

# SIGN UNCERTAINTY PRINCIPLES AND BOUNDED-DEGREE POLYNOMIALS

HENRY COHN AND DINGDING DONG

ABSTRACT. We prove an asymptotically sharp version of the Bourgain-Clozel-Kahane and Cohn-Gonçalves sign uncertainty principles for polynomials of bounded degree times a Gaussian, as the dimension tends to infinity. In particular, we show that polynomials of bounded degree cannot improve on those of degree at most three. This question arises naturally in the study of both linear programming bounds for sphere packing and the spinless modular bootstrap bound for free bosons.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Suppose we normalize the Fourier transform  $\widehat{f}$  of an integrable function  $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by

$$\widehat{f}(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) e^{-2\pi i \langle x, y \rangle} dx.$$

Which properties of  $f$  and  $\widehat{f}$  are consistent, in the sense that there exists a function  $f$  for which  $f$  and  $\widehat{f}$  behave as specified? This question is a fundamental research topic in harmonic analysis. Often, there is a trade-off between how  $f$  and  $\widehat{f}$  can behave. For example, the Heisenberg uncertainty principle says roughly that if  $f$  is tightly concentrated near a point (i.e., its values decay quickly away from that point), then  $\widehat{f}$  must be more dispersed. More generally, an uncertainty principle is any theorem that expresses a similar trade-off.

Bourgain, Clozel, and Kahane [4] discovered a beautiful uncertainty principle for the signs of functions. It deals with functions for which both  $f$  and  $\widehat{f}$  are real-valued; specifically, suppose  $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is integrable,  $\widehat{f}$  is real-valued (equivalently,  $f$  is an even function), and  $\widehat{f}$  is integrable. We furthermore impose the following sign conditions on  $f$  and  $\widehat{f}$  for some nonnegative real numbers  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$ :

- (1)  $f(x) \geq 0$  whenever  $|x| \geq \rho_1$ , while  $\widehat{f}(0) \leq 0$ , and
- (2)  $\widehat{f}(y) \geq 0$  whenever  $|y| \geq \rho_2$ , while  $f(0) \leq 0$ .

Assuming  $f$  does not vanish almost everywhere,  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  must be positive; for example, if  $\rho_1 = 0$ , then  $\widehat{f}(0) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) dx \geq 0$ , and therefore  $\widehat{f}(0) = 0$ , which implies that  $f$  vanishes almost everywhere. Either of  $\rho_1$  and  $\rho_2$  can be made arbitrarily close to zero on its own, but Bourgain, Clozel, and Kahane proved that  $\rho_1 \rho_2$  is bounded away from 0, and in fact that  $\rho_1 \rho_2 \geq cd$  for a positive constant  $c$ .

The optimal bound is not known in any dimension except  $d = 12$ , where Cohn and Gonçalves [5] showed that the minimal possible value of  $\rho_1 \rho_2$  is 2 by using techniques that originated in Viazovska's work on sphere packing [14, 6]. Cohn and

Gonçalves also studied a related uncertainty principle, which replaces the inequalities on  $f$  and  $\widehat{f}$  with

- (1)  $f(x) \geq 0$  whenever  $|x| \geq \rho_1$ , while  $\widehat{f}(0) \leq 0$ , and
- (2)  $\widehat{f}(y) \leq 0$  whenever  $|y| \geq \rho_2$ , while  $f(0) \geq 0$ .

This variant turns out to be even more closely related to sphere packing bounds. It has been solved exactly for  $d = 1, 8$ , and  $24$ , with the minimal value of  $\rho_1\rho_2$  being  $1, 2$ , and  $4$ , respectively. In fact, these bounds are implied by the sharpness of the linear programming bound for sphere packing in these dimensions. Furthermore, the answer is conjectured to be  $2/\sqrt{3}$  for  $d = 2$ , and it is known to agree with  $2/\sqrt{3}$  to at least one thousand decimal places [1]. See also [5, 1] for numerical computations, as well as [9] for a different numerical technique, which leads to the remarkable conjecture that  $\rho_1\rho_2 = 1/(1 + \sqrt{5})$  for  $d = s = 1$ .

