

COVERING THE UNIT BALL OF ℓ_p^n WITH SMALLER BALLS AND RELATED INEQUALITIES

FEIFEI CHEN, SHENGHUA GAO, XIA LI AND SENLIN WU*

(Communicated by H. Martini)

Abstract. Let B_p^n ($p\geqslant 1$) be the unit ball of ℓ_p^n and $\Gamma_m(B_p^n)$ be the smallest positive number γ such that B_p^n can be covered by m translates of γB_p^n . By using different configurations of translates of γB_p^n , we obtain a universal upper bound of $\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n)$ for fixed $p\in [1,\infty]$, a nontrivial upper bound for $\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n)$ for all $p\in [1,\infty]$ when n is small, and a useful upper bound of $\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n)$ when n and p are both large. It is still not clear whether there exists a constant $c\in (0,1)$ such that $\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n)\leqslant c$ holds whenever $p\geqslant 1$ and $n\geqslant 2$.

1. Introduction

Let $n \ge 2$ be an integer and $p \in [1, \infty)$. We denote by ℓ_p^n the space $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|_p)$, where, for each point $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\|(\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_n)\|_p = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |\alpha_i|^p\right)^{1/p}.$$

We denote by ℓ_{∞}^n the space $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|_{\infty})$, where

$$\|(\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_n)\|_{\infty}=\max_{1\leqslant i\leqslant n}|\alpha_i|.$$

For each $p \in [1,\infty]$, let B_p^n and S_p^n be the *unit ball* and the *unit sphere* of ℓ_p^n , respectively, and let $\Gamma_m(B_p^n)$ be the smallest positive number γ such that B_p^n can be covered by m translates of γB_p^n . In general, for a *convex body* (a compact convex set having interior points) K in \mathbb{R}^n , we denote by $\Gamma_m(K)$ the smallest positive number γ such that K can be covered by m translates of γK . Estimating $\Gamma_m(K)$ plays an important role in Chuanming Zong's program to attack Hadwiger's covering conjecture, cf. [16]. For more information on Hadwiger's covering conjecture we refer to [3], [4], [2], and [5].

In the terminology of [14], $\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n)$ is the *n*-th entropy number of B_p^n in ℓ_p^n . By [7, Theorem 2], $\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n) \sim 1/2$, and the constants of equivalence may depend on p

^{*} Corresponding author.



Mathematics subject classification (2020): 46B20, 52A20, 52C17, 52A15.

Keywords and phrases: Convex body, covering functionals, entropy number.

The authors are supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant numbers 12071444 and 12401125), and the Fundamental Research Program of Shanxi Province (grant numbers 202103021223191, 20210302124657, 202103021224291, and 202303021221116).

and independent on n. In fact, for each integer $n \ge 2$, $\Gamma_{2^n}\left(B_p^n\right) \ge 1/2$, $\forall p \in [1,\infty]$ and the equality holds only when $p = \infty$ (cf. [6, Theorem 1]).

Recently, Xue et al. [15] proved that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n)\leqslant \left(\frac{1}{1+c_2}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where c_2 is a constant in the interval [0.2056,0.2271]. This estimate is not optimal when p is too large. We shall determine c_2 in Corollary 2.8.

Remark 6 in [9] shows that

$$\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n) \leqslant \left(\frac{n}{n+|b(2)n|}\right)^{\frac{1}{p(n)}}, \, \forall p \geqslant 1,$$

where $b(2) \approx 0.205597$ is the solution to the equation $2^x(1+x)^{1+x}/x^x = 2$, and p(n) is the unique solution to

$$\left(\frac{n}{n+|b(2)n|}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = n^{\frac{1}{p}} - \frac{1}{2}.$$

Moreover

$$\frac{\ln n}{\ln\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)} \leqslant p(n) \leqslant \frac{\ln n}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{1 + b(2)}\right)}.$$

It is not clear whether there exists a constant $c \in (0,1)$ such that $\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n) \leq c$ holds for all $p \in [1,\infty]$ and all $n \geq 2$, since it is difficult to dominate $\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n)$ when p and p are both large.

For each $p \in [1, \infty]$, we present a universal upper bound of $\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n)$, which can be used to dominate $\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n)$ when p is relatively small.

Theorem 1.1. For each $n \ge 2$, we have

$$\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n) \leqslant \left(\frac{1}{b(2) + 0.98}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

The following result generalizes [16, Theorem 2] and provides an acceptable upper bound of $\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n)$ when n is not too large.

THEOREM 1.2. Let $n \ge 2$. For each $p \in [1, \infty]$, we have

$$\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n) \leqslant \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

When n and p are both large, we can use the following result to dominate $\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n)$.

THEOREM 1.3. Suppose that $n \ge 10$, $p \ge 2$, and $p_1(n)$ is determined by (3.3) below. Then

$$\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n) \leqslant \left(\frac{n}{n+|b(2)n|}\right)^{\frac{1}{p_1(n)}}.$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\ln n}{\ln(\ln n)}\cdot\frac{1}{p_1(n)}=1.$$

Throughout this paper, the dimension n of the underlying space is at least 2. For each positive integer m, we use the shorthand notation

$$[m] := \left\{ i \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m \right\}.$$

The cardinality of a set A will be denoted by #A.

2. A lattice point based covering of B_D^n

For $n, k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ satisfying $k \leq n$, set

$$m(n,k) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} 2^{i} \binom{n}{i} \binom{k-1}{i-1} + 1.$$

We shall use the convention that

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} n \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad m(n,0) = 1.$$

LEMMA 2.1. Suppose that $n,k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $n \geqslant 3$, and $p \geqslant 1$. If $k \leqslant n/2$, then

$$(n+k)^{\frac{1}{p}}B_p^n \subseteq n^{\frac{1}{p}}B_p^n + L_p^k$$

where

$$L_p^k = \left\{ \left(lpha_1, \cdots, lpha_n
ight) \mid \sum_{i \in [n]} \left|lpha_i
ight|^p = k, \; |lpha_i|^p \in \mathbb{N}, \; orall i \in [n]
ight\} \cup \{o\}.$$

Moreover, $\#L_p^k = m(n,k)$.

