

SL(n) CONTRAVARIANT MATRIX-VALUED VALUATIONS ON POLYTOPES

CHUNNA ZENG, YUQI ZHOU

ABSTRACT. All SL(n) contravariant matrix-valued valuations on polytopes in \mathbb{R}^n are completely classified without any continuity assumptions. Moreover, the symmetry assumption of matrices is removed. The general Lutwak-Yang-Zhang matrix turns out to be the only such valuation if $n \geq 4$, while a new function shows up in dimension three. In dimension two, the classification corresponds to the known case of SL(2) equivariant matrix-valued valuations.

1. INTRODUCTION

A classical concept from mechanics is the Legendre ellipsoid $\Gamma_2 K$ associated with a convex body K . The Legendre ellipsoid is the unique ellipsoid centered at the center of mass of K such that the ellipsoid's moment of inertia about any axis passing through the center of mass is the same as that of K . Write a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$. The Legendre ellipsoid $\Gamma_2 K$ can be defined by the moment matrix $M(K)$ of K , that is, the $(n \times n)$ -matrix with coefficients

$$M_{ij}(K) = \int_K x_i x_j dx.$$

For any convex body K with nonempty interior, its moment matrix $M(K)$ is positive definite. The moment matrix is closely related to the Bourgain slicing problem, which is one of open problems in the asymptotic theory. The Bourgain slicing problem mainly seeks a unique upper bound estimate for the isotropic constant. Klartag showed that an upper bound of the isotropic constant has the dimension dependency $n^{\frac{1}{4}}$ (see [5, 12]). A recent advancement over Klartag's finding was contributed by Chen [6].

In [21], Lutwak, Yang and Zhang defined a new ellipsoid $\Gamma_{-2} K$ for $K \in \mathcal{K}_{(o)}^n$, the space of convex bodies containing the origin in their interiors. Actually, the Lutwak-Yang-Zhang (LYZ) ellipsoid is recognized as the dual counterpart of the Legendre ellipsoid in the Brunn-Minkowski theory. They [20] also established that $\Gamma_{-2} K \subset \Gamma_2 K$ and noted that this was a geometric analogue of the Cramer-Rao inequality. For a convex polytope $P \in \mathcal{P}_{(o)}^n$, the space of convex polytopes containing the origin in their

Supported in part by the Major Special Project of NSFC (Grant No. 12141101), the Young Top-Talent program of Chongqing (Grant No. CQYC2021059145), the Research Project of Chongqing Education Commission CXQT21014 and the Characteristic innovation projects of universities in Guangdong province (Grant No. 2020KTSCX358).

Keywords: LYZ matrix, valuation, convex polytope, SL(n) contravariance.

*Corresponding author: Chunna Zeng.

interiors in \mathbb{R}^n . Then $\Gamma_{-2}P$ can be defined by the LYZ matrix with coefficients (see [21])

$$L_{ij}(P) = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}(P)} \frac{a_P(u)}{h_P(u)} u_i u_j,$$

where $\mathcal{N}(P)$ denotes the set of all outer unit normals of facets of P . For a unit normal $u \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, denote by $a_P(u)$ the $(n-1)$ -dimensional volume of the facet with normal u , and $h_P(u) = \max\{x \cdot u : x \in P\}$ the support function of P . For additional information on the LYZ ellipsoid and its connection to the Fisher information from information theory, see [13, 18, 20, 21]. Beyond Γ_2 and Γ_{-2} , there exist other well-known ellipsoids like the John ellipsoid, the L_p John ellipsoid, the Petty ellipsoid, and the M -ellipsoid. However, only Γ_2 and Γ_{-2} are linear, and their corresponding moment matrix and LYZ matrix function are ‘valuations’.

A function $\mu : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \langle \mathcal{A}, + \rangle$ defined on a collection \mathcal{S} of sets and taking values in an abelian semigroup $\langle \mathcal{A}, + \rangle$ is called a valuation if

$$\mu(P) + \mu(Q) = \mu(P \cup Q) + \mu(P \cap Q),$$

whenever $P, Q, P \cap Q$, and $P \cup Q \in \mathcal{S}$. At the beginning of the twentieth century, valuations were first constructed by Dehn in his solution of Hilbert’s Third Problem. Nearly 50 years later, Hadwiger initiated a systematic study of valuations by his celebrated characterization theorem. He revealed that all continuous, rigid motion invariant valuations on the space of convex bodies (i.e., compact convex sets) in \mathbb{R}^n are linear combinations of intrinsic volumes. Valuations have various important applications in integral geometry (see [14, Chap. 7], [11], [17, Chap. 6]). They also turned out to be extremely fruitful and useful especially in the affine geometry of convex bodies. Examples of valuations are affine surface areas, intrinsic volumes, the intersection bodies, the projection bodies, and other Minkowski valuations. See also [1–4, 8–11, 19, 22, 23, 30] for a historical account and some of the more recent contributions.

Denote by \mathbb{M}_e^n the set of real symmetric $(n \times n)$ -matrices, and \mathbb{M}^n the set of real $(n \times n)$ -matrices over \mathbb{R}^n . A function $\mu : \mathcal{P}_{(o)}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_e^n$ is called $\text{GL}(n)$ contravariant if there exists a constant $q \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\mu(\phi p) = |\det \phi^{-t}|^q \phi^{-t} \mu(p) \phi^{-1}$$

for all $P \in \mathcal{P}_{(o)}^n$ and $\phi \in \text{GL}(n)$. Let \mathcal{P}^n be the set of convex polytopes, and \mathcal{P}_o^n the subspace of all convex polytopes containing the origin in \mathbb{R}^n . Denote by \mathcal{Q}^n be either \mathcal{P}^n or \mathcal{P}_o^n .

A function $\mu : \mathcal{Q}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^n$ is called $\text{SL}(n)$ contravariant if

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

for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}^n$ and $\phi \in \text{SL}(n)$, and is called $\text{SL}(n)$ equivariant if

$$\mu(\phi p) = \phi \mu(p) \phi^t$$

for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}^n$ and $\phi \in \text{SL}(n)$.

A function defined on $\mathcal{P}_{(o)}^n$ is called (Borel) measurable if the preimage of every open set is a Borel set. In 2003, Ludwig [18] established the first characterization of the moment matrix and LYZ matrix.

Lemma 1. [18] *Let $n \geq 3$. A function $\mu : \mathcal{P}_{(o)}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_e^n$ is a measurable GL(n) contravariant valuation if and only if there exists a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\mu(P) = cM(P^*) \quad \text{or} \quad \mu(P) = cL(P)$$

for every $P \in \mathcal{P}_{(o)}^n$, where P^* is the polar body of P .

Recently, Ma and Wang [24] extended the LYZ matrix from convex polytopes containing the origin in their interiors to arbitrary convex polytopes. For a solution of Cauchy's functional equation $\zeta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the general LYZ matrix $L_\zeta(P)$ of $P \in \mathcal{P}^n$ is the $(n \times n)$ -matrix with coefficients

$$L_{\zeta,ij}(P) = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}(P) \setminus \{h_P=0\}} \frac{\zeta(a_P(u)h_P(u))}{h_P^2(u)} u_i u_j.$$

The general LYZ matrix is also shown to be essentially the unique class of SL(n) contravariant symmetric matrix-valued valuations. Furthermore, they extended Ludwig's result to \mathcal{P}_o^n without any homogeneity assumptions or any continuity assumptions.

Lemma 2. [24] *Let $n \geq 3$. A function $\mu : \mathcal{P}_o^n \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_e^n$ is an SL(n) contravariant valuation if and only if there exists a solution of Cauchy's functional equation $\zeta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\mu(P) = L_\zeta(P)$$

for every $P \in \mathcal{P}_o^n$.

The aim of this paper is to obtain a complete classification of SL(n) contravariant matrix-valued valuations on polytopes. Moreover, the symmetry assumption of matrices is removed.

