

AN ESTIMATE FOR POSITIVE DEFINITE FUNCTIONS ON FINITE ABELIAN GROUPS AND ITS APPLICATIONS

LIXIA WANG AND KE YE

ABSTRACT. This paper concentrates on positive definite functions on finite abelian groups, which are central to harmonic analysis and related fields. By leveraging the group structure and employing Fourier analysis, we establish a lower bound for the second largest value of positive definite functions. For illustrative purposes, we present three applications of our lower bound: (a) We obtain both lower and upper bounds for arbitrary functions on finite abelian groups; (b) We derive lower bounds for the relaxation and mixing times of random walks on finite abelian groups. Notably, our bound for the relaxation time achieves a quadratic improvement over the previously known one; (c) We determine a new lower bound for the size of the sumset of two subsets of finite abelian groups.

1. INTRODUCTION

Background. By endowing a finite set with an abelian group structure, any problem on this set can be reformulated as one involving functions on a finite abelian group. This perspective enables the introduction of various new techniques to study discrete problems. For instance, the technique of sum-of-squares on finite abelian groups has been developed to solve combinatorial optimization problems [10, 3, 34, 40]; When a graph is a Cayley graph, its graph-theoretic properties are closely related to the representation-theoretic properties of the underlying group [1, 11, 22, 12]; In the study of random walks, the group structure of the state space is crucial for estimating the relaxation time and mixing time [15, 33, 24, 19]. Among all functions on a given abelian group, positive definite functions constitute one of the most important classes. According to the celebrated Bochner's Theorem, a function is positive definite if and only if it is the Fourier transform of a non-negative measure. Over the past half-century, these functions have played a pivotal role in diverse fields, including harmonic analysis [36, 18, 6, 2, 9], probability theory [25, 30, 17] and quantum physics [26, 5, 23].

Let G be a finite abelian group and let $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a positive definite function. In many scenarios [1, 15, 11, 33, 24, 22, 12, 19], the second largest value of f :

$$\nu_2(f) := \max\{f(x) : x \in G, f(x) < f(1)\},$$

is the quantity that lies at the core of the problem. It can be readily shown that $\max_{x \in G} f(x) = f(1)$, where $1 \in G$ is the identity element. However, determining $\nu_2(f)$ is generally much more challenging, if not impossible. The primary focus of this paper is to establish a lower bound for $\nu_2(f)$ and present three applications of this bound.

Main contributions. The main result of this paper is Theorem 4.6, which states that

$$(1) \quad \nu_2(f) \geq f(1) \left(1 - \frac{\pi^2 |G|}{2m^2 \left(|G| - 2^t (m-1)^{\frac{s-t}{2}} \right)} \right),$$

for any positive integer $m < (2^{-t}|G|)^{1/r} + 1$. Here $s := |\text{supp}(\widehat{f})|$, $t := |\{\chi \in \text{supp}(\widehat{f}) : \chi^2 = 1\}|$ and $\text{supp}(\widehat{f})$ is the support of the Fourier transform \widehat{f} of f . Consequently, if we fix s while allowing G to vary, then we obtain $(f(1) - \nu_2(f))/f(1) = O(|G|^{-4/s})$. We illustrate three applications of (1), which are summarized as follows.

- (a) Function value estimation: We obtain both lower and upper bounds of values of arbitrary functions on finite abelian groups (cf. Proposition 5.4).
- (b) Relaxation and mixing time estimation: We establish lower bounds for the relaxation and mixing times of random walks on finite abelian groups (cf. Propositions 5.5 and 5.9). It is worth remarking that our lower bound for the relaxation time exhibits a quadratic improvement over the existing one [15, 19, 16].
- (c) Sumset size estimation: We derive a new type of lower bound for the size of the sumset of two subsets of finite abelian groups (cf. Proposition 5.12).

Organization of the paper. The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. For the reader's convenience, we provide a brief review in Section 2 on Fourier analysis on finite abelian groups and weighted graphs. In Section 3, we define positive definite functions and establish their fundamental properties. In Section 4, we extend the covering argument from graph theory to derive our lower bound (1). Additionally, for independent interest, we interpret our result from a graph-theoretic perspective. Finally, we present in Section 5 the three aforementioned applications of our lower bound.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Fourier Analysis on Finite Abelian Groups. This subsection provides a brief overview of the Fourier analysis on finite abelian groups. For more details, interested readers are referred to [31, 14, 38, 35, 37]. Let G be a finite abelian group. Throughout this paper, unless otherwise stated, we assume that the group operation on G is multiplicative and denoted by $(x, y) \mapsto xy$.

A *character* of G is a group homomorphism $\chi : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$, where $\mathbb{C}^\times := \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ is the multiplicative group of \mathbb{C} . The *dual group* \widehat{G} of G consists of all characters on G , whose group operation is the pointwise product of functions. We denote by $L(G)$ the vector space of all \mathbb{C} -valued functions on G , equipped with the complex-valued inner product:

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{x \in G} f(x) \overline{g(x)}, \quad f, g \in L(G).$$

The *Fourier transform* of f is the function $\widehat{f} : \widehat{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by $\widehat{f}(\chi) := \langle f, \chi \rangle$. For each $f \in L(G)$, we have the *Fourier expansion* $f = \sum_{\chi \in \widehat{G}} \widehat{f}(\chi) \chi$, where $\widehat{f}(\chi)$ is called a *Fourier coefficient* of f . Given $f, g \in L(G)$, the *convolution* of f and g is a function $f * g \in L(G)$ defined by

$$(f * g)(x) = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{y \in G} f(xy^{-1})g(y), \quad x \in G.$$

The basic properties of the Fourier transform and convolution are summarized below.

Theorem 2.1 ([29]). *For any $f, g \in L(G)$, we have*

- (a) $\widehat{(f * g)} = \widehat{f} \widehat{g}$.
- (b) *Parseval identity:* $\langle f, f \rangle = |G| \langle \widehat{f}, \widehat{f} \rangle = \sum_{\chi \in \widehat{G}} |\widehat{f}(\chi)|^2$.
- (c) $\widehat{\widehat{f}}(x) = \frac{1}{|G|} f(x^{-1})$.

For each subgroup H of G , we define

$$H^\perp := \{\chi \in \widehat{G} : \chi(x) = 1, x \in H\}.$$

Since there is a natural isomorphism between $\widehat{\widehat{G}}$ and G , we have $(H^\perp)^\perp = H$ under this identification. Moreover, the subgroups of G and \widehat{G} are in a one-to-one correspondence.

Lemma 2.2. [20, Problem 2.7] *The assignment $H \mapsto H^\perp$ is a bijection between the set of subgroups of G and the set of subgroups of \widehat{G} . Moreover, $H_1 \subseteq H_2$ if and only if $H_2^\perp \subseteq H_1^\perp$.*

We denote by $\pi : G \rightarrow G/H$ the quotient map and let $\pi^* : L(G/H) \rightarrow L(G)$ be the map defined by $\pi^*(f) = f \circ \pi$.

Lemma 2.3 ([29], Lemma 4.5). *We have $\pi^* \left(\widehat{G/H} \right) \subseteq H^\perp$ and the restriction map $\pi^* : \widehat{G/H} \rightarrow H^\perp$ is an isomorphism of groups.*

2.2. Weighted graphs. The primary goal of this subsection is to introduce weighted graphs and record an inequality involving their eigenvalues. Standard references are [28, 27, 22]. Let $\mathcal{G} = (V, E, w)$ be an undirected, weighted and connected graph. Here V is the set of vertices, E is the set of edges and $\omega : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ satisfies $\omega(x, y) = \omega(y, x)$ for any $(x, y) \in V \times V$, and $\omega(x, y) > 0$ if and only if $\{x, y\} \in E$. The function ω is called the *weight function* of \mathcal{G} . Given $x, y \in V$, we say that x and y are *adjacent*, denoted as $x \sim y$, if $\{x, y\} \in E$. The *degree of a vertex* $x \in V$ is $d_x := \sum_{y \in V, y \sim x} \omega(x, y)$. We denote $d_G := \max_{x \in V} d_x$.

Let $L(V, \mathbb{R})$ be the vector space consisting of all real-valued functions on V . The *Laplacian operator* of \mathcal{G} is the linear map $\Delta : L(V, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow L(V, \mathbb{R})$ defined by

$$(2) \quad (\Delta u)(x) = \sum_{\substack{y \in V \\ y \sim x}} \omega(x, y)(u(y) - u(x)), \quad u \in L(V, \mathbb{R}), \quad x \in G.$$

We remark that $\Delta = A - D$ where $A := (\omega(x, y))_{x, y \in V} \in \mathbb{R}^{|V| \times |V|}$ and $D := \text{diag}(d_x)_{x \in V} \in \mathbb{R}^{|V| \times |V|}$.

