

A family of Counterexamples on Inequality among Symmetric Functions

Jia Xu^{a,*}, Yong Yao^b

^a*Department of Mathematics, Southwest Minzu University, Chengdu, Sichuan 610041, China*

^b*Chengdu Computer Application Institute, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Chengdu, Sichuan 610213, China*

Abstract

Inequalities among symmetric functions are fundamental questions in mathematics and have various applications in science and engineering. In this paper, we tackle a conjecture about inequalities among the complete homogeneous symmetric function $H_{n,\lambda}$, that is, the inequality $H_{n,\lambda} \leq H_{n,\mu}$ implies majorization order $\lambda \preceq \mu$. This conjecture was proposed by Cuttler, Greene and Skandera in 2011. The conjecture is a close analogy with other known results on Muirhead-type inequalities. In 2021, Heaton and Shankar disproved the conjecture by showing a counterexample for degree $d = 8$ and number of variables $n = 3$. They then asked whether the conjecture is true when the number of variables, n , is large enough? In this paper, we answer the question by proving that the conjecture does not hold when $d \geq 8$ and $n \geq 2$. A crucial step of the proof relies on variables reduction. Inspired by this, we propose a new conjecture for $H_{n,\lambda} \leq H_{n,\mu}$.

Keywords: complete homogeneous symmetric function, majorization, symmetric inequalities

2000 MSC: 05E05, 14P99, 90C22

1. Introduction

Symmetric functions play indispensable ingredients in combinatorics [5, 21], and have various applications in diverse fields [19, 20, 22, 26]. An important collection of tools in the study of symmetric functions is various inequalities. Thus much research has been carried out in the hope of discovering and proving inequalities among symmetric functions, to list a few [1, 3, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23, 24, 25]. Some of them are well known and wide used, such as arithmetic mean and geometric means, Schur, Maclaurin and Muirhead-type.

It turns out that all these are special cases of inequalities among the following fundamental symmetric functions:

*Corresponding author.

Email addresses: xufine@163.com (Jia Xu), yongyao525@163.com (Yong Yao)

- Monomial symmetric functions $m_{n,\lambda}$: arithmetic means and geometric means [15], Hardy, littlewood, Polya [8],...
- Elementary symmetric functions $e_{n,\lambda}$: Maclaurin [13], Newton [17],...
- Power-sum symmetric functions $p_{n,\lambda}$: R. Gantmacher [6], Ursell [25],...
- Schur functions $s_{n,\lambda}$: Schur [8]
- Complete homogeneous symmetric functions $h_{n,\lambda}$: Grommer [7], Hunter [11],...

Naturally there have been extensive studies on inequalities among the above fundamental symmetric functions [2, 8, 15], resulting in much progress, providing very efficient way to check the inequalities, which make various applications process more efficient.

First, we list some notions and notations before concisely illustrating these works. Given a symmetric polynomial $f(x)$, the term-normalized symmetric polynomial is

$$F(x) := \frac{f(x)}{f(1, \dots, 1)}.$$

The inequation $F_{n,\lambda} \leq F_{n,\mu}$ means that $F_{n,\lambda}(x) \leq F_{n,\mu}(x)$ for every x in $\mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus 0$, where \mathbb{R}_+ is the set of nonnegative real numbers and $n \geq 2$. Thus the term-normalized symmetric functions of $m_{n,\lambda}$, $e_{n,\lambda}$, $p_{n,\lambda}$, $s_{n,\lambda}$ and $h_{n,\lambda}$ can be written by $M_{n,\lambda}$, $E_{n,\lambda}$, $P_{n,\lambda}$, $S_{n,\lambda}$ and $H_{n,\lambda}$. The following theorem is a summary of known results on these term-normalized symmetric functions. The proofs of the these results can be found in [4, 8, 16, 17, 27].

Known results: [9] Let $\mu, \lambda \in \mathbb{N}^m$ such that $|\mu| = |\lambda|$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} M_{n,\mu} \geq M_{n,\lambda} &\iff \mu \succeq \lambda, \\ E_{n,\mu} \geq E_{n,\lambda} &\iff \mu \preceq \lambda, \\ P_{n,\mu} \geq P_{n,\lambda} &\iff \mu \succeq \lambda, \\ S_{n,\mu} \geq S_{n,\lambda} &\iff \mu \succeq \lambda, \\ H_{n,\mu} \geq H_{n,\lambda} &\iff \mu \succeq \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

where " \succeq " is majorization order (see [14] or Definition 6 of this paper).

