

## Carleman's inequality for finite series

***Citation for published version (APA):***

Bruijn, de, N. G. (1963). Carleman's inequality for finite series. *Proceedings of the Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen: Series A: Mathematical Sciences*, 66(4), 505-514.

***Document status and date:***

Published: 01/01/1963

***Document Version:***

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of Record (includes final page, issue and volume numbers)

***Please check the document version of this publication:***

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

***General rights***

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

[www.tue.nl/taverne](http://www.tue.nl/taverne)

***Take down policy***

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

[openaccess@tue.nl](mailto:openaccess@tue.nl)

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

CARLEMAN'S INEQUALITY FOR FINITE SERIES

MATHEMATICS

BY

N. G. DE BRUIJN

(Communicated at the meeting of May 25, 1963)

1. *Introduction.* CARLEMAN [2] proved the following inequality for convergent infinite series  $\sum_1^\infty a_n$  with positive terms:

$$(1.1) \quad \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} (a_1 \dots a_\nu)^{1/\nu} < e \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} a_\nu.$$

The constant  $e$  is best possible, although there is no convergent series for which equality holds.

If, however, we restrict the series to a finite number of terms, we obtain an inequality with a smaller best possible bound  $\lambda_n$ :

$$(1.2) \quad \sum_{\nu=1}^n (a_1 \dots a_\nu)^{1/\nu} < \lambda_n \sum_{\nu=1}^n a_\nu$$

for all  $a_1 > 0, \dots, a_n > 0$ . It is the purpose of this paper to establish the asymptotic behaviour of  $\lambda_n$  if  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . We shall show that

$$(1.3) \quad \lambda_n = e - \frac{2\pi^2 e}{(\log n)^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log n)^3}\right).$$

The form of (1.3) reminds of similar results for the finite sections in Hilbert's inequality, where

$$(1.4) \quad \lambda_n = \pi - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\pi^5}{(\log n)^2} + O\left(\frac{\log \log n}{(\log n)^3}\right)$$

(see [1]), and in Hardy's inequality, where

$$(1.5) \quad \lambda_n = 4 - \frac{16 \pi^2}{(\log n)^2} + O\left(\frac{\log \log n}{(\log n)^3}\right)$$

(see [4]). The questions about Hilbert's and Hardy's inequalities are problems on the largest eigenvalue of a matrix, and the methods by which (1.4) and (1.5) were derived depended essentially on that point of view. Carleman's inequality, however, is essentially different in nature, and our method for proving (1.3) will have nothing in common with the linear algebra methods used for the proofs of (1.4) and (1.5).

We shall show (sec. 2), by an argument almost completely copied from CARLEMAN's paper [2], that  $\lambda_n$  is the largest solution of the equation

$h_n(\lambda) = \log(n\lambda)$ , where the functions  $h_\nu(\lambda)$  are defined recursively by  $h_1(\lambda) = 0$ , and

$$(1.6) \quad h_{\nu+1}(\lambda) - h_\nu(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\nu+1} \{ \log(1 - (\lambda\nu)^{-1} e^{h_\nu(\lambda)})^{-\nu} - h(\lambda) \}.$$

The rest of this paper is devoted to a close study of the asymptotics of this recurrence. It is a problem with several quite difficult aspects, and we present it in great detail since the methods may be applicable in many similar cases.

We shall show in sec. 3 that our final result (1.3) follows directly from the asymptotic behaviour of the logarithm of what we shall call the "breakdown index", i.e. the number of  $h_\nu$ 's we can evaluate from (1.6) (with  $h_1 = 0$ ) without having to evaluate the logarithm of a non-positive number.

It was Prof. H. S. WILF who suggested to the author to attack the asymptotic behaviour of  $\lambda_n$  by an investigation of the recurrence relations arising from Carleman's method (sec. 2 below).

