

REVERSED HARDY–LITTLEWOOD–PÓLYA INEQUALITIES WITH FINITE TERMS

HAIYAN HAN and YUTIAN LEI 

(Received 2 November 2022; accepted 23 December 2022; first published online 3 February 2023)

Abstract

We prove a reversed Hardy–Littlewood–Pólya inequality with finite terms. We also give the limit of the best constant.

2020 *Mathematics subject classification*: primary 26D15; secondary 40B05.

Keywords and phrases: reversed Hardy–Littlewood–Pólya inequality, best constant, estimates of the upper/lower bound.

1. Introduction

Let $a_i, b_i \geq 0$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots$). The Hardy–Littlewood–Pólya inequality [3, Theorem 381, page 288] states that

$$\sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^{\infty} \frac{a_i b_j}{|i-j|^\lambda} \leq K_{p,q} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i^p \right)^{1/p} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} b_i^q \right)^{1/q}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $p, q > 1$, $1/p + 1/q > 1$, $\lambda = 2 - (1/p + 1/q)$. In 2015, Huang, Li and Yin used the Hardy–Littlewood–Sobolev inequality [7] to generalise (1.1) to the case of higher dimensions. In addition, they also proved that the best constant can be approximated by the corresponding functional with finite terms [4].

In 2015, Dou and Zhu in [2] established a reversed Hardy–Littlewood–Sobolev inequality:

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{f(x)g(y) dx dy}{|x-y|^\lambda} \right| \geq C \|f\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|g\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^n)} \quad \text{for all } f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n), g \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^n),$$

where $n \geq 1$ and $p, q \in (n/(n-\lambda), 1)$ satisfy $1/p + 1/q + \lambda/n = 2$. In addition, they proved the best constant is attained. From this inequality, a reversed discrete inequality

This research was supported by NSFC (No. 11871278) of China.

© The Author(s), 2023. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of Australian Mathematical Publishing Association Inc.



in higher dimensions was also deduced in [5]:

$$\sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \frac{|f_i||g_j|}{|i-j|^\lambda} + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^n} |f_j||g_j| \geq C \|f\|_{l^p} \|g\|_{l^q} \quad \text{for all } (f, g) \in l^p(\mathbb{Z}^n) \times l^q(\mathbb{Z}^n),$$

where $f = (f_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^n}$, $g = (g_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^n}$, $\lambda < 0$, $n/(n - \lambda) < p, q < 1$ and $1/p + 1/q + \lambda/n \leq 2$. When $n = 1$ and replacing \mathbb{Z}^n by \mathbb{N} , we denote the best constant by

$$L_{p,q,\lambda} := \inf \left\{ \sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty} \frac{|f_i||g_j|}{|i-j|^\lambda} + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |f_j||g_j| : \|f\|_{l^p} = \|g\|_{l^q} = 1 \right\}. \tag{1.2}$$

In 2011, Li and Villavert [6] proved the Hardy–Littlewood–Pólya inequality with finite terms:

$$\sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^N \frac{a_i b_j}{|i-j|} \leq K_N \left(\sum_{i=1}^N a_i^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N b_i^2 \right)^{1/2}, \tag{1.3}$$

where the constant K_N satisfies

$$2 \ln N - 2 \leq K_N \leq 2(\ln N - \ln 2) + 2.$$

Comparing (1.3) with (1.1) for $p = q = 2$ shows that (1.3) is an inequality in the critical case. In contrast to the estimate of K_N above, the best constant for the upper-critical inequality is bounded with respect to N [4, Lemma 2.2]. The bounds for the best constant are helpful in giving a better understanding of the Coulomb energy in the Thomas–Fermi model describing electron gas and N -body systems [8]. The results in higher dimensions can be found in [1].

In this paper, we always assume $a_i, b_i \geq 0$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, N$). We will prove the following reversed Hardy–Littlewood–Pólya inequality with finite terms.

THEOREM 1.1. *Let $\lambda < 0$ and $p, q \in (0, 1)$ satisfy $1/p + 1/q \leq 2 - \lambda$. Then we can find a constant $L > 0$ which only depends on p, q, λ, N such that*

$$\sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^N \frac{a_i b_j}{|i-j|^\lambda} + \sum_{i=1}^N a_i b_i \geq L \left(\sum_{i=1}^N a_i^p \right)^{1/p} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N b_i^q \right)^{1/q}. \tag{1.4}$$

Denote the best constant in (1.4) by

$$L_{p,q,\lambda,N} := \min \left\{ \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^N \frac{a_i b_j}{|i-j|^\lambda} + \sum_{i=1}^N a_i b_i : \sum_{i=1}^N a_i^p = \sum_{i=1}^N b_i^q = 1 \right\}. \tag{1.5}$$