Note that unlike the other, the family of complete homogeneous is still open. The techniques successfully used for other families do not work well in general. Hence recently the effort is focused on this, making incremental progresses, producing conjectures that says that the technique could be used in large cases. In 2011, Allison Cuttler, Curtis Greene and Mark Skandera [4] conjectured that $H_{n,\mu} \geq H_{n,\lambda} \implies \mu \succeq \lambda$. Moreover, they indicated the conjecture is true when the degree $d = |\lambda| = |\mu| = 1, 2, \dots, 7$, and lead the question to $d \geq 8$. In 2021, Alexander Heaton and Isabelle Shankar found some counterexamples which overturn the conjecture for $d = 8, 9, 10$ (see [9]). Specially, they bring the $H_{3,(4,4)} - H_{3,(5,2,1)}$ ($d = 8, n = 3$), and certified its nonnegativity by utilizing the sum of squares (SOS) method.

The positive semi-definite matrix they found is left on web page (see [10]) due to the enormous and complex output. Instead, they raised the following question in [9] and put the hope to much more variables.

Question: “Is the following claim true asymptotically: $H_{n,\mu} \geq H_{n,\lambda}$ implies $\mu \succeq \lambda$?”

In this paper, we conclude this line of research by showing the technique does not work for even large cases. We show that for every sufficiently large n , there is a counter example. The precise form of our main result is stated in Theorem 7. So the answer of the above question is as follows.

Answer: “No.”

Hence there is no hope in tackling the complete homogeneous case using the previous approach. There is a need for an alternative approach. In this paper, we suggest such a potential alternative approach, as a conjecture.

Conjecture: Let $\mu, \lambda \in \mathbb{N}^m$, $|\mu| = |\lambda|$, then

$$H_{n,\mu} \geq H_{n,\lambda} \iff \forall_{u+v=n} \forall_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} H_{n,\mu}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \geq H_{n,\lambda}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v).$$

The above conjecture gives another ideas for studying Muirhead-type inequalities of complete homogenous polynomials.

2. Preliminaries

In order to precisely state the main theorem, we recall some definitions and notations.

Definition 1 (Partition [21]). *Let $d \geq 1$. The d -partition $Par(d)$ is defined by*

$$Par(d) = \{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d : \lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_d \geq 0 \text{ and } \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_d = d\}.$$

Example 2. *Note*

$$Par(3) = \{(3, 0, 0), (2, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1)\}.$$

Remark 3.

1. *We will delete 0 included in the elements of a partition if there is no confusion. For example, $(2, 1, 0)$ can be written briefly as $(2, 1)$.*
2. *If there are m consecutive λ_i that are same, then we can abbreviate them as λ_{i_m} . For example, $(1, 1, 1)$ can be written as $(\mathbf{1}_3)$.*

Definition 4 (Complete homogenous symmetric function [21]). *For a partition $\lambda \in Par(d)$, a complete homogeneous symmetric function $h_{n,\lambda}$ is written as*

$$h_{n,\lambda} = \prod_{i=1}^d h_{n,\lambda_i},$$

where

$$h_{n,\lambda_i} = \sum_{1 \leq j_1 \leq \dots \leq j_{\lambda_i} \leq n} x_{j_1} \cdots x_{j_{\lambda_i}}, \quad (\text{with } h_{n,0} = 1).$$

Remark 5. *The term-normalized form of the complete homogeneous symmetric function is*

$$H_{n,\lambda} = \frac{1}{\binom{n+\lambda_1-1}{\lambda_1} \cdots \binom{n+\lambda_d-1}{\lambda_d}} h_{n,\lambda}.$$

Definition 6 (Majorization [14]). *Let $\mu, \lambda \in \text{Par}(d)$. We say that μ majorizes λ , and write $\mu \succeq \lambda$, if*

$$\forall_{1 \leq j \leq d-1} \sum_{i=1}^j \mu_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^j \lambda_i.$$

3. Main theorem

Theorem 7 (Main Result). *For every $n \geq 2$ and $d \geq 8$, there exist $\mu, \lambda \in \text{Par}(d)$ such that $H_{n,\mu} \geq H_{n,\lambda}$ but μ does not majorizes λ , that is,*

$$\forall_{\substack{n \geq 2 \\ d \geq 8}} \exists_{\mu, \lambda \in \text{Par}(d)} H_{n,\mu} \geq H_{n,\lambda} \text{ but } \mu \not\succeq \lambda.$$

Before we plunge into technical details, we will first provide the top-level structure of the proof, in the hope of helping the reader to grasp the essence.

