

STABILITY OF GAUSSIAN POINCARÉ INEQUALITIES AND HEISENBERG UNCERTAINTY PRINCIPLE WITH MONOMIAL WEIGHTS

NGUYEN LAM, GUOZHEN LU, AND ANDREY RUSSANOV

ABSTRACT. We use the Bakry-Émery curvature-dimension criterion and Γ -calculus to establish the Poincaré inequality with monomial Gaussian measure, and then apply the duality approach to study its improvements and its gradient stability. We also set up the scale-dependent Poincaré inequality with monomial Gaussian type measure and use it to inspect the stability of the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle with monomial weight. Finally, we apply the improved versions of the monomial Gaussian Poincaré inequality to investigate the improved stability of the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle with monomial weight. As special cases of our main results, we obtain the gradient stability of the classical Gaussian Poincaré inequality, which is of independent interest. Moreover, we also establish the stability of the sharp stability inequality of the classical Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle proved in [15].

1. INTRODUCTION

The main goal of this paper is to set up the Poincaré inequality with monomial Gaussian measure, its improvements and its gradient stability, and use them to investigate the stability and the improved stability of the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle with monomial weight. Our main motivation comes from [15], in which the authors used the classical Poincaré inequality with Gaussian weight and the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle identity to derive the sharp stability, with explicit optimal constants, of the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle.

The question about the stability of geometric and functional inequalities was first raised by Brezis and Lieb in [9]. More clearly, Brezis and Lieb asked in [9] whether the difference of the two terms in the Sobolev inequalities controls the distance to the family of extremal functions. Brezis and Lieb's question was answered affirmatively by Bianchi and Egnell in [5]. Indeed, by exploiting the special structure of the Hilbert space $W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, Bianchi and Egnell established in [5] that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx - S_N \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^{\frac{2N}{N-2}} dx \right)^{\frac{N-2}{N}} \geq c_{BE} \inf_{U \in E_{Sob}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla (u - U)|^2 dx$$

for some stability constant $c_{BE} > 0$. Here S_N is the sharp Sobolev constant and E_{Sob} is the manifold of the optimizers of the Sobolev inequality. Brezis and Lieb's question together with Bianchi and Egnell's result have initiated the program of studying the

The first author was partially supported by an NSERC Discovery Grant. The research for the second and third authors were partially supported by collaboration grants and a Simons Fellowship in Mathematics from the Simons Foundation.

quantitative stability results for functional and geometric inequalities that has attracted great attention. The literature on the topic is extremely vast and therefore, we just refer the interested reader to [3, 6, 13, 16, 17, 21, 27, 28, 29, 30, 43], for the study of stability of Sobolev type inequalities.

It is worth noting that the stability constants and whether or not the stability inequalities can be attained have usually not been investigated in the literature. For instance, the precise information on the stability constant c_{BE} was totally missing in the literature until very recently. In a very recent paper [23], Dolbeault, Esteban, Figalli, Frank and Loss shed some light on the stability constant c_{BE} by providing some optimal lower bounds for c_{BE} when the dimension $N \rightarrow \infty$, and established the stability for Gaussian log-Sobolev inequality as an application. Also, König proved in [37] that the optimal lower bound is strictly smaller than the spectral gap constant $\frac{4}{N+4}$, and derived in [38] its attainability. More recently, in [18], Chen, Tang and the second author studied the explicit lower bounds of the stability of the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequalities through which they also deduced some explicit lower bounds for the stability inequality of the higher and fractional order Sobolev inequalities. Moreover, they also obtained in [19, 20] the optimal asymptotic lower bounds for the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequalities and higher and fractional Sobolev inequalities when $N \rightarrow \infty$ for $0 < s < N/2$ and when $s \rightarrow 0$ for all N . This latter estimate when $s \rightarrow 0$ also allows them to derive the global stability for the log-Sobolev inequality on the sphere established by Beckner [4] and sharpen the earlier local stability obtained by Chen et al in [17].

Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle (HUP) is a fundamental concept in quantum mechanics that states that there is a limit to the precision with which certain pairs of physical properties, such as position and momentum, can be simultaneously known. Mathematically, it can be formulated as follows: For $u \in S_0$, one has

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 |x|^2 dx \right) \geq \frac{N^2}{4} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 dx \right)^2. \quad (1.1)$$

Here S_0 is the completion of $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ under the norm $\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 |x|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. In [15], the authors proved the following HUP identity: For $u \in S_0$, $u \neq 0$ and $\lambda = \left(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 |x|^2 dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}$, one has

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 |x|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{N}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 dx = \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| \nabla \left(u e^{\frac{|x|^2}{2\lambda^2}} \right) \right|^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{\lambda^2}} dx. \quad (1.2)$$

Obviously, HUP identity (1.2) provides several important information about the HUP. For instance, it can be deduced from (1.2) that all optimizers for (1.1) are the classical Gaussian profiles. Let $E_{HUP} = \left\{ \alpha e^{-\beta|x|^2} : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \beta > 0 \right\}$ be the set of all optimizers for (1.1). Motivated by Brezis and Lieb's question, we could ask here whether or not the HUP is stable. More clearly, is it true that $\delta(u) \approx 0$ implies $u \approx \alpha e^{-\beta|x|^2}$ in some sense for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $\beta > 0$, and for some Heisenberg deficit δ ?

In an effort to answer the question of the stability of the HUP, McCurdy and Venktraman applied the concentration-compactness arguments and proved in [44] that there

exist universal constants $C_1 > 0$ and $C_2(N) > 0$ such that

$$\delta_2(u) \geq C_1 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 dx \right) d_1^2(u, E_{HUP}) + C_2(N) d_1^4(u, E_{HUP}),$$

for all $u \in S_0$. Here

$$\delta_2(u) := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |x|^2 |u|^2 dx \right) - \frac{N^2}{4} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 dx \right)^2$$

is a HUP deficit and $d_1(u, A) := \inf_{v \in A} \{\|u - v\|_2\}$ is the distance from u to the set A . Therefore, $\delta(u) \approx 0$ implies $u \approx \alpha e^{-\beta|x|^2}$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $\beta > 0$. A simple and constructive proof was provided later by Fathi in [26] to show that $C_1 = \frac{1}{4}$ and $C_2 = \frac{1}{16}$. However, these constants are not sharp. Eventually, the authors in [15] combined the HUP identity (1.2) and the following Poincaré inequality with Gaussian type measure: for all $\lambda \neq 0$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx \geq \frac{1}{|\lambda|^2} \inf_c \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u - c|^2 e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx,$$

to show the following sharp stability of HUP:

Theorem A. *For all $u \in S_0$:*

$$\delta_1(u) := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 |x|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{N}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 dx \geq d_1^2(u, E_{HUP}). \quad (1.3)$$

Moreover, the inequality is sharp and the equality can be attained by nontrivial functions $u \notin E_{HUP}$.

As a consequence, we can deduce from the above Theorem that

$$\delta_2(u) \geq N \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 dx \right) d_1^2(u, E_{HUP}) + d_1^4(u, E_{HUP})$$

and the inequality is sharp and can be attained by nontrivial functions $u \notin E_{HUP}$.

Since the inequality (1.3) in Theorem A can be attained by nontrivial optimizers, we can once again ask for its stability. More clearly, let F_{HUP} be the set of all extremizers of (1.3). Then it will be interesting to ask the following

Question 1. *Does one have that*

$$\delta_1(u) - d_1^2(u, E_{HUP}) \gtrsim d_2^2(u, F_{HUP})$$

for some distance function $d_2(u, F_{HUP})$ from u to F_{HUP} ?

