SOME INEQUALITIES FOR HYPERGEOMETRIC FUNCTIONS¹

B. C. CARLSON

1. Introduction. The hypergeometric *R*-function, $R(a; b_1, \dots, b_n; x_1, \dots, x_n)$, has recently been shown [4] to have a close connection with the theory of elementary mean values. By exploiting this connection we shall arrive at inequalities which compare *R* with (combinations of) mean values of the form $(\sum w_i x_i^t)^{1/t}$, where the weights (w) are related to the *b*-parameters by $w_i = b_i / \sum b_i$, $(i = 1, \dots, n)$. Both the *b*-parameters and the arguments (x) are required to be positive, but the *a*-parameter may be any real number.

The inequalities in their general form (Theorem 2) subsume a wide variety of special results, including some inequalities for elementary transcendental functions and elliptic integrals, inequalities due to Watson [10] and Szegö [9] for a certain integral, and new inequalities for the Gaussian and confluent hypergeometric functions as well as Appell's function F_1 . New inequalities for the surface area and capacity of an ellipsoid in n dimensions are also included.

This work began from a conversation with Dr. G. D. Chakerian at a time when I was privileged to use the facilities of the Mathematics Department of the California Institute of Technology. I wish to thank also Mr. Malcolm D. Tobey for discussions of Theorem 1, which he first proved for restricted values of t by a method different from the one used here.

2. The inequalities. The *R*-function will be defined for present purposes by an integral representation,

(2.1)
$$R(a, b, x) = \int_{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} u_{i} x_{i} \right)^{-a} P(b, u') du',$$

where (b) and (x) stand for *n*-tuples of positive numbers, $(u') = (u_1, \dots, u_{n-1})$, and $du' = du_1 \dots du_{n-1}$. The domain of integration *E* is the set of points satisfying $u_i > 0$ $(i = 1, \dots, n-1)$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} u_i < 1$. Because we define $u_n \equiv 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} u_i$, the last condition is equivalently $u_n > 0$. The positive weight function

Received by the editors April 13, 1965.

¹ Research supported by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (under Grant NsG-293 to Iowa State University) and by the Ames Laboratory of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission.

$$P(b, u') = \frac{\Gamma(b_1 + \cdots + b_n)}{\Gamma(b_1) \cdots \Gamma(b_n)} \prod_{i=1}^n u_i^{b_i-1}, \qquad (u') \in E,$$

satisfies

$$\int_{E} P(b, u') \, du' = 1.$$

A homogeneous mean of the values (x) is constructed from the *R*-function in the following way. We define the parameter c, the positive weights (w), and the hypergeometric mean M(t, c) by

$$(2.2) c \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i,$$

(2.3)
$$w_i \equiv b_i/c, \quad (i = 1, \dots, n), \quad \left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i = 1\right),$$

$$(2.4) M(t, c; x, w) \equiv [R(-t, cw, x)]^{1/t}, (t \neq 0, c > 0).$$

If t=0 or c=0, the mean value is defined to be the limiting value of M(t, c) as $t\to 0$ or $c\to 0$. It is shown in [4] that

(2.5)
$$\lim_{c\to 0} M(t, c; x, w) = M_t(x, w),$$

where M_t is the mean of order t:

(2.6)
$$M_{t}(x, w) \equiv \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} x_{i}^{t}\right)^{1/t}, \qquad (t \neq 0),$$
$$M_{0}(x, w) \equiv \prod_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}^{w_{i}}.$$

We shall want several results taken from [4] which are valid for $c \ge 0$:

(2.7)
$$\begin{array}{l} M(s,\,c;\,x,\,w) < M(t,\,c;\,x,\,w) & \text{if } s < t \text{ and } \min(x) < \max(x); \\ M(1,\,c;\,x,\,w) = M_1(x,\,w), & M(-c,\,c;\,x,\,w) = M_0(x,\,w). \end{array}$$

By $\max(x)$ we denote the largest of the positive numbers x_1, \dots, x_n . In addition to (2.7) we shall want a new result:

THEOREM 1. If min(x) < max(x), the hypergeometric mean of the positive values (x) with positive weights (w) satisfies

(2.8)
$$\begin{aligned} M(t, c; x, w) &< M_t(x, w), \qquad (t > 1, c > 0), \\ M(t, c; x, w) &> M_t(x, w), \qquad (t < 1, c > 0). \end{aligned}$$

License or copyright restrictions may apply to redistribution; see https://www.ams.org/journal-terms-of-use