TOP-LEVEL STRUCTURE:

Let $n \geq 2$ and $d \geq 8$ be arbitrary but fixed. It is sufficient to prove that there exist $\lambda, \mu \in P_d$ such that $H_{n,\mu} \geq H_{n,\lambda}$ but $\mu \not\succeq \lambda$. In general there are two different strategies for proving existence: (1) constructive, guess a potential witness and check it. (2) non-constructive, assume non-existence and derive contradiction. In this paper, we follow the constructive approach, since it is more interesting.

1. Guess a witness for μ, λ .

Since $\text{Par}(d)$ expands rapidly while d is growing. For example, $|\text{Par}(17)| = 297$ while $|\text{Par}(18)| = 385$. It takes a little luck to guess the following witness.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Case } d = 2m & : \mu = \underbrace{(2, \dots, 2)}_m = (\mathbf{2}_m) & \lambda = (3, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{2m-3}) = (3, \mathbf{1}_{2m-3}) \\ \text{Case } d = 2m + 1 & : \mu = \underbrace{(2, \dots, 2)}_m, 1 = (\mathbf{2}_m, 1) & \lambda = (3, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{2m-2}) = (3, \mathbf{1}_{2m-2}) \end{aligned}$$

2. Check that it is indeed a witness.

(a) $\mu \not\succeq \lambda$.

Trivial.

(b) $H_{n,\mu} \geq H_{n,\lambda}$

This is non-trivial, requiring much technical details. Again before we plunge into the detail, here we provide a high-level strategy. We first tackle the smallest still “open” degree $d = 8$, that is,

$$\mu = (\mathbf{2}_4) \text{ and } \lambda = (3, \mathbf{1}_5)$$

We prove it by transforming the problem into an optimization problem on the simplex. The details are given in Lemma 11 and its proof is given below. Briefly, the proof is divided into two parts, interior and boundary of the simplex. In the interior, we reduce the number of variables into 2 by Lagrange's equation (see Lemma 9). At boundary, we deal with it by proving an inequality (see Lemma 10).

After this, we extend the result with degree 8 to arbitrary degree d by using relaxation method repeatedly. The details are given in Lemma 12 and its proof is given below.

This concludes the top-level structure of the proof.

Remark 8.

1. *It will be interesting to find different counter-examples.*
2. *In fact, one wonders about the set of all counter-examples. Does it have any discernable structure?*

Lemma 9. *Let $\mu = (2_4)$ and $\lambda = (3, 1_5)$. Then we have*

$$\forall_{\substack{u+v=n \\ u,v \geq 0}} \forall_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} H_{n,\mu}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \geq H_{n,\lambda}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v).$$

Proof. Let $J_n = H_{n,\mu} - H_{n,\lambda}$. Note

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall_{\substack{u+v=n \\ u,v \geq 0}} \forall_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} J_n(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \geq 0 \\ \iff & \forall_{\substack{u+v=n \\ u,v \geq 1}} \forall_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} J_n(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \geq 0 \quad (\text{since if } u = 0 \text{ or } v = 0 \text{ then } J_n(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) = 0) \\ \iff & \forall_{\substack{k+l=n-2 \\ k,l \geq 0}} \forall_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} J_n(\mathbf{t}_{k+1}, \mathbf{1}_{l+1}) \geq 0 \quad (\text{obtained by } u = k + 1 \text{ and } v = l + 1) \end{aligned}$$

Direct computation show that

$$J_n(\mathbf{t}_{k+1}, \mathbf{1}_{l+1}) = \frac{(k+1)(l+1)}{\binom{n+2}{3} \binom{n}{1}^5 \binom{n+1}{2}^4} (t-1)^2 W(k, l, t)$$

for some polynomial W . Thus it suffices to show that

$$\forall_{\substack{k+l=n-2 \\ k,l \geq 0}} W(k, l, t) \geq 0$$

Direct calculation shows that all the coefficients of W are non-negative (see Appendix). Hence the claim holds. \square

Lemma 10. Let $\mu = (2_4)$ and $\lambda = (3, 1_5)$. We have the inequality

$$\forall_{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} H_{n+1,\mu}(x, 0) - H_{n+1,\lambda}(x, 0) \geq \frac{n^6}{(n+3)(n+1)^5} (H_{n,\mu}(x) - H_{n,\lambda}(x)).$$

