TRANSPORT-ENTROPY AND FUNCTIONAL FORMS OF BLASCHKE-SANTALÓ INEQUALITIES
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Abstract. We explore alternative functional or transport-entropy formulations of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality. In particular, we obtain new Blaschke-Santaló inequalities for $s$-concave functions. We also obtain new sharp symmetrized transport-entropy inequalities for a large class of spherically invariant probability measures, including the uniform measure on the unit Euclidean sphere and generalized Cauchy and Barenblatt distributions.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The classical Blaschke-Santaló inequality [Bla23, San49] states that if $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a convex body, then there exists $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

\begin{equation}
|K||\langle K-z \rangle^c| \leq |B_2^n|^2,
\end{equation}
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where the polar of a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined by $A^\circ = \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, y \rangle \leq 1, \forall x \in A \}$, and $B_2^n$ denotes the Euclidean unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Equality holds in (1) if and only if $K$ is an ellipsoid. Moreover, if one of the convex bodies $K$ or $K^\circ$ has its barycenter at 0 (which is for instance the case for centrally symmetric convex bodies), then (1) holds with $z = 0$.

The inequality (1) admits a functional version, first proved by Ball [Bal86] in the case of even functions, and then extended to arbitrary functions by Artstein-Avidan, Klartag and Milman [AAKM04]: for any function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ there exists $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$
\int e^{-\varphi} \, dx \int e^{-\varphi(z)^*} \, dx \leq (2\pi)^n,
$$

where, $\varphi_z(x) = \varphi(x+z)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and the Fenchel-Legendre transform of a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is defined by

$$
f^*(y) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \langle x, y \rangle - \varphi(x), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^n.
$$

Lehec [Leh09a] gave another proof of inequality (2) and showed that, if $\int xe^{-\varphi(x)} \, dx = 0$, then (2) holds with $z = 0$. One sees that (2) gives back (1) by taking $\varphi = \frac{\|x\|_2^2}{2}$.

Recently, a sharp form of Talagrand’s transport-entropy inequality for the Gaussian standard measure $\gamma$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ has been deduced from (2) by Fathi [Fat18]. More precisely, for all probability measures $\nu_1, \nu_2$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $\nu_2$ centered, it holds

$$
W_2^2(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq 2H(\nu_1|\gamma) + 2H(\nu_2|\gamma),
$$

where $W_2$ denotes the usual quadratic Wasserstein distance (with respect to the usual Euclidean norm $| \cdot |$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$), defined by

$$
W_2^2(\nu_1, \nu_2) = \inf \mathbb{E}[\|X_1 - X_2\|^2],
$$

where the infimum runs over random vectors satisfying $X_1 \sim \nu_1$ and $X_2 \sim \nu_2$, and $H(\cdot | \mu)$ denotes the relative entropy functional with respect to some measure $\mu$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and is defined by

$$
H(\nu | \mu) = \int \log \frac{d\nu}{d\mu} \, d\mu,
$$

whenever $\nu$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mu$, and $+\infty$ if this is not the case. Choosing $\nu_2 = \gamma$, Inequality (3) immediately gives back the following classical inequality obtained by Talagrand in [Tal96]: for all probability measures $\nu_1$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$

$$
W_2^2(\nu_1, \gamma) \leq 2H(\nu_1|\gamma).
$$

Without centering assumptions on $\nu_2$, the following inequality can be easily deduced from (4): for all probability measures $\nu_1, \nu_2$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$,

$$
W_2^2(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq 4H(\nu_1|\gamma) + 4H(\nu_2|\gamma).
$$

Interestingly, Inequalities (3), (4) and (5) are all sharp. We refer to [Led01] or [GL10] for applications of transport-entropy inequalities to the concentration of measure phenomenon.

The main objective of this paper is to extend the preceding results to other model probability spaces than the Gaussian space $(\mathbb{R}^n, | \cdot |, \gamma)$. For that purpose, we will rely on a more general functional version of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality that we shall now present. The functional inequality (2) is in fact a particular case of the following result first proved by Ball [Bal86] for even functions, then by the first named author and Meyer [FM07] for log-concave functions and finally extended by Lehec [Leh09c] to arbitrary measurable functions: if $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is integrable, then there exists a point $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that for any measurable function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying

$$
f(x+z)g(y) \leq \rho(\langle x, y \rangle)^2, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ such that } \langle x, y \rangle > 0,
$$

where the polar of a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined by $A^\circ = \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, y \rangle \leq 1, \forall x \in A \}$, and $B_2^n$ denotes the Euclidean unit ball of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Equality holds in (1) if and only if $K$ is an ellipsoid. Moreover, if one of the convex bodies $K$ or $K^\circ$ has its barycenter at 0 (which is for instance the case for centrally symmetric convex bodies), then (1) holds with $z = 0$.
it holds
\[ (6) \quad \int f(x) \, dx \int g(y) \, dy \leq \left( \int \rho(|x|^2) \, dx \right)^2, \]
where \( \rho : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) is some weight function such that \( \int \rho(|x|^2) \, dx < +\infty \). As first proved by Ball [Bal86], if \( f \) is even, then \( z \) can be chosen to be 0. Inequality (6) corresponds to the weight function \( \rho_0(t) = e^{-t^2/2}, \ t \geq 0 \).

In the spirit of Fathi’s version of Talagrand’s inequality [Fathi96], we show in Theorem 3.1 that the general functional version of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality (6) implies sharp transport-entropy inequalities for a class of spherically invariant probability measures that contain the standard Gaussian as a particular case. More precisely, we prove the following result in Theorem 3.1:

**Theorem.** If \( \rho : \mathbb{R}_+ \to (0, \infty) \) is a continuous non-increasing function such that \( \int \rho(|x|^2) \, dx < +\infty \), and \( t \to -\log \rho(e^t) \) is convex on \( \mathbb{R} \), then the probability measure
\[ \mu_\rho(dx) = \frac{\rho(|x|^2)}{\int \rho(|y|^2) \, dy} \]
satisfies the following inequality: for all \( \nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n) \) with \( \nu_1 \) and \( \nu_2 \) symmetric,
\[ (7) \quad T_{\omega_\rho}(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq H(\nu_1|\mu_\rho) + H(\nu_2|\mu_\rho), \]
where
\[ T_{\omega_\rho}(\nu_1, \nu_2) = \inf_{X \sim \nu_1, X_2 \sim \nu_2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \omega_\rho(X_1, X_2) \right] \]
is the optimal transport cost associated with the cost function \( \omega_\rho \) defined by
\[ \omega_\rho(x, y) = \begin{cases} \log \left( \frac{\rho(|x,y|^2)}{\rho(|x|^2)\rho(|y|^2)} \right) & \text{if } \langle x, y \rangle \geq 0, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n. \]

In the result above, and in the the rest of the paper, a probability measure \( \mu \) on \( \mathbb{R}^n \) will be called symmetric if it is invariant under the map \( \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n : x \mapsto -x \).

The proof of this result relies on a classical duality argument due to Bobkov and Götze [BG99]. Since Inequality (7) holds only for symmetric probability measures, it can be considered as some transport-entropy version of both functional Blaschke-Santaló inequality for even functions. Linearizing Inequality (7) around \( \mu_\rho \) gives back a sharp Brascamp-Lieb type inequality recently used by Cordero-Erausquin and Rotem [CER] in their study of the \( (B) \) conjecture and the Gardner-Zvavitch conjecture for rotationally invariant probability measures. More precisely, we get the following in Theorem 4.1:

**Theorem.** Let \( \rho : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) such that \( t \to \nu_\rho(t) = -\log \rho(e^t) \) is convex and increasing. Define the measure \( \mu_\rho \) in the same way as in the previous theorem. Then, for all \( f \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^n) \) even and such that \( \int f \, d\mu_\rho = 0 \),
\[ (8) \quad \int f^2 \, d\mu_\rho \leq \frac{1}{2} \int \langle H_\rho^{-1} \nabla f, \nabla f \rangle \, d\mu_\rho, \]
where \( H_\rho \) is the positive matrix given by
\[ \frac{1}{2} H_\rho(y) = \frac{1}{|y|^2} \left[ \left( I_n - \frac{y \otimes y}{|y|^2} \right) \nu_\rho'(t) + \frac{y \otimes y}{|y|^2} \nu_\rho''(t) \right] \]
where, for simplicity, we used the notation \( t = 2 \log|y| \).
2.9, one can go a step further: \cite{Leh09a} for the weight \( \rho \). This generalizes the Blaschke-Santaló inequality under a centering condition obtained by Lehec in \cite{Leh09a} in the particular case of the weight function \( \rho_0 \) defined above. As we will now explain, the answer to these questions depends on the weight function \( \rho \). Consider the class of weight functions \( (\rho_s)_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \), defined for \( s \neq 0 \) by
\[
\rho_s(t) = (1 - st)^{\frac{1}{2s}}, \quad t \geq 0.
\]
The associated probability measures are the following:

- For \( s > 0 \), we will denote
\[
d\gamma_s(x) := \mu_{\rho_s}(dx) = \frac{1}{Z_s} \left( 1 - s|x|^2 \right)^{1/(2s)} dx,
\]
where \( Z_s \) is a normalization constant. As we shall see in Theorem 3.2, the following is true.

**Theorem.** Let \( s > 0 \). Consider the probability \( \gamma_s \) defined in (9). Then, for any \( \nu_1, \nu_2 \) with compact support included in the open Euclidean ball \( B_s \) centered at the origin and of radius \( 1/\sqrt{s} \), and with \( \nu_2 \) centered,
\[
(10) \quad \mathcal{T}_{k_s}(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq H(\nu_1 | \gamma_s) + H(\nu_2 | \gamma_s),
\]
where \( k_s : B_s \times B_s \to \mathbb{R} \)
\[
k_s(x, y) = \frac{1}{s} \log \left( \frac{1 - s\langle x, y \rangle}{(1 - s|x|^2)^{1/2}(1 - s|y|^2)^{1/2}} \right), \quad x, y \in B_s.
\]

This result is analogous to Fathi’s result (3) in the Gaussian case and gives back (3) by sending \( s \to 0 \). One can show that (10) (see Remark 3.3 for explanations) also implies the following version of the functional Blaschke-Santaló inequality: for all continuous \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) and \( g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) with supports in \( B_s \) and such that \( \text{bar}(f) := \frac{\int f(x) \, dx}{\int f(y) \, dy} \) = 0 and
\[
(11) \quad f(x)g(y) \leq \rho_s(\langle x, y \rangle)^2, \quad \forall x, y \in B_s,
\]
it holds
\[
\int f(x) \, dx \int g(y) \, dy \leq \left( \int \rho_s(|x|^2) \, dx \right)^2.
\]
This generalizes the Blaschke-Santaló inequality under a centering condition obtained by Lehec in \cite{Leh09a} for the weight \( \rho_0 \) (which corresponds to the limit case \( s \to 0 \)). As we will see with Theorem 2.9, one can go a step further:
Theorem. If \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) is integrable and such that \( 0 \in \text{int}(\text{Conv}(\text{supp}(f))) \), then it holds
\[
\int f(x) \, dx \int L_s(f)(y) \, dy \leq \left( \int \rho_s(|x|^2) \, dx \right)^2 \left( 1 - s(\text{San}_s(L_s(f)), \text{bar}(f)) \right)^{n+1+\frac{1}{2}}.
\]
where
\[
L_s(f)(y) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left( \frac{1 - s(x, y)}{f(x)} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}}, \quad \text{for } s \neq 0,
\]
the infimum being taken on \( \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(x) > 0 \} \) and \( \text{San}_s(g) \) denotes the \( s \)-Santaló point of \( g \) whose definition is given in Lemma 2.3.

The proof of this theorem relies on the fact that the integral of \( L_s(f_z) \) with respect to Lebesgue, where \( f_z(x) = f(z + x) \), \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), can be expressed as the integral of \( L_s(f) \) under some weighted measure. The same type of arguments can also be used at the level of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality for sets. In particular, we show the following in Theorem 2.1.

Theorem. If \( K \) is a compact set such that \( |K| > 0 \) and \( 0 \in \text{int}(\text{Conv}(K)) \), then
\[
|K||K^o| \leq |B_2|^2 \left( 1 - \langle \text{San}(K^o), \text{bar}(K) \rangle \right)^{n+1},
\]
with equality if and only if \( K \) is a centered ellipsoid, where \( \text{San}(K^o) \) is defined in Section 2. In particular, if \( \text{bar}(K) := \{ \int x \, dx \} = 0 \) then \( |K||K^o| \leq |B_2|^2 \).

The centered inequality above seems to be new, even for convex bodies, while the case where \( \text{bar}(K) = 0 \) extends a result by Lutwak [Lut91], also reproved differently by Lehec [Leh09a], who both obtained the same inequality but under the additional assumption that \( K \) is star-shaped.

