

ADJOINT DEGREES AND SCISSORS CONGRUENCE FOR POLYTOPES

Martin Winter

(joint work with Tom Baumbach, Ansgar Freyer and Julian Weigert)

MAX PLANCK INSTITUTE
FOR MATHEMATICS IN THE SCIENCES



**combinatorial
synergies**




April 14, 2026

SCISSORS CONGRUENCE

Two polytopes P and Q are **scissors congruent** if

$$P = P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n \quad Q = Q_1 \cup \dots \cup Q_n.$$

with $Q_i = S_i(P_i)$, where $S_i \in \text{Iso}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are isometries.




SCISSORS CONGRUENCE

Two polytopes P and Q are **scissors congruent** if

$$P = P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n \quad Q = Q_1 \cup \dots \cup Q_n.$$

with $Q_i = S_i(P_i)$, where $S_i \in \text{Iso}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are isometries.




SCISSORS CONGRUENCE

Two polytopes P and Q are **scissors congruent** if

$$P = P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n \quad Q = Q_1 \cup \dots \cup Q_n.$$

with $Q_i = S_i(P_i)$, where $S_i \in \text{Iso}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are isometries.



Theorem (WALLACE, BOLYAI, GERWIEN; 1807/33/35)

Two polygons P, Q are scissors congruent if and only if $\text{vol}(P) = \text{vol}(Q)$.

HILBERT'S THIRD PROBLEM

Given any two polyhedra P and Q of equal volume, is it always possible to dissect P into finitely many polyhedral pieces P_1, \dots, P_n , which can then be reassembled to yield Q ?

– HILBERT (1900)

HILBERT'S THIRD PROBLEM

Given any two polyhedra P and Q of equal volume, is it always possible to dissect P into finitely many polyhedral pieces P_1, \dots, P_n , which can then be reassembled to yield Q ?

– HILBERT (1900)

Theorem. (DEHN; 1901)

If $P, Q \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ are scissors congruent, then they have the same Dehn invariant.

$$D(P) := \sum_{e \in P} \ell_e \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \theta(e) / 2\pi \in \mathbb{R} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} / 2\pi\mathbb{Z}.$$

HILBERT'S THIRD PROBLEM

Given any two polyhedra P and Q of equal volume, is it always possible to dissect P into finitely many polyhedral pieces P_1, \dots, P_n , which can then be reassembled to yield Q ?

– HILBERT (1900)

Theorem. (DEHN; 1901)

If $P, Q \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ are scissors congruent, then they have the same Dehn invariant.

$$D(P) := \sum_{e \in P} \ell_e \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \theta(e) / 2\pi \in \mathbb{R} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} / 2\pi\mathbb{Z}.$$

But: $D(\text{cube}) = 0$ and $D(\text{tetrahedron}) \neq 0$.

HILBERT'S THIRD PROBLEM

Given any two polyhedra P and Q of equal volume, is it always possible to dissect P into finitely many polyhedral pieces P_1, \dots, P_n , which can then be reassembled to yield Q ?

– HILBERT (1900)

Theorem. (DEHN; 1901)

If $P, Q \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ are scissors congruent, then they have the same Dehn invariant.

$$D(P) := \sum_{e \subset P} \ell_e \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \theta(e) / 2\pi \in \mathbb{R} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} / 2\pi\mathbb{Z}.$$

But: $D(\text{cube}) = 0$ and $D(\text{tetrahedron}) \neq 0$.

Theorem. (SYDLER; 1965)

$P, Q \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ are scissors congruent if and only if they have the same volume and the same Dehn invariant.

