

Quantum Talagrand-type Inequalities via Variance Decay

Fan Chang*, Peijie Li†

Abstract

We establish dimension-free Talagrand-type variance inequalities on the quantum Boolean cube $M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$. Motivated by the splitting of the local carré du champ into a conditional-variance term and a pointwise-derivative term, we introduce an α -interpolated local gradient $|\nabla_j^\alpha A|$ that bridges $\text{Var}_j(A)$ and $|d_j A|^2$. For $p \in [1, 2]$, $q \in [1, 2)$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, we prove a Talagrand-type inequality of the form

$$\|A\|_\infty^{2-p} \|\nabla^\alpha A\|_p^p \gtrsim \text{Var}(A) \cdot \max \left\{ 1, \mathcal{R}(A, q)^{p/2} \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{R}(A, q)$ is a logarithmic ratio quantifying how small either $A - \tau(A)$ or the gradient vector $(d_j A)_j$ is in L^q compared to $\text{Var}(A)^{1/2}$. As consequences we derive a quantum Eldan–Gross inequality in terms of the squared ℓ_2 -mass of geometric influences, a quantum Cordero–Erausquin–Eskenazis L^p - L^q inequality, and Talagrand-type L^p -isoperimetric bounds.

We further develop a high-order theory by introducing the local variance functional

$$V_J(A) = \int_0^\infty 2 \text{Inf}_J^2(P_t A) dt.$$

For $|J| = k$ we prove a local high-order Talagrand inequality relating $\text{Inf}_J^p[A]$ to $V_J(A)$, with a Talagrand-type logarithmic term when $\text{Inf}_J^q[A]$ is small. This yields L^p - L^q influence inequalities and partial isoperimetric bounds for high-order influences. Our proofs are purely semigroup-based, relying on an improved Lipschitz smoothing estimate for $|\nabla^\alpha P_t A|$ obtained from a sharp noncommutative Khintchine inequality and hypercontractivity.

Keywords: Talagrand’s inequality, Heat semigroups, Quantum Eldan–Gross inequality, High-order influences

Mathematics Subject Classification: 06E30; 47D07; 81P45

1 Introduction

The analysis of Boolean functions on the discrete hypercube is a meeting point of probability, combinatorics, theoretical computer science, and geometric functional analysis. We refer the reader to the excellent books [14, 26] on Boolean analysis. A recurring principle in this subject is that *global* fluctuation (i.e. $\text{Var}(f)$) is governed by *local* boundary data encoded in *influences*. Influences quantify sensitivity and noise stability, control isoperimetry on product spaces, and underlie sharp threshold phenomena in percolation and random graphs.

In the classical setting, let $f : \{\pm 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and write μ for the uniform measure on the hypercube. For $i \in [n]$, denote by $D_i f = \frac{1}{2}(f(x) - f(x^{(i)}))$ the discrete derivative in direction i

*School of Statistics and Data Science, Nankai University, Tianjin, China and Extremal Combinatorics and Probability Group (ECOPRO), Institute for Basic Science (IBS), Daejeon, South Korea. E-mail: 1120230060@mail.nankai.edu.cn. Supported by the NSFC under grant 124B2019 and the Institute for Basic Science (IBS-R029-C4).

†Department of Mathematics, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China. E-mail: lipeijie98@connect.hku.hk

where $x^{(i)}$ denotes x with the i -th coordinate flipped, and write $\text{Var}(f) = \mathbb{E}_\mu[f^2] - \mathbb{E}_\mu[f]^2$. The starting point is the Poincaré inequality (see e.g. [26, p.36])

$$\text{Var}(f) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \|D_i f\|_2^2, \quad (1)$$

which controls the variance by the Dirichlet form (equivalently, by the total L^2 -influence). A major breakthrough of Kahn–Kalai–Linial (KKL) showed that for Boolean functions $f : \{\pm 1\}^n \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$, small total influence forces the existence of a coordinate with comparatively large influence, quantitatively capturing the intuition that any nontrivial Boolean function must have an “influential variable” [20]. Soon after, Talagrand discovered a far-reaching strengthening of Poincaré, often called the L^1 - L^2 (or *influence*) *inequality*: there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that for all $f : \{\pm 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\|D_i f\|_2^2}{1 + \ln(\|D_i f\|_2 / \|D_i f\|_1)} \geq C \text{Var}(f). \quad (2)$$

Talagrand introduced (2) in his work on sharp thresholds and approximate zero–one laws [32]. For Boolean f , the random variable $|D_i f|$ takes values in $\{0, 1\}$, hence $\|D_i f\|_2^2 = \|D_i f\|_1 = \text{Inf}_i[f]$ and (2) yields, up to constants,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\text{Inf}_i[f]}{1 + \ln(1 / \text{Inf}_i[f])} \gtrsim \text{Var}(f), \quad (3)$$

which implies KKL-type lower bounds by a simple averaging argument. Talagrand’s inequality has since been revisited and extended in several directions, including discrete Fourier analytic and probabilistic viewpoints, and (partial) vector-valued extensions that connect it to metric embedding theory and Rademacher type [3, 4, 5, 8, 13, 23, 24, 27, 29].

A robust semigroup perspective was developed by Cordero-Erausquin and Ledoux [5], who extended Talagrand-type inequalities to general hypercontractive settings and proposed analogous statements in continuous product spaces. Their formulation naturally involves the *geometric influence* $\text{Inf}_i^1[f]$ (the L^1 -influence), first systematically studied in the product-space isoperimetric literature (see, e.g., [21, 22]). In particular, they obtained L^q -versions (for $q \in [1, 2]$) in which a logarithmic penalty appears precisely when $\text{Inf}_i^q[f]$ is large compared to $\text{Inf}_i^1[f]$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\text{Inf}_i^q[f] (1 + \text{Inf}_i^1[f]^2 / \text{Inf}_i^q[f])}{[1 + \ln^+(\text{Inf}_i^q[f] / \text{Inf}_i^1[f]^2)]^{q/2}} \gtrsim \text{Var}(f). \quad (4)$$

More recently, Eldan and collaborators developed a powerful *pathwise stochastic analysis* approach to correlation, concentration and influence inequalities on the discrete hypercube [7, 10, 11, 12], leading to new quantitative stability statements for near-extremizers and to striking inequalities beyond the classical hypercontractive framework. In parallel, Eldan and Gross [8] discovered an inequality relating sensitivity, variance, and the ℓ_2 -mass of influences:

$$\|\nabla f\|_1 \gtrsim \text{Var}(f) \sqrt{1 + \ln^+ \left(\frac{1}{\sum_i \text{Inf}_i[f]^2} \right)}, \quad (5)$$

where $|\nabla f| = \sqrt{\sum_i |D_i f|^2}$. See also subsequent alternative proofs and extensions [9, 15, 17, 19].

1.1 Quantum Boolean analysis and Talagrand-type inequalities

The *quantum Boolean cube* replaces scalar functions on $\{\pm 1\}^n$ by observables $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ equipped with the normalized trace τ and Schatten norms $\|\cdot\|_p$. Montanaro and Osborne [25]

initiated the systematic study of *quantum Boolean functions*, defined as observables on an n -qubit system whose spectrum is contained in $\{-1, 1\}$ (equivalently, Hermitian unitaries A with $A^2 = \mathbf{1}$). The natural noise operator is the depolarizing semigroup $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$, which is hypercontractive and admits a noncommutative Bakry–Émery calculus. The corresponding discrete derivatives are the conditional expectations τ_j (normalized tracing out the j -th qubit) and the derivations $d_j := \mathbb{I} - \tau_j$. For $p \geq 1$, the L^p -influence is defined by $\text{Inf}_j^p[A] := \|d_j A\|_p^p$, and $\text{Inf}_j^1[A]$ is often called the *geometric influence*.

A sequence of recent works established quantum counterparts of classical influence phenomena. Rouzé, Wirth and Zhang [30] proved quantum analogues (geometric influence version) of KKL, Friedgut’s junta theorem, and Talagrand-type influence inequalities on $M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$. In particular, they obtained a Talagrand-type lower bound for $q \in [1, 2]$ (with constants deteriorating as $q \uparrow 2$), providing a noncommutative analogue of the “sub- L^2 ” Talagrand regime. Subsequently, Blecher, Gao and Xu [2] sharpened the geometric ($q = 1$) case and proved the quantum L^1 -version

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\text{Inf}_j^1[A]}{1 + \ln^+(1/\text{Inf}_j^1[A])} \gtrsim \text{Var}(A), \quad \|A\|_\infty \leq 1, \quad (6)$$

which may be viewed as the direct quantum counterpart of (3). Beyond this first-order strengthening, [2] also initiates a systematic study of *high-order* influences on the quantum Boolean cube and develops a quantum analogue of the random-restriction technology, leading to high-order Talagrand/KKL-type consequences for k -th order influences.

In parallel to these developments, Jiao, Lin, Luo and Zhou [18] introduced an independent quantum random-restriction method on the qubit cube and proved a quantum Eldan–Gross inequality, together with quantum Talagrand-type and quantum KKL-type consequences. In a different noncommutative model (the CAR algebra), Jiao, Luo and Zhou [19] established an Eldan–Gross inequality for projections by developing noncommutative counterparts of the Falik–Samorodnitsky inequality and a Buser-type inequality. By contrast, in our qubit-cube setting the Eldan–Gross-type bound we require will follow directly from the semigroup proof of our dimension-free Talagrand-type inequality (Theorem 1.1 below), without invoking random restrictions.

1.2 Main results

A recurring feature of the depolarizing semigroup on the quantum Boolean cube $M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ is that its local carré du champ admits a canonical splitting into a *conditional-variance* part and a *pointwise-derivative* part. More precisely, for each $j \in [n]$ one has $\Gamma_j(A) = \frac{1}{2}\text{Var}_j(A) + \frac{1}{2}|d_j A|^2$, so that $\Gamma_j(A)$ lies exactly halfway between $\text{Var}_j(A)$ and $|d_j A|^2$. Motivated by this decomposition, we introduce an α -interpolated (local) gradient. For $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, define

$$|\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2 := (1 - \alpha)\text{Var}_j(A) + \alpha|d_j A|^2, \quad |\nabla^\alpha A|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n |\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2. \quad (7)$$

This interpolates between the purely conditional quantity $|\nabla_j^0 A|^2 = \text{Var}_j(A)$ and the pointwise quantity $|\nabla_j^1 A|^2 = |d_j A|^2$, while the midpoint reproduces the carré du champ: $|\nabla_j^{1/2} A|^2 = \Gamma_j(A)$. Moreover, since $\tau \circ \tau_j = \tau$, the L_2 -mass of $|\nabla_j^\alpha A|$ is independent of α :

$$\|\nabla_j^\alpha A\|_2^2 = \tau(|\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2) = \tau(\text{Var}_j(A)) = \text{Inf}_j^2[A],$$

so that this family provides a convenient bridge between L^2 -influences and the L^∞ -smoothing estimates needed in our arguments.

Our first main theorem establishes a *dimension-free* Talagrand-type variance inequality on the quantum cube, exhibiting a logarithmic gain when either $A - \tau(A)$ or the gradient vector $(d_j A)_j$ is small in L^q relative to $\text{Var}(A)^{1/2}$.

Theorem 1.1. *For $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and $1 \leq q \leq p \leq 2$,*

$$\|A\|_{\infty}^{2-p} \|\nabla^{\alpha} A\|_p^p \geq \text{Var}(A) \cdot \left(\frac{1+2\alpha}{3}\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \cdot \max \left\{ C_1^{1.1}(p), C_2^{1.1}(p) \cdot \mathcal{R}(A, q)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right\},$$

where

$$C_1^{1.1}(p) = \frac{\left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{p-1}}{\text{Beta}(\frac{3}{4}; \frac{p}{2}, \frac{p}{2})}, \quad C_2^{1.1}(p) = \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{p-1} \cdot \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \cdot \frac{p}{2} \cdot \max_{r \geq 0} \frac{1 - e^{-r}}{r^{\frac{p}{2}}},$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}(A, q) = \frac{q}{2-q} \max \left\{ \ln \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\|A - \tau(A)\|_q^2} \right), \ln \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\sum_j \|d_j A\|_q^2} \right) \right\}.$$

The quantity $\mathcal{R}(A, q)$ measures how small the L^p -mass of $A - \tau(A)$ and of gradient vector $(d_j A)_j$ are relative to $\text{Var}(A)$; when either is substantially smaller than $\text{Var}(A)^{1/2}$, the theorem yields a genuine logarithmic gain. From this we deduce

- (1) a *quantum Eldan–Gross inequality* in terms of the squared ℓ_2 -mass of L^1 -influences (Corollary 1.3).
- (2) a *quantum Cordero-Erausquin–Eskenazis L^p - L^q inequality* (Corollary 1.4).
- (3) a *quantum Talagrand-type isoperimetric inequality* (Corollary 1.7);

In many problems, *first-order* information is not sufficient: one needs to quantify the effect of a *coalition* of variables. This motivates several notions of *influence of a set* $J \subseteq [n]$, typically defined through higher-order derivatives or conditional variances. While these notions are not always equivalent, they capture a common idea: boundary size at scale $|J|$ and sensitivity to simultaneous perturbations on J ; see, for instance, the systematic discussion in [1].

Two recent results illustrate the role of high-order influences as genuine extensions of KKL/Talagrand principles. First, Tanguy [33] proved a *second-order* Talagrand-type inequality and derived a dichotomy: either a single coordinate has influence at least $(\frac{1}{n})^{1/(1+\eta)}$, or there exists a *pair* (i, j) with second-order influence at least of order $(\frac{\log n}{n})^2$. Second, motivated by Tal’s definition of influence of a set, Przybyłowski [28] established a *d-set KKL theorem*: for each fixed d , every Boolean function f admits a d -subset with influence at least $\frac{1}{10} W^{\geq d}[f] (\frac{\log n}{n})^d$, where $W^{\geq d}[f]$ denotes the Fourier weight above level d . These results show that higher-order influences provide a refined “multi-scale boundary” theory on the discrete cube.

Recently, Blecher, Gao and Xu [2] initiated a systematic study of *high-order* influences on the quantum Boolean cube by defining, for $J \subseteq [n]$, $\text{Inf}_J^p[A] := \|d_J A\|_p^p$ where $d_J := \prod_{j \in J} d_j$, and developing a corresponding higher-order Talagrand/KKL theory. In particular, they proved a *high-order quantum Talagrand inequality* controlling the k -th order Fourier tail $W^{\geq k}[A] := \sum_{|s| \geq k} |\hat{A}_s|^2$ via the k -th order geometric influences:

$$W^{\geq k}[A] \leq 24^k k! \sum_{|J|=k} \frac{\text{Inf}_J^1[A]}{\left[\ln(1/\text{Inf}_J^1[A])\right]^k}, \quad (8)$$

and deduced the high-order quantum KKL-type lower bound

$$\max_{|J|=k} \text{Inf}_J^1[A] \gtrsim \left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^k W^{\geq k}[A], \quad \forall 1 \leq k \leq n \quad (9)$$

highlighting that high-order influences are both natural and powerful in the quantum setting.

The results above are fundamentally *global*: they bound a Fourier tail quantity such as $W^{\geq k}[A]$ by aggregating all k -th order influences. For many applications, one seeks a *local* principle that compares the influence of a *specific* subset J to the portion of the variance attributable to J . In this paper, we introduce a *high-order local variance functional* $V_J(A)$, defined via the semigroup by

$$V_J(A) := \int_0^\infty 2 \text{Inf}_J[P_t A] dt,$$

which admits a Pauli–Fourier expansion supported on coefficients whose support contains J .

Our second main theorem is a two-exponent local Talagrand inequality for high-order influences.

Theorem 1.2 (Local quantum Talagrand-type inequality for high-order influences). *Let $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$, $J \subseteq [n]$ with $k := |J| \geq 1$, $p \in [1, 2]$ and $q \in [1, 2)$. Then*

$$\|A\|_\infty^{2-p} \text{Inf}_J^p[A] \geq 2^{(p-2)k} \cdot V_J(A) \cdot \max \left\{ k, \frac{q}{2-q} \ln^+ \left(\frac{\sqrt{k} V_J(A)^{1/2}}{\text{Inf}_J^q[A]^{1/q}} \right) \right\}.$$

The baseline term k reflects a *restricted Poincaré effect*: since all Fourier–Pauli modes counted by $V_J(A)$ have level at least k , the semigroup decay provides a spectral gap of size k , leading to the rough bound $\text{Inf}_J^p[A] \gtrsim 2^{(p-2)k} \cdot k \cdot V_J(A)$. The second term yields a *Talagrand-type logarithmic amplification* whenever the auxiliary L^q -influence is significantly smaller than its natural scale $\sqrt{k} \cdot V_J(A)^{1/2}$. From this we deduce

- (1) a *quantum Talagrand L^p - L^q inequality for high-order influences* (Corollary 1.5).
- (2) a *local quantum L^p -isoperimetric inequality for high-order influences* (Corollary 1.8);

1.3 Quantum Talagrand-type influence inequalities

Several recent works established *quantum* analogues of the Eldan–Gross inequality. On the qubit cube $M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$, Jiao, Lin, Luo and Zhou [18] developed a quantum version of the random-restriction method and proved a quantum Eldan–Gross inequality (together with quantum Talagrand and quantum KKL-type consequences). In a different noncommutative model, namely the CAR algebra, Jiao, Luo and Zhou [19] established an Eldan–Gross inequality for projections by developing noncommutative counterparts of the Falik–Samorodnitsky inequality and a Buser-type inequality. In contrast, in our setting the corresponding bound follows directly from Theorem 1.1, whose proof relies on a standard semigroup method.