Moreover, we define two bilinear operators on $L(V, \mathbb{R})$:

$$(3) \quad \Gamma(u, v) = \frac{1}{2} (\Delta(uv) - u\Delta v - (\Delta u)v), \quad \Gamma_2(u, v) = \frac{1}{2} (\Delta\Gamma(u, v) - \Gamma(u, \Delta v) - \Gamma(\Delta u, v)),$$

where $u, v \in L(V, \mathbb{R})$. For simplicity, we denote $\Gamma(u) := \Gamma(u, u)$ and $\Gamma_2(u) := \Gamma_2(u, u)$. We say that \mathcal{G} is $\text{CD}(0, \infty)$ if $\Gamma_2(u) \geq 0$ for all $u \in L(G, \mathbb{R})$.

Theorem 2.4 ([28], Theorem 1.2). *Let $\mathcal{G} = (V, E, \omega)$ be an undirected, weighted and connected graph. Suppose that \mathcal{G} is $\text{CD}(0, \infty)$ and $0 = \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$ are eigenvalues of $-\Delta$. Then for any natural number $k \geq 2$, we have $\lambda_k \leq Cd_G k^2 \lambda_2$ where $C := \left(\frac{20\sqrt{2}e}{e-1} \right)^2$.*

3. POSITIVE DEFINITE FUNCTIONS

In this section, we investigate real-valued functions whose Fourier coefficients are all non-negative. These functions, known as positive definite functions, play a crucial role in harmonic analysis on groups [7, 8, 32]. To begin with, we summarize several basic properties of functions on finite abelian groups in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Given a function $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we denote by H the subgroup of \widehat{G} generated by $\text{supp}(\widehat{f}) := \{\chi \in \widehat{G} : \widehat{f}(\chi) \neq 0\}$. Then the followings hold:*

- (a) *There is a well-defined function $\widetilde{f} : G/H^\perp \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $\widetilde{f}(xH^\perp) = f(x)$ for any $x \in G$.*
- (b) *Let $\pi : G \rightarrow G/H^\perp$ be the quotient map and let $\pi^* : \widehat{G/H^\perp} \rightarrow \widehat{G}$ be the induced map defined by $\pi^*(\rho) := \rho \circ \pi$ is an isomorphism from $\widehat{G/H^\perp}$ to H .*
- (c) *$\widetilde{f} = \sum_{\chi \in \text{supp} \widetilde{f}} \widehat{f}(\chi)(\pi^*)^{-1}(\chi)$.*
- (d) *Suppose that f is real-valued. For any $\chi \in \widehat{G}$, we have $\widehat{f}(\chi^{-1}) = \overline{\widehat{f}(\chi)}$. If moreover $\widehat{f}(\chi) \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\widehat{f}(\chi^{-1}) = \widehat{f}(\chi)$.*

Proof. To prove (a), it is sufficient to show $f(y) = f(x)$ for all $y \in xH^\perp$. By definition, there exists some $z \in H^\perp$ such that $y = xz$. Since H is generated by $\text{supp}(\widehat{f})$, $H^\perp = \{z \in G : \chi(z) = 1, \chi \in \text{supp}(\widehat{f})\}$. This implies

$$f(y) = \sum_{\chi \in \text{supp}(\widehat{f})} \widehat{f}(\chi)\chi(y) = \sum_{\chi \in \text{supp}(\widehat{f})} \widehat{f}(\chi)\chi(x)\chi(z) = \sum_{\chi \in \text{supp}(\widehat{f})} \widehat{f}(\chi)\chi(x) = f(x).$$

By Lemma 2.3, (b) is clear. For (c), we notice that (b) implies $\rho := (\pi^*)^{-1}(\chi) \in \widehat{G/H^\perp}$ for each $\chi \in \text{supp}(\widehat{f}) \subseteq H \subseteq \widehat{G}$. Moreover, we have

$$\rho(xH^\perp) = \rho \circ \pi(x) = \pi^*(\rho)(x) = \chi(x),$$

which leads to

$$\widetilde{f}(xH^\perp) = f(x) = \sum_{\chi \in \text{supp}(\widehat{f})} \widehat{f}(\chi)\chi(x) = \sum_{\chi \in \text{supp}(\widehat{f})} \widehat{f}(\chi) [(\pi^*)^{-1}(\chi)](xH^\perp).$$

By definition of $\widehat{f}(\chi)$ and the assumption that f is real-valued, it is straightforward to verify (d). \square

For each $f \in L(G)$, we define

$$(4) \quad R_f : L(\widehat{G}) \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad R_f(v) = \frac{|G|\langle \widehat{f} * v, v \rangle}{\langle v, v \rangle}.$$

Lemma 3.2. *For each real-valued function on a finite abelian group G , we have $\max_{x \in G} f(x) = \max_{v \in L(\widehat{G}) \setminus \{0\}} R_f(v)$.*

Proof. Suppose $\max_{x \in G} f(x) = f(x_0)$ for some $x_0 \in G$. Denote $v := |G|\widehat{\delta_{x_0}}$ where δ_{x_0} is the indicator function of x_0 defined by

$$\delta_{x_0}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = x_0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly, we have $\widehat{v} = \delta_{x_0^{-1}}$. Since the Fourier transform is an isometry, we obtain

$$\frac{\langle \widehat{f} * v, v \rangle}{\langle v, v \rangle} = \frac{\left\langle \widehat{(\widehat{f} * v)}, \widehat{v} \right\rangle}{\langle \widehat{v}, \widehat{v} \rangle} = \frac{\sum_{x \in G} f(x^{-1})|\widehat{v}(x)|^2}{|G|\sum_{x \in G} |\widehat{v}(x)|^2} = \frac{f(x_0)}{|G|}. \quad \square$$

In the following, we denote values of $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in the non-increasing order as

$$\nu_1(f) \geq \nu_2(f) \geq \dots \geq \nu_n(f).$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let f be a real-valued function on a finite abelian group G . Given $v \in L(\widehat{G}) \setminus \{0\}$ such that $v(\chi) \geq 0$ for all $\chi \in \widehat{G}$, we denote*

$$\mu := |\text{supp}(v)|, \quad M := \frac{|G|R_f(v) - \mu \sum_{i=1}^k \nu_i(f)}{|G| - \mu k}.$$

If $k\mu < |G|$ (resp. $k\mu \geq |G|$), then $\nu_{k+1}(f) \geq M$ (resp. $\nu_{k+1}(f) \leq M$).

Proof. For each $1 \leq i \leq k$, we choose $x_i \in G$ such that $\nu_i(f) = f(x_i)$. Denote $S := \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$. We consider the function $f_1 : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$f_1(x) = \begin{cases} \nu_{k+1}(f), & \text{if } x \in S, \\ f(x), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By definition, we have $\nu_1(f_1) = \nu_{k+1}(f)$. For each $\chi \in \widehat{G}$, we have

$$\widehat{f}_1(\chi) = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{x \in S} \nu_{k+1}(f)\overline{\chi(x)} + \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{x \in G \setminus S} f(x)\overline{\chi(x)} = \widehat{f}(\chi) - \frac{1}{|G|}g(\chi),$$

where $g : \widehat{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is defined by

$$g(\chi) = \sum_{i=1}^k (\nu_i(f) - \nu_{k+1}(f))\overline{\chi(x_i)}.$$

Since f_1 is real-valued, Lemma 3.2 implies

$$(5) \quad \nu_{k+1}(f) = \nu_1(f_1) \geq R_{f_1}(v) = R_f(v) - \frac{\langle g * v, v \rangle}{\langle v, v \rangle}.$$

By assumption, v is a non-negative function on \widehat{G} , which leads to

$$(6) \quad |g * v(\chi)| = \left| \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{\rho \in \widehat{G}} g(\rho^{-1})v(\chi\rho) \right| = \left| \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{\rho \in \widehat{G}} \sum_{i=1}^k (\nu_i(f) - \nu_{k+1}(f)) \overline{\rho^{-1}(x_i)} v(\chi\rho) \right| \\ \leq \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{\rho \in \widehat{G}} \sum_{i=1}^k (\nu_i(f) - \nu_{k+1}(f)) v(\chi\rho) \\ = \left(\sum_{i=1}^k (\nu_i(f) - \nu_{k+1}(f)) \right) \langle v, 1 \rangle.$$

