

THE EXTENDED REVERSE ULTRA LOG-CONCAVITY OF TRANSPosed BOROS-MOLL SEQUENCES

JAMES JING YU ZHAO

ABSTRACT. The Boros-Moll sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{\ell=0}^m$ arise in the study of evaluation of a quartic integral. After the infinite log-concavity conjecture of the sequence $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{\ell=0}^m$ was proposed by Boros and Moll, a lot of interesting inequalities on $d_\ell(m)$ were obtained, although the conjecture is still open. Since $d_\ell(m)$ has two parameters, it is natural to consider the properties for the sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$, which are called the *transposed Boros-Moll sequences* here. In this paper, we mainly prove the extended reverse ultra log-concavity of the transposed Boros-Moll sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$, and hence give an upper bound for the ratio $d_\ell^2(m)/(d_\ell(m-1)d_\ell(m+1))$. A lower bound for this ratio is also established which implies a result stronger than the log-concavity of the sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$. As a consequence, we also show that the transposed Boros-Moll sequences possess a stronger log-concave property than the Boros-Moll sequences do. At last, we propose some conjectures on the Boros-Moll sequences and their transposes.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is concerned with the extended reverse ultra log-concavity of the transposed Boros-Moll sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$. Boros and Moll [3, 6] investigated a quartic integral and provided a closed-form expression associated with a special class of Jacobi polynomials, that is,

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{1}{(t^4 + 2xt^2 + 1)^{m+1}} dt = \frac{\pi}{2^{m+3/2}(x+1)^{m+1/2}} P_m(x)$$

for $x > -1$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, where the polynomial

$$(1.1) \quad P_m(x) = \sum_{j,k} \binom{2m+1}{2j} \binom{m-j}{k} \binom{2k+2j}{k+j} \frac{(x+1)^j (x-1)^k}{2^{3(k+j)}}.$$

By employing Ramanujan's Master Theorem, Boros and Moll proved that

$$(1.2) \quad P_m(x) = 2^{-2m} \sum_{k=0}^m 2^k \binom{2m-2k}{m-k} \binom{m+k}{k} (x+1)^k,$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05A20, 11B83.

Key words and phrases. Log-concavity, reverse ultra log-concavity, extended reverse ultra log-concavity, Boros-Moll sequences, transposed Boros-Moll sequences.

which can be identified as the Jacobi polynomials $P_m^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x)$ with $\alpha = m + 1/2$ and $\beta = -\alpha$, where

$$P_m^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^m (-1)^{m-k} \binom{m+\beta}{m-k} \binom{m+k+\alpha+\beta}{k} \left(\frac{1+x}{2}\right)^k.$$

Chen, Pang and Qu [13] applied a combinatorial argument to show that the double sum (1.1) can be reduced to the single sum (1.2).

The term $d_\ell(m)$ is the coefficient of x^ℓ in the polynomial $P_m(x)$, which is called the Boros-Moll polynomial, and the sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{\ell=0}^m$ are called the Boros-Moll sequences. Clearly, one sees from (1.2) that

$$(1.3) \quad d_\ell(m) = 2^{-2m} \sum_{k=\ell}^m 2^k \binom{2m-2k}{m-k} \binom{m+k}{k} \binom{k}{\ell}$$

for $0 \leq \ell \leq m$. See [2, 4, 5, 7, 25] for more background on these sequences.

A sequence $\{a_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ with real numbers is said to be *log-concave* if for any $i \geq 1$,

$$(1.4) \quad a_i^2 - a_{i-1}a_{i+1} \geq 0.$$

If the inequality sign of (1.4) reverses, then the sequence $\{a_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ is called *log-convex*. A polynomial is said to be log-concave if its coefficient sequence is log-concave, see Brenti [9] and Stanley [27].

Boros and Moll [4] showed that the sequence $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{\ell=0}^m$ is unimodal with the maximum term located in the middle, see also [1, 5]. Moll [25] further conjectured that the sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{\ell=0}^m$ are log-concave, which was proved by Kauers and Paule [23] with a computer algebra method. Chen *et al.* [14] also gave a combinatorial proof for this conjecture by building a structure of partially 2-colored permutations.

A sequence $\{a_i\}_{i=0}^n$ is called *ultra log-concave* if $\{a_i / \binom{n}{i}\}_{i=0}^n$ is log-concave, that is,

$$(1.5) \quad \frac{a_i^2}{\binom{n}{i}^2} \geq \frac{a_{i-1}}{\binom{n}{i-1}} \cdot \frac{a_{i+1}}{\binom{n}{i+1}},$$

see Liggett [24]. Clearly, the inequality (1.5) implies

$$i(n-i)a_i^2 - (n-i+1)(i+1)a_{i-1}a_{i+1} \geq 0,$$

which is stronger than (1.4). It is well-known that the coefficients of a realrooted polynomial form an ultra log-concave sequence. Liggett [24] also mentioned that the ultra log-concavity of a sequence $\{a_i\}_{i=0}^n$ implies the log-concavity of the sequence $\{i!a_i\}_{i=0}^n$.

A sequence $\{a_i\}_{i=0}^n$ is called *reverse ultra log-concave* if the reverse relation in (1.5) holds. For instance, Han and Seo [20] showed the log-concavity and reverse ultra log-concavity of the Bessel polynomial

$$B_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{(n+k)!}{2^k k! (n-k)!} x^k.$$

Moreover, Chen and Gu [11, Theorems 1.1 & 1.2] proved that for $m \geq 2$ and $1 \leq \ell \leq m-1$,

$$(1.6) \quad \frac{d_\ell^2(m)}{d_{\ell-1}(m)d_{\ell+1}(m)} < \frac{(m-\ell+1)(\ell+1)}{(m-\ell)\ell},$$

and

$$(1.7) \quad \frac{d_\ell^2(m)}{d_{\ell-1}(m)d_{\ell+1}(m)} > \frac{(m-\ell+1)(\ell+1)(m+\ell)}{(m-\ell)\ell(m+\ell+1)}.$$

Clearly, the inequality (1.6) implies the reverse ultra log-concavity of the Boros-Moll sequences. And (1.7) is stronger than the log-concavity of the Boros-Moll sequences. Their results suggest that, in the asymptotic sense, the Boros-Moll sequences are just on the borderline between ultra log-concavity and reverse ultra log-concavity.