Corollary 1.3 (Quantum Eldan–Gross inequality). *Let $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ satisfy $\|A\|_\infty \leq 1$. Then*

$$\|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p \geq C^{1.3}(p) \text{Var}(A) \left[1 + \ln^+ \left(\frac{1}{\sum_j \text{Inf}_j^1[A]^2} \right) \right]^{\frac{p}{2}}. \quad (10)$$

holds for all $1 \leq p < 2$, where one may take

$$C^{1.3}(p) = 2^{-\frac{p}{2}} \min\{C_2^{1.1}(p), C_1^{1.7}(p)\},$$

with $C_2^{1.1}(p)$ from Theorem 1.1 and $C_1^{1.7}(p)$ from Corollary 1.7. Here $C^{1.3}(p) \rightarrow 0$ as $p \rightarrow 2$.

In particular, if A is unitary Hermitian (i.e. $A^* = A$ and $A^2 = \mathbf{1}$), then (10) holds with $C^{1.3}(p) \geq C > 0$ for all $1 \leq p \leq 2$.

Cordero-Erausquin and Eskenazis [4] proved the following sharp scalar-valued L^1-L^p inequality by combining Khintchine's inequality with Lust-Piquard's Riesz transform inequalities [6]. Let μ be the uniform probability measure on $\{\pm 1\}^n$. Then, for every $p \in (1, \infty)$, there exists a constant $C_p > 0$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every function $f : \{\pm 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$,

$$\|f - \mathbb{E}_\mu f\|_p \leq C_p \frac{\|\|\nabla f\|\|_p}{1 + \sqrt{\log(\|\|\nabla f\|\|_p / \|\|\nabla f\|\|_1)}}. \quad (11)$$

Equivalently, raising both sides of (11) to the p -th power yields

$$\|f - \mathbb{E}_\mu f\|_p^p \leq C_p^p \frac{\|\|\nabla f\|\|_p^p}{\left[1 + \sqrt{\log(\|\|\nabla f\|\|_p / \|\|\nabla f\|\|_1)}\right]^p}, \quad (12)$$

so that the logarithmic improvement is of the optimal order $[\log(\cdot)]^{p/2}$ in the denominator. As pointed out in their paper, if one instead follows the approach based on the techniques of [16], then one only obtains a weaker logarithmic improvement, in which the logarithmic factor appears with exponent $\alpha_p = \frac{p}{\max\{p, 2\}}$ for every $p \in (1, \infty)$.

Using our Theorem 1.1, we establish a *quantum* analogue of the Cordero-Erausquin–Eskenazis phenomenon on the quantum Boolean cube, with a logarithmic correction of the same order $p/2$ arising naturally from our method. Finally, we emphasize a difference in parameter ranges: while (11) (and hence (12)) holds for all $p \in (1, \infty)$ in the classical scalar setting, our quantum result is currently proved only in the regime $1 \leq q < 2$ and $q \leq p \leq 2$.

Corollary 1.4 (Quantum Cordero-Erausquin–Eskenazis L^p - L^q inequality). *For every $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, $1 \leq q < 2$, $q \leq p \leq 2$ and $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ satisfying $\|A\|_\infty \leq 1$,*

$$\frac{\|\|\nabla^\alpha A\|\|_p^p}{\left[1 + \frac{q}{2-q} \ln^+(\|\|\nabla^\alpha A\|\|_p^p / \|\|\nabla^\alpha A\|\|_q^2)\right]^{\frac{p}{2}}} \geq C_\alpha^{1.4}(p, q) \text{Var}(A). \quad (13)$$

Here $C_\alpha^{1.4}(p, q) \geq C(q) > 0$ for every fixed q , and $C_\alpha^{1.4}(p, q) \rightarrow 0$ as $q \rightarrow 2$.

As an application of Theorem 1.2, which provides a Talagrand-type lower bound for each fixed k -subset in terms of the restricted variance functional $V_J(A)$, we can aggregate over all $|J| = k$ and obtain the following quantum Talagrand L^p - L^q inequality.

Corollary 1.5 (Quantum Talagrand L^p - L^q inequality). *Let $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ satisfy $\|A\|_\infty \leq 1$. Fix $k \in [n]$ and let $p \in [1, 2]$, $q \in [1, 2)$. Then*

$$\sum_{\substack{J \subseteq [n] \\ |J|=k}} \frac{\text{Inf}_J^p[A]}{k + \frac{q}{2-q} \ln^+(\sqrt{k} \cdot \text{Inf}_J^p[A]^{1/2} / \text{Inf}_J^q[A]^{1/q})} \geq C_k^{1.5}(p, q) \sum_{\substack{J \subseteq [n] \\ |J|=k}} V_J(A) \quad (14)$$

where one may take $C_k^{1.5}(p, q) := \left(2^{1+k(2-p)} + \frac{1}{2e} \frac{q}{2-q}\right)^{-1}$. In particular, when $k = 1$, we have

$$\sum_{j \in [n]} \frac{\text{Inf}_j^p[A]}{1 + \frac{q}{2-q} \ln^+(\text{Inf}_j^p[A]^{1/2} / \text{Inf}_j^q[A]^{1/q})} \geq C_1^{1.5}(p, q) \text{Var}(A),$$

Remark 1.6. In particular,

- If $q = 1$ and $k = 1$, then for every $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ with $\|A\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $p \in [1, 2]$,

$$\sum_{j \in [n]} \frac{\text{Inf}_j^p[A]}{1 + \frac{1}{2} \ln^+(\text{Inf}_j^p[A] / \text{Inf}_j^1[A]^2)} \geq C_1^{1.5}(p, 1) \text{Var}(A).$$

which gives a quantum Boolean version of (4).

- If $q = p < 2$ and $k = 1$, then for every $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ with $\|A\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $p \in [1, 2)$,

$$\sum_{j \in [n]} \frac{\text{Inf}_j^p[A]}{1 + \frac{1}{2} \ln^+ (1/\text{Inf}_j^p[A])} \geq C_1^{1.5}(p, p) \text{Var}(A),$$

which recovers [2, (3.22)] up to a multiplicative constant depending only on p .

1.4 Quantum isoperimetric inequalities

Discrete isoperimetric inequalities on the hypercube formalize the principle that a non-constant Boolean function cannot simultaneously have a small “boundary” and nontrivial variance. In recent work, Rouzé, Wirth, and Zhang raised the question of whether one can recover the Gaussian- and hypercube-type isoperimetric phenomena in other discrete and quantum settings; we refer interested readers to their paper for further background and motivation [30, Section 6.4]. Using Theorem 1.1, we extend this isoperimetric principle to the *quantum* Boolean cube as follows.

Corollary 1.7 (Quantum isoperimetric inequality). *Let $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ satisfy $\|A\|_\infty \leq 1$. Then*

$$\|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p \geq C_1^{1.7}(p) \text{Var}(A) \left[\ln \left(\frac{e}{\text{Var}(A)} \right) \right]^{\frac{p}{2}}, \quad (15)$$

holds for all $1 \leq p < 2$, where one may take

$$C_1^{1.7}(p) := \left[C_2^{1.1}(p)^{-\frac{2}{p}} + \frac{p}{e(2-p)} + C_1^{1.1}(p)^{-\frac{2}{p}} \left(1 - \frac{2p}{2-p} \ln \frac{3}{2\pi} \right) \right]^{-\frac{p}{2}},$$

with $C_1^{1.1}(p), C_2^{1.1}(p)$ from Theorem 1.1. Here $C_1^{1.7}(p) \rightarrow 0$ as $p \rightarrow 2$.

In particular, if A is unitary Hermitian (i.e. $A^* = A$ and $A^2 = \mathbf{1}$), then (15) holds with

$$C_2^{1.7}(p) := 2^{-\frac{p}{2}} \min\{C_1^{1.1}(p), C_2^{1.1}(p)\} \geq C > 0,$$

for all $1 \leq p \leq 2$.

Our bound can be viewed as a noncommutative generalization of the recent Talagrand L_p -isoperimetric inequality on the discrete cube, see [9, Theorem 3.8]. In particular, when A is a projection and $p = 1$, this recovers [18, Theorem 1.10].

Corollary 1.8. *Let $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ satisfy $\|A\|_\infty \leq 1$. Fix $J \subseteq [n]$ with $k := |J| \geq 1$, and let $p \in [1, 2)$. Then*

$$\text{Inf}_J^p[A] \geq C_k^{1.8}(p) V_J(A) \ln \left(\frac{e^k}{\sqrt{k V_J(A)}} \right), \quad (16)$$

where one may take $C_k^{1.8}(p) := \left(2^{1+(2-p)k} + \frac{1}{ek(2-p)} \right)^{-1}$. Moreover, one has

$$\max_{\substack{J \subseteq [n] \\ |J|=k}} \text{Inf}_J^p[A] \geq \frac{C_k^{1.8}(p)}{2k \binom{n}{k}} \cdot W^{\geq k}[A] \ln \left(\frac{e^{2k} \binom{n}{k}}{W^{\geq k}[A]} \right). \quad (17)$$

In particular, when A is a projection, and $k, p = 1$, this improves [30, Theorem 6.12]. Finally, we emphasize that our Talagrand-type bounds are intrinsically sub- L_2 : the explicit prefactors degenerate as $p \uparrow 2$ (e.g. $C_1^{1.7}(p) \rightarrow 0$), and therefore these statements do not yield a meaningful L^2 endpoint by taking limits.

Organization. This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we collect the background on analysis on the quantum Boolean cube, including the Fourier–Pauli expansion, Schatten norms, conditional expectations and discrete derivatives, as well as the depolarizing semigroup and its basic functional inequalities (Poincaré, hypercontractivity, and related analytic facts). Section 3 contains the semigroup-based proofs of our main results: we first establish a quantum L^p –Poincaré inequality in Section 3.1, and then prove the dimension-free Talagrand-type variance inequality (Theorem 1.1) in Section 3.2. We subsequently derive the main consequences: the quantum Eldan–Gross inequality (Corollary 1.3), the quantum Cordero–Erausquin–Eskenazis L^p – L^q inequality (Corollary 1.4), and quantum isoperimetric bounds (Corollary 1.7) in Sections 3.3–3.5. In Section 4 we develop the higher-order theory: we introduce the local variance functional $V_J(A)$ and prove the local Talagrand inequality for k -th order influences (Theorem 1.2) in Section 4.1, followed by quantum Talagrand-type L^p – L^q influence inequality (Corollary 4.2) and partial isoperimetric bounds (Corollary 1.8) in Sections 4.2–4.3. Finally, Appendix A records a self-contained proof of an improved Talagrand-type bound in the classical discrete cube setting via a directly differential-inequality argument.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Fourier analysis on quantum Boolean hypercube

The n -qubit algebra and Schatten norms. Throughout the paper we work on the n -qubit matrix algebra $M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n} \cong M_{2^n}(\mathbb{C})$ equipped with the normalized trace $\tau = \frac{1}{2^n} \text{tr}(\cdot)$. For $1 \leq p < \infty$, we use the normalized Schatten- p norm of $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ defined as

$$\|A\|_p = \tau(|A|^p)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where $|A| := (A^*A)^{1/2}$. For $p = \infty$, $\|\cdot\|_\infty = \|\cdot\|$ is the usual operator norm.

Following [25, Definition 3.1], we say $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ is a *quantum Boolean function* if $A = A^*$ and $A^2 = \mathbf{1}$. Here and in what follows, $\mathbf{1}$ always denotes the identity operator. A quantum Boolean function A is *balanced* if $\text{tr}(A) = 0$.

Pauli basis and Fourier–Pauli expansion. One pillar of analysis on the Boolean hypercube is that every function $f : \{\pm 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has the Fourier–Walsh expansion, i.e. can be expressed as a linear combination of characters. Our quantum analogues of the characters for 1 qubit are the Pauli matrices

$$\sigma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Clearly, these are quantum Boolean functions, and they form a basis of $M_2(\mathbb{C})$. For $s = (s_1, \dots, s_n) \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^n$, define $\sigma_s := \sigma_{s_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{s_n}$. Then $\{\sigma_s\}_{s \in \{0,1,2,3\}^n}$ is an orthonormal basis of $M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ (using $\langle X, Y \rangle := \tau(X^*Y)$). Accordingly, every $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ admits a unique Fourier–Pauli expansion

$$A = \sum_{s \in \{0,1,2,3\}^n} \widehat{A}_s \sigma_s, \quad \widehat{A}_s = \tau(\sigma_s A) = \frac{1}{2^n} \text{tr}(\sigma_s A). \quad (18)$$

If A is self-adjoint, then $\widehat{A}_s \in \mathbb{R}$ for all s .

For $s \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}^n$, we define its support and level by $\text{supp}(s) := \{j \in [n] : s_j \neq 0\}$. For each integer $d \geq 1$, the *Fourier weight* of $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ at degree d is

$$W^{=d}[A] = \sum_{\substack{s \in \{0,1,2,3\}^n \\ |\text{supp}(s)|=d}} |\widehat{A}_s|^2.$$

We will also use the notation

$$W^{\geq d}[A] = \sum_{\substack{s \in \{0,1,2,3\}^n \\ |\text{supp}(s)| \geq d}} |\widehat{A}_s|^2.$$

The variance is

$$\text{Var}(A) := \tau(|A - \tau(A)\mathbf{1}|^2) = \sum_{s \neq 0} |\widehat{A}_s|^2. \quad (19)$$

Conditional expectations and discrete derivatives. For each $j \in [n]$, let $\tau_j : M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n} \rightarrow M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ be the trace-preserving conditional expectation that traces out the j -th tensor factor:

$$\tau_j := \mathbb{I}^{\otimes(j-1)} \otimes \tau \otimes \mathbb{I}^{\otimes(n-j)}.$$

Here \mathbb{I} denotes the identity map on $M_2(\mathbb{C})$. Equivalently, τ_j is unital completely positive and satisfies $\tau \circ \tau_j = \tau$. For $J \subseteq [n]$ we set $\tau_J := \prod_{j \in J} \tau_j$ (the product is well-defined since the maps commute). It is standard that τ_J is contractive on Schatten norms:

$$\|\tau_J(A)\|_p \leq \|A\|_p, \quad 1 \leq p \leq \infty. \quad (20)$$

The quantum analogue of the bit-flip map is given by

$$d_j(A) := \mathbb{I}^{\otimes(j-1)} \otimes \left(\mathbb{I} - \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \right) \otimes \mathbb{I}^{\otimes(n-j)}(A) = \sum_{\substack{s \in \{0,1,2,3\}^n \\ s_j \neq 0}} \widehat{A}_s \sigma_s,$$

and for $J \subseteq [n]$, the *higher-order* derivative

$$d_J := \prod_{j \in J} d_j.$$

Each d_j is an idempotent ($d_j^2 = d_j$) and d_J is also an idempotent. In the Pauli basis,

$$d_j(\sigma_s) = \begin{cases} \sigma_s, & s_j \neq 0, \\ 0, & s_j = 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{and hence} \quad d_J(\sigma_s) = \begin{cases} \sigma_s, & J \subseteq \text{supp}(s), \\ 0, & J \not\subseteq \text{supp}(s). \end{cases}$$

L^p -influences. For $p \geq 1$, we denote by $\text{Inf}_j^p[A] := \|d_j A\|_p^p$ the L^p -influence of j on the operator $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$, and by $\text{Inf}^p[A] := \sum_{j=1}^n \text{Inf}_j^p[A]$ the associated total L^p -influence. The L^1 -influence is also called *the geometric influence*. For a subset $J \subseteq [n]$ we analogously define the high-order influence

$$\text{Inf}_J^p[A] := \|d_J A\|_p^p.$$

For $p = 2$, Parseval's identity gives

$$\text{Inf}_J^2[A] = \|d_J A\|_2^2 = \sum_{s: J \subseteq \text{supp}(s)} |\widehat{A}_s|^2.$$

Generator and depolarizing semigroup. Let $\mathcal{L} := \sum_{j=1}^n d_j$ be the generator of the n -fold tensor product of the one-qubit depolarizing semigroup. Define

$$P_t = e^{-t\mathcal{L}} = (e^{-t}\mathbb{I} + (1 - e^{-t})\tau(\cdot)\mathbb{I})^{\otimes n} \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{} \frac{1}{2^n} \text{tr}(\cdot). \quad (21)$$

Then $(P_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a *tracially symmetric quantum Markov semigroup*. In the Fourier-Pauli expansion, decomposition,

$$P_t(A) = \sum_{s \in \{0,1,2,3\}^n} e^{-t|\text{supp}(s)|} \widehat{A}_s \sigma_s. \quad (22)$$

In particular,

$$\text{Inf}^2[A] = \sum_{j=1}^n \|d_j A\|_2^2 = \sum_{s \in \{0,1,2,3\}^n} |\text{supp}(s)| |\widehat{A}_s|^2. \quad (23)$$

Lemma 2.1 (Poincaré inequality [25]). *For $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ and $t \geq 0$, we have*

$$\text{Var}(A) \leq \text{Inf}^2[A] \iff \text{Var}(P_t A) \leq e^{-2t} \text{Var}(A).$$

Lemma 2.2 (Hypercontractivity [25]). *For $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ and $t \geq 0$, we have*

$$\|P_t A\|_2 \leq \|A\|_{1+e^{-2t}}.$$

Commutation and derivative decay. Since each P_t is a polynomial in commuting maps $\{\tau_j\}_{j=1}^n$, it commutes with every d_J . Moreover, for every j one has the one-site decomposition

$$P_t^{(j)} = \tau_j + e^{-t} d_j,$$

and hence tensorization yields exponential decay of derivatives.

