

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

RELATIVE WIDTH MEASURES AND THE PLANK PROBLEM

RICHARD JOHN GARDNER

RELATIVE WIDTH MEASURES AND THE PLANK PROBLEM

R. J. GARDNER

A relative width measure in a convex body K in \mathbf{R}^n for a set Θ of directions is a Borel probability measure in K such that the measure of the intersection of K with each slab orthogonal to a direction in Θ is equal to the relative width of the slab. Such measures are studied in connection with the unsolved plank problem of Th. Bang.

0. Introduction. Tarski's plank problem was solved by Th. Bang [2] when he showed that if a convex body K in \mathbf{R}^n is covered by a finite number of slabs, the sum of their widths is at least the minimum width of K . Bang conjectured that a stronger, and affine invariant, inequality should hold; namely, that the sum of the relative widths of the slabs is at least one (the relative width of a slab is its width divided by the width of K in the same direction). This is still unsolved.

A relative width measure is a Borel probability measure in K such that the measure of the intersection of K with any slab is precisely the relative width of the slab. An example, known to Archimedes, is normalized surface area measure in a ball in \mathbf{R}^3 ; another is the projection of this measure, normalized, in a disc in \mathbf{R}^2 . If such a measure exists in K , then Bang's conjecture is true for K . This observation has been made several times in the literature, but does not seem to have been thoroughly investigated.

We study these measures, always with Bang's conjecture in mind. For this application, the measures need only have the relative width property for directions corresponding to the covering slabs, and in fact a reduction shows that we need only seek them for coordinate directions. Theorem 1 shows that measures with the latter property always exist in \mathbf{R}^2 , which generalizes the known special case of Bang's conjecture for two slabs. However, Example 2 shows that even measures with this weaker property do not generally exist for K in \mathbf{R}^3 .

Section 3 concerns measures with the relative width property for infinite sets of directions. Here, using Fourier transform techniques and particularly a method due to K. Falconer, we show (Theorem 3) that measures with the relative width property for all directions do

not exist in the ball in \mathbf{R}^n for $n > 3$. (After this paper was written, I learned that G. Schwarz also proves this in [23].) In Theorem 4 we refine this result, and show that those in the disc in \mathbf{R}^2 and ball in \mathbf{R}^3 are essentially the only such measures. Sufficiently 'large' infinite sets of directions also guarantee uniqueness of relative width measures, while in §4 we show that in \mathbf{R}^2 and \mathbf{R}^3 finite sets of directions do not.

I thank Don Chakerian for many stimulating and helpful discussions on Bang's plank problem, and for providing some useful references; and L. Zalcman for supplying the case $n = 3$ of Theorem 5.

1. Relative width measures and the plank problem. We shall write $\text{int } E$ and ∂E for the interior and boundary of a set E , respectively.

Suppose K is a compact convex set in \mathbf{R}^n , and θ is a direction (which we identify throughout with the corresponding unit vector in \mathbf{R}^n). We denote by $W(K, \theta)$ the *width* of K in the direction θ ; that is, the distance between two hyperplanes which are orthogonal to θ and which support K . If K is a fixed compact convex set, and H is a convex set, the *relative width* of H in the direction θ , when $W(K, \theta) \neq 0$, is

$$w(H, \theta) = W(H \cap K, \theta) / W(K, \theta).$$

A *slab* orthogonal to θ is the closed set between two hyperplanes which are orthogonal to θ .

A *measure* is a non-negative set function, assumed countably additive unless otherwise stated. Let μ be a Borel probability measure in the compact convex set K , and let Θ be a set of directions. We say that μ is a *relative width measure* in K for Θ if

$$\mu(S \cap K) = w(S, \theta)$$

whenever S is a slab orthogonal to some $\theta \in \Theta$.

Suppose now that $\Theta = \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k\}$ is a finite set of directions, K is a compact convex set in \mathbf{R}^n and S_i is a slab orthogonal to θ_i , $1 \leq i \leq k$. If $K \subset \bigcup_i S_i$, is it true that $\sum_i w(S_i, \theta_i) \geq 1$? This is Bang's plank problem (see [3]). It is an affine invariant form of Tarski's plank problem [24], solved by Bang in [2] when he showed that the weaker inequality

$$(1) \quad \sum_i W(S_i \cap K, \theta_i) \geq \min_{\theta} \{W(K, \theta)\}$$

holds.

It is not a new observation that relative width measures are relevant to Bang's plank problem. This has essentially been noted by G. Hajós

and A. Rényi [20], D. Ohmann [17] and J. W. Green [12], among others. For, if μ is a relative width measure in K for $\Theta = \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k\}$, then

$$(2) \quad \sum_i \mu(S_i \cap K) \geq \mu(K) = 1 \Rightarrow \sum_i w(S_i, \theta_i) \geq 1,$$

as required.

