

ON SHARP BOUNDS FOR MARGINAL DENSITIES OF PRODUCT MEASURES

BY

GALYNA LIVSHYTS

*School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology,
Atlanta, GA 30319, USA
e-mail: glivshyts6@math.gatech.edu*

AND

GRIGORIS PAOURIS

*Department of Mathematics (Mailstop 3368), Texas A&M University,
College Station, TX 77843-3368, USA
e-mail: grigoris@math.tamu.edu*

AND

PETER PIVOVAROV

*Mathematics Department, University of Missouri,
Columbia, MO 65211, USA
e-mail: pivovarovp@missouri.edu*

ABSTRACT

We discuss optimal constants in a recent result of Rudelson and Vershynin on marginal densities. We show that if f is a probability density on \mathbb{R}^n of the form $f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i)$, where each f_i is a density on \mathbb{R} , say bounded by one, then the density of any marginal $\pi_E(f)$ is bounded by $2^{k/2}$, where k is the dimension of E . The proof relies on an adaptation of Ball's approach to cube slicing, carried out for functions. Motivated by inequalities for dual affine quermassintegrals, we also prove an isoperimetric inequality for certain averages of the marginals of such f for which the cube is the extremal case.

Received July 28, 2015 and in revised form December 8, 2015

1. Introduction

In this note we present an alternate approach to a recent theorem of Rudelson and Vershynin on marginal densities of product measures [18]. To fix the notation, if f is a probability density on Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n and E is a subspace, the marginal density of f on E is defined by

$$\pi_E(f)(x) = \int_{E^\perp+x} f(y)dy \quad (x \in E).$$

In [18], it is proved that if $f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i)$, where each f_i is a density on \mathbb{R} , bounded by 1, then for any $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, and any subspace E of dimension k ,

$$(1.1) \quad \|\pi_E(f)\|_{L^\infty(E)}^{1/k} \leq C,$$

where C is an absolute constant.

In [18], it is pointed out that when $k = 1$, the constant C in (1.1) may be taken to be $\sqrt{2}$. This follows from a theorem of Rogozin [17], which reduces the problem to $f = \mathbb{1}_{Q_n}$ where $Q_n = [-1/2, 1/2]^n$ is the unit cube, together with Ball’s theorem [1], [2] on slices of Q_n . More precisely, one can formulate Rogozin’s Theorem as follows: if θ is a unit vector with linear span $[\theta]$, then

$$(1.2) \quad \|\pi_{[\theta]}(f)\|_{L^\infty([\theta])} \leq \|\pi_{[\theta]}(\mathbb{1}_{Q_n})\|_{L^\infty([\theta])}$$

for any f in the class

$$\mathcal{F}_n = \left\{ f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i) : \|f_i\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq 1 = \|f_i\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}, i = 1, \dots, n \right\}.$$

By definition of the marginal density and the Brunn–Minkowski inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi_{[\theta]}(\mathbb{1}_{Q_n})\|_{L^\infty([\theta])} &= \max_{x \in [\theta]} |Q_n \cap (\theta^\perp + x)|_{n-1} \\ &= |Q_n \cap \theta^\perp|_{n-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $|\cdot|_{n-1}$ denotes $(n - 1)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure. Ball’s theorem gives $|Q_n \cap \theta^\perp|_{n-1} \leq \sqrt{2}$, which shows $C = \sqrt{2}$ works in (1.1).

Since Ball’s theorem holds in higher dimensions, i.e.,

$$(1.3) \quad \max_{E \in G_{n,k}} |Q_n \cap E^\perp|_{n-k}^{1/k} \leq \sqrt{2} \quad (k \geq 1),$$

where $G_{n,k}$ is the Grassmannian of all k -dimensional subspaces of \mathbb{R}^n , it is natural to expect that $C = \sqrt{2}$ works in (1.1) for all $k > 1$. However, in the

absence of a multi-dimensional analogue of Rogozin’s result (1.2), the authors of [18] prove (1.1) with an absolute constant C via different means.

Our goal is to show that one can determine the optimal C for suitable $k > 1$ directly by adapting Ball’s arguments giving (1.3), and a related estimate, to the functional setting. The main result of this paper is the following theorem.