It is also worthy to note that the HUP identity (1.2) is just a consequence of a more general L^2 -Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg identity that has been established in [15]. Indeed, it was showed in [15] that

Theorem B. *Let $0 < R \leq \infty$, U and V be C^1 -functions on $(0, R)$ and let*

$$W(r) = (U(r)V(r))' + (N-1) \frac{U(r)V(r)}{r} - V^2(r).$$

Then for all $u \in C_0^\infty(B_R \setminus \{0\})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{B_R} U^2(|x|) |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{B_R} V^2(|x|) |u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_R} [W(|x|) + V^2(|x|)] |u|^2 dx \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_R} \left| \frac{\|Vu\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\|U|\nabla u\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}}} U(|x|) \nabla u + \frac{\|U|\nabla u\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\|Vu\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}}} V(|x|) u \frac{x}{|x|} \right|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, by choosing $U = \text{sign}(N - a - b - 1) r^{-b}$, $V = r^{-a}$. Then

$$W = [|N - 1 - a - b| r^{-a-b-1} - r^{-2a}].$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{|x|^{2b}} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{|x|^{2a}} |u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \left| \frac{N - 1 - a - b}{2} \right| \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{1}{|x|^{a+b+1}} |u|^2 dx \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| \text{sign}(N - a - b - 1) \frac{\left\| \frac{u}{|x|^a} \right\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\left\| \frac{|\nabla u|}{|x|^b} \right\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{1}{|x|^b} \nabla u + \frac{\left\| \frac{|\nabla u|}{|x|^b} \right\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\left\| \frac{u}{|x|^a} \right\|_2^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{1}{|x|^a} u \frac{x}{|x|} \right|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, with $a = -1$ and $b = 0$, we obtain (1.2).

Theorem B has been extended further in [22]. Indeed, it was showed in [22] that

Theorem C. *Let Ω be an open set in \mathbb{R}^N , $V \geq 0$ be a smooth function and $\vec{X} \in C^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N)$. Then for any $u \in C_0^1(\Omega)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{\Omega} V |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} V |\vec{X}|^2 |u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} \text{div}(V \vec{X}) |u|^2 dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} V \left| \left(\frac{\int_{\Omega} V |\vec{X}|^2 |u|^2 dx}{\int_{\Omega} V |\nabla u|^2 dx} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \nabla u - \left(\frac{\int_{\Omega} V |\nabla u|^2 dx}{\int_{\Omega} V |\vec{X}|^2 |u|^2 dx} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} u \vec{X} \right|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

We note that a L^p -version of Theorem C has also been studied in [22] and then has been used to investigate the stability of the L^p -Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg inequalities. Variants of Theorem C have also been studied in [24, 31, 32, 36, 41, 42], to name just a few.

In this paper, we are interested in the sharp versions and the stability of the Gaussian Poincaré inequality and the HUP with monomial weight. Here, a monomial weight is a weight of the form $x^A := x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_N^{\alpha_N}$, $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N \geq 0$. We also say that the monomial weight x^A is full if $\alpha_i > 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, N$. Otherwise, we say that x^A is partial. Let $D = N + \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_N$ and $\mathbb{R}_*^N = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x_i > 0 \text{ if } \alpha_i > 0\}$ be the dimension and the Weyl chamber associated to x^A . We note that the functional and geometric inequalities with monomial weights have been studied intensively in the literature. For instance, motivated by an open question raised by Brezis [8], Cabré and Ros-Oton established in [10] the Sobolev inequality with monomial weight and used it to investigate the problem of the regularity of stable solutions to reaction-diffusion problems of double revolution. In [11, 12], the authors also studied the Sobolev, Morrey, Trudinger and isoperimetric inequalities with monomial weight x^A and homogeneous weight. The optimal constants of the Trudinger-Moser inequalities with monomial weights were computed explicitly in [25, 35, 40]. In [2], Bakry, Gentil and Ledoux combined the stereographic projection and the Curvature-Dimension condition to set up the sharp Sobolev inequality with monomial weight. Also, mass transport approach was used to study the sharp constants and optimizers for the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities and logarithmic Sobolev inequalities with arbitrary norm and with monomial weights in [39, 45]. In [14], the author provided a proof for the Hardy-Sobolev-type inequalities with monomial weights. However, the best constant and the extremals for the inequalities were not studied there. Recently, sharp L^p -Hardy inequalities and optimal Hardy-Sobolev inequalities with monomial weight have also been studied in [24]. In [46], the author derived a double-weighted Hardy-Sobolev inequality and used it to establish the Gross' type logarithmic Sobolev inequality [33, 34] with monomial weights using product structure and the Moser-Onofri-Beckner inequality [4] with monomial weights.

It is also worth mentioning that by choosing suitable potential V and vector field \vec{X} in Theorem C, we can derive a HUP identity with monomial weight. Indeed, with $V = x^A$ and $\vec{X} = -x$, we have

$$\operatorname{div} \left(V \vec{X} \right) = -\operatorname{div} \left(x^A x \right) = -x^A \operatorname{div} (x) - x \cdot \nabla x^A = -Dx^A.$$

Therefore, Theorem C implies that

Proposition 1.1. *For $u \in S_A$, $u \neq 0$ and $\lambda = \left(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 |x|^2 x^A dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 x^A dx} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}$. We have that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 x^A dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 |x|^2 x^A dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{D}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 x^A dx \\ &= \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \nabla \left(u e^{\frac{|x|^2}{2\lambda^2}} \right) \right|^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{\lambda^2}} x^A dx. \end{aligned}$$

Here S_A is the completion of $N_* := \left\{ u \in C_0^\infty \left(\overline{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \right) : \nabla u \cdot \vec{\eta} = 0 \text{ on } \partial \mathbb{R}_*^N \right\}$, where $\vec{\eta}$ is the outer normal vector of \mathbb{R}_*^N , under the norm $\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 x^A dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 |x|^2 x^A dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

It is also clear that from the above identity, we obtain the HUP with monomial weight

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 x^A dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 |x|^2 x^A dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq \frac{D}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 x^A dx,$$

together with its sharp constant $\frac{D}{2}$ and all its optimizers $E_{HUPA} := \left\{ \alpha e^{-\beta|x|^2} : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \beta > 0 \right\}$. Therefore, once again, we may ask if the HUP with monomial weight is stable. More precisely, we would like to answer the following question:

Question 2. *Does one have that*

$$\delta_A(u) := \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 x^A dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 |x|^2 x^A dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{D}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 x^A dx \gtrsim d_A^2(u, E_{HUPA})$$

for some distance function $d_A(u, E_{HUPA})$ from u to E_{HUPA} ?

Motivated by the results and approaches in [15], Question 1 and Question 2, the first main goal of this paper is to set up the Poincaré inequality for monomial Gaussian weight and its improvements. More precisely, let $d\mu_A = \frac{x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2} dx} dx$ be the Gaussian measure with monomial weight. Let X_A be the completion of N_* under the norm $\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 d\mu_A \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then we will show the following Poincaré inequality with monomial weights:

Theorem 1.1. *For all $u \in X_A$, we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A. \quad (1.4)$$

Moreover, if x^A is partial, then (1.4) can be attained by non-constant functions.

