

## MEAN VALUES DEPENDING ON SOME GENERAL FUNCTIONS

J. Allard<sup>1</sup> and D. Ghişă<sup>2</sup>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In Orlicz space theory, (see for example [2] and [4]), an important role is played by functions  $\phi: \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  such that

$$(\Delta_2) \quad \phi(2u) \leq M\phi(u) \quad \text{for all } u \in \mathbb{R}^+$$

for some fixed  $M > 0$ . This condition is known as the Birnbaum and Orlicz condition. The function  $u \rightarrow u^r$  is such a function. In this particular example,  $M = 2^r$  and equality holds in  $(\Delta_2)$ . In this note, we introduce a larger class of functions which also satisfy condition  $(\Delta_2)$  with equality. Furthermore, we show that the functions introduced satisfy generalizations of some classical inequalities.

Let  $u \in ]0, \infty[$  and  $n = [\log_2 u]$  where  $[x]$  stands for the greatest integer smaller or equal to  $x$ . For  $r > 0$  and  $M > 1$ , we define

$$(1) \quad \phi_{r,M}(u) = \begin{cases} 0 & u = 0 \\ M^n ((u/2^n)^r - (M-2^r)/(M-1)) & u > 0. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to verify that

$$(2) \quad \phi_{r,M}(2u) = M\phi_{r,M}(u) \quad \text{for all } u \in \mathbb{R}^+$$

and that  $\phi_{r,M}$  is continuous and strictly increasing. If  $M = 2^r$ , then  $\phi_{r,M}(u) = u^r$  for all  $u \in \mathbb{R}^+$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>Partially supported by the National Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, Grants #A-4808 and RD-100-1605 and the Conseil de recherche de l'Université de Moncton.

<sup>2</sup>Partially supported by the Conseil de recherche de l'Université de Moncton.

In Section 2, we state a few general facts. In Section 3, we prove that a generalization of the first Clarkson inequality holds for  $\phi_{r,M}$  if  $r \geq 2$  and  $M \geq 2^r$ . In Section 4, some results on generalized means are proven. In Section 5, a generalization of the Hölder inequality is established. In view of the fact that the Minkowski inequality for the function  $u \rightarrow u^r$  is often introduced as a consequence of the Hölder inequality, it is interesting to note that the Minkowski inequality does not hold for the function considered in Section 5, except for the particular case  $M = 2^r$ . Finally, in Section 6, we introduce a generalization of the Jensen inequality.

The properties of the functions introduced in the present note make them useful in a certain number of areas including the construction of Orlicz spaces with particular properties.

## 2. GENERALITIES

The following lemma will be used frequently.

*Lemma (2.1).* Let  $S, T > 0$  and let  $f: \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  be a function such that  $f(Sx) = Tf(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . Then

(i) The  $k$ th-derivative  $f^{(k)}$  of  $f$  exists at a point  $x$  if and only if it exists at  $S^n x$  for all  $n = 0, 1, -1, \dots$  and we have the following equality

$$f^{(k)}(S^n x) = (T/S^k)^n f^{(k)}(x);$$

(ii) The function  $f$  is increasing (resp. decreasing, convex, concave) if and only if it is increasing (resp. decreasing, convex, concave) in a neighborhood of some interval of the form  $[a, Sa[$  ( $a > 0$ ).

The proof of this lemma is elementary.

We now return to the function  $\phi_{r,M}$  defined in Section 1. It is useful to notice that  $\phi_{r,M}: \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  can be characterized as follows. Let  $K = (M-2^r)/(M-1)$ . Then  $\phi_{r,M}$  is the only continuous real valued function  $\phi$  defined on  $\mathbb{R}^+$  such that (i)  $\phi(u) = u^r - K$  for  $u \in [1, 2[$  and (ii)  $\phi$  satisfies the condition

$$(3) \quad \phi(2u) = M\phi(u) \quad \text{for all } u \geq 0.$$

The function  $\phi_{r,M}$  is indefinitely differentiable at all points not of the form  $2^n$  ( $n = 0, -1, 1, \dots$ ). If  $u \in ]2^n, 2^{n+1}[$ , then

