

Product Inequalities for Multivariate Gaussian, Gamma, and Positively Upper Orthant Dependent Distributions

Dominic Edelmann ^{¶,*}, Donald Richards[†], and Thomas Royen[‡]

April 14, 2022

Abstract

The Gaussian product inequality is an important conjecture concerning the moments of Gaussian random vectors. While all attempts to prove the Gaussian product inequality in full generality have failed, numerous partial results have been derived during the last decades. We provide further results in this direction. Most importantly, we establish a strong version of the Gaussian product inequality for multivariate gamma distributions in the case of nonnegative correlations, thereby extending a result recently derived by Ouimet [13]. Further, we show that the Gaussian product inequality holds with any positive exponents for all random vectors with positive components, whenever the underlying vector is positively upper orthant dependent. Finally, we show that the Gaussian product inequality with negative exponents follows directly from the Gaussian correlation inequality.

1 Introduction

Let d be a positive integer, and let $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$ be a random vector taking values in \mathbb{R}^d and having a multivariate Gaussian distribution with probability density

^{*}Division of Biostatistics, German Cancer Research Center, Im Neuenheimer Feld 280, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany. E-mail: dominic.edelmann@dkfz-heidelberg.de.

[¶] Corresponding Author, E-mail: dominic.edelmann@dkfz-heidelberg.de.

[†]Department of Statistics, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, U.S.A. E-mail: richards@stat.psu.edu.

[‡]University of Applied Sciences, D-55411 Bingen, Germany. E-mail: thomas.royen@t-online.de.

MSC 2010 subject classifications: Primary 60E15; Secondary 62E15, 62H10.

Keywords and phrases: Moment inequalities, multivariate gamma distribution, multivariate Gaussian distribution, multivariate survival function, Wishart distribution.

function,

$$(2\pi)^{-n/2} |\Sigma|^{-1/2} \exp(-\frac{1}{2} x' \Sigma^{-1} x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

with a non-singular covariance matrix Σ . We refer to the random vector \mathbf{X} as having a *centered* Gaussian distribution because $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{X}) = 0$, and we write $\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{N}_d(0, \Sigma)$.

The Gaussian product inequality (GPI) conjecture states that, for any centered Gaussian random vector $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there holds the inequality,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j=1}^d X_j^{2n} \right) \geq \prod_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}(X_j^{2n}). \quad (1.1)$$

We refer readers to Frenkel [4] and Ouimet [13] for details of the history, motivation, and literature on this inequality.

Several generalizations of (1.1) have been studied recently. Li and Wei [12] considered, as an extension of (1.1), conditions such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j=1}^d |X_j|^{n_j} \right) \geq \prod_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}(|X_j|^{n_j}), \quad (1.2)$$

for arbitrary $n_1, \dots, n_d > 0$. Wei [19] derived hypotheses under which the inequality

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j=1}^d |X_j|^{n_j} \right) \geq \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in I} |X_j|^{n_j} \right) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in I^c} |X_j|^{n_j} \right), \quad (1.3)$$

holds for all index sets $I \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$, where $I^c = \{1, \dots, d\} \setminus I$. To distinguish between these inequalities, we call (1.2) the *weak form* and (1.3) the *strong form* of the GPI.

The weak form of the GPI was established by Frenkel [4] for $n_1 = \dots = n_d = 2$ and arbitrary d , and by Lan, *et al.* [10] for $d = 3$ and integer exponents n_1, n_2 , and n_3 with equality between at least two exponents. Ouimet [13] developed recently a novel and far-reaching approach to the GPI, proving (1.2) for arbitrary d with nonnegative even integer exponents n_j when the covariance matrix Σ is *completely positive*, i.e., $\Sigma = CC'$ where $C = (c_{ij})$ is a $d \times d$ matrix with $c_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, d$. Nevertheless, it still remains unknown whether the weak form of the GPI (1.2) is valid for general Σ .

On the other hand, one can show that the strong form of the GPI (1.3) fails for $d = 3$ with $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 2$. Consider for example a multivariate normal for which the diagonal entries of the covariance matrix are 1 and the off-diagonal entries are $Cov(X_1, X_2) = Cov(X_1, X_3) = r$ and $Cov(X_2, X_3) = r_{23} < -\frac{1}{2}$. It is then straightforward to see that $\mathbb{E}[X_1^2 X_2^2 X_3^2] - \mathbb{E}[X_1^2 X_2^2] \mathbb{E}[X_3^2] < 0$.