We note that this Poincaré inequality includes the classical Poincaré inequality with Gaussian measure by taking $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_N = 0$. The approach we use to prove (1.4) is the Bakry-Émery Curvature-Dimension criterion. This method was first introduced in the 1980's by Bakry and Émery in [1]. Since then, it has been widely used to study several problems such as heat-kernel and spectral estimates, Harnack inequalities, Brunn-Minkowski-type inequalities, and isoperimetric, functional and concentration inequalities, in different settings such as (weighted) Riemannian geometry, Markov diffusion operators, metric measure spaces, graphs and discrete spaces. The interested reader is referred to the excellent book [2], for instance, and the references therein.

As showed in [15], one can use the Poincaré inequality to establish the stability of HUP. Therefore, we can expect that in order to answer Question 1 and set up improved stability of HUP, we will need to study improved and stability versions of the Poincaré inequality. This is indeed our next aim. More precisely, we will show that by using the duality approach, which is sometimes called the L^2 Hörmander method (see [7], for instance), we can obtain some improvements for Theorem 1.1. More clearly, we will prove that

Theorem 1.2. For $u \in X_A$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \nabla \left[u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right) x d\mu_A \cdot x \right] \right|^2 d\mu_A. \end{aligned} \quad (1.5)$$

If x^A is partial, then (1.5) can be attained by non-linear functions.

In the case when x^A is partial, we can regard (1.5) as a gradient stability version of the Poincaré inequality (1.4).

As a consequence, by applying the Poincaré inequality to the RHS of (1.5), we also obtain the following improved Poincaré inequality with monomial Gaussian weight that can be used to study the improved stability of the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle with monomial weight:

Proposition 1.2. For $u \in X_A$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u x d\mu_A \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A \right|^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u x d\mu_A \right) \cdot x + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A \right) \cdot x \right|^2 d\mu_A. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, in the classical Gaussian weight $d\mu_0 = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2} dx} dx = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2}}{(2\pi)^{\frac{N}{2}}} dx$, by noting that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x d\mu_0 = \vec{0}$, we obtain as a consequence of Theorem 1.2 and Proposition 1.2 that for $u \in X_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_0 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0 \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| \nabla u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u x d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0 \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u x d\mu_0 \right) \cdot x \right|^2 d\mu_0. \quad (1.7)$$

Obviously, this is an improvement of the classical Poincaré inequality with Gaussian weights:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_0 \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0. \quad (1.8)$$

Moreover, (1.6) implies that

Theorem 1.3. For $u \in X_0$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_0 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0 \geq \frac{1}{2} \inf_{c, \vec{d}} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \nabla \left[u - \left(c + \vec{d} \cdot x \right) \right] \right|^2 d\mu_0.$$

Also, the equality can be attained by non-linear functions.

This can be considered as a version of the gradient stability of the classical Poincaré inequality with Gaussian measure.

We also note that as in Proposition 1.3, the equality in (1.6) can be achieved by non-linear functions. However, it is not the case for (1.7). In this situation, we will show that by using the standard spectral analysis of the Hermite polynomials, we can obtain the following version that provides the sharp constant for (1.7):

Theorem 1.4. *For $u \in X_0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_0 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0 \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| \nabla u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u x d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0 \\ & \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u x d\mu_0 \right) \cdot x \right|^2 d\mu_0. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the equality can be attained by non-linear functions.

This result will play an important role in answering Question 1.

Regarding the stability of the HUP with monomial weight, Theorem 1.1 and its improvements are not enough to answer the Question 2. In fact, as showed in [15], in order to study the stability of the HUP, one needs a version of the Poincaré inequality with the monomial Gaussian weight depending on the scaling factor. Therefore, our next goal is to establish a scale-dependent Poincaré inequality with the monomial Gaussian weight.

More clearly, let $\lambda > 0$ and $d\mu_{A,\lambda} = \frac{x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx} dx$ be the Gaussian type measure with monomial weight. Let $X_{\lambda,A}$ be the completion of N_* under the norm $\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 d\mu_{A,\lambda} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_{A,\lambda} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then we will establish the following Poincaré inequality with $d\mu_{A,\lambda}$:

Theorem 1.5. *For $u \in X_{\lambda,A}$, we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_{A,\lambda} \geq \frac{1}{|\lambda|^2} \inf_c \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u - c|^2 d\mu_{A,\lambda}. \quad (1.9)$$

Moreover, if x^A is partial, then (1.9) can be attained by non-constant functions.

In the same spirit, we also obtain the improved scale-dependent Poincaré inequality with the monomial Gaussian weight. More clearly, let $\lambda > 0$ and recall that $d\mu_{A,\lambda} =$

$\frac{x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx} dx$ is the Gaussian type measure with monomial weight. Then we have that

Theorem 1.6. For $\lambda > 0$ and $u \in X_{\lambda,A}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_{A,\lambda} \\ & \geq \frac{1}{|\lambda|^2} \inf_{c, \vec{d}} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} (|u - c|^2 + \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \left| u - c + \vec{d} \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A - c \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A \right|^2 - \vec{d} \cdot x + c \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A \right) \cdot x \right|^2) d\mu_{A,\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can deduce the improved scale-dependent Poincaré inequality with the Gaussian type measure. More precisely, let $d\mu_\lambda = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx} dx$ be the Gaussian type measure. Then we can establish the following Poincaré inequality with $d\mu_\lambda$:

Theorem 1.7. For $\lambda > 0$ and $u \in X_{\lambda,0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_\lambda \\ & \geq \frac{1}{|\lambda|^2} \inf_{c, \vec{d}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(|u - c|^2 + \left| u - c - \vec{d} \cdot x \right|^2 \right) d\mu_\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the equality can be attained by non-linear functions.

Our next goal is use the scale-dependent Poincaré inequality with the monomial Gaussian weight to answer Question 2 and establish the stability of the HUP with monomial weight, in the spirit of [15]. Indeed, by combining the identity in Proposition 1.1 and the scale-dependent Poincaré inequality with the monomial Gaussian weight (1.9), we can provide an affirmative answer to Question 2. More precisely, we will prove that with the distance function

$$d_A(u, E_{HUPA}) := \inf_{c, \lambda \neq 0} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - c e^{-\frac{1}{2\lambda^2}|x|^2} \right|^2 x^A dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

one has the following stability result for HUP with monomial weight:

Theorem 1.8. Let $u \in S_A$. Then

$$\delta_A(u) \geq d_A^2(u, E_{HUPA}). \quad (1.10)$$

Moreover, if x^A is partial, then (1.10) can be attained by nontrivial functions $u \notin E_{HUPA}$.