Lemma 2.3 (Derivative decay). *Let $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$, $t \geq 0$, $J \subseteq [n]$ with $k := |J|$, and $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Then*

$$d_J P_t A = P_t d_J A, \quad \text{and} \quad \|d_J P_t A\|_p \leq e^{-kt} \|d_J A\|_p.$$

In particular, for $k = 1$ we have $\|d_j P_t A\|_p \leq e^{-t} \|d_j A\|_p$.

Carré du champ and conditional variances. The carré du champ of the quantum semi-group P_t is given by

$$\Gamma = \sum_{j=1}^n \Gamma_j, \quad 2\Gamma_j(A) = d_j(A^*)A + A^*d_j(A) - d_j(A^*A) = \text{Var}_j(A) + |d_j A|^2, \quad A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n},$$

where the (operator-valued) conditional variance is $\text{Var}_j(A) = \tau_j(|A - \tau_j(A)|^2)$. Note that $\tau(\text{Var}_j(A)) = \|d_j A\|_2^2$ for every j . We will also use the gradient estimate:

Lemma 2.4 (Gradient estimate [30]). *For $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ and $t \geq 0$,*

$$\Gamma(P_t A) \leq e^{-t} P_t \Gamma(A).$$

High-order partial variances. Let $\emptyset \neq J \subseteq [n]$ with $|J| = k$, we define the J -partial variance of A by

$$V_J(A) := \int_0^\infty 2 \text{Inf}_J^2[P_t A] dt = \int_0^\infty 2 \|d_J P_t A\|_2^2 dt. \quad (24)$$

In fact, consider the J -Riesz transform $R_J(A) := d_J \mathcal{L}^{-1/2}(A - \tau(A))$, then

$$V_J(A) = \|R_J(A)\|_2^2 = \text{Var}(R_J(A)). \quad (25)$$

Using (22) and $d_J(\sigma_s) = \sigma_s \mathbb{1}_{J \subseteq \text{supp}(s)}$, we obtain the Fourier–Pauli formula

$$V_J(A) = \sum_{s: J \subseteq \text{supp}(s)} \frac{1}{|\text{supp}(s)|} |\widehat{A}_s|^2. \quad (26)$$

In particular, since $J \subseteq \text{supp}(s)$ implies $|\text{supp}(s)| \geq |J| = k$, we have the *restricted Poincaré decay*

$$V_J(P_t A) \leq e^{-2kt} V_J(A), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (27)$$

We will also use the elementary “restricted Poincaré” bound:

Lemma 2.5 (Restricted Poincaré inequality). *For $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ and $J \subseteq [n]$ with $k := |J|$, we have*

$$kV_J(A) \leq \text{Inf}_J^2[A]. \quad (28)$$

Proof. It follows directly from (26) since $\frac{k}{|\text{supp}(s)|} \leq 1$ whenever $|\text{supp}(s)| \geq k$. \square

In particular, summing the partial variances over all k -subsets admits a clean Fourier lower bound:

Proposition 2.6. *For every integer $1 \leq k \leq n$,*

$$\sum_{|J|=k} V_J(A) \geq \frac{1}{k} W^{\geq k}[A]. \quad (29)$$

Proof. Starting from (26) and exchanging the order of summation,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|J|=k} V_J(A) &= \sum_{|J|=k} \sum_{\text{supp}(s) \supseteq J} \frac{1}{|\text{supp}(s)|} |\widehat{A}_s|^2 = \sum_{|\text{supp}(s)| \geq k} \sum_{\substack{J \subseteq \text{supp}(s) \\ |J|=k}} \frac{1}{|\text{supp}(s)|} |\widehat{A}_s|^2 \\ &= \sum_{|\text{supp}(s)| \geq k} \binom{|\text{supp}(s)|}{k} \frac{1}{|\text{supp}(s)|} |\widehat{A}_s|^2 = \sum_{m=k}^n \binom{m}{k} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{|\text{supp}(s)|=m} |\widehat{A}_s|^2 \\ &= \sum_{m=k}^n \binom{m}{k} \frac{1}{m} W^{=m}[A]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the identity $\binom{m}{k} \frac{1}{m} = \frac{1}{k} \binom{m-1}{k-1}$ and $\binom{m-1}{k-1} \geq 1$ for all $m \geq k$, we have $\binom{m}{k} \frac{1}{m} \geq \frac{1}{k}$, hence

$$\sum_{m=k}^n \binom{m}{k} \frac{1}{m} W^{=m}[A] \geq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{m=k}^n W^{=m}[A] = \frac{1}{k} W^{\geq k}[A].$$

\square

2.2 Basic analytic facts

We collect several analytic inequalities used repeatedly in the sequel.

Fact 2.7 (Noncommutative Hölder). *Let $1 \leq p, q, r \leq \infty$ with $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q}$. Then for all $X, Y \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$,*

$$\|XY\|_r \leq \|X\|_p \|Y\|_q, \quad \text{and} \quad |\tau(XY)| \leq \|X\|_p \|Y\|_{p'}.$$

Fact 2.8 (Schatten interpolation between L^2 and L^∞). *For every $X \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ and every $r \in [2, \infty]$,*

$$\|X\|_r \leq \|X\|_2^{\frac{2}{r}} \|X\|_\infty^{1-\frac{2}{r}}.$$

Equivalently, for $p \in [1, 2]$ and $p' = \frac{p}{p-1} \in [2, \infty]$,

$$\|X\|_{p'} \leq \|X\|_2^{\frac{2}{p'}} \|X\|_\infty^{1-\frac{2}{p'}}.$$

Fact 2.9 (Operator norm bounds for d_J). *Let $J \subseteq [n]$ with $k := |J| \geq 1$. Then*

$$\|d_J\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \leq 2^k, \quad \text{hence} \quad \|d_J A\|_\infty \leq 2^k \|A\|_\infty.$$

Fact 2.10 (Hölder in time). *Let $(g_t)_{t \geq 0}$ and $(h_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be nonnegative measurable functions and let $\theta \in [0, 1]$. Then*

$$\int_0^\infty g_t^{1-\theta} h_t^\theta dt \leq \left(\int_0^\infty g_t dt \right)^{1-\theta} \left(\int_0^\infty h_t dt \right)^\theta.$$

Fact 2.11 (Kadison–Schwarz inequality [31]). *If φ is a unital positive map, then for every normal element a in its domain, we have $\varphi(a^*a) \geq \varphi(a^*)\varphi(a)$ and $\varphi(a^*a) \geq \varphi(a)\varphi(a^*)$. In particular, we have $\varphi(a^*a) \cdot 1 \geq \varphi(a^*)\varphi(a) = |\varphi(a)|^2$, when φ is a linear functional.*

3 Proofs of main results

3.1 Quantum L^p -Poincaré inequality

This subsection develops the analytic input underlying our Talagrand-type inequalities, namely a family of *L^p -Poincaré (spectral gap) estimates* on the quantum Boolean cube.

At a high level, the strategy follows a classical semigroup paradigm: we first obtain pointwise control of the local derivative $|d_j A|$ by a conditional variance quantity, then propagate this through the depolarizing semigroup to deduce sharp smoothing bounds for $|\nabla^\alpha P_t A|$ in operator norm, and finally integrate in time to obtain an L^p -Poincaré inequality. Compared with the standard gradient estimate $\Gamma(P_t A) \leq e^{-t} P_t \Gamma(A)$ (Lemma 2.4), our argument yields an explicit *improved decay factor* for the interpolated gradients $|\nabla_j^\alpha \cdot|$, which is one of the key technical inputs in the proofs of our main theorems.

Lemma 3.1 (Khintchine estimate). *For every $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ and $j \in [n]$, $|d_j A|^2 \leq 3\text{Var}_j(A)$.*

Proof. Fix $j \in [n]$ and expand A in the Fourier-Pauli basis grouped by the j -th coordinate:

$$A = \sum_{s \in \{0,1,2,3\}^n} \widehat{A}_s \sigma_s = \sum_{x \in \{0,1,2,3\}} \sigma_x^j A_x^j$$

where

$$A_x^j = \sum_{s: s_j=x} \widehat{A}_s \sigma_{s^{(j \mapsto 0)}}, \quad \sigma_x^j = \sigma_0^{\otimes(j-1)} \otimes \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_0^{\otimes(n-j)}.$$

Here $s^{(j \mapsto 0)}$ denotes the multi-index obtained from s by replacing s_j with 0. By definition of $d_j = \mathbb{I} - \tau_j$ we have

$$d_j A = \sum_{x \neq 0} \sigma_x^j A_x^j, \quad |d_j A|^2 = \sum_{x,y \neq 0} (A_x^j)^* (\sigma_x^j)^* \sigma_y^j A_y^j, \quad \text{Var}_j(A) = \tau_j(|d_j A|^2) = \sum_{x \neq 0} |A_x^j|^2.$$

To bound the cross-terms, note that for any distinct $x, y \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ the operator $|\sigma_x^j A_x^j - \sigma_y^j A_y^j|^2$ is positive semidefinite; expanding it yields

$$(A_x^j)^* (\sigma_x^j)^* \sigma_y^j A_y^j + (A_y^j)^* (\sigma_y^j)^* \sigma_x^j A_x^j \leq (A_x^j)^* (\sigma_x^j)^* \sigma_x^j A_x^j + (A_y^j)^* (\sigma_y^j)^* \sigma_y^j A_y^j = |A_x^j|^2 + |A_y^j|^2,$$

since $(\sigma_x^j)^* \sigma_x^j = (\sigma_y^j)^* \sigma_y^j = \mathbf{1}$. Summing over the three unordered pairs $\{x, y\} \subset \{1, 2, 3\}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} |d_j A|^2 &= \sum_{x \neq 0} |A_x^j|^2 + \sum_{x,y \neq 0: x < y} [(A_x^j)^* (\sigma_x^j)^* \sigma_y^j A_y^j + (A_y^j)^* (\sigma_y^j)^* \sigma_x^j A_x^j] \\ &\leq \sum_{x \neq 0} |A_x^j|^2 + \sum_{x,y \neq 0: x < y} [|A_x^j|^2 + |A_y^j|^2] = 3 \sum_{x \neq 0} |A_x^j|^2 = 3\text{Var}_j(A). \end{aligned}$$

A Bell-state example shows the sharpness: take $n = 2$, $j = 1$, and $A = P_{\Phi^+} := |\Phi^+\rangle\langle\Phi^+|$ with $|\Phi^+\rangle = (|00\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. Then $\tau_1(A) = \frac{1}{4}I_4$, hence $B = d_1 A = A - \frac{1}{4}I_4$ and

$$|B|^2 = (A - \frac{1}{4}I_4)^2 = \frac{1}{2}A + \frac{1}{16}I_4, \quad \tau_1(|B|^2) = \frac{3}{16}I_2.$$

Thus $|B|^2$ has eigenvalue $\frac{9}{16}$ on $|\Phi^+\rangle$, whereas $3\tau_1(|B|^2) = \frac{9}{16}I_4$, showing that the constant 3 is attained and cannot be improved. \square

Remark 3.2. In the commutative (classical) cube, the analogue of Lemma 3.1 is the trivial identity $|D_j f|^2 = \mathbb{E}_j(|D_j f|^2)$ since $|D_j f|$ depends only on bits other than the j -th. In the quantum setting the noncommutativity prevents such a pointwise reduction, and the factor 3 is a genuinely quantum feature reflecting the three nontrivial Pauli directions. Estimates of this type are implicit in noncommutative Khintchine theory and appear naturally when comparing conditional variances and pointwise gradients on matrix algebras.

Recall that for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ we defined the α -interpolated local gradient by

$$|\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2 := (1 - \alpha)\text{Var}_j(A) + \alpha|d_j A|^2.$$

This interpolates between the conditional-variance quantity ($\alpha = 0$) and the pointwise derivative ($\alpha = 1$), while the midpoint $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ recovers the carré du champ: $|\nabla_j^{1/2} A|^2 = \Gamma_j(A)$.

Corollary 3.3 (Gradient comparison). *For $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 1], j \in [n]$, and $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})$,*

$$|\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2 \geq B(\alpha, \beta)|\nabla_j^\beta A|^2, \quad (30)$$

with $B(\alpha, \beta) = \min\{\frac{1+2\alpha}{1+2\beta}, \frac{1-\alpha}{1-\beta}\}$. Consequently, summing over j yields $|\nabla^\alpha A|^2 \geq B(\alpha, \beta)|\nabla^\beta A|^2$.

Proof. Indeed, pointwise in each coordinate j we have $0 \leq |d_j A|^2 \leq 3\text{Var}_j(A)$.

- If $\alpha \geq \beta$, then $\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \geq \frac{\beta}{1-\beta}$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2 &= (1 - \alpha)\text{Var}_j(A) + \alpha|d_j A|^2 = \frac{1 - \alpha}{1 - \beta} \left((1 - \beta)\text{Var}_j(A) + \alpha \frac{1 - \beta}{1 - \alpha} |d_j A|^2 \right) \\ &\geq \frac{1 - \alpha}{1 - \beta} ((1 - \beta)\text{Var}_j(A) + \beta|d_j A|^2) = \frac{1 - \alpha}{1 - \beta} |\nabla_j^\beta A|^2. \end{aligned}$$

- If $\alpha \leq \beta$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2 &= (1 - \alpha)\text{Var}_j(A) + \alpha|d_j A|^2 \\ &\geq \left(1 - \alpha - 3 \frac{\beta - \alpha}{1 + 2\beta} \right) \text{Var}_j(A) + \left(\alpha + \frac{\beta - \alpha}{1 + 2\beta} \right) |d_j A|^2 \\ &= \frac{1 + 2\alpha}{1 + 2\beta} ((1 - \beta)\text{Var}_j(A) + \beta|d_j A|^2) = \frac{1 + 2\alpha}{1 + 2\beta} |\nabla_j^\beta A|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the cases completes the proof. \square

The next lemma is a one-coordinate estimate for $|\nabla_j^\alpha P_t A|^2$. It is proved by exploiting the explicit one-site form $P_t^{(j)} = \tau_j + e^{-t}d_j$ and the Kadison–Schwarz inequality for the remaining tensor factors.

Lemma 3.4 (Gradient estimate). *For every $j \in [n]$, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, $t \geq 0$ and $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$,*

$$|\nabla_j^\alpha P_t A|^2 \leq C_\alpha(t)P_t|\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2,$$

with $C_\alpha(t) = \frac{1+2\alpha}{e^{2t}+2\alpha e^t}$. Consequently, summing over j yields $|\nabla^\alpha P_t A|^2 \leq C_\alpha(t)P_t|\nabla^\alpha A|^2$.

