

ON ACCUMULATED SPECTROGRAMS FOR GABOR FRAMES

SIMON HALVDANSSON

ABSTRACT. Analogs of classical results on accumulated spectrograms, the sum of spectrograms of eigenfunctions of localization operators, are established for Gabor multipliers on tight frames. We show that the lattice ℓ^1 distance between the accumulated spectrogram and the indicator function of the Gabor multiplier mask is bounded by the length of the perimeter of the mask and that this bound is sharp in general. The methods developed for the proofs are also used to show that the Weyl-Heisenberg ensemble restricted to a lattice is hyperuniform.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

In time-frequency analysis, localization operators restrict a signal to a subset Ω of the time-frequency plane [7]. The spectral behavior of such operators has been studied extensively [2, 12, 14, 21, 26, 27], showing that there are approximately $|\Omega|$ eigenvalues close to 1, followed by a *plunge region* of size comparable to the length of the perimeter of Ω , after which the remaining eigenvalues are close to 0. In [3], Abreu, Gröchenig and Romero showed that Ω can be estimated from only the spectrograms of the first $\lceil |\Omega| \rceil$ eigenfunctions using the *accumulated spectrogram*

$$(1) \quad \rho_\Omega(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\lceil |\Omega| \rceil} |V_g h_k^\Omega(z)|^2$$

where g is the underlying window function, V_g is the short-time Fourier transform and $(h_k^\Omega)_{k=1}^\infty$ are the eigenfunctions of the localization operator. That result was eventually improved by a sharp estimate in [6] to

$$(2) \quad \|\rho_\Omega - \chi_\Omega\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2d})} \leq C_g |\partial\Omega|$$

where χ_Ω is the indicator function of Ω and C_g is a constant depending only on g .

While these results have been numerically verified and used in the discrete setting [3, 5, 8, 9, 19], there have been no proofs that corresponding results hold for Gabor multipliers, the discrete version of localization operators. It is the goal of this article to fill this gap by establishing versions of the main results of [3, 6] which are valid in the setting of tight Gabor frames. Before stating the results, we establish some notation and conventions.

Date: May 2024.

Keywords: Accumulated spectrogram, Gabor multiplier, Localization operator, Gabor frame, Weyl-Heisenberg ensemble

A *Gabor frame* is a collection $\{\pi(\lambda)g\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$, induced by the pair (g, Λ) , where $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the *window function* and $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ is a lattice, satisfying the inequalities

$$A\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \leq \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |\langle f, \pi(\lambda)g \rangle|^2 \leq B\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)}^2 \quad \text{for all } f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

for a pair of *frame bounds* $A, B > 0$ [17]. When $A = B$, the frame is said to be *tight*. Throughout the article, we will always take (g, Λ) to induce a tight frame with frame bound 1 so that $V_g : L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \ell^2(\Lambda)$ is an isometry and moreover assume that $\|g\|_{L^2} = 1$. When this is not the case, suitable arrangements can be made, see Section 2.2. Such a frame gives rise to the reconstruction formula

$$f = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \langle f, \pi(\lambda)g \rangle \pi(\lambda)g \quad \text{for } f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$$

which holds in the L^2 sense. The analog of localization operators in this setting, *Gabor multipliers* [13], are then constructed by restricting the above formula to a subset $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ as

$$(3) \quad G_{\Omega, \Lambda}^g f = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \chi_{\Omega}(\lambda) V_g f(\lambda) \pi(\lambda)g \quad \text{for } f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

From now on, we will always assume that Ω is compact so that $G_{\Omega, \Lambda}^g$ is a compact and self-adjoint operator whose eigendecomposition can be written as

$$G_{\Omega, \Lambda}^g = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^{\Omega} (h_k^{\Omega} \otimes h_k^{\Omega})$$

where $(h_k^{\Omega})_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $(h_k^{\Omega} \otimes h_k^{\Omega})(f) = \langle f, h_k^{\Omega} \rangle h_k^{\Omega}$ is a rank-one projection operator. The accumulated spectrogram on Λ is then defined, analogously to (1), as

$$\rho_{\Omega}(\lambda) = \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} |V_g h_k^{\Omega}(\lambda)|^2$$

since it is the first $|\Omega \cap \Lambda|$ eigenvalues which are close to 1 in this setting [11]. For technical reasons, all our main results will require the window function g to belong to the space

$$M_{\Lambda}^*(\mathbb{R}^d) = \left\{ g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) : \|g\|_{M_{\Lambda}^*} = \left(\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |\lambda| |V_g g(\lambda)|^2 \right)^{1/2} < \infty \right\}.$$

By [15, Proposition 2.1], $M_{\Lambda}^*(\mathbb{R}^d)$ can be embedded inside a weighted modulation space under some conditions on Λ but we do not pursue this direction further.

We are now ready to state our main results, the first of which is analogous to the sharp growth bound (2).

Theorem 1.1. *Let $g \in M_{\Lambda}^*(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ be compact with finite perimeter. Then*

$$\|\rho_{\Omega} - \chi_{\Omega}\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)} \leq \|g\|_{M_{\Lambda}^*}^2 (C|\partial\Omega| + D)$$

for constants C, D only dependent on Λ .

This result can be used to approximate Ω directly from ρ_Ω as a level set.

Corollary 1.2. *Let $g \in M_\Lambda^*(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ be compact with finite perimeter and*

$$\tilde{\Omega} = \{\lambda \in \Lambda : \rho_\Omega(\lambda) > 1/2\}.$$

Then

$$|(\Omega \Delta \tilde{\Omega}) \cap \Lambda| \leq \|g\|_{M_\Lambda^*}^2 (C|\partial\Omega| + D)$$

where Δ denotes the symmetric difference of two sets and C, D are constants only dependent on Λ .

In general, it is impossible to establish a tighter bound on the ℓ^1 norm than Theorem 1.1 which we prove in Theorem 1.3 below where a special case is investigated. This result is analogous to [6, Theorem 1.6].

Theorem 1.3. *Let $g \in M_\Lambda^*(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that the conditions of Lemma 3.2 are satisfied. Then there exists constants C_1, C_2, D such that*

$$C_1 R^{2d-1} \leq \|\rho_{B(0,R)} - \chi_{B(0,R)}\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)} \leq C_2 R^{2d-1} + D.$$

The proofs of these results follow similar paths to the original results in [3, 6] and the main novelty of the present work lies in the geometric arguments relating the lattice to $\partial\Omega$.

