Pacific Journal of Mathematics

REARRANGEMENT INEQUALITIES INVOLVING CONVEX FUNCTIONS

DAVID LONDON

Vol. 34, No. 3

July 1970

REARRANGEMENT INEQUALITIES INVOLVING CONVEX FUNCTIONS

DAVID LONDON

Let $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ be *n*-tuples of non-negative numbers. Then

(1)
$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} (a'_i + b'_i) \leq \prod_{i=1}^{n} (a_i + b'_i) \leq \prod_{i=1}^{n} (a^*_i + b'_i)$$

and

(2)
$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^* b_i' \leq \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i' \leq \sum_{i=1}^n a_i' b_i'.$$

 $a' = (a'_i, \dots, a'_n)$ and $a^* = (a^*_1, \dots, a^*_n)$ are respectively the rearrangement of a in a nondecreasing or nonincreasing order. (1) was recently found by Minc and (2) is well known. In this note we show that these inequalities are special cases of rearrangement inequalities valid for functions having some convex properties.

Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be an *n*-tuple of real numbers. We denote by $x^* = (x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*)$ the *n*-tuple *x* rearranged in a nonincreasing order $x_1^* \ge x_2^* \ge \dots \ge x_n^*$, and we denote by $x' = (x'_1, \dots, x'_n)$ the same *n*-tuple rearranged in a nondecreasing order $x'_1 \le x'_2 \le \dots \le x'_n$.

Recently Minc [2] proved that if $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ are real *n*-tuples such that $a_i, b_i \ge 0, i = 1, \dots, n$, then

(1)
$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} (a'_i + b'_i) \leq \prod_{i=1}^{n} (a_i + b'_i) \leq \prod_{i=1}^{n} (a^*_i + b'_i) .$$

If $a_i > 0$ and $b_i \ge 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, then (1) is equivalent to

$$(1)' \qquad \sum_{i=1}^n \log\left(1+rac{b'_i}{a'_i}
ight) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \log\left(1+rac{b'_i}{a_i}
ight) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \log\left(1+rac{b'_i}{a^*_i}
ight).$$

(see also [4, Theorem 2] and [5]).

It is well known [1, Th. 368] that if $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ are real *n*-tuples, then

$$(\ 2\) \qquad \qquad \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^* b_i' \leqq \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i' \leqq \sum_{i=1}^n a_i' b_i' \; .$$

If $a_i > 0$ and $b_i \ge 0, i = 1, \dots, n$, then (2) is obviously equivalent to

$$(2)' \qquad \qquad \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{b_i'}{a_i'}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{b_i'}{a_i}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{b_i'}{a_i^*}\right).$$

In the present note we generalize (1)' and (2)' for more general

functions. An inequality analogue to (1)' is proved for functions f(x) such that $f(e^x)$ is convex (Theorem 1), and an inequality analogue to (2)' is proved for convex functions f(x) (Theorem 2).

In our proof we use the following theorem of Mirsky [3]: Given two *n*-tuples $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ such that $x_i \ge 0$ and $y_i \ge 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. If

$$\sum\limits_{i=1}^k y_i^* \leq \sum\limits_{i=1}^k x_i^*$$
 , $k=1,\,\cdots,\,n$,

then y lies in the convex hull of the set of vectors $(\delta_1 x_{\tau(1)}, \dots, \delta_n x_{\tau(n)})$, where each δ_i takes the values 0 or 1 and τ ranges over all permutations of $(1, \dots, n)$.

2. Two rearrangement inequalities.

THEOREM 1. Let $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ be n-tuples satisfying $a_i > 0$ and $b_i \ge 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let f(x) be a real valued function defined for $x \ge 1$ such that $F(x) = f(e^x)$ is convex for $x \ge 0$ and $f(1) \le f(x)$ for $x \ge 1$. Then

(3)
$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} f\left(1 + \frac{b'_i}{a'_i}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} f\left(1 + \frac{b'_i}{a_i}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} f\left(1 + \frac{b'_i}{a_i^*}\right).$$

If F(x) is strictly convex, then equality in the right inequality of (3) holds if and only if $b'/a^* = (b'_1/a^*_1, \dots, b'_n/a^*_n)$ is a rearrangement of $b'/a = (b'_1/a_1, \dots, b'_n/b_n)$, and equality in the left inequality of (3) holds if and only if $b'/a' = (b'_1/a'_1, \dots, b'_n/a'_n)$ is a rearrangement of b'/a.

