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## On Levinson's inequality


#### Abstract

We give a very simple proof of the classical Levinson inequality and generalize the result by Mercer.


## 1. Introduction

In 1964 Norman Levinson ([3]) used the Taylor expansion to prove the following inequality.

Theorem 1.1 ([3])
Suppose that $f:[0, c] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has a nonnegative third derivative, for $i=1, \ldots, n$ $p_{i}>0,0 \leqslant x_{i} \leqslant \frac{c}{2}, y_{i}=c-x_{i}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i}=1$, then the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i} f\left(x_{i}\right)-f(\bar{x}) \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i} f\left(y_{i}\right)-f(\bar{y}) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds. Here $\bar{x}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i} x_{i}$ and $\bar{y}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i} y_{i}$ denote the weighted arithmetic means.

The same year Tiberiu Popoviciu generalized it by showing that for (1) to hold it is enough that $f$ be 3-convex ([6]), and Peter S. Bullen ([2]) gave an alternative proof using mathematical induction. There are also other versions of this inequality, see e.g. [5]. By rescaling axes, the classic Levinson inequality can be restated in the following way.

Theorem 1.2 ([2])
If $f:[a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is 3-convex, $a \leqslant x_{i}, y_{i} \leqslant b, x_{i}+y_{i}=c, p_{i}>0$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i}=1$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max \left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right) \leqslant \min \left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

then (1) holds.
As we can see, both versions assume that $x$ 's and $y$ 's add up to the same number. Recently, Mercer made a significant improvement in [4].

Theorem 1.3
If $f:[a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $f^{\prime \prime \prime} \geqslant 0, p_{i}>0$ for $i=1, \ldots, n, \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i}=1$, and $a \leqslant x_{i}$, $y_{i} \leqslant b$ are such that (2) holds and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i}\left(x_{i}-\bar{x}\right)^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i}\left(y_{i}-\bar{y}\right)^{2} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

then (1) holds.
It is natural to try to get similar result for 3-convex function. In this paper we shall give a very simple proof of Theorem 1.2 and generalize the Mercer's result in the following way.

Theorem 1.4
Let $I$ be an open subinterval of $\mathbb{R}$ (bounded or unbounded), $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a 3-convex function and $X, Y:(\Omega, \mu) \rightarrow I$ be two random variables satisfying

V1) $\mathbf{E}\left[X^{2}\right], \mathbf{E}\left[Y^{2}\right], \mathbf{E}[f(X)], \mathbf{E}[f(Y)], \mathbf{E}\left[f^{\prime}(X)\right], \mathbf{E}\left[f^{\prime}(Y)\right], \mathbf{E}\left[X f^{\prime}(X)\right], \mathbf{E}\left[Y f^{\prime}(Y)\right]$ are finite,

V2) ess $\sup X \leqslant \operatorname{ess} \inf Y$,
V3) $\operatorname{Var} X=\operatorname{Var} Y$,
then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathbf{E}[f(X)]-f(\mathbf{E}[X]) \leqslant \mathbf{E}[f(Y)]-f(\mathbf{E}[Y]) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

We also provide some conditions for (4) to hold if the condition V3) is not satisfied.

## 2. Definitions and basic properties

Definition 2.1
For a function $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ its $n^{\text {th }}$ divided difference is defined inductively by the formula

$$
\left[x_{0}, \ldots, x_{n} ; f\right]= \begin{cases}f\left(x_{0}\right) & \text { if } n=0 \\ \frac{\left[x_{0}, \ldots, x_{n-2}, x_{n} ; f\right]-\left[x_{0}, \ldots, x_{n-2}, x_{n-1} ; f\right]}{x_{n}-x_{n-1}} & \text { if } n>0\end{cases}
$$

where $x_{i}$ 's are pairwise distinct.
Definition 2.2
A function $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called $n$-convex if

$$
\left[x_{0}, \ldots, x_{n} ; f\right] \geq 0
$$

for any choice of arguments, and $n$-concave if the inverse inequality holds.

