

L^p - HEISENBERG–PAULI–WEYL UNCERTAINTY INEQUALITIES ON CERTAIN TWO-STEP NILPOTENT LIE GROUPS

PRITAM GANGULY AND JAYANTA SARKAR

ABSTRACT. This article presents the L^p -Heisenberg–Pauli–Weyl uncertainty inequality for the group Fourier transform on a broad class of two-step nilpotent Lie groups, specifically the two-step MW groups. This inequality quantitatively demonstrates that on two-step MW groups, a nonzero function and its group Fourier transform cannot both be sharply localized. The proof primarily relies on utilizing the dilation structure inherent to two-step nilpotent Lie groups and estimating the Schatten class norms of the group Fourier transform. The inequality we establish is new even in the simplest case of Heisenberg groups. Our result significantly sharpens all previously known L^p -Heisenberg–Pauli–Weyl uncertainty inequalities for $1 \leq p < 2$ within the realm of two-step nilpotent Lie groups.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

Nearly a century ago, in 1927, Heisenberg [12] first introduced the idea that the position and momentum of a particle cannot be precisely determined at the same time in any quantum-mechanical state. Later, Kennard [13] and Weyl [26] provided a more rigorous mathematical foundation for this concept, attributing it to Pauli. Nowadays, the mathematical community refers to this result as the Heisenberg–Pauli–Weyl uncertainty inequality, which, in its most general form, states that for every $\alpha, \beta > 0$ and $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$,

$$\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}^{\alpha+\beta} \leq C(\alpha, \beta, n) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \|x\|^{2\alpha} |f(x)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \|\xi\|^{2\beta} |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \quad (1.1)$$

where \widehat{f} stands for the Fourier transform of f , and $\|\cdot\|$ is the standard Euclidean norm. Beyond its fundamental role in quantum physics and signal processing, this inequality offers profound mathematical insights, particularly through a striking property of Fourier pairs: *a function and its Fourier transform cannot both be sharply localized*. This concept, known as the uncertainty principle in harmonic analysis, has captivated mathematicians for decades, inspiring various formulations across different mathematical contexts. Notably, Hardy introduced a qualitative version of this principle (see [9, p.227]), whereas (1.1) represents an important quantitative counterpart. For a comprehensive overview of the history of various uncertainty principles in harmonic analysis, as well as the significance of this inequality and its generalizations to other L^p norms, we refer the reader to the survey article by Folland and Sitaram [9]. We refer the reader to Section 2 for any undefined notions and symbols in this section.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 43A80. Secondary: 22E25, 43A15, 43A30.

Key words and phrases. two-step nilpotent Lie groups, MW groups, Heisenberg uncertainty principle, spectral decomposition, Schatten norm.

As is often the case in mathematics, numerous researchers, guided by mathematical intuition, have explored various generalizations of the Heisenberg–Pauli–Weyl (HPW) inequality. To establish a formal foundation for this discussion, we first note that, in view of the Plancherel formula, the inequality can be reformulated as

$$\|f\|_2^{\alpha+\beta} \leq C(\alpha, \beta, n) \|\|\cdot\|^\alpha f\|_2^\beta \|(-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^n})^{\frac{\beta}{2}} f\|_2^\alpha, \quad (1.2)$$

where $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ is the Laplacian on \mathbb{R}^n and the operator $(-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^n})^{\frac{\beta}{2}}$ is defined by

$$\widehat{(-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^n})^{\frac{\beta}{2}} f}(\xi) = \|\xi\|^\beta \widehat{f}(\xi). \quad (1.3)$$

The HPW inequality, expressed in this form, does not involve the Fourier transform, thereby allowing for generalizations to broader settings, where the Laplacian is replaced by a positive, self-adjoint operator and $\|\cdot\|$ is substituted with a suitable distance function.

The literature in this field is so extensive that it is not feasible to refer to every relevant paper in this direction. However, we will highlight key works that have significantly influenced this area of research and help shape the path we intend to take. Thangavelu [24] was the first to establish an analogue of the HPW inequality (1.2) for $\alpha = \beta = 1$, replacing the Laplacian with Hermite and special Hermite operators, as well as the sub-Laplacian on Heisenberg groups. Later, Sitaram–Sundari–Thangavelu [22] extended the result for the Heisenberg group to the range $0 < \alpha = \beta < Q/2$. Xiao–He [28] further generalized the inequality by proving it for all $\alpha, \beta > 0$. Ray [20, Theorem 4.1] established an analogue of (1.2) on two-step nilpotent Lie groups for $\alpha = \beta = 1$, where the Laplacian is replaced by the sub-Laplacian of the group. Ciatti–Ricci–Sundari [6] extended these results to two-step nilpotent Lie groups. Later, the same authors further extended (1.2) to a broader setting of Lie groups with polynomial volume growth, replacing the Laplacian with a Hörmander-type sub-Laplacian (see [5, Theorem 2.1]). Finally, Ciatti–Cowling–Ricci established a more general version of (1.2) by replacing the L^2 norm with L^p norms in the context of stratified Lie groups.

Theorem 1.1 ([4]). *Let G be a stratified Lie group equipped with a sub-Laplacian L , and let $|\cdot|$ denote a homogeneous norm. Assume that $\beta, \delta \in (0, \infty)$, $p, r \in (1, \infty)$, $s \geq 1$, and that*

$$\frac{\beta + \delta}{p} = \frac{\beta}{r} + \frac{\delta}{s}.$$

Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $f \in C_c^\infty(G)$, the following holds:

$$\|f\|_p \leq C \|\|\cdot\|^\beta f\|_s^{\frac{\delta}{\beta+\delta}} \|L^{\delta/2} f\|_r^{\frac{\beta}{\beta+\delta}}. \quad (1.4)$$

By utilizing homogeneity, one can verify that for the inequality (1.4) to hold, the condition on (p, r, s) must necessarily be satisfied. This makes the theorem the most generalized result in its class. However, it is important to highlight the work of Martini [15], who extended the L^2 -HPW inequality to broader settings. His results not only encompass the groups discussed above but also apply to spaces with exponential volume growth. Furthermore, employing a completely different approach based on the isoperimetric inequality, Dall’Ara and Trevisan [8] established an L^p version of (1.2) for a fairly general class of spaces, including non-compact Riemannian symmetric spaces, with $\beta = 1$ and $(-\Delta_{\mathbb{R}^n})^{1/2}$ replaced by an invariant gradient. Later, Martín–Milman [16] extended the L^1 case to general metric measure spaces without assuming any underlying group structure. Notably, their approach remains valid in the Gaussian setting as well.

As evident from the above discussion, the L^p -HPW inequality has only been studied beyond Euclidean space by incorporating powers of positive self-adjoint operators, specific to each setting on the right-hand side.

In the context of the Fourier transform on \mathbb{R}^n , Steinerberger [23, Theorem 1] was the first to investigate a non- L^2 variant of (1.1), establishing the result for the L^1 case. Subsequently, Xiao [27, p. 273] extended this to the full range $1 < p < \infty$. More precisely, they proved the following.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $1 \leq p < \infty$. Suppose that $\alpha, \beta \in (0, \infty)$ are such that $\beta > n(1/p - 1/2)$ whenever $1 \leq p \leq 2$, and $\alpha < n/p'$ whenever $p > 2$. Then, for any $f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$, one has*

$$\|f\|_p^{\alpha+\beta} \leq C(\alpha, \beta, n, p) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\|x\|^\alpha |f(x)|)^p dx \right)^{\frac{\beta}{p}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (\|\xi\|^\beta |\widehat{f}(\xi)|)^{p'} d\xi \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{p'}}. \quad (1.5)$$

Notice that, by the Plancherel formula, the HPW inequalities (1.1) and (1.2) are equivalent; however, their L^p counterparts for $p \neq 2$ are not. In fact, by the Hausdorff–Young inequality, the Fourier transform version (1.5) is sharper whenever $1 \leq p < 2$. This version has garnered significant attention in recent years; see, for example, [11], [3]. However, beyond Euclidean spaces—such as in two-step nilpotent Lie groups—the Fourier transform is operator-valued, making it considerably more challenging to formulate and establish a precise analogue of (1.5) in such settings. In fact, the sharper version involving the Fourier transform presented in the theorem above has drawn our interest and serves as the primary motivation for investigating the possibility of an L^p version of the HPW inequality beyond Euclidean spaces.