VALUATIONS

Whenever P , Q , $P \cap Q$ and $P \cup Q$ are polytopes, a **valuation** satisfies

$$\phi(P) + \phi(Q) = \phi(P \cup Q) + \phi(P \cap Q)$$

Examples:

- ▶ volume
- ▶ Dehn invariant
- ▶ surface area measure
- ▶ Euler characteristic
- ▶ mixed volumes
- ▶ number of contained lattice points

VALUATIONS

Whenever P , Q , $P \cap Q$ and $P \cup Q$ are polytopes, a **valuation** satisfies

$$\phi(P) + \phi(Q) = \phi(P \cup Q) + \phi(P \cap Q)$$



Examples:

- ▶ volume
- ▶ Dehn invariant
- ▶ surface area measure
- ▶ Euler characteristic
- ▶ mixed volumes
- ▶ number of contained lattice points



What we mainly care about (true for *simple valuations*):

$$\phi(P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n) = \phi(P_1) + \dots + \phi(P_n).$$



TWO COMPOSITION PUZZLES




TWO COMPOSITION PUZZLES



TWO COMPOSITION PUZZLES



PUZZLE I




Let $\nu(P)$ be the *surface area measure* of $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} .

$$\phi(P) := \nu(P) - \nu(-P)$$

Fact: a convex polygon P is centrally symmetric if and only if $\phi(P) = 0$.

PUZZLE II



$$\phi(P) := \int_{I_1 \times I_2} e^{2\pi i(x_1+x_2)} dx = \int_{I_1} e^{2\pi i x_1} dx_1 \cdot \int_{I_2} e^{2\pi i x_2} dx_2$$

Fact: a rectangle P has an integer side length if and only if $\phi(P) = 0$.


→ Stan Wagon, *“Fourteen Proofs of a Result About Tiling a Rectangle”*

DUAL VOLUMES AND
THE CANONICAL FORM




POLAR DUALITY

(polar) dual ... $P^\circ := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \langle x, y \rangle \leq 1 \text{ for all } y \in P\}$.



POLAR DUALITY

(polar) dual ... $P^\circ := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \langle x, y \rangle \leq 1 \text{ for all } y \in P\}$.



Central new idea: the volume of the dual behaves valuatival!

DUAL VOLUMES

canonical form...

$$\Omega(P; x) := d! \operatorname{vol}(P - x)^\circ = \frac{p(x)}{q(x)}$$

Observe: this is a rational function in x .

$\implies \Omega$ can be extended to points x outside of P .

Theorem. (ARKANI-HAMED, BAI, LAM; 2017)

$$\Omega(P_1 \cup \cdots \cup P_n; x) = \Omega(P_1; x) + \cdots + \Omega(P_n; x).$$

DUAL VOLUMES

canonical form...

$$\Omega(P; x) := d! \operatorname{vol}(P - x)^\circ = \frac{p(x)}{q(x)}$$

Observe: this is a rational function in x .

$\implies \Omega$ can be extended to points x outside of P .

Theorem. (ARKANI-HAMED, BAI, LAM; 2017)

$$\Omega(P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n; x) = \Omega(P_1; x) + \dots + \Omega(P_n; x).$$

$$\Omega(P; x) \cdot \prod_F L_F(x) = r(x)$$

- ▶ $L_F(x) := h_F - \langle u_F, x \rangle$... facet-defining linear form
- ▶ u_F ... unit normal vector
- ▶ h_F ... facet height

DUAL VOLUMES

canonical form...

$$\Omega(P; x) := d! \operatorname{vol}(P - x)^\circ = \frac{p(x)}{q(x)}$$

Observe: this is a rational function in x .

$\implies \Omega$ can be extended to points x outside of P .

Theorem. (ARKANI-HAMED, BAI, LAM; 2017)

$$\Omega(P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n; x) = \Omega(P_1; x) + \dots + \Omega(P_n; x).$$

$$\Omega(P; x) \cdot \prod_F L_F(x) = \operatorname{adj}_P(x)$$

... adjoint polynomial

- ▶ $L_F(x) := h_F - \langle u_F, x \rangle$... facet-defining linear form
- ▶ u_F ... unit normal vector
- ▶ h_F ... facet height

DUAL VOLUMES

canonical form...

$$\Omega(P; x) := d! \operatorname{vol}(P - x)^\circ = \frac{\operatorname{adj}_P(x)}{\prod_F L_F(x)}$$

Observe: this is a rational function in x .

$\implies \Omega$ can be extended to points x outside of P .