These sign uncertainty optimization problems can be reduced to the following problem on eigenfunctions of the Fourier transform [4, 5], with  $\rho = \sqrt{\rho_1\rho_2}$ . Here  $s = 1$  corresponds to the Bourgain-Clozel-Kahane case, while  $s = -1$  corresponds to the other variant.

**Problem 1.1.** Let  $s \in \{\pm 1\}$ , and let  $d$  be a positive integer. What is the smallest real number  $\rho \geq 0$  for which there exists a radial, integrable function  $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

- (1)  $f$  is not identically zero,
- (2)  $\widehat{f} = sf$ ,
- (3)  $f(0) = 0$ , and
- (4)  $f(x) \geq 0$  whenever  $|x| \geq \rho$ ?

Cohn and Gonçalves conjectured that the limit of  $\rho/\sqrt{d}$  as  $d \rightarrow \infty$  exists and is independent of the choice of  $s$  (Conjecture 1.5 in [5]). Determining the value of this limit is a key open problem in this area. Conjecture 3.2 in [1] predicts that  $\rho \sim \sqrt{d}/\pi$  as  $d \rightarrow \infty$ , which would improve on all existing bounds. However, the available numerics yield only three or four digits of accuracy for the limit, which makes it difficult to predict the exact answer with confidence.

In the absence of an exact solution, it is natural to study this problem numerically. One particularly tractable family of test functions is polynomials times Gaussians: we can take  $f(x) = P(2\pi|x|^2)e^{-\pi|x|^2}$ , where  $P$  is a single-variable polynomial. To compute the Fourier transform of  $f$ , it is convenient to write  $P$  as a linear combination of the Laguerre polynomials  $L_k^{d/2-1}$  of degree  $k$  with parameter  $d/2-1$ , because  $x \mapsto L_k^{d/2-1}(2\pi|x|^2)e^{-\pi|x|^2}$  is an eigenfunction of the Fourier transform with eigenvalue  $(-1)^k$ . Thus, the Fourier transform  $\widehat{f}$  is also given by  $\widehat{f}(y) = Q(2\pi|y|^2)e^{-\pi|y|^2}$  for some polynomial  $Q$ , namely the corresponding linear combination of  $(-1)^k L_k^{d/2-1}$ .

Setting  $f(x) = P(2\pi|x|^2)e^{-\pi|x|^2}$  with a suitably chosen polynomial  $P$  of degree at most three yields  $\rho \sim \sqrt{d/(2\pi)}$  (see [4, 5]). Our main theorem in this paper is a proof of Conjecture 3.2 from [5], which says that we obtain the same asymptotics as  $d \rightarrow \infty$  whenever the degree of  $P$  is bounded:

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $\rho_{d,s,n}$  be the optimal value of  $\rho$  in Problem 1.1 when  $f$  is restricted to be of the form  $f(x) = P(2\pi|x|^2)e^{-\pi|x|^2}$  with  $P$  a polynomial of degree*

at most  $n$ . Then for each fixed  $n \geq 3$  and  $s = \pm 1$ ,

$$\rho_{d,s,n} \sim \sqrt{\frac{d}{2\pi}}$$

as  $d \rightarrow \infty$ .

This theorem shows that to obtain informative numerics in high dimensions, we must use high-degree polynomials. It would be interesting to have a more precise quantitative relationship between the dimension, polynomial degree, and quality of the optimized bound. We do not even have a proof that  $\rho_{d,s,n}$  converges to the optimal value of  $\rho$  in Problem 1.1 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  with  $d$  fixed, although we expect that is true.

When  $s = -1$  and  $d$  is even, Problem 1.1 arises in theoretical physics [10] as the spinless modular bootstrap bound with  $U(1)^c$  symmetry, where  $c = d/2$ . It gives an upper bound of  $\rho^2/2$  for the spectral gap in two-dimensional conformal field theories describing  $c$  free bosons, with the most interesting case being the limit as  $c \rightarrow \infty$ . While most conformal field theories of interest in physics are not of this form, free theories are a noteworthy special case; for example, they provide a natural candidate for a holographic dual to an exotic theory of three-dimensional gravity [2, 11].