We notice that $\langle v, 1 \rangle = \langle v, \delta_{\text{supp}(v)} \rangle$ where $\delta_{\text{supp}(v)} : \widehat{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the indicator function of $\text{supp}(v)$ defined by

$$\delta_{\text{supp}(v)}(\chi) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \chi \in \text{supp}(v), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Combining (5) with (6), we obtain

$$\nu_{k+1}(f) \geq R_f(v) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^k (\nu_i(f) - \nu_{k+1}(f)) \right) \frac{|\langle v, \delta_{\text{supp}(v)} \rangle|^2}{\langle v, v \rangle} \\ \geq R_f(v) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^k (\nu_i(f) - \nu_{k+1}(f)) \right) \langle \delta_{\text{supp}(v)}, \delta_{\text{supp}(v)} \rangle \\ = R_f(v) - \frac{\mu}{|G|} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k (\nu_i(f) - \nu_{k+1}(f)) \right).$$

Therefore, we may conclude that

$$\left(1 - \frac{k\mu}{|G|} \right) \nu_{k+1}(f) \geq R_f(v) - \frac{\mu}{|G|} \sum_{i=1}^k \nu_i(f)$$

and the desired inequality follows immediately. \square

Definition 3.4 (Positive definite function). A function f on G is positive definite, denoted as $f \succeq 0$, if $\widehat{f}(\chi) \geq 0$ for any $\chi \in \widehat{G}$.

In the literature, positive definite functions are also called spectrally positive functions [21]. Given $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we consider the linear operator

$$(7) \quad M_f^G : L(\widehat{G}) \rightarrow L(\widehat{G}), \quad M_f^G(v) = |G|\widehat{f} * v.$$

In the context of linear algebra, $R_f(v)$ defined in (4) is the *Rayleigh quotient* of v with respect to the linear operator M_f^G . According to the celebrated Bochner's Theorem [4, 39, 32], $f \succeq 0$ if and only if for any M_f^G is a Hermitian positive semidefinite linear operator.

Since $f(x) = \sum_{\chi \in \widehat{G}} \widehat{f}(\chi)\chi(x)$ and $|\chi(x)| = 1$, we observe that for any real-valued positive definite function f , it holds that $\nu_1(f) := \max_{x \in G} f(x) = f(1) = \sum_{\chi \in \widehat{G}} \widehat{f}(\chi)$. We denote $\text{argmax}_{x \in G} f :=$

$\{x \in G : f(x) = \nu_1(f)\}$ and observe that $|\operatorname{argmax}_{x \in G} f|$ is determined by the support of \widehat{f} . More precisely, we have:

Proposition 3.5 (Multiplicity of $\nu_1(f)$). *Let $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a real-valued positive definite function and let H be the subgroup of \widehat{G} generated by $\operatorname{supp}(\widehat{f})$. Then $\nu_1(f) = \cdots = \nu_k(f)$ if and only if $|\widehat{G}/H| \geq k$.*

Proof. Since $f \succeq 0$, $\max_{x \in G} f(x) = \sum_{\chi \in \operatorname{supp}(\widehat{f})} \widehat{f}(\chi)$. We have $H^\perp = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in G} f$. Therefore, we conclude that $\nu_1(f) = \cdots = \nu_k(f)$ if and only if $|H^\perp| \geq k$. According to Lemma 2.2, we obtain $|H^\perp| = |\widehat{G}/H|$ and this completes the proof. \square

We have the following observation which is a direct consequence of Proposition 3.5.

Corollary 3.6. *If $f \succeq 0$ and $\operatorname{supp}(\widehat{f})$ does not generate \widehat{G} then we must have $\nu_2(f) = \nu_1(f)$.*

Applying Lemma 3.3 to a real-valued positive definite function with $k = 1$, we obtain the proposition that follows.

Proposition 3.7. *Let $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a real-valued positive definite function and let $v \in L(\widehat{G}) \setminus \{0\}$ be a non-negative function. If $\mu := |\operatorname{supp}(v)| < |G|$ then*

$$\nu_2(f) \geq \frac{|G|R_f(v) - \mu f(1)}{|G| - \mu}.$$

4. A LOWER BOUND OF $\nu_2(f)$

In this section, we investigate lower bounds of $\nu_2(f)$ for $f \succeq 0$. By Proposition 3.7, any non-negative function v on \widehat{G} with $|\operatorname{supp}(v)| < |G|$ provides a lower bound of $\nu_2(f)$ as long as we can bound $R_f(v)$ from below. The ultimate goal of this section is to construct such v .

4.1. A generalized covering argument. We first present a framework that enables one to derive a lower bound of $R_f(v)$, and consequently for $\nu_2(f)$. This framework generalizes the existing covering argument within the context of graph theory [11, 12, 13]. It is important to note that our approach is grounded in Fourier analysis, which sets it apart from the previous graph-theoretic method.

Let G_1 be an abelian group which is not necessarily finite. We denote by $L_0(G_1)$ the space of finitely supported complex-valued functions on G . Suppose that there is a group homomorphism $\eta : G_1 \rightarrow \widehat{G}$. This induces a homomorphism

$$(8) \quad \eta_* : L_0(G_1) \rightarrow L(\widehat{G}), \quad \eta_*(h)(\chi) = \begin{cases} \sum_{z \in \eta^{-1}(\chi)} h(z) & \text{if } \eta^{-1}(\chi) \neq \emptyset, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $\operatorname{supp}(h)$ is finite, the summation in (8) is finite and η_* is well-defined.

Furthermore, we assume that there is a subset S of G_1 such that $\eta(S) = \operatorname{supp}(\widehat{f})$ and $|S| = |\operatorname{supp}(\widehat{f})|$. In particular, $\eta|_S$ is a bijection between S and $\operatorname{supp}(\widehat{f})$. Thus, there is a well-defined homomorphism

$$(9) \quad M_f^{G_1} : L_0(G_1) \rightarrow L_0(G_1), \quad \left[M_f^{G_1}(h) \right](z) = \sum_{w \in S} \widehat{f}(\eta(w)^{-1})h(wz).$$

If $G_1 = \widehat{G}$ and η is the identity map, then $M_f^{G_1}$ defined by (9) coincides with M_f^G in (7).

Lemma 4.1. *Let G be a finite abelian group and let $f \in L(G)$. Suppose that G_1 is an abelian group and $\eta : G_1 \rightarrow \widehat{G}$ is a group homomorphism such that $\eta(S) = \text{supp}(\widehat{f})$ for some $S \subseteq G_1$ of cardinality $|S| = |\text{supp}(\widehat{f})|$. Then the following diagram commutes.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} L_0(G_1) & \xrightarrow{M_f^{G_1}} & L_0(G_1) \\ \eta_* \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta_* \\ L(\widehat{G}) & \xrightarrow{M_f^G} & L(\widehat{G}) \end{array}$$

Here M_f^G , η_* and $M_f^{G_1}$ are respectively defined by (7), (8) and (9).

Proof. For each $h \in L_0(G_1)$ and $\chi \in \widehat{G}$, we denote $v := \eta_*(h)$ and $v_1 := M_f^{G_1}(h)$. On the one hand, we have

$$[(M_f^G \circ \eta_*)(h)](\chi) = [M_f^G(v)](\chi) = \sum_{\rho \in \text{supp}(\widehat{f})} \widehat{f}(\rho^{-1})v(\rho\chi) = \sum_{\rho \in \text{supp}(\widehat{f})} \sum_{z \in \eta^{-1}(\rho\chi)} \widehat{f}(\rho^{-1})h(z).$$

On the other hand, we have $[(\eta_* \circ M_f^{G_1})(h)](\chi) = [\eta_*(v_1)](\chi) = \sum_{z \in \eta^{-1}(\chi)} v_1(z)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{z \in \eta^{-1}(\chi)} v_1(z) &= \sum_{z \in \eta^{-1}(\chi)} \sum_{w \in S} \widehat{f}(\eta(w)^{-1})h(wz) \\ &= \sum_{w \in S} \sum_{z \in \eta^{-1}(\chi)} \widehat{f}(\eta(w)^{-1})h(wz) \\ &= \sum_{w \in S} \sum_{z \in \eta^{-1}(\eta(w)\chi)} \widehat{f}(\eta(w)^{-1})h(z) \\ &= \sum_{\rho \in \text{supp}(\widehat{f})} \sum_{z \in \eta^{-1}(\rho\chi)} \widehat{f}(\rho^{-1})h(z). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Let $R_f : L(\widehat{G}) \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function defined by (4). By definition, for each $v \in L(\widehat{G}) \setminus \{0\}$, $R_f(v)$ is the Rayleigh quotient of v with respect to M_f^G . Thus, as a direct consequence of Lemma 4.1, we obtain a lower bound of $R_f(v)$.