Since there seems to be some confusion about the status of Bang's problem, we shall briefly survey attempts to solve it. In [17], D. Ohmann shows that it suffices to consider a convex body K in \mathbf{R}^n covered by n slabs S_1, \dots, S_n , with S_i orthogonal to the i th coordinate axis. Further, a *signed* relative width measure is constructed in K for these directions, but this is not enough for the implication (2), even when $\mu(S_i \cap K) > 0$ for each i . These and other remarks on the problem may be found in [4], where it is also shown that Bang's conjecture is true for covers of K by two slabs. Other proofs of this special case are given in [1] and [15].

Let l_i be the length of the longest chord of K parallel to θ_i , $i = 1, \dots, k$. Then Bang's proof actually shows that $\sum_i W(S_i \cap K)/l_i \geq 1$, which is stronger than (1). According to a translation, the paper [14] in Chinese only confirms this result, despite its title. Another attempt in [18] breaks down; the error is pinpointed in the review by C. A. Rogers cited under [18].

Lastly, we note variations in the proof of Bang's result ([6], [10], special cases in [7], [9]) and the interesting paper of R. Alexander [1] which relates Bang's problem for K a square to an unsolved problem of Davenport.

We begin by considering those properties of μ necessary to derive (2). We actually only need μ to be finitely additive and to satisfy $\mu(S \cap K) \leq w(S, \theta)$ for each slab S orthogonal to θ . Assuming only this, we note that the support of μ must lie in K for a straightforward application to the plank problem. For if $K \subset \mathbf{R}^2$, Θ contains at least two directions, and $\mu(\mathbf{R}^2 - K) > 0$, it is easy to find slabs S_1 and S_2 orthogonal to any two of these directions such that $K \subset S_1 \cup S_2$ and $\mu(S_1 \cup S_2) = c < 1$, from which we can only deduce that $c \leq w(S_1, \theta_1) + w(S_2, \theta_2)$. Now the first two lemmas show that we lose no generality in making our other stronger assumptions on μ .

LEMMA 1. *Suppose μ is a finitely additive Borel probability measure in K , such that $\mu(S \cap K) \leq w(S, \theta)$ for all slabs S orthogonal to θ . Then $\mu(S \cap K) = w(S, \theta)$ for all such slabs.*

Proof. Let S_1 be any slab orthogonal to θ . We can find two disjoint slabs S_2 and S_3 , both orthogonal to θ , with $K \subset \bigcup_i S_i$ and $\sum_i w(S_i, \theta) = 1$. Then

$$1 \leq \sum_i \mu(S_i \cap K) \leq \mu(S_1 \cap K) + w(S_2, \theta) + w(S_3, \theta),$$

so $\mu(S_1 \cap K) \geq 1 - w(S_2, \theta) - w(S_3, \theta) = w(S_1, \theta)$, giving $\mu(S_1 \cap K) = w(S_1, \theta)$ as required.

LEMMA 2. *Suppose μ is a finitely additive probability measure in K , defined on the algebra \mathcal{A} generated by sets $S \cap K$, where S is a slab orthogonal to θ , and θ belongs to a fixed set Θ of directions. Suppose also that $\mu(S \cap K) = w(S, \theta)$ for such sets. Then μ can be extended to a relative width measure in K for Θ .*

Proof. Let $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^m A_i$, where for each i there is a polytope P_i such that

$$(\text{int } P_i) \cap K \subset A_i \subset P_i \cap K,$$

and moreover for each face of P_i there is a $\theta \in \Theta$ such that this face is orthogonal to θ .

For each i , let H_i be a finite union of open slabs, each orthogonal to some $\theta \in \Theta$, such that

$$P_i - \text{int } P_i \subset H_i,$$

and the sum of the relative widths of the slabs in H_i is less than ε/m .

Let $C_i = (P_i - H_i) \cap K$ for each i , and $C = \bigcup_{i=1}^m C_i$. Then C is compact, $C \subset A$, and

$$\mu(C) \geq \mu\left(\bigcup_i P_i \cap K\right) - \mu\left(\bigcup_i H_i \cap K\right) > \mu(A) - \varepsilon,$$

where we have used the fact that $P_i \cap K$, $H_i \cap K$ and C all belong to \mathcal{A} .

This shows that μ is inner regular on \mathcal{A} with respect to the compact sets. By Henry's extension theorem [22, p. 51, Theorem 16], μ can be extended to a countably additive Borel measure.

REMARKS. (i) The extension provided by Henry's theorem is unique if the algebra \mathcal{A} contains a base for the topology of \mathbf{R}^n . This will be the case if Θ contains n linearly independent directions. However,

even if \mathcal{A} does contain a base, there may be more than one relative width measure in K for Θ (see Theorem 5).

(ii) Given any set Θ of directions, we may of course define μ on the sets $S \cap K$ of Lemma 2 by $\mu(S \cap K) = w(S, \theta)$. However, μ may not extend to the algebra \mathcal{A} ; Example 1 shows this.

