

REAL ANALYSIS  
INEQUALITIES

**The Inequality of Arithmetic and Geometric Means** Given  $x_1 \geq 0, x_2 \geq 0, \dots, x_n \geq 0$

$$A = \frac{x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n}{n} \quad G = (x_1 x_2 \dots x_n)^{\frac{1}{n}}$$

Then  $G < A$  unless  $x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_n$ , when  $G = A$ .

**Proof** Suppose without loss of generality that  $x_1$  is a maximal  $x_\nu$  and  $x_2$  is a minimal  $x_\nu$ .

If  $x_1 = x_2$  the  $x_r$ 's are all equal and there is nothing to prove.

Suppose then that  $x_1 > x_2$ . We form a new set of numbers  $x_{11}, x_{21}, \dots, x_{n1}$  by writing

$$x_{11} = A, \quad x_{21} = -A + x_1 + x_2, \quad x_{r1} = x_r \quad r = 3, \dots, n.$$

Let  $A_1, G_1$  be the A.M and G.M of the  $x_{r1}$ 's.

$A_1 = A$  since  $x_{11} + x_{21} = x_1 + x_2$ .

However

$$\begin{aligned} x_{11}x_{21} - x_1x_2 &= A(x_1 + x_2 - A) - x_1x_2 \\ &= (x_1 - A)(A - x_2) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

since  $x_1 > A > x_2$ .

Therefore  $G_1 > G$

If the  $x_{\nu 1}$  are not all equal we can again take a largest  $x_{\alpha 1}$  and a smallest  $x_{\beta 1}$  and replace them by  $A, x_{\alpha 1} + x_{\beta 1} - A$ .

$A_2 = A_1, G_2 > G_1$

After at most  $n - 1$  steps all the  $x$ 's are equal.

$G < G_1 < \dots < G_K = A_k = A$  therefore  $G < A$ .

**Cauchy's Inequalities** Given  $x_1 \dots x_n, y_1 \dots y_n$  real.

Then

$$\sum_{r=1}^n x_r y_r \leq \left( \sum_{r=1}^n a_r^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \sum_{r=1}^n y_r^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

with equality  $\Leftrightarrow$  the two sets are proportional i.e.  $\Leftrightarrow \exists (\lambda, \mu) \neq (0,0) | \lambda x_r + \mu y_r = 0 \ (r = 1, 2, \dots, n)$

**Proof** Consider the quadratic form  $Q(\lambda, \mu)$  defined by

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\lambda, \mu) &= \sum_{r=1}^n (\lambda x_r + \mu y_r)^2 \\ &= \lambda^2 \sum_{r=1}^n x_r^2 + 2\lambda\mu \left( \sum_{r=1}^n x_r y_r \right) + \mu^2 \sum_{r=1}^n y_r^2 \end{aligned}$$

If  $\exists \lambda, \mu \neq 0,0 | \lambda x_r + \mu y_r = 0 \ r = 1, 2, \dots, n$  then there is nothing to prove.

Suppose  $\nexists$  no such  $(\lambda, \mu)$ . Then  $Q(\lambda, \mu) > 0$  for every  $(\lambda, \mu) \neq (0,0)$ . Hence  $Q(\lambda, \mu)$  is positive definite so that

$$\left( \sum_{r=1}^n x_r y_r \right)^2 < \sum_{r=1}^n x_r^2 \sum_{r=1}^n y_r^2$$

using " $b^2 < 4ac$ ".

**Weighted Means** Given a set of non-negative numbers  $x_1 \dots x_n$  and a set of weights  $P$ , where we attach the weight  $P_r$  to  $x_r$ , each  $P > 0$ . The weighted means are

$$A_P = \frac{P_1 x_1 + \dots + P_n x_n}{P_1 + P_2 + \dots + P_n}$$

$$G_P = (x_1^{P_1} x_2^{P_2} \dots x_n^{P_n})^{\frac{1}{P_1 + P_2 + \dots + P_n}}$$

**Note** If the weights  $p_1 \dots p_n$  are replaced by  $tp_1 \dots tp_n$ , then  $A_p, G_p$  are unchanged. In particular if we take  $t = \frac{1}{P_1 + \dots + p_n}$  we get a set of weights  $Q : q_1 \dots q_n | q_1 + \dots + q_n = 1$ . Then  $G_P \leq A_P$  with equality  $\Leftrightarrow$  all the  $x$ 's are equal.

