

Hyperuniformity vs. finite 2-Wasserstein distance to a lattice

Thomas Leblé

CNRS - Université de Paris

Bernoulli World Congress 2024 - Bochum

Goal: comparing two properties of *stationary point processes*:

- ▶ **Hyperuniformity (small number variance in large disks)**
- ▶ **Finite transportation distance to a lattice**

With **D. Dereudre, D. Flimmel, and M. Huesmann (2024)**:

- ▶ *(Non)-hyperuniformity of perturbed lattices*
- ▶ *The link between hyperuniformity, Coulomb energy, and Wasserstein distance to Lebesgue for two-dimensional point processes.*

Number variance

- ▶ $\mathbf{X}$ a point configuration (loc. finite collection of points in $\mathbb{R}^d$)
- ▶ $\mathcal{D}_r$ the disk of radius $r > 0$, $|\mathcal{D}_r|$ its Lebesgue measure.
- ▶ $\text{Points}(\mathbf{X}, \mathcal{D}_r)$ the number of points of $\mathbf{X}$ inside $\mathcal{D}_r$

If $\dot{\mathbf{X}}$ is a random point configuration, write:

$$\sigma_{\dot{\mathbf{X}}}(r) := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_r|} \text{Var} \left[\text{Points}(\dot{\mathbf{X}}, \mathcal{D}_r) \right].$$

“Rescaled number variance” for the point process $\dot{\mathbf{X}}$.

Interest in the asymptotic behavior of $\sigma_{\dot{\mathbf{X}}}(r)$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$.

Hyperuniformity

A point process / random point configuration $\dot{\mathbf{X}}$ is said to be **hyperuniform** when:

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{\dot{\mathbf{X}}}(r) = 0.$$

1. For “iid points” (Poisson point process), $\sigma(r) = 1$.
2. For points on a “stationary lattice”, $\sigma(r) = O(r^{-1})$.
3. This cannot be beaten. Beck, *Acta Mathematica* 1987
(“Class-I hyperuniform”)

Gabrielli, Joyce, Sylos Labini, 2002 **super-homogeneous**
Torquato, Stillinger, 2003 **hyperuniform**

Interest?

“Order within disorder”.

- ▶ Lattices represent “usual” order: correlations persists at infinity.
- ▶ The Ginibre ensemble from RMT (eigenvalues of a $N \times N$ matrix with i.i.d. complex Gaussian entries, then $N \rightarrow \infty$, Ginibre '64) is class-I hyperuniform.
- ▶ The two-point correlation function of the Ginibre ensemble decays as $e^{-|x-y|^2}$!!

No “order” in the usual sense of long-range correlations. And yet “suppression of charge fluctuations” Martin-Yalcin, Lebowitz 80's one-component plasmas / Coulomb gases.

Torquato 2018: survey of examples of various nature.

Goals:

1. Find sufficient conditions for hyperuniformity.
2. Construct new examples (with various speeds for σ ?).

Goals:

1. Find sufficient conditions for hyperuniformity.
2. Construct new examples (with various speeds for σ ?).

Theorem (Gacs, Szasz 1975)

*In any dimension, **i.i.d.** perturbations of a lattice + finite **first** moment $\implies$ **class-I** hyperuniform.*

Goals:

1. Find sufficient conditions for hyperuniformity.
2. Construct new examples (with various speeds for σ ?).

Theorem (Gacs, Szasz 1975)

*In any dimension, **i.i.d.** perturbations of a lattice + finite **first moment** $\implies$ **class-I** hyperuniform.*

Claim (Gabrielli, 2004)

*In dimension **2**, **dependent** perturbations of a lattice + **finite second moment** $\implies$ **hyperuniform**.*

Perturbations of a lattice?

- ▶ $(p_x)_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$ “perturbation field” with $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -invariant distribution
- ▶ **Identically distributed** + more invariance conditions.
Independent versus dependent case. Size of perturbations.
- ▶ u uniform in $[0, 1]^d$ (independent of perturbations)
- ▶ Perturbed stationary lattice:

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} := \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \delta_{x+p_x+u}$$

Finite Wasserstein distance

Possible definition: we say that $\dot{\mathbf{X}}$ has finite s -Wasserstein distance to the stationary lattice when $\dot{\mathbf{X}}$ can be written as a perturbed lattice:

$$\dot{\mathbf{X}} := \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \delta_{x+p_x+u}$$

for some $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -invariant perturbation field s.t. $\mathbb{E}[|p_0|^s] < +\infty$.

Wasserstein / Optimal transport interpretation?

First result: from Wasserstein to Hyperuniform

The physics literature (Gabrielli, 2004, Kim-Torquato 2018) claims that: in dimension 2, perturbations with finite second moment cannot break hyperuniformity.