2. *Carleman's analysis.* CARLEMAN [2] attacked the problem of  $\lambda_n$  by the Lagrange multiplier method:  $\lambda_n$  is the maximum of the expression on the left-hand side of (1.2) under the condition that  $\sum_1^n a_\nu = 1$ . This easily leads to the result that  $\lambda_n$  is the largest positive value of  $\lambda$  such that the following set of equations has a solution with  $a_1 > 0, \dots, a_n > 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(a_1 - a_2) &= a_1 \\ 2\lambda(a_2 - a_3) &= (a_1 a_2)^{1/2} \\ 3\lambda(a_3 - a_4) &= (a_1 a_2 a_3)^{1/3} \\ &\dots \dots \dots \\ (n-1)\lambda(a_{n-1} - a_n) &= (a_1 \dots a_{n-1})^{1/(n-1)} \\ n\lambda a_n &= (a_1 \dots a_n)^{1/n}. \end{aligned}$$

Introducing an extra variable  $a_{n+1}$ , we can replace the last equation by

$$n\lambda(a_n - a_{n+1}) = (a_1 \dots a_n)^{1/n}, \quad a_{n+1} = 0.$$

This means that  $\lambda_n$  satisfies the condition that if we start from an arbitrary  $a_1 > 0$ , and if we evaluate  $a_2, a_3, \dots$  recursively from

$$(2.1) \quad \nu\lambda(a_\nu - a_{\nu+1}) = (a_1 \dots a_\nu)^{1/\nu},$$

then  $a_1 > 0, a_2 > 0, \dots, a_n > 0, a_{n+1} = 0$ . Moreover,  $\lambda_n$  is the largest number with this property.

We simplify (2.1) by a substitution

$$(2.2) \quad h_\nu = \nu^{-1} \log(a_1 \dots a_\nu) - \log a_\nu \quad (\nu = 1, \dots, n).$$

Now  $h_{n+1}$  is not defined, but the condition  $a_{n+1} = 0$  can be replaced by  $n\lambda a_n = (a_1 \dots a_n)^{1/n}$ , that is, by  $h_n = \log(n\lambda)$ . The advantage of (2.2) is

that we obtain a recursion expressing  $h_{\nu+1}$  in terms of  $h_\nu$ , without using  $h_1, \dots, h_{\nu-1}$ . It is obvious that  $h_1=0$ . The  $h_\nu$ 's depend on  $\lambda$ , of course, so we represent them by  $h_\nu(\lambda)$ . It is easily verified that (2.2) transforms into (1.6).

Carleman proved that  $\lambda_n < e$ , by the following argument. If for  $\lambda \geq e$  we evaluate  $h_2, h_3, \dots$  consecutively from (1.6), we can show that

$$(2.3) \quad h_\nu(\lambda) < 1 - \nu^{-1} \quad (\lambda \geq e, \nu = 2, 3, \dots),$$

and this implies that for no value of  $n$  we have  $h_n(\lambda) = \log(n\lambda)$ . In other words, our  $\lambda_n$  cannot be  $\geq e$ .

Formula (2.3) can be proved by induction. If  $h_\nu(\lambda) < 1 - \nu^{-1}$  for some  $\nu$ , then we have

$$e^{1-h_\nu(\lambda)} > 1 + \nu^{-1},$$

and, by (1.6), this is equivalent to  $h_{\nu+1}(\lambda) < 1 - (\nu+1)^{-1}$ .

From the fact that  $\lambda_n < e$  ( $n=1, 2, \dots$ ) we can derive (1.1), with  $\leq$  instead of  $<$ , however. The fact that there is no convergent series producing equality in (1.1), requires some careful reasoning: under the assumption that the equality sign holds we have to show that (2.1) is true for all  $\nu$  (with  $\lambda=e$ ); this can be done by proving that the sum of the series is a differentiable function of  $a_1, \dots, a_{\nu+1}$ , if  $a_{\nu+2}, a_{\nu+3}, \dots$  are kept constant. Once this has been done, one can show that the  $a_\nu$  derived from (2.1) in this way, produce a divergent series (if  $\lambda=e$ ). (Carleman proved  $a_\nu/a_1 > \nu^{-1}$ ; and in sec. 7 we shall determine the asymptotic behaviour of these  $a_\nu$ ).

A much simpler proof of Carleman's inequality (in the strong form (1.1)) was given later by PÓLYA (see [3]), but that method does not throw much light on our problem about the finite series.