2. Existence of relative width measures. Here and throughout λ denotes linear Lebesgue measure in \mathbf{R}^n .

Suppose K is a convex body in \mathbf{R}^n and θ is a direction. Let l be a chord of K meeting the two supporting hyperplanes to K which are orthogonal to θ . Define μ in K by $\mu(B) = \lambda(B \cap l) / \lambda(l)$. Clearly μ is a relative width measure in K for $\{\theta\}$.

If μ is a relative width measure in K for Θ , and ϕ is a nonsingular affine transformation, there is a corresponding relative width measure in $\phi(K)$. Define $\mu\phi^{-1}$ on $\phi(K)$ by

$$(\mu\phi^{-1})(B) = \mu(\phi^{-1}(B))$$

for each Borel set B in $\phi(K)$. If $\theta \in \Theta$, and H is a hyperplane orthogonal to θ , then $\phi(H)$ is a hyperplane orthogonal to some direction θ' . If $\Theta' = \{\theta' : \theta \in \Theta\}$, it is easy to see that $\mu\phi^{-1}$ is a relative width measure in $\phi(K)$ for Θ' .

THEOREM 1. *Let K be a convex body in \mathbf{R}^n and θ_1, θ_2 two directions. Then there is a relative width measure in K for $\{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$.*

Proof. If $n > 2$, let P be the span of the directions θ_1 and θ_2 , and let Ψ denote projection onto P . Let E be any Borel subset of K for which Ψ is a bijection from E to $\Psi(K)$ (such a set exists; see [16, 4D.13]). If μ is a relative width measure in $\Psi(K)$ for $\{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$, define $\tilde{\mu}$ in K by

$$\tilde{\mu}(B) = \mu(\Psi(B \cap E))$$

for Borel sets $B \subset K$. Then $\tilde{\mu}$ is a relative width measure in K for $\{\theta_1, \theta_2\}$. So it suffices to consider the case $n = 2$.

By using an affine transformation, and the remarks preceding this theorem, we may assume that θ_1 and θ_2 are parallel to the coordinate axes, and K is contained in the unit square I and meets all its sides. Let a_1, a_2 be the x -coordinates of any two points in the intersections of ∂K with the bottom and top sides of I , respectively, and b_1, b_2 the y -coordinates of any two points in the intersections of ∂K with the right and left sides of I , respectively. The four points so obtained

form the vertices of a quadrilateral $Q \subset K$ (which may degenerate to a triangle).

We consider two cases.

Case (i) $b_1 \leq b_2$ and $a_1 \leq a_2$, or $b_1 \geq b_2$ and $a_1 \geq a_2$. Let l_i , $1 \leq i \leq 4$, be the sides of Q (which cannot in this case be degenerate) labelled clockwise with l_1 the segment joining the points $(a_1, 0)$ and $(0, b_2)$. Let m be the line segment joining the points (a_1, b_1) and (a_2, b_2) . For Borel sets B in K define

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(B) = & [a_1 b_2 \lambda(B \cap l_1) / \lambda(l_1)] + [a_2(1 - b_2) \lambda(B \cap l_2) / \lambda(l_2)] \\ & + [(1 - a_2)(1 - b_1) \lambda(B \cap l_3) / \lambda(l_3)] \\ & + [(1 - a_1)b_1 \lambda(B \cap l_4) / \lambda(l_4)] \\ & + [(a_2 - a_1)(b_2 - b_1) \lambda(B \cap m) / \lambda(m)]. \end{aligned}$$

Of course, μ is the sum of suitable multiples of λ restricted to the line segments l_i and m . To check that μ is a relative width measure in K for the coordinate directions is now simply a matter of computation.

Case (ii) $b_1 \geq b_2$ and $a_2 \geq a_1$ (or $b_1 \leq b_2$ and $a_2 \leq a_1$). Let l_i , $1 \leq i \leq 4$, be the sides of Q as in Case (i). Since m may not be contained in Q , and even if it is, μ as defined above does not work, we use instead the two diagonals d_1 (joining $(a_1, 0)$ and $(a_2, 1)$) and d_2 (joining $(0, b_2)$ and $(1, b_1)$).

We seek non-negative multiples α_i and β_j of λ normalized on l_i and d_j , respectively, such that the sum of these measures is the required relative width measure.

Assuming $b_1 \geq b_2$ and $a_2 \geq a_1$, and considering slabs of the form $\{(x, y): 0 \leq x \leq c, c \leq a_1\}$ we see that the equation

$$\frac{\alpha_1}{a_1} + \frac{\alpha_2}{a_2} + \beta_2 = 1$$

must be satisfied. Slabs of the form $\{(x, y): a_1 \leq x \leq c, c \leq a_2\}$ and $\{(x, y): a_2 \leq x \leq c, c \leq 1\}$ yield similar equations, and we obtain three more by looking at horizontal slabs. In addition, we require

$$\sum \alpha_i + \sum \beta_j = 1$$

for a probability measure.