Theorem (Dereudre-Flimmell-Huesmann-L. '24)

- ▶ In dimension 2, *finite 2-Wasserstein distance to a stationary lattice implies hyperuniformity.*
No information on the speed of $\sigma(r) \rightarrow 0$ in general!
- ▶ In dimension ≥ 3 , there are *arbitrarily small perturbations of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ s.t. $\sigma(r) \rightarrow +\infty$.*
- ▶ In any dimension, *there are hyperuniform processes such that $\sigma(r) \rightarrow 0$ arbitrarily slowly.*

Converse results?

(2024) Lachièze-Rey, Yogeshwaran, and Butez, Dallaporta, Garcia-Zelada: results of the type “hyperuniform + conditions imply finite 2-Wasserstein distance”.

Theorem (Huesmann-L.)

- ▶ Hyperuniformity *does not* imply finite 2-Wasserstein distance to a lattice in general.
- ▶ However, if we impose that $\sigma(r) \rightarrow 0$ in a reasonable way

$$\sigma(r) \leq Cr^{-\epsilon}, \quad \sigma(r) \leq C \ln(r)^{-1-\epsilon}, \quad \sum_{n \geq 1} \sigma(2^n) < +\infty \quad (\star\text{-HU})$$

then $\star\text{-HU} \implies$ finite 2-Wasserstein distance to a lattice.

Summary

In dimension 2:

- ▶ Two implications

★-**HU** $\implies$ finite 2-Wasserstein to a lattice $\implies$ **HU**.

- ▶ “Gap” consists of processes such that $\sigma(r) \rightarrow 0$ very slowly.
Those processes exist!

Summary

In dimension 2:

- ▶ Two implications

★-HU $\implies$ finite 2-Wasserstein to a lattice $\implies$ HU.

- ▶ “Gap” consists of processes such that $\sigma(r) \rightarrow 0$ very slowly.
Those processes exist!

Typology of HU processes (Torquato):

1. Class-I (lattices + i.i.d perturbations, Ginibre...) $\sigma(r) \sim Cr^{-1}$
2. Class-II $\sigma(r) \sim Cr^{-1} \ln r$
3. Class-III $\sigma(r) \sim Cr^{-\epsilon}$, for $\epsilon > 0$.
4.

Perturbations with second moment are hyperuniform

Follows the lines of Gabrielli 2004:

1. Want to show: rescaled number variance $\sigma(r) \rightarrow 0$

Perturbations with second moment are hyperuniform

Follows the lines of Gabrielli 2004:

1. Want to show: rescaled number variance $\sigma(r) \rightarrow 0$
2. Variance $\leftrightarrow$ correlation structure of the perturbed lattice

Perturbations with second moment are hyperuniform

Follows the lines of Gabrielli 2004:

1. Want to show: rescaled number variance $\sigma(r) \rightarrow 0$
2. Variance $\leftrightarrow$ correlation structure of the perturbed lattice
3. “reduced covariance measure” has an explicit expression:

$$\alpha_{red}^{(2)}(B) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{1} \{x + p_x - p_0 \in B\} \right] \quad (1)$$

Fourier side: “structure factor” S

Perturbations with second moment are hyperuniform

Follows the lines of Gabrielli 2004:

1. Want to show: rescaled number variance $\sigma(r) \rightarrow 0$
2. Variance $\leftrightarrow$ correlation structure of the perturbed lattice
3. “reduced covariance measure” has an explicit expression:

$$\alpha_{red}^{(2)}(B) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{1} \{x + p_x - p_0 \in B\} \right] \quad (1)$$

Fourier side: “structure factor” S

4. Large scale properties of $\alpha_{red}^{(2)} \leftrightarrow$ small frequencies for S .

Perturbations with second moment are hyperuniform

Follows the lines of Gabrielli 2004:

1. Want to show: rescaled number variance $\sigma(r) \rightarrow 0$
2. Variance $\leftrightarrow$ correlation structure of the perturbed lattice
3. “reduced covariance measure” has an explicit expression:

$$\alpha_{red}^{(2)}(B) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{1} \{x + p_x - p_0 \in B\} \right] \quad (1)$$

Fourier side: “structure factor” S

4. Large scale properties of $\alpha_{red}^{(2)} \leftrightarrow$ small frequencies for S .
5. Taylor expansion for small frequencies, covariance structure of the perturbations appear. Need second moment!

