

248. A CYCLIC INEQUALITY*

Dragoslav S. Mitrinović

This is an expository article concerned with the cyclic inequality

$$(1) \quad \frac{x_1}{x_2 + x_3} + \frac{x_2}{x_3 + x_4} + \cdots + \frac{x_{n-1}}{x_n + x_1} + \frac{x_n}{x_1 + x_2} \geq \frac{n}{2},$$

where

$$(2) \quad x_i \geq 0, \quad x_i + x_{i+1} > 0 \quad (x_{n+1} = x_1, \quad x_{n+2} = x_2, \quad i = 1, \dots, n)$$

and its generalizations.

The challenge of inequality (1) has created lively interest among mathematicians, as may be seen from the historical sketch which follows.

As will be seen, at the present time, the only undecided cases of (1) are $n=9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25$.

One can hope that this review of inequality (1) and allied inequalities will initiate some new contributions and in particular help to solve the mentioned undecided cases of (1).

The simplest case for $n=3$ of this inequality appeared in the literature [1] in 1903; though it is possible that it is not the first appearance.

In 1954 H. S. SHAPIRO [2] raised the question of proving (1) for all $n=3, 4, \dots$. In 1956 a partial answer [3] to this question was obtained. Namely, the editors of *The American Mathematical Monthly* noted that M. J. LIDTHILL succeeded in proving that (1) is not true for $n=20$. The editors also announced that H. S. SHAPIRO submitted the proof of (1) for $n=3$ and 4, and C. R. PHELPS for $n=5$. The counterexample of M. J. LIDTHILL was published in detail in [4].

In 1958 L. J. MORDELL [5] has proved that (1) is true for $n=3, 4, 5, 6$. There is a short note [6] by A. ZULAUF appended to this paper by MORDELL. In this note he gave a counterexample by which he proved that (1) does not hold for $n=14$. This result implies that (1) is not true for even $n \geq 14$. Indeed, if we put

$$f_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{x_1}{x_2 + x_3} + \frac{x_2}{x_3 + x_4} + \cdots + \frac{x_{n-1}}{x_n + x_1} + \frac{x_n}{x_1 + x_2},$$

* Received January 25, 1969.

then the following functional identity holds

$$(3) \quad f_{n+2}(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n, x_{n-1}, x_n) = f_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) + 1.$$

Hence, if (1) is false for some n , then it is also false for $n+2$.

Another counterexample for $n=14$ was given later, 1960, by M. HERSCHORN and J. E. L. PECK [7].

All these counterexamples are of the same kind. Namely, if we set $n=2m$, $x_{2k} = x_k e$, $x_{2k-1} = 1 + b_k e$ ($k=1, \dots, m$), and e is sufficiently small and positive, then

$$f_{2m}(x_1, \dots, x_{2m}) = m + qe^2 + O(e^3) \quad (e \rightarrow 0),$$

where q is a quadratic form in a_k and b_k . If $m=7$ then $a_k \geq 0$ and b_k can be found such that $q < 0$. For instance, in the counterexample by ZULAUF we have

$$(a_1, \dots, a_7) = (7, 6, 5, 2, 0, 1, 4), \quad (b_1, \dots, b_7) = (7, 4, 1, 0, 1, 4, 6) \quad \text{and} \quad q = -2.$$

DINA GLADYS S. THOMAS [8] has proved that, for $n=8, 10, 12$, q is a positive definite quadratic form in a_k and b_k . Hence, in these cases there does not exist a counterexample of this kind.

Let us define

$$\mu(n) = \inf_{x_i \geq 0} f_n(x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad \lambda(n) = \frac{\mu(n)}{n}.$$

Identity (3) implies that

$$(4) \quad \mu(n+2) \leq \mu(n) + 1.$$

In 1958 R. A. RANKIN [9] has proved that there exists $\lambda = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda(n)$ and

$$(5) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \lambda(n) = \inf_{n \geq 1} \lambda(n).$$

He proved also that $\lambda < \frac{1}{2} - 7 \cdot 10^{-8}$, which implies that (1) is false for sufficiently large n . In his later paper [10] he proved that $\lambda > 0,33$.

The upper bound for λ was improved by A. ZULAUF [11]. He proved that $\lambda < 0,49950317$. In the same note he proved that (1) does not hold for $n=53$, i.e., $\lambda(53) < 1/2$. This and (4) imply that $\lambda(n) < 1/2$ for odd $n \geq 53$.