Our approach to proving Theorem 1.2 was inspired by a paper of Friedan and Keller [8], who gave a heuristic derivation of a bound analogous to Theorem 1.2 for a closely related problem, namely the modular bootstrap assuming only Virasoro symmetry (see Section 3.2 of [8]). We do not know how to produce a rigorous proof directly from their techniques, but our proof was motivated by their work.

We can reformulate Problem 1.1 directly in terms of Laguerre polynomials as follows. Recall that the Laguerre polynomial of degree  $n$  with parameter  $\alpha$  is given by

$$L_n^\alpha(x) = \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \binom{n+\alpha}{n-j} \frac{x^j}{j!}$$

(see, for example, Section 6.2 in [3]). These polynomials are orthogonal with respect to the measure  $x^\alpha e^{-x} dx$  on  $[0, \infty)$  when  $\alpha > -1$ . Parameters  $\alpha$  of the form  $d/2 - 1$  for positive integers  $d$  are of particular interest, since they correspond to Fourier eigenfunctions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  as above, but we will analyze arbitrary  $\alpha > -1$ . When  $\alpha = d/2 - 1$  for some dimension  $d$ ,  $s = (-1)^\gamma$ , and  $f(x) = P(2\pi|x|^2)e^{-\pi|x|^2}$  with  $P$  a polynomial of degree at most  $2m - \gamma$ , we can reformulate Problem 1.1 as the problem of minimizing the last sign change of a nontrivial linear combination  $P$  of the polynomials  $L_{2k+\gamma}^\alpha$  for  $0 \leq k < m$  such that  $P(0) = 0$ . In particular, Theorem 1.2 amounts to the statement that polynomials of this form must have sign changes at or beyond  $(2 - o(1))\alpha$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ . More precisely, there cannot exist a constant  $C < 2$  and a sequence of polynomials  $P$  of this form with  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$  such that the last sign change of  $P$  occurs before  $C\alpha$ .

To prove Theorem 1.2, we prove a universal scaling law for the asymptotics at  $(2 + c/\sqrt{\alpha})\alpha$  with  $c$  fixed as  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ , which generalizes a limiting result of Palamà [13]. Specifically, we show that every  $P$  behaves like a suitably scaled Hermite polynomial of  $c$  in this limit. This Hermite polynomial has positive degree, and therefore it changes sign as  $c$  varies. We carry out this argument in the remainder of the paper. In Section 2, we use a compactness argument to reduce the problem to studying polynomials with constant coefficients, and then we prove the theorem in Section 3.

## 2. ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIOR OF THE COEFFICIENTS

From the above reformulation of Problem 1.1, we see that to prove Theorem 1.2, it suffices to verify the following statement:

**Theorem 2.1.** *For every integer  $m \geq 2$  and  $\gamma \in \{0, 1\}$ ,*

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R_{\alpha, m}^{\gamma}}{\alpha} = 2,$$

where  $R_{\alpha, m}^{\gamma}$  is the infimum of the last sign changes over all polynomials of the form

$$P = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} p_k L_{2k+\gamma}^{\alpha}$$

that satisfy  $P(0) = 0$  and  $(p_0, \dots, p_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$ .

In this section we make a few initial observations on the asymptotic behavior of the coefficients  $p_0, \dots, p_{m-1}$  in Theorem 2.1.

**2.1. Upper bound.** We first prove the upper bound

$$\limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R_{\alpha, m}^{\gamma}}{\alpha} \leq 2$$

for all  $m \geq 2$  and  $\gamma \in \{0, 1\}$ , as in [4] and [5]. When  $m = 2$ , every polynomial  $P$  as in Theorem 2.1 is a linear combination of  $L_{\gamma}^{\alpha}(x)$  and  $L_{2+\gamma}^{\alpha}(x)$  that satisfies  $P(0) = 0$ , and there is a unique such polynomial up to scaling. Through direct computation, one can easily check that

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R_{\alpha, 2}^{\gamma}}{\alpha} = 2.$$

Since  $R_{\alpha, m}^{\gamma}$  is weakly decreasing with respect to  $m$ , the upper bound holds for all  $m \geq 2$ .