Here, we recall that we are using the deficit function

$$\delta_A(u) = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 x^A dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 |x|^2 x^A dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{D}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 x^A dx.$$

Moreover, we can use the improved scale-dependent Poincaré inequality to obtain the improved stability of the HUP with monomial weight. More precisely, let

$$F := \left\{ (\alpha + \vec{\gamma} \cdot x) e^{-\beta|x|^2} : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \vec{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^N, \beta > 0 \right\}$$

and define

$$\tilde{d}_A(u, F) := \inf_{c, \vec{d}, \lambda \neq 0} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \left(c + \vec{d} \cdot x \right) e^{-\frac{1}{2\lambda^2}|x|^2} \right|^2 x^A dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then we will prove the following improved stability of HUP with monomial weight:

Theorem 1.9. *Let $u \in S_A$. Then*

$$\delta_A(u) - d_A^2(u, E_{HUPA}) \geq \frac{1}{2} \tilde{d}_A(u, F).$$

Finally, we will apply the refined Poincaré inequality (Theorem 1.7) to provide an affirmative answer to Question 1. More precisely, recall that $d_1(u, A) = \inf_{v \in A} \{\|u - v\|_2\}$ and define

$$d_2(u, F) := \inf_{c, \vec{d}, \lambda \neq 0} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - ce^{-\frac{1}{2\lambda^2}|x|^2} \right|^2 + \left| u - \left(c + \vec{d} \cdot x \right) e^{-\frac{1}{2\lambda^2}|x|^2} \right|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then we will prove the following result that can be considered as a stability version of the sharp stability of the HUP established in [15]:

Theorem 1.10. *For all $u \in S_0$:*

$$\delta_1(u) \geq d_2^2(u, F).$$

As a consequence

$$\delta_1(u) - d_1^2(u, E_{HUP}) \geq d_1^2(u, F).$$

The paper is organized as follows: In subsection 2.1, we apply the method of Curvature-Dimension condition to study the Poincaré inequality with monomial Gaussian weight, and then use the duality approach to establish its improvement and stability. In subsection 2.2, we use the Hermite spectral method to derive sharp versions of the stability of the classical Poincaré inequality with Gaussian weights. In subsection 2.3, we set up the scale-dependent Poincaré inequality with Gaussian type measures. Finally, in Section 3, we apply the Poincaré inequalities proved in Section 2 to investigate several versions of the stability of the HUP. In particular, we provide affirmative answers of Question 1 and Question 2 in Section 3.

2. POINCARÉ TYPE INEQUALITIES WITH GAUSSIAN WEIGHTS AND THE STABILITY

2.1. Poincaré inequality with monomial Gaussian weights and its stability-Proofs of Theorem 1.1, Theorem 1.2 and Proposition 1.2.

In this subsection, we will use the Bakry-Émery's Γ -calculus to establish the Poincaré inequality with monomial Gaussian weight. For a very detailed study and various applications of the Bakry-Émery curvature-dimension criterion and Γ -calculus, we refer the interested reader to [2].

Let $d\mu_A = \frac{x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2} dx} dx$ be the Gaussian measure with monomial weight. Then we have the following Poincaré inequality with monomial-Gaussian measure $d\mu_A$:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Consider the diffusion operator

$$\mathbf{L}_A := \Delta - x \cdot \nabla + \tilde{x}_A \cdot \nabla$$

associated to the Gaussian measure with monomial weight $d\mu_A$. Here we denote $\tilde{x}_A = \left(\frac{\alpha_1}{x_1}, \frac{\alpha_2}{x_2}, \dots, \frac{\alpha_N}{x_N}\right)$. Note that $-\mathbf{L}_A$ is symmetric and ≥ 0 with respect to the measure μ_A on N_* . The Dirichlet form can be defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{E}_A(u, v) := \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, d\mu_A.$$

By integration by part, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_A(u, v) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, d\mu_A \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u \operatorname{div} \left(\nabla v \, x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2} \right) dx \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u \mathbf{L}_A v \, d\mu_A \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} v \mathbf{L}_A u \, d\mu_A. \end{aligned}$$

This implies the invariance property of \mathbf{L}_A :

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \mathbf{L}_A u \, d\mu_A = 0 \quad \forall u \in N_*.$$

We then can extend $-\mathbf{L}_A$ to a nonnegative self-adjoint operator on X_A , which we still denote by $-\mathbf{L}_A$.

Next we define the associated ‘‘carré du champ’’ operator Γ_A :

$$\Gamma_A(u, v) := \frac{1}{2} [\mathbf{L}_A(uv) - u\mathbf{L}_A v - v\mathbf{L}_A u].$$

Note that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \Gamma_A(u, v) \, d\mu_A = - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u \mathbf{L}_A v \, d\mu_A = \mathcal{E}_A(u, v).$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_A(u) &:= \Gamma_A(u, u) = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{L}_A(u^2) - u\mathbf{L}_A u - u\mathbf{L}_A u) \\ &= \sum_i |\partial_i u|^2 + u \partial_{ii} u + \sum_j \frac{\alpha_j}{x_j} u \partial_j u - \sum_j x_j u \partial_j u \\ &\quad - \sum_i u \partial_{ii} u + \sum_i u x_i \partial_i u - \sum_i u \frac{\alpha_i}{x_i} \partial_i u \\ &= |\nabla u|^2. \end{aligned}$$

We also define the ‘‘carré du champ itéré’’ operator Γ_2 by:

$$\Gamma_2(u, v) := \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{L}_A \Gamma_A(u, v) - \Gamma_A(u, \mathbf{L}_A v) - \Gamma_A(\mathbf{L}_A u, v)).$$

Then,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \Gamma_2(u, v) d\mu_A = \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \mathbf{L}_A u \mathbf{L}_A v d\mu_A.$$

Note that for all $u \in N_*$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_2(u) &:= \Gamma_2(u, u) = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{L}_A \Gamma_A(u) - \Gamma_A(u, \mathbf{L}_A u) - \Gamma_A(\mathbf{L}_A u, u)) \\ &= \sum_{i,j} |\partial_{ij} u|^2 + \partial_{ju} \partial_{ji} u - \sum_{i,j} x_j \partial_i u \partial_{ij} u + \sum_{i,j} \frac{\alpha_j}{x_j} \partial_i u \partial_{ij} u \\ &\quad - \sum_{i,j} \partial_{ju} \partial_{ii} u + \sum_i |\partial_i u|^2 + \sum_{i,j} x_i \partial_{ju} \partial_{ij} u + \sum_i |\partial_i u|^2 \frac{\alpha_i}{x_i^2} - \sum_{i,j} \frac{a_i}{x_i} \partial_{ju} \partial_{ij} u \\ &= \|\nabla^2 u\|_F^2 + |\nabla u|^2 + \left| \tilde{\nabla}_A u \right|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{\nabla}_A u = \left(\frac{\sqrt{\alpha_1}}{x_1} \partial_1 u, \dots, \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_N}}{x_N} \partial_N u \right)$$

and

$$\|A\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} |a_{ij}|^2}$$

is the Frobenius norm of the matrix A .

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_2(u) &= \|\nabla^2 u\|_F^2 + |\nabla u|^2 + \left| \tilde{\nabla}_A u \right|^2 \\ &\geq \Gamma_A(u) = |\nabla u|^2, \end{aligned}$$

we have that the probability measure $\frac{x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2} dx} dx$ satisfies the Curvature-Dimension condition $CD(1, \infty)$ [2, Definition 1.16.1]. By [2, Proposition 4.8.1], we obtain the Poincaré inequality with monomial-Gaussian measure $d\mu_A$ with constant 1, that is

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A.$$

Now, assume that x^A is partial. WLOG, let $1 \leq k < N$ and assume that $x^A = x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_k^{\alpha_k}$, $\alpha_i \geq 0$. Let $u = a + \sum_{j=k+1}^N a_j x_j$. Then since $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x_j e^{-\frac{1}{2}x_j^2} dx_j = 0$, we have $\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A = a$. Also,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A = \sum_{j=k+1}^N a_j^2$$

On the other hand, since $\nabla u = \sum_{j=k+1}^N a_j \vec{e}_j$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A = \sum_{j=k+1}^N a_j^2.$$

Therefore

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A = \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A.$$