Corollary 4.2 (Lower bound of Rayleigh quotient). *Suppose that $f \in L(G)$ has real Fourier coefficients and C is a real number. If $h : G_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a finitely supported non-negative function such that $[M_f^{G_1}(h)](z) \geq Ch(z)$ for every $z \in G_1$. Then $R_f(\eta_*(h)) \geq C$.*

Proof. Let $v := \eta_*(h)$. By Lemma 4.1, we have $M_f^G(v) = [\eta_* \circ M_f^{G_1}](h) \geq C\eta_*(h) = Cv$. This together with the non-negativity of v implies

$$R_f(\eta_*(h)) = R_f(v) = \frac{\langle M_f^G(v), v \rangle}{\|v\|^2} \geq C. \quad \square$$

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose that $f \in L(G)$ is real-valued and positive definite. If $h : G_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a finitely supported non-negative function such that $\mu := |\text{supp}(\eta_*(h))| < |G|$ and $[M_f^{G_1}(h)] \geq Ch$ for some real number $C > 0$. Then*

$$\nu_2(f) \geq \nu_1(f) + \frac{|G|(C - \nu_1(f))}{|G| - \mu}.$$

Proof. Denote $v := \eta_*(h)$. According to Proposition 3.7 and Corollary 4.2, we obtain

$$\nu_2(f) \geq \frac{|G|R_f(v) - \nu_1(f)\mu}{|G| - \mu} = \nu_1(f) + \frac{|G|(C - \nu_1(f))}{|G| - \mu}. \quad \square$$

4.2. **An estimate for $\nu_2(f)$.** If f is a real-valued function, then

$$\text{supp}(\widehat{f}) = \{\chi_1, \overline{\chi_1}, \dots, \chi_r, \overline{\chi_r}, \chi_{r+1}, \dots, \chi_{r+t}\}.$$

Here $\overline{\chi_i} = \chi_i$ if and only if $r+1 \leq i \leq r+t$. Denote $G_1 := \mathbb{Z}^r \times (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^t$. We consider a group homomorphism

$$\eta : G_1 \rightarrow \widehat{G}, \quad \eta(m_1, \dots, m_{r+t}) = \prod_{i=1}^{r+t} \chi_i^{m_i}.$$

For each $1 \leq i \leq r+t$, we denote by e_i the element of G_1 whose entries are all zero except for the i -th, which is 1. Let $S = \{\pm e_1, \dots, \pm e_r, e_{r+1}, e_{r+t}\}$ where \cdot . Then clearly we have $|S| = |\text{supp}(\widehat{f})|$ and $\eta(S) = \text{supp}(\widehat{f})$.

Lemma 4.4 (Auxiliary function). *Suppose that $f \in L(G)$ is a real-valued positive definite function such that $r \geq 1$. Let G_1 and S be as above and let m_1, \dots, m_r be fixed positive integers. We define $h_0 \in L_0(G_1)$ by*

$$h_0(x_1, \dots, x_{r+t}) = \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^r \sin\left(\frac{\pi x_i}{m_i}\right) & \text{if } 1 \leq x_i \leq m_i - 1, 1 \leq i \leq r, r \geq 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then $[M_f^{G_1}(h_0)](x) \geq \left(2 \sum_{i=1}^r \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{m_i}\right) \widehat{f}(\chi_i) + \sum_{j=1}^t \widehat{f}(\chi_{r+j})\right) h_0(x)$ for any $x \in G_1$.

Proof. By definition and Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [M_f^{G_1}(h_0)](x) &= \sum_{i=1}^r \left(\widehat{f}(\chi_i) h_0(e_i + x) + \widehat{f}(\overline{\chi_i}) h_0(-e_i + x) \right) + \sum_{j=1}^t \widehat{f}(\chi_{r+j}) h_0(e_{r+j} + x) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r \widehat{f}(\chi_i) (h_0(e_i + x) + h_0(-e_i + x)) + \sum_{j=1}^t \widehat{f}(\chi_{r+j}) h_0(e_{r+j} + x) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r \widehat{f}(\chi_i) (h_0(e_i + x) + h_0(-e_i + x)) + \sum_{j=1}^t \widehat{f}(\chi_{r+j}) h_0(x) \end{aligned}$$

for each $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{r+t}) \in G_1$. We split the discussion into two cases:

- There exists some $1 \leq i \leq r$ such that $x_i < 1$ or $x_i > m_i - 1$. Then we have $v(x) = 0$, which implies

$$[M_f^{G_1}(h_0)](x) \geq 0 = \left(\sum_{i=1}^r 2 \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{m_i}\right) \widehat{f}(\chi_i) + \sum_{j=1}^t \widehat{f}(\chi_{r+j}) \right) h_0(x)$$

- For each $1 \leq i \leq r$, $1 \leq x_i \leq m_i - 1$. It is straightforward to verify that

$$h_0(e_i + x) + h_0(-e_i + x) = 2 \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{m_i}\right) h_0(x).$$

This leads to

$$[M_f^{G_1}(h_0)](x) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^r 2 \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{m_i}\right) \widehat{f}(\chi_i) + \sum_{j=1}^t \widehat{f}(\chi_{r+j}) \right) h_0(x). \quad \square$$

We recall that for any $h \in L_0(G_1)$, $\chi \in \text{supp}(\eta_*(h))$ if and only if $\eta^{-1}(\chi) \cap \text{supp}(h) \neq \emptyset$, which is further equivalent to $\chi \in \eta(\text{supp}(h))$. Thus, for the function v defined in Lemma 4.4, we have

$$(10) \quad \mu := |\text{supp}(\eta_*(h_0))| = |\eta(\text{supp}(v))| \leq |\text{supp}(h_0)| = 2^t \prod_{i=1}^r (m_i - 1).$$

Proposition 4.5. *Let $f \in L(G)$ be a real-valued positive definite function such that $r \geq 1$. Then*

$$\nu_2(f) \geq \nu_1(f) - \frac{4|G| \sum_{i=1}^r \widehat{f}(\chi_i) \sin^2\left(\frac{\pi}{2m_i}\right)}{|G| - 2^t \prod_{i=1}^r (m_i - 1)}$$

for all positive integers m_1, \dots, m_r such that $2^t \prod_{i=1}^r (m_i - 1) < |G|$.

Proof. Denote $C := 2 \sum_{i=1}^r \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{m_i}\right) \widehat{f}(\chi_i) + \sum_{j=1}^t \widehat{f}(\chi_{r+j})$. We recall that $\nu_1(f) = f(1) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^r \widehat{f}(\chi_i) + \sum_{j=1}^t \widehat{f}(\chi_{r+j})$. According to (10), Lemma 4.4 and Proposition 4.3, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_2(f) &\geq \nu_1(f) + \frac{|G|(C - \nu_1(f))}{|G| - \mu} = \nu_1(f) - \frac{2|G| \sum_{i=1}^r \widehat{f}(\chi_i) \left(1 - \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{m_i}\right)\right)}{|G| - \mu} \\ &\geq \nu_1(f) - \frac{4|G| \sum_{i=1}^r \widehat{f}(\chi_i) \sin^2\left(\frac{\pi}{2m_i}\right)}{|G| - 2^t \prod_{i=1}^r (m_i - 1)}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

As a direct consequence of Proposition 4.5, we have the following:

Theorem 4.6 (Lower bound of $\nu_2(f)$). *Let $f \in L(G)$ be a real-valued positive definite function such that $r \geq 1$. For each positive integer $m < (2^{-t}|G|)^{1/r} + 1$, it holds that*

$$(11) \quad \nu_2(f) \geq \nu_1(f) - \frac{4|G| \sin^2\left(\frac{\pi}{2m}\right)}{|G| - 2^t (m-1)^r} \sum_{i=1}^r \widehat{f}(\chi_i) \geq \nu_1(f) \left(1 - \frac{\pi^2 |G|}{2m^2 (|G| - 2^t (m-1)^r)}\right)$$

In particular, given any positive integer s , we have

$$(12) \quad \frac{\nu_1(f) - \nu_2(f)}{\nu_1(f)} = O(|G|^{-4/s}).$$

for every real-valued positive definite function f on a finite abelian group G such that $|\text{supp}(\widehat{f})| \leq s$ and $r \geq 1$.

