

ENERGY BOUNDS FOR WEIGHTED SPHERICAL CODES AND DESIGNS VIA LINEAR PROGRAMMING

S. V. BORODACHOV, P. G. BOYVALENKOV, P. D. DRAGNEV, D. P. HARDIN, E. B. SAFF,
AND M. M. STOYANOVA

ABSTRACT. Universal bounds for the potential energy of weighted spherical codes are obtained by linear programming. The universality is in the sense of Cohn-Kumar – every attaining code is optimal with respect to a large class of potential functions (absolutely monotone), in the sense of Levenshtein – there is a bound for every weighted code, and in the sense of parameters (nodes and weights) – they are independent of the potential function. We derive a necessary condition for optimality (in the linear programming framework) of our lower bounds which is also shown to be sufficient when the potential is strictly absolutely monotone. Bounds are also obtained for the weighted energy of weighted spherical designs. We explore our bounds for several previously studied weighted spherical codes.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathbb{S}^{n-1} be the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^n . A pair (C, W) consisting of an N -tuple $C = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ of distinct points on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} and corresponding weights $W = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N)$, where $w_i > 0$ corresponds to x_i and $w_1 + w_2 + \dots + w_N = 1$, is called a *weighted spherical code*. Let $s(C) := \max\{x_i \cdot x_j : i \neq j\}$ be the maximal inner product of pairs of distinct points of C (or, for short, the maximal inner product of C). We shall denote by $|X|$ the size of a tuple X .

For a given (extended real-valued) continuous function $h : [-1, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, finite on $[-1, 1)$, and a given weighted spherical code, we consider the *weighted h -energy* of (C, W)

$$E_h(C, W) := \sum_{i \neq j} w_i w_j h(x_i \cdot x_j),$$

which arises in the electrostatic problem of distributing $N = |W|$ positive charges (not necessarily equal) on the unit sphere. Let

$$\mathcal{E}^h(W) := \inf\{E_h(C, W) : C \in (\mathbb{S}^{n-1})^{|W|}\} \quad (1)$$

be the *minimum weighted h -energy* among all weighted codes (C, W) with fixed weight W .

Similarly, for fixed $s \in [-1, 1)$ we consider

$$\mathcal{U}^h(s, W) := \sup\{E_h(C, W) : C \in (\mathbb{S}^{n-1})^{|W|}, s(C) = s\}, \quad (2)$$

the *maximum weighted h -energy* among all weighted codes (C, W) with fixed maximal inner product $s \in [-1, 1)$ and fixed weight W .

Date: March 13, 2024.

Although the general linear programming theorems that will be presented in Sections 2 and 4 (Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 4.1, respectively), hold for general potentials h , we will be especially concerned with functions that are *absolutely monotone* (*strictly absolutely monotone*); that is, $h^{(i)}(t) \geq 0$, $i = 0, 1, \dots$ ($h^{(i)}(t) > 0$, $i = 0, 1, \dots$) for all $t \in [-1, 1)$ (all $t \in (-1, 1)$). Commonly occurring absolutely monotone potentials include

$$\begin{aligned} h(t) &= [2(1-t)]^{1-n/2}, \text{ Newton potential,} \\ h(t) &= [2(1-t)]^{-\alpha/2}, \alpha > 0, \text{ Riesz potential,} \\ h(t) &= e^{-\alpha(1-t)}, \text{ Gaussian potential,} \\ h(t) &= -\log[2(1-t)], \text{ Logarithmic potential.} \end{aligned}$$

As observed by Cohn and Kumar [14, p. 101], if an absolutely monotone function fails to be strictly absolutely monotone, then it is a polynomial.

As is often the case in the study of spherical codes, the Gegenbauer polynomials $P_i^{(n)}$ of respective degrees $i = 0, 1, \dots$, play a useful role. They are orthogonal with respect to the measure

$$d\mu_n(t) := \gamma_n(1-t^2)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} dt, \quad t \in [-1, 1],$$

where $\gamma_n := \Gamma(\frac{n}{2})/\sqrt{\pi}\Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2})$ is a normalizing constant that makes μ_n a probability measure. We normalize these polynomials by $P_i^{(n)}(1) = 1$. Note that $P_i^{(n)}(t)$ is exactly the Jacobi polynomial $P_i^{(\alpha, \beta)}(t)$ with parameters $\alpha = \beta = (n-3)/2$ and the corresponding normalization.

Given a weighted code (C, W) we consider its *weighted moments*

$$M_\ell(C, W) := \sum_{i,j=1}^{|W|} w_i w_j P_\ell^{(n)}(x_i \cdot x_j), \quad \ell \geq 1. \quad (3)$$

It follows from the positive definiteness of the Gegenbauer polynomials (see e.g. [31], [5, Chapter 5]) that $M_\ell(C, W) \geq 0$ for every positive integer ℓ . The case of equality for some ℓ is especially interesting.

Definition 1.1. A weighted spherical code (C, W) is called a *weighted spherical design of strength τ* (or a *weighted spherical τ -design*) if its first τ weighted moments are zero; i.e.,

$$M_\ell(C, W) = 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq \ell \leq \tau.$$

In the equi-weighted case $w_1 = \dots = w_N = 1/N$ one obtains the classical spherical designs introduced in the seminal paper of Delsarte, Goethals, and Seidel [18] from 1977. The weighted case can be traced back to the 1960's and 70's when cubature formulas (or numerical integration schemes with some degree of precision) for approximate calculation of multiple integrals on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} were investigated [32, 34, 33, 30, 22]. The related weighted designs in \mathbb{R}^n and Euclidean designs on several concentric spheres were first considered in [29] (see also the comprehensive survey [1]).

Utilizing linear programming, we shall obtain bounds for the quantities $\mathcal{E}^h(W)$ given by (1) and $\mathcal{U}^h(s, W)$ given by (2). Our bounds are valid for all *absolutely monotone potentials* h and

are universal in the sense of Levenshtein (there is a bound for *every* weighted code) and in the sense of defining parameters (nodes and weights) that are *independent* of the potential function. Also, assuming the existence of a code that attains our bound for some absolutely monotone h , that code will attain our bound for *all absolutely monotone* h . That is, our bounds are universal in the sense of Cohn-Kumar. We shall also obtain bounds in the special cases when the codes are weighted spherical designs.

The universal lower bounds (ULB) on $\mathcal{E}^h(W)$ and universal upper bounds (UUB) on $\mathcal{U}^h(s, W)$ are derived as certain solutions of linear programs that arise naturally as generalizations of the equi-weighted frameworks from [9] for the ULB and from [11] for the UUB (see also [10] for such bounds in polynomial metric spaces). We present examples of ULB and UUB for some special weighted codes that have previously attracted attention for their high degree of precision when used in cubature formulas; see Sobolev [32], Goethals and Seidel [22], Waldron [35], and Gossil [21, Theorem 3.2].

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we develop the general linear programming technique for obtaining lower bounds on the energy of weighted codes and formulate a linear program to obtain bounds that are in a sense optimal. Then we solve that program in a certain class of polynomials to derive our universal lower bound for the quantity $\mathcal{E}^h(W)$. In the remainder of the section we consider weighted spherical designs and present examples of our lower bounds in two cases where good weighted spherical designs can be easily constructed – a weighted pentakis dodecahedron (weighted union of an icosahedron with a dodecahedron), which is a weighted spherical 9-design, and a weighted union of a cube with a crosspolytope in n dimensions, which is a weighted spherical 5-design. In Section 3 we prove a necessary condition for optimality of our lower bounds, which is also sufficient for strictly absolutely monotone potentials with positive derivatives at -1 . Section 4 is devoted to the counterpart technique for obtaining upper bounds for the quantity $\mathcal{U}^h(s, W)$. We develop the corresponding linear programming framework and propose a construction of a solution which might be optimal. The same two examples are considered from the upper bounds case point of view. In Section 5 we derive ULB and UUB for weighted spherical designs. The design properties allow us to establish both bounds for broader classes of potentials and to improve the UUB.

2. UNIVERSAL LOWER BOUNDS FOR ENERGY OF WEIGHTED CODES

2.1. A general linear programming lower bound for weighted codes. Given a potential function h , we consider the set of polynomials

$$L_h^{(n)} := \left\{ f(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{\deg(f)} f_i P_i^{(n)}(t) : f(t) \leq h(t), t \in [-1, 1], f_i \geq 0, i \geq 1 \right\},$$

where $\{P_i^{(n)}\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ are the Gegenbauer polynomials as defined in the Introduction. The set $L_h^{(n)}$ will be the feasible domain for our linear programming lower bounds for $\mathcal{E}^h(W)$.

The following theorem is a useful folklore result of Delsarte-Yudin type [16, 17, 18, 36, 24].

Hereafter we denote the common size of C and W by N .

Theorem 2.1. *If $f(t) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\deg(f)} f_\ell P_\ell^{(n)}(t) \in L_h^{(n)}$, then for every (C, W) code on \mathbb{S}^{n-1}*

$$E_h(C, W) \geq E_f(C, W) \geq f_0 - f(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2. \quad (4)$$

Consequently,

$$\mathcal{E}^h(W) \geq \sup_{f \in L_h^{(n)}} \left(f_0 - f(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \right) =: \text{ULB}(W, h). \quad (5)$$

If equality is attained throughout (4) for some f and (C, W) with $C = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$, then $f(x_i \cdot x_j) = h(x_i \cdot x_j)$ for every $i \neq j$ and $f_\ell M_\ell(C, W) = 0$ for every $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, \deg(f)\}$.

Proof. The first inequality in (4) follows obviously from $f \leq h$ in $[-1, 1]$; i.e.,

$$E_h(C, W) = \sum_{i \neq j} w_i w_j h(x_i \cdot x_j) \geq \sum_{i \neq j} w_i w_j f(x_i \cdot x_j) = E_f(C, W).$$

For the second inequality we estimate $E_f(C, W)$ from below as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} E_f(C, W) &= \sum_{i,j} w_i w_j f(x_i \cdot x_j) - f(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{\deg(f)} f_\ell \sum_{i,j} w_i w_j P_\ell^{(n)}(x_i \cdot x_j) - f(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \\ &= f_0 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\deg(f)} f_\ell M_\ell(C, W) - f(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \\ &\geq f_0 - f(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2. \end{aligned}$$

Above we used that the coefficient of f_0 is $\sum_{i,j=1}^N w_i w_j = \left(\sum_{i=1}^N w_i \right)^2 = 1$, the inequalities $f_\ell \geq 0$ for $\ell \geq 1$, and $\sum_{i,j} w_i w_j P_\ell^{(n)}(x_i \cdot x_j) = M_\ell(C, W) \geq 0$ because of the positive definiteness of the Gegenbauer polynomials. The conditions for equality follow immediately from the above. \square

Remark 2.2. We note that equality will hold for the last two quantities of the multi-display formula above if and only if $f_\ell M_\ell(C, W) = 0$ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, \deg(f)$, which is true when the weighted code (C, W) is a spherical weighted design of high enough strength. We shall use this observation in Section 5 to broaden the class of potentials for which our universal bounds hold when applied to weighted spherical designs.

