

GENERALIZATION OF AN INEQUALITY OF ALZER
FOR NEGATIVE POWERS

CHAO-PING CHEN AND FENG QI

Abstract. Let $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a positive, strictly increasing, and logarithmically concave sequence satisfying $(a_{n+1}/a_n)^n < (a_{n+2}/a_{n+1})^{n+1}$. Then we have

$$\frac{a_n}{a_{n+m}} < \left(\frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^r}{\frac{1}{n+m} \sum_{i=1}^{n+m} a_i^r} \right)^{1/r},$$

where n, m are natural numbers and r is a positive real number. The lower bound is the best possible. This generalizes an inequality of Alzer for negative powers.

1. Introduction

When studying a problem on upper bound for permanents of $(0, 1)$ -matrices, in 1964 H. Minc and L. Sathre [5] discovered several noteworthy inequalities involving $(n!)^{1/n}$. One of them is the following: If n is a positive integer, then

$$\frac{n}{n+1} < \frac{\sqrt[n]{n!}}{\sqrt[n+1]{(n+1)!}} < 1. \tag{1}$$

By investigating a problem on Lorentz sequence spaces, in 1988 J. S. Martins [4] published another lower bound for $\sqrt[n]{n!}/\sqrt[n+1]{(n+1)!}$: Let r be a positive real number and let n be a natural number, then

$$\left(\frac{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n i^r}{\frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} i^r} \right)^{1/r} \leq \frac{\sqrt[n]{n!}}{\sqrt[n+1]{(n+1)!}}. \tag{2}$$

Received February 10, 2004; revised April 15, 2004.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 26D15.

Key words and phrases. Alzer's inequality, logarithmically concave sequence, mathematical induction.

The authors were supported in part by NSF (#10001016) of China, SF for the Prominent Youth of Henan Province (#0112000200), SF of Henan Innovation Talents at Universities, Doctor Fund of Jiaozuo Institute of Technology, CHINA.

In 1993 H. Alzer [1] compared the lower bounds of (1) and (2), and established the following result: Let n be a positive integer, then for any positive real number r ,

$$\frac{n}{n+1} \leq \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n i^r / \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} i^r \right)^{1/r}. \quad (3)$$

The proof given by Alzer is remarkable, but it is quite long and complicated. Several easy proofs of (3) have been published by different authors, see [2, 7, 8], and these proofs show that in fact (3) holds with strictly inequality. By mathematical induction and Cauchy's mean-value theorem, F. Qi [6] generalized the inequality (3) and showed that: Let n and m be natural numbers, k a nonnegative integer, then

$$\frac{n+k}{n+m+k} < \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=k+1}^{n+k} i^r / \frac{1}{n+m} \sum_{i=k+1}^{n+m+k} i^r \right)^{1/r}, \quad (4)$$

where r is any given positive real number. The lower bound is the best possible. In fact, (4) is essentially equivalent to

$$\frac{n}{n+m} < \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n i^r / \frac{1}{n+m} \sum_{i=1}^{n+m} i^r \right)^{1/r}. \quad (5)$$

In this paper, the inequalities (3) and (5) are further generalized as follows.

Theorem. Let $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a positive and strictly increasing sequence satisfying

$$\frac{a_n}{a_{n+1}} \leq \frac{a_{n+1}}{a_{n+2}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\} \quad (6)$$

and

$$\left(\frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n} \right)^n < \left(\frac{a_{n+2}}{a_{n+1}} \right)^{n+1}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (7)$$

Then we have

$$\frac{a_n}{a_{n+m}} < \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^r / \frac{1}{n+m} \sum_{i=1}^{n+m} a_i^r \right)^{1/r}, \quad (8)$$

where $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and r is a positive real number. The lower bound is the best possible.

Notice that if a positive sequence $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ satisfies the inequality (6), then we call it a logarithmically concave sequence.

Proof. The inequality (8) can be written as

$$\frac{1}{(n+m)a_{n+m}^r} \sum_{i=1}^{n+m} a_i^r < \frac{1}{na_n^r} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^r,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\frac{1}{(n+1)a_{n+1}^r} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} a_i^r < \frac{1}{na_n^r} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^r. \tag{9}$$

Since

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} a_i^r = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^r + a_{n+1}^r,$$

(9) reduces to

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^r > \frac{na_n^r a_{n+1}^r}{(n+1)a_{n+1}^r - na_n^r}. \tag{10}$$

It is easy to see that the inequality (10) holds for $n = 1$. Suppose that the inequality (10) holds for some $n = k (k \geq 1)$, that is

$$\sum_{i=1}^k a_i^r > \frac{ka_k^r a_{k+1}^r}{(k+1)a_{k+1}^r - ka_k^r}. \tag{11}$$