L. J. MORDELL [12] has proved that (1) holds for $n=7$ if besides (2) we have

$$(6) \quad x_1 \geq x_7 \geq x_2 \geq x_6, \quad x_4 \geq x_2, \quad x_1 \geq x_3.$$

K. GOLDBERG informed L. J. MORDELL in his letter of February 9, 1960 that he has checked (1) for $n=7$ and he found it to be true for 300.000 pseudo-random values of x .

A. ZULAUF [13] remarked that the supplementary inequalities (6) are very restrictive. He proved that if n positive random numbers are chosen, then the probability that (1) is satisfied is at least $1/2$. This is implied by the inequality

$$f_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) + f_n(x_n, x_{n-1}, \dots, x_1) \geq n.$$

The proof of the last inequality follows:

If $A_k = x_k + x_{k+1}$ ($x_{k+n} = x_k$), then

$$\begin{aligned} & f_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) + f_n(x_n, x_{n-1}, \dots, x_1) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{x_k + x_{k+3}}{A_{k+1}} = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{A_k - A_{k+1} + A_{k+2}}{A_{k+1}} \\ &= -n + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{A_k}{A_{k+1}} + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{A_{k+2}}{A_{k+1}} > n, \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{A_k}{A_{k+1}} > n, \quad \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{A_{k+2}}{A_{k+1}} > n.$$

P. H. DIANANDA [14] has obtained the following result: If (2) is satisfied and x_{m+1}, \dots, x_{m+n} ($x_{k+n} = x_k$) is monotone for some natural number m , then (1) is true.

The bounds for λ were improved by P. H. DIANANDA in [15] and [16]. Namely, he proved that

$$0,461238 < \lambda < 0,499197.$$

In 1963, D. Ž. ĐOKOVIĆ [17] proved that (1) is true for $n=8$. P. H. DIANANDA [18] and B. BAJŠANSKI [19] have proved independently of each other that this result of ĐOKOVIĆ implies that (1) is true for $n=7$. More generally, they proved that

$$(7) \quad \mu(2m) < \mu(2m-1) + \frac{1}{2}.$$

In the same paper, P. H. DIANANDA has proved that (1) is not true for $n=27$. So, now the only undecided cases of (1) are $n=9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25$.

A. ZULAUF [20] has proved that for the modified cyclic sum

$$\sum x_k / (x_k + x_{k+1})$$

the following inequality holds

$$1 < \frac{x_1}{x_1 + x_2} + \frac{x_2}{x_2 + x_3} + \dots + \frac{x_{n-1}}{x_{n-1} + x_n} + \frac{x_n}{x_n + x_1} < n-1,$$

where x_1, \dots, x_n ($n \geq 3$) are nonnegative, and all denominators positive. These bounds are the best possible.

Let x_1, \dots, x_7 be any nonnegative numbers such that $A_k = x_k + x_{k+1}$ ($x_{k+7} = x_k$) is positive for $k=1, \dots, 7$. In this case A. ZULAUF [21] has proved the following inequalities

$$(8) \quad \sum \frac{x_k}{A_{k+2}} > 3, \quad \sum \frac{x_k}{A_{k+4}} > 3, \quad \sum \frac{x_k}{A_{k+3}} > 2$$

and some others. All bounds in (8) are the best possible. For instance, putting $(x_1, \dots, x_7) = (2t^2, t, 0, t^2, t^2, 0, t)$, we obtain

$$\sum \frac{x_k}{A_{k+3}} = 1 + \frac{2}{t} + \frac{2t}{2t+1} \rightarrow 2 \quad (t \rightarrow +\infty).$$

In [5] L. J. MORDELL conjectured that

$$(9) \quad \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right)^2 \geq k \sum_{i=1}^n x_i (x_{i+1} + \dots + x_{i+m}),$$

where $x_{n+i} = x_i$, and x_1, \dots, x_n are all nonnegative, $n \geq m+1$ and

$$k = \min \left(\frac{n}{m}, \frac{2m+2}{m} \right).$$

He proved this assertion for $n = m+1$, $n = m+2$ and for $n \geq 2m$.

It was remarked by T. MURPHY that this conjecture does not hold for $m=4$, $n=7$. The best possible value of k is $12/7$, which is smaller than $7/4$.

