

Seminar uncertainty relations
Prof. Dr. Michael M. Wolf
Dr. David Reeb
Supervisor: Oleg Szehr

Uncertainty relations and Fourier analysis

Christian Neumaier

July 11, 2013

1 Robertson-Schrödinger uncertainty relation

We discuss an uncertainty inequality for self-adjoint operators on a Hilbert space. In quantum mechanics self-adjoint operators play a fundamental role. The states of a quantum mechanical system are described as unit vectors in an appropriate Hilbert space \mathcal{H} and the observable quantities are self-adjoint operators on \mathcal{H} . In this context $M(\mu_u) := \langle Au, u \rangle$ can be interpreted as the expectation value of A in the state u and $V(\mu_u) := \|(A - M(\mu_u))u\|^2$ is a measure of the uncertainty of A in the state u .

The following theorem states that there is a positive lower bound for the product of two observables A and B in a state u as long as $\langle ABu, u \rangle \neq \langle BAu, u \rangle$.

Let A and B be densely defined operators on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with domains $D(A)$ and $D(B)$. Define the commutator $[A, B]$ as

$$[A, B] = AB - BA \quad \text{on } D([A, B]) = D(AB) \cap D(BA).$$

Proposition 1.1. (Robertson-Schrödinger uncertainty relation).

If A and B are self-adjoint operators and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, then

$$\|(A - \alpha)u\| \|(B - \beta)u\| \geq \frac{1}{2} |\langle [A, B]u, u \rangle| \quad \text{for all } u \in D([A, B]). \quad (1)$$

Proof. Since we have $[(A - \alpha), (B - \beta)] = [A, B]$ for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, we may assume $\alpha = \beta = 0$. For $u \in D([A, B])$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle [A, B]u, u \rangle| &= |\langle ABu, u \rangle - \langle BAu, u \rangle| = |\langle Bu, Au \rangle - \langle Au, Bu \rangle| \\ &= 2|\text{Im}\langle Au, Bu \rangle| \leq 2|\langle Au, Bu \rangle| \leq 2\|Au\| \|Bu\|. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Since in quantum mechanics one postulates that the space of all possible states in the system is the whole Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , in a physical context one would like to have that this uncertainty principle holds on \mathcal{H} .

In the following example we consider two of the most important self-adjoint operators in quantum mechanics, namely the momentum operator A up to some factor and the position operator B .

Let $\mathcal{H} = L^2([0, 1])$ and

$$A : D(A) \rightarrow L^2([0, 1]), Af = if'$$

with $D(A) = \{f \mid f \text{ absolutely continuous on } [0, 1], f' \in L^2([0, 1]), f(0) = f(1)\}$ and

$$B : D(B) \rightarrow L^2([0, 1]), Bf : x \mapsto xf(x)$$

with $D(B) = L^2([0, 1])$.

Note that the operators A and B are self-adjoint. Furthermore for $f \in D([A, B]) = \{f \mid f \text{ absolutely continuous on } [0, 1], f' \in L^2([0, 1]), f(0) = f(1) = 0\}$ we have

$$([A, B]f)(x) = i(xf(x))' - x(if'(x)) = ix f'(x) + if(x) - ix f'(x) = if(x).$$

So we have $[A, B] = i\mathcal{I}$ on $D([A, B])$. By definition of the closure of an operator we have $D(\overline{[A, B]}) = \{f \in L^2([0, 1]) \mid \exists (f_n) \subset D([A, B]) : f_n \rightarrow f, [A, B]f_n \text{ converges}\}$. Since $D([A, B])$ is dense in $L^2([0, 1])$ and $[A, B]f_n = if_n \rightarrow if$ we have $D(\overline{[A, B]}) = L^2([0, 1])$.