3. *The breakdown index.* We take any value of  $\lambda > 0$ , and we evaluate  $h_2, h_3, \dots$  consecutively from (1.6), starting with  $h_1=0$ . We are interested in real values of  $h_\nu$  only, and therefore we say that the procedure breaks down at the first  $\nu$  where  $1 - (\lambda\nu)^{-1} \exp(h_\nu(\lambda)) \leq 0$ , or, what is the same thing,  $h_\nu(\lambda) \geq \log(\lambda\nu)$ . It may happen that it never breaks down: if  $\lambda \geq e$  we have, by (2.3)

$$(3.1) \quad h_\nu(\lambda) < 1 - \nu^{-1} < 1 \leq \log(\lambda\nu) \quad (\nu = 1, 2, \dots).$$

We define the *breakdown index*  $N_\lambda$  as the smallest  $\nu$  for which  $h_\nu(\lambda) \geq \log(\lambda\nu)$  if there is such a  $\nu$ , and we put  $N_\lambda = \infty$  if  $h_\nu(\lambda) < \log(\lambda\nu)$  for all  $\nu$ . So for all  $\lambda > 0$  we can say that  $h_\nu(\lambda)$  is defined for all  $\nu < N_\lambda + 1$ .

If  $\lambda \geq e$  we have  $N_\lambda = \infty$  (cf. (2.3)); if  $0 < \lambda < e$ , however, it will turn out that  $N_\lambda$  is finite. And we shall show (see sec. 6) that

$$(3.2) \quad \log N_\lambda = 2^{\frac{1}{2}} \pi \left( \log \frac{e}{\lambda} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} + O(1)$$

if  $\lambda < e$ ,  $\lambda \rightarrow e$ .

It is convenient to have some monotonicity properties available, and indeed, as long as  $0 < \lambda \leq e$  these are easily obtained. We have  $h_1(\lambda) = 0$  ( $0 < \lambda \leq e$ ),  $\lambda_1$  is the largest  $\lambda$  for which  $h_1(\lambda) = \log \lambda$ , whence  $\lambda_1 = 1$ . Now  $h_2(\lambda)$  is defined for  $\lambda \geq \lambda_1$ , and  $h_2(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2} \log (1 - \lambda^{-1})^{-1}$ . This is decreasing for  $\lambda \geq \lambda_1$ , whereas  $\log 2\lambda$  is increasing. Moreover  $h_2(\lambda) \geq h_1(\lambda)$ . As  $h_2(\lambda_1) = \infty$ ,  $h_2(e) < \log 2e$  (see (2.3)), there is exactly one value of  $\lambda$  for which  $h_2(\lambda) = \log 2\lambda$ , and that is our  $\lambda_2$ . This procedure can be continued. At each step we argue that  $h_\nu$  is decreasing for  $\lambda > \lambda_{\nu-1}$ , that  $h_\nu(\lambda_{\nu-1}) = \infty$ , and that  $h_\nu(e) < \log(\nu e)$ , and we infer that  $\lambda_\nu$  is uniquely defined by  $h_\nu(\lambda) = \log(\nu\lambda)$ ; moreover  $h_{\nu+1}$  is again decreasing ( $\lambda_\nu \geq \lambda$ ), since

$$h_{\nu+1}(\lambda) = \nu(\nu+1)^{-1} \{h_\nu(\lambda) + \log(1 - (\lambda\nu)^{-1} \exp h_\nu(\lambda))^{-1}\},$$

and both terms on the right are decreasing.

So by induction we obtain that

$$1 = \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \lambda_3 < \dots < e$$

and that  $h_{\nu+1}(\lambda)$  is defined and decreasing for  $\lambda > \lambda_\nu$ . Moreover  $h_\nu(\lambda) > \log(\nu\lambda)$  if  $0 \leq \lambda < \lambda_\nu$ ,  $h_\nu(\lambda_\nu) = \log(\nu\lambda_\nu)$ ,  $h_\nu(\lambda) < \log(\nu\lambda)$  if  $\lambda > \lambda_\nu$ .

It follows that the breakdown index  $N_\lambda$  equals 1 if  $\lambda \leq \lambda_1$ , 2 if  $\lambda_1 < \lambda \leq \lambda_2$ , etc.