Wei [19] showed, however, that the strong form of the GPI holds for the case in which the exponents n_1, \dots, n_d all are negative. It is also obvious that the strong form (1.3) holds if $|\mathbf{X}| := (|X_1|, \dots, |X_d|)$, the vector of absolute values, is *associated*, i.e., if $Cov(f(|\mathbf{X}|), g(|\mathbf{X}|)) \geq 0$ for all component-wise non-decreasing functions $f, g : \mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow$

\mathbb{R} [3]. Thus if $|\mathbf{X}|$, the vector of absolute values of a centered Gaussian random vector \mathbf{X} , is associated then we deduce immediately that the strong form of the GPI holds. In particular, as noted by Ouimet [13] if the vector $|\mathbf{X}|$ is *multivariate totally positive of order 2*, denoted MTP_2 (cf., [7]) then, as the MTP_2 property implies associatedness, it follows that the strong form of the GPI holds. Moreover, for Gaussian vectors X , the MTP_2 property for its absolute values $|\mathbf{X}|$ can be characterized explicitly in terms of the covariance matrix Σ . For this purpose (and in the sequel) we call a diagonal matrix $S = \text{diag}(s_1, \dots, s_d)$ a *sign matrix* if $s_j = \pm 1$ for all $j = 1, \dots, d$. It has been shown in [8] that for a multivariate Gaussian vector with covariance matrix Σ , its absolute value $|\mathbf{X}|$ is MTP_2 if and only if all off-diagonal entries of $-S\Sigma^{-1}S$ are nonnegative; hence the strong form of the GPI holds for that class of covariance matrices.

In this article, we derive new and more general hypotheses under which the weak form of the GPI (1.2) and the strong form of the GPI (1.3) hold. We extend the results of Ouimet [13] in several directions, one of which is a proof of the strong form of the GPI (1.3) for non-negative correlations, i.e., for any covariance matrix $\Sigma = (\sigma_{ij})$ with $\sigma_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq d$. Additionally, we show that the weak form of the GPI and the strong form of the GPI follow from the properties of positive upper orthant dependence (PUOD) and strongly positive upper orthant dependence (SPUOD), respectively. Finally, we apply the Gaussian correlation inequality (Royen [14]) to obtain in Section 4 an alternative and succinct proof of the strong form of the GPI for negative exponents, derived originally by Wei [19]; further, we show that this result extends to the multivariate gamma distributions.

2 The strong form of the GPI for non-negative correlations

Ouimet [13] established the weak form of the GPI (1.2) for the multivariate normal distribution $\mathcal{N}_d(0, \Sigma)$ and with even integers n_1, \dots, n_d and completely positive covariance matrix Σ , i.e. $\Sigma = CC^t$, where $C = (c_{ij})$ is a matrix with non-negative entries $c_{ij} \geq 0$. In Theorem 2.1, we extend this result in three directions. First and most importantly, we extend the result in [13] to the case of nonnegative correlations, where $\Sigma = (\sigma_{ij})$ is such that $\sigma_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq d$. For $d \geq 5$, the assumption of nonnegative correlations is known to be less restrictive than complete positivity; cf., [5].

On the other hand, a famous counterexample of Šidák [18] established the existence of Gaussian random vectors $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, X_3)$ with completely positive covariance matrices and for which the vector $|\mathbf{X}| = (|X_1|, |X_2|, |X_3|)$ of absolute values is not positively upper orthant dependent (PUOD) and hence not associated. Hence Ouimet's result and the more general result presented here both extend the strong form of the GPI (1.3) beyond the straightforward case in which the vector of absolute values is

associated.

The second direction in which Theorem 2.1 extends results known hitherto is that we obtain the strong form (1.3), hence also the weak form (1.2).

