

# THE INEQUALITY OF MILNE AND ITS CONVERSE II

HORST ALZER AND ALEXANDER KOVAČEC

Received 15 September 2004; Accepted 19 September 2004

We prove the following let  $\alpha, \beta, a > 0$ , and  $b > 0$  be real numbers, and let  $w_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ;  $n \geq 2$ ) be positive real numbers with  $w_1 + \dots + w_n = 1$ . The inequalities  $\alpha \sum_{j=1}^n w_j / (1 - p_j^a) \leq \sum_{j=1}^n w_j / (1 - p_j) \sum_{j=1}^n w_j / (1 + p_j) \leq \beta \sum_{j=1}^n w_j / (1 - p_j^b)$  hold for all real numbers  $p_j \in [0, 1)$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ) if and only if  $\alpha \leq \min(1, a/2)$  and  $\beta \geq \max(1, (1 - \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} w_j/2)b)$ . Furthermore, we provide a matrix version. The first inequality (with  $\alpha = 1$  and  $a = 2$ ) is a discrete counterpart of an integral inequality published by E. A. Milne in 1925.

Copyright © 2006 Hindawi Publishing Corporation. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Motivated by an interesting paper of Rao [8], we proved in [1] the following double-inequality for sums.

**PROPOSITION 1.1.** *Let  $w_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ;  $n \geq 2$ ) be positive real numbers with  $w_1 + \dots + w_n = 1$ . Then we have for all real numbers  $p_j \in [0, 1)$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ),*

$$\left( \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{1 - p_j^2} \right)^{c_1} \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{1 - p_j} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{1 + p_j} \leq \left( \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{1 - p_j^2} \right)^{c_2}, \quad (1.1)$$

with the best possible exponents

$$c_1 = 1, \quad c_2 = 2 - \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} w_j. \quad (1.2)$$

The left-hand side of (1.1) (with  $c_1 = 1$ ) is a discrete version of an integral inequality due to Milne [7]. Rao showed that (1.1) (with  $c_1 = 1$  and  $c_2 = 2$ ) is valid for all  $w_j > 0$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ) with  $w_1 + \dots + w_n = 1$  and all  $p_j \in (-1, 1)$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ).

Double-inequality (1.1) admits the following matrix version; see [1, 8].

**PROPOSITION 1.2.** *Let  $w_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ;  $n \geq 2$ ) be positive real numbers with  $w_1 + \dots + w_n = 1$  and let  $I$  be the unit matrix. Then we have for all families of commuting Hermitian*

## 2 The inequality of Milne and its converse II

matrices  $P_1, \dots, P_n$  with  $0 \leq P_j < I$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ),

$$\left( \sum_{j=1}^n w_j (I^2 - P_j^2)^{-1} \right)^{c_1} \leq \sum_{j=1}^n w_j (I - P_j)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j (I + P_j)^{-1} \leq \left( \sum_{j=1}^n w_j (I^2 - P_j^2)^{-1} \right)^{c_2}, \quad (1.3)$$

with the best possible exponents

$$c_1 = 1, \quad c_2 = 2 - \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} w_j. \quad (1.4)$$

In Section 2 we provide new bounds for  $\sum_{j=1}^n w_j / (1 - p_j) \sum_{j=1}^n w_j / (1 + p_j)$ , which are closely related to those given in (1.1). It turns out that the new upper bound and the upper bound in (1.1) cannot be compared. And in Section 3 we present a matrix analogue of our discrete double-inequality.

### 2. Inequalities for sums

The following counterpart of Proposition 1.1 holds.

**THEOREM 2.1.** *Let  $\alpha, \beta, a > 0$ , and  $b > 0$  be real numbers. Further, let  $w_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ;  $n \geq 2$ ) be positive real numbers with  $w_1 + \dots + w_n = 1$ . The inequalities*

$$\alpha \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{1 - p_j^a} \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{1 - p_j} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{1 + p_j} \leq \beta \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{1 - p_j^b} \quad (2.1)$$

hold for all real numbers  $p_j \in [0, 1)$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ) if and only if

$$\alpha \leq \min(1, a/2), \quad \beta \geq \max\left(1, \left(1 - \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} w_j / 2\right) b\right). \quad (2.2)$$