Knowing this we can immediately translate (3.2) into an asymptotic formula for  $\lambda_n$ . If  $\lambda \rightarrow e$  ( $\lambda < e$ ), then  $\log N_\lambda$  tends to infinity, and therefore the  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots$  cannot stay below a constant  $< e$ . So  $\lambda_n \rightarrow e$ . If  $\lambda = \lambda_n$ , then  $N_\lambda = n$ . It follows by (3.2) that

$$\log(e/\lambda_n) = 2\pi^2 (\log n + O(1))^{-2},$$

and this leads to (1.3).

It may be remarked that for fixed  $\lambda \leq e$  the  $h_\nu(\lambda)$  are  $\geq 0$  and increase if  $\nu$  increases from 1 to  $N_\lambda$ . This follows from (1.6) by remarking that

$$(3.3) \quad \log(1 - (\lambda\nu)^{-1} e^h)^{-\nu} > h$$

for all  $h$  satisfying  $h > 0$ ,  $e^h < \lambda\nu$  (provided that  $\lambda \leq e$ ). We can derive (3.3) as follows: since  $(\lambda\nu)^{-1} e^h < 1$  the left-hand side is at least  $\nu(\lambda\nu)^{-1} e^h$ , and as  $e^h \geq eh$  for all  $h \geq 0$ , (3.3) follows.

The breakdown condition  $h_\nu \geq \log(\lambda\nu)$  is slightly awkward. We are able to replace it by a simpler one, for example  $h_\nu \geq 2$ , by virtue of the following argument. Let  $0 < \lambda < e$ , and assume that  $N$  is such that  $N < N_\lambda$  and  $h_N > 2$ . Then we have

$$(3.4) \quad \log N_\lambda - \log N < 16.$$

For, if  $N < \nu \leq N_\lambda$ , we have, by (1.6)

$$h_{\nu+1} - h_\nu > \frac{1}{\nu+1} \{\lambda^{-1} e^{h_\nu} - h_\nu\} > \frac{1}{6(\nu+1)} h_\nu^2,$$

since  $(e^h - 1)h^{-2}$  increases for  $h \geq 2$ . We simplify this by considering  $k_N, k_{N+1}, \dots$  defined by  $k_N = h_N$ , and

$$(3.5) \quad k_{v+1} - k_v = k_v^2 / (6(v+1)).$$

Obviously  $k_v \leq h_v$  ( $N \leq v \leq N_\lambda$ ), and since  $\log(\lambda v) \leq v$ , we have  $k_v \leq v$  for  $N \leq v < N_\lambda$ . Therefore (3.5) guarantees that  $k_{v+1} < \frac{4}{3}k_v$  ( $N \leq v < N_\lambda$ ), whence (3.5) implies that

$$k_v^{-1} - k_{v+1}^{-1} > (8(v+1))^{-1} \quad (N \leq v < N_\lambda).$$

Taking summation with respect to  $v$  we infer that

$$\frac{1}{2} > \sum_{N \leq v < N_\lambda} (8(v+1))^{-1},$$

and this proves (3.4).

The fact that  $\log N_\lambda - \log N = O(1)$  means that there is no harm in replacing the left-hand side of (3.2) by  $\log N$ . So if we find a value of  $v$  for which  $h_v \geq 2$ , we need not investigate the rest of the sequence until breakdown.

4. *Heuristic treatment.* Our problem is, roughly, to determine how many steps we have to take in our recurrence (1.6) in order to push  $h_v$  beyond the value 2, assuming that  $\lambda$  is fixed,  $\lambda < e$  and  $\lambda$  close to  $e$ . The right-hand side of (1.6) equals

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{1}{v+1} \{ \lambda^{-1} e^{h_v(\lambda)} - h_v + e^{2h_v(\lambda)} (2\lambda^2 v)^{-1} + e^{3h_v(\lambda)} (3\lambda^3 v^2)^{-1} + \dots \}.$$