□

Next, by using the duality approach, we can prove the following improved version of the Poincaré inequality with monomial-Gaussian measure $d\mu_A$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \nabla u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right) x d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $u \in X_A$. It is obvious that $\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right) d\mu_A = 0$. Let w be the solution of the Poisson equation

$$-\mathbf{L}_A w = u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A.$$

Note that w satisfies the Neumann boundary condition: $\nabla w \cdot \vec{\eta} = 0$ on $\partial\mathbb{R}_*^N$, where $\vec{\eta}$ is the outer normal vector of \mathbb{R}_*^N . See [7, Lemma 5.4], for instance. Recall that

$$\Gamma_2(w) = \|\nabla^2 w\|_F^2 + |\nabla w|^2 + \left| \widetilde{\nabla}_A w \right|^2.$$

Integrating both sides of the above identity, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A = \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\mathbf{L}_A w|^2 d\mu_A = \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \Gamma_2(w) d\mu_A \\ & = \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla w|^2 d\mu_A + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \|\nabla^2 w\|_F^2 d\mu_A + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \widetilde{\nabla}_A w \right|^2 d\mu_A \\ & = \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla w - \nabla u|^2 d\mu_A + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \nabla w \nabla u d\mu_A \\ & \quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \|\nabla^2 w\|_F^2 d\mu_A + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \widetilde{\nabla}_A w \right|^2 d\mu_A \\ & = \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla w - \nabla u|^2 d\mu_A - 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u \mathbf{L}_A w d\mu_A \\ & \quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \|\nabla^2 w\|_F^2 d\mu_A + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \widetilde{\nabla}_A w \right|^2 d\mu_A \\ & = \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla w - \nabla u|^2 d\mu_A + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A \\ & \quad - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \|\nabla^2 w\|_F^2 d\mu_A + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \widetilde{\nabla}_A w \right|^2 d\mu_A. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla w - \nabla u|^2 d\mu_A + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \|\nabla^2 w\|_F^2 d\mu_A + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\tilde{\nabla}_A w|^2 d\mu_A. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we obtain the Poincaré inequality with monomial weights

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A.$$

Now, we note that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \|\nabla^2 w\|_F^2 d\mu_A = \sum_i \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla \partial_i w|^2 d\mu_A.$$

By applying the Poincaré inequality with monomial Gaussian weight (Theorem 1.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla \partial_i w|^2 d\mu_A &\geq \sum_i \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \partial_i w - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \partial_i w d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla w - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \nabla w d\mu_A|^2 d\mu_A. \end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \partial_i w d\mu_A &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} w \left[\frac{\alpha_i}{x_i} - x_i \right] d\mu_A \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} w \mathbf{L}_A x_i d\mu_A \\ &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x_i \mathbf{L}_A w d\mu_A \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x_i \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right) d\mu_A. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \|\nabla^2 w\|_F^2 d\mu_A \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \nabla w - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right) x d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla w - \nabla u|^2 d\mu_A + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \|\nabla^2 w\|_F^2 d\mu_A + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\tilde{\nabla}_A w|^2 d\mu_A \\ &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u - \nabla w|^2 d\mu_A + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \nabla w - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right) x d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A \end{aligned}$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \nabla u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right) x d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A.$$

Now, assume that x^A is partial. WLOG, let $1 \leq k < N$ and assume that $x^A = x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_k^{\alpha_k}$, $\alpha_i \geq 0$. Let $u = a + \sum_{j=k+1}^N a_j x_j + \sum_{j=k+1}^N b_j (x_j^2 - 1)$. Then $\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A = a$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \sum_{j=k+1}^N a_j x_j + \sum_{j=k+1}^N b_j (x_j^2 - 1) \right|^2 d\mu_A \\ &= \sum_{j=k+1}^N a_j^2 + 2b_j^2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $\nabla u = \sum_{j=k+1}^N (a_j + 2b_j x_j) \vec{e}_j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A &= \frac{1}{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2} dx} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \sum_{j=k+1}^N (a_j + 2b_j x_j) \vec{e}_j \right|^2 x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_k^{\alpha_k} e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2} dx \\ &= \sum_{j=k+1}^N a_j^2 + 4b_j^2. \end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A = \sum_{j=k+1}^N 2b_j^2.$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right) x d\mu_A \cdot x &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left(\sum_{j=k+1}^N a_j x_j + \sum_{j=k+1}^N b_j (x_j^2 - 1) \right) x d\mu_A \cdot x \\ &= \sum_{j=k+1}^N a_j x_j. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right) x d\mu_A \cdot x = a + \sum_{j=k+1}^N b_j (x_j^2 - 1)$$

and

$$\nabla \left[u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right) x d\mu_A \cdot x \right] = \sum_{j=k+1}^N 2b_j x_j \vec{e}_j.$$

That is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \nabla \left[u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right) x d\mu_A \cdot x \right] \right|^2 d\mu_A \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \sum_{j=k+1}^N 2b_j x_j \vec{e}_j \right|^2 d\mu_A \\
&= \sum_{j=k+1}^N 4b_j^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \nabla \left[u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right) x d\mu_A \cdot x \right] \right|^2 d\mu_A.
\end{aligned}$$

□

As a consequence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u x d\mu_A \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A \right|^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u x d\mu_A \right) \cdot x + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A \right) \cdot x \right|^2 d\mu_A.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Proposition 1.2. By Theorem 1.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \nabla u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right) x d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \nabla \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right) x d\mu_A \cdot x \right) \right|^2 d\mu_A.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, by using the Poincaré inequality with monomial Gaussian weight (Theorem 1.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \nabla \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right) x d\mu_A \cdot x \right) \right|^2 d\mu_A \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right) x d\mu_A \cdot x - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left(u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right) x d\mu_A \cdot x \right) d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u x d\mu_A \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A \right|^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u x d\mu_A \right) \cdot x + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A \right) \cdot x \right|^2 d\mu_A.
\end{aligned}$$

□

2.2. Improved Poincaré inequality with the classical Gaussian measure-Proofs of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4.

In the classical Gaussian measure case $d\mu_0 = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2} dx} dx = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2}}{(2\pi)^{\frac{N}{2}}} dx$, note that $\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_0 = \vec{0}$, we can easily deduce from Theorem 1.2 and Proposition 1.2 the following improved Poincaré inequality with the classical Gaussian measure:

Theorem 2.1. *For $u \in X_0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_0 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| \nabla u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x u d\mu_0 \right) \cdot x \right|^2 d\mu_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the first inequality can be attained by nonlinear functions.

We can also prove the above result by standard spectral analysis. For the convenience of the reader, we give here the proofs of Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4 using the Hermite polynomials decomposition.

Proof of Theorem 2.1 (Theorem 1.3). It is well-known that the spectrum $\sigma(-\mathbf{L}_0) = \mathbb{N}$ and the eigenfunctions are given by the Hermite polynomials $\{\phi_k\}_{k \geq 0}$. We can assume that $\{\phi_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ forms an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mu_0)$ and $-\mathbf{L}_0 \phi_k = k \phi_k$. In particular, the first eigenvalue is $\lambda_0 = 0$ with eigenfunction $\phi_0(x) = 1$. The second eigenvalue is $\lambda_1 = 1$ with eigenfunctions $\phi_{1,i}(x) = x_i$. The third eigenvalue is $\lambda_2 = 2$.

