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## Remark on Generalization of Minkowski’s Inequality

J. JELÍNEK and J. MATKOWSKI

Praha, Bielsko-Biala*)

Received 15. March 1995

Let $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ be a measure space such that $\mu(\Omega) \leq 1$. We give some general conditions for a bijection $\varphi:[0, \infty) \mapsto[0, \infty)$, such that

$$
\varphi^{-1}\left(\int_{\Omega} \varphi \circ|x+y| \mathrm{d} \mu\right) \leq \varphi^{-1}\left(\int_{\Omega} \varphi \circ|x| \mathrm{d} \mu\right)+\varphi^{-1}\left(\int_{\Omega} \varphi \circ|y| \mathrm{d} \mu\right)
$$

for all $\mu$-integrable simple functions $x, y: \Omega \mapsto \mathbf{R}$. This generalizes result from [1].

## 1. Introduction

For a measure space $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ such that $\mu(\Omega)<\infty$, denote by $S(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ the linear space of all $\mu$-integrable step functions $x: \Omega \mapsto \mathbf{R}_{+}(:=[0, \infty))$. Let $\varphi: \mathbf{R}_{+} \mapsto \mathbf{R}_{+}$be an arbitrary bijection. Then the functional $\boldsymbol{P}_{\varphi}: S(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu) \mapsto \mathbf{R}_{+}$ given by

$$
\boldsymbol{P}_{\varphi}(x):=\varphi^{-1}\left(\int_{\Omega} \varphi \circ|x| d \mu\right), \quad x \in \boldsymbol{S}(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu),
$$

is well defined. For $\varphi(t)=\varphi(1) t^{p}(t \geq 0)$ with $p \geq 1$, the functional $\boldsymbol{P}_{\varphi}$ coincides with the $\mathscr{L}^{n}$-norm. In this note we prove the following generalization of Minkowski's inequality:

Theorem. Let $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ be a measure space such that $\mu(\Omega) \leq 1$. Suppose $\varphi: \mathbf{R}_{+} \mapsto \mathbf{R}_{+}$satisfies the following conditions:
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[^0]$1^{0} . \varphi$ is bijective, increasing, and differentiable;
$2^{0} . \varphi^{\prime}$ is strictly increasing, and locally absolutely continuous;
$3^{0}$. there exists a superadditive function $g: \mathbf{R}_{+} \mapsto \mathbf{R}_{+}$such that
$$
g=\frac{\varphi^{\prime}}{\varphi^{\prime \prime}} \text { a.e. in } \mathbf{R}_{+} .
$$

Then for all $x, y \in S(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$,

$$
\boldsymbol{P}_{\varphi p}(x+y) \leq \boldsymbol{P}_{\varphi}(x)+\boldsymbol{P}_{\varphi p}(y) .
$$

This generalizes a result from paper [1] of the second named author where $\varphi$ is assumed to be of the class $\mathscr{C}^{2}$ and such that $\varphi^{\prime \prime}>0$ and $\frac{\varphi^{\prime}}{\varphi^{\prime}}$ is superadditive in $(0, \infty)$. At the end of this paper we explain the assumption that $\mu(\Omega) \leq 1$.

## 2. Auxiliary lemma and the proof of Theorem

The proof of the theorem is based on the following.
Lemma. If $\varphi: \mathbf{R}_{+} \mapsto \mathbf{R}_{+}$satisfies the conditions $1^{0}, 2^{0}, 3^{0}$ of the theorem, then there exists a sequence of functions $\varphi_{n}: \mathbf{R}_{+} \mapsto \mathbf{R}_{+}$such that:
a) for every $n \in \mathbf{N}, \varphi_{n}$ is bijective and of the class $\mathscr{C}^{\alpha}$;
b) for every $n \in \mathbf{N}, \varphi_{n}^{\prime}>0, \varphi_{n}^{\prime \prime}>0$ in $(0, \infty)$, and the function $\frac{\varphi_{n}^{\prime \prime}}{\varphi_{n}^{\prime}}$ is superadditive in $(0, \infty)$;
c) for every $a>0$,