*Proof.* Let  $w = \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} w_j$  and  $c = 2/(2 - w)$ . First, we suppose that  $\beta \geq \max(1, b/c)$ . Since

$$\max(1, b/c) \geq \frac{1 - p^b}{1 - p^c} \quad (0 \leq p < 1), \quad (2.3)$$

we obtain

$$\beta \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{1 - p_j^b} \geq \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{1 - p_j^c}. \quad (2.4)$$

To prove the right-hand side of (2.1) we may assume that

$$0 \leq p_n \leq p_{n-1} \leq \dots \leq p_1 < 1. \quad (2.5)$$

We define

$$F(p_1, \dots, p_n) = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{1-p_j^c} - \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{1-p_j} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{1+p_j}, \quad (2.6)$$

$$F_q(p) = F(p, \dots, p, p_{q+1}, \dots, p_n), \quad 1 \leq q \leq n-1, p_{q+1} < p < 1.$$

Differentiation leads to

$$\frac{(1-p^2)^2}{W_q} F'_q(p) = c p^{c-1} \left( \frac{1-p^2}{1-p^c} \right)^2 - 2p W_q + \sum_{j=q+1}^n w_j \left( \frac{(1-p)^2}{1-p_j} - \frac{(1+p)^2}{1+p_j} \right), \quad (2.7)$$

where  $W_q = w_1 + \dots + w_q$ . Using

$$\frac{(1-p)^2}{1-p_j} - \frac{(1+p)^2}{1+p_j} \geq (1-p)^2 - (1+p)^2 \quad \text{for } j = q+1, \dots, n, \quad (2.8)$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(1-p^2)^2}{W_q} F'_q(p) &\geq c p^{c-1} \left( \frac{1-p^2}{1-p^c} \right)^2 - 4p + 2p W_q \\ &\geq c p^{c-1} \left( \frac{1-p^2}{1-p^c} \right)^2 - 4c^{-1} p = G(c, p), \quad \text{say.} \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Let

$$E(r, s; x, y) = \left( \frac{s x^r - y^r}{r x^s - y^s} \right)^{1/(r-s)} \quad (2.10)$$

be the extended mean of order  $(r, s)$  of  $x, y > 0$ . Then we have

$$G(c, p) = 4c^{-1} p^{c-1} (E(2, c; p, 1))^{4-2c} - 4c^{-1} p. \quad (2.11)$$

Since  $1 < c < 2$  and  $E(r, s; x, y)$  increases with increase in either  $r$  or  $s$  (see [4]), we obtain

$$E(2, c; p, 1) \geq E(2, 1; p, 1) = \frac{p+1}{2} > p^{1/2}. \quad (2.12)$$

From (2.11) and (2.12) we conclude that  $G(c, p) > 0$ . This implies that  $F_q$  is strictly increasing on  $[p_{q+1}, 1)$ . Hence, we get

$$\begin{aligned} F(p_1, \dots, p_n) &= F_1(p_1) \geq F_1(p_2) = F_2(p_2) \geq F_2(p_3) \\ &\geq \dots \geq F_{n-1}(p_{n-1}) \geq F_{n-1}(p_n) = \frac{1}{1-p_n^c} - \frac{1}{1-p_n^2} \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

Combining (2.4) and (2.13) it follows that the inequality on the right-hand side of (2.1) is valid.

#### 4 The inequality of Milne and its converse II

Next, let  $\alpha \leq \min(1, a/2)$ . Applying

$$\min(1, a/2) \leq \frac{1 - p^a}{1 - p^2} \quad (0 \leq p < 1) \quad (2.14)$$

and the first inequality of (1.1) (with  $c_1 = 1$ ) we conclude that the left-hand side of (2.1) holds for all real numbers  $p_j \in [0, 1)$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ).

It remains to show that the validity of (2.1) implies (2.2). We set  $p_1 = \dots = p_n = p \in (0, 1)$ . Then the left-hand side of (2.1) leads to

$$\alpha \leq \frac{1 - p^a}{1 - p^2}. \quad (2.15)$$

We let  $p$  tend to 0 and obtain  $\alpha \leq 1$ . And, if  $p$  tends to 1, then (2.15) yields  $\alpha \leq a/2$ . Let  $w = w_k$  with  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . We set  $p_j = 0$  ( $1 \leq j \leq n; j \neq k$ ) and  $p_k = p \in (0, 1)$ . Then the right-hand side of (2.1) is equivalent to

$$\frac{(1 - w + w/(1 - p))(1 - w + w/(1 + p))}{1 - w + w/(1 - p^b)} \leq \beta. \quad (2.16)$$