Proof. We first prove the theorem for n = 2. In this case the theorem becomes: Let $0 < a_1 \leq a_2$ and $0 \leq b_1 \leq b_2$. Then

$$(4) f\Big(1+\frac{b_1}{a_1}\Big)+f\Big(1+\frac{b_2}{a_2}\Big) \leq f\Big(1+\frac{b_1}{a_2}\Big)+f\Big(1+\frac{b_2}{a_1}\Big).$$

If F(x) is strictly convex, then equality in (4) holds if and only if $a_1 = a_2$ or $b_1 = b_2$.

Denote

$$1+rac{b_1}{a_1}=u_1,\;\;1+rac{b_2}{a_2}=u_2,\,1+rac{b_2}{a_1}=v_1,\,1+rac{b_1}{a_2}=v_2$$
 .

We have,

$$(5) 1 \leq u_1 \leq v_1, \ 1 \leq u_2 \leq v_1.$$

By (1) for n = 2, or directly, we obtain

$$(6) \qquad u_1 u_2 = \left(1 + \frac{b_1}{a_1}\right) \left(1 + \frac{b_2}{a_2}\right) = \frac{(a_1 + b_1)(a_2 + b_2)}{a_1 a_2} \\ \leq \frac{(a_1 + b_2)(a_2 + b_1)}{a_1 a_2} = \left(1 + \frac{b_2}{a_1}\right) \left(1 + \frac{b_1}{a_2}\right) = v_1 v_2 \ .$$

Denote

(7)
$$\log u_i = \widetilde{u}_i, \log v_i = \widetilde{v}_i, \qquad i = 1, 2.$$

From (5), (6) and (7) it follows that

(8)
$$\begin{cases} \widetilde{u}_1 \leq \widetilde{v}_1, & \widetilde{u}_2 \leq \widetilde{v}_1, \\ \widetilde{u}_1 + \widetilde{u}_2 \leq \widetilde{v}_1 + \widetilde{v}_2. \end{cases}$$

By the theorem of Mirsky stated above, it follows from (8) that $\tilde{u} = (\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2)$ lies in the convex hull of the set of vectors $(\delta_1 \tilde{v}_{\tau(1)}, \delta_2 \tilde{v}_{\tau(2)})$, where δ_1 and δ_2 take the values 0 or 1 and τ is a permutation of (1, 2). As $F(x) = f(e^x)$ is convex for $x \ge 0$, $F(x_1) + F(x_2)$ is convex in the quadrant $x_1 \ge 0$, $x_2 \ge 0$ and thus obtains its maximum in the above convex hull on one of its vertices. Hence,

$$egin{aligned} &f\Big(1+rac{b_1}{a_1}\Big)+f\Big(1+rac{b_2}{a_2}\Big)=f(u_1)+f(u_2)=F(\widetilde{u}_1)+F(\widetilde{u}_2)\ &\leq\max\left\{F(\delta_1\widetilde{v}_{ au(1)})+F(\delta_2\widetilde{v}_{ au(2)})
ight\}\leq F(\widetilde{v}_1)+F(\widetilde{v}_2)\ &=f(v_1)+f(v_2)=f\Big(1+rac{b_1}{a_2}\Big)+f\Big(1+rac{b_2}{a_1}\Big)\ . \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the fact that $F(0) \leq F(x)$ for $x \geq 0$. (4) is thus proved.

It is obvious that if $a_1 = a_2$ or $b_1 = b_2$ then equality holds in (4). We have to show that if F(x) is strictly convex and if

$$(9) \qquad \qquad 0 < a_1 < a_2 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq b_1 < b_2$$

then the inequality in (4) is strict. As F(x) is strictly convex, it is enough to show that if (9) holds then \tilde{u} does not coincide with one of the vertices $(\delta_1 \tilde{v}_{\tau(1)}, \delta_2 \tilde{v}_{\tau(2)})$. From (9) follows $\tilde{u}_1 < \tilde{v}_1$ and $\tilde{u}_2 < \tilde{v}_1$. Therefore if $\tilde{u} = (\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2)$ is a vertex, then $\tilde{u}_1 = 0$ or $\tilde{u}_2 = 0$. But $b_2 > 0$. Hence, $\tilde{u}_1 = 0$ and $(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2)$ coincides with the vertex $(0, \tilde{v}_2)$. But from $\tilde{u}_2 = \tilde{v}_2$ it follows that $b_1 = b_2$, which contradicts (9).

The theorem for $n \ge 3$ follows now by induction on n as in [2]. We prove the right inequality of (3) together with its equality statement.

If $a_1 = a_1^*$ then the result, including the equality statement, follows by the induction.