**Proof (i)** Result proved when  $P_j$  are all integers.

(ii) Result follows when  $P_j$  are commensurable; i.e. when  $\exists t > 0 | tP_1 \dots tP_n$  are all integers.

(iii) We have to deal with the case where the  $P$ 's are not commensurable.

Let  $q_1 \dots q_n$  be a set of weights  $|\sum q_j = 1$ .

Let  $Q (q_1 \dots q_n)$  be a point in  $R_n$ .

Take a set of rational points

$$P^r = (r_1 \dots r_n) \quad r_j > 0$$

where  $P^r \rightarrow Q$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ .

$G_{P^r} < A_{P^r}$  unless the  $x^\nu$  equal.

Letting  $r \rightarrow \infty$   $G_Q \leq A_Q$ .

We still have to prove strict inequality when the  $x$ 's are not all equal. Suppose then that the  $x$ 's are not all equal. Write

$$q_j = j'_j + q''_j \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

where  $q'_j > 0$   $q''_j > 0$   $q'_j$  is rational.

$$\begin{aligned} P' & : Q'_1 \dots q'_n & P'' & : q''_1 \dots q''_n \\ r' & = \sum q'_j & r'' & = \sum q''_j & r' + r'' & = 1 \end{aligned}$$

$G_{P'} < A_{P'}$  by (ii)  $G_{P''} \leq A_{P''}$

$$G_Q = (G_{P'})^{r'} (G_{P''})^{r''} \leq r' G_{P'} + r'' G_{P''} < r' A_{P'} + r'' A_{P''} = A_Q$$

using  $\sum q_j = 1$

**Hölder's Inequality** We have two sets of numbers

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 \dots x_n & \quad x_j \geq 0 \\ y_1 \dots y_n & \quad y_j \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

$\alpha, \beta$  are positive and  $\alpha + \beta = 1$ . Then

$$\sum_{\nu=1}^n x_\nu^\alpha y_\nu^\beta \leq \left( \sum_{\nu=1}^n x_\nu \right)^\alpha \left( \sum_{\nu=1}^n y_\nu \right)^\beta$$

with equality  $\Leftrightarrow$  the sets are proportional.

**Alternative Form** Suppose  $\lambda, \mu$  are positive and  $\frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{\mu} = 1$

$$\sum_{\nu=1}^n x_{\nu} y_{\nu} \leq \left( \sum_{\nu=1}^n x_{\nu}^{\lambda} \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}} \left( \sum_{\nu=1}^n y_{\nu}^{\mu} \right)^{\frac{1}{\mu}}$$

[This result above with  $\alpha, \beta$  replaced by  $\frac{1}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{\mu}$  and  $x_{\nu}^{\alpha}, x_{\nu}^{\beta}$  replaced by new variables  $x_{\nu}, y_{\nu}$ .]

This generalises to  $k$  sets and  $k$  numbers  $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_k = 1$ .

Cauchy's inequality follows with  $\lambda = \mu = 2$ .

**Proof** Write  $U = \sum_{\nu=1}^n x_{\nu}$   $V = \sum_{\nu=1}^n y_{\nu}$

Suppose  $UV > 0$  (nothing to prove otherwise).

$$\begin{aligned} U^{\alpha} V^{\beta} &= \sum_{\nu=1}^n x_{\nu}^{\alpha} y_{\nu}^{\beta} = \sum_{\nu=1}^n \left( \frac{x_{\nu}}{U} \right)^{\alpha} \left( \frac{y_{\nu}}{V} \right)^{\beta} \\ &\leq \sum_{\nu=1}^n \alpha \frac{x_{\nu}}{U} + \beta \frac{y_{\nu}}{V} = \alpha + \beta = 1 \end{aligned}$$

with equality  $\Leftrightarrow \frac{x_{\nu}}{U} = \frac{y_{\nu}}{V}$  for  $\nu = 1, 2, \dots, n$ .

These inequalities generalise to integrals.

Suppose  $f(x) \geq 0$   $g(x) \geq 0$  are continuous on  $[a, b]$

$$\int_a^b f(x)g(x) dx \leq \left( \int_a^b f^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \int_a^b g^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

This is known as Schwarz's inequality.

If  $\frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{\mu} = 1$   $\lambda > 0$   $\mu > 0$  then

$$\int_a^b f(x)g(x) dx \leq \left( \int_a^b f^{\lambda} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}} \left( \int_a^b g^{-\mu} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{\mu}}.$$

This is known as Hölder's inequality.