COMPOSITIO MATHEMATICA

J. M. HAMMERSLEY

On a conjecture of Nelder

Compositio Mathematica, tome 10 (1952), p. 241-244
<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=CM_1952__10__241_0>

© Foundation Compositio Mathematica, 1952, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Compositio Mathematica » (http://http://www.compositio.nl/) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (http://www.numdam.org/conditions). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM
Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques
http://www.numdam.org/

On a conjecture of Nelder

by

J. M. Hammersley

In a statistical problem connected with the Poisson distribution, J. A. Nelder came to consider the determinant of the information matrix

$$\int_0^\infty \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ x & x^2 \end{pmatrix} e^{-x} dF(x) \tag{1}$$

in which F is a distribution function of a non-negative variable, that is to say a non-decreasing function continuous on the right and satisfying

$$F(x) = 0,\ x < 0;\ \lim_{x\to\infty} F(x) = 1.$$

To solve his problem he had to determine what function (or functions) F would maximise this determinant. He conjectured (a) that a maximum occurred when

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x < 0 \\ \frac{1}{2}, & 0 \leqq x < 2, \\ 1, & x \geqq 2 \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

and (b) that (2) was the unique solution. In this note I shall prove conjecture (a) together with a weaker form of (b), namely that (2) is unique amongst the class of distribution functions having commensurable saltuses.

The determinant of (1) is equal to

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty (x-y)^2 e^{-(x+y)} dF(x)\, dF(y). \tag{3}$$

To relate this expression to familiar inequalities, suppose temporarily that F is a step function with saltuses of magnitude F_i at x_i for $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ Writing

$$a_{ij} = (x_i - x_j)^2 \exp(-x_i - x_j)$$

we have to prove a best possible inequality of the type

$$\Sigma_{ij} a_{ij} F_i F_j \leqq M$$

subject to $\Sigma_i F_i = 1$. Inequalities of the type

$$\Sigma_{ij} a_{ij} F_i G_j \leqq M$$

subject to the conditions $\Sigma_i F_i^p = 1$, $\Sigma_j G_j^q = 1$ are known as inequalities of the space $[p, q]$. The inequality theory of the space $[2, 2]$, known as Hilbert space, is well-developed, and other spaces in which p or q exceed unity have received some attention. However, results in the space $[1, 1]$ seem pretty scarce.

To prove conjecture (a) we note that the integrand in (3) is a bounded continuous function, and hence the integral exists as a Cauchy-Stieltjes integral. Consequently if C_n denotes the class of functions

$$E_n(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} E(x - x_i);\ \ x_i \geqq 0,\ \ E(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x < 0 \\ 1, & x \geqq 0 \end{cases}$$

there exists a sequence of functions $E_n(x)$ belonging to C_n such that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} E_n(x) = F(x)$$

is a solution which maximises (3).

When F belongs to C_n (with $n \geqq 2$) we can write Q/n^2 for (3) where

$$Q = Q(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) = S_0 S_2 - S_1^2 = \tfrac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (x_i - x_j)^2 \exp(-x_i - x_j), \tag{4}$$

$$S_m = S_m(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i^m \exp(-x_i),\ \ m = 0,\ 1,\ 2. \tag{5}$$

Let us maximise Q subject to $0 \leqq x_i \leqq \infty$. It is easy to see that Q is not a maximum if $x_i = \infty$ for any value of i. So hereafter we confine our attention to finite values of x_i. We take care of the restriction $0 \leqq x_i$ by writing $x_i = \xi_i^2$ and maximising Q with respect to the ξ_i. Consider solutions of

$$\partial Q / \partial \xi_k = -2\xi_k \exp(-\xi_k^2) L(\xi_k^2) = 0, \tag{6}$$

where

$$L(\xi_k^2) = S_0 \xi_k^4 - 2(S_0 + S_1)\xi_k^2 + (2S_1 + S_2). \tag{7}$$

For a graetest maximum (or *peak*) of Q either $\xi_k = 0$ or ξ_k^2 is a solution of $L(\xi_k^2) = 0$. So far everything is straightforward; but now we have to dispose of an unwanted root of $L = 0$, and the way of doing this is by no means obvious. Suppose that at any particular peak exactly ν of the ξ's are zero. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(2S_1 + S_2) &= \sum_{k=1}^{n} \exp(-\xi_k^2) L(\xi_k^2) \\ &= S_0 S_2 - 2(S_0 + S_1)S_1 + (2S_1 + S_2)S_0 = 2Q \geqq 16n^2/9e^2, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