**2.2. Reduction to a sequence of polynomials.** To verify Theorem 2.1, it remains to check the lower bound

$$\liminf_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \frac{R_{\alpha, m}^{\gamma}}{\alpha} \geq 2.$$

Equivalently, for every fixed  $m \geq 2$  and  $\gamma \in \{0, 1\}$ , we must show that every sequence  $(P_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$  with  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$  in the index set  $\mathcal{A}$  and each  $P_{\alpha}$  as in Theorem 2.1 satisfies

$$\liminf_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} r(P_{\alpha}(\alpha x)) \geq 2,$$

where  $r(P_{\alpha}(\alpha x))$  denotes the last sign change of  $P_{\alpha}(\alpha x)$  as a function of  $x$ . For each  $\alpha$ , we write  $P_{\alpha}$  in the form

$$P_{\alpha}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} p_{\alpha, k} \cdot \frac{L_{2k+\gamma}^{\alpha}(x)}{L_{2k+\gamma}^{\alpha}(0)},$$

so that  $P_{\alpha}(0) = 0$  is equivalent to  $\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} p_{\alpha, k} = 0$ . Since  $r(P_{\alpha}(\alpha x))$  does not change when we rescale the coefficients, we can assume without loss of generality that all the coefficients  $p_{\alpha, k}$  lie in the interval  $[-1, 1]$ . This motivates the following definition of coefficient families:

**Definition 2.2.** For every  $m \geq 2$ , let  $\mathcal{S}_m$  denote the collection of all  $m$ -tuples of sequences  $((p_{\alpha, 0})_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}, \dots, (p_{\alpha, m-1})_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}})$  such that

- (1)  $\mathcal{A} = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots\}$  with  $-1 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \dots$  and  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_i = \infty$ ,
- (2)  $p_{\alpha,k} \in \mathbb{R}$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $0 \leq k \leq m-1$ ,
- (3)  $0 < \max_{0 \leq k \leq m-1} |p_{\alpha,k}| \leq 1$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ , and
- (4)  $\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} p_{\alpha,k} = 0$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ .

**Definition 2.3.** For each  $m$ -tuple  $((p_{\alpha,0})_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}, \dots, (p_{\alpha,m-1})_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}) \in \mathcal{S}_m$  and  $\gamma \in \{0, 1\}$ , define the associated sequence of polynomials  $(P_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}$  by

$$P_\alpha(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} p_{\alpha,k} \cdot \frac{L_{2k+\gamma}^\alpha(x)}{L_{2k+\gamma}^\alpha(0)}.$$

Theorem 2.1 will be a direct consequence of the following statement:

**Theorem 2.4.** For every  $m \geq 2$ ,  $m$ -tuple  $((p_{\alpha,0})_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}, \dots, (p_{\alpha,m-1})_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}) \in \mathcal{S}_m$ , and  $\gamma \in \{0, 1\}$ , there exist  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $P_\alpha((2 + c_1/\sqrt{\alpha})\alpha)$  and  $P_\alpha((2 + c_2/\sqrt{\alpha})\alpha)$  have different signs for infinitely many  $\alpha$ , where  $P_\alpha$  is the polynomial associated to  $((p_{\alpha,0})_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}, \dots, (p_{\alpha,m-1})_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}})$  given by Definition 2.3. In particular, passing to a subsequence shows that

$$\liminf_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} r(P_\alpha(\alpha x)) \geq 2.$$

We use the rest of this paper to prove Theorem 2.4, thereby verifying Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 1.2.

**2.3. Subsequences on which coefficients converge.** Consider any fixed  $m \geq 2$  and  $m$ -tuple

$$((p_{\alpha,0})_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}, \dots, (p_{\alpha,m-1})_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}}) \in \mathcal{S}_m.$$

We first take a subsequence  $\mathcal{A}' \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  on which the coefficients  $p_{\alpha,k}$  can be written in a more informative way.