Proof. Note $h_{n+1,\mu}(x, 0) = h_{n,\mu}(x)$ and $h_{n+1,\lambda}(x, 0) = h_{n,\lambda}(x)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{H_{n+1,\mu}(x,0)}{H_{n,\mu}(x)} &= \frac{\frac{h_{n+1,\mu}(x,0)}{\binom{n+2}{2}^4}}{\frac{h_{n,\mu}(x)}{\binom{n+1}{2}^4}} = \left(\frac{\binom{n+1}{2}}{\binom{n+2}{2}} \right)^4 = \left(\frac{n}{n+2} \right)^4, \\ \frac{H_{n+1,\lambda}(x,0)}{H_{n,\lambda}(x)} &= \frac{\frac{h_{n+1,\lambda}(x,0)}{\binom{n+3}{3}^1 \binom{n+1}{1}^5}}{\frac{h_{n,\lambda}(x)}{\binom{n+2}{3}^1 \binom{n}{1}^5}} = \left(\frac{\binom{n+2}{3}}{\binom{n+3}{3}} \right)^1 \left(\frac{\binom{n}{1}}{\binom{n+1}{1}} \right)^5 = \left(\frac{n}{n+3} \right)^1 \left(\frac{n}{n+1} \right)^5. \end{aligned}$$

One can verify that

$$\left(\frac{n}{n+3} \right)^1 \left(\frac{n}{n+1} \right)^5 < \left(\frac{n}{n+2} \right)^4.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} H_{n+1,\mu}(x, 0) &> \left(\frac{n}{n+3} \right)^1 \left(\frac{n}{n+1} \right)^5 H_{n,\mu}(x) \\ H_{n+1,\lambda}(x, 0) &= \left(\frac{n}{n+3} \right)^1 \left(\frac{n}{n+1} \right)^5 H_{n,\lambda}(x) \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$H_{n+1,\mu}(x, 0) - H_{n+1,\lambda}(x, 0) \geq \frac{n^6}{(n+3)(n+1)^5} (H_{n,\mu}(x) - H_{n,\lambda}(x)).$$

□

Lemma 11. Let $\mu = (2_4)$ and $\lambda = (3, 1_5)$. We have

$$H_{n,\mu} \geq H_{n,\lambda} \quad (n \geq 2).$$

Proof. Let $J_n = H_{n,\mu} - H_{n,\lambda}$. We will prove $J_n \geq 0$ by induction on n .

Base case: The following calculation verifies that the claim is true when $n = 2$.

Direct computation show that

$$J_2 = H_{2,\mu} - H_{2,\lambda} = \frac{h_{2,\mu}}{\binom{2+1}{2}^4} - \frac{h_{2,\lambda}}{\binom{2+2}{3}^1 \binom{2}{1}^5} = (x_1 - x_2)^2 P(x_1, x_2),$$

where

$$P(x_1, x_2) = \frac{1}{10368} (47(x_1^6 + x_2^6) + 120(x_1^5 x_2 + x_1 x_2^5) + 177(x_1^4 x_2^2 + x_1^2 x_2^4) + 176x_1^3 x_2^3).$$

Thus, $J_2 \geq 0$ holds.

Induction step: Given that $J_{n-1}(x) \geq 0$ holds for $n \geq 3$, we will show that $J_n(x) \geq 0$ holds too.

Since $J_n(x)$ is homogeneous, it suffices to show that

$$\min_{x \in \Delta_n} J_n(x) \geq 0,$$

where

$$\Delta_n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n : x_1 + \cdots + x_n = 1\}.$$

Note that Δ_n is compact, hence there exists $p \in \Delta_n$ such that $J_n(p) = \min_{x \in \Delta_n} J_n(x)$. It remains to prove $J_n(p) \geq 0$, and will be done in the following two cases.

1. $p \in \Delta_n^\circ$ (the interior of Δ_n). We claim that $p = (\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{r}_v)$ for some t, r and $u + v = n$. Since p is an extreme point, it follows from Lagrange multiplier theorem that there is a real λ such that p satisfies the following equations.

