AN ELEMENTARY PROOF OF MINKOWSKI'S SECOND INEQUALITY

I. DANICIC

(Received 22 March 1968)

1. Introduction

Let K be an open convex domain in *n*-dimensional Euclidean space, symmetric about the origin O, and of finite Jordan content (volume) V. With K are associated *n* positive constants $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n$, the 'successive minima of K' and *n* linearly independent lattice points (points with integer coordinates) P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n (not necessarily unique) such that all lattice points in the body $\lambda_j K$ are linearly dependent on P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{j-1} . The points P_1, \dots, P_j lie in λK provided that $\lambda > \lambda_j$. For j = 1 this means that $\lambda_1 K$ contains no lattice point other than the origin. Obviously

$$0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_n.$$

The inequality of Minkowski which we are going to prove is

$$\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \cdots \lambda_n V \leq 2^n.$$

This is best possible, e.g. when K is a parallelopiped with sides parallel to the coordinate axes. Apart from its intrinsic interest this inequality provides a powerful tool for obtaining upper bounds for the number of solutions of Diophantine inequalities (see [3]). Apart from Minkowski's difficult proof [5] there are proofs by Davenport [2] and Weyl [4] the latter being also difficult and long. Davenport's proof is very short but contains difficulties which are discussed in [6]. On the other hand Minkowski's 'first inequality' which is a special case of the second has been proved in a very simple way by Minkowski and in a particularly elegant way by Mordell [1]. We combine here the basic ideas of Davenport and Mordell to give an elementary and self-contained proof.

2. Preliminaries

For a large positive integer l let N(l) denote the number of lattice points (u_1, \dots, u_n) for which the point

$$\left(\frac{2u_1}{l}, \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}, \frac{2u_2}{l}, \cdots, \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_n}, \frac{2u_n}{l}\right)$$

I. Danicic

lies in $\lambda_1 K$. From the definition of Jordan content it follows almost at once that

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{N(l) 2^n \lambda_1^{n-1}}{l^n \lambda_2 \cdots \lambda_n} = \text{content of } \lambda_1 K = \lambda_1^n V$$

so that

$$\lim_{l\to\infty}\frac{N(l)}{l^n}=2^{-n}\lambda_1\lambda_2\cdots\lambda_n V.$$

Minkowski's second inequality is therefore equivalent to the lemma proved below.

3. Lemma

$$N(l) \leq l^n(1+o(1))$$
 as $l \to \infty$.

PROOF. Since P_1, \dots, P_n are linearly independent lattice points there is an integral unimodular matrix A such that $A(P_1, \dots, P_n)$ is an upper triangular matrix i.e. all its elements below the principal diagonal are zero. The body AK is again symmetric in the origin, convex and open. Since Atransforms the integral lattice into itself, the successive minima of AKare again $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$. By considering the number of points

$$\left(\frac{u_1}{l}, \cdots, \frac{u_n}{l}\right)$$

which lie in K or in AK it follows that K and AK have the same content and we may thus interpret N(l) as being the number of points

$$\left(\frac{2u_1}{l},\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2},\frac{2u_2}{l},\cdots\right)$$

which lie in ${}_{1}AK$. We therefore denote AK by K in the following. As a consequence, if (u_1, \dots, u_n) is a lattice point such that

(1)
$$\begin{aligned} (u_1, \cdots, u_n) &\in \lambda_r K \quad \text{then} \\ u_r &= u_{r+1} = \cdots = u_n = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We now divide the points contributing to N(l) into two types, the good and the bad points. Put

$$c_r = \left(\frac{\lambda_{r+1}}{\lambda_r} - 1\right) \frac{\lambda_r}{\lambda_1}.$$

For any $r, 1 \leq r \leq n-1$ for which $c_r \neq 0$ and integers v_1, \dots, v_n let $s_r(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ be the hypercube

$$\frac{2v_i}{c_r l} \leq x_i \leq \frac{2(v_i+1)}{c_r l} \qquad (i=1,\cdots,n).$$

Minkowski's second inequality

We call this hypercube bad if it has at least one point in $\lambda_1 K$ and at least one point not in $\lambda_1 K$. From the definition of Jordan content it follows that if $M_r(l)$ is the number of bad hypercubes $s_r(v_1, \dots v_n)$ then

(2)
$$\lim_{l\to\infty}\left(\frac{2}{c_rl}\right)^n M_r(l) = 0.$$

We call the point

$$\left(\frac{2u_1}{l}, \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}, \frac{2u_2}{l}, \cdots, \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_n}, \frac{2u_n}{l}\right)$$

bad if it lies in some bad hypercube s_r , for some r. The number of such points in a particular hypercube is obviously O(1) and the total number of bad points is therefore

$$\sum_{r$$

We shall show that the number of good (= not bad) points is at most l^n , from which the lemma follows. Let

$$X_1 = \left(rac{2u_1}{l}, rac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} rac{2u_2}{l}, \cdots, rac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_n} rac{2u_n}{l}
ight)$$

be any good point of $\lambda_1 K$.