Now assume we are able to neglect the terms containing  $v^{-1}, v^{-2}, \dots$ ; then we have a recurrence which can be written as

$$(4.2) \quad \Delta h = (v+1)^{-1} (\lambda^{-1} e^h - h).$$

Next we consider  $v$  as a continuous variable, and we replace (4.2) by the corresponding differential equation; that is, we replace  $\Delta h$  by  $dh/dv$ . Then we get

$$\frac{d \log(v+1)}{dh} = (\lambda^{-1} e^h - h)^{-1}.$$

This suggests that if  $N$  is the number of steps necessary to increase  $h$  from 0 to about 2, then  $\log N$  is roughly equal to

$$(4.3) \quad \int_0^2 \frac{dh}{\lambda^{-1} e^h - h}.$$

The integrand has its maximum at  $h = \log \lambda$ , and this is close to 1. In the neighbourhood of that maximum it can be approximated by

$\frac{1}{2}(h - \log \lambda)^2 + (1 - \log \lambda)$ , and therefore the value of (4.3) can be compared with

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(h - \log \lambda)^2 + (1 - \log \lambda) \right\}^{-1} dh = 2^{\frac{1}{2}} \pi (\log(e/\lambda))^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

and this leads to something like (3.2).

There are various doubtful steps in this argument, but the only one that presents a serious difficulty is the first one. The terms with  $\nu^{-1}, \nu^{-2}, \dots$  in (4.1) can be expected to give only a small contribution if  $\nu$  is large, but the question (to be settled in sec. 5) is whether this contribution is small compared to  $\lambda^{-1} e^{h_\nu(\lambda)} - h_\nu(\lambda)$ . The latter expression can be small if both  $h_\nu - 1$  and  $\lambda - e$  are small, and it is especially in that region that the integrand of (4.3) produces its maximal effect.

### 5. Preliminary results

Lemma 1. If  $p > 0$  is given, then we can find an integer  $\mu > p$  and a number  $\beta (1 < \beta < e)$  such that

$$(5.1) \quad \frac{1}{2} < h_\mu(\lambda) < \log \lambda - \mu^{-1} \quad (\beta < \lambda \leq e).$$

Proof. We have  $0 < h_\nu(e) < 1 - \nu^{-1}$  ( $\nu = 2, 3, \dots$ ). And not all  $h_\nu(e)$  are  $\leq \frac{1}{2}$ . For, (1.6) implies that

$$h_{\nu+1}(e) - h_\nu(e) > (\nu + 1)^{-1} (e^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{2})$$

as long as  $h_\nu(e) < \frac{1}{2}$ , and as  $\sum_1^\infty (\nu + 1)^{-1} = \infty$ , this cannot apply to all positive integers  $\nu$ . So there is an integer  $\mu > p$  for which

$$\frac{1}{2} < h_\mu(e) < 1 - \mu^{-1}.$$

Having fixed  $\mu$  this way, we remark that  $h_\mu(\lambda)$  is continuous at  $\lambda = e$ , and the lemma follows.

Lemma 2. There exist numbers  $\beta (1 < \beta < e)$  and  $c (c > 0)$  such that for all  $\lambda$  satisfying  $\beta < \lambda \leq e$ , and for all  $\nu$  satisfying  $1 < \nu \leq N_\lambda$  ( $N_\lambda$  is the breakdown index) we have

$$(5.2) \quad \lambda^{-1} e^{h_\nu(\lambda)} - h_\nu(\lambda) > c \nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. We apply lemma 1 with  $p = 2$ , whence we obtain values of  $\mu (\mu \geq 3)$  and  $\beta$ . For the time being we keep  $\lambda$  fixed ( $\beta < \lambda < e$ ) and we write  $h_\nu$  instead of  $h_\nu(\lambda)$ .

As we remarked in sec. 3, the sequence  $h_\mu, h_{\mu+1}, \dots$  is increasing, possibly until breakdown. We shall now first consider those integers  $\nu \geq \mu$  for which  $h_\nu < \log \lambda$ .

For those  $\nu$  we can prove

$$(5.3) \quad h_{\nu+1} - h_\nu < (\nu + 1)^{-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (\log \lambda - h)^2 + \log(e/\lambda) + \frac{3}{4} \nu^{-1} \right\}.$$

This follows by expanding the logarithm in (1.6) (cf. (4.1)) and remarking that  $e^{-u} < 1 - u + \frac{1}{2}u^2$ , where  $u = \log \lambda - h_v$ , and that

$$\frac{1}{2} e^{-u} v^{-1} + \frac{1}{3} e^{-2u} v^{-2} + \frac{1}{4} e^{-3u} v^{-3} + \dots < \frac{3}{4},$$

because of  $e^{-u} < 1$ ,  $v \geq \mu \geq 3$ .