**Lemma 2.5.** *There exist constants*

$$(c_{k,i})_{\substack{0 \leq k \leq m-1, \\ 0 \leq i \leq m}}$$

a subsequence  $\mathcal{A}' \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  of  $\alpha$ , and functions

$$g_0, g_1, \dots, g_m : \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

such that

- (1)  $p_{\alpha,k} = g_0(\alpha)c_{k,0} + g_1(\alpha)c_{k,1} + \dots + g_m(\alpha)c_{k,m}$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}'$  and  $k = 0, \dots, m-1$ ,
- (2)  $-1 \leq c_{k,i} \leq 1$  for all  $k = 0, \dots, m-1$  and  $i = 0, \dots, m$ ,
- (3) for each  $i$ , the constants  $c_{k,i}$  are not all zero,
- (4)  $g_0$  is the constant function 1,
- (5) each function  $g_i$  vanishes either everywhere or nowhere on  $\mathcal{A}'$ , and
- (6)  $g_i = g_{i+1} = \dots = g_m = 0$  everywhere if  $g_i$  vanishes, while  $g_{i+1} = o(g_i)$  otherwise.

*Proof.* Since  $|p_{\alpha,k}| \leq 1$ , we can take a subsequence of  $\mathcal{A}$  on which  $p_{\alpha,k}$  converges for all  $k$ . For  $0 \leq k < m$ , let

$$c_{k,0} = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} p_{\alpha,k}.$$

Consider some  $k_1$  with  $0 \leq k_1 < m$  such that

$$|p_{\alpha,k_1} - c_{k_1,0}| = \max_k |p_{\alpha,k} - c_{k,0}|$$

for infinitely many  $\alpha$ . On this subsequence of  $\mathcal{A}$ , let  $g_1(\alpha) = p_{\alpha,k_1} - c_{k_1,0}$ . If there are infinitely many  $\alpha$  for which  $g_1(\alpha) = 0$ , then on a further subsequence  $p_{\alpha,k} = c_{k,0}$  for all  $k$ , and we can just take  $g_1, \dots, g_m$  to be the zero function and  $c_{k,1} = \dots = c_{k,m} = 1$  for all  $k$ . Otherwise, we pass to a subsequence of  $\alpha$  for which  $g_1(\alpha) \neq 0$ . Because  $|(p_{\alpha,k} - c_{k,0})/g_1(\alpha)| \leq 1$  by construction, we can take a subsequence of  $\alpha$  for which the ratio  $(p_{\alpha,k} - c_{k,0})/g_1(\alpha)$  converges for all  $k$ , and let

$$c_{k,1} = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p_{\alpha,k} - c_{k,0}}{g_1(\alpha)}.$$

We clearly have  $-1 \leq c_{k,1} \leq 1$  for all  $k$ . Moreover, since  $c_{k_1,1} = 1$  by the definition of  $g_1$  and therefore  $p_{\alpha,k_1} = c_{k_1,0} + g_1(\alpha)c_{k_1,1}$ , we can set  $c_{k_1,2} = \dots = c_{k_1,m} = 0$ .

Now consider some  $k_2 \neq k_1$  such that

$$|p_{\alpha,k_2} - c_{k_2,0} - g_1(\alpha)c_{k_2,1}| = \max_k |p_{\alpha,k} - c_{k,0} - g_1(\alpha)c_{k,1}|$$

for infinitely many  $\alpha$ . As before, define  $g_2(\alpha) = p_{\alpha,k_2} - c_{k_2,0} - g_1(\alpha)c_{k_2,1}$  on this subsequence. If there are infinitely many  $\alpha$  for which  $g_2(\alpha) = 0$ , then on a further subsequence  $p_{\alpha,k} = c_{k,0} + g_1(\alpha)c_{k,1}$  for all  $k$ , and we can take  $g_2, \dots, g_m$  to be the zero function and  $c_{k,2} = \dots = c_{k,m} = 1$  for all  $k$ . Otherwise, we can assume  $g_2(\alpha) \neq 0$  for all  $\alpha$ , and we set

$$c_{k,2} = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \frac{p_{\alpha,k} - c_{k,0} - g_1(\alpha)c_{k,1}}{g_2(\alpha)}$$

on a subsequence of  $\alpha$  for which these limits exist, so that  $-1 \leq c_{k,2} \leq 1$  for all  $k$ . Since  $p_{\alpha,k_2} = c_{k_2,0} + g_1(\alpha)c_{k_2,1} + g_2(\alpha)c_{k_2,2}$ , we can set  $c_{k_2,3} = \dots = c_{k_2,m} = 0$ .