THEOREM 1.1: *Let $1 \leq k < n$ and $E \in G_{n,k}$. Then there exists a collection of numbers $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset [0, 1]$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i = k$ such that for any bounded functions $f_1, \dots, f_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ with $\|f_i\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, the product $f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i)$ satisfies*

$$(1.4) \quad \|\pi_E(f)\|_{L^\infty(E)} \leq \min \left(\left(\frac{n}{n-k} \right)^{\frac{n-k}{2}}, 2^{k/2} \right) \prod_{i=1}^n \|f_i\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}^{\gamma_i}.$$

In particular, the theorem implies that if $f \in \mathcal{F}_n$ and $E \in G_{n,k}$, then

$$(1.5) \quad \|\pi_E(f)\|_{L^\infty(E)} \leq \min \left(\left(\frac{n}{n-k} \right)^{\frac{n-k}{2}}, 2^{k/2} \right).$$

As noted in [2], if $f = \mathbf{1}_{Q_n}$, the bound $\left(\frac{n}{n-k}\right)^{(n-k)/2}$ is achieved when $n - k$ divides n and $E_0 \in G_{n,k}$ is chosen so that $Q_n \cap E_0^\perp$ is a cube of suitable volume; note that $\left(\frac{n}{n-k}\right)^{\frac{n-k}{2}} \leq e^{k/2}$. When $k \leq n/2$, the bound $2^{k/2}$ is sharp when $Q_n \cap E_0^\perp$ is a box of suitable volume. Thus for such k , Theorem 1.1 implies

$$(1.6) \quad \sup_{E \in G_{n,k}} \|\pi_E(f)\|_{L^\infty(E)} \leq \sup_{E \in G_{n,k}} \|\pi_E(\mathbf{1}_{Q_n})\|_{L^\infty(E)} \quad (f \in \mathcal{F}_n).$$

In terms of random vectors, if $X \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is distributed according to f , then the density of the orthogonal projection $P_E X$ of X onto E is simply $\pi_E(f)$. Thus if X has density $f \in \mathcal{F}_n$ and Y has density $\mathbf{1}_{Q_n}$, the density of $P_E X$ is uniformly bounded above by the value of the density of $P_{E_0} Y$ at the origin (with E_0 chosen as above).

For another probabilistic consequence, note that (1.5) implies the following small-ball probability: for each $z \in E$,

$$(1.7) \quad \mathbb{P} \left(\|P_E X - z\| \leq \varepsilon \sqrt{k} \right) \leq (C\sqrt{2e\pi\varepsilon})^k \quad (\varepsilon > 0),$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm; this was part of the motivation in [18]; see also Tikhomirov [19] for recent work on such estimates and their use in random matrix theory.

Ball’s approach to cube slicing [1], [2] has been adapted to a variety of related problems. We mention just a sample and refer the reader to the references therein; see Barthe’s multidimensional version [3] of the Brascamp–Lieb inequality [6] and its normalized form; the use of the latter by Gluskin [11] for slices of products of measurable sets; Koldobsky and König [13] for problems involving measures other than volume; Brzezinski [8] for recent work on slices of products of Euclidean balls; Bobkov and Chistyakov [4], [5] for connections to sums of independent random variables.

Recently, bounds for marginals of arbitrary bounded densities have been found by S. Dann and the second and third-named authors [9]. They obtain extremal inequalities for certain averages; e.g., for any k and $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfying $\|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq 1 = \|f\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ and $f(0) = \|f\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)}$, one has

$$(1.8) \quad \int_{G_{n,k}} \pi_E(f)(0)^n d\mu_{n,k}(E) \leq \int_{G_{n,k}} \pi_E(\mathbf{1}_{D_n})(0)^n d\mu_{n,k}(E),$$

where $\mu_{n,k}$ is the Haar probability measure on $G_{n,k}$ and D_n is the Euclidean ball in \mathbb{R}^n of volume one centered at the origin.

Using an idea from the proof of Theorem 1.1, we also obtain the following strengthening of (1.8) within the class \mathcal{F}_n .

PROPOSITION 1.2: *Let $1 \leq k < n$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}_n$. Then*

$$(1.9) \quad \int_{G_{n,k}} \pi_E(f)(0)^n d\mu_{n,k}(E) \leq \int_{G_{n,k}} \pi_E(\mathbf{1}_{Q_n})(0)^n d\mu_{n,k}(E).$$

The latter can be seen as a type of “average” domination of marginals of $\mathbf{1}_{Q_n}$ over those of $f \in \mathcal{F}_n$. This complements the pointwise domination of Rogozin’s Theorem (1.2) when $k = 1$ and the worst-case comparison in (1.6) when $k \leq n/2$ or $n - k$ divides n . As in [9], inequality (1.9) is another step in extending results about dual affine quermassintegrals (we recall the definition in §4) from convex sets to functions in order to quantify characteristics of high-dimensional probability measures.