Our final main result is not directly related to accumulated spectrograms, but its proof uses parts of the same method used to prove the three theorems above. The Weyl-Heisenberg ensemble, originally introduced in [5] and further studied in [1, 4, 23], is a determinantal point process induced by a window function which generalizes the Ginibre ensemble. While not previously mentioned in the literature to the best of our knowledge, there is a clear discrete counterpart for tight Gabor frames where the point process is restricted to Λ . We are able to show that this point process is hyperuniform, one of the main results for the continuous case in [5].

Theorem 1.4. *Let $g \in M_\Lambda^*(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then the determinantal point process \mathcal{X}_g on Λ with correlation kernel $K_g(\lambda, \lambda') = \langle \pi(\lambda')g, \pi(\lambda)g \rangle$ is hyperuniform.*

In Section 4, we give a proper definition of the point process, define hyperuniformity and prove the theorem.

Notational conventions. The ball centered at $z \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ with radius r will be denoted by $B(z, r)$. When measuring the size of a set, we will write $|\cdot|$ for cardinalities of discrete sets, Lebesgue measures of sets with interiors as well as the length of paths or boundaries. For subsets of \mathbb{N} , we will instead use $\#$ to indicate the cardinality. The values of constants will be allowed to change between inequalities and \lesssim will indicate inequality up to a constant. Convolutions between elements of $\ell^1(\Lambda)$ will be denoted by $*_\Lambda$.

2. BACKGROUND AND TOOLS

In this section we collect some common tools and results which will be used throughout the article. For more background on the motivations and interpretations of accumulated spectrograms, see the original article [3], and for more properties of Gabor multipliers and a more thorough introduction, see [13, 17].

2.1. Bounding regularization error. In forthcoming proofs, we will repeatedly need to bound the difference $\chi_\Omega - \chi_\Omega *_\Lambda \phi$. The main tool for the continuous version of this is [3, Lemma 3.2]. To establish a version of that result for the lattice setting, we need some preliminary approximation results for lattices.

Lemma 2.1. *There exists constants C, D only dependent on Λ such that*

$$|\Lambda \cap (\partial\Omega + B(0, 1) + z_0)| \leq C|\partial\Omega| + D$$

for all compact $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ with finite perimeter and $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$.

Proof. Since Λ is a lattice, we know that there exists a number l_0 such that all points of Λ have at least distance l_0 between them. We can cover the set $\partial\Omega + B(0, 1) + z_0$ by a collection H of $2d$ -dimensional hypercubes with side length $l_0/\sqrt{2d}$ since Ω is bounded. It then holds that each element of the intersection $\Lambda \cap (\partial\Omega + B(0, 1) + z_0) \subset \partial\Omega + B(0, 1) + z_0$ is in no more than one of these hypercubes since the points of Λ are spaced by at least l_0 and two points in a hypercube with side length $l_0/\sqrt{2d}$ are at most l_0 apart from each other. Formally,

$$|\Lambda \cap (\partial\Omega + B(0, 1) + z_0)| \leq |H|.$$

Meanwhile, the hypercubes can be encapsulated in a bigger dilation around $\partial\Omega$:

$$\bigcup_{h \in H} h \subset \partial\Omega + B(0, 1 + l_0) + z_0.$$

As the collective volume of the hypercubes is given by $|H| \cdot \left(\frac{l_0}{\sqrt{2d}}\right)^{2d}$, we can estimate

$$(4) \quad |\Lambda \cap (\partial\Omega + B(0, 1) + z_0)| \leq |H| \leq \frac{(2d)^d}{l_0^{2d}} |\partial\Omega + B(0, 1 + l_0) + z_0|.$$

Now it only remains to relate this quantity to $|\partial\Omega|$. We prove the slightly more general claim that

$$|\gamma + B(0, R)| \leq C|\gamma| + D$$

for closed curves γ from which the desired conclusion will follow. Let z_1, \dots, z_n be points placed along γ which are spaced by R . It then holds that

$$\gamma + B(0, R) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n B(z_i, 2R)$$

since any point in $\gamma + B(0, R)$ is within R distance to a point in γ and any point in γ is within R distance to a point z_i .

The number of balls, n , can be related to $|\gamma|$ as

$$|\gamma| \leq R \cdot n \leq |\gamma| + R$$

since the distance between the centers along γ is R . Putting all of this together, we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |\gamma + B(0, R)| &\leq \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^n B(z_i, 2R) \right| \\ &\leq n \cdot \frac{\pi^d}{d!} (2R)^{2d} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{|\gamma|}{R} + 1 \right) \frac{\pi^d}{d!} (2R)^{2d} \end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim. Applying this result to (4), we obtain

$$|\Lambda \cap (\partial\Omega + B(0, 1) + z_0)| \leq \frac{(2d)^d}{l_0^2} \left(\frac{|\partial\Omega|}{1+l_0} + 1 \right) \frac{\pi^d}{d!} (2(1+l_0))^{2d}$$

from which we see that both constants only depend on Λ . \square

Next we show that the characteristic function χ_Ω can be well approximated by a Schwartz function f .

Lemma 2.2. *Given a compact set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ with finite perimeter, there exists a Schwartz function f such that*

- (i) $f(z) = 1$ for $z \in \Omega$,
- (ii) $\text{supp}(f) \subset \Omega + B(0, 1)$,
- (iii) $\|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty} \leq 3$,
- (iv) $\|\chi_\Omega - f\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)} \leq C|\partial\Omega| + D$

for constants C, D only dependent on Λ .

Proof. Letting $\rho(z) = d(z, \partial\Omega)$ be the distance between z and the boundary of Ω , we can define f as

$$f(z) = \begin{cases} 1, & z \in \Omega, \\ F(\rho(z)), & z \notin \Omega, \end{cases} \quad \text{where} \quad F(\rho) = \begin{cases} e^{1 - \frac{1}{\rho(2-\rho)}}, & \rho \leq 1, \\ 0, & \rho > 1. \end{cases}$$

The function F is a smooth interpolation with $\|F'\|_{L^\infty} \leq 3$ and this guarantees that $\|\nabla f\|_{L^\infty} \leq 3$. Support of f is trivial to verify so it only remains to control $\|\chi_\Omega - f\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)}$. By the properties of f , $\chi_\Omega - f$ is supported in $\partial\Omega + B(0, 1)$ and is bounded by 1. Hence the $\ell^1(\Lambda)$ norm is bounded by the cardinality $|\Lambda \cap (\partial\Omega + B(0, 1))|$ which, by Lemma 2.1, satisfies the desired bound. \square

By combining these two lemmas, we can establish the promised lattice version of [3, Lemma 3.2].

