On the Modes of Polynomials Derived from Nondecreasing Sequences

Donna Q. J. Dou

School of Mathematics
Jilin University, Changchun 130012, P. R. China

qjdou@jlu.edu.cn

Arthur L. B. Yang

Center for Combinatorics, LPMC-TJKLC
Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P. R. China

yang@nankai.edu.cn

Submitted: Oct 13, 2010; Accepted: Dec 15, 2010; Published: Jan 5, 2011
Mathematics Subject Classification: 05A20, 33F10

Abstract

Wang and Yeh proved that if $P(x)$ is a polynomial with nonnegative and nondecreasing coefficients, then $P(x+d)$ is unimodal for any $d>0$. A mode of a unimodal polynomial $f(x)=a_0+a_1x+\cdots+a_mx^m$ is an index k such that a_k is the maximum coefficient. Suppose that $M_*(P,d)$ is the smallest mode of $P(x+d)$, and $M^*(P,d)$ the greatest mode. Wang and Yeh conjectured that if $d_2>d_1>0$, then $M_*(P,d_1)\geq M_*(P,d_2)$ and $M^*(P,d_1)\geq M^*(P,d_2)$. We give a proof of this conjecture.

Keywords: unimodal polynomials, the smallest mode, the greatest mode.

1 Introduction

This paper is concerned with the modes of unimodal polynomials constructed from nonnegative and nondecreasing sequences. Recall that a sequence $\{a_i\}_{0\leq i\leq m}$ is unimodal if there exists an index $0\leq k\leq m$ such that

$$a_0\leq\cdots\leq a_{k-1}\leq a_k\geq a_{k+1}\geq\cdots\geq a_m.$$

Such an index k is called a mode of the sequence. Note that a mode of a sequence may not be unique. The sequence $\{a_i\}_{0\leq i\leq m}$ is said to be spiral if

$$a_m\leq a_0\leq a_{m-1}\leq a_1\leq\cdots\leq a_{[\frac{m}{2}]}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $[\frac{m}{2}]$ stands for the largest integer not exceeding $\frac{m}{2}$. Clearly, the spiral property implies unimodality. We say that a sequence $\{a_i\}_{0\leq i\leq m}$ is log-concave if for $1 \leq k \leq m-1$,

$$a_k^2 \geq a_{k+1}a_{k-1},$$

and it is ratio monotone if

$$\frac{a_m}{a_0} \leq \frac{a_{m-1}}{a_1} \leq \cdots \leq \frac{a_{m-i}}{a_i} \leq \cdots \leq \frac{a_{m-[\frac{m-1}{2}]}}{a_{[\frac{m-1}{2}]}} \leq 1 \tag{1.2}$$

and

$$\frac{a_0}{a_{m-1}} \leq \frac{a_1}{a_{m-2}} \leq \cdots \leq \frac{a_{i-1}}{a_{m-i}} \leq \cdots \leq \frac{a_{[\frac{m}{2}]-1}}{a_{m-[\frac{m}{2}]}} \leq 1. \tag{1.3}$$

It is easily checked that ratio monotonicity implies both log-concavity and the spiral property.

Let $P(x) = a_0 + a_1x + \cdots + a_mx^m$ be a polynomial with nonnegative coefficients. We say that $P(x)$ is unimodal if the sequence $\{a_i\}_{0\leq i\leq m}$ is unimodal. A mode of $\{a_i\}_{0\leq i\leq m}$ is also called a mode of $P(x)$. Similarly, we say that $P(x)$ is log-concave or ratio monotone if the sequence $\{a_i\}_{0\leq i\leq m}$ is log-concave or ratio monotone.

Throughout this paper $P(x)$ is assumed to be a polynomial with nonnegative and nondecreasing coefficients. Boros and Moll [2] proved that $P(x+1)$, as a polynomial of x, is unimodal. Alvarez et al. [1] showed that $P(x+n)$ is also unimodal for any positive integer n, and conjectured that $P(x+d)$ is unimodal for any $d > 0$. Wang and Yeh [6] confirmed this conjecture and studied the modes of $P(x+d)$. Llamas and Martínez-Bernal [5] obtained the log-concavity of $P(x+c)$ for $c \geq 1$. Chen, Yang and Zhou [4] showed that $P(x+1)$ is ratio monotone, which leads to an alternative proof of the ratio monotonicity of the Boros-Moll polynomials [3].

Let $M_*(P,d)$ and $M^*(P,d)$ denote the smallest and the greatest mode of $P(x+d)$ respectively. Our main result is the following theorem, which was conjectured by Wang and Yeh [6].

Theorem 1.1 *Suppose that $P(x)$ is a monic polynomial of degree $m \geq 1$ with nonnegative and nondecreasing coefficients. Then for $0 < d_1 < d_2$, we have $M_*(P,d_1) \geq M_*(P,d_2)$ and $M^*(P,d_1) \geq M^*(P,d_2)$.*

From now on, we further assume that $P(x)$ is monic, that is $a_m = 1$. For $0 \leq k \leq m$, let

$$b_k(x) = \sum_{j=k}^{m} \binom{j}{k} a_j x^{j-k}. \tag{1.4}$$

Therefore, $b_k(x)$ is of degree $m-k$ and $b_k(0) = a_k$. For $1 \leq k \leq m$, let

$$f_k(x) = b_{k-1}(x) - b_k(x), \tag{1.5}$$

which is of degree $m-k+1$. Let $f_k^{(n)}(x)$ denote the n-th derivative of $f_k(x)$.

Our proof of Theorem 1.1 relies on the fact that $f_k(x)$ has at most one real zero on $(0,+\infty)$. In fact, the derivative $f_k^{(n)}(x)$ of order $n \leq m-k$ has the same property. We establish this property by induction on n.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

To prove Theorem 1.1, we need the following three lemmas.

Lemma 2.1 *For any* $0 \le k \le m$*, we have* $b'_k(x) = (k+1)b_{k+1}(x)$*.*

Proof. Let $B_{j,k}(x)$ denote the summand of $b_k(x)$. It is readily checked that

$$B'_{j,k}(x) = (k+1)B_{j,k+1}(x).$$

The result immediately follows. ∎

Lemma 2.2 *For* $n \ge 1$ *and* $1 \le k \le m$*, we have*

$$f_k^{(n)}(x) = (k+n-1)_n b_{k+n-1}(x) - (k+n)_n b_{k+n}(x), \tag{2.1}$$

where $(m)_j = m(m-1)\cdots(m-j+1)$*.*

Proof. Use induction on n. For $n = 1$, we have

$$f_k^{(n)}(x) = f'_k(x) = kb_k - (k+1)b_{k+1}.$$

Assume that the lemma holds for $n = j$, namely,

$$f_k^{(j)}(x) = (k+j-1)_j b_{k+j-1}(x) - (k+j)_j b_{k+j}(x).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} f_k^{(j+1)}(x) &= (k+j-1)_j b'_{k+j-1}(x) - (k+j)_j b'_{k+j}(x) \\ &= (k+j)(k+j-1)_j b_{k+j}(x) - (k+j+1)(k+j)_j b_{k+j+1}(x) \\ &= (k+j)_{j+1} b_{k+j}(x) - (k+j+1)_{j+1} b_{k+j+1}(x). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ∎

Lemma 2.3 *For* $1 \le k \le m$ *and* $0 \le n \le m-k$*, the polynomial* $f_k^{(n)}(x)$ *has at most one real zero on the interval* $(0, +\infty)$*. In particular,* $f_k(x)$ *has at most one real zero on the interval* $(0, +\infty)$*.*

Proof. Use induction on n from $m-k$ to 0. First, we consider the case $n = m-k$. Recall that

$$f_k(x) = \sum_{j=k-1}^{m} \binom{j}{k-1} a_j x^{j-k+1} - \sum_{j=k}^{m} \binom{j}{k} a_j x^{j-k}.$$

Thus $f_k(x)$ is a polynomial of degree $m-k+1$. Note that

$$f_k^{(m-k)}(x) = (m-k+1)!\binom{m}{k-1} a_m x + \left[\binom{m-1}{k-1} a_{m-1} - \binom{m}{k} a_m\right](m-k)!.$$

Clearly, $f_k^{(m-k)}(x)$ has at most one real zero x_0 on $(0,+\infty)$. So the lemma is true for $n=m-k$.

Suppose that the lemma holds for $n=j$, where $m-k\geq j\geq 1$. We proceed to show that $f_k^{(j-1)}(x)$ has at most one real zero on $(0,+\infty)$. From the inductive hypothesis it follows that $f_k^{(j)}(x)$ has at most one real zero on $(0,+\infty)$. In light of (2.1), it is easy to verify that $f_k^{(j)}(+\infty)>0$ and

$$f_k^{(j)}(0)=(k+j-1)_j a_{k+j-1}-(k+j)_j a_{k+j}\leq 0.$$

It follows that either the polynomial $f_k^{(j-1)}(x)$ is increasing on the entire interval $(0,+\infty)$, or there exists a positive real number r such that $f_k^{(j-1)}(x)$ is decreasing on $(0,r]$ and increasing on $(r,+\infty)$. Again by (2.1) we find $f_k^{(j-1)}(+\infty)>0$ and

$$f_k^{(j-1)}(0)=(k+j-2)_{j-1}a_{k+j-2}-(k+j-1)_{j-1}a_{k+j-1}\leq 0.$$

So we conclude that $f_k^{(j-1)}(x)$ has at most one real zero on $(0,+\infty)$. This completes the proof. ∎

Proof of Theorem 1.1. In view of (1.4), we have

$$P(x+d)=\sum_{k=0}^{m}a_k(x+d)^k=\sum_{k=0}^{m}b_k(d)x^k.$$

Let us first prove that $M^*(P,d_1)\geq M^*(P,d_2)$. Suppose that $M^*(P,d_1)=k$. If $k=m$, then the inequality $M^*(P,d_1)\geq M^*(P,d_2)$ holds. For the case $0\leq k<m$, it suffices to verify that $b_k(d_2)>b_{k+1}(d_2)$. By Lemma 2.2, $f_{k+1}(x)$ has at most one real zero on $(0,+\infty)$. Note that

$$f_{k+1}(0)\leq 0 \quad\text{and}\quad f_{k+1}(+\infty)>0.$$

From $M^*(P,d_1)=k$ it follows that $b_k(d_1)>b_{k+1}(d_1)$, that is $f_{k+1}(d_1)>0$. Therefore, $f_{k+1}(d_2)>0$, that is, $b_k(d_2)>b_{k+1}(d_2)$.

Similarly, it can be seen that $M_*(P,d_1)\geq M_*(P,d_2)$. Suppose that $M_*(P,d_2)=k$. If $k=0$, then we have $M_*(P,d_1)\geq M_*(P,d_2)$. If $0<k\leq m$, it is necessary to show that $b_{k-1}(d_1)<b_k(d_1)$. Again, by Lemma 2.2, we know that $f_k(x)$ has at most one real zero on $(0,+\infty)$. From $M_*(P,d_2)=k$, it follows that $b_{k-1}(d_2)<b_k(d_2)$, that is $f_k(d_2)<0$. By the boundary conditions

$$f_k(0)\leq 0 \quad\text{and}\quad f_k(+\infty)>0,$$

we obtain $f_k(d_1)<0$, that is $b_{k-1}(d_1)<b_k(d_1)$. This completes the proof. ∎

Acknowledgments. This work was supported by the 973 Project, the PCSIRT Project of the Ministry of Education, and the National Science Foundation of China.

References

[1] J. Alvarez, M. Amadis, G. Boros, D. Karp, V. H. Moll and L. Rosales, An extension of a criterion for unimodality, Electron. J. Combin. 8 (2001), #R30.

[2] G. Boros and V. H. Moll, A criterion for unimodality, Electron. J. Combin. 6 (1999), #R10.

[3] W. Y. C. Chen and E. X. W. Xia, The ratio monotonicity of the Boros-Moll polynomials, Math. Comp. 78 (2009), 2269–2282.

[4] W. Y. C. Chen, A. L. B. Yang and E. L. F. Zhou, Ratio monotonicity of polynomials derived from nondecreasing sequences, Electron. J. Combin. 17 (2010), #N37.

[5] A. Llamas and J. Martínez-Bernal, Nested log-concavity, Commun. Algebra 38 (2010), 1968–1981.

[6] Y. Wang and Y.-N. Yeh, Proof of a conjecture on unimodality, European J. Combin. 26 (2005), 617–627.