Theorem 1. *Let $n \geq 4$. A function $\mu : \mathcal{P}_o^n \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^n$ is an SL(n) contravariant valuation if and only if there exists a solution of Cauchy's functional equation $\zeta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\mu(P) = L_\zeta(P)$$

for every $P \in \mathcal{P}_o^n$.

Let $(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k})$ be a positively oriented orthonormal basis. Each vector $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ can be define as the sum of three orthogonal components parallel to the standard basis vectors, that is,

$$\mathbf{a} = a_1 \mathbf{i} + a_2 \mathbf{j} + a_3 \mathbf{k}.$$

Then the antisymmetric matrix Anti(\mathbf{a}), for a vector \mathbf{a} , is defined by

$$\text{Anti}(\mathbf{a}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -a_3 & a_2 \\ a_3 & 0 & -a_1 \\ -a_2 & a_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For $\mathbf{a} = a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbf{b} = b_1\mathbf{i} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, the cross product $\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}$ is defined by

$$\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b} = \begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{i} & \mathbf{j} & \mathbf{k} \\ a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\ b_1 & b_2 & b_3 \end{vmatrix}.$$

It also can be expressed as the product of an antisymmetric matrix and a vector, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b} = \text{Anti}(\mathbf{a})\mathbf{b} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -a_3 & a_2 \\ a_3 & 0 & -a_1 \\ -a_2 & a_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \\ b_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

More generally, it obeys the following identity under matrix transformation $\phi \in \text{SL}(3)$

$$(\phi\mathbf{a}) \times (\phi\mathbf{b}) = \phi^{-t}(\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}).$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\text{Anti}(\phi\mathbf{a}) = \phi^{-t}\text{Anti}(\mathbf{a})\phi^{-1},$$

which implies that Anti is $\text{SL}(3)$ contravariant.

Let \mathcal{T}^3 be the set of simplices in \mathbb{R}^3 with one vertex at the origin. Define function $I : \mathcal{T}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^3$ as

$$I(T) = \det(u, v, w)\text{Anti}((u, v, w)\mathbf{e})$$

if $T \in \mathcal{T}^3$ with $\dim T = 3$ and $T = [o, u, v, w]$ with $\det(u, v, w) > 0$, where $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{i} + \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{k}$;
or

$$I(T) = \mathbf{0}$$

if $T \in \mathcal{T}^3$ with $\dim T \leq 2$. Here $\mathbf{0}$ denotes the matrix where every element is 0. In Section 2, it will be derived that I is an $\text{SL}(3)$ contravariant valuation.

Theorem 2. *A function $\mu : \mathcal{P}_o^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^3$ is an $\text{SL}(3)$ contravariant valuation if and only if there exist a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and a solution of Cauchy's functional equation $\xi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\mu(P) = cI(P) + 2L_\xi(P) \quad (1.1)$$

for every $P \in \mathcal{P}_o^3$. The notation $I(P)$ stands for $I(P) = \sum_{i=1}^m I(T_i)$, where $\{T_1, \dots, T_m\}$ is a triangulation of P that is dissected at the origin.

Using a relation with $\text{SL}(2)$ equivariant matrix-valued valuation, we obtain the classification in the two-dimensional case.

Theorem 3. *A function $\mu : \mathcal{P}_o^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^2$ is an $\text{SL}(2)$ contravariant valuation if and only if there exist constants $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 \in \mathbb{R}$ and solutions of Cauchy's functional equation $\alpha, \beta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\mu(P) = c_1 \tilde{M}(P) + c_2 \tilde{E}(P) + c_3 \tilde{F}(P) + \tilde{H}_\alpha(P) + \tilde{G}_\beta(P) + c_4 \rho_{\pi/2} \quad (1.2)$$

for every $P \in \mathcal{P}_o^2$, where $\rho_{\pi/2}$ is the counterclockwise rotation in \mathbb{R}^2 by the angle $\pi/2$.

Here, $\tilde{M}(P) = \psi_{\pi/2} M(P) \psi_{\pi/2}^{-1}$, where $\psi_{\pi/2} \in \mathbb{M}^2$ denotes the rotation by the angle $\pi/2$. The functions $E(P), F(P), H_\alpha(P)$ and $G_\beta(P)$ are SL(2) equivariant valuations which were proved in [29]. By applying the same transform to $E(P), F(P), H_\alpha(P)$, and $G_\beta(P)$, we obtain $\tilde{E}(P), \tilde{F}(P), \tilde{H}_\alpha(P)$, and $\tilde{G}_\beta(P)$, respectively.

Next, we extend these results to \mathcal{P}^n . This step is as in the classification of convex body valuations by Schuster and Wannerer [27] and Wannerer [28].

Theorem 4. *Let $n \geq 4$. A function $\mu : \mathcal{P}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^n$ is an SL(n) contravariant valuation if and only if there exist solutions of Cauchy's functional equation $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\mu(P) = L_{\zeta_1}(P) + L_{\zeta_2}([o, P])$$

for every $P \in \mathcal{P}^n$, where $[o, P]$ denotes the convex hull of the origin and P .

Again, the cases of dimension three and dimension two are different. We show the following results.

Theorem 5. *If $\mu : \mathcal{P}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^3$ is an SL(3) contravariant valuation if and only if there exist constants $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and solutions of Cauchy's functional equation $\xi_1, \xi_2 : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\mu(P) = c_1 I([o, P]) + c_2 \sum_{i=1}^l I([o, F_i]) + 2 L_{\xi_1}([o, P]) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^l L_{\xi_2}([o, F_i]) \quad (1.3)$$

for every $P \in \mathcal{P}^3$ with facets F_1, \dots, F_l visible from the origin.

Theorem 6. *A function $\mu : \mathcal{P}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^2$ is an SL(2) contravariant valuation if and only if there exist constants $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5 \in \mathbb{R}$ and solutions of Cauchy's functional equation $\alpha, \alpha', \beta, \beta' : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(P) = & c_1 \tilde{M}(P) + c_2 \tilde{M}([o, P]) + c_3 \tilde{E}([o, P]) + c_4 \tilde{F}([o, P]) + \tilde{H}_\alpha([o, P]) \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \tilde{H}_{\alpha'}([o, v_{i+1}, v_i]) + \tilde{G}_\beta([o, P]) + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \tilde{G}_{\beta'}([o, v_{i+1}, v_i]) + c_5 \rho_{\pi/2} \end{aligned} \quad (1.4)$$

for every $P \in \mathcal{P}^2$ with vertices v_1, \dots, v_r visible from the origin and labeled counter-clockwise.

2. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARIES

We work in n -dimensional Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n with origin o , and denote its standard basis by e_1, \dots, e_n . Write the coordinates of a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with respect to the standard basis by x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n . The standard inner product of $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is denoted by $x \cdot y$. Denote the determinant of a matrix A by $\det A$, and the $n \times n$ identity matrix by $I_n = (e_1, \dots, e_n)$. The affine hull, the relative interior, the interior, the dimension, and the boundary of a given set in \mathbb{R}^n are denoted by aff , relint , int , dim , and bd , respectively.

Denote the convex hull of $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by $[v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k]$. A convex polytope is the convex hull of finitely many points in \mathbb{R}^n . Two basic classes of polytopes are the k -dimensional standard simplex $T^k = [o, e_1, \dots, e_k]$ and $\tilde{T}^k = [e_1, \dots, e_k]$,

which is a $(k - 1)$ -dimensional simplex. For $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, let \mathcal{T}^i be the set of k -dimensional simplices with one vertex at the origin, and let $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^{i-1}$ be the set of $(i - 1)$ -dimensional simplices $T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $0 \notin T$. Generally, there exists a triangulation of a k -dimensional polytope P into simplices as a set of k -dimensional simplices $\{T_1, \dots, T_r\}$ which have pairwise disjoint interiors, with $P = \bigcup_i T_i$ and with the property that, for an arbitrary $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_j \leq r$, the intersections $T_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap T_{i_j}$ are again simplices.

For more basic results on valuations, see [11] and [25]. We now recall some basic results on valuations.

