



# DIDO'S PROBLEM AND BEYOND

S. S. Kutateladze<sup>1</sup>

Accepted: 27 December 2023

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2024

## Abstract

We overview the main ideas and techniques of the functional-analytical approach to some extremal problems of convex geometry that stem from the Queen Dido problem.

**Keywords** Isoperimetric problem · Minkowski duality · Mixed volume · Urysohn problem

## Prologue

David Mumford, one of the most beautiful mathematical minds of today, remarked once that he honestly carried out some ghastly but wholly straightforward calculations while checking something. “It took me several hours to do every bit and as I was no wiser at the end... I shall omit details here.” Narrating this episode in [1], another outstanding mathematician, Yuri Manin, concluded... “The moral: a good proof is one which makes us wiser.” The following slight abstraction of this thesis transpires: *In science, we appraise and appreciate that which makes us wiser.* The notions of a good theory open up new possibilities of solving particular problems. Rewarding is the problem whose solution paves the way to new fruitful concepts and methods. We will shortly present the main ideas and tools that relate to the classical extremal problems of Euclidean geometry.

## The Dido problem

The Dido problem is usually acknowledged as the start of the theory of extremal problems [2]. Dido was a mythical Phoenician Princess. Virgil told about the escape of Dido from her treacherous brother in the first chapter of *The Aeneid*. Dido had to decide about the choice of a tract of land near the future city of Carthage, while satisfying the famous constraint of selecting “a space of ground, which (Byrsa call'd, from the bull's hide) they first inclos'd.” By the legend, Phoenicians cut the oxhide into thin strips and enclosed a large expanse. Now, it is customary to think that the decision by Dido was reduced to the isoperimetric problem of finding a figure of the greatest area among those surrounded by a curve whose length is given. It is not excluded that Dido and her subjects solved the practical versions

---

To Anatoly Kusraev with great respect.

✉ S. S. Kutateladze  
sskut@math.nsc.ru

<sup>1</sup> Sobolev Institute of Mathematics, 4 Koptyug Avenue, 630090 Novosibirsk, Russia

of the problem when the tower was to be located at the sea coast, and part of the boundary coastline of the tract was somehow prescribed in advance.

## Minkowski duality

Assume that  $E$  is an order complete vector lattice. Let  $\bar{E} := E \cup \{+\infty\} \cup \{-\infty\}$ . Assume that  $H \subset E$  is a (convex) cone in  $E$ , and so  $-\infty$  lies beyond  $H$ . A subset  $U$  of  $H$  is *convex relative to  $H$*  or  *$H$ -convex* provided that  $U$  is the  *$H$ -support set*  $U_p^H := \{h \in H : h \leq p\}$  of some element  $p$  of  $\bar{E}$ .

Alongside the  $H$ -convex sets, we consider the so-called  $H$ -convex elements. An element  $p \in \bar{E}$  is  *$H$ -convex* provided that  $p = \sup U_p^H$ . The  $H$ -convex elements comprise the cone which is denoted by  $\mathcal{C}(H, \bar{E})$ . We may omit the references to  $H$  when  $H$  is clear from the context.

Convex elements and sets are “glued together” by the *Minkowski duality*  $\varphi : p \mapsto U_p^H$ . This duality enables us to study convex elements and sets simultaneously [3].

## The space of convex bodies

Let  $\mathcal{V}_N$  be the collection of compact convex sets in  $\mathbb{R}^N$  with the standard Minkowski addition and dilation by positive reals. The Minkowski duality makes  $\mathcal{V}_N$  into a cone in the space  $C(S_{N-1})$  of continuous functions on the Euclidean unit sphere  $S_{N-1}$ , the boundary of the unit ball  $\mathfrak{z}_N$ . This yields the so-called *Minkowski structure* on  $\mathcal{V}_N$ . Addition of the support functions of convex figures amounts to taking their algebraic sum, also called the *Minkowski addition*. It is worth observing that the *linear span*  $[\mathcal{V}_N]$  of  $\mathcal{V}_N$  is dense in  $C(S_{N-1})$ , bears a natural structure of a vector lattice and is usually referred to as the *space of convex sets*.

The study of this space stems from the pioneering breakthrough of Alexandrov in 1937 and the further insights of Radström, Hörmander, and Pinsker.

## Linear inequalities over convex surfaces

Reshetnyak demonstrated in his thesis [4] of 1954 how to produce inequalities over convex surfaces.