Third, in considering the case of even exponents, the weak form of the GPI (1.2) and the strong form (1.3) each correspond to inequalities for special cases of the multivariate gamma distributions. Precisely, the d -dimensional gamma distribution (in the sense of Krishnamoorthy and Parthasarathy [9]) may be defined by means of its moment-generating function. Denote by I_d the identity matrix of order d and, for sufficiently small $t_1, \dots, t_d \in \mathbb{R}$, define $T = \text{diag}(t_1, \dots, t_d)$. Then we say that $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$ has a multivariate gamma distribution with a not necessarily integer “degree-of-freedom parameter” 2α and positive semidefinite matrix parameter Σ , written $\mathbf{X} \sim \text{Gamma}_d(\alpha, \Sigma)$, if the moment-generating function of \mathbf{X} is

$$\mathbb{E} \exp \left(\sum_{j=1}^d t_j X_j \right) = \det(I_d - \Sigma T)^{-\alpha}. \quad (2.1)$$

This d -dimensional gamma distribution is also known as the *Wishart-Gamma distribution* since it was derived originally from the distribution of the halved diagonal of a $W_d(2\alpha, \Sigma)$ -Wishart distributed random matrix with $2\alpha \in \mathbb{N} \cup (d-1, \infty)$. In this regard, it is remarkable that the $\text{Gamma}_d(\alpha, \Sigma)$ distribution also exists for all values $2\alpha > [(d-1)/2]$, where $[u]$ denotes the integer part of $u \in \mathbb{R}$; see [15].

The $\text{Gamma}_d(\frac{1}{2}, \Sigma)$ distribution is infinitely divisible (i.e., the $\text{Gamma}_d(\alpha, \Sigma)$ distribution exists for all $\alpha > 0$) if and only if the $\text{Gamma}_d(\frac{1}{2}, \Sigma)$ distribution is multivariate totally positive of order 2 (MTP₂); see Bapat [1]. For example, one can show that $\text{Gamma}_d(\frac{1}{2}, \Sigma)$ is infinitely divisible if $\Sigma = (\sigma_{ij})$ is of “structure ℓ ” [17], i.e., $\sigma_{ij} = a_i a_j$ with $|a_j| < 1$ for all $j = 1, \dots, d$, or if Σ^{-1} is of “tree-type” (see [16] for details).

If $(X_1, \dots, X_d) \sim N_d(0, \Sigma)$ then $\frac{1}{2}(X_1^2, \dots, X_d^2)$ follows $\text{Gamma}_d(\frac{1}{2}, \Sigma)$ distribution. Consequently, in the case of even exponents, as considered in [13], the weak form (1.2) and the strong form (1.3) of the GPI intrinsically are inequalities on the $\text{Gamma}_d(\frac{1}{2}, \Sigma)$ distribution. Therefore it is natural to extend these inequalities to the more general multivariate gamma distributions having moment-generating function (2.1).

We remind the reader that we call a diagonal matrix $S = \text{diag}(s_1, \dots, s_d)$ a *sign matrix* if $s_j = \pm 1$ for all $j = 1, \dots, d$.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_d) \sim \text{Gamma}_d(\alpha, \Sigma)$, where $\Sigma = (\sigma_{ij})$ is positive semidefinite. Suppose that there exists a sign matrix S such that all the elements in $S\Sigma S$ are non-negative, i.e., $\sigma_{ij} s_i s_j \geq 0$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq d$. Then for all subsets $I \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$, and for all nonnegative integers n_1, \dots, n_d , there holds the strong form of the GPI,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j=1}^d X_j^{n_j} \right) \geq \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in I} X_j^{n_j} \right) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in I^c} X_j^{n_j} \right). \quad (2.2)$$

Proof. Since the moment-generating function (2.1) is invariant under the transformation $\Sigma \rightarrow S\Sigma S$ we can, without loss of generality, assume that $\sigma_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq d$. Moreover, by permuting the coordinates of \mathbf{X} , we may also assume that $I = \{1, \dots, p\}$ where $1 \leq p \leq d - 1$.

With sufficiently small $t_1, \dots, t_d \in [0, 1)$ and $T = \text{diag}(t_1, \dots, t_d)$, the moment-generating function of the $\text{Gamma}_d(\alpha, \Sigma)$ distribution is

$$\mathbb{E} \exp \left(\sum_{j=1}^d t_j X_j \right) = \det(I_d - \Sigma T)^{-\alpha} = \det(I_d - T^{1/2} \Sigma T^{1/2})^{-\alpha}. \quad (2.3)$$

Denote by $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_d$ the eigenvalues of the matrix $T^{1/2} \Sigma T^{1/2}$. For sufficiently small $t_1, \dots, t_d \in [0, 1)$, we have $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_d \in [0, 1)$.

