 331–344. Springer Verlag, Basel, 2011.
- [RS12] Kristian Ranestad and Bernd Sturmfels. On the convex hull of a space curve. *Advances in Geometry*, 12(1):157–178, 2012.
- [Rus16] Francesco Russo. *On the geometry of some special projective varieties*. Lecture Notes of the Unione Matematica Italiana. Springer Cham, 2016.
- [Sag21] The Sage Developers. *SageMath, the Sage Mathematics Software System (Version 9.2)*, 2021. <https://www.sagemath.org>.
- [San13] Raman Sanyal. On the derivative cones of polyhedral cones. *Advances in Geometry*, 13(2):315–321, 2013.
- [SBV⁺21] Pavel Sekatski, Jean-Daniel Bancal, Xavier Valcarce, Ernest Y. Z. Tan, Renato Renner, and Nicolas Sangouard. Device-independent quantum key distribution from generalized CHSH inequalities. *Quantum*, 5:444, 2021.
- [Sch70] Rolf Schneider. Über eine Integralgleichung in der Theorie der konvexen Körper. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 44:55–75, 1970.
- [Sch13] Rolf Schneider. *Convex Bodies: The Brunn–Minkowski Theory*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 2 edition, 2013.
- [Sch18a] Claus Scheiderer. Semidefinite representation for convex hulls of real algebraic curves. *SIAM Journal on Applied Algebra and Geometry*, 2(1):1–25, 2018.

- [Sch18b] Claus Scheiderer. Spectrahedral shadows. *SIAM Journal on Applied Algebra and Geometry*, 2(1):26–44, 2018.
- [SGP⁺21] René Schwonnek, Koon Tong Goh, Ignatius W. Primaatmaja, Ernest Y. Z. Tan, Ramona Wolf, Valerio Scarani, and Charles C. W. Lim. Device-Independent Quantum Key Distribution with Random Key Basis. *Nature Communications*, 12, 2021.
- [Sin14] Rainer Sinn. *Algebraic Boundaries of Convex Semi-Algebraic Sets*. PhD thesis, Universität Konstanz, Konstanz, 2014.
- [Sin15] Rainer Sinn. Algebraic Boundaries of Convex Semi-Algebraic Sets. *Research in the Mathematical Sciences*, 2:3, 2015.
- [SKK73] Mikio Sato, Takahiro Kawai, and Masaki Kashiwara. *Microfunctions and pseudo-differential equations*, volume 6 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 264–524. Springer, 1973.
- [SLC⁺19] Kehua Su, Na Lei, Wei Chen, Li Cui, Hang Si, Shikui Chen, and Xianfeng Gu. Curvature adaptive surface remeshing by sampling normal cycle. *Computer-Aided Design*, 111:1–12, 2019.
- [Slo19] William Slofstra. The set of quantum correlations is not closed. *Forum of Mathematics, Pi*, 7:e1, 2019.
- [SS19] Anna-Laura Sattelberger and Bernd Sturmfels. D-modules and holonomic functions. *arXiv:1910.01395*, 2019. In the volume Varieties, polyhedra, computation of EMS Series of Congress Reports: to appear.
- [Sta07] Richard Stanley. An introduction to hyperplane arrangements. In *Geometric Combinatorics*, pages 389–496. American Mathematical Society, October 2007.
- [Stu87] Bernd Sturmfels. Cyclic polytopes and d-order curves. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 24(1):103–107, 1987.
- [Stu21] Bernd Sturmfels. Twenty Facets of Convex Bodies. Available at https://www.mis.mpg.de/fileadmin/pdf/exercises_congeo21_5016.pdf, 2021.
- [SW83] Rolf Schneider and Wolfgang Weil. Zonoids and related topics. *Convexity and its Applications*, pages 296–317, 1983.
- [SY08] Bernd Sturmfels and Josephine Yu. Tropical implicitization and mixed fiber polytopes. In *Software for algebraic geometry*, pages 111–131. Springer, 2008.
- [TSB⁺20] Ernest Y. Z. Tan, Pavel Sekatski, Jean-Daniel Bancal, René Schwonnek, Renato Renner, Nicolas Sangouard, and Charles C. W. Lim. Improved DIQKD protocols with finite-size analysis. *arXiv:2012.08714*, 2020.
- [TSG⁺21] Ernest Y. Z. Tan, René Schwonnek, Koon Tong Goh, Ignatius William Primaatmaja, and Charles C. W. Lim. Computing secure key rates for quantum cryptography with untrusted devices. *npj Quantum Information*, 7(158), 2021.
- [Tsi80] Boris S. Tsirelson. Quantum generalizations of Bell’s inequality. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 4:93–100, 1980.

