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1. Introduction and main results

Let $\Gamma : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be a positively 1–homogeneous convex function such that $\Gamma(x) > 0$ for all $x \neq 0$. The Wulff problem associated to $\Gamma$ is

$$\operatorname{Min} \left\{ \int_{\partial^* E} \Gamma(v^E(x)) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} : \mathcal{L}^N(E) = \text{const} \right\},$$

where $E$ ranges among all sets of finite perimeter satisfying the constraint $\mathcal{L}^N(E) = \text{const}$. Here $v^E$ is the (generalized) outer normal to $E$ and $\partial^* E$ is the (reduced) boundary of $E$ (which equals the usual boundary $\partial E$ if $E$ is smooth). For an anisotropic function $\Gamma$, one of the first attempts to solve this problem is contained in a paper by G. Wulff [22] dating back to 1901. However, it was only in 1944 that A. Dinghas [9] proved that within the special class of convex polytopes the minimiser of (1.1) is a set homothetic to the unit ball of the dual norm of $\Gamma(x)$, i.e.,

$$W_{\Gamma} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : \langle x, v \rangle - \Gamma(v) < 0 \text{ for all } v \in S^{N-1} \},$$

which is known as the Wulff shape set.

Introducing the quantity

$$P_{\Gamma}(E) = \int_{\partial^* E} \Gamma(v^E(x)) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1},$$

the minimality of $W_{\Gamma}$ is expressed by saying that $P_{\Gamma}(E) \geq P_{\Gamma}(W_{\Gamma})$ for all sets such that $\mathcal{L}^N(E) = \mathcal{L}^N(W_{\Gamma})$ or, equivalently, that

$$P_{\Gamma}(E) \geq \left( \frac{\mathcal{L}^N(E)}{\mathcal{L}^N(W_{\Gamma})} \right)^{\frac{N-1}{N}} P_{\Gamma}(W_{\Gamma}),$$

(1.4)

for all sets $E$ with finite measure. Thus, inequality (1.4) can be viewed as a natural extension of the classical isoperimetric inequality where the usual perimeter is replaced by the ‘perimeter’ defined in (1.3). And in this respect the Wulff shape set $W_{\Gamma}$ plays the same role or the unit ball $B_1$ in the isoperimetric inequality. In fact one can prove that equality occurs in (1.4) if and only if $E$ is equivalent to $W_{\Gamma}$ (up to a translation and a homothety). This latter result was first proved by J. Taylor ([19, 20, 21]) using deep techniques of geometric measure theory and later on, with a more analytical and simpler proof, by I. Fonseca and S. Müller in [12] (see also the 2-dimensional proof given in [7]).

In this paper we give a quantitative version of inequality (1.4). Namely we prove that if $E$ is a set of finite perimeter with prescribed measure such that $P_{\Gamma}(E)$ is close to the minimum value in (1.1), then $E$ is close (in a precise, quantitative sense) to a homothetic of the Wulff shape set.

In the special case $\Gamma(x) = |x|$, i.e., when $P_{\Gamma}$ coincides with the standard perimeter, this problem was first studied by T. Bonnesen [3] in the 2-dimensional case. For the general $N$-dimensional case, recent results have been obtained by B. Fuglede (see [13]) and R. Hall [15]. But before describing them with more details, let us introduce a quantity which plays a crucial role in our problem.

Given a set of finite perimeter $E$, with finite positive measure, we call isoperimetric deficit of $E$ with respect to $\Gamma$ the quantity

$$\Delta_{\Gamma}(E) = \frac{P_{\Gamma}(E)}{P_{\Gamma}(W_{\Gamma})} \left( \frac{\mathcal{L}^N(W_{\Gamma})}{\mathcal{L}^N(E)} \right)^{\frac{N-1}{N}} - 1.$$  

(1.5)

The geometric meaning of $\Delta_{\Gamma}(E)$ is clear when one rewrites the isoperimetric inequality (1.4) in the equivalent form

$$\frac{P_{\Gamma}(E)}{P_{\Gamma}(W_{\Gamma})} \left( \frac{\mathcal{L}^N(W_{\Gamma})}{\mathcal{L}^N(E)} \right)^{\frac{N-1}{N}} \geq 1.$$  

Thus, $\Delta_{\Gamma}(E)$ measures how far is the set $E$ from realizing equality in (1.4).

Denoting by $\Delta(E)$ the isoperimetric deficit of $E$ referred to the usual perimeter $P(E)$, the theorem proved by Fuglede in [13] states that if $E$ is a convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^N (N \geq 4)$ such that $\mathcal{L}^N(E) = \mathcal{L}^N(B_1)$, then (up to a translation)

$$\delta_H(E, B_1) \leq \text{const} \left[ \Delta(E) \right]^\frac{2}{N+1},$$

(1.6)
where \( \delta_H \) denotes the Hausdorff distance of two convex sets (see the definition (1.15) below). Later on, Hall in [15] extended Fuglede's result to sets of finite perimeters. He proved that if \( \mathcal{L}^N (E) = \mathcal{L}^N (B_1) \), then (up to a translation)

\[
\mathcal{L}^N (E \Delta B_1) \leq \text{const} \left[ \Delta (E) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\]

(1.7)

However, the proof given by Fuglede heavily relies on the fact that the minimal set in the case of the usual perimeter is a ball. Indeed his argument is based on a careful estimate of the Poincaré inequality for maps from \( \mathbb{S}^{N-1} \) into \( \mathbb{R}^N \) which is obtained via spherical harmonics and the use of Laplace-Beltrami operator. On the other hand, also Hall's proof of (1.7) uses in an essential way the property that the usual perimeter decreases under Steiner symmetrization with respect to a line, a fact which is no longer true in our setting. Therefore, it is clear that both proofs fail in the anisotropic case, where the geometry of the optimal set plays no role (since \( W^\Gamma \) can be any open convex set) and thus one must try to extract all the relevant information from the smallness of \( \Delta^\Gamma (E) \) alone. Notice also that the exponent on the right-hand side of (1.7) does not seem to be optimal since, as observed in [15], the optimal exponent should be 1/2 in any dimension. Moreover, it is clear that if \( E \) is not convex one cannot expect any better estimate than (1.7), while the \( L^\infty \) type estimate (1.6) is due to the fact that \( E \) is assumed to be convex.

In order to state our main result, which deals with the anisotropic perimeter (1.3), let us recall the assumptions on the convex function \( \Gamma \),

\[
\Gamma (tx) = t \Gamma (x) \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \ t \geq 0, \quad \Gamma (x) > 0 \quad \text{if} \quad x \neq 0,
\]

(1.8)

and set

\[
m_\Gamma = \min_{v \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}} \Gamma (v), \quad M_\Gamma = \max_{v \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}} \Gamma (v).
\]

(1.9)

Notice that, denoting by \( B_r \) the open ball of radius \( r \) centered at the origin, from the definition (1.2) of \( W^\Gamma \) and from (1.9) it follows easily that

\[
B_{m_\Gamma} \subset W^\Gamma \subset B_{M_\Gamma}.
\]

(1.10)

**Theorem 1.1.** Let \( \Gamma \) be a convex function satisfying (1.8). There exists a constant \( c_0 \) depending only on \( \Gamma \) and \( N \) such that if \( E \) is a set of finite perimeter with \( \mathcal{L}^N (E) = \mathcal{L}^N (W^\Gamma) \), then there exists \( x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N \) with the property that

\[
\mathcal{L}^N ((x_0 + E) \Delta W^\Gamma) \leq c_0 \left[ \Delta^\Gamma (E) \right]^{\alpha(N)},
\]

(1.11)

where \( \alpha(N) = \frac{2}{N(N + 1)} \) if \( N \geq 3 \), \( \alpha(2) = 2/9 \).
Notice that the isoperimetric deficit $\Delta_\Gamma(E)$ is invariant under dilations. Therefore, the estimate (1.11) can be immediately extended to the case $L^N(E) \neq L^N(W_\Gamma)$, provided that we replace $E$ by $\lambda E$, where $\lambda$ is such that $L^N(\lambda E) = L^N(W_\Gamma)$.

The key idea for the proof of Theorem 1.1 is that the isoperimetric deficit can be used to estimate the difference of the measures of the $(N-1)$-dimensional sections of $E$ and $W_\Gamma$, as stated by the next lemma.

**Lemma 1.2.** Under the same assumptions of Theorem 1.1, there exists a constant $c_1$, depending only on $m_\Gamma$, $M_\Gamma$, and $N$, such that there exists a point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with the property that for all $\nu \in S^{N-1}$

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |H^{N-1}([x \in x_0 + E : \langle x, \nu \rangle = s]) - H^{N-1}([x \in W_\Gamma : \langle x, \nu \rangle = s])|ds \\
\leq c_1 [\Delta_\Gamma(E)]^{\beta(N)},
$$

(1.12)

where $\beta(N) = 1/N$ if $N \geq 3$, $\beta(2) = 1/3$.

The proof of this estimate uses two main ingredients. The first one, Theorem 2.4, is a sharp version of the classical Brunn–Minkowski inequality proved in [12]. This theorem allows us to estimate $P_\Gamma(E)$ (hence $\Delta_\Gamma(E)$) from below by means of an integral expression involving the measures of the sections of $E$ and $W_\Gamma$ orthogonal to a fixed direction $\nu$ (Lemma 2.7). However this estimate can be used for proving (1.12) only if the measures of these sections are bounded away from zero. To fulfill this requirement we must truncate the set $E$. More precisely, in Lemma 3.1 we show that if $\Delta_\Gamma(E)$ is small, one may truncate $E$ by means of two hyperplanes orthogonal to $\nu$ in such a way that the volume and the perimeter of the resulting set $\tilde{E}$ differ very little from the corresponding quantities for $E$, and the measures of all sections of $\tilde{E}$ are greater than $\Delta_\Gamma(E)$.

To understand better the role played by the estimate (1.12) notice that, by Fubini’s theorem, if $E$ and $F$ are measurable sets, then for all $\nu \in S^{N-1}$

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |H^{N-1}([x \in E : \langle x, \nu \rangle = s]) - H^{N-1}([x \in F : \langle x, \nu \rangle = s])|ds \leq L^N(E \Delta F).
$$

(1.13)

Observe that Theorem 1.1 would follow at once from (1.12) if a reverse inequality, such as

$$
L^N(E \Delta F) \leq c \sup_{\nu \in S^{N-1}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |H^{N-1}([x \in E : \langle x, \nu \rangle = s]) - H^{N-1}([x \in F : \langle x, \nu \rangle = s])|ds,
$$

(1.14)

would hold. Since the function

$$(\nu, s) \in S^{N-1} \times \mathbb{R} \mapsto (\nu, H^{N-1}([x \in E : \langle x, \nu \rangle = s]))$$

represents the Radon transform of the characteristic function $\chi_E$ of $E$, an inequality of the type (1.14) would imply the continuity of the inverse of the Radon transform of characteristic functions. Unfortunately, this continuity property is in general false (see [17]).