A measure  $\mu$  *linearly majorizes* or *dominates* a measure  $\nu$  on  $S_{N-1}$  provided that to each decomposition of  $S_{N-1}$  into finitely many disjoint Borel sets  $U_1, \dots, U_m$  there are measures  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m$  with sum  $\mu$  such that every difference  $\mu_k - \nu|_{U_k}$  annihilates all restrictions to  $S_{N-1}$  of linear functionals over  $\mathbb{R}^N$ . In symbols,  $\mu \gg_{\mathbb{R}^N} \nu$ .

For all sublinear  $p$  on  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , we have

$$\int_{S_{N-1}} p d\mu \geq \int_{S_{N-1}} p d\nu$$

if  $\mu \gg_{\mathbb{R}^N} \nu$ .

## Choquet order

Loomis introduces the concept of affine majorization in [5]:

A measure  $\mu$  *affinely majorizes* or *dominates* a measure  $\nu$ , both given on a compact convex subset  $Q$  of a locally convex space  $X$ , provided that to each decomposition of  $\nu$  into finitely many summands  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_m$  there are measures  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m$  whose sum is  $\mu$  and for which every difference  $\mu_k - \nu_k$  annihilates all restrictions to  $Q$  of affine functionals over  $X$ . In symbols,  $\mu \gg_{\text{Aff}(Q)} \nu$ .

Cartier, Fell, and Meyer proved in [6] that

$$\int_Q f d\mu \geq \int_Q f d\nu$$

for each continuous convex function  $f$  on  $Q$  if and only if  $\mu \gg_{\text{Aff}(Q)} \nu$ . An analogous necessity part for linear majorization was published in [7].

### Decomposition theorem

Majorization is a vast subject. We will use the result in [8]:  
 Assume that  $H_1, \dots, H_N$  are cones in a Riesz space  $X$ , while  $f$  and  $g$  are positive functionals on  $X$ .  
 The inequality

$$f(h_1 \vee \dots \vee h_N) \geq g(h_1 \vee \dots \vee h_N)$$

holds for all  $h_k \in H_k$  ( $k := 1, \dots, N$ ) if and only if to each decomposition of  $g$  into a sum of  $N$  positive terms  $g = g_1 + \dots + g_N$  there is a decomposition of  $f$  into a sum of  $N$  positive terms  $f = f_1 + \dots + f_N$  such that

$$f_k(h_k) \geq g_k(h_k) \quad (h_k \in H_k; k := 1, \dots, N).$$

### Alexandrov measures

The celebrated *Alexandrov Theorem* proves the unique existence of a translate of a convex body given its surface area function; see [9]. Each surface area function is an *Alexandrov measure*. So, we call a positive measure on the unit sphere which is supported by no great hypersphere and which annihilates singletons.  
 Each Alexandrov measure is a translation-invariant additive functional over the cone  $\mathcal{V}_N$ . The cone of positive translation-invariant measures in the dual  $C'(S_{N-1})$  of  $C(S_{N-1})$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{A}_N$ .

### Blaschke's sum

Given  $\mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{h} \in \mathcal{V}_N$ , the record  $\mathfrak{f} =_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mathfrak{h}$  means that  $\mathfrak{f}$  and  $\mathfrak{h}$  are equal up to translation or, in other words, are translates of one another. So,  $=_{\mathbb{R}^N}$  is the associate equivalence of the preorder  $\geq_{\mathbb{R}^N}$  on  $\mathcal{V}_N$  of the possibility of inserting one figure into the other by translation. The sum of the surface area measures of  $\mathfrak{f}$  and  $\mathfrak{h}$  generates the unique class  $\mathfrak{f} \# \mathfrak{h}$  of translates which is referred to as the *Blaschke sum* of  $\mathfrak{f}$  and  $\mathfrak{h}$ ; cp. [10].

### The natural duality

Let  $C(S_{N-1})/\mathbb{R}^N$  stand for the factor space of  $C(S_{N-1})$  by the subspace of all restrictions of linear functionals on  $\mathbb{R}^N$  to  $S_{N-1}$ . Let  $[\mathcal{A}_N]$  be the space  $\mathcal{A}_N - \mathcal{A}_N$  of translation-invariant measures, in fact, the linear span of the set of Alexandrov measures.