Proposition 2.3. *Let $\phi \in \ell^1(\Lambda)$ be non-negative and satisfy*

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \phi(\lambda) = 1, \quad \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |\lambda| |\phi(\lambda)| < \infty.$$

Then there exists constants C, D only dependent on Λ such that

$$\|\chi_\Omega - \chi_\Omega *_\Lambda \phi\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)} \leq \left(\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |\lambda| |\phi(\lambda)| \right) (C|\partial\Omega| + D)$$

for any compact set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ with finite perimeter.

Proof. Applying Lemma 2.2, we can replace χ_Ω by f using a triangle inequality argument as

$$\|\chi_\Omega - \chi_\Omega *_\Lambda \phi\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)} \leq \underbrace{\|\chi_\Omega - f\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)}}_{\leq C|\partial\Omega| + D} + \|f - f *_\Lambda \phi\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)} + \underbrace{\|f *_\Lambda \phi - \chi_\Omega *_\Lambda \phi\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)}}_{\leq (C|\partial\Omega| + D) \cdot 1}$$

where we used Young's inequality for the estimate on the last term and that $\|\phi\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)} = 1$. Now it remains to show that the middle term can be bounded by the same quantity. To do so, we will adapt [3, Lemma 3.2] to the lattice setting. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - f *_\Lambda \phi\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)} &= \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left| \sum_{\lambda' \in \Lambda} f(\lambda') \phi(\lambda - \lambda') - f(\lambda) \right| \\ &= \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left| \sum_{\lambda' \in \Lambda} [f(\lambda) - f(\lambda')] \phi(\lambda - \lambda') \right| \end{aligned}$$

since $1 = \sum_{\lambda' \in \Lambda} \phi(\lambda')$. By elementary calculus, it holds that

$$f(\lambda) - f(\lambda') = \int_0^1 \langle \nabla f(t(\lambda - \lambda') + \lambda'), \lambda - \lambda' \rangle dt,$$

and so we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - f *_\Lambda \phi\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)} &= \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left| \sum_{\lambda' \in \Lambda} \int_0^1 \langle \nabla f(t(\lambda - \lambda') + \lambda'), \lambda - \lambda' \rangle \phi(\lambda - \lambda') dt \right| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \sum_{\lambda' \in \Lambda} |\nabla f(t(\lambda - \lambda') + \lambda')| |\lambda - \lambda'| |\phi(\lambda - \lambda')| dt \\ &= \int_0^1 \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \sum_{\lambda' \in \Lambda} |\nabla f(t\lambda + \lambda')| |\lambda| |\phi(\lambda)| dt \\ &= \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |\lambda| |\phi(\lambda)| \int_0^1 \sum_{\lambda' \in \Lambda} |\nabla f(t\lambda + \lambda')| dt \end{aligned}$$

by Tonelli and Cauchy-Schwarz followed by a change of variables. We now claim that the final integral and sum can be uniformly bounded over all t and λ . Indeed, ∇f is

supported in $\partial\Omega + B(0, 1)$ and $|\nabla f|$ is uniformly bounded by 3 by Lemma 2.2 so the entire quantity can be bounded as

$$\int_0^1 3|(\Lambda + z_0) \cap (\partial\Omega + B(0, 1))| dt \leq C|\partial\Omega| + D$$

by Lemma 2.1. Plugging this back into the $\|f - f *_{\Lambda} \phi\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)}$ estimate yields

$$\|f - f *_{\Lambda} \phi\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)} \leq \left(\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |\lambda| |\phi(\lambda)| \right) (C|\partial\Omega| + D)$$

which finishes the proof. \square

2.2. Spectral properties of Gabor multipliers. The spectral properties of Gabor multipliers have much in common with those of localization operators. Note that for a tight frame with frame bound A , not necessarily equal to 1, the eigenvalues are bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \lambda_k^{\Omega} &= \langle G_{\Omega, \Lambda}^g h_k^{\Omega}, h_k^{\Omega} \rangle = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \chi_{\Omega}(\lambda) V_g h_k^{\Omega}(\lambda) \langle \pi(\lambda)g, h_k^{\Omega} \rangle \\ &\leq \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |\langle h_k^{\Omega}, \pi(\lambda)g \rangle|^2 = A \|h_k^{\Omega}\|_{L^2}^2 = A. \end{aligned}$$

When $A \neq 1$, proofs and formulas need to be modified but this is only a technical problem, not a fundamental one. It is for this reason we chose to assume that $A = 1$ in the introduction and this will be the case for the remainder of the article.

Our first lemma is well known and proofs can be found in [11].

Lemma 2.4. *The eigenvalues $\{\lambda_k^{\Omega}\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ of $G_{\Omega, \Lambda}^g$ satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} (i) \quad &\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^{\Omega} = |\Omega \cap \Lambda|, \\ (ii) \quad &\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\lambda_k^{\Omega})^2 = \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega \cap \Lambda} \sum_{\lambda' \in \Omega \cap \Lambda} |V_g g(\lambda - \lambda')|^2. \end{aligned}$$

The second property is essentially a standard result [3, Lemma 4.1] specialized to the setting of lattice convolutions $*_{\Lambda}$.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ be compact. Then*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^{\Omega} |V_g h_k^{\Omega}(\lambda)|^2 = \chi_{\Omega} *_{\Lambda} |V_g g|^2(\lambda).$$

Proof. We will compute the trace $\text{tr}(G_{\Omega, \Lambda}^g \pi(\lambda)(g \otimes g) \pi(\lambda)^*)$ using both the singular value decomposition and the definition (3) and equate the results. For the singular

value decomposition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{tr} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^{\Omega} (h_k^{\Omega} \otimes h_k^{\Omega}) \pi(\lambda) (g \otimes g) \pi(\lambda)^* \right) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^{\Omega} \operatorname{tr} \left((h_k^{\Omega} \otimes h_k^{\Omega}) \pi(\lambda) (g \otimes g) \pi(\lambda)^* \right) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^{\Omega} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle (h_k^{\Omega} \otimes h_k^{\Omega}) \pi(\lambda) (g \otimes g) \pi(\lambda)^* e_n, e_n \rangle \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^{\Omega} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle e_n, \pi(\lambda) g \rangle \langle \pi(\lambda) g, h_k^{\Omega} \rangle \langle h_k^{\Omega}, e_n \rangle \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^{\Omega} |V_g h_k^{\Omega}(\lambda)|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile the trace can also be computed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{tr} (G_{\Omega, \Lambda}^g \pi(\lambda) (g \otimes g) \pi(\lambda)^*) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle G_{\Omega, \Lambda}^g \pi(\lambda) (g \otimes g) \pi(\lambda)^* e_n, e_n \rangle \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle \pi(\lambda)^* e_n, g \rangle \langle G_{\Omega, \Lambda}^g \pi(\lambda) g, e_n \rangle \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle e_n, \pi(\lambda) g \rangle \left\langle \sum_{\lambda' \in \Lambda} \chi_{\Omega}(\lambda') \langle \pi(\lambda) g, \pi(\lambda') g \rangle \right\rangle \langle \pi(\lambda') g, e_n \rangle \\
&= \sum_{\lambda' \in \Lambda} \chi_{\Omega}(\lambda') |\langle \pi(\lambda') g, \pi(\lambda) g \rangle|^2 \\
&= \chi_{\Omega} *_{\Lambda} |V_g g|^2(\lambda)
\end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Lemma 2.6. *Let $g \in M_{\Lambda}^*(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ be compact with finite perimeter. Then*