Proof. Let $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ be an arbitrary point in $(n+k)^{\frac{1}{p}} B_p^n$. Then

$$\sum_{i \in [n]} |\alpha_i|^p \leqslant (n+k).$$

If $\sum_{i \in [n]} |\alpha_i|^p \leqslant n$, then

$$(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n) \in n^{\frac{1}{p}} B_p^n \subseteq n^{\frac{1}{p}} B_p^n + L_p^k$$

Otherwise, there exists $m \in [k]$ such that

$$n+m-1<\sum_{i\in [n]}|\alpha_i|^p\leqslant n+m.$$

On the one hand, since $\sum_{i \in [n]} (|\alpha_i|^p - \lfloor |\alpha_i|^p \rfloor) < n$, we have

$$\sum_{i\in[n]}\lfloor|\alpha_i|^p\rfloor\geqslant m.$$

Then there exist $\beta_1, \cdots, \beta_n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\beta_i \leqslant |\alpha_i|^p$$
, $\forall i \in [n]$ and $\sum_{i \in [n]} \beta_i = m$.

By Lemma 2.4 below, we have

$$\sum_{i \in [n]} \left| \alpha_i - \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha_i) \cdot \beta_i^{\frac{1}{p}} \right|^p \leqslant \sum_{i \in [n]} (|\alpha_i|^p - \beta_i) \leqslant n.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{split} (\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_n) &= \left(\alpha_1 - \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha_1) \cdot \beta_1^{\frac{1}{p}}, \cdots, \alpha_n - \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha_n) \cdot \beta_n^{\frac{1}{p}}\right) \\ &+ \left(\operatorname{sgn}(\alpha_1) \cdot \beta_1^{\frac{1}{p}}, \cdots, \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha_n) \cdot \beta_n^{\frac{1}{p}}\right) \\ &\in & n^{\frac{1}{p}} B_p^n + L_p^m. \end{split}$$

On the other hand, set

$$m_{i} = \begin{cases} \lfloor |\alpha_{i}|^{p} \rfloor, & \text{if } |\alpha_{i}|^{p} - \lfloor |\alpha_{i}|^{p} \rfloor < \frac{1}{2}, \\ \lfloor |\alpha_{i}|^{p} \rfloor + 1, & \text{if } |\alpha_{i}|^{p} - \lfloor |\alpha_{i}|^{p} \rfloor \geqslant \frac{1}{2}, \end{cases} \quad \forall i \in [n].$$
 (2.1)

We have

$$(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) = \left(\alpha_1 - \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha_1) \cdot m_1^{\frac{1}{p}}, \dots, \alpha_n - \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha_n) \cdot m_n^{\frac{1}{p}}\right) + \left(\operatorname{sgn}(\alpha_1) \cdot m_1^{\frac{1}{p}}, \dots, \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha_n) \cdot m_n^{\frac{1}{p}}\right).$$

By the triangle inequality, we have

$$n - \sum_{i \in [n]} m_i < \sum_{i \in [n]} |\alpha_i|^p - \sum_{i \in [n]} m_i \leqslant \sum_{i \in [n]} ||\alpha_i|^p - m_i| \leqslant \frac{n}{2}.$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{i\in[n]}m_i>\frac{n}{2}\geqslant k.$$

By (2.1), we have

$$\beta_i \leqslant \lfloor |\alpha_i|^p \rfloor \leqslant m_i \leqslant \lceil |\alpha_i|^p \rceil, \forall i \in [n].$$

Then there exist $m'_1, \cdots, m'_n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$eta_i \leqslant m_i' \leqslant m_i, \; \forall i \in [n] \; ext{ and } \; \sum_{i \in [n]} m_i' = k.$$

Set

$$\phi_i(\lambda) = \left| |\alpha_i| - \lambda^{\frac{1}{p}} \right|^p, \ \forall i \in [n].$$

Then, ϕ_i is decreasing on $[\beta_i, \lfloor |\alpha_i|^p \rfloor]$. We claim that

$$\phi_i(\beta_i) \geqslant \phi_i(m_i'), \ \forall i \in [n]. \tag{2.2}$$

The case when $m_i' \in [\beta_i, \lfloor |\alpha_i|^p \rfloor]$ is clear. If $m_i' > \lfloor |\alpha_i|^p \rfloor$, then

$$m_i' = m_i = \lfloor |\alpha_i|^p \rfloor + 1$$
 and $1/2 \leq |\alpha_i|^p - \lfloor |\alpha_i|^p \rfloor < 1$.

Since $\psi(x) = x^{\frac{1}{p}}$ is strictly increasing and concave on $(0, \infty)$, we have

$$2\left|\alpha_{i}\right| \geqslant 2\left(\left|\left|\alpha_{i}\right|^{p}\right| + \frac{1}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \geqslant \left(\left|\left|\alpha_{i}\right|^{p}\right|\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\left|\left|\alpha_{i}\right|^{p}\right| + 1\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Then,

$$\left(|\alpha_i|-\lfloor|\alpha_i|^p\rfloor^{\frac{1}{p}}\right)^p\geqslant \left((\lfloor|\alpha_i|^p\rfloor+1)^{\frac{1}{p}}-|\alpha_i|\right)^p.$$

Thus,

$$\phi_i(\beta_i) \geqslant \phi_i(\lfloor |\alpha_i|^p \rfloor) \geqslant \phi_i(\lfloor |\alpha_i|^p \rfloor + 1) = \phi_i(m_i').$$

Hence (2.2) holds as claimed. It follows that

$$\sum_{i\in[n]}\left||\alpha_i|-(m_i')^{\frac{1}{p}}\right|^p=\sum_{i\in[n]}\phi_i(m_i')\leqslant\sum_{i\in[n]}\phi_i(\beta_i)\leqslant n.$$

Therefore,

$$(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) = \left(\alpha_1 - \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha_1) \cdot (m'_1)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \dots, \alpha_n - \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha_n) \cdot (m'_n)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right)$$

$$+ \left(\operatorname{sgn}(\alpha_1) \cdot (m'_1)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \dots, \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha_n) \cdot (m'_n)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right)$$

$$\in n^{\frac{1}{p}} B_n^n + L_n^k.$$

Clearly, the map

$$T: L^k \to L_p^k,$$

$$(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \mapsto \left(\operatorname{sgn}(\alpha_1) \cdot |\alpha_1|^{\frac{1}{p}}, \dots, \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha_n) \cdot |\alpha_n|^{\frac{1}{p}}\right)$$

is a bijection, where

$$L^k = \left\{ (lpha_1, \cdots, lpha_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \mid \sum_{i \in [n]} |lpha_i| = k
ight\} \cup \{o\}.$$

Clearly, $\#L^k$ equals the number of integer points in $(kB_1^n)\setminus ((k-1)B_1^n)$. By [12, Problem 29 and its solution] or [1], we have $\#L_p^k = \#L^k = m(n,k)$.