Since  $\lambda < e$ ,  $\frac{1}{2} < h_\mu \leq h_v < \log \lambda$ , we have  $0 < \log \lambda - h_v < \frac{1}{2}$ , and therefore we can replace (5.3) by the linear recurrence relation

$$(5.4) \quad h_{v+1} - h_v < (v+1)^{-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{4} (\log \lambda - h_v) + \log (e/\lambda) + \frac{3}{4} v^{-1} \right\}.$$

Putting

$$\log \lambda - h_v + 4 \log (e/\lambda) - v^{-1} = t_v,$$

(5.4) transforms into

$$(5.5) \quad t_{v+1} > t_v \left\{ 1 - \frac{1}{4}(v+1)^{-1} \right\}.$$

By (5.1) we have  $t_\mu > 0$ , and it follows that  $t_v > 0$  for all  $v$  under consideration.

We have  $1 - \frac{1}{4}x > (1-x)^{\frac{1}{2}}$  ( $0 < x < 1$ ), whence (5.5) shows that

$$t_{v+1} > t_v v^{\frac{1}{2}} (v+1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

It easily follows that

$$(5.6) \quad t_{v+1} \geq (v+1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} t_\mu$$

for all  $v$  under consideration, i.e. for all  $v$  for which  $h_v < \log \lambda$ . This is certainly satisfied if  $t_v > 4 \log (e/\lambda)$ , and (5.6) guarantees that this is true as long as  $v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} t_\mu > 4 \log (e/\lambda)$ . Therefore

$$(5.7) \quad t_v \geq v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} t_\mu \quad (\mu \leq v < \mu t_\mu^4 (4 \log (e/\lambda))^{-4}),$$

and we are sure that no breakdown occurs in this range.

We can now attack (5.2). If  $0 < h < \log \lambda$ , we have

$$e^{h - \log \lambda} - h > \log (e/\lambda) + \frac{1}{3} (\log \lambda - h)^2$$

(for  $e^{-u} > 1 - u + \frac{1}{3}u^2$  if  $0 < u < 1$ ), and as  $0 \leq \log (e/\lambda) < 1$  we obtain

$$e^{h - \log \lambda} - h > (\log (e/\lambda))^2 + \frac{1}{3} (\log \lambda - h)^2 > \frac{1}{3^{\frac{1}{2}}} (4 \log (e/\lambda) + \log \lambda - h)^2,$$

since  $u^2 + \frac{1}{3}v^2 > u^2 + (\frac{1}{4}v)^2 > \frac{1}{2}(u + \frac{1}{4}v)^2$ . Applying this with  $h = h_v$ , and remarking that (5.7) leads to

$$4 \log (e/\lambda) + \log \lambda - h_v > v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} t_\mu,$$

we obtain that the left-hand side of (5.2) is at least

$$\left( \frac{1}{3^{\frac{1}{2}}} \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} t_\mu^2 \right) v^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

This holds in the region indicated in (5.7). The remaining regions do not cause much trouble. First, for the values  $1 \leq v < \mu$  we have  $h_v(\lambda) <$

$< \log \lambda - \mu^{-1}$  (see (5.1) and use the fact that  $h_\nu$  increases if  $\nu$  increases (sec. 3)). It follows that

$$\lambda^{-1} e^{h_\nu} - h_\nu > \frac{1}{3}(\log \lambda - h_\nu)^2 > \frac{1}{3}\mu^{-2} > (\frac{1}{3}\mu^{-2})\nu^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

if  $1 \leq \nu < \mu$ . In the second place, we have to consider the following range (which is empty if  $\lambda = e$ )

$$\mu t_\mu^4 (4 \log (e/\lambda))^{-4} \leq \nu < N_\lambda.$$

Here we use that  $\lambda^{-1} e^{h_\nu} - h_\nu \geq \log (e/\lambda)$  for all  $h$ , whence (5.1) is realised with

$$c = \mu^{\frac{1}{2}} t_\mu^2 4^{-2} (\log (e/\beta))^{-1}.$$

In all three cases the constant is independent of  $\lambda$  and  $\nu$ , so this completes the proof of the lemma.