$$\left| \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \sum_{\lambda' \in \Lambda} \chi_{\Omega}(\lambda) \chi_{\Omega}(\lambda') |V_g g(\lambda - \lambda')|^2 - |\Omega \cap \Lambda| \right| \leq \|g\|_{M_{\Lambda}^*}^2 (C|\partial\Omega| + D)$$

for constants C, D only dependent on Λ .

Proof. We estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \sum_{\lambda' \in \Lambda} \chi_{\Omega}(\lambda) \chi_{\Omega}(\lambda') |V_g g(\lambda - \lambda')|^2 - |\Omega \cap \Lambda| \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \chi_{\Omega}(\lambda) (\chi_{\Omega} *_{\Lambda} |V_g g|^2(\lambda)) - \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \chi_{\Omega}(\lambda) \right| \\
&= \left| \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \chi_{\Omega}(\lambda) (\chi_{\Omega} *_{\Lambda} |V_g g|^2(\lambda) - \chi_{\Omega}(\lambda)) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left| \chi_{\Omega} *_{\Lambda} |V_g g|^2(\lambda) - \chi_{\Omega}(\lambda) \right| = \|\chi_{\Omega} *_{\Lambda} |V_g g|^2 - \chi_{\Omega}\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition 2.3 to the final norm yields the desired bound. \square

Next we strengthen a result from [11] using the above lemma. This is analogous to [3, Proposition 3.4].

Lemma 2.7. *Let $g \in M_{\Lambda}^*(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ be compact with finite perimeter. Then for each $\delta \in (0, 1)$,*

$$(5) \quad \left| \#\{k : \lambda_k^{\Omega} > 1 - \delta\} - |\Omega \cap \Lambda| \right| \leq C_{\delta} \|g\|_{M_{\Lambda}^*}^2 (C|\partial\Omega| + D)$$

where $C_{\delta} = \max\left\{\frac{1}{\delta}, \frac{1}{1-\delta}\right\}$ and C, D are constants only dependent on Λ .

Proof. By [11, Lemma 4.14], the left hand side of (5) can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \#\{k : \lambda_k^{\Omega} > 1 - \delta\} - |\Omega \cap \Lambda| \right| \\
&\leq \max\left\{\frac{1}{\delta}, \frac{1}{1-\delta}\right\} \left| \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega \cap \Lambda} \sum_{\lambda' \in \Omega \cap \Lambda} |V_g g(\lambda - \lambda')|^2 - |\Omega \cap \Lambda| \right|
\end{aligned}$$

from which the result follows by an application of Lemma 2.6. \square

2.3. Lattice Gabor space. The image space of the standard short-time Fourier transform, the so called *Gabor space* $V_g(L^2) \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) with reproducing kernel $K_g(z, w) = \langle \pi(w)g, \pi(z)g \rangle$ [14]. The Toeplitz operators on this space, Gabor-Toeplitz operators, are unitarily equivalent to localization operators via conjugation with the STFT. Similarly, it can be shown that the image of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ under our STFT, which maps to $\ell^2(\Lambda)$, also is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space [14, Section 5] with reproducing kernel

$$(6) \quad K_g(\lambda, \lambda') = \langle \pi(\lambda')g, \pi(\lambda)g \rangle.$$

We will have use for the following property which is easiest to prove in the context of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be normalized and $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |V_g e_n(z)|^2 = 1 \quad \text{for all } z \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}.$$

Proof. Since $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is an orthonormal basis, so is $(V_g e_n)_{n=1}^\infty \subset V_g(L^2)$ by Moyal's formula. Using that for any orthonormal basis $(e_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ of a RKHS, the reproducing kernel can be written as $K_g(z, z') = \sum_{n=1}^\infty e_n(z) \overline{e_n(z')}$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 = \|g\|_{L^2}^2 &= \langle \pi(z)g, \pi(z)g \rangle = K_g(z, z) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} V_g e_n(z) \overline{V_g e_n(z)} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |V_g e_n(z)|^2 \end{aligned}$$

which is what we wished to show. \square

3. ACCUMULATED SPECTROGRAMS

In this section we prove all the theorems on accumulated spectrograms. As we will see, the proofs generally follow those from [3] and [6].

3.1. ℓ^1 estimate. We first set out to prove our most important result, Theorem 1.1, using the approach from [6].

The following lemma allows us to move from $\|\rho_\Omega - \chi_\Omega\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)}$ to a purely spectral quantity since $\text{tr}(G_{\Omega, \Lambda}^g) = |\Omega \cap \Lambda|$ by Lemma 2.4. In the corresponding statement for localization operators, we do not get equality since the accumulated spectrogram is dependent on the quantity $[|\Omega|]$ and consequently the proof here is slightly simpler.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ be compact, then*

$$\|\rho_\Omega - \chi_\Omega\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)} = 2 \left(|\Omega \cap \Lambda| - \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} \lambda_k^\Omega \right).$$

Proof. Note first that the eigenvalues can be written as

$$(7) \quad \lambda_k^\Omega = \langle G_{\Omega, \Lambda}^g h_k^\Omega, h_k^\Omega \rangle = \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega \cap \Lambda} V_g h_k^\Omega(\lambda) \langle \pi(\lambda)g, h_k^\Omega \rangle = \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega \cap \Lambda} |V_g h_k^\Omega(\lambda)|^2.$$

The sum defining $\|\rho_\Omega - \chi_\Omega\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)}$ can be split into two parts, the interior and exterior of Ω . For the interior, we have that $\chi_\Omega(\lambda) = 1$ and $\rho_\Omega(\lambda) \leq 1$ by the remark following