THEOREM 1.2. *Let $\lambda < 0$ and $p, q \in ((1 - \lambda)^{-1}, 1)$ satisfy $1/p + 1/q \leq 2 - \lambda$. Then $L_{p,q,\lambda,N} \rightarrow L_{p,q,\lambda}$ when $N \rightarrow \infty$.*

2. Proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1. Write $a = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N)$ and $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_N)$. Set

$$J(a, b) = \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^N \frac{a_i b_j}{|i-j|^\lambda} + \sum_{i=1}^N a_i b_i - L_{p,q,\lambda,N} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N a_i^p \right)^{1/p} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N b_i^q \right)^{1/q}.$$

Clearly, $J(a, b) \geq 0$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}_+^N := \{x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) : x_i \geq 0, i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$. However,

$$\mathbb{S}(N) := \left\{ (a, b) : \sum_{i=1}^N a_i^p = \sum_{i=1}^N b_i^q = 1 \right\}$$

is compact in $\mathbb{R}_+^N \times \mathbb{R}_+^N$ and hence the minimisation problem (1.5) has solutions in $\mathbb{S}(N)$. Thus, we can find $(a(N), b(N)) \in \mathbb{S}(N)$ such that $J(a(N), b(N)) = 0$. We call $(a(N), b(N))$ the minimiser of J . Therefore, both the partial derivatives of J are equal to zero at $(a(N), b(N))$. Namely,

$$\left[\frac{d}{dt} J(a(N) + ta, b(N)) \right]_{t=0} = \left[\frac{d}{dt} J(a(N), b(N) + tb) \right]_{t=0} = 0$$

for any $(a, b) \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \times \mathbb{R}_+^N$. From this result, by simple calculation, we see that

$$\begin{cases} L_{p,q,\lambda,N} a(N)_i^{p-1} = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{b(N)_j}{|i-j|^\lambda} + b(N)_i \\ L_{p,q,\lambda,N} b(N)_i^{q-1} = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{a(N)_j}{|i-j|^\lambda} + a(N)_i. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Noting $(a(N), b(N)) \neq (0, 0)$ (because $(a(N), b(N)) \in \mathbb{S}(N)$), from (2.1) we see that

$$\min\{a(N)_i, b(N)_i\} > 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq N.$$

Therefore, $L_{p,q,\lambda,N} > 0$.

Next, we prove that $L_{p,q,\lambda,N}$ has a positive lower bound which is independent of N . Multiplying (2.1)₁ by $a(N)_i$ and summing from 1 to N gives

$$L_{p,q,\lambda,N} \sum_{i=1}^N a(N)_i^p = \sum_{i,j=1}^N \frac{a(N)_i b(N)_j}{|i-j|^\lambda} + \sum_{i=1}^N a(N)_i b(N)_i. \tag{2.2}$$

Write

$$\begin{cases} \bar{a}(N) = (a(N)_1, a(N)_2, \dots, a(N)_N, 0, \dots), \\ \bar{b}(N) = (b(N)_1, b(N)_2, \dots, b(N)_N, 0, \dots). \end{cases}$$

Since $(a(N), b(N)) \in \mathbb{S}(N)$,

$$(\bar{a}(N), \bar{a}(N)) \in \mathbb{S} := \{(a, b) : \|a\|_p = \|b\|_q = 1\}.$$

From (2.2) and (1.2), it follows that

$$L_{p,q,\lambda,N} = L_{p,q,\lambda,N} \sum_{i=1}^N a(N)_i^p = \sum_{i,j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\bar{a}(N)_i \bar{b}(N)_j}{|i-j|^\lambda} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \bar{a}(N)_i \bar{b}(N)_i \geq L_{p,q,\lambda}. \tag{2.3}$$

Therefore, $L_{p,q,\lambda,N} > 0$ with the lower bound (2.3). This proves (1.4). □

REMARK 2.1. We claim that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{a(N)_i, b(N)_i\} = 0.$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume $a(N)_1 = \min_{1 \leq i \leq N} \{a(N)_i, b(N)_i\}$. From (2.1),

$$\begin{aligned} L_{p,q,\lambda,N} &= a(N)_1^{1-p} \left(\sum_{j=2}^N \frac{b(N)_j}{(j-1)^\lambda} + b(N)_1 \right) \\ &\geq a(N)_1^{2-p} \left(\sum_{j=2}^N \frac{1}{(j-1)^\lambda} + 1 \right) = a(N)_1^{2-p} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N-1} j^{-\lambda} + 1 \right) \\ &\geq a(N)_1^{2-p} \left(\int_1^N (r-1)^{-\lambda} dr + 1 \right) = a(N)_1^{2-p} \left(\frac{(N-1)^{1-\lambda}}{1-\lambda} + 1 \right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