Lemma 3. [25] *Let $\mu : \mathcal{P}_o^n \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be a valuation. Then μ is determined by its values on n -simplices with one vertex at the origin and its value on $\{o\}$.*

Lemma 4. [25] *Let $\mu : \mathcal{P}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be a valuation. Then μ is determined by its values on n -simplices.*

Denote by $\text{SL}(n)$ the group of special linear transformations, i.e., those with linear transformations ϕ with determinant $\det \phi = 1$, and by $\text{GL}(n)$ the group of general linear transformations, i.e., those with linear transformations ϕ with determinant $\det \phi \neq 0$. In addition, a general reference on convex geometry is the book by Schneider [26] or Gardner [7]. Let $\mu : \mathcal{Q}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^n$ be an $\text{SL}(n)$ contravariant valuation. Then μ can be decomposed as

$$\mu(P) = \frac{1}{2}(\mu(P) + \mu(P)^t) + \frac{1}{2}(\mu(P) - \mu(P)^t)$$

for all $P \in \mathcal{Q}^n$. Clearly, $\mu(P) + \mu(P)^t$ is a symmetric matrix and $\mu(P) - \mu(P)^t$ is an antisymmetric matrix.

A valuation on \mathcal{Q}^n is called simple if it vanishes on every $P \in \mathcal{Q}^n$ with $\dim P \leq n - 1$.

Lemma 5. *The function I is a simple $\text{SL}(3)$ contravariant valuation on \mathcal{T}^3 .*

Proof. By the definition of I we obtain that it is indeed simple on \mathcal{T}^3 .

Next, we are going to prove that I is a valuation on \mathcal{T}^3 . It suffices to show that

$$I(T_1) + I(T_2) = I(T_1 \cup T_2) + I(T_1 \cap T_2) \quad (2.1)$$

for $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{T}^3$ with $T_1 \cup T_2 \in \mathcal{T}^3$. It is clear that (2.1) holds for $T_1 \subseteq T_2$ or $T_1 \supseteq T_2$. So we just need to consider the case $\dim T_1 = \dim T_2 = 3$ with $T_1 \not\subseteq T_2$ and $T_1 \not\supseteq T_2$.

Assume that

$$T_1 = [o, u, v, k_1v + (1 - k_1)w]$$

and

$$T_2 = [o, u, k_2v + (1 - k_2)w, w],$$

where $0 < k_1 \leq k_2 < 1$ and $\det(u, v, w) > 0$. Without loss of generality, we have

$$T_1 \cup T_2 = [o, u, v, w]$$

and

$$T_1 \cap T_2 = [o, u, k_2v + (1 - k_2)w, k_1v + (1 - k_1)w].$$

Setting $\det(u, v, w) = r$. We have $\det(u, v, k_1v + (1 - k_1)w) = (1 - k_1)r$, $\det(u, k_2v + (1 - k_2)w, w) = k_2r$, and $\det(u, k_2v + (1 - k_2)w, k_1v + (1 - k_1)w) = (k_2 - k_1)r$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} I(T_1) &= (1 - k_1)r \text{Anti}((u, v, k_1v + (1 - k_1)w)\mathbf{e}), \\ I(T_2) &= k_2r \text{Anti}((u, k_2v + (1 - k_2)w, w)\mathbf{e}), \\ I(T_1 \cup T_2) &= r \text{Anti}((u, v, w)\mathbf{e}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$I(T_1 \cap T_2) = (k_2 - k_1)r \text{Anti}((u, k_2v + (1 - k_2)w, k_1v + (1 - k_1)w)\mathbf{e}).$$

Let $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)^t$, $v = (v_1, v_2, v_3)^t$ and $w = (w_1, w_2, w_3)^t$, then

$$\begin{aligned} &I(T_1) + I(T_2) \tag{2.2} \\ &= (1 - k_1)r \text{Anti} \begin{pmatrix} u_1 + (1 + k_1)v_1 + (1 - k_1)w_1 \\ u_2 + (1 + k_1)v_2 + (1 - k_1)w_2 \\ u_3 + (1 + k_1)v_3 + (1 - k_1)w_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ &\quad + k_2r \text{Anti} \begin{pmatrix} u_1 + k_2v_1 + (2 - k_2)w_1 \\ u_2 + k_2v_2 + (2 - k_2)w_2 \\ u_3 + k_2v_3 + (2 - k_2)w_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \text{Anti} \begin{pmatrix} (1 - k_1 + k_2)ru_1 + (1 - k_1^2 + k_2^2)rv_1 + ((1 - k_1)^2 + (2k_2 - k_2^2))rw_1 \\ (1 - k_1 + k_2)ru_2 + (1 - k_1^2 + k_2^2)rv_2 + ((1 - k_1)^2 + (2k_2 - k_2^2))rw_2 \\ (1 - k_1 + k_2)ru_3 + ((1 - k_1^2 + k_2^2)rv_3 + ((1 - k_1)^2 + (2k_2 - k_2^2))rw_3 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &I(T_1 \cup T_2) + I(T_1 \cap T_2) \tag{2.3} \\ &= r \text{Anti} \begin{pmatrix} u_1 + v_1 + w_1 \\ u_2 + v_2 + w_2 \\ u_3 + v_3 + w_3 \end{pmatrix} + (k_2 - k_1)r \text{Anti} \begin{pmatrix} u_1 + (k_1 + k_2)v_1 + (2 - k_1 - k_2)w_1 \\ u_2 + (k_1 + k_2)v_2 + (2 - k_1 - k_2)w_2 \\ u_3 + (k_1 + k_2)v_3 + (2 - k_1 - k_2)w_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \text{Anti} \begin{pmatrix} (k_2 - k_1 + 1)ru_1 + (k_2^2 - k_1^2 + 1)rv_1 + ((k_2 - k_1)(2 - k_1 - k_2) + 1)rw_1 \\ (k_2 - k_1 + 1)ru_2 + (k_2^2 - k_1^2 + 1)rv_2 + ((k_2 - k_1)(2 - k_1 - k_2) + 1)rw_2 \\ (k_2 - k_1 + 1)ru_3 + ((k_2^2 - k_1^2 + 1)rv_3 + ((k_2 - k_1)(2 - k_1 - k_2) + 1)rw_3 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing coefficients in (2.2) and (2.3) shows that (2.1) holds.

Finally, we show that I is $\text{SL}(3)$ contravariant. Let $T \in \mathcal{T}^3$ with $\dim T = 3$ and $T = [o, u, v, w]$ with $\det(u, v, w) > 0$. Then for $\phi \in \text{SL}(3)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(\phi T) &= \det(\phi u, \phi v, \phi w) \text{Anti}(\phi(u, v, w)\mathbf{e}) \\ &= \det \phi \det(u, v, w) \phi^{-t} \text{Anti}((u, v, w)\mathbf{e}) \phi^{-1} \\ &= \phi^{-t} I(T) \phi^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $T \in \mathcal{T}^3$ with $\dim T \leq 2$, we have $I(\phi T) = \phi^{-t} I(T) \phi^{-1} = \mathbf{0}$ for all $\phi \in \text{SL}(3)$. \square

Lemma 6. *The function I is a simple $\text{SL}(3)$ contravariant valuation on \mathcal{P}_o^3 .*

Proof. Since the function $I : \mathcal{T}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^3$ can be extended to a valuation on finite unions of simplices in \mathbb{R}^3 that have one vertex at the origin. For $T_1, \dots, T_m \in \mathcal{T}^3$, it follows from the inclusion-exclusion principle that

$$I(T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_m) = \sum_{j=1}^m (-1)^{j-1} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_j \leq m} I(T_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap T_{i_j}).$$

Triangulate $P \in \mathcal{P}_o^3$ into simplices T_1, \dots, T_l with one vertex at the origin. Therefore, by the simplicity of I on \mathcal{T}^3 we derive

$$I(P) = I(T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_l) = \sum_{i=1}^l I(T_i).$$

Combined with Lemma 5, it follows that I is a simple $\text{SL}(3)$ contravariant valuation on \mathcal{P}_o^3 . \square

For $\nu = (1 - \lambda)e_1 - \lambda e_2$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, let H be the hyperplane through the origin with normal vector ν . Write the two half-spaces bounded by H in a such way of H^+ and H^- :

$$H^+ = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x \cdot ((1 - \lambda)e_1 - \lambda e_2) \geq 0\}$$

and

$$H^- = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x \cdot ((1 - \lambda)e_1 - \lambda e_2) \leq 0\}.$$

This hyperplane induces the series of triangulations of rT^n as well as $r\tilde{T}^n$ due to the following definition.