Proof. We observe that $2 \sum_{i=1}^r \widehat{f}(\chi_i) \leq \nu_1(f)$. Then (11) is obtained from Theorem 4.5 immediately by setting $m_1 = \dots = m_r = m$. For (12), we notice that $2^t (m-1)^r \leq (m-1)^{t/2} (m-1)^r = (m-1)^{s/2}$ if $m \geq 5$. Moreover, if $2^s < |G|$ and $m = \alpha |G|^{2/s}$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, then we have

$$(13) \quad \frac{\nu_1(f) - \nu_2(f)}{\nu_1(f)} \leq \frac{2 \sin^2\left(\frac{\pi}{2m}\right)}{1 - \alpha^{s/2}} \leq \frac{\pi^2}{2(1 - \alpha^{s/2})m^2} = \frac{\pi^2}{2(1 - \alpha^{s/2})\alpha^2} |G|^{-4/s}. \quad \square$$

In the subsequent discussion, applications of Theorem 4.6 are of particular interest to us. Nonetheless, Proposition 4.5 may provide a better lower bound of $\nu_2(f)$ than Theorem 4.6, as the following example illustrates.

Example 4.7. On $G = \mathbb{Z}/40\mathbb{Z}$, we consider $f(x) = 2\chi(x) + 2\chi^{-1}(x) + \chi^5(x) + \chi^{-5}(x)$ where $\chi(x) := \exp(2\pi i x/40)$. A direct calculation reveals that $\nu_1(f) = 6$, $\nu_2(f) = \nu_3(f) = 5.364$ and $\nu_4(f) = \nu_5(f) = 3.804$. It is straightforward to verify that the best lower bound of $\nu_2(f)$ obtained by Proposition 4.5 is 4.214 when $(m_1, m_2) = (7, 4)$, while the bound obtained by Theorem 4.6 is 4.026 when $m = 5$.

We conclude this subsection by a brief discussion on the best choice of m in Theorem 4.6. To this end, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.8. *Let d be a positive integer and let c be a positive real number. We define a function $\theta(x) = x^2(1 - c(x-1)^d)$ on $[1, \infty)$. Then θ has a maximizer and any maximizer x_0 of θ must satisfy*

$$\left(\frac{2}{2c+cd}\right)^{\frac{1}{d}} < x_0 < \left(\frac{2}{2c+cd}\right)^{\frac{1}{d}} + 1.$$

Proof. Since $c, d > 0$ and $\theta'(x) = 2x(1 - c(x-1)^d) - cd x^2(x-1)^{d-1}$, we may conclude that $\theta'(1) = 2 > 0$ and $\theta'(x) < 0$ for sufficiently large x . This implies that θ attains its maximum at some point x_0 in $[1, \infty)$. In particular, $\theta'(x_0) = 0$. Thus, we obtain

$$(2c+cd)x_0^d > 2 = 2c(x_0-1)^d + cd(x_0-1)^{d-1}x_0 > (2c+cd)(x_0-1)^d,$$

which implies $(2/(2c+cd))^{1/d} < x_0 < (2/(2c+cd))^{1/d} + 1$. \square

Now we apply Lemma 4.8 to the lower bound in (11) with $c = 2^t/|G|$ and $d = r$.

Proposition 4.9. *Let $f, G, t, r, \nu_1(f)$ and $\nu_2(f)$ be as in Theorem 4.6. If $\kappa := (2^{1-t}(2+r)^{-1}|G|)^{1/r}$ is not an integer, then the best lower bound given by (11) is*

$$\nu_2(f) \geq \nu_1(f) \left(1 - \frac{\pi^2|G|}{2\lceil\kappa\rceil^2(|G| - 2^t\lceil\kappa\rceil^r)}\right).$$

In Example 4.7, the best lower bound provided by Theorem 4.6 is achieved when $m = 5 = \lceil\sqrt{20}\rceil$. This is obtained through a direct calculation, as confirmed by Proposition 4.9.

4.3. A digression from the perspective of graph theory. Let G be a finite abelian group. For any function $w : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $w(x) = w(x^{-1})$ for any $x \in G$, we denote by $\text{Cay}(G, w)$ be *weighted Cayley graph* [1] determined by the pair (G, w) . By definition, $\text{Cay}(G, w)$ is the weighted graph with vertex set G , edge set $E = \{\{x, y\} \subseteq G : x^{-1}y \in \text{supp}(w)\}$ and the weight function $\omega : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by $\omega(x, y) = w(x^{-1}y)$. In particular, $\text{Cay}(G, \delta_S)$ is the usual Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(G, S)$ where δ_S is the indicator function of a symmetric subset $S \subseteq G$.

We notice that there is a one to one correspondence between the set of weighted Cayley graphs and $L(\widehat{G})$. Indeed, we have

$$(14) \quad \Phi : \{\text{Cay}(G, w) : w \in L(G)\} \rightarrow L(\widehat{G}), \quad \Phi(\text{Cay}(G, w)) = |G|\widehat{w}.$$

It is straightforward to verify that $\Phi^{-1}(f) = \text{Cay}(G, \widehat{f})$ for any $f \in L(\widehat{G})$. In particular, $\Phi(\text{Cay}(G, w))$ is real-valued and positive definite if and only if $w(\chi) = w(\overline{\chi}) \geq 0$ for any $\chi \in \widehat{G}$.

The existence of Φ enables us to view weighted Cayley graphs as functions on G . Consequently, we can investigate spectral properties of these graphs through their corresponding functions. The *adjacency matrix* of $\text{Cay}(G, w)$ is the matrix $A(G, w) = (a_{x,y})_{x,y \in G} \in \mathbb{C}^{|G| \times |G|}$ such that $a_{x,y} = w(x^{-1}y)$.

Lemma 4.10. [1, Corollary 3.2] *Suppose that $w(\chi) = w(\overline{\chi}) \geq 0$ for any $\chi \in \widehat{G}$. Let $\mu_1 \geq \dots \geq \mu_{|G|}$ be eigenvalues of $A(G, w)$. Then $\mu_i = \nu_i(\Phi(\text{Cay}(G, w)))$ for each $1 \leq i \leq |G|$.*

Proposition 4.11. *For any fixed positive integer s , we have*

$$\lambda_2(\text{Cay}(G, w)) = O(|G|^{-4/s})$$

for any $w \in L(G)$ such that $|\text{supp}(w)| \leq s$, $\text{supp}(w) \not\subseteq \{x \in G : x^2 = 1\}$ and $w(x) = w(x^{-1}) \geq 0$ for all $x \in G$. Here $\lambda_2(\text{Cay}(G, w))$ is the second smallest eigenvalue of the minus normalized Laplacian operator of $\text{Cay}(G, w)$.

Proof. Let $f := \Phi(\text{Cay}(G, w)) = |G|\widehat{w} \in L(\widehat{G})$. Then $\widehat{f}(x) = w(x^{-1}) = w(x)$. According to Lemma 4.10 and Theorem 4.6, we have $\lambda_2(\text{Cay}(G, w)) = (\nu_1(f) - \nu_2(f))/\nu_1(f) = O(|G|^{-4/s})$. \square

We recall that each s -regular Cayley graph on G is of the form $\text{Cay}(G, \delta_S)$, where $S \subseteq G$ is symmetric with $|S| = s$. Proposition 4.11 implies that $\lambda_2(\text{Cay}(G, S)) = s(1 - O(|G|^{-4/s}))$, as long as $S \not\subseteq \{x \in G : x^2 = 1\}$. This is also proved in [12] by the covering argument for graphs.

5. APPLICATIONS

This section is concerned with three applications of Theorem 4.6: (a) Estimating values of arbitrary functions on finite abelian groups; (b) Obtaining lower bounds for the relaxation time and mixing time of random walks on finite abelian groups; (c) Deriving a lower bound for the size of the sumset of two subsets of finite abelian groups.

5.1. Function value estimation. Let f be a real-valued function on G with real Fourier coefficients. We denote values of f in the non-increasing order $\nu_1(f) \geq \dots \geq \nu_{|G|}(f)$. In this subsection, we apply Theorem 4.6 to obtain lower and upper bounds of $\nu_k(f)$, for each $3 \leq k \leq |G|$.

Given a real-valued positive definite function f on G , we consider the weighted Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(\widehat{G}, \widehat{f})$ defined as in Subsection 4.3. We recall from [27] that $\text{Cay}(\widehat{G}, \widehat{f})$ is a *Ricci flat graph*. As a consequence, we have the lemma that follows.