Let us now turn to the range \( s < 0 \). Applying Inequality (7) with the weight function \( t \mapsto (1 + t)^{-\beta} \) and \( \beta > n/2 \), yields
\[
\beta \mathcal{T}_\omega(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq H(\nu_1|\mu_\beta) + H(\nu_2|\mu_\beta),
\]
where the optimal transport cost \( \mathcal{T}_\omega \) is defined with respect to the cost function \( \omega \) given by
\[
\omega(x, y) = \begin{cases} 
-2 \log \left( \frac{1 + \langle x, y \rangle}{\sqrt{1 + \|x\|^2} \sqrt{1 + \|y\|^2}} \right) & \text{if } \langle x, y \rangle > 0 \ , \ x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \\
+\infty & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]
The fact that the cost function \( \omega \) can take the value \( +\infty \) makes inequality (12) for Cauchy type distributions more rigid than its counterpart (10) for Barenblatt type distributions. Namely, it is not possible to extend (12) to couples of probability measures \( (\nu_1, \nu_2) \) with \( \nu_1 \) arbitrary and \( \nu_2 \) symmetric. See Remark 3.9 for more details. For the particular value \( \beta = (n+1)/2 \), it turns out that the canonical geometric framework for (12) is the unit sphere \( S^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) equipped with the uniform probability measure, denoted by \( \sigma \). In Theorem 3.7, we establish the following.

Theorem. Let \( \alpha : S^n \times S^n \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{ +\infty \} \) be the cost function defined by
\[
\alpha(u, v) = \begin{cases} 
\log \left( \frac{1}{\langle u, v \rangle} \right) & \text{if } \langle u, v \rangle > 0 \\
+\infty & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}, \quad u, v \in S^n
\]
and denote by \( \mathcal{T}_\alpha \) the corresponding transport cost on \( P(S^n) \). Then, for all probability measures \( \nu_1, \nu_2 \) on \( S^n \) which are invariant under the maps \( S^n \to S^n : u \mapsto -u \) and \( S^n \to S^n : u \mapsto (u_1, \ldots, u_n, -u_{n+1}) \), it holds
\[
(n + 1) \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq H(\nu_1|\sigma) + H(\nu_2|\sigma).
\]
This result is deduced from \cite{12} using the fact that the standard Cauchy distribution \( \mu_{(n+1)/2} \) is the image of \( \sigma_+ \), the uniform probability measure on the upper half sphere \( S^n_+ \), under the so-called gnomonic transformation:

\[
S^n_+ \to \mathbb{R}^n : u \mapsto \left( \frac{u_1}{u_{n+1}}, \frac{u_2}{u_{n+1}}, \ldots, \frac{u_n}{u_{n+1}} \right).
\]

The cost function \( \alpha \) defined above has been introduced by Oliker \cite{Oli07} (see also \cite{Ber10} and \cite{Kol20}) in connection with the so-called Aleksandrov problem in convex geometry. Recently, Kolesnikov \cite{Kol20} proved the following inequality involving the transport cost \( T_\alpha \): for any symmetric probability measure \( \nu \) on \( S^n \) (that is, invariant under the map \( S^n \to S^n : u \mapsto -u \)), it holds

\[
(n + 1)T_\alpha(\nu, \sigma) \leq H(\nu/\sigma).
\]

Thus \cite{14} already improves \cite{15} for a special class of distributions. As it turns out, one can improve \cite{15} further. We show in Theorem \ref{thm:3.7} by a direct proof using the Blaschke-Santaló inequality written in polar coordinates together with the dual Kantorovich type formula for \( T_\alpha \), that \cite{14} holds under the sole assumption that \( \nu_1 \) and \( \nu_2 \) are symmetric. We refer to the end of Section \ref{sec:3.3} for additional comments about the sharpness of this improvement of Kolesnikov inequality \cite{15}.

2. Blaschke-Santaló’s inequality for compact sets and s-concave functions

In the first subsection, we extend to arbitrary compact sets the result of Lutwak \cite{Lut91} and Lehec \cite{Leh09a} stating that the Blaschke-Santaló inequality holds for star-shaped sets with barycenter at the origin. In the second subsection, we generalize this to the Blaschke-Santaló inequality for s-concave functions, for \( s \geq 0 \). Recall that a function \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) is s-concave, for \( s > 0 \), if \( f^s \) is concave on its support; for \( s < 0 \) if \( f^s \) is convex and for \( s = 0 \), one says log-concave and it means that \( \log(f) \) is concave. In fact, for sets as well as for functions, we prove an inequality valid also if the barycenter is not at the origin.

2.1. Blaschke-Santaló inequality for compact sets. For any set \( A \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \) we define its polar by \( A^\circ = \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, y \rangle \leq 1, \forall x \in A \} \). Then, one has \( A^\circ = (\text{Conv}(A, 0))^\circ \), thus the set \( A^\circ \) is a closed convex set containing the origin and, from the bipolar theorem, one has \( (A^\circ)^\circ = \text{Conv}(A, 0) \). The classical Blaschke-Santaló \cite{Bla23, San49} inequality asserts that, for any convex body \( K \) in \( \mathbb{R}^n \), one has

\[
\min_{z \in \text{int}(K)} |K||K - z|^s \leq |B_2^n|^s,
\]

with equality if and only if \( K \) is an ellipsoid. For any convex body \( K \), we define its support function \( h_K(y) = \sup_{x \in K} \langle x, y \rangle \), for \( y \in \mathbb{R}^n \). If, moreover, \( K \) contains the origin, we define its radial function by \( \rho_K(u) = \sup\{ t : tu \in K \} \), for \( u \in S^{n-1} \) and one has \( \rho_K(u) = h_K(u)^{-1} \), for all \( u \in S^{n-1} \). For any \( z \) in the interior of a convex body \( K \) and any \( y \in \mathbb{R}^n \), one has

\[
h_{K - z}(y) = \sup_{x \in K} \langle x - z, y \rangle = h_K(y) - \langle z, y \rangle.
\]

Integrating in polar coordinates, we get

\[
|(K - z)^\circ| = \frac{1}{n} \int_{S^{n-1}} \rho_{(K - z)^\circ}(u)n\sigma(u) = \frac{1}{n} \int_{S^{n-1}} \frac{d\sigma(u)}{(h_K(u) - \langle z, u \rangle)^n}.
\]

This formula shows that the map \( z \mapsto |(K - z)^\circ| \) is strictly convex. Moreover, it is not difficult to see that \( |(K - z)^\circ| \) tends to infinity when \( z \to \partial K \). It follows that the minimum \( \min_z |(K - z)^\circ| \) is reached at a unique point \( \text{San}(K) \) called the Santaló point of \( K \), which is in the interior of \( K \). It follows that Blaschke-Santaló theorem may be reformulated as follows: for any convex body \( K \) such that \( \text{San}(K) = 0 \) one has \( |K||K^\circ| \leq |B_2^n|^2 \), with equality if and only if \( K \) is a centered ellipsoid. We
say that a measurable set $K$ with finite and positive volume is centered if its center of mass $\text{bar}(K)$ is defined by
\[
\text{bar}(K) = \int_K \frac{x \, dx}{|K|}
\]
is at the origin. Since $\text{San}(K)$ is the unique critical point of the function $z \mapsto |(K - z)^\circ|$, we get that $z = \text{San}(K)$ if and only if $\nabla |(K - z)^\circ| = 0$. By differentiating (16) and integrating in spherical coordinates, we get
\[
\nabla |(K - z)^\circ| = \int_{S^{n-1}} \frac{ud\sigma(u)}{(h_K(u) - \langle z, u \rangle)^{n+1}} = (n + 1) \int_{(K-z)^\circ} x \, dx = (n + 1) |(K - z)^\circ| \text{bar}((K - z)^\circ).
\]
It follows that the Santaló point $\text{San}(K)$ of $K$ is also the unique point $z$ such that $\text{bar}((K - z)^\circ) = 0$. One deduces from this property that $\text{San}(K - \text{bar}(K))^\circ = 0$ and that $\text{San}(K) = 0$ if and only if $\text{bar}(K)^\circ = 0$. Thus, the following third reformulation of Blaschke-Santaló inequality holds: for any convex body $K$ such that $\text{bar}(K) = 0$, one has $|K||K^\circ| \leq |B^n_2|^2$, with equality if and only if $K$ is an ellipsoid. Lutwak noticed this in [Lut91] and extended it to the case of compact star-shaped bodies. A compact set $A$ is called star-shaped with respect to the origin if for any $a \in A$ the segment $\{ta : t \in [0, 1]\}$ is contained in $A$. In his Theorem 3.15 in [Lut91], Lutwak proved that if $A$ is star-shaped with respect to the origin and has barycenter at the origin then $|A||A^\circ| \leq |B^n_2|^2$, with equality if and only if $A$ is a centered ellipsoid. This result was also reproved by Lehec [Lehec] who deduced it from a version of this theorem for log-concave functions. In the following theorem, we extend Lutwak’s theorem to any compact set with a different proof.

**Theorem 2.1.** Let $K$ be a compact set such that $|K| > 0$ and $0 \in \text{int}(\text{Conv}(K))$. Then
\[
|K||K^\circ| \leq |B^n_2|^2 \left(1 - \langle \text{San}(K^\circ), \text{bar}(K) \rangle \right)^{n+1},
\]
with equality if and only if $K$ is a centered ellipsoid. In particular, if $\text{bar}(K) = 0$ then $|K||K^\circ| \leq |B^n_2|^2$, with equality if and only if $K$ is a centered ellipsoid.

**Remark 2.2.** Formula (17) seems to be new even in the case of convex sets.

**Remark 2.3.** If $K$ is convex, since $\text{bar}(K) \in K$ and $\text{San}(K^\circ) \in K^\circ$, one has $\langle \text{San}(K^\circ), \text{bar}(K) \rangle \leq 1$, but it follows from the proof that actually $\langle \text{San}(K^\circ), \text{bar}(K) \rangle \leq 0$, see remark 2.6.

**Remark 2.4.** Another formulation of the Blaschke-Santaló inequality for compact sets follows directly from the case of convex sets but with a less natural polarity point: given a compact set $A$, choosing $z = \text{San}($Conv$(A))$ and applying the classical inequality to Conv$(A)$, we get $(A - z)^\circ = ($Conv$(A) - z)^\circ$ and we deduce that
\[
|A||(A - z)^\circ| \leq |\text{Conv}(A)||(\text{Conv}(A) - z)^\circ| \leq |B^n_2|^2.
\]
Before proving this theorem we first give a lemma which is very classical in projective geometry.

**Lemma 2.5.** For $z \neq 0$, we denote the open halfspace $H_z = \{y : 1 + \langle y, z \rangle > 0\}$ and the map
\[
F_z : H_z \to \mathbb{R}^n \text{ is defined for any } y \in H_z \text{ by }
\]
\[
F_z(y) = \frac{y}{1 + \langle y, z \rangle}.
\]
Then
(i) The map $F_z$ is a bijection from $H_z$ onto $H_{-z}$ whose reciprocal is $F_{-z}$ and the Jacobian determinant of $F_z$ is $J_z(y) := (1 + \langle y, z \rangle)^{-(n+1)}$.
(ii) For any compact set $K$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $0, z \in \text{int}(\text{Conv}(K))$, we have $(K - z)^\circ = F_{-z}(K^\circ)$ and
\[
|(K - z)^\circ| = \int_{(K-z)^\circ} \frac{dx}{(1 - \langle z, x \rangle)^{n+1}}.
\]
Remark 2.6. Proof of Remark 2.3: if $K$ is convex then, using that, in formula (19), one has $z = \text{San}(K^\circ)$, it follows from the definition of the Santaló point that $|(K^\circ - z)^{\circ}| \leq |K^\circ|^1$. Thus, we conclude that $\langle \text{San}(K^\circ), \text{bar}(K) \rangle \leq 0$. Notice that, applied to $K^\circ$, it gives also $\langle \text{San}(K), \text{bar}(K) \rangle \leq 0$. 

Now we give the proof of Theorem 2.1. 

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $K$ be a compact set such that $0 < |K| < +\infty$ and $0 \in \text{int}(\text{Conv}(K))$. Then $K^\circ$ is a convex body to which we apply the classical Blaschke-Santaló’s inequality: for $z = \text{San}(K^\circ)$ one has

$$|(K^\circ - z)^{\circ}| \leq |B^n_2|,$$

with equality if and only if $K^\circ$ is an ellipsoid. Since $0 \in \text{int}(K^\circ)$ and $z \in \text{int}(K^\circ)$ we may apply formula (18) to $K^\circ$ and we get

$$|(K^\circ - z)^{\circ}| = \int_{K^\circ} \frac{dx}{(1 - \langle z, x \rangle)^{n+1}}.$$

Using that $K \subset K^\circ$ and applying Jensen’s inequality to the function $\varphi(x) = (1 - \langle z, x \rangle)^{-(n+1)}$, which is convex on $K$, we deduce that

$$|(K^\circ - z)^{\circ}| \geq \int_K \frac{dx}{(1 - \langle z, x \rangle)^{n+1}} \geq \frac{|K|}{(1 - \langle \text{San}(K^\circ), \text{bar}(K) \rangle)^{n+1}}.$$

This concludes the proof of the inequality. If there is equality in this inequality, then, from the equality case in Blaschke-Santaló’s inequality, we deduce that $K^\circ$ is an ellipsoid. Moreover, from the equality case in Jensen’s inequality, it follows that $\text{San}(K^\circ) = 0$, thus $\text{bar}(K) = 0$. Finally, one has $|K| = |K^\circ|$ which implies that $|\text{Conv}(K)|/|K| = 0$. Since $K$ is compact, it follows that $K = K^\circ$. We thus conclude that $K$ is a centered ellipsoid. \qed
2.2. Blaschke-Santaló inequality for the \( s \)-concave duality. The following general form of the functional Blaschke-Santaló inequality was proved by Ball [Bal86] in the even case, by the first-named author and Meyer [PM07] in the log-concave case, and by Lehec [Leh09e] in the general case.