The vector consisting of the last n-r coordinates of X_1 we denote by X_{r+1}^* . Since X_1 is a good point it is contained in a good hypercube $s_r(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ for each r for which $c_r \neq 0$. This hypercube s_r therefore lies in $\lambda_1 K$ and hence the point

$$\left(\frac{2v_1}{c_r l}, \cdots, \frac{2v_r}{c_r l}, X_{r+1}^*\right)$$

is in $\lambda_1 K$. We can therefore assign to every X_{r+1}^* an integral vector $V_r = (V_1, \dots, V_r)$ such that

(3)
$$\left(\frac{2V_r}{c_r l}, X_{r+1}^*\right) \in \lambda_1 K$$

and if $c_r = 0$ we take $V_r = (0, 0, \dots 0)$. It is important to note that V_r depends only on u_{r+1}, \dots, u_n . If X and Y are two points of $\lambda_r K$ (r < n) then

(4)
$$X + \left(\frac{\lambda_{r+1}}{\lambda_r} - 1\right) Y \in \lambda_{r+1}K.$$

By (3)

$$\frac{\lambda_r}{\lambda_1}\left(\frac{2V_r}{c_r l}, X_{r+1}^*\right) \in \lambda_r K.$$

I. Danicic

Starting with X_1 we define a point X_r of $\lambda_r K$ inductively by the formula

(5)
$$X_{r+1} = X_r + \left(\frac{\lambda_{r+1}}{\lambda_r} - 1\right) \frac{\lambda_r}{\lambda_1} \left(\frac{2V_r}{c_r l}, X_{r+1}^*\right)$$
i.e. $X_{r+1} = X_r + \left(\frac{2V_r}{l}, c_r X_{r+1}^*\right)$

which by (4) lies in $\lambda_{r+1}K$, even if $c_r = 0$. Since

$$c_r = \frac{\lambda_{r+1} - \lambda_r}{\lambda_1}$$

it follows by induction from (5) that

(6)
$$X_r = \left(\frac{2u_1}{l}, \cdots, \frac{2u_r}{l}, \frac{\lambda_r}{\lambda_{r+1}}, \frac{2u_{r+1}}{l}, \cdots, \frac{\lambda_r}{\lambda_n}, \frac{2u_n}{l}\right) + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \frac{2}{l} (V_j, O)$$

from which it can be seen that

(7)
$$X_r = \left(\cdots, \frac{2u_r}{l}, \frac{\lambda_r}{\lambda_{r+1}}, \frac{2u_{r+1}}{l}, \cdots, \frac{\lambda_r}{\lambda_n}, \frac{2u_n}{l}\right)$$

For given integers k_1, \dots, k_n satisfying $0 \le k_i < l$ we consider those good points X_1 which satisfy

$$\frac{l}{2} X_n \equiv (k_1, k_2, \cdots, k_n) \pmod{l}.$$

This has a meaning since $(l/2)X_n$ is a lattice point and every point X_n satisfies such a congruence. We shall show that there is at most one such point X_1 . If

$$X'_1 = \left(\frac{2u'_1}{l}, \cdots, \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_n}, \frac{2u'_n}{l}\right)$$

is another such point, then denoting corresponding quantities by using accents, we have

(8)
$$\frac{l}{2} X_n \equiv \frac{l}{2} X'_n \pmod{l}.$$

Putting

$$X = \frac{X_n - X_n'}{2}$$

we have that $X \in \lambda_n K$, by the convexity and symmetry of $\lambda_n K$, and by (8) X is a lattice point. Since the *n*'th coordinate of X is $(u_n - u'_n)/l$ and all coordinates are integers it follows from (1) that $u_n = u'_n$. Since V_{n-1} depends only on u_n it follows that $V_{n-1} = V'_{n-1}$. Suppose we have already proved

that $u_j = u'_j$ for $j = n, \dots, r+1$. This implies $V_j = V'_j$ for $j = n-1, \dots, r$. Hence, by (6),

 $X = \frac{1}{2}(X_r - X'_r) \in \lambda_r K$

which by (7) and (1) implies $u_r = u'_r$. Thus corresponding to given k_1, \dots, k_n there is at most one point X_1 and since there are l^n sets (k_1, \dots, k_n) there are at most l^n points X_1 , and the lemma follows.

References

- Mordell, L. J., 'On some arithmetical results in the Geometry of Numbers', Compositio Math. 1 (1934).
- [2] Davenport, H., Minkowski's inequality for the minima associated with a convex body', Quarterly J. of Math. (10) 38 (1939), 119-121.
- [3] Davenport, H., 'Indefinite quadratic forms in many variables (II)', Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) 8 (1958), 109-126.
- [4] Weyl, H., 'On Geometry of Numbers', Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) 47 (1942), 268-289.
- [5] Minkowski, H., Geometrie der Zahlen (Teubner 1896) chapter 5.
- [6] Bambah, R. P., Woods, A. C. and Zassenhaus, H., 'Three proofs of Minkowski's second inequality in the geometry of numbers', J. Aust. Math. Soc. 5 (1965), 453-462.

University College of Wales Aberystwyth Gt. Britain

[5]