Lemma 6, so

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\lambda \in \Omega \cap \Lambda} |\rho_\Omega(\lambda) - \chi_\Omega(\lambda)| &= |\Omega \cap \Lambda| - \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega \cap \Lambda} \rho_\Omega(\lambda) \\
&= |\Omega \cap \Lambda| - \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega \cap \Lambda} |V_g h_k^\Omega(\lambda)|^2 \\
&= |\Omega \cap \Lambda| - \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} \lambda_k^\Omega
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (7) for the second to last step. Meanwhile for the exterior where $\chi_\Omega(\lambda) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\lambda \in \Omega^c \cap \Lambda} |\rho_\Omega(\lambda) - \chi_\Omega(\lambda)| &= \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega^c \cap \Lambda} \rho_\Omega(\lambda) \\
&= \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \rho_\Omega(\lambda) - \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega \cap \Lambda} \rho_\Omega(\lambda) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |V_g h_k^\Omega(\lambda)|^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} \sum_{\lambda \in \Omega \cap \Lambda} |V_g h_k^\Omega(\lambda)|^2 \\
&= |\Omega \cap \Lambda| - \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} \lambda_k^\Omega.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining these two results, we get the expression in the statement of the lemma. \square

Theorem 1.1. *Let $g \in M_\Lambda^*(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ be compact with finite perimeter. Then*

$$\|\rho_\Omega - \chi_\Omega\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)} \leq \|g\|_{M_\Lambda^*}^2 (C|\partial\Omega| + D)$$

for constants C, D only dependent on Λ .

Proof. By Lemma 2.4 followed by Lemma 2.6, it holds that

$$(8) \quad 0 \leq \text{tr}(G_{\Omega, \Lambda}^g) - \text{tr}((G_{\Omega, \Lambda}^g)^2) \leq \|g\|_{M_\Lambda^*}^2 (C|\partial\Omega| + D).$$

We can also write the trace difference (8) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{tr}(G_{\Omega,\Lambda}^g) - \operatorname{tr}((G_{\Omega,\Lambda}^g)^2) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^\Omega (1 - \lambda_k^\Omega) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} \lambda_k^\Omega (1 - \lambda_k^\Omega) + \sum_{k=|\Omega \cap \Lambda|+1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^\Omega (1 - \lambda_k^\Omega) \\
&\geq \lambda_{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|}^\Omega \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} (1 - \lambda_k^\Omega) + (1 - \lambda_{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|}^\Omega) \sum_{k=|\Omega \cap \Lambda|+1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^\Omega \\
&= \lambda_{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|}^\Omega |\Omega \cap \Lambda| - \lambda_{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|}^\Omega \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} \lambda_k^\Omega + (1 - \lambda_{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|}^\Omega) \left(|\Omega \cap \Lambda| - \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} \lambda_k^\Omega \right) \\
&= \lambda_{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|}^\Omega |\Omega \cap \Lambda| + |\Omega \cap \Lambda| (1 - \lambda_{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|}^\Omega) - \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} \lambda_k^\Omega \\
&= |\Omega \cap \Lambda| - \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} \lambda_k^\Omega.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above with (8) yields

$$|\Omega \cap \Lambda| - \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} \lambda_k^\Omega \leq \|g\|_{M_\Lambda^*}^2 (C|\partial\Omega| + D).$$

We can use this estimate together with Lemma 3.1 to conclude that

$$\|\rho_\Omega - \chi_\Omega\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)} = 2 \left(|\Omega \cap \Lambda| - \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} \lambda_k^\Omega \right) \leq 2\|g\|_{M_\Lambda^*}^2 (C|\partial\Omega| + D)$$

which is what we wished to show. \square

Remark. The above proof can be extended to apply to multi-window Gabor multipliers [10, 24] or, more generally, mixed-state Gabor multipliers [11, 24, 29] in the same way as was done in [25] as Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.6 both are valid in this setting. In the notation of [11], this means that if S is a trace-class operator with $\operatorname{tr}(S) = 1$ such that (S, Λ) is a tight mixed-state Gabor frame and $G_{\Omega,\Lambda}^S = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^\Omega (h_k^\Omega \otimes h_k^\Omega)$, we can set $\rho_\Omega^S = \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} Q_S(h_k^\Omega)$ and it will hold that

$$\|\rho_\Omega^S - \chi_\Omega\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)} \leq 2 \left(\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |\lambda| \tilde{S}(\lambda) \right) (C|\partial\Omega| + D).$$

This type of generalization is analogous to that for the accumulated Cohen's class in [25].

Remark. Parallel to the development of accumulated spectrograms, there have been corresponding results for the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of *wavelet* localization operators, see [2, 16, 20, 26, 32]. It is likely that results similar to Theorem 1.1 hold in the frame setting for accumulated scalograms but we make no attempts to prove this here.

Theorem 1.1 can be used to approximate Ω as the set where $\rho_\Omega > 1/2$. The task of approximately inverting the mapping $\Omega \mapsto G_{\Omega, \Lambda}^g$ has been studied elsewhere in the continuous setting [2, 3, 19, 28], but not in the discrete case.

Corollary 1.2. *Let $g \in M_\Lambda^*(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ be compact with finite perimeter and*

$$\tilde{\Omega} = \{\lambda \in \Lambda : \rho_\Omega(\lambda) > 1/2\}.$$

Then

$$|(\Omega \Delta \tilde{\Omega}) \cap \Lambda| \leq \|g\|_{M_\Lambda^*}^2 (C|\partial\Omega| + D)$$

where Δ denotes the symmetric difference of two sets and C, D are constants only dependent on Λ .

Proof. Define $E = \{\lambda \in \Lambda : |\rho_\Omega(\lambda) - \chi_\Omega(\lambda)| \geq 1/2\}$, then we can bound the cardinality of E using Chebyshev's inequality as

$$\begin{aligned} |E| &= |\{\lambda \in \Lambda : |\rho_\Omega(\lambda) - \chi_\Omega(\lambda)| \geq 1/2\}| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\rho_\Omega - \chi_\Omega\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|g\|_{M_\Lambda^*}^2 (C|\partial\Omega| + D) \end{aligned}$$

using Theorem 1.1. We claim that $(\Omega \Delta \tilde{\Omega}) \cap \Lambda \subset E$. Indeed, if $\lambda \in \Lambda$ is in Ω but not $\tilde{\Omega}$, then $\chi_\Omega(\lambda) = 1$ and $\rho_\Omega(\lambda) \leq 1/2$ so $|\rho_\Omega(\lambda) - \chi_\Omega(\lambda)| \geq 1/2$. Meanwhile if λ is in $\tilde{\Omega}$ but not Ω , then $\chi_\Omega(\lambda) = 0$ and $\rho_\Omega(\lambda) > 1/2$ so $|\rho_\Omega(\lambda) - \chi_\Omega(\lambda)| > 1/2$. This proves the inclusion from which the result follows. \square

3.2. Sharpness of estimate. On top of improving the L^1 estimate of $\rho_\Omega - \chi_\Omega$, [6] also showed that it is impossible to establish stronger bounds by bounding the growth from below in the special case of dilated balls. In this section, we do the same by following a similar strategy as that used to prove [6, Theorem 1.6].