Lemma 5.1. [27, Proposition 1.6] *If $f \in L(G)$ is real-valued and positive definite, then $\text{Cay}(\widehat{G}, \widehat{f})$ is $\text{CD}(0, \infty)$.*

For a real-valued $f \in L(G)$, we define $t := |\{\chi \in \text{supp}(\widehat{f}) : \chi^2 = 1\}|$ and $r := (|G| - t)/2$. The proof of the following lemma is inspired by an spectral estimate for Cayley graphs [28, Corollary 4.7].

Lemma 5.2. *Let $C := \left(\frac{20\sqrt{2}e}{e-1}\right)^2$ and let $f \in L(G)$ be a real-valued positive definite function with $r \geq 1$. Then for any positive integer $m < (2^{-t}|G|)^{1/r} + 1$, we have*

$$\nu_k(f) \geq \nu_1(f) - Ck^2 \frac{\pi^2 |G|}{2m^2 (|G| - 2^t(m-1)^r)} \nu_1(f)^2.$$

Proof. Let $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{|G|}$ be eigenvalues of the adjacency matrix $A(\widehat{G}, \widehat{f})$ of $\text{Cay}(\widehat{G}, \widehat{f})$. According to Lemma 4.10, we have $\lambda_k = \nu_k(f)$ for any $1 \leq k \leq |G|$. By Theorem 2.4 and Lemma 5.1, we obtain $\nu_1(f) - \nu_k(f) \leq Ck^2(\nu_1(f) - \nu_2(f))\nu_1(f)$. The proof is complete by Theorem 4.6. \square

We observe that for each real-valued function f with real Fourier coefficients, there exist real-valued positive definite functions f_1 and f_2 such that $f = f_1 - f_2$.

Lemma 5.3. *Let f_1 and f_2 be real-valued positive definite functions on G and let $f := f_1 - f_2$. For any $1 \leq k \leq |G|$, we have*

$$\nu_k(f_1) - \nu_1(f_2) \leq \nu_k(f) \leq \nu_1(f_1) - \nu_{n-k+1}(f_2).$$

Proof. Assume $\nu_i(f_1) = f_1(x_i)$ for some $x_i \in G$ where $1 \leq i \leq k$. Then

$$f(x_i) = f_1(x_i) - f_2(x_i) \geq \nu_k(f_1) - \nu_1(f_2),$$

which implies $\nu_k(f) \geq \nu_k(f_1) - \nu_1(f_2)$. For the upper bound, we consider $-f = f_2 - f_1$. By the above argument, we obtain

$$-\nu_k(f) = \nu_{n-k+1}(-f) \geq \nu_{n-k+1}(f_2) - \nu_1(f_1). \quad \square$$

For $i = 1, 2$, we denote

$$t_i := |\{\chi \in \text{supp}(\widehat{f}_i) : \chi^2 = 1\}|, \quad r_i := (|G| - t_i)/2.$$

Lemma 5.3 together with Proposition 5.2 leads to the following estimate of $\nu_k(f)$.

Proposition 5.4. [Lower and upper bound for $\nu_k(f)$] Let $C := \left(\frac{20\sqrt{2}\epsilon}{e-1}\right)^2$ and let f, f_1, f_2 be as in Lemma 5.3. Suppose $k \geq 3$. If $r_1, r_2 \geq 1$, then for any positive integers $m_i < (2^{-t_i}|G|)^{1/r_i} + 1$, $i = 1, 2$, we have

$$-\frac{Ck^2\pi^2|G|\nu_1(f_1)^2}{2m_1^2(|G| - 2^{t_1}(m_1 - 1)^{r_1})} \leq \nu_k(f) - f(1) \leq \frac{C(n-k+1)^2\pi^2|G|\nu_1(f_2)^2}{2m_2^2(|G| - 2^{t_2}(m_2 - 1)^{r_2})}.$$

5.2. Relaxation and mixing time estimation. The second application of Theorem 4.6 is concerned with the relaxation and mixing times of random walks on finite abelian groups. To begin with, we briefly recall some necessary notions, standard references for which are [33, 24]. A *probability distribution* on a finite abelian group G is a function $p : G \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\sum_{g \in G} p(g) = 1$. The *random walk* on G driven by p is the *Markov chain* with the *state space* G and *transition probability matrix* $K = (K_{xy})_{x, y \in G}$ where $K_{xy} := p(x^{-1}y)$. We further assume that p satisfies the following two conditions:

- (a) For each $x \in G$, $p(x) = p(x^{-1})$.
- (b) For each $x \in G$, $\{xy : y \in \text{supp}(p)\}$ generates G .

The random walk driven by such p is reversible [33, Section 2.2], irreducible and aperiodic [33, Proposition 2.3].

Let $1 = \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{|G|} \geq -1$ be the eigenvalues of the transition probability matrix $K \in \mathbb{R}^{|G| \times |G|}$. The *relaxation time* T_{rel} and the *absolute relaxation time* T_{rel}^* of the random walk driven by p are respectively defined by

$$T_{\text{rel}} := \frac{1}{1 - \lambda_2}, \quad T_{\text{rel}}^* := \frac{1}{1 - \max\{|\lambda_2|, |\lambda_{|G|}|\}}.$$

Proposition 5.5 (Lower bound of relaxation time). *For any positive integer s and probability p on G satisfying (a), (b) and $|\text{supp}(p)| \leq s$, we have $T_{\text{rel}}^* = \Omega(|G|^{4/s})$ and $T_{\text{rel}} = \Omega(|G|^{4/s})$.*

Proof. By definition, we have $T_{\text{rel}}^* \geq T_{\text{rel}}$. Thus, it suffices to prove $T_{\text{rel}} = \Omega(|G|^{4/s})$. If $\text{supp}(p) \not\subseteq \{x \in G : x^2 = 1\}$, we define $f := |G|\hat{p}$ so that $\hat{f}(x) = p(x^{-1})$ for any $x \in G$. Hence we have $\lambda_2 = \nu_2(f) \leq \nu_1(f) = 1$. According to Theorem 4.6, we obtain $1 - \lambda_2 = O(|G|^{-4/s})$ and the lower bound of T_{rel} follows immediately. It is left to consider the case where $\text{supp}(p) \subseteq \{x \in G : x^2 = 1\}$. By assumption, $\text{supp}(p)$ generates G . Thus, we must have $|G| \leq \sum_{k=0}^s \binom{s}{k} = 2^s$, which implies $|G|^{4/s} \leq 16$ and $T_{\text{rel}} = \Omega(|G|^{4/s})$ holds trivially. \square

Remark 5.6. In earlier works such as [15] and [19], it was proved that $T_{\text{rel}} = \Omega(p^{2/s})$ for $G = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$. Very recently, this lower bound is extended to any finite abelian group [16, Theorem 6.1]. According to Proposition 5.5, the exponent of the existing lower bound can be further improved from $2/s$ to $4/s$.

The exponent of the lower bound in Proposition 5.5 is tight, as demonstrated by the following example.

Example 5.7. Let $G = \text{Cay}(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}, \{1, -1\})$ and let p be the probability on G defined by

$$p(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } x \in \{1, -1\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In this case, we have $|G| = n$ and $s = 2$ and Proposition 5.5 yields $T_{\text{rel}} = \Omega(n^2)$ and $T_{\text{rel}}^* = \Omega(n^2)$. On the other hand, a direct calculation [24, Example 12.3.1] indicates that T_{rel} is of order n^2 . Moreover, when n is odd, T_{rel}^* is also of order n^2 .

Let G_1, G_2, \dots, G_d be finite abelian groups and let p_1, \dots, p_d be probability distributions on these groups, respectively. Suppose that w is a probability distribution on $\{1, \dots, d\}$. Denote $G := \prod_{j=1}^d G_j$ and define the matrix $K = (K_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{|G| \times |G|}$ by

$$K_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}} := \sum_{j=1}^d \left(\prod_{i \neq j} \delta_{x_i, y_i} \right) w(j) p_j(x_j^{-1} y_j),$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d), \mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_d)$ are elements of G and

$$\delta_{x, y} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = y \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The random walk on G with the transition probability matrix K is called the *product chain* of random walks on G_1, \dots, G_d driven by p_1, \dots, p_d , respectively.

