# A NOTE ON A PAPER BY S. HABER

## A. McD. MERCER

Department of Mathematics and Statistics University of Guelph Guelph, Ontario, Canada NIG 2W1

(Received September 23, 1982 and in revised form February 26, 1983)

ABSTRACT. A technique used by S. Haber to prove an elementary inequality is applied here to obtain a more general inequality for convex sequences.

KEY WORDS AND PHRASES. Convex sequences, Hadamard's inequality for convex functions, rearrangements.

1980 MATHEMATICS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION CODE. Primary 26D15, Secondary 40G05.

#### 1. INTRODUCTION.

Let a and b be non-negative. Then the following elementary inequality was proved in [1].

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \left[ a^{n} + a^{n-1} b + \ldots + b^{n} \right] \ge \left( \frac{a+b}{2} \right)^{n} \quad (n=0,1,2,\ldots) \dots$$
 (1.1)

Now this inequality can be obtained at once by taking  $f(t) = t^n$  in the well-known result

$$\frac{1}{b-a} \int_{a}^{b} f(t)dt \ge f(\frac{a+b}{2}) \quad \dots \qquad (1.2)$$

which holds whenever f is convex in [a,b]. However, the method used in [1] to obtain (1.1) is interesting and it is the purpose of the present note to show that it can be used to prove a considerably more general result about sequences. Indeed this more general result will have (1.2) as a consequence.

### 2. MAIN RESULTS.

A lemma which we shall use is the following LEMMA. If

$$\beta_0 \geq \beta_1 \geq \beta_2 \geq \cdots \geq \beta_m$$

and

$$\sum_{\nu=0}^{m} \alpha_{\nu} = 0$$

and if the ordering of the  $\alpha_{_{\rm V}}$  is such that each positive  $\,\alpha\,$  precedes all the negative ones, then

$$\sum_{\nu=0}^{m} \alpha_{\nu} \beta_{\nu} \geq 0.$$

This lemma, which is easily proved, is not the one stated by Haber but, essentially, it is what he used. For with  $b_{i}$  defined as in [1]

$$(i = 0 \ 1 \ 2, \ \dots, \ \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$$
: n even)

we do not in fact have

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\mathbf{n}}{2} \\ \Sigma \\ \mathbf{i}=0 \end{bmatrix} = 0$$

which is what is needed to apply the lemma quoted there.

Our result is the following.

THEOREM. Let  $\{u_{v}\}_{v=0}^{n}$  be a convex sequence. Then

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{\nu=0}^{n} u_{\nu} \geq \frac{1}{2^{n}} \sum_{\nu=0}^{n} {n \choose \nu} u_{\nu} \dots \qquad (2.1)$$

To see that (1.2) is a consequence of (2.1) let the function f(x) be bounded and convex (and hence continuous) on [a,b] and take

$$u_{v} = f(a + \frac{v}{n} (b-a))$$

Then (2.1) reads

$$\frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{n=0}^{n} f(a + \frac{\nu}{n} (b-a)) \ge \frac{1}{2^{n}} \sum_{\nu=0}^{n} {n \choose \nu} f(a + \frac{\nu}{n} (b-a))...$$
(2.2)

On letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$  the left-hand side here tends to the left-hand side of (1.2). And by virtue of Bernstein's result

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{\nu=0}^{n} {n \choose \nu} \phi \left(\frac{\nu}{n} \times^{\nu} (1-x)^{n-\nu} = \phi(x) \dots \right)$$
(2.3)

whenever  $\phi \in C[0,1]$  we see that the right-hand side of (2.2) tends to  $f(\frac{a+b}{2})$ . Merely take  $\phi(x) = f(a + x(b-a))$  and x = 1/2 in (2.3).

We now proceed to prove (2.1) .

**PROOF.** Following Haber let us put  $Q = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$  and write

$$\begin{array}{c} Q \\ \Sigma \\ \nu=0 \end{array}^{*} \gamma_{\nu} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 + \dots + \gamma_Q \quad \text{if $n$ is odd} \\ \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 + \dots + \gamma_{Q-1} + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_Q \quad \text{if $n$ is even} \end{array} \right.$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{n+1}\sum_{\nu=0}^{n} u_{\nu} - \frac{1}{2^{n}}\sum_{\nu=0}^{n} {n \choose \nu} u_{\nu} = \sum_{\nu=0}^{Q} c_{\nu} [u_{\nu} + u_{n-\nu}]$$

where

$$c_v = \frac{1}{n+1} - \frac{1}{2^n} {n \choose v}$$

Since  $\{u_v\}_v^n = 0$  is convex then

$$u_{\nu+1} + u_{n-\nu-1} \le u_{\nu} + u_{n-\nu}$$
,  $(0 \le \nu \le Q-1)$ 

which is to say that the sequence  $\{u_v + u_{n-v}\}_v^Q = 0$  is non-increasing. We see too that the sequence  $\{c_v\}_v^Q = 0$  is non-increasing and that  $\sum_{\lambda=0}^{Q*} c_{\lambda} = 0$ . Appealing to the Lemma quoted above we find that v=0

$$\sum_{\nu=0}^{Q} c_{\nu} [u_{\nu} + u_{n-\nu}] \ge 0$$

and this complets the proof of (2.1).

In conclusion I wish to thank the referee for his helpful advice concerning the lemma used here.

#### REFERENCES

 HABER, S. An Elementary Inequality, <u>Internat. J. Math. and Math. Sci. Vol. 2</u> No. 3 (1979) 531-535.

2. HARDY, G.H., LITTLEWOOD, J.E., POLYA, G., Inequalities Cambridge (1973).