Definition 1. For $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, define the linear transform $\phi_1 \in GL(n)$ by

$$\phi_1 e_1 = \lambda e_1 + (1 - \lambda)e_2, \quad \phi_1 e_2 = e_2, \quad \phi_1 e_j = e_j, \quad \text{where } j = 3, \dots, n,$$

and $\phi_2 \in GL(n)$ by

$$\phi_2 e_1 = e_1, \quad \phi_2 e_2 = \lambda e_1 + (1 - \lambda)e_2, \quad \phi_2 e_j = e_j, \quad \text{where } j = 3, \dots, n.$$

It is clear that

$$sT^n \cap H^+ = \phi_2 sT^n, \quad sT^n \cap H^- = \phi_1 sT^n, \quad \text{and } sT^n \cap H = \phi_1 sT^{n-1}, \quad (2.4)$$

for every $s > 0$. Similarly,

$$s\tilde{T}^n \cap H^+ = \phi_2 s\tilde{T}^n, \quad s\tilde{T}^n \cap H^- = \phi_1 s\tilde{T}^n, \quad \text{and } s\tilde{T}^n \cap H = \phi_1 s\tilde{T}^{n-1}, \quad (2.5)$$

for every $s > 0$.

The well-known solution of Cauchy's functional equation is one of the main ingredients in our proofs. Since we do not assume continuity, also functionals that depend on solutions $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of Cauchy's functional equation

$$f(x + y) = f(x) + f(y)$$

for all $x, y \in [0, \infty)$. If f is a measurable function, then f is linear.

3. SL(n) CONTRAVARIANT VALUATIONS ON \mathcal{P}_o^n

3.1. The two-dimensional case.

Lemma 7. *If $\mu : \mathcal{Q}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^2$ is an $SL(2)$ equivariant valuation. Then*

$$\omega(P) = \psi_{\pi/2} \mu(P) \psi_{\pi/2}^{-1}$$

is an $SL(2)$ contravariant valuation, where $\psi_{\pi/2}$ is described by the rotation by the angle $\pi/2$ as $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

Proof. Since μ is equivariant, then for every $\phi \in SL(2)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(\phi P) &= \psi_{\pi/2} \mu(\phi P) \psi_{\pi/2}^{-1} \\ &= \psi_{\pi/2} \phi \mu(P) \phi^t \psi_{\pi/2}^{-1} \\ &= \psi_{\pi/2} \phi \psi_{\pi/2}^{-1} \psi_{\pi/2} \mu(P) \psi_{\pi/2}^{-1} \psi_{\pi/2} \phi^t \psi_{\pi/2}^{-1} \\ &= \psi_{\pi/2} \phi \psi_{\pi/2}^{-1} \omega(P) \psi_{\pi/2} \phi^t \psi_{\pi/2}^{-1} \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Let $\phi = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$. Therefore,

$$\psi_{\pi/2} \phi \psi_{\pi/2}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} d & -c \\ -b & a \end{pmatrix} = \phi^{-t}$$

and

$$\psi_{\pi/2} \phi^t \psi_{\pi/2}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a & c \\ b & d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} d & -b \\ -c & a \end{pmatrix} = \phi^{-1}.$$

Thus, (3.1) is equivalent to

$$\omega(\phi P) = \phi^{-t} \omega(P) \phi^{-1}$$

for every $\phi \in SL(2)$. □

Lemma 8. ([29]) *A function $\mu : \mathcal{P}_o^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^2$ is an $SL(2)$ equivariant valuation if and only if there exist constants $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 \in \mathbb{R}$ and solutions of Cauchy's functional equation $\alpha, \beta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\mu(P) = c_1 M(P) + c_2 E(P) + c_3 F(P) + H_\alpha(P) + G_\beta(P) + c_4 \rho_{\pi/2} \tag{3.2}$$

for every $P \in \mathcal{P}_o^2$, where $\rho_{\pi/2}$ is the counterclockwise rotation in \mathbb{R}^2 by the angle $\pi/2$.

Now, combining Lemma 7 and Lemma 8, we obtain Theorem 3.

3.2. The three-dimensional case.

Lemma 9. *If $\mu : \mathcal{P}_o^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^3$ is an $SL(3)$ contravariant valuation, then $\mu(\{o\}) = \mathbf{0}$.*

Proof. Set $\mu(\{o\}) = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{31} & a_{22} & a_{33} \end{pmatrix}$ and $\psi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} s^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{s} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{s} \end{pmatrix}$ for $s \neq 0$. The $SL(3)$ contravariance of μ implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\{o\}) &= \mu(\psi_1\{o\}) = \psi_1^{-t} \mu(\{o\}) \psi_1^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{s^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & s & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & s \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{31} & a_{22} & a_{33} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{s^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & s & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & s \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}/s^4 & a_{12}/s & a_{13}/s \\ a_{21}/s & s^2 a_{22} & s^2 a_{23} \\ a_{31}/s & s^2 a_{22} & s^2 a_{33} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{31} & a_{22} & a_{33} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

In the last step, we apply the arbitrariness of s to obtain $a_{ij} = 0$, where $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$. This yields $\mu(\{o\}) = \mathbf{0}$. \square

Lemma 10. *If $\mu : \mathcal{P}_o^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^3$ is an $SL(3)$ contravariant valuation, then there exists a constant $t_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\mu(rT^1) = t_1 r \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

for $r \neq 0$.

Proof. Set $\mu(T^1) = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix}$, and $\psi_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & B_{12} \\ \mathbf{0} & B_{22} \end{pmatrix}$ for any pair of matrices B_{12} and B_{22} with $B_{22} \in SL(2)$. The $SL(3)$ contravariance of μ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(T^1) &= \mu(\psi_2 T^1) = \psi_2^{-t} \mu(T^1) \psi_2^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{0} \\ -B_{22}^{-t} B_{12}^t & B_{22}^{-t} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -B_{12} B_{22}^{-1} \\ \mathbf{0} & B_{22}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & -A_{11} B_{12} B_{22}^{-1} + A_{12} B_{22}^{-1} \\ -B_{22}^{-t} B_{12}^t A_{11} + B_{22}^{-t} A_{21} & B_{22}^{-t} B_{12}^t A_{11} B_{12} B_{22}^{-1} - B_{22}^{-t} A_{21} B_{12} B_{22}^{-1} \\ & -B_{22}^{-t} B_{12}^t A_{12} B_{22}^{-1} + B_{22}^{-t} A_{22} B_{22}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Setting $B_{12} = \mathbf{0}$ in (3.3), we have

$$A_{12} B_{22}^{-1} = A_{12}, B_{22}^{-t} A_{21} = A_{21} \text{ and } B_{22}^{-t} A_{22} B_{22}^{-1} = A_{22} \quad (3.4)$$

for $B_{22} \in \text{SL}(2)$. Let $B_{22} = \begin{pmatrix} s & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{s} \end{pmatrix}$ for $s \neq 0$, then (3.4) becomes

$$A_{12} = A_{21} = \mathbf{0} \text{ and } A_{22} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x \\ y & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.5)$$

for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. Inserting (3.5) into (3.3) we have

$$A_{11}B_{12}B_{22}^{-1} = B_{22}^{-t}B_{12}^tA_{11} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (3.6)$$

For $B_{12} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $B_{22} = I_{22}$, which is the (2×2) identity matrix, it follows from (3.6) that

$$A_{11} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (3.7)$$

Combining (3.3), (3.5) and (3.7), then we have

$$B_{22}^{-t}A_{22}B_{22}^{-1} = A_{22}.$$

Let $B_{22} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, then there exists a constant $t_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $A_{22} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & t_1 \\ -t_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

Therefore, applying $\psi_3 = \begin{pmatrix} r & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & r & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{r^2} \end{pmatrix}$ for $r \neq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(rT^1) &= \mu(\psi_3T^1) = \psi_3^{-t}\mu(T^1)\psi_3^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{r} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{r} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & r^2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & t_1 \\ 0 & -t_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{r} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{r} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & r^2 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= t_1r \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 11. *If $\mu : \mathcal{P}_o^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^3$ is an $SL(3)$ contravariant valuation, then there exists a constant $t_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\mu(rT^2) = \frac{t_1r}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

for $r \neq 0$.