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \det(I_d - T^{1/2} \Sigma T^{1/2})^{-\alpha} &= \exp \left(-\alpha \log \det(I_d - T^{1/2} \Sigma T^{1/2}) \right) \\ &= \exp \left(-\alpha \sum_{j=1}^d \log(1 - \varepsilon_j) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting into this sum the series expansions,

$$-\log(1 - \varepsilon_j) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon_j^n}{n},$$

$j = 1, \dots, d$, and interchanging the order of summation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \det(I_d - \Sigma T)^{-\alpha} &= \exp \left(\alpha \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon_j^n}{n} \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\alpha \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^d \varepsilon_j^n \right) = \exp \left(\alpha \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}[(\Sigma T)^n] \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Next, we partition Σ and T into block matrices,

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & \Sigma_{12} \\ \Sigma_{21} & \Sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where Σ_{11} and $T_1 = \text{diag}(t_1, \dots, t_p)$ are $p \times p$, $\Sigma_{12} = \Sigma'_{21}$ is $p \times (d - p)$, and Σ_{22} and $T_2 = \text{diag}(t_{p+1}, \dots, t_d)$ are $(d - p) \times (d - p)$. Then,

$$T^{1/2} \Sigma T^{1/2} = \begin{pmatrix} T_1^{1/2} \Sigma_{11} T_1^{1/2} & T_1^{1/2} \Sigma_{12} T_2^{1/2} \\ T_2^{1/2} \Sigma_{21} T_1^{1/2} & T_2^{1/2} \Sigma_{22} T_2^{1/2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.5)$$

Let

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

be a symmetric matrix which has been partitioned similarly to Σ . By induction on n , we find that

$$A^n = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11}^n + Q_{11,n}(A) & Q_{12,n}(A) \\ Q_{21,n}(A) & A_{22}^n + Q_{22,n}(A) \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.6)$$

where each matrix $Q_{ij,n}(A)$ is a homogeneous polynomial in A with nonnegative coefficients; for instance,

$$Q_{11,2}(A) = A_{12}A_{21}, \quad Q_{12,2}(A) = [Q_{21,2}(A)]' = A_{11}A_{12} + A_{12}A_{22}, \quad Q_{22,2} = A_{21}A_{12}.$$

Denote by \mathbb{N}_0 the set of nonnegative integers. Applying (2.6) to (2.5), and taking traces, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}[(\Sigma T)^n] &= \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}[(T^{1/2} \Sigma T^{1/2})^n] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}[(T_1^{1/2} \Sigma_{11} T_1^{1/2})^n] + \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}[(T_2^{1/2} \Sigma_{22} T_2^{1/2})^n] + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^2 Q_{ii,n}(T^{1/2} \Sigma T^{1/2}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}[(\Sigma_{11} T_1)^n] + \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}[(\Sigma_{22} T_2)^n] + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d, \\ n_1 + \dots + n_d = n}} c_{\mathbf{n}} t_1^{n_1} \dots t_d^{n_d}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

It is also evident from (2.6) that the coefficients $c_{\mathbf{n}}$ are polynomials in the entries of Σ and have nonnegative coefficients. Therefore $c_{\mathbf{n}} \geq 0$ for all \mathbf{n} since the entries of Σ are nonnegative, and moreover we have $c_{(0,\dots,0)} = 0$.

Substituting (2.7) into (2.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\det(I_d - \Sigma T)^{-\alpha} \\ &= \exp\left(\alpha \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}[(\Sigma_{11} T_1)^n]\right) \exp\left(\alpha \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}[(\Sigma_{22} T_2)^n]\right) \exp\left(\sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \alpha c_{\mathbf{n}} t_1^{n_1} \dots t_d^{n_d}\right) \\ &= \det(I_p - \Sigma_{11} T_1)^{-\alpha} \det(I_{d-p} - \Sigma_{22} T_2)^{-\alpha} \cdot \exp\left(\sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \alpha c_{\mathbf{n}} t_1^{n_1} \dots t_d^{n_d}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

Next, the Maclaurin expansion of the exponential function leads to

$$\exp\left(\sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \alpha c_{\mathbf{n}} t_1^{n_1} \dots t_d^{n_d}\right) = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} b_{\mathbf{m}} t_1^{m_1} \dots t_d^{m_d}, \quad (2.9)$$

Since $c_{(0,\dots,0)} = 0$ and $c_{\mathbf{n}} \geq 0$ for all \mathbf{n} then $b_{(0,\dots,0)} = 1$ and $b_{\mathbf{m}} \geq 0$ for all \mathbf{m} .

