Hindawi Publishing Corporation Journal of Inequalities and Applications Volume 2010, Article ID 461215, 9 pages doi:10.1155/2010/461215

Research Article

A Converse of Minkowski's Type Inequalities

Romeo Meštrović¹ and David Kalaj²

¹ Maritime Faculty, University of Montenegro, Dobrota 36, 85330 Kotor, Montenegro

Correspondence should be addressed to Romeo Meštrović, romeo@ac.me

Received 6 August 2010; Accepted 20 October 2010

Academic Editor: Jong Kim

Copyright © 2010 R. Meštrović and D. Kalaj. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

We formulate and prove a converse for a generalization of the classical Minkowski's inequality. The case when 0 is also considered. Applying the same technique, we obtain an analog converse theorem for integral Minkowski's type inequality.

1. Introduction

If p > 1, $a_i \ge 0$, and $b_i \ge 0$ (i = 1, ..., n) are real numbers, then by the classical Minkowski's inequality

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} (a_i + b_i)^p\right)^{1/p} \le \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i^p\right)^{1/p} + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i^p\right)^{1/p}.$$
(1.1)

This inequality was published by Minkowski [1, pages 115–117] hundred years ago in his famous book "Geometrie der Zahlen."

It is also known (see [2]) that for $0 the above inequality is satisfied with "<math>\geq$ " instead of " \leq ".

Many extensions and generalizations of Minkowski's inequality can be found in [2, 3]. We want to point out the following inequality:

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{ij}\right)^{p}\right)^{1/p} \le \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij}^{p}\right)^{1/p},\tag{1.2}$$

² Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, University of Montenegro, Džordža Vašingtona BB, 81000 Podgorica, Montenegro

where p > 1 and $a_{ij} \ge 0$ (i = 1, ..., m; j = 1, ..., n) are real numbers. Furthermore, if $0 , then the inequality (1.2) is satisfied with "<math>\ge$ " instead of " \le " [2, Theorem 24, page 30]. In both cases, equality holds if and only if all columns $(a_{1j}, a_{2j}, ..., a_{mj})$, j = 1, 2, ..., n, are proportional.

An extension of inequality (1.2) was formulated by Ingham and Jessen (see [2, pages 31-32]). In 1948, Tôyama [4] published a converse of the inequality of Ingham and Jessen (see also a recent paper [5] for a weighted version of Tôyama's inequality). Namely, Tôyama showed that if 0 < q < p and $a_{ij} \ge 0$ (i = 1, ..., m; j = 1, ..., n) are real numbers, then

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij}^{p}\right)^{q/p}\right)^{1/q} \leq (\min(m,n))^{1/q-1/p} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{ij}^{q}\right)^{p/q}\right)^{1/p}.$$
 (1.3)

The main result of this paper gives a converse of inequality (1.2). On the other hand, our result may be regarded as a nonsymmetric analogue of the above inequality, and it is given as follows.

Theorem 1.1. Let p > 0, q > 0, and $a_{ij} \ge 0$ (i = 1, ..., m; j = 1, ..., n) be real numbers. Then for $p \ge 1$ we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij}^{p} \right)^{1/p} \le C \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{ij}^{q} \right)^{p/q} \right)^{1/p}, \tag{1.4}$$

where C is a positive constant given by

$$C = \begin{cases} m^{1-1/q} & \text{if } 1 \le p \le q, \\ (\min(m, n))^{1/q - 1/p} m^{1-1/q} & \text{if } 1 \le q < p, \\ m^{1-1/p} & \text{if } 0 < q \le 1 \le p. \end{cases}$$
(1.5)

If 0 , then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij}^{p} \right)^{1/p} \ge K \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{ij}^{q} \right)^{p/q} \right)^{1/p}, \tag{1.6}$$

where *K* is a positive constant given by

$$K = \begin{cases} m^{1-1/q} & \text{if } 0 < q \le p < 1, \\ (\min(m, n))^{1/q - 1/p} m^{1-1/q} & \text{if } 0 < p < q < 1, \\ m^{1-1/p} & \text{if } 0 < p < 1 \le q. \end{cases}$$

$$(1.7)$$

Inequality (1.4) with $1 \le p \le q$ and inequality (1.6) with $0 < q \le p < 1$ are sharp for all m and n, and they are attained for $a_{ij} = a$, i = 1, ..., m, j = 1, ..., n. If $m \le n$, then inequality (1.4) is sharp in the cases when $1 \le q < p$ and $0 < q \le 1 \le p$. In both cases the equalities are attained for

$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} a, & \text{if } i = j, \\ 0, & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$
 (1.8)

When $m \le n$, the equalities in (1.6) concerned with $0 and <math>0 are also attained for previously defined values <math>a_{ij}$.