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{n}=\varphi, \quad \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{n}^{\prime}=\varphi^{\prime}, \quad \text { uniformly on }[0, a] ;
$$

d)

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi_{n}^{\prime}}{\varphi_{n}^{\prime \prime}}=g \quad \text { a.e. } \quad \text { in } \quad \mathbf{R}_{+}\left(\text {and } \text { in } \mathscr{L}_{l o c}^{1}\right)
$$

where $g$ is defined in the theorem; this convergence is uniform on every compact interval of the continuity of $g$ contained in $(0, \infty)$.

Proof. By $1^{10}$ and $2^{0}$ the function $\log O \varphi^{\prime}$ is locally absolutely continuous. Consequently it is equal to a primitive of its derivative

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\log \bigcirc \varphi^{\prime}\right)^{\prime}=\frac{\varphi^{\prime \prime}}{\varphi^{\prime}}=\frac{1}{g} . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Take a sequence $\varrho_{n}: \mathbf{R} \mapsto \mathbf{R}_{+}$of $\mathscr{C}^{\infty}$-smooth even functions such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{supp} \varrho_{n} \subset\left[-\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}\right], \quad \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \varrho_{n}=1, \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and define $g_{n}: \mathbf{R}_{+} \mapsto \mathbf{R}_{+}$by the formula

$$
g_{n}(t)=\int_{0}^{\infty} g(t s) \varrho_{n}(1-s) d s, \quad t \geq 0, \quad n \in \mathbf{N}
$$

Note that $g_{n}$ is increasing, bijective, superadditive, of the class $\mathscr{C}^{*}$, and

$$
\lim g_{n}=g \quad \text { a.e. } \quad \text { in } \quad \mathbf{R}_{+} .
$$

Since $g$ is increasing, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{n}(t\} \geq \int_{1}^{\infty} g(t s) \varrho_{n}(1-s) d s \geq \int_{1}^{\infty} g(t) \varrho_{n}(1-s) d s=\frac{g(t)}{2} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $t \geq 0$.
Now we are going to define $\varphi_{n}, n \in \mathbf{N}$. First we define its derivative $\varphi_{n}^{\prime}$ in such a way that $\log \bigcirc \varphi_{n}^{\prime}$ is the primitive of $\frac{1}{g_{n}}$ for which $\varphi_{n}^{\prime}(1)=\varphi^{\prime}(1)$. The value $\varphi_{n}^{\prime}(0)$ is well-defined if $\int_{0}^{1} \frac{1}{y_{n}}<\infty$; otherwise we put $\varphi_{n}^{\prime}(0)=0$. By (1), (3) and the Lebesgue majorization theorem, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{n}^{\prime}=\varphi^{\prime} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

pointwise on $(0, \infty)$. As all functions here are continuous and increasing, it follows that the convergence (4) is uniform on every compact interval contained in $(0, \infty)$. For proving that (4) holds uniformly on [0, 1] too, we will distinguish two cases depending on $\varphi^{\prime}(0)>0$ or $\varphi^{\prime}(0)=0$.

If $\varphi^{\prime}(0)>0$, then by (1) the function $\frac{1}{9}$ is integrable on [ 0,1 ], and using the Lebesgue majorization theorem, as above, we obtain that (4) holds pointwise, and, therefore, uniformly on $[0,1]$.

Now suppose that $\varphi^{\prime}(0)=0$. We know that $\varphi^{\prime}$ is continuous, increasing, (4) holds uniformly on $[\varepsilon, 1]$ for every $\varepsilon \in(0,1)$, and that $\varphi_{n}^{\prime}$ is increasing and positive on $(0,1]$. Thus the convergence must be uniform on $[0,1]$, too.

The definition of the function $\varphi_{n}$, for which $\varphi_{n}(0)=0$, is obvious. Evidently, $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{n}=\varphi$ uniformly on $[0, a]$ for every $a>0$, and the lemma is proved.