If  $p$  tends to 0, then  $1 \leq \beta$ . And, if  $p$  tends to 1, then we get  $(1 - w/2)b \leq \beta$ .  $\square$

*Remarks 2.2.* (i) We define for  $b > 0$ ,

$$H(b) = \max(1, (1 - w/2)b) \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{1 - p_j^b}, \quad (2.17)$$

where  $w_j > 0$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ),  $w_1 + \dots + w_n = 1$ ,  $w = \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} w_j$ , and  $p_j \in [0, 1)$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n$ ). If  $0 < b < 2/(2 - w)$ , then

$$H'(b) = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j p_j^b \log(p_j)}{(1 - p_j^b)^2} \leq 0. \quad (2.18)$$

And, if  $b > 2/(2 - w)$ , then

$$H'(b) = (1 - w/2) \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{(1 - p_j^b)^2} (1 - p_j^b + p_j^b \log(p_j^b)) \geq 0. \quad (2.19)$$

This implies that  $H$  is decreasing on  $(0, 2/(2 - w)]$  and increasing on  $[2/(2 - w), \infty)$ . Hence: if (2.2) holds, then the function

$$H^*(\beta, b) = \beta \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{1 - p_j^b} \quad (2.20)$$

satisfies  $H^*(\beta, b) \geq H^*(1, 2/(2 - w))$ . This means that the expression on the right-hand side of (2.1) attains its smallest value if  $\beta = 1$  and  $b = 2/(2 - w)$ . Similarly, we obtain: if (2.2) holds, then the expression on the left-hand side of (2.1) attains its largest value if  $\alpha = 1$  and  $a = 2$ .

(ii) The upper bounds given in (1.1) with  $c_2 = 2 - w$  and (2.1) with  $\beta = 1, b = 2/(2 - w)$  cannot be compared. To prove this we set  $p_1 = \dots = p_n = p \in (0, 1)$  and denote by  $R_1(p)$  and  $R_2(p)$  the expressions on the right-hand side of (1.1) and (2.1), respectively. Then we get

$$R_1(p) = \left( \frac{1}{1 - p^2} \right)^{c_2}, \quad R_2(p) = \frac{1}{1 - p^b}. \tag{2.21}$$

First, we show that  $R_1(p) > R_2(p)$  in the neighbourhood of 1. Let

$$\Delta(p) = R_1(p) - R_2(p), \quad \varphi(p) = (1 - p^b)\Delta(p). \tag{2.22}$$

Since  $c_2 > 1, b > 1$  we have

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \varphi(p) = \lim_{p \rightarrow 1} \frac{bp^{b-1}}{2pc_2(1 - p^2)^{c_2-1}} - 1 = \infty. \tag{2.23}$$

This implies that  $\varphi$  and  $\Delta$  are positive in the neighbourhood of 1.

Next, we show that  $R_1(p) < R_2(p)$  in the neighbourhood of 0. Let

$$\sigma(p) = \Delta(p^{1/2}). \tag{2.24}$$

We obtain  $\sigma(0) = 0$  and since  $0 < b/2 < 1$  we get

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow 0} \sigma'(p) = \lim_{p \rightarrow 0} \left( \frac{c_2}{(1 - p)^{c_2+1}} - \frac{b}{2} p^{b/2-1} \frac{1}{(1 - p^{b/2})^2} \right) = -\infty. \tag{2.25}$$

This implies that  $\sigma$  and  $\Delta$  attain negative values in the neighbourhood of 0.

(iii) The two-parameter mean value family defined in (2.10) has been the subject of intensive research. The main properties are studied in [4–6], where also historical remarks and references can be found.

### 3. Matrix inequalities

We now provide a matrix analogue of Theorem 2.1. The reader who wants to have a proper understanding of the following theorem and its proof needs a general knowledge of matrix theory. We refer to the monographs [2, 3].