Again by definition of the closure of an operator we have $\overline{[A, B]}f = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [A, B]f_n = if$ for some $(f_n) \subset D([A, B])$ such that $f_n \rightarrow f$. Thus we have $\overline{[A, B]} = i\mathcal{I}$ on $L^2([0, 1])$. We would like to have

$$\|Af\| \|Bf\| \geq \frac{1}{2} |\langle \overline{[A, B]}f, f \rangle| \quad \text{for all } f \in D(A) \cap D(B) \cap D(\overline{[A, B]}). \quad (2)$$

Since we have $D(A) \cap D(B) \cap D(\overline{[A, B]}) = D(A)$ this would imply for all $f \in D(A)$

$$\begin{aligned} \|Af\|^2 \|Bf\|^2 &\geq \frac{1}{4} |\langle \overline{[A, B]}f, f \rangle|^2 \\ \Rightarrow \int_0^1 |if'(x)|^2 dx \int_0^1 |xf(x)|^2 dx &= \|f'\|^2 \int_0^1 x^2 |f(x)|^2 dx \stackrel{\text{Plancherel}}{=} \|\widehat{f'}\|^2 \int_0^1 x^2 |f(x)|^2 dx \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} |\langle if, f \rangle|^2 = \frac{\|f\|^4}{4} \\ \widehat{f'}(\xi) = 2\pi i \xi \widehat{f}(\xi) &\Leftrightarrow \int_0^1 \xi^2 |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \int_0^1 x^2 |f(x)|^2 dx \geq \frac{\|f\|^4}{16\pi^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Due to denseness of $D(A)$ and continuity of the scalar product we obtain

$$\int_0^1 \xi^2 |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \int_0^1 x^2 |f(x)|^2 dx \geq \frac{\|f\|^4}{16\pi^2} \quad \text{for all } f \in L^2([0, 1]).$$

This is Heisenberg's uncertainty relation on $L^2([0, 1])$. The quantum mechanical interpretation of this is that we have the uncertainty relation for all states of the system and not just for the subset $D([A, B])$ as in the Robertson-Schrödinger uncertainty relation.

Now we consider the constant function $g \equiv 1$ ($g \in D(A) \cap D(B) \cap D(\overline{[A, B]}) = D(A)$). We have $Ag = 0$ and $|\langle \overline{[A, B]}g, g \rangle| = 1$ in contradiction to (2).

Note that we have $D(A) \cap D(B) \supset D([A, B])$ but in general $D(A) \cap D(B) \not\subset D(\overline{[A, B]})$ and therefore we need $D(A) \cap D(B) \cap D(\overline{[A, B]})$ as domain in (2).

Recall that for Banach spaces X, Y an operator $A : D(A) \rightarrow Y$, $D(A) \subset X$ is called closed iff

$$(x_n)_n \subset D(A), \quad x_n \rightarrow x, \quad Ax_n \rightarrow y \text{ implies } x \in D(A) \text{ and } Ax = y.$$

If the operator $[A, B]$ is closed then $D(\overline{[A, B]}) = D([A, B])$ and thus in this case (1) and (2) coincide. Since (2) does not hold in the above example, the operator $[A, B]$ is not closed.

Nevertheless it is possible to show the following n-dimensional form of Heisenberg's inequality. For a proof refer to [F].

Theorem 1.2. *Let $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then we have*

$$\int \|x - a\|^2 |f(x)|^2 dx \int \|\xi - b\|^2 |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi \geq \frac{n^2}{16\pi^2} \|f\|_2^4. \quad (3)$$

2 Logarithmic uncertainty inequalities

In this section we deduce a logarithmic uncertainty inequality which implies a sharp form of Heisenberg's n-dimensional uncertainty inequality .

At first we fix some definitions and notations. If a probability measure μ on \mathbb{R}^n has finite variance, i.e. $\int \|x\|^2 d\mu < \infty$, then the mean $M(\mu) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and the covariance matrix $V(\mu) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are defined by

$$M(\mu) = \int x d\mu(x) \quad \text{and} \quad V(\mu)_{ij} = \int (x - M(\mu))_i (x - M(\mu))_j d\mu(x).$$

We call $\rho \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ a probability density function if there is a probability measure μ on \mathbb{R}^n such that $d\mu(x) = \rho(x)dx$. In this case we write $M(\rho)$ and $V(\rho)$ instead of $M(\mu)$ and $V(\mu)$.