- [Tsi87] Boris S. Tsirelson. Quantum analogues of the Bell inequalities. the case of two spatially separated domains. *Journal of Soviet Mathematics*, 36:557–570, 1987.
- [TZ06] Wojciech Tadej and Karol Życzkowski. A concise guide to complex Hadamard matrices. *Open Systems & Information Dynamics*, 13:133–177, 2006.
- [Vai95] Israel Vainsencher. Enumeration of n -fold tangent hyperplanes to a surface. *Journal of Algebraic Geometry*, 4(3):503–526, 1995.
- [Vit91] Richard A. Vitale. Expected absolute random determinants and zonoids. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 1(2):293–300, 1991.
- [VW01] Karl G. H. Vollbrecht and Reinhard F. Werner. Entanglement measures under symmetry. *Physical Review A*, 64:062307, 2001.
- [Wei77] Wolfgang Weil. Blaschkes Problem der lokalen Charakterisierung von Zonoiden. *Archiv der Mathematik*, 29(1):655–659, 1977.
- [Wei82] Wolfgang Weil. Zonoide und verwandte Klassen konvexer Körper. *Monatshefte für Mathematik*, 94(1):73–84, 1982.
- [Wik21] Wikipedia contributors. Quantum key distribution — Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Quantum_key_distribution&oldid=1049733050, 2021. [Online; accessed 25-October-2021].
- [Win82] Peter Wintgen. Normal cycle and integral curvature for polyhedra in Riemannian manifolds. In Gy. Soos and J. Szente, editors, *Differential Geometry*, volume 31 of *Colloquia mathematica Societatis Janos Bolyai*, pages 805–816. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982.
- [WR] Wolfram Research, Inc., Mathematica, Version 12.0. Champaign, IL, 2019.
- [WW01] Reinhard F. Werner and Michael M. Wolf. All multipartite Bell correlation inequalities for two dichotomic observables per site. *Physical Review A*, 64:032112, 2001.
- [WWS16] Yukun Wang, Xingyao Wu, and Valerio Scarani. All the self-testings of the singlet for two binary measurements. *New Journal of Physics*, 18:025021, 2016.
- [Yan11] Nikos Yannakakis. Stampacchia’s property, self-duality and orthogonality relations. *Set-Valued and Variational Analysis*, 19:555–567, 2011.
- [Zäh86] Martina Zähle. Integral and current representation of Federer’s curvature measures. *Archiv der Mathematik*, 46:557–567, 1986.
- [Zei90] Doron Zeilberger. A holonomic systems approach to special functions identities. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 32(3):321–368, 1990.
- [Zha99a] Gaoyong Zhang. Intersection bodies and polytopes. *Mathematika*, 46(1):29–34, 1999.
- [Zha99b] Gaoyong Zhang. A positive solution to the Busemann-Petty problem in \mathbb{R}^4 . *Annals of Mathematics. Second Series*, 149(2):535–543, 1999.
- [Zie95] Günter M Ziegler. *Lectures on polytopes*, volume 152 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer Verlag, New York, 1995. Revised edition, 1998; seventh updated printing 2007.

Bibliographische Daten

Semialgebraic Convex Bodies
(Semialgebraische konvexe Körper)
Meroni, Chiara
Universität Leipzig, Dissertation, 2022
155 Seiten,
39 Abbildungen,
148 Referenzen

Selbstständigkeitserklärung

Hiermit erkläre ich, die vorliegende Dissertation selbstständig und ohne unzulässige fremde Hilfe angefertigt zu haben. Ich habe keine anderen als die angeführten Quellen und Hilfsmittel benutzt und sämtliche Textstellen, die wörtlich oder sinngemäß aus veröffentlichten oder unveröffentlichten Schriften entnommen wurden, und alle Angaben, die auf mündlichen Auskünften beruhen, als solche kenntlich gemacht. Ebenfalls sind alle von anderen Personen bereitgestellten Materialien oder erbrachten Dienstleistungen als solche gekennzeichnet.

Leipzig, den June 15, 2022

.....
(Chiara Meroni)

Daten zum Autor

Name: Chiara Meroni
Geburtsdatum: 22.01.1996 in Gorizia (Italien)

10/2015 - 7/2018 B.Sc. in Mathematik
Universität Trieste

10/2018 - 7/2020 M.Sc. in Mathematik
Universität Trieste

seit 10/2020 Doktorandin der Mathematik