Of particular importance is the case when the supremum in (5) is taken over the class of polynomials $L_h^{(n)} \cap \mathcal{P}_m$, where \mathcal{P}_m denotes the class of polynomials of degree at most m . This yields the linear program

$$\begin{cases} \text{maximize} & f_0 - f(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \\ \text{subject to} & f \in L_h^{(n)} \cap \mathcal{P}_m. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

For particular parameters h , W , and m we shall obtain explicit solutions of this linear program. We shall denote the maximized objective function by $\text{ULB}_m(W, h)$. Note that

$$S_W := \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \geq \frac{1}{N} \quad (7)$$

with equality if and only if $w_1 = w_2 = \dots = w_N = 1/N$ (i.e., in the classical case of equi-weighted code). Then it follows that

$$f_0 - f(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \leq f_0 - \frac{f(1)}{N},$$

where the right-hand side coincides exactly with the quantity that appears in the linear programming bound for the equi-weighted codes. This means that the bounds from Theorem 2.1 will be always less than the bounds for the corresponding equi-weighted case. In any case, it is important to note that the quantity

$$N_W := \frac{1}{S_W} = 1 / \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2$$

has to play an important role since it is going to determine the parameters (nodes and weights) of the universal lower bound in the same way as the cardinality N does in [9]. Clearly, as the weights w_i get closer in value to one another, as measured by the *variance*

$$\text{var } W := (1/N)S_W - 1/N^2, \quad (8)$$

the quantity N_W approaches $|W| = N$ from below. The inequality (7), written as $N \geq N_W$, means that N_W is always less than or equal to the tuple size N with equality only for equal weights and serves to replace N in the framework from [9]. This discussion further justifies the bounds in this paper as natural generalizations of the ULB from [9] and UUB from [11]. Note that in the UUB setting of Section 4 one additional constant, denoted by N_1 , will appear, where $N_1 > N \geq N_W$.

We now introduce the necessary parameters for our lower bounds. Choose the integer m so that

$$D(n, m) < N_W \leq D(n, m + 1), \quad (9)$$

and write $m = 2k - 1 + \varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}$ shows the parity of m , and

$$D(n, m) := \binom{n+k-2+\varepsilon}{n-1} + \binom{n+k-2}{n-1}$$

is the Delsarte-Goethals-Seidel bound [18] for spherical m -designs. The numbers $D(n, m)$, $m = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, define a partition of the positive integers into consecutive intervals. It is not necessary to have N_W and N in the same interval $(D(n, m), D(n, m + 1)]$ but the examples below will suggest that better bounds are obtained for closer values of N_W and N .

2.2. Universal lower bound for weighted codes. Let the nodes and weights $(\alpha_i, \rho_i)_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon}$ be determined (as explained in the next paragraph) by the equation

$$L_m(n, s) = N_W, \quad m = 2k - 1 + \varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}, \quad (10)$$

where

$$L_m(n, s) := \binom{k+n-3+\varepsilon}{n-2} \left[\frac{2k+n-3+2\varepsilon}{n-1} - \frac{(1+s)^\varepsilon \left(P_{k-1+\varepsilon}^{(n)}(s) - P_{k+\varepsilon}^{(n)}(s) \right)}{(1-s) \left(\varepsilon P_k^{(n)}(s) + P_{k+\varepsilon}^{(n)}(s) \right)} \right]$$

is the Levenshtein bound for the maximal cardinality of a code on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} having maximal inner product s (obtained in 1979 [25]; see also [26, 27]). The Levenshtein bound $L_m(n, s)$ is valid (and optimal in a sense; see [26],[27, Theorem 5.39]) in the interval $s \in [t_{k-1+\varepsilon}^{1,1-\varepsilon}, t_k^{1,\varepsilon}]$, where $t_k^{a,b}$ is the largest zero of the Jacobi polynomial $P_k^{(a+(n-3)/2, b+(n-3)/2)}(t)$, $k \geq 1$, with $t_0^{1,1} := -1$.

The numbers $(\alpha_i)_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon}$ are the roots of (10) considered as an equation in the variable s . For a given s , the largest root $\alpha_{k-1+\varepsilon}$ equals s and $\alpha_0 = -1$ if and only if $\varepsilon = 1$ (this is equivalent to $m = 2k$). Then the weights $(\rho_i)_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon}$ are computed by substituting the Lagrange basis polynomials $\ell_i(t) = \prod_{j \neq i} (t - \alpha_j)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1+\varepsilon$ in the quadrature formula (11) below. Explicit formulas for $(\rho_i)_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon}$ in the case $\varepsilon = 0$ (this is for odd $m = 2k - 1$) can be found in [8, Appendix A4] (see also the expressions in the proof of Corollary 5.39 from [27]). We note also the identity $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i = 1 - 1/N_W$ which is obtained by setting $f(t) \equiv 1$ in (11).

It is crucial for our approach that the quadrature formula (cf. [27, Theorem 5.39])

$$f_0 = \frac{f(1)}{L_m(n, s)} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i f(\alpha_i) = \frac{f(1)}{N_W} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i f(\alpha_i) \quad (11)$$

holds true for every polynomial $f(t) = f_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{\deg(f)} f_i P_i^{(n)}(t)$ of degree at most $2k-1+\varepsilon$ (recall that N_W is less than but possibly close to N). The formula (11) is called a $1/N_W$ -quadrature rule in the framework from [9].

As in the equi-weighted case we will need two facts from the theory of orthogonal polynomials. Namely, it is well known that the Gegenbauer expansions of the polynomials $P_i^{(n)}(t)P_j^{(n)}(t)$ and $(t+1)P_i^{(n+2)}(t)P_j^{(n+2)}(t)$ have nonnegative coefficients for every i, j ; see [20]. In [27], these properties are called *Krein conditions* and *strengthened Krein conditions*, respectively (cf. [27, Sections 3 and 5]).

We are now in a position to solve the linear program (6).

Theorem 2.3. (*ULB for weighted codes*) Let W be such that N_W satisfies (9) and let h be absolutely monotone. Then

$$\mathcal{E}^h(W) \geq \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i h(\alpha_i), \quad (12)$$

where the parameters $(\alpha_i, \rho_i)_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon}$ are defined as above. This bound cannot be improved by any polynomial from $L_h^{(n)} \cap \mathcal{P}_m$; i.e., the maximized objective function $\text{ULB}_m(W, h)$ is equal to the right-hand side of (12).

Proof. Let f be the unique Hermite interpolant to h at the nodes $(\alpha_i)_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon}$ counted twice except for the case $\alpha_0 = -1$ (equivalent to $m = 2k$) which is counted once. Then $\deg(f) \leq m$, so (11) along with the interpolation conditions $f(\alpha_i) = h(\alpha_i)$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1+\varepsilon$, yields the equalities

$$f_0 - f(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i f(\alpha_i) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i h(\alpha_i) = \text{ULB}_m(W, h).$$

The error formula for the Hermite interpolation implies that for all $t \in [-1, 1]$

$$h(t) - f(t) = \frac{h^{(2k+\varepsilon)}(\xi)}{(2k+\varepsilon)!} (t - \alpha_0)^{2-\varepsilon} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1+\varepsilon} (t - \alpha_i)^2, \quad \xi \in (-1, 1).$$

As $h^{(2k+\varepsilon)} \geq 0$ on $[-1, 1]$, we conclude that $f(t) \leq h(t)$ for every $t \in [-1, 1]$.

It remains to prove that f is positive definite to complete the verification that $f \in L_h^{(n)}$.

We first consider the case $\varepsilon = 0$. Order the multiset of nodes as

$$(\alpha_0, \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_{k-1}) = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{2k-1}, t_{2k})$$

(i.e., $t_{2i+1} = t_{2i+2} = \alpha_i$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$). Then the Newton interpolation formula (see, for example, [4])

$$f(t) = h(t_1) + \sum_{r=1}^{2k-1} h[t_1, \dots, t_{r+1}] \prod_{j=1}^r (t - t_j)$$

implies that the polynomial f is a nonnegative linear combination of the constant 1 and the partial products

$$\prod_{j=1}^r (t - t_j), \quad r = 1, 2, \dots, 2k-1. \quad (13)$$

It follows from [14, Theorem 3.1] that all polynomials

$$(t - \alpha_0)(t - \alpha_1) \cdots (t - \alpha_i), \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, k-2,$$

expand in the system $\{P_i^{((n-1)/2, (n-3)/2)}(t)\}$ with nonnegative coefficients. Since every polynomial $P_i^{((n-1)/2, (n-3)/2)}(t)$ is positive definite (cf. [27, Eq. (5.119)]); this follows directly from the

Christoffel-Darboux formula which relates explicitly this polynomial to the Gegenbauer polynomials $P_j^{(n)}$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, i-1$, the Krein condition implies that all partial products (13) with $r \leq 2k-2$ are positive definite. The only remaining partial product (with $r = 2k-1$ in (13)) is exactly the Levenshtein polynomial $f_{2k-1}^{(n,s)}(t)$ which is positive definite as well (see, for example, [27, Theorem 5.42]). Therefore f is positive definite and (12) follows in this case.