Proof. Set $\mu(T^2) = \begin{pmatrix} A_{22} & A_{21} \\ A_{12} & A_{11} \end{pmatrix}$ and $\psi_4 = \begin{pmatrix} I_{22} & B_{21} \\ \mathbf{0} & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ for any matrix B_{21} . The $\text{SL}(3)$ contravariance of μ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(T^2) &= \mu(\psi_4 T^2) = \psi_4^{-t} \mu(T^2) \psi_4^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} I_{22} & \mathbf{0} \\ -B_{21}^t & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_{22} & A_{21} \\ A_{12} & A_{11} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_{22} & -B_{21} \\ \mathbf{0} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} A_{22} & -A_{22}B_{21} + A_{21} \\ -B_{21}^t A_{22} + A_{12} & B_{21}^t A_{22} B_{21} - A_{12} B_{21} - B_{21}^t A_{21} + A_{11} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

This yields

$$B_{21}^t A_{22} = A_{22} B_{21} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (3.9)$$

For $B_{21} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, then we have $A_{22} = \mathbf{0}$ and $A_{12} B_{21} + B_{21}^t A_{21} = 0$. Setting $A_{12} = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 \end{pmatrix}$, $A_{21} = \begin{pmatrix} a_3 \\ a_4 \end{pmatrix}$ and $B_{21} = \begin{pmatrix} c \\ d \end{pmatrix}$ for every $c, d \in \mathbb{R}$, it follows from (3.9) that

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c \\ d \end{pmatrix} + (c \ d) \begin{pmatrix} a_3 \\ a_4 \end{pmatrix} = c(a_1 + a_3) + d(a_2 + a_4) = 0$$

for any $c, d \in \mathbb{R}$. It leads to $a_1 + a_3 = a_2 + a_4 = 0$. Next, for $\psi_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \in \text{SL}(3)$, and by $\psi_5 T^2 = T^2$ and the $\text{SL}(3)$ contravariance of μ , we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & a_2 \\ 0 & 0 & a_1 \\ -a_2 & -a_1 & A_{11} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -a_1 \\ 0 & 0 & -a_2 \\ a_1 & a_2 & A_{11} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, $a_1 = -a_2$, and there exist constants $t_2, t_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mu(T^2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -t_2 \\ 0 & 0 & t_2 \\ t_2 & -t_2 & t_3 \end{pmatrix}$.

On the other hand, using ψ_3 , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(rT^2) &= \mu(\psi_3 T^2) = \psi_3^{-t} \mu(T^2) \psi_3^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{r} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{r} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & r^2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -t_2 \\ 0 & 0 & t_2 \\ t_2 & -t_2 & t_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{r} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{r} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & r^2 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -t_2 r \\ 0 & 0 & t_2 r \\ t_2 r & -t_2 r & t_3 r^4 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Let $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \text{GL}(3)$ be defined as in Definition 1. Since

$$T^2 \cap H^+ = \phi_2 T^2, \quad T^2 \cap H^- = \phi_1 T^2, \quad \text{and} \quad T^2 \cap H = \phi_1 T^1,$$

then the valuation property of μ gives

$$\mu(T^2) + \mu(\phi_1 T^1) = \mu(\phi_1 T^2) + \mu(\phi_2 T^2).$$

Note that $\phi_1/\lambda^{\frac{1}{3}}$, $\phi_2/(1-\lambda)^{\frac{1}{3}}$ belong to $SL(3)$, then by the $SL(3)$ contravariance of μ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(T^2) + \lambda^{\frac{2}{3}}\phi_1^{-t}\mu\left(\lambda^{\frac{1}{3}}T^1\right)\phi_1^{-1} &= \lambda^{\frac{2}{3}}\phi_1^{-t}\mu\left(\lambda^{\frac{1}{3}}T^2\right)\phi_1^{-1} \\ &+ (1-\lambda)^{\frac{2}{3}}\phi_2^{-t}\mu\left((1-\lambda)^{\frac{1}{3}}T^2\right)\phi_2^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

Combining Lemma 10 and (3.10), (3.11) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -t_2 \\ 0 & 0 & t_2 \\ t_2 & -t_2 & t_3 \end{pmatrix} + t_1 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \lambda - 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda \\ 1 - \lambda & -\lambda & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \lambda^{\frac{2}{3}} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\lambda} & \frac{\lambda-1}{\lambda} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -\lambda^{\frac{1}{3}}t_2 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda^{\frac{1}{3}}t_2 \\ \lambda^{\frac{1}{3}}t_2 & -\lambda^{\frac{1}{3}}t_2 & \lambda^{\frac{4}{3}}t_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\lambda} & 1 & 0 \\ \frac{\lambda-1}{\lambda} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ (1-\lambda)^{\frac{2}{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda} & \frac{1}{1-\lambda} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -(1-\lambda)^{\frac{1}{3}}t_2 \\ 0 & 0 & (1-\lambda)^{\frac{1}{3}}t_2 \\ (1-\lambda)^{\frac{1}{3}}t_2 & -(1-\lambda)^{\frac{1}{3}}t_2 & (1-\lambda)^{\frac{4}{3}}t_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{1-\lambda} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & (\lambda-2)t_2 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda t_2 \\ (2-\lambda)t_2 & -\lambda t_2 & \lambda^2 t_3 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & (\lambda-1)t_2 \\ 0 & 0 & (\lambda+1)t_2 \\ (1-\lambda)t_2 & -(\lambda+1)t_2 & (1-\lambda)^2 t_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & (2\lambda-3)t_2 \\ 0 & 0 & (2\lambda+1)t_2 \\ (3-2\lambda)t_2 & -(2\lambda+1)t_2 & (2\lambda^2-2\lambda+1)t_3 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

for every $0 < \lambda < 1$. Therefore,

$$t_2 = \frac{t_1}{2} \text{ and } t_3 = 0,$$

which yields

$$\mu(rT^2) = \frac{t_1 r}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

□

Lemma 12. *If $\mu : \mathcal{P}_o^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^3$ is an $SL(3)$ contravariant valuation, then μ is simple. Moreover, there exists a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\mu(r^{\frac{1}{3}}T^3) = cI(r^{\frac{1}{3}}T^3) + 2L_\xi(r^{\frac{1}{3}}T^3)$$

for $r > 0$.