Let $k_1(n)$ be the nonnegative integer satisfying

$$m(n, k_1(n)) \leq 2^n < m(n, k_1(n) + 1).$$

COROLLARY 2.2. Let $p \ge 1$. We have

$$\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n) \leqslant \left(\frac{n}{n+k_1(n)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

In Section 2.1 we collect some technical lemmas showing that $k_1(n)$ is well defined (cf. Lemma 2.3), and providing estimates of $n/(n+k_1(n))$.

2.1. Auxiliary Lemmas

We shall use the following Stirling's approximation (cf. [13]):

$$n! = \sqrt{2\pi} n^{n+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-n} e^{r_n},$$

where

$$\frac{1}{12n+1} < r_n < \frac{1}{12n}.$$

LEMMA 2.3. Let n and k be nonnegative integers with $n \ge 3$ and $k \le n$. We have

- (a) m(n,k) is strictly increasing with respect to k when $k \in [0, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor]$;
- (b) $m(n,1) = 1 + 2n < 2^n$, $\forall n \ge 3$ and m(3,2) = 19;
- (c) $m(n, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor) > 2^n, \forall n > 3;$
- (d) $m(n,6) < 2^n$ holds for sufficiently large n;
- (e) $m(n, |n/4|) > 2^n$ holds for sufficiently large n.

Proof. (a) and (b) is obvious.

(c). If n is even, then n = 2l for some integer $l \ge 2$. By

$$\binom{2l}{l} = \binom{l}{l} \cdot \binom{l}{0} + \binom{l}{l-1} \cdot \binom{l}{1} + \dots + \binom{l}{0} \cdot \binom{l}{l}$$

$$\geqslant \binom{l}{l} + \binom{l}{l-1} + \dots + \binom{l}{0} = 2^{l},$$

we have

$$m\left(n, \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor\right) > \binom{n}{\left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor} \cdot 2^{\left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor} \geqslant 2^{n}. \tag{2.3}$$

If *n* is odd, then there exists an integer $l \ge 2$ such that n = 2l + 1. By

we obtain (2.3) again.

- (d). It is a consequence of the fact that m(n,6) is a polynomial of degree 6 with respect to n.
 - (e). By Stirling's approximation, we have

$$\binom{n}{\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor} = \frac{n!}{\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor! \cdot (n - \lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor)!} = a_n \cdot \frac{n^n}{\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor \lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor \cdot (n - \lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor)^{n - \lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor}}$$
$$= a_n \cdot \frac{1}{\left(\frac{\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor}{n}\right)^{\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor}{n}\right)^{n - \lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor}},$$

where

$$a_n = \frac{\sqrt{2\pi \cdot n}}{\sqrt{2\pi \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \right\rfloor} \cdot \sqrt{2\pi \cdot \left(n - \left\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \right\rfloor\right)}} \cdot \frac{e^{r_n}}{e^{r_{\lfloor n/4 \rfloor}} \cdot e^{r_{n-\lfloor n/4 \rfloor}}}.$$

By

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\left\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \right\rfloor}{n} = \frac{1}{4},$$

we have

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \sqrt[n]{\frac{\binom{n}{\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor} \cdot 2^{\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \rfloor}}{2^n}} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{4}} \cdot (1 - \frac{1}{4})^{1 - \frac{1}{4}}} \cdot \frac{2^{\frac{1}{4}}}{2} = 2\sqrt[4]{\frac{2}{27}} > 1.$$

Therefore, when n is sufficiently large, we have

$$m\left(n, \left\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \right\rfloor\right) > \binom{n}{\left\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \right\rfloor} \cdot 2^{\left\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \right\rfloor} > 2^n. \quad \Box$$

Clearly, $k_1(3) = 1 \le \lfloor 3/2 \rfloor$, which, together with (a), (b), and (c) in Lemma 2.3, shows that $k_1(n) \le \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, $\forall n \ge 3$.

LEMMA 2.4. ([9]) *If either* $x \ge a \ge 0$ *or* $x \le a \le 0$, *then*

$$|x-a|^p \leqslant |x|^p - |a|^p, \ \forall p \in [1, \infty).$$

For each $x \in (0, 1/2]$, set

$$h(x) = \sqrt{1+x^2} - x$$
, $g(x) = \sqrt{1+x^2} - 1$,

and

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{(1 - h(x))^{1 - h(x)} \cdot h(x)^{h(x)}} \cdot \frac{x^{x}}{(1 - h(x))^{1 - h(x)} \cdot g(x)^{g(x)}} \cdot 2^{1 - h(x)}.$$

LEMMA 2.5. The function f defined above is strictly increasing on (0, 1/2].

Proof. Since h(x) is strictly decreasing on (0,1/2], we have h(x) < 1, $\forall x \in (0,1/2]$. Moreover,

$$\frac{x}{h(x)+x-1} > 1, \ \forall x \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right].$$

Clearly, g(x) is strictly increasing on (0, 1/2]. It can be verified that

$$\ln(f(x)) = -2(1 - h(x))\ln(1 - h(x)) - h(x)\ln(h(x)) - g(x)\ln(g(x)) + x\ln x + \ln 2 \cdot (1 - h(x)).$$

Since

$$g(x) = h(x) + x - 1$$
 and $(1 - h(x))^2 = 2 \cdot h(x)(h(x) + x - 1)$,

we have

$$\begin{split} \frac{\mathrm{d} \left(\ln(f(x)) \right)}{\mathrm{d} x} = & 2h'(x) (1 + \ln(1 - h(x))) - h'(x) (1 + \ln(h(x))) \\ & - (h'(x) + 1) (1 + \ln(h(x) + x - 1)) + (1 + \ln x) - \ln 2 \cdot h'(x) \\ = & h'(x) [2 \ln(1 - h(x)) - \ln h(x) - \ln(h(x) + x - 1) - \ln 2] \\ & + \ln x - \ln(h(x) + x - 1) \\ = & h'(x) \cdot \ln \left(\frac{(1 - h(x))^2}{2 \cdot h(x) \cdot (h(x) + x - 1)} \right) + \ln \left(\frac{x}{h(x) + x - 1} \right) \\ = & \ln \left(\frac{x}{h(x) + x - 1} \right) > 0. \end{split}$$

This completes the proof. \Box

Let a(2) be the solution to the equation f(x) = 2 on (0, 1/2]. Numerical calculation shows that $a(2) \approx 0.2140287$.