Nevertheless, we are able to get an estimate of the type (1.14), with $F$ replaced by $W/\Gamma_1$, using the fact that $W/\Gamma_1$ is a convex set and that $\mathcal{L}^N(E) = \mathcal{L}^N(W/\Gamma_1)$. To this aim, one needs to observe that when $F$ is a convex polytope and $H_\nu$ is a hyperplane orthogonal to $\nu$ containing one of the of the $(N-1)$-dimensional facets of $F$ and $H_\nu^+$ is the open half space determined by $H_\nu$ not containing $F$, then the measure of $(E \setminus F) \cap H_\nu^+$ can be estimated by

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\{x \in E: \langle x, \nu \rangle = s\}) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\{x \in F: \langle x, \nu \rangle = s\})| \, ds.$$ 

This fact, together with the equality $\mathcal{L}^N(E) = \mathcal{L}^N(F)$, yields (1.14) with a constant $c$ depending on the number of facets of $F$. Combining this observation with a quantitative approximation result of convex sets by polytopes (see Theorem 2.9), leads eventually to the proof of (1.11). However, this approximation argument is responsible for the fact that the exponent on the right-hand side of (1.11) is much worse than the one in (1.12).

We conclude the presentation of the main results contained in the paper observing that when $E$ is convex (or, for $N = 2$, connected (see [3])), the $L^1$ type estimate (1.11) can be replaced by an $L^\infty$ one. In order to state this stronger estimate we recall that if $C_1$ and $C_2$ are two open convex sets in $\mathbb{R}^N$ the Hausdorff distance of the two sets is defined by

$$\delta_H(C_1, C_2) = \max \left\{ \sup_{x \in C_1} \inf_{y \in C_2} |x - y|, \sup_{y \in C_2} \inf_{x \in C_1} |x - y| \right\}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.15)

**Theorem 1.3.** Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, there exists a constant $c_2$ depending only on $\Gamma$ and $N$, such that if $E$ is an open convex set with $\mathcal{L}^N(E) = \mathcal{L}^N(W_\Gamma)$, then there exists $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with the property that

$$\delta_H(x_0 + E, W_\Gamma) \leq c_2 \left[ \Delta_\Gamma(E) \right]^{\alpha(N) / N}, \hspace{1cm} (1.16)$$

where $\alpha(N)$ is the exponent appearing in (1.11).
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2. Background material

We collect in this section the definition and a few basic properties of sets of finite perimeter needed in the sequel. For all this material our main reference is the book [2]. The section contains also a few results on convex sets which are probably known only to the specialists in the field. However for all these properties we have preferred to refer to the books [4], [14] instead of referring to the original papers. Finally, the section contains a sharp form of the classical Brunn–Minkowski inequality proved in [12].

Let $E$ be a measurable set in $\mathbb{R}^N$. We recall that $E$ is a set of finite perimeter if the distributional derivative $D\chi_E$ of its characteristic function $\chi_E$ is a Radon measure with values in $\mathbb{R}^N$ having finite total variation $|D\chi_E|(\mathbb{R}^N)$. The quantity $|D\chi_E|(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is called the perimeter of $E$ and denoted by $P(E)$.

If $E$ is a set of finite perimeter, the reduced boundary $\partial^* E$ of $E$ consists of all points $x \in \text{supp} |D\chi_E|$ such that the limit

$$\nu^E(x) = \lim_{\rho \to 0} \frac{D\chi_E(B_\rho(x))}{|D\chi_E(B_\rho(x))|}$$

exists and satisfies $|\nu^E(x)| = 1$. The vector $\nu^E(x)$ is called the generalized outer normal to $E$ at $x$. From (2.1) it is clear that $-\nu^E(x)$ coincides with the derivative $\frac{D\chi_E}{|D\chi_E|}(x)$ of the Radon measure $D\chi_E$ with respect to its total variation. Notice also that the reduced boundary $\partial^* E$ is a (generally proper) subset of the topological boundary $\partial E$. However, if $E$ is a $C^1$ open set, then $\partial^* E = \partial E$. Moreover, a result due to De Giorgi (see, e.g., [2, Theorem 3.59]) states that if $E$ is a set of finite perimeter, then

$$|D\chi_E| = H^{N-1} \cap \partial^* E. \quad (2.2)$$

The following proposition is a generalization to $P_\Gamma$ of a well known approximation result of sets of finite perimeter by smooth sets.

**Proposition 2.1.** Let $E$ be a set of finite perimeter, with finite measure. Then, there exists a sequence $E_j$ of $C^\infty$ bounded open sets such that

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} \mathcal{L}^N(E_j \triangle E) = 0, \quad \lim_{j \to \infty} P_\Gamma(E_j) = P_\Gamma(E). \quad (2.3)$$

Moreover, if $E$ is contained in a bounded open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\Omega_0$ is an open set such that $\Omega \subset \subset \Omega_0$, the sets $E_j$ can be chosen so that $E_j \subset \Omega_0$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

**Proof.** If $\Gamma = |x|$, i.e., $P_\Gamma$ coincides with the usual perimeter, the assertion is a well known property of sets of finite perimeter (see [2, Theorem 3.42]) stating that there exists a sequence of $C^\infty$ bounded open sets $E_j$ such that

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} \mathcal{L}^N(E_j \triangle E) = 0, \quad \lim_{j \to \infty} P(E_j) = P(E). \quad (2.4)$$
From equations (2.1) and (2.2) and from the definition (1.3) we have

\[ P_{\Gamma}(E) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \Gamma\left(-\frac{D\chi_E}{|D\chi_E|}\right) d|D\chi_E|. \]  

(2.5)

Thus, the second equality in (2.3) follows at once from (2.4) and from Reschetnyak's continuity theorem (see [2, Theorem 2.39]).

**Remark 2.2.** Notice that if \( E \) is a measurable set with finite measure, then

\[
\lim_{\lambda \to 1} \mathcal{L}^N(\lambda E \triangle E) = \lim_{\lambda \to 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\chi_{\lambda E}(x) - \chi_E(x)| \, dx = \lim_{\lambda \to 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\chi_E(x/\lambda) - \chi_E(x)| \, dx = 0,
\]

(2.6)

where the last equality follows approximating \( \chi_E \) in \( L^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \) by a continuous function with compact support \( \varphi \) and then letting \( \|\varphi - \chi_E\|_{L^1} \) go to zero. Thus, multiplying the smooth sets \( E_j \) satisfying (2.3) by \( \lambda_j = \left(\frac{\mathcal{L}^N(E)}{\mathcal{L}^N(E_j)}\right)^{1/N} \) and using (2.6), we get that the sets \( E_j' = \lambda_j E_j \), satisfy the two equalities in (2.3) and the constraint \( \mathcal{L}^N(E_j') = \mathcal{L}^N(E) \) for all \( j \).

The following **Brunn–Minkowski inequality** (see [4, Theorem 8.1.1]) holds for all measurable subsets of \( \mathbb{R}^N \) (here and in the sequel \( \mathcal{L}^N \) stands for the Lebesgue measure).

**Theorem 2.3 (Brunn–Minkowski inequality).** If \( E \) and \( F \) are measurable sets in \( \mathbb{R}^N \), then

\[
\mathcal{L}^N(E + F) \geq \left(\left(\mathcal{L}^N(E)\right)^{1/N} + \left(\mathcal{L}^N(F)\right)^{1/N}\right)^N.
\]

(2.7)

Let us now introduce some quantities which are going to play an important role in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Let \( E \) be a measurable set with positive, finite measure and \( v \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1} \) a fixed direction. We set, for all \( s \in \mathbb{R} \),

\[
E_{v,s} = \{ x \in E : \langle x, v \rangle = s \}, \quad E_{v,s}^- = \{ x \in E : \langle x, v \rangle < s \},
\]

\[
h_{E,v}(s) = \frac{\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E_{v,s})}{\mathcal{L}^N(E)}, \quad g_{E,v}(s) = \frac{\mathcal{L}^N(E_{v,s}^-)}{\mathcal{L}^N(E)}.
\]

In the sequel, we shall often take \( v \) equal to the \( N \)-th coordinate vector \( e_N \). In this case we shall simply write \( E_s, E_s^-, g_E(s), h_E(s), \) in place of \( E_{v,s}, E_{v,s}^-, g_{E,v}(s), h_{E,v}(s) \), and denote the generic point \( x \in \mathbb{R}^N \) also by \( (x', s) \), with \( x' \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \) and \( s \in \mathbb{R} \).
A few remarks on the above definitions are in order. First, recall that the intersection of two sets of finite perimeter is a set of finite perimeter (see [2, Proposition 3.38]). Therefore, if $E$ is bounded and has finite perimeter the same is true for each set $E_{v,s}^-$. Moreover, if $E$ is a $C^\infty$ open set, from the definition of reduced boundary one easily gets that for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\partial^* E_{v,s}^- = (\partial E \cap \{x : \langle x, v \rangle < s\}) \cup (E \cap \{x : \langle x, v \rangle = s\}) \cup \Sigma_{v,s}, \quad (2.8)$$

where $\Sigma_{v,s}$ is a subset of $(\partial E)_{v,s}$. Notice also that $g_{E,v}$ is an absolutely continuous function and that $g'_{E,v}(s) = h_{E,v}(s)$ for $\mathcal{L}^1$-a.e. $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

The following sharp version of Brunn-Minkowski inequality can be found in [12, Lemma 3.2].

**Theorem 2.4.** Let $v \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ and let $E, F$ be bounded measurable sets such that $\mathcal{L}^N(E) = \mathcal{L}^N(F)$. If the functions $g_{E,v}$ and $g_{F,v}$ satisfy $g'_{E,v}(s) > 0$, $g'_{F,v}(s) > 0$ for $\mathcal{L}^1$-a.e. $s$ in the sets $\{0 < g_{E,v} < 1\}$ and $\{0 < g_{F,v} < 1\}$, respectively, then for all $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\mathcal{L}^N (E + \varepsilon F) \geq \mathcal{L}^N (E) \int_0^1 \left( 1 + \varepsilon \left( \frac{\gamma_{F,v}(t)}{\gamma_{E,v}(t)} \right)^{\frac{1}{N-1}} \right)^{-1} \left( 1 + \varepsilon \frac{\gamma_{E,v}(t)}{\gamma_{F,v}(t)} \right) dt, \quad (2.9)$$

where $\gamma_{E,v}(t) = h_{E,v}(g_{E,v}(t))$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$ and $\gamma_{F,v}$ is defined similarly.

Notice that since $g_{E,v}$ is a strictly increasing absolutely continuous function with $g'_{E,v}(s) > 0$ for $\mathcal{L}^1$-a.e. $s$ in $\{0 < g_{E,v} < 1\}$, then $g_{E,v}^{-1}$ is absolutely continuous in $(0, 1)$ and

$$\gamma_{E,v}(t) = h_{E,v}(g_{E,v}(t)) = \frac{1}{Dg_{E,v}^{-1}(t)} \quad \text{for } \mathcal{L}^1\text{-a.e. } t \in (0, 1).$$

Next lemma contains some useful properties of the function $h_{E,v}$.

**Lemma 2.5.** Let $E$ be a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$ and let $v \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$. Then $h_{E,v} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is lower semicontinuous. Moreover, if $E$ is $C^\infty$ and

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\{x \in \partial E : v^E(x) = \pm v\}) = 0, \quad (2.10)$$

$h_{E,v}$ is continuous and for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$

$$P^\Gamma(E_{v,s}^-) = \int_{\{x \in \partial E: \langle x, v \rangle < s\}} \Gamma(v^E(x)) d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} + \Gamma(v)\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E_{v,s}). \quad (2.11)$$

**Proof.** To simplify the notation we assume $v = e_N$ and $\mathcal{L}^N(E) = 1$.

One can easily check that if $E$ is any open subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$, then $h_E$ is lower semicontinuous.
Let us now assume that \( E \) is smooth and that (2.10) holds. Let \( C_R = (-R, R)^{N-1} \times (\alpha, \beta) \) be an open cylinder such that \( \overline{E} \subset C_R \); then the function \( s \in \mathbb{R} \to \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((C_R \setminus \overline{E})_s) \) is lower semicontinuous.