Definition 2.1. *Let ρ be a probability density function on \mathbb{R}^n . We define the entropy of ρ by*

$$E(\rho) = - \int \rho(x) \ln \rho(x) dx.$$

Theorem 2.2. *If ρ is a probability density function on \mathbb{R}^n with finite variance, then $E(\rho)$ is well-defined and*

$$E(\rho) \leq \frac{1}{2} \ln[(2\pi e)^n \det V(\rho)]. \quad (4)$$

Proof. One can show that composing ρ with a translation and a rotation does not affect the quantities in (4) (see appendix 1).

For the translated density function $\rho'(x) = \rho(x - t)$ we have $M(\rho') = M(\rho) + t$. Since translations of ρ do not affect (4), by choosing $t = -M(\rho)$ we can assume that $M(\rho) = 0$. Since $V(\rho)$ is symmetric and real there is a rotation $R \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that $R^T V(\rho) R$ is diagonal. For the rotated density function $\rho'(x) = \rho(Rx)$ we have $V(\rho') = R^T V(\rho) R$ (see appendix 1). Since rotations of ρ do not affect (4) we can assume that $V(\rho)$ is diagonal.

If we replace ρ by ρ' with $\rho'(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n c_i \rho(c_i x_1, \dots, c_n x_n)$, $c_i > 0$ for all i , then both sides of (4) decrease by $\sum_i \ln c_i$ (see appendix 2). Furthermore we have $V(\rho')_{ii} = \int x_i^2 \rho'(x) dx = \frac{1}{c_i^2} V(\rho)_{ii}$ and thus by choosing $c_i = \sqrt{V(\rho)_{ii}}$ we can assume that $V(\rho) = \mathcal{I}$.

Now let $\Phi(x) = (2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} e^{-\frac{\|x\|^2}{2}} \rho(x)$ and $d\gamma(x) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{n}{2}} e^{-\frac{\|x\|^2}{2}} dx$, then we obtain $\int \Phi(x) d\gamma(x) = \int \rho(x) dx = 1$.

Since γ is a probability measure and $t \mapsto t \ln t$ is a convex function, by Jensen's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left[\int \Phi(x) d\gamma(x) \right] \ln \left[\int \Phi(x) d\gamma(x) \right] \leq \int \Phi(x) \ln \Phi(x) d\gamma(x) \\ &= \int \rho(x) \left[\frac{n}{2} \ln 2\pi + \frac{1}{2} \|x\|^2 + \ln \rho(x) \right] dx \\ &= \frac{n}{2} \ln 2\pi \int \rho(x) dx + \frac{1}{2} \int \sum_i x_i^2 \rho(x) dx - E(\rho) \\ &= \frac{n}{2} \ln 2\pi + \frac{1}{2} \sum_i V(\rho)_{ii} - E(\rho). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have $E(\rho) \leq \frac{n}{2} \ln 2\pi + \frac{1}{2} \sum_i V(\rho)_{ii}$. Since $V(\rho) = \mathcal{I}$, we have $V(\rho)_{ii} = 1$ and $\det V(\rho) = 1$ and therefore we obtain

$$E(\rho) \leq \frac{1}{2} \ln[(2\pi e)^n \det V(\rho)]. \quad \square$$

We will make use of the following trivial lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose $\Phi(t) \leq \Psi(t)$ for $t \in [a, b]$ and $\Phi(a) = \Psi(a)$. If Φ and Ψ are differentiable at a , then $\Phi'(a) \leq \Psi'(a)$.*

We show the central uncertainty inequality in terms of entropy.

Theorem 2.4. *If $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\|f\|_2 = 1$, we have*

$$E(|f|^2) + E(|\widehat{f}|^2) \geq n(1 - \ln 2). \quad (5)$$

Proof. We consider the sharp Hausdorff-Young inequality

$$\|\widehat{f}\|_q \leq p^{\frac{n}{2p}} q^{-\frac{n}{2q}} \|f\|_p \quad (1 \leq p \leq 2, \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1).$$

We choose $p = \frac{q}{q-1}$, take both sides of this inequality to the power of q and write it in integral form:

$$\int |\widehat{f}(\omega)|^q d\omega \leq \frac{q}{q-1} \frac{n(q-1)}{2} q^{-\frac{n}{2}} \left(\int |f(x)|^{\frac{q}{q-1}} dx \right)^{q-1}. \quad (6)$$

Now we want to apply Lemma 2.3. We consider both sides of the inequality (6) as functions of q , with $q \in [2, 2 + \epsilon]$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. We assume that the integrals on both sides of (6) are finite for $q \in [2, 2 + \epsilon]$.

