

**Problem j13-I-1/j13-I-15.** Let  $d(k)$  be the number of all natural divisors of a number  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Prove that for any  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  the sequence  $(d(n^2 + 1))_{n=n_0}^{\infty}$  is not strictly monotone. (Vilnius University)

*Solution.* Note that  $d(n^2 + 1) < n$  for all even  $n$ . Indeed, the number  $n^2 + 1$  is not square and so it is possible to split the set of all its divisors into pairs  $\{d, (n^2 + 1)/d\}$  where  $d < n$  and  $d$  is odd. The number of divisors in all such pairs does not exceed  $n$ .

Let us assume that starting from some  $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ , the sequence is strictly monotone. For  $d(n^2 + 1)$  is always even, we get

$$d((n+1)^2 + 1) \geq d(n^2 + 1) + 2$$

or, in general,

$$d((n+k)^2 + 1) \geq d(n^2 + 1) + 2k$$

for any natural numbers  $n \geq n_0$  and  $k \geq 1$ . Let  $N \geq n_0$  (e.g.,  $N = n_0$ ). Taking any  $s \geq N - d(N^2 + 1)$  (such that  $N + s$  is even), we get

$$d((N+s)^2 + 1) \geq d(N^2 + 1) + 2s \geq N + s,$$

which is a contradiction with  $d((N+s)^2 + 1) < N + s$ .  $\square$

**Problem j13-I-2/j13-I-19.** Let  $A = [a_{i,j}]$  be an  $m \times n$  real matrix with at least one non-zero element. For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  let  $R_i := \sum_{j=1}^n a_{i,j}$  (the sum of the  $i$ -th row of  $A$ ) and for each  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  let  $C_j := \sum_{i=1}^m a_{i,j}$  (the sum of the  $j$ -th column of  $A$ ). Prove that there exist indices  $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that

$$a_{k,l} > 0, \quad R_k \geq 0, \quad C_l \geq 0,$$

or

$$a_{k,l} < 0, \quad R_k \leq 0, \quad C_l \leq 0.$$

(University of Zagreb)

*Solution.* Consider the following sets of indices (some of them may be empty):

$$I^+ := \{ i \in \{1, \dots, m\} \mid R_i \geq 0 \},$$

$$I^- := \{ i \in \{1, \dots, m\} \mid R_i < 0 \},$$

$$J^+ := \{ j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid C_j > 0 \},$$

$$J^- := \{ j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid C_j \leq 0 \}.$$

Suppose that the statement of the problem does not hold. Then (but not equivalently) we have  $a_{i,j} \leq 0$  for every  $(i,j) \in I^+ \times J^+$  and we have  $a_{i,j} \geq 0$  for every  $(i,j) \in I^- \times J^-$ . Let us write the sum  $\sum_{(i,j) \in I^- \times J^+} a_{i,j}$  in two different ways:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(i,j) \in I^- \times J^+} a_{i,j} &= \sum_{i \in I^-} \left( \sum_{j=1}^n a_{i,j} - \sum_{j \in J^-} a_{i,j} \right) = \sum_{i \in I^-} R_i - \sum_{(i,j) \in I^- \times J^-} a_{i,j} \leq 0, \\ \sum_{(i,j) \in I^- \times J^+} a_{i,j} &= \sum_{j \in J^+} \left( \sum_{i=1}^m a_{i,j} - \sum_{i \in I^+} a_{i,j} \right) = \sum_{j \in J^+} C_j - \sum_{(i,j) \in I^+ \times J^+} a_{i,j} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\sum_{(i,j) \in I^- \times J^+} a_{i,j} = 0$  and we have only equalities in the two formulae above. This is only possible if  $\sum_{i \in I^-} R_i = 0$  and  $\sum_{j \in J^+} C_j = 0$ , so  $I^- = \emptyset$  and  $J^+ = \emptyset$ ,<sup>†</sup> which means  $R_i \geq 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, m$  and  $C_j \leq 0$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . Moreover, from

$$0 \leq \sum_{i=1}^m R_i = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n a_{i,j} = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^m a_{i,j} = \sum_{j=1}^n C_j \leq 0,$$

we conclude  $R_i = 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$  and  $C_j = 0$  for  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . Since  $A$  is a non-zero matrix, there are indices  $k$  and  $l$  such that  $a_{k,l} \neq 0$ , but  $R_k = 0$  and  $C_l = 0$ , which leads to a contradiction with the assumption that the statement of the problem is false.  $\square$

---

<sup>†</sup> If  $I^- \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\sum_{(i,j) \in I^- \times J^+} a_{i,j} \leq \sum_{i \in I^-} R_i < 0$  — a contradiction. We can argue similarly to show  $J^+ = \emptyset$ .

**Problem j13-I-3/j13-I-9.** Find the limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{1 + 2\sqrt{1 + 3\sqrt{\cdots + (n-1)\sqrt{1+n}}}} .$$

(Dr. Moubinool Omarjee, Paris†)

*Solution.* Let

$$u_{m,n} = \sqrt{1 + m\sqrt{1 + (m+1)\sqrt{\cdots + (n-1)\sqrt{1+n}}}} .$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} u_{m,n}^2 &= 1 + mu_{m+1,n} , \\ u_{m,n}^2 - (m+1)^2 &= m(u_{m+1,n} - (m+2)) . \end{aligned}$$

Using the equality  $|a - b| = |a^2 - b^2|/|a + b|$  and inequality  $u_{m,n} + m + 1 \geq m + 2$ , we get

$$|u_{m,n} - m - 1| \leq \frac{m}{m+2} |u_{m+1,n} - (m+2)| .$$

We deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} |u_{2,n} - 3| &\leq \frac{2}{4} \cdot \frac{3}{5} \cdots \frac{n-1}{n+1} \cdot |u_{n-1,n} - n| , \\ |u_{2,n} - 3| &\leq \frac{6}{n(n+1)} \left( \sqrt{1 + (n-1)\sqrt{1+n}} - n \right) = O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) . \end{aligned}$$

So we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_{2,n} = 3 .$$

□

---

† This problem is formally proposed by the University of Ostrava.

**Problem j13-I-4/j13-I-12.** Let  $A$  and  $B$  be complex hermitian  $2 \times 2$  matrices with pairs of eigenvalues  $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$  and  $(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ , respectively. Determine all possible pairs  $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$  of eigenvalues of the matrix  $C = A + B$ . (A matrix  $A = [a_{i,j}]$  is hermitian if and only if  $a_{i,j} = \overline{a_{j,i}}$  for all  $i, j$ .) (Charles University in Prague)

*Solution.* Recall that all eigenvalues of a hermitian matrix are real numbers and that there exists an orthonormal basis consisting of eigenvectors of the matrix. As we can add a sufficiently large multiple of the identity matrix to both matrices  $A$  and  $B$ , we can suppose wlog that  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2 > 0$  and also  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 > 0$ .

Let us also wlog suppose  $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2$ ,  $\beta_1 \geq \beta_2$ ,  $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2$  and  $\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 \geq \beta_1 - \beta_2$ . By easy arguments, we can see

$$\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 = \text{Tr } C = \text{Tr } A + \text{Tr } B = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \beta_1 + \beta_2.$$

Further, it holds that

$$\gamma_1 \leq \alpha_1 + \beta_1, \quad \gamma_2 \geq \alpha_2 + \beta_2.$$

(The first inequality can be seen if we rewrite it slightly:  $\gamma_1 = \|C\| \leq \|A\| + \|B\| = \alpha_1 + \beta_1$ . The second inequality follows if we consider the equality above and the first inequality together. — Alternatively,  $\gamma_1 = \max(Cx, x)/(x, x) \leq \max(Ax, x)/(x, x) + \max(Bx, x)/(x, x) = \alpha_1 + \beta_1$  and  $\gamma_2 = \min(Cx, x)/(x, x) \geq \min(Ax, x)/(x, x) + \min(Bx, x)/(x, x) = \alpha_2 + \beta_2$ .) Later we will also prove the inequalities

$$\gamma_1 \geq \alpha_1 + \beta_2, \quad \gamma_2 \leq \beta_1 + \alpha_2$$

(in fact, it suffices to prove only the first one because the second one follows if we use the equality given above).

From these inequalities, we can see that  $\gamma_1 \in [\alpha_1 + \beta_2, \alpha_1 + \beta_1]$ . (The value of  $\gamma_2$  has to be “complementary” to obtain the right value of the sum  $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2$ . It also worths noting that even if  $\gamma_1 = \alpha_1 + \beta_2$ , then still  $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2 = \beta_1 + \alpha_2$ . This follows from the assumption  $\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 \geq \beta_1 - \beta_2$ .) We will show that  $\gamma_1$  can assume any value from the given interval  $[\alpha_1 + \beta_2, \alpha_1 + \beta_1]$ . Consequently, the set of all possible pairs  $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$  of eigenvalues of the matrix  $C = A + B$  is

$$\{(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) : \alpha_1 + \beta_2 \leq \gamma_1 \leq \alpha_1 + \beta_1, \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \beta_1 + \beta_2\}.$$

To see this, let us put

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad P(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos t & \sin t \\ -\sin t & \cos t \end{pmatrix}.$$

The matrix  $A$  obviously has eigenvalues  $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ . The matrix  $B(t) = P^{-1}(t)BP(t)$  obviously has eigenvalues  $(\beta_1, \beta_2)$ . If we note that  $P^{-1}(t) = P^T(t)$  and define the matrix  $C(t) = A + B(t)$ , we have

$$C(0) = A + B = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 + \beta_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_2 + \beta_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad C\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 + \beta_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_2 + \beta_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The matrix  $C(0)$  has the eigenvalue  $\gamma_1(0) = \alpha_1 + \beta_1$ . (Note that  $\gamma_1(0) \geq \gamma_2(0) = \alpha_2 + \beta_2$ .) The matrix  $C(\pi/2)$  has the eigenvalue  $\gamma_1(\pi/2) = \alpha_1 + \beta_2$ . (Note that  $\gamma_1(\pi/2) \geq \gamma_2(\pi/2) = \alpha_2 + \beta_1$ .) As both eigenvalues  $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$  of a matrix  $C$  depend continuously on the coefficients of the matrix, we deduce that  $\gamma_1(t)$  is a continuous function. Consequently, it assumes every value from the interval  $[\alpha_1 + \beta_2, \alpha_1 + \beta_1]$ , which we wanted to demonstrate.

Now it only remains to prove the inequality  $\gamma_1 \geq \alpha_1 + \beta_2$  for any two complex hermitian matrices  $A$  and  $B$ . Let us recall that we still wlog suppose  $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2 > 0$ ,  $\beta_1 \geq \beta_2 > 0$  and  $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2 > 0$ . Let  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  denote the eigenvectors of the matrix  $A$  corresponding to the eigenvalues  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$ , respectively, and let  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  denote the eigenvectors of  $B$  corresponding to the eigenvalues  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$ , respectively. We can suppose that the bases

$\{v_1, v_2\}$  and  $\{w_1, w_2\}$  are orthonormal. So there exists some unitary matrix  $U = \begin{pmatrix} u_{11} & u_{12} \\ u_{21} & u_{22} \end{pmatrix}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &= u_{11}w_1 + u_{12}w_2, & \text{and} & & w_1 &= \overline{u_{11}}v_1 + \overline{u_{21}}v_2, \\ v_2 &= u_{21}w_1 + u_{22}w_2, & & & w_2 &= \overline{u_{12}}v_1 + \overline{u_{22}}v_2. \end{aligned}$$

We will estimate  $\gamma_1$  in the following way. First,

$$\gamma_1 = \sup\{\|Cx\| : \|x\| = 1\} \geq \|Cv_1\|$$

where  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the Euclidean norm. (Let us justify the formula. Recall that  $\gamma_1 = \max_{\|x\|=1}(Cx, x)$ . Obviously,  $\gamma_1^2$  is the greater eigenvalue of  $C^2$ . Consequently, it follows that  $\gamma_1^2 = \max_{\|x\|=1}(C^2x, x)$ . As  $C$  is hermitian, we have  $(C^2x, x) = x^*CCx = x^*C^*Cx = (Cx, Cx) = \|Cx\|^2$ .) Second,

$$\begin{aligned} Cv_1 &= (A+B)v_1 = \alpha_1v_1 + \beta_1u_{11}w_1 + \beta_2u_{12}w_2 = (\alpha_1 + \beta_2)v_1 + (\beta_1 - \beta_2)u_{11}w_1 = \\ &= (\alpha_1 + \beta_2 + (\beta_1 - \beta_2)u_{11}\overline{u_{11}})v_1 + (\beta_1 - \beta_2)u_{11}\overline{u_{21}}v_2. \end{aligned}$$

As the vectors  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are orthonormal and  $(\beta_1 - \beta_2)u_{11}\overline{u_{11}} \geq 0$ , we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1 \geq \|Cv_1\| &= \sqrt{|\alpha_1 + \beta_2 + (\beta_1 - \beta_2)u_{11}\overline{u_{11}}|^2 + |(\beta_1 - \beta_2)u_{11}\overline{u_{21}}|^2} \geq \\ &\geq \sqrt{|\alpha_1 + \beta_2 + (\beta_1 - \beta_2)u_{11}\overline{u_{11}}|^2} \geq \alpha_1 + \beta_2. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Problem j13-II-1/j13-II-51.** Two real square matrices  $A$  and  $B$  satisfy the conditions  $A^{2002} = B^{2003} = I$  and  $AB = BA$ . Prove that  $A + B + I$  is invertible. (The symbol  $I$  denotes the identity matrix.)  
(University of Belgrade)

*Solution.* Let  $(A + B + I)x = 0$  for some vector  $x$ , i.e.,  $(B + I)x = -Ax$ . Then we have  $-A^2x = A(B + I)x = (B + I)Ax = -(B + I)^2x$ , and, continuing in this way,  $(B + I)^kx = (-1)^k A^kx$ . As  $A^{2002} = I$ , we get  $(B + I)^{2002}x = x$ , i.e.,

$$((B + I)^{2002} - I)x = (B^{2003} - I)x = 0.$$

(Recall  $B^{2003} = I$ .) In other words, taking that  $p(t) = (t + 1)^{2002} - 1$  and  $q(t) = t^{2003} - 1$  are polynomials, we have just got

$$p(B)x = q(B)x = 0.$$

But, since 2003 is a prime,  $q(t)/(t - 1)$  is a primitive polynomial for all its roots, and therefore none of them is a root of the another monic polynomial  $p(t)$  of degree 2002; further, the remained root  $t = 1$  of  $q(t)$  is not a root of  $p(t)$ , which implies that  $p(t)$  and  $q(t)$  are coprime.†

Since there exist non-zero polynomials  $r(t)$  and  $s(t)$  such that  $r(t)p(t) - s(t)q(t) = 1$  (recall the Euclidean algorithm), we can conclude that  $x = r(B)p(B)x - s(B)q(B)x = 0$ , and so  $A + B + I$  must be invertible indeed.  $\square$

---

† The polynomials  $p(t)$  and  $q(t)$  are really coprime (i.e. relatively prime). Here is another argument: Every polynomial (of degree  $\geq 1$ ) can be written as a product of factors of degree 1. In particular,  $p(t) = (t + 1)^{2002} - 1 = \prod_{k=1}^{2002} (t - z_{p,k})$  and  $q(t) = t^{2003} - 1 = \prod_{k=1}^{2003} (t - z_{q,k})$ , where  $z_{p,1}, \dots, z_{p,2002}$  and  $z_{q,1}, \dots, z_{q,2003}$  are the roots of the polynomial  $p$  and  $q$ , respectively. Obviously, the polynomials  $p$  and  $q$  are relatively prime iff they have no root in common.

It is easy to see that the roots of  $q$  lie on the unit circle in the complex plane. Similarly, it is easy to see that all roots of  $p$  are on the circle with radius 1 and its centre at the point  $-1$ .

Thus, the intersections of the two circles,

$$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \pm i\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} = \cos \pm \frac{3\pi}{2} + i \sin \pm \frac{3\pi}{2} = (-1) + (\cos \pm \frac{\pi}{2} + i \sin \pm \frac{\pi}{2}),$$

are the only possible common roots of  $q$  and  $p$ . But none of these two points is a root of  $q$ . It follows that  $p$  and  $q$  are coprime.

**Problem j13-II-2/j13-I-17.** Let  $\{D_1, D_2, \dots, D_n\}$  be a set of disks (a disk is a circle with its interior) in the Euclidean plane and  $a_{ij} = S(D_i \cap D_j)$  be the area of  $D_i \cap D_j$ . Prove that for any numbers  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}$  the following inequality holds:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} x_i x_j \geq 0.$$

(Warsaw University)

*Solution.* Let  $\chi_{D_i}: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be the characteristic function of the set  $D_i$ :

$$\chi_{D_i}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (x, y) \in D_i, \\ 0, & \text{if } (x, y) \notin D_i. \end{cases}$$

We have:

$$\chi_{D_i \cap D_j} = \chi_{D_i} \chi_{D_j},$$

$$S(D_i) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \chi_{D_i}(x, y) \, dx \, dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \chi_{D_i}^2(x, y) \, dx \, dy,$$

$$S(D_i \cap D_j) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \chi_{D_i \cap D_j}(x, y) \, dx \, dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \chi_{D_i}(x, y) \chi_{D_j}(x, y) \, dx \, dy.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} x_i x_j &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n x_i \chi_{D_i}(x, y) x_j \chi_{D_j}(x, y) \, dx \, dy = \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (x_1 \chi_{D_1}(x, y) + \dots + x_n \chi_{D_n}(x, y))^2 \, dx \, dy \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Problem j13-II-3/j13-II-70.** A sequence  $(a_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$  of real numbers is defined recursively by

$$a_0 := 0, \quad a_1 := 1, \quad a_{n+2} := a_{n+1} + \frac{a_n}{2^n}, \quad n \geq 0.$$

Prove that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} \cdot \prod_{k=1}^n (2^k - 1)}.$$

(University of Zagreb)

*Remark.* In fact, we will prove the following:

- (a) The sequence  $(a_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$  is convergent.
- (b)  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 1/(2^{n(n-1)/2} \cdot \prod_{k=1}^n (2^k - 1))$ .
- (c) The limit  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$  is an irrational number.

*Solution.* (a) Obviously,  $a_n \geq 0$  for every  $n \geq 0$ . The sequence  $(a_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$  is increasing since  $a_{n+2} - a_{n+1} = a_n/2^n \geq 0$  for every  $n \geq 0$ . It suffices to show that  $(a_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$  is bounded from above. For each  $n \geq 0$ , we have  $a_{n+2} \leq a_{n+1} + a_{n+1}/2^n = a_{n+1}(1 + 1/2^n)$ . Using the inequality between geometric and arithmetic mean, for every  $n \geq 1$  we obtain

$$a_{n+2} \leq \prod_{k=0}^n \left(1 + \frac{1}{2^k}\right) = 2 \prod_{k=1}^n \left(1 + \frac{1}{2^k}\right) \leq 2 \left(\frac{1}{n} \left(n + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{2^k}\right)\right)^n \leq 2 \left(\frac{n+1}{n}\right)^n \leq 2e.$$

(b) Consider the power series  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n$ . Since  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{|a_n|} \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{2e} = 1$ , its radius of convergence is  $R \geq 1$ . Therefore, on the open unit disc, with center at the origin, it converges to a holomorphic function  $f(z) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n$ . Inductively, we obtain  $a_{n+2} = 1 + \sum_{k=0}^n a_k/2^k$  for any  $n \geq 0$ . So  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = 1 + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k/2^k = 1 + f(\frac{1}{2})$  and we have to find  $f(\frac{1}{2})$ .

Now we use the recurrent relation for  $(a_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$  to obtain a functional equation for  $f$ . We multiply  $a_{n+2} := a_{n+1} + a_n/2^n$  by  $z^{n+2}$  and sum over all  $n \geq 0$  to get

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{n+2} z^{n+2} = z \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{n+1} z^{n+1} + z^2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n \left(\frac{z}{2}\right)^n,$$

that is

$$f(z) - z = z f(z) + z^2 f\left(\frac{z}{2}\right),$$

or

$$(1 - z)f(z) = z^2 f\left(\frac{z}{2}\right) + z \quad \text{for } |z| < 1. \quad (1)$$

We substitute  $z = 1/2^n$  for  $n = 1, \dots, N$  (where  $N \geq 1$  is a fixed number) into (1), then multiply the  $n$ -th equality by some constant  $s_n > 0$  and finally sum up those  $N$  equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \frac{1}{2})f(\frac{1}{2}) &= (\frac{1}{2})^2 f(\frac{1}{4}) + \frac{1}{2}, & | \cdot s_1, \\ (1 - \frac{1}{4})f(\frac{1}{4}) &= (\frac{1}{4})^2 f(\frac{1}{8}) + \frac{1}{4}, & | \cdot s_2, \\ & \vdots \\ (1 - \frac{1}{2^n})f(\frac{1}{2^n}) &= (\frac{1}{2^n})^2 f(\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}) + \frac{1}{2^n}, & | \cdot s_n, \\ (1 - \frac{1}{2^{n+1}})f(\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}) &= (\frac{1}{2^{n+1}})^2 f(\frac{1}{2^{n+2}}) + \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}, & | \cdot s_{n+1}, \\ & \vdots \\ (1 - \frac{1}{2^N})f(\frac{1}{2^N}) &= (\frac{1}{2^N})^2 f(\frac{1}{2^{N+1}}) + \frac{1}{2^N}, & | \cdot s_N, \end{aligned}$$


---


$$\frac{s_1}{2} f\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = \frac{s_N}{2^{2N}} f\left(\frac{1}{2^{N+1}}\right) + \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{s_n}{2^n}.$$

To obtain the given result (namely, to achieve cancelling of the terms with  $f(\frac{1}{2^n})$  for  $n = 2, \dots, N$ ), we had to choose the numbers  $s_n$  so that

$$(1 - \frac{1}{2^{n+1}})s_{n+1} = (\frac{1}{2^n})^2 s_n, \quad \text{for } n \geq 0. \quad (2a)$$



Let us put

$$s_0 := 1. \quad (2b)$$

It follows that  $s_1 = 2$ . Equalities (2b) and (2a) lead to

$$s_n = \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{s_{k+1}}{s_k} = \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{\left(\frac{1}{2^k}\right)^2}{1 - \frac{1}{2^{k+1}}} = \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{2^{k-1}(2^{k+1} - 1)} = \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}-n} \prod_{k=1}^n (2^k - 1)}$$

for every  $n \geq 1$ . Finally, we have

$$f\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = \frac{s_N}{2^{2N}} f\left(\frac{1}{2^{N+1}}\right) + \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{s_n}{2^n} = \frac{f\left(\frac{1}{2^{N+1}}\right)}{2^{\frac{N(N-1)}{2}+N} \prod_{k=1}^N (2^k - 1)} + \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} \prod_{k=1}^n (2^k - 1)}.$$

The first term tends to 0 when  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , so

$$f\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} \prod_{k=1}^n (2^k - 1)}. \quad (3)$$

(c) The proof of  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$  is based on the fact that the series in (3) converges “very rapidly”. Suppose that its sum equals  $\frac{p}{q}$  for some positive integers  $p$  and  $q$ . For each integer  $N \geq 1$ , denote

$$q_N := 2^{\frac{N(N-1)}{2}} \prod_{k=1}^N (2^k - 1), \quad p_N := q_N \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} \prod_{k=1}^n (2^k - 1)}.$$

Obviously,  $p_N$  and  $q_N$  are positive integers. We manage to estimate  $pq_N - qp_N$ . We have

$$q_N = 2^{\frac{N(N-1)}{2}} \prod_{k=1}^N (2^k - 1) < 2^{\frac{N(N-1)}{2}} \prod_{k=1}^N 2^k = 2^{N^2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p}{q} - \frac{p_N}{q_N} &= \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} \prod_{k=1}^n (2^k - 1)} \leq \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} \prod_{k=1}^n 2^{k-1}} = \\ &= \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{n(n-1)}} \leq \sum_{m=N(N+1)}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^m} = \frac{1}{2^{N^2+N-1}} < \frac{1}{2^{N-1} q_N}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $0 < pq_N - qp_N < \frac{q}{2^{N-1}}$ ,<sup>†</sup> so  $(pq_N - qp_N)_{N \geq 1}$  is a sequence of positive integers that converges to 0. This is a contradiction and we are done.  $\square$

---

<sup>†</sup> It is easy to see from the definition of the numbers  $p_N$  that the sequence  $\left(\frac{p_N}{q_N}\right)$  is strictly increasing to the limit  $\frac{p}{q}$ . Hence  $\frac{p_N}{q_N} < \frac{p}{q}$ ,  $qp_N < pq_N$ , and  $0 < pq_N - qp_N$ . As the difference is integer, we have even  $1 \leq pq_N - qp_N$ .

**Problem j13-II-4/j13-I-18.** Let  $f, g: [0, 1] \rightarrow (0, +\infty)$  be continuous functions such that  $f$  and  $\frac{g}{f}$  are increasing. Prove that

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\int_0^x f(t) dt}{\int_0^x g(t) dt} dx \leq 2 \int_0^1 \frac{f(t)}{g(t)} dt.$$

(University of Zagreb)

*Solution.* First, we estimate the expression inside the integral sign on the left side of the given inequality. By the Chebycheff's inequality for integrals applied to increasing functions  $f$  and  $\frac{g}{f}$  on the segment  $[0, x]$  (where  $x \in (0, 1]$  is fixed), we get

$$\left( \frac{1}{x} \int_0^x f(t) dt \right) \left( \frac{1}{x} \int_0^x \frac{g(t)}{f(t)} dt \right) \leq \frac{1}{x} \int_0^x g(t) dt,$$

that is,

$$\frac{\int_0^x f(t) dt}{\int_0^x g(t) dt} \leq \frac{x}{\int_0^x \frac{g(t)}{f(t)} dt} \quad (1)$$

for every  $x \in (0, 1]$ . From the integral form of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality on the segment  $[0, x]$ , we have

$$\left( \int_0^x \frac{g(t)}{f(t)} dt \right) \left( \int_0^x \frac{t^2 f(t)}{g(t)} dt \right) \geq \left( \int_0^x t dt \right)^2 = \frac{x^4}{4},$$

or

$$\frac{1}{\int_0^x \frac{g(t)}{f(t)} dt} \leq \frac{4}{x^4} \int_0^x \frac{t^2 f(t)}{g(t)} dt. \quad (2)$$

From (1) and (2) we obtain

$$\frac{\int_0^x f(t) dt}{\int_0^x g(t) dt} \leq \frac{4}{x^3} \int_0^x \frac{t^2 f(t)}{g(t)} dt. \quad (3)$$

Finally, it remains to integrate (3) over  $x \in (0, 1]$  and to reverse the order of integration.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \frac{\int_0^x f(t) dt}{\int_0^x g(t) dt} dx &\leq \int_0^1 \left( \int_0^x \frac{4t^2 f(t)}{x^3 g(t)} dt \right) dx = \int_0^1 \left( \int_t^1 \frac{4t^2 f(t)}{x^3 g(t)} dx \right) dt = \\ &= \int_0^1 \frac{4t^2 f(t)}{g(t)} \left( \int_t^1 \frac{dx}{x^3} \right) dt = \int_0^1 \frac{4t^2 f(t)}{g(t)} \left( \frac{1}{2t^2} - \frac{1}{2} \right) dt = \\ &= 2 \int_0^1 \frac{f(t)}{g(t)} (1 - t^2) dt \leq 2 \int_0^1 \frac{f(t)}{g(t)} dt. \end{aligned}$$

(*Remark.* The constant 2 on the right hand side of the given inequality is optimal, i.e., the least possible. Consider  $f(t) := 1$  and  $g(t) := t + \varepsilon$  for some fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\int_0^x f(t) dt}{\int_0^x g(t) dt} dx = \int_0^1 \frac{x}{\frac{1}{2}x^2 + \varepsilon x} dx = 2 \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{x + 2\varepsilon} = 2 \ln(1 + 2\varepsilon) - 2 \ln 2 - 2 \ln \varepsilon$$

and

$$\int_0^1 \frac{f(t)}{g(t)} dt = \int_0^1 \frac{dt}{t + \varepsilon} = \ln(1 + \varepsilon) - \ln \varepsilon.$$

The quotient of these two expressions can be made arbitrarily close to 2 since

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \frac{2 \ln(1 + 2\varepsilon) - 2 \ln 2 - 2 \ln \varepsilon}{\ln(1 + \varepsilon) - \ln \varepsilon} = 2 \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \frac{-\frac{\ln(1+2\varepsilon)}{\ln \varepsilon} + \frac{\ln 2}{\ln \varepsilon} + 1}{-\frac{\ln(1+\varepsilon)}{\ln \varepsilon} + 1} = 2.$$

Therefore, the constant 2 is the best possible one.)  $\square$