Now we give the
Proof of theorem. Let $\varphi_{n}, n \in \mathbf{N}$, be the sequence of functions constructed in the lemma, and let $x, y \in S(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ be arbitrary. Then by Theorem 3 in [1] we have

$$
\varphi_{n}^{-1}\left(\int_{\Omega} \varphi_{n} \circ|x+y| d \mu\right) \leq \varphi_{n}^{-1}\left(\int_{\Omega} \varphi_{n} \circ|x| d \mu\right)+\varphi_{n}^{-1}\left(\int_{\Omega} \varphi_{n} \circ|y| d \mu\right)
$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ here and making use of the lemma, we get

$$
\varphi^{-1}\left(\int_{\Omega} \varphi \bigcirc|x+y| d \mu\right) \leqq \varphi^{-1}\left(\int_{\Omega} \varphi \bigcirc|x| d \mu\right)+\varphi^{-1}\left(\int_{\Omega} \varphi \bigcirc|y| d \mu\right)
$$

which, by the definition of $\boldsymbol{P}_{\varphi}$, completes the proof.

Remark 1. Suppose that $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ is a measure space such that there exist $A, B \in \Sigma$ satisfying the condition

$$
0<\mu(A)<1<\mu(B)<\infty .
$$

In [1] it is shown that if $\varphi: \mathbf{R}_{+} \mapsto \mathbf{R}_{+}$is bijective, $\varphi^{-1}$ continuous at 0 , and

$$
\boldsymbol{P}_{\varphi}(x+y) \leq \boldsymbol{P}_{\varphi}(x)+\boldsymbol{P}_{\varphi}(y) \quad \text { holds for all } x, y \in \boldsymbol{S}(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu),
$$

then $\varphi(t)=\varphi(1) t^{p}(t \geq 0)$, for some $p \geq 1$. This shows in particular that the assumption $\mu(\Omega) \leq 1$ is essential.

In this connection let us also mention the following
Remark 2. Suppose that $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu)$ has the following property: for every $A \in \Sigma$

$$
\mu(A)=0 \quad \text { or } \quad \mu(A) \geq 1 .
$$

Under this assumption it is proved in [2] that if $\varphi: \mathbf{R}_{+} \mapsto \mathbf{R}_{+}$is a convex homeomorphism of $\mathbf{R}_{+}$such that $\varphi$ is geometrically convex in $(0, \infty)$, i.e. that

$$
\varphi(\sqrt{s t}) \leq \sqrt{\varphi(s) \varphi(t)} \quad \text { for all } \quad s, t>0,
$$

then

$$
\boldsymbol{P}_{\varphi}(x+y) \leq \boldsymbol{P}_{\varphi}(x)+\boldsymbol{P}_{\varphi}(y) \quad \text { for all } \quad x, y \in S(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu),
$$

In the proof of this result the one-sided derivatives and Zygmund's lemma are used. It turns out that the argument can be simplified if we work with smooth functions $\varphi$. The following result permits us to do it.

Proposition. Suppose that $\varphi$ is a convex and geometrically convex homeomorphism of $\mathbf{R}_{+}$onto itself. Then there exists a sequence $\varphi_{n}, n \in \mathbf{N}$, of $\mathscr{C}^{\infty}$-smooth convex and geometrically convex diffeomorphisms of $\mathbf{R}_{+}$onto itself such that

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{n}=\varphi
$$

uniformly on $[0, a]$ for every $a>0$.
Proof. Taking the function $\varrho_{n}$ given by (2) in the previous proof, we define $\varphi_{n}$ as follows

$$
\varphi_{n}(t):=\exp \int \varrho_{n}(u) \log \varphi\left(t e^{-u}\right) d u, \quad t>0
$$

and $\varphi_{n}(0)=0$ to have $\varphi_{n}$ continuous at 0 . Since $\left\{\varphi_{n}\right\}$ converges to $\varphi$ pointwise on $\mathbf{R}_{+}$, the monotonicity of $\varphi_{n}$ and $\varphi$ implies that the convergence is uniform on $[0, a]$ for every $a>0$.