**Theorem 2.7.** Let \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) be integrable. Then there exists \( z \in \mathbb{R}^n \) such that whenever \( g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) is a measurable function satisfying \( f(x + z)g(y) \leq \rho((x, y))^2 \) for all \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \) such that \( \langle x, y \rangle > 0 \) for some weight function \( \rho : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) such that \( \int \rho(|x|^2) \, dx < +\infty \), it holds

\[
\int f(x) \, dx \int g(y) \, dy \leq \left( \int \rho(|x|^2) \, dx \right)^2.
\]

Moreover, the point \( z \) can be selected in the interior of the convex hull of the support of the measure with density \( f \). In the case where \( f \) is even, then \( z \) can be chosen to be 0.

The fact that \( z \) can be chosen in the convex hull of the support of \( \nu_f(dx) = f(x) \, dx \) follows from Lehec’s construction of \( z \) as the center of a Yao-Yao partition for \( \nu_f \) (see [Leh09e, Theorem 9]) and from Proposition 5 of [Leh09c] which implies that the center of any such partition must belong to the convex hull of the support of \( \nu_f \). In the following, we shall denote \( z = f(z +) \).

For \( s \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) non identically zero, we define its \( s \)-concave dual function \( \mathcal{L}_s g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) in the following way: for every \( y \in \mathbb{R}^n \)

\[
\mathcal{L}_s g(y) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{(1 - s \langle x, y \rangle)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{g(x)}, \quad \text{for} \ s \neq 0,
\]

where the infimum is taken on \( \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : g(x) > 0\} \). For \( s = 0 \), we set

\[
\mathcal{L}_0 g(y) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{e^{-\langle x, y \rangle}}{g(x)}.
\]

Notice that the \( s \)-dual (even of a non \( s \)-concave function) is \( s \)-concave and that the \( 0 \)-dual is very much related to the Legendre transform since for any function \( \varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \) one has \( \mathcal{L}_0(e^{-\varphi}) = e^{-\varphi^*} \), where \( \varphi^* \) is the Legendre transform of \( \varphi \) defined by \( \varphi^*(y) = \sup_x (\langle x, y \rangle - \varphi(x)) \).

This class was previously studied by Artstein-Avidan and Milman [AAAM08] where they proved that \( \mathcal{L}_s \) is essentially the only order reversing transformation on \( s \)-concave functions. They also show that this duality is the usual polarity transform on the epigraphs of the functions for \( s = 1 \).

Applied to the function \( \rho_s(t) = (1 - st)^{\frac{1}{2s}} \), for \( s \neq 0 \) and \( \rho_0(t) = e^{-t/2} \), Theorem 2.7 implies that for any integrable function \( f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+ \), there exists \( z \) such that for any \( s > -1/n \),

\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f(x) \, dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{L}_s(f_z)(y) \, dy \leq \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_s(|x|^2) \, dx \right)^2 := c_s,
\]

where a direct explicit computation gives that \( c_0 = (2\pi)^n \) and

\[
c_s = \left( \frac{\pi}{s} \right)^n \left( \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{1 + \frac{1}{2s}}{2} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{1 + \frac{1}{2s} + \frac{n}{2}}{2} \right)} \right)^2 \quad \text{for} \ s > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad c_s = \left( \frac{\pi}{|s|} \right)^n \left( \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{1}{2|s|} - \frac{n}{2} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{1}{2|s|} \right)} \right)^2 \quad \text{for} \ -\frac{1}{s} < s < 0.
\]

Inequality (21) was established earlier in the case where \( \frac{1}{s} \) is an integer and \( s = 0 \) by Artstein-Avidan, Klartag, and Milman [AAKM04]. For \( s < 0 \), inequality (21) was proved by Rotem in [Rot14]. In particular, for \( s = 0 \), this gives back the Blaschke-Santaló inequality for the Legendre transform established in [AAKM04] which states that for any function \( \varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \) there exists \( z \in \mathbb{R}^n \) such that

\[
\int e^{-\varphi} \int e^{-(\varphi_z)^*} \leq (2\pi)^n.
\]
This theorem was reproved by Lehec [Leh09a] who also established that if the barycenter of $e^{-\varphi}$ defined \( \text{bar}(e^{-\varphi}) = \int xe^{-\varphi(x)} \, dx / \int e^{-\varphi} \) is at the origin then one may choose \( z = 0 \), that is

\[
\int e^{-\varphi} \int e^{-\varphi^*} \leq (2\pi)^n.
\]

We extend this theorem to the $s$-duality for any $s \geq 0$. First we define the barycenter of $f$ to be $\text{bar}(f) = \int x f(x) \, dx / \int f$. As in the case of sets we first state a lemma that is the functional analogue of Lemma 2.8. Recall that $F_s(y) = \frac{y}{1 + \langle y, z \rangle}$.

**Lemma 2.8.** Let $s \geq 0$ and $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a measurable function such that $f(0) > 0$.

1. Then for every $z, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ one has $L_s(f_z)(y) = (1 + s\langle z, y \rangle)^\frac{1}{2} L_s f(F_{sz}(y))$, for $s > 0$ and $L_0(f_z)(y) = e^{sz} L_0 f(y)$.
2. Moreover if $f(z) > 0$, then \( \{ x : L_s f(x) > 0 \} \subset H_{sz} = \{ x : 1 - s\langle z, x \rangle > 0 \} \) and, for $s > 0$,
   \[
   \int L_s(f_z) = \int \frac{L_s f(x)}{(1 - s\langle z, x \rangle)^{n+1+\frac{1}{2}}} \, dx.
   \]
3. If $f$ is bounded and $L_s f$ is integrable then the function $S(z) := \int L_s(f_z)$ is strictly convex and admits a unique minimum at a point $s_\text{ Sanford}(f)$ that we call the $s$-Santaló point of $f$ and which is in the interior of Conv($\text{supp}(f)$).

**Proof.** (1) For $s = 0$, the relation is clear. Let us assume that $s > 0$. From the definition one has

\[
L_s(f_z)(y) = \inf_x \frac{(1 - s\langle x, y \rangle)^\frac{1}{2}}{f(x + z)} = \inf_x \frac{(1 + s\langle z, y \rangle - s\langle x, y \rangle)^\frac{1}{2}}{f(x)}.
\]

Since the infimum runs on the set $\{ x : f(x) > 0 \}$ and since $f(0) > 0$ one deduces that

\[
L_s(f_z)(y) \leq (1 + s\langle z, y \rangle)^\frac{1}{2} \frac{f(0)}{f(0)}.
\]

Hence $L_s(f_z)(y) = 0$ if $1 + s\langle z, y \rangle \leq 0$. Moreover, for $y \in H_{sz}$, one has

\[
L_s(f_z)(y) = (1 + s\langle z, y \rangle)^\frac{1}{2} L_s f \left( \frac{y}{1 + s\langle z, y \rangle} \right) = (1 + s\langle z, y \rangle)^\frac{1}{2} L_s f(F_{sz}(y)).
\]

(2) In the same way, from the definition of $L_s$, if $f(z) > 0$ then for all $y$, $L_s(f)(y) \leq \frac{(1 - s\langle z, y \rangle)^\frac{1}{2}}{f(z)}$. Thus if $L_s(f)(y) > 0$ then $1 - s\langle z, y \rangle > 0$ which means that $y \in H_{sz}$. Thus, using the change of variable $y = F_{sz}(x)$, for $y \in H_{sz}$ and the fact that $(1 + s\langle z, y \rangle)(1 - s\langle z, x \rangle) = 1$, we get

\[
\int L_s(f_z) \, dy = \int_{H_{sz}} (1 + s\langle z, y \rangle)^\frac{1}{2} L_s f(F_{sz}(y)) \, dy = \int_{H_{sz}} \frac{L_s f(x)}{(1 - s\langle z, x \rangle)^{n+1+\frac{1}{2}}} \, dx.
\]

(3) The convexity is a direct consequence of formula \[22\]. The boundedness of $f$ implies that $L_s(f)(0) > 0$ and so $0$ is in the interior of the support of $L_s f$. The existence of a unique minimizer was recently proved by Ivanov and Werner in [IW21]. They assumed for their proof that $f$ is $s$-concave but using that $L_s L_s L_s f_z = L_s f_z$, we can actually assume that $f$ is $s$-concave. Moreover, it is clear that $\text{supp}(L_s f_z) = \langle \text{supp}(f_z) \rangle$ so if it is not in the interior of Conv($\text{supp}(f_z)$) then $0$ is not in the interior of Conv($\text{supp}(f_z)$) and $\text{supp}(L_s f_z) = \langle \text{supp}(f_z) \rangle$ is unbounded, which implies that $\int L_s f_z = +\infty$. \[Q.E.D.\]

Using the preceding lemma, we can now prove the following theorem.
Theorem 2.9. Let $s \geq 0$ and $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be integrable such that $\int f > 0$ and $0 \in \text{int}(\text{Conv(supp}(f))).$ Then, for $s > 0,$
\[
\int f \int L_s f \leq c_s (1 - s \langle \text{San}_s(L_s(f)), \text{bar}(f) \rangle)^{n+1+\frac{1}{s}} \quad \text{and} \quad \int f \int L_0 f \leq (2\pi)^n e^{-\langle \text{San}_0(L_0(f)), \text{bar}(f) \rangle}
\]
In particular, if $\text{bar}(f) = 0$ then $\int f \int L_s f \leq c_s.$

Proof of Theorem 2.9. The proof of this theorem is similar to that of Theorem 2.1. Fix a function $f$ (without any concavity assumption), such that $0 \in \text{int}(\text{Conv(supp}(f)))$ and $0 < \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f < +\infty.$ Then, from (21) applied to $L_s f,$ one has, for $z = \text{San}_s(L_s(f)),$
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} L_s f(x) \, dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} L_s((L_s f)_z)(y) \, dy \leq c_s.
\]
Since $L_s f(z) > 0,$ applying (2) of Lemma 2.8, we deduce that
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} L_s((L_s f)_z)(y) \, dy = \int \frac{L_s L_s f(x)}{(1 - s \langle z, x \rangle)^{n+1+\frac{1}{s}}} \, dx.
\]
Using that $L_s L_s f(x) \geq f(x)$ and Jensen’s inequality, we get
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} L_s((L_s f)_z)(y) \, dy \geq \int \frac{f(x)}{(1 - s \langle z, x \rangle)^{n+1+\frac{1}{s}}} \, dx \geq \int \frac{f(x) \, dx}{(1 - s \langle \text{San}_s(L_s(f)), \text{bar}(f) \rangle)^{n+1+\frac{1}{s}}}
\]
which concludes the proof of the theorem. \qed

3. Transport-entropy forms of Blaschke-Santaló inequality

Given a measurable cost function $c : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\},$ bounded from below, the optimal transport cost between two probability measures $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is defined as follows
\[
\mathcal{T}_c(\nu_1, \nu_2) = \inf \left\{ \int c(x, y) \, d\pi(x, y) : \pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n), \quad \pi(\mathbb{R}^n \times \cdot) = \nu_1(\cdot), \quad \pi(\cdot \times \mathbb{R}^n) = \nu_2(\cdot) \right\},
\]
where $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n)$) denotes the set of all Borel probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$ (resp. $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$).