**Lemma 3.** There exists a number  $\beta (1 < \beta < e)$  such that for every  $\lambda$  satisfying  $\beta < \lambda < e$  there exists an index  $N < N_\lambda$  with  $h_N > 2$ .

*Proof.* We apply lemma 1 with  $p = 2e^3$ , and lemma 1 provides us with  $\mu (\mu > 2e^3)$  and  $\beta$  such that (5.1) holds.

Next consider the numbers  $h_\mu, h_{\mu+1}, h_{\mu+2}, \dots$  as far as they are  $< 3$ . If  $\nu \geq \mu, h_\nu < 3$ , we have

$$(5.8) \quad (\lambda\nu)^{-1} e^{h_\nu} < \frac{1}{2},$$

and we easily evaluate from (1.6), using  $\lambda^{-1} e^{h_\nu} - h_\nu \geq \log (e/\lambda)$ , and using the development (4.1), that

$$(\nu + 1)^{-1} \log (e/\lambda) < h_{\nu+1} - h_\nu < 1.$$

The lower estimate shows that not for all  $\nu \geq \mu$  we have  $h_\nu \leq 2$ , since  $\sum_{\nu=\mu}^\infty (h_{\nu+1} - h_\nu)$  would diverge. And if  $h_\sigma$  is the last one below 2, then  $h_{\sigma+1}$  is still below 3, the difference being less than 1. So we can take  $N = \sigma + 1$ . It should be remarked that (5.8) guarantees that  $\nu < N_\lambda$ .

6. *Behaviour of  $\theta(h_\nu)$ .* As suggested by the discussion in sec. 4, we shall study  $\theta(h_\nu)$ , where  $\theta$  is the function defined by

$$(6.1) \quad \theta(y) = \int_0^y \frac{dx}{e^x/\lambda - x}.$$

We first simplify the recurrence formula (1.6). Assuming

$$(6.2) \quad 1 < \lambda \leq e, \nu > 2e^2, h_\nu < 2,$$

we have

$$h_{\nu+1} - h_\nu = (\nu + 1)^{-1} \{ \lambda^{-1} e^{h_\nu} - h_\nu + \varrho_\nu \},$$

where

$$|\varrho_\nu| = \nu \sum_{j=2}^\infty (e^{h_\nu} \lambda^{-1} \nu^{-1})^j j^{-1} < e^4 \nu^{-1}.$$

We deduce that

$$|h_{v+1} - h_v| \leq (v+1)^{-1} (e^2 + e^4),$$

and from this rough estimate we easily obtain

$$|\lambda^{-1} e^x - x - (\lambda^{-1} e^{h_v} - h_v)| \leq c_1 v^{-1} \quad (h_v \leq x \leq h_{v+1}),$$

with  $c_1$  not depending on  $\lambda$  or  $v$  (still assuming (6.2) and  $\beta < \lambda \leq e$ ).

We next apply the mean value theorem:

$$\theta(h_{v+1}) - \theta(h_v) = (h_{v+1} - h_v) \theta'(x)$$

with some  $x$  between  $h_v$  and  $h_{v+1}$ . Hence

$$(6.3) \quad \theta(h_{v+1}) - \theta(h_v) = (v+1)^{-1} (H + \varrho_v) / (H + \sigma_v),$$

where  $H = \lambda^{-1} e^{h_v} - h_v$ , and  $|\varrho_v| < e^4 v^{-1}$ ,  $|\sigma_v| < c_1 v^{-1}$ .

Introducing the extra assumption that  $\beta < \lambda \leq e$  (see lemma 1), we now have, by (5.2),

$$|\varrho_v| < e^4 c^{-1} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} H, \quad |\sigma_v| < c_1 c^{-1} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} H.$$

Using this in connection with (6.3), we observe that we can find an integer  $\kappa > 2e^2$ ,  $\kappa$  not depending on  $\lambda$ , such that under the extra assumptions  $h_v < 2$ ,  $v > \kappa$  we have

$$|\theta(h_{v+1}) - \theta(h_v) - \log((v+1)/v)| < c_3 v^{-3/2}.$$

Now assuming  $\lambda < e$ , we take the sum over the values  $\kappa \leq v < N$ , where  $N$  is the first index with  $h_N > 2$  (see lemma 2). It results that

$$(6.4) \quad |\theta(h_N) - \log N| < c_4 + \log \kappa + \theta(h_\kappa)$$

where  $c_4$  is an absolute constant.

