Provided for non-commercial research and educational use. Not for reproduction, distribution or commercial use.

Mathematica Balkanica

Mathematical Society of South-Eastern Europe
A quarterly published by
the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences – National Committee for Mathematics

The attached copy is furnished for non-commercial research and education use only. Authors are permitted to post this version of the article to their personal websites or institutional repositories and to share with other researchers in the form of electronic reprints.

Other uses, including reproduction and distribution, or selling or licensing copies, or posting to third party websites are prohibited.

For further information on Mathematica Balkanica visit the website of the journal http://www.mathbalkanica.info

or contact:

Mathematica Balkanica - Editorial Office; Acad. G. Bonchev str., Bl. 25A, 1113 Sofia, Bulgaria Phone: +359-2-979-6311, Fax: +359-2-870-7273, E-mail: balmat@bas.bg



Generalization of Ky Fan Inequality

Zhen Wang, Ji Chen

Presented by Bl. Sendov

1. Introduction

The following inequality due to Ky Fan was recorded in [1]:

(1)
$$\left[\frac{\prod_{1}^{n} x_{i}}{\prod_{1}^{n} (1 - x_{i})} \right]^{1/n} < \frac{\sum_{1}^{n} x_{i}}{\sum_{1}^{n} (1 - x_{i})}, \ 0 \le x_{i} \le \frac{1}{2},$$

unless $x_1 = x_2 = ... = x_n$. With the notation

$$M_p(x) = (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^p)^{1/p}, x_i > 0;$$

and

$$M_0(x) = \lim_{p \to 0} M_p(x) = (\Pi_1^n x_i)^{1/n},$$

(1) becomes

(2)
$$\frac{M_0(x)}{M_0(1-x)} < \frac{M_1(x)}{M_1(1-x)}.$$

D. Segaiman [2] conjectured that

(3)
$$\frac{M_p(x)}{M_n(1-x)} < \frac{M_g(x)}{M_g(1-x)}, \ p < g.$$

F. Chan, D. Goldberg and S. Gonek [2] gave some counterexamples when $0 < 2^p/p < 2^q/q$ or p+q > 9. In addition, they proved that (3) is true for p+q=0 > p or $0 \le p \le 1 \le q \le 2$.

Recently the case p=-1 and q=0 was proved to be true by Wan-Lan Wang and Peng-Fei Wang [3]. And the case $-1 \le p \le 0 \le q \le 1$ was proved by Guang-Xing Li and Ji Chen [4].

In this paper, we determine all the exponents p and q such that (3) is true.

Theorem. For arbitrary n, p < q, the inequality

Zhen Wang, Ji Chen

(4)
$$\left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}^{p}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (1-x_{i})^{p}} \right]^{1/p} \leq \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}^{q}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (1-x_{i})^{q}} \right]^{1/q} (0 < x_{i} \leq \frac{1}{2})$$

holds if and only if $|p+q| \le 3$, $2^p/p \ge 2^q/q$ when p>0, $p2^p \le q2^q$ when q<0.

The proof of the sufficiency is contained in Section 3, 4 and 5. In the proof we assume $pq \neq 0$, otherwise by letting p or $q \rightarrow 0$, it is easy to see that (4) is also true. In Section 2, we will prove the necessity.

2. Proof of the necessity

In [2], it was proved that (4) and p < q were equivalent when n = 2, and that if (4) holded, then $2^p/p \ge 2^q/q$ for p > 0. When q < 0, take $x_1 = x_2 = \ldots = x_{n-1} = \varepsilon$ ($0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$) and $x_n = 1/2$, (4) becomes

(5)
$$\left[\frac{(n-1)\varepsilon^p + (\frac{1}{2})^p}{(n-1)(1-\varepsilon)^p + (\frac{1}{2})^p} \right]^{1/p} \leq \left[\frac{(n-1)\varepsilon^q + (\frac{1}{2})^q}{(n-1)(1-\varepsilon)^q + (\frac{1}{2})^q} \right]^{1/q},$$

or

(6)
$$\frac{\left[\varepsilon^{p} + \frac{1}{2^{p}(n-1)}\right]^{1/p}}{\left[\varepsilon^{q} + \frac{1}{2^{q}(n-1)}\right]^{1/p}} \leq \frac{\left[(1-\varepsilon)^{p} + \frac{1}{2^{p}(n-1)}\right]^{1/p}}{\left[(1-\varepsilon)^{q} + \frac{1}{2^{q}(n-1)}\right]^{1/q}}.$$