In the same paper L. J. MORDELL proved that the minimum values F_n, G_n of

$$F_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i^2 - 2x_i x_{i+1}) \quad (x_{n+1} = x_1),$$

$$G_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i x_{i+1}$$

are

$$F_n = -\frac{1}{n} \quad (n=3, 4, 5), \quad F_n = -\frac{1}{6} \quad (n \geq 6),$$

$$G_2 = 0, \quad G_3 = -\frac{1}{7}, \quad G_n = -\frac{1}{6} \quad (n \geq 4),$$

where $x_i \geq 0$ ($i=1, \dots, n$) and $x_1 + \dots + x_n = 1$.

In [22] P. H. DIANANDA obtained interesting results concerning (9), namely: Let $k(m, n)$ be the largest value of k , such that (9) holds. Then

$$1^\circ \quad k(m, n) = \frac{n}{m} \text{ if } n \mid m+2 \text{ or } 2m \text{ or } 2m+1 \text{ or } 2m+2,$$

$$\text{or if } n \mid m+3 \text{ and } n=8 \text{ or } 9 \text{ or } 12,$$

$$\text{or if } n \mid m+4 \text{ and } n=12,$$

$$k(m, n) < \frac{n}{m} \text{ otherwise;}$$

$$2^\circ \quad k(m, n) = \frac{2m+2}{n} \text{ if } n > 2m+2;$$

$$3^\circ \quad k(m, n) = \frac{12n}{n+12m-6} \text{ if } n \mid 2m-1 \text{ and } n > 6;$$

$$4^\circ \quad k(m, n) = \frac{k(m - rn, n)}{1 + rk(m - rn, n)} \text{ if } rn < m \quad (r = 1, 2, \dots);$$

$$5^\circ \quad k(m, n + 1) \geq k(m, n) \geq k(m + 1, n).$$

V. J. D. BASTON [23] has complemented these results by the following:

$$6^\circ \quad k(m, 2m - t) = \frac{4(t + 2)}{3t + 4} \text{ if } t \neq 3 \text{ and } m \geq \max\left(2t, \frac{3t}{2} + 2\right);$$

$$7^\circ \quad k(7, 11) < k(m, 2m - 3) < \frac{20}{13} \text{ for } m \geq 7;$$

$$8^\circ \quad k(m, n) < \frac{2(r + 1)[(r + 1)(m + 1) - rn]}{(2r + 1)[(r + 1)m - rn] + 2r(r + 1)} \text{ if } m + 2 < n < 2m - 1$$

and r is an integer such that $\frac{r + 2}{r + 1} < \frac{n}{m} < \frac{r + 1}{r}$.

P. H. DIANANDA [24] also considered the following two inequalities

$$(10) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i}{x_{i+1} + \dots + x_{i+m}} \geq \frac{n}{m},$$

$$(11) \quad \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)^2 \geq \frac{n}{m} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i(x_{i+1} + \dots + x_{i+m}),$$

where $x_{n+k} = x_k$ and $x_i > 0$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$), and proved the following results:

1° Inequality (10) is true if

$$(12) \quad \sin \frac{r}{n} \pi \geq \sin(2m + 1) \frac{r}{n} \pi \quad \left(r = 1, \dots, \left[\frac{n^*}{2}\right]\right).$$

2° Inequality (10) is true if

$$(13) \quad n \mid m + 2, \text{ or } 2m, \text{ or } 2m + 1, \text{ or } 2m + 2.$$

3° If (12) is true, then inequality (11) holds.

4° If (13) is true, (12) is true.

In [25] P. H. DIANANDA obtained more general results, as for example,

$$\inf_{x, y, z > 0} \left(\frac{x^2}{yz} + \frac{4y^2}{yz + zx} + \frac{(x + 2z)^2}{zx + 2xy} \right) = 6.$$

Let x_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$) be positive real numbers and $x_{n+k} = x_k$. P. H. DIANANDA in three papers [16], [26], [27] has proved respectively the following results:

$$\inf_{x_1, \dots, x_n} \frac{4}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i}{3x_{i+1} + x_{i+2} + |x_{i+1} - x_{i+2}|} = 2^s - s \quad \left(s = \frac{1}{n} \left[\frac{n}{3}\right]\right),$$

$$\inf_{x_1, \dots, x_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i^2}{x_{i+1}^2 - x_{i+1}x_{i+2} + x_{i+2}^2} = \left[\frac{n + 1}{2}\right],$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i}{x_{i+1} + \dots + x_{i+m}} \geq \frac{1}{m} \left[\frac{n + m - 1}{m}\right] \geq \frac{n}{m^2}.$$

Finally, we note the following cyclic inequality [28]

$$\frac{x_1 + \cdots + x_k}{x_{k+1} + \cdots + x_n} + \frac{x_2 + \cdots + x_{k+1}}{x_{k+2} + \cdots + x_1} + \cdots + \frac{x_n + x_1 + \cdots + x_{k-1}}{x_k + \cdots + x_{n-1}} > \frac{nk}{n-k},$$

where x_1, \dots, x_n are positive numbers, and $n > k > 1$.