Moreover, since, by (2.10), \( \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((\partial E)_s) = 0 \) for all \( s \in \mathbb{R} \),

\[
\begin{align*}
    h_E(s) &= 2^{N-1}R^{N-1} - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((C_R \setminus \overline{E})_s) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((\partial E)_s) \\
    &= 2^{N-1}R^{N-1} - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((C_R \setminus \overline{E})_s).
\end{align*}
\] (2.12)

Thus \( h_E \) is upper semicontinuous, hence continuous.

Let us now fix \( s \in \mathbb{R} \). As we have just observed, (2.10) implies that \( \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((\partial E)_s) = 0 \). Thus, (2.11) follows at once from this equation and from equality (2.8).

Lemma 2.5 could be suitably extended to sets of finite perimeter (compare for instance with Proposition 1.2 in [6]). However this general version, which would require a more delicate proof, is not needed in the sequel.

Next lemma is a sharper version of the approximation result stated in Proposition 2.1 and it is used in order to prove the estimate of \( P_\Gamma(E) \) provided by Lemma 2.7.

**Lemma 2.6.** Take \( E \) a bounded set of finite perimeter and let \( \nu \in S^{N-1} \) such that \( h_{E,\nu}(s) > 0 \) for \( L^1 \)-a.e. \( s \in \{0 < g_{E,\nu} < 1\} \). Then, there exists a sequence of \( C^\infty \) equibounded open sets \( E_j \), such that \( L^N(E_j \triangle E) \to 0 \), \( P_\Gamma(E_j) \to P_\Gamma(E) \) as \( j \to \infty \), with the property that \( h_{E_j,\nu}(s) > 0 \) for all \( s \in \{0 < g_{E_j,\nu} < 1\} \).

**Proof.** Notice that for \( N \geq 3 \) the result is trivial (even without the positivity assumption on \( h_{E,\nu} \)). In fact, it is enough to add to \( E \) a sequence of thin cylinders in direction \( \nu \) with arbitrarily small perimeters.

This argument clearly fails in dimension \( N = 2 \). In this case, let us assume for simplicity that \( \nu = e_2 \). By Proposition 2.1 there exists a sequence of equibounded \( C^\infty \) open sets \( E'_j \) such that \( L^N(E'_j \triangle E) \to 0 \) and \( P_\Gamma(E'_j) \to P_\Gamma(E) \). Let us set \( (\alpha_j, \beta_j) = \{s : 0 < g_{E'_j}(s) < 1\} \), \( C_j = \{s \in (\alpha_j, \beta_j) : h_{E'_j}(s) = 0\} \) and take an open set \( A_j \) containing \( C_j \) such that \( L^1(A_j) < L^1(C_j) + 1/j \). Then, for any \( j \), \( A_j \) is the union of countably many open intervals \( I^h_j \). Notice that \( L^1(C_j) \to 0 \), hence \( L^1(A_j) \to 0 \). To conclude the proof it is enough to set

\[ E_j = E'_j \cup (\cup_{j} B^h_j), \]

where each \( B^h_j \) is a suitably placed disk, corresponding to the interval \( I^h_j \), with the property that \( P(\cup_{j} B^h_j) \leq cL^1(A_j) \) and \( h_{E_j}(s) > 0 \) for all \( s \) such that \( 0 < g_{E_j}(s) < 1 \). \( \Box \)

Next result is essentially contained in the proof of Theorem 3.3 of [12]. However, since it provides an important tool for our proof of Theorem 1.1, for reader’s convenience we give the details of its proof.
Lemma 2.7. Let $E$ be a bounded set of finite perimeter such that $\mathcal{L}^N(E) = \mathcal{L}^N(W_\Gamma)$. Then, for any $v \in S^{N-1}$ such that $h_{E,v}(s) > 0$ for $\mathcal{L}^1$-a.e. $s \in (0 < g_E < 1)$,

$$P_\Gamma(E) \geq \mathcal{L}^N(W_\Gamma) \int_0^1 \left[ (N - 1) \left( \frac{\gamma_{W_\Gamma,v}(t)}{\gamma_{E,v}(t)} \right)^{\frac{1}{N-1}} + \frac{\gamma_{E,v}(t)}{\gamma_{W_\Gamma,v}(t)} \right] dt,$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.13)

where $\gamma_{E,v}, \gamma_{W_\Gamma,v}$ are defined as in Theorem 2.4.

Proof. Let us assume $v = e_N$. If $E$ is a $C^\infty$ bounded open set, it is well known (see for instance Lemma 4.7 in [11]) that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{\mathcal{L}^N(E + \varepsilon W_\Gamma) - \mathcal{L}^N(E)}{\varepsilon}.$$  

From this equality, by applying (2.9) with $F = W_\Gamma$, with elementary calculations we get

$$P_\Gamma(E) \geq \mathcal{L}^N(W_\Gamma) \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^1 \left\{ 1 + \varepsilon \left( \frac{\gamma_{W_\Gamma}(t)}{\gamma_{E}(t)} \right)^{\frac{1}{N-1}} \right\}^{N-1} \left( 1 + \varepsilon \frac{\gamma_{E}(t)}{\gamma_{W_\Gamma}(t)} - 1 \right) dt$$  

$$= \mathcal{L}^N(W_\Gamma) \int_0^1 \left[ (N - 1) \left( \frac{\gamma_{W_\Gamma}(t)}{\gamma_{E}(t)} \right)^{\frac{1}{N-1}} + \frac{\gamma_{E}(t)}{\gamma_{W_\Gamma}(t)} \right] dt,$$

hence the assertion follows. Notice also that (2.13), by means of the change of variable $t = g_E(s)$, can be restated as

$$P_\Gamma(E) \geq \mathcal{L}^N(W_\Gamma) \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left[ (N - 1) \left( \frac{\gamma_{W_\Gamma}(g_E(s))}{h_E(s)} \right)^{\frac{1}{N-1}} + \frac{h_{E,v}(s)}{\gamma_{W_\Gamma}(g_E(s))} \right] h_E(s) ds.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.14)

The general case of a set of finite perimeter then follows by a straightforward approximation argument based on Lemma 2.6 and Remark 2.2.

Let us state a few results on convex sets that will be needed in the sequel. The first one, which is a consequence of the Brunn–Minkowski inequality (2.7), concerns the function $h_{E,v}$, when $E$ is convex.

Proposition 2.8. Let $C$ be a bounded open convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$ and $v \in S^{N-1}$. Then, the set $I = \{ s \in \mathbb{R} : h_{C,v}(s) > 0 \}$ is an open interval and the function $s \in I \rightarrow h_{C,v}^{1/(N-1)}(s)$ is concave.

Proof. Let us assume, without loss of generality, that $\mathcal{L}^N(C) = 1$ and $v = e_N$. We claim that if $s_1, s_2 \in I$, then for any $t \in (0, 1)$

$$th_{C,v}^{\frac{1}{N-1}}(s_1) + (1 - t)h_{C,v}^{\frac{1}{N-1}}(s_2) \leq h_{C,v}^{\frac{1}{N-1}}(ts_1 + (1 - t)s_2).$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.15)
To this aim, we observe that since $C$ is convex, any convex combination of $C_{s_1}$ and $C_{s_2}$ is contained in $C$. Therefore we have

$$tC_{s_1} + (1 - t)C_{s_2} \subseteq C_{ts_1 + (1 - t)s_2} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, 1).$$

From this inclusion, applying the Brunn–Minkowski inequality (2.7) in $\mathbb{R}^{N - 1}$ and recalling that $L^N(C) = 1$, we get

$$h_\frac{1}{N - 1}^\mathbb{R}^N( ts_1 + (1 - t)s_2 ) \geq \left[ \mathcal{H}^{N - 1}( ts_1 + (1 - t)s_2 ) \right]^\frac{1}{N - 1} \geq \left[ \mathcal{H}^{N - 1}( ts_1 ) \right]^\frac{1}{N - 1} + \left[ \mathcal{H}^{N - 1}( (1 - t)s_2 ) \right]^\frac{1}{N - 1} = th_\frac{1}{N - 1}^\mathbb{R}^N( s_1 ) + (1 - t)h_\frac{1}{N - 1}^\mathbb{R}^N( s_2 ).$$

Hence, (2.15) follows and from (2.15) we get immediately that $I$ is an interval and that $h_\frac{1}{N - 1}^\mathbb{R}^N$ is concave in $I$. The fact that $I$ is open is a consequence of the lower semicontinuity of $h_C$ stated in Lemma 2.5.

The following approximation result (see [14, Section 5.2] and [10]) states that any bounded open convex set $C$ can be approximated from outside by a convex polytope $P_k$ with at most $k$ facets such that the measure of $P_k \setminus C$ is estimated by a suitable power of $k$.

**Theorem 2.9.** Let $C$ be a bounded open convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^N$. Then, there exists a constant $c_3$ depending only on $C$, such that for any integer $k \geq N + 1$ there exists a convex polytope $P_k$ with at most $k$ facets, containing $C$, with the property that

$$L^N( P_k \setminus C ) \leq \frac{c_3}{k^{\frac{2}{N - 1}}}. \quad (2.16)$$

### 3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. Throughout the section we assume that $E$ is a set of finite perimeter such that

$$L^N(E) = L^N(W_{\Gamma}). \quad (3.1)$$

To simplify the notation we shall denote the isoperimetric deficit (1.5) of $E$ by $\Delta(E)$ or even by $\Delta$ if the set $E$ to which we refer is understood. Notice that with assumption (3.1) in force,

$$\Delta(E) = \frac{P_{\Gamma}(E) - P_{\Gamma}(W_{\Gamma})}{P_{\Gamma}(W_{\Gamma})}. \quad (3.2)$$
We start with a technical lemma. We show that if the isoperimetric deficit $\Delta$ of a set $E$ is small then, given any direction $v$, we may truncate $E$ by two hyperplanes orthogonal to $v$, without changing much the volume and the perimeter, in such a way that almost any section orthogonal to $v$ of the truncate of $E$ has measure bounded away from zero by $\Delta$.