Adding a_{k+1}^r to the both sides of (11), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_i^r > \frac{(k+1)a_{k+1}^{2r}}{(k+1)a_{k+1}^r - ka_k^r}. \tag{12}$$

By mathematical induction, it remains to show that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_i^r > \frac{(k+1)a_{k+1}^r a_{k+2}^r}{(k+2)a_{k+2}^r - (k+1)a_{k+1}^r}. \tag{13}$$

From (12) and (13) it is sufficient to show that

$$\frac{(k+1)a_{k+1}^{2r}}{(k+1)a_{k+1}^r - ka_k^r} > \frac{(k+1)a_{k+1}^r a_{k+2}^r}{(k+2)a_{k+2}^r - (k+1)a_{k+1}^r},$$

which can be rearranged as

$$(k+1) \left(\frac{a_{k+1}}{a_{k+2}} \right)^r - k \left(\frac{a_k}{a_{k+1}} \right)^r < 1. \tag{14}$$

We define for $r > 0$

$$f(r) = (k+1) \left(\frac{a_{k+1}}{a_{k+2}} \right)^r - k \left(\frac{a_k}{a_{k+1}} \right)^r.$$

Differentiation yields

$$\begin{aligned} f'(r) &= (k+1) \left(\frac{a_{k+1}}{a_{k+2}} \right)^r \ln \left(\frac{a_{k+1}}{a_{k+2}} \right) - k \left(\frac{a_k}{a_{k+1}} \right)^r \ln \left(\frac{a_k}{a_{k+1}} \right) \\ &= - \left(\frac{a_{k+1}}{a_{k+2}} \right)^r \ln \left(\frac{a_{k+2}}{a_{k+1}} \right)^{k+1} + \left(\frac{a_k}{a_{k+1}} \right)^r \ln \left(\frac{a_{k+1}}{a_k} \right)^k. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$0 < \frac{a_k}{a_{k+1}} \leq \frac{a_{k+1}}{a_{k+2}}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N},$$

$$1 < \left(\frac{a_{k+1}}{a_k}\right)^k < \left(\frac{a_{k+2}}{a_{k+1}}\right)^{k+1}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

It is easy to see that

$$\left(\frac{a_k}{a_{k+1}}\right)^r \ln \left(\frac{a_{k+1}}{a_k}\right)^k < \left(\frac{a_{k+1}}{a_{k+2}}\right)^r \ln \left(\frac{a_{k+2}}{a_{k+1}}\right)^{k+1}$$

which implies that $f'(r) < 0$ and $f(r) < f(0) = 1$, and then (14) holds.

By L' Hospital rule, easy calculation produces

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^r / \frac{1}{n+m} \sum_{i=1}^{n+m} a_i^r \right)^{1/r} = \frac{a_n}{a_{n+m}},$$

thus, the lower bound given in (8) is the best possible. The proof is complete.

The authors [3] showed that (3) holds strictly for all natural numbers n and all real numbers r . Now we pose the following open problem.

Open Problem. What conditions does the sequence $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ satisfy such that (8) holds for all natural numbers n, m and all real numbers r ?

References

- [1] H. Alzer, *On an inequality of H. Minc and L. Sathre*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **179** (1993), 396-402.
- [2] Ch.-P. Chen and F. Qi, *Notes on proofs of Alzer's inequality*, Octagon Mathematical Magazine **11** (2003), 29-33.
- [3] Ch.-P. Chen and F. Qi, *Extension of H. Alzer's inequality for negative powers*, Tamkang Journal of Mathematics **36** (2005), 69-72.
- [4] J. S. Martins, *Arithmetic and geometric means, an application to Lorentz sequence spaces*, Math. Nachr. **139** (1988), 281-288.
- [5] H. Minc and L. Sathre, *Some inequalities involving $(r!)^{1/r}$* , Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. **14** (1964/65), 41-46.
- [6] F. Qi, *Generalization of H. Alzer's inequality*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **240** (1999), 294-297.
- [7] J. Sándor, *On an inequality of Alzer*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **192** (1995), 1034-1035.
- [8] J. S. Ume, *An elementary proof of H. Alzer's inequality*, Math. Japon. **44** (1996), 521-522.

Department of Applied Mathematics and Informatics, Henan Polytechnic University, Jiaozuo City, Henan 454010, CHINA.

E-mail: chenchao ping@sohu.com

Department of Applied Mathematics and Informatics, Henan Polytechnic University, Jiaozuo City, Henan 454010, CHINA.

E-mail: qifeng@jz it.edu.cn