In this article, we aim to establish an L^p version of the HPW uncertainty inequality for the group Fourier transform on two-step MW groups. To present our results, we introduce the necessary notation with minimal explanation, deferring a more detailed discussion to Section 2. Let G be a two-step MW group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{v} \oplus \mathfrak{z}$, where \mathfrak{z} denotes the center of \mathfrak{g} . It is known that there exists a Zariski-open subset $\Lambda \subset \mathfrak{z}^* \setminus \{0\}$ of full measure, which parametrizes the irreducible unitary representations of G relevant to the Plancherel measure. Moreover, for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, the corresponding representation π_λ is realized on $L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda)$, where \mathfrak{p}_λ is a subspace of \mathfrak{v} . For a suitable function f on G , the group Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}(f)$ is an operator-valued function on Λ , where for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)$ is a bounded operator on $L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda)$. Since the Fourier transform is operator-valued, deriving an analogue of the Fourier-side expression on the right-hand side of (1.5) requires careful observation. In this setting, the sub-Laplacian \mathcal{L} serves as the analogue of the Laplacian, and its Fourier transform satisfies

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{L}^{\beta/2} f)(\lambda) = \mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) H(\eta(\lambda))^{\beta/2},$$

where $H(\eta(\lambda))$ denotes the generalized scaled Hermite operator (see (2.10)). As a result, the term $\|\xi\|^\beta$ is naturally replaced by $H(\eta(\lambda))^{\beta/2}$ in this framework. A similar approach was employed in the special case of Heisenberg groups in [22] when addressing the L^2 -case. This insight naturally leads us to the following precise analogue of Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $1 \leq p \leq 2$. Assume that $\gamma > 0$, $\beta > Q(1/p - 1/2)$, and $f \in L^p(G)$. Then for $p \neq 1$, we have*

$$\|f\|_p^{\gamma+\beta} \leq C(\gamma, \beta, n, k, p) \| |\cdot|^\gamma f \|_p^\beta \left(\int_\Lambda \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{S_{p'}(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^{p'} |Pf(\lambda)| d\lambda \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{p'}},$$

and for $p = 1$, we have

$$\|f\|_1^{\gamma+\beta} \leq C(\gamma, \beta, n, k) \left(\int_G |x|^\gamma |f(x)| dx \right)^\beta \left(\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{op} \right)^\gamma.$$

Here, Q stands for the homogeneous dimension of G , and $\|\cdot\|_{S_{p'}(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}$ denotes the Schatten p' -norm on the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda)$ (see Appendix A).

This inequality demonstrates a quantitative uncertainty principle in the realm of two-step nilpotent groups, illustrating the limitation of simultaneously localizing a function in some weighted L^p norm and its operator-valued Fourier transform in an appropriate Schatten norm. The key novelty of our proof lies in extending spectral techniques for the operator-valued Fourier transform beyond $L^2(G)$, combined with the use of the inherent dilation structure present in the group. While the dilation structure in the Euclidean setting is isotropic, in G , it is non-isotropic. Consequently, the emergence of the homogeneous dimension Q instead of the topological dimension is a natural outcome.

Now, we compare our result with previously established analogues of the HPW inequality in the context of nilpotent Lie groups. Our primary focus is on the works of Ciatti–Cowling–Ricci [4] and Dall’Ara–Trevisan[8], as these are the only two studies that address the L^p case.

A key component of the approach in Ciatti et. al. [4] is the L^p boundedness of the Hardy-type operator

$$f \mapsto |\cdot|^{-\alpha} L^{-\alpha/2} f,$$

which relies on the hypoellipticity of the sub-Laplacian L . However, this assumption requires the stratification of the Lie algebra. Since two-step MW groups are not necessarily stratified (see [17, p. 453, Example 2]), our result accommodates some non-stratified two-step nilpotent Lie groups as well. Furthermore, in light of the Hausdorff–Young inequality, our result strengthens Theorem 1.1 in the range $1 < p < 2$. Additionally, our case for $p = 1$ is entirely novel, as Ciatti et. al. does not address the case $p = 1$.

On the other hand, the work of [8] addresses the general case of unimodular Lie groups equipped with a system of left-invariant vector fields that generate their Lie algebra. Their approach is geometric, establishing a link between the L^1 case and a weak isoperimetric inequality, then extending the results to L^p by reducing it to L^1 . However, their method is specifically designed to prove the inequality involving the gradient (analogue of $(-\mathcal{L})^{1/2}$) and does not extend to settings involving other powers of the sub-Laplacian \mathcal{L} . In contrast, our results accommodate various powers of the sub-Laplacian and utilize the group Fourier transform, refining, and generalizing the work of [8] in the context of two-step MW groups.

Finally, we turn our attention to the works of [21], [6], and [15], which primarily focus on the L^2 case, considering positive powers of a positive operator under specific assumptions. Their spectral-theoretic approach relies heavily on heat kernel techniques, which in turn require assuming the hypoellipticity of the operator, which is not necessary in our case. Although their L^2 results, via the Plancherel formula, are equivalent to ours in terms of the group Fourier transform, they do not directly apply to our setting, as the sub-Laplacian in a two-step MW group may not always be hypoelliptic.

Returning to our result, as far as we know, the case $1 \leq p < 2$ of Theorem 1.3 is new, even for several well-known and extensively studied examples of two-step MW groups—such as Heisenberg groups, H -type groups, and tensor products of H -type groups. Unlike the approaches in [4] and [6], our method relies on the explicit representation theory of the

group, which confines our analysis to the two-step MW setting. It is also worth noting that our method does not readily extend to the $p > 2$ case due to technical challenges in estimating Schatten norms. However, if the class of groups under consideration is stratified, the $p > 2$ version follows from Theorem 1.4 via a dual Hausdorff–Young inequality for the group Fourier transform.

We conclude the introduction with a brief outline of the paper. In Section 2, we introduce the necessary background on harmonic analysis on two-step MW groups and gather necessary results. Then, in Section 3, we present the proof of our main result.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we introduce the necessary notations and review fundamental results on harmonic analysis for two-step MW groups, which are essential for this paper. Most of these definitions and results are drawn from [10, 1, 2, 6].

2.1. Basic Notations. The letters \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R}^+ , \mathbb{C} and \mathbb{N} denote respectively the set of real numbers, positive real numbers, complex numbers, and nonnegative integers. For $1 < p < \infty$, let $p' := \frac{p}{p-1}$ be the conjugate exponent of p . For $p = 1$, we define $p' = \infty$ and for $p = \infty$, we define $p' = 1$. For a measure space Y , let $L^p(Y)$ denote the usual Lebesgue spaces over Y . We denote by $\|f\|_p$ the L^p norm of $f \in L^p(G)$, where G is the group we are working on. Throughout this article, the symbols c, C, C_1 , etc., denote positive constants whose values may change with each occurrence. Everywhere in this article, the notation $f_1 \lesssim f_2$ (respectively, $f_1 \gtrsim f_2$) indicates the existence of positive constants (depending only on the space) C_1 and C_2 such that $f_1 \leq C_1 f_2$ (respectively, $f_1 \geq C_2 f_2$). We write $f_1 \asymp f_2$ if both $f_1 \lesssim f_2$ and $f_2 \lesssim f_1$ hold. Additionally, we use $C(\varepsilon)$ to denote a constant that depends on the parameter ε . We denote by $\|T\|_{\text{op}}$ the operator norm of the linear operator T on a Banach space X and by $\|\cdot\|_X$ the norm of X .

2.2. Two-step nilpotent Lie groups. A Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} over \mathbb{R} is called two-step nilpotent if $[\mathfrak{g}, [\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]] = 0$ and $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}] \neq 0$. The connected, simply connected Lie group G corresponding to such a \mathfrak{g} is called a two-step nilpotent Lie group.

Let G be a connected, simply connected, two-step nilpotent Lie group with the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} . We write $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{v} \oplus \mathfrak{z}$, where \mathfrak{z} is the center of \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{v} is a subspace of \mathfrak{g} complementary to \mathfrak{z} . We choose an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ in \mathfrak{g} such that the above decomposition is orthogonal. Since G is nilpotent, the exponential map $\exp : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow G$ is an analytic diffeomorphism. We therefore identify the elements of G with those of \mathfrak{g} via the exponential map. We denote the element $x = \exp(V + Z) \in G$ by (V, Z) , where $V \in \mathfrak{v}$, $Z \in \mathfrak{z}$. By the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula, the product law in G is given by

$$(V, Z)(V', Z') = \left(V + V', Z + Z' + \frac{1}{2}[V, V'] \right), \quad V, V' \in \mathfrak{v}; \quad Z, Z' \in \mathfrak{z}.$$

We denote by dV and dZ the Lebesgue measure on \mathfrak{v} and \mathfrak{z} respectively. Then $dx = dVdZ$ is a Haar measure on G . As the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} is of step two, it is graded. Therefore, \mathfrak{g} is equipped with a canonical family of dilations $\{\delta_r\}_{r>0}$ which are Lie algebra automorphisms defined by [10, p. 5]

$$\delta_r(V, Z) = (rV, r^2Z), \quad V \in \mathfrak{v}, \quad Z \in \mathfrak{z}.$$

The dilations δ_r lift through the exponential map to define a one-parameter group of automorphisms of G , which we still denote by δ_r , making G a homogeneous group. We denote

by

$$Q = \dim \mathfrak{v} + 2 \dim \mathfrak{z}$$

the homogeneous dimension of G and by e the identity element of G . The importance of homogeneous dimension stems from the following relation

$$\int_G f(\delta_r(x)) dx = r^{-Q} \int_G f(x) dx, \quad \text{for all } f \in L^1(G), \text{ and } r > 0. \quad (2.1)$$

A homogeneous norm on G is a continuous function $|\cdot| : G \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfying the following:

- i) $|\cdot|$ is smooth on $G \setminus \{e\}$;
- ii) $|\delta_r(x)| = r|x|$, for all $r > 0$, $x \in G$;
- iii) $|x^{-1}| = |x|$, for all $x \in G$;
- iv) $|x| = 0$ if and only if $x = e$.