Let $\varepsilon \to 0$, (6) yields

(7)
$$1 \leq \frac{\left[1 + \frac{1}{2^{p}(n-1)}\right]^{1/p}}{\left[1 + \frac{1}{2^{q}(n-1)}\right]^{1/q}},$$

hence

(8)
$$\left[1 + \frac{1}{2^{p}(n-1)}\right]^{1/p} \ge \left[1 + \frac{1}{2^{q}(n-1)}\right]^{1/q}.$$

By using the Maclaurin expansion in $\frac{1}{n}$, we obtain

(9)
$$1 + (p 2^{p} n)^{-1} + o(1/n^{2}) \ge 1 + (q 2^{q} n)^{-1} + o(1/n^{2}).$$

So if $p 2^p > q 2^q$, (4) would be faulse for sufficiently large n. In the equivalent inequality of (4):

(10)
$$\left[\frac{\sum_{1}^{n} (1-u_{i})^{p}}{\sum_{1}^{n} (1+u_{i})^{p}} \right]^{1/p} \leq \left[\frac{\sum_{1}^{n} (1-u_{i})^{q}}{\sum_{1}^{n} (1+u_{i})^{q}} \right]^{1/q}, \ 0 \leq u_{i} < 1.$$

Let $u_1 = u_2 = ... = u_{n-1} = 0$ and $u_n = u$ (0 < u < 1), then (10) becomes

(11)
$$\left[\frac{(n-1)+(1-u)^p}{(n-1)+(1+u)^p} \right]^{1/p} \leq \left[\frac{(n-1)+(1-u)^q}{(n-1)+(1+u)^q} \right]^{1/q}.$$

Take the Macluarin expansion of (11) in u:

$$1 - \frac{2}{n}u + \frac{2}{n^2}u^2 - \frac{(n-1)[(n-2)p^2 - 2np] + 2(n^2 + 2)}{3n^3}u^3 + o(u^4)$$

$$(12) \quad \leq 1 - \frac{2}{n}u + \frac{2}{n^2}u^2 - \frac{(n-1)[(n-2)q^2 - 3nq] + 2(n^2 + 2)}{3n^3}u^3 + o(u^4).$$

Thus for u sufficiently small, (10) holds only if

$$(13) (n-2)p^2 - 3np \ge (n-2)q^2 - 3nq,$$

or

$$(14) (p-q)[(n-2)(p+q)-3n] \ge 0.$$

So for $n \ge 3$, we have

$$(15) p+q \leq \frac{3n}{n-2}.$$

Let $n \to +\infty$, (15) yields $p+q \le 3$.

Similarly, the expansion of (10) with $u_1 = u_2 = ... = u_{n-1} = u$ (0 < u < 1), $u_n = 0$ gives

$$(16) p+q \ge \frac{-3n}{n-2}.$$

So we obtain $p+q \ge -3$.

3. An equivalence proposition

In this section, we are to establish an equivalence proposition as follows: **Proposition**. For p < q, the following inequalities are equivalent:

(i)
$$\left[\frac{\sum_{1}^{n} \lambda_{i} x_{i}^{p}}{\sum_{1}^{n} \lambda_{i} (1-x_{i})^{p}}\right]^{1/p} < \left[\frac{\sum_{1}^{n} \lambda_{i} x_{i}^{q}}{\sum_{1}^{n} \lambda_{i} (1-x_{i})^{q}}\right]^{1/q},$$

where
$$\lambda_i > 0$$
, $0 < x_i \le 1/2$, $i = 1, 2, ..., n$ and $x_1, x_2, ..., x_n$ are not all equal:
$$\left[\frac{\lambda x^p + \mu y^p}{\lambda (1-x)^p + \mu (1-y)^p}\right]^{1/p} < \left[\frac{\lambda x^q + \mu y^q}{\lambda (1-x)^q + \mu (1-y)^q}\right]^{1/q},$$

where λ , $\mu > 0$, $0 < x \neq v \le 1/2$:

(iii)
$$\left[\frac{\lambda + (1-u)^p}{\lambda + (1+u)^p} \right]^{1/p} < \left[\frac{\lambda + (1-u)^q}{\lambda + (1+u)^q} \right]^{1/q},$$

where $\lambda > 0$, 0 < u < 1.