By Spectral theorem, we can write

$$u = \sum_{k \geq 0} c_k \phi_k$$

with $c_k = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u \phi_k d\mu_0$. Note that $c_0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u \phi_0 d\mu_0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0$. Also, $c_1 \phi_1 = \sum_j \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u x_j d\mu_0 \right) x_j$.

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(\sum_{i \geq 1} c_i \phi_i \right) \left(\sum_{j \geq 1} c_j \phi_j \right) d\mu_0 \\
&= \sum_{i \geq 1} c_i^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$-\mathbf{L}_0 u = \sum_{k \geq 0} k c_k \phi_k = \sum_{k \geq 1} k c_k \phi_k.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_0 &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u \mathbf{L}_0 u d\mu_0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(\sum_{k \geq 0} k c_k \phi_k \right) \left(\sum_{i \geq 0} c_i \phi_i \right) d\mu_0 \\ &= \sum_{i \geq 1} i c_i^2. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, we obtain the Poincaré inequality:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_0 \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0.$$

Also,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_0 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0 = \sum_{i \geq 2} (i-1) c_i^2.$$

Next, note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| \partial_j u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x_j u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0 \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\partial_j u|^2 d\mu_0 - 2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x_j u d\mu_0 \right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_j u d\mu_0 \right) + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x_j u d\mu_0 \right)^2 \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\partial_j u|^2 d\mu_0 - 2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x_j u d\mu_0 \right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \partial_j u \partial_j x_j d\mu_0 \right) + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x_j u d\mu_0 \right)^2 \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\partial_j u|^2 d\mu_0 + 2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x_j u d\mu_0 \right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u \mathbf{L}_0 x_j d\mu_0 \right) + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x_j u d\mu_0 \right)^2 \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\partial_j u|^2 d\mu_0 - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x_j u d\mu_0 \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| \nabla u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_0 - \sum_i \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x_i u d\mu_0 \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_{i \geq 2} i c_i^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_0 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0 \\ &= \sum_{i \geq 2} (i-1) c_i^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \geq 2} i c_i^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| \nabla u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, the equality happens with $u = \sum_{k=0}^2 c_k \phi_k$. □

Actually, we can prove a better result that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_0 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| \nabla u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0 \\
&\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x u d\mu_0 \right) \cdot x \right|^2 d\mu_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 1.4. As above, let

$$u = \sum_{k \geq 0} c_k \phi_k.$$

WLOG, assume that $c_0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u \phi_0 d\mu_0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 = 0$. Then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_0 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0 = \sum_{i \geq 2} (i-1) c_i^2.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x u d\mu_0 \right) \cdot x \right|^2 d\mu_0 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 d\mu_0 - \sum_i \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x_j u d\mu_0 \right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{i \geq 2} c_i^2
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_0 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| \nabla u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0 \\
&\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} x u d\mu_0 \right) \cdot x \right|^2 d\mu_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, the equalities happen when $u = \sum_{k=0}^2 c_k \phi_k$. □

2.3. Scale-dependent Poincaré inequality with monomial Gaussian weight-Proofs of Theorem 1.5, Theorem 1.6 and Theorem 1.7.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. We have from Theorem 1.1 that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2} dx \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \frac{1}{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2} dx} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2} dx \right|^2 x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2} dx.$$

Now, let $u(x) = v(\lambda x)$. Then $\nabla u = \lambda \nabla v(\lambda x)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2} dx &= \lambda^{2-N-D} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla v(\lambda x)|^2 (\lambda x)^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|\lambda x|^2} d(\lambda x) \\ &= \lambda^{2-N-D} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla v|^2 x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2} dx &= \lambda^{-N-D} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} v(\lambda x) (\lambda x)^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|\lambda x|^2} d(\lambda x) \\ &= \lambda^{-N-D} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} v x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2} dx &= \lambda^{-N-D} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \frac{1}{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2} dx} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2} dx \right|^2 x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2}|x|^2} dx \\ &= \lambda^{-N-D} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| v - \frac{1}{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} v x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx \right|^2 x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain the following

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla v|^2 x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx \\ &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| v - \frac{1}{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} v x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx \right|^2 x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx \\ &\geq \inf_c \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |v - c|^2 x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Now, assume that x^A is partial. WLOG, let $1 \leq k < N$ and assume that $x^A = x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_k^{\alpha_k}$, $\alpha_i \geq 0$. Then, as in the proof of Theorem 1.1, it is easy to verify that with $v = a + \sum_{j=k+1}^N a_j x_j$, then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla v|^2 x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx = \inf_c \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |v - c|^2 x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx = \sum_{j=k+1}^N a_j^2.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.6. From Proposition 1.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u x d\mu_A \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A \right|^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u x d\mu_A \right) \cdot x + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A \right) \cdot x \right|^2 d\mu_A. \end{aligned}$$

As above, with the change of variable $u(x) = v(\lambda x)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_A - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \right|^2 d\mu_A \\ & = \lambda^{2-N-D} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla v|^2 x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx \\ & \quad - \lambda^{-N-D} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |v - C_A(\lambda, v)|^2 x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx \end{aligned}$$

for some $C_A(\lambda, v)$.

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u x d\mu_A \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A - \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A \right|^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u x d\mu_A \right) \cdot x + \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u d\mu_A \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A \right) \cdot x \right|^2 d\mu_A \\ & = \lambda^{-N-D} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| v - C_A(\lambda, v) + \vec{D}_A(\lambda, v) \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A - C_A(\lambda, v) \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A \right|^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \vec{D}_A(\lambda, v) \cdot x + C_A(\lambda, v) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A \right) \cdot x \right|^2 x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx \end{aligned}$$

for some vector $\vec{D}_A(\lambda, v)$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & |\lambda|^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla v|^2 x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx \\ & \geq \inf_{c, \vec{d}} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} (|v - c|^2 + \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} \left| v - c + \vec{d} \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A - c \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A \right|^2 - \vec{d} \cdot x + c \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x d\mu_A \right) \cdot x \right|^2) x^A e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.7. We have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_0 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0 \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u x d\mu_0 \right) \cdot x \right|^2 d\mu_0.$$

Let $u(x) = v(\lambda x)$. Then $\nabla u = \lambda \nabla v(\lambda x)$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 d\mu_0 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 \right|^2 d\mu_0 \\ &= \lambda^{2-N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla v|^2 e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx \\ & - \lambda^{-N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| v - C_0(\lambda, v) \right|^2 e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx. \end{aligned}$$

for some $C_0(\lambda, v)$.