The equations can be solved by setting $\beta_1 = 0$ or $\beta_2 = 0$. If $\beta_1 = 0$, we obtain:

$$\alpha_1 = a_1 b_1 b_2 / \Delta_1,$$

$$\alpha_2 = a_2 (1 - b_1)(1 - b_2) / \Delta_2,$$

$$\alpha_3 = (1 - a_2)(1 - b_1)(1 - b_2) / \Delta_2,$$

$$\alpha_4 = (1 - a_1) b_1 b_2 / \Delta_1 \quad \text{and}$$

$$\beta_2 = (b_1 - b_2)(a_1 b_1 (1 - b_2) - a_2 b_2 (1 - b_1) - a_1 a_2 (b_1 - b_2)) / \Delta_1 \cdot \Delta_2,$$

where $\Delta_1 = b_2 + a_1(b_1 - b_2)$ and $\Delta_2 = (1 - a_2)(b_1 - b_2) + (1 - b_1)$.

These are the solutions if the second factor Γ_2 in the numerator of β_2 is non-negative. If not, we set $\beta_2 = 0$, obtaining solutions for α_i from those above by interchanging a_1 and b_2 , a_2 and b_1 , and α_2 and α_4 . We also get

$$\beta_1 = (a_2 - a_1)(a_2 b_2 (1 - a_1) - a_1 b_1 (1 - a_2) - b_1 b_2 (a_2 - a_1)) / \Delta'_1 \cdot \Delta'_2,$$

where Δ'_i is the expression corresponding to Δ_i . Denoting the second factor in the numerator of β_1 by Γ_1 , we see that $\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 = 0$, so that $\beta_1 > 0$ if $\Gamma_2 < 0$.

If $a_1 = a_2$ and $b_1 = b_2$, we solve as in Case (i). Degenerate cases where Q reduces to a triangle may be solved as above, and here the measure is supported by the boundary of the triangle.

It follows that Bang's conjecture is true for two slabs, and so Theorem 1 can be regarded as a generalization of this known result. In fact, only Case (i) of Theorem 1 is needed for this. To see this, suppose $K \subset S_1 \cup S_2$, where S_1 and S_2 are slabs orthogonal to the coordinate axes. Let $R = S_1 \cap S_2$, and let Q be the quadrilateral obtained by drawing tangent lines to the convex hull of K and R at the vertices of R . Now $Q \subset S_1 \cup S_2$, and we may assume Q is inscribed in the unit square. Then Q is as in Case (i) of Theorem 1. Since Q is wider than K in the coordinate directions, the existence of a relative width measure in Q gives the result for K .

In fact, the measure from Case (i) of Theorem 1 was found by analyzing the proof of Bang's conjecture for two slabs in [15].

In view of the difficulty of finding a relative width measure in K for two directions, it is surprising that there are convex bodies which have relative width measures for *all* directions; namely, the ellipses in \mathbf{R}^2 and ellipsoids in \mathbf{R}^3 (see Theorem 3). It would perhaps be unreasonable to expect all convex bodies to support such measures, but the point is that by Ohmann's reduction of Bang's problem, we

only require a relative width measure in a convex body K in \mathbf{R}^n for the n coordinate directions. However, we show in Example 2 that this may not exist, even when $n = 3$.

The proof of the following lemma is a slightly modified version of ([8], Theorem 3), due to K. Falconer, which deals only with absolutely continuous μ .

LEMMA 3. *Suppose K is a compact convex set in \mathbf{R}^n , Θ is a set of directions, and μ is a relative width measure in K for Θ . Let the centroid of K with respect to the density $d\mu$ be at the origin, and the support function of K be $k(\theta)$. Then there is a second-degree homogeneous polynomial $p(\theta)$ such that $k^2(\theta) = p(\theta)$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$.*

Proof. Let $\theta \in \Theta$, let L be the line through the origin in the direction θ , and suppose that ν is the projection of μ on L . Since μ is a relative width measure in K for $\{\theta\}$, we have

$$\nu = (k(\theta) + k(-\theta))^{-1} \lambda_L,$$

where λ_L is λ restricted to L . Now if f is a 'ridge function'—a function on K which depends only on $x \cdot \theta = t$ for all $x \in K$ —then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_K f(x) d\mu(x) &= \int_{-k(-\theta)}^{k(\theta)} f(t) d\nu(t) \\ &= (k(\theta) + k(-\theta))^{-1} \int_{-k(-\theta)}^{k(\theta)} f(t) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since the centroid of K with respect to $d\mu$ is at the origin, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left[\int_K x d\mu(x) \right] \cdot \theta = \int_K (x \cdot \theta) d\mu(x) \\ &= (k(\theta) + k(-\theta))^{-1} \int_{-k(-\theta)}^{k(\theta)} t dt, \end{aligned}$$

giving $k(\theta) = k(-\theta)$.