The author wishes to thank Professors R. A. RANKIN and P. H. DIANANDA which have read this paper in manuscript and gave valuable comments.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. M. NESBITT, *Problem 15114*, Educational Times (2) 3 (1903), 37—38.
- [2] H. S. SHAPIRO, *Problem 4603*, Amer. Math. Monthly 61 (1954), 571.
- [3] H. S. SHAPIRO, *Problem 4603*, Amer. Math. Monthly 63 (1956), 191—192.
- [4] C. V. DURELL, *Query*, Math. Gaz. 40 (1956), 266.
- [5] L. J. MORDELL, *On the inequality ... and some others*, Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg 22 (1958), 229—240.
- [6] A. ZULAUF, *Note on a conjecture of L. J. Mordell*, Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg 22 (1958), 240—241.
- [7] M. HERSCHERN and J. E. L. PECK, *Problem 4603*, Amer. Math. Monthly 67 (1960), 87—88.
- [8] DINA GLADYS S. THOMAS, *On the definiteness of certain quadratic forms arising in a conjecture of L. J. Mordell*, Amer. Math. Monthly 68 (1961), 472—473.
- [9] R. A. RANKIN, *An inequality*, Math. Gaz. 42 (1958), 39—40.
- [10] R. A. RANKIN, *A cyclic inequality*, Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. (2) 12 (1960/61), 139—147.
- [11] A. ZULAUF, *On a conjecture of L. J. Mordell, II.*, Math. Gaz. 42 (1959), 182—184.
- [12] L. J. MORDELL, *Note on the inequality ...*, J. London Math. Soc. 37 (1962), 176—178.
- [13] A. ZULAUF, *Note on an inequality*, Math. Gaz. 46 (1962), 41—42.
- [14] P. H. DIANANDA, *Inequalities for some cyclic sums*, J. London Math. Soc. 38 (1963), 60—62.
- [15] P. H. DIANANDA, *A cyclic inequality and an extension of it. I.*, Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. (2) 13 (1962/63), 79—84.
- [16] P. H. DIANANDA, *A cyclic inequality and an extension of it. II.*, Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. (2) 13 (1962/63), 143—152.
- [17] D. Ž. ĐOKOVIĆ, *Sur une inégalité*, Proc. Glasgow Math. Assoc. 6 (1963), 1—10.
- [18] P. H. DIANANDA, *On a cyclic sum*, Proc. Glasgow Math. Assoc. 6 (1963), 11—13.
- [19] B. BAJŠANSKI, *A remark concerning the lower bound of ...*, Univ. Beograd. Publ. Elektrotehn. Fak. Ser. Mat. Fiz. № 70 — № 76 (1962), 19—20.
- [20] A. ZULAUF, *Note on the expression ...*, Math. Gaz. 42 (1958), 42.
- [21] A. ZULAUF, *Note on some inequalities*, Math. Gaz. 42 (1958), 42—44.
- [22] P. H. DIANANDA, *On a conjecture of L. J. Mordell regarding an inequality involving quadratic forms*, J. London Math. Soc. 36 (1961), 185—192.
- [23] V. J. D. BASTON, *On a cyclic sum of Mordell*, Acta Arith. 11 (1965), 133—146.
- [24] P. H. DIANANDA, *Extensions of an inequality of H. S. Shapiro*, Amer. Math. Monthly 66 (1959), 489—491.
- [25] P. H. DIANANDA, *Inequalities for a class of cyclic and other sums*, J. London Math. Soc. 37 (1962), 424—431.
- [26] P. H. DIANANDA, *Some cyclic and other inequalities. II.*, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 58 (1962) 703—705.
- [27] P. H. DIANANDA, *Some cyclic and other inequalities*, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 58 (1962), 425—427.
- [28] D. S. MITRINOVIĆ, *Problem 75*, Mat. Vesnik 4 (19) (1967), 103.