It is known that homogeneous norms always exist on stratified Lie groups [10, p. 8]. It is also known that for any homogeneous norm $|\cdot|$ on G there exists $C(G) > 0$ such that

$$|xy| \leq C(G)(|x| + |y|), \quad x \in G, y \in G$$

(see [10, Proposition 1.6]). Moreover, any two homogeneous norms on G are equivalent: if $|\cdot|_1$ and $|\cdot|_2$ are two homogeneous norms on G then there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$C^{-1}|x|_1 \leq |x|_2 \leq C|x|_1, \quad \text{for all } x \in G.$$

From now onwards, we shall work with a fixed homogeneous norm $|\cdot|$ on G . We will need the following formula for integration in ‘‘polar coordinates’’ [10, Proposition 1.15]: for all $f \in L^1(G)$,

$$\int_G f(x) dx = \int_0^\infty \int_S f(\delta_r(\omega)) r^{Q-1} d\sigma(\omega) dr, \quad (2.2)$$

where $S = \{\omega \in G : |\omega| = 1\}$ and σ is a unique positive Radon measure on S such that $\sigma(S) = 1$. The convolution of two functions f and g in G is given by

$$f * g(x) = \int_G f(y)g(y^{-1}x) dy.$$

We denote by $\mathcal{S}(G)$ the Schwartz space of G , that is, the space of functions f on G such that $f \circ \exp$ is in the Schwartz space of the Euclidean space \mathfrak{g} .

2.3. Harmonic analysis on two-step MW groups. In this subsection, we will describe the representation theory of two-step MW groups mostly gathered from [6, 2, 1] (see also [7, 18, 20]). Let G be a connected, simply connected, two-step nilpotent Lie group and \mathfrak{g} , \mathfrak{v} , \mathfrak{z} be as defined in the previous subsection. Let \mathfrak{g}^* , \mathfrak{v}^* , and \mathfrak{z}^* denote the dual vector spaces of \mathfrak{g} , \mathfrak{v} , and \mathfrak{z} respectively. For $\lambda \in \mathfrak{z}^*$, let B_λ stand for the skew-symmetric bilinear form on \mathfrak{v} defined by

$$B_\lambda(V, V') = \lambda([V, V']), \quad (V, V' \in \mathfrak{v}).$$

Definitions 2.1. A connected, simply connected, two-step nilpotent Lie group G is said to be two-step MW group if the bilinear form B_λ is non-degenerate for some $\lambda \in \mathfrak{z}^*$.

The condition for a group to be an MW group was introduced by Moore and Wolf in [17]. This class of two-step nilpotent Lie groups is quite broad, encompassing the Heisenberg

group, H -type groups, and the more general Métivier groups (see [19, p. 316] for their definitions). It is known that for a two-step MW group G the set defined by

$$\Lambda_0 = \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{z}^* \mid B_\lambda \text{ is nondegenerate}\}$$

is a Zariski open subset of \mathfrak{z}^* and gives a parameterization of the irreducible unitary representations of G relevant to the Plancherel measure. Since for each $\lambda \in \Lambda_0$, B_λ is a skew-symmetric, nondegenerate bilinear form on \mathfrak{v} , it follows that $\dim \mathfrak{v} = 2n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, identifying \mathfrak{v} with \mathbb{C}^n , we consider an orthonormal basis $\{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_n\}$ of \mathfrak{v} . From the properties of a skew-symmetric bilinear form, it also follows that for a fixed $\lambda \in \Lambda_0$, the orthonormal basis $\{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_n\}$ of \mathfrak{v} can be transformed to another orthonormal basis $\{V_1(\lambda), V_2(\lambda), \dots, V_n(\lambda)\}$ of \mathfrak{v} by a transformation D_λ , where

$$V_j(\lambda) = P_j(\lambda) + iQ_j(\lambda), \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

such that there exist positive numbers $\eta_j(\lambda)$ satisfying

$$\lambda([P_i(\lambda), Q_j(\lambda)]) = \delta_{i,j} \eta_j(\lambda), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq n.$$

It is known that (see [6], [18]) one can find a smaller Zariski-open subset $\Lambda \subset \Lambda_0$ of \mathfrak{z}^* where each $\eta_j(\lambda)$ is real-analytic, hence smooth and homogeneous of degree one in λ . Moreover, each base vectors $P_j(\lambda)$, $Q_j(\lambda)$ can be chosen so to depend smoothly on $\lambda \in \Lambda$. We note that Λ is a set of full measure in \mathbb{R}^k , where k is the dimension of \mathfrak{z} . Thus, the homogeneous dimension of G is $Q = 2n + 2k$.

We now fix $\lambda \in \Lambda$, and define the following subspaces of \mathfrak{v} given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{p}_\lambda &= \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{P_1(\lambda), \dots, P_n(\lambda)\}, \\ \mathfrak{q}_\lambda &= \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{Q_1(\lambda), \dots, Q_n(\lambda)\}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives rise to the following decomposition

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{v} \oplus \mathfrak{z} = \mathfrak{p}_\lambda \oplus \mathfrak{q}_\lambda \oplus \mathfrak{z},$$

and so any element $V \in \mathfrak{v}$ can be written as

$$V = P(\lambda) + Q(\lambda), \quad \text{where } P(\lambda) \in \mathfrak{p}_\lambda, Q(\lambda) \in \mathfrak{q}_\lambda.$$

Let $\{T_1, \dots, T_k\}$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathfrak{z} . With respect to the above decomposition, we write any element $x \in G$, as $x = \exp(X(\lambda, x))$, where $X(\lambda, x) = (P(\lambda), Q(\lambda), T) \in \mathfrak{g}$. More precisely, we identify x with

$$(p(\lambda), q(\lambda), t) := (p_1(\lambda), \dots, p_n(\lambda), q_1(\lambda), \dots, q_n(\lambda), t_1, \dots, t_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n+k},$$

where

$$P(\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^n p_j(\lambda) P_j(\lambda), \quad Q(\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^n q_j(\lambda) Q_j(\lambda), \quad T = \sum_{j=1}^k t_j T_j.$$

The basis $\{P_1(\lambda), Q_1(\lambda), \dots, P_n(\lambda), Q_n(\lambda), T_1, \dots, T_k\}$ of \mathfrak{g} is called an almost symplectic basis. Let $\{T_1^*, \dots, T_k^*\}$ denote the dual basis in \mathfrak{z}^* .

For $\lambda \in \Lambda$, we define an irreducible unitary representation π_λ of G realized on $L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda)$ by the following action [1, p. 2693]:

$$\pi_\lambda(x)\phi(\xi) = e^{i \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j t_j + i \sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j(\lambda) (p_j(\lambda) \xi_j(\lambda) + \frac{1}{2} p_j(\lambda) q_j(\lambda))} \phi(\xi(\lambda) + q(\lambda)), \quad (2.3)$$

where $x = (p(\lambda), q(\lambda), t) \in G$, $\phi \in L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda)$, $\lambda = \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j T_j^*$, and $\xi(\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j(\lambda) Q_j(\lambda)$. There are other irreducible unitary representations of G , which do not play any role in the

Plancherel formula [7, 20]. To simplify the notation, we will omit the dependence on λ whenever it is clear from the context.

We define the Fourier transform of $f \in L^1(G)$ by the operator-valued integral

$$\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) = \int_G f(x) \pi_\lambda(x) dx, \quad \lambda \in \Lambda.$$

We note that $\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)$ is a bounded linear operator on $L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda)$ with

$$\|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|f\|_{L^1(G)}, \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \Lambda. \quad (2.4)$$

Moreover, \mathcal{F} exchanges convolution and compositions, that is,

$$\mathcal{F}(f * g)(\lambda) = \mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \circ \mathcal{F}(g)(\lambda).$$

It is known that if $f \in L^1(G) \cap L^2(G)$, then $\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)$ is a Hilbert–Schmidt operator. We also have the following Plancherel formula [6] (see also [20]):

$$\int_G |f(x)|^2 dx = C \int_\Lambda \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda, \quad (2.5)$$

where $|\text{Pf}(\lambda)| = \prod_{j=1}^n \eta_j(\lambda)$ is the Pfaffian of B_λ , and $d\lambda$ is the Lebesgue measure of \mathfrak{z}^* . In the formula above, $\|\cdot\|_{S_p(\mathcal{H})}$, $p \in [1, \infty]$, denotes the Schatten p -norm on a separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . For more details on Schatten class operators, we refer the reader to the Appendix A. The formula (2.5) extends the definition of the Fourier transform to all $f \in L^2(G)$; the Fourier transform thus defined will verify the above equality of norms.