Corollary 5.8 (Lower bound of relaxation time of product chain). *Let s be a fixed positive integer. If p_1, \dots, p_d satisfy conditions (a) and (b) with $\max\{|\text{supp}(p_j)| : 1 \leq j \leq d, w(j) > 0\} \leq s$, then we have $T_{\text{rel}}^* = \Omega(w(j)^{-1} |G_j|^{4/s})$ and $T_{\text{rel}} = \Omega(w(j)^{-1} |G_j|^{4/s})$, for any $1 \leq j \leq d$ such that $w(j) > 0$.*

Proof. Since $T_{\text{rel}}^* \geq T_{\text{rel}}$, it is sufficient to establish the lower bound of T_{rel} . For each $1 \leq j \leq d$, we denote by K_j the transition probability matrix of the random walk on G_j driven by p_j . According to [24, Lemma 12.11], we have

$$T_{\text{rel}}(G) = \max_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq d \\ w(j) > 0}} \{w(j)^{-1} T_{\text{rel}}(G_j)\}.$$

Here $T_{\text{rel}}(G)$ (resp. $T_{\text{rel}}(G_j)$) is the relaxation time of the product chain (resp. random walk on G_j driven by p_j). This implies that $T_{\text{rel}}(G) \geq w(j)^{-1} T_{\text{rel}}(G_j)$ for any $1 \leq j \leq d$ such that $w(j) > 0$. The desired lower bound of T_{rel} follows from Proposition 5.5. \square

Next, we focus on estimating the mixing time, another essential characteristic of random walks. Given two measures μ and ν on G and a positive integer l , we respectively define

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{TV}} := \max_{A \subseteq G} |\mu(A) - \nu(A)|, \quad p^{(l)} := \underbrace{p * \dots * p}_{l \text{ times}}.$$

Let u_0 be the uniform probability on G defined by $u_0(x) = 1/|G|$ for each $x \in G$. For each $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$, the *mixing time* of the random walk on G driven by p is

$$T_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon) := \min\{m : \|p^{(m)} - u_0\|_{\text{TV}} \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

Proposition 5.9 (Lower bound of mixing time). *For any positive integer s and probability p on G satisfying (a), (b) and $|\text{supp}(p)| \leq s$, we have*

$$\frac{T_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon)}{\log\left(\frac{1}{2\varepsilon}\right)} = \Omega(|G|^{4/s}),$$

Proof. By [24, Theorem 12.4], we have

$$(15) \quad T_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon) \geq (T_{\text{rel}}^* - 1) \log\left(\frac{1}{2\varepsilon}\right),$$

and the proof is complete by Proposition 5.5. \square

Let s be a positive integer. Suppose that G be a finite abelian group and p is a probability distribution on G satisfying (a) and (b) with $|\text{supp}(p)| \leq s$. For $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$, we denote by $T_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon)$ the mixing time of the product chain of random walks on $G_1 = \cdots = G_d = G$ driven by $p_1 = \cdots = p_d = p$ with $w : \{1, \dots, d\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ defined by $w(j) := 1/d$, $1 \leq j \leq d$. We may derive two different types of lower bounds for $T_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon)$.

Corollary 5.10 (Lower bound of mixing time for product chain). *For any fixed integer s , we have $T_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon) = \Omega(d|G|^{4/s}) \log(\frac{1}{2\varepsilon})$ and $T_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon) \geq \Omega(d \log d |G|^{4/s}) + O(d) \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} - 1)$.*

Proof. According to Corollary 5.8 and (15), we have $T_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon) = \Omega(d|G|^{4/s}) \log(1/(2\varepsilon))$. On the other hand, by [24, Example 13.10] and Proposition 5.5, we obtain

$$T_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon) \geq \Omega(d \log d |G|^{4/s}) + O(d) \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} - 1\right). \quad \square$$

5.3. Sumset size estimation. Our final application of Theorem 4.6 pertains to the size of the sumset of two subsets of finite abelian groups. Let A, B be subsets of a finite abelian group G . We denote

$$AB := \{xy : x \in A, y \in B\}, \quad A^{-1} := \{x^{-1} : x \in A\}.$$

The set AB is called the *sumset* of A and B . If G is an additive group, we denote the sumset of A and B by $A + B$. We say that A is *symmetric* if $A = A^{-1}$. The problem of estimating $|AB|$ lies at the core of additive combinatorics [37]. The goal of this subsection is to establish a lower bound of $|AB|$ by Theorem 4.6.

Lemma 5.11. *Given positive definite functions $f, g \in L(G)$, we have $\text{supp}(\widehat{fg}) = \text{supp}(f) \text{supp}(g)$. If g is also real-valued, then $\text{supp}(\widehat{fg}) = \text{supp}(f) \text{supp}(g)^{-1}$.*

Proof. We note that $\widehat{fg} = |G| \widehat{f} * \widehat{g}$. Since both f and g are positive definite, their Fourier coefficients are non-negative. Thus, for each $\chi \in \widehat{G}$, $\chi \in \text{supp}(\widehat{fg})$ if and only if there is some $\rho \in \widehat{G}$ such that $\widehat{f}(\chi\rho^{-1}) > 0$ and $\widehat{g}(\rho) > 0$. This is further equivalent to $\chi \in \text{supp}(f) \text{supp}(g)$. If g is also real-valued, Lemma 3.1 (d) implies that $\text{supp}(g) = \text{supp}(g)^{-1}$. \square

Suppose that A, B are symmetric subsets of G and H is the subgroup of G generated by $A \cup B$. Let f, g be real-valued positive definite functions on \widehat{G} such that $\text{supp}(\widehat{f}) = A$ and $\text{supp}(\widehat{g}) = B$. By Lemma 5.11, we have $\text{supp}(\widehat{fg}) = AB \subseteq H$. Suppose that $h := \widehat{fg} : \widehat{G}/H^\perp \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the function induced by fg in Lemma 3.1 (a) and $\pi : \widehat{G} \rightarrow \widehat{G}/H^\perp$ is the quotient map. Proposition 3.5 indicates that

$$\nu_2(h) = \mu_2(f, g) := \max\{f(\chi)g(\chi) : \chi \in \widehat{G}, f(\chi)g(\chi) < \nu_1(f)\nu_1(g)\}.$$

Proposition 5.12 (Lower bound of sumset size). *If $|A||B| \leq 2 \log |H| / \log(m-1)$ for some integer $m \geq 5$, then we have*

$$2 \frac{\log |H|}{\log(m-1)} \geq |AB| \geq 2 \frac{\log |H| + \log \left(1 - \frac{\pi^2}{2m^2} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_2(f, g)}{\nu_1(f)\nu_1(g)}\right)^{-1}\right)}{\log(m-1)}.$$

Proof. The first inequality is obvious since $|AB| \leq |A||B|$. According to Lemma 3.1 (c), we may derive that

$$\begin{aligned}
h &= \sum_{z \in AB} \widehat{fg}(z) [(\pi^*)^{-1}(z)] \\
&= \sum_{z \in AB} |G|(\widehat{f} * \widehat{g})(z) [(\pi^*)^{-1}(z)] \\
&= \sum_{z \in AB} \sum_{x \in A} \widehat{f}(x) \widehat{g}(x^{-1}z) [(\pi^*)^{-1}(z)] \\
&= \sum_{x \in A} \widehat{f}(x) \sum_{y \in B} \widehat{g}(y) [(\pi^*)^{-1}(xy)] \\
&= \sum_{x \in A} \widehat{f}(x) [(\pi^*)^{-1}(x)] \sum_{y \in B} \widehat{g}(y) [(\pi^*)^{-1}(y)].
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we conclude that $\nu_1(h) = \nu_1(f)\nu_1(g)$. Let $s := |AB|$. Then $|\text{supp}(\widehat{h})| = |\text{supp}(\widehat{fg})| = s$. Since $m \geq 5$, by (11), we have

$$\nu_2(h) \geq \nu_1(h) \left(1 - \frac{\pi^2 |H|}{2m^2 (|H| - (m-1)^{s/2})} \right),$$

from which the second inequality follows immediately. \square

Example 5.13. Let $p \geq 17$ be a prime and let $G := \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$. We consider two subsets of G : $A = \{\mathbf{v}_1, -\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, -\mathbf{v}_2\}$ and $B = \{\mathbf{v}_3, -\mathbf{v}_3\}$, where $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2\}$ is a basis of $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbf{v}_3 \in \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ is nonzero. We define two functions $f, g : \widehat{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f(\rho) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in A} \rho(\mathbf{x}), \quad g(\rho) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in B} \rho(\mathbf{x}).$$

It is clear that both f and g are positive definite functions on \widehat{G} and $\text{supp}(\widehat{f}) = A$, $\text{supp}(\widehat{g}) = B$. Indeed, by identifying \widehat{G} with G , we have

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = 2 \left(\cos \left(\frac{2\pi \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{v}_1}{p} \right) + \cos \left(\frac{2\pi \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{v}_2}{p} \right) \right), \quad g(\mathbf{x}) = 2 \cos \left(\frac{2\pi \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{v}_3}{p} \right),$$

where $\mathbf{x} \in G$ and $\mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{z}$ denotes the usual inner product of vectors $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in G$. According to Proposition 5.12, we obtain

$$8 \geq |AB| \geq 2 \frac{2 \log p + \log \left(1 - \frac{\pi^2}{50} \left(1 - \frac{\mu_2(f, g)}{8} \right)^{-1} \right)}{\log 4}.$$

In particular, if $p = 17$, $\mathbf{v}_1 = (1, 0)$, $\mathbf{v}_2 = (9, 9)$ and $\mathbf{v}_3 = (2, 0)$, then it is straightforward to verify that $\mu_2(f, g) = 5.71$, which implies $|AB| \geq 7$.