**THEOREM 3.1.** *Let  $\alpha, \beta, a > 0$ , and  $b > 0$  be real numbers. Further, let  $w_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n; n \geq 2$ ) be positive real numbers with  $w_1 + \dots + w_n = 1$ . The inequalities*

$$\alpha \sum_{j=1}^n w_j (I - P_j^a)^{-1} \leq \sum_{j=1}^n w_j (I - P_j)^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j (I + P_j)^{-1} \leq \beta \sum_{j=1}^n w_j (I - P_j^b)^{-1} \tag{3.1}$$

hold for all families of commuting Hermitian matrices  $P_1, \dots, P_n$ , satisfying  $0 \leq P_j < I$  in the Löwner ordering, if and only if

$$\alpha \leq \min(1, a/2), \quad \beta \geq \max\left(1, \left(1 - \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} w_j/2\right)b\right). \tag{3.2}$$

## 6 The inequality of Milne and its converse II

*Proof.* First, we assume that (3.2) is valid. Since the  $P_j$  commute, there exists a nonsingular matrix  $S$  such that  $S^{-1}P_jS = \text{diag}(\dots, \lambda_{lj}, \dots)$ , where  $\lambda_{1j}, \dots, \lambda_{nj}$  are the eigenvalues of  $P_j$ . By definition of the positive semidefinite ordering (Löwner ordering) it follows that  $P_j < I$  implies  $0 \leq \lambda_{lj} < 1$  for  $l = 1, \dots, n$ . So the expressions given in (3.1) make sense. Denoting by  $L$ ,  $M$ , and  $R$  the matrices on the left-hand side, in the middle, and on the right-hand side of (3.1), respectively, we get

$$\begin{aligned} S^{-1}LS &= \text{diag} \left( \dots, \alpha \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{1 - \lambda_{lj}^a}, \dots \right), & S^{-1}MS &= \text{diag} \left( \dots, \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{1 - \lambda_{lj}} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{1 + \lambda_{lj}}, \dots \right), \\ S^{-1}RS &= \text{diag} \left( \dots, \beta \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_j}{1 - \lambda_{lj}^b}, \dots \right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Applying Theorem 2.1 we obtain  $S^{-1}LS \leq S^{-1}MS \leq S^{-1}RS$ , and hence  $L \leq M \leq R$ .

Next, we suppose that (3.1) holds for all families of commuting Hermitian matrices  $P_1, \dots, P_n$ , satisfying  $0 \leq P_j < I$ . We proceed in analogy with the proof of Theorem 2.1: put  $P_1 = \dots = P_n = \text{diag}(p, \dots, p)$  with  $p \in (0, 1)$ . Then the left-hand side of (3.1) leads to an inequality for scalar matrices (i.e., multiples of the identity  $I$ ), namely,

$$\alpha \frac{1}{1 - p^a} I \leq \frac{1}{1 - p} I \cdot \frac{1}{1 + p} I. \tag{3.4}$$

Considering a pair of corresponding diagonal entries we conclude that this inequality is equivalent to (2.15). Tending with  $p$  to 0 and 1, respectively, we get  $\alpha \leq \min(1, a/2)$ . Next, let  $w = w_k$ , where  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . We set  $P_j = 0$  for  $j \neq k$  and  $P_k = pI$ . Then the right-hand side of (3.1) yields

$$((1 - w)I + (w/(1 - p))I) \cdot ((1 - w)I + (w/(1 + p))I) \leq \beta((1 - w)I + (w/(1 - p^b))I). \tag{3.5}$$

Again, this is an inequality for scalar matrices and it suffices to consider diagonal entries. This leads to (2.16). We let  $p$  tend to 0 and 1, respectively, and obtain the second of the inequalities (3.2).  $\square$

## References

- [1] H. Alzer and A. Kovačec, *The inequality of Milne and its converse*, Journal of Inequalities and Applications 7 (2002), no. 4, 603–611.
- [2] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985.
- [3] ———, *Topics in Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.
- [4] E. B. Leach and M. C. Sholander, *Extended mean values*, The American Mathematical Monthly 85 (1978), no. 2, 84–90.
- [5] ———, *Extended mean values. II*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications 92 (1983), no. 1, 207–223.
- [6] ———, *Multi-variable extended mean values*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications 104 (1984), no. 2, 390–407.

- [7] E. A. Milne, *Note on Rosseland's integral for the stellar absorption coefficient*, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society **85** (1925), 979–984.
- [8] C. R. Rao, *Statistical proofs of some matrix inequalities*, Linear Algebra and its Applications **321** (2000), no. 1-3, 307–320.

Horst Alzer: Morsbacher Street 10, 51545 Waldbröl, Germany  
*E-mail address:* alzerhorst@freenet.de

Alexander Kovačec: Departamento de Matemática, Universidade de Coimbra, 3001-454 Coimbra, Portugal  
*E-mail address:* kovacec@mat.uc.pt