Theorem. (ARKANI-HAMED, BAI, LAM; 2017)

$$\Omega(P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n; x) = \Omega(P_1; x) + \dots + \Omega(P_n; x).$$

$$\Omega(P; x) \cdot \prod_F L_F(x) = \operatorname{adj}_P(x) \quad \dots \text{adjoint polynomial}$$




- ▶ $L_F(x) := h_F - \langle u_F, x \rangle$... facet-defining linear form
- ▶ u_F ... unit normal vector
- ▶ h_F ... facet height

ADJOINT DEGREES

- ▶ “Generically” the adjoint adj_P has degree $\overbrace{\#\text{facets}}{=: m} - d - 1$.


ADJOINT DEGREES

- ▶ “Generically” the adjoint adj_P has degree $\overbrace{\#\text{facets}}{=: m} - d - 1$.
- ▶ **But:** this is not true in general.



ADJOINT DEGREES

- ▶ “Generically” the adjoint adj_P has degree $\overbrace{\#\text{facets}}{=: m} - d - 1$.
- ▶ **But:** this is not true in general.




We call this deficiency in degree the **degree drop** of P :

$$\text{drop}(P) := (m - d - 1) - \deg \text{adj}_P .$$

ADJOINT DEGREES

- ▶ “Generically” the adjoint adj_P has degree $\overbrace{\#\text{facets}}{=: m} - d - 1$.
- ▶ **But:** this is not true in general.



We call this deficiency in degree the **degree drop** of P :

$$\text{drop}(P) := (m - d - 1) - \deg \text{adj}_P .$$

Example: for the d -cube $\square_d := [-1, 1]^d$ we have

$$\Omega(\square_d; x) = \frac{\text{some constant}}{\prod_i (1 - x_i^2)} \implies \text{drop}(\square_d) = d - 1 .$$

THE DROP UNDER COMPOSITION

Lemma.

$$\text{drop}(P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n) \geq \min_i \text{drop}(P_i).$$

Proof. Observe

$$\deg \Omega(P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n) = \deg \left(\sum_i \Omega(P_i) \right) \leq \max_i \deg \Omega(P_i).$$

Then use $\text{drop}(P) = -d - 1 - \deg \Omega(P)$. □

THE DROP UNDER COMPOSITION


Lemma.

$$\text{drop}(P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n) \geq \min_i \text{drop}(P_i).$$

Proof. Observe

$$\text{deg } \Omega(P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n) = \text{deg} \left(\sum_i \Omega(P_i) \right) \leq \max_i \text{deg } \Omega(P_i).$$

Then use $\text{drop}(P) = -d - 1 - \text{deg } \Omega(P)$. □



THE DROP UNDER COMPOSITION

Lemma.

$$\text{drop}(P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n) \geq \min_i \text{drop}(P_i).$$


Proof. Observe

$$\text{deg } \Omega(P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n) = \text{deg} \left(\sum_i \Omega(P_i) \right) \leq \max_i \text{deg } \Omega(P_i).$$

Then use $\text{drop}(P) = -d - 1 - \text{deg } \Omega(P)$. □

Questions:

- ▶ What other polytopes have a drop?
- ▶ What characterizes polytopes with a particular drop s ?



PROPERTIES OF THE DROP

(i) $\text{drop}(P_1 \times \cdots \times P_n) = n - 1 + \sum_i \text{drop}(P_i).$

(ii) if F is a facet of P , then

$$\text{drop}(F) \geq \text{drop}(P) - 1,$$

with equality if and only if P has a facet F' parallel to F .

(iii) $\text{drop}(P) \leq d - 1.$

(iv) $\text{drop}(SP + t) = \text{drop}(P).$

(v) if π is a projection onto a hyperplane, then

$$\text{drop}(\pi P) \geq \text{drop}(P) - 1.$$

(vi) $\text{drop}(P_1 + \cdots + P_n) \geq (d - 1) - \sum_i (d_i - 1) + \sum_i \text{drop}(P_i).$

(vii) if P is centrally symmetric

$$\text{drop}(P) \text{ is } \begin{cases} \text{even} & \text{if } d \text{ is odd} \\ \text{odd} & \text{if } d \text{ is even} \end{cases}.$$

MAXIMAL DROP

Lemma.