The Boros-Moll sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{\ell=0}^m$ satisfy many other interesting inequalities. For instance, Chen and Xia [16, Theorem 1.1] showed that the Boros-Moll polynomials possess the strictly ratio monotone property, which implies both log-concavity and the spiral property. Chen, Wang and Xia [15] introduced the notion of interlacing log-concavity of a sequence of polynomials with positive coefficients which is stronger than the log-concavity of the polynomials themselves, and showed the interlacing log-concavity of $\{P_m(x)\}_{m \geq 0}$.

For a sequence $\{a_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ of real numbers, define an operator \mathcal{L} by $\mathcal{L}(\{a_i\}_{i \geq 0}) = \{b_i\}_{i \geq 0}$, where $b_i = a_i^2 - a_{i-1}a_{i+1}$ for $i \geq 0$, with the convention that $a_{-1} = 0$. Boros and Moll [7] introduced the notion of infinite log-concavity. A sequence $\{a_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ is said to be k -log-concave if the sequence $\mathcal{L}^j(\{a_i\}_{i \geq 0})$ is nonnegative for each $1 \leq j \leq k$, and $\{a_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ is said to be ∞ -log-concave if $\mathcal{L}^k(\{a_i\}_{i \geq 0})$ is nonnegative for any $k \geq 1$. The following conjecture was proposed by Boros and Moll and is still open.

Conjecture 1.1. [7] *The Boros-Moll sequence $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{\ell=0}^m$ is ∞ -log-concave.*

Brändén [8] provided an approach to Conjecture 1.1 by relating real-rooted polynomials to higher-order log-concavity. Although, as shown by Boros and Moll [4], the polynomials $P_m(x)$ are not real-rooted in general, Brändén introduced two polynomials derived from $P_m(x)$ and conjectured the real-rootedness of them [8, Conjectures 8.5 & 8.6], which have been confirmed by Chen, Dou and Yang [10], and hence the 2-log-concavity and the 3-log-concavity of the BorosMoll polynomials were obtained. In another direction, Chen and Xia [17] showed a proof of the 2-log-concavity of the Boros-Moll sequences by using the approach of recurrence relations.

Guo [19] proved the higher order Turán inequalities of the Boros-Moll sequences by showing an equivalent form [19, Eq. (9)] established in [18]. Zhao [30] gave a simple proof of these higher order Turán inequalities by employing a sufficient condition built by Hou and Li [21, Theorem 5.2], together with a set of sharp enough bounds of $d_\ell^2(m)/(d_{\ell-1}(m)d_{\ell+1}(m))$ given in (1.6) and [30, Theorem 3.1].

Since $d_\ell(m)$ has two parameters, it is natural to investigate properties for the sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$, which are called the *transposed Boros-Moll sequences* in this paper.

The sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$ were proved to be log-convex for $\ell = 0$, log-concave for $\ell \geq 1$ and 2-log-concave for $\ell \geq 2$ by Jiang and Wang [22]. The higher order Turán inequalities for the sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$ were also derived for $\ell \geq 2$ in [22].

Recently, Zhang and Zhao [29] showed that the Boros-Moll sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{\ell=0}^m$, its normalizations $\{d_\ell(m)/\ell!\}_{\ell=0}^m$, and its transposes $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$ satisfy the Briggs inequality, which arising from Briggs' conjecture that if a polynomial $a_0 + a_1x + \cdots + a_nx^n$ with real coefficients has only negative zeros, then $a_k^2(a_k^2 - a_{k-1}a_{k+1}) > a_{k-1}^2(a_{k+1}^2 - a_k a_{k+2})$ for any $1 \leq k \leq n-1$. In order to prove the Briggs inequality for the sequence $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$, they established the strict ratio-log-convexity of $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$ for $\ell \geq 1$. As a consequence, the strict log-convexity of the sequence $\{\sqrt[n]{d_\ell(\ell+n)}\}_{n \geq 1}$ for $\ell \geq 1$ was also obtained.

In this paper, we mainly show that the transposed Boros-Moll sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$ possess the extended reverse ultra log-concavity property. A sequence $\{a_i\}_{i \geq k}$ is called extended ultra log-concave if $\{a_i/\binom{i}{k}\}_{i \geq k}$ is log-concave, and the extended reverse ultra log-concavity of the sequence $\{a_i\}_{i \geq k}$ is defined in a similar way of the reverse ultra log-concavity.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we first recall some known recurrence relations for $d_\ell(m)$ which will be applied in our proofs. In Section 3, we first prove the extended reverse ultra log-concavity of the transposed Boros-Moll sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$, and hence give an upper bound for the ratio $d_\ell^2(m)/(d_\ell(m-1)d_\ell(m+1))$. We further establish a lower bound for this ratio in Theorem 3.2, which implies an inequality stronger than the log-concavity of the sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$. As will be seen, the upper and lower bounds for $d_\ell^2(m)/(d_\ell(m-1)d_\ell(m+1))$ are very close to each other, it may be said that, in the asymptotic sense, the sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$ are just on the borderline between extended ultra log-concavity and extended reverse ultra log-concavity for any $\ell \geq 1$. Finally, we propose some conjectures on the Boros-Moll sequences and their transposes in Section 4.

2. THE RECURRENCES

Kauers and Paule [23] used a computer algebra system to derive the following recurrence relations for $d_\ell(m)$, which will be employed in our proofs. For $\ell \geq 0$ and $m \geq \ell$,

$$(2.1) \quad 4(m^2 + m)(m + 1 - \ell)d_\ell(m + 1) = 2m(8m^2 + 8m - 4\ell^2 + 3)d_\ell(m) \\ - (16m^2 - 1)(m + \ell)d_\ell(m - 1),$$

$$(2.2) \quad (m + 2 - \ell)(m + \ell - 1)d_{\ell-2}(m) = (2m + 1)(\ell - 1)d_{\ell-1}(m) - \ell(\ell - 1)d_\ell(m),$$

$$(2.3) \quad 2(m + 1)d_\ell(m + 1) = 2(m + \ell)d_{\ell-1}(m) + (4m + 2\ell + 3)d_\ell(m),$$

$$(2.4) \quad 2(m + 1)(m + 1 - \ell)d_\ell(m + 1) = (4m - 2\ell + 3)(m + \ell + 1)d_\ell(m) \\ - 2\ell(\ell + 1)d_{\ell+1}(m).$$

It should be mentioned that Moll [26] independently derived the relations (2.1) and (2.2) via the WZ-method [28]. As remarked by Chen and Xia [16, Sec. 2], the recursions (2.3) and (2.4) can be easily deduced from (2.1) and (2.2), moreover, (2.1) and (2.2) can be also derived from (2.3) and (2.4).