Finally

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u d\mu_0 - \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u x d\mu_0 \right) \cdot x \right|^2 d\mu_0 \\ &= \lambda^{-N} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| v - C_0(\lambda, v) - \vec{D}_0(\lambda, v) \cdot x \right|^2 e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx \end{aligned}$$

for some $C_0(\lambda, v)$ and $\vec{D}_0(\lambda, v)$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & |\lambda|^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla v|^2 e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx \\ & \geq \inf_{c, \vec{d}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(|v - c|^2 + \left| v - c - \vec{d} \cdot x \right|^2 \right) e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Now, let $u_\lambda = a_1(x_1^2 - \lambda^2) + \dots + a_N(x_N - \lambda^2)$. Then with $d\mu_\lambda = e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx$, we have by direct computation that

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda|^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u_\lambda|^2 e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx &= 4\lambda^2 \sum a_i^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \inf_{c, \vec{d}} \left(2(2\lambda^4 \sum a_i^2) + 2|c|^2 + |d|^2 \lambda^2 \right) \\ &= \inf_{c, \vec{d}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(|u_\lambda - c|^2 + \left| u_\lambda - c - \vec{d} \cdot x \right|^2 \right) e^{-\frac{1}{2|\lambda|^2}|x|^2} dx. \end{aligned}$$

□

3. STABILITY AND THE IMPROVED STABILITY OF THE HEISENBERG UNCERTAINTY PRINCIPLE WITH MONOMIAL WEIGHT-PROOFS OF THEOREM 1.8, THEOREM 1.9 AND THEOREM 1.10

Proof of Theorem 1.8. Let $u \in N_* \setminus \{0\}$. We have from Proposition 1.1 and the scale-dependent Poincaré inequality for monomial Gaussian weight (Theorem 1.5) with $\lambda =$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 |x|^2 x^A dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 x^A dx} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \text{ that} \\
& \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 |x|^2 x^A dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 x^A dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{D}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 x^A dx \\
& = \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \nabla \left(u e^{\frac{|x|^2}{2\lambda^2}} \right) \right|^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{\lambda^2}} x^A dx \\
& \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u e^{\frac{|x|^2}{2\lambda^2}} - \frac{1}{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x^A e^{-\frac{1}{\lambda^2}|x|^2} dx} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u e^{\frac{|x|^2}{2\lambda^2}} x^A e^{-\frac{1}{\lambda^2}|x|^2} dx \right|^2 x^A e^{-\frac{1}{\lambda^2}|x|^2} dx \\
& = \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \frac{e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2\lambda^2}}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x^A e^{-\frac{1}{\lambda^2}|x|^2} dx} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} u e^{\frac{|x|^2}{2\lambda^2}} x^A e^{-\frac{1}{\lambda^2}|x|^2} dx \right|^2 x^A dx \\
& \geq \inf_{c, \lambda \neq 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - c e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2\lambda^2}} \right|^2 x^A dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, assume that x^A is partial. WLOG, let $1 \leq k < N$ and assume that $x^A = x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_k^{\alpha_k}$, $\alpha_i \geq 0$. Let $u = x_N e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}} \notin E_{HUPA}$. Then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 |x|^2 x^A dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x_N^2 |x|^2 x^A e^{-|x|^2} dx$$

Also since $\nabla u = (\vec{e}_N - x_N x) e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 x^A dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\vec{e}_N - x_N x|^2 x^A e^{-|x|^2} dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} (1 - 2x_N^2 + x_N^2 |x|^2) x^A e^{-|x|^2} dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x_N^2 |x|^2 x^A e^{-|x|^2} dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\left(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 |x|^2 x^A dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 x^A dx} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} = 1.$$

By Proposition 1.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 x^A dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 |x|^2 x^A dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{D}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 x^A dx \\
& = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \nabla \left(u e^{\frac{|x|^2}{2}} \right) \right|^2 x^A e^{-|x|^2} dx \\
& = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x^A e^{-|x|^2} dx.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - ce^{-\frac{1}{2\lambda^2}|x|^2} \right|^2 x^A dx \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| x_N e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2}} - ce^{-\frac{1}{2\lambda^2}|x|^2} \right|^2 x^A dx \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x^A e^{-|x|^2} dx + c^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} e^{-\frac{1}{\lambda^2}|x|^2} x^A dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$d_A^2(u, E_{HUPA}) = \inf_{c, \lambda \neq 0} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - ce^{-\frac{1}{2\lambda^2}|x|^2} \right|^2 x^A dx \right) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} x^A e^{-|x|^2} dx.$$

That is

$$\delta_A(u) = d_A^2(u, E_{HUPA}).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.9. Let $u \in N_* \setminus \{0\}$. We have from Proposition 1.1 and the improved scale-dependent Poincaré inequality for monomial Gaussian weight (Theorem 1.6) with

$$\lambda = \left(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 |x|^2 x^A dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 x^A dx} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \text{ that}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 |x|^2 x^A dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |\nabla u|^2 x^A dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{D}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} |u|^2 x^A dx \\
&= \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| \nabla \left(ue^{\frac{|x|^2}{2\lambda^2}} \right) \right|^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{\lambda^2}} x^A dx \\
&\geq \inf_{c, \vec{d}, \lambda \neq 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left(\left| u - ce^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2\lambda^2}} \right|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left| u - \left(c + \vec{d} \cdot x \right) e^{-\frac{1}{2\lambda^2}|x|^2} \right|^2 \right) x^A dx \\
&\geq \inf_{c, \lambda \neq 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - ce^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2\lambda^2}} \right|^2 x^A dx + \frac{1}{2} \inf_{c, \vec{d}, \lambda \neq 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}_*^N} \left| u - \left(c + \vec{d} \cdot x \right) e^{-\frac{1}{2\lambda^2}|x|^2} \right|^2 x^A dx.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.10. By applying the improved scale-dependent Poincaré inequality with the Gaussian type measure (Theorem 1.7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 |x|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{N}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^2 dx \\
&= \frac{\lambda^2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| \nabla \left(ue^{\frac{|x|^2}{2\lambda^2}} \right) \right|^2 e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{\lambda^2}} dx \\
&\geq \inf_{c, \vec{d}, \lambda \neq 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(\left| ue^{\frac{|x|^2}{2\lambda^2}} - c \right|^2 + \left| ue^{\frac{|x|^2}{2\lambda^2}} - c - \vec{d} \cdot x \right|^2 \right) e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{\lambda^2}} dx
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \inf_{c, \vec{d}, \lambda \neq 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(\left| u - ce^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2\lambda^2}} \right|^2 + \left| u - \left(c + \vec{d} \cdot x \right) e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2\lambda^2}} \right|^2 \right) dx \\
&\geq \inf_{c, \lambda \neq 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - ce^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2\lambda^2}} \right|^2 dx + \inf_{c, \vec{d}, \lambda \neq 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| u - \left(c + \vec{d} \cdot x \right) e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2\lambda^2}} \right|^2 dx.
\end{aligned}$$