2. Preliminaries

The setting is Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n with the standard basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$, usual inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|$ and unit sphere S^{n-1} . We reserve $|\cdot|_k$ for k -dimensional Lebesgue measure; the subscript k will be omitted if the context is clear. We denote the positive reals by \mathbb{R}^+ .

For a Borel set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ of finite Lebesgue measure, the symmetric rearrangement A^* of A is the symmetric interval $A^* = [-|A|/2, |A|/2]$. For an integrable function $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ its symmetric decreasing rearrangement g^* is defined by

$$g^*(x) = \int_0^\infty \mathbf{1}_{\{g>t\}^*}(x)dt.$$

This can be compared with the layer-cake representation of g :

$$(2.1) \quad g(x) = \int_0^\infty \mathbf{1}_{\{g>t\}}(x)dt = \int_0^{\|g\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}} \mathbf{1}_{\{g>t\}}(x)dt.$$

Then g and g^* are equimeasurable, i.e., $|\{g > t\}| = |\{g^* > t\}|$ for each $t > 0$. In particular, $\|g\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} = \|g^*\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}$ for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$.

3. Adapting Ball’s arguments

We start with the following basic fact used in [1], [2], proved for completeness.

LEMMA 3.1: *Let $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in S^{n-1}$ and let A be a measurable subset of b^\perp with $\dim(\text{span}(A)) = k \in \{1, \dots, n - 1\}$. Then for each $1 \leq i \leq n$,*

$$|b_i||A|_k \leq |P_i(A)|_k,$$

where $P_i = P_{e_i^\perp}$ is the orthogonal projection onto e_i^\perp .

Proof. We may assume that $P_i : b^\perp \rightarrow e_i^\perp$ is injective (otherwise $b_i = 0$ and the inequality is trivial). We may also assume that $b \neq \pm e_i$ (otherwise equality holds). Let v_1, \dots, v_k be an orthonormal basis of $\text{span}(A)$ with $v_1 = \frac{1}{\|P_i b\|}e_i - \frac{b_i}{\|P_i b\|}b$ and v_2, \dots, v_k orthogonal to both e_i and b . Then $P_i(v_i) = v_i$ for $i \geq 2$, and $\|P_i(v_1)\| = |b_i|$. Consider the k -dimensional cube $C = \prod_{i=1}^k [0, v_i] \subset \text{span}(A)$. Then $P_i C$ is a k -dimensional box in e_i^\perp with the sides $|b_i|, 1, \dots, 1$. Hence $|P_i(C)|_k = |b_i||C|_k$. Thus the lemma is true for coordinate cubes in $\text{span}(A)$. The inequality follows by approximating A by disjoint cubes. Since $P_i|_{b^\perp}$ is injective, the images of such cubes under P_i remain disjoint. ■

The first ingredient in Ball’s approach is the following integral inequality [1].

THEOREM 3.2: *For every $p \geq 2$,*

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^\infty \left| \frac{\sin t}{t} \right|^p dt \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{p}}.$$

The second ingredient is Ball’s normalized form [2] of the Brascamp-Lieb inequality [6].

THEOREM 3.3: *Let u_1, \dots, u_m be unit vectors in \mathbb{R}^n , $m \geq n$, and $c_1, \dots, c_m > 0$ satisfying $\sum_1^m c_i u_i \otimes u_i = I_n$. Then for integrable functions $f_1, \dots, f_m : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$,*

$$(3.2) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \prod_{i=1}^m f_i(\langle u_i, x \rangle)^{c_i} dx \leq \prod_{i=1}^m \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} f_i \right)^{c_i} .$$

There is equality if the f_i ’s are identical Gaussian densities.

We will also use the following standard fact, proved for the convenience of the reader.