For each $n \ge 12$, $k \in \lfloor \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \rfloor \setminus [5]$, and $j \in [k]$, set

$$b(n,k,j) = \binom{n}{j} \cdot \binom{k-1}{j-1} \cdot 2^{j}.$$

For each $j \in [k-1]$, we have

$$\frac{b(n,k,j+1)}{b(n,k,j)} = 2 \cdot \frac{\binom{n}{j+1} \cdot \binom{k-1}{j}}{\binom{n}{j} \cdot \binom{k-1}{j-1}} = 2 \cdot \frac{(n-j)(k-j)}{(j+1)j} \leqslant nk.$$

Clearly

$$j(n,k) = n + k + \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{n^2 + k^2 + n + k + \frac{1}{4}}.$$
 (2.4)

is the root of the equation b(n,k,j+1)/b(n,k,j) = 1 that is strictly less than k (the other one is strictly greater than k). Therefore,

$$b(n, k, 1) < \cdots < b(n, k, |j(n, k)|)$$

and

$$b(n,k,\lfloor j(n,k)\rfloor+1) > \cdots > b(n,k,k).$$

Moreover,

$$j(n,k) = n + k + \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{n^2 + k^2} - \left(\sqrt{n^2 + k^2 + n + k + \frac{1}{4}} - \sqrt{n^2 + k^2}\right)$$
$$= n + k + \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{n^2 + k^2} - \frac{n + k + \frac{1}{4}}{\sqrt{n^2 + k^2 + n + k + \frac{1}{4}} + \sqrt{n^2 + k^2}}.$$

By

$$0<\frac{n+k+\frac{1}{4}}{\sqrt{n^2+k^2+n+k+\frac{1}{4}}+\sqrt{n^2+k^2}}<\frac{n+k+\frac{1}{4}}{\left(n+\frac{1}{2}\right)+k}<1,$$

we have

$$n+k-\sqrt{n^2+k^2}-\frac{3}{2}<\lfloor j(n,k)\rfloor < n+k-\sqrt{n^2+k^2}+\frac{1}{2}.$$
 (2.5)

Since $k \ge 6$, it can be verified that

$$\lfloor j(n,k) \rfloor > n+k-\sqrt{n^2+k^2}-\frac{3}{2} > \frac{k}{2}.$$

By (2.5), there exists $\theta_1(n,k) \in \left(-\frac{3}{2},\frac{1}{2}\right)$ such that

$$\lfloor j(n,k)\rfloor = n + k - \sqrt{n^2 + k^2} + \theta_1(n,k).$$

By Stirling's approximation, we have

$$b(n,k,j) = \binom{n}{j} \cdot \binom{k-1}{j-1} \cdot 2^{j}$$

$$= \frac{j}{k} \cdot \binom{n}{j} \cdot \binom{k}{j} \cdot 2^{j}$$

$$= \theta_{2}(n,k,j) \cdot 2^{j} \cdot \frac{n^{n}}{j^{j} \cdot (n-j)^{n-j}} \cdot \frac{k^{k}}{j^{j} \cdot (k-j)^{k-j}},$$
(2.6)

where

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_2(n,k,j) &= \frac{j}{k} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{2\pi \cdot n}}{\sqrt{2\pi \cdot j} \cdot \sqrt{2\pi \cdot (n-j)}} \cdot \frac{e^{r_n}}{e^{r_j} \cdot e^{r_{n-j}}} \\ &\cdot \frac{\sqrt{2\pi \cdot k}}{\sqrt{2\pi \cdot j} \cdot \sqrt{2\pi \cdot (k-j)}} \cdot \frac{e^{r_k}}{e^{r_j} \cdot e^{r_{k-j}}}. \end{aligned}$$

For each sequence $\{(n,k_n,j_n)\}_{n=12}^{\infty}$ of triples satisfying $k_n \in \lfloor \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \rfloor \setminus [5]$ and $j_n \in [k_n-1]$, we have

 $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt[n]{\theta_2(n,k_n,j_n)} = 1.$

LEMMA 2.6. Let $n \ge 12$, $k_n \in \lfloor \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \rfloor \setminus [5]$, and $j(n,k_n)$ be defined as (2.4), and

$$\theta(n,k_n) := b(n,k_n,\lfloor j(n,k_n)\rfloor) \cdot \left(f\left(\frac{k_n}{n}\right)\right)^{-n}.$$

Then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt[n]{\theta(n,k_n)} = 1.$$

Proof. Set $k = k_n$, j = |j(n,k)|,

$$A(n,k) = n + k - \sqrt{n^2 + k^2}, \ B(n,k) = \sqrt{n^2 + k^2} - k, \ C(n,k) = \sqrt{n^2 + k^2} - n,$$

and

$$\theta_3(n,k) = \frac{(A(n,k) + \theta_1(n,k))^{A(n,k)}}{(A(n,k))^{A(n,k)}} \cdot (A(n,k) + \theta_1(n,k))^{\theta_1(n,k)}.$$

We have

$$\begin{split} j^{j} = & (A(n,k) + \theta_{1}(n,k))^{A(n,k) + \theta_{1}(n,k)} \\ = & (A(n,k))^{A(n,k)} \cdot \frac{(A(n,k) + \theta_{1}(n,k))^{A(n,k) + \theta_{1}(n,k)}}{(A(n,k))^{A(n,k)}} \\ = & (A(n,k))^{A(n,k)} \cdot \theta_{3}(n,k). \end{split}$$

It can be verified that

$$\left|\frac{\theta_1(n,k)}{A(n,k)}\right| \leqslant \frac{3}{k+3} \leqslant \frac{1}{3}.$$

Set

$$f_1(x) = \begin{cases} (1+x)^{\frac{1}{x}}, & x \in (-1, +\infty) \setminus \{0\}, \\ e, & x = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then f_1 is strictly decreasing on $(-1,+\infty)$. Thus there exist positive numbers δ and Δ which are universal lower and upper bound of

$$\frac{(A(n,k) + \theta_1(n,k))^{A(n,k)}}{(A(n,k))^{A(n,k)}} = \left(f_1\left(\frac{\theta_1(n,k)}{A(n,k)}\right)\right)^{\theta_1(n,k)},$$

respectively. Since k/2 < j < k, we have

$$k^{-\frac{3}{2}} \leqslant (A(n,k) + \theta_1(n,k))^{\theta_1(n,k)} \leqslant k^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then it is clear that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt[n]{\theta_3(n,k)} = 1$. Similarly, there exist $\theta_4(n,k)$ and $\theta_5(n,k)$ satisfying

$$(n-j)^{n-j} = (B(n,k))^{B(n,k)} \cdot \theta_4(n,k),$$

$$(k-j)^{k-j} = (C(n,k))^{C(n,k)} \cdot \theta_5(n,k),$$

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \sqrt[n]{\theta_4(n,k)} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \sqrt[n]{\theta_5(n,k)} = 1.$$