Relative entropy is another classical functional on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ that we shall now recall. Whenever $m$ is some measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ (not necessarily of mass 1) and $d\nu = f \, dm \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n),$ the relative entropy of $\nu$ with respect to $m$ is defined by
\[
H(\nu|m) = \int f \log f \, dm,
\]
as soon as the right-hand side makes sense (that is to say $f \log^+ f$ or $f \log^- f$ is $m$-integrable). In particular, when $m$ is a probability measure, $H(\nu|m)$ always makes sense in $\mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}.$

Comparing optimal transport costs to relative entropy is the purpose of the family of transport-entropy inequalities introduced by Marton [Mar86] [Mar96a] Mar96b and Talagrand [Tal96] in the nineties. We refer to the survey [GL10] for a presentation of this class of inequalities and their applications in the concentration of measure phenomenon. One of the most classical example of such an inequality is the so-called Talagrand’s transport inequality for the standard Gaussian measure. It reads as follows:
\[
W_2^2(\nu, \gamma) \leq 2H(\nu|\gamma), \quad \forall \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n),
\]
where $\gamma$ is the standard Gaussian probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^n,$ and $W_2^2(\nu, \gamma)$ is the squared Wasserstein distance, which is equal to $\mathcal{T}_c(\nu, \gamma)$ for $c(x, y) = |x - y|^2,$ $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n.$ This inequality is optimal with
equality obtained when \( \nu \) is a translation of \( \gamma \). Using the triangle inequality for \( W_2 \), it is easily seen that the following variant involving two probability measures also holds

\[
W_2^2(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq 4H(\nu_1 | \gamma) + 4H(\nu_2 | \gamma), \quad \forall \nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n).
\]

This inequality is still optimal with equality achieved when \( \nu_1 \) and \( \nu_2 \) are two standard Gaussian with opposite means. Recently, a symmetrized version of this inequality was obtained by Fathi [Fat18], namely

\[
W_2^2(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq 2H(\nu_1 | \gamma) + 2H(\nu_2 | \gamma),
\]

whenever \( \nu_1 \) is centered and \( \nu_2 \) is arbitrary. Fathi derived (23) from a functional version of Blaschke-Santaló’s inequality.

The aim of this section is to further explore the relationships between transport-entropy inequalities and functional forms of Blaschke-Santaló inequality given in Theorem 2.7. We will in particular derive from the latter some optimal transport-entropy inequalities for spherically invariant probability models that go beyond the Gaussian case.

### 3.1. General costs

Utilizing Theorem 2.7 gives us two different families of transport-entropy inequalities for a large class of spherically invariant probability measures.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let \( \rho : \mathbb{R}^n \to (0, \infty) \) be a continuous non-increasing function such that \( \int \rho(|x|^2) \, dx < +\infty \), and \( t \mapsto -\log \rho(e^t) \) is convex on \( \mathbb{R} \). Let \( \mu_\rho \) be the probability measure with density proportional to \( \rho(|x|^2) \).

(i) For all \( \nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n) \) we have

\[
\mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\omega}_\rho}(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq H(\nu_1 | \mu_\rho) + H(\nu_2 | \mu_\rho),
\]

where the optimal transport cost \( \mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\omega}_\rho} \) is defined with respect to the cost function \( \tilde{\omega}_\rho \) given by

\[
\tilde{\omega}_\rho(x, y) = \log \left( \frac{\rho(|x|^2)\rho(|y|^2)}{\rho(|x|^2)\rho(|y|^2)} \right), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]

(ii) For all \( \nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n) \) with \( \nu_1 \) and \( \nu_2 \) symmetric, we have

\[
\mathcal{T}_{\omega_\rho}(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq H(\nu_1 | \mu_\rho) + H(\nu_2 | \mu_\rho),
\]

where the optimal transport cost \( \mathcal{T}_{\omega_\rho} \) is defined with respect to the cost function \( \omega_\rho \) given by

\[
\omega_\rho(x, y) = \begin{cases} 
\log \left( \frac{\rho(|x|^2)\rho(|y|^2)}{\rho(|x|^2)\rho(|y|^2)} \right) & \text{if } \langle x, y \rangle \geq 0, \\
+\infty & \text{otherwise},
\end{cases} \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]

Furthermore, there is equality in inequalities (24) and (25) when \( \nu_1 = \nu_2 = \mu_\rho \).

Before turning to the proof of Theorem 3.1 let us make some comments. If (24) holds for all couples \( \nu_1, \nu_2 \) without restriction, note that the cost \( \tilde{\omega}_\rho \) is not very standard. For instance, if \( \rho_0(t) = e^{-t/2} \) for which \( \mu_\rho = \gamma \) is the standard Gaussian, one gets \( \tilde{\omega}_{\rho_0}(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}(|x| - |y|)^2 \), \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \) instead of the usual quadratic cost \( \frac{1}{2}|x - y|^2 \). The cost \( \omega_\rho \) seems better adapted to the geometry of the measure \( \mu_\rho \), but the corresponding transport-entropy inequality (25) requires symmetry assumptions on \( \nu_1, \nu_2 \). Taking Fathi’s result (23) into consideration, a natural question is to ask whether these symmetry assumptions can be relaxed or not. We will see in the next two sections that the answer to this question depends on the cost function \( \rho \).
Proof. In this proof we adapt the classical dualization argument by Bobkov and Götze [BG99] to our context. Let us first prove (i). Rewriting Theorem 2.7 (even case) with respect to the functions

\[ F(x) = \log f(x) - \log \rho(|x|^2), \quad G(y) = \log g(y) - \log \rho(|y|^2), \]

we get the following: for all bounded measurable functions \( F, G \) such that \( F \) is even and

\[ (26) \quad F \oplus G \leq \tilde{\omega}_\rho \]

it holds

\[ (27) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^F d\mu_{\rho} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^G d\mu_{\rho} \leq 1, \]

where \( F \oplus G(x, y) = F(x) + G(y), \ x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \). We now introduce two probability measures \( \nu_1, \nu_2 \). Then, taking the logarithm of inequality (27), we find that

\[ (28) \quad H(\nu_1|m) + H(\nu_2|m) \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F \, d\nu_1 - \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^F \, d\mu_{\rho} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} G \, d\nu_2 - \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^G \, d\mu_{\rho} \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F \, d\nu_1 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} G \, d\nu_2, \]

where the first inequality comes from the duality formula for the relative entropy functional: if \( \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n) \) and \( \log d\nu/dm \in L^1(\nu) \), then

\[ H(\nu|m) = \sup_{f \in L^1(\nu)} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f \, d\nu - \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^f \, dm \right\}. \]

Optimizing in (28) with respect to \( F \) and \( G \), we thus find that

\[ H(\nu_1|\mu_{\rho}) + H(\nu_2|\mu_{\rho}) \geq \sup_{(F,G) \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F \, d\nu_1 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} G \, d\nu_2 \right\} \]

where the supremum runs over the set \( S \) of couples of bounded measurable functions \( (F,G) \) with \( F \) even and satisfying (26).

Now, if \( (F,G) \) is a couple of bounded measurable functions satisfying (26) (with \( F \) not necessarily even), then by symmetry of \( \tilde{\omega}_\rho \), the even function \( \tilde{F}(x) = \max\{F(x), F(-x)\}, x \in \mathbb{R}^n \), is such that \( (\tilde{F},G) \in S \), and \( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \tilde{F} \, d\nu_1 \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F \, d\nu_1 \), and so we may remove the assumption on evenness of \( F \) and conclude that

\[ \sup_{(F,G) \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F \, d\nu_1 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} G \, d\nu_2 \right\} = \sup_{(F,G) : \tilde{\omega}_\rho \leq \omega_{\rho}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F \, d\nu_1 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} G \, d\nu_2 \right\} = \tilde{T}_{\omega_{\rho}}(\nu_1, \nu_2), \]

where the second equality comes from the Kantorovich duality theorem (see e.g. [Vil09, Theorem 5.10]) which applies since the cost function \( \tilde{\omega}_\rho \) is lower semicontinuous (and even continuous) and bounded from below thanks to the log-concavity of \( t \mapsto \rho(e^t) \) (it is, in fact, non-negative, a proof of which can be found in Lemma 4.3). This completes the proof of (i).

Let us now prove (ii). Reasoning exactly as before, one concludes that for any \( \nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n) \), it holds

\[ H(\nu_1|\mu_{\rho}) + H(\nu_2|\mu_{\rho}) \geq \sup_{(F,G) \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F \, d\nu_1 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} G \, d\nu_2 \right\}, \]

where \( \mathcal{S} \) is the set of couples of bounded measurable functions \( (F,G) \) with \( F \) even such that \( F \oplus G \leq \omega_{\rho} \). Let \( (F,G) \) be a couple of bounded measurable functions (with \( F \) not necessarily even) such that \( F \oplus G \leq \omega_{\rho} \). Since, for all \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \), \( \omega_{\rho}(x, y) = \omega_{\rho}(-x, -y) \), defining \( \tilde{F}(x) = \frac{1}{2}(F(x) + F(-x)) \) and
\( \bar{G}(y) = \frac{1}{2}(G(y) + G(-y)) \), one gets that \((\bar{F}, \bar{G}) \in \bar{S}\). If \(\nu_1\) and \(\nu_2\) are further assumed to be symmetric, it holds \(\int \bar{F} \, d\nu_1 = \int F \, d\nu_1\) and \(\int \bar{G} \, d\nu_2 = \int G \, d\nu_2\). Thus, in this case,

\[
\sup_{(F,G) \in S} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F \, d\nu_1 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} G \, d\nu_2 \right\} = \sup_{(F,G) \in S} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F \, d\nu_1 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} G \, d\nu_2 \right\} = T_{\omega_\rho}(\nu_1, \nu_2),
\]

applying Kantorovich duality for the last equation, which completes the proof of \((ii)\).

Finally, note that \(\tilde{\omega}_\rho\) and \(\omega_\rho\) are both non-negative and vanish on the diagonal, so that \(T_{\omega_\rho}(\mu_\rho, \mu_\rho) = T_{\tilde{\omega}_\rho}(\mu_\rho, \mu_\rho) = 0\). There is thus equality in Inequalities \((24)\) and \((25)\) when \(\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \mu_\rho\).

In the next subsections, we will study the consequences of Theorem 3.1 for two special costs, related respectively to Barenblatt-type and Cauchy-type distributions.

### 3.2. Barenblatt-type distributions

Let \(s > 0\) and denote by \(B_s = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| < \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}}\}\) the open Euclidean ball of center 0 and radius \(\frac{1}{\sqrt{s}}\). Consider the probability measure

\[
\gamma_s(dx) = \frac{1}{Z_s} \left(1 - s|x|^2\right)^{1/(2s)} 1_{B_s}(x)\,dx
\]

which is a particular case of the so-called Barenblatt profiles. Consider the cost function \(k_s : B_s \times B_s \to \mathbb{R}\) defined by

\[
k_s(x, y) = \frac{1}{s} \log \left(\frac{1 - s\langle x, y \rangle}{(1 - s|x|^2)^{1/2}(1 - s|y|^2)^{1/2}}\right), \quad x, y \in B_s.
\]

For this particular cost, the conclusion of Theorem 3.1 can be improved, as shown in the following result.

**Theorem 3.2.** For all \(s > 0\), the probability measure \(\gamma_s\) satisfies the following transport-entropy inequality:

\[
T_{k_s}(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq H(\nu_1 | \gamma_s) + H(\nu_2 | \gamma_s),
\]

for all probability measures \(\nu_1, \nu_2\), one of which is centered and with supports \(K_1, K_2 \subset B_s\).

This result is exactly analogous to Fathi’s result \((23)\) in the Gaussian case. Moreover, note that as \(s \to 0\), it holds \(\gamma_s \to \gamma\) (the standard Gaussian) and one recovers \((23)\).

**Proof of Theorem 3.2** Applying Theorem 2.7 to \(\rho_s(t) = [1 - st]^{1/(2s)}\), \(t \geq 0\), yields the following: for any \(s > 0\) and \(f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+\) integrable, it holds

\[
\int f(x) \, dx \inf_{z \in \text{conv} \, S_f} \int L_s(f_2)(y) \, dy \leq \left(\int_{B_s} (1 - s|x|^2)^{1/(2s)} \, dx\right)^2 = Z_s^2,
\]

where \(S_f\) denotes the support of the measure \(\nu_f(dx) = f(x) \, dx\) and the operator \(L_s\) is defined by \((20)\). Let \(b_s(x, y) = \frac{1}{s} \log[1 - s\langle x, y \rangle], x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n\). It is enough to prove that

\[
T_{b_s}(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq H(\nu_1 | \text{Leb}) + H(\nu_2 | \text{Leb}) + 2 \log Z_s,
\]

for all probability measures \(\nu_1, \nu_2\) with supports \(K_1, K_2 \subset B_s\) and such that \(\nu_1\) is centered. Note that \(b_s\) is bounded and continuous on \(K_1 \times K_2\). Therefore, applying Kantorovich duality theorem on \(K_1 \times K_2\) yields the following identity

\[
T_{b_s}(\nu_1, \nu_2) = \sup_{\varphi \in C_b(K_2)} \left\{ \int_{K_1} Q_s \varphi(x_1) \, d\nu_1(x_1) - \int_{K_2} \varphi(x_2) \, d\nu_2(x_2) \right\},
\]

where \(C_b(K_2)\) denotes the set of bounded continuous functions on \(K_2\) and

\[
Q_s \varphi(x_1) = \inf_{x_2 \in K_2} \{ \varphi(x_2) + b_s(x_1, x_2)\}, \quad x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]
Take $\varphi \in C_b(K_2)$ and define $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_+$ by $f(x_2) = e^{-\varphi(x_2)}$ if $x_2 \in K_2$ and 0 otherwise. Note the following relation:

$$e^{Q_s \varphi} = L_s(f).$$

According to what precedes, it holds

$$\int f(x_2) dx_2 \inf_{z \in \text{conv} K_2} \int L_s(f_z)(x_1) dx_1 \leq Z_s^2.$$ 