In view of (2.4) and (2.5), applying the noncommutative Riesz–Thorin interpolation, one can obtain the following analogue of Hausdorff–Young inequality [14]: for $1 < p < 2$, we have

$$\left(\int_\Lambda \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\|_{S_{p'}(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^{p'} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \leq C_p \|f\|_{L^p(G)}. \quad (2.6)$$

The inversion formula for the Fourier transform on G reads as follows [2, Proposition 1.1]: there exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that for all Schwartz class functions f in G

$$f(x) = \kappa \int_\Lambda \text{tr}(\pi_\lambda(x)^* \mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)) |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda, \quad \text{for all } x \in G. \quad (2.7)$$

We end this subsection by recording an important property of the group Fourier transform. For $r > 0$, we define the standard dilation operator d_r on $L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda)$ by

$$d_r \phi(\xi) = \phi(r\xi), \quad \xi \in \mathfrak{p}_\lambda, \phi \in L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda).$$

For a function f on G , we define $\delta_r f(x) = f(\delta_r(x))$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $f \in L^1(G)$. Then*

$$\mathcal{F}(\delta_r f)(\lambda) = r^{-Q} d_r \circ \mathcal{F}(f)(r^{-2}\lambda) \circ d_r^{-1}, \quad \lambda \in \Lambda.$$

Proof. We first observe that

$$\pi_\lambda(rp, rq, 0) = d_r^{-1} \circ \pi_{r^2\lambda}(p, q, 0) \circ d_r, \quad \text{for all } p \in \mathfrak{p}_\lambda, q \in \mathfrak{q}_\lambda, r > 0, \quad (2.8)$$

which can be easily checked using the definition of π_λ (2.3), and the fact that each η_j is homogeneous of degree one. Now a simple change of variable yields

$$\mathcal{F}(\delta_r f)(\lambda) = \int_G f(rp, rq, r^2t) \pi_\lambda(p, q, t) dp dq dt$$

$$= r^{-Q} \int_{p_\lambda} \int_{q_\lambda} \int_{\mathfrak{z}} f(p, q, t) \pi_\lambda(r^{-1}p, r^{-1}q, r^{-2}t) dp dq dt. \quad (2.9)$$

For $\mu \in \Lambda$, we define f^μ as the Euclidean Fourier transform of f with respect to the central variable evaluated at μ , i.e.,

$$f^\mu(p, q) = \int_{\mathfrak{z}} f(p, q, t) e^{i\mu(t)} dt, \quad (p, q) \in \mathfrak{p}_\mu \oplus \mathfrak{q}_\mu.$$

Thus, we can rewrite (2.9) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(\delta_r f)(\lambda) &= r^{-Q} \int_{p_\lambda} \int_{q_\lambda} \int_{\mathfrak{z}} f(p, q, t) e^{i\lambda(r^{-2}t)} dt \pi_\lambda(r^{-1}p, r^{-1}q, 0) dq dp \\ &= r^{-Q} \int_{p_\lambda} \int_{q_\lambda} f^{\lambda/r^2}(p, q) \pi_\lambda(r^{-1}p, r^{-1}q, 0) dq dp \\ &= r^{-Q} d_r \circ \left(\int_{p_\lambda} \int_{q_\lambda} f^{r^{-2}\lambda}(p, q) \pi_{r^{-2}\lambda}(p, q, 0) dq dp \right) \circ d_{r^{-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (2.8) in the last step. The lemma follows immediately from the definition of $f^{r^{-2}\lambda}$. \square

2.4. The sub-Laplacian. We may consider an element X of \mathfrak{g} as a left-invariant differential operator acting on $C^\infty(G)$, where the action is given by

$$X(f)(y) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} f(y \exp(tX)) \right|_{t=0}, \quad y \in G, f \in C^\infty(G).$$

We recall that $\{V_1, V_2, \dots, V_{2n}\}$ is an orthonormal basis of \mathfrak{v} . The sub-Laplacian on G is defined by

$$\mathcal{L} = - \sum_{j=1}^{2n} V_j^2.$$

It is a positive, self-adjoint operator that is homogeneous of degree 2 with respect to dilations, meaning that

$$\delta_r^{-1} \circ \mathcal{L} \circ \delta_r = r^2 \mathcal{L}, \quad \text{for all } r > 0.$$

In order to describe the Fourier theory of \mathcal{L} , let us recall the basis of Hermite functions $\{\varphi_m\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$, normalized in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, and satisfying

$$\varphi_m''(\tau) - \tau^2 \varphi_m(\tau) = -(2m + 1) \varphi_m(\tau), \quad \text{for all } \tau \in \mathbb{R}.$$

For a fixed $\lambda \in \Lambda$, we define generalised (scaled) Hermite functions as follows:

$$\Phi_\alpha^{\eta(\lambda)}(\xi) := \prod_{j=1}^n \varphi_{\alpha_j, \eta_j(\lambda)}(\xi_j) \quad (\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n),$$

where

$$\varphi_{m, \beta}(\tau) = \beta^{\frac{1}{4}} \varphi_m(\beta^{\frac{1}{2}} \tau), \quad (m, \beta) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}^+, \tau \in \mathbb{R}.$$

It is known that $\{\Phi_\alpha^{\eta(\lambda)} : \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n\}$ forms an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda)$. The sub-Laplacian \mathcal{L} satisfies [20, p. 305]

$$\pi_\lambda(\mathcal{L}) = \sum_{j=1}^n \left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \xi_j^2} + \eta_j(\lambda)^2 \xi_j^2 \right) =: H(\eta(\lambda)), \quad \lambda \in \Lambda,$$

where $\eta(\lambda) = (\eta_1(\lambda), \dots, \eta_n(\lambda))$. The operator $H(\eta(\lambda))$ is called the scaled Hermite operator with parameter $\eta(\lambda)$ whose spectral decomposition is given by the following formula

$$H(\eta(\lambda))\Phi_\alpha^{\eta(\lambda)} = \sum_{j=1}^n (2\alpha_j + 1)\eta_j(\lambda)\Phi_\alpha^{\eta(\lambda)}. \quad (2.10)$$

We set

$$\zeta_j(\alpha, \lambda) = (2\alpha_j + 1)\eta_j(\lambda), \quad (\alpha, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N}^d \times \Lambda,$$

and the frequencies associated with $H(\eta(\lambda))$ is defined by

$$\zeta(\alpha, \lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^n \zeta_j(\alpha, \lambda), \quad (\alpha, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N}^d \times \Lambda.$$

Thus, for $\psi \in L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda)$, we have

$$H(\eta(\lambda))\psi = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \langle \psi, \Phi_\alpha^{\eta(\lambda)} \rangle \Phi_\alpha^{\eta(\lambda)}, \quad (2.11)$$

where the sum on the right-hand side converges in the L^2 norm, and

$$\langle \psi, \Phi_\alpha^{\eta(\lambda)} \rangle = \int_{\mathfrak{p}_\lambda} \psi(\xi) \Phi_\alpha^{\eta(\lambda)}(\xi) d\xi.$$

We recall that $|\text{Pf}(\lambda)| = \prod_{j=1}^n \eta_j(\lambda)$. Since each η_j is homogeneous of degree one in λ , so are ζ_j and ζ . Moreover, $\zeta(\alpha, \lambda) = 0$ if and only if $\lambda = 0$. Thus, using the homogeneity and smoothness of η_j , we get following estimates (see [2, p. 572]): for all $(\alpha, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N}^d \times \Lambda$,

$$\zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \asymp (|\alpha| + n)\|\lambda\|; \quad (2.12)$$

$$|\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \asymp \|\lambda\|^n. \quad (2.13)$$

3. PROOF OF MAIN RESULTS

This section is dedicated to proving our main result, Theorem 1.3. Throughout this section, unless stated otherwise, all implicit and explicit constants depend only on β, γ, n, k . The proof is divided into three cases: $p = 1$, $1 < p < 2$, and $p = 2$. For the reader's convenience, we present each case as a separate theorem. We begin with the $p = 1$ case.