The 1-convex (resp. concave) functions are the increasing (resp. decreasing) functions, while the 2-convex (resp. concave) functions are convex (resp. concave) functions, i.e. the functions satisfying the inequality

$$
f(t x+(1-t) y) \leqslant(\text { resp. } \geqslant) t f(x)+(1-t) f(y)
$$

for all $x, y \in I$ and $0<t<1$.
The following property follows immediately from definition.
Property 2.3
The function $g$ is convex if and only if its divided difference $h(x, y)=\frac{g(x)-g(y)}{x-y}$, $x \neq y$ increases in both variables.

This implies immediately
Property 2.4
If $g$ is convex, then its right and left derivatives exist in the interior of its domain and for $x<y$ the inequalities

$$
g_{-}^{\prime}(x) \leqslant g_{+}^{\prime}(x) \leqslant g_{-}^{\prime}(y) \leqslant g_{+}^{\prime}(y)
$$

hold.
Another useful property of symmetric sum follows also from Property 2.3.
Property 2.5
If $g$ is convex, then the symmetric sum $g(a+x)+g(a-x)$ increases for $x>0$.
Boas and Widder gave the following characterization of $n$-convex functions.
Property 2.6 ([1])
If a function $g$ is $n$-convex, then it is $n-2$ times differentiable and $g^{(n-2)}$ is convex.

At the end of this section let us remind the Leibniz Rule.

## Lemma 2.7 (Differentiation under integral)

Let $I$ be an open subinterval of $\mathbb{R}$ and $(\Omega, \mu)$ be a measure space. Suppose a function $h: I \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the following conditions:

L1) for every $t \in I$ the function $h(t, \cdot)$ is integrable,
L2) for every $t \in I$ the derivative $h_{t}$ exists $\mu$ a.e.
L3) there exists an integrable function $\theta: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for every $t\left|h_{t}(t, \omega)\right| \leqslant$ $\theta(\omega)$.

Then for every $t \in I$

$$
\frac{d}{d t} \int_{\Omega} h(t, \omega) \mu(d \omega)=\int_{\Omega} h_{t}(t, \omega) \mu(d \omega)
$$

## 3. Simple proof of Theorem 1.2

We can rewrite (1) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
f\left(c-\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i} x_{i}\right)-f\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i} x_{i}\right) \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i} f\left(c-x_{i}\right)-\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i} f\left(x_{i}\right) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is the Jensen inequality for the function $g(x)=f(c-x)-f(x)$. The function $g$ is differentiable by Property 2.6. To show its convexity, note that

$$
g^{\prime}(x)=-\left[f^{\prime}(c-x)+f^{\prime}(x)\right]=-\left[f^{\prime}\left(\frac{c}{2}+\left(\frac{c}{2}-x\right)\right)+f^{\prime}\left(\frac{c}{2}-\left(\frac{c}{2}-x\right)\right)\right] .
$$

As $x$ increases, $\frac{c}{2}-x$ decreases, and by Property 2.5 , the expression in square brackets decreases. Thus $g^{\prime}$ increases, so $g$ is convex and we are done.

## 4. Proof of Theorem 1.4

For $0 \leqslant t \leqslant 1$ define two new random variables

$$
X_{t}=t X+(1-t) \mathbf{E}[X] \quad \text { and } \quad Y_{t}=t Y+(1-t) \mathbf{E}[Y]
$$

and consider the function

$$
\begin{equation*}
U(t, \omega)=f\left(Y_{t}(\omega)\right)-f(\mathbf{E}[Y])-\left[f\left(X_{t}(\omega)\right)-f(\mathbf{E}[X])\right] \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Our goal will be to show that $V(t)=\int_{\Omega} U(t, \omega) \mu(d \omega)$ is a nonnegative, increasing, convex function of $t$.

Let $d$ be any number satisfying ess sup $X \leqslant d \leqslant \operatorname{ess} \inf Y$. The proof is split into several steps.

### 4.1. Behavior near the endpoints of the interval $I=(a, b)$

The functions $f$ and $f^{\prime}$ are continuous, thus bounded on every compact subinterval of $(a, b)$. In order to obtain some global bounds we need to know how they behave near the ends.

Remark 4.1
Since a function $g$ is convex or concave in the interval $(a, b)$, its monotonicity cannot change more that once. If it is not bounded near $a$, we conclude that there exists $a^{\prime}>a$ such that $g$ preserves sign and $|g|$ decreases in $\left(a, a^{\prime}\right)$. Similarly, or $g$ is bounded near $b$ or there exists $b^{\prime}<b$ such that $g$ preserves sign and $|g|$ increases in $\left(b^{\prime}, b\right)$.