Theorem 1.3. *Let $g \in M_\Lambda^*(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that the conditions of Lemma 3.2 are satisfied. Then there exists constants C_1, C_2, D such that*

$$C_1 R^{2d-1} \leq \|\rho_{B(0,R)} - \chi_{B(0,R)}\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)} \leq C_2 R^{2d-1} + D.$$

We will prove the theorem by showing that the size of the plunge region grows at least as fast as the boundary of the balls. The theorem on which the following lemma is based uses a different measure of the size of the boundary so we have to use a geometric argument to show that it is equivalent to the Lebesgue measure that we use.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that*

$$|V_g g(z)| \leq C(1 + |z|)^{-s}$$

for some $C > 0$ and $s > 2d - 1$. Assume further that there is a positive number r such that the fundamental domain of Λ is contained in $B(0, r)$ and

$$V_g g(\lambda) \neq 0 \quad \text{for } \lambda \in B(0, 3r) \cap \Lambda.$$

Then there exists a $\delta > 0$ and a constant c such that

$$cR^{2d-1} \leq \#\{k : \delta < \lambda_k^{B(0,R)} < 1 - \delta\}.$$

Proof. This lemma essentially boils down to translating [13, Theorem 5.5.3] to our case where we measure the size of the boundary by $|\partial\Omega|$. To be able to apply [13, Theorem 5.5.3], it needs to hold that

$$(9) \quad |S_{B(0,R)}^k| \leq C|\partial^{3r} B(0, R)|$$

where

$$\partial^r \Omega = \{\lambda \in \Omega \cap \Lambda : B(\lambda, r) \cap \Omega^c \cap \Lambda \neq \emptyset\} \cup \{\lambda \in \Omega^c \cap \Lambda : B(\lambda, r) \cap \Omega \cap \Lambda \neq \emptyset\}$$

and

$$S_\Omega^k = \{\lambda \in \Omega \cap \Lambda : k \leq d(\lambda, \Omega^c \cap \Lambda) < k + 1\}.$$

If we can show that our boundary measure $|\partial B(0, R)|$ is bounded by $|\partial^{3r} B(0, R)|$, that will finish the proof of the lemma. Note that our usage of $3r$ stems from us assuming that $V_g g(\lambda) \neq 0$ on a larger ball than that which contains the fundamental domain of Λ .

It is stated in [13, Remark 5.5.4 (ii)] that (9) holds for dilations of bounded domains with smooth boundary which includes balls so with that it only remains to show that $|\partial B(0, R)| \lesssim |\partial^{3r} B(0, R)|$. To that end, we let $E = \partial B(0, R) + B(0, r)$ and claim that

$$(10) \quad R^{2d-1} \lesssim |E| \lesssim |E \cap \Lambda| \leq |\partial^{3r} B(0, R)|.$$

For the first step, if $R \leq r$, then $E = B(0, R + r)$ for which it is clear that $R^{2d-1} \lesssim |B(0, R + r)|$. Otherwise, $E = B(0, R + r) \setminus B(0, R - r)$ and

$$|E| = c(R + r)^{2d} - c(R - r)^{2d} = c'R^{2d-1}$$

by the mean value theorem.

Next to show that $|E| \lesssim |E \cap \Lambda|$, we first claim that

$$(11) \quad E \subset \bigcup_{\lambda \in E \cap \Lambda} B(\lambda, 2r).$$

Indeed, any point $e \in E$ is within distance r to a point in $\partial B(0, R)$. Letting z_e denote that point, it also holds that $B(z_e, r) \subset E$ and that $B(z_e, r) \cap \Lambda \neq \emptyset$ since the fundamental domain of Λ is contained in $B(0, r)$. Letting λ denote a point in the

nonempty intersection, it holds that $d(e, \lambda) \leq d(z, z_e) + d(z_e, \lambda) \leq 2r$ since $\lambda \in E$ by $B(z_e, r) \subset E$. Having proved (11), we can write

$$|E| \leq \sum_{\lambda \in E \cap \Lambda} |B(\lambda, 2r)| = c|E \cap \Lambda|.$$

For the last step of (10), we claim that $E \cap \Lambda \subset \partial^{3r} B(0, R)$. To that end, fix $\lambda \in E \cap \Lambda$ inside $B(0, R)$. It is our goal to find another lattice element outside $B(0, R)$ which is within $3r$ distance of λ . First, let b_λ be an element in $\partial B(0, R)$ such that $d(\lambda, b_\lambda) < r$. Now let $B_\lambda = B(b_\lambda + rb_\lambda/|b_\lambda|, r)$ be a ball outside of $B(0, R)$ with center a distance r from b_λ in the same direction from the origin. Then the distance from b_λ to the center of B_λ is r and since the fundamental domain of Λ is contained in $B(0, r)$, there is a lattice point of $\Lambda \cap B(0, R)^c$ in B_λ . Since this point is within the ball, the distance from the original point λ and the lattice point in B_λ must be less than $r + r + r = 3r$. The same argument works for $\lambda \notin B(0, R)$ with B_λ replaced by $B(b_\lambda - rb_\lambda/|b_\lambda|, r)$ and so we can conclude that $E \cap \Lambda \subset \partial^{3r} B(0, R)$, finishing the proof. \square

Remark. In [13] it is stated that the proofs of the results of [13, Section 5.5], including [13, Theorem 5.5.3], “will appear elsewhere” but this has not yet appeared.