For $\varepsilon = 1$ we need the strengthened Krein condition. Now the interpolation nodes are ordered as

$$(\alpha_0 = -1, \alpha_1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, \alpha_k) = (-1, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{2k-1}, t_{2k})$$

and our polynomial f is a nonnegative linear combination of 1 and the partial products

$$(t+1) \prod_{j=1}^r (t-t_j), \quad r = 1, 2, \dots, 2k-1. \quad (14)$$

Theorem 3.1 from [14] now implies that all polynomials

$$(t-\alpha_1)(t-\alpha_2) \cdots (t-\alpha_i), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1,$$

expand in the system $\{P_i^{(n+2)}(t)\}$ with nonnegative coefficients. Then all partial products from (14) with $r \leq 2k-2$ expand with nonnegative coefficients in $(t+1)P_i^{(n+2)}(t)P_j^{(n+2)}(t)$ and the strengthened Krein condition completes the argument. Finally, in the case $r = 2k-1$ we obtain exactly the Levenshtein polynomial $f_{2k}^{(n,s)}(t)$ which is positive definite and this is exactly what is needed to complete the proof that $f \in L_h^{(n)} \cap \mathcal{P}_m$. Thus, (12) follows in this case as well.

If $g(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{\deg(g)} g_i P_i^{(n)}(t)$ is a polynomial from $L_h^{(n)} \cap \mathcal{P}_m$ and f is defined as above, then (11) can be applied to see that the lower bound provided by g satisfies

$$g_0 - g(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i g(\alpha_i) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i h(\alpha_i) = f_0 - f(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 = \text{ULB}_m(W, h),$$

which completes the proof. \square

We next establish the monotonicity of $\text{ULB}_m(W, h)$ in N_W .

Theorem 2.4. *Let $V = (v_1, \dots, v_{\tilde{N}})$ and $W = (w_1, \dots, w_N)$ be two weight vectors with positive components such that $\sum_{i=1}^{|\tilde{V}|} v_i = \sum_{i=1}^{|\tilde{W}|} w_i = 1$, and suppose that $N_V < N_W$ (equivalently, $S_V > S_W$). Let \tilde{m} and m be the positive integers associated with V and W , respectively, via (9). Then $m \geq \tilde{m}$ and*

$$\text{ULB}_m(W, h) > \text{ULB}_{\tilde{m}}(V, h).$$

If $m = \tilde{m}$, then the nodes $(\alpha_i)_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon}$ for N_W are strictly greater than the corresponding nodes for N_V .

Proof. The inequality $N_V < N_W$ implies via (9) that $m \geq \tilde{m}$. If the equality holds, (10) and the monotonicity of the Levenshtein function $L(n, s)$ imply the monotonicity of the nodes α_i ; i.e., they are increasing with $s = \alpha_{k-1+\varepsilon}$ which is increasing with N_W (see [8]).

Let f and g be the (unique) polynomial solutions of (6) associated with W and V , respectively. Then, as $g \in L_h^{(n)} \cap \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{m}} \subseteq L_h^{(n)} \cap \mathcal{P}_m$, the optimality of f over $L_h^{(n)} \cap \mathcal{P}_m$ yields

$$\text{ULB}_m(W, h) = f_0 - \frac{f(1)}{N_W} \geq g_0 - \frac{g(1)}{N_W} > g_0 - \frac{g(1)}{N_V} = \text{ULB}_{\tilde{m}}(V, h).$$

Note that g has positive Gegenbauer coefficients and $g(1) = g_0 + \dots + g_{\tilde{m}} > 0$. \square

2.3. Low degrees bounds. We proceed with derivation of more explicit forms of the first degrees ULB. For degree one ULB, we have (see [27, Table 6.1] for the first five degrees Levenshtein bounds) $L_1(n, s) = (s - 1)/s = N_W$ (note that $s \in [-1, -1/n]$ is negative). This gives

$$\alpha_0 = -\frac{1}{N_W - 1}, \quad \rho_0 = -\frac{1}{\alpha_0 N_W} = \frac{N_W - 1}{N_W},$$

where $2 \leq N_W (\leq N) \leq n + 1$. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{E}^h(W) \geq \text{ULB}_1(W, h) = \rho_0 h(\alpha_0) = \frac{N_W - 1}{N_W} \cdot h\left(-\frac{1}{N_W - 1}\right), \quad 2 \leq N_W \leq n + 1.$$

The degree two ULB is computed via $L_2(n, s) = 2n(1 - s)/(1 - ns) = N_W$, where $s \in [-1/n, 0]$ (corresponding to the restrictions $n + 1 \leq N_W \leq 2n$), giving the parameters

$$\alpha_0 = -1, \quad \alpha_1 = -\frac{2n - N_W}{n(N_W - 2)},$$

$$\rho_0 = \frac{N_W - n - 1}{(n + 1)N_W - 4n}, \quad \rho_1 = \frac{n(N_W - 2)^2}{N_W((n + 1)N_W - 4n)}.$$

This leads to the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^h(W) &\geq \text{ULB}_2(W, h) = \rho_0 h(\alpha_0) + \rho_1 h(\alpha_1) \\ &= \frac{N_W(N_W - n - 1)h(-1) + n(N_W - 2)^2 h\left(-\frac{2n - N_W}{n(N_W - 2)}\right)}{N_W((n + 1)N_W - 4n)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $n + 1 \leq N_W \leq 2n$.

The degree three ULB is already too complicated to be explicitly stated here. However, for particular suitable potentials, like the Fejes Tóth potential (see the next paragraph), where the potential and the formulas for the weights $(\rho_i)_{i=0}^{k-1}$ via the nodes $(\alpha_i)_{i=0}^{k-1}$ (this is for $\varepsilon = 0$, i.e. $m = 2k - 1$) from [8, Appendix] are relatively simple and fit well each other, the calculations of $\text{ULB}_3(W, h)$ are still doable.

The potential $h(t) = -\sqrt{2(1 - t)}$ fits in the above scheme because $2 + h(t)$ is absolutely monotone. This potential corresponds to the Fejes Tóth problem [19] and it has been studied by many authors (see, for example, [3, 2] and references therein). The degrees 1-3 ULB for weighted codes and this particular potential (and their asymptotic consequences) can be extracted from [2] simply by replacing N by N_W and dividing by N_W^2 .

2.4. Examples. In contrast to difficulties for derivation of more explicit analytic expressions of $\text{ULB}_m(W, h)$ for $m \geq 3$, the numerical calculations of bounds for given n , h , and W can be easily programmed. In this subsection we present several examples, where the ULB and the actual weighted energy are computed.

In all computations here and below we used two independent programs, one in Maple and one in Mathematica. Both programs produced the same numbers with 50-digits precision. For the sake of short presentation, we truncate or round up (depending on whether the bounds are lower or upper, respectively) the real numbers giving the weighted energy ULB and UUB. The values of the remaining real parameters (N_W , nodes, weights) are rounded to the fourth digit.

Example 2.5. (Union of icosahedron and dodecahedron.) Let $C_{32} \subset \mathbb{S}^2$ consist of the 12 vertices of an icosahedron, each of weight $w_I = 20/(21 \cdot 32) = 5/168$, and the 20 vertices of a dodecahedron, each of weight $w_D = 36/(35 \cdot 32) = 9/280$. The vertices of the icosahedron are the centers of the spherical caps defined by the twelve pentagonal faces of the dodecahedron. In geometry, this is called a pentakis dodecahedron or a kisdodecahedron. Note that (C_{32}, W) is a weighted spherical 9-design (see [22, Section 5], [23, Example 3.6]).

We proceed with computations of the actual weighted energy of (C_{32}, W) and the corresponding $\text{ULB}_9(W, h)$ for the potential function $h(t) = 1/\sqrt{2(1-t)}$.

The weighted energy of (C_{32}, W) is computed from the information about its structure from Table 1. There are two types of points, I and D, respectively, according to whether they belong to the icosahedron or the dodecahedron, which define the two different distance distributions (the last two rows of Table 1). To shorten the notation we set

$$a := \frac{\sqrt{1 - 2/\sqrt{5}}}{\sqrt{3}}, \quad b := \frac{\sqrt{1 + 2/\sqrt{5}}}{\sqrt{3}}.$$

TABLE 1. Structure of (C_{32}, W) .

	Inner products					
	-1	$\pm 1/\sqrt{5}$	$\pm a$	$\pm b$	$\pm 1/3$	$\pm \sqrt{5}/3$
Type	Number of points					
I	1	5	5	5	0	0
D	1	0	3	3	6	3

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
E_h(C_{32}, W) &= \sum_{i \neq j} w_i w_j h(x_i \cdot x_j) \\
&= 12w_I^2 \left(h(-1) + 5h(-1/\sqrt{5}) + 5h(1/\sqrt{5}) \right) \\
&\quad + 120w_I w_D \left(h(a) + h(-a) + h(b) + h(-b) \right) \\
&\quad + 20w_D^2 \left(h(-1) + 6h(-1/3) + 6h(1/3) + 3h(-\sqrt{5}/3) + 3h(\sqrt{5}/3) \right) \\
&\approx 0.8050318.
\end{aligned}$$

We have $N_W = 1/\sum_{i=1}^{32} w_i^2 = 735/23 \approx 31.9565217$ which is close to the cardinality 32 of C_{32} . We compute the ULB for $n = 3$, N_W , and the Coulomb potential $h(t) = 1/\sqrt{2(1-t)}$. Since N_W belongs to the interval $(D(3, 9), D(3, 10)] = (30, 36]$ (note that $N = 32$ is in the same interval), we solve the equation $L_9(3, s) = N_W$ to derive the parameters $(\alpha_i, \rho_i)_{i=0}^4$ with approximate values as shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2. Parameters $(\alpha_i, \rho_i)_{i=0}^4$ for $(n, N, N_W) = (3, 32, 735/23)$.

i	0	1	2	3	4
α_i	-0.9412	-0.6741	-0.2109	0.3281	0.7793
ρ_i	0.0771	0.1889	0.2636	0.2612	0.1777

Therefore,

$$\mathcal{E}^h(W) \geq \text{ULB}_9(W, h) = \sum_{i=0}^4 \rho_i h(\alpha_i) \approx 0.804786,$$

which is very close to the actual h -energy of (C_{32}, W) .

It is worth mentioning that in the equi-weighted case, the Coulomb energy of $(C_{32}, (1/32)^{32})$ is $E_h(C_{32}, ((1/32)^{32})) \approx 0.8052$ and the universal lower bound from [9] for $(n, N) = (3, 32)$ and the same h is ≈ 0.8049 . \square

Example 2.6. (Union of cube and cross-polytope.) We consider a weighted code (C_{qp}, W) comprised of the union of a cube and a cross-polytope on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} defined by their duality; i.e., each pair of antipodal vertices of the cross-polytope defines a symmetry axis of two opposite facets of the cube. Each point of the cross-polytope has weight $w_p := 1/(2n + n^2)$ and each point of the cube has weight $w_c := n^2/2^n(2n + n^2)$. We see that the sum of weights of the union is 1. Furthermore, (C_{qp}, W) is a weighted 5-design on S^{n-1} for $n \geq 3$, as we now show.

