

# Strengthening Han's Fourier Entropy-Influence Inequality via an Information-Theoretic Proof

Peijie LI

The University of Hong Kong

*lpeijie98@connect.hku.hk*

Guangyue HAN

The University of Hong Kong

*ghan@hku.hk*

December 4, 2025

## Abstract

We strengthen Han's Fourier entropy-influence inequality

$$\mathbf{H}[\widehat{f}] \leq C_1 \mathbf{I}(f) + C_2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{I}_i(f) \ln \frac{1}{\mathbf{I}_i(f)}$$

originally proved for  $\{-1, 1\}$ -valued Boolean functions with  $C_1 = 3 + 2 \ln 2$  and  $C_2 = 1$ . We show, by a short information-theoretic proof, that it in fact holds with sharp constants  $C_1 = C_2 = 1$  for all real-valued Boolean functions of unit  $L^2$ -norm, thereby establishing the inequality as an elementary structural property of Shannon entropy and influence.

## 1 Introduction

For a real-valued Boolean function  $f: \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the Fourier coefficients relative to the basis of parity functions  $\chi_S(x) \triangleq \prod_{i \in S} x_i$  in the  $L^2$ -space with respect to the uniform measure on  $\{-1, 1\}^n$ , are given by  $\widehat{f}(S) \triangleq \langle f, \chi_S \rangle_{L^2}$ ,  $S \subseteq [n]$ . The influence of coordinate  $i \in [n]$  and the total influence of  $f$  can be expressed in terms of the Fourier coefficients as

$$\mathbf{I}_i(f) \triangleq \sum_{S \ni i} \widehat{f}(S)^2, \quad \mathbf{I}(f) \triangleq \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{I}_i(f) = \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} |S| \widehat{f}(S)^2.$$

If further  $\|f\|_{L^2} = 1$ , then the Fourier weights  $\{\widehat{f}(S)^2\}_{S \subseteq [n]}$  sum up to 1 and form a probability distribution. The Fourier entropy of  $f$  is defined as the Shannon entropy of this distribution:

$$\mathbf{H}[\widehat{f}] \triangleq \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} \widehat{f}(S)^2 \ln \frac{1}{\widehat{f}(S)^2}.$$

For a more comprehensive exposition on the analysis of Boolean functions, we refer to [1].

The study of entropy and influence in Boolean functions originates with the *Fourier Entropy–Influence (FEI) conjecture*, posed by Friedgut and Kalai [2], which asserts that there exists a universal constant  $C > 0$  such that  $\mathbf{H}[\widehat{f}] \leq C \mathbf{I}(f)$  for all  $f: \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ . While the problem remains open in general, several partial results have been established [3–14]. Most recently, Han [14] established that there exists universal constants  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  such that

$$\mathbf{H}[\widehat{f}] \leq C_1 \mathbf{I}(f) + C_2 \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{I}_i(f) \ln \frac{1}{\mathbf{I}_i(f)},$$

for all  $f: \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ , which offers fresh structural insight for the FEI conjecture. In fact, Han’s proof yields the explicit values  $C_1 = 3 + 2 \ln 2$  and  $C_2 = 1$ .

## 2 Main Result

As detailed in the following theorem, we strengthen Han’s inequality by showing that it holds with sharp constants  $C_1 = C_2 = 1$  for all real-valued Boolean functions of unit  $\mathbf{L}^2$ -norm, via a short information-theoretic proof. For the standard information-theoretic tools used in the proof, such as the chain rule of entropy and the log-sum inequality, we refer to [15].

**Theorem.** *For every real-valued Boolean function  $f: \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $\|f\|_{\mathbf{L}^2} = 1$ ,*

$$\mathbf{H}[\widehat{f}] \leq \mathbf{I}(f) + \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{I}_i(f) \ln \frac{1}{\mathbf{I}_i(f)}.$$

*Proof.* For each  $J \subseteq [n]$ , we define a probability distribution  $P_J$  on  $2^J$  via

$$P_J(S) \triangleq \sum_{T \subseteq [n] \setminus J} \widehat{f}(S \cup T)^2, \quad S \subseteq J,$$

which is precisely the marginal distribution of Fourier weights restricted to  $J$ . We construct a Markov chain of random sets  $\mathcal{S}_i \subseteq [i]$ ,  $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$ , with initial state  $\mathcal{S}_0 \equiv \emptyset$  and transitions

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{S}_i = T \mid \mathcal{S}_{i-1} = S) \triangleq \begin{cases} P_{[i]}(S)/P_{[i-1]}(S), & \text{if } T = S, \\ P_{[i]}(S \cup \{i\})/P_{[i-1]}(S), & \text{if } T = S \cup \{i\}, \quad S \subseteq [i-1]. \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

By construction, for each  $i$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_i \sim P_{[i]}$ , and the conditional entropy of  $\mathcal{S}_i$  given  $\mathcal{S}_{i-1}$  is

$$\mathbf{H}[\mathcal{S}_i \mid \mathcal{S}_{i-1}] = \sum_{S \subseteq [i-1]} P_{[i]}(S) \ln \frac{P_{[i-1]}(S)}{P_{[i]}(S)} + P_{[i]}(S \cup \{i\}) \ln \frac{P_{[i-1]}(S)}{P_{[i]}(S \cup \{i\})}.$$

Note that by definition,

$$\sum_{S \subseteq [i-1]} P_{[i-1]}(S) = 1, \quad \sum_{S \subseteq [i-1]} P_{[i]}(S \cup \{i\}) = \mathbf{I}_i(f), \quad \sum_{S \subseteq [i-1]} P_{[i]}(S) = 1 - \mathbf{I}_i(f).$$