**Lemma 3.1.** There exist a constant $\Delta_1$, depending only on $N$, and two constants $c_4, c_5$, depending only on $M_\Gamma$ and $N$, such that if $E$ is a bounded set with finite perimeter and $\Delta(E) < \Delta_1$, then for all $v \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$ there exist $s_1 < s_2$ with the property that

(i) \[ h_{E,v}(s) \geq c_4 \Delta(E) \quad \text{for } \mathcal{L}^1\text{-a.e. } s \in (s_1, s_2), \]

(ii) \[ \mathcal{L}^N([x \in E : \langle x, v \rangle < s_1 \text{ or } \langle x, v \rangle > s_2]) \leq \frac{4N}{N-1} \mathcal{L}^N(E)\Delta(E), \]

(iii) \[ P_\Gamma([x \in E : s_1 < \langle x, v \rangle < s_2]) \leq P_\Gamma(E)(1 + \Delta(E)), \]

(iv) \[ s_2 - s_1 \leq c_5. \]

**Proof.** **STEP 1.** We start by proving the assertion under the additional assumption that $E$ is a $C^\infty$ open set and that

\[ \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\{x \in \partial E : v^E(x) = \pm v\}) = 0. \] (3.3)

Moreover, to simplify notation we assume that $v = e_N$ and set

\[ (\alpha, \beta) = \{s \in \mathbb{R} : 0 < g_E(s) < 1\}. \]

For $s \in (\alpha, \beta)$, by rescaling $E^-_s$ and using the minimality of $W_\Gamma$ we have

\[ P_\Gamma(E^-_s) = g_E^{-N}(s)P_\Gamma\left(\frac{E^-_s}{g_E^{1/N}(s)}\right) \geq g_E^{-N}(s)P_\Gamma(W_\Gamma). \]

Similarly,

\[ P_\Gamma(E \setminus E^-_s) \geq (1 - g_E(s))\frac{N-1}{N} P_\Gamma(W_\Gamma). \]

Adding these two inequalities, and recalling (2.11) and (3.3), we get that for any $s \in (\alpha, \beta)$

\[ P_\Gamma(E) + h_E(s)\mathcal{L}^N(E)[\Gamma(-e_N) + \Gamma(e_N)] \geq P_\Gamma(W_\Gamma)\left[\frac{N-1}{g_E(s)} + (1 - g_E(s))\frac{N-1}{N}\right]. \]
This inequality, together with (3.1), (3.2) and (1.9) yields

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{P_\Gamma(W_\Gamma)}{2M_\Gamma \mathcal{L}^N(W_\Gamma)} & \leq \left[ \frac{N-1}{N} g_E^N(s) + (1 - g_E(s)) \frac{N-1}{N} - 1 - \Delta \right] \\
& = \frac{N}{2M_\Gamma} \left[ \frac{N-1}{N} g_E^N(s) + (1 - g_E(s)) \frac{N-1}{N} - 1 - \Delta \right],
\end{align*}
\]

where the last equality is a consequence of the well known equality

\[
P_\Gamma(W_\Gamma) = N \mathcal{L}^N(W_\Gamma),
\]

which, in turn, follows from the coarea formula and the properties of the convex function \(\Gamma\) (see for instance [12, Proposition 2.6 (iii)]).

Let \(\varphi : [0, +\infty) \to \mathbb{R}\) be the function

\[
\varphi(t) = t^{N-1} + (1 - t)^{N-1} - 1 - \frac{N-1}{N} t.
\]

Notice that \(\varphi(0) = 0\) and that for any \(t \in (0, 1/3^N)\) we have

\[
\varphi'(t) = \frac{N-1}{N} [t^{-1/N} - (1 - t)^{-1/N} - 1] > \frac{N-1}{N} [t^{-1/N} - 2^{1/N} - 1]
\]

\[
> \frac{N-1}{N} [t^{-1/N} - 3] > 0.
\]

Therefore,

\[
\varphi(t) > 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in \left(0, \frac{1}{3^N}\right). \quad (3.6)
\]

Next, we set

\[
\Delta_1 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{3^N} \frac{N-1}{N}, \quad (3.7)
\]

and prove the assertion for \(\Delta < \Delta_1\). Let \(s' \in (\alpha, \beta)\) be the smallest point such that

\[
g_E(s') = \frac{2N}{N - 1}.
\]

Such a point exists, since \(g_E\) is continuous, \(g_E(\alpha) = 0\) and \(g_E(\beta) = 1 > 1/3^N > 2\Delta N / (N - 1)\). Moreover, from (3.6) we have that \(\varphi(g_E(s')) > 0\), hence

\[
\frac{N-1}{N} g_E^N(s') + (1 - g_E(s'))^{N-1} - 1 > \frac{N-1}{N} g_E(s') = 2\Delta. \quad (3.8)
\]
Similarly, let us denote by $s''$ the largest point in $(\alpha, \beta)$ such that

$$g_E(s'') = 1 - 2\Delta \frac{N}{N-1}.$$ 

Since $\varphi(1 - g_E(s'')) > 0$, as before we get

$$(1 - g_E(s''))^{N-1}_N + g_E^{N-1}_N (s'') - 1 > \frac{N-1}{N} (1 - g_E(s'')) = 2\Delta. \quad (3.9)$$

Let us now set, for $t \in (0, 1)$,

$$\psi(t) = t^{N-1}_N + (1-t)^{N-1}_N - 1. \quad (3.10)$$

The function $\psi$ is strictly increasing in $(0, 1/2)$ and strictly decreasing in $(1/2, 1)$. Therefore, since by the choice of $\Delta_1$ and the definition of $s'$, $s''$ we have $g_E(s') \in (0, 1/2), g_E(s'') \in (1/2, 1)$, from (3.8), (3.9), we get that

$$\psi(g_E(s)) \geq \psi(g_E(s')) = \psi(g_E(s'')) > 2\Delta \quad \text{for all } s \in (s', s''). \quad (3.11)$$

Thus, (3.4) and (3.11) yield

$$h_E(s) > \frac{N}{2M_\Gamma} \Delta \quad \text{for all } s \in (s', s''). \quad (3.12)$$

Finally, we choose the levels $s_1$ and $s_2$ as follows,

$$s_1 = \sup\left\{ s \in (\alpha, s') : h_E(s) < \frac{N}{2M_\Gamma} \Delta \right\}, \quad s_2 = \inf\left\{ s \in (s'', \beta) : h_E(s) < \frac{N}{2M_\Gamma} \Delta \right\}.$$ 

Notice that this definition is well posed since $h_E$ is continuous (by assumption (3.3) and Lemma 2.5) and $h_E(s) = 0$ for all $s < \alpha$ and $s > \beta$. Thus, from (3.12) we get

$$h_E(s_1) = h_E(s_2) = \frac{N}{2M_\Gamma} \Delta, \quad (3.13)$$

hence, from (3.12) and the definition of $s_1, s_2$, (i) follows.

STEP 2. Assertion (ii) follows from the equalities in (3.8) and (3.9), since

$$\mathcal{L}^N \left( \{x \in E : \langle x, \nu \rangle < s_1 \text{ or } \langle x, \nu \rangle > s_2 \} \right) \leq \mathcal{L}^N (E) [g_E(s') + (1 - g_E(s''))]$$

$$= 4\mathcal{L}^N (E) \frac{N}{N-1} \Delta.$$
To prove (iii), recall that assumption (3.3) implies that \( \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\partial E_s) = 0 \) for all \( s \in \mathbb{R} \). Therefore from (2.11), (3.13), and (3.5) we get

\[
P_\Gamma((x \in E : s_1 < \langle x, v \rangle < s_2)) = \int_{\partial E \cap \{s_1 < \langle x, v \rangle < s_2\}} \Gamma(v^E) \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}
\]

\[
+ \left[ \Gamma(-e_N)h_E(s_1) + \Gamma(e_N)h_E(s_2) \right] \mathcal{L}^N(E)
\]

\[
\leq P_\Gamma(E) + 2M_\Gamma \mathcal{L}^N(W_\Gamma) \frac{N}{2M_\Gamma} \Delta
\]

\[
= P_\Gamma(E) + P_\Gamma(W_\Gamma) \Delta \leq P_\Gamma(E)(1 + \Delta).
\]

To prove (iv) we argue as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 in [12]. Notice that from (3.4), (3.10), (3.11), we get for all \( s \in (s', s'') \)

\[
h_E(s) \geq \frac{N}{2M_\Gamma} \left[ \frac{N-1}{g_E^N}(s) + (1 - g_E(s)) \frac{N-1}{N} - 1 - \Delta \right]
\]

\[
= \frac{N}{4M_\Gamma} \left[ \frac{N-1}{g_E^N}(s) + (1 - g_E(s)) \frac{N-1}{N} - 1 \right]
\]

\[
+ \frac{N}{4M_\Gamma} \left[ \frac{N-1}{g_E^N}(s) + (1 - g_E(s)) \frac{N-1}{N} - 1 - 2\Delta \right]
\]

\[
\geq \frac{N}{4M_\Gamma} \left[ \frac{N-1}{g_E^N}(s) + (1 - g_E(s)) \frac{N-1}{N} - 1 \right]
\]

\[
= \frac{N}{4M_\Gamma} \psi(g_E(s))
\]

Therefore, integrating on \( (s', s'') \), we obtain

\[
\frac{N}{4M_\Gamma}(s'' - s') \leq \int_{s'}^{s''} \frac{h_E(s)}{\psi(g_E(s))} \, ds = \int_{s'}^{s''} \frac{g_E'(s)}{\psi(g_E(s))} \, ds \leq \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\psi(t)} \, dt = c(N).
\]

Thus, \( s'' - s' \) is bounded by a constant depending only on \( N \) and \( M_\Gamma \). On the other hand, from the definition of \( s_1 \) we obtain

\[
\frac{N\Delta}{2M_\Gamma}(s' - s_1) \leq \int_{s_1}^{s'} h_E(s) \, ds = \int_{s_1}^{s'} g_E'(s) \, ds \leq g_E(s') = \frac{2\Delta N}{N - 1}.
\]

Hence \( s' - s_1 \leq 4M_\Gamma/(N - 1) \) and a similar estimate holds for \( s_2 - s'' \). From these inequalities and from (3.14), (iv) follows.
STEP 3. Let us fix $\nu$ and prove the assertion without assuming (3.3). To this aim we observe that the set

$$\left\{ v \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1} : \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\{x \in \partial E : v^E(x) = \pm v\}) > 0 \right\}.$$ 

is at most countable. Therefore, there exists a sequence $v_j$ converging to $v$ and such that (3.3) holds for all $v_j$. Thus, from what we have proved in Step 2 we get a sequence of equibounded intervals $(s_{1,j}, s_{2,j})$ such that (i)–(iv) hold for all $v_j$. For all $j$, let $O_j$ be an orthogonal map from $\mathbb{R}^N$ into itself such that $O_j(v) = v_j$. Notice that $h_{E,v_j} = h_{O_j^{-1}(E),v}$ and that $\mathcal{L}^N(E \triangle O_j^{-1}(E)) \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$. Thus, (1.13) yields

$$h_{E,v_j} \to h_{E,v} \text{ in } L^1(\mathbb{R}),$$

hence up to a subsequence (not relabelled) there holds $h_{E,v_j}(s) \to h_{E,v}(s)$ for $L^1$-a.e. $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, we may assume that $s_{1,j} \to s_1$ and $s_{2,j} \to s_2$. Hence, letting $j \to \infty$, estimates (i) and (iv) for $v$ follow from the corresponding inequalities for the $v_j$’s.

Notice also that

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} \mathcal{L}^N(\{x \in E : s_1 < \langle x, v \rangle < s_2\} \triangle \{x \in E : s_1,j < \langle x, v_j \rangle < s_2,j\}) = 0. \quad (3.15)$$

Hence (ii) follows.

Finally, notice that from (2.5), by Reschetnyak’s lower semicontinuity theorem (see [2, Theorem 2.38]), we have that $P_{\Gamma}$ is lower semicontinuous with respect to the convergence in measure of sets with equibounded perimeters. Therefore, from (3.15) we get

$$P_{\Gamma}(\{x \in E : s_1 < \langle x, v \rangle < s_2\}) \leq \liminf_{j \to \infty} P_{\Gamma}(\{x \in E : s_{1,j} < \langle x, v_j \rangle < s_{2,j}\}).$$

Hence (iii) follows.

Finally, the case of a bounded set of finite perimeter $E$ can be easily obtained by an approximation argument using Proposition 2.1 and Remark 2.2.

The following elementary lemma will be used later.