Then, by (2.6), we have

$$\begin{split} b(n,k,j) = & \theta_{2}(n,k,j) \cdot 2^{\theta_{1}(n,k)} \cdot 2^{A(n,k)} \\ & \cdot \frac{n^{n}}{\left[(A(n,k))^{A(n,k)} \cdot \theta_{3}(n,k) \right] \cdot \left[(B(n,k))^{B(n,k)} \cdot \theta_{4}(n,k) \right]} \\ & \cdot \frac{k^{k}}{\left[(A(n,k))^{A(n,k)} \cdot \theta_{3}(n,k) \right] \cdot \left[(C(n,k))^{C(n,k)} \cdot \theta_{5}(n,k) \right]} \\ = & \theta_{2}(n,k,j) \cdot 2^{\theta_{1}(n,k)} \cdot \frac{1}{(\theta_{2}(n,k))^{2} \cdot \theta_{4}(n,k) \cdot \theta_{5}(n,k)} \cdot \left(f\left(\frac{k}{n}\right) \right)^{n}. \end{split}$$

It follows that

$$\theta(n,k) = \theta_2(n,k,j) \cdot 2^{\theta_1(n,k)} \cdot \frac{1}{(\theta_3(n,k))^2 \cdot \theta_4(n,k) \cdot \theta_5(n,k)}.$$

Therefore, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt[n]{\theta(n,k)} = 1$. \square

LEMMA 2.7. We have

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{k_1(n)}{n} = a(2) \approx 0.2140287.$$

Proof. By (d) and (e) in Lemma 2.3, $6 \le k_1(n) < \lfloor n/4 \rfloor$ holds for large n. On the one hand, by $b(n,k_1(n),|j(n,k_1(n))|) \le 2^n$, we have

$$\sqrt[n]{\theta(n,k_1(n))} \cdot f\left(\frac{k_1(n)}{n}\right) \leqslant 2,$$

or, equivalently,

$$\frac{k_1(n)}{n} \leqslant f^{-1}\left(\frac{2}{\sqrt[n]{\theta(n,k_1(n))}}\right).$$

Therefore,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{k_1(n)}{n}\leqslant a(2).$$

On the other hand, by

$$\begin{split} m(n,k) &= 1 + \binom{n}{1} \cdot 2 + \binom{n}{2} \cdot \binom{k-1}{1} \cdot 2^2 + \dots + \binom{n}{k} \cdot \binom{k-1}{k-1} \cdot 2^k \\ &\leq (k+1)(b(n,k,\lfloor j(n,k)\rfloor) + b(n,k,\lfloor j(n,k)\rfloor + 1)) \\ &\leq (k+1)(nk+1)b(n,k,\lfloor j(n,k)\rfloor) \\ &< n^3 b(n,k,\lfloor j(n,k)\rfloor), \end{split}$$

we have

$$\begin{split} 2^n &< n^3 \cdot b(n, k_1(n) + 1, \lfloor j(n, k_1(n) + 1) \rfloor) \\ &= n^3 \cdot \theta(n, k_1(n) + 1) \cdot \left(f\left(\frac{k_1(n) + 1}{n}\right) \right)^n. \end{split}$$

Hence

$$\frac{k_1(n)+1}{n} > f^{-1}\left(\frac{2}{\sqrt[n]{n^3 \cdot \theta(n, k_1(n)+1)}}\right).$$

Therefore,

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{k_1(n)}{n}\geqslant a(2).$$

This completes the proof. \Box

COROLLARY 2.8. We have

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n) \leqslant \left(\frac{1}{1+a(2)}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We claim that, for each integer $n \in [2,49]$, we have

$$\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n) \leqslant \left(\frac{5}{6}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

If n = 2, then, since each planar convex body K can be covered by 4 translates of $(\sqrt{2}/2)K$ (cf. [8]),

$$\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n)\leqslant \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}<\frac{5}{6}\leqslant \left(\frac{5}{6}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}},\ \forall p\geqslant 1.$$

The case when $n \in [3,49] \setminus \{6\}$ can be seen from Table 1. Now suppose that n = 6. If $p \in [1,2]$, by Lemma 3.1 below, we have

$$\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n) \leqslant \Gamma_{2n}(B_p^n) \leqslant \left(\frac{5}{6}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}};$$

n	$k_1(n)$	$\frac{n}{n+k_1(n)}$	n	$k_1(n)$	$\frac{n}{n+k_1(n)}$	n	$k_1(n)$	$\frac{n}{n+k_1(n)}$
3	1	0.75	4	1	0.8	5	1	0.83333
6	1	0.85714	7	2	0.77778	8	2	0.8
9	2	0.81818	10	2	0.83333	11	3	0.78571
12	3	0.80000	13	3	0.8125	14	3	0.82353
15	3	0.83333	16	4	0.80000	17	4	0.80952
18	4	0.81818	19	4	0.82609	20	5	0.80000
21	5	0.80769	22	5	0.81481	23	5	0.82143
24	5	0.82579	25	6	0.80645	26	6	0.81250
27	6	0.81818	28	6	0.82353	29	7	0.80556
30	7	0.81081	31	7	0.81579	32	7	0.82051
33	7	0.825	34	8	0.80952	35	8	0.81395
36	8	0.81818	37	8	0.82222	38	9	0.80851
39	9	0.8125	40	9	0.81633	41	9	0.82
42	9	0.82353	43	10	0.81132	44	10	0.81482
45	10	0.81818	46	10	0.82143	47	11	0.81035
48	11	0.81356	49	11	0.81667	50	11	0.81967

Table 1: *Estimates of* $n/(n+k_1(n))$ *in low dimensions.*

if $p \ge 2$, then, by Lemma 3.4 below, we have

$$\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n) \leqslant \left(\frac{5}{6}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leqslant \left(\frac{5}{6}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

This proves the claim.

Set c = b(2) - 0.02. For each $n \ge 50$, we have $cn \le b(2)n - 1$, which shows that $(1+c)n \le n + |b(2)n|$. By [9, Proposition 5], we have

$$\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n) \leqslant \left(\frac{n}{n + \lfloor b(2)n \rfloor}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leqslant \left(\frac{n}{(1+c)n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$
$$= \left(\frac{1}{b(2) + 0.98}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \approx 0.8435^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Thus, for each $n \ge 3$, we have

$$\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n) \leqslant \max\left\{ \left(\frac{5}{6}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \left(\frac{1}{b(2)+0.98}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\} = \left(\frac{1}{b(2)+0.98}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad \Box$$

3. Further covering methods

In this section we present two elementary configurations of smaller balls to cover B_p^n . They yield good upper bounds for $\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n)$ when n is small.