PROOF. By (2.1) and (2.4) we have

(2.9)
$$[M(t,c;x,w)]^t = \int_E \left(\sum_{i=1}^n u_i x_i\right)^t P(cw,u') du', \quad (c>0).$$

If $\min(x) < \max(x)$, then $(\sum u_i x_i)^t < \sum u_i x_i^t$ for t > 1 or t < 0, with reversed inequality for 0 < t < 1; this follows directly from the fact that $M_t(x, u)$ is a strictly increasing function of t. Using (2.9) and (2.7), we have

$$\int_{E} (\sum u_{i}x_{i}^{t})P(cw, u') du' = M(1, c; x^{t}, w) = M_{1}(x^{t}, w)$$
$$= \sum w_{i}x_{i}^{t} = [M_{i}(x, w)]^{t}.$$

The inequalities of Theorem 1 follow immediately provided that $t \neq 0$. If t=0 and c>0, the integral representation [4] of M(0, c) and the concavity of the logarithmic function show that

In preparation for the statement of Theorem 2, we define several quantities in terms of elementary mean values, assuming always that (b), c, and (w) are related by (2.2) and (2.3):

$$H(a, b, x) \equiv [M_{1}(x, w)]^{-a} = (\sum b_{i}x_{i}/c)^{-a},$$

$$J(a, b, x) \equiv [M_{-a}(x, w)]^{-a} = \sum b_{i}x_{i}^{-a}/c,$$

$$K(a, b, x) \equiv [M_{0}(x, w)]^{-a} = \prod x_{i}^{-ab_{i}/c},$$

$$J'(a, b, x) \equiv [M_{0}(x, w)]^{-c}[M_{c-a}(x, w)]^{c-a} = (\prod x_{i}^{-b_{i}})\sum b_{i}x_{i}^{c-a}/c,$$

$$H'(a, b, x) \equiv [M_{0}(x, w)]^{-c}[M_{-1}(x, w)]^{c-a}$$

$$= (\prod x_{i}^{-b_{i}})(\sum b_{i}x_{i}^{-1}/c)^{a-c}.$$

As implied by (2.7) and (2.20) below, there are several values of a for which the hypergeometric function R(a, b, x) takes a simple form:

(2.12)

$$R = M_{1} = H = J, \qquad (a = -1), \\
R = 1 = H = J = K, \qquad (a = 0), \\
R = M_{0}^{-c} = H' = J' = K, \qquad (a = c), \\
R = M_{0}^{-c} M_{-1}^{-1} = H' = J', \qquad (a = c + 1).$$

License or copyright restrictions may apply to redistribution; see https://www.ams.org/journal-terms-of-use

[February

Having disposed of these special values, we now state

THEOREM 2. If the arguments (x) and parameters (b) are all positive and if min(x) < max(x), the hypergeometric function R(a, b, x) and the elementary functions defined by (2.11) satisfy

PROOF. The main inequalities are those relating to R; all other parts of the theorem follow easily from the inequality $M_s < M_t$ if s < t. It is evident from (2.7) and (2.8) that

(2.18)
$$M_{1} < M(t, c) < M_{i}, \qquad (1 < t < \infty), \\ M_{i} < M(t, c) < M_{1}, \qquad (0 < t < 1), \\ M_{0} < M(t, c) < M_{1}, \qquad (-c < t < 0), \\ M_{i} < M(t, c), \qquad (-c - 1 < t < -c). \end{cases}$$

Several additions to this list could be made (for instance, the last inequality is valid also for $-\infty < t < -c-1$) without sharpening the final results. We now raise each of the inequalities (2.18) to the power t, use (2.4), and substitute t = -a, thereby proving those parts of Theorem 2 which compare R with H, J, or K. In the inequalities

$$H(a, b, x) < R(a, b, x) < J(a, b, x), \qquad (-\infty < a < -1),$$

we now replace a by c-a and (x) by $(x^{-1}) \equiv (x_1^{-1}, \cdots, x_n^{-1})$. The elementary relation $M_t(x^{-1}, w) = [M_{-t}(x, w)]^{-1}$ implies that

(2.19)
$$H(c-a, b, x^{-1}) = \left[M_0(x, w)\right]^c H'(a, b, x)$$

and that (2.19) still holds if H and H' are replaced by J and J' (or by K and K' = K). The Euler transformation of R is a similar equation [2]:

$$(2.20) \quad R(c-a,b,x^{-1}) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}^{b_{i}}\right) R(a,b,x) = [M_{0}(x,w)]^{c} R(a,b,x).$$

Thus (2.13) implies (2.17), and similarly all those parts of Theorem 2

which compare R with H' or J' are implied by those parts which compare R with H or J.