Assume now that $a_1 = a_k^*$ and $a_l = a_1^*$, where $k, l \neq 1$. Using the proved result for n = 2 and the induction hypothesis for n - 1, we obtain

(10)

$$\begin{split} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f\left(1 + \frac{b'_{i}}{a_{i}}\right) &= f\left(1 + \frac{b'_{1}}{a_{k}^{*}}\right) + f\left(1 + \frac{b'_{i}}{a_{1}^{*}}\right) + \sum_{\substack{i=2\\i\neq l}}^{n} f\left(1 + \frac{b'_{i}}{a_{i}}\right) \\ &\leq f\left(1 + \frac{b'_{1}}{a_{1}^{*}}\right) + \left\{f\left(1 + \frac{b'_{l}}{a_{k}^{*}}\right) + \sum_{\substack{i=2\\i\neq l}}^{n} f\left(1 + \frac{b'_{i}}{a_{i}}\right)\right\} \\ &\leq f\left(1 + \frac{b'_{1}}{a_{1}^{*}}\right) + \sum_{i=2}^{n} f\left(1 + \frac{b'_{i}}{a_{1}^{*}}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} f\left(1 + \frac{b'_{i}}{a_{i}^{*}}\right), \end{split}$$

and the right inequality of (3) is proved.

If equality holds in the right inequality of (3), then equality holds in all the inequalities of (10). Hence, using the proved equality statement for n = 2 and the induction hypothesis for n - 1, it follows that

(11)
$$a_1^* = a_k^* = a_1 = a_l$$

 \mathbf{or}

$$(12) b_1' = b_l'$$

holds, and

(13)
$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{b'_2}{a_2^*}, \cdots, \frac{b'_n}{a_n^*} \end{pmatrix}$$
 is a rearrangement of
$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{b'_2}{a_2}, \cdots, \frac{b'_{l-1}}{a_{l-1}}, \frac{b'_l}{a_1}, \frac{b'_{l+1}}{a_{l+1}}, \cdots, \frac{b'_n}{a_n} \end{pmatrix}$$

Combining (11) or (12) with (13), it follows that b'/a^* is a rearrangement of b'/a, and the proof of the right inequality is completed.

The proof of the left inequality is similar.

For $f(x) = \log x$, (3) reduces to (1)'. We note that although F(x) = x is not strictly convex, the statement of equality appearing in (3) holds true for this case too. This follows from the fact that the general equality statement for $n \ge 3$ was derived only from its validity for n = 2, and for $f(x) = \log x$ it is easy to check directly that it holds for n = 2.

THEOREM 2. Let $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ be n-tuples satisfying $a_i > 0$ and $b_i \ge 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let f(x) be a real valued function defined and convex for $x \ge 0$ and satisfying $f(0) \le f(x)$ for $x \ge 0$. Then

(14)
$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} f\left(\frac{b'_i}{a'_i}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} f\left(\frac{b'_i}{a_i}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} f\left(\frac{b'_i}{a^*_i}\right).$$

If f(x) is strictly convex, then the same equality statement as in Theorem 1 holds.

Proof. For n = 2, (14) becomes: Let $0 < a_1 \leq a_2$ and $0 \leq b_1 \leq b_2$. Then

(15)
$$f\left(\frac{b_1}{a_1}\right) + f\left(\frac{b_2}{a_2}\right) \leq f\left(\frac{b_1}{a_2}\right) + f\left(\frac{b_2}{a_1}\right).$$

As before, we first prove the theorem for n = 2. Denote

$$rac{b_1}{a_1}=x_1, \ \ rac{b_2}{a_2}=x_2, \ \ rac{b_2}{a_1}=y_1, \ \ rac{b_1}{a_2}=y_2 \;.$$

Using (2) for n = 2, we obtain

(16)
$$\begin{cases} x_1 \leq y_1, & x_2 \leq y_1, \\ x_1 + x_2 \leq y_1 + y_2 \end{cases}$$

From (16) it follows that $x = (x_1, x_2)$ lies in the convex hull of the set of vectors $(\delta_1 y_{\tau(1)}, \delta_2 y_{\tau(2)})$.

From here on the proof proceeds very similar to the proof of Theorem 1, and we omit the details.

For f(x) = x, (14) reduces to (2)'. The equality statement of Theorem 1 holds, as before, also in this case, although f(x) is not strictly convex.