With the above lemma in place, we are ready to proceed with the proof of the theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. The upper bound follows from Theorem 1.1 since $|\partial B(0, R)| = cR^{2d-1}$ so it only remains to prove the lower bound. From Lemma 3.1 we have that

$$\|\rho_\Omega - \chi_\Omega\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)} = 2 \left(|\Omega \cap \Lambda| - \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} \lambda_k^\Omega \right)$$

which we can bound from below using Lemma 2.4 as

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \left(|\Omega \cap \Lambda| - \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} \lambda_k^\Omega \right) &= \left(|\Omega \cap \Lambda| - \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} \lambda_k^\Omega \right) + \left(\text{tr}(G_{\Omega, \Lambda}^g) - \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} \lambda_k^\Omega \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} (1 - \lambda_k^\Omega) + \sum_{k=|\Omega \cap \Lambda|+1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^\Omega \\ &\geq \sum_{k=1}^{|\Omega \cap \Lambda|} \lambda_k^\Omega (1 - \lambda_k^\Omega) + \sum_{k=|\Omega \cap \Lambda|+1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^\Omega (1 - \lambda_k^\Omega) \\ (12) \qquad &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^\Omega (1 - \lambda_k^\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, from Lemma 3.2 we know that there exists a $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that

$$cR^{2d-1} \leq \#\{k : \delta < \lambda_k^{B(0, R)} < 1 - \delta\}$$

for all $R > 0$. Letting $P \subset \mathbb{N}$ denote the indices k such that $\delta < \lambda_k^{B(0,R)} < 1 - \delta$ for this δ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^{B(0,R)} (1 - \lambda_k^{B(0,R)}) &\geq \sum_{k \in P} \lambda_k^{B(0,R)} (1 - \lambda_k^{B(0,R)}) \\ &\geq \delta^2 |P| \geq \delta^2 c R^{2d-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into (12), we can relate it to $\|\rho_{\Omega} - \chi_{\Omega}\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)}$ with $\Omega = B(0, R)$ to get

$$\|\rho_{B(0,R)} - \chi_{B(0,R)}\|_{\ell^1(\Lambda)} \geq \delta^2 |P| \geq \delta^2 c R^{2d-1}$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Note that if we choose g to be the standard Gaussian, the conditions of Lemma 3.2 are fulfilled so the above theorem is not vacuous.

4. HYPERUNIFORMITY OF WEYL-HEISENBERG ENSEMBLES ON LATTICES

As we saw in Section 2.3, the image space $V_g(L^2) \subset \ell^2(\Lambda)$ is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space. The corresponding RKHS for the continuous STFT was used to induce a determinantal point process on \mathbb{R}^{2d} in [1, 4, 5], the Weyl-Heisenberg ensemble, and by the same procedure we can induce a determinantal point process \mathcal{X}_g on Λ with k -point intensities

$$\rho_k(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) = \det ([K_g(\lambda_i, \lambda_j)]_{1 \leq i, j \leq k})$$

where K_g is the reproducing kernel $K_g(\lambda, \lambda') = \langle \pi(\lambda')g, \pi(\lambda)g \rangle$ from (6) [14, 22].

A point process \mathcal{X} is said to be *hyperuniform* if the variance of the number of points in a large ball grows slower than the volume [30, 31]. Letting $\mathcal{X}(\Omega)$ denote the points in a set Ω , this means that

$$(13) \quad \mathbb{V}[\mathcal{X}(B(0, R))] = o(R^{2d}).$$

In particular, when the growth is on the order of R^{2d-1} , the point process is said to be *class I* hyperuniform.

A standard formula (see e.g. [18, Proposition 1.E.1]) specialized to the case of a lattice Λ states that for a determinantal point process with correlation kernel K ,

$$(14) \quad \mathbb{V} \left[\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{X}} f(\lambda) \right] = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} f(\lambda)^2 K(\lambda, \lambda) - \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \sum_{\lambda' \in \Lambda} f(\lambda) f(\lambda') K(\lambda, \lambda') K(\lambda', \lambda).$$

We will use this formula to show that our determinantal point process \mathcal{X}_g on Λ , induced by a tight Gabor frame, is class I hyperuniform.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $g \in M_{\Lambda}^*(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then the determinantal point process \mathcal{X}_g on Λ with correlation kernel $K_g(\lambda, \lambda') = \langle \pi(\lambda')g, \pi(\lambda)g \rangle$ is hyperuniform.*

Proof. With $K_g(\lambda, \lambda') = \langle \pi(\lambda')g, \pi(\lambda)g \rangle$, we have that $K_g(\lambda, \lambda) = 1$ and $K_g(\lambda, \lambda') = K_g(\lambda', \lambda)$. Hence, with $\phi(\lambda - \lambda') = |K(\lambda, \lambda')|^2$, we can write (14) as

$$\mathbb{V}[\mathcal{X}_g(\Omega)] = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \chi_\Omega(\lambda) - \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \sum_{\lambda' \in \Lambda} \chi_\Omega(\lambda) \chi_\Omega(\lambda') \phi(\lambda - \lambda').$$

From here Lemma 2.6 applies and bounds the variance by $\|g\|_{M_\Lambda^*}^2 (C|\partial\Omega| + D)$. This implies the desired growth behavior (13) when specialized to the case $\Omega = B(0, R)$. \square

Acknowledgements. This project was partially supported by the Project Pure Mathematics in Norway, funded by Trond Mohn Foundation and Tromsø Research Foundation.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. D. Abreu, “Entanglement entropy and hyperuniformity of Ginibre and Weyl–Heisenberg ensembles,” *Lett. Math. Phys.*, vol. 113, no. 3, 2023. DOI: [10.1007/s11005-023-01674-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11005-023-01674-y).
- [2] L. D. Abreu and M. Dörfler, “An inverse problem for localization operators,” *Inverse Problems*, vol. 28, no. 11, p. 115001, 2012. DOI: [10.1088/0266-5611/28/11/115001](https://doi.org/10.1088/0266-5611/28/11/115001).
- [3] L. D. Abreu, K. Gröchenig, and J. L. Romero, “On accumulated spectrograms,” *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, vol. 368, no. 5, pp. 3629–3649, 2015. DOI: [10.1090/tran/6517](https://doi.org/10.1090/tran/6517).
- [4] L. D. Abreu, K. Gröchenig, and J. L. Romero, “Harmonic analysis in phase space and finite Weyl–Heisenberg ensembles,” *J. Stat. Phys.*, vol. 174, no. 5, pp. 1104–1136, 2019. DOI: [10.1007/s10955-019-02226-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10955-019-02226-2).
- [5] L. D. Abreu, J. M. Pereira, J. L. Romero, and S. Torquato, “The Weyl–Heisenberg ensemble: Hyperuniformity and higher Landau levels,” *J. Stat. Mech. Theory Exp.*, vol. 2017, no. 4, p. 043103, 2017. DOI: [10.1088/1742-5468/aa68a7](https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-5468/aa68a7).
- [6] L. D. Abreu, J. M. Pereira, and J. L. Romero, “Sharp rates of convergence for accumulated spectrograms,” *Inverse Problems*, vol. 33, no. 11, p. 115008, 2017. DOI: [10.1088/1361-6420/aa8d79](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6420/aa8d79).
- [7] I. Daubechies, “Time-frequency localization operators: A geometric phase space approach,” *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 605–612, 1988. DOI: [10.1109/18.9761](https://doi.org/10.1109/18.9761).
- [8] M. Dörfler, “Gabor analysis for a class of signals called music,” PhD thesis, University of Vienna, 2002.
- [9] M. Dörfler, F. Luef, and E. Skrettingland, *Local structure and effective dimensionality of time series data sets*, 2021. arXiv: [2111.02153](https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.02153) [math.FA].
- [10] M. Dörfler and B. Torrésani, “Representation of operators in the time-frequency domain and generalized Gabor multipliers,” *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 261–293, 2009. DOI: [10.1007/s00041-009-9085-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00041-009-9085-x).
- [11] H. G. Feichtinger, S. Halvdansson, and F. Luef, *Measure-operator convolutions and applications to mixed-state Gabor multipliers*, 2023. arXiv: [2308.04985](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.04985) [math.FA].
- [12] H. G. Feichtinger and K. Nowak, “A Szegő-type theorem for Gabor-Toeplitz localization operators,” *Michigan Math. J.*, vol. 49, no. 1, 2001. DOI: [10.1307/mmj/1008719032](https://doi.org/10.1307/mmj/1008719032).