$$(4) \quad \phi'_{r,M}(u) = r(M/2)^n (u/2^n)^{r-1}$$

and

$$(5) \quad \phi''_{r,M}(u) = (r-1)r(M/4)^n (u/2^n)^{r-2}.$$

Furthermore, we have the following limits

$$(6) \quad \lim_{u \rightarrow (2^n)^-} \phi'_{r,M}(u) = r 2^{r-1} (M/2)^{n-1}$$

$$(7) \quad \lim_{u \rightarrow (2^n)^+} \phi'_{r,M}(u) = r(M/2)^n.$$

From these facts, we deduce that  $\phi_{r,M}$  is convex (resp. concave) if  $r \geq 1$  and  $M \geq 2^r$  (resp.  $0 < r < 1$  and  $M \leq 2^r$ ).

Since  $\phi_{r,M}$  is strictly increasing, its inverse is defined. If  $v \in [M^n(1-k), M^{n+1}(1-k)[$  then

$$(8) \quad \phi_{r,M}^{-1}(v) = 2^n ((v/M^n) + K)^{1/r}.$$

The inverse function satisfies the condition

$$(9) \quad \phi_{r,M}^{-1}(Mv) = 2\phi_{r,M}^{-1}(v) \quad \text{for all } v \geq 0.$$

In particular, lemma (2.1) applies to  $\phi_{r,M}^{-1}$ .

### 3. THE FIRST CLARKSON INEQUALITY

In this section, we consider a generalization of the first Clarkson inequality. Given a function  $\phi: \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ , consider the following inequality, where  $M > 0$  is fixed.

$$(10) \quad \phi(u+v) + \phi(|u-v|) \leq (M/2)(\phi(u) + \phi(v)).$$

If  $\phi$  is the function  $u \rightarrow u^r$  and  $r \geq 2$ , then (10) holds with  $M = 2^r$  and is known as the first Clarkson inequality [5]. It is used in the study of uniformly convex spaces [1] and in the study of extremal length [5], [6].

**Proposition (3.1).** If  $r \geq 2$  and  $M \geq 2^r$ , then the function  $\phi = \phi_{r,M}$  satisfies (10).

**Proof.** Let  $\phi = \phi_{r,M}$ . Consider the function

$$(11) \quad F(u,v) = (M/2)(\phi(u) + \phi(v)) - \phi(u+v) - \phi(|u-v|).$$

It suffices to show that  $F(u,v) \geq 0$ . Without loss of generality, we can

assume that  $u \geq v$ . Furthermore, (2) implies that

$$(12) \quad F(u,v) = M^n F(2^{-n}u, 2^{-n}v).$$

Consequently, it is sufficient to prove that (11) holds for  $u \in [1, 2[$  and  $v \in ]0, u]$ .

Let  $D_1 = \{(u,v) \mid 1 \leq u < 2 \text{ and } 0 < v \leq u\}$ . For  $(u,v) \in D_1$ , let  $\ell = [\log_2 v]$ ,  $m = [\log_2(u+v)]$ ,  $n = [\log_2(u-v)]$ ,  $\alpha = M/2^r$  and

$K = (M-2^r)/(M-1)$ . Then  $\ell \leq 0$ ,  $m = 0$  or  $1$ ,  $n \leq 0$ ,  $\alpha \geq 1$  and  $0 \leq K < 1$ .

With these definitions, (11) can be rewritten as follows:

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} F(u,v) = 2^{r-1} \alpha \{ & (u^{r-K}) + (\alpha^\ell u^{r-M^\ell K}) \} \\ & - (\alpha^m (u+v)^\ell - M^m K) \\ & - (\alpha^n (u-v)^r - M^n K). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the function  $F(u,v)$  is continuously differentiable on an open dense subset  $D_1^i$  of  $D_1$ . We will show that  $\partial F/\partial v \leq 0$  on  $D_1^i$ . An easy computation shows that

$$(14) \quad \frac{1}{r(u+v)^{r-1}} \frac{\partial F}{\partial v} = \alpha^{\ell-m+1} \left( \frac{2v}{u+v} \right)^{r-1} - 1 + \alpha^{n-m} \left( \frac{u-v}{u+v} \right)^{r-1}.$$