Now we have for all $s, t>0$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi_{n}(\sqrt{s t}) & =\exp \int \varrho_{n}(u) \log \varphi\left(\sqrt{s t} e^{-u}\right) d u \leq \exp \int \varrho_{n}(u) \log \sqrt{\varphi\left(s e^{-u}\right) \varphi\left(t e^{-u}\right)} d u= \\
& \exp \int \varrho_{n}(u)\left[\frac{1}{2}\left(\log \varphi\left(s e^{-u}\right)+\log \varphi\left(t e^{-u}\right)\right)\right] d u=\sqrt{\varphi_{n}(s) \varphi_{n}(t)}
\end{aligned}
$$

which shows that $\varphi_{n}$ is geometrically convex.
Now we shall show that $\varphi_{n}$ is convex. As $\varphi$ is convex with $\varphi(0)=0$, the function $\frac{\varphi(t)}{t}$ is increasing, too. For $0<s<t$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi_{n}(s)= & \exp \int \varrho_{n}(u) \log \varphi\left(s e^{-u}\right) d u \leq \exp \int \varrho_{n}(u) \log \frac{s}{t} \varphi\left(t e^{-u}\right)= \\
& \exp \int \varrho_{n}(u)\left[\log \frac{s}{t}+\log \varphi\left(t e^{-u}\right)\right] d u=\frac{s}{t} \varphi_{n}(t)
\end{aligned}
$$

which was to be shown.
For showing that $\varphi_{n}$ is convex, we use the following known property of geometrically convex functions $\varphi$ : if the function $\frac{\varphi_{n}(t)}{t}$ is increasing, then $\varphi_{n}$ is convex. Let us show it briefly. Suppose that $\varphi_{n}$ is not convex; then there are points $0<s<u<t$ and a linear function $l$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi_{n}(s)-l(s)=\varphi_{n}(t)-l(t)=0 \quad \text { and } \quad \varphi_{n}(u)-l(u)>0 \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The points $s, t$ can be changed without changing $l$ so that (5) holds for all $u \in(s, t)$. For $u=\sqrt{s t}$ we get from (5) by a simple calculation

$$
\varphi_{n}(\sqrt{s t})>\varphi_{n}(s) \frac{\sqrt{t}}{\sqrt{s}+\sqrt{t}}+\varphi_{n}(t) \frac{\sqrt{s}}{\sqrt{s}+\sqrt{t}}
$$

Thanks to the geometrical convexity of $\varphi_{n}$, it follows

$$
\begin{gathered}
(\sqrt{s}+\sqrt{t}) \sqrt{\varphi_{n}(s) \varphi_{n}(t)}>\varphi_{n}(s) \sqrt{t}+\varphi_{n}(t) \sqrt{t} \\
(\sqrt{s}+\sqrt{t}) \sqrt{\frac{\varphi_{n}(s) \varphi_{n}(t)}{s t}}>\frac{\varphi_{n}(s)}{s} \sqrt{s}+\frac{\varphi_{n}(t)}{t} \sqrt{t} \\
\sqrt{\frac{\varphi_{n}(s)}{s}} \sqrt{s}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varphi_{n}(t)}{t}}-\sqrt{\frac{\varphi_{n}(s)}{s}}\right)>\sqrt{\varphi_{n}(t) t \sqrt{t}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varphi_{n}(t)}{t}}-\sqrt{\frac{\varphi_{n}(s)}{s}}\right) .}
\end{gathered}
$$

We see that the inequality $\sqrt{\frac{\varphi_{n}(t)}{t}}+\sqrt{\frac{\varphi_{n}(s)}{s}} \geqq 0$ is not possible, so the function $\frac{\varphi_{n}(t)}{t}$ could not be increasing if $\varphi_{n}$ were not convex. the proposition is proved.
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