Since $f$ is 3-convex, its derivative is convex and its monotonicity changes at most once. Thus the convexity of $f$ changes at most once, and consequently the Remark 4.1 applies to both $f$ and $f^{\prime}$.

### 4.2. Absolute integrability

Let $g$ be any of $f, f^{\prime}$ or $\operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{R}} \cdot f^{\prime}$, where $\operatorname{Id}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is the identity function on $\mathbb{R}$. It
follows from the results of the subsection 4.1. that $g$ is bounded from above or from below on $(a, d]$. Since

$$
\int_{\Omega} g(X) \mu(d \omega)=\int_{\{\omega: g(X(\omega))>0\}} g(X) \mu(d \omega)+\int_{\{\omega: g(X(\omega))<0\}} g(X) \mu(d \omega)
$$

we conclude that two integrals in this formula are finite, thus so is the third one, therefore

$$
\int_{\Omega}|g(X)| \mu(d \omega)=\int_{\{\omega: g(X(\omega))>0\}} g(X) \mu(d \omega)-\int_{\{\omega: g(X(\omega))<0\}} g(X) \mu(d \omega)
$$

is also finite.
The same holds for $g(Y)$.

### 4.3. Leibniz Rule

We shall show now that the function $U$ defined by formula (6) satisfies the Leibniz Rule. Consider $f\left(X_{t}\right)$. If $f$ is bounded near $a$, then clearly the assumption L1) is satisfied. If not, then choose $a^{\prime}$ as in step 4.1. in such a way that $a^{\prime}<\mathbf{E}[X]$. Let $M=\max _{x \in\left[a^{\prime}, d\right]}|f(x)|$. Then we have

$$
\left|f\left(X_{t}(\omega)\right)\right| \leqslant \begin{cases}M & \text { if } X_{t}(\omega) \in\left[a^{\prime}, d\right] \\ |f(X(\omega))| & \text { otherwise, since } X_{t}(\omega) \geqslant X(\omega)\end{cases}
$$

Thus $\left|f\left(X_{t}\right)\right| \leqslant \max (M, f(X))$ and we are done with L1).
By Property 2.6 condition L2) is also satisfied. To show that L3) holds note that

$$
\left|\frac{d}{d t} f\left(X_{t}\right)\right|=\left|(X-\mathbf{E}[X]) f^{\prime}\left(X_{t}\right)\right| \leqslant|X|\left|f^{\prime}\left(X_{t}\right)\right|+|\mathbf{E}[X]|\left|f^{\prime}\left(X_{t}\right)\right|
$$

If $f^{\prime}$ is bounded, then the right-hand side is not greater that $M|X|+N$ for some $M, N>0$, otherwise the same reasoning as above applied to $f^{\prime}$ gives the bound $\max \left(\left|X f^{\prime}(X)\right|+|\mathbf{E}[X]|\left|f^{\prime}(X)\right|,\left(\max \left(\left|a^{\prime}\right|,|d|\right)+|\mathbf{E}[X]|\right) M\right)$.

The same reasoning can be applied to $f\left(Y_{t}\right)$, so we can apply the Leibniz Rule to the function $U$.

### 4.4. Final step

Clearly, $U(0, \omega)=0$, so $V(0)=0$. The function $U$ is differentiable in $t$ for all $\omega$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
U_{t}(t, \omega)=(Y(\omega)-\mathbf{E}[Y]) f^{\prime}\left(Y_{t}(\omega)\right)-(X(\omega)-\mathbf{E}[X]) f^{\prime}\left(X_{t}(\omega)\right) \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Applying the Leibniz Rule we obtain

$$
V^{\prime}(0)=\int_{\Omega} U_{t}(0, \omega) \mu(d \omega)=0
$$

In virtue of Property 2.6 , the convexity of the derivative of a 3 -convex functions implies that $f_{-}^{\prime \prime}(\operatorname{esssup} X) \leqslant f_{+}^{\prime \prime}($ essinf $Y)\left(f_{ \pm}^{\prime \prime}\right.$ denotes here the right and left derivatives of $\left.f^{\prime}\right)$. Let $A$ be an arbitrary number from the interval $\left[f_{-}^{\prime \prime}(\operatorname{ess} \sup X)\right.$, $\left.f_{+}^{\prime \prime}(\operatorname{ess} \inf Y)\right]$.