$$\frac{\partial J_n}{\partial x_i}(p) = \lambda \frac{\partial h_{n,1}}{\partial x_i}(p), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial h_{n,1}}{\partial x_i} &= 1, \\ \frac{\partial h_{n,2}}{\partial x_i} &= x_i + h_{n,1}, \\ \frac{\partial h_{n,3}}{\partial x_i} &= x_i^2 + h_{n,1}x_i + h_{n,2}, \\ \frac{\partial J_n}{\partial x_i} &= \frac{\partial (H_{n,\mu} - H_{n,\lambda})}{\partial x_i}, \\ &= \frac{\partial \left(\frac{h_{n,2}^4}{\binom{n+1}{2}^4} - \frac{h_{n,1}^5 h_{n,3}}{\binom{n+2}{3}^4 \binom{n}{1}^5} \right)}{\partial x_i}, \end{aligned}$$

this in turn implies that each of the p_i is a root of the quadratic equation

$$ax_i^2 + bx_i + c = 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a &= -\binom{n+2}{3}^{-1} \binom{n}{1}^{-5} \\ b &= 4\binom{n+1}{2}^{-4} h_{n,2}^3(p) - \binom{n+2}{3}^{-1} \binom{n}{1}^{-5} \\ c &= 4\binom{n+1}{2}^{-4} h_{n,2}^3(p) - \binom{n+2}{3}^{-1} \binom{n}{1}^{-5} (h_{n,2}(p) + 5h_{n,3}(p)) - \lambda \end{aligned}$$

Thus p_1, \dots, p_n take at most two different numbers. Without loss of generality, suppose $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\} = \{t, r\}$. J_n is symmetric, so p can be written as follows.

$$p = (\underbrace{t, \dots, t}_u, \underbrace{r, \dots, r}_v) = (\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{r}_v), \quad u, v \in \mathbb{N}, \quad u + v = n.$$

Noticed that $J_n(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \geq 0 \iff J_n(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{r}_v) \geq 0$ due to homogeneity of J_n . Hence by Lemma 9, we have

$$J_n(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \geq 0 \implies J_n(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{r}_v) \geq 0 \implies J_n(p) \geq 0.$$

2. $p \in \partial\Delta_n$ (the boundary of Δ_n). Let $p = (p_1, \dots, p_{n-1}, 0)$ by symmetry. Thus, $J_n(p) \geq 0$ is trivial. Since from Lemma 10 and the induction hypothesis, we have

$$J_n(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, 0) \geq \frac{(n-1)^6}{(n+2)n^5} J_{n-1}(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \geq 0.$$

According to the principle of induction, the proof is done. \square

Lemma 12. *We have*

$$H_{n,(\mathbf{2}_m)} \geq H_{n,(3, \mathbf{1}_{2m-3})}, \quad H_{n,(\mathbf{2}_m, 1)} \geq H_{n,(3, \mathbf{1}_{2m-2})} \quad (m \geq 4).$$

where $\mathbf{2}_m = \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_m$, $\mathbf{1}_v = \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_v$.

Proof. From Lemma 11, we have

$$\frac{H_{n,(\mathbf{2}_4)} }{H_{n,(3, \mathbf{1}_5)}} \geq 1, \tag{1}$$

where $n \geq 2$ and $m = 4$.

Generally, let $F_{n,m} = \frac{H_{n,(\mathbf{2}_m)}}{H_{n,(3, \mathbf{1}_{2m-3})}}$. We claim that

$$F_{n,m} \geq F_{n,m-1} \tag{2}$$

It is because

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{F_{n,m}}{F_{n,m-1}} &= \frac{\frac{\binom{n+2}{3} \binom{n}{1}^{2m-3}}{\binom{n+1}{2}^m} \frac{(h_{n,2})^m}{h_{n,3} (h_{n,1})^{2m-3}}}{\frac{\binom{n+2}{3} \binom{n}{1}^{2m-5}}{\binom{n+1}{2}^{m-1}} \frac{(h_{n,2})^{m-1}}{h_{n,3} (h_{n,1})^{2m-5}}} \\ &= \frac{2n \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i^2 + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} x_i x_j}{n+1 \left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} x_i \right)^2} \\ &= \frac{n(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2) + n(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^2}{(n+1)(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^2} \\ &\geq \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^2 + n(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^2}{(n+1)(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^2} \quad \text{from } n \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 \right) \geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \right)^2 \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

By using inequality (2) repeatedly and combining formula (1), we have

$$F_{n,m} \geq F_{n,m-1} \geq \cdots \geq F_{n,4} = \frac{H_{n,(2_4)}}{H_{n,(3,1_5)}} \geq 1.$$

Hence

$$H_{n,(2_m)} \geq H_{n,(3,1_{2m-3})}.$$

Further, note that $H_{n,\lambda}$ is multiplicative, then

$$\frac{H_{n,(2_m,1)}}{H_{n,(3,1_{2m-2})}} = \frac{H_{n,(2_m)}}{H_{n,(3,1_{2m-3})}} = F_{n,m} \geq 1,$$

Hence

$$H_{n,(2_m,1)} \geq H_{n,(3,1_{2m-2})}.$$

□

Now let us complete the proof of Theorem 7.