We bring an additional example. The function $f(x) = x \log (x + 1)$ is strictly convex for $x \ge 0$ and satisfies $f(0) \le f(x)$. Hence, applying Theorem 2, we obtain

(17)
$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{b'_i}{a'_i}\right) \log\left(1 + \frac{b'_i}{a_i}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{b'_i}{a_i}\right) \log\left(\frac{b'_i}{a_i} + 1\right) \\ \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{b'_i}{a^*_i}\right) \log\left(\frac{b'_i}{a^*_i} + 1\right)$$

or

$$(17)' \qquad \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{b'_i}{a'_i} + 1\right)^{b'_i/a'_i} \leq \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{b'_i}{a_i} + 1\right)^{b'_i/a_i} \leq \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{b'_i}{a^*_i} + 1\right)^{b'_i/a^*_i}.$$

References

- 1. G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, and G. Pólya, Inequalities, Cambridge, 1934.
- 2. H. Minc, Rearrangement inequalities (to appear).

3. L. Mirsky, On a convex set of matrices, Arch. der Math. 10 (1959), 88-92.

4. A. Oppenheim, Inequalities connected with definite hermitian forms, II, Amer. Math. Monthly, **61** (1954), 463-466.

5. H. D. Ruderman, Two new inequalities, Amer. Math. Monthly, 59 (1952), 29-32.

Received February 26, 1970.

TECHNION, ISRAEL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY HAIFA, ISRAEL

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

H. SAMELSON Stanford University Stanford, California 94305 J. DUGUNDJI Department of Mathematics University of Southern California Los Angeles, California 90007

RICHARD ARENS

University of California Los Angeles, California 90024

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

B. H. NEUMANN

F. WOLE

K. YOSHIDA

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF OREGON OSAKA UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

STANFORD UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO UNIVERSITY OF UTAH WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY CHEVRON RESEARCH CORPORATION

TRW SYSTEMS NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal. but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its content or policies.

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the Pacific Journal of Mathematics should be in typed form or offset-reproduced, (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. The editorial "we" must not be used in the synopsis, and items of the bibliography should not be cited there unless absolutely necessary, in which case they must be identified by author and Journal. rather than by item number. Manuscripts, in duplicate if possible, may be sent to any one of the four editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Rev. Index to Vol. 39. All other communications to the editors should be addressed to the managing editor, Richard Arens, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

50 reprints are provided free for each article; additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The Pacific Journal of Mathematics is published monthly. Effective with Volume 16 the price per volume (3 numbers) is \$8.00; single issues, \$3.00. Special price for current issues to individual faculty members of supporting institutions and to individual members of the American Mathematical Society: \$4.00 per volume; single issues \$1.50. Back numbers are available.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley, California, 94708.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.), 7-17, Fujimi 2-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

RICHARD PIERCE

University of Washington Seattle, Washington 98105

Pacific Journal of Mathematics Vol. 34, No. 3 July, 1970

Richard Hindman Bouldin, <i>The peturbation of the singular spectrum</i> Hugh D. Brunk and Søren Glud Johansen, <i>A generalized Radon-Nikodym</i>	569
<i>derivative</i>	282
with inductive and projective topologies	619
Esmond Ernest Devun, Special semigroups on the two-cell	639
Murray Eisenberg and James Howard Hedlund, <i>Expansive automorphisms</i>	007
of Banach spaces	647
Frances F. Gulick, Actions of functions in Banach algebras	657
Douglas Harris, <i>Regular-closed spaces and proximities</i>	675
Norman Lloyd Johnson, <i>Derivable semi-translation planes</i>	687
Donald E. Knuth, Permutations, matrices, and generalized Young	
tableaux	709
Herbert Frederick Kreimer, Jr., On the Galois theory of separable	
algebras	729
You-Feng Lin and David Alon Rose, Ascoli's theorem for spaces of	
multifunctions	741
David London, <i>Rearrangement inequalities involving convex functions</i>	749
Louis Pigno, A multiplier theorem	755
Helga Schirmer, Coincidences and fixed points of multifunctions into	
trees	759
Richard A. Scoville, <i>Some measure algebras on the integers</i>	769
Ralph Edwin Showalter, Local regularity of solutions of Sobolev-Galpern	
partial differential equations	781
Allan John Sieradski, <i>Twisted self-homotopy equivalences</i>	789
John H. Smith, On S-units almost generated by S-units of subfields	803
Masamichi Takesaki, Algebraic equivalence of locally normal	
representations	807
Joseph Earl Valentine, An analogue of Ptolemy's theorem and its converse in	
hyperbolic geometry	817
David Lawrence Winter, Solvability of certain p-solvable linear groups of	
finite order	827