Indeed, since C_{qp} is antipodal and the weights of points in each antipodal pair are equal, all odd (in particular the first, third, and fifth) weighted moments (3) of (C_{qp}, W) equal zero. To show that the fourth weighted moment is zero, we denote by Q the set of vertices of the cube and by P the set of vertices of the cross-polytope in (C_{qp}, W) and observe that for every

$$x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
U_4(x) &:= w_c \sum_{y \in Q} (x \cdot y)^4 + w_p \sum_{y \in P} (x \cdot y)^4 \\
&= \frac{w_c}{n^2} \sum_{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n \in \{-1, 1\}} (\sigma_1 x_1 + \dots + \sigma_n x_n)^4 + 2w_p \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^4 \\
&= \frac{2^n w_c}{n^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^4 + 3 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n x_i^2 x_j^2 \right) + 2w_p \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^4 \\
&= \frac{3}{2n + n^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^4 + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n x_i^2 x_j^2 \right) \\
&= \frac{3}{2n + n^2} (x_1^2 + \dots + x_n^2)^2 = \frac{3}{2n + n^2} = \gamma_n \int_{-1}^1 t^4 (1 - t^2)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Using a similar argument, we can also show that

$$U_2(x) := w_c \sum_{y \in Q} (x \cdot y)^2 + w_p \sum_{y \in P} (x \cdot y)^2 = \frac{1}{n} = \gamma_n \int_{-1}^1 t^2 (1 - t^2)^{\frac{n-3}{2}} dt, \quad x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}.$$

Consequently,

$$w_c \sum_{y \in Q} P_2^{(n)}(x \cdot y) + w_p \sum_{y \in P} P_2^{(n)}(x \cdot y) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}. \tag{16}$$

Finally, expressing $P_4^{(n)}$ from the Gegenbauer expansion of t^4 and using (15), (16), and the fact that (15) equals the constant term in the Gegenbauer expansion of t^4 , we obtain that

$$w_c \sum_{y \in Q} P_4^{(n)}(x \cdot y) + w_p \sum_{y \in P} P_4^{(n)}(x \cdot y) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1},$$

which together with (16) implies that the second and the fourth weighted moments (3) of (C_{qp}, W) equal zero. Thus, (C_{qp}, W) is a weighted 5-design.

For $n = 2$, (C_{qp}, W) is a regular 8-gon and the weights are equal; i.e. it is a tight spherical 7-design. Therefore, it is a sharp spherical code and a universally optimal configuration [14].

In three and four dimensions, the codes (C_{qp}, W) can be described as follows. On \mathbb{S}^2 , each point of the cross-polytope will have weight $1/15$ and each point of the cube will have weight $3/40$, giving a weighted spherical 5-design of 14 points; on \mathbb{S}^3 , each point of the cross-polytope will have weight $1/24$ and each point of the cube will also have weight $1/24$ (thus, we obtain a 24-cell, an equi-weighted spherical 5-design; see [13]).

For any h , the actual weighted h -energy of (C_{qp}, W) is

$$\begin{aligned} E_h(C_{qp}, W) &= 2nw_p^2 (h(-1) + (2n-2)h(0)) \\ &\quad + 2^{n+1}nw_pw_c \left(h\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) + h\left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \right) \\ &\quad + 2^nw_c^2 \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n}{k} h\left(-1 + \frac{2k}{n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The ULB for the corresponding parameters $(n, |C_{qp}| = 2n + 2^n, N_W)$, where

$$N_W = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{2n+2^n} w_i^2} = \frac{1}{2nw_p^2 + 2^nw_c^2} = \frac{n(n+2)^22^n}{n^3 + 2^{n+1}}$$

(note that $N_W \in (D(n, 5), D(n, 6)]$ for $3 \leq n \leq 6$ only), is computed as follows. We solve

$$L_5(n, s) = N_W \iff \frac{((n+2)(n+3)s^2 + 4(n+2)s - n + 1)(1-s)}{2s(3 - (n+2)s^2)} = \frac{(n+2)^22^n}{n^3 + 2^{n+1}}$$

to obtain the nodes $(\alpha_i)_{i=0}^2$. Then the quadrature weights $(\rho_i)_{i=0}^2$ are computed by setting f equal to the Lagrange basis polynomials in (11) or by the known formulas

$$\rho_0 = -\frac{(1-\alpha_1^2)(1-\alpha_2^2)}{\alpha_0 N_W (\alpha_0^2 - \alpha_1^2)(\alpha_0^2 - \alpha_2^2)}, \quad \rho_1 = -\frac{(1-\alpha_0^2)(1-\alpha_2^2)}{\alpha_1 N_W (\alpha_1^2 - \alpha_0^2)(\alpha_1^2 - \alpha_2^2)}$$

from [8] and the relation $\rho_0 + \rho_1 + \rho_2 = 1 - 1/N_W$.

The ULB in dimensions $2 \leq n \leq 7$, calculated for the absolutely monotone potential

$$h(t) = \frac{1}{(2(1-t))^{(n-2)/2}},$$

are shown in the sixth column of Table 4. It is $\text{ULB}_7(W, h)$ for $n = 2$, $\text{ULB}_5(W, h)$ for $3 \leq n \leq 6$ and $\text{ULB}_6(W, h)$ for $n = 7$. Note that the bound $\text{ULB}_7(W, h)$ is attained for $n = 2$, where it coincides with the ULB for the equi-weighted case [9] (recall that the attaining (C_{qp}, W) is an equi-weighted regular 8-gon).

We remark that the h -energy in the equi-weighted case and the corresponding ULB from [9] for the 14-point C_{qp} in three dimensions are ≈ 0.70757 and ≈ 0.70629 , respectively. \square

Many other examples from the classical sources [32, 34, 33, 30, 22] can be similarly explored. Also, one can derive upper bounds from the next section and bounds for weighted spherical designs in the last section.

3. ON THE OPTIMALITY OF THE ULB

We showed in Theorem 2.3 that the bound (12) cannot be improved by using polynomials of degree m or less. We shall extend this result by proving a necessary and sufficient condition for the optimality of (12) among polynomials from the whole set $L_h^{(n)}$.

TABLE 3. Approximate parameters and ULB for $(n, N, N_W) = (n, 2n + 2^n, N_W)$, $2 \leq n \leq 7$, $h(t) = (2(1-t))^{-(n-2)/2}$.

n	N_W	N	(α_i)	(ρ_i)	ULB	Energy of (C_{qp}, W)
2	8	8	-1 $-\sqrt{2}/2$ 0 $\sqrt{2}/2$	1/8 1/4 1/4 1/4	0.875	0.875
3	13.95	14	-0.8580 -0.2701 0.5225	0.1832 0.3832 0.3618	0.7058	0.7070
4	24	24	-0.8173 -0.2575 0.4749	0.1384 0.4339 0.3858	0.5781	0.5798
5	41.48	42	-0.7428 -0.1910 0.4684	0.1424 0.4680 0.3653	0.4825	0.4901
6	71.44	76	-0.6753 -0.1327 0.4705	0.1540 0.4996 0.3323	0.4074	0.4314
7	121.16	142	-1 -0.5936 -0.0772 0.4748	0.0022 0.1785 0.5165 0.2944	0.3462	0.3993

With parameters as in Theorem 2.3 we define the functions

$$Q_j(n, s) := \frac{1}{N_W} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i P_j^{(n)}(\alpha_i), \quad j \geq 1, \quad (17)$$

and call them *test functions*. The name will be justified by Theorem 3.1.

It is easy to see that $Q_j(n, s) \equiv 0$ for $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ (because in this case the right-hand side in (17) is equal, via the quadrature (11), to the coefficient f_0 of the Gegenbauer polynomial $P_j^{(n)}$, which clearly equals 0). The next theorem, which is a weighted analog of Theorems 2.6 and 4.1 from [9] (see also Theorem 3.1 in [7] and Theorem 5.47 in [27]), shows that the values of the test functions $Q_j(n, s)$ for $j \geq m + 1$ are as meaningful as their signs are.

Theorem 3.1. *Let h be absolutely monotone. For given n , N_W , and parameters m and $(\alpha_i, \rho_i)_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon}$ as in Theorem 2.3, the following is true.*

(a) *If $Q_j(n, s) \geq 0$ for every positive integer j , then the bound $ULB_m(W, h)$ cannot be improved by any polynomial from $L_h^{(n)}$; i.e.,*

$$ULB(W, h) = ULB_m(W, h).$$

(b) If h is strictly absolutely monotone, $h^{(i)}(-1) > 0$ for all $i \geq 0$, and $Q_j(n, s) < 0$ for some positive integer $j \geq m + 1$, then there exists a polynomial from $L_h^{(n)}$ of degree j that gives a bound on $\mathcal{E}^h(W)$ better than $ULB_m(W, h)$; i.e.,

$$ULB(W, h) > ULB_m(W, h).$$

Proof. (a) Let us assume that $f \in L_h^{(n)}$ has degree $d \geq m + 1$ (the case $d \leq m$ is covered by Theorem 2.3). We decompose f as

$$f(t) = g(t) + \sum_{j=m+1}^d f_j P_j^{(n)}(t), \quad (18)$$

where $g \in \mathcal{P}_m$. Note that $f_0 = g_0$ and $f_j \geq 0$ for every relevant j . Using the quadrature (11) for h and the representation (18), we consecutively reorganize and finally estimate from above the bound generated by f as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f_0 - \frac{f(1)}{N_W} &= g_0 - \frac{f(1)}{N_W} \\ &= \frac{g(1)}{N_W} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i g(\alpha_i) - \frac{1}{N_W} \cdot \left(g(1) + \sum_{j=m+1}^d f_j \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i \left(f(\alpha_i) - \sum_{j=m+1}^d f_j P_j^{(n)}(\alpha_i) \right) - \frac{1}{N_W} \cdot \sum_{j=m+1}^d f_j \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i f(\alpha_i) - \sum_{j=m+1}^d f_j \left(\frac{1}{N_W} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i P_j^{(n)}(\alpha_i) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i f(\alpha_i) - \sum_{j=m+1}^d f_j Q_j(n, s) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i h(\alpha_i) = ULB_m(W, h), \end{aligned}$$

where, for the last inequality, we used $f_i \geq 0$ and $Q_j(n, s) \geq 0$ for $j = m + 1, \dots, d$.