$C(S_{N-1})/\mathbb{R}^N$  and  $[\mathcal{A}_N]$  are made dual by the canonical bilinear form

$$\langle f, \mu \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \int_{S_{N-1}} f d\mu$$

$$(f \in C(S_{N-1})/\mathbb{R}^N, \mu \in [\mathcal{A}_N]).$$

For  $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathcal{V}_N/\mathbb{R}^N$  and  $\mathfrak{h} \in \mathcal{A}_N$ , the quantity  $\langle \mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{h} \rangle$  coincides with the *mixed volume*  $V_1(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{f})$ .

### Cones of feasible directions

Given a cone  $K$  in a vector space  $X$  in duality with another vector space  $Y$ , the *dual* of  $K$  is

$$K^* := \{y \in Y \mid (\forall x \in K) \langle x, y \rangle \geq 0\}.$$

To a convex subset  $U$  of  $X$  and  $\bar{x} \in U$  there corresponds

$$U_{\bar{x}} := \text{Fd}(U, \bar{x}) := \{h \in X \mid (\exists \alpha \geq 0) \bar{x} + \alpha h \in U\},$$

the *cone of feasible directions* of  $U$  at  $\bar{x}$ .

Let  $\bar{\mathfrak{f}} \in \mathcal{A}_N$ . Then, the dual  $\mathcal{A}_{N, \bar{\mathfrak{f}}}^*$  of the cone of feasible directions of  $\mathcal{A}_N$  at  $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}$  may be represented as follows

$$\mathcal{A}_{N, \bar{\mathfrak{f}}}^* = \{f \in \mathcal{A}_N \mid \langle \bar{\mathfrak{f}}, f \rangle = 0\}.$$

### Dual cones in spaces of surfaces

Let  $\mathfrak{f}$  and  $\mathfrak{h}$  be convex figures. Then,

- (1)  $\mu(\mathfrak{f}) - \mu(\mathfrak{h}) \in \mathcal{V}_N^* \leftrightarrow \mu(\mathfrak{f}) \gg_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mu(\mathfrak{h})$ ;
- (2) If  $\mathfrak{f} \geq_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mathfrak{h}$  then  $\mu(\mathfrak{f}) \gg_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mu(\mathfrak{h})$ ;
- (3)  $\mathfrak{f} \geq_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathfrak{h} \leftrightarrow \mu(\mathfrak{f}) \gg_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mu(\mathfrak{h})$ ;
- (4) If  $\mathfrak{h} - \bar{\mathfrak{f}} \in \mathcal{A}_{N, \bar{\mathfrak{f}}}^*$  then  $\mathfrak{h} =_{\mathbb{R}^N} \bar{\mathfrak{f}}$ ;
- (5) If  $\mu(\mathfrak{h}) - \mu(\bar{\mathfrak{f}}) \in \mathcal{V}_{N, \bar{\mathfrak{f}}}^*$  then  $\mathfrak{h} =_{\mathbb{R}^N} \bar{\mathfrak{f}}$ .

It stands to reason to avoid discriminating between a convex figure, the respective equivalence class of translates in  $\mathcal{V}_N/\mathbb{R}^N$ , and the corresponding measure in  $\mathcal{A}_N$ .

### Comparison between the structures

OBJECT OF PARAMETRIZATION	MINKOWSKI'S STRUCTURE	BLASCHKE'S STRUCTURE
cone of sets	$\mathcal{V}_N/\mathbb{R}^N$	$\mathcal{A}_N$
dual cone	$\mathcal{V}_N^*$	$\mathcal{A}_N^*$
positive cone	$\mathcal{A}_N^*$	$\mathcal{A}_N$
typical linear functional	$V_1(\mathfrak{z}_N, \cdot)$ (width)	$V_1(\cdot, \mathfrak{z}_N)$ (area)
concave functional (power of volume)	$V^{1/N}(\cdot)$	$V^{(N-1)/N}(\cdot)$
simplest convex program	Urysohn's problem	isoperimetric problem
operator-type constraint	inclusion of figures	inequalities on "curvatures"
Lagrange's multiplier	surface	function
differential of volume at a point $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}$ is proportional to	$V_1(\bar{\mathfrak{f}}, \cdot)$	$V_1(\cdot, \bar{\mathfrak{f}})$

As regards Brunn–Minkowski theory, see, for instance, [11, 12].

### The external Urysohn problem

Among the convex figures, circumscribing  $\mathfrak{K}_0$  and having integral breadth fixed, find a convex body of greatest volume. This is the celebrated Urysohn problem [13] aggravated by a constraint on the location; cp. [14, 15].