LEMMA 3.1. *If* $p \in [1,\infty]$ *and* $n \ge 2$, *then*

$$\Gamma_{2n}(B_p^n) \leqslant \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Proof. Let e_1, \ldots, e_n be the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^n . For each $i \in [n]$, set

$$\begin{split} c_i^+ &= \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} e_i, \quad c_i^- &= -\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} e_i, \\ H_i^+ &= \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle x | e_i \rangle \geqslant \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\}, \end{split}$$

and

$$H_i^- = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \langle x | e_i \rangle \leqslant -\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \right\}.$$

Clearly,

$$S_p^n = \bigcup_{i \in [n]} \left[(S_p^n \cap H_i^+) \cup (S_p^n \cap H_i^-) \right].$$

Let x be an arbitrary point in B_p^n . If x = o, then

$$||x - c_1^+||_p = ||c_1^+||_p = \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leqslant \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Otherwise, assume without loss of generality that, $y = x/\|x\|_p \in S_n^p \cap H_1^+$. Then there exists $z \in S_p^n$ satisfying $\langle z|e_1 \rangle = (1/n)^{1/p}$ such that

$$y \in \left\{ \frac{\lambda e_1 + (1 - \lambda)z}{\|\lambda e_1 + (1 - \lambda)z\|_p} \mid \lambda \in [0, 1] \right\}.$$

By [11, Lemma 2.1], we have

$$\|y - c_1^+\|_p \le \|z - c_1^+\|_p = \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

By [10, Lemma 5],

$$\begin{split} \left\|x-c_1^+\right\|_p \leqslant \max\left\{\left\|y-c_1^+\right\|_p, \left\|c_1^+\right\|_p\right\} \\ \leqslant \max\left\{\left(1-\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}, \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right\} = \left(1-\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{split}$$

Thus

$$B_p^n \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in [n]} \left[\left(c_i^+ + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} B_p^n \right) \cup \left(c_i^- + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} B_p^n \right) \right]. \quad \Box$$

LEMMA 3.2. Let $p \geqslant 2$, $\lambda \in (0, (1/n)^{1/p})$, $c_{\lambda} = (\lambda, ..., \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and

$$D = \left\{ (lpha_1, \cdots, lpha_n) \mid \sum_{i \in [n]} lpha_i^p \leqslant 1; \; lpha_i \geqslant 0, \; orall i \in [n]
ight\}.$$

Then

$$M(\lambda) := \max \left\{ \|c_{\lambda} - x\|_p^p \mid x \in D \right\} = \max \left\{ (1 - \lambda)^p + (n - 1)\lambda^p, n\lambda^p \right\}.$$

Proof. Let x be an arbitrary point in $D \setminus \{c_{\lambda}\}$, y be the point of intersection of the ray $[c_{\lambda}, x]$ and the boundary of D. First suppose that $\|y\|_p < 1$. If y is the origin o, then

$$||c_{\lambda} - x||_p^p \le ||c_{\lambda} - y||_p^p = n\lambda^p.$$

Otherwise, let $z = y / ||y||_p$. Then, by [10, Lemma 5], we have

$$\|c_{\lambda} - x\|_p^p \leqslant \|c_{\lambda} - y\|_p^p \leqslant \max\left\{\|c_{\lambda} - o\|_p^p, \|c_{\lambda} - z\|_p^p\right\} \leqslant \max\left\{\|c_{\lambda} - o\|_p^p, \gamma\right\},$$

where

$$\gamma := \max \left\{ \|c_{\lambda} - w\|_{p}^{p} \mid w \in D \cap S_{p}^{n} \right\}.$$

Therefore, to complete the proof, we only need to show that $\gamma = (1 - \lambda)^p + (n - 1)\lambda^p$. Clearly,

$$\gamma \geqslant (1-\lambda)^p + (n-1)\lambda^p$$
.

Assume that γ is attained at $w_0 = (\alpha_1^0, \dots, \alpha_n^0) \in D \cap S_p^n$. Set

$$J = \left\{ i \in [n] \mid \alpha_i^0 \neq 0 \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad k := \#J.$$

Clearly, k > 0. Without loss of generality, we may assume that J = [k]. Then $(\alpha_1^0, \dots, \alpha_n^0)$ is a solution to the optimization problem

$$\max \quad |\alpha_1 - \lambda|^p + \dots + |\alpha_k - \lambda|^p + (n - k)\lambda^p$$
s.t.
$$\sum_{i \in [k]} \alpha_i^p = 1,$$

$$\alpha_i \geqslant 0, \ \forall i \in [k].$$

Let

$$L(\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_k) = |\alpha_1 - \lambda|^p + \cdots + |\alpha_k - \lambda|^p + (n-k)\lambda^p + \mu(\alpha_1^p + \cdots + \alpha_k^p - 1).$$

By the Lagrange multiplier method, $(\alpha_1^0, \dots, \alpha_k^0)$ is a solution to the following system of equations

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \alpha_i} = p \cdot |\alpha_i - \lambda|^{p-1} \cdot \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha_i - \lambda) + \mu \cdot p \cdot \alpha_i^{p-1} = 0, \ \forall i \in [k],$$
 (3.1)

$$\alpha_1^p + \dots + \alpha_k^p - 1 = 0.$$
 (3.2)

By (3.1), we have

$$\left|\frac{\alpha_i^0 - \lambda}{\alpha_i^0}\right|^{p-1} \cdot \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha_i^0 - \lambda) = -\mu, \forall i \in [k].$$

Then

$$rac{lpha_1^0-\lambda}{lpha_1^0}=\cdots=rac{lpha_k^0-\lambda}{lpha_k^0}
eq 1.$$

Therefore $\alpha_1^0 = \cdots = \alpha_k^0$. By (3.2), we have

$$\alpha_1^0 = \dots = \alpha_k^0 = \left(\frac{1}{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Note that

$$\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \geqslant \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} > \lambda.$$

Thus

$$\gamma = \|c_{\lambda} - w_0\|_p = k \left(\left(\frac{1}{k} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} - \lambda \right)^p + (n - k)\lambda^p$$
$$= (1 - \lambda \cdot k^{\frac{1}{p}})^p + (n - k)\lambda^p$$
$$\leq (1 - \lambda)^p + (n - 1)\lambda^p. \quad \Box$$