3. THE MAIN RESULTS

The objective of this section is to show the main result of this paper, the extended reverse ultra log-concavity of the transposed Boros-Moll sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$.

Theorem 3.1. *For each $\ell \geq 0$, the transposed Boros-Moll sequence $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$ is strictly extended reverse ultra log-concave. That is, for each $\ell \geq 1$ and $m \geq \ell + 1$, we have*

$$(3.1) \quad \left(\frac{d_\ell(m)}{\binom{m}{\ell}} \right)^2 < \left(\frac{d_\ell(m-1)}{\binom{m-1}{\ell}} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{d_\ell(m+1)}{\binom{m+1}{\ell}} \right)$$

or, equivalently,

$$(3.2) \quad \frac{d_\ell^2(m)}{d_\ell(m-1)d_\ell(m+1)} < \frac{(m-\ell+1)m}{(m-\ell)(m+1)}.$$

We further establish a lower bound for $d_\ell^2(m)/(d_\ell(m-1)d_\ell(m+1))$, which implies an inequality stronger than the log-concavity of the transposed Boros-Moll sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$.

Theorem 3.2. *For each $\ell \geq 0$ and $m \geq \ell + 1$, we have*

$$(3.3) \quad \frac{d_\ell^2(m)}{d_\ell(m-1)d_\ell(m+1)} > \frac{(m-\ell+1)m^3}{(m-\ell)(m+1)(m^2+1)}.$$

It is easily checked that for $\ell \geq 2$ and $m \geq \ell + 1$,

$$(3.4) \quad \frac{(m-\ell+1)m^3}{(m-\ell)(m+1)(m^2+1)} > \frac{m^2+1}{m^2}.$$

Consequently, we obtain the following relation from Theorem 3.2.

Corollary 3.3. *For each $\ell \geq 2$ and $m \geq \ell + 1$, we have*

$$\frac{d_\ell^2(m)}{d_\ell(m-1)d_\ell(m+1)} > \frac{m^2+1}{m^2}.$$

Clearly, Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 imply, respectively, that the transposed Boros-Moll sequence $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$ is strictly log-convex for $\ell = 0$ and is strictly log-concave for each $\ell \geq 1$. Besides, Corollary 3.3 establishes an inequality which is stronger than the log-concavity of the transposed Boros-Moll sequences.

Moreover, we obtain the following relation which implies that the transposed Boros-Moll sequences possess a stronger log-concave property than the Boros-Moll sequences do.

Proposition 3.4. *For $\ell \geq 1$ and $m \geq \ell + 1$, we have*

$$(3.5) \quad d_\ell^2(m) > d_\ell(m-1)d_\ell(m+1) > d_{\ell-1}(m)d_{\ell+1}(m).$$

Proof. Fixed $\ell \geq 1$ and $m \geq \ell + 1$. The first inequality in (3.5) was proved in [22, Theorem 3.1], which can also be derived from Theorem 3.2. Combining (3.2) and (1.7), it follows that

$$\frac{d_\ell^2(m)}{d_\ell(m-1)d_\ell(m+1)} < \frac{(m-\ell+1)m}{(m-\ell)(m+1)} < \frac{(m-\ell+1)(\ell+1)(m+\ell)}{(m-\ell)\ell(m+\ell+1)} < \frac{d_\ell^2(m)}{d_{\ell-1}(m)d_{\ell+1}(m)},$$

which yields the second inequality in (3.5). \square

3.1. A lower bound for $d_{\ell+1}(m)/d_\ell(m)$. In order to prove Theorem 3.1, we first establish a sufficiently sharp lower bound for the ratio $d_{\ell+1}(m)/d_\ell(m)$ which is stated in Theorem 3.5. For $\ell \geq 1$ and $m \geq \ell + 1$, set

$$(3.6) \quad W(\ell, m) = \frac{m(2m+1)(2\ell+3) - \sqrt{\Delta_1}}{4m(\ell^2 + \ell)},$$

where

$$(3.7) \quad \Delta_1 = 52m^4 + (64\ell^2 + 56)m^3 + (16\ell^4 + 36\ell^2 + 13)m^2 - 8\ell^2m - 4\ell^2.$$

Theorem 3.5. *Let $W(\ell, m)$ be given by (3.6). For integers $\ell \geq 1$ and $m \geq \ell + 1$, we have*

$$(3.8) \quad \frac{d_{\ell+1}(m)}{d_\ell(m)} > W(\ell, m).$$

Proof. Note that Theorem 3.5 is equivalent to the following statement. That is,

$$(3.9) \quad \frac{d_{\ell+1}(m)}{d_\ell(m)} > W(\ell, m),$$

for $m \geq 2$ and $1 \leq \ell \leq m - 1$. So, we aim to prove (3.9) by using induction on m . For $m = 2$ and $\ell = 1$, it is easy to check that

$$\frac{d_2(2)}{d_1(2)} - W(1, 2) = \frac{2}{5} - \frac{25 - 2\sqrt{127}}{8} = \frac{10\sqrt{127} - 109}{40} > 0.$$

Assume that (3.9) is true, that is, for $1 \leq \ell \leq m - 1$,

$$(3.10) \quad d_{\ell+1}(m) > W(\ell, m)d_\ell(m).$$

It suffices to prove that for $1 \leq \ell \leq m$,

$$(3.11) \quad d_{\ell+1}(m+1) > W(\ell, m+1)d_\ell(m+1).$$

For $\ell = m$, we have $d_{m+1}(m+1)/d_m(m+1) = 2/(2m+3)$, and

$$W(m, m+1) = \frac{4m^3 + 16m^2 + 21m + 9 - \sqrt{\omega}}{4m(m+1)^2},$$

where

$$\omega = 16m^6 + 96m^5 + 296m^4 + 520m^3 + 581m^2 + 402m + 121 > 0.$$

Direct computation gives that

$$\frac{d_{m+1}(m+1)}{d_m(m+1)} - W(m, m+1) = \frac{(2m+3)\sqrt{\omega} - (8m^4 + 36m^3 + 74m^2 + 73m + 27)}{4m(2m+3)(m+1)^2} > 0,$$

since $(2m+3)^2\omega - (8m^4 + 36m^3 + 74m^2 + 73m + 27)^2 = 4(4m+3)(4m+5)(m^2 + 6m + 6) > 0$. Thus, (3.11) holds for $\ell = m$.