Notice that  $2v/(u+v) \leq 1$  and  $(u-v)/(u+v) \leq 1$ . Therefore, (14) decreases as  $r$  increases (for  $\alpha$  fixed). We claim that (14) decreases as  $\alpha$  increases (for  $r$  fixed). We must examine the various values of  $\ell$ ,  $m$ ,  $n$  possible. If  $u+v \in [1, 2[$ , then  $v < 1$ . Therefore, if  $m = 0$ , then  $\ell \leq -1$ . If  $u+v \in [2, 4[$ , then  $v \in [1, 2[$  and  $u-v \in [0, 1[$ . Therefore, if  $m = 1$ , then  $\ell = 0$  and  $n \leq -1$ . In either case, it follows easily that the exponents of  $\alpha$  on (14) are negative. Since  $\alpha \geq 1$ , we can deduce that (14) decreases as  $\alpha$  increases, as claimed. For  $r = 2$  and  $\alpha = 1$ , it is easily computed that (14) is equal to 0. We conclude that (14) is negative for  $r \geq 2$  and  $\alpha = 1$ . It follows that  $\partial F/\partial v \leq 0$  for  $(u,v) \in D_1^i$ .

Since  $F(u,u) = 0$ , the continuity of  $F$  and the fact that  $\partial F/\partial v$  exists and is non-positive on  $D_1^i$  imply that  $F(u,v) \geq 0$  for  $(u,v) \in D_1$  as required.

4. GENERALIZED MEANS

Let  $a = (a_1, a_2, \dots)$  and  $q = (q_1, q_2, \dots)$  be finite or infinite sequences such that  $a_k \geq 0$ ,  $q_k \geq 0$  and  $\sum q_k = 1$ . The  $\phi_{r,M}$ -mean of  $a$  with respect to the weight  $q$  is defined to be

$$M_{r,M}(a; q) = \phi_{r,M}^{-1}(\sum q_k \phi_{r,M}(a_k)),$$

if  $\sum q_k \phi_{r,M}(a_k) < \infty$ . Otherwise set  $M_{r,M}(a; q) = \infty$ . We will consider  $M_{r,M} = M_{r,M}(a; q)$  as a function of  $r$  and  $M$ . We have the following proposition.

Proposition (4.1). If  $0 < r \leq r'$  and  $M/2^r \leq M'/2^{r'}$ , then  $M_{r,M} \leq M_{r',M'}$ .

Proof. According to Theorem 92 of [3], it is sufficient to show that the function

$$\psi = \phi_{r',M'} \circ \phi_{r,M}^{-1}$$

is convex.

Since

$$\psi(My) = M'\psi(y) \quad \text{for all } y \geq 0$$

we can apply lemma (2.1). Therefore, we will restrict our attention to a neighborhood of  $[(1-K), M(1-K)[$  where  $K = (M-2^r)/(M-1)$ . First, assume that  $y \in ]1-K, M(1-K)[$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(y) &= (y+K)^{r'/r} - K' \\ \psi'(y) &= (r/r')(y+K)^{(r'/r)-1} \\ \psi''(y) &= ((r'/r)-1)(r'/r)(y+K)^{(r'/r)-2}. \end{aligned}$$

By hypothesis,  $r \leq r'$ . Therefore  $\psi''(y) \geq 0$  and  $\psi$  is a convex function on  $]1-K, M(1-K)[$ . We now consider the point  $1-K$ . We must compare limits from the left and from the right:

$$L = \lim_{y \rightarrow (1-K)^-} \psi'(y) = (M/M')(r'/r)2^{r'-r}$$

and

$$R = \lim_{y \rightarrow (1-K)^+} \psi'(y) = r'/r.$$

We obtain immediately that  $L \leq R$  if (and only if)  $M/2^r \leq M'/2^{r'}$  as required.

## 5. HÖLDER INEQUALITY

The following proposition is a generalization of the classical Hölder inequality, which is obtained by taking  $M = 2^r$  and  $M' = 2^{r'}$ .