Remark 1.2. Note that, proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 1.1, we can prove similar inequalities to (1.4) and (1.6) with $\sum_{j=1}^{n}(\sum_{i=1}^{m})$ instead of $\sum_{i=1}^{m}(\sum_{j=1}^{n})$ on the left-hand side of these inequalities. For example, such an inequality concerning the case when $1 \le q < p$ (i.e., (1.4)) is

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{ij}^{p} \right)^{1/p} \le n^{1-1/p} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{ij}^{q} \right)^{p/q} \right)^{1/p}. \tag{1.9}$$

The above inequality is sharp if $n \le m$, but it is not in spirit of a converse of Minkowski's type inequality.

The following consequence of Theorem 1.1 for m = 2 and q = 2 can be viewed as a converse of Minkowski's inequality (1.1).

Corollary 1.3. Let $n \ge 1$, p > 0, and let $a_j \ge 0$, $b_j \ge 0$ (j = 1, ..., n) be real numbers. Then for $p \ge 1$

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{j}^{p}\right)^{1/p} + \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{j}^{p}\right)^{1/p} \leq 2^{1-\min\{1/2,1/p\}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(a_{j}^{2} + b_{j}^{2}\right)^{p/2}\right)^{1/p}.$$
 (1.10)

If 0 , then

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{j}^{p}\right)^{1/p} + \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} v_{j}^{p}\right)^{1/p} \ge 2^{1-1/p} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(a_{j}^{2} + b_{j}^{2}\right)^{p/2}\right)^{1/p}.$$
(1.11)

Remark 1.4. It is well known that Minkowski's inequality is also true for complex sequences as well. More precisely, if $p \ge 1$ and u_i , v_i (i = 1, ..., n) are arbitrary complex numbers, then

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |u_j + v_j|^p\right)^{1/p} \le \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |u_j|^p\right)^{1/p} + \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} |v_j|^p\right)^{1/p}.$$
(1.12)

Note that the above inequality with $u_j = a_j \in \mathbb{R}$ and $v_j = ib_j$, $b_j \in \mathbb{R}$, for each j = 1, 2, ..., n, becomes

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(a_j^2 + b_j^2\right)^{p/2}\right)^{1/p} \le \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j^p\right)^{1/p} + \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} v_j^p\right)^{1/p}.$$
(1.13)

We see that the first inequality of Corollary 1.3 may be actually regarded as a converse of the previous inequality.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.1

Lemma 2.1 (see [2, page 26]). If $u_1, u_2, \dots u_k, s, r$ are nonnegative real numbers and 0 < s < r, then

$$(u_1^s + u_2^s + \dots + u_k^s)^{1/s} \ge (u_1^r + u_2^r + \dots + u_k^r)^{1/r}.$$
 (2.1)

Proof of Theorem 1.1. In our proof we often use the well-known fact that the scale of power means is nondecreasing (see [2]). More precisely, if $a_1, a_2, ..., a_k$ are nonnegative integers and $0 < \alpha \le \beta < +\infty$, then

$$\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^k a_i^{\alpha}}{k}\right)^{1/\alpha} \le \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^k a_i^{\beta}}{k}\right)^{1/\beta}.$$
(2.2)

In all the cases, for each i = 1, 2, ..., m, we denote that

$$a_i := \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}^p\right)^{1/p}.$$
 (2.3)

We will consider all the six cases related to the inequalities (1.4) and (1.6).

Case 1 (1 $\leq p \leq q$). The inequality between power means of orders $q/p \geq 1$ and 1 for m positive numbers b_i , i = 1, 2, ..., m, states that

$$\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m b_i^{q/p}}{m}\right)^{p/q} \ge \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m b_i}{m},\tag{2.4}$$

whence for any fixed j = 1, 2, ..., n, after substitution of $b_i = a_{ij}^p$, i = 1, 2, ..., m, we obtain

$$\left(a_{1j}^{q} + a_{2j}^{q} + \dots + a_{mj}^{q}\right)^{p/q} \ge m^{(p/q)-1} \left(a_{1j}^{p} + a_{2j}^{p} + \dots + a_{mj}^{p}\right),\tag{2.5}$$

whence after summation over j we find that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(a_{1j}^{q} + a_{2j}^{q} + \dots + a_{mj}^{q} \right)^{p/q} \ge m^{(p/q)-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{ij}^{p}$$

$$= m^{(p/q)-1} \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{i}^{p}.$$
(2.6)

Because $p \ge 1$, the inequality between power means of orders p and 1 implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i^p \ge m^{1-p} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i \right)^p. \tag{2.7}$$

The above inequality and (2.6) immediately yield

$$m^{1-1/q} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{ij}^{q} \right)^{p/q} \right)^{1/p} \ge \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij}^{p} \right)^{1/p}. \tag{2.8}$$

Case 2 (1 \leq q < p). If $m \leq$ n, then $C = m^{1-1/p}$ in (1.4), and a related proof is the same as that for the following case when $0 < q \leq 1 \leq p$.