Applying (2.3) and (2.9) to (2.8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \left(\mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{X_j^{n_j}}{n_j!}\right) t_1^{n_1} \dots t_d^{n_d} \\ &= \left(\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^p} \mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^p \frac{(t_j X_j)^{k_j}}{k_j!}\right) \cdot \left(\sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d-p}} \mathbb{E} \prod_{j=p+1}^d \frac{(t_j X_j)^{l_j}}{l_j!}\right) \cdot \left(\sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} b_{\mathbf{m}} t_1^{m_1} \dots t_d^{m_d}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Collecting terms in \mathbf{n} on the right-hand side of the above expression, we obtain

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \left(\mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{X_j^{n_j}}{n_j!} \right) t_1^{n_1} \cdots t_d^{n_d} = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \left[\sum_{(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}) + \mathbf{m} = \mathbf{n}} b_{\mathbf{m}} \left(\mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^p \frac{X_j^{k_j}}{k_j!} \right) \cdot \left(\mathbb{E} \prod_{j=p+1}^d \frac{X_j^{l_j}}{l_j!} \right) \right] \prod_{j=1}^d t_j^{n_j}.$$

Next, we decompose the inner summation into terms corresponding to the cases in which $\mathbf{m} = (0, \dots, 0)$ and $\mathbf{m} \neq (0, \dots, 0)$. Noting that $b_{(0, \dots, 0)} = 1$, we obtain

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \left(\mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{X_j^{n_j}}{n_j!} \right) t_1^{n_1} \cdots t_d^{n_d} = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \left[\left(\mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^p \frac{X_j^{n_j}}{n_j!} \right) \cdot \left(\mathbb{E} \prod_{j=p+1}^d \frac{X_j^{n_j}}{n_j!} \right) + \delta_{\mathbf{n}} \right] \prod_{j=1}^d t_j^{n_j},$$

with $\delta_{\mathbf{n}} \geq 0$. Comparing the coefficients of the monomials $t_1^{n_1} \cdots t_d^{n_d}$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^d \left(\frac{X_j^{n_j}}{n_j!} \right) = \left(\mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^p \frac{X_j^{n_j}}{n_j!} \right) \cdot \left(\mathbb{E} \prod_{j=p+1}^d \frac{X_j^{n_j}}{n_j!} \right) + \delta_{\mathbf{n}} \geq \left(\mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^p \frac{X_j^{n_j}}{n_j!} \right) \cdot \left(\mathbb{E} \prod_{j=p+1}^d \frac{X_j^{n_j}}{n_j!} \right).$$

on multiplying both sides by $\prod_{j=1}^d n_j!$ we obtain (2.2), the strong form of the GPI. \square

Corollary 2.2. *Suppose that $(X_1, \dots, X_d) \sim N_d(0, \Sigma)$. Also, suppose that there exists a sign matrix, $S = \text{diag}(\pm 1, \dots, \pm 1)$ such that all off-diagonal elements of the matrix $S\Sigma S$ are non-negative. Then the strong form of the GPI (1.3) holds for all even integers n_1, \dots, n_d .*

This corollary follows from the well-known result that if $(X_1, \dots, X_d) \sim N_d(0, \Sigma)$ then $\frac{1}{2}(X_1^2, \dots, X_d^2)$ follows a $\text{Gamma}_d(\frac{1}{2}, \Sigma)$ distribution.