We have

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{U_{t}(u, \omega)-U_{t}(v, \omega)}{u-v}= & (Y(\omega)-\mathbf{E}[Y]) \frac{f^{\prime}\left(Y_{u}(\omega)\right)-f^{\prime}\left(Y_{v}(\omega)\right)}{u-v} \\
& -(X(\omega)-\mathbf{E}[X]) \frac{f^{\prime}\left(X_{u}(\omega)\right)-f^{\prime}\left(X_{v}(\omega)\right)}{u-v} \\
= & (Y(\omega)-\mathbf{E}[Y])^{2} \frac{f^{\prime}\left(Y_{u}(\omega)\right)-f^{\prime}\left(Y_{v}(\omega)\right)}{Y_{u}(\omega)-Y_{v}(\omega)} \\
& -(X(\omega)-\mathbf{E}[X])^{2} \frac{f^{\prime}\left(X_{u}(\omega)\right)-f^{\prime}\left(X_{v}(\omega)\right)}{X_{u}(\omega)-X_{v}(\omega)}  \tag{8}\\
= & (Y(\omega)-\mathbf{E}[Y])^{2}\left[\frac{f^{\prime}\left(Y_{u}(\omega)\right)-f^{\prime}\left(Y_{v}(\omega)\right)}{Y_{u}(\omega)-Y_{v}(\omega)}-A\right] \\
& +(X(\omega)-\mathbf{E}[X])^{2}\left[A-\frac{f^{\prime}\left(X_{u}(\omega)\right)-f^{\prime}\left(X_{v}(\omega)\right)}{X_{u}(\omega)-X_{v}(\omega)}\right] \\
& +A\left[(Y(\omega)-\mathbf{E}[Y])^{2}-(X(\omega)-\mathbf{E}[X])^{2}\right]
\end{align*}
$$

Property 2.3 applied to $f^{\prime}$ shows that the expressions in square brackets in (8) are nonnegative a.e., so

$$
\frac{U_{t}(u, \omega)-U_{t}(v, \omega)}{u-v} \geqslant A\left[(Y(\omega)-\mathbf{E}[Y])^{2}-(X(\omega)-\mathbf{E}[X])^{2}\right] \quad \text { a.e. }
$$

Integrating and applying once more the Leibniz Rule one get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{V^{\prime}(u)-V^{\prime}(v)}{u-v} \geqslant A(\operatorname{Var} Y-\operatorname{Var} X)=0 . \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

This means $V^{\prime}$ is increasing, and we conclude that $V$ is nonnegative and convex in the unit interval. In particular $V(0) \leqslant V(1)$, which is the Levinson inequality.

## 5. Further results

Let us take a closer look at the proof of Theorem 1.4. We have some freedom in selection of $A$ : this can be any number from the gap between $f^{\prime \prime}(X)$ and $f^{\prime \prime}(Y)$. The critical inequality (9) holds not only if $\operatorname{Var} Y=\operatorname{Var} X$ but also in case when $A(\operatorname{Var} Y-\operatorname{Var} X) \geqslant 0$. This means that if the gap between $X$ 's and $Y$ 's is in the area where the function $f$ is strictly convex/concave (i.e. $A>(<) 0)$, then the assumption V3) of Theorem 1.4 can be replaced by a weaker condition $\operatorname{Var} Y \geqslant(\leqslant) \operatorname{Var} X$.

If $f$ changes convexity between $X$ 's and $Y$ 's, then we can choose $A=0$ and the assumption V3) becomes obsolete. In fact, in this case the Levinson inequality follows immediately from the Jensen inequality, because the left-hand side of (4) is nonpositive, while its right-hand side is nonnegative. Thus we obtain the following version of Theorem 1.4.