Now suppose that m > n. By the inequality for power means of orders $p/q \ge 1$ and 1, we obtain

$$\left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(a_{1j}^{q} + a_{2j}^{q} + \dots + a_{mj}^{q}\right)^{p/q}}{n}\right)^{q/p} \\
\geq \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(a_{1j}^{q} + a_{2j}^{q} + \dots + a_{mj}^{q}\right)}{n} = \frac{m}{n} \cdot \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(a_{i1}^{q} + a_{i2}^{q} + \dots + a_{in}^{q}\right)}{m}.$$
(2.9)

Next, by the inequality for power means (of orders $q \ge 1$ and 1), we obtain

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(a_{i1}^{q} + a_{i2}^{q} + \dots + a_{in}^{q} \right)}{m} \ge \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(a_{i1}^{q} + a_{i2}^{q} + \dots + a_{in}^{q} \right)^{1/q}}{m} \right)^{q}. \tag{2.10}$$

For any fixed $i \in \{1, 2, ..., m\}$ the inequality (2.1) of Lemma 2.1 with s = p > q = r implies that

$$\left(a_{i1}^q + a_{i2}^q + \dots + a_{in}^q\right)^{1/q} \ge \left(a_{i1}^p + a_{i2}^p + \dots + a_{in}^p\right)^{1/p}.$$
 (2.11)

Obviously, inequalities (2.9), (2.10), and (2.11) immediately yield

$$n^{1-q/p} \cdot m^{q-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{ij}^{q} \right)^{p/q} \right)^{q/p} \ge \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij}^{p} \right)^{1/p} \right)^{q}, \tag{2.12}$$

which is actually inequality (1.4) with the constant $C = n^{1/q-1/p} \cdot m^{1-1/q}$.

Case 3 (0 < $q \le 1 \le p$). By inequality (2.1) with r = q and s = p, for each j = 1, 2, ..., n, we obtain

$$\left(a_{1j}^q + a_{2j}^q + \dots + a_{mj}^q\right)^{p/q} \ge a_{1j}^p + a_{2j}^p + \dots + a_{mj}^p, \tag{2.13}$$

whence after summation over j, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(a_{1j}^{q} + a_{2j}^{q} + \dots + a_{mj}^{q} \right)^{p/q}$$

$$\geq \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{ij}^{p} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(a_{i1}^{p} + a_{i2}^{p} + \dots + a_{in}^{p} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{i}^{p}.$$
(2.14)

By the inequality for power means (of orders $p \ge 1$ and 1), we get

$$\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i^p}{m}\right)^{1/p} \ge \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i}{m}$$
(2.15)

or equivalently

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i^p\right)^{1/p} \ge m^{(1/p)-1} \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i = m^{(1/p)-1} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij}^p\right)^{1/p}.$$
 (2.16)

The above inequality and (2.14) immediately yield

$$m^{1-1/p} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{ij}^{q} \right)^{p/q} \right)^{1/p} \ge \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij}^{p} \right)^{1/p}, \tag{2.17}$$

as desired.

Case 4 ($0 < q \le p < 1$). The proof can be obtained from those of Case 1, by replacing " \ge " with " \le " in each related inequality.

Case 5 (0 < p < q < 1). If $m \le n$, then the proof is the same as that for Case 6. If m > n, then the proof can be obtained from those of Case 2, by replacing " \ge " with " \le " in each related inequality.