(b) We shall find an improvement of the bound $ULB_m(W, h)$ by using the polynomial

$$f(t) = g(t) + \mu P_j^{(n)}(t),$$

where the constant $\mu > 0$ and the polynomial $g(t) \in \mathcal{P}_m$ will be suitably chosen.

We first define an auxiliary potential

$$\tilde{h}(t) := h(t) - \mu P_j^{(n)}(t),$$

where $\mu > 0$ is chosen in such a way that the derivatives $\tilde{h}^{(i)}(t) \geq 0$ on $[-1, 1]$ for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, j$. Since $\tilde{h}^{(i)}(t) = h^{(i)}(t) > 0$ for $i \geq j + 1$, this choice of μ makes the new potential $\tilde{h}(t)$ absolutely monotone.

Next, we choose the polynomial $g(t)$ as the Hermite interpolant of \tilde{h} at the nodes $(\alpha_i)_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon}$ in exactly the same way as we constructed f to interpolate h in Theorem 2.3; i.e.,

$$g(\alpha_i) = \tilde{h}(\alpha_i), \quad g'(\alpha_i) = \tilde{h}'(\alpha_i), \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, k-1+\varepsilon,$$

where the interpolation is simple if and only if $(\varepsilon, i) = (1, 0)$. It follows in the same way as in Theorem 2.3 that $g \in L_{\tilde{h}}^{(n)}$, implying immediately that $f \in L_h^{(n)}$.

In what follows in the proof we compute the bound from f and show that it is greater than $\text{ULB}_m(W, h)$. Let $g(t) = \sum_{\ell=0}^m g_\ell P_\ell^{(n)}(t)$ be the Gegenbauer expansion of g . Note that $f_0 = g_0$ and $f(1) = g(1) + \mu$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i g(\alpha_i) &= \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i \tilde{h}(\alpha_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i h(\alpha_i) - \mu \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i P_j^{(n)}(\alpha_i) \\ &= \text{ULB}_m(W, h) - \mu \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i P_j^{(n)}(\alpha_i). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i g(\alpha_i) = g_0 - \frac{g(1)}{N_W}$$

by the formula (11) for g and

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i P_j^{(n)}(\alpha_i) = Q_j(n, s) - \frac{1}{N_W}$$

by the definition of the test functions (17), we obtain

$$g_0 - \frac{g(1)}{N_W} = \text{ULB}_m(W, h) + \frac{\mu}{N_W} - \mu Q_j(n, s).$$

But the left-hand side is equal to $f_0 - (f(1) - \mu)/N_W$, and so

$$f_0 - \frac{f(1)}{N_W} = \text{ULB}_m(W, h) - \mu Q_j(n, s) > \text{ULB}_m(W, h),$$

showing that the bound from the polynomial f is better than $\text{ULB}_m(W, h)$. \square

The better bound deduced from the polynomial f from Theorem 3.1(b) can be computed numerically but it seems to not be the best that can be obtained by higher degree polynomials. A

technique, called skip 2-add 2, was developed for obtaining bounds via higher degree polynomials in the equi-weighted case in [12]. It can be applied for weighted codes as well.

The same test functions were defined and investigated in the case of upper bounds¹ for the maximal cardinality of spherical codes of given dimension and maximal inner product in [7]. It follows from the investigation from [7] that the first two nonzero test functions, $Q_{m+1}(n, s)$ and $Q_{m+2}(n, s)$, are always non-negative. This means that the assumption $Q_j(n, s) < 0$ in Theorem 3.1 (b) is possible only for $j \geq m + 3$; i.e., the degree of an improving polynomial (if any) will be at least $m + 3$.

4. UNIVERSAL UPPER BOUNDS FOR ENERGY OF WEIGHTED CODES WITH GIVEN MINIMUM DISTANCE

4.1. A general linear programming upper bound for weighted codes. We assume now that (C, W) is a weighted spherical code on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} with $|C| = |W| = N$ and maximal inner product $s(C) \in [-1, 1)$ (equivalently, minimum distance $d(C) = \sqrt{2(1 - s(C))}$). In the sequel, we shall often omit C in the notation of the maximal inner product. Then it is natural to consider upper bounds for the quantity $\mathcal{U}^h(s, W)$ defined in (2). As with Theorem 2.1 we first derive a general linear program.

We now define the admissible set of polynomials for linear programming as

$$U_h^{(n,s)} := \left\{ g(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{\deg(g)} g_i P_i^{(n)}(t) : g(t) \geq h(t), t \in [-1, s], g_i \leq 0, i = 1, \dots, \deg(g) \right\}.$$

Then every polynomial from the set $U_h^{(n,s)}$ provides a upper bound for $\mathcal{U}^h(s, W)$ as shown in the next theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *If $g \in U_h^{(n,s)}$, then for every weighted code (C, W) on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} with cardinality (size) N and maximal inner product $s = s(C) \in [-1, 1)$,*

$$E_h(C, W) \leq E_g(C, W) \leq g_0 - g(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2.$$

Consequently,

$$\mathcal{U}^h(s, W) \leq \inf_{g \in U_h^{(n,s)}} \left(g_0 - g(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \right). \quad (19)$$

Proof. The first inequality follows obviously from $g \geq h$ in $[-1, s]$ since all inner products of C belong to that interval; i.e.,

$$E_h(C, W) = \sum_{i \neq j} w_i w_j h(x_i \cdot x_j) \leq \sum_{i \neq j} w_i w_j g(x_i \cdot x_j) = E_g(C, W).$$

¹In this case the universal bound is the Levenshtein bound.

For the second inequality, we estimate $E_g(C, W)$ from above as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
E_g(C, W) &= \sum_{i,j} w_i w_j g(x_i \cdot x_j) - g(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \\
&= \sum_{\ell=0}^{\deg(g)} g_\ell \sum_{i,j} w_i w_j P_\ell^{(n)}(x_i \cdot x_j) - g(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \\
&\leq g_0 - g(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We used that $(\sum_{i=1}^N w_i)^2 = 1$, $g_\ell \leq 0$ for $\ell \geq 1$, and $\sum_{i,j} w_i w_j P_\ell^{(n)}(x_i \cdot x_j) = M_\ell(C, W) \geq 0$ for $\ell \geq 1$. Since (C, W) was arbitrary with tuple size $|C| = N$ and maximal inner product s , (19) follows. \square

By analogy with the ULB case we consider the infimum in (19) over the class of polynomials $U_h^{(n,s)} \cap \mathcal{P}_m$. Thus, we obtain the linear program

$$\begin{cases} \text{minimize} & g_0 - g(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \\ \text{subject to} & g \in U_h^{(n,s)} \cap \mathcal{P}_m. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

4.2. A construction of feasible polynomials. We next construct polynomials in $U_h^{(n,s)}$ to be used in the linear program (20) following the approach from [11].

We introduce an additional parameter

$$N_1 := L_m(n, s) = \frac{f_m^{(n,s)}(1)}{f_0},$$

where $f_m^{(n,s)}(t)$, $m = 2k - 1 + \varepsilon$, $\varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}$, is the Levenshtein polynomial corresponding to s (i.e., the polynomial, used by Levenshtein for obtaining the bound $L_m(n, s)$). Thus, N_1 determines upper bound parameters $(\alpha_i^{(n,s)}, \rho_i^{(n,s)})$ in the same way as N_W does for the lower bound parameters (α_i, ρ_i) in Theorem 2.3.

In the next theorem we construct feasible polynomials $g \in U_h^{(n,s)} \cap \mathcal{P}_m$, where m is determined by N_1 , and compute the corresponding universal upper bound (UUB).

Theorem 4.2. (*UUB for weighted codes*) *Let s be such that N_1 satisfies $D(n, m) < N_1 \leq D(n, m + 1)$ and let h be such that $h^{(m)} \geq 0$. Then*

$$\mathcal{U}^h(s, W) \leq -\lambda^* f_0 \left(1 - \frac{N_1}{N_W}\right) + (g_T)_0 - \frac{g_T(1)}{N_W}, \quad (21)$$

where, as specified below in (23) and (24), T is a set of nodes in $[-1, s]$ and g_T is the Hermite interpolating polynomial to h in the nodes T ; furthermore, f_0 is the zeroth Gegenbauer coefficient of the Levenshtein polynomial $f_m^{(n,s)}$ and λ^* is a constant defined below in (25).

Proof. We consider the polynomials

$$g(t) := -\lambda f_m^{(n,s)}(t) + g_T(t) = \sum_{i=0}^m g_i P_i^{(n)}(t), \quad (22)$$

where $\lambda \geq 0$ is a parameter (to be determined later) and

$$g_T(t) := H_{h,T}(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} (g_T)_i P_i^{(n)}(t) \quad (23)$$

is the Hermite interpolating polynomial to the function $h(t)$ that agrees with $h(t)$ exactly in the points of a multiset T . We denote by $\alpha_0^{(n,s)} < \alpha_1^{(n,s)} < \dots < \alpha_{k-2+\varepsilon}^{(n,s)} < \alpha_{k-1+\varepsilon}^{(n,s)} = s$ the roots of the Levenshtein polynomial $f_m^{(n,s)}(t)$ and define

$$T := \begin{cases} \{\alpha_0^{(n,s)}, \alpha_0^{(n,s)}, \alpha_1^{(n,s)}, \alpha_1^{(n,s)}, \dots, \alpha_{k-2}^{(n,s)}, \alpha_{k-2}^{(n,s)}, \alpha_{k-1}^{(n,s)} = s\} & \text{if } m = 2k - 1 \\ \{\alpha_0^{(n,s)} = -1, \alpha_1^{(n,s)}, \alpha_1^{(n,s)}, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}^{(n,s)}, \alpha_{k-1}^{(n,s)}, \alpha_k^{(n,s)} = s\} & \text{if } m = 2k \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

to be the multiset of these roots counted with their multiplicities.