3.1. Proof for $p = 1$ case.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that $\gamma > 0$ and $\beta > \frac{1}{2}Q$. Then, for all $f \in L^1(G)$, we have*

$$\|f\|_1^{\gamma+\beta} \lesssim \left(\int_G |x|^\gamma |f(x)| dx \right)^\beta \left(\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{op} \right)^\gamma.$$

Proof. First, we demonstrate that the above inequality remains invariant under dilation and multiplication by a constant. In order to do so, for $r > 0$, and $c > 0$, we set

$$h(x) = cf(\delta_{r^{-1}}(x)), \quad x \in G.$$

The formula (2.1) shows that $\|h\|_1 = cr^Q \|f\|_1$, and

$$\int_G |x|^\gamma |h(x)| dx = cr^{Q+\gamma} \int_G |x|^\gamma |f(x)| dx. \quad (3.1)$$

Now, on the Fourier transform side, using Lemma 2.2 we observe that

$$\mathcal{F}(h)(\lambda) = cr^Q d_{r^{-1}} \circ \mathcal{F}(f)(r^2\lambda) \circ d_{r^{-1}}^{-1}, \quad \lambda \in \Lambda,$$

which yields

$$\|\mathcal{F}(h)(\lambda)H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{\text{op}} = cr^Q \|d_{r^{-1}} \circ \mathcal{F}(f)(r^2\lambda) \circ d_{r^{-1}}^{-1} H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{\text{op}}. \quad (3.2)$$

In view of the spectral decomposition (2.11) of $H(\eta(\lambda))$, for any $\psi \in L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda)$, we see that

$$H(\eta(r^2\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\psi = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} \zeta(\alpha, r^2\lambda)^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \langle \psi, \Phi_\alpha^{\eta(r^2\lambda)} \rangle \Phi_\alpha^{\eta(r^2\lambda)}.$$

Now, using the homogeneity of η along with a change of variable, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi, \Phi_\alpha^{\eta(r^2\lambda)} \rangle \Phi_\alpha^{\eta(r^2\lambda)} &= \langle \psi, \Phi_\alpha^{r^2\eta(\lambda)} \rangle \Phi_\alpha^{r^2\eta(\lambda)} \\ &= \langle d_r^{-1}\psi, \Phi_\alpha^{\eta(\lambda)} \rangle d_r \Phi_\alpha^{\eta(\lambda)}. \end{aligned}$$

This, together with the homogeneity of ζ shows that

$$H(\eta(r^2\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}} = r^\beta d_r \circ H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \circ d_r^{-1}. \quad (3.3)$$

Therefore, plugging (3.3) into (3.2), we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{F}(h)(\lambda)H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{\text{op}} = cr^{Q-\beta} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(r^2\lambda)H(\eta(r^2\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{\text{op}}$$

which yields

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(h)(\lambda)H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{\text{op}} = cr^{Q-\beta} \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{\text{op}}.$$

This, together with (3.1), establishes the claimed invariance.

Thus, in view of this observation, we may assume that

$$\|f\|_1 = 1 = \int_G |x|^\gamma |f(x)| dx. \quad (3.4)$$

Hence, in order to prove the theorem, it suffices to prove that

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{\text{op}} \geq C > 0. \quad (3.5)$$

First, note from (3.4) that for any $a > 0$

$$1 = \int_G |x|^\gamma |f(x)| dx \geq \int_{|x| \geq a} |x|^\gamma |f(x)| dx \geq a^\gamma \int_{|x| \geq a} |f(x)| dx.$$

This implies that

$$\int_{|x| \leq a} |f(x)| dx = \|f\|_1 - \int_{|x| \geq a} |f(x)| dx \geq 1 - a^{-\gamma}. \quad (3.6)$$

The constant a will be specified later. We now assert that $f \in L^2(G)$. To do so, we first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_\Lambda \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \\ &= \int_\Lambda \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_\alpha^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda)}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq 1} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \\
&\quad + \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) > 1} \zeta(\alpha, \lambda)^{-\beta} \zeta(\alpha, \lambda)^{\beta} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda. \tag{3.7}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, in view of the hypothesis, namely $\|f\|_1 = 1$, and the inequality (2.4), the last expression is dominated by

$$\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq 1} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda + \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) > 1} \zeta(\alpha, \lambda)^{-\beta} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda.$$

Using the observations that $|\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \asymp \|\lambda\|^n$ and $\zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \asymp (|\alpha| + n) \|\lambda\|$ (see (2.13) and (2.12)), there exists positive constants C_1, C_2 such that

$$\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq 1} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \lesssim \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} \int_{\|\lambda\| \leq \frac{C_1}{|\alpha| + n}} \|\lambda\|^n d\lambda \lesssim \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} (|\alpha| + n)^{-n-k} < \infty. \tag{3.8}$$

Here and throughout the section, we identify Λ with \mathbb{R}^k while performing integration over Λ . Similarly, using the hypothesis $\beta > Q/2 = n + k$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) > 1} \zeta(\alpha, \lambda)^{-\beta} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \\
&\lesssim \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} (|\alpha| + n)^{-\beta} \int_{\|\lambda\| > \frac{C_2}{|\alpha| + n}} \|\lambda\|^{n-\beta} d\lambda \\
&\lesssim \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} (|\alpha| + n)^{-\beta} \int_{\frac{C_2}{|\alpha| + n}}^{\infty} u^{n-\beta+k-1} du \\
&\lesssim \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} (|\alpha| + n)^{-n-k} < \infty. \tag{3.9}
\end{aligned}$$

Using the estimates (3.8) and (3.9) in (3.7), we arrive at

$$\int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda}))}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \lesssim 1 + \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{\text{op}}^2.$$

Since the right-hand side of the above inequality is finite, applying the Plancherel formula (2.5), we deduce that $f \in L^2(G)$. We now use Hölder inequality in (3.6), to obtain

$$1 - a^{-\gamma} \leq \int_{|x| \leq a} |f(x)| dx \leq \left(\int_{|x| \leq a} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{|x| \leq a} |f(x)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

which shows via the integration in ‘‘polar coordinate’’ formula (2.2) that

$$\|f\|_2^2 \geq a^{-Q} (1 - a^{-\gamma})^2. \tag{3.10}$$

Now, following the approach in (3.9) and carefully tracking the constants, we obtain for any $c > 0$ that

$$\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) > c} \zeta(\alpha, \lambda)^{-\beta} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \leq C_3 c^{n-\beta+k}, \tag{3.11}$$

where $C_3 > 0$ is constant depending only on n and k . Consequently, for any $c > 0$, this gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\zeta(\alpha, \lambda) > c} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \tag{3.12} \\
 &= \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\zeta(\alpha, \lambda) > c} \zeta(\alpha, \lambda)^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\
 &\leq \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{\text{op}}^2 \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\zeta(\alpha, \lambda) > c} \zeta(\alpha, \lambda)^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\
 &\leq C_4 c^{n-\beta+k}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Finally, combining the last estimate with (3.10), we conclude that for any $c, a > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq c} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\
 &= \int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda}))}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda - \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) > c} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\
 &= \|f\|_2^2 - \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) > c} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\
 &\geq a^{-Q} (1 - a^{-\gamma})^2 - C_4 c^{n-\beta+k}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $\beta > Q/2 = n + k$, we can choose c sufficiently large, and a accordingly so that the last quantity is a positive constant. Therefore, we get positive constants C_0 and c_1 such that

$$\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq c_1} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \geq C_0.$$

This, in view of $\|\mathcal{F}f(\lambda)\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|f\|_1 = 1$, implies

$$\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq c_1} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \geq C_0.$$

We now choose $0 < c_2 < c_1$ suitably so that

$$\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: c_2 \leq \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq c_1} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \geq \frac{C_0}{2}. \tag{3.13}$$

We observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: c_2 \leq \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq c_1} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\
 &= \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: c_2 \leq \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq c_1} \zeta(\alpha, \lambda)^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\
 &\leq c_2^{-\frac{\beta}{2}} \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{\text{op}} \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: c_2 \leq \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq c_1} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda,
 \end{aligned}$$

where the last integral is finite. This, in view of (3.13), proves that there exists a positive constant $C(\beta, n, k)$ such that

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{\text{op}} \geq C(\beta, n, k),$$

completing the proof of the theorem. \square

3.2. Proof for $1 < p < 2$ case. The core idea of the proof is to suitably adapt the approach used in the L^1 case. However, since the Schatten p -norm is more intricate than the operator norm, its analysis demands a more delicate and nuanced treatment. To improve readability and facilitate a structured approach to the proof, we first isolate a crucial intermediate step and present it as a lemma. This will help clarify the underlying argument before proceeding to the main proof.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $1 < p < 2$, and $\beta > Q(1/p - 1/2)$. Assume that $f \in L^p(G)$ is such that*

$$A(f, \beta) := \int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{S_{p'}(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda}))}^{p'} |Pf(\lambda)| \, d\lambda < \infty.$$

Then for any fixed $r > 0$, the following holds:

$$\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq r} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |Pf(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \lesssim r^{(n+k)(1-2/p')} \|f\|_p^2, \quad (3.14)$$

and

$$\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) > r} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |Pf(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \lesssim (r^{n+k-\beta p/(2-p)})^{1-\frac{2}{p'}} A(f, \beta)^2. \quad (3.15)$$

Consequently, $f \in L^2(G)$.

