



Article title: The Ehrhart volume conjecture is false in sufficiently higher dimensions in \mathbb{R}^n : The Ehrhart volume conjecture

Authors: Theophilus Agama[1]

Affiliations: African Institute for Mathematical sciences[1]

Orcid ids: 0000-0001-7790-9368[1]

Contact e-mail: theophilus@aims.edu.gh

License information: This work has been published open access under Creative Commons Attribution License <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. Conditions, terms of use and publishing policy can be found at <https://www.scienceopen.com/>.

Preprint statement: This article is a preprint and has not been peer-reviewed, under consideration and submitted to AfricArXiv Preprints for open peer review.

DOI: 10.14293/111.000/000027.v1

Preprint first posted online: 27 May 2022

Keywords: volume, ball, lattice, point

THE EHRHART VOLUME CONJECTURE IS FALSE IN SUFFICIENTLY HIGHER DIMENSIONS IN \mathbb{R}^n

T. AGAMA

ABSTRACT. Using the method of compression, we show that volume $Vol(K)$ of a ball K in \mathbb{R}^n with a single lattice point in its interior as center of mass satisfies the lower bound

$$Vol(K) \gg \frac{n^n}{\sqrt{n}}$$

thereby disproving the Ehrhart volume conjecture, which claims that the upper bound must hold

$$Vol(K) \leq \frac{(n+1)^n}{n!}$$

for all convex bodies with the required property.

1. Introduction

The Ehrhart volume conjecture is the assertion that any convex body K in \mathbb{R}^n with a single lattice point in its interior as barycenter must have volume satisfying the upper bound

$$Vol(K) \leq \frac{(n+1)^n}{n!}.$$

The conjecture has only been proven for various special cases in very specific settings. For instance, Ehrhart proved the conjecture in the two dimensional case and for simplices [2]. The conjecture has also been settled for a large class of rational polytopes [1]. In this paper, we study the Ehrhart volume conjecture. We show that the claimed inequality fails for some convex bodies, providing a counter example to the Ehrhart volume conjecture. The main idea that goes into the disprove pertains to a certain construction of a ball in \mathbb{R}^n and the realization that after some little tweak of the internal structure, the ball satisfies the requirements of the conjecture but has too much volume, at least a volume beyond that postulated by Ehrhart. In particular, we prove the following lower bound

Theorem 1.1. *Let $Vol(K)$ denotes the volume of a ball in \mathbb{R}^n with only one lattice points in its interior as its center of mass. Then $Vol(K)$ satisfies the lower bound*

$$Vol(K) \gg \frac{n^n}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Date: May 27, 2022.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 54C40, 14E20; Secondary 46E25, 20C20.

Key words and phrases. minimal; circle.

1.1. Notations and conventions. Through out this paper, we will assume that r is sufficiently large for the radius of a sphere. We write $f(s) \gg g(s)$ if there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $f(s) \geq c|g(s)|$ for all s sufficiently large. If the constant depends of some variable, say t , then we denote the inequality by $f(s) \gg_t g(s)$. We write $f(s) = o(g(s))$ if the limits holds $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(s)}{g(s)} = 0$.

2. Preliminaries and background

Definition 2.1. By the compression of scale $m > 0$ ($m \in \mathbb{R}$) fixed on \mathbb{R}^n we mean the map $\mathbb{V} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\mathbb{V}_m[(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)] = \left(\frac{m}{x_1}, \frac{m}{x_2}, \dots, \frac{m}{x_n} \right)$$

for $n \geq 2$ and with $x_i \neq x_j$ for $i \neq j$ and $x_i \neq 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Remark 2.2. The notion of compression is in some way the process of re scaling points in \mathbb{R}^n for $n \geq 2$. Thus it is important to notice that a compression roughly speaking pushes points very close to the origin away from the origin by certain scale and similarly draws points away from the origin close to the origin.

Proposition 2.1. *A compression of scale $1 \geq m > 0$ with $\mathbb{V}_m : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bijective map.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathbb{V}_m[(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)] = \mathbb{V}_m[(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)]$, then it follows that

$$\left(\frac{m}{x_1}, \frac{m}{x_2}, \dots, \frac{m}{x_n} \right) = \left(\frac{m}{y_1}, \frac{m}{y_2}, \dots, \frac{m}{y_n} \right).$$

It follows that $x_i = y_i$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Surjectivity follows by definition of the map. Thus the map is bijective. \square

2.1. The mass of compression. In this section we recall the notion of the mass of compression on points in space and study the associated statistics.