## Theorem 5.1

Let $I$ be an open subinterval of $\mathbb{R}$ (bounded or unbounded), $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a 3-convex function and $X, Y:(\Omega, \mu) \rightarrow I$ be two random variables satisfying
(1) $\mathbf{E}\left[X^{2}\right], \mathbf{E}\left[Y^{2}\right], \mathbf{E}[f(X)], \mathbf{E}[f(Y)], \mathbf{E}\left[f^{\prime}(X)\right], \mathbf{E}\left[f^{\prime}(Y)\right], \mathbf{E}\left[X f^{\prime}(X)\right], \mathbf{E}\left[Y f^{\prime}(Y)\right]$ are finite,
(2) ess $\sup X \leqslant \operatorname{ess} \inf Y$,
(3) $f_{+}^{\prime \prime}(\operatorname{ess} \sup X)>0$ and $\operatorname{Var} X \leqslant \operatorname{Var} Y$, or $f_{-}^{\prime \prime}(\operatorname{ess} \inf Y)<0$ and $\operatorname{Var} X \geqslant$ $\operatorname{Var} Y$, or $f_{+}^{\prime \prime}(\operatorname{ess} \sup X) \leqslant 0 \leqslant f_{-}^{\prime \prime}(\operatorname{ess} \inf Y)$,
then

$$
\mathbf{E}[f(X)]-f(\mathbf{E}[X]) \leqslant \mathbf{E}[f(Y)]-f(\mathbf{E}[Y])
$$

If $X$ and $Y$ are discrete random variables, then we obtain the following corollary.

## Corollary 5.2

Let $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a 3-convex function, $p_{1}, \ldots, p_{m}$ and $q_{1}, \ldots, q_{n}$ be positive real numbers such that $p_{1}+\ldots+p_{m}=q_{1}+\ldots+q_{n}=1$. For $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}, y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n} \in I$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max _{1 \leqslant i \leqslant m} x_{i} \leqslant \min _{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n} y_{i} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

let $\bar{x}=\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_{i} x_{i}$ and $\bar{y}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i} y_{i}$. If

$$
f_{+}^{\prime \prime}\left(\max x_{i}\right)>0 \quad \text { and } \quad \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_{i}\left(x_{i}-\bar{x}\right)^{2} \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i}\left(y_{i}-\bar{y}\right)^{2},
$$

or

$$
f_{-}^{\prime \prime}\left(\min x_{i}\right)<0 \quad \text { and } \quad \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_{i}\left(x_{i}-\bar{x}\right)^{2} \geqslant \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i}\left(y_{i}-\bar{y}\right)^{2},
$$

or

$$
f_{+}^{\prime \prime}\left(\max _{1 \leqslant i \leqslant m} x_{i}\right) \leqslant 0 \leqslant f_{-}^{\prime \prime}\left(\min _{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n} y_{i}\right)
$$

then

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_{i} f\left(x_{i}\right)-f(\bar{x}) \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i} f\left(y_{i}\right)-f(\bar{y})
$$

The function $V$ used in the proof of Theorem 1.4 is convex, so we can apply the Hermite-Hadamard inequality.

Corollary 5.3
If the assumptions of Theorem 1.4 or 5.1 are satisfied and $F(x)=\int f(x) d x$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & \leqslant \mathbf{E}\left[f\left(\frac{Y+\mathbf{E}[Y]}{2}\right)\right]-f(\mathbf{E}[Y])-\mathbf{E}\left[f\left(\frac{X+\mathbf{E}[X]}{2}\right)\right]+f(\mathbf{E}[X]) \\
& \leqslant \mathbf{E}\left[\frac{F(Y)-F(\mathbf{E}[Y])}{Y-\mathbf{E}[Y]}\right]-f(\mathbf{E}[Y])-\mathbf{E}\left[\frac{F(X)-F(\mathbf{E}[X])}{X-\mathbf{E}[X]}\right]+f(\mathbf{E}[X]) \\
& \leqslant \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{E}[f(Y)]-f(\mathbf{E}[Y])-\mathbf{E}[f(X)]+f(\mathbf{E}[X])) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Its discrete version reads as follows

## Corollary 5.4

Under the assumptions of Corollary 5.2 the following inequalities are valid:

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i} f\left(\frac{y_{i}+\bar{y}}{2}\right)-f(\bar{y})-\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_{i} f\left(\frac{x_{i}+\bar{x}}{2}\right)+f(\bar{x}) \\
& \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i} \frac{\int_{\bar{y}}^{y_{i}} f(t) d t}{y_{i}-\bar{y}}-f(\bar{y})-\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_{i} \frac{\int_{\bar{x}}^{x_{i}} f(t) d t}{x_{i}-\bar{x}}+f(\bar{x}) \\
& \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i} f\left(y_{i}\right)-f(\bar{y})-\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_{i} f\left(x_{i}\right)+f(\bar{x})\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that the rightmost inequality can be rewritten in a nice symmetric form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_{i}\left(\frac{f\left(x_{i}\right)+f(\bar{x})}{2}-\frac{\int_{\bar{x}}^{x_{i}} f(t) d t}{x_{i}-\bar{x}}\right) \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i}\left(\frac{f\left(y_{i}\right)+f(\bar{y})}{2}-\frac{\int_{\bar{y}}^{y_{i}} f(t) d t}{y_{i}-\bar{y}}\right) \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

while the leftmost inequality is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_{i}\left(\frac{\int_{\bar{x}}^{x_{i}} f(t) d t}{x_{i}-\bar{x}}-f\left(\frac{x_{i}+\bar{x}}{2}\right)\right) \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i}\left(\frac{\int_{\bar{y}}^{y_{i}} f(t) d t}{y_{i}-\bar{y}}-f\left(\frac{y_{i}+\bar{y}}{2}\right)\right) \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 6. Applications

As an application we provide generalization and refinement of the famous Ky Fan inequality: if $0<x_{i} \leqslant \frac{1}{2}$ and $y_{i}=1-x_{i}$, then

$$
\frac{A\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{i}\right)}{A\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{i}\right)} \leqslant \frac{G\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{i}\right)}{G\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{i}\right)}
$$

Levinson in [3] noticed, that this inequality (in weighted version) follows from his inequality by taking $f(x)=\log x$. The logarithmic function is concave, so if $\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_{i}\left(x_{i}-\bar{x}\right)^{2} \geqslant \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i}\left(y_{i}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}$ and (10) holds, then Corollary 5.4 yields

$$
\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i} y_{i}}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_{i} x_{i}} \leqslant \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{n} A^{q_{i}}\left(y_{i}, \bar{y}\right)}{\prod_{i=1}^{m} A^{p_{i}}\left(x_{i}, \bar{x}\right)} \leqslant \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{n} I^{q_{i}}\left(y_{i}, \bar{y}\right)}{\prod_{i=1}^{m} I^{p_{i}}\left(x_{i}, \bar{x}\right)} \leqslant \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{n} G^{q_{i}}\left(y_{i}, \bar{y}\right)}{\prod_{i=1}^{m} G^{p_{i}}\left(x_{i}, \bar{x}\right)} \leqslant \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{n} y_{i}^{q_{i}}}{\prod_{i=1}^{m} x_{i}^{p_{i}}}
$$

where $A(x, y)=\frac{x+y}{2}, I(x, y)=e^{-1}\left(\frac{x^{x}}{y^{y}}\right)^{\frac{1}{x-y}}$ and $G(x, y)=\sqrt{x y}$ are the arithmetic, identric and geometric means.

Consider the function $f(x)=-\frac{1}{x}$ for $x>0$.
If $x$ 's and $y$ 's are the same as in the previous example, then, by (11)

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_{i}\left(\frac{1}{H\left(x_{i}, \bar{x}\right)}-\frac{1}{L\left(x_{i}, \bar{x}\right)}\right) \geqslant \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i}\left(\frac{1}{H\left(y_{i}, \bar{y}\right)}-\frac{1}{L\left(y_{i}, \bar{y}\right)}\right)
$$

where $H(x, y)=\frac{2 x y}{x+y}$ and $L(x, y)=\frac{x-y}{\log x-\log y}$ denote the harmonic and the logarithmic means. In this case Corollary 5.4 gives

$$
\frac{1}{\bar{x}}-\frac{1}{\bar{y}} \geqslant \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{p_{i}}{L\left(x_{i}, \bar{x}\right)}-\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{q_{i}}{L\left(y_{i}, \bar{y}\right)}
$$

In particular, setting $y_{1}=\ldots=y_{n}>\max x_{i}$ we obtain the inequality

$$
\frac{1}{\bar{x}} \geqslant \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{p_{i}}{L\left(x_{i}, \bar{x}\right)}
$$

valid for all positive $x$ 's.
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