Remark 3.5. We have $C_\alpha(t) \leq e^{-\frac{2+2\alpha}{1+2\alpha}t}$. In particular, when $\alpha = 1/2$, we have

$$\Gamma(P_t A) \leq \frac{2}{e^{2t} + e^t} P_t \Gamma(A) \leq e^{-\frac{3}{2}t} P_t \Gamma(A)$$

for $t \geq 0$ and $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$, which improves the estimate in [30] (Lemma 2.4).

Proof. Fix $j \in [n]$, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, $t \geq 0$, and $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$. Recall that $P_t^j = \tau_j + e^{-t}d_j$. We prove two estimates.

- (Estimate for P_t^j) We claim that $|\nabla_j^\alpha P_t^j A|^2 \leq C_\alpha(t) P_t^j |\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2$.

Since $d_j \tau_j = 0$ and $d_j^2 = d_j$, we have $d_j P_t^j = e^{-t} d_j$. Hence $|d_j P_t^j A|^2 = e^{-2t} |d_j A|^2$ and $\text{Var}_j(P_t^j A) = \tau_j(|d_j P_t^j A|^2) = e^{-2t} \text{Var}_j(A)$, which implies that

$$|\nabla_j^\alpha P_t^j A|^2 = e^{-2t} |\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2. \quad (31)$$

Moreover, by the Corollary 3.1, i.e. $|d_j A|^2 \leq 3 \text{Var}_j(A)$,

$$|\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2 = (1 - \alpha) \text{Var}_j(A) + \alpha |d_j A|^2 \leq (1 + 2\alpha) \text{Var}_j(A) = (1 + 2\alpha) \tau_j(|\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2),$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_j(|\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2) &\geq \frac{1}{1 + 2\alpha} |\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2 \\ \Rightarrow P_t^j (|\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2) &= e^{-t} |\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2 + (1 - e^{-t}) \tau_j(|\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2) \geq \left(e^{-t} + \frac{1 - e^{-t}}{1 + 2\alpha} \right) |\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Combining this with (31) yields

$$|\nabla_j^\alpha P_t^j A|^2 = e^{-2t} |\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2 \leq \frac{(1 + 2\alpha)e^{-2t}}{1 + 2\alpha e^{-t}} P_t^j |\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2 = \frac{1 + 2\alpha}{e^{2t} + 2\alpha e^t} P_t^j |\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2.$$

- (Estimate for P_t^i with $i \neq j$) We claim that $|\nabla_j^\alpha P_t^i A|^2 \leq P_t^i |\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2$ for $i \neq j$.

Note that P_t^i is unital and completely positive, by the Kadison–Schwarz inequality (Fact 2.11),

$$|P_t^i(A)|^2 \leq P_t^i(|A|^2), \quad A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}. \quad (33)$$

Moreover, P_t^i commutes with τ_j and d_j , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_j^\alpha P_t^i A|^2 &= (1 - \alpha) \tau_j |d_j P_t^i A|^2 + \alpha |d_j P_t^i A|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(33)}{\leq} (1 - \alpha) P_t^i \tau_j |d_j A|^2 + \alpha P_t^i |d_j A|^2 = P_t^i |\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, since $P_t = \prod_{k=1}^n P_t^k$ and P_t^k 's commute, write $P_t = P_t^j (\prod_{i \neq j} P_t^i)$. Applying the first estimate to $B := \prod_{i \neq j} P_t^i A$ and then repeatedly applying the second estimate to bound $|\nabla_j^\alpha B|^2$ by $(\prod_{i \neq j} P_t^i) |\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2$ (using positivity) yields

$$|\nabla_j^\alpha P_t A|^2 = |\nabla_j^\alpha P_t^j B|^2 \leq C_\alpha(t) P_t^j |\nabla_j^\alpha B|^2 \leq C_\alpha(t) P_t^j |\nabla_j^\alpha A|^2,$$

as desired. \square

We next derive an L^∞ smoothing estimate for the gradient of $P_t A$. This is the noncommutative analogue of the classical Lipschitz contraction of the heat semigroup on the cube, and will be the principal ingredient in our semigroup proof of the L^p -Poincaré inequality.

Lemma 3.6 (Lipschitz smoothing). *For $t > 0$, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, $q \in [2, \infty]$ and $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$,*

$$\| |\nabla^\alpha P_t A| \|_q \leq G_\alpha(t)^{-1/2} \|A\|_q \quad (34)$$

where

$$G_\alpha(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{(e^t - 1)(e^t + 1 + 4\alpha)}{2(1 - \alpha)(1 + 2\alpha)}, & \alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ \frac{(e^t - 1)(e^t + 3)}{1 + 2\alpha}, & \alpha \geq \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Fix $\beta \in [0, 1]$. By the carré du champ identity,

$$P_t(|A|^2) - |P_t A|^2 = \int_0^t 2P_s \Gamma(P_{t-s} A) \, ds \stackrel{(30)}{\geq} B(1/2, \beta) \int_0^t 2P_s |\nabla^\beta P_{t-s} A|^2 \, ds. \quad (35)$$

Using the gradient estimate (Lemma 3.4) with parameter β and time s to $P_{t-s} A$:

$$|\nabla^\beta P_s(P_{t-s} A)|^2 = |\nabla^\beta P_t A|^2 \leq C_\beta(s) P_s(|\nabla^\beta P_{t-s} A|^2).$$

Rearranging gives the pointwise lower bound $P_s |\nabla^\beta P_{t-s} A|^2 \geq C_\beta(s)^{-1} |\nabla^\beta P_t A|^2$. Plugging into (35) yields

$$\int_0^t 2P_s |\nabla^\beta P_{t-s} A|^2 \, ds \geq I_\beta(t) |\nabla^\beta P_t A|^2 \stackrel{(30)}{\geq} I_\beta(t) B(\beta, \alpha) |\nabla^\alpha P_t A|^2,$$

where

$$I_\beta(t) = \int_0^t 2C_\beta(s)^{-1} \, ds = \frac{1}{1+2\beta} (e^t + 1 + 4\beta) (e^t - 1).$$

Rounding up, and optimizing over $\beta \in [0, 1]$, we obtain

$$|\nabla^\alpha P_t A|^2 \leq G_\alpha(t)^{-1} (P_t(|A|^2) - |P_t A|^2) \leq G_\alpha(t)^{-1} P_t(|A|^2)$$

where

$$G_\alpha(t) = \sup_{\beta \in [0, 1]} B(1/2, \beta) I_\beta(t) B(\beta, \alpha) = \begin{cases} B(1/2, \alpha) I_\alpha(t), & \alpha \leq 1/2, \\ I_{1/2}(t) B(1/2, \alpha), & \alpha \geq 1/2. \end{cases}$$

Hence, by the contraction property of P_t under the $q/2$ -norm, we obtain

$$\|\nabla^\alpha P_t A\|_q^2 = \|\nabla^\alpha P_t A\|_{q/2}^2 \leq G_\alpha(t)^{-1} \|P_t(|A|^2)\|_{q/2} \leq G_\alpha(t)^{-1} \| |A|^2 \|_{q/2} = G_\alpha(t)^{-1} \|A\|_q^2,$$

the result follows. \square

We now integrate the smoothing estimate to obtain an L^p -Poincaré inequality. This should be compared with the classical L^p -Poincaré inequality on the discrete cube, and with the quantum L^1 -case discussed in [30, Theorem 6.14]; our proof is purely semigroup-based and yields an explicit constant.

Lemma 3.7 (Quantum L^p -Poincaré inequality). *For $1 \leq p \leq 2$, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$,*

$$\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_p \geq \frac{3}{2\pi} \left(\frac{1+2\alpha}{3} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|A - \tau(A)\|_p.$$

Remark 3.8. Taking $\alpha = 1$, note that

$$\|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p = \tau \left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^n |d_j A|^2 \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \right) = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^n |d_j A|^2 \right\|_{p/2}^{p/2} \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \| |d_j A|^2 \|_{p/2}^{p/2} = \sum_{j=1}^n \tau(|d_j A|^p) = \text{Inf}^p[A], \quad (36)$$

where we use the fact that the Schatten- r quasi-norm satisfies the r -triangle inequality ($\|X + Y\|_p^p \leq \|X\|_p^p + \|Y\|_p^p$). When $p = 1$, this recovers [30, Theorem 6.14] with a slight better constant.

Proof of Lemma 3.7. Fix $A, B \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ and $1 \leq p \leq 2$, and let $p' = \frac{p}{p-1} \in [2, \infty)$. Since $A - P_t A = \int_0^t \mathcal{L} P_s A \, ds$, we have

$$\tau((A - P_t A)^* B) = \int_0^t \tau((\mathcal{L} P_s A)^* B) \, ds = \int_0^t \sum_{j=1}^n \tau((d_j P_s A)^* B) \, ds = \int_0^t \sum_{j=1}^n \tau((d_j P_s A)^* d_j B) \, ds.$$

Using $d_j P_s = P_s d_j$ twice and τ -symmetry of P_s ,

$$\tau((d_j P_s A)^* d_j B) = \tau((P_s d_j A)^* d_j B) = \tau((d_j A)^* P_s (d_j B)) = \tau((d_j A)^* d_j (P_s B)).$$

Therefore,

$$\tau((A - P_t A)^* B) = \int_0^t \sum_{j=1}^n \tau((d_j A)^* d_j (P_s B)) \, ds.$$

By the noncommutative Hölder inequality (Fact 2.7) for column vectors,

$$\left| \tau \left(\sum_{j=1}^n (d_j A)^* d_j (P_s B) \right) \right| \leq \left\| \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |d_j A|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_p \left\| \left(\sum_{j=1}^n |d_j P_s B|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{p'}.$$

Since $|\nabla^1 A|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n |d_j A|^2$, this becomes

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^n \tau((d_j A)^* d_j (P_s B)) \right| \leq \left\| |\nabla^1 A| \right\|_p \left\| |\nabla^1 P_s B| \right\|_{p'} \stackrel{(34)}{\leq} G_1(s)^{-1/2} \left\| |\nabla^1 A| \right\|_p \|B\|_{p'}.$$

Taking the supremum over $\|B\|_{p'} = 1$ (duality of noncommutative L_p) yields

$$\|A - P_t A\|_p = \sup_{\|B\|_{p'} = 1} |\tau((A - P_t A)^* B)| \leq \left\| |\nabla^1 A| \right\|_p \int_0^t G_1(s)^{-1/2} \, ds$$

Taking $t \rightarrow \infty$ and using $P_t A \rightarrow \tau(A) \mathbf{1}$ in L_p , we conclude

$$\|A - P_t A\|_p \leq \left\| |\nabla^1 A| \right\|_p \int_0^\infty G_1(s)^{-1/2} \, ds.$$

For $\alpha = 1$ we have $G_1(s) = \frac{1}{3}(e^s + 3)(e^s - 1)$. A convenient substitution $u = \sqrt{\frac{e^s - 1}{e^s + 3}}$ gives

$$\int_0^\infty G_1(s)^{-1/2} \, ds = 2\sqrt{3} \int_0^1 \frac{du}{1 + 3u^2} = 2 \arctan(\sqrt{3}) = \frac{2\pi}{3}.$$

Finally, by (30) with $\beta = 1$, i.e., $|\nabla^\alpha A|^2 \geq \frac{1+2\alpha}{3} |\nabla^1 A|^2$, and since the function $t \mapsto t^{p/2}$ is operator monotone on $(0, \infty)$ for $\frac{p}{2} \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, we obtain

$$|\nabla^\alpha A|^p = (|\nabla^\alpha A|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} \geq \left(\frac{1+2\alpha}{3} \right)^{p/2} |\nabla^1 A|^p.$$

Operating by τ and taking power $1/p$ on both sides, we obtain

$$\left\| |\nabla^\alpha A| \right\|_p \geq \left(\frac{1+2\alpha}{3} \right)^{1/2} \left\| |\nabla^1 A| \right\|_p,$$

the result follows. \square

3.2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

The proof follows the Cordero-Erausquin–Ledoux semigroup strategy for Talagrand-type L^1 – L^2 inequalities, adapted to the depolarizing semigroup on the quantum cube.

(i) *From variance decay to a gradient lower bound.* Assume a short-time decay $\text{Var}(P_t A) \leq e^{-2\mathcal{R}t} \text{Var}(A)$ on $t \in [0, \varepsilon]$. Integrating $\frac{d}{dt} \text{Var}(P_t A) = -2 \text{Inf}[P_t A]$ gives $(1 - e^{-2\mathcal{R}t}) \text{Var}(A) \leq$

$\int_0^t 2 \text{Inf}[P_s A] ds$. We then upper bound $\text{Inf}[P_s A]$ by $\|\nabla^1 A\|_p \|\nabla^1 P_{2s} A\|_{p'}$, and control the p' -norm by interpolation between L^2 (spectral gap) and L^∞ (Lipschitz smoothing). This yields an explicit integral inequality, and optimizing in t produces a Talagrand-type lower bound on $\|A\|_\infty^{2-p} \|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p$ in terms of $\text{Var}(A)$ and \mathcal{R} .

(ii) *Producing \mathcal{R} via hypercontractivity.* Hypercontractivity plus Schatten-norm log-convexity gives a one-step estimate at time ε :

$$\text{Var}(P_\varepsilon A) \leq \text{Var}(A)^{1-\vartheta} m^\vartheta, \quad m = \min\{\|A - \tau(A)\|_q^2, \sum_j \|d_j A\|_q^2\}.$$

Log-convexity of $t \mapsto \text{Var}(P_t A)$ upgrades this to a uniform short-time decay, yielding $\mathcal{R} = \max\{1, \frac{\vartheta}{2\varepsilon} \ln(\text{Var}(A)/m)\}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$. We first claim that, if there exists $\mathcal{R}, \epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\text{Var}(P_t A) \leq e^{-2\mathcal{R}t} \text{Var}(A), \quad t \in [0, \epsilon], \quad (37)$$

then we have

$$\|A\|_\infty^{2-p} \|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p \geq \text{Var}(A) \sup_{t \in (0, \epsilon]} \frac{1 - e^{-2\mathcal{R}t}}{\int_0^t 2e^{-2(p-1)s} G_1(2s)^{-(1-\frac{p}{2})} ds}. \quad (38)$$

By assumption, for all $t \in (0, \epsilon]$

$$(1 - e^{-2\mathcal{R}t}) \text{Var}(A) \leq \text{Var}(A) - \text{Var}(P_t A) = \int_0^t 2 \text{Inf}[P_s A] ds.$$

Applying the vector-valued noncommutative Hölder inequality (Fact 2.7), we have

$$\text{Inf}[P_s A] = \sum_{j=1}^n \tau(|d_j P_s A|^2) = \left| \tau \left(\sum_{j=1}^n (d_j A)^* (d_j P_{2s} A) \right) \right| \leq \|\nabla^1 A\|_p \|\nabla^1 P_{2s} A\|_{p'}, \quad (39)$$

where $p' = \frac{p}{p-1} \in [2, \infty]$ is the Hölder conjugate of p . Then by the logarithmic convexity of the normalized Schatten- $1/r$ norm in r (Fact 2.8), we have

$$\|\nabla^1 P_{2s} A\|_{p'} \leq \|\nabla^1 P_{2s} A\|_2^{\frac{2}{p'}} \|\nabla^1 P_{2s} A\|_\infty^{\frac{p'-2}{p'}} = \|\nabla^1 P_{2s} A\|_2^{2\frac{p-1}{p}} \|\nabla^1 P_{2s} A\|_\infty^{\frac{2-p}{p}}.$$

As a consequence of the L^2 -Poincaré inequality, we have

$$\|\nabla^1 P_{2s} A\|_2^2 = \text{Inf}[P_{2s} A] \leq e^{-2s} \text{Inf}[P_s A].$$

Moreover, applying the Lipschitz smoothing estimate (Lemma 3.6), we have

$$\|\nabla^1 P_{2s} A\|_\infty \leq G_1(2s)^{-1/2} \|A\|_\infty.$$

Plugging these into (39) gives

$$\text{Inf}[P_s A] \leq \|\nabla^1 A\|_p (e^{-2s} \text{Inf}[P_s A])^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \left(G_1(2s)^{-1/2} \|A\|_\infty \right)^{\frac{2-p}{p}}.$$

If $\text{Inf}[P_s A] = 0$ the desired bound is trivial; otherwise, taking power p and cancelling $\text{Inf}[P_s A]^{p-1}$ on both side, we obtain:

$$\text{Inf}[P_s A] \leq e^{-2(p-1)s} G_1(2s)^{-(1-\frac{p}{2})} \|A\|_\infty^{2-p} \|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p.$$

Hence for all $t \in (0, \epsilon]$,

$$\left(1 - e^{-2\mathcal{R}t}\right) \text{Var}(A) \leq \|A\|_\infty^{2-p} \|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p \int_0^t 2e^{-2(p-1)s} G_1(2s)^{-(1-\frac{p}{2})} ds.$$

Optimizing over t yields the result.