A feasible convex body  $\bar{\mathfrak{K}}$  is a solution to the external Urysohn problem if and only if there are a positive measure  $\mu$  and a positive real  $\bar{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}_+$  satisfying

- (1)  $\bar{\alpha} \mu(\mathfrak{z}_N) \gg_{\mathbb{R}^N} \mu(\bar{\mathfrak{K}}) + \mu;$
- (2)  $V(\bar{\mathfrak{K}}) + \frac{1}{N} \int_{S_{N-1}} \bar{\mathfrak{K}} d\mu = \bar{\alpha} V_1(\mathfrak{z}_N, \bar{\mathfrak{K}});$
- (3)  $\bar{\mathfrak{K}}(z) = \mathfrak{K}_0(z)$  for all  $z$  in the support of  $\mu.$

### Solutions

If  $\mathfrak{K}_0 = \mathfrak{z}_{N-1}$  then  $\bar{\mathfrak{K}}$  is a *spherical lens* and  $\mu$  is the restriction of the surface area function of the ball of radius  $\bar{\alpha}^{1/(N-1)}$  to the complement of the support of the lens to  $S_{N-1}.$


If  $\mathfrak{K}_0$  is an equilateral triangle then the solution  $\bar{\mathfrak{K}}$  looks as follows:



$\bar{\mathfrak{K}}$  is the union of  $\mathfrak{K}_0$  and three congruent slices of a circle of radius  $\bar{\alpha}$  and centers  $O_1-O_3,$  while  $\mu$  is the restriction of  $\mu(\mathfrak{z}_2)$  to the subset of  $S_1$  comprising the endpoints of the unit vectors of the shaded zone.

### Symmetric solutions

This is the general solution of the internal Urysohn problem inside a triangle in the class of centrally symmetric convex figures:



## Current hyperplanes

Find two convex figures  $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}$  and  $\bar{\mathfrak{h}}$  lying in a given convex body  $\mathfrak{f}_0$ , separated by a hyperplane with the unit outer normal  $z_0$ , and having the greatest total volume of  $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}$  and  $\bar{\mathfrak{h}}$  given the sum of their integral breadths.

A feasible pair of convex bodies  $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}$  and  $\bar{\mathfrak{h}}$  solves the internal Urysohn problem with a current hyperplane if and only if there are convex figures  $\mathfrak{f}$  and  $\mathfrak{h}$  and positive reals  $\bar{\alpha}$  and  $\bar{\beta}$  satisfying

- (1)  $\bar{\mathfrak{f}} = \mathfrak{f} \# \bar{\alpha} \mathfrak{z}_N$ ;
- (2)  $\bar{\mathfrak{h}} = \mathfrak{h} \# \bar{\beta} \mathfrak{z}_N$ ;
- (3)  $\mu(\mathfrak{f}) \geq \bar{\beta} \varepsilon_{z_0}$ ,  $\mu(\mathfrak{h}) \geq \bar{\alpha} \varepsilon_{-z_0}$ ;
- (4)  $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}(z) = \mathfrak{f}_0(z)$  for all  $z \in \text{supp}(\mathfrak{f}) \setminus \{z_0\}$ ;
- (5)  $\bar{\mathfrak{h}}(z) = \mathfrak{f}_0(z)$  for all  $z \in \text{supp}(\mathfrak{h}) \setminus \{-z_0\}$ , with  $\text{supp}(\mathfrak{f})$  standing for the support of  $\mathfrak{f}$ , i.e. the support of the surface area measure  $\mu(\mathfrak{f})$  of  $\mathfrak{f}$ .

## Pareto optimality

Consider a bunch of economic agents each of which intends to maximize his own income. The *Pareto efficiency principle* asserts that as an effective agreement of the conflicting goals it is reasonable to take any state in which nobody can increase his income in any way other than diminishing the income of at least one of the other fellow members.

Formally speaking, this implies the search of the maximal elements of the set comprising the tuples of incomes of the agents at every state; i.e., some vectors of a finite-dimensional arithmetic space endowed with the coordinatewise order. Clearly, the concept of Pareto optimality was already abstracted to arbitrary ordered vector spaces; see, for instance, [16-19].