It follows from the log-sum inequality and  $(1 - x) \ln(1/(1 - x)) \leq x$  for  $x \in [0, 1]$  that

$$\mathbf{H}[\mathcal{S}_i | \mathcal{S}_{i-1}] \leq (1 - \mathbf{I}_i(f)) \ln \frac{1}{1 - \mathbf{I}_i(f)} + \mathbf{I}_i(f) \ln \frac{1}{\mathbf{I}_i(f)} \leq \mathbf{I}_i(f) + \mathbf{I}_i(f) \ln \frac{1}{\mathbf{I}_i(f)}.$$

Finally, note that the terminal distribution  $\mathcal{S}_n \sim P_{[n]}$  is exactly the Fourier weight distribution  $P_{[n]}(S) = \widehat{f}(S)^2$ ,  $S \subseteq [n]$ , and each  $\mathcal{S}_i$  is a deterministic function of  $\mathcal{S}_n$ . Applying the chain rule of entropy together with the Markovity of  $\mathcal{S}_0, \mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$ , we obtain

$$\mathbf{H}[\widehat{f}] = \mathbf{H}[\mathcal{S}_n] = \mathbf{H}[\mathcal{S}_n, \mathcal{S}_{n-1}, \dots, \mathcal{S}_0] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{H}[\mathcal{S}_i | \mathcal{S}_{i-1}, \dots, \mathcal{S}_0] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{H}[\mathcal{S}_i | \mathcal{S}_{i-1}].$$

Combining the bounds above completes the proof.  $\square$

### 3 Discussion

Our proof interprets the Fourier distribution as being generated one coordinate at a time. At each step  $i$ , the uncertainty added is exactly the entropy contribution of whether coordinate  $i$  enters the random set. The chain rule of entropy then implies that the total entropy of the terminal distribution is the sum of these step-wise incremental uncertainties. Since the uncertainty at step  $i$  is controlled by the influence of coordinate  $i$ , the whole inequality emerges naturally: entropy accumulates coordinate-by-coordinate, with each step bounded by influence.

Han’s original argument in [14] proceeds by restricting the Boolean function to subsets of coordinates and analyzing the Fourier coefficients of these restricted functions iteratively. While the restriction method is well suited to  $\{-1, 1\}$ -valued functions, it generally fails to preserve the  $L^2$ -normalization and thus does not extend naturally to real-valued functions. By contrast, our information-theoretic approach works directly with restricted Fourier weights, thereby avoiding reliance on the Boolean codomain.

From our proof, it is clear that such Fourier entropy-influence inequality arises directly from Fourier analysis and the entropy structure. It should therefore be regarded as a universal structural principle, applicable in broader analytic contexts well beyond the Boolean setting.

### Reference

- [1] R. O’Donnell. *Analysis of Boolean Functions*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [2] E. Friedgut and G. Kalai. “Every monotone graph property has a sharp threshold”. In: *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 124.10 (1996), pp. 2993–3002.
- [3] J. Bourgain. “On the distribution of the Fourier spectrum of Boolean functions”. In: *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 131.1 (2002), pp. 269–276.
- [4] B. Das, M. Pal, and V. Visavaliya. “Entropy-Influence Conjecture Revisited”. In: *arXiv preprint* (2011). eprint: [1110.4301](https://arxiv.org/abs/1110.4301).
- [5] R. O’Donnell, J. Wright, and Y. Zhou. “The Fourier entropy-influence conjecture for certain classes of Boolean functions”. In: *ICALP*. 2011.

- [6] R. O’Donnell and L. Y. Tan. “A composition theorem for the Fourier Entropy-Influence conjecture”. In: *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*. Springer. 2013, pp. 780–791.
- [7] A. Wan, J. Wright, and C. Wu. “Decision trees, protocols and the entropy-influence conjecture”. In: *Proceedings of the 5th conference on Innovations in theoretical computer science*. 2014, pp. 67–80.
- [8] S. Chakraborty, R. Kulkarni, S. V. Lokam, and N. Saurabh. “Upper bounds on Fourier entropy”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 654 (2016), pp. 92–112.
- [9] R. Hod. “Improved lower bounds for the Fourier entropy/influence conjecture via lexicographic functions”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.00762* (2017).
- [10] S. Chakraborty, S. Karmalkar, S. Kundu, S. V. Lokam, and N. Saurabh. “Fourier entropy-influence conjecture for random linear threshold functions”. In: *Latin American Symposium on Theoretical Informatics*. Springer. 2018, pp. 275–289.
- [11] G. Shalev. “On the Fourier Entropy Influence conjecture for extremal classes”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.03646* (2018).
- [12] E. Kelman, G. Kindler, N. Lifshitz, D. Minzer, and M. Safra. “Towards a proof of the Fourier-entropy conjecture?” In: *Geometric and Functional Analysis* 30.4 (2020), pp. 1097–1138.
- [13] S. Arunachalam, S. Chakraborty, M. Koucký, N. Saurabh, and R. De Wolf. “Improved bounds on Fourier entropy and min-entropy”. In: *ACM Transactions on Computation Theory (TOCT)* 13.4 (2021), pp. 1–40.
- [14] X. Han. “A new bound for the Fourier-Entropy-Influence conjecture”. In: *Combinatorica* 45.4 (2025).
- [15] T. Cover and J. Thomas. *Elements of Information Theory*. Second Edition. Wiley-Interscience, 2006.