By lemma 1, we can determine  $\beta_1 (\beta < \beta_1 < e)$  such that  $h_\kappa(\lambda) < \log \lambda$  for all  $\lambda$  satisfying  $\beta_1 < \lambda < e$ . Therefore, in the integral defining  $\theta(h_\kappa)$ , the maximum of the integrand is attained at  $x = h_\kappa$ , whence, by (5.1),

$$c_4 + \log \kappa + \theta(h_\kappa) < c_4 + \log \kappa + (\log \lambda) \cdot (c\kappa^{-\frac{1}{2}})^{-\frac{1}{2}} < c_5,$$

where  $c_5$  is an absolute constant.

It is not difficult to find the asymptotic behaviour of  $\theta(\infty)$ , if  $\lambda < e$ ,  $\lambda \rightarrow e$ , by routine methods (cf. sec. 4). They lead to

$$(6.5) \quad \theta(\infty) = \int_0^\infty \frac{dx}{e^x/\lambda - x} = 2^{\frac{1}{2}} \pi (\log(e/\lambda))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + O(1) \quad (\lambda < e, \lambda \rightarrow e),$$

and it is also easy to see that

$$\theta(\infty) - \theta(2) = O(1).$$

As  $\theta(2) \leq \theta(h_N) \leq \theta(\infty)$ , (6.2) now leads to

$$\log N = 2^{\frac{1}{2}} \pi (\log(e/\lambda))^{-\frac{1}{2}} + O(1).$$

According to the discussion in sec. 3, this completes the proof of (3.2), and it was already shown there that (3.2) leads to our main result (1.3).

7. *The case  $\lambda=e$ .* If  $\lambda=e$  the behaviour of the  $h_\nu$  is different: they all stay below 1, and tend to 1, and the asymptotic problem is how  $1-h_\nu$  behaves if  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ . The answer is immediately obtained from sec. 6, where  $\lambda=e$  was not excluded. We obtain (cf. (6.4)), now for all  $\nu$ ,

$$|\theta(h_\nu) - \log \nu| < c_6,$$

where  $c_6$  is an absolute constant.

Instead of (6.5), we now have to use the behaviour of  $\theta(h)$  if  $\lambda=e$ ,  $h \rightarrow 1$ , given by

$$\theta(h) = \frac{2}{1-h} + \frac{2}{3} \log \frac{1}{1-h} + O(1) \quad (0 \leq h < 1),$$

and we easily derive

$$h_\nu = 1 - \frac{2}{\log \nu} - \frac{4}{3} \frac{\log \log \nu}{(\log \nu)^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log \nu)^2}\right).$$

From (1.6) it now follows that  $h_{\nu+1} - h_\nu = O(\nu^{-1} (\log \nu)^{-2})$ , and so we obtain for the  $a_\nu$  (see (2.2))

$$\log a_\nu - \log a_{\nu+1} = \nu^{-1} h_\nu + (h_\nu - h_{\nu-1}) = \nu^{-1} (h_\nu + O((\log \nu)^{-2})).$$

By standard summation methods we can finally show that there exists a constant  $A$  such that

$$a_\nu = A \nu^{-1} \left\{ (\log \nu)^2 - \frac{4}{3} (\log \nu) (\log \log \nu) + O(\log \nu) \right\}.$$

*Technological University,  
Eindhoven, Netherlands*

#### REFERENCES

1. BRUJN, N. G. DE and H. S. WILF, On Hilbert's inequality in  $n$  dimensions, Bull. American Math. Soc. 68, 70-73 (1962).
2. CARLEMAN, T., Sur les fonctions quasi-analytiques. Conférences faites au cinquième congrès des mathématiciens scandinaves (Helsingfors, 1923), 181-196.
3. HARDY, G. H., J. E. LITTLEWOOD and G. PÓLYA, Inequalities. Cambridge 1934.
4. WILF, H. S., Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A. 65 (= Indagationes Mathematicae 24), 340-343 (1962).