**Lemma 3.2.** Let $h : [a, b] \to [0, +\infty)$ be an absolutely continuous function, $J \subset [a, b]$ a measurable set and and $\varphi : J \to [a, b]$ a measurable function such that $|\varphi(s) - s| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $s \in J$. Then

$$\int_J |h(s) - h(\varphi(s))| \, ds \leq 2\varepsilon \int_a^b |h'(s)| \, ds.$$ 

**Proof.** Setting $\varphi(s) = s$ if $s \in [a, b] \setminus J$, we may always assume that $J = [a, b]$. From the assumption $\varphi(s) \in [a, b]$, $|\varphi(s) - s| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $s \in [a, b]$ we get, by Fubini’s theorem

$$\int_a^b |h(s) - h(\varphi(s))| \, ds = \int_a^b ds \int_{\varphi(s)}^s h'(t) \, dt \leq \int_a^b ds \int_{s-\varepsilon}^{s+\varepsilon} |h'(t)| \chi_{[a,b]}(t) \, dt$$

$$= \int_a^b |h'(t)| \, dt \int_a^b \chi_{[s-\varepsilon, s+\varepsilon]}(t) \, ds \leq 2\varepsilon \int_a^b |h'(t)| \, dt.$$ 

Hence the assertion follows.
Next lemma is the main step toward the proof of Theorem 1.1 and apart from an extra boundedness assumption made on $E$, it coincides with Lemma 1.2. Its proof is rather long, but it rests only on the two preliminary lemmas proved in this section and on Lemma 2.7, not requiring any further deep result. For the reader’s convenience it has been divided in several steps, each one providing a preliminary estimate to (3.16).

**Lemma 3.3.** Given $R > 0$, there exists a constant $c_6$, depending only on $R$, $N$, $M_\Gamma$, $m_\Gamma$ such that if $E$ is a set of finite perimeter contained in a ball of radius $R$, then there exists a point $x_0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with the property that for all $\nu \in S^{N-1}$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}([x_0 + E : \langle x, \nu \rangle = s]) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}([x \in W_\Gamma : \langle x, \nu \rangle = s])| \, ds \leq c_6 \Delta^{\beta(N)}(E),$$

(3.16)

where $\beta(N)$ is the exponent appearing in (1.12).

**Proof.** Let us still denote by $E$ the set obtained by translating $E$ (if necessary) in such a way that its barycenter coincides with the origin. Similarly, let us denote by $W$ the set obtained by translating $W_\Gamma$ in such a way that also the barycenter of $W$ is at the origin. Thus, there exists a constant $L$, depending only on $R$, $N$, $M_\Gamma$ such that

$$E \subset B_L, \quad W \subset B_L.$$  

(3.17)

In the sequel, we shall denote by $c$ a constant, which may vary from line to line, depending only on $N$, $M_\Gamma$, $m_\Gamma$. If the constant depends also on $L$ (hence, on the given radius $R$) we will stress this fact by writing $c(L)$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume $\nu = e_N$.

**STEP 1.** From Lemma 3.1 and from the definition (3.7) of $\Delta_1$ we get that if $\Delta < \Delta_1$, there exist $s_1' < s_2'$ such that, setting

$$E' := \{(x', s) \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \times \mathbb{R} : s_1' < s < s_2'\},$$

the following estimates hold:

$$\begin{cases}
  h_{E'}(s) \geq c_4 \Delta \quad \text{for } \mathcal{L}^1\text{-a.e. } s \in (s_1', s_2'), \\
  \mathcal{L}^N(E \setminus E') \leq \frac{4N}{N-1} \mathcal{L}^N(E) \Delta \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}^N(E), \\
  P_\Gamma(E') \leq P_\Gamma(E)(1 + \Delta).
\end{cases}$$

(3.18)

Let us now set

$$\lambda = \left(\frac{\mathcal{L}^N(E)}{\mathcal{L}^N(E')}\right)^{\frac{1}{N}} , \quad \widetilde{E} = \lambda E'.$$
Notice that $\mathcal{L}^N(\tilde{E}) = \mathcal{L}^N(E)$ and that

$$(s_1, s_2) := \{ s : 0 < g_E(s) < 1 \} = (\lambda s'_1, \lambda s'_2).$$

The inequalities in (3.18) yield the following inequalities for $\tilde{E}$ and for the constant $\lambda \geq 1$.

$$\begin{cases}
    h_{\tilde{E}}(s) \geq \frac{c_4 \Delta}{\lambda} & \text{for } \mathcal{L}^1\text{-a.e. } s \in (s_1, s_2), \\
    P_{T'}(\tilde{E}) \leq \lambda^{N-1}(1 + \Delta) P_{T'}(E), \\
    1 \leq \lambda \leq \left(1 - \frac{4N \Delta}{N-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{N}} \leq 1 + \Delta \leq c'.
\end{cases} \quad (3.19)$$

Let us apply (2.13) to $\tilde{E}$; we get

$$P_{T'}(\tilde{E}) \geq \mathcal{L}^N(W) \int_0^1 \left[ (N - 1) \left( \frac{\gamma_W(t)}{\gamma_{\tilde{E}}(t)} \right)^{\frac{1}{N-1}} + \frac{\gamma_{\tilde{E}}(t)}{\gamma_W(t)} \right] dt.$$ 

From this inequality, recalling (3.5), we have

$$P_{T'}(\tilde{E}) - P_{T'}(W) \geq \mathcal{L}^N(W) \int_0^1 \left[ (N - 1) \left( \frac{\gamma_W(t)}{\gamma_{\tilde{E}}(t)} \right)^{\frac{1}{N-1}} + \frac{\gamma_{\tilde{E}}(t)}{\gamma_W(t)} - N \right] dt \quad (3.20)$$

$$= N \mathcal{L}^N(W) \int_0^1 \frac{\gamma_{\tilde{E}}(t)}{\gamma_W(t)} \left[ \frac{N - 1}{N} \left( \frac{\gamma_W(t)}{\gamma_{\tilde{E}}(t)} \right)^{\frac{N}{N-1}} + 1 - \frac{\gamma_W(t)}{\gamma_{\tilde{E}}(t)} \right] dt.$$ 

Let us now consider the following elementary inequalities

$$\frac{t^p}{p} + \frac{p-1}{p} - t \geq \begin{cases}
    c(p)(t - 1)^2 & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq 2 \\
    c(p)(t^p - 1) & \text{if } t \geq 2,
\end{cases} \quad (3.21)$$

where

$$p = \frac{N}{N-1}. \quad (3.22)$$

From (3.19)$_2$, (3.2) and (3.19)$_3$ we deduce that

$$P_{T'}(\tilde{E}) - P_{T'}(W) \leq \lambda^{N-1}(1 + \Delta) P_{T'}(E) - P_{T'}(W) = P_{T'}(W) \left[ \lambda^{N-1}(1 + \Delta)^2 - 1 \right] \leq c P_{T'}(W) \Delta.$$
Thus, setting
\[ A = \{ t \in (0, 1) : \gamma_W(t)/\gamma_E(t) \geq 2 \}, \quad A^c = (0, 1) \setminus A, \]
recalling (3.20), (3.21), we are lead to the estimate
\[
\int_A \frac{\gamma_E(t)}{\gamma_W(t)} \left( \frac{\gamma_W(t)}{\gamma_E(t)} \right)^p - 1 \, dt + \int_{A^c} \frac{\gamma_E(t)}{\gamma_W(t)} \left( \frac{\gamma_W(t)}{\gamma_E(t)} - 1 \right)^2 \, dt \leq c\Delta. \tag{3.23}
\]
where \( p \) is the exponent defined in (3.22).

**STEP 2.** Let \( \delta \) be a positive number (to be chosen later), such that
\[
\delta < \frac{\omega_{N-1}m_1^{N-1}}{L^N(W^\Gamma)}, \tag{3.24}
\]
where \( \omega_{N-1} \) is the \( L^N \)-measure of the unit ball in \( \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \). We set
\[
(\alpha, \beta) = \{ s : 0 < g_W(s) < 1 \},
\]
\[
\alpha_\delta = \inf\{ s \in (\alpha, \beta) : h_W(s) \geq \delta \},
\]
\[
\beta_\delta = \sup\{ s \in (\alpha, \beta) : h_W(s) \geq \delta \}.
\]
Since \( W \) contains a ball of radius \( m_1^\Gamma \), by the choice of \( \delta \) it follows that \( \alpha_\delta \) and \( \beta_\delta \) are well defined. Proposition 2.8 and the definition of \( \alpha_\delta, \beta_\delta \) yield
\[
h_W(s) < \delta \quad \text{for} \quad s \in (\alpha, \alpha_\delta) \cup (\beta_\delta, \beta), \quad h_W(s) \geq \delta \quad \text{for} \quad s \in (\alpha_\delta, \beta_\delta). \tag{3.25}
\]
Moreover we set
\[
\sigma_1 = g_W^{-1}(g_W(\alpha_\delta)), \quad \sigma_2 = g_W^{-1}(g_W(\beta_\delta)). \tag{3.26}
\]
Clearly, we have that \( s_1 \leq \sigma_1 < \sigma_2 \leq s_2 \).

Since for a.e. \( t \in (0, 1) \)
\[
\gamma_E(t) = \frac{1}{Dg_E^{-1}(t)}, \quad \gamma_W(t) = \frac{1}{Dg_W^{-1}(t)},
\]
from (3.23) we get that
\[
c\Delta \geq \int_{g_W(\alpha_\delta)}^{g_W(\beta_\delta)} x_A(t) \frac{|(Dg_E^{-1})_p - (Dg_W^{-1})_p|}{Dg_E^{-1}(Dg_W^{-1})_p-1} \, dt \tag{3.27}
\]
\[
\geq c(p) \int_{g_W(\alpha_\delta)}^{g_W(\beta_\delta)} x_A(t) \frac{|Dg_E^{-1} - Dg_W^{-1}|}{(Dg_E^{-1})^{2/p}(Dg_W^{-1})^{p-1}} \, dt.
\]
Notice that from (3.19) and (3.25) we have that for every $t \in (g_W(\alpha_\delta), g_W(\beta_\delta))$

$$Dg^{-1}_E(t) = \frac{1}{h_E(g_E^{-1}(t))} \leq \frac{\lambda}{c_4 \Delta}, \quad Dg^{-1}_W(t) = \frac{1}{h_W(g_W^{-1}(t))} \leq \frac{1}{\delta}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.28)

Therefore, combining these estimates with (3.27) yields

$$\int_{g_W(\alpha_\delta)}^{g_W(\beta_\delta)} \chi_A(t) |Dg^{-1}_E(t) - Dg^{-1}_W(t)| dt \leq c \left( \frac{\Delta}{\delta} \right)^{p-1}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.29)

On the other hand, from (3.23) and (3.28) again, we have

$$\int_{g_W(\alpha_\delta)}^{g_W(\beta_\delta)} \chi_A(t) |Dg^{-1}_E(t) - Dg^{-1}_W(t)| dt \leq c \left( \frac{\Delta}{\delta} \right)^{1/2} \left( \sigma_2 - \sigma_1 \right)^{1/2} \leq c(L) \left( \frac{\Delta}{\delta} \right)^{1/2}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.30)