Taking second moments, we get

$$\int_K (x \cdot \theta)^2 d\mu(x) = (k(\theta) + k(-\theta))^{-1} \int_{-k(-\theta)}^{k(\theta)} t^2 dt = k^2(\theta)/3.$$

The left-hand side is a second-degree homogeneous polynomial in $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n)$, giving the result.

EXAMPLE 1. A convex body T in \mathbf{R}^2 with no relative width measure for a certain set of three directions.

Let T be the triangle with vertices at the origin, $(0, 1)$ and $(1, 0)$, and Θ the set of directions orthogonal to the edges of T . Suppose μ were a relative width measure in T for Θ , and let c be the centroid of T relative to $d\mu$. From Lemma 3 we require only the fact that if $t(\theta)$ is the support function of T with respect to c , then $t(\theta) = t(-\theta)$ for $\theta \in \Theta$. From the coordinate directions, we get $c = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, which contradicts $t(\theta) = t(-\theta)$ for θ orthogonal to the hypotenuse of T .

EXAMPLE 2. A convex body U in \mathbf{R}^3 with no relative width measure for the three coordinate directions.

Let U be the tetrahedron in \mathbf{R}^3 with vertices at the origin, $(1, 0, 0)$, $(0, 1, 0)$ and $(0, 0, 1)$. If a relative width measure μ with centroid c existed, then, as in Example 1, using the x - and y -directions, $c = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, a)$ for some $a \geq 0$. Since $c \in U$, $a = 0$, contradicting symmetry of the support function at c in the z -direction.

Many examples such as those above could be obtained in the same way. Let us note, however, that there are convex bodies in \mathbf{R}^3 without relative width measures for the coordinate directions, to which Lemma 3 cannot be applied. One such is the regular octahedron centered at the origin, with axes in the coordinate directions. This has all the required symmetry, and another proof is needed to show that there is no measure; we omit this here. Despite the non-existence of a relative width measure for this regular octahedron or for the tetrahedron in Example 2, Bang's conjecture is true for 3 slabs covering these polyhedra orthogonal to the coordinate directions. To see this, apply Bang's theorem in its stronger form mentioned in §1.

3. Existence and uniqueness for infinite Θ . In this section we apply Fourier transform techniques to study the existence and uniqueness of relative width measures in convex bodies for infinite sets of directions.

THEOREM 2. *Let K be a compact convex set in \mathbf{R}^n , and Θ a (necessarily infinite) set of directions with the property that each analytic function on \mathbf{R}^n vanishing on each line through the origin parallel to some $\theta \in \Theta$, is identically zero. Then if μ is a relative width measure in K for Θ , μ is unique.*

Proof. Suppose μ_i , $i = 1, 2$, are relative width measures in K for Θ . Let $\hat{\mu}_i$ be the Fourier transform of μ_i . Then for $d \in \mathbf{R}^n$ with $d/|d| = \theta \in \Theta$ and $x \cdot \theta = t$, we have

$$\hat{\mu}_i(d) = \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} e^{-ix \cdot d} d\mu_i(x) = (k(\theta) + k(-\theta))^{-1} \int_{-k(-\theta)}^{k(\theta)} e^{-i|d|t} dt,$$

as in the proof of Lemma 3, since $e^{-ix \cdot d}$ is a ridge function. Here we are assuming that K contains the origin, and $k(\theta)$ is the support function of K . It follows that $\hat{\mu}_1(d) = \hat{\mu}_2(d)$ for each d on a line through the origin parallel to some $\theta \in \Theta$. It is known (see [5, p. 272]) that $\hat{\mu}_i$ is analytic, so by our assumptions $\hat{\mu}_1 - \hat{\mu}_2$ is identically zero. Since a measure is uniquely determined by its Fourier transform [5, Theorem 8.2.4], the result follows.

REMARK. In \mathbf{R}^2 , any infinite set of directions satisfies the conditions of Theorem 2. In \mathbf{R}^3 more is required, as easy examples show; however, a set of directions which is infinite in each of an infinite set of planes would do.

The following result was first proved in [23], in the language of probability theory.

THEOREM 3. *There is a relative width measure ν_n^λ in the unit ball B^n in \mathbf{R}^n for the unit sphere, S^{n-1} , the set of all directions, if and only if $n = 2$ or 3.*

Proof. Let $d \in \mathbf{R}^n$, $d/|d| = \theta$ and $x \cdot \theta = t$. Then the Fourier transform $\hat{\nu}_n$ of ν_n must satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\nu}_n(d) &= \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} e^{-ix \cdot d} d\nu_n(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^1 e^{-i|d|t} \\ &= \begin{cases} (\sin |d|)/|d| & (|d| \neq 0), \\ 1 & (|d| = 0). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

For $n = 2$, this is the Fourier transform of the function

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} (1 - |x|^2)^{-1/2}/2\pi & (|x| < 1), \\ 0 & (|x| \geq 1), \end{cases}$$

so that ν_2 is the measure with this density function (and is therefore absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure in \mathbf{R}^2).