It remains to show (3.11) for $1 \leq \ell \leq m - 1$. To this end, applying the recurrence relations (2.3) and (2.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\ell+1}(m+1) &= \frac{m+\ell+1}{m+1}d_{\ell}(m) + \frac{4m+2\ell+5}{2(m+1)}d_{\ell+1}(m), \\ d_{\ell}(m+1) &= \frac{(4m-2\ell+3)(m+\ell+1)}{2(m+1)(m+1-\ell)}d_{\ell}(m) - \frac{\ell(\ell+1)}{(m+1)(m+1-\ell)}d_{\ell+1}(m), \end{aligned}$$

for $1 \leq \ell \leq m - 1$. Then the inequality (3.11) can be rewritten as

$$(3.12) \quad P \cdot d_{\ell+1}(m) > Q \cdot d_{\ell}(m),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} P &= 8m^3 + 32m^2 + 43m - 4\ell^2m - 4\ell^2 + 19 - \sqrt{\Delta_2}, \\ Q &= \frac{(m+1+\ell)((m+1)F - (4m-2\ell+3)\sqrt{\Delta_2})}{2(\ell^2+\ell)}, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_2 &= 52m^4 + (64\ell^2 + 264)m^3 + (16\ell^4 + 228\ell^2 + 493)m^2 + (32\ell^4 + 256\ell^2 + 402)m \\ &\quad + 16\ell^4 + 88\ell^2 + 121, \\ F &= 16\ell m^2 + 24m^2 - 16\ell^2m + 16\ell m + 54m + 8\ell^3 - 12\ell^2 - 8\ell + 27. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\Delta_2 > 0$ and $F > 0$. Observe that $P > 0$, because for $1 \leq \ell \leq m - 1$, we have $8m^3 + 32m^2 + 43m - 4\ell^2m - 4\ell^2 + 19 > 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &(8m^3 + 32m^2 + 43m - 4\ell^2m - 4\ell^2 + 19)^2 - \Delta_2 \\ &= 64m^4(m^2 - \ell^2) + 128m^3(4m^2 - 3\ell^2) + 4m^2(415m^2 - 207\ell^2) + 8m(349m^2 - 94\ell^2) \\ &\quad + (2572m^2 - 240\ell^2) + 1232m + 240 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in view of (3.10) and (3.12), it is sufficient to show that for $1 \leq \ell \leq m - 1$,

$$(3.13) \quad P \cdot W(\ell, m) > Q.$$

With the aid of a computer, it is easy to check that

$$P \cdot W(\ell, m) - Q = \frac{G_1 + G_2\sqrt{\Delta_2} - (G_3 - \sqrt{\Delta_2})\sqrt{\Delta_1}}{4m(\ell^2 + \ell)},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G_1 &= (m^2 + m)(12m^2 + 24m - 16\ell^4 + 28\ell^2 + 3), \\ G_2 &= 8m^3 + 8m^2 - 4\ell^2m + 3m, \\ G_3 &= (m+1)(8m^2 + 24m - 4\ell^2 + 19). \end{aligned}$$

Observer that $G_3 > G_2 > 0$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq m - 1$. Moreover, $G_3 - \sqrt{\Delta_2} > 0$ since

$$G_3^2 - \Delta_2 = 4(4m+3)(4m+5)(m+2)^2(m+1+\ell)(m+1-\ell) > 0.$$

So we have $(G_3 - \sqrt{\Delta_2})\sqrt{\Delta_1} > 0$. To prove (3.13), we need to determine the sing of $G_1 + G_2\sqrt{\Delta_2}$.

Claim 3.6. *For $m \geq 2$ and $1 \leq \ell \leq m - 1$, we have $G_1 + G_2\sqrt{\Delta_2} > 0$.*

Since $G_1 = (m^2 + m)(12m^2 + 24m - 16\ell^4 + 28\ell^2 + 3)$, it is clear that for any given $\ell \geq 1$, $G_1 \geq 0$ for sufficiently large m . If $G_1 \geq 0$, then Claim 3.6 holds. We proceed to prove the case that $G_1 < 0$. In this case, we have $G_1 + G_2\sqrt{\Delta_2} = G_2\sqrt{\Delta_2} - |G_1|$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} G_2^2\Delta_2 - |G_1|^2 &= 4m^2(4m + 3)(4m + 5)(m + 1 + \ell)(m + 1 - \ell)(52m^4 + 64\ell^2m^3 + 160m^3 \\ &\quad + 16\ell^4m^2 + 100\ell^2m^2 + 161m^2 - 8\ell^2m + 80m - 32\ell^4 - 20\ell^2 + 18) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which leads to $G_1 + G_2\sqrt{\Delta_2} > 0$. Thus Claim 3.6 is proved.

We proceed to show

$$(3.14) \quad G_1 + G_2\sqrt{\Delta_2} > (G_3 - \sqrt{\Delta_2})\sqrt{\Delta_1}.$$

In order to do so, we derive that

$$(G_1 + G_2\sqrt{\Delta_2})^2 - (G_3 - \sqrt{\Delta_2})^2\Delta_1 = -H_1 + H_2\sqrt{\Delta_2},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &= 8(m + 1)^2(832m^7 + 1536\ell^2m^6 + 4576m^6 + 512\ell^4m^5 + 7104\ell^2m^5 + 9556m^5 \\ &\quad + 1792\ell^4m^4 + 11648\ell^2m^4 + 9358m^4 + 2048\ell^4m^3 + 7588\ell^2m^3 + 4192m^3 \\ &\quad + 800\ell^4m^2 + 770\ell^2m^2 + 646m^2 - 32\ell^6m + 120\ell^4m - 1018\ell^2m \\ &\quad - 16\ell^6 + 32\ell^4 - 241\ell^2), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} H_2 &= 8(m + 1)(128m^6 + 128\ell^2m^5 + 496m^5 + 448\ell^2m^4 + 672m^4 + 480\ell^2m^3 + 368m^3 \\ &\quad + 120\ell^2m^2 + 64m^2 + 8\ell^4m - 62\ell^2m + 4\ell^4 - 19\ell^2). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $H_1 > 0$ and $H_2 > 0$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq m - 1$. In view of

$$\begin{aligned} H_2^2\Delta_2 - H_1^2 &= 256(m + 1)^2(4m + 3)^2(4m + 5)^2((m + 1)^2 - \ell^2)^2(156m^8 + 192\ell^2m^7 \\ &\quad + 636m^7 + 816\ell^2m^6 + 891m^6 + 256\ell^4m^5 + 1256\ell^2m^5 + 498m^5 \\ &\quad + 64\ell^6m^4 + 720\ell^4m^4 + 812\ell^2m^4 + 87m^4 + 128\ell^6m^3 + 576\ell^4m^3 \\ &\quad + 208\ell^2m^3 + 48\ell^6m^2 + 88\ell^4m^2 + 19\ell^2m^2 - 64\ell^4m - 16\ell^4) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

we deduce that $H_2\sqrt{\Delta_2} - H_1 > 0$, which leads to (3.14), as well as (3.13), for $1 \leq \ell \leq m - 1$. This completes the proof. \square