Proof. [Proof of Theorem 7]

1. $d \geq 8$ and even: Let $d = 2m$ where $m \geq 4$. Take $\mu = (2_m), \lambda = (3, 1_{2m-3})$. From Lemma 12, we have $H_{n,\mu} = H_{n,(2_m)} \geq H_{n,(3,1_{2m-3})} = H_{n,\lambda}$, but

$$\mu = (2_m) = (\underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_m) \not\leq (3, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{2m-3}) = (3, 1_{2m-3}) = \lambda.$$

2. $d \geq 9$ and odd: Let $d = 2m + 1$ for $m \geq 4$. Take $\mu = (2_m, 1), \lambda = (3, 1_{2m-2})$. From Lemma 12, we have $H_{n,\mu} \geq H_{n,\lambda}$, but $\mu \not\leq \lambda$.

We have completed the proof. □

4. A conjecture

In this section, we propose a conjecture for an alternative characterization. The conjecture (see below) is inspired by the following observation.

Proposition 13. *Let $\mu, \lambda \in \text{Par}(d)$. We have*

$$\begin{array}{llll} M_{n,\mu} \geq M_{n,\lambda} & \iff & \forall_{u+v=n} \quad \forall_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} & M_{n,\mu}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \geq M_{n,\lambda}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \\ E_{n,\mu} \geq E_{n,\lambda} & \iff & \forall_{u+v=n} \quad \forall_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} & E_{n,\mu}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \geq E_{n,\lambda}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \\ P_{n,\mu} \geq P_{n,\lambda} & \iff & \forall_{u+v=n} \quad \forall_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} & P_{n,\mu}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \geq P_{n,\lambda}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \\ S_{n,\mu} \geq S_{n,\lambda} & \iff & \forall_{u+v=n} \quad \forall_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} & S_{n,\mu}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \geq S_{n,\lambda}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \end{array}$$

Proof.

\implies :

It is obvious.

\impliedby :

- M

The following proof is essentially based on comparing degrees. It is straightforward to show

$$\deg_t M_{n,\alpha}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) = \sum_{i=1}^u \alpha_i$$

Now observe

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall_{u+v=n} \forall_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} M_{n,\mu}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \geq M_{n,\lambda}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \\ \implies & \forall_{u+v=n} \deg_t M_{n,\mu}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \geq \deg_t M_{n,\lambda}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \quad \text{by comparing them when } t \rightarrow \infty \\ \iff & \forall_{u+v=n} \sum_{i=1}^u \mu_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^u \lambda_i \\ \iff & \mu \succeq \lambda \quad \text{from the definition of } \succeq \\ \iff & M_{n,\mu} \geq M_{n,\lambda} \end{aligned}$$

- S

The following proof is the same as the proof for M . It is straightforward to show

$$\deg_t S_{n,\alpha}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) = \sum_{i=1}^u \alpha_i$$

Now observe

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall_{u+v=n} \forall_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} S_{n,\mu}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \geq S_{n,\lambda}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \\ \implies & \forall_{u+v=n} \deg_t S_{n,\mu}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \geq \deg_t S_{n,\lambda}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \quad \text{by comparing them when } t \rightarrow \infty \\ \iff & \forall_{u+v=n} \sum_{i=1}^u \mu_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^u \lambda_i \\ \iff & \mu \succeq \lambda \quad \text{from the definition of } \succeq \\ \iff & S_{n,\mu} \geq S_{n,\lambda} \end{aligned}$$

- E

The following proof is almost the same as the proof for M . However there is a subtle difference. It is straightforward to show

$$\deg_t E_{n,\alpha}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) = \sum_{i=1}^u \alpha'_i$$

where α' denotes the conjugate of the partition α , that is, $\alpha'_j = \max\{i \mid \alpha_i > j\}$.