Proof. Fix $r > 0$. Using Hölder's inequality, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq r} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |Pf(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\ & \leq \left(\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq r} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^{p'} |Pf(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \right)^{\frac{2}{p'}} \left(\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq r} |Pf(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \right)^{1-\frac{2}{p'}} \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

where the last term, in view of (2.13), and (2.12), can be estimated as

$$\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq r} |Pf(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \lesssim \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \|\lambda\|(|\alpha|+n) \leq cr} \|\lambda\|^n \, d\lambda = \sum_{\alpha} \int_{\|\lambda\| \leq \frac{cr}{|\alpha|+n}} \|\lambda\|^n \, d\lambda \lesssim r^{n+k}. \quad (3.17)$$

Since $p' > 2$, applying Theorem A.2, we deduce that

$$\sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq r} \|\mathcal{F}f(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^{p'} \leq \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} \|\mathcal{F}f(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^{p'} \leq \|\mathcal{F}f(\lambda)\|_{S_{p'}(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda}))}^{p'}.$$

which, invoking the Hausdorff–Young inequality (2.6), results in

$$\left(\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq r} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^{p'} |Pf(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \right)^{\frac{2}{p'}} \lesssim \|f\|_p^2. \quad (3.18)$$

Using the estimates (3.17) and (3.18) in (3.16) we obtain

$$\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq r} \|\mathcal{F}f(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \lesssim r^{(n+k)(1-2/p')} \|f\|_p^2,$$

proving (3.14). Now, to show (3.15), we first write

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) > r} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\ &= \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) > r} \zeta(\alpha, \lambda)^{-\beta} \zeta(\alpha, \lambda)^{\beta} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) > r} \zeta(\alpha, \lambda)^{\beta p'/2} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^{p'} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \right)^{\frac{2}{p'}} \\ &\quad \times \left(\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) > r} \zeta(\alpha, \lambda)^{-\beta p/(2-p)} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \right)^{1-\frac{2}{p'}}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

where we have applied Hölder's inequality to attain the last inequality. Using (2.13), (2.12) and Fubini's theorem, there exist constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) > r} \zeta(\alpha, \lambda)^{-\beta p/(2-p)} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} (|\alpha| + n)^{-\beta p/(2-p)} \int_{\|\lambda\| > \frac{cr}{|\alpha|+n}} \|\lambda\|^{n-\beta p/(2-p)} \, d\lambda \\ &\lesssim r^{n+k-\beta p/(2-p)} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} (|\alpha| + n)^{-n-k} \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

where in the second last inequality, the integral is finite because

$$\beta > Q(1/p - 1/2) = (n+k) \frac{2-p}{p}.$$

Next, for the other integral, using Theorem A.2, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) > r} \zeta(\alpha, \lambda)^{\beta p'/2} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^{p'} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\ &\leq \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^{p'} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\ &\lesssim \int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}f(\lambda)H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{S_{p'}(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda}))}^{p'} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Using this inequality together with (3.20) in (3.19) we get

$$\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) > r} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda$$

$$\lesssim \left(r^{n+k-\beta p/(2-p)} \right)^{1-\frac{2}{p'}} \left(\int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{S_{p'}(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda}))}^{p'} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \right)^{\frac{2}{p'}},$$

completing the proof of (3.14). Finally, using (3.14), and (3.15), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda}))}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \\ &= \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \\ &= \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq r} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda + \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) > r} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \\ &\lesssim r^{(n+k)(1-2/p')} \|f\|_p^2 + \left(r^{n+k-\beta p/(2-p)} \right)^{1-\frac{2}{p'}} A(f, \beta)^2 < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

by the hypothesis, which, in light of the Plancherel formula (2.5), establishes that $f \in L^2(G)$. \square

We now proceed with the proof for the case $1 < p < 2$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $1 < p < 2$. Suppose that $\gamma > 0$, and $\beta > Q(1/p - 1/2)$. Then, for all $f \in L^p(G)$, we have*

$$\|f\|_p^{\gamma+\beta} \lesssim \| |\cdot|^{\gamma} f \|_p^{\beta} \left(\int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{S_{p'}(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda}))}^{p'} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{p'}}.$$

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we can verify that the desired inequality remains unchanged under dilation and scalar multiplication. Therefore, we may assume that

$$\| |\cdot|^{\gamma} f \|_p = 1 = \|f\|_p.$$

Now, without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$\int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{S_{p'}(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda}))}^{p'} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \leq 1, \quad (3.21)$$

as the desired inequality is trivial otherwise. Thus, it is enough to prove that there exists a positive constant $C(\beta, n, k, p)$ such that

$$\int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{S_{p'}(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda}))}^{p'} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \geq C(\beta, n, k, p). \quad (3.22)$$

Under the assumption that (3.21) holds, by Lemma 3.2, we have $f \in L^2(G)$. Applying Plancherel's theorem along with (3.14) and (3.15), we obtain that for any $r > 0$,

$$\|f\|_2^2 \lesssim r^{n+k} (1 + r^{-\beta p/(2-p)}). \quad (3.23)$$

Now, as in the proof of the Theorem 3.1, for any $a > 0$, we have

$$1 = \int_G |x|^{\gamma p} |f(x)|^p dx \geq \int_{|x| \geq a} |x|^{\gamma p} |f(x)|^p dx \geq a^{\gamma p} \int_{|x| \geq a} |f(x)|^p dx$$

which yields

$$\int_{|x| \leq a} |f(x)|^p dx = \|f\|_p^p - \int_{|x| \geq a} |f(x)|^p dx \geq 1 - a^{-\gamma p}. \quad (3.24)$$

Now, applying Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$\int_{|x|\leq a} |f(x)|^p dx \leq \left(\int_{|x|\leq a} |f(x)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left(\int_{|x|\leq a} dx \right)^{1-\frac{p}{2}} \lesssim a^{Q(1-p/2)} \left(\int_{|x|\leq a} |f(x)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{p}{2}},$$

which, in view of (3.24), for any $a > 0$, then implies

$$\int_{|x|\leq a} |f(x)|^2 dx \gtrsim ((1 - a^{-\gamma p})a^{Q(p/2-1)})^{\frac{2}{p}} = (1 - a^{-\gamma p})^{\frac{2}{p}} a^{Q(1-2/p)}.$$

This, combined with the Plancherel formula and (3.15), establishes the following spectral estimate on the Fourier transform side: for any $r > 0$, $a > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha:\zeta(\alpha,\lambda)\leq r} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \\ &= \|f\|_2^2 - \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha:\zeta(\alpha,\lambda)>r} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \\ &\geq \int_{|x|\leq a} |f(x)|^2 dx - \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha:\zeta(\alpha,\lambda)>r} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \\ &\geq C_1(1 - a^{-\gamma p})^{\frac{2}{p}} a^{Q(1-2/p)} - C(n, k, \beta) r^{\frac{Q(2-p)}{2p}-\beta} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\beta > Q(1/p - 1/2)$, we note that $\frac{Q(2-p)}{2p} - \beta < 0$. Thus, by choosing $r = r_1$ sufficiently large (depending on β, γ, Q, p , if necessary), and a accordingly so that there exists $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$C_1(1 - a^{-\gamma p})^{\frac{2}{p}} a^{Q(1-2/p)} - C(n, k, \beta) r_1^{\frac{Q(2-p)}{2p}-\beta} \geq C_2,$$

we get

$$\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha:\zeta(\alpha,\lambda)\leq r_1} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \geq C_2.$$

We recall from (3.14) that, there exists $C_3 > 0$ such that for any $r > 0$

$$\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha:\zeta(\alpha,\lambda)\leq r} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \leq C_3 r^{\frac{Q}{2}-\frac{2-p}{p}}.$$

As $p < 2$, we can choose $r_2 > 0$ small such that

$$C_3 r_2^{\frac{Q}{2}-\frac{2-p}{p}} \leq \frac{1}{2} C_2$$

so that, in view of (3.15), we have

$$\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha:\zeta(\alpha,\lambda)\leq r_2} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \leq \frac{1}{2} C_2.$$

Consequently,

$$\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha:r_2<\zeta(\alpha,\lambda)\leq r_1} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq r_1} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\
&\quad - \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq r_2} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \geq \frac{1}{2} C_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

Now, using Theorem A.2, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{S_{p'}(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda}))}^{p'} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\
&\geq \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^{p'} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\
&\geq \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: r_2 < \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq r_1} \zeta(\alpha, \lambda)^{\beta p'/2} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^{p'} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\
&\geq r_2^{\beta p'/2} \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: r_2 < \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq r_1} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^{p'} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

Applying Hölder's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: r_2 < \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq r_1} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\
&\leq \left(\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: r_2 < \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq r_1} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^{p'} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \right)^{\frac{2}{p'}} \left(\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: r_2 < \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq r_1} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \right)^{1 - \frac{2}{p'}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

Using the estimate for Pfaffian (2.13), one can show that

$$\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: r_2 < \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq r_1} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \lesssim r_1^{n+k} - r_2^{n+k}.$$

Thus, invoking the above estimate and (3.25) in (3.27), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: r_2 < \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq r_1} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^{p'} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\
&\gtrsim (r_1^{n+k} - r_2^{n+k})^{(1-p'/2)} \left(\int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha: r_2 < \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \leq r_1} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) \Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_{\lambda})}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \right)^{\frac{p'}{2}} \\
&\gtrsim (r_1^{n+k} - r_2^{n+k})^{(1-p'/2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

This, together with (3.26), shows that

$$\int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{S_{p'}}^{p'} |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \gtrsim r_2^{\beta p'/2} (r_1^{n+k} - r_2^{n+k})^{(1-p'/2)}$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