Proof. (i) obviously implies (iii).

Now suppose (iii) is true, let x > y and y/x = 1 - u, x/(1-x) = k, then 0 < u < 1, $0 < k \le 1$ and (1-y)/(1-x) = 1 + ku. So (ii) is equivalent to the following:

(17)
$$f(k) = \frac{1}{a} \ln \frac{\lambda + \mu (1 - u)^q}{\lambda + \mu (1 + ku)^q} - \frac{1}{p} \ln \frac{\lambda + \mu (1 - u)^p}{\lambda + \mu (1 + ku)^p} > 0.$$

Derivate f(k), one can obtain

(18)
$$f'(k) = \frac{-\mu (1+ku)^{q-1}u}{\lambda + \mu (1+ku)^q} + \frac{\mu (1+ku)^{p-1}u}{\lambda + \mu (1+ku)^p}$$
$$= \frac{u}{1+ku} \left[\frac{\mu (1+ku)^p}{\lambda + \mu (1+ku)^p} - \frac{\mu (1+ku)^q}{\lambda + \mu (1+ku)^q} \right] < 0.$$

Hence

(19)
$$f(k) \ge f(1) = \frac{1}{a} \ln \frac{\lambda + (1-u)^q}{\lambda + (1+u)^q} - \frac{1}{p} \ln \frac{\lambda + (1-u)^p}{\lambda + (1+u)^p} > 0.$$

(ii) is established.

We will use induction to show that (i) is true if (ii) holds. At first, (ii) is the case n=2 of (i). Now assume that (i) holds for some $n \ (n \ge 2)$.

Let $1/2 \ge x_1 \ge x_2 \ge ... \ge x_{n+1}$, and x_i are not all equal, then there exist $\mu > 0$ and $\nu = \lambda_1 \lambda_{n+1}/\mu > 0$ such that

(20)
$$\frac{\sum_{1}^{n+1} \lambda_{i} x_{i}^{p}}{\sum_{1}^{n+1} \lambda_{i} (1 - x_{i})^{p}} = \frac{\mu x_{1}^{p} + \lambda_{n+1} x_{n+1}^{p}}{\mu (1 - x_{1})^{p} + \lambda_{n+1} (1 - x_{n+1})^{p}}$$
$$= \frac{\lambda_{1} x_{1}^{p} + \nu x_{n+1}^{p}}{\lambda_{1} (1 - x_{1})^{p} + \nu (1 - x_{n+1})^{p}} = R^{p}.$$

It is clear that $(\lambda_1 - \mu)(\lambda_{n+1} - \nu) \leq 0$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\lambda_1 \geq \mu$. So

(21)
$$R^{p} = \frac{(\lambda_{1} - \mu)x_{1}^{p} + \sum_{1}^{n} \lambda_{i} x_{i}^{p}}{(\lambda_{1} - \mu)(1 - x_{1})^{p} + \sum_{1}^{n} \lambda_{i} (1 - x_{i})^{p}}.$$

By the assumption, we have

(22)
$$R = \left[\frac{(\lambda_{1} - \mu)x_{i}^{p} + \sum_{2}^{n} \lambda_{i} x_{i}^{p}}{(\lambda_{1} - \mu)(1 - x_{1})^{p} + \sum_{2}^{n} \lambda_{i} (1 - x_{i})^{p}} \right]^{1/p}$$

$$\leq \left[\frac{(\lambda_{1} - \mu)x_{1}^{q} + \sum_{2}^{n} \lambda_{i} x_{i}^{q}}{(\lambda_{1} - \mu)(1 - x_{1})^{q} + \sum_{2}^{n} \lambda_{i} (1 - x_{i})^{q}} \right]^{1/q},$$

and

$$(23) R = \left[\frac{\mu x_1^p + \lambda_{n+1} x_{n+1}^p}{\mu (1-x_1)^p + \lambda_{n+1} (1-x_{n+1})^p} \right]^{1/p} < \left[\frac{\mu x_1^q + \lambda_{n+1} x_{n+1}^q}{\mu (1-x_1)^q + \lambda_{n+1} (1-x_{n+1})^q} \right]^{1/q}.$$

So we have

(24)
$$R < \left[\frac{\sum_{1}^{n+1} \lambda_{i} x_{i}^{q}}{\sum_{1}^{n+1} \lambda_{i} (1-x_{i})^{q}} \right]^{1/q}.$$

Therefore, we get (i) is true for arbitrary n, the proposition is established.