3.2. Proof of Theorem 3.1. We are now in a position to prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Applying the recurrence relations (2.1) and (2.4), the inequality (3.2) can be rewritten as

$$(3.15) \quad A \left(\frac{d_{\ell+1}(m)}{d_\ell(m)} \right)^2 + B \left(\frac{d_{\ell+1}(m)}{d_\ell(m)} \right) + C < 0, \quad m \geq \ell + 1,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A &= 4m^2\ell^2(\ell + 1)^2, \\ B &= -2m^2(2m + 1)\ell(\ell + 1)(2\ell + 3), \\ C &= (m - \ell)[4(\ell^2 + 3\ell - 1)m^3 + (4\ell^3 + 8\ell - 5)m^2 - (2\ell + 1)m - \ell]. \end{aligned}$$

The discriminant of the above quadratic function on $d_{\ell+1}(m)/d_\ell(m)$ is

$$\Delta = 4m^2\ell^2(\ell + 1)^2\Delta_1,$$

where Δ_1 is given by (3.7). Clearly, $\Delta_1 > 0$, and hence $\Delta > 0$ for $\ell \geq 1$ and $m \geq \ell + 1$. Thus, the quadratic function in (3.15) has two distinct zeros, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= \frac{m(2m + 1)(2\ell + 3) - \sqrt{\Delta_1}}{4m(\ell^2 + \ell)}, \\ x_2 &= \frac{m(2m + 1)(2\ell + 3) + \sqrt{\Delta_1}}{4m(\ell^2 + \ell)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $A > 0$, it suffices to prove that for $\ell \geq 1$ and $m \geq \ell + 1$,

$$(3.16) \quad x_1 < \frac{d_{\ell+1}(m)}{d_\ell(m)} < x_2.$$

By Chen and Xia [16, Lemma 3.1], for $\ell \geq 1$ and $m \geq \ell + 1$,

$$(3.17) \quad \frac{d_{\ell+1}(m)}{d_\ell(m)} < \frac{m - \ell}{\ell + 1}.$$

It is easy to check that

$$\frac{m - \ell}{\ell + 1} - x_2 = -\frac{m(4\ell^2 + 2\ell + 6m + 3) + \sqrt{\Delta_1}}{4m(\ell^2 + \ell)} < 0,$$

which leads to $d_{\ell+1}(m)/d_\ell(m) < x_2$ for $\ell \geq 1$ and $m \geq \ell + 1$. It remains to show that for $\ell \geq 1$ and $m \geq \ell + 1$,

$$(3.18) \quad \frac{d_{\ell+1}(m)}{d_\ell(m)} > x_1,$$

which is obtained in Theorem 3.5. This completes the proof. \square

3.3. Proof of Theorem 3.2. The goal of this part is to complete the proof of Theorem 3.2, the lower bound for $d_\ell^2(m)/(d_\ell(m-1)d_\ell(m+1))$.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Fix $\ell \geq 0$. Applying the recurrence relations (2.1), the inequality (3.3) can be rewritten as

$$(3.19) \quad \mathcal{A} \left(\frac{d_\ell(m+1)}{d_\ell(m)} \right)^2 + \mathcal{B} \left(\frac{d_\ell(m+1)}{d_\ell(m)} \right) + \mathcal{C} > 0, \quad m \geq \ell + 1,$$

where

$$\mathcal{A} = 4m^4(m + 1 - \ell)^2(m + 1),$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B} &= -2m^4(m+1-\ell)(8m^2+8m-4\ell^2+3), \\ \mathcal{C} &= (16m^2-1)(m+1)(m^2+1)(m^2-\ell^2).\end{aligned}$$

The discriminant of the above quadratic function on $d_\ell(m+1)/d_\ell(m)$ is

$$\Delta = 4m^4(m+1-\ell)^2 \cdot f_\ell(m),$$

where

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{aligned}f_\ell(m) &= -12m^6 + (64\ell^2 - 72)m^5 + (16\ell^4 + 100\ell^2 - 47)m^4 + (120\ell^2 + 8)m^3 \\ &\quad + (56\ell^2 + 4)m^2 - 8\ell^2m - 4\ell^2.\end{aligned}$$

We aim to prove (3.19). For this purpose, we need to determine the sign of Δ first. For $\ell = 0$, we have

$$f_0(m) = -m^2[(m-1)(12m^3 + 84m^2 + 131m + 123) + 119] < 0$$

for $m \geq 1$. Thus $\Delta < 0$ for $\ell = 0$ and $m \geq 1$. So (3.19) is proved for $\ell = 0$, since $\mathcal{A} > 0$.

We proceed to prove (3.19) for $\ell \geq 1$. Given $\ell \geq 1$, observe that the number of sign changes of the coefficients sequence of $f_\ell(m)$ is 2. Thus by Descartes' rule of signs, the polynomial $f_\ell(m)$ has at most two positive zeros. In view of the fact that $f_\ell(0) = -4\ell^2 < 0$, $f_\ell(1) = 16\ell^4 + 328\ell^2 - 119 > 0$ and $f_\ell(+\infty) = -\infty$, the polynomial $f_\ell(m)$ has only two positive zeros, denoted by $r_1(\ell)$ and $r_2(\ell)$, where $0 < r_1(\ell) < 1 < r_2(\ell) < +\infty$.

Clearly, $f_\ell(\ell+1) = 16\ell^8 + 128\ell^7 + 504\ell^6 + 1080\ell^5 + 1085\ell^4 + 44\ell^3 - 826\ell^2 - 588\ell - 119 > 0$ for any integer $\ell \geq 1$. Thus, $r_2(\ell) > \ell + 1$. Then we shall discuss in two cases.

Case 1. $m > \lfloor r_2(\ell) \rfloor \geq \ell + 1$. In this case, we have $f_\ell(m) < 0$, and hence $\Delta < 0$, which yields (3.19) since $\mathcal{A} > 0$.