3. Some special cases. Assume x and y to be positive and unequal. From (2.1) and (2.15) we find that

$$R(1; 1, 1; x, y) = (\log x - \log y)/(x - y)$$

satisfies H < R < K; hence

(3.1)
$$(xy)^{1/2} < \frac{x-y}{\log x - \log y} < \frac{x+y}{2}$$

If $r \neq 0$, then $R(1-r; 1, 1; x, y) = (x^r - y^r)/r(x-y)$ lies always between $H = \left[\frac{1}{2}(x+y)\right]^{r-1}$ and $J = \frac{1}{2}(x^{r-1}+y^{r-1})$ according to Theorem 2. This statement is sharper than the very useful result [5, Theorem 41] that it lies always between x^{r-1} and y^{r-1} .

If 0 < a < c the *R*-function has the integral representation [2, Equation (7.1)]

(3.2)
$$B(a, c - a)R(a, b, x) = \int_0^\infty t^{c-a-1} \prod_{i=1}^n (t + x_i)^{-b_i} dt,$$

where B is the beta function. The integral was considered by Watson [10] and Szegö [9], who proved the right and left parts, respectively, of the inequality H < R < K for the case 0 < a = c - 1. This is a special case of (2.15).

Gauss' hypergeometric function is expressible in terms of the R-function by

$$(3.3) {}_{2}F_{1}(a, b; c; x) = R(a; b, c - b; 1 - x, 1).$$

Assume c > b > 0 and $-\infty < x < 1$, $x \neq 0$. Then the inequalities of Theorem 2 remain valid when the following substitutions are made:

$$R = {}_{2}F_{1}(a, b; c; x),$$

$$K = (1 - x)^{-ab/c},$$

$$H = (1 - bx/c)^{-a},$$

$$H' = (1 - x)^{c-a-b}[1 - x + bx/c]^{a-c},$$

$$J = 1 + (b/c)[(1 - x)^{-a} - 1],$$

$$J' = (b/c)(1 - x)^{c-a-b} + (1 - b/c)(1 - x)^{-b}.$$

If c > a > 0 it may be useful to recall that both members of (3.3) are symmetric in a and b.

Inequalities for confluent hypergeometric functions can be obtained by taking a limit of Equations (3.4) in either of two ways. In the first limiting process (replacing x by x/a and letting $a \rightarrow \infty$), (2.13) or (2.17) yields only a weaker form (with < replaced by \leq) of the inequalities

$$(3.5) \quad e^{bx/c} < {}_{1}F_{1}(b;c;x) < 1 + (b/c)(e^{x}-1), \quad (c > b > 0, x \neq 0).$$

However, strict inequality is easy to prove if x > 0 by comparing the power series of the three members, and if x < 0 by Kummer's transformation of $_1F_1$. In the other limiting process (replacing x by cx and letting $c \rightarrow \infty$), (2.13)-(2.15) become the following inequalities, valid for $b \ge 0$ and $x \le 0$:

$$(3.6) \quad (1-bx)^{-a} \leq {}_{2}F_{0}(a, b; x), \qquad (-\infty < a \leq -1),$$

$$(3.7) 1 \leq {}_{2}F_{0}(a, b; x) \leq (1 - bx)^{-a}, (-1 \leq a \leq 0),$$

$$(3.8) \quad (1-bx)^{-a} \leq {}_{2}F_{0}(a,b;x) \leq 1, \qquad (0 \leq a < \infty).$$

Results analogous to those for Gauss' hypergeometric function are easily found for Appell's function F_1 by using the relation

$$(3.9) \quad F_1(a, b, b'; c; x, y) = R(a; b, b', c - b - b'; 1 - x, 1 - y, 1).$$

4. Area and capacity of an ellipsoid. The ellipsoid $\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^2/a_i^2 = 1$ has volume $V = a_1 a_2 \cdots a_n \pi^{n/2} / \Gamma(\frac{1}{2}n+1)$; its surface area S and capacity C are given by

(4.1)
$$S/nV = R(-\frac{1}{2}; \frac{1}{2}, \cdots, \frac{1}{2}; \overline{a_1}^2, \cdots, \overline{a_n}^2), \quad (n \ge 2),$$

$$(4.2) (n-2)/C = R(\frac{1}{2}n-1; \frac{1}{2}, \cdots, \frac{1}{2}; a_1^2, \cdots, a_n^2), (n \ge 3).$$

The expression for S is derived by writing the surface area as an (n-1)-fold integral [6, Equation (10)] and comparing with (2.1); the expression for C comes from separating Laplace's equation in confocal coordinates [1] and using (3.2).