4. Three lemmas

Lemma 1. If $\alpha \leq 0$, $\alpha < \beta \leq 1-\alpha$, $0 \leq u < 1$, then

$$(25) (1+u)^{\alpha} + (1-u)^{\alpha} \ge (1+u)^{\beta} + (1-u)^{\beta},$$

the equality is attained if and only if u=0 or $(\alpha, \beta)=(0, 1)$. Proof. Let $\varphi(x)=(1+u)^x+(1-u)^x$ (0<u<1), then

(26)
$$\varphi''(x) = (1+u)^x [\ln(1+u)]^2 + (1-u)^x [\ln(1-u)]^2 > 0.$$

So we have to establish (25) only for $\beta = 1 - \alpha$, i.e.

(27)
$$\Phi(u) = (1+u)^{\alpha} + (1-u)^{\alpha} - [(1+u)^{1-\alpha} + (1-u)^{1-\alpha}].$$

where $\alpha < 0$, 0 < u < 1.

$$\Phi(u) = 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left[{\alpha \choose 2n} - {1-\alpha \choose 2n} \right] u^{2n}$$

$$= 2\alpha (\alpha - 1) \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{u^{2n}}{(2n)!} \left[\prod_{k=2}^{2n-1} (\alpha - k) - \prod_{k=2}^{2n-1} (-\alpha - k + 1) \right]$$

$$\geq 2\alpha (\alpha - 1) \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{u^{2n}}{(2n)!} \left[\prod_{k=2}^{2n-1} (\alpha - k) - \prod_{k=2}^{2n-1} |-\alpha - k + 1| \right]$$

$$> 0.$$

This proofs the lemma

(28)

Lemma 2. If $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1 - \alpha$ and $0 < u \le 1$. Let

(29)
$$G(u) = (1+u)^{\alpha} + (1-u)^{\alpha} - (1+u)^{\beta} - (1-u)^{\beta},$$

then there exists a unique u_0 , such that (i) G(u)>0 for $0< u< u_0$; (ii) G(u)<0 for $u_0< u \le 1$.

Proof. We have $\beta(\beta-1) < \alpha(\alpha-1) < 0$, hence

$$(30) 0 < \frac{\alpha(\alpha - 1)}{\beta(\beta - 1)} < 1.$$

Define

(31)
$$g(u) = \frac{(1+u)^{\beta-2} + (1-u)^{\beta-2}}{(1+u)^{\alpha-2} + (1-u)^{\alpha-2}}, \ 0 < u < 1.$$

We have

$$g'(u) = \frac{(\beta - 2)[(1 + u)^{\beta - 3} - (1 - u)^{\beta - 3}]}{(1 + u)^{\alpha - 2} + (1 - u)^{\alpha - 2}}$$

$$-\frac{(\alpha-2)[(1+u)^{\alpha-3}-(1-u)^{\alpha-3}][(1+u)^{\beta-2}+(1-u)^{\beta-2}]}{[(1+u)^{\alpha-2}+(1-u)^{\alpha-2}]^{2}}$$

$$<\frac{\alpha-2}{[(1+u)^{\alpha-2}+(1-u)^{\alpha-2}]^{2}}\{[(1+u)^{\beta-3}-(1-u)^{\beta-3}][(1+u)^{\alpha-2}+(1-u)^{\alpha-2}]$$

$$-[(1+u)^{\alpha-3}-(1-u)^{\alpha-3}][(1+u)^{\beta-2}+(1-u)^{\beta-2}]\}$$

$$=\frac{2(\alpha-2)(1+u)^{\alpha+\beta-6}}{[(1+u)^{\alpha-2}+(1-u)^{\alpha-2}]^{2}}[(\frac{1-u}{1+u})^{\alpha-3}-(\frac{1-u}{1+u})^{\beta-3}]<0.$$