Definition 2.3. By the mass of a compression of scale $m > 0$ ($m \in \mathbb{R}$) fixed, we mean the map $\mathcal{M} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{V}_m[(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)]) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{m}{x_i}.$$

It is important to notice that the condition $x_i \neq x_j$ for $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is not only a quantifier but a requirement; otherwise, the statement for the mass of compression will be flawed completely. To wit, suppose we take $x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_n$, then it will follows that $\text{Inf}(x_j) = \text{Sup}(x_j)$, in which case the mass of compression of scale m satisfies

$$m \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\text{Inf}(x_j) - k} \leq \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{V}_m[(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)]) \leq m \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\text{Inf}(x_j) + k}$$

and it is easy to notice that this inequality is absurd. By extension one could also try to equalize the sub-sequence on the bases of assigning the supremum and the Infimum and obtain an estimate but that would also contradict the mass of compression inequality after a slight reassignment of the sub-sequence. Thus it is important for the estimate to make any good sense to ensure that any tuple

$(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ must satisfy $x_i \neq x_j$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. Hence in this paper this condition will be highly extolled. In situations where it is not mentioned, it will be assumed that the tuple $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is such that $x_i \leq x_j$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.

Lemma 2.4. *The estimate holds*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \frac{1}{n} = \log x + \gamma + O\left(\frac{1}{x}\right)$$

where $\gamma = 0.5772 \dots$.

Remark 2.5. Next we prove upper and lower bounding the mass of the compression of scale $m > 0$.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $x_i \neq 0$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $x_i \neq x_j$ for $i \neq j$, then the estimates holds*

$$m \log \left(1 - \frac{n-1}{\sup(x_j)}\right)^{-1} \ll \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{V}_m[(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)]) \ll m \log \left(1 + \frac{n-1}{\inf(x_j)}\right)$$

for $n \geq 2$.

Proof. Let $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for $n \geq 2$ with $x_j \neq 0$. Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{V}_m[(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)]) &= m \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{x_j} \\ &\leq m \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\inf(x_j) + k} \end{aligned}$$

and the upper estimate follows by the estimate for this sum. The lower estimate also follows by noting the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{V}_m[(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)]) &= m \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{x_j} \\ &\geq m \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\sup(x_j) - k}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 2.6. Let $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $x_i \neq 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Then by the gap of compression of scale $m > 0$, denoted $\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)]$, we mean the expression

$$\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)] = \left\| \left(x_1 - \frac{m}{x_1}, x_2 - \frac{m}{x_2}, \dots, x_n - \frac{m}{x_n} \right) \right\|$$

Definition 2.7. Let $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $x_i \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then by the ball induced by $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ under compression of scale $m > 0$, denoted $\mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)]$ we mean the inequality

$$\left\| \vec{y} - \frac{1}{2} \left(x_1 + \frac{m}{x_1}, x_2 + \frac{m}{x_2}, \dots, x_n + \frac{m}{x_n} \right) \right\| < \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)].$$

A point $\vec{z} = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) \in \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)]}[(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)]$ if it satisfies the inequality. We call the ball the circle induced by points under compression if we take the dimension of the underlying space to be $n = 2$.

Remark 2.8. In the geometry of balls under compression of scale $m > 0$, we will assume implicitly that $1 \geq m > 0$. The circle induced by points under compression is the ball induced on points when we take $n = 2$.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for $n \geq 2$, then we have*

$$\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)]^2 = \mathcal{M} \circ \mathbb{V}_1 \left[\left(\frac{1}{x_1^2}, \dots, \frac{1}{x_n^2} \right) \right] + m^2 \mathcal{M} \circ \mathbb{V}_1[(x_1^2, \dots, x_n^2)] - 2mn.$$

In particular, we have the estimate

$$\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)]^2 = \mathcal{M} \circ \mathbb{V}_1 \left[\left(\frac{1}{x_1^2}, \dots, \frac{1}{x_n^2} \right) \right] - 2mn + O \left(m^2 \mathcal{M} \circ \mathbb{V}_1[(x_1^2, \dots, x_n^2)] \right)$$

for $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{N}^n$, where $m^2 \mathcal{M} \circ \mathbb{V}_1[(x_1^2, \dots, x_n^2)]$ is the error term in this case.