Proof. By the valuation property of μ , it follows that

$$\mu(r^{\frac{1}{3}}T^3) + \mu(\phi_1 r^{\frac{1}{3}}T^2) = \mu(\phi_1 r^{\frac{1}{3}}T^3) + \mu(\phi_2 r^{\frac{1}{3}}T^3).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(r^{\frac{1}{3}}T^3) + \lambda^{\frac{2}{3}}\phi_1^{-t}\mu\left((\lambda r)^{\frac{1}{3}}T^2\right)\phi_1^{-1} &= \lambda^{\frac{2}{3}}\phi_1^{-t}\mu\left((\lambda r)^{\frac{1}{3}}T^3\right)\phi_1^{-1} \\ &+ (1-\lambda)^{\frac{2}{3}}\phi_2^{-t}\mu\left(((1-\lambda)r)^{\frac{1}{3}}T^3\right)\phi_2^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Setting $\lambda = a/a+b$ and $r = a+b$ for $a, b > 0$. Combining with Lemma 11, it follows from (3.12) that

$$\begin{aligned} (a+b)^{\frac{2}{3}}\mu\left((a+b)^{\frac{1}{3}}T^3\right) + \frac{t_1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -(a+2b) \\ 0 & 0 & a \\ a+2b & -a & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ = a^{\frac{2}{3}}\phi_1^{-t}\mu(a^{\frac{1}{3}}T^3)\phi_1^{-1} + b^{\frac{2}{3}}\phi_2^{-t}\mu(b^{\frac{1}{3}}T^3)\phi_2^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

For $x^{\frac{2}{3}}\mu(x^{\frac{1}{3}}T^3) = \begin{pmatrix} g_{11}(x) & g_{12}(x) & g_{13}(x) \\ g_{21}(x) & g_{22}(x) & g_{23}(x) \\ g_{31}(x) & g_{32}(x) & g_{33}(x) \end{pmatrix}$ and $\psi_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(x^{\frac{1}{3}}T^3) &= \mu(\psi_6 x^{\frac{1}{3}}T^3) = \psi_6^{-t}\mu(x^{\frac{1}{3}}T^3)\psi_6^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} x^{-\frac{2}{3}} \begin{pmatrix} g_{11}(x) & g_{12}(x) & g_{13}(x) \\ g_{21}(x) & g_{22}(x) & g_{23}(x) \\ g_{31}(x) & g_{32}(x) & g_{33}(x) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= x^{-\frac{2}{3}} \begin{pmatrix} g_{33}(x) & g_{31}(x) & g_{32}(x) \\ g_{13}(x) & g_{11}(x) & g_{12}(x) \\ g_{23}(x) & g_{21}(x) & g_{22}(x) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= x^{-\frac{2}{3}} \begin{pmatrix} g_{11}(x) & g_{12}(x) & g_{13}(x) \\ g_{21}(x) & g_{22}(x) & g_{23}(x) \\ g_{31}(x) & g_{32}(x) & g_{33}(x) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

It leads to

$$g_{11} = g_{22} = g_{33}, g_{12} = g_{23} = g_{31} \text{ and } g_{13} = g_{21} = g_{32}.$$

Therefore, (3.13) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{pmatrix} g_1(a+b) & g_2(a+b) & g_3(a+b) \\ g_3(a+b) & g_1(a+b) & g_2(a+b) \\ g_2(a+b) & g_3(a+b) & g_1(a+b) \end{pmatrix} + \frac{t_1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -(a+2b) \\ 0 & 0 & a \\ a+2b & -a & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{(a+b)^2+b^2}{a^2}g_1(a) - \frac{(a+b)b}{a^2}g_3(a) - \frac{(a+b)b}{a^2}g_2(a) & \frac{a+b}{a}g_2(a) - \frac{b}{a}g_1(a) & \frac{a+b}{a}g_3(a) - \frac{b}{a}g_2(a) \\ \frac{a+b}{a}g_3(a) - \frac{b}{a}g_1(a) & g_1(a) & g_2(a) \\ \frac{a+b}{a}g_2(a) - \frac{b}{a}g_3(a) & g_3(a) & g_1(a) \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ \begin{pmatrix} g_1(b) & \frac{a+b}{b}g_2(b) - \frac{a}{b}g_1(b) & g_3(b) \\ \frac{a+b}{b}g_3(b) - \frac{a}{b}g_1(b) & \frac{(a+b)^2+a^2}{b^2}g_1(b) - \frac{(a+b)a}{b^2}g_3(b) - \frac{(a+b)a}{b^2}g_2(b) & \frac{a+b}{b}g_2(b) - \frac{a}{b}g_3(b) \\ g_2(b) & \frac{a+b}{b}g_3(b) - \frac{a}{b}g_2(b) & g_1(b) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$g_1(a+b) = \frac{(a+b)^2 + b^2}{a^2}g_1(a) - \frac{(a+b)b}{a^2}g_3(a) - \frac{(a+b)b}{a^2}g_2(a) + g_1(b), \quad (3.14)$$

$$g_3(a+b) = \frac{a+b}{a}g_3(a) - \frac{b}{a}g_1(a) + \frac{a+b}{b}g_3(b) - \frac{a}{b}g_1(b), \quad (3.15)$$

$$g_2(a+b) + \frac{t_1(a+2b)}{2} = \frac{a+b}{a}g_2(a) - \frac{b}{a}g_3(a) + g_2(b), \quad (3.16)$$

$$g_2(a+b) = \frac{a+b}{a}g_2(a) - \frac{b}{a}g_1(a) + \frac{a+b}{b}g_2(b) - \frac{a}{b}g_1(b), \quad (3.17)$$

$$g_1(a+b) = g_1(a) + \frac{(a+b)^2 + a^2}{b^2}g_1(b) - \frac{(a+b)a}{b^2}g_3(b) - \frac{(a+b)a}{b^2}g_2(b), \quad (3.18)$$

$$g_3(a+b) - \frac{t_1a}{2} = g_3(a) + \frac{a+b}{b}g_3(b) - \frac{a}{b}g_2(b), \quad (3.19)$$

$$g_3(a+b) - \frac{t_1(a+2b)}{2} = \frac{a+b}{a}g_3(a) - \frac{b}{a}g_2(a) + g_3(b), \quad (3.20)$$

$$g_2(a+b) + \frac{t_1a}{2} = g_2(a) + \frac{a+b}{b}g_2(b) - \frac{a}{b}g_3(b), \quad (3.21)$$

$$g_1(a+b) = g_1(a) + g_1(b). \quad (3.22)$$

By (3.15) and (3.17), we obtain

$$g_2(a+b) - g_3(a+b) = \frac{a+b}{a}(g_2(a) - g_3(a)) + \frac{a+b}{b}(g_2(b) - g_3(b)),$$

which is equivalent to

$$g_2(x) - g_3(x) = \eta(x)x, \quad (3.23)$$

where $\eta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a solution of Cauchy's functional equation. Applying (3.16), (3.21) and (3.23), we have

$$t_1 = \eta(a) - \frac{a}{b}\eta(b). \quad (3.24)$$

It follows from (3.20), (3.21) and (3.23) that $\eta(a+b) + t_1 = \eta(a) + \eta(b)$. Hence,

$$t_1 = 0. \quad (3.25)$$

Inserting (3.25) into (3.24), we have $\eta(a)/a = \eta(b)/b$. So there exists a constant $t_4 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\eta(x) = t_4x$. Further, combining (3.16), (3.23) and (3.25), we have $g_2(a+b) = g_2(a) + g_2(b) + abt_4$. This yields

$$g_2(x) = \xi(x) + \frac{t_4x^2}{2}, \quad (3.26)$$

where $\xi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a solution of Cauchy's functional equation. So

$$g_3(x) = \xi(x) - \frac{t_4x^2}{2}. \quad (3.27)$$

By (3.14), (3.26) and (3.27), we obtain

$$g_1(a+b) = \frac{a^2 + 2b^2 + 2ab}{a^2}g_1(a) + g_1(b) - \frac{2(a+b)b}{a^2}\xi(a). \quad (3.28)$$

Similarly, it follows from (3.18), (3.26) and (3.27) that

$$g_1(a+b) = g_1(a) + \frac{2a^2 + b^2 + 2ab}{b^2}g_1(b) - \frac{2(a+b)a}{b^2}\xi(b). \quad (3.29)$$

Combining (3.28) and (3.29), then we have

$$\frac{g_1(a) - \xi(a)}{a^3} = \frac{g_1(b) - \xi(b)}{b^3}.$$

Hence, there exists a constant $h \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$g_1(x) = \xi(x) + hx^3. \quad (3.30)$$

Inserting (3.22) into (3.14) it concludes that $2g_1(a) - g_2(a) - g_3(a) = 0$. Applying (3.26), (3.27) and (3.30) to obtain $h = 0$. Thus,

$$g_1(x) = \xi(x). \quad (3.31)$$

From (3.25), Lemma 10 and Lemma 11, we have $\mu(rT^1) = \mu(rT^2) = \mathbf{0}$ for every $r > 0$. Since every k -dimensional simplex $T \in \mathcal{P}_o^3$ is an $\mathrm{SL}(3)$ image of rT^k for $k = 1, 2$, we obtain $\mu(T) = \mathbf{0}$ for every simplex T with $\dim T \leq 2$. Moreover, applying the triangulation of k -dimensional polytope P into simplices as a set of k -dimensional simplices $\{T_1, \dots, T_m\}$, which have one vertex at the origin and pairwise disjoint interiors. Then it follows from the inclusion-exclusion principle that $\mu(P) = \mathbf{0}$ for every $P \in \mathcal{P}_o^3$ on $\dim T \leq 2$, that is, μ is simple.