In a sense, we use the polynomial $f_m^{(n,s)}$ to “adjust” g_T in order to obtain a suitable $g \in U_h^{(n,s)}$. Indeed, we have $g_T(t) \geq h(t)$ for $t \in [-1, s]$ from the interpolation (as described above) and the error formula in the Hermite interpolation

$$h(t) - g_T(t) = \frac{h^{(m)}(\xi)}{m!} (t - \alpha_0^{(n,s)})^{2-\varepsilon} (t - s) \prod_{i=1}^{k-2+\varepsilon} (t - \alpha_i^{(n,s)})^2, \quad \xi \in (-1, 1),$$

(note we interpolate only the value of h at s). Since $f_m^{(n,s)}(t) \leq 0$ for $t \in [-1, s]$ and $\lambda > 0$, we conclude that

$$g(t) = -\lambda f_m^{(n,s)}(t) + g_T(t) \geq h(t), \quad t \in [-1, s].$$

Moreover, since $f_i > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, in the Gegenbauer expansion of the Levenshtein polynomial

$$f_m^{(n,s)}(t) = \sum_{i=0}^m f_i P_i^{(n)}(t)$$

(see, e.g., [27, Theorem 5.42]), it is clear that large enough $\lambda > 0$ will ensure that

$$g_i = -\lambda f_i + (g_T)_i \leq 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m-1, \quad g_m = -\lambda f_m < 0$$

showing that $g \in U_h^{(n,s)}$ for such λ . Finally, combining the interpolation conditions and the properties of the Levenshtein polynomial (i.e., $g_T(\alpha_i^{(n,s)}) = h(\alpha_i^{(n,s)})$ and $f_m^{(n,s)}(\alpha_i^{(n,s)}) = 0$),

we see that $g(\alpha_i^{(n,s)}) = h(\alpha_i^{(n,s)})$. Note that $g'(\alpha_i^{(n,s)}) = h'(\alpha_i^{(n,s)})$ follows also (except in the case $\alpha_0^{(n,s)} = -1$) from (22) since $(f_m^{(n,s)})'(\alpha_i^{(n,s)}) = 0$ in all relevant cases.

Assume that we have chosen $\lambda = \lambda_0$ such that $g(t) = -\lambda_0 f_m^{(n,s)}(t) + g_T(t)$ belongs to $U_h^{(n,s)}$. Then the bound provided via the so-chosen $g(t)$ in Theorem 4.1 can be calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}^h(s, W) &\leq g_0 - g(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \\ &= -\lambda_0 f_0 + (g_T)_0 - (-\lambda_0 f_m^{(n,s)}(1) + g_T(1)) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \\ &= -\lambda_0 f_0 \left(1 - L_m(n, s) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \right) + (g_T)_0 - g_T(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \\ &= -\lambda^* f_0 \left(1 - \frac{N_1}{N_W} \right) + (g_T)_0 - \frac{g_T(1)}{N_W} \end{aligned}$$

(note the presence of the coefficient f_0 of the Levenshtein polynomial $f_m^{(n,s)}$). We remark that

$$N_1 = L_m(n, s) = f_m^{(n,s)}(1)/f_0 \geq N \geq N_W.$$

The linear dependence on λ_0 of the bound means that λ_0 must be as small as possible. Summarizing the requirements for the best value of λ_0 , which we denote by λ^* , we conclude that

$$\lambda^* := \max \left\{ \frac{(g_T)_i}{f_i} : i \in I(g_T) \right\}, \quad (25)$$

where $I(g_T) := \{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\} : (g_T)_i > 0\}$ is the set of the indices of the positive coefficients in the Gegenbauer expansion of g_T (we choose $\lambda^* = 0$ if the set $I(g_T)$ is empty). This completes the proof. \square

Remark 4.3. We emphasize the difference between the definitions of the nodes $(\alpha_i)_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon}$ for the lower bounds (Section 2) and $(\alpha_i^{(n,s)})_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon}$ for the upper bounds (this section). In the case of ULB we find the nodes via the equation (10); i.e., they are defined via $N_W = 1/\sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2$, while for UUB we derive them as roots of the polynomial $f_m^{(n,s)}(t)$ used for obtaining the Levenshtein bound $L_m(n, s)$ for the given s ; i.e., they are defined via the number s .

Remark 4.4. If h is absolutely monotone, then g_T is positive definite as in Theorem 2.3; i.e. $I(g_T) = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and

$$\lambda^* := \max \left\{ \frac{(g_T)_1}{f_1}, \dots, \frac{(g_T)_{m-1}}{f_{m-1}} \right\}, \quad m > 1, \quad (26)$$

and $\lambda^* = 0$ for $m = 1$.

The quadrature rule (11) for g_T with N_1 gives

$$(g_T)_0 - \frac{g_T(1)}{N_1} = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i^{(n,s)} g_T(\alpha_i^{(n,s)}) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i^{(n,s)} h(\alpha_i^{(n,s)}),$$

where $g_T(\alpha_i^{(n,s)}) = h(\alpha_i^{(n,s)})$ from the interpolation. Using this, we can write the bound (21) as follows:

$$\mathcal{U}^h(s, W) \leq \left(-\lambda^* f_0 + \frac{g_T(1)}{N_1} \right) \left(1 - \frac{N_1}{N_W} \right) + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i^{(n,s)} h(\alpha_i^{(n,s)}).$$

This formula involves the potential h explicitly.

Remark 4.5. We remark that in [11, Theorem 3.2] the requirement of absolute monotonicity of h can be weakened in the same way as in Theorem 4.2.

4.3. Small degrees UUB. We present explicitly degree one and two UUB. They are valid for $N_1 \in (D(n, m), D(n, m + 1)]$ and s in a certain interval whose left endpoint is determined from the Levenshtein bound $N_1 = L_m(n, s) \geq N$.

For $N_1 \in (2, n + 1]$ and $s \in [-1/(N - 1), -1/n]$, we consider the degree one UUB (21), where the parameters are determined as follows: $m = 1$, $L_1(n, s) = (s - 1)/s$ is the first Levenshtein bound (cf. [27, Table 6.1] for the first five Levenshtein bounds),

$$g(t) = -\lambda f_1^{(n,s)}(t) + g_T(t) = -\lambda(t - s) + g_T(t)$$

is our linear programming polynomial (22), and $\alpha_0^{(n,s)} = s$, $\rho_0^{(n,s)} = 1/(1 - s)$ are the corresponding Levenshtein's parameters. Then the polynomial $g_T(t)$ has degree $m - 1 = 0$; i.e., it is a constant which is found from the interpolation equality $g_T(s) = h(s)$. Thus $\lambda^* = 0$ and we find $f(t) = h(s)$ giving the (trivial) bound

$$\mathcal{U}^h(s, W) \leq \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \right) h(s) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{N_W} \right) h(s).$$

Indeed, this bound is straightforward upon estimating all terms in the energy sum $E_h(C, W)$ from above by the constant $h(s)$ and taking into account that $w_1 + \dots + w_N = 1$.

For fixed $N_1 \in (n + 1, 2n]$ and $s \in [(N - 2n)/n(N - 2), 0]$, we consider (21) for degree $m = 2$. Let

$$N_1 := L_2(n, s) = 2n(1 - s)/(1 - ns).$$

We are searching for the UUB polynomial

$$g(t) = -\lambda f_2^{(n,s)}(t) + g_T(t) = -\lambda(t + 1)(t - s) + g_T(t)$$

as described in Theorem 4.2. The Levenshtein's parameters can be computed as in section 2.3 but we need $\alpha_0^{(n,s)} = -1$ and $\alpha_1^{(n,s)} = s$ only. The degree one polynomial $g_T(t)$ is found from the interpolation set $T = \{-1, s\}$; whence $g_T(-1) = h(-1)$ and $g_T(s) = h(s)$. Thus,

$$g_T(t) = \frac{h(s) - h(-1)}{1 + s} t + \frac{h(s) + sh(-1)}{1 + s}.$$

The coefficient λ^* is chosen to make $g_1 = 0$ in the Gegenbauer expansion $g(t) = g_0 + g_1 P_1^{(n)}(t) + g_2 P_2^{(n)}(t)$ (there is only one element in the set from (25)). This gives

$$\lambda^* = \frac{h(s) - h(-1)}{1 - s^2}$$

and, therefore,

$$g(t) = -\frac{h(s) - h(-1)}{1 - s^2} \cdot t^2 + \frac{h(s) - s^2 h(-1)}{1 - s^2}.$$

We can use now directly Theorem 4.1. Since

$$g_0 = \frac{(n-1)h(s) + (1 - ns^2)h(-1)}{n(1 - s^2)}, \quad g(1) = h(-1),$$

we obtain

$$\mathcal{U}^h(s, W) \leq g_0 - \frac{g(1)}{N_W} = \frac{(n-1)h(s) + (1 - ns^2)h(-1)}{n(1 - s^2)} - \frac{h(-1)}{N_W}.$$

The degree three UUB is quite complicated to be stated here. However, numerical calculations are feasible as in the case of ULB.

4.4. Examples. We compute the UUB from Theorem 4.2 for the cases discussed in Section 2. Thereby, we obtain a strip where the weighted h -energy belongs for given n , h , and W (and s for the upper bounds).

Example 4.6. We consider the case of the weighted code $(C_{32}, W) \subset \mathbb{S}^2$ from Example 2.5. Since the maximal inner product of C_{32} is

$$s = s(C_{32}) = \sqrt{1 + 2/\sqrt{5}/\sqrt{3}} \approx 0.794654$$

(this is the constant b from Example 2.5), we compute the UUB for $\mathcal{U}^h(s, W)$ for the parameters $n = 3$, $N_W \approx 31.95\dots$, and s and for the Coulomb potential $h(t) = 1/\sqrt{2(1-t)}$.

The interpolation nodes are the roots of the Levenshtein polynomial $f_9^{(3,s)}$; i.e.,

$$(\alpha_i^{(3,s)})_{i=0}^4 \approx (-0.9247, -0.6213, -0.1493, 0.3703, 0.7946).$$

The polynomial g_T is positive definite (i.e., $(g_T)_i \geq 0$ for all i and we use (26); this is, in fact, part of more general property) and

$$\lambda^* = \frac{(g_T)_1}{f_1} \approx 7.47994$$

via (25). The UUB polynomial g has $g_1 = 0$ and $g_i < 0$ for $2 \leq i \leq 9$. Finally, the UUB is

$$\mathcal{U}^h(s, W) \leq 0.8234054.$$

We recall that the actual Coulomb energy of (C_{32}, W) is ≈ 0.8050318 and the ULB is ≈ 0.804786 . \square

Example 4.7. We compute the UUB for the parameters from the weighted codes from Example 2.6. For convenience and comparison, we recall the actual energy and the ULB from that example.