Case 2. $r_1(\ell) < \ell + 1 \leq m \leq \lfloor r_2(\ell) \rfloor$. In this case, we have $f_\ell(m) \geq 0$, and hence $\Delta \geq 0$. Thus, the quadratic function in (3.19) has two zeros, that is,

$$\begin{aligned}x_\ell(m) &= \frac{m^2(8m^2 + 8m - 4\ell^2 + 3) - \sqrt{f_\ell(m)}}{4m^2(m+1)(m+1-\ell)}, \\ y_\ell(m) &= \frac{m^2(8m^2 + 8m - 4\ell^2 + 3) + \sqrt{f_\ell(m)}}{4m^2(m+1)(m+1-\ell)}.\end{aligned}$$

To prove (3.19) for $\ell \geq 1$, we have the following claim.

Claim 3.7. *For $\ell \geq 1$ and $\ell + 1 \leq m \leq \lfloor r_2(\ell) \rfloor$, we have*

$$(3.21) \quad \frac{d_\ell(m+1)}{d_\ell(m)} > y_\ell(m).$$

Note that Zhao [30, Theorem 2.1] obtained a lower bound for $d_\ell(m+1)/d_\ell(m)$. That is, for any $m \geq 2$ and $1 \leq \ell \leq m-1$,

$$(3.22) \quad \frac{d_\ell(m+1)}{d_\ell(m)} > U(\ell, m),$$

where

$$(3.23) \quad U(\ell, m) = \frac{(4m^2 + 7m - 2\ell^2 + 3)(m + \ell^2) + \ell\sqrt{\lambda_\ell(m)}}{2(m+1)(m-\ell+1)(m+\ell^2)},$$

with

$$(3.24) \quad \lambda_\ell(m) = (m + \ell^2)(4\ell^4 + 8\ell^2m + 5\ell^2 + m).$$

Clearly, we have (3.22) holds for $\ell \geq 1$ and $m \geq \ell + 1$. Then it is sufficient to show that for $\ell \geq 1$ and $\ell + 1 \leq m \leq \lfloor r_2(\ell) \rfloor$,

$$(3.25) \quad U(\ell, m) \geq y_\ell(m).$$

We proceed to prove (3.25). By a simple computation, we have

$$U(\ell, m) - y_\ell(m) = \frac{K_1 + K_2\sqrt{\lambda_\ell(m)} - K_3\sqrt{f_\ell(m)}}{4m^2(m+1)(m-\ell+1)(m+\ell^2)},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &= 3m^2(2m+1)(m+\ell^2), \\ K_2 &= 2\ell m^2, \\ K_3 &= m + \ell^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it remains to show

$$(3.26) \quad K_1 + K_2\sqrt{\lambda_\ell(m)} - K_3\sqrt{f_\ell(m)} \geq 0.$$

Note that $K_1, K_2, K_3 > 0$ for $\ell \geq 1$ and $m \geq \ell + 1$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(K_1 + K_2\sqrt{\lambda_\ell(m)} \right)^2 - \left(K_3\sqrt{f_\ell(m)} \right)^2 \\ &= 4(m + \ell^2) \left(m^2M_1 + (2\ell^4 + \ell^2)m + \ell^4 + 3\ell m^4(2m + 1)\sqrt{\lambda_\ell(m)} - m^2M_2 \right) \\ &> 4m^2(m + \ell^2) \left(M_1 + 3\ell m^2(2m + 1)\sqrt{\lambda_\ell(m)} - M_2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 &= 12m^5 + 27m^4 + (3\ell^2 + 14)m^3 + \ell^2, \\ M_2 &= 4\ell^2m^4 + 12\ell^4m^3 + (20\ell^4 + 16\ell^2 + 2)m^2 + (30\ell^4 + 16\ell^2 + 1)m + 14\ell^4. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, $M_1, M_2 > 0$ for $\ell \geq 1$ and $m \geq \ell + 1$. We proceed to prove

$$M_1 + 3\ell m^2(2m + 1)\sqrt{\lambda_\ell(m)} - M_2 > 0.$$

To this end, we derive that

$$\left(M_1 + 3\ell m^2(2m + 1)\sqrt{\lambda_\ell(m)} \right)^2 - M_2^2 = S_\ell(m) + T_\ell(m)\sqrt{\lambda_\ell(m)},$$

where

$$S_\ell(m) = 144m^{10} + 648m^9 + (272\ell^4 + 108\ell^2 + 1065)m^8 + (336\ell^6 + 504\ell^4 + 198\ell^2 + 756)m^7$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + (452\ell^6 + 169\ell^4 + 77\ell^2 + 196)m^6 - (336\ell^8 + 336\ell^6 + 122\ell^4 - 16\ell^2)m^5 \\
& - (1084\ell^8 + 1091\ell^6 + 360\ell^4 + 10\ell^2 + 4)m^4 - (1536\ell^8 + 1600\ell^6 + 666\ell^4 \\
& + 68\ell^2 + 4)m^3 - (1460\ell^8 + 1408\ell^6 + 372\ell^4 + 32\ell^2 + 1)m^2 \\
& - (840\ell^8 + 448\ell^6 + 28\ell^4)m - (196\ell^8 - \ell^4),
\end{aligned}$$

$$T_\ell(m) = 6\ell m^2(2m + 1)(12m^5 + 27m^4 + (3\ell^2 + 14)m^3 + \ell^2).$$

Observe that $T_\ell(m) > 0$. We claim that $S_\ell(m) > 0$ for $\ell \geq 1$ and $m \geq \ell + 1$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
S_\ell(\ell) = & -\ell^2(360\ell^{10} + 1368\ell^9 + 2130\ell^8 + 1716\ell^7 + 822\ell^6 + 342\ell^5 + 186\ell^4 + 96\ell^3 \\
& + 35\ell^2 + 4\ell + 1) < 0,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
S_\ell(\ell + 1) = & 312\ell^{12} + 2880\ell^{11} + 11402\ell^{10} + 26950\ell^9 + 48379\ell^8 + 84450\ell^7 + 146585\ell^6 \\
& + 211096\ell^5 + 223433\ell^4 + 164196\ell^3 + 78696\ell^2 + 22230\ell + 2800 > 0,
\end{aligned}$$

for $\ell \geq 1$. Thus there exists a real $x_0 \in (\ell, \ell + 1)$ such that $S_\ell(x_0) = 0$ for any $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$. It is clear that the number of sign changes of the coefficients sequence of $S_\ell(m)$ is one for $\ell \geq 1$. Therefore, by Descartes' rule of signs, the polynomial $S_\ell(m)$ has only one positive zero x_0 for $\ell \geq 1$. It follows that $S_\ell(m) > 0$ for $\ell \geq 1$ and $m \geq \ell + 1$. So, we have

$$S_\ell(m) + T_\ell(m)\sqrt{\lambda_\ell(m)} > 0$$

for $\ell \geq 1$ and $m \geq \ell + 1$, which leads to (3.26), and hence (3.25) is proved. \square

Recall that (1.6) and (1.7) give two bounds for $d_\ell^2(m)/(d_{\ell-1}(m)d_{\ell+1}(m))$ which were established by Chen and Gu [11, Theorems 1.1 & 1.2] while studying the reverse ultra log-concavity of the Boros-Moll polynomials. The distance between these two bounds is

$$D_1 = \frac{(m - \ell + 1)(\ell + 1)}{(m - \ell)\ell(m + \ell + 1)}.$$

These two bounds are very close to each other since D_1 is very small. As mentioned by Chen and Gu [11], in the asymptotic sense, the Boros-Moll sequences are just on the borderline between ultra log-concavity and reverse ultra log-concavity.

Also notice that the distance between the upper and lower bounds for $d_\ell^2(m)/(d_\ell(m - 1)d_\ell(m + 1))$ provided by Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, respectively, is

$$D_2 = \frac{(m - \ell + 1)m}{(m - \ell)(m + 1)(m^2 + 1)}.$$

Clearly, for any given $\ell \geq 1$, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} D_2/m^{-2} = 1$, which implies that D_2 is very small. It means that the two bounds given in Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 are very sharp. Therefore, in the asymptotic sense, we may say that the transposed Boros-Moll sequences are just on the borderline between extended ultra log-concavity and extended reverse ultra log-concavity.

4. SOME CONJECTURES

To conclude this paper, we propose some conjectures related to the Boros-Moll sequences and their transposes.

Motivated by Boros and Moll's ∞ -log-concavity conjecture, we first propose a conjecture on the ∞ -log-concavity of the transposed Boros-Moll sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$. Note that the sequences $\{d_0(m)\}_{m \geq 0}$ and $\mathcal{L}(\{d_1(m)\}_{m \geq 1})$ were proved to be log-convex by Jiang and Wang [22]. For $\ell = 2$, it is easily checked with a computer that the sequence $\mathcal{L}^5(\{d_2(m)\}_{m \geq 2})$ got many negative terms, which implies that the sequence $\{d_2(m)\}_{m \geq 2}$ is not 5-log-concave. However, for $\ell \geq 3$, numerical computation reveals that the beginning terms of the sequences $\mathcal{L}^j(\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell})$ are positive and increase very fast, which suggests the following conjecture.

Conjecture 4.1. *The transposed Boros-Moll sequences $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$ are ∞ -strictly-log-concave for any $\ell \geq 3$.*

The next two conjectures are on log-concavity and extended reverse ultra log-concavity of the sequences $\{d_\ell(m-1)d_\ell(m+1)/d_\ell^2(m)\}_{m \geq \ell+1}$.

Conjecture 4.2. *For each $\ell \geq 1$, the sequence $\{d_\ell(m-1)d_\ell(m+1)/d_\ell^2(m)\}_{m \geq \ell+1}$ is log-concave.*

Conjecture 4.3. *For each $\ell \geq 0$, the sequence $\{d_\ell(m-1)d_\ell(m+1)/d_\ell^2(m)\}_{m \geq \ell+1}$ is extended reverse ultra log-concave.*

Numerical experiments suggest that the ratio sequence $\{d_\ell(m)/d_{\ell-1}(m)\}_{1 \leq \ell \leq m}$ is neither log-concave nor log-convex. This sequence may have a distinctive log-behavior with half log-convex and half log-concave.

Conjecture 4.4. *For $m \geq 3$, the sequence $\{d_\ell(m)/d_{\ell-1}(m)\}_{1 \leq \ell \leq \lfloor m/2 \rfloor + 1}$ is log-convex, and the sequence $\{d_\ell(m)/d_{\ell-1}(m)\}_{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor \leq \ell \leq m}$ is log-concave. That is,*

$$(4.1) \quad \left(\frac{d_\ell(m)}{d_{\ell-1}(m)} \right)^2 < \left(\frac{d_{\ell-1}(m)}{d_{\ell-2}(m)} \right) \left(\frac{d_{\ell+1}(m)}{d_\ell(m)} \right)$$

holds for $2 \leq \ell \leq \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$, and the inequalities in (4.1) reverse for $\lfloor m/2 \rfloor + 1 \leq \ell \leq m-1$.

Clearly, Conjecture 4.4 is equivalent to that $r_\ell(m) < 1$ for $2 \leq \ell \leq \lfloor m/2 \rfloor$ and $r_\ell(m) > 1$ for $\lfloor m/2 \rfloor + 1 \leq \ell \leq m-1$, where

$$(4.2) \quad r_\ell(m) = \frac{d_\ell^3(m)d_{\ell-2}(m)}{d_{\ell-1}^3(m)d_{\ell+1}(m)}.$$

We have verified Conjecture 4.4 for $3 \leq m \leq 200$. For example, $\{r_\ell(9)\}_{2 \leq \ell \leq 8}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} r_2(9) &= \frac{60275815334620606439322}{78173355142115765635889}, & r_3(9) &= \frac{122118613523526671413768}{133528261319822227027923}, \\ r_4(9) &= \frac{135495563425805832093}{139776208550739676384}, & r_5(9) &= \frac{2512968603767684}{2503881674347833}, \end{aligned}$$

$$r_6(9) = \frac{3844942434909}{3698150303624}, \quad r_7(9) = \frac{2672864807424}{2420889681239}, \quad r_8(9) = \frac{3879265207}{2951578112}.$$

We see that

$$r_2(9) < 1, \quad r_3(9) < 1, \quad r_4(9) < 1, \quad r_5(9) > 1, \quad r_6(9) > 1, \quad r_7(9) > 1, \quad r_8(9) > 1.$$

Chen, Guo and Wang [12] introduced the notion of *infinitely log-monotonic*. For a sequence $\{a_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ of real numbers, define an operator \mathcal{R} by $\mathcal{R}\{a_i\}_{i \geq 0} = \{b_i\}_{i \geq 0}$, where $b_i = a_{i+1}/a_i$ for $i \geq 0$. A sequence $\{a_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ is called log-monotonic of order k if for j odd and not exceeds $k - 1$, the sequence $\mathcal{R}^j\{a_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ is log-concave and for j even and not exceeds $k - 1$, the sequence $\mathcal{R}^j\{a_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ is log-convex. A sequence $\{a_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ is called *infinitely log-monotonic* if it is log-monotonic of order k for all integers $k \geq 1$. By applying the log-behavior of the Riemann zeta function and the gamma function, Chen *et al.* [12] also showed the infinite log-monotonicity of the Bernoulli numbers, the Catalan numbers and the central binomial coefficients.

The transposed Boros-Moll sequence $\{d_0(m)\}_{m \geq 0}$ was proved to be log-convex in [22, Theorem 3.1] and is easily checked to be ratio log-concave, and hence is log-monotonic of order 2. Further numerical experiments suggests the following conjecture.

Conjecture 4.5. *The transposed Boros-Moll sequence $\{d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$ is infinitely log-monotonic for $\ell = 0$. The sequence $\{d_\ell(m+1)/d_\ell(m)\}_{m \geq \ell}$ is infinite log-monotonic for each $\ell \geq 1$.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Arthur L. B. Yang for valuable suggestion and comments for previous version.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Alvarez, M. Amadis, G. Boros, D. Karp, V.H. Moll, and L. Rosales, An extension of a criterion for unimodality, *Electron. J. Combin.* 8(1) (2001), # R30.
- [2] T. Amdeberhan, and V.H. Moll, A formula for a quartic integral: a survey of old proofs and some new ones, *Ramanujan J.* 18(1) (2009), 91–102.
- [3] G. Boros and V.H. Moll, An integral hidden in Gradshteyn and Ryzhik, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 106(2) (1999) 361–368.
- [4] G. Boros and V.H. Moll, A sequence of unimodal polynomials, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 237(1) (1999) 272–287.
- [5] G. Boros and V.H. Moll, A criterion for unimodality, *Electron. J. Combin.* 6 (1999) R10.
- [6] G. Boros and V.H. Moll, The double square root, Jacobi polynomials and Ramanujan’s master theorem, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 130(1-2) (2001) 337–344.
- [7] G. Boros and V.H. Moll, *Irresistible integrals*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [8] P. Brändén, Iterated sequences and the geometry of zeros, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 658 (2011) 115–131.
- [9] F. Brenti, Unimodal, log-concave, and Pólya frequency sequences in combinatorics, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 413 (1989), 1–106.
- [10] W.Y.C. Chen, D.Q.J. Dou, and A.L.B. Yang, Brändén’s conjectures on the Boros-Moll polynomials, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 20 (2013), 4819–4828.

- [11] W.Y.C. Chen and C.C.Y. Gu, The reverse ultra log-concavity of the Boros-Moll polynomials, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 137(12) (2009), 3991–3998.
- [12] W.Y.C. Chen, J.J.F. Guo, and L.X.W. Wang, Infinitely log-monotonic combinatorial sequences, *Adv. in Appl. Math.* 52 (2014), 99–120.
- [13] W.Y.C. Chen, S.X.M. Pang and E.X.Y. Qu, On the combinatorics of the Boros–Moll polynomials, *Ramanujan J.* 21 (2010) 41–51.
- [14] W.Y.C. Chen, S.X.M. Pang, and E.X.Y. Qu, Partially 2-colored permutations and the Boros–Moll polynomials, *Ramanujan J.* 27 (2012) 297–304.
- [15] W.Y.C. Chen, L.X.W. Wang, and E.X.W. Xia, Interlacing log-concavity of the Boros-Moll polynomials, *Pacific J. Math.* 254 (2011), no. 1, 89–99.
- [16] W.Y.C. Chen and E.X.W. Xia, The ratio monotonicity of the Boros-Moll polynomials, *Math. Comp.* 78(268) (2009), 2269–2282.
- [17] W.Y.C. Chen and E.X.W. Xia, 2-log-concavity of the Boros-Moll polynomials, *Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc.* (2) 56 (2013), no. 3, 701–722.
- [18] J.J.F. Guo, An inequality for coefficients of the real-rooted polynomials, *J. Number Theory* 225 (2021), 294–309.
- [19] J.J.F. Guo, Higher order Turán inequalities for Boros-Moll sequences, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 150(8) (2022), 3323–3333.
- [20] H. Han and S. Seo, Combinatorial proofs of inverse relations and log-concavity for Bessel numbers, *European J. Combin.* 29 (2008), 1544–1554.
- [21] Q.-H. Hou and G. Li, Log-concavity of P -recursive sequences, *J. Symbolic Comput.* 107 (2021), 251–268.
- [22] J.Z.X. Jiang and L.X.W. Wang, Properties arising from Laguerre-Pólya class for the Boros-Moll numbers, *Adv. in Appl. Math.* 154 (2024), 102637.
- [23] M. Kauers and P. Paule, A computer proof of Moll’s log-concavity conjecture, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 135(12) (2007), 3847–3856.
- [24] T.M. Liggett, Ultra logconcave sequences and negative dependence, *J. Combin. Theory. Ser. A* 79 (1997), 315–325.
- [25] V.H. Moll, The evaluation of integrals: a personal story, *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.* 49(3) (2002), 311–317.
- [26] V.H. Moll, Combinatorial sequences arising from a rational integral, *Online J. Anal. Comb.* No. 2 (2007), Art. 4, 17 pp.
- [27] R.P. Stanley, Log-concave and unimodal sequences in algebra, combinatorics, and geometry, in *Graph Theory and Its Applications: East and West*, *Ann. New York Acad. Sci.* 576 (1989), 500–535.
- [28] H.S. Wilf and D. Zeilberger, An algorithmic proof theory for hypergeometric (ordinary and q) multisum/integral identities, *Invent. Math.* 108 (1992), 575–633.
- [29] Z.-X. Zhang, J.J.Y. Zhao, The Briggs inequality of Boros-Moll sequences, submitted, 2024.
- [30] J.J.Y. Zhao, A simple proof of higher order Turán inequalities for Boros-Moll sequences, *Results Math.* 78 (2023), no. 126.

SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTING, GUANGZHOU COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY AND BUSINESS, FOSHAN 528138, P.R. CHINA.

Email address: zhao@gzgs.edu.cn