For $q = 2$ equality holds in (6).

Differentiating the left-hand side of (6) yields

$$\frac{d}{dq} \int |\widehat{f}(\omega)|^q d\omega = \int |\widehat{f}(\omega)|^q \ln |\widehat{f}(\omega)| d\omega$$

and for $q = 2$ we obtain

$$\int |\widehat{f}(\omega)|^2 \ln |\widehat{f}(\omega)| d\omega = \frac{1}{2} \int |\widehat{f}(\omega)|^2 \ln |\widehat{f}(\omega)|^2 d\omega = -\frac{1}{2} E(|\widehat{f}|^2).$$

Differentiating the right-hand side of (6) we obtain for $q=2$ (see appendix 3)

$$\frac{n}{2} (\ln 2 - 1) + \frac{1}{2} E(|f|^2).$$

Using Lemma 2.3 we obtain

$$-\frac{1}{2} E(|\widehat{f}|^2) \leq \frac{n}{2} (\ln 2 - 1) + \frac{1}{2} E(|f|^2)$$

and thus

$$E(|f|^2) + E(|\widehat{f}|^2) \geq n(1 - \ln 2). \quad \square$$

Corollary 2.5. *If $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\|f\|_2 = 1$, then*

$$\det V(|f|^2) \det V(|\widehat{f}|^2) \geq (16\pi^2)^{-n}. \quad (7)$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\ln\left[(2\pi e)^{2n} \det V(|f|^2) \det V(|\widehat{f}|^2)\right] &= \ln\left[(2\pi e)^n \det V(|f|^2)\right] + \ln\left[(2\pi e)^n \det V(|\widehat{f}|^2)\right] \\
&\stackrel{(4)}{\geq} 2(E(|f|^2) + E(|\widehat{f}|^2)) \stackrel{(5)}{\geq} 2n(1 - \ln 2) \quad \text{and thus} \\
\det V(|f|^2) \det V(|\widehat{f}|^2) &\geq (2\pi e)^{-2n} e^{2n - 2n \ln 2} = (4\pi^2)^{-n} 2^{-2n} = (16\pi^2)^{-n}. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Since we can assume that $V(\rho)$ is diagonal for any probability density function ρ , by the inequality of arithmetic and geometric means we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
[\det V(\rho)]^{\frac{1}{n}} &= \left(\prod_{i=1}^n V(\rho)_{ii}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n V(\rho)_{ii} = \frac{1}{n} \int \sum_{i=1}^n (x - M(\rho))_i^2 \rho(x) dx \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \int \|x - M(\rho)\|^2 \rho(x) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus Corollary 2.5 is a sharp form of the n-dimensional Heisenberg inequality (3).

Appendix

1. Invariance of the quantities in equation (4) under translations and rotations of the density function ρ

1. Composing ρ with a translation does not affect $E(\rho)$.

Consider $\rho \mapsto \rho'$, $\rho'(x) = \rho(x - t)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} E(\rho') &= - \int \rho'(x) \ln \rho'(x) dx = - \int \rho(\underbrace{x-t}_{:=x'}) \ln \rho(x-t) dx \\ &= - \int \rho(x') \ln \rho(x') \underbrace{|det J|}_{=1} dx' = E(\rho), \end{aligned}$$

since $x = x' + t \Rightarrow \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial x'_k} = \delta_{ik} \Rightarrow$ Jacobian matrix $J = \mathcal{I} \Rightarrow det J = 1$.