Remark 2.3. An alternative approach to establishing the Gaussian case in Corollary 2.2) can be obtained from the classical Isserlis-Wick formula [6]. To see this, we write

$$\mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^p X_j^{2m_j} = \mathbb{E} \left(\underbrace{X_1 \cdots X_1}_{2m_1 \text{ terms}} \cdot \underbrace{X_2 \cdots X_2}_{2m_2 \text{ terms}} \cdots \underbrace{X_p \cdots X_p}_{2m_p \text{ terms}} \right), \quad (2.10)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \prod_{j=p+1}^d X_j^{2m_j} = \mathbb{E} \left(\underbrace{X_{p+1} \cdots X_{p+1}}_{2m_{p+1} \text{ terms}} \cdot \underbrace{X_{p+2} \cdots X_{p+2}}_{2m_{p+2} \text{ terms}} \cdots \underbrace{X_d \cdots X_d}_{2m_d \text{ terms}} \right), \quad (2.11)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^d X_j^{2m_j} = \mathbb{E} \left(\underbrace{X_1 \cdots X_1}_{2m_1 \text{ terms}} \cdot \underbrace{X_2 \cdots X_2}_{2m_2 \text{ terms}} \cdots \underbrace{X_d \cdots X_d}_{2m_d \text{ terms}} \right). \quad (2.12)$$

By the Isserlis-Wick formula, the expectations (2.10), (2.11), and (2.12) can be written as a sum of products of the elements of Σ_{11} , Σ_{22} , and Σ , respectively. Moreover, a

simple inspection of the terms arising in the evaluation of (2.10) and (2.11) show that the product of those two expectations yields a collection of terms that are a subset of the terms arising from evaluation of (2.12). Since we assume that $\sigma_{ij} \geq 0$ for all i and j then we obtain the strong form of the GPI.

Remark 2.4. We note that Theorem 2.1 can be extended further to distributions more general than the multivariate gamma distributions. In particular, consider the case of mutually independent random vectors Y_1, \dots, Y_p such that for $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, $Y_i \sim \text{Gamma}_d(\alpha_i, \Sigma_i)$ where, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, all entries of the matrix Σ_i are non-negative. Further, denote by Y_{ij} the j -th component of Y_i . We now define a random vector (Z_1, \dots, Z_d) by $Z_j = \sum_{i=1}^p Y_{ij}$, $j = 1, \dots, d$. The moment-generating function then reads

$$\prod_{i=1}^p \det(I_d - \Sigma_i T)^{-\alpha_i} = \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \text{tr}[(\Sigma_i T)^n] \right).$$

Exploiting the additivity of the traces and using similar arguments as in the proof Theorem 2.1 then yields that an analogous theorem also holds for the vector (Z_1, \dots, Z_d) .

3 Positive upper orthant dependence and the GPI

In this section, we investigate the validity of the inequalities (1.2) and (1.3) without making specific assumptions on the distribution of the marginals of \mathbf{X} . As already pointed out in the introduction, (1.3) holds true if the absolute values $|\mathbf{X}|$ are associated. It is also clear that (1.3) holds when $|\mathbf{X}|$ is *weakly associated* [20].

In this section, we show that (1.3) follows from the notion of strong positive upper orthant dependence (SPUOD), which has been shown to be strictly weaker than weak association [20]. Moreover the weak form (1.2) follows from the notion of positive upper orthant dependence (PUOD).

Let us recall [2] that a random vector $V = (V_1, \dots, V_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is said to be *positively upper orthant dependent* (PUOD) if

$$\mathbb{P}(V_1 \geq t_1, \dots, V_d \geq t_d) \geq \prod_{j=1}^d \mathbb{P}(V_j \geq t_j)$$

for all $t_1, \dots, t_d \in \mathbb{R}$. We will also say that the vector V is *strongly positively upper orthant dependent* (SPUOD) if

$$\mathbb{P}(V_1 \geq t_1, \dots, V_d \geq t_d) \geq \prod_{j \in I} \mathbb{P}(V_j \geq t_j) \cdot \prod_{j \in I^c} \mathbb{P}(V_j \geq t_j)$$

for all $I \subset 1, \dots, d$.

We begin with a result which, in the one-dimensional case, is classical in the literature on the statistical analysis of survival data.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_d)$ be a random vector with nonnegative components Y_1, \dots, Y_d and such that $\mathbb{E}(Y_1 \cdots Y_d) < \infty$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_1 \cdots Y_d) = \int_0^\infty \cdots \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(Y_1 \geq t_1, \dots, Y_d \geq t_d) dt_1 \cdots dt_d. \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. For completeness, we provide a direct proof; cf., [11]. For $y \geq 0$, let χ_y be the indicator function of the interval $[0, y]$; i.e., $\chi_y(t) = 1$ if $0 \leq t \leq y$, and $\chi_y(t) = 0$ if $t > y$. Then

$$\int_0^\infty \chi_y(t) dt = y,$$

and it follows by an application of Fubini's theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(Y_1 \cdots Y_d) &= \mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^d \int_0^\infty \chi_{Y_j}(t_j) dt_j \\ &= \int_0^\infty \cdots \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^d \chi_{Y_j}(t_j) dt_j. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

It is trivial that

$$\prod_{j=1}^d \chi_{Y_j}(t_j) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } Y_1 \geq t_1, \dots, Y_d \geq t_d; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases};$$

therefore

$$\mathbb{E} \prod_{j=1}^d \chi_{Y_j}(t_j) = \mathbb{P}(Y_1 \geq t_1, \dots, Y_d \geq t_d).$$

Substituting the latter result into (3.2), we obtain (3.1). \square

Theorem 3.2. *For a fixed integer k , where $1 \leq k < d$, suppose that a random vector $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$ is such that the vector of absolute values, $(|X_1|, \dots, |X_d|)$ is PUOD. If $\mathbb{E}(X_1^{n_1} \cdots X_d^{n_d}) < \infty$ with any positive, not necessarily integer exponents n_1, \dots, n_d then we obtain the weak form of the GPI,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j=1}^d |X_j|^{n_j} \right) \geq \prod_{j=1}^d \mathbb{E}(|X_j|^{n_j}). \quad (3.3)$$

Similarly, if $(|X_1|, \dots, |X_d|)$ is SPUOD and $\mathbb{E}(X_1^{2n_1} \cdots X_d^{2n_d}) < \infty$, we obtain the strong form of the GPI,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j=1}^d |X_j|^{n_j} \right) \geq \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in I} |X_j|^{n_j} \right) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in I^c} |X_j|^{n_j} \right). \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. Suppose that $(|X_1|, \dots, |X_d|)$ is PUOD. Replacing each t_j by t_j^{1/n_j} and simplifying the various inequalities on the X_j , $j = 1, \dots, d$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_1|^{n_1} \geq t_1, \dots, |X_d|^{n_d} \geq t_d) \geq \prod_{j=1}^d \mathbb{P}(|X_j|^{n_j} \geq t_j)$$

for all $t_1, \dots, t_d \geq 0$. Integrating both sides of this inequality with respect to t_1, \dots, t_d over $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$ then, by applying Lemma 3.1, we obtain (3.3).

The strong form of the GPI (3.4) can be derived analogously starting from the assumption that $(|X_1|, \dots, |X_d|)$ is SPUOD. \square

4 The strong form of the GPI for negative exponents

The strong form of the GPI (1.3) in the case where the exponents are all negative has been proved earlier by Wei [19]. We now derive this result succinctly by an application of the Gaussian correlation inequality [14] and the method of integrating the multivariate survival function, as applied earlier in Section 3.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that $(X_1, \dots, X_d) \sim N_d(0, \Sigma)$ and that $n_1, \dots, n_d \in (0, 1)$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j=1}^d |X_j|^{-n_j} \right) \geq \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in I} |X_j|^{-n_j} \right) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in I^c} |X_j|^{-n_j} \right), \quad (4.1)$$

for all $I \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $I = \{1, \dots, p\}$. We note that the conditions on n_1, \dots, n_d are necessary to ensure that the moments in (4.1) are finite.

For $t_1, \dots, t_d > 0$, we apply the Gaussian correlation inequality [14] to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(|X_1|^{-n_1} \geq t_1, \dots, |X_d|^{-n_d} \geq t_d) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(|X_1| \leq t_1^{-1/n_1}, \dots, |X_d| \leq t_d^{-1/n_d}) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(|X_1| \leq t_1^{-1/n_1}, \dots, |X_p| \leq t_p^{-1/n_p}) \mathbb{P}(|X_{p+1}| \leq t_{p+1}^{-1/n_{p+1}}, \dots, |X_d| \leq t_d^{-1/n_d}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(|X_1|^{-n_1} \geq t_1, \dots, |X_p|^{-n_p} \geq t_p) \mathbb{P}(|X_{p+1}|^{-n_{p+1}} \geq t_{p+1}, \dots, |X_d|^{-n_d} \geq t_d). \end{aligned}$$

Integrating the first and last terms of this inequality with respect to $t_1, \dots, t_d \in (0, \infty)$, we obtain (4.1). \square

The argument used to prove Proposition 4.1 also establishes the novel finding that if a random vector (Y_1, \dots, Y_d) with (almost surely) positive components satisfies the Gaussian correlation inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_1 \leq t_1, \dots, Y_d \leq t_d) \geq \mathbb{P}(Y_1 \leq t_1, \dots, Y_p \leq t_p) \mathbb{P}(Y_{p+1} \leq t_{p+1}, \dots, Y_d \leq t_d)$$

for all $t_1, \dots, t_d > 0$, then

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{j=1}^d Y_j^{-n_j}\right) \geq \mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{j=1}^p Y_j^{-n_j}\right) \cdot \mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{j=p+1}^d Y_j^{-n_j}\right),$$

for all $n_1, \dots, n_d < 0$ such that the expectations exist, and for all $1 \leq p \leq d - 1$. In particular, the strong form of the GPI with negative exponents holds for the multivariate gamma distributions treated in [14].

Acknowledgments. We are grateful to Frédéric Ouimet for drawing our attention to his article [13] which motivated us to take another look at the GPI.

References

- [1] Bapat, R. B. (1989). Infinite divisibility of multivariate gamma distributions and M-matrices, *Sankhyā*, 51, 73–78.
- [2] Dharmadhikari, S., and Joag-Dev, K. (1988). *Unimodality, convexity, and applications*. Academic Press, San Diego.
- [3] Esary, J. D., Proschan, F., and Walkup, D. W. (1967). Association of random variables, with applications. *Ann. Math. Stat.*, 38, 1466–1474.
- [4] Frenkel, P. E. (2008). Pfaffians, Hafnians and products of real linear functionals. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 15, 351–358.
- [5] Gray, L. J., and Wilson, D. G. (1980). Nonnegative factorization of positive semi-definite nonnegative matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 31, 119–127.
- [6] Kan, R. (2008). From moments of sum to moments of product. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 99, 542–554.
- [7] Karlin, S., and Rinott, Y. (1980). Classes of orderings of measures and related correlation inequalities. I. Multivariate totally positive distributions. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 10, 467–498.
- [8] Karlin, S., and Rinott, Y. (1981). Total positivity properties of absolute value multinormal variables with applications to confidence interval estimates and related probabilistic inequalities. *Ann. Statist.*, 5, 1035–1049.
- [9] Krishnamoorthy, A. S., and Parthasarathy, M. (1951). A multivariate gamma-type distribution. *Ann. Math. Stat.*, 22, 549–557.
- [10] Lan, G., Hu, Z.-C., and Sun, W. (2020). The three-dimensional Gaussian product inequality. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 485, 123858.

- [11] Liu, Y. (2020). A general treatment of alternative expectation formulae. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 166, 108863.
- [12] Li, W. V., and Wei, A. (2012). A Gaussian inequality for expected absolute products. *J. Theor. Probab.*, 25, 92–99.
- [13] Ouimet, F. (2021). A combinatorial proof of the Gaussian product inequality conjecture beyond the MTP_2 case. [arXiv:2112.12283](https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.12283).
- [14] Royen, T. (2014). A simple proof of the Gaussian correlation conjecture extended to multivariate gamma distributions. *Far East J. Theor. Statist.*, 48, 139–145.
- [15] Royen, T. (2016). A note on the existence of the multivariate gamma distribution. [arXiv:1606.04747](https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.04747).
- [16] Royen, T. (1994). On some multivariate gamma distributions connected with spanning trees. *Ann. Inst. Math. Statist.*, 46, 361–371.
- [17] Royen, T. (1991). Multivariate gamma distributions with one-factorial accompanying correlation matrices and applications to the distribution of the multivariate range. *Metrika*, 38, 299–315.
- [18] Šidák, Z. (1971). On multivariate normal probabilities of rectangles: Their dependence on correlations. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 42, 169–175.
- [19] Wei, A. (2014). Representations of the absolute value function and applications in Gaussian estimates. *J. Theor. Probab.*, 27, 1059–1070.
- [20] Zheng, Y., and Cai, N. (2011). A note on the relations between some concepts of positive dependence. *Commun. Statist. Theory & Methods*, 40, 1335–1341.