LEMMA 3.4: *Let $1 \leq k < n$ and $E \in G_{n,k}$. Then there exist vectors w_1, \dots, w_n in $\mathbb{R}^{n-k} = \text{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_{n-k}\}$ such that $I_{n-k} = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \otimes w_i$, and for any integrable function $f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i)$ with $f_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$,*

$$(3.3) \quad \pi_E(f)(0) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-k}} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(\langle y, w_i \rangle) dy .$$

Proof. Let $v_1, \dots, v_{n-k} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be an orthonormal basis of E^\perp and let w_i be defined by

$$w_i := (\langle v_1, e_i \rangle, \dots, \langle v_{n-k}, e_i \rangle), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n .$$

In matrix terms, if V is the $n \times (n - k)$ matrix with columns v_1, \dots, v_{n-k} , then $w_i = V^T e_i$, where V^T is the transpose of V . Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_i w_i^T = \sum_{i=1}^n V^T e_i e_i^T V = I_{\mathbb{R}^{n-k}}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_E(f)(0) &= \int_{E^\perp} f(y) dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-k}} f \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} y_i v_i \right) dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-k}} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(\langle Vy, e_i \rangle) dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-k}} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(\langle y, w_i \rangle) dy. \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

The following two propositions extend Ball’s estimates on slices of the cube to coordinate boxes. It is essential that we obtain estimates that are uniform among all such boxes. The proofs draw heavily on [2].

PROPOSITION 3.5: *Let $1 \leq k < n$ and $H \in G_{n,n-k}$. Then there exists $\{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset [0, 1]$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i = n - k$ such that for any $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \mathbb{R}^+$, the box $B = \prod_{i=1}^n [-z_i/2, z_i/2]$ satisfies*

$$(3.4) \quad |B \cap H| \leq \left(\frac{n}{n-k}\right)^{\frac{n-k}{2}} \prod_{i=1}^n z_i^{\beta_i}.$$

Proof. Let w_1, \dots, w_n be as in Lemma 3.4 (with k and $n - k$ interchanged). For $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $u_i = w_i / \|w_i\|$ and $a_i = \|w_i\|$ and $\beta_i = a_i^2$. For $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \mathbb{R}^+$, we apply (3.3) with $f = \mathbb{1}_B$ and $E = H^\perp$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} |B \cap H| &= \pi_{H^\perp}(\mathbb{1}_B)(0) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{[-\frac{z_i}{2}, \frac{z_i}{2}]}(\langle y, w_i \rangle) dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{[-\frac{z_i}{2a_i}, \frac{z_i}{2a_i}]}(\langle y, u_i \rangle) dy. \end{aligned}$$

Using Theorem 3.3, the latter is at most

$$(3.5) \quad \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}_{[-\frac{z_i}{2a_i}, \frac{z_i}{2a_i}]}(t) dt \right)^{a_i^2} = \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{z_i}{a_i} \right)^{a_i^2}.$$

As in [2, Proof of Proposition 4], we use the bound

$$\prod_{i=1}^n a_i^{-a_i^2} \leq \left(\frac{n}{n-k}\right)^{\frac{n-k}{2}},$$

from which the lemma follows. ■

PROPOSITION 3.6: *Let $1 \leq k \leq n/2$ and $H \in G_{n,n-k}$. Then there exists $\{\beta_j\}_{j=1}^n \subset [0, 1]$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i = n - k$ such that for any $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \mathbb{R}^+$, the box $B = \prod_{j=1}^n [-z_j/2, z_j/2]$ satisfies*

$$(3.6) \quad |B \cap H| \leq 2^{k/2} \prod_{j=1}^n z_j^{\beta_j}.$$

Proof. Assume first that all unit vectors $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in H^\perp$ satisfy $b_i \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let $\tilde{P} = P_{H^\perp}$ be the orthogonal projection onto H^\perp . For

$i = 1, \dots, n$, let $u_i = \frac{\tilde{P}e_i}{\|\tilde{P}e_i\|}$ and $a_i = \|\tilde{P}e_i\|$. Note that

$$(3.7) \quad (i) \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 u_i \otimes u_i = I_{H^\perp}, \quad (ii) \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 = k.$$

By our assumption, all $a_i \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, since a_i is the i -th coordinate of the unit vector u_i in H^\perp .