For $n = 3$, it is known (see, for example, [11, p. 199]) that $\hat{\nu}_3$ is the Fourier transform of the distribution $\delta(|x| - 1)/4\pi$, so that ν_3 is normalized surface area measure in B^3 .

If $n > 3$, the Fourier transform of $\hat{\nu}_n$ is known, since it appears in the solution of the wave equation [11, pp. 197-9], and is a distribution of higher order and not a measure. However, a more straightforward way to see that no measure exists for $n > 3$ is as follows. Suppose ν_n to exist, and let μ be the projection of ν_n onto any 3-dimensional

coordinate plane L , so that for Borel sets B in L , we have $\mu(B) = \nu_n(B \times \mathbf{R}^{n-3})$. Then μ is a relative width measure in B^3 for S^2 , so that $\mu = \nu_3$ by Theorem 2. By the above, the support of ν_3 lies in S^2 , so the support of ν_n is contained in $(S^2 \times \mathbf{R}^{n-3}) \cap B^n$, which lies in $\mathbf{R}^3 \times \{0\}$, and hence in a coordinate hyperplane. This is impossible, since ν_n must vanish on each hyperplane.

The above theorem uses ideas of K. Falconer [8, Theorem 3] for $n = 2$ and 3. The existence of ν_2 and ν_3 have long been known. Indeed, ν_2 is the projection of $(\nu_3/2)$, and that ν_3 has the right properties was observed by Archimedes!

THEOREM 4. *Let K be a convex body in \mathbf{R}^n , and Θ a set of directions as in Theorem 2. Suppose a relative width measure μ in K for Θ exists, the centroid of K with respect to $d\mu$ is at the origin, and $k(\theta)$ is the support function of K . Then K contains a line segment l , or a 2-dimensional ellipse E or a 3-dimensional ellipsoid E , such that $k(\theta)$ agrees with the support function of l or E , respectively, for $\theta \in \Theta$, and μ is either*

- (i) *normalized linear Lebesgue measure in l , or*
- (ii) *the canonical relative width measure in E obtained by a suitable affine transformation of ν_2 or ν_3 , respectively.*

Proof. Lemma 3 shows that $k^2(\theta) = p(\theta)$ for $\theta \in \Theta$, where $p(\theta)$ is a second-degree homogeneous polynomial in θ . It follows that $k(\theta)$ agrees with the support function of an m -dimensional ellipsoid for $\theta \in \Theta$, for some m with $1 \leq m \leq n$. (For the non-degenerate case $m = n$, the proof is given in [19, p. 825, second paragraph]. In the degenerate case, suppose $p(\theta)$ contains only the variables $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m$ for $m < n$. Then there is an m -dimensional ellipsoid E in \mathbf{R}^m whose support function $h(\theta)$ satisfies $h^2(\theta) = p(\theta)$. Now note that the support function of E regarded as a subset of \mathbf{R}^n is still $h(\theta)$.) By taking an affine transformation we may assume that this ellipsoid is B^m . Therefore μ has the relative width property in B^m for Θ , and even though the support of μ may a priori not lie inside B^m , we may use Theorems 2 and 3 to see that $m \leq 3$ and μ is an affine image of ν_2 in B^2 or ν_3 in B^3 ; except in the degenerate case $m = 1$, when $k(\theta)$ agrees with the support function of a line segment for $\theta \in \Theta$ and μ must be normalized linear Lebesgue measure on this segment (this is the case $n = 1$ in Theorem 3).

Since the support of μ must lie inside K , we see that K contains the line segment, ellipse or ellipsoid, completing the proof.

Theorem 4 goes quite far in characterizing relative width measures for infinite Θ . Although constraints are also placed on K , it need not actually be an ellipsoid. To see this, let Θ be an infinite set of directions in \mathbf{R}^2 which is sparse enough to allow the existence of a convex body K , containing B^2 but different from B^2 , such that for $\theta \in \Theta$, K and B^2 have common supporting lines parallel to θ .

4. Uniqueness for finite Θ . The results of §3 raise the question whether certain finite sets of directions might force uniqueness of the corresponding relative width measures. The next theorem uses a result from the theory of Radon transforms to show that this is not so, at least in dimensions two and three.

THEOREM 5. *Let $n = 2$ or 3 , and let Θ be a finite set of directions in \mathbf{R}^n . Then there are two different relative width measures in B^n for Θ .*

Proof. Let $n \geq 2$. Denote by $H(t, \theta)$ the hyperplane in \mathbf{R}^n orthogonal to θ at distance $|t|$ from the origin. By [13, Proposition 7.6], if K is any compact set there is a function f supported in K , infinitely differentiable on K and not identically zero, such that

$$\int_{H(t, \theta)} f(x) dm(x) = 0$$

for all t and $\theta \in \Theta$, where m is $(n-1)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure in the hyperplane $H(t, \theta)$.