Applying (3.26), (3.27) and (3.31), it yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(r^{\frac{1}{3}}T^3) &= r^{-\frac{2}{3}} \begin{pmatrix} \xi(r) & \xi(r) + \frac{t_4 r^2}{2} & \xi(r) - \frac{t_4 r^2}{2} \\ \xi(r) - \frac{t_4 r^2}{2} & \xi(r) & \xi(r) + \frac{t_4 r^2}{2} \\ \xi(r) + \frac{t_4 r^2}{2} & \xi(r) - \frac{t_4 r^2}{2} & \xi(r) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= t_4 r^{\frac{4}{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} \\ -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \xi(r) r^{-\frac{2}{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= -\frac{t_4}{2} I(r^{\frac{1}{3}}T^3) + 2L_\xi(r^{\frac{1}{3}}T^3). \end{aligned}$$

Set $c = -\frac{t_4}{2}$ to complete the proof. \square

Next, we give the proof of Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. By Lemma 6 we obtain that (1.1) determines an $\mathrm{SL}(3)$ contravariant valuation on \mathcal{P}_o^3 . On the other hand, combining Lemma 3, Lemma 9 and Lemma 12 we complete the reverse statement. \square

3.3. The higher-dimensional case. First, we use the tensor representation for $A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{M}$, that is

$$A = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} a_{ij} e_i \otimes e_j,$$

and write $a_{ij} = A(e_i, e_j)$. For every $\phi \in \mathrm{GL}(n)$ and $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define

$$(\phi^{-t} \cdot A)(y_1, y_2) = A(\phi^{-1}y_1, \phi^{-1}y_2),$$

where $1 \leq l < k \leq n-1$ and $l, k \neq i$. Applying the $SL(n)$ contravariance of μ we have

$$\mu(rT^{n-1})(e_i, e_n) = \mu(\tau_6 r T^{n-1})(e_i, e_n) = \mu(rT^{n-1})(\tau_6^{-1} e_i, \tau_6^{-1} e_n) = -\mu(rT^{n-1})(e_i, e_n).$$

This yields $\mu(rT^{n-1})(e_i, e_n) = 0$. Similarly, we know $\mu(rT^{n-1})(e_n, e_i) = 0$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. Applying $\tau_0 \in SL(n)$ in the proof of Lemma 14. Since $\tau_0 r T^n = r T^n$, the $SL(n)$ contravariance of μ implies

$$\mu(rT^n)(e_i, e_j) = \mu(\tau_0 r T^n)(e_i, e_j) = \mu(rT^n)(\tau_0^{-1} e_i, \tau_0^{-1} e_j) = \mu(rT^n)(e_j, e_i),$$

where $i \neq j$ and $r > 0$. Hence, $\mu(rT^n)$ is symmetric. Moreover, by Lemma 14 we obtain $\mu(r\tilde{T}^k) = \mathbf{0}$ for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$. Then the symmetry consumption of the images of μ can be removed in the proof of Ma and Wang [24]. Combining with Lemma 2 we complete the proof. \square

4. $SL(n)$ CONTRAVARIANT VALUATIONS ON \mathcal{P}^n

4.1. The two-dimensional case.

Lemma 15. [29] *A function $\mu : \mathcal{P}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^2$ is an $SL(2)$ equivariant valuation if and only if there exist constants $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5 \in \mathbb{R}$ and solutions of Cauchy's functional equation $\alpha, \alpha', \beta, \beta' : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(P) = & c_1 M(P) + c_2 M([o, P]) + c_3 E([o, P]) + c_4 F([o, P]) + H_\alpha([o, P]) \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} H_{\alpha'}([o, v_{i+1}, v_i]) + G_\beta([o, P]) + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} G_{\beta'}([o, v_{i+1}, v_i]) + c_5 \rho_{\pi/2} \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

for every $P \in \mathcal{P}^2$ with vertices v_1, \dots, v_r visible from the origin and labeled counter-clockwise.

Theorem 6 follows from Lemma 7 and Lemma 15 immediately.

4.2. The three-dimensional case.

Lemma 16. *If $\mu : \mathcal{P}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^3$ is an $SL(3)$ contravariant valuation, then there exist a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and a solution of Cauchy's functional equation $\xi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\mu(r^{\frac{1}{3}}\tilde{T}^3) = c I([o, r^{\frac{1}{3}}\tilde{T}^3]) + 2 L_\xi([o, r^{\frac{1}{3}}\tilde{T}^3])$$

for every $r > 0$.

Proof. Using proofs similar to Lemma 10 and Lemma 11, we have $\mu(r^{\frac{1}{3}}\tilde{T}^k) = \mathbf{0}$ for $k = 1, 2$. Let $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in GL(3)$ be defined as in Definition 1. Combining (2.4) and the valuation property of μ we have

$$\mu(r^{\frac{1}{3}}\tilde{T}^3) = \lambda^{\frac{2}{3}} \phi_1^{-t} \mu\left((\lambda r)^{\frac{1}{3}}\tilde{T}^3\right) \phi_1^{-1} + (1-\lambda)^{\frac{2}{3}} \phi_2^{-t} \mu\left(((1-\lambda)r)^{\frac{1}{3}}\tilde{T}^3\right) \phi_2^{-1}.$$

Setting $\lambda = a/a+b$ and $r = a+b$ for $a, b > 0$ to obtain

$$(a+b)^{\frac{2}{3}} \mu\left((a+b)^{\frac{1}{3}}\tilde{T}^3\right) = a^{\frac{2}{3}} \phi_1^{-t} \mu(a^{\frac{1}{3}}\tilde{T}^3) \phi_1^{-1} + b^{\frac{2}{3}} \phi_2^{-t} \mu(b^{\frac{1}{3}}\tilde{T}^3) \phi_2^{-1}.$$

Next, using a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 12, then there exist a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and a solution of Cauchy's functional equation $\xi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\mu(r^{\frac{1}{3}}\tilde{T}^3) = cI([o, r^{\frac{1}{3}}\tilde{T}^3]) + 2L_\xi([o, r^{\frac{1}{3}}\tilde{T}^3]).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 5. It follows from Lemma 6 that the expression in (1.3) is an SL(3) contravariant valuation. It remains to show the reverse statement.

First, it suffices to consider $T \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^3$ for $r > 0$. Let $T \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}^3$ with F being the facet of T visible from the origin, then $[o, F] \cap T = F$ and $[o, F] \cup T = [o, T]$. Using the valuation property of μ and the inclusion-exclusion principle, we have

$$\mu([o, T]) = \mu([o, F] \cup T) = \mu(T) + \mu([o, F]) - \mu(F). \quad (4.2)$$

From Theorem 2 there exist a constant $k_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and a solution of Cauchy's functional equation $\xi_1 : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\mu([o, T]) = k_1 I([o, T]) + 2L_{\xi_1}([o, T]) \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$\mu([o, F]) = k_1 I([o, F]) + 2L_{\xi_1}([o, F]). \quad (4.4)$$

By Lemma 16 there exist a constant $k_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and a solution of Cauchy's functional equation $\xi'_1 : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\mu(F) = k_2 I([o, F]) + 2L_{\xi'_1}([o, F]). \quad (4.5)$$

From (4.2), (4.3), (4.4) and (4.5) we obtain

$$\mu(T) = k_1 I([o, T]) + (k_2 - k_1) I([o, F]) + 2L_{\xi_1}([o, T]) + 2L_{\xi'_1 - \xi_1}([o, F]).$$

Let $c_1 = k_1$, $c_2 = (k_2 - k_1)$ and $\xi_2 = \xi'_1 - \xi_1$, we have

$$\mu(T) = c_1 I([o, T]) + c_2 I([o, F]) + 2L_{\xi_1}([o, T]) + 2L_{\xi_2}([o, F]). \quad (4.6)$$

Second, let $P \in \mathcal{P}^3 \setminus \mathcal{P}_o^3$, Triangulate P into simplices T_1, \dots, T_r . Let F_1, \dots, F_l be the facets of P visible from the origin.