Iterating this process at most  $m$  times, we can write each  $p_{\alpha,k}$  as

$$p_{\alpha,k} = g_0(\alpha)c_{k,0} + \dots + g_{m'}(\alpha)c_{k,m'}$$

for some  $m' \leq m$  on a subsequence  $\mathcal{A}' \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ . We are done if  $m' = m$ ; otherwise, taking  $g_{m'+1}, \dots, g_m$  to be the zero function and  $c_{k,i} = 1$  for all  $k = 0, \dots, m-1$  and  $i = m'+1, \dots, m$  gives the result.  $\square$

From now on, we restrict ourselves to the subsequence  $\mathcal{A}' \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  given by Lemma 2.5, so that

$$p_{\alpha,k} = \sum_{i=0}^m c_{k,i} g_i(\alpha)$$

for  $k = 0, \dots, m-1$ . Correspondingly, we can decompose  $P_\alpha$  as follows:

**Definition 2.6.** For every  $0 \leq i \leq m$  and  $\gamma \in \{0, 1\}$ , let

$$P_{\alpha,i}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} c_{k,i} \cdot \frac{L_{2k+\gamma}^\alpha(x)}{L_{2k+\gamma}^\alpha(0)},$$

so that

$$P_\alpha = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \sum_{i=0}^m c_{k,i} g_i(\alpha) \cdot \frac{L_{2k+\gamma}^\alpha(x)}{L_{2k+\gamma}^\alpha(0)} = \sum_{i=0}^m g_i(\alpha) \cdot P_{\alpha,i}.$$

## 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.4

We will need two key facts about Laguerre polynomials, namely Palamà's theorem and Erdélyi's multiplication theorem. Let  $H_\ell$  be the Hermite polynomial of degree  $\ell$ , which is given by

$$H_\ell(x) = (-1)^\ell e^{x^2} \frac{d^\ell}{dx^\ell} e^{-x^2}$$

(see, for example, Section 6.1 in [3]).

**Theorem 3.1** (Palamà's theorem [13]). *For all nonnegative integers  $\ell$  and real numbers  $x$ ,*

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_\ell^\alpha(\alpha + x\sqrt{2\alpha})}{(\alpha/2)^{\ell/2}} = \frac{(-1)^\ell}{\ell!} H_\ell(x).$$

**Theorem 3.2** (Erdélyi's multiplication theorem [7]). *For all nonnegative integers  $n$  and real numbers  $\lambda$ ,  $x$ , and  $\alpha$  such that  $\alpha$  is not a negative integer,*

$$\frac{L_n^\alpha(\lambda x)}{L_n^\alpha(0)} = \sum_{\ell=0}^n \binom{n}{\ell} \lambda^\ell (1-\lambda)^{n-\ell} \frac{L_\ell^\alpha(x)}{L_\ell^\alpha(0)}.$$

For more recent references in English, see (6.2.14) in [3] or equation 18.7.26 in [12] for Palamà's theorem and equation 18.18.12 in [12] for the multiplication theorem.

With the decomposition of  $P_{\alpha,\gamma}$  given in Definition 2.6 and the above two theorems, we are ready to prove Theorem 2.4.

*Proof of Theorem 2.4.* Recall from Definition 2.6 the decomposition

$$P_\alpha = \sum_{i=0}^m g_i(\alpha) \cdot P_{\alpha,i},$$

where

$$P_{\alpha,i}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} c_{k,i} \cdot \frac{L_{2k+\gamma}^\alpha(x)}{L_{2k+\gamma}^\alpha(0)}.$$

Since  $P_\alpha(0) = 0$ , we have  $c_{0,i} + \dots + c_{m-1,i} = 0$  for each  $i$ .

Since  $L_\ell^\alpha(0) = \binom{\ell+\alpha}{\ell} \sim \alpha^\ell/\ell!$  as  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ , an equivalent statement to Palamà's theorem is that

$$\frac{L_\ell^\alpha(\alpha + x\sqrt{2\alpha})}{L_\ell^\alpha(0)} = \frac{(-1)^\ell H_\ell(x)}{(2\alpha)^{\ell/2}} + o(\alpha^{-\ell/2})$$

as  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ .

Now applying the multiplication theorem with  $\lambda = 2$  shows that

$$P_{\alpha,i}(2\alpha + c\sqrt{\alpha}) = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} c_{k,i} \sum_{\ell=0}^{2k+\gamma} \binom{2k+\gamma}{\ell} 2^\ell (-1)^{2k+\gamma-\ell} \frac{L_\ell^\alpha(\alpha + c\sqrt{\alpha}/2)}{L_\ell^\alpha(0)},$$

which is a linear combination of the polynomials  $L_\ell^\alpha(\alpha + c\sqrt{\alpha}/2)/L_\ell^\alpha(0)$  for  $\ell > 0$  with coefficients that are independent of  $\alpha$ . (Note that the coefficient for  $\ell = 0$  is  $(-1)^\gamma(c_{0,i} + \dots + c_{m-1,i}) = 0$ .) In other words,

$$P_{\alpha,i}(2\alpha + c\sqrt{\alpha}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{2(m-1)+\gamma} K_{\ell,i} \frac{L_\ell^\alpha(\alpha + c\sqrt{\alpha}/2)}{L_\ell^\alpha(0)}$$

for some constants  $K_{\ell,i}$  that are not all zero.

Let  $\ell_i$  be the smallest  $\ell$  for which  $K_{\ell,i} \neq 0$ . Then Palamà's theorem implies that for some constant  $k_i \neq 0$ ,

$$P_{\alpha,i}(2\alpha + c\sqrt{\alpha}) = k_i \frac{H_{\ell_i}(c/\sqrt{8})}{\alpha^{\ell_i/2}} + o(\alpha^{-\ell_i/2})$$

as  $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ . Specifically,  $k_i = K_{\ell_i,i}(-1)^{\ell_i}/2^{\ell_i/2}$ .

Now pick  $i_0 \in \{0, \dots, m\}$  such that for infinitely many  $\alpha$ ,

$$\left| \frac{g_{i_0}(\alpha)}{\alpha^{\ell_{i_0}/2}} \right| \geq \left| \frac{g_{i'}(\alpha)}{\alpha^{\ell_{i'}/2}} \right| \quad \text{for all } i' \neq i_0.$$

Notice that  $g_{i_0}(\alpha)$  is everywhere nonzero on this subsequence, as none of the polynomials  $P_\alpha$  is the zero polynomial. Now we can take a subsequence of  $\alpha$  such that for all  $i \in \{0, \dots, m\}$ ,

$$\frac{g_i(\alpha)/\alpha^{\ell_i/2}}{g_{i_0}(\alpha)/\alpha^{\ell_{i_0}/2}} \rightarrow b_i$$

for some  $-1 \leq b_i \leq 1$ . On this subsequence,

$$\begin{aligned} P_\alpha((2 + c/\sqrt{\alpha})\alpha) &= \frac{g_{i_0}(\alpha)}{\alpha^{\ell_{i_0}/2}} (b_0 k_0 H_{\ell_0}(c/\sqrt{8}) + \dots + b_m k_m H_{\ell_m}(c/\sqrt{8})) \\ &\quad + o(g_{i_0}(\alpha)/\alpha^{\ell_{i_0}/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $g_{i+1} = o(g_i)$  for all  $g_i \neq 0$ , if there exist  $i_1 \neq i_2$  with  $\ell_{i_1} = \ell_{i_2}$ , then at least one of  $b_{i_1}, b_{i_2}$  is 0. Hence without loss of generality, we can assume that all the degrees  $\ell_i$  are distinct. Moreover, since every  $k_i \neq 0$  and in particular  $b_{i_0} = 1$ , we know that

$$F(c) := b_0 k_0 H_{\ell_0}(c/\sqrt{8}) + \dots + b_m k_m H_{\ell_m}(c/\sqrt{8})$$

is not the zero polynomial. For each positive integer  $\ell$ ,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} H_n(c/\sqrt{8}) e^{-c^2/8} dc = 0$$