Next, we show by hypercontractivity that for every $\epsilon > 0$ and $q \in [1, 2)$, we can take

$$\mathcal{R} = \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \min \left\{ \frac{\tanh(\epsilon)}{2/q - 1}, 1 \right\} \max \left\{ \ln \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\|A - \tau(A)\|_q^2} \right), \ln \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\sum_j \|d_j A\|_q^2} \right) \right\} \right\}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{R} \geq 1$ is a direct consequence of the Poincaré inequality. Write $\vartheta = \min \left\{ \frac{\tanh(\epsilon)}{2/q - 1}, 1 \right\}$. We claim that

$$\text{Var}(P_\epsilon A) \leq \text{Var}(A)^{1-\vartheta} \left(\min \left\{ \|A - \tau(A)\|_q^2, \sum_{j=1}^n \|d_j A\|_q^2 \right\} \right)^{\vartheta}. \quad (40)$$

The result then follows from the logarithmic convexity of $t \mapsto \text{Var}(P_t A)$.

- We first show that

$$\text{Var}(P_\epsilon A) \leq \text{Var}(A)^{1-\vartheta} \left(\|A - \tau(A)\|_q^2 \right)^{\vartheta}.$$

Note that P_t and τ commute, we have

$$\text{Var}(P_\epsilon A) = \|P_\epsilon A - \tau(P_\epsilon A)\|_2^2 = \|P_\epsilon(A - \tau(A))\|_2^2.$$

Applying the hypercontractivity (Lemma 2.2), we have

$$\|P_\epsilon(A - \tau(A))\|_2 \leq \|A - \tau(A)\|_{1+e^{-2\epsilon}}.$$

By the logarithmic convexity of the normalized Schatten-1/r norm in r (so that $\frac{1}{1+e^{-2\epsilon}} = \frac{1-\vartheta}{2} + \frac{\vartheta}{q}$ whenever $\vartheta < 1$), we have

$$\|A - \tau(A)\|_{1+e^{-2\epsilon}} \leq \|A - \tau(A)\|_2^{1-\vartheta} \|A - \tau(A)\|_q^\vartheta.$$

The result follows.

- We then show that

$$\text{Var}(P_\epsilon A) \leq \text{Var}(A)^{1-\vartheta} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \|d_j A\|_q^2 \right)^{\vartheta}.$$

Note that with $\tau_{<j} = \tau_1 \tau_2 \cdots \tau_{j-1}$, we have

$$\text{Var}(A) = \|A\|_2^2 - |\tau(A)|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n \|\tau_{<j}(A)\|_2^2 - \|\tau_{<j} \tau_j(A)\|_2^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n \|\tau_{<j}(d_j A)\|_2^2.$$

Using commutation of P_t with $\tau_{<j}$ and d_j , we have

$$\text{Var}(P_\epsilon A) = \sum_{j=1}^n \|\tau_{<j}(d_j P_\epsilon A)\|_2^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n \|P_\epsilon \tau_{<j}(d_j A)\|_2^2.$$

Applying the hypercontractivity and interpolation as above to each term:

$$\|P_\epsilon \tau_{<j}(d_j A)\|_2 \leq \|\tau_{<j}(d_j A)\|_{1+e^{-2\epsilon}} \leq \|\tau_{<j}(d_j A)\|_2^{1-\vartheta} \|\tau_{<j}(d_j A)\|_q^\vartheta.$$

Since $\tau_{<j}$ is contractive under the normalized Schatten- q norm, $\|\tau_{<j}(d_j A)\|_q \leq \|d_j A\|_q$. Hence

$$\text{Var}(P_\epsilon A) \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\|\tau_{<j}(d_j A)\|_2^{1-\vartheta} \|d_j A\|_q^\vartheta \right)^2 \leq \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \|\tau_{<j}(d_j A)\|_2^2 \right)^{1-\vartheta} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \|d_j A\|_q^2 \right)^\vartheta,$$

where the last step is Hölder. The result follows.

Taking the better of the two bounds yields (40). Now set $m := \min \left\{ \|A - \tau(A)\|_q^2, \sum_{j=1}^n \|d_j A\|_q^2 \right\}$ and

$$\kappa := \vartheta \ln \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{m} \right) = \vartheta \ln \left(\max \left\{ \frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\|A - \tau(A)\|_q^2}, \frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\sum_{j=1}^n \|d_j A\|_q^2} \right\} \right) \geq 0,$$

so that (40) reads $\text{Var}(P_\epsilon A) \leq e^{-\kappa} \text{Var}(A)$. Moreover, $t \mapsto \text{Var}(P_t A)$ is log-convex, Hölder's inequality implies that for every $t \in [0, \epsilon]$

$$\text{Var}(P_t A) \leq \text{Var}(P_0 A)^{1-\frac{t}{\epsilon}} \text{Var}(P_\epsilon A)^{\frac{t}{\epsilon}} = \text{Var}(A)^{1-\frac{t}{\epsilon}} \text{Var}(P_\epsilon A)^{\frac{t}{\epsilon}} \leq e^{-\frac{\kappa}{\epsilon} t} \text{Var}(A).$$

Combining this with the spectral gap bound $\text{Var}(P_t A) \leq e^{-2t} \text{Var}(A)$, we obtain (37) with $\mathcal{R} = \max\{1, \frac{\kappa}{2\epsilon}\}$.

Finally, we combine the estimates. For $\alpha = 1$ we have $G_1(s) = \frac{1}{3}(e^s + 3)(e^s - 1)$. A direct change of variables gives, for all $t > 0$,

$$\int_0^t 2e^{-2(p-1)s} G_1(2s)^{-(1-\frac{p}{2})} ds = \left(\frac{4}{3} \right)^{p-1} \text{Beta} \left(\frac{3}{4} (1 - e^{-2t}); \frac{p}{2}, \frac{p}{2} \right), \quad (41)$$

where $\text{Beta}(x; a, b) = \int_0^x t^{a-1} (1-t)^{b-1} dt$ is the incomplete Beta function.

(1) *The $C_1^{1,1}(p)$ bound (spectral gap only).* Taking $\mathcal{R} = 1$ in (38), using (41), and sending $t \rightarrow \infty$ yields

$$\|A\|_\infty^{2-p} \|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p \geq \text{Var}(A) \left(\frac{3}{4} \right)^{p-1} \sup_{t>0} \frac{1 - e^{-2t}}{\text{Beta} \left(\frac{3}{4} (1 - e^{-2t}); \frac{p}{2}, \frac{p}{2} \right)} = \frac{\left(\frac{3}{4} \right)^{p-1}}{\text{Beta} \left(\frac{3}{4}; \frac{p}{2}, \frac{p}{2} \right)} \text{Var}(A).$$

(2) *The $C_2^{1,1}(p)$ bound (hypercontractive bound).* Fix $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0 = \text{arctanh}(2/q - 1)$ and set $r = \tanh(\epsilon) \in (0, \frac{2-q}{q}]$, we have $\vartheta = \tanh(\epsilon) \frac{q}{2-q}$ and thus

$$\max \left\{ 1, \frac{\kappa}{2\epsilon} \right\} = \max \left\{ 1, \frac{\tanh(\epsilon)}{2\epsilon} \cdot \frac{q}{2-q} \cdot \ln \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{m} \right) \right\} \geq \frac{\tanh(\epsilon)}{2\epsilon} \mathcal{R}(A, q),$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}(A, q) = \max \left\{ 2, \frac{q}{2-q} \max \left\{ \ln \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\|A - \tau(A)\|_q^2} \right), \ln \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\sum_j \|d_j A\|_q^2} \right) \right\} \right\}.$$

Choosing $t = \epsilon$ in (38) and using $\mathcal{R} \geq \frac{\tanh(\epsilon)}{2\epsilon} \mathcal{R}(A, q)$ gives

$$\frac{1 - e^{-2\mathcal{R}t}}{\int_0^t 2e^{-2(p-1)s} G_1(2s)^{-(1-\frac{p}{2})} ds} \geq \frac{1 - e^{-\tanh(\epsilon)\mathcal{R}(A, q)}}{\text{Beta} \left(\frac{3}{4} (1 - e^{-2\epsilon}); \frac{p}{2}, \frac{p}{2} \right)} = \frac{1 - e^{-r\mathcal{R}(A, q)}}{\text{Beta} \left(\frac{3}{4} \frac{2r}{1+r}; \frac{p}{2}, \frac{p}{2} \right)},$$

where we use $e^{-2\epsilon} = \frac{1-\tanh(\epsilon)}{1+\tanh(\epsilon)}$. Applying Lemma 3.9 with $a = p/2$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 < r \leq \frac{2-q}{q}} \frac{1 - e^{-r\mathcal{R}(A,q)}}{\text{Beta}(\frac{3}{4}\frac{2r}{1+r}; \frac{p}{2}, \frac{p}{2})} &\geq \frac{p}{2} \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \sup_{0 < r \leq \frac{2-q}{q}} \frac{1 - e^{-r\mathcal{R}(A,q)}}{r^{\frac{p}{2}}} \\ &= \frac{p}{2} \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \sup_{0 < \tilde{r} \leq \frac{2-q}{q}\mathcal{R}(A,q)} \frac{1 - e^{-\tilde{r}}}{\tilde{r}^{\frac{p}{2}}} \mathcal{R}(A, q)^{\frac{p}{2}} \\ &\geq \frac{p}{2} \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \sup_{0 < \tilde{r} \leq 2\frac{2-q}{q}} \frac{1 - e^{-\tilde{r}}}{\tilde{r}^{\frac{p}{2}}} \mathcal{R}(A, q)^{\frac{p}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.10 and $\frac{2(2-p)}{p} \leq \frac{2(2-q)}{q}$, we have $\tilde{r}_* \leq \frac{2(2-q)}{q}$. Consequently, whenever $\mathcal{R}(A, q) \geq 2$ the interval $(0, \frac{2-q}{q}\mathcal{R}(A, q)]$ contains \tilde{r}_* , and therefore

$$\sup_{0 < \tilde{r} \leq \frac{2-q}{q}\mathcal{R}(A,q)} \frac{1 - e^{-\tilde{r}}}{\tilde{r}^{\frac{p}{2}}} = \max_{\tilde{r} \geq 0} \frac{1 - e^{-\tilde{r}}}{\tilde{r}^{\frac{p}{2}}}.$$

Putting everything together yields (for $\mathcal{R}(A, q) \geq 2$)

$$\|A\|_{\infty}^{2-p} \|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p \geq \text{Var}(A) \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{p-1} \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \frac{p}{2} \left(\max_{\tilde{r} \geq 0} \frac{1 - e^{-\tilde{r}}}{\tilde{r}^{\frac{p}{2}}}\right) \mathcal{R}(A, q)^{\frac{p}{2}}.$$

Together with the $C_1^{1,1}(p)$ bound, this yields the stated $\max\{C_1^{1,1}(p), C_2^{1,1}(p)\mathcal{R}(A, q)^{\frac{p}{2}}\}$ term. By (30) with $\beta = 1$, i.e., $|\nabla^\alpha A|^2 \geq \frac{1+2\alpha}{3}|\nabla^1 A|^2$, and since the function $t \mapsto t^{p/2}$ is operator monotone on $(0, \infty)$ for $\frac{p}{2} \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, we obtain

$$|\nabla^\alpha A|^p = (|\nabla^\alpha A|^2)^{\frac{p}{2}} \geq \left(\frac{1+2\alpha}{3}\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} |\nabla^1 A|^p.$$

Taking $\tau(\cdot)$ gives

$$\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_p^p \geq \left(\frac{1+2\alpha}{3}\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p.$$

Multiplying by $\|A\|_{\infty}^{2-p}$ and combining with the $\alpha = 1$ estimate finishes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.9. *Let $a \in [1/2, 1]$ and $r \in [0, 1]$. Then*

$$\text{Beta}\left(\frac{3r}{2(1+r)}; a, a\right) \leq \frac{1}{a} \left(\frac{3}{2}r\right)^a.$$

Proof. Write $x = \frac{3r}{2(1+r)}$. Use the substitution $t = \frac{3r}{2} \cdot \frac{u}{1+ru}$, which maps $u \in [0, 1]$ bijectively to $t \in [0, x]$. A direct computation gives $dt = \frac{3r}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{(1+ru)^2} du$ and $1 - t = \frac{1 - \frac{ru}{2}}{1+ru}$. Hence, with $a \in [1/2, 1]$,

$$\text{Beta}(x; a, a) = \int_0^x t^{a-1} (1-t)^{a-1} dt = \left(\frac{3r}{2}\right)^a \int_0^1 u^{a-1} \left(1 - \frac{ru}{2}\right)^{a-1} (1+ru)^{-2a} du.$$

For $t \in [0, 1]$ we have $(1 - \frac{t}{2})(1+t) \geq 1$, hence $1 - \frac{t}{2} \geq (1+t)^{-1}$. Applying this with $t = ru \in [0, 1]$ yields $(1 - \frac{ru}{2})^{a-1} \leq (1+ru)^{1-a}$ for any $a \leq 1$, and therefore the integrand is bounded by

$$u^{a-1} (1+ru)^{1-a} (1+ru)^{-2a} = u^{a-1} (1+ru)^{1-3a} \leq u^{a-1},$$

since $1 - 3a \leq 0$ for $a \in [1/2, 1]$. Thus $\text{Beta}(x; a, a) \leq (\frac{3r}{2})^a \int_0^1 u^{a-1} du = (\frac{3r}{2})^a \cdot \frac{1}{a}$. \square

Lemma 3.10. For $p \in [1, 2]$, the function $\varphi_p(\tilde{r}) := \frac{1-e^{-\tilde{r}}}{\tilde{r}^{p/2}}$ attains its maximum at some $\tilde{r}_* \in [0, \frac{2(2-p)}{p}]$.

Proof. For $p = 2$, $\varphi_2(\tilde{r}) = (1 - e^{-\tilde{r}})/\tilde{r}$ is maximized at $\tilde{r} = 0$ (by the limit value 1). Assume $p < 2$. The critical point $\tilde{r}_* > 0$ satisfies

$$\frac{d}{d\tilde{r}} \log \varphi_p(\tilde{r}) = \frac{e^{-\tilde{r}}}{1 - e^{-\tilde{r}}} - \frac{p}{2} \frac{1}{\tilde{r}} = 0 \iff e^{\tilde{r}} = 1 + \frac{2}{p} \tilde{r}.$$

Using $e^{\tilde{r}} \geq 1 + \tilde{r} + \frac{\tilde{r}^2}{2}$ we obtain $1 + \frac{2}{p} \tilde{r} \geq 1 + \tilde{r} + \frac{\tilde{r}^2}{2}$. Hence $\tilde{r} \leq \frac{2(2-p)}{p}$. \square

3.3 Proof of quantum Eldan–Gross inequality

Proof of Corollary 1.3. Let $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ satisfy $\|A\|_\infty \leq 1$ and let $1 \leq p < 2$. Apply Theorem 1.1 with $\alpha = 1$ and $q = 1$. Since $\|A\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $p \leq 2$, we have $\|A\|_\infty^{2-p} \leq 1$ and may drop this factor. Also, keeping only the second term inside $\mathcal{R}(A, 1)$ (and inserting \ln^+ to handle the case when the logarithm is negative), we obtain

$$\|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p \geq C_2^{1.1}(p) \text{Var}(A) \left[\ln^+ \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\sum_j \text{Inf}_j^1[A]^2} \right) \right]^{\frac{p}{2}}.$$

By Corollary 1.7, for $1 \leq p < 2$ and $\|A\|_\infty \leq 1$,

$$\|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p \geq C_1^{1.7}(p) \text{Var}(A) \left[\ln \left(\frac{e}{\text{Var}(A)} \right) \right]^{p/2}. \quad (42)$$

Note that $\text{Var}(A) \leq \tau(A^*A) \leq \|A\|_\infty^2 \leq 1$. Then $\ln(\frac{e}{\text{Var}(A)}) \geq 1$. Set $a := \ln^+ \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\sum_j \text{Inf}_j^1[A]^2} \right) \geq 0$, $b := \ln \left(\frac{e}{\text{Var}(A)} \right) \geq 0$ and $r := \frac{p}{2} \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. From these two inequalities we get

$$\|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p \geq \text{Var}(A) \max\{C_2^{1.1}(p)a^r, C_1^{1.7}(p)b^r\} \geq \text{Var}(A) \min\{C_2^{1.1}(p), C_1^{1.7}(p)\} \max\{a^r, b^r\}.$$

Using $\max\{a^r, b^r\} \geq ((a+b)/2)^r = 2^{-r}(a+b)^r$ yields

$$\|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p \geq 2^{-\frac{p}{2}} \min\{C_2^{1.1}(p), C_1^{1.7}(p)\} \text{Var}(A) (a+b)^r. \quad (43)$$