Case 6 (0 < p < 1 $\leq q$). For any fixed j = 1,2,...,n, inequality (2.1) of Lemma 2.1 with r = q and s = p gives

$$\left(a_{1j}^q + a_{2j}^q + \dots + a_{mj}^q\right)^{p/q} \le a_{1j}^p + a_{2j}^p + \dots + a_{mj}^p, \tag{2.18}$$

whence after summation over j, we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(a_{1j}^{q} + a_{2j}^{q} + \dots + a_{mj}^{q} \right)^{p/q} \le \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{ij}^{p} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{i}^{p}.$$
 (2.19)

As 1/p > 1, for positive integers b_1, b_2, \dots, b_m , there holds

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i}{m} \le \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i^{1/p}}{m}\right)^p, \tag{2.20}$$

whence for any fixed j = 1, 2, ..., n, after substitution of $b_i = a_i^p$, i = 1, 2, ..., m, we obtain

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i^p\right)^{1/p} \le m^{(1/p)-1} \sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i = m^{(1/p)-1} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij}^p\right)^{1/p}.$$
 (2.21)

The above inequality and (2.19) immediately yield

$$m^{1-1/p} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_{ij}^{q} \right)^{p/q} \right)^{1/p} \le \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij}^{p} \right)^{1/p}, \tag{2.22}$$

and the proof is completed.

3. The Integral Analogue of Theorem 1.1

Let (X, Σ, μ) be a measure space with a positive Borel measure μ . For any $0 let <math>L^p = L^p(\mu)$ denote the usual Lebesgue space consisting of all μ -measurable complex-valued functions $f: X \to \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\int_{X} |f|^{p} d\mu < +\infty. \tag{3.1}$$

Recall that the usual norm $\|\cdot\|_p$ of $f \in L^p$ is defined as $\|f\|_p = (\int_X |f|^p d\mu)^{1/p}$ if $p \ge 1$; $\|f\|_p = \int_X |f|^p d\mu$ if 0 .

The following result is the integral analogue of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 3.1. For given $0 let <math>u_1, u_2, ..., u_m$ be arbitrary functions in L^p . Then, if $1 \le p < +\infty$, we have

$$||u_1||_p + \dots + ||u_m||_p \le m^{1-\min\{1/2,1/p\}} \left\| \sqrt{|u_1|^2 + \dots + |u_m|^2} \right\|_p.$$
 (3.2)

If 0 , then

$$||u_1||_p + \dots + ||u_m||_p \ge m^{1-1/p} \left\| \sqrt{|u_1|^2 + \dots + |u_m|^2} \right\|_p.$$
 (3.3)

Both inequalities are sharp

For $1 the equality in (3.2) and (3.3) is attained if <math>u_1 = u_2 = \cdots = u_m$ a.e. on X. If p > 2 or $0 , then the equality is attained for <math>u_i = \chi_{E_i}$, where E_i are μ -measurable sets with $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, such that $\mu(E_1) = \mu(E_2) = \cdots = \mu(E_n)$ and $E_i \cap E_j = \emptyset$ whenever $i \ne j$.

Proof. The proof of each inequality is completely similar to the corresponding one given in Theorem 1.1 with a fixed q = 2. For clarity, we give here only a proof related to the case when $1 \le p \le 2$. Applying the inequality between power means of orders $2/p \ge 1$ and 1 to the functions $|u_i|^p$ (i = 1, ..., m), we have

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} |u_i|^2\right)^{p/2} \ge m^{(p/2)-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} |u_i|^p\right). \tag{3.4}$$

Integrating the above relation, we obtain

$$\int_{X} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} |u_{i}|^{2} \right)^{p/2} d\mu \ge m^{(p/2)-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \int_{X} |u_{i}|^{p} d\mu \right), \tag{3.5}$$

which can be written in the form

$$\left\| \sqrt{|u_{1}|^{2} + \dots + |u_{m}|^{2}} \right\|_{p} \ge m^{1/2 - 1/p} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \int_{X} |u_{i}|^{p} d\mu \right)^{1/p}$$

$$= \sqrt{m} \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} ||u_{i}||_{p}}{m} \right)^{1/p}$$

$$\ge \sqrt{m} \cdot \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m} ||u_{i}||_{p}}{m}.$$
(3.6)

Obviously, the above inequality yields (3.2) for 1 .

Corollary 3.2. Let $p \ge 1$, and let w = u + iv be a complex function in L^p . Then there holds the sharp inequality

$$||u||_p + ||v||_p \le 2^{1-\min(1/2,1/p)} ||u + iv||_p.$$
 (3.7)

References

- [1] H. Minkowski, Geometrie der Zahlen, Teubner, Leipzig, Germany, 1910.
- [2] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, and G. Pólya, Inequalities, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1952.
- [3] E. F. Beckenbach and R. Bellman, Inequalities, vol. 30 of Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Springer, Berlin, Germany, 1961.
- [4] H. Toyama, "On the inequality of Ingham and Jessen," Proceedings of the Japan Academy, vol. 24, no. 9,
- pp. 10–12, 1948. [5] H. Alzer and S. Ruscheweyh, "A converse of Minkowski's inequality," *Discrete Mathematics*, vol. 216, no. 1-3, pp. 253-256, 2000.