3.3. Proof for $p = 2$ case. We now arrive at the proof of our final case, namely $p = 2$. In [22], the authors studied the L^2 -HPW inequality for the Heisenberg group using a local uncertainty inequality involving the group Fourier transform. However, their approach was restricted to a special case where the sub-Laplacian and the homogeneous norm appear with equal powers. Later, [28] established the L^2 inequality in full generality, but their method relied heavily on heat kernel techniques. In the following, we build upon the approach of [28] while addressing the challenge that the sub-Laplacian in our setting is not necessarily hypoelliptic. To overcome this, we avoid dependence on the heat kernel associated with the sub-Laplacian and instead leverage the scaled Hermite semigroup on the Fourier transform side.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\gamma > 0$, $\beta > 0$. Then for all $f \in L^2(G)$, we have*

$$\|f\|_2^{\gamma+\beta} \lesssim \| |\cdot|^\gamma f \|_2^\beta \left(\int_\Lambda \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) H(\eta(\lambda))\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^{\frac{\beta}{2}} |Pf(\lambda)| d\lambda \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}. \quad (3.28)$$

Proof. We first assume that $\beta \leq 2$, and $\gamma < Q/2$. For $s > 0$, we decompose $\mathcal{F}(f)$ as

$$\mathcal{F}(f) = \mathcal{F}(f) e^{-sH(\eta(\lambda))} + \mathcal{F}(f) (I - e^{-sH(\eta(\lambda))}).$$

Then, using the Plancherel formula (2.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_2 &\lesssim \left(\int_\Lambda \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) e^{-sH(\eta(\lambda))}\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |Pf(\lambda)| d\lambda \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \left(\int_\Lambda \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) (I - e^{-sH(\eta(\lambda))})\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |Pf(\lambda)| d\lambda \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &=: I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

To estimate I_1 , we decompose f as

$$f = f\chi_{B_r} + f(1 - \chi_{B_r}) =: f_1 + f_2,$$

where $B_r = \{x \in G : |x| \leq r\}$ for some $r > 0$, to be specified later. Thus, by using linearity of the group Fourier transform \mathcal{F} , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq \left(\int_\Lambda \|\mathcal{F}(f_1)(\lambda) e^{-sH(\eta(\lambda))}\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |Pf(\lambda)| d\lambda \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \left(\int_\Lambda \|\mathcal{F}(f_2)(\lambda) e^{-sH(\eta(\lambda))}\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |Pf(\lambda)| d\lambda \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

We now estimate the two terms on the right-hand side of (3.30) separately. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\int_\Lambda \|\mathcal{F}(f_1)(\lambda) e^{-sH(\eta(\lambda))}\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |Pf(\lambda)| d\lambda \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f_1)(\lambda)\|_{\text{op}} \left(\int_\Lambda \|e^{-sH(\eta(\lambda))}\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |Pf(\lambda)| d\lambda \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

It can be easily checked that

$$\left(\int_\Lambda \|e^{-sH(\eta(\lambda))}\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |Pf(\lambda)| d\lambda \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim s^{-\frac{Q}{4}}.$$

This, together with the fact that $\|\mathcal{F}(f_1)(\lambda)\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|f_1\|_1$, $\forall \lambda \in \Lambda$, implies that

$$\left(\int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f_1)(\lambda)e^{-sH(\eta(\lambda))}\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim s^{-\frac{Q}{4}} \|f_1\|_1. \quad (3.31)$$

Using the Hölder inequality we observe that

$$\|f_1\|_1 = \int_{|x| \leq r} |x|^\gamma |x|^{-\gamma} |f(x)| dx \leq \left(\int_G |x|^{2\gamma} |f(x)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{|x| \leq r} |x|^{-2\gamma} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Employing the polar decomposition of the Haar measure (2.2), we compute the last integral as follows:

$$\int_{|x| \leq r} |x|^{-2\gamma} dx = \int_0^r v^{-2\gamma} v^{Q-1} dv = \frac{r^{Q-2\gamma}}{Q-2\gamma},$$

where we have used the assumption that $\gamma < Q/2$. Consequently, from (3.31), we derive

$$\left(\int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f_1)(\lambda)e^{-sH(\eta(\lambda))}\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \left(\frac{s^{-Q/2} r^{Q-2\gamma}}{Q-2\gamma} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_G |x|^{2\gamma} |f(x)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3.32)$$

We estimate the other term in the right-hand side of (3.30), by noting that $S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))$ is a two sided ideal in the Banach algebra of bounded operators on $L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda)$, as follows:

$$\int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f_2)(\lambda)e^{-sH(\eta(\lambda))}\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \lesssim \|f_2\|_2^2 = \int_{|x| > r} |f(x)|^2 dx \leq r^{-2\gamma} \int_G |x|^{2\gamma} |f(x)|^2 dx,$$

where we have used $\|e^{-sH(\eta(\lambda))}\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1$ and the Plancherel formula. Thus, plugging in the above inequality and (3.32) into (3.30), we obtain

$$I_1 \lesssim (s^{-\frac{Q}{4}} r^{\frac{Q}{2}-\gamma} + r^{-\gamma}) \left(\int_G |x|^{2\gamma} |f(x)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which upon taking $r = s^{\frac{1}{2}}$ simplifies to

$$I_1 \lesssim s^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}} \left(\int_G |x|^{2\gamma} |f(x)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (3.33)$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} I_2^2 &= \int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)(I - e^{-sH(\eta(\lambda))})\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \\ &= \int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}H(\eta(\lambda))^{-\frac{\beta}{2}}(I - e^{-sH(\eta(\lambda))})\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda \\ &= \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} \zeta(\alpha, \lambda)^{-\beta} (1 - e^{-s\zeta(\alpha, \lambda)})^2 \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda)}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the following simple observation for $0 < \beta \leq 2$:

$$u^{-\beta}(1 - e^{-su})^2 \leq s^{\beta} \quad (u > 0),$$

in the above inequality, we obtain

$$I_2 \lesssim s^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \left(\int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} =: s^{\frac{\beta}{2}} B(f, \beta). \quad (3.34)$$

Therefore, for any $s > 0$, using (3.33) and (3.34) in (3.29), we obtain

$$\|f\|_2 \lesssim s^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}} \|\cdot\| \cdot \|\gamma f\|_2 + s^{\frac{\beta}{2}} B(f, \beta). \quad (3.35)$$

It can be shown that the right-hand side of the above inequality is optimized for

$$s = \left(\frac{\gamma \|\cdot\| \cdot \|\gamma f\|_2}{\beta B(f, \beta)} \right)^{2/(\gamma+\beta)}.$$

Hence, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_2 &\lesssim \left(\frac{\gamma \|\cdot\| \cdot \|\gamma f\|_2}{\beta B(f, \beta)} \right)^{-\gamma/(\gamma+\beta)} \|\cdot\| \cdot \|\gamma f\|_p + \left(\frac{\gamma \|\cdot\| \cdot \|\gamma f\|_2}{\beta B(f, \beta)} \right)^{\beta/(\gamma+\beta)} B(f, \beta) \\ &\lesssim \|\cdot\| \cdot \|\gamma f\|_2^{\frac{\beta}{\gamma+\beta}} B(f, \beta)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma+\beta}} \end{aligned} \quad (3.36)$$

proving the inequality (3.28) for $\beta \leq 2$, and $\gamma < Q/2$.

Now, for the case $\beta > 2$, using

$$\frac{\zeta(\alpha, \lambda)}{t} \leq 1 + \left(\frac{\zeta(\alpha, \lambda)}{t} \right)^\beta \quad ((\alpha, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N}^n \times \Lambda),$$

for any $t > 0$, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\ &= \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} \zeta(\alpha, \lambda) \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda)}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\ &\leq t \int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_2^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda + t^{1-\beta} \int_{\Lambda} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} \zeta(\alpha, \lambda)^\beta \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)\Phi_{\alpha}^{\eta(\lambda)}\|_{L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda)}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\ &= t\|f\|_2^2 + t^{1-\beta} \int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

This, after optimizing as a function of t , yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \\ &\lesssim \|f\|_2^{2(1-\frac{1}{\beta})} \left(\int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the above inequality in (3.28) for $\beta = 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_2 &\lesssim \|\cdot\| \cdot \|\gamma f\|_2^{\frac{1}{1+\gamma}} \left(\int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2(1+\gamma)}} \\ &\lesssim \|\cdot\| \cdot \|\gamma f\|_2^{\frac{1}{1+\gamma}} \left(\|f\|_2^{2(1-\frac{1}{\beta})} \left(\int_{\Lambda} \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda)H(\eta(\lambda))^{\frac{\beta}{2}}\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^2 |\text{Pf}(\lambda)| \, d\lambda \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2(1+\gamma)}}. \end{aligned}$$

After performing a straightforward algebraic manipulation with indices, the above inequality leads to

$$\|f\|_2^{\gamma+\beta} \lesssim \|\cdot\|^\gamma \|f\|_2^\beta \left(\int_\Lambda \|\mathcal{F}(f)(\lambda) H(\eta(\lambda))\|_{S_2(L^2(\mathfrak{p}_\lambda))}^{\frac{\beta}{2}} \|\text{Pf}(\lambda)\| \, d\lambda \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}$$

establishing the result for $\beta > 2$.