Assume for the time being that z_1, \dots, z_n are fixed and satisfy $|B| = \prod_{j=1}^n z_j = 1$. Let $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ be a random vector with density $\mathbb{1}_B$ and $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$ be a random vector with density $\mathbb{1}_{Q_n}$. The characteristic function $\Phi : H^\perp \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of $\tilde{P}X$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(w) &= \mathbb{E} \exp \left(i \langle w, \tilde{P}X \rangle \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \exp \left(i \sum_{j=1}^n X_j a_j \langle w, u_j \rangle \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \exp \left(i \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j z_j a_j \langle w, u_j \rangle \right) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{2 \sin \frac{1}{2} z_j a_j \langle w, u_j \rangle}{z_j a_j \langle w, u_j \rangle}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the marginal density $\pi_{H^\perp}(\mathbb{1}_B)$ is continuous, we can apply the Fourier inversion formula (e.g., [10, Theorem 9.5.4]) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |B \cap H| &= \pi_{H^\perp}(\mathbb{1}_B)(0) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^k} \int_{H^\perp} \Phi(w) dw \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi^k} \int_{H^\perp} \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{\sin z_j a_j \langle w, u_j \rangle}{z_j a_j \langle w, u_j \rangle} dw \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\pi^k} \int_{H^\perp} \prod_{j=1}^n \left| \frac{\sin z_j a_j \langle w, u_j \rangle}{z_j a_j \langle w, u_j \rangle} \right| dw \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi^k} \int_{H^\perp} \prod_{j=1}^n \Phi_j(\langle w, u_j \rangle) dw, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Phi_j : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is defined by $\Phi_j(t) = \left| \frac{\sin z_j a_j t}{z_j a_j t} \right|$. Consequently, Theorem 3.3 with $c_j = \frac{1}{a_j^2}$ implies that $|B \cap H|$ is at most

$$(3.8) \quad \frac{1}{\pi^k} \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \Phi_j(t)^{\frac{1}{a_j^2}} dt \right)^{a_j^2} = \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Phi_j(t)^{\frac{1}{a_j^2}} dt \right)^{a_j^2}$$

(cf. (3.7)). Finally, we use Theorem 3.2:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Phi_j(t)^{\frac{1}{a_j^2}} dt &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \frac{\sin z_j a_j t}{z_j a_j t} \right|^{\frac{1}{a_j^2}} dt \\ &= \frac{1}{z_j a_j} \left(\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \frac{\sin t}{t} \right|^{\frac{1}{a_j^2}} dt \right) \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{z_j}. \end{aligned}$$

In summary, for any $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \mathbb{R}^+$ with $|B| = \prod_{j=1}^n z_j = 1$, we have

$$(3.9) \quad |B \cap H| \leq \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{z_j} \right)^{a_j^2} = 2^{k/2} \prod_{j=1}^n z_j^{-a_j^2}.$$

For an arbitrary box $B = \prod_{j=1}^n [-\frac{z_j}{2}, \frac{z_j}{2}]$, we get via scaling that

$$(3.10) \quad |B \cap H| \leq 2^{k/2} \prod_{j=1}^n z_j \prod_{j=1}^n z_j^{-a_j^2} = 2^{k/2} \prod_{j=1}^n z_j^{\beta_j},$$

where $\beta_j = 1 - a_j^2$. Note that we assumed $a_j \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, so in fact $\beta_j \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$.

Suppose now that there exists a unit vector $b \in H^\perp$ such that $b_i \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ for some i . By induction, assume the proposition is true for all dimensions at most $n - 1$ and for all k . For $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \mathbb{R}^+$, note that the cylinder

$$C = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x_j| \leq \frac{z_j}{2} \quad \forall j \neq i \right\}$$

satisfies $|B \cap H| \leq |C \cap H|$. By Lemma 3.1,

$$(3.11) \quad |C \cap H| \leq \frac{1}{b_i} |P_i(C \cap H)| \leq \sqrt{2} |\tilde{B} \cap \tilde{H}|,$$

where \tilde{B} is an $(n - 1)$ -dimensional box with sides $\{z_j\}_{j \neq i}$ and $\tilde{H} = P_i H$ is a $(k - 1)$ -codimensional subspace in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} . If $k = 1$, then

$$|\tilde{B} \cap \tilde{H}| = |\tilde{B}| = \prod_{j \neq i} z_j,$$

and thus

$$|B \cap H| \leq \sqrt{2} \prod_{j \neq i} z_j,$$

hence the proposition holds with $\beta_j = 1$ for $j \neq i$. If $k \geq 2$, we use the inductive hypothesis: there exists $\{\beta_j\}_{j \neq i} \subset [0, 1]$ with $\sum_{j \neq i} \beta_j = n - 1 - (k - 1) = n - k$ such that