Now observe

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall_{u+v=n} \forall_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} E_{n,\mu}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \geq E_{n,\lambda}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \\ \implies & \forall_{u+v=n} \deg_t E_{n,\mu}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \geq \deg_t E_{n,\lambda}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \quad \text{by comparing them when } t \rightarrow \infty \\ \iff & \forall_{u+v=n} \sum_{i=1}^u \mu'_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^u \lambda'_i \\ \iff & \mu' \succeq \lambda' \quad \text{from the definition of } \succeq \\ \iff & \mu \preceq \lambda \quad \text{from Theorem 3.2 of [4]} \\ \iff & E_{n,\mu} \geq E_{n,\lambda} \end{aligned}$$

- P

It was proved in P.753 of [4], using a proof technique quite different from the proof for M , because the degree comparison does not provide any information since

$$\deg_t P_{n,\alpha}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) = d.$$

□

The above results naturally leads to the following conjecture.

Conjecture 14. *We conjecture that*

$$H_{n,\mu} \geq H_{n,\lambda} \iff \forall_{u+v=n} \forall_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} H_{n,\mu}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) \geq H_{n,\lambda}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v).$$

Remark 15. *The proof technique used for M , S and E does not work since $\deg_t H_{n,\alpha}(\mathbf{t}_u, \mathbf{1}_v) = d$. The proof technique used for P does not seem to work either.*

Remark 16. *We checked the conjecture on all possible μ, λ with increasing degrees and number of variables. We used the following tools.*

1. *LHS: difference substitution method (DS) [30, 28, 29, 31, 32].*
2. *RHS: Sturm sequence.*

We have verified this by explicit computation up through $d = 12$ and $n = 12$, and have not found any counter-example. We invite the reader to help complete the proof or disproof of the conjecture.

5. Appendix

$$\begin{aligned} W(k, l, t) = & (k+2)(k+1)^3(k^4 + 2k^3l + k^2l^2 + 12k^3 + 17k^2l + 5kl^2 + 49k^2 + 43kl \\ & + 5l^2 + 82k + 32l + 47)t^6 + 2(k+2)(k+1)^3(3k^3l + 6k^2l^2 + 3kl^3 + 2k^3 \\ & + 32k^2l + 37kl^2 + 7l^3 + 21k^2 + 106kl + 52l^2 + 64k + 109l + 60)t^5 \\ & + (l+1)(k+1)^2(15k^4l + 30k^3l^2 + 15k^2l^3 + 11k^4 + 173k^3l + 208k^2l^2 \\ & + 46kl^3 + 121k^3 + 677k^2l + 426kl^2 + 35l^3 + 442k^2 + 1074kl + 272l^2 \\ & + 662k + 599l + 354)t^4 + 4(l+1)^2(k+1)^2(5k^3l + 10k^2l^2 + 5kl^3 + 6k^3 \\ & + 53k^2l + 53kl^2 + 6l^3 + 51k^2 + 157kl + 51l^2 + 125k + 125l + 88)t^3 \\ & + (l+1)^2(k+1)(15k^3l^2 + 30k^2l^3 + 15kl^4 + 46k^3l + 208k^2l^2 + 173kl^3 \\ & + 11l^4 + 35k^3 + 426k^2l + 677kl^2 + 121l^3 + 272k^2 + 1074kl + 442l^2 \\ & + 599k + 662l + 354)t^2 + 2(l+2)(l+1)^3(3k^3l + 6k^2l^2 + 3kl^3 + 7k^3 \\ & + 37k^2l + 32kl^2 + 2l^3 + 52k^2 + 106kl + 21l^2 + 109k + 64l + 60)t \\ & + (l+2)(l+1)^3(k^2l^2 + 2kl^3 + l^4 + 5k^2l + 17kl^2 + 12l^3 + 5k^2 + 43kl \\ & + 49l^2 + 32k + 82l + 47) \end{aligned}$$

Acknowledgements. The authors are grateful to Bi-can Xia for drawing their attention to some relevant references and to Hoon Hong for helpful conversations. This work was supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, Southwest Minzu University (2020NYB40).

References

- [1] G. Blekherman, C. Riener. Symmetric Non-Negative Forms and Sums of Squares. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*. 65, 2021, 764-799.
- [2] P.S. Bullen, *Handbook of Means and their Inequalities*, in: *Mathematics and its Applications*, vol. 560, Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 2003, Revised from the 1988 original [P.S. Bullen, D.S. Mitrinović and P.M. Vasić, *Means and their inequalities*, Reidel, Dordrecht; MR0947142].
- [3] V. Cîrtoaje. The Equal Variable Method. *Journal of Inequalities in Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 8(1), 2007, 1-21.
- [4] A. Cuttler, C. Greene, M. Skandera. Inequalities for symmetric means, *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 32 (6), 2011, 745-761.
- [5] Ira M. Gessel. An introduction to symmetric functions. [https:// people.brandeis.edu / gessel /homepage /slides /Symmetric-functions. pdf](https://people.brandeis.edu/~gessel/homepage/slides/Symmetric-functions.pdf). 2016, 7-10.