LEMMA 3.3. If $n \ge 3$ and $p \ge 2$, then

$$1 + (n-1)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} > n^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Proof. Let

$$g(x) = 1 + (x-1)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} - x^{\frac{1}{p}}, \ \forall x \in [3, \infty).$$

Then,

$$g'(x) = \frac{1}{p-1} \cdot \frac{1}{(x-1)^{\frac{p-2}{p-1}}} - \frac{1}{p} \cdot \frac{1}{x^{\frac{p-1}{p}}}.$$

Since

$$\frac{1}{p-1} > \frac{1}{p} > 0$$
 and $0 \le \frac{p-2}{p-1} < \frac{p-1}{p}$,

we have

$$(x-1)^{\frac{p-2}{p-1}} < (x-1)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} < x^{\frac{p-1}{p}}.$$

Thus g'(x) > 0. Consequently,

$$g(n) \geqslant g(3) = 1 + 2^{\frac{1}{p-1}} - 3^{\frac{1}{p}} > 1 + 2^{\frac{1}{p}} - 3^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Set $h(t) = 1 + 2^t - 3^t$, $\forall t \in (0, 1/2]$. Since

$$h'(t) = 2^t \cdot \ln 2 - 3^t \cdot \ln 3 = 2^t \cdot \ln 3 \cdot \left(\frac{\ln 2}{\ln 3} - \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^t\right) < 0,$$

we have $h(t) \ge h(1/2) = 1 + \sqrt{2} - \sqrt{3} > 0$. This completes the proof. \square

LEMMA 3.4. If $p \ge 2$ and $n \ge 3$, then

$$\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n) \leqslant \gamma(n,p) := \frac{(n-1)^{\frac{1}{p}}}{\left(1 + (n-1)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}\right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}}}.$$

Moreover, $\gamma(n,p)$ *is strictly decreasing on* $[2,\infty)$ *with respect to* p.

Proof. Take

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{1 + (n-1)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}$$

in Lemma 3.2. Then $\lambda < 1/2$, which implies that $(1-\lambda)^p > \lambda^p$. It follows that

$$(1-\lambda)^p + (n-1)\lambda^p > n\lambda^p.$$

Thus

$$\begin{split} M(\lambda) = & (1-\lambda)^p + (n-1)\lambda^p \\ = & \left(\frac{(n-1)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{1+(n-1)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}\right)^p + \left(\frac{1}{1+(n-1)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}\right)^p \cdot (n-1) \\ = & \frac{(n-1)\left(1+(n-1)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}\right)}{\left(1+(n-1)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}\right)^p} = \gamma(n,p)^p. \end{split}$$

This means that the portion of B_p^n in the nonnegative orthant can be covered by a ball (with respect to $\|\cdot\|_p$) having radius $\gamma(n,p)$. Therefore, $\Gamma_{2^n}(B_p^n) \leqslant \gamma(n,p)$.

Let

$$L = L(p) = \frac{\ln(n-1)}{p} - \frac{p-1}{p} \cdot \ln\left[1 + (n-1)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}\right].$$

Then

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}L}{\mathrm{d}p} = -\frac{1}{p^2} \left[\ln(1+(n-1)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}) - \ln(n-1)^{\left(\frac{p}{p-1}\cdot \frac{(n-1)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{1+(n-1)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}-1\right)} \right].$$

It is not difficult to verify that

$$\frac{1}{p-1} > \frac{p}{p-1} \cdot \frac{(n-1)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}}{1 + (n-1)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}} - 1.$$

Hence dL/dp < 0. This completes the proof. \Box

Proof of Theorem 1.2. The case when n = 2 follows from the fact that (as we have mentioned in the proof of Theorem 1.1)

$$\Gamma_4(B_p^2) \leqslant \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \ \forall p \in [1, \infty].$$

The case when $n \ge 3$ follows from Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.4. \square

LEMMA 3.5. If $\alpha > 1$, then $\phi_{\alpha}(t) = (\alpha^t - 1)^{\frac{1}{t}}$ is strictly increasing on $(0, \infty)$.

Proof. Clearly,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d} \ln \phi_{\alpha}(t)}{\mathrm{d} t} = \frac{\frac{\alpha^{t} \cdot \ln \alpha}{\alpha^{t} - 1} \cdot t - \ln(\alpha^{t} - 1)}{t^{2}} = \frac{\alpha^{t} \cdot \ln \alpha \cdot t - (\alpha^{t} - 1) \cdot \ln(\alpha^{t} - 1)}{t^{2} \cdot (\alpha^{t} - 1)}.$$

Set

$$\psi(t) = \alpha^t \cdot \ln \alpha \cdot t - (\alpha^t - 1) \cdot \ln(\alpha^t - 1), \ \forall t \in (0, +\infty).$$

Then $\psi(0^+) = 0$ and

$$\psi'(t) = \ln \alpha \left[\alpha^t + t \cdot \alpha^t \cdot \ln \alpha \right] - \left(1 + \ln(\alpha^t - 1) \right) \cdot \alpha^t \cdot \ln \alpha$$
$$= \ln \alpha \left[\alpha^t \ln \alpha^t - \alpha^t \cdot \ln(\alpha^t - 1) \right] > 0.$$

It follows that $\psi(t) > 0$, $\forall t > 0$. Therefore $\phi_{\alpha}(t)$ is strictly increasing on $(0, \infty)$ as claimed. \square

LEMMA 3.6. Let ϕ_{α} be defined as in Lemma 3.5. We have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\ln n}{\ln(\ln n)} \cdot \phi_{\alpha}^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) = 1.$$

Proof. Let $t(n) := \phi_{\alpha}^{-1}(\frac{1}{n})$. Then t(n) > 0, $\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\lim_{n \to \infty} t(n) = 0$. Now,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\ln n}{\ln(\ln n)} \cdot \phi_{\alpha}^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right) = \lim_{t \to 0^{+}} \frac{\ln \frac{1}{\phi_{\alpha}(t)}}{\ln\left[\ln \frac{1}{\phi_{\alpha}(t)}\right]} \cdot t$$

$$= \lim_{t \to 0^{+}} \frac{-t \cdot \frac{\ln(\alpha^{t} - 1)}{t}}{\ln\left(-\frac{\ln(\alpha^{t} - 1)}{t}\right)}$$

$$= \lim_{t \to 0^{+}} \frac{-\ln(\alpha^{t} - 1)}{\ln[-\ln(\alpha^{t} - 1)] - \ln t}.$$