Indeed, by its construction, the support of the measure $f(x) dx$ is $K_2$. Note that the following inequality holds, for any $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$L_s(f_z)(y) \geq (1 + s\langle z, y \rangle)_+ L_s f(F_{sz}(y)), \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where, for any $a \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, the map $F_a(y) = \frac{y}{\|\langle z, a \rangle\|_2}$, $y \in H_a = \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n : 1 + \langle z, a \rangle > 0 \}$ is a bijection from $H_a$ onto $H_{-a}$ (this is Item (1) of Lemma 2.5; when $f(0) = 0$ there is equality but this not needed here). So it holds

$$\int L_s(f_z)(x_1) dx_1 \geq \int (1 + s\langle z, x_1 \rangle)_+^{1/s} L_s f(F_{sz}(x_1)) dx_1$$

$$= \int_{H_{sz}} (1 + s\langle z, x_1 \rangle)_+^{1/s} L_s f(F_{sz}(x_1)) dx_1$$

$$= \int_{H_{-sz}} \frac{1}{(1 - s\langle z, u \rangle)^{n+1+s}} L_s f(u) du$$

$$= \int e^{Q_s \varphi(u)} dm_z(u),$$

where $dm_z(u) = \frac{1}{(1-s\langle z,u \rangle)^{n+1+s}} 1_{H_{-sz}}(u) du$. Therefore,

$$-2 \log Z_s \leq - \log \int_{K_2} e^{-\varphi(x_2)} dx_2 - \inf_{z \in \text{conv} K_2} \log \int e^{Q_s \varphi(x_1)} dm_z(x_1)$$

and so

$$-2 \log Z_s + \int Q_s \varphi \, d\nu_1 - \varphi \, d\nu_2$$

$$\leq -\varphi \, d\nu_2 - \log \int_{K_2} e^{-\varphi(x_2)} dx_2 + \int Q_s \varphi \, d\nu_1 - \inf_{z \in \text{conv} K_2} \log \int e^{Q_s \varphi(x_1)} dm_z(x_1)$$

$$\leq H(\nu_2|\text{Leb}) + \sup_{z \in \text{conv} K_2} H(\nu_1|m_z),$$

where the last inequality follows from the bound

$$\int \psi \, d\nu - \log \int e^{-\psi} \, dm \leq H(\nu|m), \quad \forall \nu \ll m.$$

Note that if $z \in B_s$, then $B_s \subset H_{-sz}$ and so in particular $\nu_1 \ll m_z$. 

Finally, for all $z \in B_s$, it holds
\[
H(\nu_1 | m_z) = \int_{B_s} \log \frac{d\nu_1}{dm_z} \, d\nu_1 \\
= H(\nu_1 | \text{Leb}) - \int_{B_s} \log \frac{dm_z}{dx} \, d\nu_1 \\
= H(\nu_1 | \text{Leb}) + (n + 1 + \frac{1}{s}) \int_{B_s} \log (1 - s\langle z, x_1 \rangle) \, d\nu_1(x_1) \\
\leq H(\nu_1 | \text{Leb}) + (n + 1 + \frac{1}{s}) \log \left(1 - s\langle z, x_1 \nu_1(x_1) \rangle \right) \\
= H(\nu_1 | \text{Leb}),
\]
using the concavity of the logarithm and the fact that $\nu_1$ is centered. This completes the proof. \(\square\)

**Remark 3.3.** Suppose that $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is a continuous function such that $\int x f(x) \, dx = 0$ and $f = 0$ outside $B_s$. Denote by $K_2 = \{x \in B_s : f(x) \neq 0\}$ and $\varphi = -\log f \in C_0(K_2)$. Then, using (29) and (30), one gets
\[
\int Q_s \varphi \, d\nu_1 - H(\nu_1 | \text{Leb}) + \int -\varphi \, d\nu_2 - H(\nu_2 | \text{Leb}) \leq 2 \log Z_s,
\]
for all $\nu_1, \nu_2$ with compact support in $B_s$ and $\nu_2$ centered. Taking
\[
d\nu_1(x) = \frac{e^{Q_s \varphi(x)}}{\int e^{Q_s \varphi(y)} \, dy} \, dx = \frac{L_s f(x)}{\int L_s f(y) \, dy} \, dx \quad \text{and} \quad d\nu_2(x) = \frac{e^{-\varphi(x)}}{\int e^{-\varphi(y)} \, dy} \, dx = \frac{f(x)}{\int f(y) \, dy} \, dx
\]
(thanks to (31)) and noting that $\nu_2$ is centered, one gets
\[
\int f \int L_s f \leq \left(\int \rho_s(|x|^2) \, dx\right)^2,
\]
which essentially gives back the conclusion of Theorem 2.9 in the centered case.

3.3. **Cauchy-type distributions.** In this section, we consider the cost function
\[
\rho_\beta(t) = \frac{1}{(1 + t)^\beta}, \quad t \geq 0
\]
for which $x \mapsto \rho_\beta(|x|^2)$ is integrable whenever $\beta > n/2$. For $\beta > n/2$, we consider the following Cauchy type distribution
\[
d\mu_\beta(x) = \frac{1}{Z_\beta(1 + |x|^2)^\beta} \, dx, \quad \text{with} \quad Z_\beta = \pi^{n/2} \Gamma(\beta - n/2)/\Gamma(\beta).
\]
The following result follows immediately from Item (ii) of Theorem 3.1

**Corollary 3.4.** For any $\beta > n/2$, the Cauchy type probability measure $\mu_\beta$ satisfies the following transport-entropy inequality: for all $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with $\nu_1$ and $\nu_2$ symmetric, we have
\[
\beta T_\omega(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq H(\nu_1 | \mu_\beta) + H(\nu_2 | \mu_\beta),
\]
where the optimal transport cost $T_\omega$ is defined with respect to the cost function $\omega$ given by
\[
\omega(x, y) = \begin{cases} 
-2 \log \left(\frac{1 + \langle x, y \rangle}{\sqrt{1 + |x|^2} \sqrt{1 + |y|^2}}\right) & \text{if } \langle x, y \rangle > 0, \\
+\infty & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n.
\]
Note that a similar transport-entropy inequality holds with respect to the cost function $\tilde{\omega}(x, y) = -2 \log \left(\frac{1 + \langle x, y \rangle}{\sqrt{1 + |x|^2} \sqrt{1 + |y|^2}}\right)$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, without symmetry restrictions on $\nu_1, \nu_2$. 
Proof. The function $t \mapsto \log(1 + e^t)$ being convex on $\mathbb{R}$, the conclusion immediately follows from Theorem 3.1 (Item (ii)). \qed

It turns out that sharp transport-entropy inequalities for a family of probability measures on the Euclidean unit sphere can be derived from Corollary 3.4. To state this result, we need to introduce additional notation. Let

$$S^n = \left\{ u = (u_1, \ldots, u_{n+1}) : \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} u_i^2 = 1 \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad S^n_+ = S^n \cap \{ u \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : u_{n+1} \geq 0 \}$$

be respectively the $n$-dimensional Euclidean unit sphere and upper half unit sphere of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and denote by $\sigma$ the uniform probability measure on $S^n$ and by $\sigma_+ (\cdot) = 2\sigma(S^n_+ \cap \cdot)$ the normalized restriction of $\sigma$ to $S^n_+$ (the dimension $n$ is omitted in the notation of $\sigma$ and $\sigma_+$). For any $\beta > n/2$, let $\sigma_{\beta,+} \in \mathcal{P}(S^n_+)$ (resp. $\sigma_\beta \in \mathcal{P}(S^n)$) be the probability measure with a density proportional to

$$u \mapsto |u_{n+1}|^{2\beta - (n+1)}$$

with respect to $\sigma_+$ (resp. $\sigma$). Note that $\sigma$ and $\sigma_{\beta,+}$ correspond to the parameter $\beta = (n + 1)/2$.

The set of Borel probability measures on $S^n$ (resp. $S^n_+$) will be denoted by $\mathcal{P}(S^n)$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}(S^n_+)$). A probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(S^n)$ will be called symmetric if it is invariant under the map $S^n \to S^n : u \mapsto -u$. The set of all symmetric probability measures on $S^n$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{P}_s(S^n)$.

Finally, let $\alpha : S^n \times S^n \to \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{ +\infty \}$ be the cost function defined by

$$\alpha(u, v) = \begin{cases} \log \left( \frac{1}{|u,v|} \right) & \text{if } \langle u, v \rangle > 0 \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad u, v \in S^n$$

and $T_\alpha$ the associated optimal transport cost on $\mathcal{P}(S^n)$. This cost function has been introduced by Oliker [Oli07] (see also [Ber16] and [Kol20]) in connection with the so-called Aleksandrov problem in convex geometry.

Recall the definition of the geodesic distance $d_{S^n}$ on $S^n$:

$$d_{S^n}(u, v) = \arccos(\langle u, v \rangle), \quad u, v \in S^n.$$ The cost $\alpha$ can thus also be expressed as

$$\alpha(u, v) = \begin{cases} -\log \cos(d_{S^n}(u, v)) & \text{if } d_{S^n}(u, v) < \pi/2 \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad u, v \in S^n. \quad (34)$$

Remark 3.5. Characterizing couples $(\mu, \nu)$ for which the transport cost $T_\alpha(\mu, \nu)$ is finite is a delicate question, discussed in particular in [Ber16]. Note that, according to Lemma 3.3 of [Kol20] and Remark 4.9 of [Ber16], if $\mu, \nu$ are symmetric probability measures such that $\mu$ has a positive density with respect to $\sigma$ and $\nu$ is such that $\nu(S^n \cap L) = 0$ for any hyperplane $L$ passing through the origin, then $T_\alpha(\mu, \nu) < +\infty$.

Corollary 3.6. Let $\beta > n/2$.

(i) For any $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(S^n_+)$ which are invariant under the map $S^n_+ \to S^n_+ : u \mapsto (-u_1, \ldots, -u_n, u_{n+1})$, it holds

$$2\beta T_\alpha(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq H(\nu_1|\sigma_\beta, +) + H(\nu_2|\sigma_\beta, +).$$

(ii) For any $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_s(S^n)$ which are also invariant under the map $S^n \to S^n : u \mapsto (u_1, \ldots, u_n, -u_{n+1})$, it holds

$$2\beta T_\alpha(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq H(\nu_1|\sigma_\beta) + H(\nu_2|\sigma_\beta).$$
Proof. Let us prove (i), following the proof of [Goz07, Theorem 19]. Denote by $\mu = \mu_{(n+1)/2}$ the multivariate Cauchy distribution with density $Z^{-1}(1 + |x|^2)^{-(n+1)/2}$. Consider the map

$$T : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{S}^n_+ : x \mapsto \frac{1}{(1 + |x|^2)^{1/2}} (x, 1),$$

denoting by $\mathbb{S}^n_+ = \mathbb{S}^n \cap \{ u \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : u_{n+1} > 0 \}$. This transformation is bijective with inverse

$$T^{-1} : \mathbb{S}^n_+ \to \mathbb{R}^n : u \mapsto \frac{1}{u_{n+1}} (u_1, \ldots, u_n),$$

which is sometimes called gnomonic projection. It is easy to check that $T^{-1}$ pushes forward $\sigma_+$ onto $\mu$, or equivalently that $T$ pushes forward $\mu$ onto $\sigma_+$. For any $\beta > n/2$, the probability measure $\mu_\beta$ has density

$$g_{\beta}(x) = \frac{C_\beta}{(1 + |x|^2)^{(n+1)/2}}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

with respect to $\mu$. Therefore, the probability measure $T_\# \mu_\beta$ has density $g_{\beta}(T^{-1})$ with respect to $T_\# \mu = \sigma_+$. A simple calculation shows that

$$g_{\beta}(T^{-1}(u)) = C_\beta u_{n+1}^{2\beta-(n+1)}, \quad u \in \mathbb{S}^n_+,$$

and so $\sigma_{\beta,+} = T_\# \mu_\beta$.

Note the following relation between the cost functions $\omega$ (of Corollary 3.4) and $\alpha$:

$$\alpha(u, v) = \frac{1}{2} \omega(T^{-1}(u), T^{-1}(v)), \quad \forall u, v \in \mathbb{S}^n_+.$$

Let $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}^n_+)$ be invariant under the map $u \mapsto (-u_1, \ldots, -u_n, u_{n+1})$. If $H(\nu_1|\sigma_{\beta,+}) = +\infty$ or $H(\nu_2|\sigma_{\beta,+}) = +\infty$ there is nothing to prove. Let assume that $H(\nu_1|\sigma_{\beta,+}) < +\infty$ and $H(\nu_2|\sigma_{\beta,+}) < +\infty$. In particular, $\nu_1$ and $\nu_2$ do not give mass to $\mathbb{S}^n \cap \{ u \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : u_{n+1} = 0 \}$ and can thus be seen as elements of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}^n_+)$. Define $\nu_1' := T_\#^{-1} \nu_1$ and $\nu_2' := T_\#^{-1} \nu_2$, which are symmetric and so, according to Corollary 3.4 applied to $\mu_\beta$, it holds

$$\beta T_\omega(\nu_1', \nu_2') \leq H(\nu_1'|\mu_\beta) + H(\nu_2'|\mu_\beta).$$

If $\pi'$ is a coupling between $\nu_1'$ and $\nu_2'$ and $\pi$ is the push forward of $\pi'$ under the map $(x, y) \mapsto (T(x), T(y))$, it holds

$$\frac{1}{2} \int \omega(x, y) d\pi'(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} \int \omega(T^{-1}(u), T^{-1}(v)) d\pi(u, v) = \int \alpha(u, v) d\pi(u, v) \geq T_\alpha(\nu_1, \nu_2),$$

since $\pi$ has $\nu_1$ and $\nu_2$ as marginals. Therefore, $T_\alpha(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq \frac{1}{2} T_\omega(\nu_1', \nu_2')$. Finally, a simple calculation shows that

$$H(\nu_1'|\mu_\beta) = H(T_\#^{-1} \nu_1|T_\#^{-1} \sigma_{\beta,+}) = H(\nu_1|\sigma_{\beta,+}),$$

which completes the proof of (i).

Let us now prove (ii). Let $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ be invariant under the maps $u \mapsto -u$ and $u \mapsto (u_1, \ldots, u_n, -u_{n+1})$ with densities $f_1, f_2$ with respect to $\sigma_\beta$. For $i = 1, 2$, it holds $\nu_i(\mathbb{S}^n_+) = 1/2$. Define $d\nu_{i,+}(u) = 2 f_i 1_{\mathbb{S}^n_+}(u) d\sigma_\beta(u) = f_i(u) d\sigma_{\beta,+}(u)$. Then it holds

$$H(\nu_i|\sigma_\beta) = \int f_i \log f_i d\sigma_\beta = 2 \int_{\mathbb{S}^n_+} f_i \log f_i d\sigma_\beta = \int f_i \log f_i d\sigma_{\beta,+} = H(\nu_{i,+}|\sigma_{\beta,+}).$$

On the other hand, if $(U, V)$ is a coupling between $\nu_{1,+}$ and $\nu_{2,+}$ and $\varepsilon$ is such that $\mathbb{P}(\varepsilon = \pm 1) = 1/2$ and is independent of $(U, V)$, then $X = (U_1, \ldots, U_n, \varepsilon U_{n+1})$, $Y = (V_1, \ldots, V_n, \varepsilon V_{n+1})$ is a coupling between $\nu_1$ and $\nu_2$, and it holds $\mathbb{E}[\omega(X, Y)] = \mathbb{E}[\omega(U, V)]$. From this follows that $T_\alpha(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq T_\alpha(\nu_{1,+}, \nu_{2,+})$. Thus (ii) immediately follows from (i), which completes the proof. \qed
For the probability measure $\sigma$ (corresponding to $\beta = (n + 1)/2$), the conclusion of Corollary 3.6 can be improved, as the following result shows.

**Theorem 3.7.** For all symmetric probability measures $\nu_1, \nu_2$ on $\mathbb{S}^n$, it holds

$$\alpha(n + 1)T_\alpha(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq H(\nu_1|\sigma) + H(\nu_2|\sigma).$$

The preceding result is an improvement of a result by Kolesnikov [Kol20] who obtained the following transport-entropy inequality on $\mathbb{S}^n$:

$$\alpha(n + 1)T_\alpha(\nu, \sigma) \leq H(\nu|\sigma),$$

for all symmetric probability $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}^n)$. The proof by Kolesnikov is based on the Monge-Ampère equation relating the density of $\nu$ to the optimal transport map $T$ transporting $\sigma$ on $\mu$. The determinant of the Jacobian matrix of $T$ is controlled with the help of the classical Blaschke-Santaló inequality for convex bodies (see the proof of [Kol20, Theorem 7.3]). Kolesnikov also establishes links between minimizers of the functional

$$\nu_1 \rightarrow H(\nu_1|\sigma) - \alpha(n + 1)T_\alpha(\nu_1, \nu_2),$$

with $\nu_1, \nu_2$ symmetric and the log-Minkowski problem; we refer to [Kol20] for further explanations and references. Remark 3.11 below gathers further comments on (35) and (36).

Before turning to the proof of (35), let us comment on the role of the symmetry assumption. It turns out that for any constant $C > 0$, the inequality

$$CT_\alpha(\nu, \sigma) \leq H(\nu|\sigma),$$

can not be true for all $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}^n)$. This follows immediately from the following lemma:

**Lemma 3.8.** There exists $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}^n)$ such that $T_\alpha(\nu, \sigma) = +\infty$ and $H(\nu|\sigma) < +\infty$.

In particular, contrary to Fathi’s Inequality (23) for the standard Gaussian measure, (35) is not true if only one of the probability measures $\nu_1, \nu_2$ is assumed to be symmetric.

**Proof of Lemma 3.8.** Let $A \subset \mathbb{S}^n$ be some spherical cap and define $d\nu = \frac{\Delta A}{\sigma(A)}\,d\sigma$. Then $H(\nu|\sigma) = -\log\sigma(A) < +\infty$. On the other hand, if $(X, Y)$ is a coupling between $\sigma$ and $\nu$, then denoting by

$$A_{\pi/2} = \{y \in \mathbb{S}^n : \exists x \in A \text{ s.t. } d_{\mathbb{S}^n}(x, y) < \pi/2\},$$

it holds

$$\mathbb{P}(d(X, Y) < \frac{\pi}{2}) \leq \mathbb{P}(Y \in A_{\pi/2}) = \sigma(A_{\pi/2}).$$

If $A$ is small enough, then $\sigma(A_{\pi/2}) < 1$ and so $\mathbb{P}(d(X, Y) \geq \frac{\pi}{2}) > 0$. Therefore, by definition of $\alpha$, $E[\alpha(X, Y)] = +\infty$. The coupling being arbitrary, one concludes that $T_\alpha(\nu, \sigma) = +\infty$. □

**Remark 3.9.** Note that the preceding construction can be easily adapted to show that, for any $\beta > n/2$, (32) can be false if only one of the measures $\nu_1, \nu_2$ is assumed to be symmetric.

Our proof of Theorem 3.7 is based on the following Kantorovich type duality for the cost function $\alpha$. To state this result, let us introduce additional notation. Recall that if $C \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is a convex body, the support function of $C$ is the function denoted by $h_C$ defined by

$$h_C(y) = \sup_{x \in C} \langle x, y \rangle, \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$$

and when $C$ contains 0 in its interior, the radial function of $C$ is the function denoted by $\rho_C$ defined by

$$\rho_C(x) = \sup\{r \geq 0 : rx \in C\}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}.$$
Lemma 3.10. For all probability measures $\nu_1, \nu_2$ on $\mathbb{S}^n$, it holds

$$T_\alpha(\nu_1, \nu_2) = \sup_C \int -\ln h_C \, d\nu_1 + \int \ln \rho_C \, d\nu_2,$$

where the supremum runs over the set of all convex bodies $C$ containing 0 in their interiors. Moreover, when $\nu_1$ and $\nu_2$ are symmetric, the supremum can be restricted to centrally symmetric convex bodies $C$.

This duality relation was first established by Oliker in [Oli07] in his transport approach to Alexandrov’s problem on the Gauss curvature prescription of Euclidean convex sets (see also [Ber16] in particular for the question of dual attainment). For the sake of completeness, we briefly sketch the proof of Lemma 3.10.

Proof. For any $\nu_1, \nu_2$ probability measures on $\mathbb{S}^n$, Kantorovich duality [Vil09] Theorem 5.10 (i) yields to

$$T_\alpha(\nu_1, \nu_2) = \sup_{\phi, \psi} \int \phi \, d\nu_1 + \int \psi \, d\nu_2,$$

where the supremum runs over the set of couples $(\phi, \psi)$ of bounded continuous functions on $\mathbb{S}^n$ such that

$$\phi(x) + \psi(y) \leq \alpha(x, y), \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{S}^n. \tag{38}$$

Whenever $\nu_1, \nu_2$ are symmetric, and $(\phi, \psi)$ satisfies (38), then defining $\bar{\phi}(x) = \frac{1}{2}(\phi(x) + \phi(-x))$ and $\bar{\psi}(y) = \frac{1}{2}(\psi(y) + \psi(-y))$, $x, y \in \mathbb{S}^n$, the couple $(\bar{\phi}, \bar{\psi})$ satisfies (38) (because $\alpha(-x, -y) = \alpha(x, y)$) and is such that

$$\int \bar{\phi} \, d\nu_1 + \int \bar{\psi} \, d\nu_2 = \int \phi \, d\nu_1 + \int \psi \, d\nu_2.$$ 

Therefore, in this symmetric case, the supremum in (37) can be further restricted to couples of even functions $(\bar{\phi}, \bar{\psi})$. Let us now consider the $\alpha$-transform $f^\alpha$ of a function $f : \mathbb{S}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$f^\alpha(y) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{S}^n} \{ \alpha(x, y) - f(x) \}, \quad y \in \mathbb{S}^n.$$

It is not difficult to check that whenever $f$ is bounded on $\mathbb{S}^n$, then $f^\alpha$ is bounded and continuous on $\mathbb{S}^n$, and if $f$ is even then $f^\alpha$ is also even. Using a well-known double conjugation argument (see [Vil09] Theorem 5.10 (i) for details), one sees that the duality formula (37) can be further restricted to couples $(\phi, \psi)$ of $\alpha$-conjugate functions, that is to say such that $\phi^\alpha = \bar{\psi}$ and $\psi^\alpha = \bar{\phi}$. Moreover, in the case where $\nu_1, \nu_2$ are symmetric, (37) can be restricted to couples $(\phi, \psi)$ of even $\alpha$-conjugate functions. With the change of functions $h = e^{-\phi}$ and $\rho = e^\psi$, we see that $(\phi, \psi)$ is a couple of continuous (even) $\alpha$-conjugate functions, if and only if $(h, \rho)$ is a couple of continuous (even) positive functions such that

$$h(x) = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{S}^n} \rho(y) \langle x, y \rangle, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{S}^n \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\rho(y)} = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{S}^n} \frac{\langle x, y \rangle}{h(x)}, \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{S}^n.$$

It is well-known that to any such couple $(h, \rho)$ uniquely corresponds a convex body $C$ containing 0 in its interior such that $h = h_C$ and $\rho = \rho_C$; we refer to [Oli07] Theorem 2 for details. In the case, $h$ and $\rho$ are both even, then $C$ is centrally symmetric, which completes the proof. \hfill $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.7. Let $C$ be a centrally symmetric convex body in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. According to the classical Blaschke-Santaló inequality, it holds

$$|C| |C^\circ| \leq |B_2^{n+1}|^2.$$
Calculating the volume of $C$ in polar coordinates yields to
\[
|C| = (n + 1)|B_2|^{n+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} 1_C(ru)r^n \, dr \right) \, d\sigma(u) = |B_2|^{n+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_C(u)^{n+1} \, d\sigma(u),
\]
where $\rho_C$ denotes the radial function of $C$. Similarly,
\[
|C^c| = |B_2|^{n+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_{C^c}(u)^{n+1} \, d\sigma(u) = |B_2|^{n+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{h_C(u)^{n+1}} \, d\sigma(u),
\]
using the well-known (and easy to check) relation $\rho_{C^c} = 1/h_C$, where $h_C$ is the support function of $C$. So, for every symmetric convex body in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, it holds
\[
\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho_C(u)^{n+1} \, d\sigma(u) \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{h_C(u)^{n+1}} \, d\sigma(u). \tag{39}
\]
On the other hand, if $\nu_1, \nu_2$ are two symmetric probability measures on $\mathbb{S}^n$, Lemma 3.10 yields
\[
(n + 1) \mathcal{T}_{\alpha}(\nu_1, \nu_2) = \sup_C \int -\ln (h_C^{n+1}) \, d\nu_1 + \int \ln (\rho_C^{n+1}) \, d\nu_2,
\]
where the supremum runs over the set of all centrally symmetric convex bodies $C$ containing 0 in their interiors. Reasoning exactly as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, one sees that (39) implies (and is in fact equivalent to)
\[
(n + 1) \mathcal{T}_{\alpha}(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq H(\nu_1 | \sigma) + H(\nu_2 | \sigma),
\]
for all $\nu_1, \nu_2$ symmetric. This completes the proof. \hfill \Box

In order to discuss Inequalities (35) and (36), let us recall that the uniform probability measure $\sigma$ on $\mathbb{S}^n$ satisfies the following Poincaré inequality: for any smooth function $f : \mathbb{S}^n \to \mathbb{R},$
\[
\lambda_1(\mathbb{S}^n) \text{Var}_\sigma(f) \leq \int |\nabla_{\mathbb{S}^n} f|^2 \, d\sigma,
\]
with the sharp constant $\lambda_1(\mathbb{S}^n) = n$ (corresponding to the spectral gap of the Laplace operator on $\mathbb{S}^n$). Equality in (40) is reached for every linear form. Under symmetry assumptions, the constant in (40) can be improved. More precisely, for all smooth functions $f : \mathbb{S}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(-u) = f(u)$, for all $u \in \mathbb{S}^n$, it holds
\[
\lambda_2(\mathbb{S}^n) \text{Var}_\sigma(f) \leq \int |\nabla_{\mathbb{S}^n} f|^2 \, d\sigma,
\]
where $\lambda_2(\mathbb{S}^n) = 2(n + 1)$ is the second non-zero eigenvalue of the Laplace operator on $\mathbb{S}^n$. Moreover, Equality in (41) is reached whenever $f$ is the restriction to $\mathbb{S}^n$ of a homogeneous polynomial of degree 2. For the sake of completeness, we recall the classical argument leading to (41).

**Proof of (41).** For all $d = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ denote by $H_d \subset L^2(\sigma)$ the space of degree $d$ homogeneous harmonic polynomials (restricted to $\mathbb{S}^n$). It is well-known that
\[
L^2(\sigma) = \bigoplus_{d=0}^{+\infty} H_d
\]
and that for all $f \in H_d$, it holds $\Delta_{\mathbb{S}^n} f = -d(d + n - 1)f$. If $f : \mathbb{S}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth even function then it can be written as $f = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} f_{2k}$, with $f_{2k} \in H_{2k}$, for all $k \geq 0$. Therefore, by integration by part:
\[
\int |\nabla_{\mathbb{S}^n} f|^2 \, d\sigma = - \int f \nabla_{\mathbb{S}^n} f \, d\sigma = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} 2k(2k + n - 1) \int f_k^2 \, d\sigma \geq 2(n + 1) \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \int f_k^2 \, d\sigma = 2(n + 1) \text{Var}_\sigma(f),
\]
which proves (41). Whenever $f \in H_0 \oplus H_2$, equality clearly holds. This is in particular the case if $f$ is the restriction to the sphere of a degree 2 homogeneous polynomial. Indeed, suppose that $f = P_{\mathbb{S}^n}$,
where \( P : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R} \) is some degree 2 homogeneous polynomial. Then there is some constant \( c \) such that \( \Delta_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}} P = c \). The polynomial \( Q \) defined by \( Q(x) = P(x) - \frac{c}{2(n+1)} |x|^2 \), \( x \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \), is homogeneous of degree 2 and harmonic. Moreover, it holds \( f = Q|_n + \frac{c}{2(n+1)} \) and so \( f \in H_0 \oplus H_2 \). \( \square \)

Recall the expression (44) which will be used in the following remark on the optimality of (35).

Remark 3.11.

- First let us relate Kolesnikov’s Inequality (36) to existing transport-entropy inequalities on \( \mathbb{S}^n \). A simple calculation shows that \( -\log \cos u \geq \frac{u^2}{2} \) for all \( u \in [0, \pi/2] \). Therefore, (36) implies that for all symmetric probability measures \( \nu \) on \( \mathbb{S}^n \), it holds

\[
\frac{n+1}{2} W_2^2(\nu, \sigma) \leq H(\nu|\sigma),
\]

with \( W_2 \) being the usual Wasserstein distance on \( \mathbb{S}^n \) (with respect to the geodesic distance \( d_{\mathbb{S}^n} \)). The inequality (42) is an improvement of the following classical transport-entropy inequality:

\[
\frac{n}{2} W_2^2(\nu, \sigma) \leq H(\nu|\sigma),
\]

that holds for all \( \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}^n) \). Inequality (43) can for instance be deduced from the log-Sobolev inequality on \( \mathbb{S}^n \) that holds with the optimal constant \( 2/n \) using the Otto-Villani theorem [OV00]. The constant \( n/2 \) in (43) is optimal. Indeed, according to a well-known general linearization argument of [OV00], (43) implies the sharp Poincaré inequality (40). Using the fact that the function \( u \mapsto -\log \cos \sqrt{u} \) is convex and increasing on \([0, (\pi/2)^2]\), it follows from Jensen inequality that (36) implies the following transport-entropy inequality:

\[
-(n+1) \log \cos W_2(\nu, \sigma) \leq H(\nu|\sigma)
\]

for all symmetric \( \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}^n) \). Inequality (44) improves the conclusion of [EKS15, Corollary 3.29] in the case of symmetric probability measures on \( \mathbb{S}^n \). See Remark 7.4 of [Kol20] for other transport-entropy inequalities derived from (36).

- Now let us discuss the sharpness of Inequality (35). Reasoning as above, we see that (35) implies the following variant of (42):

\[
\frac{n+1}{2} W_2^2(\nu_1, \nu_2) \leq H(\nu_1|\sigma) + H(\nu_2|\sigma),
\]

for all symmetric probability measure \( \nu_1, \nu_2 \) on \( \mathbb{S}^n \). Adapting the linearization argument of [OV00] (see below for a sketch of proof), one can see that (45) implies the Poincaré inequality (41) for smooth even functions \( f : \mathbb{S}^n \to \mathbb{R} \). In comparison, for the same class of functions \( f \), (42) only yields to Poincaré inequality with the sub-optimal constant \( \lambda = n+1 \), so that (35) is a strict improvement of (36). As explained above, the constant \( 2(n+1) \) is sharp, with equality obtained for instance for \( f(u) = u_1^2 \), \( u \in \mathbb{S}^n \).

For the sake of completeness, let us recall how to deduce the Poincaré inequality (41) from (45).

Proof of (45) \( \Rightarrow \) (41). Let \( f : \mathbb{S}^n \to \mathbb{R} \) be a smooth and even function. Without loss of generality, one can also assume that \( \int f \, d\sigma = 0 \). Bounding the second-order derivatives, one sees there is some constant \( C > 0 \) such that

\[
f(v) \leq f(u) + |\nabla_{\mathbb{S}^n} f|(u)d_{\mathbb{S}^n}(u,v) + Cd_{\mathbb{S}^n}^2(u,v), \quad \forall u, v \in \mathbb{S}^n.
\]
For all $t > 0$, consider $\nu_{1,t} = (1 - tf)\sigma$ and $\nu_{2,t} = (1 + tf)\sigma$. For all $t$ small enough, $\nu_{1,t}$ and $\nu_{2,t}$ are symmetric probability measures on $S^n$. If $\pi$ is a coupling between $\nu_{1,t}$ and $\nu_{2,t}$ for $W_2$, it holds

$$\int f^2 \, d\sigma = \int f \, d\left(\frac{\nu_{2,t} - \nu_{1,t}}{2t}\right) = \frac{1}{2t} \int f(v) - f(u) \, d\pi(u, v) \leq \frac{1}{2t} \int |\nabla_{S^n} f|(u) d\nu_{2,t}(u, v) + C d_{S^n}^2(u, v) \, d\pi(u, v) \leq \frac{1}{2t} \left( \int |\nabla_{S^n} f|^2 \, d\sigma \right)^{1/2} W_2(\nu_{1,t}, \nu_{2,t}) + C \frac{1}{2t} W_2^2(\nu_{1,t}, \nu_{2,t}).$$

According to (45), it holds

$$\frac{1}{t^2} W_2^2(\nu_{1,t}, \nu_{2,t}) \leq \frac{2}{n+1} \left( \frac{H(\nu_{1,t}\mu)}{t^2} + \frac{H(\nu_{2,t}\mu)}{t^2} \right),$$

and a simple calculation shows that $\frac{H(\nu_{1,t}\mu)}{t^2} \to \frac{1}{2} \int f^2 \, d\sigma$. Therefore,

$$\limsup_{t \to 0} \frac{1}{t^2} W_2^2(\nu_{1,t}, \nu_{2,t}) \leq \frac{2}{n+1} \int f^2 \, d\sigma.$$ 

So passing to the limit above yields to

$$\int f^2 \, d\sigma \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \int |\nabla_{S^n} f|^2 \, d\sigma \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{2}{n+1} \int f^2 \, d\sigma \right)^{1/2},$$

which amounts to (41). □

In the following, we derive some simple consequences of Inequality (35) in terms of measure concentration for symmetric sets of the sphere. Whenever $A, B \subset S^n$, we will set

$$d_{S^n}(A, B) = \inf_{x \in A, y \in B} d_{S^n}(x, y)$$

to denote the distance between $A$ and $B$.

**Corollary 3.12.** Suppose that $A, B \subset S^n$ are two symmetric subsets of $S^n$, then $d_{S^n}(A, B) \leq \pi/2$ and it holds

$$\sigma(A)\sigma(B) \leq \cos^{n+1}(d_{S^n}(A, B)).$$

**Proof.** The fact that $d_{S^n}(A, B) \leq \pi/2$ is obvious. Inequality (46) is then immediately derived from the transport entropy inequality (35) using a general argument by Marton which is detailed in e.g. [Goz07, Theorem 10]. □

**Remark 3.13.** Inequality (46) is not always true for general sets $A, B$ such that $d_{S^n}(A, B) \leq \pi/2$. Indeed, if $A$ and $B$ are two (small enough) spherical caps such that $d_{S^n}(A, B) = \pi/2$, then Inequality (46) would imply that $\sigma(A)\sigma(B) = 0$ which is obviously false.

In particular, if $A$ is some symmetric set of $S^n$ such that $\sigma(A) \geq 1/2$ and $B = S^n \setminus A_r$, where $0 < r \leq \pi/2$ and $A_r = \{y \in S^n : d_{S^n}(y, A) < r\}$ is the $r$-enlargement of $A$, it holds

$$\sigma(S^n \setminus A_r) \leq 2 \cos^{n+1}(r), \quad \forall 0 \leq r \leq \pi/2.$$ 

In comparison, for a general set $A \subset S^n$ such that $\sigma(A) \geq 1/2$, the classical Talagrand inequality (43) yields to

$$\sigma(S^n \setminus A_r) \leq 2e^{-\frac{r^2}{2}}, \quad \forall 0 \leq r \leq \pi/2.$$
and, if $A$ is supposed symmetric, Inequality (45) gives
\begin{equation}
\sigma(S^n \setminus A, r) \leq 2e^{-\ln s + \pi^2}, \quad \forall 0 < r \leq \pi/2.
\end{equation}

Since $\cos(r) \leq e^{-r^2/2}$ for $r \leq 0 \leq \pi/2$, the bound (47) is clearly better than bounds (48) and (49). On the other hand, the classical isoperimetric inequality on $S^n$ implies that if a general set $A \subset S^n$ is such that $\sigma(A) \geq 1/2$, then
\begin{equation}
\sigma(S^n \setminus A, r) \leq \psi_n(r) := \frac{1}{2s_n} \int_r^{\pi/2} \cos^{-1}(u) du, \quad \forall r \geq 0,
\end{equation}
with $s_n = \int_0^{\pi/2} \cos^{-1}(u) du$ (see e.g. [Led01]), with equality if $A$ is a spherical cap of measure 1/2. It is not difficult to see that
\[ \frac{\cos^n(r)}{n} \leq \int_r^{\pi/2} \cos^{-1}(u) du \leq \frac{1}{\sin(r)} \frac{\cos^n(r)}{n}, \quad \forall 0 < r \leq \pi/2 \]
and $s_n \sim \sqrt{\frac{n}{2\pi}}$, so that for any $0 < a < b < \frac{\pi}{2}$,
\[ c \frac{\cos^{n+1}(r)}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \psi_n(r) \leq c' \frac{\cos^{n+1}(r)}{\sin(a) \cos(b) \sqrt{n}}, \quad \forall r \in [a, b], \]
where $c, c'$ are constants independent of $a, b$ and $n$. Thus for $r \in [a, b]$ the bound (47) is off only by a factor of order $1/\sqrt{n}$ from the optimal bound (50).

## 4. Linearization of transport-Entropy inequalities

In this section, we show that, by linearizing the transport-entropy inequality (25), one recovers the following sharp Brascamp-Lieb type inequality due to Cordero-Erausquin and Rotem [CER]. Notice that the same inequality can be also obtained by linearizing the functional Blaschke-Santaló inequality (6).

**Theorem 4.1.** Assume that $t \mapsto v_p(t) = -\log \rho(e^t)$ is convex and increasing. Then, for all $f \in C_c^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ even and such that $\int f d\mu_p = 0$,
\begin{equation}
\int f^2 d\mu_p \leq \frac{1}{2} \int \langle H_p^{-1} \nabla f, \nabla f \rangle d\mu_p,
\end{equation}
where the positive matrix $H_p$ is given by
\[ \frac{1}{2} H_p(y) = \frac{1}{|y|^2} \left[ \left( I_n - \frac{y \otimes y}{|y|^2} \right) v_p'(s) + \frac{y \otimes y}{|y|^2} v''(s) \right] \]
where we set $s = 2 \log |y|$.

**Remark 4.2.** This result is exactly the one obtained in [CER] Theorem 3] for the probability $\mu_p$. Namely, using the same notation as in [CER], if $v_p(s) = w(e^{s/2})$, we find
\[ 2H_p(y) = \frac{w'(|y|)}{|y|} \left( 2I_n - \frac{y \otimes y}{|y|^2} \right) + \frac{y \otimes y}{|y|^2} w''(|y|), \]
which is easily seen to be the same matrix as the one appearing in [CER] Theorem 3]. As observed in [CER], the Poincaré inequality (51) admits non-trivial equality cases, and is therefore sharp. Note however that [CER] Theorem 3] is much stronger than Theorem 4.1 above since it shows that the weighted Poincaré inequality (51) is satisfied not only by the model probability measure $\mu_p$ but also by any log-concave perturbation of $\mu_p$. This raises the question to know if (25) is also true for log-concave perturbations of $\mu_p$. 

Remark 4.4. Proof. First, note that by monotonicity, for any assumed nonincreasing.

\[ \omega_{\rho}(x, y) = \begin{cases} \log \left( \frac{\rho(x, y)^2}{\rho(|x|^2)\rho(|y|^2)} \right) & \text{if } \langle x, y \rangle > 0 \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]

The following result collects some properties of the cost function \( \omega_{\rho} \) and in particular relates the matrix \( H_{\rho} \) to the behavior of \( \omega_{\rho} \) near the diagonal.

**Lemma 4.3.** Assume \( \rho : \mathbb{R}^n_+ \to \mathbb{R}^n_+ \) is nonincreasing, and that \( t \mapsto \rho(e^t) \) is log-concave. The cost function \( \omega_{\rho} \) defined in (53) then satisfies the following:

1. \( \omega_{\rho} \geq 0 \).

If \( t \mapsto \rho(e^t) \) is furthermore assumed to be strictly log-concave, then

2. if \( \rho \) is of class \( C^3 \), then for every \( y \neq 0 \), there exists a symmetric definite positive matrix \( H_{\rho} \) such that

\[ \omega_{\rho}(y + h, y) = \frac{1}{2} \langle H_{\rho} h, h \rangle + o(|h|^2) \]

when \( h \to 0 \);

3. for every compact subset \( K \) and \( \rho > 0 \), there exists a constant \( \eta > 0 \) such that for all \( x \in K, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \)

\[ |x - y| > \delta \implies \omega_{\rho}(x, y) \geq \eta. \]

**Remark 4.4.** The log-concavity of \( t \mapsto \rho(e^t) \) is, in fact, equivalent to the nonnegativity of \( \omega_{\rho} \) if \( \rho \) is assumed nonincreasing.

**Proof.** First, note that by monotonicity, for any \( x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n \),

\[ \omega_{\rho}(x, y) \geq \log \left( \frac{\rho(|x||y|)^2}{\rho(|x|^2)\rho(|y|^2)} \right). \]

To prove point (1), it suffices to show that, for any \( s, t > 0 \),

\[ \log \left( \frac{\rho(e^{s/2}e^{t/2})^2}{\rho(e^s)\rho(e^t)} \right) \geq 0. \]

Rewriting this inequality in terms of \( v_{\rho}(t) = -\log(\rho(e^t)) \), we find that it is equivalent to

\[ v_{\rho} \left( \frac{s + t}{2} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} v_{\rho}(s) + \frac{1}{2} v_{\rho}(t), \]

which in turn is equivalent to the convexity of \( v_{\rho} \).

Item (2) is a direct consequence of the computation of the second derivative of \( \varphi(h) = \omega_{\rho}(y, y + h) \) or, in terms of the function \( v_{\rho} \), \( \varphi(h) = -2v_{\rho}(\log(|y + y + h|)) + v_{\rho}(\log(|y|^2)) + v_{\rho}(\log(|y + h|^2)) \). We find that

\[ \nabla \varphi(0) = 0, \quad \nabla^2 \varphi(0) = \frac{2}{|y|^2} \left[ \left( I_n - \frac{y \otimes y}{|y|^2} \right) v_{\rho}'(s) + \frac{y \otimes y}{|y|^2} v_{\rho}''(s) \right] = H_{\rho}, \]

where we wrote \( |y|^2 = e^s \) for brevity. Strict convexity implies monotonicity of \( v_{\rho} \), so both matrices appearing in the Hessian are nonnegative. Moreover, the second matrix is positive on the line spanned
by $y$, and the first matrix is positive on its orthogonal, thus their sum must be positive. For future reference, we may rewrite $H_\rho$ in terms of $\rho$ rather than $v_\rho$:

$$
\frac{1}{2}H_\rho = -\frac{\rho'(s)}{\rho(s)} I_n + \left(\frac{\rho^2(s)}{\rho^2(s)} - \frac{\rho''(s)}{\rho(s)}\right)(y \otimes y).
$$

A Taylor expansion yields the formula of item (2).

The last point is an immediate (but useful enough to be stated) consequence of the strict convexity of $v_\rho$. Notice that $\omega_\rho(x, y) > 0$ whenever $x \neq y$. This is true because the monotonicity and the convexity of $\rho$ are strict. The stated result is then simply the consequence of continuity, if $x$ and $y$ are taken in some compact sets. However, we want a uniform estimate when $x$ and $y$ are both in some compact sets. Hence, we take in some compact sets. However, we want a uniform estimate when $x$ and $y$ are both in some compact sets.

The next result establishes some Hamilton-Jacobi type (in)equation for $R(\varepsilon f)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

**Lemma 4.5.** Let $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and assume that $\rho$ is strictly decreasing, and that $t \mapsto \rho(e^t)$ is log-concave. Then

$$
R(\varepsilon f) \geq \varepsilon f - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 \langle H_\rho^{-1} \nabla f, \nabla f \rangle + o(\varepsilon^2),
$$

when $\varepsilon$ goes to 0, with

$$
\frac{1}{2}H_\rho = -\frac{\rho'(s)}{\rho(s)} I_n + \left(\frac{\rho^2(s)}{\rho^2(s)} - \frac{\rho''(s)}{\rho(s)}\right)(y \otimes y), \quad s = 2 \log|y|.
$$

**Proof.** As is usual when linearizing such semigroups, the key is to localize the infimum. Namely, recalling (52)

$$
R(\varepsilon f)(y) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\varepsilon f(x) + \omega_\rho(x, y)\},
$$

if $x_\varepsilon$ is a minimizer of this expression, we want to prove that $|x_\varepsilon - y|$ goes to 0 uniformly in $y$ as $\varepsilon$ goes to 0. Of course, we must also prove that such a $x_\varepsilon$ exists.

We would like the result to be independent from the variable $y$. To that end, notice that since $f$ has compact support, we may restrict the study to $y$ in a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Indeed, notice that, in general $R(\varepsilon f)(y) \leq \varepsilon f(y)$. Assume more specifically now that $y \in \text{supp}(f)^c$. In that case, $R(\varepsilon f)(y) \leq 0$. Since $\omega_\rho \geq 0$, the infimum in the Hopf-Lax semigroup can only be reached for $x = y$, or for $x \in \text{supp}(f)$. In other words, whenever $y \in \text{supp}(f)^c$,

$$
R(\varepsilon f)(y) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\varepsilon f(x) + \omega_\rho(x, y)\} = \min(0, \inf_{x \in \text{supp}(f)} \{\varepsilon f(x) + \omega_\rho(x, y)\})
$$

Furthermore, according to the point (i) of Lemma 4.3 there exist $\nu > 0$ such that $x \in \text{supp}(f)$ and $|x - y| > 1$ implies that $\omega_\rho(x, y) > \eta$. As such, if $\varepsilon < \eta/\|f\|_{\infty}$, $d(y, \text{supp}(f)) > \delta$ implies that $R(\varepsilon f)(y) = 0$. 

We now restrict our study to some ball $B$ that contains $\text{supp}(f) + B(0, 1)$. Assume that $y \in B$. To make the calculations a little bit clearer, we rewrite (52) as

$$R(\varepsilon f)(y) = \inf_{h \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\varepsilon f(y + h) + \omega_\rho(y + h, y)\},$$

The immediate estimate $R(\varepsilon f) \leq \varepsilon \|f\|_\infty$ means that to find the infimum, we may restrict $h$ to be in the set

$$\{h \in \mathbb{R}^n, \varepsilon f(y + h) + \omega_\rho(y + h, y) \leq \varepsilon \|f\|_\infty\} \subset \{h \in \mathbb{R}^n, \omega_\rho(y + h, y) \leq 2\varepsilon \|f\|_\infty\}$$

Now, recall that for any $y \in B$,

$$\omega_\rho(y + h, y) = \frac{1}{2}\langle H_\rho h, h \rangle + o(|h|^2),$$

where $H_\rho$ is a continuous (positive definite) function of $y$, and the remainder term is uniform in $y$. This implies that there exists $r, \delta > 0$ such that if $|h| < r$ implies

$$\omega_\rho(y + h, y) \geq \delta|h|^2.$$

Owing to point (3) of Lemma 4.3, there also exists $\eta' > 0$ such that if $|h| > r$, then

$$\omega_\rho(y + h, y) \geq \eta'.$$

If $2\varepsilon \|f\|_\infty < \eta'$, then $\omega_\rho(y + h, y) \leq 2\varepsilon \|f\|_\infty$ implies that $|h| < r$, and thus

$$R(\varepsilon f)(y) = \inf_{|h| < r} \{\varepsilon f(y + h) + \omega_\rho(y + h, y)\},$$

The fact that $B(0, r)$ is compact implies the existence of a minimizer $h_\varepsilon$,

$$R(\varepsilon f)(y) = \varepsilon f(y + h_\varepsilon) + \omega_\rho(y + h_\varepsilon, y).$$

Since $\omega_\rho(y + h_\varepsilon, y) \geq \eta|h|^2$, we can already state that $|h_\varepsilon| \leq C\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ for some constant $C$ independent from $y$, but we can do better. The function $f$ is Lipschitz for some constant $L > 0$. Then,

$$\varepsilon f(y) - \varepsilon L|h_\varepsilon| + \delta|h_\varepsilon|^2 \leq R(\varepsilon f)(y) \leq \varepsilon f(y),$$

and thus $|h_\varepsilon| \leq C'\varepsilon$ for $C' = L/\delta > 0$, which we emphasize is independent from $y$.

Now that the minimizer $h_\varepsilon$ is localized, the rest follows naturally.

$$R(\varepsilon f)(y) = \varepsilon f(y + h_\varepsilon) + \omega_\rho(y + h_\varepsilon, y)$$

$$= \varepsilon f(y) + \varepsilon \langle \nabla f(y), h_\varepsilon \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle H_\rho h_\varepsilon, h_\varepsilon \rangle + o(\varepsilon^2)$$

$$\geq \varepsilon f(y) - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 \langle H_\rho^{-1} \nabla f(y), \nabla f(y) \rangle + o(\varepsilon^2),$$

since $\langle H_\rho z, z \rangle \geq 0$, where $z = h_\varepsilon + \varepsilon H_\rho^{-1} \nabla f(y)$.

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 1.1. Let us underline that in order to retrieve the sharp constant in the final inequality, one needs to consider a two sided linearization involving $T_{\omega_\rho}((1 - \varepsilon f)\mu_\rho, (1 + \varepsilon f)\mu_\rho)$, rather than $T_{\omega_\rho}((1 + \varepsilon f)\mu_\rho, \mu_\rho)$.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** Choose $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that its integral against $\mu_\rho$ is 0, and consider, for $\varepsilon > 0$, $\nu_1 = (1 + \varepsilon f)\mu_\rho$ and $\nu_2 = (1 - \varepsilon f)\mu_\rho$. Linearizing the entropy is straightforward: since $(1 + \varepsilon) \ln(1 + \varepsilon) = \varepsilon^2/2 + o(\varepsilon^2)$, the right-hand side of inequality (25) is equal to

$$H((1 + \varepsilon f)\mu_\rho|\mu_\rho) + H((1 - \varepsilon f)\mu_\rho|\mu_\rho) = \varepsilon^2 \int f^2 \, d\mu_\rho + o(\varepsilon^2).$$
For the left hand side, note that since $R(\varepsilon f)(y) - \varepsilon f(x) \leq \omega_\rho(x, y)$,
\[
T_\omega(\nu_1, \nu_2) \geq \int R(\varepsilon f)\,d\nu_1 - \int \varepsilon f\,d\nu_2
\]
\[
= \int R(\varepsilon f)(1 + \varepsilon f)\,d\mu_\rho - \int \varepsilon f(1 - \varepsilon f)\,d\mu_\rho
\]
Lemma 4.5 applies, and assuming that $\varepsilon$ is sufficiently small, the remainder term is uniform and zero outside of a compact. We may integrate it to find
\[
T_\omega(\nu_1, \nu_2) \geq \left( \varepsilon f - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \langle H_\rho^{-1} \nabla f, \nabla f \rangle \right)(1 + \varepsilon f)\,d\mu_\rho - \int \varepsilon f(1 - \varepsilon f)\,d\mu_\rho + o(\varepsilon^2)
\]
\[
= \varepsilon^2 \left( -\frac{1}{2} \langle H_\rho^{-1} \nabla f, \nabla f \rangle d\mu_\rho + 2 \int f^2 d\mu_\rho + o(1) \right)
\]
Combine these two observations to find that, after dividing by $\varepsilon^2$, letting it go to 0 leads to the claimed Poincaré inequality. □
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