A zonotope $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ attains the maximal possible $\text{drop}(P) = d - 1$.

MAXIMAL DROP

Lemma.

A zonotope $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ attains the maximal possible $\text{drop}(P) = d - 1$.

Proof. (actually, three proofs) We have $\text{drop}(P) \leq d - 1$, but also a zonotope ...

1. ... is a projection of an n -cube \square_n :

$$\text{drop}(\pi_d \square_n) \geq \underbrace{\text{drop}(\square_n)}_{=n-1} - (n - d) = d - 1.$$

2. ... is a Minkowski sum of line segments S_1, \dots, S_n :


$$\text{drop}(S_1 + \dots + S_n) \geq (d - 1) - \sum_i \underbrace{(\dim(S_i) - 1)}_{=0} + \sum_i \underbrace{\text{drop}(S_i)}_{=0} = d - 1.$$

3. ... can be tiled by parallelepipeds P_1, \dots, P_n :

$$\text{drop}(P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n) \geq \min_i \underbrace{\text{drop}(P_i)}_{=d-1} = d - 1.$$


WHAT ELSE HAS A DROP?

Observation: for maximal drop facets must come in parallel pairs.



WHAT ELSE HAS A DROP?


Observation: for maximal drop facets must come in parallel pairs.



Question: can a non-centrally symmetric polygon have a drop?


WHAT ELSE HAS A DROP?


Observation: for maximal drop facets must come in parallel pairs.





Question: can a non-centrally symmetric polygon have a drop?


“Proof” that the answer is No:
















$$\begin{aligned}\phi(P) &= \phi(P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n) \\ &= \phi(P_1) + \dots + \phi(P_n) \\ &= \phi(P_1 + t_1) + \dots + \phi(P_n + t_n) \\ &= \phi((P_1 + t_1) \cup \dots \cup (P_n + t_n)) = \phi(Q)\end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}\phi(P) &= \phi(P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n) \\ &= \phi(P_1) + \dots + \phi(P_n) \\ &\stackrel{?}{=} \phi(P_1 + t_1) + \dots + \phi(P_n + t_n) \\ &= \phi((P_1 + t_1) \cup \dots \cup (P_n + t_n)) = \phi(Q)\end{aligned}$$

TRANSLATION SCISSORS CONGRUENCE



$$\begin{aligned}\phi(P) &= \phi(P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n) \\ &= \phi(P_1) + \dots + \phi(P_n) \\ &\stackrel{?}{=} \phi(P_1 + t_1) + \dots + \phi(P_n + t_n) \\ &= \phi((P_1 + t_1) \cup \dots \cup (P_n + t_n)) = \phi(Q)\end{aligned}$$

A NEW TRANSLATION-INVARIANT
VALUATION

Ω_0

THE VIEW FROM INFINITY

$$\Omega_0(P; x) := \Omega(P; x_0, x)|_{x_0=0} = \frac{\text{adj}_P(x_0, x)|_{x_0=0}}{(-1)^m \prod_F \langle u_F, x \rangle}.$$

One can view this as

- ▶ restricting Ω to the hyperplane at infinity (given by $x_0 = 0$).
- ▶ restricting the numerator (resp. denominator) to the “expected leading monomials”.

THE VIEW FROM INFINITY

$$\Omega_0(P; x) := \Omega(P; x_0, x)|_{x_0=0} = \frac{\text{adj}_P(x_0, x)|_{x_0=0}}{(-1)^m \prod_F \langle u_F, x \rangle}.$$

One can view this as

- ▶ restricting Ω to the hyperplane at infinite (given by $x_0 = 0$).
- ▶ restricting the numerator (resp. denominator) to the “expected leading monomials”.

Lemma.

Ω_0 is a translation-invariant valuation. (whereas Ω is not)

Proof idea. Translations preserve the leading coefficients of a polynomial:

$$p(x) = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} x^{\alpha} \quad \longrightarrow \quad p(x+t) = \sum_{\alpha} p_{\alpha} (x+t)^{\alpha}. \quad \square$$

HOW TO USE Ω_0

Observation: $\Omega_0(P) = 0$ if and only if $\text{drop}(P) > 0$.