It remains to lower bound $a+b$ by $1 + \ln^+ \left(\frac{1}{\text{Inf}^1[A]} \right)$ with $\text{Inf}^1[A] := \sum_{j=1}^n \text{Inf}_j^1[A]^2$. We claim that for all $\text{Var}(A) \in (0, 1]$ and all $\text{Inf}^1[A] > 0$,

$$\ln^+ \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\text{Inf}^1[A]} \right) + \ln \left(\frac{e}{\text{Var}(A)} \right) \geq 1 + \ln^+ \left(\frac{1}{\text{Inf}^1[A]} \right). \quad (44)$$

Indeed:

- If $\text{Var}(A) \geq \text{Inf}^1[A]$, then $\ln^+(\text{Var}(A)/\text{Inf}^1[A]) = \ln(\text{Var}(A)/\text{Inf}^1[A])$ and the left-hand side equals

$$\ln \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\text{Inf}^1[A]} \right) + \ln \left(\frac{e}{\text{Var}(A)} \right) = \ln \left(\frac{e}{\text{Inf}^1[A]} \right) = 1 + \ln \left(\frac{1}{\text{Inf}^1[A]} \right) \geq 1 + \ln^+ \left(\frac{1}{\text{Inf}^1[A]} \right).$$

- If $\text{Var}(A) < \text{Inf}^1[A]$, then $\ln^+(\text{Var}(A)/\text{Inf}^1[A]) = 0$ and the left-hand side equals $\ln(\frac{e}{\text{Var}(A)}) = 1 + \ln(\frac{1}{\text{Var}(A)})$. Since $\text{Var}(A) < \text{Inf}^1[A]$ implies $\frac{1}{\text{Var}(A)} > \frac{1}{\text{Inf}^1[A]}$, we have $\ln(\frac{1}{\text{Var}(A)}) \geq \ln^+ \left(\frac{1}{\text{Inf}^1[A]} \right)$

Since $C_1^{1.7}(p) \rightarrow 0$ as $p \rightarrow 2$, we also have $C^{1.3}(p) \rightarrow 0$. The same proof for unitary Hermitian case. \square

3.4 Proof of quantum Cordero-Erausquin–Eskenazis inequality

Proof of Corollary 1.4. Assume that $\text{Var}(A) > 0$ (otherwise (13) is trivial). Applying Theorem 1.1 yields

$$\frac{\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_p^p}{\text{Var}(A)} \geq \left(\frac{1+2\alpha}{3}\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \cdot \max \left\{ C_1^{1.1}(p), C_2^{1.1}(p) \cdot \left[\frac{q}{2-q} \ln \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\|A - \tau(A)\|_q^2} \right) \right]^{\frac{p}{2}} \right\}.$$

From the second term we obtain

$$\frac{3}{1+2\alpha} C_2^{1.1}(p)^{-\frac{2}{p}} \left(\frac{\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_p^p}{\text{Var}(A)} \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \geq \frac{q}{2-q} \ln \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\|A - \tau(A)\|_q^2} \right).$$

Using quantum L^q -Poincaré inequality (Lemma 3.7) and gradient comparison with $\beta = 1$ (Corollary 3.3), we have

$$\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_q^2 \geq \frac{1+2\alpha}{3} \|\nabla^1 A\|_q^2 \geq \frac{1+2\alpha}{3} \left(\frac{3}{2\pi} \right)^2 \|A - \tau(A)\|_q^2,$$

and hence

$$\ln \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\|A - \tau(A)\|_q^2} \right) \geq \ln \left(\frac{3(1+2\alpha)}{(2\pi)^2} \right) + \ln^+ \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_q^2} \right).$$

Since $\ln^+ x \leq e^{-1}x$ for $x > 0$, we have

$$e^{-1} \left(\frac{\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_p^p}{\text{Var}(A)} \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \geq \ln^+ \left[\left(\frac{\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_p^p}{\text{Var}(A)} \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \right] = \frac{2}{p} \ln^+ \left(\frac{\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_p^p}{\text{Var}(A)} \right).$$

Note that

$$\ln^+ \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_q^2} \right) + \ln^+ \left(\frac{\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_p^p}{\text{Var}(A)} \right) = \ln^+ \left(\frac{\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_p^p}{\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_q^2} \right),$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{3}{1+2\alpha} C_2^{1.1}(p)^{-\frac{2}{p}} + \frac{p}{2e} \frac{q}{2-q} \right) \left(\frac{\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_p^p}{\text{Var}(A)} \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \\ \geq \frac{q}{2-q} \left(\ln \left(\frac{3(1+2\alpha)}{(2\pi)^2} \right) + \ln^+ \left(\frac{\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_p^p}{\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_q^2} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that we also have

$$\frac{3}{1+2\alpha} C_1^{1.1}(p)^{-\frac{2}{p}} \left(1 - \frac{q}{2-q} \ln \left(\frac{3(1+2\alpha)}{(2\pi)^2} \right) \right) \left(\frac{\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_p^p}{\text{Var}(A)} \right)^{\frac{2}{p}} \geq 1 - \frac{q}{2-q} \ln \left(\frac{3(1+2\alpha)}{(2\pi)^2} \right).$$

Combining the estimates together, we obtain

$$\frac{\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_p^p}{\text{Var}(A)} \geq C_\alpha^{1.4}(p, q) \left[1 + \frac{q}{2-q} \ln^+ \left(\frac{\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_p^p}{\|\nabla^\alpha A\|_q^2} \right) \right]^{\frac{p}{2}},$$

with

$$C_\alpha^{1.4}(p, q) = \left[\frac{3}{1+2\alpha} C_2^{1.1}(p)^{-\frac{2}{p}} + e^{-1} \frac{p}{2} \frac{q}{2-q} + \frac{3}{1+2\alpha} C_1^{1.1}(p)^{-\frac{2}{p}} \left(1 - \frac{q}{2-q} \ln \left(\frac{3(1+2\alpha)}{(2\pi)^2} \right) \right) \right]^{-\frac{p}{2}},$$

which completes the proof. \square

3.5 Proofs of quantum isoperimetric-type inequalities

Proof of Corollary 1.7. Let $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ satisfy $\|A\|_\infty \leq 1$ and let $1 \leq p < 2$. Since $\|A\|_\infty \leq 1$, we have $\text{Var}(A) \leq \tau(A^*A) \leq \|A\|_\infty^2 \leq 1$, hence $\ln \frac{e}{\text{Var}(A)} \geq 1$.

Apply Theorem 1.1 with $\alpha = 1$ and $q = p$. (Here $p < 2$ ensures $q = p < 2$ so $\mathcal{R}(A, p)$ is well-defined.) Because $\|A\|_\infty^{2-p} \leq 1$, the factor $\|A\|_\infty^{2-p}$ may be dropped, giving

$$\frac{\|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p}{\text{Var}(A)} \geq \max \left\{ C_1^{1.1}(p), C_2^{1.1}(p) \left[\frac{p}{2-p} \ln \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\|A - \tau(A)\|_p^2} \right) \right]^{\frac{p}{2}} \right\}. \quad (45)$$

Note that $\ln x \leq e^{-1}x$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(C_2^{1.1}(p)^{-\frac{2}{p}} + \frac{p}{e(2-p)} \right) \left[\frac{\|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p}{\text{Var}(A)} \right]^{\frac{2}{p}} &\geq \frac{p}{2-p} \left[\ln \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\|A - \tau(A)\|_p^2} \right) + \frac{2}{p} \ln \left(\frac{\|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p}{\text{Var}(A)} \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{2p}{2-p} \ln \left(\frac{\|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p}{\|A - \tau(A)\|_p} \right) + \ln \left(\frac{1}{\text{Var}(A)} \right) \geq \frac{2p}{2-p} \ln \left(\frac{3}{2\pi} \right) + \ln \left(\frac{1}{\text{Var}(A)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from the quantum p -Poincaré inequality (Lemma 3.7). Let $B(p) := \frac{2p}{2-p} \ln(\frac{3}{2\pi})$ (note $B(p) < 0$). Adding $1 - B(p)$ to both sides gives

$$\left(C_2^{1.1}(p)^{-\frac{2}{p}} + \frac{p}{e(2-p)} \right) \left[\frac{\|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p}{\text{Var}(A)} \right]^{\frac{2}{p}} + (1 - B(p)) \geq \ln \left(\frac{e}{\text{Var}(A)} \right).$$

On the other hand, from (45) we also have

$$1 - B(p) \leq \frac{1 - B(p)}{C_1^{1.1}(p)^{2/p}} \cdot \left[\frac{\|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p}{\text{Var}(A)} \right]^{\frac{2}{p}}$$

Therefore,

$$K(p) \left[\frac{\|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p}{\text{Var}(A)} \right]^{\frac{2}{p}} \geq \ln \left(\frac{e}{\text{Var}(A)} \right), \quad K(p) := C_2^{1.1}(p)^{-\frac{2}{p}} + \frac{p}{e(2-p)} + \frac{1 - B(p)}{C_1^{1.1}(p)^{2/p}},$$

Rearranging gives (15) with $C_1^{1.7}(p) = K(p)^{-\frac{p}{2}}$. Finally, $C_1^{1.7}(p) \rightarrow 0$ as $p \rightarrow 2$ since $K(p) \geq \frac{p}{e(2-p)} \rightarrow \infty$.

Assume now that $A^* = A$ and $A^2 = \mathbf{1}$. Applying Theorem 1.1 with $\alpha = 1$ and $q = 1$, we obtain

$$\frac{\|\nabla^1 A\|_p^p}{\text{Var}(A)} \geq \max \left\{ C_1^{1.1}(p), C_2^{1.1}(p) \left[\ln \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\|A - \tau(A)\|_1^2} \right) \right]^{\frac{p}{2}} \right\} \geq C_2^{1.7}(p) \left[1 + \ln \left(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\|A - \tau(A)\|_1^2} \right) \right]^{\frac{p}{2}}.$$

Claim 3.11. $\text{Var}(A) = \|A - \tau(A)\|_1$ for unitary Hermitian A .

Indeed, A has eigenvalues ± 1 , thus it can be decomposed as $A = \Pi_+ - \Pi_-$, where Π_\pm is the projection onto the ± 1 -eigenspace. Let $u := \tau(\Pi_+)$, so $\tau(\Pi_-) = 1 - u$ since $\Pi_+ + \Pi_- = \mathbf{1}$. Now we have

$$\tau(A) = \tau(\Pi_+) - \tau(\Pi_-) = 2u - 1, \quad |A - \tau(A)| = (2 - 2u)\Pi_+ + 2u\Pi_-$$

and hence

$$\|A - \tau(A)\|_1 = (2 - 2u)\tau(\Pi_+) + 2u\tau(\Pi_-).$$

on the other hand,

$$\text{Var}(A) = \tau(A^2) - \tau(A)^2 = 1 - (2u - 1)^2 = 4u(1 - u),$$

proving the claim. With this identity, $\ln(\frac{\text{Var}(A)}{\|A - \tau(A)\|_1^2}) = \ln(\frac{1}{\text{Var}(A)})$. Let $u := \ln(\frac{1}{\text{Var}(A)}) \geq 0$, so $\ln(\frac{e}{\text{Var}(A)}) = 1 + u$. Using the elementary bound $1 + u \leq 2 \max\{1, u\}$, we get

$$(1 + u)^{\frac{p}{2}} \leq 2^{\frac{p}{2}} \max\{1, u^{\frac{p}{2}}\}.$$

Therefore,

$$\max\{C_1^{1,1}(p), C_2^{1,1}(p)u^{\frac{p}{2}}\} \geq 2^{-\frac{p}{2}} \min\{C_1^{1,1}(p), C_2^{1,1}(p)\}(1 + u)^{\frac{p}{2}}.$$

Combining these gives (15) with $C_2^{1,7}(p)$ as desired. \square

4 Proofs of local Talagrand inequalities for high-order influences

Our argument follows the same semigroup method as the classical proof of Cordero-Erausquin–Ledoux for Talagrand-type L^1 - L^2 inequalities: a *short-time decay* of an appropriate variance functional is converted into a *lower bound* on an L^p -gradient, and the decay rate is then produced by hypercontractivity plus interpolation. The novelty here is that we work with *high-order* derivatives d_J and the associated *high-order local variance* V_J (see (24)), which are intrinsic to the quantum cube and were systematically introduced (in the geometric case $p = 1$) in [2]. Compared to the $k = 1$ case, the key new features are: (i) the decay of $d_J P_t$ at rate $|J|$, (ii) the operator norm growth $\|d_J\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \lesssim 2^{|J|}$, and (iii) the appearance of the exponent $\lambda = (p - 1) + |J|(2 - p)$, which we keep *explicit* (rather than crudely lower bounding by 1).

Lemma 4.1. *Let $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$, $t \geq 0$, $J \subseteq [n]$ and $p \in [1, \infty]$. Then $\|d_J P_t A\|_p \leq e^{-t|J|} \|d_J A\|_p$.*

Proof. Write $P_t = \prod_{i=1}^n P_t^i$ where $P_t^i = \tau_i + e^{-t} d_i$ acts on the i -th qubit. Fix $J \subseteq [n]$ and factor $P_t = P_t^J P_t^{-J}$ with $P_t^J := \prod_{i \in J} P_t^i$ and $P_t^{-J} := \prod_{i \notin J} P_t^i$. Since for each $i \in J$ we have $d_i P_t^i = e^{-t} d_i$ and d_i commutes with P_t^j for $j \neq i$,

$$d_J P_t = \left(\prod_{i \in J} d_i \right) P_t^J P_t^{-J} = \left(\prod_{i \in J} (d_i P_t^i) \right) P_t^{-J} = e^{-t|J|} d_J P_t^{-J}.$$

Hence $d_J P_t A = e^{-t|J|} P_t^{-J} (d_J A)$. The result then follows from the contraction property of P_t^{-J} under p -norms. \square

Fact 4.2. *Let $A \in M_2(\mathbb{C})^{\otimes n}$ and let $J \subseteq [n]$ with $k := |J| \geq 1$. Then for every $s \geq 0$,*

$$\|d_J P_s A\|_2^2 = \sum_{r: \text{supp}(r) \supseteq J} e^{-2|\text{supp}(r)|s} |\widehat{A}_r|^2 \leq e^{-2ks} \sum_{r: \text{supp}(r) \supseteq J} |\widehat{A}_r|^2 = e^{-2ks} \text{Inf}_J[A]. \quad (46)$$

Proof. It is directly deduced from the Fourier–Pauli expansion of A . \square

Fact 4.3. *For any $J \subseteq [n]$ we have $\|d_J\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \leq 2^{|J|}$.*

Proof. Notice that $\|\tau_j(A)\|_{\infty} \leq \|A\|_{\infty}$, hence

$$\|d_j A\|_{\infty} = \|A - \tau_j(A)\|_{\infty} \leq \|A\|_{\infty} + \|\tau_j(A)\|_{\infty} \leq 2\|A\|_{\infty},$$

so by submultiplicativity we have done. \square

4.1 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $J \subseteq [n]$ with $k := |J| \geq 1$. If $V_J(A) = 0$, then $\text{Inf}_J[P_t A] = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, hence $d_J A = 0$ and the inequality is trivial. Assume $V_J(A) > 0$. We first claim that, if there exists $\mathcal{R}, \epsilon > 0$ such that

$$V_J(P_t A) \leq e^{-2\mathcal{R}t} V_J(A), \quad t \in [0, \epsilon],$$

then we have

$$\|A\|_\infty^{2-p} \|d_J A\|_p^p \geq 2^{(p-2)k} V_J(A) \mathcal{R}.$$

Indeed, for any $t \in (0, \epsilon]$,

$$(1 - e^{-2\mathcal{R}t}) V_J(A) \leq V_J(A) - V_J(P_t A) = \int_0^t 2 \text{Inf}_J[P_s A] ds.$$

By the noncommutative Hölder inequality (Fact 2.7), we have

$$\text{Inf}_J[P_s A] = \tau(|d_J P_s A|^2) = |\tau((d_J A)^*(d_J P_{2s} A))| \leq \|d_J A\|_p \|d_J P_{2s} A\|_{p'},$$

where $p' = \frac{p}{p-1} \in [2, \infty]$ is the Hölder conjugate of p . Then by the logarithmic convexity of the normalized Schatten-1/r norm in r (Fact 2.8), we have

$$\|d_J P_{2s} A\|_{p'} \leq \|d_J P_{2s} A\|_2^{\frac{2}{p'}} \|d_J P_{2s} A\|_\infty^{\frac{p'-2}{p'}} = \|d_J P_{2s} A\|_2^{2\frac{p-1}{p}} \|d_J P_{2s} A\|_\infty^{\frac{2-p}{p}}.$$