So g(u) is strictly decreasing with g(0) = 1 and g(1) = 0. Hence there exists a unique $u_1 \in (0, 1)$ such that

(33)
$$g(u_1) = \frac{\alpha(\alpha - 1)}{\beta(\beta - 1)}.$$

Note that

(34)
$$G'(u) = \alpha [(1+u)^{\alpha-1} - (1-u)^{\alpha-1}] - \beta [(1+u)^{\beta-1} - (1-u)^{\beta-1}],$$

(35)
$$G''(u) = -\beta (\beta - 1)[(1 + u)^{\alpha - 2} + (1 - u)^{\alpha - 2}][9(u) - \frac{\alpha (\alpha - 1)}{\beta (\beta - 1)}],$$

and from above we know that G''(u)>0 for $u\in(0, u_1)$, G''(u)<0 for $u\in(u_1, 1)$. Because G(0)=G'(0)=0, we have G'(u)>0, G(u)>0 for $u\in[0, u_1]$. But $G'(1)=-\infty$, so there exists a unique $u_2\in(u_1, 1)$ such that G'(u)>0 when $u\in(u_1,u_2)$, G'(u)<0 when $u\in(u_2, 1)$. Then G(u) strictly increases in $(0, u_2)$ and strictly decreases in $(u_2, 1)$, and since $G(1)=2^{n}$, $2^{n}<0$, we can find a unique $u\in(u_1, 1)$ such that G'(u)>0 in

since $G(1)=2^{\alpha}-2^{\beta}<0$, we can find a unique $u_0\in(u_2, 1)$ such that G(u)>0 in $(0, u_0), G(u) < 0 \text{ in } (u_0, 1).$

Lemma 3. If p < q, $p+q \le 3$ and $2^p/p \ge 2^q/q$ for p>0, then

(36)
$$\frac{(1+u)^p - (1-u)^p}{p} \ge \frac{(1+u)^q - (1-u)^q}{q}, \ 0 \le u < 1,$$

equality occurs if and only if u=0 or (p, q)=(1, 2).

Proof. Let

(37)
$$H(u) = \frac{(1+u)^p - (1-u)^p}{p} - \frac{(1+u)^q - (1-u)^q}{q}, \ 0 \le u < 1.$$

Then

(38)
$$H'(u) = [(1+u)^{p-1} + (1-u)^{p-1}] - [(1+u)^{q-1} | (1-u)^{q-1}].$$

When $p \le 1$, $p-1 < q-1 \le 1-(p-1)$, by Lemma 1 we obtain $H'(u) \ge 0$. Thus $H(u) \ge H(0) = 0$ with equality if and only if u = 0 or (p, q) = (1, 2). When p>1, then q<3-p. Otherwise q-1=1-(p-1), then

(39)
$$\frac{(p-1)(p-2)}{(q-1)(q-2)} = 1.$$

Repeat the steps in the proof of Lemma 2, it should have H'(u) < 0. So H(0) > H(1), i.e. $2^p/p < 2^q/q$. It is a contradiction. Thus 0 < p-1 < q-1 < 1-(p-1). By Lemma 2, H'(u) has its unique zero point u_0 in (0, 1), such that the following is true:

$$H'(u) > 0$$
 for $0 < u < u_0$, hence $H(u) > H(0) = 0$;
 $H'(u) < 0$ for $u_0 < u < 1$, hence $H(u) > H(1) = 2^p/p - 2^q/q \ge 0$;
and $H(u_0) > 0$.

These establish the lemma.

5. Proof of the sufficiency of the theorem

From the equivalence proposition in Section 3, we only need to prove the following inequality:

(40)
$$\left[\frac{\lambda + (1-u)^p}{\lambda + (1+u)^p} \right]^{1/p} < \left[\frac{\lambda + (1-u)^q}{\lambda + (1+u)^q} \right]^{1/q},$$

where $\lambda > 0$, 0 < u < 1, p < q, $|p+q| \le 3$, $2^p/p \ge 2^q/q$ when p > 0, $p \cdot 2^p \le q \cdot 2^q$ when q < 0. The above inequality is equivalent to