Thus, defining for all $t \geq 0$

$$\Psi(t) = t^{p-1} + t^{1/2},$$

from (3.29), (3.30), we get

$$\int_{g_W(\alpha_\delta)}^{g_W(\beta_\delta)} |Dg^{-1}_E(t) - Dg^{-1}_W(t)| dt \leq c \Psi \left( \frac{\Delta}{\delta} \right)$$

hence, by definition (3.26),

$$|g^{-1}_E(t) - g^{-1}_W(t) - \sigma_1 + \alpha_\delta| \leq c \Psi \left( \frac{\Delta}{\delta} \right) \quad \text{for all } t \in [g_W(\alpha_\delta), g_W(\beta_\delta)].$$

Therefore, setting $t = g_E(s)$ in the previous inequality gives

$$|g^{-1}_W(g_E(s)) - s + \sigma_1 - \alpha_\delta| \leq c \Psi \left( \frac{\Delta}{\delta} \right) \quad \text{for all } s \in [\sigma_1, \sigma_2].$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.31)

Choosing $s = \sigma_2$ in this inequality, and recalling (3.26), we get in particular

$$|\beta_\delta - \alpha_\delta - (\sigma_2 - \sigma_1)| \leq c \Psi \left( \frac{\Delta}{\delta} \right).$$ \hspace{1cm} (3.32)
STEP 3. Going back to (3.23) we may estimate
\[
c \Delta \geq \int_{g_W(\alpha)}^{g_W(\beta)} \frac{\chi_A |\gamma_W(t) - \gamma_E(t)|}{\gamma_{\tilde{E}(t)}^{p-1} |\gamma_W(t)|} dt
\]
\[
\geq c(p) \int_{g_W(\alpha)}^{g_W(\beta)} \chi_A |\gamma(t) - \gamma_E(t)| \frac{|\gamma_W(t) + \gamma_{\tilde{E}(t)}^{p-1} - 1|}{\gamma_{\tilde{E}(t)}^{p-1} |\gamma_W(t)|} dt
\]
\[
\geq c(p) \int_{g_W(\alpha)}^{g_W(\beta)} \chi_A |\gamma(t) - \gamma_E(t)| \frac{1}{\gamma_{\tilde{E}(t)}^{2-p} |\gamma_W(t)|} dt
\]

Recalling that $W$ is contained in a ball of radius $M_{\Gamma}$, hence
\[
\gamma_W(t) \leq \omega_{N-1} M_{\Gamma}^{N-1} / \mathcal{L}^N (W_\Gamma)
\]
for all $t \in (0, 1)$, and using (3.19)$_1$, from the inequality above we obtain
\[
\int_{g_W(\alpha)}^{g_W(\beta)} \chi_A |\gamma_W(t) - \gamma_E(t)| \frac{1}{\gamma_{\tilde{E}(t)}} dt \leq c \Delta^{p-1}.
\]
(3.33)

Arguing as in the proof of (3.30), we have
\[
\int_{g_W(\alpha)}^{g_W(\beta)} \chi_A \frac{1}{\gamma_{\tilde{E}(t)}} dt
\]
\[
\leq \left( \int_{g_W(\alpha)}^{g_W(\beta)} \chi_A \frac{|\gamma_W(t) - \gamma_E(t)|^2}{\gamma_{\tilde{E}(t)} |\gamma_W(t)|} dt \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_{g_W(\alpha)}^{g_W(\beta)} \chi_A \frac{1}{\gamma_{\tilde{E}(t)}^2} dt \right)^{1/2}
\]
\[
\leq c \Delta^{1/2} \left( \int_{g_W(\alpha)}^{g_W(\beta)} D g_{\tilde{E}}^{-1}(t) dt \right)^{1/2} \leq c(L) \Delta^{1/2}.
\]

From this estimate and from (3.33), by the change of variable $t = g_{\tilde{E}}(s)$, we conclude that
\[
\int_{g_W(\alpha)}^{g_W(\beta)} \frac{|\gamma_W(t) - \gamma_E(t)|}{\gamma_{\tilde{E}(t)}^p} dt = \int_{\sigma_1}^{\sigma_2} |h_W(g_W^{-1}(g_{\tilde{E}}(s))) - h_{\tilde{E}}(s)| ds \leq c \Psi(\Delta).
\]
(3.34)
Using (3.34) leads to the following estimate
\[
\int_{\sigma_1}^{\sigma_2} |h_W(s + \alpha_\delta - \sigma_1) - h_{\tilde{E}}(s)| \, ds \leq \int_{\sigma_1}^{\sigma_2} |h_W(g^{-1}_W(g_{\tilde{E}}(s))) - h_{\tilde{E}}(s)| \, ds
\]
\[
+ \int_{\sigma_1}^{\sigma_2} |h_W(s + \alpha_\delta - \sigma_1) - h_W(g^{-1}_W(g_{\tilde{E}}(s)))| \, ds
\]
\[
\leq c \Psi(\Delta) + \int_{\sigma_1}^{\sigma_2} |h_W(s + \alpha_\delta - \sigma_1) - h_W(g^{-1}_W(g_{\tilde{E}}(s)))| \, ds
\]
\[
+ \int_{\sigma_1}^{\sigma_2} |h_W(s + \alpha_\delta - \sigma_1) - h_W(g^{-1}_W(g_{\tilde{E}}(s)))| \, ds.
\]

Using (3.32) and the fact that \( h_W(s) \leq \omega_{N-1} M_{\Gamma}^{N-1}/\mathcal{L}^N(W_\Gamma) \) for all \( s \in \mathbb{R} \), the last integral in (3.35) can be estimated by \( \Psi(\Delta/\delta) \).

In order to estimate the integral before the last one, first notice that from Proposition 2.8 it follows that \( h_W \) is an absolutely continuous function in \((\alpha, \beta)\), such that there exists a point \( \gamma \in (\alpha, \beta) \) with the property that \( h_W \) in increasing in \((\alpha, \gamma)\) and decreasing in \((\gamma, \beta)\). Then, we set \( h(s) = h_W(s + \alpha_\delta - \sigma_1) \), for \( s \in (\alpha - \alpha_\delta + \sigma_1, \beta - \alpha_\delta + \sigma_1) \) and observe that
\[
\int_{\alpha - \alpha_\delta + \sigma_1}^{\beta - \alpha_\delta + \sigma_1} |h'(s)| \, ds = \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} |h'_W(s)| \, ds \leq (\beta - \alpha) \max h_W \leq 2L \max h_W \leq c(L).
\]

Finally, we apply Lemma 3.2 to \( h \) and to the function \( \varphi(s) = g^{-1}_W(g_{\tilde{E}}(s)) + \sigma_1 - \alpha_\delta \). Since, by (3.31), \( |\varphi(s) - s| \leq c \Psi(\Delta/\delta) \) for all \( s \in (\sigma_1, \min(\beta_\delta - \alpha_\delta + \sigma_1, \sigma_2)) \subset (\alpha - \alpha_\delta + \sigma_1, \beta - \alpha_\delta + \sigma_2) \), by Lemma 3.2 we conclude that
\[
\int_{\sigma_1}^{\min(\beta_\delta - \alpha_\delta + \sigma_1, \sigma_2)} |h_W(s + \alpha_\delta - \sigma_1) - h_W(g^{-1}_W(g_{\tilde{E}}(s)))| \, ds \leq c(L) \Psi(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}).
\]

Thus, from (3.35), (3.36), and from the inequality \( \Delta \leq (\omega_{N-1} M_{\Gamma}^{N-1}/\mathcal{L}^N(W_\Gamma)) \) (which is a consequence of (3.24)), we have
\[
\int_{\sigma_1}^{\sigma_2} |h_W(s + \alpha_\delta - \sigma_1) - h_{\tilde{E}}(s)| \, ds \leq c(L) \Psi(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}).
\]

**STEP 4.** We claim that there exists a constant \( c'(L) \) such that
\[
|\alpha_\delta - \sigma_1| + |\beta_\delta - \sigma_2| \leq c'(L) \left[ \delta + \Psi\left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right)\right].
\]
To prove (3.38) let us denote by \((x'_E, s_E)\) the barycenter of \(\widetilde{E}\). Since the barycenter of \(E\) is at the origin we have
\[
s_E = \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}^N(\widetilde{E})} \int_{\widetilde{E}} s \, dx' = \frac{\lambda^{N+1}}{\mathcal{L}^N(E)} \int_{E'} r \, dy' dr = \frac{\lambda^{N+1}}{\mathcal{L}^N(E)} \left[ \int_{E'} r \, dy' dr - \int_E r \, dy' dr \right].
\]
Hence, from (3.18), (3.17) and (3.19), we get
\[
|s_E| \leq \frac{\lambda^{N+1}}{\mathcal{L}^N(E)} \int_{E \setminus E'} |r| \, dy' dr \leq \frac{4NL\lambda^{N+1}\Delta}{N - 1} \leq c(L)\Delta. \quad (3.39)
\]
On the other hand, by Fubini’s theorem,
\[
s_E = \int_{s_1}^{s_2} s h_E(s) \, ds = \int_{s_1}^{s_2} s h_E(s) \, ds + \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \int_{\sigma_1}^{\sigma_2} s h_E(s) ds + \int_{s_1}^{s_2} \int_{\sigma_1}^{\sigma_2} s h_E(s) ds \\
= \int_{s_1}^{s_2} s h_E(s) ds + \int_{\sigma_1}^{\sigma_2} s \left[ h_E(s) - h_W(s + \alpha\delta - \sigma_1) \right] ds \\
+ \int_{\sigma_1}^{\sigma_2} s h_W(s + \alpha\delta - \sigma_1) ds + \int_{\sigma_2}^{s_2} s h_E(s) ds. \quad (3.40)
\]
Now, since \(h_E(s) \geq 0\), from (3.17), (3.26), the equality \(h_{\widetilde{E}} = g'_{\widetilde{E}}\) and (3.25), we get
\[
\int_{s_1}^{s_2} |s h_{\widetilde{E}}(s)| \, ds \leq L \int_{s_1}^{s_2} h_{\widetilde{E}}(s) \, ds \\
= L g_W(\alpha\delta) = L \int_{\alpha\delta}^{\beta} h_W(s) \, ds \leq 2L^2\delta. \quad (3.41)
\]
Similarly,
\[
\int_{\sigma_2}^{s_2} |s h_{\widetilde{E}}(s)| \, ds \leq L \int_{s_1}^{s_2} h_{\widetilde{E}}(s) \, ds \\
= L(1 - g_W(\alpha\delta)) = L \int_{\alpha\delta}^{\beta} h_W(s) \, ds \leq 2L^2\delta. \quad (3.42)
\]
Therefore, recalling (3.37), and collecting all the estimates (3.39)–(3.42), we have
\[
\left| \int_{\alpha\delta}^{\sigma_2 - \sigma_1 + \alpha\delta} (s - \alpha\delta + \sigma_1) h_W(s) \, ds \right| = \left| \int_{\sigma_1}^{\sigma_2} s h_W(s + \alpha\delta - \sigma_1) \, ds \right| \\
\leq |s_E| + \int_{s_1}^{s_2} |s h_{\widetilde{E}}(s)| \, ds + \int_{\sigma_1}^{\sigma_2} |s h_E(s) - h_W(s + \alpha\delta - \sigma_1)| \, ds \\
+ \int_{\sigma_2}^{s_2} |s h_E(s)| \, ds \\
\leq c(L) \left[ \delta + \Psi\left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right) \right]. \quad (3.43)
\]
Recalling that the barycenter of $W$ is at the origin, we have also
\[
0 = \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} s h_W(s) \, ds = \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} (s - \alpha_\delta + \sigma_1) h_W(s) \, ds + (\alpha_\delta - \sigma_1) \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} h_W(s) \, ds
\]
\[
= \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} (s - \alpha_\delta + \sigma_1) h_W(s) \, ds + (\alpha_\delta - \sigma_1).
\]
Thus, from this equation, (3.43), (3.17), (3.32) and (3.25) we have
\[
|\alpha_\delta - \sigma_1| = \left| \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} (s - \alpha_\delta + \sigma_1) h_W(s) \, ds \right| \leq \left| \int_{\alpha}^{\alpha_\delta} (s - \alpha_\delta + \sigma_1) h_W(s) \, ds \right|
\]
\[
+ \left| \int_{\beta_\delta}^{\beta} (s - \alpha_\delta + \sigma_1) h_W(s) \, ds \right| + \left| \int_{\alpha_\delta}^{\sigma_2 - \alpha - \sigma_1} (s - \alpha_\delta + \sigma_1) h_W(s) \, ds \right|
\]
\[
+ \left| \int_{\sigma_2 - \alpha - \sigma_1}^{\beta_\delta} (s - \alpha_\delta + \sigma_1) h_W(s) \, ds \right| \leq c(L) \left[ \delta + \Psi\left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right) \right].
\]
From this inequality and from (3.32), inequality (3.38) follows at once.