Next, using improved L^2 -decay for high-order derivatives (Fact 4.2), we have

$$\|d_J P_{2s} A\|_2^2 = \|P_s(d_J P_s A)\|_2^2 \leq e^{-2ks} \|d_J P_s A\|_2^2 = e^{-2ks} \text{Inf}_J[P_s A].$$

Moreover, applying the estimate in Lemma 4.1 and the fact that $\|d_J\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \leq 2^k$, we have

$$\|d_J P_{2s} A\|_\infty \leq e^{-2ks} \|d_J A\|_\infty \leq 2^k e^{-2ks} \|A\|_\infty.$$

Combining these bounds yields,

$$\text{Inf}_J[P_s A] \leq \|d_J A\|_p \left(e^{-2ks} \text{Inf}_J[P_s A] \right)^{\frac{p-1}{p}} \left(2^k e^{-2ks} \|A\|_\infty \right)^{\frac{2-p}{p}}.$$

If $\text{Inf}_J[P_s A] = 0$ the desired bound is trivial; otherwise, taking power p and canceling $\text{Inf}_J(P_s A)^{p-1}$ on both sides, we obtain

$$\text{Inf}_J[P_s A] \leq 2^{k(2-p)} e^{-2ks[(p-1)+(2-p)]} \|A\|_\infty^{2-p} \|d_J A\|_p^p.$$

Integrating the above over $s \in [0, t]$ gives, for any $t \in (0, \epsilon]$,

$$(1 - e^{-2\mathcal{R}t}) V_J(A) \leq 2^{k(2-p)} \|A\|_\infty^{2-p} \|d_J A\|_p^p \int_0^t 2e^{-2ks} ds = \frac{2^{k(2-p)}(1 - e^{-2kt})}{k} \|A\|_\infty^{2-p} \|d_J A\|_p^p.$$

Then optimizing over $t \in (0, \epsilon]$ gives

$$\|A\|_\infty^{2-p} \|d_J A\|_p^p \geq 2^{-k(2-p)} V_J(A) \cdot k \cdot \sup_{t \in (0, \epsilon]} \frac{1 - e^{-2\mathcal{R}t}}{1 - e^{-2kt}} = 2^{k(p-2)} V_J(A) \cdot \mathcal{R}.$$

Next, we show by hypercontractivity that for every $\epsilon > 0$ and $q \in [1, 2)$, we can take

$$\mathcal{R} = \max \left\{ k, \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \min \left\{ \frac{\tanh(\epsilon)}{2/q - 1}, 1 \right\} \ln \left(\frac{k \cdot V_J(A)}{\|d_J A\|_q^2} \right) \right\}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{R} \geq k$ is a direct consequence of the restricted Poincaré inequality (27). Write $\vartheta = \min \left\{ \frac{\tanh(\epsilon)}{2/q-1}, 1 \right\}$. It suffices to prove the partial variance decay inequality at $t = \epsilon$:

$$V_J(P_\epsilon A) \leq V_J(A)^{1-\vartheta} \left(\frac{\|d_J A\|_q^2}{k} \right)^\vartheta. \quad (47)$$

The result then follows from the logarithmic convexity of $t \mapsto V_J(P_t A)$. Indeed, using $d_J P_t = P_t d_J$,

$$V_J(P_\epsilon A) = \int_0^\infty 2 \|d_J P_{\epsilon+t} A\|_2^2 dt = \int_0^\infty 2 \|P_\epsilon(d_J P_t A)\|_2^2 dt.$$

Applying the hypercontractivity for P_ϵ and interpolation between L^2 and L^q :

$$\|P_\epsilon(d_J P_t A)\|_2 \leq \|d_J P_t A\|_{1+e^{-2\epsilon}} \leq \|d_J P_t A\|_2^{1-\vartheta} \|d_J P_t A\|_q^\vartheta.$$

Applying Hölder inequality in t yields

$$V_J(P_\epsilon A) \leq \left(\int_0^\infty 2 \|d_J P_t A\|_2^2 dt \right)^{1-\vartheta} \left(\int_0^\infty 2 \|d_J P_t A\|_q^2 dt \right)^\vartheta.$$

Note that the first integral recovers $V_J(A)$:

$$\int_0^\infty 2 \|d_J P_t A\|_2^2 dt = \int_0^\infty 2 \text{Inf}_J(P_t A) dt = V_J(A).$$

Moreover, applying the estimate in Lemma 4.1, we can bound the second integral:

$$\int_0^\infty 2 \|d_J P_t A\|_q^2 dt \leq \|d_J A\|_q^2 \int_0^\infty 2 e^{-2kt} dt = \frac{1}{k} \|d_J A\|_q^2.$$

This proves (47).

Finally, we combine the estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \|A\|_\infty^{2-p} \|d_J A\|_p^p &\geq 2^{(p-2)k} V_J(A) \sup_{\epsilon > 0} \max \left\{ k, \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \min \left\{ \frac{\tanh(\epsilon)}{2/q-1}, 1 \right\} \ln \left(\frac{k V_J(A)}{\|d_J A\|_q^2} \right) \right\} \\ &= 2^{(p-2)k} V_J(A) \max \left\{ k, \frac{q}{2-q} \ln^+ \left(\frac{\sqrt{k} \cdot V_J(A)^{1/2}}{\|d_J A\|_q} \right) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

4.2 Proof of quantum Talagrand L^p - L^q inequality

Proof of Corollary 1.5. Fix $J \subseteq [n]$ with $|J| = k$. If $V_J(A) = 0$, then $\text{Inf}_J(P_t A) = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, hence $d_J A = 0$ and $\text{Inf}_J^p[A] = 0$; the desired inequality for this J is trivial. Assume henceforth that $V_J(A) > 0$. Since $\|A\|_\infty \leq 1$, Theorem 1.2 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\text{Inf}_J^p[A]}{V_J(A)} &\geq 2^{(p-2)k} \max \left\{ k, \frac{q}{2-q} \ln^+ \left(\frac{\sqrt{k} \cdot V_J(A)^{1/2}}{\text{Inf}_J^q[A]^{1/q}} \right) \right\} \\ &\geq 2^{(p-2)k-1} \left(k + \frac{q}{2-q} \ln^+ \left(\frac{\sqrt{k} \cdot V_J(A)^{1/2}}{\text{Inf}_J^q[A]^{1/q}} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using $\ln^+(xy) \leq \ln^+(x) + \ln^+(y)$ for $x, y > 0$ and $\ln^+ x \leq e^{-1}x$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(2^{1+k(2-p)} + \frac{1}{2e} \cdot \frac{q}{2-q} \right) \frac{\text{Inf}_J^p[A]}{V_J(A)} &\geq k + \frac{q}{2-q} \left(\ln^+ \frac{\sqrt{k} \cdot V_J(A)^{1/2}}{\text{Inf}_J^q[A]^{1/q}} + \frac{1}{2} \ln^+ \frac{\text{Inf}_J^p[A]}{V_J(A)} \right) \\ &\geq k + \frac{q}{2-q} \ln^+ \left(\frac{\sqrt{k} \cdot \text{Inf}_J^p[A]^{1/2}}{\text{Inf}_J^q[A]^{1/q}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Rounding up, we obtain

$$\frac{\text{Inf}_J^p[A]}{k + \frac{q}{2-q} \ln^+(\sqrt{k} \text{Inf}_J^p[A]^{1/2} / \text{Inf}_J^q[A]^{1/q})} \geq C_k^{1.5}(p, q) V_J(A).$$

Taking summation over all J with $|J| = k$ proves (14) with $C_k^{1.5}(p, q) := \left(2^{1+k(2-p)} + \frac{1}{2e} \frac{q}{2-q}\right)^{-1}$. \square

4.3 Proof of quantum partial isoperimetric inequality

Proof of Corollary 1.8. If $V_J(A) = 0$ the claim is trivial, so assume $V_J(A) > 0$. Applying Theorem 1.2 with $q = p$ and $\|A\|_\infty \leq 1$ to get

$$\frac{\text{Inf}_J^p[A]}{V_J(A)} \geq 2^{(p-2)k-1} \left(k + \frac{p}{2-p} \ln^+ \left(\frac{\sqrt{k} \cdot V_J(A)^{1/2}}{\text{Inf}_J^p[A]^{1/p}} \right) \right).$$

Note that $\ln^+ x \leq e^{-1}x$ and $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p} \in [-\frac{1}{2}, 0)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 2^{1+(2-p)k} \cdot \frac{\text{Inf}_J^p[A]}{V_J(A)} + \frac{1}{2-p} \cdot \frac{1}{e} \cdot \frac{\text{Inf}_J^p[A]}{k \cdot V_J(A)} \\ & \geq k + \frac{p}{2-p} \ln^+ \left(\frac{\sqrt{k} \cdot V_J(A)^{1/2}}{\text{Inf}_J^p[A]^{1/p}} \right) + \frac{p}{2-p} \cdot \frac{1}{p} \cdot \ln^+ \left(\frac{\text{Inf}_J^p[A]}{k \cdot V_J(A)} \right) \\ & = k + \frac{p}{2-p} \ln^+ \left(k^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} \cdot V_J(A)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}} \right) = k + \frac{1}{2} \left(\ln \frac{1}{k V_J(A)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently,

$$\text{Inf}_J^p[A] \geq C_k^{1.8}(p) V_J(A) \left[k + \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{1}{k V_J(A)} \right) \right], \quad C_k^{1.8}(p) := \left(2^{1+(2-p)k} + \frac{1}{ek(2-p)} \right)^{-1}.$$

Let J_* maximize $V_J(A)$ among all $|J| = k$. Then by Proposition 2.6 on has

$$V_{J_*}(A) = \max_{|J|=k} V_J(A) \geq \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{|J|=k} V_J(A) \geq \frac{1}{k \binom{n}{k}} W^{\geq k}[A].$$

Let $\phi(x) := x \ln \left(\frac{e^k}{\sqrt{kx}} \right)$ for $x \in (0, 1]$. A direct computation shows

$$\begin{aligned} \phi'(x) &= \ln \left(\frac{e^k}{\sqrt{kx}} \right) - \frac{1}{2} = k - \frac{1}{2} \ln k - \frac{1}{2} \ln x - \frac{1}{2} \geq k - \frac{1}{2} \ln k - \frac{1}{2} \\ &\geq k - \frac{1}{2}(k-1) - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{k}{2} > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we use $\ln x \leq 0$ as $x \in (0, 1]$ and $\ln k \leq k-1$ for $k \geq 1$. Hence ϕ is strictly increasing on $(0, 1]$. Since $\|A\|_\infty \leq 1$ implies $0 \leq V_J(A) \leq \|A\|_2^2 \leq \|A\|_\infty^2 \leq 1$, we have $V_{J_*}(A) \in (0, 1]$, and by monotonicity of ϕ ,

$$\max_{|J|=k} \text{Inf}_J^p[A] \geq C_k^{1.8}(p) \phi(V_{J_*}(A)) \geq C_k^{1.8}(p) \phi \left(\frac{W^{\geq k}[A]}{k \binom{n}{k}} \right) = \frac{C_k^{1.8}(p)}{2k \binom{n}{k}} \cdot W^{\geq k}[A] \ln \left(\frac{e^{2k} \binom{n}{k}}{W^{\geq k}[A]} \right).$$

This is exactly (17). \square

References

- [1] A. Biswas and P. Sarkar. Influence of a set of variables on a Boolean function. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 37(3):2148–2171, 2023.
- [2] D. P. Blecher, L. Gao, and B. Xu. Geometric influences on quantum Boolean cubes. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 289(11):Paper No. 111132, 47, 2025.
- [3] J. Bourgain, J. Kahn, G. Kalai, Y. Katznelson, and N. Linial. The influence of variables in product spaces. *Israel J. Math.*, 77(1-2):55–64, 1992.
- [4] D. Cordero-Erausquin and A. Eskenazis. Talagrand’s influence inequality revisited. *Anal. PDE*, 16(2):571–612, 2023.
- [5] D. Cordero-Erausquin and M. Ledoux. Hypercontractive measures, Talagrand’s inequality, and influences. In *Geometric aspects of functional analysis*, volume 2050 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 169–189. Springer, Heidelberg, 2012.
- [6] L. B. Efraim and F. Lust-Piquard. Poincaré type inequalities on the discrete cube and in the CAR algebra. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 141(3-4):569–602, 2008.
- [7] R. Eldan. Second-order bounds on correlations between increasing families. *Combinatorica*, 42(suppl. 1):1099–1118, 2022.
- [8] R. Eldan and R. Gross. Concentration on the Boolean hypercube via pathwise stochastic analysis. *Invent. Math.*, 230(3):935–994, 2022.
- [9] R. Eldan, G. Kindler, N. Lifshitz, and D. Minzer. Isoperimetric inequalities made simpler. *Discrete Anal.*, pages Paper No. 7, 23, 2025.
- [10] R. Eldan, D. Mikulincer, and P. Raghavendra. Noise stability on the Boolean hypercube via a renormalized Brownian motion. In *STOC’23—Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 661–671. ACM, New York, [2023] ©2023.
- [11] R. Eldan and O. Shamir. Log concavity and concentration of Lipschitz functions on the Boolean hypercube. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 282(8):Paper No. 109392, 22, 2022.
- [12] R. Eldan, A. Wigderson, and P. Wu. An optimal “it ain’t over till it’s over” theorem. In *STOC’23—Proceedings of the 55th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 853–866. ACM, New York, [2023] ©2023.
- [13] D. Falik and A. Samorodnitsky. Edge-isoperimetric inequalities and influences. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 16(5):693–712, 2007.
- [14] C. Garban and J. E. Steif. *Noise sensitivity of Boolean functions and percolation*, volume 5 of *Institute of Mathematical Statistics Textbooks*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2015.
- [15] P. Ivanisvili and Y. Stone. The KKL inequality and Rademacher type 2. *Discrete Anal.*, pages Paper No. 2, 14, 2024.
- [16] P. Ivanisvili, R. van Handel, and A. Volberg. Rademacher type and Enflo type coincide. *Ann. of Math.* (2), 192(2):665–678, 2020.
- [17] P. Ivanisvili and H. Zhang. On the Eldan–Gross inequality. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 290(4):Paper No. 111255, 2026.

- [18] Y. Jiao, W. Lin, S. Luo, and D. Zhou. Quantum KKL-type Inequalities Revisited. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.12399*, 2024.
- [19] Y. Jiao, S. Luo, and D. Zhou. Functional L_1 - L_p inequalities in the CAR algebra. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 288(2):Paper No. 110700, 49, 2025.
- [20] J. Kahn, G. Kalai, and N. Linial. The influence of variables on Boolean functions. In *29th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 68–80. IEEE Comput. Soc. Press, Washington, DC, [1988] ©1988.
- [21] N. Keller, E. Mossel, and A. Sen. Geometric influences. *Ann. Probab.*, 40(3):1135–1166, 2012.
- [22] N. Keller, E. Mossel, and A. Sen. Geometric influences II: correlation inequalities and noise sensitivity. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 50(4):1121–1139, 2014.
- [23] E. Kelman, S. Khot, G. Kindler, D. Minzer, and M. Safra. Theorems of KKL, Friedgut, and Talagrand via random restrictions and Log-Sobolev inequality. In *12th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference*, volume 185 of *LIPICS. Leibniz Int. Proc. Inform.*, pages Art. No. 26, 17. Schloss Dagstuhl. Leibniz-Zent. Inform., Wadern, 2021.
- [24] F. Koehler, N. Lifshitz, D. Minzer, and E. Mossel. Influences in mixing measures. In *STOC’24—Proceedings of the 56th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 527–536. ACM, New York, [2024] ©2024.
- [25] A. Montanaro and T. J. Osborne. Quantum Boolean functions. *Chic. J. Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, pages Article 1, 41, 2010.
- [26] R. O’Donnell. *Analysis of Boolean functions*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2014.
- [27] R. O’Donnell and K. Wimmer. KKL, Kruskal–Katona, and monotone nets. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 42(6):2375–2399, 2013.
- [28] T. Przybyłowski. KKL Theorem for the Influence of a Set of Variables. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 39(4):2328–2349, 2025.
- [29] R. Rossignol. Threshold for monotone symmetric properties through a logarithmic Sobolev inequality. *Ann. Probab.*, 34(5):1707–1725, 2006.
- [30] C. Rouzé, M. Wirth, and H. Zhang. Quantum Talagrand, KKL and Friedgut’s theorems and the learnability of quantum Boolean functions. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 405(4):Paper No. 95, 47, 2024.
- [31] E. Størmer. *Positive linear maps of operator algebras*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, Heidelberg, 2013.
- [32] M. Talagrand. On Russo’s approximate zero-one law. *Ann. Probab.*, 22(3):1576–1587, 1994.
- [33] K. Tanguy. Talagrand inequality at second order and application to Boolean analysis. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 33(2):692–714, 2020.