$$|\tilde{B} \cap \tilde{H}| \leq 2^{(k-1)/2} \prod_{j \neq i} z_j^{\beta_j}.$$

Using (3.11), and taking $\beta_j = 0$, we conclude that

$$|B \cap H| \leq 2^{k/2} \prod_{j \neq i} z_j^{\beta_j}. \quad \blacksquare$$

4. Proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Proposition 1.2

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By translating if necessary, we may assume that

$$(4.1) \quad \|\pi_E(f)\|_{L^\infty(E)} = \pi_E(f)(0).$$

For $i = 1, \dots, n$, set $c_i = \|f_i\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$ and consider the box $C = \prod_{i=1}^n [0, c_i]$. Let w_1, \dots, w_n be as in Lemma 3.4. Using (3.3), the rearrangement inequality of Rogers [16] and Brascamp–Lieb–Luttinger [7], and the layer-cake representation (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_E(f)(0) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-k}} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i(\langle y, w_i \rangle) dy \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-k}} \prod_{i=1}^n f_i^*(\langle y, w_i \rangle) dy \\ &= \int_0^{c_1} \cdots \int_0^{c_n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-k}} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{f_i^* > t_i\}}(\langle x, w_i \rangle) dx dt_1 \cdots dt_n. \end{aligned}$$

Write $dt = dt_1 \cdots dt_n$ and $M = \left(\frac{n}{n-k}\right)^{\frac{n-k}{2}}$. Since each f_i^* is symmetric and decreasing, the set $\{f_i^* > t_i\}$ is a symmetric interval. Consequently, we apply Proposition 3.5 with $z_i := |\{f_i^* > t_i\}|$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, to get

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_E(f)(0) &\leq M \int_C \prod_{i=1}^n |\{f_i^* > t_i\}|^{\beta_i} dt \\ &\leq M \prod_{i=1}^n c_i^{1-\beta_i} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n \|f_i^*\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}^{\beta_i} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq M \prod_{i=1}^n c_i^{1-\beta_i};$$

here we used Fubini’s theorem, Hölder’s inequality and the fact that

$$(4.2) \quad \int_0^{c_i} |\{f_i^* > t_i\}| dt_i = \|f_i^*\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} = \|f_i\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} = 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Thus setting $\gamma_i = 1 - \beta_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, we obtain the first estimate in the theorem. Repeating the latter argument with $M = 2^{k/2}$, using Proposition 3.6, concludes the proof of the theorem. ■

Before proving Proposition 1.2, we recall the following notion, proposed by Lutwak: if K is a convex body in \mathbb{R}^n , and $1 \leq k < n$, the dual affine quermass-integrals of K are defined by

$$(4.3) \quad \tilde{\Phi}_k(K) = \frac{\omega_n}{\omega_k} \left(\int_{G_{n,k}} |K \cap E|^n d\mu_{n,k}(E) \right)^{\frac{1}{n}},$$

where ω_n is the volume of the Euclidean ball in \mathbb{R}^n of radius one; see [14], [15] for further background. Grinberg [12] proved that

$$(4.4) \quad \tilde{\Phi}_k(K) = \tilde{\Phi}_k(SK)$$

for each volume-preserving linear transformation S ; see [9] for a generalization of the latter invariance property for functions.

Proof of Proposition 1.2. Let w_1, \dots, w_n be as in Lemma 3.4. As in the proof of Theorem 1.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_E(f)(0) &\leq \int_0^1 \cdots \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-k}} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{f_i^* > t_i\}}(\langle x, w_i \rangle) dx dt_1 \cdots dt_n \\ &= \int_{[0,1]^n} |B(t) \cap E^\perp| dt, \end{aligned}$$

where $B(t)$ is the origin-symmetric box with side-lengths $|\{f_i^* \geq t_i\}|$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{G_{n,k}} \pi_E(f)(0)^n d\mu_{n,k}(E) \\ &\leq \int_{G_{n,k}} \left(\int_{[0,1]^n} |B(t) \cap E^\perp| dt \right)^n d\mu_{n,k}(E) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \int_{G_{n,k}} \left(\int_{[0,1]^n} \left(\prod_{j=1}^n | \{f_j^* > t_j\} | \right)^{\frac{n-k}{n}} | \tilde{B}(t) \cap E^\perp | dt \right)^n d\mu_{n,k}(E),$$

where $\tilde{B}(t) = B(t)/|B(t)|^{1/n}$. Using Hölder’s inequality (twice), along with (4.2) and (4.4), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{G_{n,k}} \pi_E(f)(0)^n d\mu_{n,k}(E) &\leq \int_{[0,1]^n} \int_{G_{n,k}} | \tilde{B}(t) \cap E^\perp |^n d\mu_{n,k}(E) dt \\ &= \int_{G_{n,k}} |Q_n \cap E^\perp|^n d\mu_{n,k}(E). \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