**STEP 5.** Let us now prove (3.16). To this aim we first estimate
\[
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |h_E(s) - h_W(s)| \, ds = \int_{\sigma_1}^{\sigma_2} |h_E(s) - h_W(s)| \, ds + \int_{(\alpha, \beta) \setminus (\sigma_1, \sigma_2)} h_W(s) \, ds
\]
\[
+ \int_{(s_1, s_2) \setminus (\sigma_1, \sigma_2)} h_E(s) \, ds = I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \quad (3.44)
\]
Now,
\[
I_1 \leq \int_{\sigma_1}^{\sigma_2} |h_E(s) - h_W(s + \alpha_\delta - \sigma_1)| \, ds + \int_{\sigma_1}^{\sigma_2} |h_W(s + \alpha_\delta - \sigma_1) - h_W(s)| \, ds.
\]
The first integral on the right-hand side is estimated in (3.37), while the second one is estimated, using (3.38) and Lemma 3.2, exactly as we have estimated the integral in (3.36). Thus, we get
\[
I_1 \leq c(L) \left[ \delta + \Psi\left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right) \right]. \quad (3.45)
\]
Moreover, (3.25) and (3.38) yield
\[
I_2 \leq \int_{(\alpha, \beta) \setminus (\alpha_\delta, \beta_\delta)} h_W(s) \, ds + \int_{(\alpha_\delta, \beta_\delta) \setminus (\sigma_1, \sigma_2)} h_W(s) \, ds \leq c(L) \left[ \delta + \Psi\left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right) \right]. \quad (3.46)
\]
Finally, arguing as in the proof of (3.41) and (3.42), we get
\[ I_3 \leq 4L\delta \]
and from this inequality and the inequalities (3.44)–(3.46) we obtain
\[
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\tilde{E}_s) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(W_s)| \, ds = \mathcal{L}^N(W_\Gamma) \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |h(\tilde{E}_s) - h_W(s)| \, ds \\
\leq c(L) \left[ \delta + \Psi\left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right) \right]. \tag{3.47}
\]

Since \( E' \subset E \) by construction and \( W/\lambda \subset W \) by the convexity of \( W \) and the fact that \( W \) contains the origin, we get
\[
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E_s) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(W_s)| \, ds \leq \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E_s) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E'_s)| \, ds \\
+ \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E'_s) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((W/\lambda)_s)| \, ds \\
+ \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}((W/\lambda)_s) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(W_s)| \, ds \\
\leq \mathcal{L}^N(E \setminus E') + \frac{1}{\lambda N} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\tilde{E}_s) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(W_s)| \, ds + \left(1 - \frac{1}{\lambda N}\right) \mathcal{L}^N(W_\Gamma) \\
\leq c(L) \left[ \delta + \Psi\left(\frac{\Delta}{\delta}\right) \right].
\]

where the last inequality follows from (3.18)\(_2\), (3.47) and (3.19)\(_3\).

Let us assume \( N \geq 3 \); from the inequality above, recalling (3.22), (3.16) follows by choosing \( \delta = \Delta^{1/3} \). This choice, by (3.24), implies (3.16) when
\[
\Delta < \min\left\{ \Delta_3, \left(\frac{\omega_{N-1}M_{1,\Gamma}^{N-1}}{\mathcal{L}^N(W_\Gamma)}\right)^N \right\}. \tag{3.48}
\]

On the other hand, if \( \Delta \) is greater than or equal to the quantity on the right-hand side, (3.16) trivially follows with a suitably large constant \( c_6 \).

If \( N = 2 \) the conclusion follows by choosing \( \delta = \Delta^{1/3} \). \( \square \)

We are now in position to give the proof of Lemma 1.2.

**Proof of Lemma 1.2.**  **Step 1.** Let us assume that \( E \) is a \( C^\infty \) bounded open set with \( \Delta(E) < \Delta_2 \), where \( \Delta_2 \) is a positive constant satisfying various conditions that
will be indicated during the proof. First, we require $\Delta_2 < \Delta_1$. Thus, from Lemma 3.1 it follows that there exist $\sigma_{1,1} < \sigma_{2,1}$, with $\sigma_{2,1} - \sigma_{1,1} \leq c_5$ and a set $E_1$ such that

$$
\begin{align*}
E_1 &= \{ x \in E : \sigma_{1,1} < \langle x, e_1 \rangle < \sigma_{2,1} \}, \\
\mathcal{L}^N(E \setminus E_1) &\leq \frac{4N}{N-1}\mathcal{L}^N(E)\Delta(E) \leq \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}^N(E), \\
P_1(E_1) &\leq P_1(E)(1 + \Delta(E)).
\end{align*}
$$

(3.49)

Let us denote by $\lambda_1$ a positive constant such that $\mathcal{L}^N(\lambda_1 E_1) = \mathcal{L}^N(E)$. Arguing as in the Step 1 of the proof of Lemma 3.3 we conclude that there exist a constant $\gamma_0 > 1$ depending only on $N$ such that

$$
\begin{align*}
1 &\leq \lambda_1 \leq 1 + \gamma_0\Delta(E) \\
\lambda_1 E_1 &\subset \{ x : s_{1,1} < \langle x, e_1 \rangle < s_{2,1} \}, \text{ where } s_{2,1} - s_{1,1} \leq \gamma_0c_5, \\
\Delta(\lambda_1 E_1) &\leq \gamma_0\Delta(E).
\end{align*}
$$

(3.50)

Let us choose $\Delta_2$ such that $\gamma_0\Delta_2 < \Delta_1$. Thus, we may apply Lemma 3.1 again to $\lambda_1 E_1$ and get a set $E_2$ satisfying the same inequalities (3.49) satisfied by $E_1$, with $E, e_1, E_1$ replaced by $\lambda_1 E_1, e_2, E_2$, respectively. As before, we denote by $\lambda_2$ a positive constant such that $\mathcal{L}^N(\lambda_2 E_2) = \mathcal{L}^N(\lambda_1 E_1) = \mathcal{L}^N(E)$. Then, $\lambda_2$ and the set $\lambda_2 E_2$ satisfy the same inequalities (3.50) satisfied by $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_1 E_1$, with $E, e_1$ replaced by $\lambda_1 E_1, e_2$, respectively. However, since $\lambda_1 E_1$ is bounded in the direction $e_1, \lambda_2 E_2$ will be bounded in both directions $e_1$ and $e_2$.

Let us choose $\Delta_2$ such that $\gamma_0\Delta_2 < \Delta_1$. Thus, we may repeat the previous argument for all coordinate directions thus getting $N$ sets $E_i$ and $N$ positive numbers $\lambda_i \geq 1$, such that the following conditions hold for all $i = 1, \ldots, N$

$$
\begin{align*}
E_i &\subset \lambda_{i-1} E_{i-1}, \quad \mathcal{L}^N(\lambda_i E_i) = \mathcal{L}^N(E), \quad \Delta(\lambda_i E_i) \leq \gamma_0^i\Delta(E) \\
\mathcal{L}^N(\lambda_{i-1} E_{i-1} \setminus E_i) &\leq \frac{4N}{N-1}\mathcal{L}^N(E)\Delta(\lambda_{i-1} E_{i-1}) \leq \gamma_1\Delta(E), \\
1 &\leq \lambda_i \leq 1 + \gamma_0\Delta(\lambda_i E_i) \leq 1 + \gamma_0^{i+1}\Delta(E), \\
\lambda_i E_i &\subset \{ x : s_{1,i} < \langle x, e_i \rangle < s_{2,i} \} \quad \text{where } s_{2,i} - s_{1,i} \leq \gamma_0c_5
\end{align*}
$$

where we have set $E_0 = E$ and $\lambda_0 = 1$ and $\gamma_1$ is a constant depending only on $N$ and $\mathcal{L}^N(W_\Gamma)$.

Let us now set $\tilde{E} = \lambda_N E_N$. Notice that by construction $\tilde{E}$ is contained in a ball of radius $R_0$ depending only on $\gamma_0$ and $c_5$, i.e., only on $N$ and $M_\Gamma$. Therefore,
from Lemma 3.3 we conclude that there exists a point $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that for all $\nu \in \mathbb{S}^{N-1}$
\[
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}((y_0 + \tilde{E})_{v,s}) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((W_{\Gamma})_{v,s})| \, ds \leq c_7 \Delta(E)^{\beta(N)},
\]
with $c_7$ depending only on $N, m_{\Gamma}, M_{\Gamma}$. Let us now set $\lambda = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i$, $x_0 = y_0/\lambda$. We have
\[
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}((x_0 + E)_{v,s}) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((W_{\Gamma})_{v,s})| \, ds
\]
\[
\leq \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}((x_0 + E)_{v,s}) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((x_0 + E_1)_{v,s})| \, ds
\]
\[
+ \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}((x_0 + E_1)_{v,s}) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((W_{\Gamma})_{v,s})| \, ds
\]
\[
\leq L^N (E \Delta E_1) + \frac{1}{\lambda_1^N} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}((\lambda_1 x_0 + \lambda_1 E_1)_{v,s}) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((\lambda_1 W_{\Gamma})_{v,s})| \, ds
\]
\[
\leq \gamma_1 \Delta(E) + \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}((\lambda_1 x_0 + \lambda_1 E_1)_{v,s}) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((\lambda_1 W_{\Gamma})_{v,s})| \, ds.
\]
Continuing to estimate the last integral on the right-hand side as we did with the one on the left hand-side, after $N - 1$ steps we get, recalling (3.51),
\[
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}((x_0 + E)_{v,s}) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((W_{\Gamma})_{v,s})| \, ds
\]
\[
\leq N \gamma_1 \Delta(E) + \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(((\prod_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i) x_0 + \lambda_N E_N)_{v,s}) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(((\prod_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i) W_{\Gamma})_{v,s})| \, ds
\]
\[
\leq N \gamma_1 \Delta(E) + \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}((\lambda_0 + \tilde{E})_{v,s}) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((W_{\Gamma})_{v,s})| \, ds
\]
\[
+ \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}((\lambda W_{\Gamma})_{v,s}) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((W_{\Gamma})_{v,s})| \, ds
\]
\[
\leq N \gamma_1 \Delta(E) + c_7 \Delta(E)^{\beta(N)} + (\lambda^N - 1) L^N (W_{\Gamma}) \leq \tilde{c} \Delta(E)^{\beta(N)},
\]
where $\tilde{c}$ depends only on $N, m_{\Gamma}, M_{\Gamma}$. 