A An Improved Talagrand-type inequality via differential inequality

This appendix records a self-contained semigroup proof of an “improved” Talagrand–KKL-type bound on the discrete cube.

A.1 Fourier analysis on Boolean hypercube

Let $\{P_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be the *heat semigroup* on the discrete cube $\{-1, 1\}^n$ with respect to the uniform probability measure μ . Its generator L acts on the Walsh–Fourier characters $\{\chi_S(x)\}_{S \subseteq [n]}$ by $L\chi_S = -|S|\chi_S$.

For $i \in [n]$ we define the *discrete derivative*

$$D_i f(x) := \frac{f(x) - f(x^{(i)})}{2},$$

where $x^{(i)}$ is obtained from x by flipping the i -th coordinate. Then $D_i \chi_S = \chi_S$ if $i \in S$ and 0 otherwise.

We introduce the “local energy” at coordinate i by

$$V_i(f) := \int_0^\infty 2 \|D_i P_t f\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2 dt = \sum_{S \ni i} \frac{\hat{f}(S)^2}{|S|}. \quad (48)$$

The Fourier identity follows from the diagonal action of P_t on characters: $D_i P_t f = \sum_{S \ni i} e^{-t|S|} \hat{f}(S) \chi_S$ and $\int_0^\infty 2e^{-2t|S|} dt = \frac{1}{|S|}$. Summing (48) over i yields

$$\sum_{i=1}^n V_i(f) = \sum_{S \neq \emptyset} \hat{f}(S)^2 = \text{Var}(f), \quad (49)$$

so $\{V_i(f)\}$ is a “variance decomposition” compatible with the semigroup. It will be convenient to denote, for a fixed $g \in L^2(\mu)$,

$$u(t) := \|P_t g\|_{L^2}^2 = \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} e^{-2t|S|} \hat{g}(S)^2. \quad (50)$$

Differentiating in t gives

$$u'(t) = -2 \sum_S |S| e^{-2t|S|} \hat{g}(S)^2 \quad (51)$$

In particular, if $\mathbb{E}[g] = 0$ then $\hat{g}(\emptyset) = 0$, hence $|S| \geq 1$ on the support of \hat{g} and

$$-u'(t) = 2 \sum_S |S| e^{-2t|S|} \hat{g}(S)^2 \geq 2 \sum_S e^{-2t|S|} \hat{g}(S)^2 = 2u(t). \quad (52)$$

We will apply this with $g = D_i f$, in which case $u(0) = \|D_i f\|_{L^2}^2$ and $V_i(f) = \int_0^\infty 2u(t) dt$.

Lemma A.1 (L^q spectral gap for the Beckner–Bonami semigroup). *Let $f : \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $\mathbb{E}[f] = 0$. Then for every $q \in [1, \infty]$ and every $t \geq 0$,*

$$\|P_t f\|_{L^q} \leq e^{-c_q t} \|f\|_{L^q}, \quad (53)$$

where one may take

$$c_q := \begin{cases} 2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) & \text{if } 1 \leq q \leq 2, \\ \frac{2}{q} & \text{if } 2 \leq q \leq \infty. \end{cases}$$

Lemma A.2. *Let (Ω, μ) be a probability space and let $h : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be measurable with $h \not\equiv 0$. For any $q \in [1, 2)$ we have*

$$\text{Ent}(h^2) \geq \frac{2q}{2-q} \|h\|_{L^2}^2 \log_+ \left(\frac{\|h\|_{L^2}}{\|h\|_{L^q}} \right), \quad (54)$$

where $\text{Ent}(h^2) := \mathbb{E}[h^2 \log h^2] - \mathbb{E}[h^2] \log \mathbb{E}[h^2]$.

Proof. If $\|h\|_2 \leq \|h\|_q$, then the right-hand side of (54) is nonpositive (since the logarithm is ≤ 0 and we apply \log_+), while the left-hand side is always ≥ 0 . Thus (54) holds trivially in this case as well. It suffices to consider the case $\|h\|_{L^2} > \|h\|_{L^q}$.

Let $m_r := \mathbb{E}[|h|^r]$ for $r > 0$ and $\|h\|_r = m_r^{1/r}$. Define $\phi(r) := \log \|h\|_r = \frac{1}{r} \log m_r$. Note that $m'_r = \frac{d}{dr} \mathbb{E}[|h|^r] = \mathbb{E}[|h|^r \log |h|]$ and

$$\phi'(r) = -\frac{1}{r^2} \log m_r + \frac{1}{r} \cdot \frac{m'_r}{m_r} = -\frac{1}{r^2} \log m_r + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\mathbb{E}[|h|^r \log |h|]}{m_r}.$$

On the other hand, by the definition of entropy,

$$\text{Ent}(h^2) = \mathbb{E}[h^2 \log(h^2)] - \mathbb{E}[h^2] \log \mathbb{E}[h^2] = 2\mathbb{E}[h^2 \log |h|] - m_2 \log m_2. \quad (55)$$

Thus

$$\phi'(2) = -\frac{1}{4} \log m_2 + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\frac{1}{2}\text{Ent}(h^2) + \frac{1}{2}m_2 \log m_2}{m_2} = \frac{\text{Ent}(h^2)}{4\|h\|_2^2} \quad (56)$$

Therefore

$$\text{Ent}(h^2) = 4\|h\|_2^2 \phi'(2). \quad (57)$$

Next we use the following standard convexity:

Fact A.3. *Let (Ω, μ) be a probability space and $h : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function, not identically zero. Then for any $1 \leq r < \infty$ such that $\|h\|_r < \infty$, the map $r \mapsto \log \|h\|_r$ is convex as a function of $1/r$.*

Write $\psi(\theta) := \phi(1/\theta) = \log \|h\|_{1/\theta}$. Let $q \in [1, 2)$ be fixed. Then by convexity of ψ we have

$$\log \|h\|_q = \psi\left(\frac{1}{q}\right) \geq \psi\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) + \psi'\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{2}\right) = \log \|h\|_2 - 4\phi'(2) \cdot \frac{2-q}{2q}. \quad (58)$$

Hence

$$\phi'(2) \geq \frac{q}{2(2-q)} \left(\log \|h\|_2 - \log \|h\|_q \right) = \frac{q}{2(2-q)} \log \frac{\|h\|_2}{\|h\|_q}.$$

Using (57) we conclude that

$$\text{Ent}(h^2) \geq 4\|h\|_2^2 \cdot \frac{q}{2(2-q)} \log \frac{\|h\|_2}{\|h\|_q} = \frac{2q}{2-q} \|h\|_2^2 \log \frac{\|h\|_2}{\|h\|_q}. \quad (59)$$

This proves (54) in the case $\|h\|_2 > \|h\|_q$. □

Lemma A.4. *For all $t \geq 0$ we have*

$$-u'(t) \geq \frac{2q}{2-q} u(t) \log_+ \left(\frac{\sqrt{u(t)}}{\|g\|_{L^q}} \right). \quad (60)$$

Proof. Recall that the classical logarithmic Sobolev inequality: for any $f : \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\text{Ent}(f^2) \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \|D_i f\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (61)$$

Now we take $f := P_t g$ then combining (51):

$$\text{Ent}((P_t g)^2) \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \|D_i P_t g\|_{L^2}^2 = 2 \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} |S| e^{-2t|S|} \hat{g}(S)^2 = -u'(t).$$

On the other hand, applying Lemma A.2 to $h = P_t g$ gives

$$\text{Ent}((P_t g)^2) \geq \frac{2q}{2-q} \|P_t g\|_{L^2}^2 \log_+ \frac{\|P_t g\|_{L^2}}{\|P_t g\|_{L^q}}.$$

Since P_t is a contraction on $L^q(\mu)$, we have $\|P_t g\|_{L^q} \leq \|g\|_{L^q}$. Therefore

$$-u'(t) \geq \text{Ent}((P_t g)^2) \geq \frac{2q}{2-q} u(t) \log_+ \frac{\sqrt{u(t)}}{\|g\|_{L^q}}.$$

□

Combining Lemmas A.4 and (52) we obtain a stronger differential inequality.

Lemma A.5. *Assume that $\mathbb{E}[g] = 0$. Then for all $t \geq 0$,*

$$-u'(t) \geq u(t) \left(1 + \frac{q}{2-q} \log_+ \left(\frac{\sqrt{u(t)}}{\|g\|_{L^q}} \right) \right). \quad (62)$$

Lemma A.6. *Let $u : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be differentiable and satisfy*

$$-u'(t) \geq u(t) \left(1 + c \log_+ \frac{\sqrt{u(t)}}{b} \right), \quad (63)$$

for some constants $c > 0$, $b > 0$. Set $V := \int_0^\infty 2u(t)dt \in [0, \infty]$. Then we have

$$V \leq G(u(0)), \quad (64)$$

where

$$G(x) := \int_0^x \frac{2}{1 + c \log_+(\sqrt{s}/b)} ds.$$

Proof. From (63) we immediately have $-u'(t) \geq u(t) \geq 0$, so $u'(t) \leq 0$ for all t , that is, u is nonincreasing. As u is also nonnegative, the limit $\ell := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u(t)$ exists in $[0, \infty)$. By definition of $G(x)$, the integrand is nonnegative and locally integrable on $[0, \infty)$, so G is differentiable on $(0, \infty)$ with derivative

$$G'(x) = \frac{2}{1 + c \log_+(\sqrt{x}/b)}.$$

We also have $G(0) = 0$ and G is nondecreasing on $[0, \infty)$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} G(u(t)) &= G'(u(t)) \cdot u'(t) = \frac{2}{1 + c \log_+(\sqrt{u(t)}/b)} \cdot u'(t) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{1 + c \log_+(\sqrt{u(t)}/b)} \cdot \left[-u(t)(1 + c \log_+ \frac{\sqrt{u(t)}}{b}) \right] = -2u(t). \end{aligned}$$

Integrating the above over $[0, T]$ and letting $T \rightarrow \infty$ (using the monotone convergence theorem), we obtain

$$\int_0^\infty 2u(t)dt \leq G(u(0)) - \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} G(u(T)).$$

Since $u(T) \downarrow \ell$ and G is nondecreasing, the limit on the right exists and equals $G(\ell) \geq 0$. Hence

$$V = \int_0^\infty 2u(t)dt \leq G(u(0)) - G(\ell) \leq G(u(0)),$$

which is exactly (64). □

A.2 Proof of the main theorem

Lemma A.7. Fix $c \geq 1$ and $b > 0$, and define $G(x)$ as above. Then for all $x \geq 0$ we have

$$G(x) \leq C \cdot \frac{x}{1 + c \log_+(\sqrt{x}/b)}, \quad (65)$$

where one may take $C := 4 + 2(1 + e^2) \left(1 + \frac{c}{2}\right)$.

Proof. We consider two cases.

Case 1: $0 \leq x \leq b^2$. In this range, we have $\sqrt{s}/b \leq 1$ for all $s \in [0, x]$, hence $\log_+(\sqrt{s}/b) = 0$. Thus $G(x) = \int_0^x 2ds = 2x$. On the other hand the right-hand side of (65) equals Cx . As $C \geq 2$, (65) holds in this case.

Case 2: $x > b^2$. Set $L := \log \frac{x}{b^2} > 0$ and $\alpha := \frac{c}{2} \geq \frac{1}{2}$. We split the integral at b^2 :

$$G(x) = \int_0^{b^2} 2ds + \int_{b^2}^x \frac{2}{1 + c \log(\sqrt{s}/b)} ds = 2b^2 + \int_{b^2}^x \frac{2}{1 + \alpha \log(s/b^2)} ds.$$

Make the change of variables $s = b^2 e^t$, $t \in [0, L]$; then $ds = b^2 e^t dt$ and

$$\int_{b^2}^x \frac{2}{1 + \alpha \log(s/b^2)} ds = 2b^2 \int_0^L \frac{e^t}{1 + \alpha t} dt = 2b^2 \left(\int_0^2 \frac{e^t}{1 + \alpha t} dt + \int_2^L \frac{e^t}{1 + \alpha t} dt \right)$$

Now we define $g(t) := \frac{e^t}{1 + \alpha t}$ for $t \geq 0$. On $[0, 2]$ we use the crude bound $g(t) \leq e^t$ to get

$$\int_0^2 g(t) dt \leq \int_0^2 e^t dt = e^2 - 1 \leq e^2.$$

Note that a direct computation shows

$$\frac{g'(t)}{g(t)} = \frac{1 - \alpha + \alpha t}{1 + \alpha t} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

where we use $2(1 - \alpha + \alpha t) = 2 - 2\alpha + 2\alpha t \geq 1 + \alpha t$ when $t \geq 2$ and $\alpha \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Equivalently, the function $h(t) := e^{-t/2} g(t)$ is nondecreasing on $[2, \infty)$, and so for every $2 \leq t \leq L$,

$$g(t) \leq g(L) e^{(t-L)/2}.$$

On $[2, L]$ we use the estimate above:

$$\int_2^L g(t) dt \leq g(L) \int_2^L e^{(t-L)/2} dt \leq 2g(L).$$

Thus

$$G(x) \leq 2b^2 + 2b^2 \left(e^2 + 2 \frac{e^L}{1 + \alpha L} \right) = 2b^2(1 + e^2) + \frac{4x}{1 + \alpha L}.$$

Note that $x > b^2$ implies $y := x/b^2 \geq 1$. For $y \geq 1$ we have $\log y \leq y - 1$, hence

$$1 + \alpha \log y \leq 1 + \alpha(y - 1) = \alpha y + (1 - \alpha) \leq (1 + \alpha)y.$$

Therefore

$$\frac{x}{1 + \alpha L} = \frac{b^2 y}{1 + \alpha \log y} \geq \frac{b^2 y}{(1 + \alpha)y} = \frac{b^2}{1 + \alpha}.$$

Equivalently,

$$b^2 \leq (1 + \alpha) \frac{x}{1 + \alpha L}.$$

Finally we have

$$G(x) \leq 2(1 + e^2)(1 + \alpha) \frac{x}{1 + \alpha L} + \frac{4x}{1 + \alpha L} = \left(4 + 2(1 + e^2)(1 + \alpha)\right) \frac{x}{1 + \alpha L}.$$

□

Theorem A.8. Let $f : \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow [-1, 1]$, let $1 \leq p \leq 2$ and $1 \leq q < 2$, and set $c_q = \frac{q}{2-q}$, $C_q := 4 + 2(1 + e^2) \left(1 + \frac{q}{2(2-q)}\right)$. Then for each $i \in [n]$ we have

$$V_i(f) \leq C_q \cdot \frac{\|D_i f\|_{L^p}^p}{1 + c_q \cdot \log_+ \left(\|D_i f\|_{L^p}^{p/2} / \|D_i f\|_{L^q} \right)}. \quad (66)$$

Summing over i and using $\sum_{i=1}^n V_i(f) = \text{Var}(f)$, we obtain

$$\text{Var}(f) \leq C_q \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\|D_i f\|_{L^p}^p}{1 + c_q \log_+ \left(\|D_i f\|_{L^p}^{p/2} / \|D_i f\|_{L^q} \right)}. \quad (67)$$

Proof. We have already shown that for each $i \in [n]$, with $g = D_i f$ and $u(t) = \|P_t g\|_2^2$,

$$V_i(f) = \int_0^\infty 2u(t)dt \leq G(u(0)) = G(\|D_i f\|_2^2),$$

where

$$G(x) := \int_0^x \frac{2}{1 + c_q \log_+ \left(\sqrt{s} / \|D_i f\|_q \right)} ds$$

and $c_q = \frac{q}{2-q}$. Since we assume $f : \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow [-1, 1]$, for every $x \in \{-1, 1\}^n$, $|D_i f(x)| \leq \frac{|f(x)| + |f(x^{(i)})|}{2} \leq 1$. Hence for any $1 \leq p \leq 2$ and any real number y with $|y| \leq 1$ we have $|y|^2 \leq |y|^p$, and therefore pointwise

$$|D_i f(x)|^2 \leq |D_i f(x)|^p, \quad \forall x \in \{-1, 1\}^n.$$

On the other hand, by definition the integrand in G is nonnegative, so G is nondecreasing on $[0, \infty)$. Therefore $G(\|D_i f\|_2^2) \leq G(\|D_i f\|_p^p)$. Hence for each i we have $V_i(f) \leq G(\|D_i f\|_p^p)$. Applying Lemma A.7, we have done. \square