(41)
$$F(\lambda) = \frac{1}{q} \ln \frac{\lambda + (1-u)^q}{\lambda + (1+u)^q} - \frac{1}{p} \ln \frac{\lambda + (1-u)^p}{\lambda + (1+u)^p} > 0.$$

But

$$F'(\lambda) = \frac{1}{q} \left[\frac{1}{\lambda + (1-u)^q} - \frac{1}{\lambda + (1+u)^q} \right] - \frac{1}{p} \left[\frac{1}{\lambda + (1-u)^p} - \frac{1}{\lambda + (1+u)^p} \right]$$

$$= (A\lambda^2 + B\lambda + C)/Q(\lambda),$$
(42)

where

(43)
$$Q(\lambda) = [\lambda + (1-u)^q][\lambda + (1+u)^q][\lambda + (1-u)^p][\lambda + (1+u)^p],$$

(44)
$$A = \frac{(1+u)^q - (1-u)^q}{q} - \frac{(1+u)^p - (1-u)^p}{p},$$

(45)
$$B = [(1+u)^{p} + (1-u)^{p}] \frac{(1+u)^{q} - (1-u)^{q}}{q} - [(1+u)^{q} + (1-u)^{q}] \frac{(1+u)^{p} - (1-u)^{p}}{p},$$

(46)
$$C = (1-u)^{p+q} \left[\frac{(1+u)^{-q} - (1-u)^{-q}}{-q} - \frac{(1+u)^{-p} - (1-u)^{-p}}{-p} \right].$$

By Lemma 3, when $(p, q) \neq (1, 2)$ and $(p, q) \neq (-2, -1)$, we have A < 0 and C > 0. If (p, q) = (1, 2) then A = 0, $B = -4u^3 < 0$, $C = 2u^3(1-u)^2 > 0$. If (p, q) = (-2, -1) then $A = -2u^3/(1-u^2)^2 < 0$, $B = 4u^3/(1-u^2)^3 > 0$, C = 0. Thus for all these cases, $F'(\lambda)$ has a unique positive root λ_0 such that $F'(\lambda) > 0$ for $0 < \lambda < \lambda_0$; $F'(\lambda) < 0$ for $\lambda > \lambda_0$. So

(47)
$$F(\lambda) > F(0) = F(+\infty) = 0 \text{ for } \lambda > 0.$$

Now the theorem is proved.

6. Some remarks and a conjecture

Remark 2. In the case $pq \neq 0$, from the processes of the proof, we can see the equality in (4) is attained if and only if $x_1 = x_2 = ... = x_n$. If pq = 0, all the results in Section 2 to 5 can be founded without any difference with the case $pq \neq 0$. So the equality in (4) occurs if and only if x_i are all equal.

Remark 2. Inequality (4) is for all natural numbers n, and there is not the best result for each fixed n except n=2. We propose a conjecture for this condition as follows:

Conjecture. If
$$p < q$$
, $|p+q| \le 3n/(n-2)$,

(48)
$$[1+2^{p}/(n-1)]^{1/p} \ge [1+2^{q}/(n-1)]^{1/q} \text{ when } p>0,$$

and

(49)
$$[1+1/2^{p}(n-1)]^{1/p} \ge [1+1/2^{q}(n-1)]^{1/q} \text{ when } q < 0,$$

then

(50)
$$\left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}^{p}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (1-x_{i})^{p}} \right]^{1/p} < \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}^{q}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (1-x_{i})^{q}} \right]^{1/q}, \ 0 < x_{i} \le \frac{1}{2},$$

unless $x_1 = x_2 = \ldots = x_n$.

References

1. E. F. Beckenbach. Inequalities. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1961, 5.

2. F. Chan, D. Goldberg, S. Gonek. On extensions of an inequality among means. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 42, 1974, 202-207.

W.-L. Wang, P.-F. Wang. A class of inequalities for the symmetric function (Chinese). Acta Math. Sinica, 27, 1984, 485-497.
 Guang-Xing Li, Ji Chen. A generalization of the Ky Fan inequality (Chinese). Hunan Shuxue

Tongxun, 1989, No 4, 37-39.

Received 02.04.1991

Department of Mathematics University of Science and Technology of China Hefei, Anhui THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Department of Mathematics Ningbo University Ningbo, Zhejiang THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA