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AbStract. In this paper we shall give another global upper bound for Jensen's discrete inequality which is better than existing ones. For instance, we determine a new converse for the generalized $A-G$ inequality.
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## 1. Introduction

Throughout this paper, $\tilde{x}=\left\{x_{i}\right\}$ is a finite sequence of real numbers belonging to a fixed closed interval $I=[a, b], a<b$, and $\tilde{p}=\left\{p_{i}\right\}, \sum p_{i}=1$ is a sequence of positive weights associated with $\tilde{x}$. If $f$ is a convex function on $I$, then the well-known Jensen's inequality [1, 4] asserts that:

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leq \sum p_{i} f\left(x_{i}\right)-f\left(\sum p_{i} x_{i}\right) \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

One can see that the lower bound zero is of global nature since it does not depend on $\tilde{p}$ and $\tilde{x}$ but only on $f$ and the interval $I$, whereupon $f$ is convex.

An upper global bound (i.e. depending on $f$ and $I$ only) for Jensen's inequality is given by Dragomir [3].
Theorem 1.1. If $f$ is a differentiable convex mapping on $I$, then we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum p_{i} f\left(x_{i}\right)-f\left(\sum p_{i} x_{i}\right) \leq \frac{1}{4}(b-a)\left(f^{\prime}(b)-f^{\prime}(a)\right):=D_{f}(a, b) \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

In [5] we obtain an upper global bound without a differentiability restriction on $f$. Namely, we proved the following:

Theorem 1.2. If $\tilde{p}, \tilde{x}$ are defined as above, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum p_{i} f\left(x_{i}\right)-f\left(\sum p_{i} x_{i}\right) \leq f(a)+f(b)-2 f\left(\frac{a+b}{2}\right):=S_{f}(a, b) \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $f$ that is convex over $I:=[a, b]$.

In many cases the bound $S_{f}(a, b)$ is better than $D_{f}(a, b)$.
For instance, for $f(x)=-x^{s}, 0<s<1 ; f(x)=x^{s}, s>1 ; I \subset \mathbb{R}^{+}$, we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{f}(a, b) \leq D_{f}(a, b), \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for each $s \in(0,1) \bigcup(1,2] \bigcup[3,+\infty)$.
In this article we establish another global bound $T_{f}(a, b)$ for Jensen's inequality, which is better than both of the aforementioned bounds $D_{f}(a, b)$ and $S_{f}(a, b)$.

Finally, we determine $T_{f}(a, b)$ in the case of the generalized $A-G$ inequality.

## 2. Results

Our main result is contained in the following
Theorem 2.1. Let $f, \tilde{p}, \tilde{x}$ be defined as above and $p, q>0, p+q=1$. Then

$$
\begin{align*}
\sum p_{i} f\left(x_{i}\right)-f\left(\sum p_{i} x_{i}\right) & \leq \max _{p}[p f(a)+q f(b)-f(p a+q b)]  \tag{2.1}\\
& :=T_{f}(a, b)
\end{align*}
$$

Remark 1. It is easy to see that $g(p):=p f(a)+(1-p) f(b)-f(p a+(1-p) b)$ is concave for


The next theorem demonstrates that the inequality (2.1) is stronger than (1.2) or (1.3).
Theorem 2.2. Let $\tilde{I}$ be the domain of a convex function $f$ and $I:=[a, b] \subset \tilde{I}$. Then
I. $T_{f}(a, b) \leq D_{f}(a, b)$;
II. $T_{f}(a, b) \leq S_{f}(a, b)$,
for each $I \subset \tilde{I}$.
The following well known $A-G$ inequality [4] asserts that

$$
\begin{equation*}
A(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x}) \geq G(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x}) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
A(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x}):=\sum p_{i} x_{i} ; \quad G(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x}):=\prod x_{i}^{p_{i}}, \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

are generalized arithmetic, i.e., geometric means, respectively.
Applying Theorems 2.1 (cf [2]) and 2.2 with $f(x)=-\log x$, one obtains the following converses of the $A-G$ inequality:

$$
\begin{equation*}
1 \leq \frac{A(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x})}{G(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x})} \leq \exp \left(\frac{(b-a)^{2}}{4 a b}\right) \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
1 \leq \frac{A(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x})}{G(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x})} \leq \frac{(a+b)^{2}}{4 a b} . \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $1+x \leq e^{x}, x \in \mathbb{R}$, putting $x=\frac{(b-a)^{2}}{4 a b}$, one can see that the inequality 2.5 is stronger than (2.4) for each $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^{+}$.

An even stronger converse of the $A-G$ inequality can be obtained by applying Theorem 2.1.
Theorem 2.3. Let $\tilde{p}, \tilde{x}, A(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x}), G(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x})$ be defined as above and $x_{i} \in[a, b], 0<a<b$.
Denote $u:=\log (b / a) ; w:=\left(e^{u}-1\right) / u$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
1 \leq \frac{A(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x})}{G(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x})} \leq \frac{w}{e} \exp \frac{1}{w}:=T(w) . \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Comparing the bounds $D, S$ and $T$, i.e., (2.4), (2.5) and (2.6) for arbitrary $\tilde{p}$ and $x_{i} \in$ $[a, 2 a], a>0$, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& 1 \leq \frac{A(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x})}{G(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x})} \leq e^{1 / 8} \approx 1.1331  \tag{2.7}\\
& 1 \leq \frac{A(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x})}{G(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x})} \leq 9 / 8=1.125 \tag{2.8}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
1 \leq \frac{A(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x})}{G(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x})} \leq 2(e \log 2)^{-1} \approx 1.0615 \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

respectively.
Remark 2. One can see that $T(w)=S(t)$, where Specht's ratio $S(t)$ is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(t):=\frac{t^{1 /(t-1)}}{e \log t^{1 /(t-1)}} \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $t=b / a$.
It is known [6, 7] that $S(t)$ represents the best possible upper bound for the $A-G$ inequality with uniform weights, i.e.

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(t)\left(x_{1} x_{2} \cdots x_{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \frac{x_{1}+x_{2}+\cdots+x_{n}}{n}\left(\geq\left(x_{1} x_{2} \cdots x_{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}}\right) . \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore Theorem 2.3 shows that Specht's ratio is the best upper bound for the generalized $A-G$ inequality also.

## 3. Proofs

Proof of Theorem 2.1] Since $x_{i} \in[a, b]$, there is a sequence $\left\{\lambda_{i}\right\}, \lambda_{i} \in[0,1]$, such that $x_{i}=$ $\lambda_{i} a+\left(1-\lambda_{i}\right) b$.

Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum p_{i} f\left(x_{i}\right)-f\left(\sum p_{i} x_{i}\right) \\
& =\sum p_{i} f\left(\lambda_{i} a+\left(1-\lambda_{i}\right) b\right)-f\left(\sum p_{i}\left(\lambda_{i} a+\left(1-\lambda_{i}\right) b\right)\right) \\
& \leq \sum p_{i}\left(\lambda_{i} f(a)+\left(1-\lambda_{i}\right) f(b)\right)-f\left(a \sum p_{i} \lambda_{i}+b \sum p_{i}\left(1-\lambda_{i}\right)\right. \\
& =f(a)\left(\sum p_{i} \lambda_{i}\right)+f(b)\left(1-\sum p_{i} \lambda_{i}\right)-f\left[a\left(\sum p_{i} \lambda_{i}\right)+b\left(1-\sum p_{i} \lambda_{i}\right)\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

Denoting $\sum p_{i} \lambda_{i}:=p ; 1-\sum p_{i} \lambda_{i}:=q$, we have that $0 \leq p, q \leq 1, p+q=1$.
Consequently,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum p_{i} f\left(x_{i}\right)-f\left(\sum p_{i} x_{i}\right) & \leq p f(a)+q f(b)-f(p a+q b) \\
& \leq \max _{p}[p f(a)+q f(b)-f(p a+q b)] \\
& :=T_{f}(a, b)
\end{aligned}
$$

and the proof of Theorem 2.1 is complete.

## Proof of Theorem 2.2

## Part I.

Since $f$ is convex (and differentiable, in this case), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\forall x, t \in I: f(x) \geq f(t)+(x-t) f^{\prime}(t) \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular,

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(p a+q b) \geq f(a)+q(b-a) f^{\prime}(a) ; \quad f(p a+q b) \geq f(b)+p(a-b) f^{\prime}(b) \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
p f(a)+q f(b)-f(p a+q b) & =p(f(a)-f(p a+q b))+q(f(b)-f(p a+q b)) \\
& \leq p\left(q(a-b) f^{\prime}(a)\right)+q\left(p(b-a) f^{\prime}(b)\right) \\
& =p q(b-a)\left(f^{\prime}(b)-f^{\prime}(a)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{f}(a, b) & :=\max _{p}[p f(a)+q f(b)-f(p a+q b)] \\
& \leq \max _{p}\left[p q(b-a)\left(f^{\prime}(b)-f^{\prime}(a)\right)\right] \\
& =\frac{1}{4}(b-a)\left(f^{\prime}(b)-f^{\prime}(a)\right) \\
& :=D_{f}(a, b) .
\end{aligned}
$$

## Part II.

We shall prove that, for each $0 \leq p, q, p+q=1$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
p f(a)+q f(b)-f(p a+q b) \leq f(a)+f(b)-2 f\left(\frac{a+b}{2}\right) . \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed,

$$
\begin{aligned}
p f(a)+q f(b)-f(p a+q b) & =f(a)+f(b)-(q f(a)+p f(b))-f(p a+q b) \\
& \leq f(a)+f(b)-(f(q a+p b)+f(p a+q b)) \\
& \leq f(a)+f(b)-2 f\left(\frac{1}{2}(q a+p b)+\frac{1}{2}(p a+q b)\right) \\
& =f(a)+f(b)-2 f\left(\frac{a+b}{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since the right-hand side of the above inequality does not depend on $p$, we immediately get

$$
\begin{equation*}
T_{f}(a, b) \leq S_{f}(a, b) \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof of Theorem 2.3. By Theorem 2.1, applied with $f(x)=-\log x$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & \leq \log \frac{A(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x})}{G(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x})} \\
& \leq T_{-\log x}(a, b) \\
& =\max _{p}[\log (p a+q b)-p \log a-q \log b] .
\end{aligned}
$$

Using standard arguments it is easy to find that the unique maximum is attained at the point $p$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
p=\frac{b}{b-a}-\frac{1}{\log b-\log a} . \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $0<a<b$, we get $0<p<1$ and after some calculations, it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leq \log \frac{A(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x})}{G(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x})} \leq \log \left(\frac{b-a}{\log b-\log a}\right)+\frac{a \log b-b \log a}{b-a}-1 . \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Putting $\log (b / a):=u,\left(e^{u}-1\right) / u:=w$ and taking the exponent, one obtains the result of Theorem 2.3.
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