- [13] H. G. Feichtinger and K. Nowak, “A first survey of Gabor multipliers,” in *Advances in Gabor Analysis*, H. G. Feichtinger and T. Strohmer, Eds. Boston, MA: Birkhäuser Boston, 2003, pp. 99–128. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4612-0133-5_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-0133-5_5).
- [14] H. G. Feichtinger, K. Nowak, and M. Pap, “Spectral properties of Toeplitz operators acting on Gabor type reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces,” in *Mathematics Without Boundaries*. Springer New York, 2014, pp. 163–180. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4939-1106-6_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-1106-6_6).
- [15] H. G. Feichtinger, K. Nowak, and M. Pap, “Asymptotic boundary forms for tight Gabor frames and lattice localization domains,” *J. Appl. Math. Phys.*, vol. 03, no. 10, pp. 1316–1342, 2015. DOI: [10.4236/jamp.2015.310160](https://doi.org/10.4236/jamp.2015.310160).
- [16] S. Ghobber, “Some results on wavelet scalograms,” *Int. J. Wavelets Multiresolut. Inf. Process.*, vol. 15, no. 03, p. 1750019, 2017. DOI: [10.1142/s0219691317500199](https://doi.org/10.1142/s0219691317500199).
- [17] K. Gröchenig, *Foundations of Time-Frequency Analysis*. Birkhäuser Boston, 2001. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4612-0003-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-0003-1).
- [18] M. Guillaume and J. Gautier, “On sampling determinantal point processes,” PhD thesis, Ecole Centrale de Lille, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://theses.hal.science/tel-03132893>.
- [19] S. Halvdansson, *Five ways to recover the symbol of a non-binary localization operator*, 2023. arXiv: [2301.11618](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.11618) [math.FA].
- [20] S. Halvdansson, “Quantum harmonic analysis on locally compact groups,” *J. Funct. Anal.*, vol. 285, no. 8, p. 110096, 2023. DOI: [10.1016/j.jfa.2023.110096](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2023.110096).
- [21] C. E. Heil, J. Ramanathan, and P. N. Topiwala, “Asymptotic singular value decay of time-frequency localization operators,” in *Wavelet Applications in Signal and Image Processing II*, A. F. Laine and M. A. Unser, Eds., SPIE, 1994. DOI: [10.1117/12.188774](https://doi.org/10.1117/12.188774).
- [22] J. Hough, M. Krishnapur, Y. Peres, and B. Virág, *Zeros of Gaussian analytic functions and determinantal point processes*. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society, 2009. DOI: [10.1090/ULECT/051](https://doi.org/10.1090/ULECT/051).
- [23] M. Katori and T. Shirai, “Partial isometries, duality, and determinantal point processes,” *Random Matrices Theory Appl.*, vol. 11, no. 03, 2021. DOI: [10.1142/s2010326322500253](https://doi.org/10.1142/s2010326322500253).
- [24] F. Luef and E. Skrettingland, “Mixed-state localization operators: Cohen’s class and trace class operators,” *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 2064–2108, 2019. DOI: [10.1007/s00041-019-09663-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00041-019-09663-3).
- [25] F. Luef and E. Skrettingland, “On accumulated Cohen’s class distributions and mixed-state localization operators,” *Constr. Approx.*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 31–64, 2019. DOI: [10.1007/s00365-019-09465-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00365-019-09465-2).
- [26] F. D. Mari, H. G. Feichtinger, and K. Nowak, “Uniform eigenvalue estimates for time-frequency localization operators,” *J. Lond. Math. Soc.*, vol. 65, no. 03, pp. 720–732, 2002. DOI: [10.1112/s0024610702003101](https://doi.org/10.1112/s0024610702003101).
- [27] J. Ramanathan and P. Topiwala, “Time–frequency localization and the spectrogram,” *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 209–215, 1994. DOI: [10.1006/acha.1994.1008](https://doi.org/10.1006/acha.1994.1008).
- [28] J. L. Romero and M. Speckbacher, *Estimation of binary time-frequency masks from ambient noise*, 2022. arXiv: [2205.10205](https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.10205) [cs.SD].
- [29] E. Skrettingland, “Quantum harmonic analysis on lattices and Gabor multipliers,” *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, vol. 26, no. 3, 2020. DOI: [10.1007/s00041-020-09759-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00041-020-09759-1).

- [30] S. Torquato, “Hyperuniform states of matter,” *Phys. Rep.*, vol. 745, pp. 1–95, 2018. DOI: [10.1016/j.physrep.2018.03.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2018.03.001).
- [31] S. Torquato and F. H. Stillinger, “Local density fluctuations, hyperuniformity, and order metrics,” *Phys. Rev. E*, vol. 68, no. 4, 2003. DOI: [10.1103/physreve.68.041113](https://doi.org/10.1103/physreve.68.041113).
- [32] M. W. Wong, *Wavelet Transforms and Localization Operators*. Birkhäuser Basel, 2002. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-0348-8217-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-0348-8217-0).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, NORWEGIAN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, 7491 TRONDHEIM, NORWAY.

Email address: `simon.halvdansson@ntnu.no`