2. Composing ρ with a translation does not affect $V(\rho)$.

Consider $\rho \mapsto \rho'$, $\rho'(x) = \rho(x - t)$. Using

$$\begin{aligned} M(\rho') &= \int x \rho'(x) dx = \int x \rho(\underbrace{x-t}_{:=x'}) dx = \int (x' + t) \rho(x') \underbrace{|det J|}_{=1} dx' \\ &= M(\rho) + t \underbrace{\int \rho(x') dx'}_{=1} = M(\rho) + t \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V(\rho')_{ij} &= \int (x - M(\rho'))_i (x - M(\rho'))_j \rho'(x) dx \\ &= \int (x - M(\rho) - t)_i (x - M(\rho) - t)_j \rho(\underbrace{x-t}_{:=x'}) dx \\ &= \int (x' - M(\rho))_i (x' - M(\rho))_j \rho(x') \underbrace{|det J|}_{=1} dx' = V(\rho)_{ij}. \end{aligned}$$

3. Composing ρ with a rotation does not affect $E(\rho)$.

A rotation is a map $R: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ with $R^T R = \mathcal{I}$, $R R^T = \mathcal{I}$, i.e. $R^T = R^{-1}$.

Consider $\rho \mapsto \rho'$, $\rho'(x) = \rho(Rx)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} E(\rho') &= - \int \rho'(x) \ln \rho'(x) dx = - \int \rho(\underbrace{Rx}_{:=x'}) \ln \rho(Rx) dx \\ &= - \int \rho(x') \ln \rho(x') \underbrace{|det J|}_{=1} dx' = E(\rho), \end{aligned}$$

since $x = R^{-1}x' \Rightarrow x_i = \sum_j R_{ij}^{-1} x'_j \Rightarrow \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial x'_k} = R_{ik}^{-1} \Rightarrow$ Jacobian matrix $J = R^{-1}$ and we

have $1 = det(R^T R) = [det(R^T)]^2 = [det(R^{-1})]^2 = [det(J)]^2 \Rightarrow |det J| = 1$.

4. Composing ρ with a rotation does not affect $\det V(\rho)$.

Consider $\rho \mapsto \rho'$, $\rho'(x) = \rho(Rx)$. We have

$$M(\rho') = \int x \rho'(x) dx = \int x \rho(\underbrace{Rx}_{:=x'}) dx = \int R^{-1} x' \rho(x') \underbrace{|\det J|}_{=1} dx' = R^{-1} M(\rho)$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} V(\rho')_{ij} &= \int (x - M(\rho'))_i (x - M(\rho'))_j \rho(\underbrace{Rx}_{:=x'}) dx \\ &= \int [R^{-1}(x' - M(\rho))]_i [R^{-1}(x' - M(\rho))]_j \rho(x') \underbrace{|\det J|}_{=1} dx' \\ &= \int \sum_{k,l} R_{ik}^{-1} (x' - M(\rho))_k R_{jl}^{-1} (x' - M(\rho))_l \rho(x') dx' \\ &= \sum_{k,l} R_{ik}^{-1} R_{jl}^{-1} \int (x' - M(\rho))_k (x' - M(\rho))_l \rho(x') dx' \\ &= \sum_{k,l} R_{ik}^T V(\rho)_{kl} R_{lj} \\ &= (R^T V(\rho) R)_{ij}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have $V(\rho') = R^T V(\rho) R$ and therefore

$$\det V(\rho') = \det(R^T V(\rho) R) = \det(R^T R) \det V(\rho) = \det V(\rho).$$

2. Effects of the transformation $\rho(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n c_i \rho(c_1 x_1, \dots, c_n x_n)$ on equation (4)

Replace ρ by $\prod_{i=1}^n c_i \rho(c_1 x_1, \dots, c_n x_n) = \det C \rho(Cx)$, for $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $C_{ij} = c_i \delta_{ij}$.

We show that by this transformation both sides of (4) decrease by $\sum_i \ln c_i$.

Let $\rho \mapsto \rho'$, $\rho'(x) = \det C \rho(Cx)$.

