

An Unsettled Inequality: 10337

Horst Alzer; M. J. Pelling

The American Mathematical Monthly, Vol. 106, No. 10. (Dec., 1999), p. 970.

Stable URL:

http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002-9890%28199912%29106%3A10%3C970%3AAUI1%3E2.0.CO%3B2-9

The American Mathematical Monthly is currently published by Mathematical Association of America.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <u>http://www.jstor.org/journals/maa.html</u>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIVALS

An Unsettled Inequality

10337 [1993, 798; 1995, 659]. Proposed by Horst Alzer, Waldbröl, Germany. Let $n \ge 1$ be an integer. Let x_1, \ldots, x_n be real numbers with $x_i \in (0, 1/2]$. Consider the statement

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{x_i}{1 - x_i} \le \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^n}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (1 - x_i)^n}.$$
 (**F**_n)

(a) Prove \mathbf{F}_n for $n \leq 3$.

- (**b**) Show that \mathbf{F}_n is false for $n \ge 6$.
- (c)* What about \mathbf{F}_4 and \mathbf{F}_5 ?

Solution of part (c)* by M. J. Pelling, London, England. We show that \mathbf{F}_4 is true, with equality if and only if $x_1 = x_2 = x_3 = x_4$.

Write w, x, y, z for x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 , and write $\overline{w}, \overline{x}, \overline{y}, \overline{z}$ for 1 - w, 1 - x, 1 - y, 1 - z, respectively. Then \mathbf{F}_4 may be written in the equivalent form

$$\frac{w^4 + x^4 + y^4 + z^4}{wxyz} \ge \frac{\bar{w}^4 + \bar{x}^4 + \bar{y}^4 + \bar{z}^4}{\bar{w}\bar{x}\bar{y}\bar{z}}.$$
 (1)

Without loss of generality, suppose that $w \ge x \ge y \ge z$. Subtracting 4 from both sides of (1) and rearranging terms leads to

$$\frac{(w^2 - x^2)^2}{wxyz} + \frac{(y^2 - z^2)^2}{wxyz} + \frac{2(wx - yz)^2}{wxyz} \ge \frac{(\bar{w}^2 - \bar{x}^2)^2}{\bar{w}\bar{x}\bar{y}\bar{z}} + \frac{(\bar{y}^2 - \bar{z}^2)^2}{\bar{w}\bar{x}\bar{y}\bar{z}} + \frac{2(\bar{w}\bar{x} - \bar{y}\bar{z})^2}{\bar{w}\bar{x}\bar{y}\bar{z}}.$$
(2)

By repeated use of the elementary inequality

$$p + \frac{1}{p} \ge q + \frac{1}{q}$$
 whenever $p \ge q \ge 1$, (3)

we show that each term on the left of (2) is greater than or equal to the corresponding term on the right.

Since $w + x \le 1$, we have $w - x \ge w^2 - x^2$ or $w\bar{w} \ge x\bar{x}$. With p = w/x and $q = \bar{x}/\bar{w}$, we have $p \ge q \ge 1$, so

$$\frac{(w+x)^2}{wx} \ge \frac{(\bar{w}+\bar{x})^2}{\bar{w}\bar{x}}$$
(4)

by (3). Since $yz \le \bar{y}\bar{z}$ and $(w-x)^2 = (\bar{w}-\bar{x})^2$, (4) implies

$$\frac{(w^2 - x^2)^2}{wxyz} = \frac{(w+x)^2}{wx} \frac{(w-x)^2}{yz} \ge \frac{(\bar{w} + \bar{x})^2}{\bar{w}\bar{x}} \frac{(\bar{w} - \bar{x})^2}{\bar{y}\bar{z}} = \frac{(\bar{w}^2 - \bar{x}^2)^2}{\bar{w}\bar{x}\bar{y}\bar{z}}.$$
 (5)

The same reasoning proves

$$\frac{(y^2 - z^2)^2}{wxyz} \ge \frac{(\bar{y}^2 - \bar{z}^2)^2}{\bar{w}\bar{x}\bar{y}\bar{z}}.$$
(6)

Now let p = wx/(yz) and $q = \bar{y}\bar{z}/(\bar{w}\bar{x})$. Again $p \ge q \ge 1$, so (3) implies

$$\frac{2(wx - yz)^2}{wxyz} \ge \frac{2(\bar{w}\bar{x} - \bar{y}\bar{z})^2}{\bar{w}\bar{x}\bar{y}\bar{z}}.$$
(7)

Adding (5), (6), and (7) yields (2).

Since equality holds in (3) only when p = q, we have equality in \mathbf{F}_4 only if $w/x = \bar{x}/\bar{w}$, $y/z = \bar{z}/\bar{y}$, and $wx/(yz) = \bar{y}\bar{z}/(\bar{w}\bar{x})$, which forces w = x = y = z.

Editorial comment. Pelling also contributed a lengthy proof of \mathbf{F}_5 and showed that equality holds in \mathbf{F}_5 only when $x_1 = x_2 = x_3 = x_4 = x_5$.