Proposition (5.1.). Let  $r > 1$ ,  $r' > 1$ ,  $(r-1)(r'-1) \geq 1$ ,  $M \geq 2^r$ ,  $M' \geq 2^{r'}$ . Then

$$\sum q_i a_i b_i \leq M_{r,M}(a;q) M'_{r',M'}(b;q)$$

where  $a = (a_1, a_2, \dots)$ ,  $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots)$  and  $q = (q_1, q_2, \dots)$  are finite or infinite sequences of positive numbers, and  $\sum q_i = 1$ .

Proof. According to Theorem 100 of [3], it is sufficient to prove that the function

$$F(y, y') = \phi_{r,M}^{-1}(y) \phi_{r',M'}^{-1}(y')$$

is a concave function of  $(y, y')$ . Notice that

$$F(M^n y, M'^{n'} y') = 2^{n+n'} F(y, y').$$

This observation together with an easy generalization of Lemma (2.1) implies that it is sufficient to consider the restriction of  $F$  to an open neighborhood of the set

$$D_2 = [1-K, M(1-K)] \times [1-K', M'(1-K')]$$

where  $K, K'$  are as in Section 4. Furthermore, in order to prove the concavity of  $F$ , it is sufficient to show that the function

$$G(t) = F(c+dt, c'+d't)$$

is concave in  $t$  for all  $c, c', d, d', t \in \mathbb{R}^+$  such that  $(c+dt, c'+d't)$  is in the domain under consideration.

Let  $D'_2$  denote the interior of  $D_2$  and let  $c, c', d, d', t$  be such that  $(c+dt, c'+d't) \in D'_2$ . Then

$$G(t) = (c+dt+K)^{1/r} (c'+d't+K')^{1/r'}$$

Let

$$A = \frac{d}{c+dt+K} \quad \text{and} \quad A' = \frac{d'}{c'+d't+K'}$$

After some computations, we obtain that

$$\frac{G'(t)}{G(t)} = \frac{A}{r} + \frac{A'}{r'}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{G''(t)}{G(t)} &= \left( \frac{A}{r} + \frac{A'}{r'} \right)^2 - \frac{A^2}{r^2} - \frac{A'^2}{r'^2} \\ &= \frac{2AA'}{rr'} - \left(1 - \frac{1}{r}\right) \frac{A^2}{r} - \left(1 - \frac{1}{r'}\right) \frac{A'^2}{r'}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the assumption that  $(1/r) + (1/r') \leq 1$ , it is easily seen that the last expression is smaller or equal to  $-(1/rr')/(A-A')^2$ . Therefore  $G''(t)/G(t) \leq 0$ . Since  $G(t) > 0$ , we deduce that  $G''(t) \leq 0$ .

We must now consider certain boundary points. For instance, assume that  $c + dt_0 + K = 1 - K$ . After a simple computation, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow t_0^+} G'(t) - \lim_{t \rightarrow t_0^-} G'(t) &= d \left\{ \lim_{y \rightarrow (1-K)^+} \phi_{r,M}^{-1}(y) - \lim_{y \rightarrow (1-K)^-} \phi_{r,M}^{-1}(y) \right\} \phi_{r,M}^{-1}(c' + d't + K') \end{aligned}$$

The middle factor of the last expression is non-positive due to the concavity of  $\phi_{r,M}^{-1}$  at  $y = 1 - K$ . The other factors are obviously positive. Therefore, the concavity of  $G$  at this point is proven. Other boundary points are treated similarly.

Remark (5.2). It can be shown that the Minkowski inequality does not hold for the function  $\phi_{r,M}$  if  $r > 1$  and  $M > 2^r$ . In order to do this, one can study the convexity of the function  $\phi_{r,M}^{-1} \{ \sum p_i \phi(x_i + u_i t) \}$  for  $p_i, x_i, u_i, t \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $x_i + u_i t \in \mathbb{R}^+$  and  $p_i \geq 0, \sum p_i = 1$  [3]. It is easy to show that this function is neither convex nor concave for  $r, M$  as in proposition (5.1).