Lemma 2.9 (Compression estimate). *Let $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ for $n \geq 2$ and $x_i \neq x_j$ for $i \neq j$, then we have*

$$\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)]^2 \ll n \sup(x_j^2) + m^2 \log \left(1 + \frac{n-1}{\inf(x_j)^2} \right) - 2mn$$

and

$$\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)]^2 \gg n \inf(x_j^2) + m^2 \log \left(1 - \frac{n-1}{\sup(x_j^2)} \right)^{-1} - 2mn.$$

Theorem 2.10. *Let $\vec{z} = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ with $z_i \neq z_j$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq n$. Then $\vec{z} \in \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{y}]}[\vec{y}]$ if and only if*

$$\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{z}] < \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{y}].$$

Proof. Let $\vec{z} \in \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{y}]}[\vec{y}]$ for $\vec{z} = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ with $z_i \neq z_j$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, then it follows that $\|\vec{y}\| > \|\vec{z}\|$. Suppose on the contrary that

$$\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{z}] \geq \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{y}],$$

then it follows that $\|\vec{y}\| \leq \|\vec{z}\|$, which is absurd. Conversely, suppose

$$\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{z}] < \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{y}]$$

then it follows from Proposition 2.3 that $\|\vec{z}\| < \|\vec{y}\|$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \vec{z} - \frac{1}{2} \left(y_1 + \frac{m}{y_1}, \dots, y_n + \frac{m}{y_n} \right) \right\| &< \left\| \vec{y} - \frac{1}{2} \left(y_1 + \frac{m}{y_1}, \dots, y_n + \frac{m}{y_n} \right) \right\| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{y}]. \end{aligned}$$

This certainly implies $\vec{z} \in \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{y}]}[\vec{y}]$ and the proof of the theorem is complete. \square

Theorem 2.11. *Let $\vec{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ with $x_i \neq x_j$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq n$. If $\vec{y} \in \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]}[\vec{x}]$ then*

$$\mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{y}]}[\vec{y}] \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]}[\vec{x}].$$

Proof. First let $\vec{y} \in \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]}[\vec{x}]$ and suppose for the sake of contradiction that

$$\mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{y}]}[\vec{y}] \not\subseteq \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]}[\vec{x}].$$

Then there must exist some $\vec{z} \in \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{y}]}[\vec{y}]$ such that $\vec{z} \notin \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]}[\vec{x}]$. It follows from Theorem 2.10 that

$$\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{z}] \geq \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}].$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{y}] &> \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{z}] \\ &\geq \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}] \\ &> \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{y}] \end{aligned}$$

which is absurd, thereby ending the proof. \square

Remark 2.12. Theorem 2.11 tells us that points confined in certain balls induced under compression should by necessity have their induced ball under compression covered by these balls in which they are contained.

2.2. Admissible points of balls induced under compression. We launch the notion of admissible points of balls induced by points under compression. We study this notion in depth and explore some possible connections.

Definition 2.13. Let $\vec{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $y_i \neq y_j$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq n$. Then \vec{y} is said to be an admissible point of the ball $\mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]}[\vec{x}]$ if

$$\left\| \vec{y} - \frac{1}{2} \left(x_1 + \frac{m}{x_1}, \dots, x_n + \frac{m}{x_n} \right) \right\| = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}].$$

Remark 2.14. It is important to notice that the notion of admissible points of balls induced by points under compression encompasses points on the ball. These points in geometrical terms basically sit on the outer of the induced ball.

Theorem 2.15. *The point $\vec{y} \in \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]}[\vec{x}]$ is admissible if and only if*

$$\mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{y}]}[\vec{y}] = \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]}[\vec{x}]$$

and $\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{y}] = \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]$.

Proof. First let $\vec{y} \in \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]}[\vec{x}]$ be admissible and suppose on the contrary that

$$\mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{y}]}[\vec{y}] \neq \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]}[\vec{x}].$$

Then there exist some $\vec{z} \in \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]}[\vec{x}]$ such that

$$\vec{z} \notin \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{y}]}[\vec{y}].$$

Applying Theorem 2.10, we obtain the inequality

$$\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{y}] \leq \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{z}] < \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}].$$