To deal with the case $n = 2$, take $K = B^2$ and let f be any such function; then f is bounded, $|f(x)| \leq M$ say. Let $g(x)$ be the density function for the measure ν_2 (see Theorem 3), and note that $g(x) \geq (1/2\pi)$ for $x \in \text{int } B^2$. It follows that if we define

$$\mu(E) = \int_E (g(x) - (f(x)/2\pi M)) dx$$

for Borel sets E in B^2 , then μ is a Borel measure in B^2 which is different from ν_2 .

Let $\theta \in \Theta$, and let S be the slab orthogonal to θ bounded by the hyperplanes $H(t_1, \theta)$ and $H(t_2, \theta)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(S) &= \int_S g(x) dx - \frac{1}{2\pi M} \int_S f(x) dx \\ &= \nu_2(S) - \frac{1}{2\pi M} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_{H(t, \theta)} f(x) dm(x) dt = \nu_2(S), \end{aligned}$$

so that μ is a relative width measure in B^2 for Θ , as required.

Now let $n = 3$. If f is a spherical surface harmonic of order n on S^2 , and θ is a direction in \mathbf{R}^3 such that $f(\theta) = 0$, then

$$\int_{S^2 \cap H(t, \theta)} f d\lambda_t = 0,$$

where λ_t is normalized linear measure in the circle $S^2 \cap H(t, \theta)$. (This follows from [25, p. 100], which uses the expansion of f involving Legendre polynomials.) Suppose that $\Theta = \{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k\}$ is a finite set of directions. By [21, §18], the vector space of (pure) harmonics on S^2 of order n has dimension $2n + 1$. Therefore if $2n + 1 > k$, by linear algebra there is a spherical harmonic f of order n such that $f(\theta_i) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. If $|f| \leq M$ on S^2 and E is a Borel set in B^3 , we put

$$\mu(E) = \int_{E \cap S^2} (1 - f(x)/M) d\nu_3(x).$$

The proof that μ is a relative width measure in B^3 for Θ which is different from ν_3 now follows that from the case $n = 2$ above.

It remains open whether there is a relative width measure in B^n , $n \geq 4$, for the coordinate directions (or any finite set of directions).

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Alexander, *A problem about lines and ovals*, Amer. Math. Monthly, **75** (1968), 482-487.
- [2] Th. Bang, *On covering by parallel-strips*, Mat. Tidsskr. B, (1950), 49-53.
- [3] ———, *A solution of the "plank problem"*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **2** (1951), 990-993.
- [4] ———, *Some remarks on the union of convex bodies*, Tolfte Skand. Kongr., 1953, (1954), 5-11.
- [5] H. Bauer, *Probability Theory and Elements of Measure Theory*, Academic Press, London (1981).
- [6] M. Bognár, *On W. Fenchel's solution of the plank problem*, Acta. Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar., **12** (1961), 269-270.
- [7] H. G. Eggleston, *On triangles circumscribing plane convex sets*, J. London Math. Soc., **28** (1953), 36-46.
- [8] K. J. Falconer, *The determination of a function from its projections*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc., **85** (1979), 351-355.
- [9] ———, *Function space topologies defined by sectional integrals and applications to an extremal problem*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc., **87** (1980), 81-96.
- [10] W. Fenchel, *On Th. Bang's solution of the plank problem*, Mat. Tidsskr. B, (1951), 49-51.
- [11] I. M. Gel'fand and G. E. Shilov, *Generalized Functions*, Vol. I, Academic Press, New York (1964).

- [12] J. W. Green, *On the determination of a function in the plane by its integrals over straight lines*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **9** (1958), 758–762.
- [13] S. Helgason, *The Radon Transform*, Birkhäuser, Boston (1980).
- [14] T.-Y. Lee, J.-S. Lin, K.-C. Tong and M.-Y. Zhang, *A solution of Bang's "plank problem"*, (in Chinese), J. Chinese Math. Soc., **2** (1953), 139–143.
- [15] W. O. J. Moser, *On the relative widths of coverings by convex bodies*, Canad. Math. Bull., **1** (1958), 154.
- [16] Y. N. Moschovakis, *Descriptive Set Theory*, North-Holland, Amsterdam (1980).
- [17] D. Ohmann, *Eine Abschätzung für die Dicke bei Überdeckung durch konvexe Körper*, J. Reine Angew. Math., **190** (1952), 125–128.
- [18] ———, *Kurzer Beweis einer Abschätzung für die Breite bei Überdeckung durch konvexe Körper*, Arch. Math., **8** (1957), 150–152. (See the review in Zentralblatt für Math., **81** (1959), 165.)
- [19] C. M. Petty, *Surface area of a convex body under affine transformations*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **12** (1961), 824–828.
- [20] A. Rényi, *On projections of probability distributions*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar., **3** (1952), 131–142.
- [21] G. Sansone, *Orthogonal Functions*, Robert E. Kreiger Pub. Co., New York, 1977.
- [22] L. Schwartz, *Radon Measures on Arbitrary Topological Spaces and Cylindrical Measures*, Oxford Univ. Press, Bombay (1973).
- [23] Gideon Schwarz, *Multivariate distributions with uniformly distributed projections*, Annals of Probab., **13** (1985), 1371–1372.
- [24] A. Tarski, *Further remarks about the degree of equivalence of polygons*, (in Polish), Odbitka Z. Parametru., **2** (1932), 310–314.
- [25] P. Ungar, *Freak theorem about functions on a sphere*, J. London Math. Soc., **29** (1954), 100–103.

