



A Converse to Cauchy's Inequality

Author(s): D. Zagier

Source: *The American Mathematical Monthly*, Vol. 102, No. 10 (Dec., 1995), pp. 919-920

Published by: [Mathematical Association of America](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2975271>

Accessed: 19/05/2011 11:38

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. 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 <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=maa>.

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.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Mathematical Association of America is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Mathematical Monthly*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

A Converse to Cauchy's Inequality

D. Zagier

Denote by \mathfrak{M} the set of monotone decreasing functions $f: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ for which $I(f) = \int_0^\infty f(x) dx$ converges. For $f, g \in \mathfrak{M}$ the scalar product $(f, g) = I(fg)$ converges, and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the inequalities $0 \leq f(x) \leq 1$ imply the estimate

$$(f, g) \leq \min(I(f), I(g), (f, f)^{1/2}(g, g)^{1/2}) \quad (f, g \in \mathfrak{M}). \quad (1)$$

An inequality for (f, g) in terms of the same data but in the other direction, namely

$$(f, g) \geq \frac{(f, f)(g, g)}{\max(I(f), I(g))} \quad (f, g \in \mathfrak{M}), \quad (2)$$

was proved in an earlier article with the same title (up to translation) by a trick involving a quadruple integral [2]. We give here a more general result with a much simpler proof.

Theorem. *Let f and g be monotone decreasing nonnegative functions on $[0, \infty)$. Then*

$$(f, g) \geq \frac{(f, F)(g, G)}{\max(I(F), I(G))} \quad (3)$$

for any integrable (but not necessarily monotone) functions $F, G: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$.

Proof: For all $x \geq 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (f, F) &= I(F)f(x) + \int_0^\infty [f(t) - f(x)]F(t) dt \\ &\leq I(F)f(x) + \int_0^x [f(t) - f(x)] dt, \end{aligned}$$

and hence, since $\int_0^x G(t) dt$ is bounded from above by both x and $I(G)$,

$$\begin{aligned} (f, F) \int_0^x G(t) dt &\leq I(F)xf(x) + I(G) \int_0^x [f(t) - f(x)] dt \\ &\leq \max(I(F), I(G)) \int_0^x f(t) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Now multiply by $-dg(x)$ and integrate by parts from 0 to ∞ . The left-hand side gives $(f, F)(g, G)$, the right-hand side gives $\max(I(F), I(G))(f, g)$, and the inequality remains true because the measure $-dg(x)$ is nonnegative. ■

Remarks. 1. Another proof of (3) can be obtained as follows. It is geometrically clear (and easily proved) that for f monotone decreasing the largest value of (f, F) as F ranges over integrable functions $[0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with a given value of $I(F)$ is attained by taking F to be "as far left as possible," i.e., equal to 1 for $0 \leq x \leq I(F)$ and to 0 otherwise. Therefore the maximum of $(f, F)(g, G)/A$ as F and G range

over functions $[0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with $\max(I(F), I(G)) \leq A$ is equal to $A^{(-1)} \int_0^A f(x) dx \cdot \int_0^A g(x) dx$, and this is $\leq (f, g)$ because the average of the product of two decreasing functions on an interval is at least equal to the product of their averages.

2. A further generalization of (2) is the inequality

$$W(fg) \geq \frac{W(fF)W(gG)}{\max(W(F), W(G))}$$

valid for any positive linear functional $W(f) = \int_0^\infty f(x)w(x) dx$ ($w(x) > 0$), monotone decreasing functions f and g , and functions $F, G: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with $W(F)$ and $W(G)$ finite. To prove it, apply (3) to the functions $f \circ \nu$, $g \circ \nu$, $F \circ \nu$ and $G \circ \nu$, where $\nu(x) = \int_0^x w(x') dx'$. The case $F = f$, $G = g$ is the weighted generalization of (2) proved in [1].

3. As pointed out in [1], both bounds (1) and (2) are best possible in terms of the four parameters $I(f)$, (f, f) , $I(g)$, and (g, g) . The bound (2) cannot be attained for generic values of these parameters but can be approached arbitrarily closely by taking f and g to be step functions with only two non-zero values (i.e. equal to 1 for $x \leq x_0$, to C for $x_0 < x \leq x_1$, and to 0 for $x > x_1$, where $0 < x_0 < x_1$ and $0 < C < 1$). Such functions with given values of $I(f)$ and (f, f) form a one-parameter family (the numbers x_0, x_1 and C determine each other). If $I(g) \leq I(f)$ and we let f move to the left ($x_0 \rightarrow 0$) and g to the right ($C \rightarrow 0$) in their respective families, then $\int_0^\infty f(x)g(x) dx$ tends to $(f, f)(g, g)/I(f)$.

4. Monotone decreasing functions $f: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ can be interpreted as the integrals of probability measures ($f(x) = \int_x^\infty d\mu$ where $d\mu$ is a nonnegative measure with integral 1). Hence (2) can be interpreted as a statement about correlations of statistical distributions. One such result, which was the original motivation for the inequality, is an estimate of the possible values of the ‘‘Gini coefficient’’ for a population consisting of two sub-populations, when the size, average income, and Gini coefficients of each of these is given [3]. (The Gini coefficient is a measure of the inequity of distributions of income in a large population which is used widely in mathematical economics.) Since the inequalities (2) and (3) are very general, they should have other applications, perhaps also in pure mathematics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. I would like to thank Joop Kolk for encouragement and helpful conversations, and the students of Analyse C for their interest and patience.

REFERENCES

1. J. V. Pečarić, *A weighted version of Zagier's inequality*, Nieuw Archief voor Wiskunde **12** (1994), 125–127.
2. D. Zagier, *Een ongelijkheid tegengesteld aan die van Cauchy*, Proc. Nederl. Akad. Wet. **80** (1977), 349–351.
3. D. Zagier, *Inequalities for the Gini coefficient of composite populations*, J. Math. Economics **12** (1983), 103–118.

*Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik
Gottfried-Claren-Straße 26
D-53225 Bonn, GERMANY
and
Faculteit Wiskunde
Universiteit Utrecht
Budapestlaan 6
3508 TA Utrecht, NETHERLANDS*