Theorem.

If P and Q are translation scissors congruent, then

$$\text{drop}(P) > 0 \iff \text{drop}(Q) > 0.$$

But ...

- ▶ We can only distinguish drop vs. no-drop.
- ▶ We lose all information about the precise value of the degree drop.


CENTRAL SYMMETRY \Leftrightarrow drop = 1

Theorem.

For $d = 2$ we have $\text{drop}(P) > 0$ if and only if P is centrally-symmetric.

Proof.

- ▶ every edge needs a parallel edge \Rightarrow must be a $2n$ -gon



- ▶ $\Omega_0(P) = 0$ and this is preserved in all steps ⚡

□


CENTRAL SYMMETRY $\Leftrightarrow \text{drop} = 1$

Theorem.

For $d = 2$ we have $\text{drop}(P) > 0$ if and only if P is centrally-symmetric.


Proof.

- ▶ every edge needs a parallel edge \Rightarrow must be a $2n$ -gon



- ▶ $\Omega_0(P) = 0$ and this is preserved in all steps ζ

□




CENTRAL SYMMETRY \Leftrightarrow drop = 1

Theorem.

For $d = 2$ we have $\text{drop}(P) > 0$ if and only if P is centrally-symmetric.

Proof.

- ▶ every edge needs a parallel edge \Rightarrow must be a $2n$ -gon



- ▶ $\Omega_0(P) = 0$ and this is preserved in all steps ζ

□


Theorem.


P has maximal degree drop $d - 1$ if and only if P is a zonotope.




Proof.



- ▶ if P has maximal drop, then so do its faces.
- ▶ all 2-faces centrally symmetric \Rightarrow zonotope.




□























Question: Are zonotopes only translation scissors congruent to zonotopes?
or stronger, is the precise degree drop preserved under TS congruence?

YES AND NO

Theorem.

In dimension $d \leq 3$ the degree drop is a translation scissors invariant.

Proof. (for $d = 3$)

$$\text{drop}(P) = \begin{cases} 0 & \Omega_0 \neq 0 \\ 1 & \Omega_0 = 0 \text{ and } P \text{ is not centrally symmetric} . \\ 2 & \Omega_0 = 0 \text{ and } P \text{ is centrally symmetric} \end{cases}$$

Both $\Omega_0 = 0$ and being centrally symmetric are TS invariant. □

YES AND NO

Theorem.

In dimension $d \leq 3$ the degree drop is a translation scissors invariant.

Proof. (for $d = 3$)

$$\text{drop}(P) = \begin{cases} 0 & \Omega_0 \neq 0 \\ 1 & \Omega_0 = 0 \text{ and } P \text{ is not centrally symmetric .} \\ 2 & \Omega_0 = 0 \text{ and } P \text{ is centrally symmetric} \end{cases}$$

Both $\Omega_0 = 0$ and being centrally symmetric are TS invariant. □

Corollary.

In dimension $d \leq 3$, being a zonotope is a translation scissors invariant.

YES AND NO

Theorem.

In dimension $d \leq 3$ the degree drop is a translation scissors invariant.

Proof. (for $d = 3$)

$$\text{drop}(P) = \begin{cases} 0 & \Omega_0 \neq 0 \\ 1 & \Omega_0 = 0 \text{ and } P \text{ is not centrally symmetric} . \\ 2 & \Omega_0 = 0 \text{ and } P \text{ is centrally symmetric} \end{cases}$$

Both $\Omega_0 = 0$ and being centrally symmetric are TS invariant. □

Corollary.

In dimension $d \leq 3$, being a zonotope is a translation scissors invariant.

This is not true in dimensions $d \geq 4$.

Example: 4-cube and 24-cell.