since, when $x_i = 2$ for $1 \leqq i \leqq \frac{1}{2}n$ and $x_i = 0$ for $\frac{1}{2}n < i \leqq n$,

$$Q = \begin{cases} n^2/e^2 & \text{for } n \text{ even} \\ (n^2 - 1)/e^2 & \text{for } n \text{ odd} \end{cases}. \tag{9}$$

Next, because $(2x + x^2)e^{-x} \leqq 2(1 + \sqrt{2})e^{-\sqrt{2}}$, we get

$$2\nu(n - \nu)(1 + \sqrt{2})e^{-\sqrt{2}} \geqq 16n^2/9e^2$$

and hence

$$\frac{\nu}{n} \geqq \frac{1}{2}\left\{1 - \sqrt{\left[1 - \frac{32}{9(1+\sqrt{2})e^{2-\sqrt{2}}}\right]}\right\} \geqq 0.287. \tag{10}$$

Now x^2e^{-x} is an increasing function for $0 < x < 2$: so at any peak of Q at least one of the roots of $L(x_k) = 0$ must satisfy $x_k \geqq 2$ for at least one value of k; for otherwise we could increase Q by multiplying each x_i by some constant greater than unity. When the greater root of (7) satisfies $\xi_k^2 \geqq 2$, we have

$$\sqrt{(S_0^2 + S_1^2 - S_0S_2)} \geqq S_0 - S_1. \tag{11}$$

We now derive a contradiction by supposing that at any peak of Q there is at least one value of k, say $k = l$, such that x_l is strictly positive and is the lesser root of $L(x_l) = 0$. We have

$$S_0x_l = S_0 + S_1 - \sqrt{(S_1^2 + S_0^2 - S_0S_2)} \tag{12}$$

$$\partial^2Q/\partial\xi_l^2 = -8\xi_l^2\exp(-\xi_l^2)\{S_0\xi_l^2 - (S_0 + S_1) + \exp(-\xi_l^2)\}. \tag{13}$$

At a maximum the right-hand side of (13) cannot be positive. Also $(1 - x)e^{-x} \geqq -e^{-2}$ and $xe^{-x} \leqq e^{-1}$. By (11) and (12)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leqq S_0x_l - (S_0 + S_1) + \exp(-x_l) = \exp(-x_l) - \sqrt{(S_0^2 + S_1^2 - S_0S_2)} \\ &\leqq \exp(-x_l) - (S_0 - S_1) \leqq \exp(-x_l) - \exp(-x_l) + \\ &\qquad\qquad + x_l\exp(-x_l) - \nu + (n - \nu - 1)e^{-2} \\ &\leqq e^{-1} - \nu + (n - \nu - 1)e^{-2} = \frac{n}{e^2}\left\{1 + \frac{1}{n}(e-1) - \frac{\nu}{n}(e^2+1)\right\} \\ &\leqq \frac{n}{e^2}\left\{1 + \frac{1}{2}(e-1) - \frac{\nu}{n}(e^2+1)\right\} = \frac{n}{e^2}\left\{\frac{1}{2}(e+1) - \frac{\nu}{n}(e^2+1)\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\frac{\nu}{n} \leqq \frac{(e+1)}{2(e^2+1)} \leqq 0.252$$

which contradicts (10). Hence at any peak any non-zero value of

x_k is equal to the greater root of $L(x_k) = 0$, say $x_k = x_0$. Then

$$Q = \nu(n - \nu) x_0^2 \exp(- x_0)$$

and Q attains its maximum for

$$x_0 = 2, \ \nu = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}n & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \\ \frac{1}{2}(n \pm 1) & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

and then Q satisfies (9). This completes the proof and shows that the least upper bound of (3) is $1/e^2$.

(Oblatum 24-3-52)