□

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Bakry, M. Émery, Diffusions hypercontractives. In: Séminaire de probabilités, XIX, 1983/84, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1123, pp. 177–206. Springer (1985)
- [2] D. Bakry, I. Gentil, M. Ledoux, Analysis and Geometry of Markov Diffusion Operators, Grundlehren Math. Wiss., 348 [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences] Springer, Cham, 2014, xx+552 pp.
- [3] T. Bartsch, T. Weth, M. Willem, A Sobolev inequality with remainder term and critical equations on domains with topology for the polyharmonic operator, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 18 (2003), 253–268.
- [4] W. Beckner, Sharp Sobolev inequalities on the sphere and the Moser-Trudinger inequality, Ann. of Math. (2) 138 (1993), no. 1, 213–242.
- [5] G. Bianchi, H. Egnell, A note on the Sobolev inequality, J. Funct. Anal. 100 (1991), 18–24.
- [6] M. Bonforte, J. Dolbeault, B. Nazaret, Nikita, Stability in Gagliardo-Nirenberg-Sobolev inequalities, Flows, regularity and the entropy method, [arXiv:2007.03674v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.03674v2)
- [7] M. Bonnefont. Poincaré inequality with explicit constant in dimension $d \geq 1$. [Global Sensitivity Analysis and Poincaré inequalities \(Toulouse 2022\) Note](#).
- [8] H. Brezis, Is there failure of the inverse function theorem? Morse theory, minimax theory and their applications to nonlinear differential equations, Proc. Workshop held at the Chinese Acad. of Sciences, Beijing, 1999, 23–33, New Stud. Adv. Math., 1, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2003.
- [9] H. Brezis, E.H. Lieb, Sobolev inequalities with remainder terms, J. Funct. Anal. 62 (1985), 73–86.
- [10] X. Cabré, X. Ros-Oton, Regularity of stable solutions up to dimension 7 in domains of double revolution. Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 38, 2013, 135–154.
- [11] X. Cabré, X. Ros-Oton, Sobolev and isoperimetric inequalities with monomial weights. J. Differential Equations 255 (2013), no. 11, 4312–4336.
- [12] X. Cabré, X. Ros-Oton, J. Serra, Sharp isoperimetric inequalities via the ABP method. J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) 18 (2016), no. 12, 2971–2998
- [13] E. Carlen, A. Figalli, Stability for a GNS inequality and the log-HLS inequality, with application to the critical mass Keller-Segel equation, Duke Math. J. 162 (2013), no.3, 579–625.
- [14] H. Castro, Hardy-Sobolev-type inequalities with monomial weights. Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) 196 (2017), no. 2, 579–598.
- [15] C. Cazacu, J. Flynn, N. Lam, G. Lu, Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg identities, inequalities and their stabilities, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 182 (2024), 253–284.
- [16] S. Chen, R. Frank, T. Weth, Remainder terms in the fractional Sobolev inequality, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 62 (2013), no. 4, 1381–1397.
- [17] L. Chen, G. Lu, H. Tang, Sharp stability of log-Sobolev and Moser-Onofri inequalities on the sphere, J. Funct. Anal. 285 (2023), no. 5, Paper No. 110022, 24 pp.
- [18] L. Chen, G. Lu, H. Tang, Stability of Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequalities with explicit lower bounds, Adv. Math. 450 (2024), Paper No. 109778, 28 pp.
- [19] L. Chen, G. Lu, H. Tang, Optimal asymptotic lower bound for stability of fractional Sobolev inequality and the global stability of Log-Sobolev inequality on the sphere, [arXiv:2312.11787](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.11787).
- [20] L. Chen, G. Lu, H. Tang, Optimal stability of Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev and Sobolev inequalities of arbitrary orders with dimension-dependent constants, [arXiv:2405.17727](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.17727).

- [21] A. Cianchi, N. Fusco, F. Maggi, A. Pratelli, The sharp Sobolev inequality in quantitative form, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.(JEMS)* 11 (2009), no. 5, 1105-1139.
- [22] A. X. Do, J. Flynn, N. Lam, G. Lu, L^p -Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg inequalities and their stabilities, arXiv.2310.07083.
- [23] J. Dolbeault, M.J. Esteban, A. Figalli, R. Frank, M. Loss, Sharp stability for Sobolev and log-Sobolev inequalities, with optimal dimensional dependence, arXiv:2209.08651.
- [24] N.T. Duy, N. Lam, G. Lu, p -Bessel pairs, Hardy's identities and inequalities and Hardy-Sobolev inequalities with monomial weights, *J. Geom. Anal.* 32 (2022), no. 4, Paper No. 109, 36 pp.
- [25] N.T. Duy, L.T. Nghia, L.L. Phi, Sharp Trudinger-Moser inequalities with homogeneous weights, *Electron. J. Differential Equations* 2019, Paper No. 105, 16 pp.
- [26] M. Fathi, A short proof of quantitative stability for the Heisenberg-Pauli-Weyl inequality, *Nonlinear Anal.* 210 (2021), Paper No. 112403, 3 pp.
- [27] A. Figalli, D. Jerison, Quantitative stability for sumsets in \mathbb{R}^n *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* 17 (2015), no. 5, 1079-1106.
- [28] A. Figalli, D. Jerison, Quantitative stability for the Brunn-Minkowski inequality, *Adv. Math.* 314 (2017), 1-47
- [29] A. Figalli, R. Neumayer, Gradient stability for the Sobolev inequality: the case $p \geq 2$, *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* 21 (2019), no. 2, 319-354.
- [30] A. Figalli, Y. Zhang, Sharp gradient stability for the Sobolev inequality, *Duke Math. J.* 171 (2022), no. 12, 2407-2459
- [31] J. Flynn, N. Lam, G. Lu, Hardy-Poincaré-Sobolev type inequalities on hyperbolic spaces and related Riemannian manifolds, *J. Funct. Anal.* 283 (2022), no. 12, Paper No. 109714, 37 pp.
- [32] J. Flynn, N. Lam, G. Lu, S. Mazumdar, Hardy's identities and inequalities on Cartan-Hadamard manifolds, *J. Geom. Anal.* 33 (2023), no. 1, Paper No. 27, 34 pp.
- [33] L. Gross, Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities, *Amer. J. Math.* 97 (1975), no. 4, 1061-1083.
- [34] L. Gross, Hypercontractivity and logarithmic Sobolev inequalities for the Clifford Dirichlet form, *Duke Math. J.* 42 (1975), no. 3, 383-396.
- [35] P. Gurka, D. Hauer, More insights into the Trudinger-Moser inequality with monomial weight, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 60 (2021), no. 1, Paper No. 16, 27 pp.
- [36] X. Huang, D. Ye, First order Hardy inequalities revisited, *Commun. Math. Res.* 38 (2022), no. 4, 535-559.
- [37] T. König, On the sharp constant in the Bianchi-Engell stability inequality, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* 55 (2023), no. 4, 2070-2075
- [38] T. König, Stability for the Sobolev inequality: existence of a minimizer, arXiv: 2211.14185, to appear in *JEMS*.
- [39] N. Lam, General sharp weighted Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg inequalities. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* 149 (2019), no. 3, 691-718.
- [40] N. Lam, Sharp Trudinger-Moser inequalities with monomial weights. *NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl.* 24 (2017), no. 4, Art. 39, 21 pp.
- [41] N. Lam, G. Lu, L. Zhang, Factorizations and Hardy's type identities and inequalities on upper half spaces, *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations* 58 (2019), no. 6, Paper No. 183, 31 pp.
- [42] N. Lam, G. Lu, L. Zhang, Geometric Hardy's inequalities with general distance functions, *J. Funct. Anal.* 279 (2020), no. 8, 108673, 35 pp.
- [43] G. Lu, J. Wei, On a Sobolev inequality with remainder terms, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 128 (1999), 75-84.
- [44] S. McCurdy, R. Venkatraman, Quantitative stability for the Heisenberg-Pauli-Weyl inequality, *Nonlinear Anal.* 202 (2021), Paper No. 112147, 13 pp.
- [45] V. H. Nguyen, Sharp weighted Sobolev and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities on half-spaces via mass transport and consequences. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)* 111 (2015), no. 1, 127-148.
- [46] J. Wang, Weighted Hardy-Sobolev, log-Sobolev and Moser-Onofri-Beckner inequalities with monomial weights. *Potential Anal.* 58 (2023), no. 2, 225-240.

NGUYEN LAM: SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND THE ENVIRONMENT, GRENFELL CAMPUS, MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND, CORNER BROOK, NL A2H5G4, CANADA

Email address: `n1am@mun.ca`

GUOZHEN LU: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT, STORRS, CT 06269, USA

Email address: `guozhen.lu@uconn.edu`

ANDREY RUSSANOV: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT, STORRS, CT 06269, USA

Email address: `andrey.russanov@uconn.edu`