We conclude this subsection by a brief discussion on the sumset size estimation for \mathbb{Z} . Let A and B be finite symmetric subsets of \mathbb{Z} . Suppose that n and m are the maximum values of the elements in A and B , respectively. We denote by $\overline{A}, \overline{B}$ images of A, B in the quotient group $\mathbb{Z}/(n+m+1)\mathbb{Z}$. It is obvious that $|\overline{A} + \overline{B}| = |A + B|$ and Proposition 5.12 applies if $|A + B|$ is small.

Moreover, we recall from [37, Lemma 2.1] that $|A + A| \leq \binom{|A|+1}{2}$ for any finite subset $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$. We notice that $\nu_1(\widehat{\delta}_A) = |A|$ and \overline{A} generates \mathbb{Z}_p for each prime $p \geq 2n+1$. Therefore, as a consequence of Proposition 5.12, we may derive the corollary that follows.

Corollary 5.14. *Let A be a finite symmetric subset of \mathbb{Z} and let $m \geq 5$ be an integer number. For any prime number p such that $p \geq 2 \max_{a \in A} \{a\} + 1$ and $2 \log p / \log(m-1) \geq \binom{|A|+1}{2}$, we have*

$$|A + A| \geq 2 \frac{\log p + \log \left(1 - \frac{\pi^2}{2m^2} \left(1 - \frac{\nu_2 \left(\widehat{\delta_A}^2 \right)}{|A|^2} \right)^{-1} \right)}{\log(m-1)}.$$

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Babai. Spectra of Cayley graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 27(2):180–189, 1979.
- [2] W. Banaszczyk. On a certain class of positive definite functions and measures on locally compact Abelian groups and inner-product spaces. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 282(1):Paper No. 109261, 41, 2022.
- [3] G. Blekherman, J. a. Gouveia, and J. Pfeiffer. Sums of squares on the hypercube. *Math. Z.*, 284(1-2):41–54, 2016.
- [4] S. Bochner. Monotone Funktionen, Stieltjessche Integrale und harmonische Analyse. *Math. Ann.*, 108(1):378–410, 1933.
- [5] M. J. Caola. Self-Fourier functions. *J. Phys. A*, 24(19):L1143–L1144, 1991.
- [6] M. Daws and P. Salmi. Completely positive definite functions and Bochner’s theorem for locally compact quantum groups. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 264(7):1525–1546, 2013.
- [7] R. E. Edwards. *Fourier series. A modern introduction. Vol. 1*, volume 64 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, second edition, 1979.
- [8] R. E. Edwards. *Fourier series. Vol. 2*, volume 85 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, second edition, 1982. A modern introduction.
- [9] W. Erb. Graph signal interpolation with positive definite graph basis functions. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, 60:368–395, 2022.
- [10] H. Fawzi, J. Saunderson, and P. A. Parrilo. Sparse sums of squares on finite abelian groups and improved semidefinite lifts. *Math. Program.*, 160(1-2):149–191, 2016.
- [11] J. Friedman. Some geometric aspects of graphs and their eigenfunctions. *Duke Math. J.*, 69(3):487–525, 1993.
- [12] J. Friedman, R. Murty, and J.-P. Tillich. Spectral estimates for abelian Cayley graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 96(1):111–121, 2006.
- [13] J. Friedman and J.-P. Tillich. Generalized Alon-Boppana theorems and error-correcting codes. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 19(3):700–718, 2005.
- [14] W. Fulton and J. Harris. *Representation theory*, volume 129 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991. A first course, Readings in Mathematics.
- [15] A. Greenhalgh. *Random walks on groups with subgroup invariance properties*. PhD thesis, Stanford University, 1989.
- [16] J. Hermon and S. Olesker-Taylor. Geometry of random Cayley graphs of Abelian groups. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 33(5):3520–3562, 2023.
- [17] H. Heyer. *Probability measures on locally compact groups*, volume Band 94 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1977.
- [18] A. Hinrichs and J. Vyříral. On positive positive-definite functions and Bochner’s Theorem. *J. Complexity*, 27(3-4):264–272, 2011.
- [19] R. Hough. Mixing and cut-off in cycle walks. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 22:Paper No. 90, 49, 2017.
- [20] I. M. Isaacs. *Character theory of finite groups*. AMS Chelsea Publishing, Providence, RI, 2006. Corrected reprint of the 1976 original [Academic Press, New York; MR0460423].
- [21] Z. Kelley and R. Meka. Strong bounds for 3-progressions. In *2023 IEEE 64th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science—FOCS 2023*, pages 933–973. IEEE Computer Soc., Los Alamitos, CA, [2023] ©2023.
- [22] B. Klartag, G. Kozma, P. Ralli, and P. Tetali. Discrete curvature and abelian groups. *Canad. J. Math.*, 68(3):655–674, 2016.
- [23] Y. V. Kovchegov. Small-x F_2 structure function of a nucleus including multiple pomeron exchanges. *Phys. Rev. D*, 60:034008, Jun 1999.
- [24] D. A. Levin, Y. Peres, and E. L. Wilmer. *Markov chains and mixing times*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2009. With a chapter by James G. Propp and David B. Wilson.
- [25] P. Lévy. Fonctions caractéristiques positives. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B*, 265:A249–A252, 1967.
- [26] E. H. Lieb. Baryon mass inequalities in quark models. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 54:1987–1990, May 1985.
- [27] Y. Lin and S.-T. Yau. Ricci curvature and eigenvalue estimate on locally finite graphs. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 17(2):343–356, 2010.
- [28] S. Liu and N. Peyerimhoff. Eigenvalue ratios of non-negatively curved graphs. *Combin. Probab. Comput.*, 27(5):829–850, 2018.

- [29] M. B. Nathanson. *Elementary methods in number theory*, volume 195 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
- [30] J. F. Price. On positive definite functions over a locally compact group. *Canadian J. Math.*, 22:892–896, 1970.
- [31] W. Rudin. *Fourier analysis on groups*, volume No. 12 of *Interscience Tracts in Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Interscience Publishers (a division of John Wiley & Sons, Inc.), New York-London, 1962.
- [32] W. Rudin. *Fourier analysis on groups*. Wiley Classics Library. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1990. Reprint of the 1962 original, A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [33] L. Saloff-Coste. Random walks on finite groups. In *Probability on discrete structures*, volume 110 of *Encyclopaedia Math. Sci.*, pages 263–346. Springer, Berlin, 2004.
- [34] L. Slot and M. Laurent. Sum-of-squares hierarchies for binary polynomial optimization. *Math. Program.*, 197(2):621–660, 2023.
- [35] B. Steinberg. *Representation theory of finite groups*. Universitext. Springer, New York, 2012. An introductory approach.
- [36] J. Stewart. Positive definite functions and generalizations, an historical survey. *Rocky Mountain J. Math.*, 6(3):409–434, 1976.
- [37] T. Tao and V. H. Vu. *Additive combinatorics*, volume 105 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, paperback edition, 2010.
- [38] A. Terras. *Fourier analysis on finite groups and applications*, volume 43 of *London Mathematical Society Student Texts*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.
- [39] A. Weil. *L'intégration dans les groupes topologiques et ses applications*, volume No. 869 of *Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles [Current Scientific and Industrial Topics]*. Hermann & Cie, Paris, 1940. [This book has been republished by the author at Princeton, N. J., 1941.].
- [40] J. Yang, K. Ye, and L. Zhi. Computing sparse Fourier sum of squares on finite abelian groups in quasi-linear time. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, 73:Paper No. 101686, 19, 2024.

STATE KEY LABORATORY OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE,
CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Email address: wanglixia@amss.ac.cn

STATE KEY LABORATORY OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, ACADEMY OF MATHEMATICS AND SYSTEMS SCIENCE,
CHINESE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Email address: keyk@amss.ac.cn