This proves the assertion when $\Delta < \Delta_2$. Otherwise, the assertion follows with a suitably large constant $c_1$.

**Step 2.** Let us now assume that $E$ is a set of finite perimeter. From Proposition 2.1 we then get that there exists a bounded $C^\infty$ open set $E'$ such that $\mathcal{L}^N(E') = \mathcal{L}^N(E)$, $\mathcal{L}^N(E \Delta E') \leq \Delta(E)$. Thus, from what we have proved in Step 1 it follows that there exists a point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that (1.12) holds for $E'$. Thus, we obtain that for all $v \in S^{N-1}$

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}((x_0 + E)_{v,s}) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((W_\Gamma)_{v,s})| ds
\leq \mathcal{L}^N(E \Delta E') + \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}((x_0 + E')_{v,s}) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((W_\Gamma)_{v,s})| ds
\leq \Delta(E) + \tilde{c} \Delta(E)^{\beta(N)}.
$$

Hence, the assertion follows. \qed

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.1.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** Let us apply Lemma 1.2 to $E$. By translating $E$, if necessary, we may assume that (1.12) holds with $x_0 = 0$, i.e.,

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E_{v,s}) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((W_\Gamma)_{v,s})| ds \leq c_1 \Delta^{\beta(N)} \quad \text{for all } v \in S^{N-1}. \tag{3.52}
$$

Given $k \geq N + 1$, by Theorem 2.9 there exists a convex polytope $P_k$, with at most $k$ facets, containing $W_\Gamma$ and such that

$$
\mathcal{L}^N(P_k \setminus W_\Gamma) \leq \frac{c_3}{k \frac{N-1}{2}}. \tag{3.53}
$$

Let us denote by $v^i$ the exterior normal to the $i$-th facet of $P_k$, $\pi_i = \{x : \langle x, v^i \rangle = s_i\}$ the hyperplane containing the $i$-th facet and $H_i = \{x : \langle x, v^i \rangle < s_i\}$. Denoting by $l$ the number of facets of $P_k$, we have $P_k = \cap_{i=1}^l H_i$ and

$$
\mathcal{L}^N(E \setminus P_k) \leq \sum_{i=1}^l \mathcal{L}^N(E \setminus H_i)
\leq \sum_{i=1}^l \int_{s_i}^{+\infty} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E_{v^i,s}) ds
= \sum_{i=1}^l \int_{s_i}^{+\infty} |\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E_{v^i,s}) - \mathcal{H}^{N-1}((W_\Gamma)_{v^i,s})| ds, \tag{3.54}
$$
where the last equality follows from the fact that also $W_{\Gamma} \subset H_i$ for all $i$. Estimating the last integrals in (3.54) by (3.52) we get that

$$\mathcal{L}^N (E \setminus P_k) \leq k c_1 \Delta^\beta(N).$$

Combining this estimate with (3.53) yields

$$\mathcal{L}^N (E \setminus W_{\Gamma}) \leq \mathcal{L}^N (E \setminus P_k) + \mathcal{L}^N (P_k \setminus W_{\Gamma}) \leq k c_1 \Delta^\beta(N) + \frac{c_3}{k^{\frac{2}{(N-1)}}}$$

and minimizing the right-hand side with respect to $k$ we get the estimate

$$\mathcal{L}^N (E \setminus W_{\Gamma}) \leq \tilde{c} \Delta^\alpha(N), \quad (3.55)$$

for $\Delta$ less than some $\Delta_3$ depending on $c_1$, $c_3$, $N$. The conclusion then follows from (3.55) and from the fact that, since $\mathcal{L}^N (E) = \mathcal{L}^N (W_{\Gamma})$,

$$\mathcal{L}^N (W_{\Gamma} \setminus E) = \mathcal{L}^N (E \setminus W_{\Gamma}) \leq \tilde{c} \Delta^\alpha(N).$$

Finally, if $\Delta \geq \Delta_3$, (1.11) easily follows with a suitable constant $c_0$ depending on $\Delta_3$ and $\mathcal{L}^N (W_{\Gamma})$. \hfill $\square$

4. Convex sets

In this section we give the proof of Theorem 1.3. Namely, we show that if $E$ is a convex set, Theorem 1.1 holds with the estimate on the $\mathcal{L}^N$ measure of $E \setminus W_{\Gamma}$ replaced by a stronger estimate in terms of the Hausdorff distance between $E$ and $W_{\Gamma}$.

Next lemma shows how the diameter of a convex set of given volume can be estimated by its perimeter.

**Lemma 4.1.** Let $C$ be any open convex set. Then, there exists a constant $c_8$, depending only on $N$, such that

$$\text{diam}(C) \leq c_8 \frac{[\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\partial C)]^{N-1}}{[\mathcal{L}^N(C)]^{N-2}}.$$

**Proof.** Let us fix two points $x$, $y \in \partial C$ such that

$$d := \text{diam}(C) = |x - y|.$$

By rotating and translating, we may always assume without loss of generality that the vector $x - y$ is parallel to $e_N$ and that $\langle x, e_N \rangle > \langle y, e_N \rangle$. Setting $\mathcal{L}^N(C) = M$, by Fubini’s theorem there exists $s \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1} \{ x' \in \mathbb{R}^{N-1} : (x', s) \in C \} \geq \frac{M}{d}.$$
Replacing \( x \) by \( y \) if necessary, we may assume that \( \langle x, e_N \rangle - s \geq d/2 \). Let \( V \) denote the convex hull of the point \( x \) and the \((N-1)\)-dimensional section \( C_s \). \( V \) is a cone contained in \( C \) and a well known property of convex sets (see e.g. [5, Lemma 2.4]) implies that

\[
\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\partial V) \leq \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\partial C).
\] (4.1)

Let us denote by \( S \subset \partial V \) the lateral surface of the cone \( V \). Since the height of \( V \) is at least \( d/2 \) a simple estimate based on the coarea formula gives

\[
\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(S) \geq \frac{d}{2(N-1)} \mathcal{H}^{N-2}(\partial C_s).
\] (4.2)

This estimate proves the assertion when \( N = 2 \). If \( N \geq 3 \), the classical isoperimetric inequality yields

\[
\mathcal{H}^{N-2}(\partial C_s) \geq (N-1)\omega_{N-1}^{\frac{1}{N-1}} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(C) \left( \frac{M}{d} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{N-1}}.
\]

Therefore, from (4.1) and (4.2) we get

\[
\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\partial C) \geq \omega_{N-1}^{\frac{1}{N-1}} \frac{d}{2} \left( \frac{M}{d} \right)^{\frac{N-2}{N-1}}.
\]

Hence, the assertion follows.

\[ \Box \]

**Lemma 4.2.** Let \( C \) and \( W \) two open convex sets such that \( \mathcal{L}^N(C) = \mathcal{L}^N(W) \) and \( \mathcal{L}^N(C \triangle W) < \mathcal{L}^N(C)/2 \). Then, there exists a constant \( c_9 \), depending only on \( N \), such that

\[
\delta_H(C, W) \leq c_9(\text{diam}(C) + \text{diam}(W)) \left( \frac{\mathcal{L}^N(C \triangle W)}{\mathcal{L}^N(C)} \right)^{1/N}.
\]

**Proof.** Let us assume that \( \delta_H(C, W) > 0 \), otherwise there is nothing to prove. Since the role of \( C \) and \( W \) in the definition (1.15) of the Hausdorff distance is symmetric, we may also assume without loss of generality that

\[
\delta_H(C, W) = \sup_{x \in C} \inf_{y \in W} |x - y|.
\]

Since \( W \) is convex, the function \( x \in \overline{C} \mapsto \text{dist}(x, W) \) is convex. Since a convex function on a convex set attains its maximum on the boundary, there exists a point \( \overline{x} \in \partial C \setminus \overline{W} \) such that \( \delta_H(C, W) = \text{dist}(\overline{x}, W) \). Let us denote by \( \overline{y} \) the point in \( \partial W \) such that

\[
\delta_H(C, W) = \text{dist}(\overline{x}, W) = |\overline{x} - \overline{y}|.
\]
Up to rotation and translation, we may assume that $\bar{x} = 0$, that $\bar{y} = (0, \ldots, 0, \delta_H)$ and that $W \subset \{(x', s) \in \mathbb{R}^N : s \geq \delta_H\}$. Notice that from this inclusion it follows that no point of $C$ lies below the hyperplane $x_N = 0$, otherwise the Hausdorff distance between the two sets $C$ and $W$ would be strictly greater than $|\bar{x} - \bar{y}|$. Therefore, recalling the assumption $\mathcal{L}^N(C \triangle W) < \mathcal{L}^N(C)/2$, we have that

$$
\mathcal{L}^N(\{(x', s) \in C : s > \delta_H\}) > \frac{\mathcal{L}^N(C)}{2}.
$$

Thus, by Fubini’s theorem there exists $s_0 > \delta_H$ such that

$$
\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(C_{s_0}) > \frac{\mathcal{L}^N(C)}{2\text{diam}(C)}.
$$

Let $V$ be the cone equal to the convex hull of the origin and of the set $C_{s_0}$ and let

$$
V' = \{(x', s) \in V : 0 < s < \delta_H\}.
$$

Then, $V' \subset C \setminus W$, and thus, taking into account (4.3), we get

$$
\mathcal{L}^N(C \setminus W) \geq \mathcal{L}^N(V') = \int_0^{\delta_H} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\{(x', s) \in V'\})ds
$$

$$
= \int_0^{\delta_H} \mathcal{H}^{N-1}(C_{s_0})\left(\frac{s}{s_0}\right)^{N-1}ds
$$

$$
\geq \frac{\mathcal{L}^N(C)}{2\text{diam}(C)} \frac{\delta_H^N}{N^N s_0^{N-1}} \geq \frac{\mathcal{L}^N(C)\delta_H^N}{2N(\text{diam}(C))^N}.
$$

From this inequality the assertion follows immediately. \hfill \Box

**Proof of Theorem 1.3.** Let $C$ be a convex set such that $\mathcal{L}^N(C) = \mathcal{L}^N(W_\Gamma)$, with $\Delta = \Delta(C) \leq 1$. We have

$$
\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\partial C) \leq \frac{1}{m_\Gamma} P_\Gamma(C) \leq \frac{2}{m_\Gamma} P_\Gamma(W) \leq c,
$$

where the constant $c$ depends only on $N, m_\Gamma$ and $m_\Gamma$. Thus, from Lemma 4.1 it follows that

$$
\text{diam}(C) \leq \tilde{c}.
$$

(4.4)

Let us assume also that $\Delta < \Delta_4$, with

$$
\Delta_4 = \left(\frac{\mathcal{L}^N(W_\Gamma)}{2c_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha(N)}},
$$
where $c_0$ is the constant provided by Theorem 1.1. With this choice of $\Delta_4$, from Theorem 1.1 we have that (up to a translation)

$$\mathcal{L}^N(C \Delta W_\Gamma) \leq c_0 \Delta^{\alpha(N)} \Delta_4 \leq \frac{\mathcal{L}^N(C)}{2}.$$ 

The result then follows from Lemma 4.2 and (4.4). The case $\Delta \geq \Delta_4$ is obvious. □
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