HOMOGENEITY

HOMOGENEITY OF Ω_0

A valuation is **k -homogeneous** if for all $\lambda > 0$ holds

$$\phi(\lambda P) = \lambda^k \phi(P).$$

HOMOGENEITY OF Ω_0

A valuation is **k -homogeneous** if for all $\lambda > 0$ holds

$$\phi(\lambda P) = \lambda^k \phi(P).$$

Lemma.

Ω_0 is 1-homogeneous. (whereas Ω is not)

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega(\lambda P; x) &= \text{vol}(\lambda P - x)^\circ \\ &= \text{vol}(\lambda(P - x/\lambda))^\circ \\ &= \text{vol}(\lambda^{-1}(P - x/\lambda)^\circ) \\ &= \lambda^{-d} \text{vol}(P - x/\lambda)^\circ = \lambda^{-d} \Omega(P; x/\lambda).\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_0(\lambda P; x) &= \lambda^{-d} \Omega(P; 0, x/\lambda) = \lambda^{-d} \frac{\text{adj}_P(0, x/\lambda)}{\prod_F L_F(0, x/\lambda)} \\ &= \lambda^{-d} \frac{\lambda^{-(m-d-1)} \text{adj}_P(0, x)}{\lambda^{-m} \prod_F L_F(0, x)} = \lambda \frac{\text{adj}_P(0, x)}{\prod_F L_F(0, x)} = \lambda \Omega_0(P; x).\end{aligned}$$

□

HOMOGENEITY IS GREAT!

Theorem. (MCMULLEN)

If Ω_0 is 1-homogeneous, then it is **Minkowski additive**:

$$\Omega_0(P_1 + \cdots + P_n) = \Omega_0(P_1) + \cdots + \Omega_0(P_n).$$


HOMOGENEITY IS GREAT!

Theorem. (MCMULLEN)

If Ω_0 is 1-homogeneous, then it is **Minkowski additive**:

$$\Omega_0(P_1 + \cdots + P_n) = \Omega_0(P_1) + \cdots + \Omega_0(P_n).$$

Observation: Minkowski sums of low-dimensional polytopes have a degree drop.




HOMOGENEITY IS GREAT!

Theorem. (MCMULLEN)

If Ω_0 is 1-homogeneous, then it is **Minkowski additive**:

$$\Omega_0(P_1 + \cdots + P_n) = \Omega_0(P_1) + \cdots + \Omega_0(P_n).$$

Observation: Minkowski sums of low-dimensional polytopes have a degree drop.




HOMOGENEITY IS GREAT!

Theorem. (MCMULLEN)

If Ω_0 is 1-homogeneous, then it is **Minkowski additive**:

$$\Omega_0(P_1 + \cdots + P_n) = \Omega_0(P_1) + \cdots + \Omega_0(P_n).$$

Observation: Minkowski sums of low-dimensional polytopes have a degree drop.



Theorem.

If P is a centrally-symmetric polytope of odd dimension with $\text{drop}(P) > 0$, then each half Q of a central dissection has $\text{drop}(Q) > 0$ as well.

A CHARACTERIZATION IN DIMENSION THREE

Theorem.

If P is a 3-dimensional polytope, then

$$\text{drop}(P) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } P + (-P) \text{ is } \underline{\text{not}} \text{ a zonotope} \\ 1 & \text{if } P + (-P) \text{ is a zonotope, but } P \text{ itself is } \underline{\text{not}} . \\ 2 & \text{if } P \text{ is a zonotope} \end{cases}$$

We currently have no such characterization in higher dimensions.

McMULLEN'S DECOMPOSITION

Theorem. (McMULLEN)

If Ω_0 is translation-invariant, 1-homogeneous and weakly continuous, then there is a valuation ϕ on $(d - 1)$ -dimensional cones so that

$$\Omega_0(P) = \sum_{e \subset P} \ell_e \phi(N_P(e)).$$

Questions:

- ▶ How to verify weak continuity?
- ▶ How to determine the valuation ϕ ?