## Vector isoperimetric problem

Given are some convex bodies  $\mathfrak{h}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{h}_M$ . Find a convex body  $\mathfrak{f}$  encompassing a given volume and minimizing each of the mixed volumes  $V_1(\mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{h}_1), \dots, V_1(\mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{h}_M)$ . In symbols,

$$\mathfrak{f} \in \mathcal{A}_N; \hat{p}(\mathfrak{f}) \geq \hat{p}(\bar{\mathfrak{f}}); (\langle \mathfrak{h}_1, \mathfrak{f} \rangle, \dots, \langle \mathfrak{h}_M, \mathfrak{f} \rangle) \rightarrow \inf.$$

Clearly, this is a Slater regular convex program in the Blaschke structure.

Each Pareto-optimal solution  $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}$  of the vector isoperimetric problem has the form

$$\bar{\mathfrak{f}} = \alpha_1 \mathfrak{h}_1 + \dots + \alpha_m \mathfrak{h}_m,$$

where  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$  are positive reals.

## The Leidenfrost problem

Given the volume of a three-dimensional convex figure, minimize its surface area and vertical breadth.

By symmetry, everything reduces to an analogous plane two-objective problem, whose every Pareto-optimal solution is by 2 a *stadium*, a weighted Minkowski sum of a disk and a horizontal straight-line segment.

A plane spheroid, a Pareto-optimal solution of the Leidenfrost problem, is the result of the rotation of a stadium around the vertical axis through the center of the stadium.

## Internal Urysohn problem with flattening

Given are some convex body  $\mathfrak{K}_0 \in \mathcal{V}_N$  and some flattening direction  $\bar{z} \in S_{N-1}$ . Considering  $\mathfrak{K} \subset \mathfrak{K}_0$  of fixed integral breadth, maximize the volume of  $\mathfrak{K}$ , and minimize the breadth of  $\mathfrak{K}$  in the flattening direction:  $\mathfrak{K} \in \mathcal{V}_N; \mathfrak{K} \subset \mathfrak{K}_0; \langle \mathfrak{K}, \mathfrak{z}_N \rangle \geq \langle \bar{\mathfrak{K}}, \mathfrak{z}_N \rangle; (-p(\mathfrak{K}), b_{\bar{z}}(\mathfrak{K})) \rightarrow \inf$ .

For a feasible convex body  $\bar{\mathfrak{K}}$  to be Pareto-optimal in the internal Urysohn problem with the flattening direction  $\bar{z}$  it is necessary and sufficient that there be positive reals  $\alpha, \beta$  and a convex figure  $\mathfrak{K}$  satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\bar{\mathfrak{K}}) &= \mu(\mathfrak{K}) + \alpha \mu(\mathfrak{z}_N) + \beta(\varepsilon_{\bar{z}} + \varepsilon_{-\bar{z}}); \\ \bar{\mathfrak{K}}(z) &= \mathfrak{K}_0(z) \quad (z \in \text{supp}(\mu(\mathfrak{K}))). \end{aligned}$$

## Rotational symmetry

Assume that a plane convex figure  $\mathfrak{K}_0 \in \mathcal{V}_2$  has the symmetry axis  $A_{\bar{z}}$  with generator  $\bar{z}$ . Assume further that  $\mathfrak{K}_{00}$  is the result of rotating  $\mathfrak{K}_0$  around the symmetry axis  $A_{\bar{z}}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{K} &\in \mathcal{V}_3; \\ \mathfrak{K} &\text{ is a convex body of rotation around } A_{\bar{z}}; \\ \mathfrak{K} &\supset \mathfrak{K}_{00}; \langle \mathfrak{z}_N, \mathfrak{K} \rangle \geq \langle \mathfrak{z}_N, \bar{\mathfrak{K}} \rangle; \\ (-p(\mathfrak{K}), b_{\bar{z}}(\mathfrak{K})) &\rightarrow \inf. \end{aligned}$$

Each Pareto-optimal solution is the result of rotating around the symmetry axis a Pareto-optimal solution of the plane internal Urysohn problem with flattening in the direction of the axis.

## Soap bubbles

Little is known about the analogous problems in arbitrary dimensions; cp. [20, 21]. An especial place is occupied by the result of Porogelov who demonstrated that the “soap bubble” in a tetrahedron has the form of the result of the rolling of a ball over a solution of the internal Urysohn problem, i.e. the weighted Blaschke sum of a tetrahedron and a ball; see [22].