- [6] R. Gantmacher, *The Theory of Matrices*, vol. 2, Chelsea, New York, 1959.
- [7] J. Grommer. Ganze transzendente Funktionen mit lauter reellen Nullstellen. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 144, 1914, 114-166.
- [8] G.H. Hardy, J.E. Littlewood, G. Pólya. *Inequalities*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1934.
- [9] A. Heaton, I. Shankar. An SOS counterexample to an inequality of symmetric functions. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 225, 2021, 106656.
- [10] A. Heaton, I. Shankar. SOS counterexample. <https://github.com/alexheaton2/SOS-counterexample>.
- [11] D.B. Hunter. The positive-definiteness of the complete symmetric functions of even order. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 82(2),1977, 255-258.
- [12] I. G. Macdonald, *Symmetric Functions and Hall Polynomials*, 2nd edition, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1998.
- [13] C. Maclaurin, A second letter to Martin Foulkes, Esq., concerning the roots of equations with the demonstrations of other rules in algebra, *Philos. Trans.*, 36, 1729, 59-96.
- [14] A.W. Marshall, I. Olkin. *Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and its Applications*, Academic Press, New York, 1979.
- [15] D.S. Mitrinovic, *Analytic Inequalities*, in cooperation with P.M. Vasić, in: *Grundlehren Math. Wiss.*, Vol. 165, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1970.
- [16] R. F. Muirhead. Some methods applicable to identities of symmetric algebraic functions of n letters, *Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc.*, 21, 1902/03, 144-157.
- [17] I. Newton. *Arithmetica universalis: sive de compositione et resolutione arithmetica liber*, Leiden, Opera, I, 1732.
- [18] C.Riener. Symmetric Semi-algebraic sets and Non-negativity of Symmetric polynomials. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*. 220(8), 2016, 2809-2815.
- [19] C.E. Shannon, A symbolic analysis of relay and switching circuits, *AIEE Trans.*, 57 (1938), 713-723.
- [20] Swati, Shovan Bhaumik, Multiple target tracking based on homogeneous symmetric transformation of measurements, *Aerospace Science and Technology*. 27(1), 2013, 32-43.
- [21] R. Stanley. *Enumerative Combinatorics*, vol. 2, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.

- [22] Maarten L. Terpstra, Matteo Maspero, Alessandro Sbrizzi, Cornelis A.T. van den Berg, ℓ_1 -loss: A symmetric loss function for magnetic resonance imaging reconstruction and image registration with deep learning, *Medical Image Analysis*. 80, 2022, 102509.
- [23] V. Timofte. On the positivity of symmetric polynomial functions. Part I: General results, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 284(1), 2003, 174-190.
- [24] V.Timofte, A.Timofte. On algorithms testing positivity of real symmetric polynomials. *Journal of Inequalities and Applications*, 135, 2021.
- [25] H.D. Ursell, Inequalities between sums of powers, *Proceedings of The London Mathematical Society*, 9(3), 1959, 432-450.
- [26] David G.L. Wang, Monica M.Y. Wang, A combinatorial formula for the Schur coefficients of chromatic symmetric functions, *Discrete Applied Mathematics*. 285, 2020, 621-630.
- [27] Suvrit Sra. On inequalities for normalized Schur functions, *Eur. J. Comb.* 51, 2016, 492-494.
- [28] B.C. Xia, L. Yang. Automated inequality proving and discovering. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd, Singapore, 2016.
- [29] J. Xu, Y. Yao. Pólya method and the successive difference substitution method, *Science China Mathematics*, 42, 2012, 203-213. (in Chinese)
- [30] L.Yang. Solving Harder Problems with Lesser Mathematics. In: *Proceedings of the 10th Asian Technology Conference in Mathematics*, ATCM Inc., Blacksburg, 2005. 37-46.
- [31] L.Yang, Y. Yao. Difference substitution matrices and the decision of nonnegativity of polynomials. *J. Sys. Sci. & Math. Scis.* 29, 2009, 1169-1177. (in Chinese)
- [32] Y. Yao. Infinite product convergence of SDS sets and machine decision for positive semi-definite forms, *Science China Mathematics* 40, 2010, 252-264. (in Chinese)