by orthogonality, and thus

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F(c) e^{-c^2/8} dc = 0$$

as well. Thus, there must exist  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $F(c_1) > 0$  and  $F(c_2) < 0$ . It follows that for sufficiently large  $\alpha$ ,  $P_\alpha((2 + c_1/\sqrt{\alpha})\alpha)$  and  $P_\alpha((2 + c_2/\sqrt{\alpha})\alpha)$  have different signs, as desired.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] N. Afkhami-Jeddi, H. Cohn, T. Hartman, D. de Laat, and A. Tajdini, *High-dimensional sphere packing and the modular bootstrap*, J. High Energy Phys. (2020), no. 12, Paper No. 066, 44. arXiv:2006.02560 MR4239386 doi:10.1007/jhep12(2020)066
- [2] N. Afkhami-Jeddi, H. Cohn, T. Hartman, and A. Tajdini, *Free partition functions and an averaged holographic duality*, J. High Energy Phys. (2021), no. 1, Paper No. 130, 42. arXiv:2006.04839 MR4257711 doi:10.1007/jhep01(2021)130
- [3] G. E. Andrews, R. Askey, and R. Roy, *Special functions*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 71, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999. MR1688958 doi:10.1017/CBO9781107325937
- [4] J. Bourgain, L. Clozel, and J.-P. Kahane, *Principe d'Heisenberg et fonctions positives*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **60** (2010), no. 4, 1215–1232. arXiv:0811.4360 MR2722239 doi:10.5802/aif.2552



- [5] H. Cohn and F. Gonçalves, *An optimal uncertainty principle in twelve dimensions via modular forms*, *Invent. Math.* **217** (2019), no. 3, 799–831. arXiv:1712.04438 MR3989254 doi:10.1007/s00222-019-00875-4
- [6] H. Cohn, A. Kumar, S. D. Miller, D. Radchenko, and M. Viazovska, *The sphere packing problem in dimension 24*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **185** (2017), no. 3, 1017–1033. arXiv:1603.06518 MR3664817 doi:10.4007/annals.2017.185.3.8
- [7] A. Erdélyi, *Funktionalrelationen mit konfluenten hypergeometrischen Funktionen. Erste Mitteilung: Additions- und Multiplikationstheoreme*, *Math. Z.* **42** (1936), 125–143. doi:10.1007/BF01160067
- [8] D. Friedan and C. A. Keller, *Constraints on 2d CFT partition functions*, *J. High Energy Phys.* (2013), no. 10, Paper No. 180, 38. arXiv:1307.6562 doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2013)180
- [9] F. Gonçalves, F. Oliveira e Silva, and J. P. G. Ramos, *New sign uncertainty principles*, preprint, 2020. arXiv:2003.10771
- [10] T. Hartman, D. Mazáč, and L. Rastelli, *Sphere packing and quantum gravity*, *J. High Energy Phys.* (2019), no. 12, Paper No. 48, 66. arXiv:1905.01319 MR4075697 doi:10.1007/jhep12(2019)048
- [11] A. Maloney and E. Witten, *Averaging over Narain moduli space*, *J. High Energy Phys.* (2020), no. 10, Paper No. 187, 46. arXiv:2006.04855 MR4203918 doi:10.1007/jhep10(2020)187
- [12] F. W. J. Olver, D. W. Lozier, R. F. Boisvert, and C. W. Clark (eds.), *NIST handbook of mathematical functions*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010, <https://dlmf.nist.gov>. MR2723248
- [13] G. Palamà, *Sulla soluzione polinomiale della  $(a_1x + a_0)y'' + (b_1x + b_0)y' - nb_1y = 0$* , *Boll. Unione Mat. Ital., II. Ser.* **1** (1939), 27–35.
- [14] M. S. Viazovska, *The sphere packing problem in dimension 8*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **185** (2017), no. 3, 991–1015. arXiv:1603.04246 MR3664816 doi:10.4007/annals.2017.185.3.7

MICROSOFT RESEARCH NEW ENGLAND, ONE MEMORIAL DRIVE, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02142, USA  
Email address: cohn@microsoft.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138, USA  
Email address: ddong@math.harvard.edu