## Is Dido’s problem solved?

From a utilitarian standpoint, the answer is definitely in the affirmative. There is no evidence that Dido experienced any difficulties, showed indecisiveness, and procrastinated the choice of the tract of land. Practically speaking, the situation in which Dido made her decision was not as primitive as it seems at the first glance. The appropriate generality is unavailable in the mathematical model known as the classical isoperimetric problem. For more details see [23, 24]. Dido’s problem inspiring our ancestors remains the same intellectual challenge as Kant’s starry heavens above and the moral law within.

**Funding** The research was supported by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation (Agreement 075–02–2021–1844) and carried out in the framework of the State Task to the Sobolev Institute of Mathematics (Project FWNF–2022–0004).

**Data availability** The author has no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

## Declarations

**Competing interests** The author declares no competing interests.

## REFERENCES

1. Manin Y.I., *A Course of Mathematical Logic for Mathematicians*, New York: Springer, 2010.
2. Kelvin B., "Isoperimetric problems," In: Kelvin B. and Thompson Nature series, vol. II, Ch. Isoperimetric Problems, pp. 571-592, Macmillan and Co., London, 1891
3. Kutateladze S. S. and Rubinov A. M. "The Minkowski duality and its applications," *Russian Math. Surveys*, **27**:3, 137–191 (1972).
4. Reshetnyak Yu. G. *On the Length and Swerve of a Curve and the Area of a Surface*, (Ph. D. Thesis, unpublished), Leningrad State University, Leningrad, 1954.
5. Loomis L. "Unique direct integral decomposition on convex sets," *Amer. Math. J.*, **84**:3, 509–526 (1962).
6. Cartier P., Fell J. M., and Meyer P. A. "Comparaison des mesures portées par un ensemble convexe compact," *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, **64**, 435–445 (1964).
7. Kutateladze S. S. "Positive Minkowski-linear functionals over convex surfaces," *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **11**:3, 767–769 (1970).
8. Kutateladze S. S. "Choquet boundaries in  $K$ -spaces," *Russian Math. Surveys*, **30**:4, 115–155 (1975).
9. Alexandrov A. D. *Selected Works. Part 1: Selected Scientific Papers*, Gordon and Breach, London etc. (1996).
10. Firey W. "Blaschke sums of convex bodies and mixed bodies," in: *Proc. of the Colloquium on Convexity*, 1965, I Kobenhavns Univ. Mat. Inst., Copenhagen, (1967), 94–101.
11. Schneider R. *Convex Bodies: The Brunn–Minkowski Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1993).
12. Gardner R. J. "The Brunn–Minkowski Inequality," *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **39**:3, 355–405 (2002).
13. Urysohn P. S. "Interdependence between the integral breadth and volume of a convex body," *Mat. Sb.*, **31**:3, 477–486 (1924).
14. Rosales C. "Isoperimetric regions in rotationally symmetric convex bodies," *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, **51**:5, 1201–1214 (2003).
15. Ritore M. and Rosales C. "Existence and characterization of regions minimizing perimeter under a volume constraint inside Euclidean cones," *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **356**:11, 4601–4622 (2004).
16. Zălinescu C. *Convex Analysis in General Vector Spaces*, World Scientific, New Jersey, etc. (2002).
17. Göpfert A., Tammer Ch., Riahi H., and Zălinescu C. *Variational Methods in Partially Ordered Spaces*, Springer-Verlag, New York (2003).
18. Jahn J. *Vector Optimization: Theory, Applications, and Extensions*, Berlin, Springer-Verlag (2004).
19. Kusraev A. G. and Kutateladze S. S. *Subdifferential Calculus: Theory and Applications*, Nauka, Moscow (2007).
20. Isenberg C. *The Science of Soap Films and Soap Bubbles*, Dover Publications, New York (1992).
21. Lovett D. *Demonstrating Science with Soap Films*, IOP Publishing Ltd., Bristol and Philadelphia (1994).
22. Pogorelov A. V. "Imbedding a 'soap bubble' into a tetrahedron," *Math. Notes*, **56**:2, 824–826 (1994).
23. Kutateladze S. S. "Multiobjective problems of convex geometry," *Sib. Math. J.*, **50**:5, 887–897 (2010).
24. Kutateladze S. S. "Multiple criteria problems over Minkowski balls," *J. Appl. Ind. Math.*, **7**:2, 208–214 (2013).

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Springer Nature or its licensor (e.g. a society or other partner) holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.