McMULLEN'S DECOMPOSITION

Theorem. (McMULLEN)

If Ω_0 is translation-invariant, 1-homogeneous and weakly continuous, then there is a valuation ϕ on $(d - 1)$ -dimensional cones so that

$$\Omega_0(P) = \sum_{e \subset P} \ell_e \phi(N_P(e)).$$

Questions:

- ▶ How to verify weak continuity?
- ▶ How to determine the valuation ϕ ?

Theorem.

$$\Omega_0(P; x) = -\frac{1}{\|x\|^2} \sum_{e \subset P} \ell_e \Omega(\pi_e T_P(e); \pi_e x).$$

McMULLEN'S DECOMPOSITION FOR $d = 2$

Theorem.

For $d = 2$ holds

$$\Omega_0(P; x) = -\frac{1}{\|x\|^2} \sum_{e \in P} \frac{\ell_e}{\langle x, u_e \rangle}.$$

McMULLEN'S DECOMPOSITION FOR $d = 2$

Theorem.

For $d = 2$ holds

$$\Omega_0(P; x) = -\frac{1}{\|x\|^2} \sum_{e \subset P} \frac{\ell_e}{\langle x, u_e \rangle}.$$

Case study: the triangle

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{-\text{adj}_\Delta}{\langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_2 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle} &= -\frac{1}{\|x\|^2} \left(\frac{\ell_1}{\langle x, u_1 \rangle} + \frac{\ell_2}{\langle x, u_2 \rangle} + \frac{\ell_3}{\langle x, u_3 \rangle} \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{\|x\|^2} \frac{\ell_1 \langle x, u_2 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle + \ell_2 \langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle + \ell_3 \langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_2 \rangle}{\langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_2 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle} \end{aligned}$$

McMULLEN'S DECOMPOSITION FOR $d = 2$

Theorem.

For $d = 2$ holds

$$\Omega_0(P; x) = -\frac{1}{\|x\|^2} \sum_{e \in CP} \frac{\ell_e}{\langle x, u_e \rangle}.$$

Case study: the triangle

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{-\text{adj}_\Delta}{\langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_2 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle} &= -\frac{1}{\|x\|^2} \left(\frac{\ell_1}{\langle x, u_1 \rangle} + \frac{\ell_2}{\langle x, u_2 \rangle} + \frac{\ell_3}{\langle x, u_3 \rangle} \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{\|x\|^2} \frac{\ell_1 \langle x, u_2 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle + \ell_2 \langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle + \ell_3 \langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_2 \rangle}{\langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_2 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle} \end{aligned}$$

McMULLEN'S DECOMPOSITION FOR $d = 2$

Theorem.

For $d = 2$ holds

$$\Omega_0(P; x) = -\frac{1}{\|x\|^2} \sum_{e \in CP} \frac{\ell_e}{\langle x, u_e \rangle}.$$

Case study: the triangle

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{-\text{adj}_\Delta}{\langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_2 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle} &= -\frac{1}{\|x\|^2} \left(\frac{\ell_1}{\langle x, u_1 \rangle} + \frac{\ell_2}{\langle x, u_2 \rangle} + \frac{\ell_3}{\langle x, u_3 \rangle} \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{\|x\|^2} \frac{\ell_1 \langle x, u_2 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle + \ell_2 \langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle + \ell_3 \langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_2 \rangle}{\langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_2 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{adj}_\Delta \|x\|^2 = \ell_1 \langle x, u_2 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle + \ell_2 \langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle + \ell_3 \langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_2 \rangle$$

McMULLEN'S DECOMPOSITION FOR $d = 2$

Theorem.

For $d = 2$ holds

$$\Omega_0(P; x) = -\frac{1}{\|x\|^2} \sum_{e \subset P} \frac{\ell_e}{\langle x, u_e \rangle}.$$