TABLE 4. Approximate parameters and UUB for $(n, N, N_W, s, N_1) = (n, 2n + 2^n, N_W, s, N_1)$, $2 \leq n \leq 7$, $h(t) = (2(1-t))^{-(n-2)/2}$.

n	N_W	N	s	m	N_1	ULB	Energy of (C_{qp}, W)	UUB
2	8	8	$1/\sqrt{2}$	7	8	0.875	0.875	0.875
3	13.95	14	$1/\sqrt{3}$	5	16.098	0.7058	0.7070	0.7357
4	24	24	$1/2$	5	26	0.5781	0.5798	0.5988
5	41.48	42	$3/5$	6	81.351	0.4825	0.4901	0.708
6	71.44	76	$2/3$	7	289.561	0.4074	0.4314	1.0421
7	121.16	142	$5/7$	8	2228.146	0.3462	0.3993	1.9464

5. ULB AND UUB FOR WEIGHTED SPHERICAL DESIGNS

In the case when a weighted spherical code is also a weighted design, the ULB and UUB may be extended to wider class of potentials, which we now describe.

5.1. ULB on energy for weighted spherical τ -designs. Assume that (C, W) is a weighted spherical τ -design on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} such that $N_W \in (D(n, \tau), D(n, \tau + 1)]$. Then the ULB (12) is valid with $m = \tau$ but the restrictions $f_i \geq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq \tau$ are no longer needed since the moments $M_i(C, W)$, $1 \leq i \leq \tau$, are equal to 0. We restate Theorem 2.3 for this case.

Theorem 5.1. (*ULB for weighted designs*) Let (C, W) be a weighted spherical τ -design, $\tau = 2k - 1 + \varepsilon$, and W be such that N_W satisfies (9). If the potential function h is such that $h^{(\tau+1)} \geq 0$, then

$$E_h(C, W) \geq \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i h(\alpha_i), \quad (27)$$

where the parameters $(\alpha_i, \rho_i)_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon}$ are the same as in Theorem 2.3. This bound cannot be improved by any polynomial f of degree at most τ that satisfies $f \leq h$ in $[-1, 1)$.

Proof. The assumption on h allows us to apply the Hermite error formula in the same manner as in Theorem 2.3. Then (27) follows analogously regardless of the sign of the Gegenbauer coefficients of f since $f_\ell M_\ell(C, W) = 0$ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, \tau$. \square

In the case of absolutely monotone potential h , the bounds (12) and (27) coincide.

We shall need the following equivalent definition of weighted τ -designs.

Lemma 5.2. *A weighted spherical code $(C, W) \subset \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, $C = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$, is a weighted spherical τ -design if and only if the following quadrature formula*

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} p(y) d\sigma_n(y) = \sum_{i=1}^N w_i p(x_i), \quad (28)$$

holds for all polynomials in n variables of total degree at most τ . Here σ_n is the Lebesgue surface measure of \mathbb{S}^{n-1} normalized so that $\sigma_n(\mathbb{S}^{n-1}) = 1$.

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof in the equi-weighted case. We begin with recalling some facts about spherical harmonics. A real-valued function on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} is called a *spherical harmonic of degree ℓ* if it is the restriction of a homogeneous polynomial Y in n variables of degree ℓ that is harmonic, i.e. for which $\Delta Y \equiv 0$. Denote by $\mathcal{P}_{\tau,n}$ the space of polynomials in n variables of degree at most τ and \mathbb{H}_ℓ^n the subspace of spherical harmonics of degree $\ell \leq \tau$, where $Z(n, \ell) := \dim(\mathbb{H}_\ell^n)$ and $\{Y_{\ell,k}\}_{k=1}^{Z(n,\ell)}$ is an orthonormal basis of \mathbb{H}_ℓ^n . Since the restriction $\mathcal{P}_{\tau,n}|_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}}$ is a direct sum of the orthogonal subspaces \mathbb{H}_ℓ^n , $\ell = 0, 1, \dots, \tau$, it suffices to prove the lemma for $p \in \mathbb{H}_\ell^n$, $\ell \leq \tau$.

Since $w_1 + \dots + w_N = 1$, the quadrature (28) holds trivially for the constant polynomial; i.e. for $\ell = 0$. Let us fix $1 \leq \ell \leq \tau$. Then the left-hand side of (28) vanishes as p is harmonic and homogeneous of degree at least 1 (the mean-value property holds). From the Addition formula [28, Theorem 2] (see also [5, Formula (5.1.14)]) we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{Z(n,\ell)} Y_{\ell,k}(x_i) Y_{\ell,k}(x_j) = Z(n, \ell) P_\ell^{(n)}(x_i \cdot x_j),$$

which implies that

$$M_\ell(C, W) = \frac{1}{Z(n, \ell)} \sum_{k=1}^{Z(n,\ell)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N w_i Y_{\ell,k}(x_i) \right)^2.$$

Thus, if (C, W) is a weighted τ -design, then $M_\ell(C, W) = 0$ and the right-hand side of (28) holds true for all $\{Y_{\ell,k}\}_{k=1}^{Z(n,\ell)}$ and hence for all $p \in \mathbb{H}_\ell^n$. On the other hand, if the quadrature (28) holds for all $p \in \mathbb{H}_\ell^n$, then it holds for all $Y_{\ell,k}$, which implies $M_\ell(C, W) = 0$ and completes the proof. \square

Next, note that the identity

$$f(1) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 + \sum_{i \neq j} w_i w_j f(x_i \cdot x_j) = f_0 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\tau} f_\ell M_\ell(C, W) \quad (29)$$

(holding for $\deg(f) \leq \tau$; used in the proof of Theorem 2.3) may be utilized to show that the following characterization of weighted spherical designs is valid.

Theorem 5.3. *A weighted spherical code (C, W) on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} is a weighted spherical τ -design if and only if*

$$\sum_{i \neq j} w_i w_j f(x_i \cdot x_j) = f_0 - f(1) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \quad (30)$$

holds for any real polynomial of degree at most τ .

Proof. If (C, W) is a weighted spherical τ -design on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , then $M_\ell(C, W) = 0$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq \tau$ yields (30) directly from (29).

Conversely, assume that (30) holds for any polynomial f of degree at most τ . Then for the polynomial $f(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{\tau} P_i^{(n)}(t)$ we obtain that

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{\tau} M_\ell(C, W) = 0;$$

whence $M_\ell(C, W) = 0$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq \tau$. □

The condition (30) can be further specialized as we shall see in the next theorem, where we prove that the left-hand side of (30) decomposes into N equal parts (when $x = x_i \in C$).

Theorem 5.4. *A weighted spherical code (C, W) on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} is a weighted spherical τ -design if and only if for any point $x \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$ the equality*

$$\sum_{j=1}^N w_j f(x \cdot x_j) = f_0 \quad (31)$$

holds for any real polynomial f of degree at most τ and every $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$.

Proof. If (C, W) is a weighted spherical τ -design on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} , then $M_\ell(C, W) = 0$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq \tau$. Let $f(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\tau} f_k P_k^{(n)}(t)$ be the Gegenbauer expansion of f . Then for every $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ we have that $p(x) := \sum_{j=1}^N w_j f(x \cdot x_j) \in \mathcal{P}_{\tau, n}$ and from Lemma 5.2 and the Funk-Hecke formula we derive that

$$\sum_{j=1}^N w_j f(x \cdot x_j) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} f(x \cdot y) d\sigma_n(y) = \int_{-1}^1 f(t) d\mu_n(t) = f_0.$$

Suppose now that the identity (31) holds for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. Applying it for $x_i \in C$, then multiplying by w_i and adding for all i , we utilize $f(t) = P_\ell^{(n)}(t)$ to derive that $M_\ell(C, W) = 0$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq \tau$. □

The identity (31) from Theorem 5.4 could be used to estimate the frequency and location of inner products of C via the polynomial f . Indeed, on the left-hand side we have all inner products of (any) point $x_i \in C$ with the other points of C as values of f while the right-hand side does not depend on the structure of C . This approach was used in [6] for obtaining bounds on the extreme

(smallest and largest) inner products that imply some nonexistence results for (equi-weighted) spherical designs of odd strengths and odd cardinalities.

Applications of Theorem 5.4 for obtaining bounds for polarization of weighted spherical designs will be considered in a future paper.

5.2. UUB for weighted spherical τ -designs. As was the case for the ULB for weighted designs, the condition $g_\ell \leq 0$ for the linear programming polynomials for UUB is no longer necessary for $1 \leq \ell \leq \tau$ since $M_\ell(C, W) = 0$ in (29) for these ℓ .

We first reformulate Theorem 4.1. Let

$$V_h^{(n,s,\tau)} := \left\{ g(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{\deg(g)} g_i P_i^{(n)}(t) : g(t) \geq h(t), t \in [-1, s], \deg(g) \leq \tau \right\}.$$

Theorem 5.5. *If $g \in V_h^{(n,s,\tau)}$, then for every weighted spherical τ -design (C, W) on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} with cardinality (size) N and maximal inner product $s = s(C) \in [-1, 1)$,*

$$E_h(C, W) \leq E_g(C, W) = g_0 - g(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2.$$

Consequently,

$$E_h(C, W) \leq \inf_{g \in V_h^{(n,s,\tau)}} \left(g_0 - g(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 \right). \quad (32)$$

Proof. Obvious from $g \geq h$ in $[-1, s]$ and (29). \square

Theorem 5.6. *Let h be such that $h^{(\tau)} \geq 0$ and (C, W) be a weighted spherical τ -design on \mathbb{S}^{n-1} with cardinality (size) N and maximal inner product $s = s(C) \in [-1, 1)$. Assume that $N_1 = L_m(n, s)$ satisfies (9) with $m = \tau = 2k - 1 + \varepsilon$. Then*

$$E_h(C, W) \leq \frac{(N_W - N_1)g_T(1)}{N_W N_1} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1+\varepsilon} \rho_i^{(n,s)} h(\alpha_i^{(n,s)}), \quad (33)$$

where the set T of interpolation nodes and the polynomial g_T are as in Theorem 4.2.