Received June 8, 1987 and in revised form October 25, 1987. Work done while visiting UC Davis, Davis, CA 95616, USA.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES
KING FAHD UNIVERSITY OF PETROLEUM & MINERALS
DHAHRAN 31261, SAUDI ARABIA

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

V. S. VARADARAJAN
(Managing Editor)
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90024
HERBERT CLEMENS
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84112
R. FINN
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

HERMANN FLASCHKA
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
VAUGHAN F. R. JONES
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720
STEVEN KERCKHOFF
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

ROBION KIRBY
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720
C. C. MOORE
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720
HAROLD STARK
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

R. ARENS E. F. BECKENBACH B. H. NEUMANN F. WOLF K. YOSHIDA
(1906-1982)

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA	UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA	UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY	STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA	UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO	UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY	WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its content or policies.

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Please do not use built up fractions in the text of the manuscript. However, you may use them in the displayed equations. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. In particular it should contain no bibliographic references. Please propose a heading for the odd numbered pages of less than 35 characters. Manuscripts, in triplicate, may be sent to any one of the editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Reviews, Index to Vol. 39. Supply name and address of author to whom proofs should be sent. All other communications should be addressed to the managing editor, or Elaine Barth, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024.

There are page-charges associated with articles appearing in the Pacific Journal of Mathematics. These charges are expected to be paid by the author's University, Government Agency or Company. If the author or authors do not have access to such Institutional support these charges are waived. Single authors will receive 50 free reprints; joint authors will receive a total of 100 free reprints. Additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is issued monthly as of January 1966. Regular subscription rate: \$190.00 a year (5 Vols., 10 issues). Special rate: \$95.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

Subscriptions, orders for numbers issued in the last three calendar years, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 969, Carmel Valley, CA 93924, U.S.A. Old back numbers obtainable from Kraus Periodicals Co., Route 100, Millwood, NY 10546.

The Pacific Journal of Mathematics at P.O. Box 969, Carmel Valley, CA 93924 (ISSN 0030-8730) publishes 5 volumes per year. Application to mail at Second-class postage rates is pending at Carmel Valley, California, and additional mailing offices. Postmaster: send address changes to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 969, Carmel Valley, CA 93924.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION
Copyright © 1988 by Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Waleed A. Al-Salam and Mourad Ismail, <i>q-beta integrals and the q-Hermite polynomials</i>	209
Johnny E. Brown, <i>On the Ilieff-Sendov conjecture</i>	223
Lawrence Jay Corwin and Frederick Paul Greenleaf, <i>Spectrum and multiplicities for restrictions of unitary representations in nilpotent Lie groups</i>	233
Robert Jay Daverman, <i>1-dimensional phenomena in cell-like mappings on 3-manifolds</i>	269
P. D. T. A. Elliott, <i>A localized Erdős-Wintner theorem</i>	287
Richard John Gardner, <i>Relative width measures and the plank problem</i>	299
F. Garibay, Peter Abraham Greenberg, L. Reséndis and Juan José Rivaud, <i>The geometry of sum-preserving permutations</i>	313
Shanyu Ji, <i>Uniqueness problem without multiplicities in value distribution theory</i>	323
Igal Megory-Cohen, <i>Finite-dimensional representation of classical crossed-product algebras</i>	349
Mirko Navara, Pavel Pták and Vladimír Rogalewicz, <i>Enlargements of quantum logics</i>	361
Claudio Nebbia, <i>Amenability and Kunze-Stein property for groups acting on a tree</i>	371
Chull Park and David Lee Skoug, <i>A simple formula for conditional Wiener integrals with applications</i>	381
Ronald Scott Irving and Brad Shelton, <i>Correction to: "Loewy series and simple projective modules in the category \mathcal{O}_S"</i>	395
Robert Tijdeman and Lian Xiang Wang, <i>Correction to: "Sums of products of powers of given prime numbers"</i>	396