Perturbations with second moment are hyperuniform

Follows the lines of Gabrielli 2004:

1. Want to show: rescaled number variance $\sigma(r) \rightarrow 0$
2. Variance $\leftrightarrow$ correlation structure of the perturbed lattice
3. “reduced covariance measure” has an explicit expression:

$$\alpha_{red}^{(2)}(B) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{1} \{x + p_x - p_0 \in B\} \right] \quad (1)$$

Fourier side: “structure factor” S

4. Large scale properties of $\alpha_{red}^{(2)} \leftrightarrow$ small frequencies for S .
5. Taylor expansion for small frequencies, covariance structure of the perturbations appear. Need second moment!
6. Difficult part: justifying that **only** small frequencies matter.

★-HU implies finite Wasserstein distance

- ▶ True “Wasserstein” interpretation: need a theory of optimal transportation for point processes. see Martin’s talk, Thursday 2pm “Optimal Transport and the Role of Entropy”. Infinite-volume theory, constructed as “per unit volume” limits for invariant objects.

★-HU implies finite Wasserstein distance

- ▶ True “Wasserstein” interpretation: need a theory of optimal transportation for point processes. see Martin’s talk, Thursday 2pm “Optimal Transport and the Role of Entropy”. Infinite-volume theory, constructed as “per unit volume” limits for invariant objects.

Distances to the Lebesgue measure / a lattice are equivalent.

★-HU implies finite Wasserstein distance

- ▶ True “Wasserstein” interpretation: need a theory of optimal transportation for point processes. see Martin’s talk, Thursday 2pm “Optimal Transport and the Role of Entropy”. Infinite-volume theory, constructed as “per unit volume” limits for invariant objects.

Distances to the Lebesgue measure / a lattice are equivalent.

- ▶ In finite-volume, classical inequalities relating:
 1. 2-Wasserstein distance between $\mathbf{m}_0$ and Lebesgue measure in a square.
 2. The negative Sobolev H^{-1} norm of $\mathbf{m}_0 - \text{Lebesgue}$ in that square.

★-HU implies finite Wasserstein distance

- ▶ True “Wasserstein” interpretation: need a theory of optimal transportation for point processes. see Martin’s talk, Thursday 2pm “Optimal Transport and the Role of Entropy”. Infinite-volume theory, constructed as “per unit volume” limits for invariant objects.

Distances to the Lebesgue measure / a lattice are equivalent.

- ▶ In finite-volume, classical inequalities relating:
 1. 2-Wasserstein distance between $\mathbf{m}_0$ and Lebesgue measure in a square.
 2. The negative Sobolev H^{-1} norm of $\mathbf{m}_0 - \text{Lebesgue}$ in that square.

Ledoux “On optimal matching of Gaussian samples” 2019:

$$W_2(\mathbf{m}_0, \text{Lebesgue}) \leq C \|\mathbf{m}_0 - \text{Lebesgue}\|_{H^{-1}}$$

(Any dimension!)

★-HU implies finite Wasserstein distance - II

Controlling $H^{-1} \implies$ controlling 2-Wasserstein distance.

H^{-1} norm of $\mathbf{m}_0 - \text{Lebesgue}$ is related to *Coulomb energy*.

$$\iint g(x-y) d(\mathbf{m}_0 - \text{Lebesgue})(x) d(\mathbf{m}_0 - \text{Lebesgue})(y),$$

where g is the Coulomb kernel.

Theorem (HL)

1. *In any dimension, finite Coulomb energy of a point process implies finite 2-Wasserstein distance to the Lebesgue measure.*
2. *The converse is (barely false) but becomes true under uniform density condition.*
3. *In dimension 2, ★-HU is equivalent (!) to finite Coulomb.*

The last step relies on a recent result of Sodin-Yakir-Wenmann.

Counter-example: hyperuniform but not finite distance

Take $\Lambda_N := [-\sqrt{N}, \sqrt{N}]^2$. Throw $|\Lambda_N|$ i.i.d. points in Λ_N .

- ▶ Average Wasserstein distance between the points and Lebesgue (or a portion of lattice...) is $CN^2 \log N$ Ajtai, Komlos, Tusnady 1984.
- ▶ Within Λ_N , the rescaled number variance is of order 1...

Counter-example: hyperuniform but not finite distance

Take $\Lambda_N := [-\sqrt{N}, \sqrt{N}]^2$. Throw $|\Lambda_N|$ i.i.d. points in Λ_N .

- ▶ Average Wasserstein distance between the points and Lebesgue (or a portion of lattice...) is $CN^2 \log N$ Ajtai, Komlos, Tusnady 1984.
- ▶ Within Λ_N , the rescaled number variance is of order 1...

Tile $\mathbb{R}^2$ with copies of Λ_N , throw $|\Lambda_N|$ i.i.d. points in each copy.

- ▶ The **transportation cost per unit volume** grows like $\log N$
- ▶ The rescaled number variance becomes **small at large scales**.

Choose N randomly in such a way that:

$$\sum_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{P}(N = n) \log n = +\infty.$$

Thank you for your attention!