It follows from Proposition 2.3 that $\|\vec{x}\| < \|\vec{y}\|$ or $\|\vec{y}\| < \|\vec{x}\|$. By joining this points to the origin by a straight line, this contradicts the fact that the point \vec{y} is an admissible point of the ball $\mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]}[\vec{x}]$. The latter equality follows from assertion that two balls are indistinguishable. Conversely, suppose

$$\mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{y}]}[\vec{y}] = \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]}[\vec{x}]$$

and $\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{y}] = \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]$. Then it follows that the point \vec{y} lives on the outer of the indistinguishable balls and must satisfy the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \vec{z} - \frac{1}{2} \left(y_1 + \frac{m}{y_1}, \dots, y_n + \frac{m}{y_n} \right) \right\| &= \left\| \vec{z} - \frac{1}{2} \left(x_1 + \frac{m}{x_1}, \dots, x_n + \frac{m}{x_n} \right) \right\| \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}] = \left\| \vec{y} - \frac{1}{2} \left(x_1 + \frac{m}{x_1}, \dots, x_n + \frac{m}{x_n} \right) \right\|$$

and \vec{y} is indeed admissible, thereby ending the proof. \square

Remark 2.16. We note that we can replace the set \mathbb{N}^n used in our construction with \mathbb{R}^n at the compromise of imposing the restrictions $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $x_i > 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $x_i \neq x_j$ for $i \neq j$. The following construction in our next result in the sequel employs this flexibility.

3. The lower bound

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\text{Vol}(K)$ denotes the volume of a ball in \mathbb{R}^n with only one lattice points in it's interior as its center of mass. Then $\text{Vol}(K)$ satisfies the lower bound*

$$\text{Vol}(K) \gg \frac{n^n}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Proof. Pick arbitrarily a point $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $x_i > 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $x_i \neq x_j$ for $i \neq j$ such that $\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}] = n$. This ensures the ball induced under compression is of radius $\frac{n}{2}$. Next we apply the compression of fixed scale $m \leq 1$, given by $\mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]$ and construct the ball induced by the compression given by

$$K := \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]}[\vec{x}]$$

with radius $\frac{(\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}])}{2} = \frac{n}{2}$. By appealing to Theorem 2.15 admissible points $\vec{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^k$ ($\vec{x}_i \neq \vec{x}$) of the ball of compression induced must satisfy the condition $\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}_i] = n$. Also by appealing to Theorem 2.10 points $\vec{x}_i \in \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]}[\vec{x}]$ must satisfy the inequality

$$\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}_i] < \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}] = n.$$

The number of integral points in the largest ball contained in the $n \times n \times \cdots \times n$ (n times) grid that shares admissible points on both sides with the grid is

$$\begin{aligned}
 N_n(n) &= \sum_{\substack{\vec{x}_l \in n^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n \\ \mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}_l] \leq n}} 1 \\
 &\geq \sum_{\vec{x}_l \in n^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}_l]}{n} \\
 &\gg \sum_{\substack{\vec{x}_l \in n^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n \\ 1 \leq i \leq n}} \frac{\sqrt{n} \inf(x_{l_i})}{n} \\
 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\substack{\vec{x}_l \in n^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n \\ 1 \leq i \leq n}} \sqrt{n} \inf(x_{l_i}) \\
 &\geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{n} \sum_{\substack{\vec{x}_l \in n^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n \\ 1 \leq i \leq n}} \min_{\vec{x}_l \in n^n} \inf(x_{l_i}) \\
 &\gg \frac{\min_{\vec{x}_l \in n^n} \inf(x_{l_i})_{i=1}^n \times \sqrt{n}}{n} \sum_{\substack{\vec{x}_l \in n^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n \\ 1 \leq i \leq n}} 1 \\
 &\gg \frac{\sqrt{n}}{n} \times n^n.
 \end{aligned}$$

We note that the number of lattice points $N_n(n)$ in the ball $K := \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]}[\vec{x}]$ and the volume $Vol(K)$ satisfies the asymptotic relation $N_n(n) \sim Vol(K)$ so that by removing all sub-grid of the grid $n \times n \cdots \times n$ (n times) contained in the ball $K := \mathcal{B}_{\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{G} \circ \mathbb{V}_m[\vec{x}]}[\vec{x}]$ except the sub-grid $\frac{n}{2} \times \frac{n}{2} \times \cdots \times \frac{n}{2}$ (n times), we see that we are left with only one lattice point as the center of the ball. This completes the construction. \square

4. Data availability statement

The manuscript has no associated data.

5. Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest regarding this manuscript. ¹.

REFERENCES

1. Berman, Robert J and Berndtsson, Bo *The volume of Kähler–Einstein Fano varieties and convex bodies*, Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal), vol. 2017:723, De Gruyter, 2017, pp 127–152.
2. Ehrhart, Eugène *Volume réticulaire critique d'un simplexe*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin/New York Berlin, New York, 1979.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, AFRICAN INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCE, GHANA
E-mail address: theophilus@aims.edu.gh/emperordagama@yahoo.com