The desired equality follows directly from

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+} \frac{\ln(\alpha^t - 1)}{\ln t} = \lim_{t\to 0^+} \frac{\frac{1}{\alpha^t - 1} \cdot \alpha^t \cdot \ln \alpha}{\frac{1}{t}} = 1,$$

and

$$\lim_{t \to 0^+} \frac{\ln(-\ln(\alpha^t - 1))}{\ln t} = \lim_{t \to 0^+} \frac{\frac{1}{-\ln(\alpha^t - 1)} \cdot \frac{-1}{\alpha^t - 1} \cdot \alpha^t \cdot \ln \alpha}{\frac{1}{t}} = 0. \quad \Box$$

Assume that $n \ge 10$. It is clear that $\left(\frac{n}{n + \lfloor b(2)n \rfloor}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ is strictly increasing with respect to p. It can be verified that

$$\left(\frac{n}{n+\lfloor b(2)n\rfloor}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \frac{(n-1)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\lceil 1+(n-1)\rceil^{\frac{1}{2}}} \iff \frac{n}{n-1} < \lfloor b(2)n\rfloor$$

and that

$$\lim_{p \to +\infty} \gamma(n,p) = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \lim_{p \to +\infty} \left(\frac{n}{n + \lfloor b(2)n \rfloor} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} = 1.$$

Thus there is a unique number $p_1(n) \in (2, +\infty)$ satisfying

$$\gamma(n, p_1(n)) = \left(\frac{n}{n + \lfloor b(2)n \rfloor}\right)^{\frac{1}{p_1(n)}}.$$
(3.3)

Proof of Theorem 1.3. The first inequality follows directly from Lemma 3.4 and the definition of $p_1(n)$.

Set $p = p_1(n)$. Then

$$1 + \left(\frac{1}{n-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} = \left(\frac{n + \lfloor b(2)n \rfloor}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}.$$
 (3.4)

Since

$$\frac{n+b(2)n-1}{n} < \frac{n+\lfloor b(2)n\rfloor}{n} \leqslant \frac{n+b(2)n}{n},$$

we have

$$1 + b(2) - \frac{1}{10} < \frac{n + \lfloor b(2)n \rfloor}{n} \le 1 + b(2),$$

or, equivalently,

$$(0.9 + b(2))^{\frac{1}{p-1}} < \left(\frac{n + \lfloor b(2)n \rfloor}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}} \leqslant (1 + b(2))^{\frac{1}{p-1}}.$$

By (3.4), we have

$$(0.9+b(2))^{\frac{1}{p-1}}-1<\left(\frac{1}{n-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}\leqslant (1+b(2))^{\frac{1}{p-1}}-1.$$

It follows that

$$\phi_{0.9+b(2)}\left(\frac{1}{p-1}\right) < \frac{1}{n-1} \leqslant \phi_{1+b(2)}\left(\frac{1}{p-1}\right).$$

Therefore,

$$\phi_{1+b(2)}^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{n-1}\right)<\frac{1}{p-1}\leqslant\phi_{0.9+b(2)}^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{n-1}\right).$$

By Lemma 3.6, the proof is complete. \Box

REFERENCES

- [1] U. BETKE AND M. HENK, *Intrinsic volumes and lattice points of crosspolytopes*, Monatsh. Math. **115** (1993), no. 1–2, 27–33.
- [2] K. BEZDEK AND M. A. KHAN, The geometry of homothetic covering and illumination, Discrete Geometry and Symmetry, Springer Proc. Math. Stat., vol. 234, Springer, Cham, 2018, pp. 1–30.
- [3] V. BOLTYANSKI AND I. Z. GOHBERG, Stories about covering and illuminating of convex bodies, Nieuw Arch. Wisk. (4) 13 (1995), no. 1, 1–26.
- [4] V. BOLTYANSKI, H. MARTINI, AND P. S. SOLTAN, Excursions into Combinatorial Geometry, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997.
- [5] L. FEJES TÓTH, G. FEJES TÓTH, AND W. KUPERBERG, Lagerungen arrangements in the plane, on the sphere, and in space, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 360, Springer, Cham, [2023] ©2023, translated from the German [0057566], with a foreword by Thomas Hales.
- [6] CHAN HE, H. MARTINI, AND SENLIN WU, On covering functionals of convex bodies, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 437 (2016), no. 2, 1236–1256.
- [7] M. KOSSACZKÁ AND J. VYBÍRAL, Entropy numbers of finite-dimensional embeddings, Expo. Math. 38 (2020), no. 3, 319–336.
- [8] M. LASSAK, Covering a plane convex body by four homothetical copies with the smallest positive ratio, Geom. Dedicata 21 (1986), no. 2, 157–167.
- [9] XIA LI, LINGXU MENG, AND SENLIN WU, Covering functionals of convex polytopes with few vertices, Arch. Math. (Basel) 119 (2022), no. 2, 135–146.
- [10] H. MARTINI, K. J. SWANEPOEL, AND G. WEISS, The geometry of Minkowski spaces a survey. I, Expo. Math. 19 (2001), no. 2, 97–142.
- [11] H. MARTINI AND SENLIN WU, Concurrent and parallel chords of spheres in normed linear spaces, Studia Sci. Math. Hungar. 47 (2010), no. 4, 505–512.
- [12] G. PÓLYA AND G. SZEGŐ, Problems and theorems in analysis. I, Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998, Series, integral calculus, theory of functions, Translated from the German by Dorothee Aeppli, Reprint of the 1978 English translation.

- [13] H. ROBBINS, A remark on Stirling's formula, Amer. Math. Monthly 62 (1955), 26–29.
- [14] V. TEMLYAKOV, A remark on entropy numbers, Studia Math. 263 (2022), no. 2, 199–208.
- [15] FEI XUE, YANLU LIAN, AND YUQIN ZHANG, On Hadwiger's covering functional for the simplex and the cross-polytope, 2021.
- [16] CHUANMING ZONG, A quantitative program for Hadwiger's covering conjecture, Sci. China Math. 53 (2010), no. 9, 2551–2560.

(Received August 31, 2024)

Feifei Chen School of Mathematics North University of China Taiyuan 030051, China e-mail: chernfeifei@163.com

Shenghua Gao
Department of Applied Mathematics
Harbin University of Science and Technology
Harbin 150080, China
e-mail: nucgaoshenghua@163.com

Xia Li School of Mathematics North University of China Taiyuan 030051, China e-mail: lixia2016@nuc.edu.cn Senlin Wu

School of Mathematics
North University of China
Taiyuan 030051, China
e-mail: wusenlin@nuc.edu.cn