5. Acknowledgements

It is our pleasure to thank Alex Koldobsky for helpful discussions. Galyna Livshyts would like to thank the University of Missouri and Texas A&M University for their hospitality during visits in which this project started. Galyna Livshyts is supported by a Kent State University Fellowship and US NSF grant 1101636 (to A. Zvavitch and D. Ryabogin). Grigoris Paouris is supported by the A. Sloan Foundation, US NSF grant CAREER-1151711 and BSF grant 2010288. This work was also partially supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation (#317733 to Peter Pivovarov).

References

- [1] K. Ball, *Cube slicing in \mathbf{R}^n* , Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **97** (1986), no. 3, 465–473.
- [2] K. Ball, *Volumes of sections of cubes and related problems*, Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis (1987–88), Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1376, Springer, Berlin, 1989, pp. 251–260.
- [3] F. Barthe, *On a reverse form of the Brascamp-Lieb inequality*, Inventiones Mathematicae **134** (1998), no. 2, 335–361.
- [4] S. G. Bobkov and G. P. Chistyakov, *Bounds for the maximum of the density of the sum of independent random variables*, Rossiiskaya Akademiya Nauk. Sankt-Peterburgskoe Otdelenie. Matematicheskii Institut im. V. A. Steklova. Zapiski Nauchnykh Seminarov (POMI) **408** (2012), no. Veroyatnost i Statistika. 18, 62–73, 324.
- [5] S. G. Bobkov and G. P. Chistyakov, *On concentration functions of random variables*, Journal of Theoretical Probability **28** (2015), no. 3, 976–988.
- [6] H. J. Brascamp and E. H. Lieb, *Best constants in Young’s inequality, its converse, and its generalization to more than three functions*, Advances in Mathematics **20** (1976), no. 2, 151–173.

- [7] H. J. Brascamp, Elliott H. Lieb and J. M. Luttinger, *A general rearrangement inequality for multiple integrals*, J. Functional Analysis **17** (1974), 227–237.
- [8] P. Brzezinski, *Volume estimates for sections of certain convex bodies*, Mathematische Nachrichten **286** (2013), no. 17–18, 1726–1743.
- [9] S. Dann, G. Paouris and P. Pivovarov, *Bounding marginal densities via affine isoperimetry*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (2016), electronically published on July 1, 2016, DOI: 10.1112/plms/pdw026 (to appear in print).
- [10] R. M. Dudley, *Real Analysis and Probability*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 74, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002, Revised reprint of the 1989 original.
- [11] E. Gluskin, *On the multivariable version of Ball's slicing cube theorem*, Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1850, Springer, Berlin, 2004, pp. 117–121.
- [12] E. L. Grinberg, *Isoperimetric inequalities and identities for k -dimensional cross-sections of convex bodies*, Mathematische Annalen **291** (1991), no. 1, 75–86.
- [13] H. König and A. Koldobsky, *On the maximal measure of sections of the n -cube*, Geometric Analysis, Mathematical Relativity, and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations, Contemporary Mathematics, vol. 599, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2013, pp. 123–155.
- [14] E. Lutwak, *A general isepiphanic inequality*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **90** (1984), no. 3, 415–421.
- [15] E. Lutwak, *Intersection bodies and dual mixed volumes*, Advances in Mathematics **71** (1988), no. 2, 232–261.
- [16] C. A. Rogers, *A single integral inequality*, Journal of the London Mathematical Society. Second Series **32** (1957), 102–108.
- [17] B. A. Rogozin, *An estimate for the maximum of the convolution of bounded densities*, Akademiya Nauk SSSR. Teoriya Veroyatnostei i ee Primeneniya **32** (1987), no. 1, 53–61, English translation: Theory Probab. Appl. **32** (1987), no. 1, 48–56.
- [18] M. Rudelson and R. Vershynin, *Small ball probabilities for linear images of high dimensional distributions*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **19** (2015), 9594–9617.
- [19] K. Tikhomirov, *The smallest singular value of random rectangular matrices with no moment assumptions on entries*, Israel J. Math. **212** (2016), no. 1, 289–314.