Applying the inclusion-exclusion principle, Lemma 4 and (4.6), we drive that

$$\mu(P) = c_1 I([o, P]) + c_2 \sum_{i=1}^l I([o, F_i]) + 2L_{\xi_1}([o, P]) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^l L_{\xi_2}([o, F_i]).$$

Finally, for $P \in \mathcal{P}^3$. Since it follows from Lemma 12 that $\mu(r^{\frac{1}{3}}\tilde{T}^k) = \mathbf{0}$ for $k = 1, 2$. Combining the triangulation, the inclusion-exclusion principle and Lemma 16, the assertion holds.

□

4.3. **The higher-dimensional case.** In the final step, we extend Theorem 1 to \mathcal{P}^n .

Lemma 17. [24] *Let $n \geq 4$. A function $\mu : \mathcal{P}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_e^n$ is an $SL(n)$ contravariant valuation if and only if there exist solutions of Cauchy's functional equation $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\mu(P) = L_{\zeta_1}(P) + L_{\zeta_2}([o, P])$$

for every $P \in \mathcal{P}^n$, where $[o, P]$ denotes the convex hull of the origin and P .

Actually, the symmetry assumption in Lemma 17 can be removed for $n \geq 4$.

Proof of Theorem 4. Since $\tau_0 r T^n = r T^n$ and $\tau_0 r \tilde{T}^n = r \tilde{T}^n$, where $\tau_0 \in SL(n)$ comes from Lemma 14 and $r > 0$. The $SL(n)$ contravariance of μ implies

$$\mu(r T^n)(e_i, e_j) = \mu(\tau_0 r T^n)(e_i, e_j) = \mu(r T^n)(\tau_0^{-1} e_i, \tau_0^{-1} e_j) = \mu(r T^n)(e_j, e_i)$$

and

$$\mu(r \tilde{T}^n)(e_i, e_j) = \mu(\tau_0 r \tilde{T}^n)(e_i, e_j) = \mu(r \tilde{T}^n)(\tau_0^{-1} e_i, \tau_0^{-1} e_j) = \mu(r \tilde{T}^n)(e_j, e_i),$$

where $i \neq j$ and $r > 0$. Hence, $\mu(r T^n)$ and $\mu(r \tilde{T}^n)$ are both symmetric.

Furthermore, by Lemma 14 we obtain $\mu(r \tilde{T}^k) = \mathbf{0}$ for $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$. Hence, the symmetry consumption of the images of μ can be removed in the proof of Ma and Wang [24]. Apply Lemma 17 to complete the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Alesker, Continuous rotation invariant valuations on convex sets, *Ann. of Math.* (2) 149 (1999), 977-1005.
- [2] S. Alesker, Description of continuous isometry covariant valuations on convex sets, *Geom. Dedicata* 74 (1999), 241-248.
- [3] S. Alesker, On P. McMullen's conjecture on translation invariant valuations, *Adv. Math.* 155 (2000), 239-263.
- [4] S. Alesker, Description of translation invariant valuations on convex sets with solution of P. McMullen's conjecture, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 11 (2001), 244-272.
- [5] S. Artstein-Avidan, A. Giannopoulos and V. D. Milman, *Asymptotic geometric analysis. Part I*, *Math. Surveys Monogr*, American Mathematical Society, vol. 202, Providence, RI, 2015.
- [6] Y. Chen, An almost constant lower bound of the isoperimetric coefficient in the KLS conjecture, *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 31 (2021), 34-61.
- [7] R. J. Gardner, *Geometric tomography*, *Encyclopedia Math. Appl.* 58, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [8] D. A. Klain, Star valuations and dual mixed volumes, *Adv. Math.* 121 (1996), 80-101.
- [9] D. A. Klain, Invariant valuations on star-shaped sets, *Adv. Math.* 125 (1997), 95-113.
- [10] D. A. Klain, Even valuations on convex bodies, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 352 (2000), 71-93.
- [11] D. A. Klain, G. C. Rota, *Introduction to geometric probability*, *Lezioni Lincee [Lincei Lectures]*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.

- [12] B. Klartag, E. Milman, Centroid bodies and the logarithmic Laplace transform—a unified approach, *J. Funct. Anal.* 262 (2012), 10-34.
- [13] O. G. Guleryuz, E. Lutwak, D. Yang, G. Zhang, Information-theoretic inequalities for contoured probability distributions, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 48 (2002), 2377-2383.
- [14] P. M. Gruber, *Convex and discrete geometry*, Grundlehren Math. Wiss., 336 [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences] Springer, Berlin, 2007.
- [15] M. Ludwig, Moment vectors of polytopes, IV International Conference in "Stochastic Geometry, Convex Bodies, Empirical Measures and Applications to Engineering Science", Vol. II (Tropea, 2001), *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo (2) Suppl.* 70 (2002), 123-138.
- [16] M. Ludwig, Projection bodies and valuations, *Adv. Math.* 172 (2002), 158-168.
- [17] M. Ludwig, Valuations of polytopes containing the origin in their interiors, *Adv. Math.* 170 (2002), 239-256.
- [18] M. Ludwig, Ellipsoids and matrix-valued valuations, *Duke Math. J.* 119 (2003), 159-188.
- [19] M. Ludwig, M. Reitzner, A characterization of affine surface area, *Adv. Math.* 147 (1999), 138-172.
- [20] E. Lutwak, D. Yang, and G. Zhang, The Cramer-Rao inequality for star bodies, *Duke Math. J.* 112 (2002), 59-81.
- [21] E. Lutwak, D. Yang, and G. Zhang, A new ellipsoid associated with convex bodies, *Duke Math. J.* 104 (2000), 375-390.
- [22] P. McMullen, Valuations and dissections, *Handbook of convex geometry*, Vol. A, B, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1993, 933-988.
- [23] P. McMullen, R. Schneider, Valuations on convex bodies, *Convexity and its applications*, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1983, 170-247.
- [24] D. Ma, W. Wang, LYZ matrices and SL(n) contravariant valuations on polytopes, *Canad. J. Math.* 73 (2021), 383-398.
- [25] L. Parapatits, SL(n)-contravariant L_p -Minkowski valuations, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 366 (2014), 1195-1211.
- [26] R. Schneider, *Convex bodies: the Brunn-Minkowski theory*, Encyclopedia Math. Appl. 44, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [27] F. E. Schuster, T. Wannerer, GL(n) contravariant Minkowski valuations, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 364 (2012), 815-826.
- [28] T. Wannerer, GL(n) equivariant Minkowski valuations, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 60 (2011), 1655-1672.
- [29] W. Wang, SL(n) equivariant matrix-valued valuations on polytopes, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* (2022), 10302-10346.
- [30] C. N. Zeng, D. Ma, SL(n) covariant vector valuations on polytopes, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 370 (2018), 8999-9023.

1.SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS SCIENCES, CHONGQING NORMAL UNIVERSITY, CHONGQING 401331, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA; INSTITUT FÜR DISKRETE MATHEMATIK UND GEOMETRIE, TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT WIEN, WIEDNER HAUPTSTRASSE 8-10/1046, 1040 WIEN, AUSTRIA

Email address: zengchn@cqu.edu.cn

2.SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, CHONGQING NORMAL UNIVERSITY, CHONGQING
401332, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
Email address: zhouyuqi202212@163.com