However, since $\mathbb{S}(N) \subset \mathbb{S}(N+1)$, it follows that $L_{p,q,\lambda,N}$ is nonincreasing with respect to N . Therefore, $L_{p,q,\lambda,N} \leq L_{p,q,\lambda,1}$. Taking $a_1 = b_1 = 1$, we see that $(a_1, b_1) \in \mathbb{S}(1)$ and hence $L_{p,q,\lambda,1} \leq a_1 b_1 = 1$. This gives the upper bound

$$L_{p,q,\lambda,N} \leq 1. \tag{2.5}$$

Combining (2.5) with (2.4) yields

$$a(N)_1^{2-p} = O(N^{\lambda-1}) \quad (N \rightarrow \infty).$$

This implies our claim.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2. By (1.2), we can find a minimising sequence $(a^{(m)}, b^{(m)}) \in \mathbb{S}$ such that

$$\sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^{\infty} \frac{a_i^{(m)} b_j^{(m)}}{|i-j|^\lambda} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i^{(m)} b_i^{(m)} \leq L_{p,q,\lambda} + \frac{1}{m}.$$

The convergence of this series implies

$$\sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^{\infty} \frac{a_i^{(m),N_m} b_j^{(m),N_m}}{|i-j|^\lambda} + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i^{(m),N_m} b_i^{(m),N_m} \leq L_{p,q,\lambda} + \frac{2}{m} \tag{2.6}$$

when $N_m > m$ is sufficiently large. Here,

$$\begin{cases} a_i^{(m),N_m} = a_i^{(m)} & \text{when } i \leq N_m, \\ a_i^{(m),N_m} = 0 & \text{when } i > N_m, \end{cases}$$

and $b_i^{(m),N_m}$ is defined by the same truncation. Since $(a^{(m)}, b^{(m)}) \in \mathbb{S}$,

$$\|a^{(m),N_m}\|_p^p \geq 1 - \frac{1}{m}, \quad \|b^{(m),N_m}\|_q^q \geq 1 - \frac{1}{m}, \quad (2.7)$$

when $N_m > m$ is sufficiently large. Therefore, noting that

$$\left(\frac{a^{(m),N_m}}{\|a^{(m),N_m}\|_p}, \frac{b^{(m),N_m}}{\|b^{(m),N_m}\|_q} \right) \in \mathbb{S}(N_m),$$

from (1.5), (2.6) and (2.7), we deduce

$$L_{p,q,\lambda,N_m} \leq \left(L_{p,q,\lambda} + \frac{2}{m} \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{m} \right)^{-(1/p+1/q)}$$

for large N_m . Letting $m \rightarrow \infty$ and combining with (2.3) completes the proof. \square

Acknowledgement

The authors thank the anonymous referee very much for the useful suggestions.

References

- [1] Z. Cheng and C. Li, ‘An extended discrete Hardy–Littlewood–Sobolev inequality’, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **34** (2014), 1951–1959.
- [2] J. Dou and M. Zhu, ‘Reversed Hardy–Littlewood–Sobolev inequality’, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* **2015**(19) (2015), 9696–9726.
- [3] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood and G. Pólya, *Inequalities*, 2nd edn (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1952).
- [4] G. Huang, C. Li and X. Yin, ‘Existence of the maximizing pair for the discrete Hardy–Littlewood–Sobolev inequality’, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **35** (2015), 935–942.
- [5] Y. Lei, Y. Li and T. Tang, ‘Critical conditions and asymptotics for discrete systems of the Hardy–Littlewood–Sobolev type’, *Tohoku Math. J.*, to appear.
- [6] C. Li and J. Villavert, ‘An extension of the Hardy–Littlewood–Pólya inequality’, *Acta Math. Sci.* **31**(6) (2011), 2285–2288.
- [7] E. Lieb, ‘Sharp constants in the Hardy–Littlewood–Sobolev and related inequalities’, *Ann. of Math.* (2) **118** (1983), 349–374.
- [8] E. Lieb, ‘Coherent states as a tool for obtaining rigorous bounds’, in: *Coherent States, Past, Present and Future: Proceedings of the International Symposium, Oak Ridge, 1993* (eds. D. H. Feng, J. R. Klauder and M. R. Strayer) (World Scientific, Singapore, 1994), 267–278.

HAIYAN HAN, Department of Teacher Education,
Maanshan Teacher’s College, Maanshan, Anhui 243041, PR China
e-mail: 349818273@qq.com

YUTIAN LEI, Institute of Mathematics, School of Mathematical Sciences,
Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing 210023, PR China
e-mail: leiutian@njnu.edu.cn