Mathematical
Inequalities
& Applications
Volume 20, Number 4 (2017), 1107–1120 doi:10.7153/mia-2017-20-71

SHARP GAUTSCHI INEQUALITY FOR PARAMETER $0 < p < 1$ WITH APPLICATIONS

ZHEN-HANG YANG, WEN ZHANG AND YU-MING CHU

(*Communicated by N. Elezović*)

Abstract. In the article, we present the best possible parameters a, b on the interval $(0,\infty)$ such that the Gautschi double inequality $[(x^p+a)^{1/p}-x]/a < e^{x^p}\int_x^\infty e^{-t^p}dt < [(x^p+b)^{1/p}-x]/b$ holds for all $x>0$ and $p\in(0,1)$. As applications, we find new bounds for the incomplete gamma function $\Gamma(a,x)=\int_x^\infty t^{a-1}e^{-t}dt$.

1. Introduction

Let $a>0$ and $x>0$. Then the classical gamma function $\Gamma(x)$, incomplete gamma function $\Gamma(a,x)$ and psi function $\psi(x)$ are defined by

$$\Gamma(x)=\int_0^\infty t^{x-1}e^{-t}dt, \quad \Gamma(a,x)=\int_x^\infty t^{a-1}e^{-t}dt, \quad \psi(x)=\frac{\Gamma'(x)}{\Gamma(x)},$$

respectively. It is well known that the identities

$$\int_x^\infty e^{-t^p}dt=\frac{1}{p}\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{p},x^p\right), \quad \int_0^x e^{-t^p}dt=\frac{1}{p}\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)-\frac{1}{p}\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{p},x^p\right) \tag{1.1}$$

hold for all $x,p>0$.

Recently, the bounds and asymptotic expansions for the integral $\int_x^\infty e^{-t^p}dt$ or $\int_0^x e^{-t^p}dt$ have attracted the interest of many researchers. In particular, many remarkable inequalities and asymptotic formulas for both integrals can be found in the literature [2, 4, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31]. Let

$$I_p(x)=e^{x^p}\int_x^\infty e^{-t^p}dt. \tag{1.2}$$

Then we clearly see that

$$I_1(x)=1, \quad I_{1/2}(x)=2(\sqrt{x}+1), \tag{1.3}$$

Mathematics subject classification (2010): 33B20, 26D07, 26D15.
Keywords and phrases: Incomplete gamma function, gamma function, psi function.
The research was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants 61673169, 61374086, 11371125 and 11401191, and the Tianyuan Special Funds of the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 11626101.

and $I_p(x)$ is divergent if $p \leqslant 0$. The functions $I_3(x)$ and $I_4(x)$ can be used to research the heat transfer problem [36] and electrical discharge in gases [30], respectively.

Komatu [17] and Pollak [26] proved that the double inequality

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{x^2+2}+x} < I_2(x) < \frac{1}{\sqrt{x^2+\frac{4}{\pi}}+x}$$

holds for all $x > 0$.

In [8], Gautschi proved that the double inequality

$$\frac{1}{a}\left[(x^p+a)^{1/p}-x\right] < I_p(x) < \frac{1}{b}\left[(x^p+b)^{1/p}-x\right] \tag{1.4}$$

holds for all $x > 0$ and $p > 1$ if and only if $a \geqslant 2$ and

$$b \leqslant \lambda_0 = \Gamma^{p/(1-p)}\left(1+\frac{1}{p}\right) \tag{1.5}$$

by use of the monotonicity of the difference of the functions $I_p(x)$ and $[(x^p+a)-x]/a$.

An application of inequality (1.4) in radio propagation mode was given in [7].

Alzer [1] presented the best possible parameters α and β such that the double inequality

$$\left(1-e^{-\alpha x^p}\right)^{1/p} < \frac{1}{\Gamma\left(1+\frac{1}{p}\right)}\int_0^x e^{-t^p}dt < \left(1-e^{-\beta x^p}\right)^{1/p}$$

holds for all $x > 0$ and $p > 0$ with $p \neq 1$.

Motivated by the Gautschi double inequality (1.4), it is natural to ask what are the best possible parameters a and b on the interval $(0,\infty)$ such that the Gautschi double inequality (1.4) takes place for all $x > 0$ and $p \in (0,1)$? The main purpose of this paper is to answer this question and present new bounds for the incomplete gamma function $\Gamma(a,x) = \int_x^\infty t^{a-1}e^{-t}dt$.

2. Lemmas

In order to prove our main results, we first need to introduce an auxiliary function.

Let $-\infty \leqslant a < b \leqslant \infty$, f and g be differentiable on (a,b), and $g' \neq 0$ on (a,b). Then the function $H_{f,g}$ [37, 39] is defined by

$$H_{f,g}(x) = \frac{f'(x)}{g'(x)}g(x) - f(x). \tag{2.1}$$

LEMMA 2.1. (See [37, Theorem 9]) *Let $\infty \leqslant a < b \leqslant \infty$, f and g be differentiable on (a,b) with $f(b^-) = g(b^-) = 0$ and $g'(x) < 0$ on (a,b), $H_{f,g}$ be defined by (2.1). Then the following statements are true:*

(1) *If* $H_{f,g}(a^+)>0$ *and there exists* $\lambda\in(a,b)$ *such that* $f'(x)/g'(x)$ *is strictly decreasing on* (a,λ) *and strictly increasing on* (λ,b)*, then there exists* $\mu\in(a,b)$ *such that* $f(x)/g(x)$ *is strictly decreasing on* (a,μ) *and strictly increasing on* (μ,b)*;*

(2) *If* $H_{f,g}(a^+)<0$ *and there exists* $\lambda^*\in(a,b)$ *such that* $f'(x)/g'(x)$ *is strictly increasing on* (a,λ^*) *and strictly decreasing on* (λ^*,b)*, then there exists* $\mu^*\in(a,b)$ *such that* $f(x)/g(x)$ *is strictly increasing on* (a,μ^*) *and strictly decreasing on* (μ^*,b)*.*

LEMMA 2.2. (See [3, Theorem 1.25]) *Let* $-\infty<a<b<\infty$*,* $f,g:[a,b]\to\mathbb{R}$ *be continuous on* $[a,b]$ *and differentiable on* (a,b)*, and* $g'(x)\neq 0$ *on* (a,b)*. If* $f'(x)/g'(x)$ *is increasing (decreasing) on* (a,b)*, then so are the functions*

$$\frac{f(x)-f(a)}{g(x)-g(a)},\qquad \frac{f(x)-f(b)}{g(x)-g(b)}.$$

If $f'(x)/g'(x)$ *is strictly monotone, then the monotonicity in the conclusion is also strict.*

LEMMA 2.3. *The double inequality*

$$x<\Gamma^{1/(x-1)}(1+x)<2 \tag{2.2}$$

holds for all $x\in(1,2)$*, and inequality (2.2) is reversed for all* $x\in(2,\infty)$*.*

Proof. Let $J_1(x)=\log\Gamma(x+1)$, $J_2(x)=x-1$ and $J(x)=\log\left[\Gamma^{1/(x-1)}(1+x)\right]$. Then we clearly see that

$$J_1(1)=J_2(1)=0,\quad J(x)=\frac{J_1(x)}{J_2(x)} \tag{2.3}$$

and $J_1'(x)/J_2'(x)=\psi(x+1)$ is strict increasing on the interval $(1,\infty)$.

It follows from Lemma 2.2 and (2.3) together with the monotonicity of the function $J_1'(x)/J_2'(x)$ on the interval $(1,\infty)$ that the function $\Gamma^{1/(x-1)}(1+x)$ is strictly increasing on $(1,\infty)$. Therefore, $\Gamma^{1/(x-1)}(1+x)<2$ for $x\in(1,2)$ and $\Gamma^{1/(x-1)}(1+x)>2$ for $x\in(2,\infty)$ follow easily from the monotonicity of the function $\Gamma^{1/(x-1)}(1+x)$ on the interval $(1,\infty)$.

Next, we prove that the inequality

$$\Gamma^{1/(x-1)}(1+x)>(<)x \tag{2.4}$$

holds for all $x\in(1,2)$ $(x\in(2,\infty))$. Let

$$\varphi(x)=\log\Gamma(x+1)-(x-1)\log x. \tag{2.5}$$

Then we clearly see that

$$\varphi(1)=\varphi(2)=0 \tag{2.6}$$

and

$$\varphi''(x)=\psi'(x)-\frac{1}{x}-\frac{1}{x^2}<0 \tag{2.7}$$

for $x \in (1,\infty)$.

Inequality (2.7) implies that $\varphi(x)$ is strictly concave on $(1,\infty)$. Then equation (2.6) leads to the conclusion that

$$\varphi(x) > (2-x)\varphi(1) + (x-1)\varphi(2) = 0 \tag{2.8}$$

for all $x \in (1,2)$, and

$$0 = \varphi(2) > \frac{x-2}{x-1}\varphi(1) + \frac{1}{x-1}\varphi(x) = \frac{1}{x-1}\varphi(x) \tag{2.9}$$

for $x > 2$.

Therefore, inequality (2.4) follows easily from (2.5), (2.8) and (2.9). □

LEMMA 2.4. *Let* $p \in (0,1)$ *and* $a,x \in (0,\infty)$. *Then the function* $a \to [(x^p + a)^{1/p} - x]/a$ *is strictly increasing on* $(0,\infty)$.

Proof. Let

$$\omega_1(a) = (x^p + a)^{1/p} - x, \quad \omega_2(a) = a, \quad \omega(a) = \frac{\omega_1(a)}{\omega_2(a)} = \frac{(x^p + a)^{1/p} - x}{a}. \tag{2.10}$$

Then we clearly see that

$$\omega_1(0) = \omega_2(0) = 0, \tag{2.11}$$

$$\left[\frac{\omega_1'(a)}{\omega_2'(a)}\right]' = \frac{1-p}{p^2 (x^p + a)^{(2p-1)/p}} > 0 \tag{2.12}$$

for all $p \in (0,1)$ and $a,x \in (0,\infty)$.

Therefore, Lemma 2.4 follows easily from Lemma 2.2 and (2.10)–(2.12). □

LEMMA 2.5. *Let* $p \in (0,1)$ *and* $a,x \in (0,\infty)$, $H_{f,g}(x)$ *be defined by (2.1), and* $f_1(x)$ *and* $g_1(x)$ *be defined by*

$$f_1(x) = \left[(x^p + a)^{1/p} - x\right] e^{-x^p}, \quad g_1(x) = \int_x^\infty e^{-t^p}\, dt, \tag{2.13}$$

respectively. Then the following statements are true:

(1) $H_{f_1,g_1}(0^+) = +\infty$ *for* $a > 1/p$;

(2) $H_{f_1,g_1}(0^+) = -\infty$ *for* $a < 1/p$.

Proof. Let

$$u = u(x) = \left(\frac{x^p + a}{x^p}\right)^{1/p} \in (1,\infty). \tag{2.14}$$

Then from (2.13) and (2.14) one has

$$f_1(0) = a^{1/p}, \quad g_1(0) = \frac{1}{p}\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{p}\right) = \Gamma\left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right) > 0, \tag{2.15}$$

$$\frac{f_1'(x)}{g_1'(x)} = -\left(\frac{x^p+a}{x^p}\right)^{1/p-1} + px^p\left[\left(\frac{x^p+a}{x^p}\right)^{1/p} - 1\right] + 1 \tag{2.16}$$
$$= 1 + \frac{(pa-1)u + u^{1-p} - pa}{u^p - 1}.$$

It follows from (2.1), (2.15) and (2.16) that

$$H_{f_1,g_1}(0^+) = \lim_{x\to 0^+}\frac{f_1'(x)}{g_1'(x)}\lim_{x\to 0^+} g_1(x) - \lim_{x\to 0^+} f_1(x) \tag{2.17}$$
$$= \Gamma\left(1+\frac{1}{p}\right)\left[1 + \lim_{u\to\infty}\frac{(pa-1)u + u^{1-p} - pa}{u^p - 1}\right] - a^{1/p}.$$

Note that

$$\lim_{u\to\infty}\frac{(pa-1)u+u^{1-p}-pa}{u^p-1} = \begin{cases} +\infty, & a > \frac{1}{p}, \\ -\infty, & a < \frac{1}{p}. \end{cases} \tag{2.18}$$

Therefore, Lemma 2.5 follows from (2.17) and (2.18). □

LEMMA 2.6. *Let* $p \in (0,1/2)\cup(1/2,1)$, $a,x \in (0,\infty)$, $I_p(x)$ *be defined by (1.2) and the function* $x \to R_p(a,x)$ *be defined by*

$$R_p(a,x) = \frac{(x^p+a)^{1/p} - x}{I_p(x)}. \tag{2.19}$$

Then the following statements are true:

(1) *The function* $x \to R_p(a,x)$ *is strictly decreasing on* $(0,\infty)$ *if* $a \geqslant \max\{1/p,2\}$;

(2) *The function* $x \to R_p(a,x)$ *is strictly increasing on* $(0,\infty)$ *if* $a \leqslant \min\{1/p,2\}$;

(3) *There exists* $x_0 \in (0,\infty)$ *such that the function* $x \to R_p(a,x)$ *is strictly increasing on* $(0,x_0)$ *and strictly decreasing on* (x_0,∞) *if* $p \in (0,1/2)$ *and* $2 = \min\{1/p,2\} < a < \max\{1/p,2\} = 1/p$;

(4) *There exists* $x^* \in (0,\infty)$ *such that the function* $x \to R_p(a,x)$ *is strictly decreasing on* $(0,x^*)$ *and strictly increasing on* (x^*,∞) *if* $p \in (1/2,1)$ *and* $1/p = \min\{1/p,2\} < a < \max\{1/p,2\} = 2$.

Proof. Let $f_1(x)$ and $g_1(x)$ be defined by (2.13), $u = u(x) \in (1,\infty)$ be defined by (2.14), and and $h(u)$ and $h_1(u)$ be defined by

$$h(u) = (p-1)(ap-1)u^{2p} - ap^2u^{2p-1} + (2p+ap-2)u^p + 1 - p, \tag{2.20}$$

$$h_1(u) = 2(p-1)(ap-1)u^p - ap(2p-1)u^{p-1} + 2p + ap - 2. \tag{2.21}$$

Then we clearly see that

$$f_1(\infty) = g_1(\infty) = 0, \quad g_1'(x) = -e^{x^p} < 0, \tag{2.22}$$

$$R_p(a,x) = \frac{f_1(x)}{g_1(x)}. \tag{2.23}$$

It follows from (2.14), (2.16), (2.20) and (2.21) that

$$h(1) = h_1(1) = 0, \tag{2.24}$$

$$\left[\frac{f_1'(x)}{g_1'(x)}\right]' = \frac{\frac{d}{du}\left[1 + \frac{(pa-1)u+u^{1-p}-pa}{u^p-1}\right]}{\frac{dx}{du}} = \frac{(u^p-1)^{1/p-1}}{a^{1/p}u^{2p-1}}h(u), \tag{2.25}$$

$$h'(u) = pu^{p-1}h_1(u), \tag{2.26}$$

$$h_1'(u) = p(p-1)u^{p-2}[2(ap-1)(u-1)+(a-2)]. \tag{2.27}$$

We divide the proof into six cases.

Case 1 $p \in (1/2,1)$ and $a \geqslant \max\{1/p,2\}$. Then we clearly see that $a \geqslant 2 > 1/p$ and (2.24)–(2.27) lead to the conclusion that $f_1'(x)/g_1'(x)$ is strictly decreasing on $(0,\infty)$. Therefore, the function $x \to R_p(a,x)$ is strictly decreasing on $(0,\infty)$ follows from (2.22), (2.23) and Lemma 2.2 together with the monotonicity of $f_1'(x)/g_1'(x)$ on the interval $(0,\infty)$.

Case 2 $p \in (1/2,1)$ and $a \leqslant \min\{1/p,2\}$. Then we clearly see that $a \leqslant 1/p < 2$ and (2.24)–(2.27) lead to the conclusion that $f_1'(x)/g_1'(x)$ is strictly increasing on $(0,\infty)$. Therefore, the function $x \to R_p(a,x)$ is strictly increasing on $(0,\infty)$ follows from (2.22), (2.23) and Lemma 2.2 together with the monotonicity of $f_1'(x)/g_1'(x)$ on the interval $(0,\infty)$.

Case 3 $p \in (1/2,1)$ and $\min\{1/p,2\} < a < \max\{1/p,2\}$. Then we clearly see that

$$\frac{1}{p} < a < 2 \tag{2.28}$$

and (2.27) can be rewritten as

$$h_1'(u) = 2p(ap-1)(p-1)u^{p-2}(u-u_0) \tag{2.29}$$

with $u_0 = 1 + (2-a)/[2(ap-1)] \in (1,\infty)$.

It follows from (2.20), (2.21), (2.28) and (2.29) that

$$h(\infty) = -\infty, \quad h_1(\infty) = -\infty \tag{2.30}$$

and $h_1(u)$ is strictly increasing on $(1,u_0)$ and strictly decreasing on (u_0,∞). Then (2.24), (2.26) and (2.30) lead to the conclusion that there exists $u_1 \in (1,\infty)$ such that $h(u)$ is strictly increasing on $(1,u_1)$ and strictly decreasing on (u_1,∞).

From (2.14) we clearly see that the function $x \to u = u(x)$ is strictly decreasing from $(0,\infty)$ onto $(1,\infty)$. Then from (2.24), (2.25) and (2.30) together with the piecewise monotonicity of $h(u)$ on the interval $(0,\infty)$ we know that there exists $x_1 \in (0,\infty)$ such that $f_1'(x)/g_1'(x)$ is strictly decreasing on $(0,x_1)$ and strictly increasing on (x_1,∞).

Therefore, part (4) follows from Lemma 2.5(1), (2.22) and (2.28) together with the piecewise monotonicity of $f_1'(x)/g_1'(x)$ on the interval $(0,\infty)$ and Lemma 2.1(1).

Case 4 $p \in (0,1/2)$ and $a \geqslant \max\{1/p,2\}$. Then we clearly see that $a \geqslant 1/p > 2$ and (2.24)–(2.27) lead to the conclusion that $f_1'(x)/g_1'(x)$ is strictly decreasing on $(0,\infty)$. Therefore, the function $x \to R_p(a,x)$ is strictly decreasing on $(0,\infty)$ follows from Lemma 2.2, (2.22), (2.23) and the monotonicity of the function $f_1'(x)/g_1'(x)$ on the interval $(0,\infty)$.

Case 5 $p\in(0,1/2)$ and $a\leqslant\min\{1/p,2\}$. Then we clearly see that $a\leqslant 2<1/p$ and (2.24)–(2.27) lead to the conclusion that $f_1'(x)/g_1'(x)$ is strictly increasing on $(0,\infty)$. Therefore, the function $x\to R_p(a,x)$ is strictly increasing on $(0,\infty)$ follows from Lemma 2.2, (2.22), (2.23) and the monotonicity of the function $f_1'(x)/g_1'(x)$ on the interval $(0,\infty)$.

Case 6 $p\in(0,1/2)$ and $\min\{1/p,2\}<a<\max\{1/p,2\}$. Then we clearly see that

$$2<a<1/p, \tag{2.31}$$

and (2.20), (2.21) and (2.29) lead to the conclusion that

$$h(\infty)=+\infty,\quad h_1(\infty)=+\infty \tag{2.32}$$

and $h_1(u)$ is strictly decreasing on $(1,u_0)$ and strictly increasing on (u_0,∞).

It follows from (2.24), (2.26), (2.32) and the piecewise monotonicity of the function $h_1(u)$ on the interval $(1,\infty)$ that there exists $u_2\in(1,\infty)$ such that $h(u)$ is strictly decreasing on $(1,u_2)$ and strictly increasing on (u_2,∞). Then (2.24), (2.25), (2.32) and the monotonicity of the function $x\to u=u(x)$ lead to the conclusion that there exists $x_2\in(0,\infty)$ such that $f_1'(x)/g_1'(x)$ is strictly increasing on $(0,x_2)$ and strictly decreasing on (x_2,∞).

Therefore, part (3) follows from Lemma 2.1(2), Lemma 2.5(2), (2.22), (2.23) and (2.31) together with the piecewise monotonicity of $f_1'(x)/g_1'(x)$ on $(0,\infty)$. $\square$

REMARK 2.7. Let $R_p(a,x)$ be defined by (2.19). Then from (2.15), (2.16), (2.22) and (2.23) we clearly see that

$$R_p(a,0^+)=\frac{a^{1/p}}{\Gamma\left(1+\frac{1}{p}\right)}, \tag{2.33}$$

$$R_p(a,\infty)=\lim_{x\to\infty}\frac{f_1'(x)}{g_1'(x)}=1+\lim_{u\to1^-}\frac{(pa-1)u+u^{1-p}-pa}{u^p-1}=a. \tag{2.34}$$

REMARK 2.8. Let $p\in(0,1/2)\cup(1/2,1)$, $a,x\in(0,\infty)$ and $R_p(a,x)$ be defined by (2.19). Then from Lemma 2.6(3) and (4) we know that the equation

$$\frac{dR_p(a,x)}{dx}=0$$

has a unique solution $x=\mu_0$ on the interval $(0,\infty)$ if $\min\{1/p,2\}<a<\max\{1/p,2\}$.

From Lemma 2.6 and Remarks 2.7 and 2.8 we get Corollary 2.9 immediately.

COROLLARY 2.9. *Let $p\in(0,1/2)\cup(1/2,1)$, $a,x\in(0,\infty)$, $I_p(x)$ be defined by (1.2) and μ_0 be defined by Remark 2.8. Then the following statements are true:*

(1) *If $a \geqslant \max\{1/p, 2\}$, then the double inequality*

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(1+\frac{1}{p}\right)}{a^{1/p}}\left[(x^p+a)^{1/p}-x\right] < I_p(x) < \frac{1}{a}\left[(x^p+a)^{1/p}-x\right] \tag{2.35}$$

holds for all $x \in (0,\infty)$, and inequality (2.35) is reversed if $a \leqslant \min\{1/p, 2\}$;

(2) *If $p \in (0,1/2)$ and $2 = \min\{1/p,2\} < a < \max\{1/p,2\} = 1/p$, then the double inequality*

$$\frac{1}{R_p(a,\mu_0)}\left[(x^p+a)^{1/p}-x\right] \leqslant I_p(x) < \max\left\{\frac{\Gamma\left(1+\frac{1}{p}\right)}{a^{1/p}}, \frac{1}{a},\right\}\left[(x^p+a)^{1/p}-x\right]$$

takes place for all $x \in (0,\infty)$;

(3) *If $p \in (1/2,1)$ and $1/p = \min\{1/p,2\} < a < \max\{1/p,2\} = 2$, then the double inequality*

$$\min\left\{\frac{\Gamma\left(1+\frac{1}{p}\right)}{a^{1/p}}, \frac{1}{a},\right\}\left[(x^p+a)^{1/p}-x\right] < I_p(x) \leqslant \frac{1}{R_p(a,\mu_0)}\left[(x^p+a)^{1/p}-x\right]$$

is valid for all $x \in (0,\infty)$.

REMARK 2.10. Let $a,x>0$ and $R_p(a,x)$ be defined by (2.19). Then from (1.3) we clearly see that

$$R_{1/2}(a,x) = a + \frac{a(a-2)}{2(1+\sqrt{x})}, \quad R_{1/2}(2,x) = 2,$$

the identities (2.33) and (2.34) are also valid for $p = 1/2$, $R_{1/2}(a,x)$ is strictly decreasing from $(0,\infty)$ onto $(a, a^2/2)$ if $a > 2$ and strictly increasing from $(0,\infty)$ onto $(a^2/2, a)$ if $a < 2$, inequality (2.35) holds for $p = 1/2$ and all $x > 0$ if $a > 2$ and the reversed inequality of (2.35) takes place for $p = 1/2$ and all $x > 0$ if $a < 2$.

3. Main results

THEOREM 3.1. *Let $p \in (0,1)$, $a,b>0$, $x>0$, $I_p(x)$ be defined by (1.2) and λ_0 be defined by (1.5). Then the following statements are true:*

(1) *If $p \in (0,1/2)$, then the double inequality*

$$\frac{1}{a}\left[(x^p+a)^{1/p}-x\right] < I_p(x) < \frac{1}{b}\left[(x^p+b)^{1/p}-x\right] \tag{3.1}$$

holds for all $x>0$ if and only if $a \leqslant 2$ and $b \geqslant \lambda_0$;

(2) *If $p \in (1/2,1)$, then inequality (3.1) takes place for all $x>0$ if and only if $a \leqslant \lambda_0$ and $b \geqslant 2$;*

(3) *If* $p = 1/2$, *then inequality (3.1) is valid for all* $x > 0$ *if and only if* $a < 2$ *and* $b > 2$;

(4) *If* $p = 1/2$ *and* $a = 2$, *then the identity*

$$I_p(x) = \frac{1}{a}\left[(x^p + a)^{1/p} - x\right] \tag{3.2}$$

holds for all $x > 0$.

Proof. (1) For $p \in (0,1/2)$, we first prove that the inequality

$$I_p(x) > \frac{1}{a}\left[(x^p + a)^{1/p} - x\right] \tag{3.3}$$

holds for all $x > 0$ if and only if $a \leqslant 2$.

If $p \in (0,1/2)$ and $a \leqslant 2$, then $a \leqslant \min\{1/p, 2\} = 2 < 1/p$ and Corollary 2.9(1) leads to the conclusion that inequality (3.3) holds for all $x > 0$.

If $p \in (0,1/2)$ and inequality (3.3) holds for all $x > 0$, then we use the proof by contradiction to prove that $a \leqslant 2$. We divide the proof into two cases.

Case 1 $p \in (0,1/2)$ and $a \geqslant 1/p$. Then $a \geqslant \max\{1/p, 2\}$ and Corollary 2.9(1) leads to the conclusion that $I_p(x) < \left[(x^p + a)^{1/p} - x\right]/a$ for all $x > 0$, which contradicts with inequality (3.3).

Case 2 $p \in (0,1/2)$ and $2 < a < 1/p$. Then $\min\{1/p, 2\} < a < \max\{1/p, 2\}$. Let $R_p(a,x)$ be defined by (2.19), then from Lemma 2.6(3) and (2.34) we clearly see that there exists $x_0 \in (0,\infty)$ such that $I_p(x) < \left[(x^p + a)^{1/p} - x\right]/a$ for all $x \in (x_0, \infty)$, which also contradicts with inequality (3.3).

Next, we prove that the inequality

$$I_p(x) < \frac{1}{b}\left[(x^p + b)^{1/p} - x\right] \tag{3.4}$$

holds for all $p \in (0,1/2)$ and $x > 0$ if and only if $b \geqslant \lambda_0$.

It follows from (1.5) and Lemma 2.3 together with Corollary 2.9(2) that $2 = \min\{1/p, 2\} < \lambda_0 < \max\{1/p, 2\} = 1/p$, $1/\lambda_0 = \Gamma(1 + 1/p)/\lambda_0^{1/p}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} I_p(x) &< \max\left\{\frac{\Gamma\left(1+\frac{1}{p}\right)}{\lambda_0^{1/p}}, \frac{1}{\lambda_0}\right\}\left[(x^p + \lambda_0)^{1/p} - x\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda_0}\left[(x^p + \lambda_0)^{1/p} - x\right] \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

for all $x > 0$.

Therefore, inequality (3.4) holds for $p \in (0,1/2)$, $b \geqslant \lambda_0$ and all $x > 0$ follows from Lemma 2.4 and (3.5).

If inequality (3.4) holds for $p \in (0,1/2)$ and all $x > 0$. Then from (2.19) and (2.33) we get

$$\frac{R_p(b, 0^+)}{b} = \frac{b^{1/p-1}}{\Gamma\left(1+\frac{1}{p}\right)} \geqslant 1, \quad b \geqslant \lambda_0.$$

(2) For $p \in (1/2,1)$, we first prove that the inequality

$$I_p(x) > \frac{1}{a}\left[(x^p+a)^{1/p}-x\right] \tag{3.6}$$

holds for all $x>0$ if and only if $a \leqslant \lambda_0$.

If $p \in (1/2,1)$, then from (1.5), Lemma 2.3 and Corollary 2.9(3) we clearly see that $1/p=\min\{1/p,2\}<\lambda_0<\max\{1/p,2\}=2$, $1/\lambda_0=\Gamma(1+1/p)/\lambda_0^{1/p}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} I_p(x) &> \min\left\{\frac{\Gamma\left(1+\frac{1}{p}\right)}{\lambda_0^{1/p}}, \frac{1}{\lambda_0}\right\}\left[(x^p+\lambda_0)^{1/p}-x\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda_0}\left[(x^p+\lambda_0)^{1/p}-x\right] \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

for all $x>0$. Therefore, inequality (3.6) holds for $p\in(1/2,1)$, $a \leqslant \lambda_0$ and all $x>0$ follows from Lemma 2.4 and (3.7).

If $p \in (1/2,1)$ and inequality (3.6) holds all $x>0$, then equations (2.19) and (2.33) lead to the conclusion that

$$\frac{R_p(a,0^+)}{a}=\frac{a^{1/p-1}}{\Gamma\left(1+\frac{1}{p}\right)} \leqslant 1, \quad a \leqslant \lambda_0.$$

Next, we prove that the second inequality of (3.1) holds for all $p\in(1/2,1)$ and $x>0$ if and only if $b \geqslant 2$.

If $p \in (1/2,1)$ and $b\geqslant 2$. Then $b \geqslant \max\{1/p,2\}=2>1/p$ and the second inequality of (3.1) holds for all $x>0$ follows from Corollary 2.9(1).

We use the proof by contradiction to prove that $b \geqslant 2$ if $p\in(1/2,1)$ and the second inequality of (3.1) holds for all $x>0$. We divide the proof into two cases.

Case 1 $p\in(1/2,1)$ and $b\leqslant \min\{1/p,2\}=1/p$. Then Corollary 2.9(1) leads to the conclusion that $I_p(x)>\left[(x^p+b)^{1/p}-x\right]/b$ for all $x>0$, which contradicts with the second inequality of (3.1).

Case 2 $p\in(1/2,1)$ and $1/p=\min\{1/p,2\}<b<\max\{1/p,2\}=2$. Then from Lemma 2.6(4) and (2.34) we know that there exists $x^*\in(0,\infty)$ such that the function $x\rightarrow R_p(b,x)$ is strictly decreasing on $(0,x^*)$ and strictly increasing on (x^*,∞) and $I_p(x)>\left[(x^p+b)^{1/p}-x\right]/b$ for all $x\in(x^*,\infty)$, which also contradicts with the second inequality of (3.1).

(3) If $p=1/2$, then inequality (3.1) holds for $a<2$, $b>2$ and all $x>0$ follows easily from Remark 2.10.

If $p=1/2$ and inequality (3.1) holds for all $x>0$. Then from (1.3) and (3.1) we get

$$2\sqrt{x}+a<2(\sqrt{x}+1)<2\sqrt{x}+b$$

and

$$a<2, \quad b>2.$$

(4) If $p=1/2$ and $a=2$, then from (1.3) we clearly see that

$$I_p(x)=\frac{1}{a}\left[(x^p+a)^{1/p}-x\right]=2(\sqrt{x}+1). \quad \square$$

It is well known that the incomplete gamma function $\Gamma(a,x)=\int_x^\infty t^{a-1}e^{-t}dt$ has many important applications in the fields of special functions [16, 32, 35], statistics [15], integral equations [10], semiconductors [20] and transcendence [21]. For more information about the incomplete gamma function, we refer the interested readers to see [5, 19, 33, 34, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45]. As applications of Theorem 3.1, we next present new bounds for the incomplete gamma function to end this article.

Let $p\in(0,1)$, $a,x>0$, $q=1/p\in(1,\infty)$ and $u=x^p>0$. Then from (1.1) and (1.2) one has

$$I_p(x)=qe^u\Gamma(q,u), \quad (x^p+a)^{1/p}-x=(u+a)^q-u^q,$$

and Corollary 2.9, Remark 2.10 and Theorem 3.1 lead to Corollaries 3.2 and 3.3 immediately.

COROLLARY 3.2. *Let $q>1$, $a>0$ and $u>0$. Then the following statements are true:*

(1) *If $(q,a)\in\{(q,a)|a\geqslant q>2\}\cup\{(q,a)|a\geqslant 2>q>1\}\cup\{(q,a)|a>q=2\}$, then the double inequality*

$$\frac{\Gamma(1+q)\left[(u+a)^q-u^q\right]}{qa^q}<e^u\Gamma(q,u)<\frac{(u+a)^q-u^q}{qa} \tag{3.8}$$

holds for all $u>0$, and inequality (3.8) is reversed if $(q,a)\in\{(q,a)|q>2\geqslant a\}\cup\{(q,a)|a\leqslant q,1<q<2\}\cup\{(q,a)|a<q=2\}$;

(2) *If $q>a>2$, then the double inequality*

$$\frac{e^{u_0}\Gamma(q,u_0)}{(u_0+a)^q-u_0^q}\left[(u+a)^q-u^q\right]\leqslant e^u\Gamma(q,u)<\max\left\{\frac{\Gamma(1+q)}{a^q},\frac{1}{a}\right\}\frac{(u+a)^q-u^q}{q}$$

takes place for all $u>0$, where u_0 is the unique solution of the equation

$$\frac{d}{du}\left[\frac{(u+a)^q-u^q}{e^u\Gamma(q,u)}\right]=0$$

on the interval $(0,\infty)$;

(2) *If $1<q<a<2$, then the double inequality*

$$\min\left\{\frac{\Gamma(1+q)}{a^q},\frac{1}{a}\right\}\frac{(u+a)^q-u^q}{q}<e^u\Gamma(q,u)\leqslant\frac{e^{u_0}\Gamma(q,u_0)}{(u_0+a)^q-u_0^q}\left[(u+a)^q-u^q\right]$$

is valid for all $u>0$.

COROLLARY 3.3. *Let $q > 1$ and $a,b,u > 0$ and λ_0 be defined by (1.5). Then the following statements are true:*

(1) *If $q > 2$, then the double inequality*

$$\frac{(u+a)^q - u^q}{qa} < e^u\Gamma(q,u) < \frac{(u+b)^q - u^q}{qb} \tag{3.9}$$

holds for all $u > 0$ if and only if $a \leqslant 2$ and $b \geqslant \lambda_0$;

(2) *If $1 < q < 2$, then inequality (3.9) takes place for all $u > 0$ if and only if $a \leqslant \lambda_0$ and $b \geqslant 2$;*

(3) *If $q = 2$, then inequality (3.9) is valid for all $u > 0$ if and only if $a < 2$ and $b > 2$;*

(4) *If $a = q = 2$, then the identity*

$$e^u\Gamma(q,u) = \frac{(u+a)^q - u^q}{qa}$$

holds for all $u > 0$.

REFERENCES

[1] H. ALZER, *On some inequalities for the incomplete gamma function*, Math. Comp. **66**, (218) (1997), 771–778.

[2] H. ALZER AND Á. BARICZ, *Functional inequalities for the incomplete gamma function*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **385**, (1) (2013), 167–178.

[3] G. D. ANDERSON, M. K. VAMANAMURTHY AND M. VUORINEN, *Conformal Invariants, Inequalities, and Quasiconformal Maps*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, (1997).

[4] J. M. BORWEIN AND O. Y. CHAN, *Uniform bounds for the complementary incomplete gamma function*, Math. Inequal. Appl. **12**, (1) (2009), 115–121.

[5] Y.-M. CHU, X.-M. ZHANG AND Z.-H. ZHANG, *The geometric convexity of a function involving gamma function with applications*, Commun. Korean Math. Soc. **25**, (3) (2010), 373–383.

[6] Á. ELBERT AND A. LAFORGIA, *An inequality for the product of two integrals related to the incomplete gamma function*, J. Inequal. Appl. **5**, (1) (2000), 39–51.

[7] G. FRANKLIN MONTGOMERY, *On the transmission error function for meteor-burst communication*, Proc. IRE. **46**, (1958), 1423–1424.

[8] W. GAUTSCHI, *Some elementary inequalities relating to the gamma and incomplete gamma function*, J. Math. Phys. **38**, (1959/60), 77–81.

[9] B. GUHA, *Expansion of incomplete gamma function in terms of Jacobi polynomials*, Indian J. Pure Appl. Math. **12**, (8) (1981), 990–993.

[10] H.-L. GUPTA, *An integral equation involving incomplete gamma function as the kernel*, Indian J. Pure Appl. Math. **7**, (12) (1976), 1361–1366.

[11] S. S. GUPTA AND M. N. WAKNIS, *A system of inequalities for the incomplete gamma function and the normal integral*, Ann. Math. Statist. **36**, (1965), 139–149.

[12] A. GUTHMANN, *Asymptotische Entwicklungen für unvollständige Gammafunktionen*, Fourm Math. **3**, (2) (1991), 105–141.

[13] M. E. H. ISMALL AND A. LAFORGIA, *Functional inequalities for incomplete gamma and related functions*, Math. Inequal. Appl. **9**, (2) (2006), 299–302.

[14] R. N. KALIA AND S. KEITH, *Fractional calculus and expansions of incomplete gamma functions*, Appl. Math. Lett. **3**, (1) (1990), 19–21.

[15] S. H. KHAMIS, *Incomplete gamma functions expansions of statistical distribution functions*, Bull. Inst. Internat. Statist. **37**, (3) (1960), 385–396.

[16] W. F. KIBBLE, *A Bessel function in terms of incomplete Gamma functions*, J. Indian Math. Soc. **3**, (1) (1939), 271–294.

[17] Y. KOMATU, *Elementary inequalities for Mills' ratio*, Rep. Statist. Appl. Res. Un. Jap. Sci. Engrs. **4**, (1955), 69–70.

[18] A. LAFORGIA AND P. NATALINI, *Supplements to known monotonicity results and inequalities for the gamma and incomplete gamma function*, J. Inequal. Appl. **2006**, Article ID 48727 (2006), 8 pages.

[19] Y. L. LUKE, *On the error in the Padé approximants for a form of the incomplete gamma function including the exponential function*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **6**, (5) (1975), 829–839.

[20] B. A. MAMEDOV, *Analytical evaluation of the thermionic emission probability for semiconductor-insulator interfaces using incomplete gammam functions*, Appl. Math. Comput. **217**, (13) (2011), 6282–6285.

[21] M. R. MURTY AND E. SAHA, *Transcendental values of the incomplete gamma function and related questions*, Arch. Math. **105**, (3) (2015), 271–283.

[22] P. NATALINI AND B. PALUMBO, *Inequalities for the incomplete gamma function*, Math. Inequal. Appl. **3**, (1) (2000), 69–77.

[23] E. NEUMAN, *Inequalities and bounds for the incomplete gamma function*, Results Math. **63**, (3–4) (2013), 1209–1214.

[24] R. B. PARIS, *Error bounds for the uniform asymptotic expansion of the incomplete gamma function*, J. Comput. Appl. Math. **147**, (1) (2002), 215–231.

[25] R. B. PARIS, *A uniform asymptotic expansion for the incomplete gamma function*, J. Comput. Appl. Math. **148**, (2) (2002), 323–339.

[26] H. O. POLLAK, *A remark on "Elementary inequalities for Mills' ratio" by Yûsaku Komatu*, Rep. Statist. Appl. Res. Un. Jap. Sci. Engrs. **4**, (1956), 110–110.

[27] F. QI, *Monotonicity results and inequalities for the gamma and incomplete gamma functions*, Math. Inequal. Appl. **5**, (1) (2002), 61–67.

[28] F. QI AND S.-L. GUO, *Inequalities for the incomplete gamma and related functions*, Math. Inequal. Appl. **2**, (1) (1999), 47–53.

[29] F. QI AND J.-Q. MEI, *Some inequalities of the incomplete gamma and related functions*, Z. Anal. Anwendungen **18**, (3) (1999), 793–799.

[30] W. O. SCHUMANN, *Elektrische Durchbruchfeldstäke von Gasen*, Springer, Berlin, 1923.

[31] N. M. TEMME, *The asymptotic expansion of the incomplete gamma functions*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **10**, (4) (1979), 757–766.

[32] M.-K. WANG AND Y.-M. CHU, *Refinements of transformation inequalities for zero-balanced hypergeometric functions*, Acta Math. Sci. **37B**, (3) (2017), 607–622.

[33] M.-K. WANG, Y.-M. CHU AND S.-L. QIU, *Sharp bounds for generalized elliptic integrals of the first kind*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **429**, (2) (2015), 744–757.

[34] M.-K. WANG, Y.-M. CHU AND Y.-Q. SONG, *Asymptotical formulas for Gaussian and generalized hypergeometric functions*, Appl. Math. Comput. **276**, (2016), 44–60.

[35] M.-K. WANG, Y.-M. LI AND Y.-M. CHU, *Inequalities and infinite product formula for Ramanujan generalized modular equation function*, Ramanujan J. DOI 10.1007/s11139-017-9888-3.

[36] K. YAMAGATA, *A contribution to the theory of non-isothermal laminar flow of fluids inside a straight tube of circular cross section*, Mem. Fac. Engineering, Kyushu Imp. Univ. **8**, (1940), 365–449.

[37] Z.-H. YANG, *A new way to prove L'Hospital Monotone Rules with applications*, arXiv:1409.6408 [math.CA], available online at `http://arxiv.org/pdf/1409.6408v1.pdf`.

[38] Z.-H. YANG AND Y.-M. CHU, *Asymptotic forumlas for gamma function with applications*, Appl. Math. Comput. **270**, (2015), 665–680.

[39] Z.-H. YANG, Y.-M. CHU AND M.-K. WANG, *Monotonicity criterion for the quotient of power series with applications*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **428**, (1) (2015), 587–604.

[40] Z.-H. YANG, W. ZHANG AND Y.-M. CHU, *Monotonicity and inequalities involving the incomplete gamma function*, J. Inequal. Appl. **2016**, Article 221 (2016), 10 pages.

[41] Z.-H. YANG, W. ZHANG AND Y.-M. CHU, *Monotonicity of the incomplete gamma function with applications*, J. Inequal. Appl. **2016**, Article 251 (2016), 10 pages.

[42] X.-M. ZHANG AND Y.-M. CHU, *A double inequality for gamma function*, J. Inequal. Appl. **2009**, Article ID 503782 (2009), 7 pages.

[43] T.-H. ZHAO AND Y.-M. CHU, *A class of logarithmicall complete monotonic functions associated with a gamma function*, J. Inequal. Appl. **2010**, Article ID 392431 (2010), 11 pages.
[44] T.-H. ZHAO, Y.-M. CHU AND Y.-P. JIANG, *Monotonic and logarithmically convex properties of a function involving gamma functions*, J. Inequal. Appl. **2009**, Article ID 728612 (2009), 13 pages.
[45] T.-H. ZHAO, Y.-M. CHU AND H. WANG, *Logarithmically complete monotonicity properties relating to the gamma function*, Abstr. Appl. Anal. **2011**, Article ID 896483 (2011), 13 pages.

(Received July 21, 2016)

Zhen-Hang Yang
Department of Mathematics
Huzhou University
Huzhou 313000, P. R. China
e-mail: yzhkm@163.com

Wen Zhang
Friedman Brain Institute
Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai
New York, NY 10029, USA
e-mail: zhang.wen81@gmail.com

Yu-Ming Chu
Department of Mathematics
Huzhou University
Huzhou 313000, P. R. China
e-mail: chuyuming2005@126.com