Proof. We naturally consider an interpolant g that stays above h in $[-1, s]$ so we utilize the nodes from the multiset T from (24) but with m replaced by τ . This produces the polynomial $g = g_T$, which can be also viewed as the polynomial from (22) with $\lambda = 0$ (i.e., without the correction via the Levenshtein polynomial $f_\tau^{(n,s)}$). Since $\deg(g) = \deg(g_T) = \tau - 1$, the verification of $g \geq h$ in $[-1, s]$ by the Hermitte interpolation error formula

$$h(t) - g(t) = \frac{h^{(\tau)}(\xi)}{\tau!} (t - \alpha_0)^{2-\varepsilon} (t - s) \prod_{i=1}^{k-2+\varepsilon} (t - \alpha_i)^2, \quad \xi \in (-1, 1),$$

requires $h^{(\tau)}(t) \geq 0$ only.

Therefore, $g \in V_h^{(n,s,\tau)}$ and Theorem 5.5 implies

$$E_h(C, W) \leq (g_T)_0 - g_T(1) \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2,$$

which yields (33) by the quadrature rule (11) applied for the polynomial g with N_1 instead of N_W and the interpolation equalities $g(\alpha_i^{(n,s)}) = h(\alpha_i^{(n,s)})$. \square

We illustrate the UUB (33) with continuation of our two examples.

Example 5.7. Theorem 5.6 can be applied to Examples 2.5 and 4.6 with $n = 3$, $\tau = 9$, $N = 32$, weights W as in (C_{32}, W) , and every potential with $h^{(9)} \geq 0$ (note that both N and N_1 belong to the ninth Delsarte-Goethals-Seidel interval $(D(3, 9), D(3, 10)] = (30, 36]$). Using again the Coulomb potential $h(t) = 1/\sqrt{2(1-t)}$ for comparison and computing (33), we obtain

$$E_h(C, W) \leq 0.805816$$

for such weighted spherical designs. This bound is very close to the actual energy of (C_{32}, W) and the corresponding ULB (recall that $E_h(C_{32}, W) \approx 0.8050318$ and $\mathcal{E}^h(W) \geq 0.804786$). The interpolation nodes and the polynomial g_T itself are the same as in Example 4.6. \square

Example 5.8. We apply Theorem 5.6 for parameters of weighted designs as in Examples 2.6 and 4.7 and for potentials h with $h^{(5)}(t) \geq 0$. The numbers N and N_1 belong to the interval $(D(n, 5), D(n, 6)]$ for $3 \leq n \leq 5$. We compute the UUB for the Coulomb potential again to obtain:

$$E_h(C, W) \leq 0.70893$$

for every weighted 5-design (with weights as $(C_{qp}, W) \subset \mathbb{S}^2$) with 14 points on \mathbb{S}^2 ,

$$E_h(C, W) \leq 0.58111$$

for any (equi-weighted) 5-design with 24 points on \mathbb{S}^3 , and

$$E_h(C, W) \leq 0.500221$$

for every weighted 5-design (with weights as $(C_{qp}, W) \subset \mathbb{S}^4$) with 42 points on \mathbb{S}^4 . These values are very close to the actual energy and the corresponding ULBs (cf. Table 4). \square

Acknowledgments. The research of the second author was supported, in part, by Bulgarian NSF grant KP-06-N72/6-2023. The research of the third author is supported, in part, by the Lilly Endowment. The research of the sixth author was supported, in part, by Contract BG-RRO-2-004-0008, SUMMIT Sofia University Marking Momentum for Innovation and Technological Transfer, Work group 3.2.1. Numerical Analysis, Theory of Approximations and Their Applications (NATATA).

REFERENCES

- [1] Bannai, Ei, Bannai, Et., A survey on spherical designs and algebraic combinatorics on spheres, *Europ. J. Combin.* **30**, 1392–1425 (2009).
- [2] Barg, A., Boyvalenkov, P., Stoyanova, M., Bounds for the sum of distances in spherical sets of small size, *Discr. Math.*, **346**, art. 113346 (2023).
- [3] Bilyk, D., Matzke, R. W., On the Fejes Tóth problem about the sum of angles between lines, *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.* **147**, 51–59 (2019).
- [4] de Boor, C., Divided differences, *Surveys in Approximation Theory* **1**, 46–69 (2005).
- [5] Borodachov, S. V., Hardin, D. P., Saff, E. B., *Discrete Energy on Rectifiable Sets*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, 2019.
- [6] Boumova, S., Boyvalenkov, P., Danev, D., Necessary conditions for existence of some designs in polynomial metric spaces, *Europ. J. Combin.* **20**, 213–225 (1999).
- [7] Boyvalenkov, P., Danev, D., Bumova, S., Upper bounds on the minimum distance of spherical codes, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **42**, 1576–1581 (1996).
- [8] Boyvalenkov, P., Danev, D., Landgev, I., On maximal spherical codes II, *J. Combin. Designs* **7**, 316–326 (1999).
- [9] Boyvalenkov, P., Dragnev, P., Hardin, D., Saff, E., Stoyanova, M., Universal lower bounds for potential energy of spherical codes, *Constr. Approx.* **44**, 385–415 (2016).
- [10] Boyvalenkov, P., Dragnev, P., Hardin, D., Saff, E., Stoyanova, M., Energy bounds for codes in polynomial metric spaces, *Anal. Math. Phys.* **9**, 781–808 (2019).
- [11] Boyvalenkov, P., Dragnev, D., Hardin, D., Saff, E., Stoyanova, M., Upper bounds for energies of spherical codes with given cardinality and separation, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **88**, 1811–1826 (2020).
- [12] Boyvalenkov, P., Dragnev, P., Hardin, D., Saff, E., Stoyanova, M., Bounds for spherical codes: the Levenshtein framework lifted, *Math. Comp.* **90**, 1323–1356 (2021).
- [13] Cohn, H., Conway, J., Elkies, N., Kumar, A., The D_4 root system is not universally optimal, *Experim. Math.* **16**, 313–320 (2007).
- [14] Cohn, H., Kumar, A., Universally optimal distribution of points on spheres, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **20**, 99–148 (2007).
- [15] Cohn, H., Woo, J., Three-point bounds for energy minimization, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **25**, 929–958 (2012).
- [16] Delsarte, P., An Algebraic Approach to the Association Schemes in Coding Theory, *Philips Res. Rep. Suppl.* **10**, 1973.
- [17] Delsarte, P., Bounds for unrestricted codes by linear programming, *Philips Res. Rep.* **27**, 272–289 (1972).
- [18] Delsarte, P., Goethals, J.-M., Seidel, J. J., Spherical codes and designs, *Geom. Dedic.* **6**, 363–388 (1977).
- [19] Fejes Tóth, L., On the sum of distances determined by a pointset, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung.* **7**, 397–401 (1956).
- [20] Gaspar, G., Linearization of the product of Jacobi polynomials - I, *Canad. J. Math.* **22**, 171–175 (1970).
- [21] Godsil, C. D., Polynomial spaces, *Discrete Mathematics*, **73**, 71–88 (1988/89).
- [22] Goethals, J.M., Seidel, J.J., Cubature Formulae, Polytopes, and Spherical Designs. In: Davis, C., Grünbaum, B., Sherk, F.A. (eds) *The Geometric Vein*, Springer, New York, 1981.
- [23] Hughes, D., Waldron, S., Spherical (t, t) -designs with a small number of vectors, *Lin. Alg. Appl.* **608**, 84–106, (2021).
- [24] Kolushov, A. V., Yudin, V. A., Extremal dispositions of points on the sphere, *Anal. Math.* **23**, 25–34 (1997).
- [25] Levenshtein, V. I., On bounds for packings in n -dimensional Euclidean space, *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **20**, 417–421 (1979).
- [26] Levenshtein, V. I., Designs as maximum codes in polynomial metric spaces, *Acta Applic. Math.* **25**, 1–82 (1992).
- [27] Levenshtein, V. I., Universal bounds for codes and designs, in *Handbook of Coding Theory*, V. S. Pless and W. C. Huffman, Eds., Elsevier, Amsterdam, Ch. 6, 499–648 (1998).
- [28] Müller, C., *Spherical Harmonics*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **17** Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1966.
- [29] Neumaier, A., Seidel, J. J., Discrete measures for spherical designs, eutactic stars and lattices, *Indagationes Mathematicae (Proceedings)*, **91**, 321–334 (1988).

- [30] Salihov, G. N., On the theory of cubature formulas for multidimensional spheres. Dissertation, Acad. Sci. USSR, Novosibirsk 1978 (in Russian).
- [31] Schoenberg, I. J., Positive definite functions on spheres, *Duke Math. J.* **9**, 96–107 (1942).
- [32] Sobolev, S. L., Cubature formulas on the sphere invariant under finite groups of rotations, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **146**, 310–313 (1962). (in Russian); English translation *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **3**, 1307–1310 (1962).
- [33] Sobolev, S. L., *Introduction to the Theory of Cubature Formulas* (Russian). Nauka 1974.
- [34] Stroud, A. H., *Approximate Calculation of Multiple Integrals*. Prentice-Hall 1971.
- [35] Waldron S., *An Introduction to Finite Tight Frames*, New York, Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis, Birkhäuser/Springer, 2018.
- [36] Yudin, V. A., Minimal potential energy of a point system of charges, *Discret. Mat.* **4**, 115-121 (1982), in Russian; English translation: *Discr. Math. Appl.* **3**, 75–81 (1983).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TOWSON UNIVERSITY, 7800 YORK RD, TOWSON, MD, 21252, USA

Email address: sborodachov@towson.edu

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, BULGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, 8 G BONCHEV STR., 1113 SOFIA, BULGARIA

Email address: peter@math.bas.bg

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, FORT WAYNE, IN 46805, USA

Email address: dragnevp@pfw.edu

CENTER FOR CONSTRUCTIVE APPROXIMATION, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE, TN 37240, USA

Email address: doug.hardin@vanderbilt.edu

CENTER FOR CONSTRUCTIVE APPROXIMATION, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE, TN 37240, USA

Email address: edward.b.saff@vanderbilt.edu

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, SOFIA UNIVERSITY “ST. KLIMENT OHRIDSKI”, 5 JAMES BOURCHIER BLVD., 1164 SOFIA, BULGARIA

Email address: stoyanova@fmi.uni-sofia.bg