Assume that a_1, \dots, a_n are positive, finite, and not all equal. Then Theorem 2 gives inequalities for S and C, in particular

(4.3)
$$\prod a_i^{-1/n} < \sum a_i^{-1/n} < S/nV < (\sum a_i^{-2}/n)^{1/2}.$$

For n=3 these inequalities were found by Peano and Pólya [7]; for general *n* the members of (4.3) were discussed by Lehmer [6, p. 230] as approximations (but not as bounds) for S in the case of nearly spherical ellipsoids.

If n=3, inequalities for C and S are equivalent to inequalities for the symmetric normal elliptic integrals [3]

(4.4)
$$R_F(x, y, z) \equiv R(\frac{1}{2}; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}; z, y, z),$$

$$R_G(x, y, z) \equiv R(-\frac{1}{2}; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}; \frac{1}{2}; x, y, z).$$

If x, y, z are positive and not all equal, Theorem 2 shows that

(4.5)
$$\left(\frac{3}{x+y+z}\right)^{1/2} < R_F(x, y, z) < (xyz)^{-1/6},$$

$$(4.6) \quad (xyz)^{1/6} < \frac{x^{1/2} + y^{1/2} + z^{1/2}}{3} < R_G(x, y, z) < \left(\frac{x + y + z}{3}\right)^{1/2}.$$

Inequalities for C due to Pólya and Szegö [8, Equation (1.7)] are equivalent to inequalities for R_F that are sharper than (4.5):

(4.7)
$$\frac{3}{x^{1/2} + y^{1/2} + z^{1/2}} < R_F(x, y, z) < \frac{3}{(yz)^{1/4} + (zx)^{1/4} + (xy)^{1/4}}$$

The left side of (4.7) is generalized to any $n \ge 3$ by

THEOREM 3. If x_1, \dots, x_n are nonnegative and not all equal, then

$$(4.8) \left(n / \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^{1/2}\right)^{n-2} < R(\frac{1}{2}n-1; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \cdots, \frac{1}{2}; x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n),$$

$$(n \ge 3).$$

PROOF. Assume y_1, \dots, y_n are positive and not all equal. The inequality

$$(\sum y_i/n)^{n-1} > (\prod y_i) \sum y_i^{-1}/n, \qquad (n \ge 3),$$

is part of Maclaurin's theorem for elementary symmetric functions [5, Theorem 52]. Replacing y_i by $(t+x_i)^{1/2}$, where t>0, we have

$$\prod (t+x_i)^{-1/2} > \left[\sum (t+x_i)^{1/2}/n\right]^{1-n} \sum (t+x_i)^{-1/2}/n$$
$$= (1-\frac{1}{2}n)^{-1}(d/dt) \left[\sum (t+x_i)^{1/2}/n\right]^{2-n}.$$

We now integrate with respect to t and use (3.2) with $a = \frac{1}{2}n - 1 = c - 1$.

Theorems 2 and 3 show that the capacity of an ellipsoid in n dimensions $(n \ge 3)$ with positive semiaxes satisfies

(4.9)
$$\prod a_i^{1-2/n} < C/(n-2) < \left(\sum a_i/n\right)^{n-2}$$

unless the ellipsoid is a sphere.

References

1. H. Bateman, Partial differential equations of mathematical physics, Dover, New York, 1944, p. 422.

[February

2. B. C. Carlson, Lauricella's hypergeometric function F_D , J. Math. Anal. Appl. 7 (1963), 452–470.

3. ——, Normal elliptic integrals of the first and second kinds, Duke Math. J. 31 (1964), 405–419.

4. ——, A hypergeometric mean value, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 16 (1965), 759-766.

5. G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, and G. Pólya, *Inequalities*, 2nd ed., Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1959.

6. D. H. Lehmer, Approximations to the area of an n-dimensional ellipsoid, Canad. J. Math. 2 (1950), 267-282.

7. G. Pólya, Approximations to the area of the ellipsoid, Publ. Inst. Mat. Rosario 5 (1943), 13 pp.

8. G. Pólya and G. Szegö, Inequalities for the capacity of a condenser, Amer. J. Math. 67 (1945), 1-32.

9. G. Szegö, An inequality, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. 6 (1935), 78-79.

10. G. N. Watson, An inequality, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. 5 (1934), 221-223.

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY