

A SURVEY OF SOME BOUNDS FOR GAUSS' HYPERGEOMETRIC FUNCTION AND RELATED BIVARIATE MEANS

ROGER W. BARNARD, KENDALL C. RICHARDS AND HILARI C. TIEDEMAN

(Communicated by E. Neuman)

Abstract. We give an expository summary of a collection of inequalities involving Gauss' hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1$ and the closely-related power mean (and certain other bivariate means). Two conjectures involving simultaneous sharp bounds for the hypergeometric function are included. Sharpness for the corresponding zero-balanced case is observed.

1. Introduction

This investigation begins with the fundamental concept of a homogeneous bivariate *mean* which is defined here as a continuous function $\mathcal{M} : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\min(x, y) \leq \mathcal{M}(x, y) \leq \max(x, y)$ and $\mathcal{M}(\lambda x, \lambda y) = \lambda \mathcal{M}(x, y)$ for all $x, y, \lambda > 0$. The arithmetic mean $\mathcal{A}(x, y) \equiv \frac{x+y}{2}$ and the geometric mean $\mathcal{G}(x, y) \equiv \sqrt{xy}$ are special cases of the family of power means (or Hölder means) given by

$$\mathcal{A}_\lambda(x, y) \equiv \left(\frac{x^\lambda + y^\lambda}{2} \right)^{1/\lambda} \quad (\lambda \neq 0),$$

with $\mathcal{A}_0(x, y) \equiv \sqrt{xy}$. A standard argument can be used to show that the function $\lambda \mapsto \mathcal{A}_\lambda$ is increasing. From this follows one of many proofs (see [9]) of the well-known arithmetic mean - geometric mean inequality: $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{A}_0 \leq \mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A}$ where each is evaluated at (x, y) . Other interesting (but perhaps less familiar) means include the *logarithmic mean* $\mathcal{L}(x, y) \equiv (x - y) / (\ln x - \ln y)$ and the *identric mean* $\mathcal{I}(x, y) \equiv \frac{1}{e} \left(\frac{x^x}{y^y} \right)^{1/(x-y)}$ for $x \neq y$ (with $\mathcal{L}(x, x) \equiv x \equiv \mathcal{I}(x, x)$ preserving continuity). The previous inequality has been refined (e.g., see [9]) by these two means to yield

$$\mathcal{G} \leq \mathcal{L} \leq \mathcal{I} \leq \mathcal{A}. \tag{1}$$

(It is worth noting here that (1) has an elegant generalization given by Páles' Comparison Theorem [14] below.) The elliptical arc length function

$$E(x, y) \equiv \int_0^{\pi/2} \sqrt{x^2 \cos^2 t + y^2 \sin^2 t} dt$$

Mathematics subject classification (2010): 33C05, 33-02.

Keywords and phrases: Gauss' hypergeometric function, Hölder/power mean, arithmetic-geometric mean, logarithmic mean, Stolarsky mean.

gives rise to the mean $\hat{E}(x, y) \equiv \frac{2}{\pi}E(x, y)$. The important *complete elliptic integral* of the second kind $\mathcal{E}(r) \equiv E(1, \sqrt{1-r^2})$ is a much-studied function arising in mathematical physics (e.g., see [16]) and can be expressed in terms of the Gaussian hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1$ defined by

$${}_2F_1(\alpha, \beta; \gamma; z) \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\alpha)_n(\beta)_n}{(\gamma)_n n!} z^n, \quad |z| < 1,$$

$(\alpha)_n \equiv \Gamma(\alpha + n)/\Gamma(\alpha) = \alpha(\alpha + 1) \cdots (\alpha + n - 1)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(\alpha)_0 \equiv 1$. The representation of \mathcal{E} in terms of ${}_2F_1$ is

$$\mathcal{E}(r) \equiv \int_0^{\pi/2} (1 - r^2 \sin^2 \theta)^{1/2} d\theta = \frac{\pi}{2} {}_2F_1(-1/2, 1/2; 1; r^2)$$

and can be established by way of Euler’s integral representation for ${}_2F_1$:

$${}_2F_1(\alpha, \beta; \gamma; z) = \frac{\Gamma(\gamma)}{\Gamma(\gamma - \beta)\Gamma(\beta)} \int_0^1 t^{\beta-1} (1-t)^{\gamma-\beta-1} (1-tz)^{-\alpha} dt$$

for $\gamma > \beta > 0$ and $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [1, \infty)$ (see [16]). By the earlier discussion involving \hat{E} , it follows that ${}_2F_1(-1/2, 1/2; 1; 1-r^2) = \hat{E}(1, r)$. Given this representation, it is natural to seek relationships between ${}_2F_1$ and other means.

2. Bounds for the Bivariate Hypergeometric Mean

A unifying cornerstone for much of the work in this pursuit is due to B.C. Carlson. In a series of seminal papers in the 1960’s (see [10] and the references therein), Carlson et al. investigated the general *hypergeometric mean* value which is defined as an extension of Euler’s integral representation. A specific case of the hypergeometric mean of interest here is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_a(x, y) \equiv x \cdot [{}_2F_1(-a, 1/2; 1; 1 - y/x)]^{\frac{1}{a}}.$$

Thus, $\mathcal{H}_a(x^p, y^p)^{1/p} = x \cdot [{}_2F_1(-a, 1/2; 1; 1 - y^p/x^p)]^{\frac{1}{ap}}$ with $a = 1/2$ and $p = 2$ again reveals the mean $\mathcal{H}_{1/2}(1, r^2)^{1/2} = {}_2F_1(-1/2, 1/2; 1; 1 - r^2)$. Carlson’s work in this area is widely cited and his insights in relating ${}_2F_1$ to the power mean motivated several conjectures and subsequent discoveries, some of which are highlighted below.

M. Vuorinen [19] conjectured that $\mathcal{H}_{1/2}(1, r) = {}_2F_1(-1/2, 1/2; 1; 1 - r)^2$ is sharply bounded below by the power mean of order $3/4$. This was proven by the authors in [5]. Later, H. Alzer et al. [3] found a sharp upper bound. Together, these results become

THEOREM A. [3, 5] *For all $r \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\mathcal{A}_\lambda(1, r) \leq {}_2F_1(-1/2, 1/2; 1; 1 - r)^2 \leq \mathcal{A}_\mu(1, r),$$

if $\lambda \leq 3/4$ (sharp¹) and $\mu \geq \ln(\sqrt{2})/\ln(\pi/2)$ (sharp).

(Remark: Precursors of the inequalities in Theorem A date back to astronomers like Kepler who sought estimates of elliptical arc length. Ramanujan’s interest in \mathcal{E}

¹(i.e., best possible)

led him to construct his own estimates (see [1]). Theorem A provides the best lower and upper power mean approximations to \mathcal{E} . Other computable bounds for the complete elliptic integrals have been discovered by H. Kazi and E. Neuman in [12].) The *arithmetic-geometric mean* due to Gauss (see [6, 16]) is given by

$$\mathcal{AG}(1, r) = \frac{1}{{}_2F_1(1/2, 1/2; 1; 1 - r^2)}.$$

It is known that

$$\mathcal{A}_0(x, y) \leq \mathcal{AG}(x, y) \leq \mathcal{A}_{1/2}(x, y) \quad \text{for all } x, y > 0. \tag{2}$$

Vamanamurthy and Vuorinen [18] showed that the order $1/2$ is sharp in (2). It should also be noted that the complete elliptical integral of the first kind corresponds to this case of the hypergeometric function:

$$\mathcal{K}(r) \equiv \int_0^{\pi/2} (1 - r^2 \sin^2 \theta)^{-1/2} d\theta = \frac{\pi}{2} {}_2F_1(1/2, 1/2; 1; r^2),$$

Sharp bounds for \mathcal{K} follow directly from (2) which can be restated as

$$\mathcal{A}_\lambda(1, r) \leq \frac{1}{{}_2F_1(1/2, 1/2; 1; 1 - r^2)} \leq \mathcal{A}_\mu(1, r), \tag{3}$$

where $\lambda \leq 0$ (sharp), $\mu \geq 1/2$ (sharp) and $r \in (0, 1)$. Related known inequalities involving the logarithmic mean include

$$\mathcal{L}(1, r) \leq \frac{1}{{}_2F_1(1/2, 1/2; 1; 1 - r^2)} \leq \mathcal{L}_{3/2}(1, r), \tag{4}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_p(x, y) \equiv \mathcal{L}(x^p, y^p)^{1/p}$. The first inequality in (4) is due to Carlson and Vuorinen [11] and the second is due to Borwein and Borwein [7]. Kazi and Neuman (see Theorem 4.1 in [12]) provided the following improvement of (4) with

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}(1, r), \mathcal{G}(1, r)) \leq \frac{1}{{}_2F_1(1/2, 1/2; 1; 1 - r^2)} \leq \mathcal{L}_{3/2}(\mathcal{A}(1, r), \mathcal{G}(1, r)).$$

Results of the type in (3) and in Theorem A motivate a search for generalizations applicable when $(\pm a, b; c; \cdot)$ replaces $(\pm 1/2, 1/2; 1; \cdot)$. Guidance in this direction is provided by numerical evidence and by Carlson's [10] work on the hypergeometric mean and weighted power means given by

$$\mathcal{A}_\lambda(\omega; x, y) \equiv \left(\omega x^\lambda + (1 - \omega) y^\lambda \right)^{1/\lambda} \quad (\lambda \neq 0)$$

$\mathcal{A}_0(\omega; x, y) \equiv x^\omega y^{1-\omega}$, with weights $\omega, 1 - \omega > 0$. (Note: Throughout the remaining discussion, the equally-weighted mean is implied if the weights are omitted: $\mathcal{A}_\lambda(x, y) = \mathcal{A}_\lambda(1/2; x, y)$.) Carlson [10] verified results that imply

$$\mathcal{A}_a(1 - b/c; 1, 1 - r) \leq {}_2F_1(-a, b; c; r)^{1/a}, \quad \forall r \in (0, 1) \tag{5}$$

if $1 \geq a$ and $c > b > 0$. Carlson [10] also showed that the inequality in (5) reverses if $a > 1$. Notice that, when $a = 1/2 = b = c/2$, the sharp power mean order is $3/4$ rather than a . This naturally inspires a quest to replace the order of the power mean a in (5) by the best possible value. Efforts to find *sharp power mean orders* and an intrinsic generalization of Theorem A resulted in the following:

THEOREM B. [15] *Suppose $1 \geq a, b > 0$ and $c > \max(-a, b)$. If $c \geq \max(1 - 2a, 2b)$, then*

$$\mathcal{A}_\lambda(1 - b/c; 1, 1 - r) \leq {}_2F_1(-a, b; c; r)^{1/a}, \quad \forall r \in (0, 1)$$

if and only if $\lambda \leq \frac{a+c}{1+c}$. If $c \leq \min(1 - 2a, 2b)$, then

$$\mathcal{A}_\mu(1 - b/c; 1, 1 - r) \geq {}_2F_1(-a, b; c; r)^{1/a}, \quad \forall r \in (0, 1)$$

if and only if $\mu \geq \frac{a+c}{1+c}$.

Borwein et al. [8] studied hypergeometric analogues of \mathcal{AG} that take the form $1/2F_1(1/2 - s, 1/2 + s; 1; 1 - r^p)^q$. Simultaneous sharp bounds extending (3) for these analogues of \mathcal{AG} are given by (see [4, 10])

$$\mathcal{A}_\lambda(\alpha; 1, r) \leq \frac{1}{{}_2F_1(\alpha, 1 - \alpha; 1; 1 - r^p)^{\frac{1}{\alpha p}}} \leq \mathcal{A}_\mu(\alpha; 1, r), \quad \forall r \in (0, 1)$$

if $\lambda \leq 0$ (sharp) and $\mu \geq p(1 - \alpha)/2$ (sharp) where $0 < \alpha \leq 1/2, p > 0$.

The next corollary highlights the corresponding simultaneous sharp bounds for the *zero-balanced* hypergeometric function of the form ${}_2F_1(a, b; a + b; \cdot)$ (also studied in [2, 4, 7, 8]). The first inequality in (6) follows from Theorem B. The second inequality in (6) follows directly from the work of Carlson on the R -hypergeometric functions (see (2.15) and (3.4) in [10]). Here, we verify the sharpness of the second inequality and note that the upper bound can also be obtained using elementary series techniques (we prove the stronger result that $r \mapsto \mathcal{A}_0\left(\frac{b}{a+b}; 1, \frac{1}{(1-r)^a}\right) - {}_2F_1(a, b; a + b; r)$ is absolutely monotonic under the stated conditions).

COROLLARY 1. (see also [4, 10]) *Suppose $1 + a \geq b \geq a > 0$. Then for all $r \in (0, 1)$*

$$\mathcal{A}_\rho\left(\frac{a}{a+b}; 1, \frac{1}{(1-r)^a}\right) \leq {}_2F_1(a, b; a + b; r) \leq \mathcal{A}_\sigma\left(\frac{a}{a+b}; 1, \frac{1}{(1-r)^a}\right) \quad (6)$$

if $\rho \leq \frac{-b}{a(1+a+b)}$ (sharp) and $\sigma \geq 0$ (sharp).

Proof. The first inequality in (6) follows directly from Theorem B by replacing a by $-a$ and c by $a + b$. Hence

$$\mathcal{A}_\mu(\alpha; 1, 1 - r)^{-a} \leq {}_2F_1(a, b; a + b; r), \quad \text{for all } r \in (0, 1)$$

if and only if $\mu \geq b/(a + b + 1)$. Since $\mathcal{A}_\mu(\omega; 1, 1 - r)^{-a} = \mathcal{A}_{-\mu/a}(\omega; 1, (1 - r)^{-a})$, we obtain the first inequality in (6) for $\rho = -\mu/a$. An elementary proof of the second

inequality in (6) is as follows. By the monotonicity of $\sigma \mapsto \mathcal{A}_\sigma$, it suffices to prove it for the simple case that $\sigma = 0$. It follows by induction that $\left(\frac{ab}{a+b}\right)_n > \frac{(a)_n(b)_n}{(a+b)_n}$ for all $n - 1 \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus $\mathcal{A}_0\left(\frac{b}{a+b}; 1, \frac{1}{(1-r)^a}\right) = (1-r)^{-ab/(a+b)} = \sum_{n=0}^\infty \left(\frac{ab}{a+b}\right)_n \frac{r^n}{n!} > \sum_{n=0}^\infty \frac{(a)_n(b)_n}{n!(a+b)_n} r^n = {}_2F_1(a, b; a+b; r)$, for all $r \in (0, 1)$. Sharpness follows from the observation that for $\hat{\sigma} < 0$, $\mathcal{A}_{\hat{\sigma}}(\omega; 1, (1-r)^{-a})$ has a positive finite limit as $r \rightarrow 1^-$ while ${}_2F_1(a, b; a+b; r) \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow 1^-$ (see [16], p. 111). Thus, for $\hat{\sigma} < 0$ and r sufficiently close to and less than 1, it follows that

$${}_2F_1(a, b; a+b; r) > \mathcal{A}_{\hat{\sigma}}\left(\frac{b}{a+b}; 1, \frac{1}{(1-r)^a}\right).$$

That is, $\sigma \geq 0$ is sharp for (6). \square

3. Conjectures and Related Results

Note that either lower or upper bounds are guaranteed by Theorem B under essentially complementary conditions on the parameters. It is also desirable to find simultaneous upper and lower bounds of the form

$$\mathcal{A}_\lambda(1-b/c; 1, 1-r) \leq {}_2F_1(-a, b; c; r)^{1/a} \leq \mathcal{A}_\mu(1-b/c; 1, 1-r), \tag{7}$$

Using Alzer’s [3] approach to the upper bound in Theorem A and numerical evidence, we conjecture the following companion to Theorem B:

CONJECTURE I. *Let $1 \geq a, c > b > 0$ and $c > b - a$. Suppose $c \geq \max(1 - 2a, 2b)$. Then*

$${}_2F_1(-a, b; c; r)^{1/a} \leq \mathcal{A}_\mu(1-b/c; 1, 1-r), \text{ for all } r \in (0, 1) \tag{8}$$

if $\mu \geq \frac{a \ln(1-b/c)}{\ln\left(\frac{\Gamma(c+a-b)\Gamma(c)}{\Gamma(c-b)\Gamma(c+a)}\right)}$ (sharp). Suppose $c \leq \min(1 - 2a, 2b)$. Then the inequality in (8) reverses if $\mu \leq \frac{a \ln(1-b/c)}{\ln\left(\frac{\Gamma(c+a-b)\Gamma(c)}{\Gamma(c-b)\Gamma(c+a)}\right)}$ (sharp).

By the work of Alzer [3] in verifying the second inequality in Theorem A, the conjecture holds when $a = b = c/2 = 1/2$. It is also interesting to note that, with a replaced by $-a$, the sharp value of $\mu_c \equiv \frac{-a \ln(1-b/c)}{\ln\left(\frac{\Gamma(c-a-b)\Gamma(c)}{\Gamma(c-b)\Gamma(c-a)}\right)}$ in Conjecture I has the property that $\mu_c \rightarrow 0$ as c approaches $a + b$ from above. Thus Corollary 1 provides an example of (7) and a verification of Conjecture I in the zero-balanced case.

CONJECTURE II. *If $a > 1$ and $b > 0$, then*

$$\mathcal{A}_\lambda(1/2; 1, 1-r) \leq {}_2F_1(-a, b; 2b; r)^{1/a}, \text{ for all } r \in (0, 1)$$

if $\lambda \leq \frac{a \ln(2)}{\ln\left(\frac{\Gamma(b)\Gamma(2b+a)}{\Gamma(2b)\Gamma(b+a)}\right)}$ (sharp).

As evidence for these conjectures leading to simultaneous bounds of the type in (7), we have the following two propositions (discussed in [17] and presented here for the reader’s convenience) which address the above conjectures in the case that $b = 1$.

PROPOSITION 1. *Suppose $a \in (-1, 1)$. If $a > -1/2$, then for all $r \in (0, 1)$*

$$\mathcal{A}_\lambda(1/2; 1, 1-r) \leq {}_2F_1(-a, 1; 2; r)^{1/a} \leq \mathcal{A}_\mu(1/2; 1, 1-r) \quad (9)$$

if $\lambda \leq \frac{a+2}{3}$ (sharp) and $\mu \geq \frac{a \ln(2)}{\ln(1+a)}$ (sharp). If $a < -1/2$, then (9) holds for all $r \in (0, 1)$ if $\lambda \leq \frac{a \ln(2)}{\ln(1+a)}$ (sharp) and $\mu \geq \frac{a+2}{3}$ (sharp).

PROPOSITION 2. *If $a > 1$, then*

$$\mathcal{A}_\lambda(1/2; 1, 1-r) \leq {}_2F_1(-a, 1; 2; r)^{1/a} \leq \mathcal{A}_\mu(1/2; 1, 1-r) \quad \forall r \in (0, 1)$$

if $\lambda \leq \frac{a \ln(2)}{\ln(1+a)}$ (sharp) and $\mu \geq \frac{a+2}{3}$ (sharp).

Proofs for both of these propositions can be obtained by applying Páles' Comparison Theorem [14] discussed below. This theorem involves the Stolarsky mean which is defined for distinct $x, y > 0$ and $ab(a-b) \neq 0$ as

$$\mathcal{D}_{a,b}(x, y) \equiv \left(\frac{b(x^a - y^a)}{a(x^b - y^b)} \right)^{1/(a-b)}$$

and continuously extended when $ab(a-b) = 0$ or $x = y$. (Interestingly, the Stolarsky mean has sharp bounds in terms of the identric mean as shown in [13].)

PÁLES' COMPARISON THEOREM. [14] *The inequality $\mathcal{D}_{(a,b)}(x, y) \leq \mathcal{D}_{(c,d)}(x, y)$ holds true for all $x, y > 0$ if and only if $a + b \leq c + d$ and*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(a, b) &\leq \mathcal{L}(c, d) && \text{if } 0 \leq \min(a, b, c, d) \\ \frac{|a| - |b|}{a - b} &\leq \frac{|c| - |d|}{c - d} && \text{if } \min(a, b, c, d) < 0 < \max(a, b, c, d) \\ -\mathcal{L}(-a, -b) &\leq -\mathcal{L}(-c, -d) && \text{if } \max(a, b, c, d) \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The connection between the work by Páles and the hypergeometric function becomes clear by noting that

$$\begin{aligned} {}_2F_1(-a, 1; 2; r)^{1/a} &= \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(1-\sigma)_n (1)_n}{(2)_n n!} r^n \right)^{1/(\sigma-1)} && \text{(substituting } \sigma - 1 \text{ for } a) \\ &= \left(\frac{1 - (1-r)^\sigma}{\sigma r} \right)^{1/(\sigma-1)} = \mathcal{D}_{1+a, 1}(1, 1-r) \end{aligned}$$

We will also use the following basic lemma:

LEMMA. *Suppose $f(\sigma) \equiv \frac{\sigma+1}{3} - \frac{\ln(2)(\sigma-1)}{\ln(\sigma)}$ when $\sigma \neq 1$ and $f(1) \equiv \frac{2}{3} - \ln(2)$. Then $f(\sigma) > 0 \forall \sigma \in (0, 1/2) \cup (2, \infty)$ and $f(\sigma) < 0 \forall \sigma \in (1/2, 2)$.*

Proof. Let $f(\sigma) = \frac{\sigma-1}{3 \ln(\sigma)} g(\sigma)$ where $g(\sigma) = \left[\left(\frac{\sigma+1}{\sigma-1} \right) \ln(\sigma) - 3 \ln 2 \right]$. It can be shown that $g'(\sigma) = \frac{1}{\sigma(\sigma-1)^2} h(\sigma)$ where $h(\sigma) = \sigma^2 - 1 - 2\sigma \ln(\sigma)$, which is increasing

on $(0, \infty)$ with $h(1) = 0$. Thus, $g'(\sigma) < 0$ on $(0, 1)$ and $g'(\sigma) > 0$ on $(1, \infty)$. Thus, g is decreasing on $(0, 1)$ and increasing on $(1, \infty)$ with $g(1/2) = 0 = g(2)$ and $g(1) < 0$. Therefore, $f(\sigma) = \frac{\sigma+1}{3} - \frac{\ln(2)(\sigma-1)}{\ln(\sigma)} > 0$ on $(0, 1/2) \cup (2, \infty)$ and $f(\sigma) < 0$ on $(1/2, 2)$, which proves the lemma. \square

Proof of Proposition 1. First suppose $1 > a > -1/2$. The left-hand side of (9) is a special case of Theorem B. Páles' Comparison Theorem implies

$${}_2F_1(-a, 1; 2; r)^{1/a} = \mathcal{D}_{a+1,1}(1, 1-r) \leq \mathcal{D}_{2\mu,\mu}(1, 1-r) = \mathcal{A}_\mu(1, 1-r)$$

if and only if (i) $a+2 \leq 3\mu$ and (ii) $\mathcal{L}(a+1, 1) \leq \mathcal{L}(2\mu, \mu)$. Let $\sigma = a+1$. Simplifying we find that (i) and (ii) hold if and only if $\mu \geq \max\left(\frac{\sigma+1}{3}, \frac{(\sigma-1)\ln(2)}{\ln(\sigma)}\right)$. Since $1 > a > -1/2$, we have $2 > \sigma > 1/2$ and hence $\frac{(\sigma-1)\ln(2)}{\ln(\sigma)} > \frac{\sigma+1}{3}$ by the above lemma. Therefore, the right-hand side inequality in (9) holds when $\mu \geq \frac{a\ln(2)}{\ln(a+1)}$.

Now suppose $-1 < a < -1/2$. Then $0 < \sigma < 1/2$ and hence the left-hand side in (9) holds if and only if $\lambda \leq \frac{a\ln(2)}{\ln(a+1)} = \min\left(\frac{\sigma+1}{3}, \frac{(\sigma-1)\ln(2)}{\ln(\sigma)}\right)$, by the preceding lemma. The right-hand side of (9) in this case is again a special case of Theorem B. \square

The proof of Proposition 2 follows in a similar manner.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. ALMKVIST AND B. BERNDT, *Gauss, Landen, Ramanujan, the arithmetic-geometric mean, ellipses, pi, and the Ladies Diary*, Amer. Math. Monthly, **95** (1988), 585–608.
- [2] G.D. ANDERSON, R.W. BARNARD, K.C. RICHARDS, M.K. VAMANAMURTHY, AND M. VUORINEN, *Inequalities for zero-balanced hypergeometric functions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **347** (1995), 1713–1723.
- [3] H. ALZER H. AND S.-L. QIU, *Monotonicity theorems and inequalities for the complete elliptic integrals*, J. Comput. Appl. Math., **172** (2004), 289–312.
- [4] R.W. BARNARD AND K.C. RICHARDS, *On inequalities for hypergeometric analogues of the arithmetic-geometric mean*, J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math., **8**, 3 (2007), Article 65, 5 pp.
- [5] R.W. BARNARD, K. PEARCE, AND K.C. RICHARDS, *An inequality involving the generalized hypergeometric function and the arc length of an ellipse*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., **31** (2000), 693–699.
- [6] J.M. BORWEIN AND P.B. BORWEIN, *Pi and the AGM*, Wiley, New York, 1987.
- [7] J.M. BORWEIN AND P.B. BORWEIN, *Inequalities for compound mean iterations with logarithmic asymptotes*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **177** (1993), 572–582.
- [8] J.M. BORWEIN, P.B. BORWEIN, AND F. GARVAN, *Hypergeometric analogues of the arithmetic-geometric mean iteration*, Constr. Approx., **9** (1993), 509–523.
- [9] P.S. BULLEN, *Handbook of Means and Their Inequalities*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2003.
- [10] B.C. CARLSON, *Some inequalities for hypergeometric functions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **16** (1966), 32–39.
- [11] B.C. CARLSON AND M. VUORINEN, *An inequality for the AGM and the logarithmic mean*, SIAM Rev., **33** (1991), 655.
- [12] H. KAZI AND E. NEUMAN, *Inequalities and bounds for elliptic integrals*, J. Approx. Theory, **146**, 2 (2007), 212–226.
- [13] E. NEUMAN AND J. SÁNDOR, *Inequalities involving Stolarsky and Gini means*, Math. Pannon., **14**, 1 (2003), 29–44.
- [14] Z. PÁLES, *Inequalities for differences of powers*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **131** (1988), 271–281.

- [15] K.C. RICHARDS, *Sharp power mean bounds for the Gaussian hypergeometric function*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **308** (2005), 303–313.
- [16] N.M. TEMME, *Special Functions: An Introduction to the Classical Functions of Mathematical Physics*, Wiley Interscience, New York, 1996.
- [17] H.C. TIEDEMAN, *Means are more than average*, Southwestern University Honors Thesis, Kendall Richards: Thesis Advisor (2007).
- [18] M.K. VAMANAMURTHY AND M. VUORINEN, *Inequalities for means*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **183** (1994), 155–166.
- [19] M. VUORINEN, *Hypergeometric functions in geometric function theory*, in: Proc Special Functions and Differential Equations, K.R. Srinivasa, R. Jaganathan, G. Van der Jeugy (Eds.), Allied Publishers, New Delhi, 1998.

(Received June 12, 2009)

Roger W. Barnard
Department of Mathematics
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas 79409
e-mail: roger.w.barnard@ttu.edu

Kendall C. Richards
Department of Mathematics
Southwestern University
Georgetown, Texas 78627
e-mail: richards@southwestern.edu

Hilari C. Tiedeman
Computational and Applied Mathematics
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, Texas 75205
e-mail: htiedeman@smu.edu