Case study: the triangle

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{-\text{adj}_\Delta}{\langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_2 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle} &= -\frac{1}{\|x\|^2} \left(\frac{\ell_1}{\langle x, u_1 \rangle} + \frac{\ell_2}{\langle x, u_2 \rangle} + \frac{\ell_3}{\langle x, u_3 \rangle} \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{\|x\|^2} \frac{\ell_1 \langle x, u_2 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle + \ell_2 \langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle + \ell_3 \langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_2 \rangle}{\langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_2 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{adj}_\Delta \|x\|^2 = \ell_1 \langle x, u_2 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle + \ell_2 \langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_3 \rangle + \ell_3 \langle x, u_1 \rangle \langle x, u_2 \rangle$$

$$\text{adj}_\Delta = \frac{\text{Area}(\Delta)}{\text{CircR}(\Delta)}.$$

McMULLEN'S DECOMPOSITION FOR SIMPLICES

Theorem.

$$\Omega_0(P; x) = -\frac{1}{\|x\|^2} \sum_e \ell_e \Omega(\pi_e T_P(e); \pi_e x).$$

First proof idea: triangulate P + prove theorem for simplices.

McMULLEN'S DECOMPOSITION FOR SIMPLICES



Theorem.

$$\Omega_0(P; x) = -\frac{1}{\|x\|^2} \sum_e \ell_e \Omega(\pi_e T_P(e); \pi_e x).$$



First proof idea: triangulate P + prove theorem for simplices.

$$\begin{aligned} & \underbrace{\text{adj}_\Delta = \Omega_0(P; x) \cdot \prod_F \langle x, u_F \rangle}_{\text{adj}_\Delta = \Omega_0(P; x) \cdot \prod_F \langle x, u_F \rangle} \\ & \det \begin{pmatrix} | & | & \dots & | \\ u_0 & u_1 & \dots & u_d \\ | & | & \dots & | \\ h_0 & h_1 & \dots & h_d \end{pmatrix} \|x\|^2 \\ & = \sum_{i < j} \det \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} | & & | & & | & & | \\ u_0 & \dots & v_i & \dots & v_j & \dots & u_d \\ | & & | & & | & & | \\ 0 & \dots & 1 & \dots & 1 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}}_{\ell_{ij} \Omega(T_P(e_{ij})) \cdot \prod_F \langle x, u_F \rangle} \langle u_i, x \rangle \langle u_j, x \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

SECOND PROOF IDEA: ORTHOSCHEMES



SECOND PROOF IDEA: ORTHOSCHEMES



$$v_0 = (0, 0, 0, \dots, 0),$$

$$v_1 = (h_1, 0, 0, \dots, 0),$$

$$v_2 = (h_1, h_2, 0, \dots, 0),$$

$$v_3 = (h_1, h_2, h_3, \dots, 0),$$

$$\vdots$$

$$v_d = (h_1, h_2, h_3, \dots, h_d),$$

$$u_0 = (h_0, 0, 0, \dots, 0, 0),$$

$$u_1 = (-h_2, h_1, 0, \dots, 0, 0),$$



$$u_2 = (0, -h_3, h_2, \dots, 0, 0),$$

$$u_3 = (0, 0, -h_4, h_3, \dots, 0, 0),$$

$$\vdots$$

$$u_d = (0, 0, 0, \dots, 0, -h_{d+1}),$$

SECOND PROOF IDEA: ORTHOSCHEMES



$$\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^2 = - \sum_{\substack{i,j=0 \\ i < j}}^d \frac{h_{i+1}^2 + \dots + h_j^2}{h_i h_{i+1} h_j h_{j+1}} (h_{i+1} x_i - h_i x_{i+1})(h_{j+1} x_j - h_j x_{j+1}).$$

Thank you.

- ▶ $\text{drop}(P) := m - d - 1 - \deg \text{adj}_P$ is a well-behaved polytope invariant.
→ **Q:** What characterizes polytopes of a particular drop?
- ▶ Zonotopes are the polytopes with the largest possible drop $d - 1$.
- ▶ The reduced canonical form Ω_0 is translation-invariant and 1-homogeneous.
→ Interesting from the perspective of valuation theory.
→ Useful for questions of scissors congruence.
- ▶ Ω_0 gives rise to fascinating polynomial identities involving edge lengths and normal vectors.

“The canonical form, scissors congruence and adjoint degrees of polytopes”.

with Tom Baumbach, Ansgar Freyer, Julian Weigert. arXiv:2508.04275