We now focus on the case $\gamma > Q/2$. We fix $0 < \gamma_0 < Q/2$. Using the following simple inequality

$$\left(\frac{|x|}{r}\right)^{\gamma_0} \leq 1 + \left(\frac{|x|}{r}\right)^\gamma \quad (x \in G),$$

for any $r > 0$, we get

$$\|\cdot\|^\gamma \|f\|_2 \leq r^{\gamma_0} \|f\|_2 + r^{\gamma_0-\gamma} \|\cdot\|^\gamma \|f\|_2.$$

The right-hand side of the above inequality, viewed as a function of r , is optimized when

$$r = \left(\frac{(\gamma - \gamma_0) \|\cdot\|^\gamma \|f\|_2}{\gamma_0 \|f\|_2} \right)^{1/\gamma}.$$

Substituting this particular value of r into the last inequality, we obtain

$$\|\cdot\|^\gamma \|f\|_2 \lesssim \|f\|_2^{1-\frac{\gamma_0}{\gamma}} \|\cdot\|^\gamma \|f\|_2^{\frac{\gamma_0}{\gamma}}.$$

Finally, combining this with (3.28) for $\gamma = \gamma_0$ and performing a straightforward calculation, we derive

$$\|f\|_2^{\gamma+\beta} \lesssim \|\cdot\|^\gamma \|f\|_2^\beta B(f, \beta)^\gamma.$$

This completes the proof. \square

APPENDIX A. SCHATTEN CLASS NORMS

We fix a separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and norm $\|\cdot\|$. Let us first recall the definition of Schatten class operators.

Definitions A.1. For $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, the Schatten p -class of \mathcal{H} , denoted by $S_p(\mathcal{H})$, is defined as the family of all compact operators T on \mathcal{H} whose singular value sequence, that is, the sequence of eigenvalues of $(T^*T)^{1/2}$, $\{s_n(T)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ belongs to $l^p(\mathbb{N})$.

The class $S_p(\mathcal{H})$ equipped with the norm

$$\|T\|_{S_p(\mathcal{H})} = \|\{s_n(T)\}\|_{l^p(\mathbb{N})},$$

is a Banach space. In particular, elements of $S_1(\mathcal{H})$ and $S_2(\mathcal{H})$ are known as trace class operators and Hilbert–Schmidt operators, respectively. We also note that $S_\infty(\mathcal{H})$ is the space of all bounded operators on \mathcal{H} equipped with the operator norm.

A sequence of functions $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathcal{H} is a frame for \mathcal{H} if there exist constants $0 < C_1 \leq C_2$ such that

$$C_1 \|f\|^2 \leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\langle f, f_n \rangle|^2 \leq C_2 \|f\|^2, \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathcal{H}.$$

For a given frame $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, the smallest possible constant C_2 is called the upper frame bound.

We present the following characterization of the Schatten classes in terms of frames. The next theorem is taken from [25, Section 5].

Theorem A.2. *Let T be a compact operator on a separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} and $2 < p \leq \infty$. Then $T \in S_p(\mathcal{H})$ if and only if there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|Tf_n\|^p \leq C,$$

for every frame $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of \mathcal{H} . Moreover,

$$\|T\|_{S_p(\mathcal{H})} = \sup \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \|Tf_n\|^p,$$

where the supremum is taken over all frames $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of \mathcal{H} with an upper frame bound smaller than or equal to 1.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Jayanta Sarkar is supported by the INSPIRE faculty fellowship (Faculty Registration No.: IFA22-MA-172) from the Department of Science and Technology, Government of India.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bagchi, S.; Kumar, A.; Sen, S. *Roe-Strichartz theorem on two-step nilpotent Lie groups*. Math. Nachr. 296 (2023), no. 7, 2691–2700.
- [2] Bahouri, H.; Fermanian-Kammerer, C.; Gallagher, I. *Dispersive estimates for the Schrödinger operator on step-2 stratified Lie groups*. Anal. PDE 9 (2016), no. 3, 545–574.
- [3] Chen, X., Dang, P., and Mai, W. *L^p -type Heisenberg-Pauli-Weyl uncertainty principles for fractional Fourier transform*. Applied Mathematics and Computation, 491, 129236.(2025)
- [4] Ciatti, P.; Cowling, M. G.; Ricci, F. *Hardy and uncertainty inequalities on stratified Lie groups*. Adv. Math. 277 (2015), 365–387.
- [5] Ciatti, P.; Ricci, F.; Sundari, M. *Heisenberg-Pauli-Weyl uncertainty inequalities and polynomial volume growth*. Adv. Math. 215 (2007), no. 2, 616–625.
- [6] Ciatti, P.; Ricci, F.; Sundari, M. *Uncertainty inequalities on stratified nilpotent groups*. Bull. Kerala Math. Assoc. 2005, Special Issue, 53–72 (2007).
- [7] Corwin, L. J.; Greenleaf, F. P. *Representations of nilpotent Lie groups and their applications*. Part I. Basic theory and examples. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 18. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990. viii+269 pp.
- [8] Dall’Ara, G. M; Trevisan, D. *Uncertainty inequalities on groups and homogeneous spaces via isoperimetric inequalities*. J. Geom. Anal. 25 (2015), no. 4, 2262–2283.
- [9] Folland, G. B.; Sitaram, A. *The uncertainty principle: a mathematical survey*. J. Fourier Anal. Appl. 3 (1997), no. 3, 207–238.
- [10] Folland, G. B.; Stein, E. M. *Hardy spaces on homogeneous groups*. Mathematical Notes, 28. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ; University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1982. xii+285 pp.
- [11] Fu, X.; Xiao, J. *An uncertainty principle on the Lorentz spaces*, Nonlinear Analysis, Volume 237 (2023),113367, ISSN 0362-546X
- [12] Heisenberg, W. *Über den anschaulichen inhalt der quantentheoretischen kinematic und mechanik*. Zeit. Physik, 43:172–198, 1927.
- [13] Kennard, E. H. *Zur quantenmechanik einfacher bewegungstypen*. Zeit. Physik, 44:326–352, 1927.
- [14] Kunze, R. A. *L_p Fourier transforms on locally compact unimodular groups*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 89 (1958), 519–540.
- [15] Martini, A. *Generalized uncertainty inequalities*. Math. Z. 265 (2010), no. 4, 831–848.
- [16] Martín, J.; Milman, M. *Isoperimetric weights and generalized uncertainty inequalities in metric measure spaces*. J. Funct. Anal. 270 (2016), no. 9, 3307–3343.
- [17] Moore, C. C.; Wolf, J. A. *Square integrable representations of nilpotent groups*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 185 (1973), 445–462 (1974).

- [18] Müller, D.; Ricci, F. *Solvability for a class of doubly characteristic differential operators on 2-step nilpotent groups*. Ann. of Math. (2) 143 (1996), no. 1, 1–49.
- [19] Müller, D.; Seeger, A. *Singular spherical maximal operators on a class of two step nilpotent Lie groups*. Israel J. Math. 141 (2004), 315–340.
- [20] Ray, S. K. *Uncertainty principles on two step nilpotent Lie groups*. Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci. 111 (2001), no. 3, 293–318.
- [21] Ricci, F. *Uncertainty inequalities on spaces with polynomial volume growth*. Rend. Accad. Naz. Sci. XL Mem. Mat. Appl. 29(1), 327–337 (2005)
- [22] Sitaram, A.; Sundari, M.; Thangavelu, S. *Uncertainty principles on certain Lie groups*. Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci. 105 (1995), no. 2, 135–151.
- [23] Steinerberger, S. *Fourier uncertainty principles, scale space theory and the smoothest average*. Math. Res. Lett. 28 (2021), no. 6, 1851–1874.
- [24] Thangavelu, S. *Some uncertainty inequalities*. Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci. 100 (1990), no. 2, 137–145.
- [25] Villarroya, P. *The Schatten classes of Calderón-Zygmund operators*. J. Fourier Anal. Appl. 30 (2024), no. 1, Paper No. 9, 75 pp.
- [26] Weyl, H. *Gruppentheorie und Quantenmechanik*, volume 122. Verlag von S. Hirzel, Leipzig, 1928.
- [27] Xiao, Jie *L^p -uncertainty principle via fractional Schrödinger equation*. J. Differential Equations 313 (2022), 269–284.
- [28] Xiao, J.; He, J. *Uncertainty inequalities for the Heisenberg group*. Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci. 122 (2012), no. 4, 573–581.

(Pritam Ganguly) INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT PADERBORN, WARBURGER STR. 100, 33098 PADERBORN, GERMANY.

Email address: pritam1995.pg@gmail.com, pritamg@math.upb.de

(Jayanta Sarkar) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH KOLKATA, MOHANPUR-741246, NADIA, WEST BENGAL, INDIA.

Email address: jayantasarkarmath@gmail.com, jayantasarkar@iiserkol.ac.in