For the left side of (4) we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(\rho') &= - \int \det C \rho(\underbrace{Cx}_{:=x'}) \ln[\det C \rho(Cx)] dx \\ &= - \det C \int \rho(x') [\ln(\det C) + \ln(\rho(x'))] \underbrace{|\det J|}_{=\det C^{-1}} dx' \\ &= E(\rho) - \ln \prod_i c_i = E(\rho) - \sum_i \ln c_i, \end{aligned}$$

since $x = C^{-1} x'$ with $C_{ij}^{-1} = \frac{1}{c_i} \delta_{ij} \Rightarrow x_i = \frac{1}{c_i} x'_i \Rightarrow \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial x'_k} = \frac{1}{c_i} \delta_{ik} \Rightarrow$ Jacobian matrix $J = C^{-1}$.

For the left side we first notice that

$$V(\rho')_{ii} = \int x_i^2 \det C \rho(\underbrace{Cx}_{:=x'}) dx = \det C \int \frac{1}{c_i^2} x_i'^2 \rho(x') \det C^{-1} dx' = \frac{1}{c_i^2} V(\rho)_{ii}.$$

Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \ln[(2\pi e)^n \det V(\rho')] &= \frac{1}{2} \ln[(2\pi e)^n \prod_i V(\rho')_{ii}] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \ln[(2\pi e)^n \prod_i \frac{1}{c_i^2} V(\rho)_{ii}] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \ln[(2\pi e)^n \det V(\rho)] + \frac{1}{2} \ln \prod_i \frac{1}{c_i^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \ln[(2\pi e)^n \det V(\rho)] - \sum_i \ln c_i.
\end{aligned}$$

3. Differentiating the right hand side of the Hausdorff-Young inequality

The right hand side of the Hausdorff-Young inequality (to the power of q) in integral form is

$$f(q) := \underbrace{\frac{q}{q-1}}_{:=a(q)} \underbrace{q^{-\frac{n}{2}}}_{:=b(q)} \underbrace{\left(\int |f(x)|^{\frac{q}{q-1}} dx \right)^{q-1}}_{:=c(q)}.$$

Note that $\|f\|_2 = 1$ by assumption in the Theorem.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
a'(q) &= \frac{q}{q-1} \frac{n(q-1)}{2} \left[-\frac{n}{2q} + \frac{n}{2} \ln\left(\frac{q}{q-1}\right) \right] \Rightarrow a'(2) = 2^{\frac{n}{2}} \frac{n}{4} (-1 + \ln 2) + n \ln 2 \cdot 2^{\frac{n}{2}-2} \\
b'(q) &= -\frac{n}{2} q^{-\frac{n+2}{2}} \Rightarrow b'(2) = -\frac{n}{2} 2^{-\frac{n+2}{2}}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
c'(q) &= \left(\int |f(x)|^{\frac{q}{q-1}} dx \right)^{q-1} \left(\frac{1}{\int |f(x)|^{\frac{q}{q-1}} dx} \left[\int |f(x)|^{\frac{q}{q-1}} \ln |f(x)| \frac{-1}{(q-1)^2} dx \right] (q-1) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \ln \left(\int |f(x)|^{\frac{q}{q-1}} dx \right) \right) \\
\Rightarrow c'(2) &= \frac{1}{2} E(|f|^2)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f'(2) &= a'(2)b(2)c(2) + a(2)b'(2)c(2) + a(2)b(2)c'(2) \\
&= \left(2^{\frac{n}{2}} \frac{n}{4} (-1 + \ln 2) + n \ln 2 \cdot 2^{\frac{n}{2}-2} \right) 2^{-\frac{n}{2}} \|f\|_2^2 \\
&\quad + 2^{\frac{n}{2}} \left(-\frac{n}{2} 2^{-\frac{n+2}{2}} \right) \|f\|_2^2 \\
&\quad + 2^{\frac{n}{2}} 2^{-\frac{n}{2}} \frac{1}{2} E(|f|^2) \\
&= \frac{n}{2} (\ln 2 - 1) + \frac{1}{2} E(|f|^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Reference

[F] Gerald B. Folland, Alladi Sitaram. The Uncertainty Principle: A Mathematical Survey, The Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications, 1997.