## 6. JENSEN-COOPER INEQUALITY

Let  $a = (a_1, \dots, a_\ell)$  be a finite sequence of positive real numbers and let  $\phi: \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  be a monotonic function. Then define

$$S_\phi(a) = \phi^{-1} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \phi(a_k) \right).$$

For  $r, M$  as in Section 1, we denote

$$S_{r,M}(a) = S_{\phi_{r,M}}(a).$$

The following proposition generalizes an inequality due to Jensen and Cooper (see [3], page 84, footnote b).

Proposition (6.1). Let  $0 < r < r'$  and  $1 < M < M'$ . Assume that  $(M-2^r)/(M-1) \leq (M'-2^{r'})/(M'-1)$ . Then  $S_{r,M}(a) < S_{r',M'}(a)$  for all finite sequence  $a = (a_1, \dots, a_\ell)$  of positive numbers).

Proof. According to Theorem 105 of [3], it is sufficient to prove that the quotient function

$$(15) \quad Q(u) = \phi_{r',M'}(u)/\phi_{r,M}(u)$$

is an increasing function. Since  $Q(2u) = (M'/M)Q(u)$ , we can apply lemma (2.1). In fact, it is sufficient to show that  $Q(u)$  is increasing on the open interval  $]1, 2[$ . The derivative  $Q'(u)$  is positive if and only if

$$(16) \quad f(u) = \phi'_{r',M'}(u)\phi_{r,M}(u) - \phi_{r',M'}(u)\phi'_{r,M}(u) \geq 0.$$

For  $u \in ]1, 2[$ ,

$$(17) \quad f(u) = r'u^{r'-1}(u^r - K) - ru^{r-1}(u^{r'} - K').$$

We claim that

$$(18) \quad \lim_{u \rightarrow 2^-} f(u) \geq 0.$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{u \rightarrow 2^-} f(u) &= r'2^{r'-1}(2^r - K) - r2^{r-1}(2^{r'} - K') \geq 0 \\ &= \left( \frac{r2^{r-1}}{2^r - 1} \right) \left( \frac{M-1}{M} \right) \leq \left( \frac{r'2^{r'-1}}{2^{r'} - 1} \right) \left( \frac{M'-1}{M'} \right). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to establish the last inequality by computing the derivatives

$$\frac{d}{dx} \left( \frac{x2^{x-1}}{2^x - 1} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d}{dy} \left( \frac{y-1}{y} \right).$$

This proves (18).

Finally, we consider the function

$$(19) \quad \begin{aligned} g(u) &= u^{-r-r'+1}f(u) \\ &= (r'-r) + (ru^{-r'}K' - r'u^{-r}K) \end{aligned}$$

where  $K = (M-2^r)/(M-1)$  and  $K' = (M'-2^{r'})/(M'-1)$ . By hypothesis,  $K \leq K'$ . It follows easily that

$$(20) \quad g'(u) = -rr'u^{-r'-1}K' + r'ru^{-r-1}K \leq 0.$$

Therefore  $g(u)$  is decreasing for  $u \in ]1,2[$ . We conclude that  $f(u)$  is also decreasing on the same interval. Together with (18), this fact implies that  $f(u)$  and therefore  $Q(u)$  are increasing on  $]1,2[$ . The proposition follows.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Clarkson, J. A. "Uniformly convex spaces", *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 40 (1936), 396-414.
- [2] Dinculeanu, N. *Integration on Locally Compact Spaces* (Leyden: Noordhoff Int. Pub., 1974).
- [3] Hardy, G. H., Littlewood, J. E. and Polya, G. *Inequalities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).
- [4] Krasno el'skii, M. A. and Rutickii, Ya. B. *Convex Functions and Orlicz Spaces* (Groningen: P. Noordhoff Ltd., 1961).
- [5] Ohtsuka, M. *Extremal Length and Precise Functions in 3-Space* (Hiroshima University, 1973).
- [6] Ziemer, W. P. "Extremal length and conformal capacity", *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 126 (1967), 406-473.

