## Comment on "Which is greater:  $e^{\pi}$  or  $\pi^e$ ? An unorthodox physical solution to a classic puzzle"

Roderick M. Macrae<sup>\*1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Chemistry, Marian University, Indianapolis, Indiana 46222-1997

July 16, 2024

In a recent Note[[1](#page-3-0)], Vallejo and Bove provide a physical argument based nominally on the second law of thermodynamics as a way of resolving the mathematical question appearing in the title. A remarkable aspect of their argument is that it does not depend on the numerical value of  $\pi$ , because  $e^x \geq x^e$  for all positive x, with equality occurring only when  $x = e$ . Moreover, their argument does not depend on the validity of the second law but is rather a limited proof of it for this particular case.

Their argument is based on a scenario in which an incompressible solid body A with constant heat capacity C at initial temperature  $T_1 = \pi$  in the units of some absolute temperature scale is placed in contact with an ideal reservoir B at initial temperature  $T_2 = e$  in the same units. The system evolves irreversibly to equilibrium at the temperature of the reservoir. In these units  $\Delta S_A = C(1 - \ln \pi)$  and  $\Delta S_B = C(\pi/e - 1)$ , leading to an overall entropy change  $\Delta S = C (\pi/e - \ln \pi)$ . Invoking the second law  $\Delta S > 0$  for an irreversible process, the authors obtain  $\pi > \ln \pi^e$  and thus  $e^{\pi} \geq \pi^e$ .

The argument appears to depend on the value of e through  $\ln e = 1$  as one of the steps in obtaining  $\Delta S_A$  (the more general case is discussed below), but does not make use of the numerical value of  $\pi$ , for example by determining the direction of heat flow through its relation with e. Thus, the argument and consequently the result must be independent of the value of  $\pi$  provided it is real and positive. This comment investigates this situation more fully.

Stepping back for a moment from the authors' specific choice of temperature scale but following the same

<sup>\*</sup>ORCiD: 0000-0002-9083-2518

arguments, the more general expression for the overall entropy change can be shown to be

<span id="page-1-0"></span>
$$
\Delta S = C \left( \ln T_2 - \ln T_1 + \frac{T_1}{T_2} - 1 \right),
$$
\n(1)

where the first two terms represent  $\Delta S_A$  and the last two  $\Delta S_B$ . Letting T<sub>2</sub>/T<sub>1</sub> equal x > 0 (both are absolute temperatures), we may rewrite this as

<span id="page-1-2"></span>
$$
\Delta S = C \left( \ln x + \frac{1}{x} - 1 \right), \tag{2}
$$

where the variable part can easily be shown to have a single minimum of zero occurring at  $x = 1$ , and a positive second derivative. This can be interpreted to imply that *heat flow between two bodies at different temperatures is always accompanied by an increase in total entropy*, and is, in slightly different form, an argument commonly found in thermodynamics for entropy increase as an indicator of the direction of spontaneous change[[2](#page-3-1)]. In this particular case the entropy change is positive quite independent of the direction of heat flow, that is, of whether the reservoir is hotter or cooler than the body.

The choice by the authors of the rather special unit system in which  $T_2 = e$  allows eqn. [1](#page-1-0) to be rewritten in the form

<span id="page-1-1"></span>
$$
\Delta S = C \left( \frac{T_1}{e} - \ln T_1 \right), \tag{3}
$$

because the second term in eqn. [1](#page-1-0), which equals 1 in these units, cancels with the fourth term, which is equal to 1 in any units. As a restriction of eqn. [1](#page-1-0) to a particular unit scale, eqn. [3](#page-1-1) inherits its qualitative behavior and is  $\geq 0$  for all values of T<sub>1</sub>, whether greater than or less than e. The case T<sub>1</sub> =  $\pi$  is a rather arbitrary special case. Vallejo and Bove note the more general inequality in their equation 7.

While the above arguments show that the numerical value of  $\pi$  is not important in this case, the numerical value of Euler's number *e* is critical, as the function  $f(x) = a^x - x^a$  is uniformly non-negative over  $(0, \infty)$ *only* for  $a = e$ . For  $a > 1$ ,  $f(x)$  has in general two roots and is negative between them, while for  $0 < a \le 1$ there is only one root, lying in the same interval, and approaching zero from above as  $a \rightarrow 0$ . The solutions to  $f(x) = 0$  take the form

$$
x = -aW(-\ln(a)/a)/\ln(a), \tag{4}
$$

where W is the Lambert W-function. The behavior of the roots of  $f(x)$  is a consequence of the two-valued nature of W(x) over  $-1/e < x < 0$ . In this region the branch with values greater than -1 is known as the principal branch and typically denoted  $W_0(x)$ , while the secondary (lower) branch is usually denoted  $W_{-1}(x)[3, 4]$  $W_{-1}(x)[3, 4]$  $W_{-1}(x)[3, 4]$  $W_{-1}(x)[3, 4]$  $W_{-1}(x)[3, 4]$ . Figure [1](#page-2-0) shows the dependence on a of the roots of  $f(x)$  in the vicinity of  $a = e$ .

<span id="page-2-0"></span>

Figure 1: Roots of  $f(x) = a^x - x^a$  showing the branches originating from  $W_0(x)$  and  $W_{-1}(x)$ . The branches coincide at  $a = e$ .

Following on from the arguments of Vallejo and Bove, equation [2](#page-1-2), when coupled with the second law, might be taken as a "proof" that  $1 - 1/x$  is a lower bound for  $ln(x)$ , as is well known. However, the inequality follows straightforwardly from the analytical properties of the function, and the second law need never be invoked. Rather, the inequality acts as a demonstration that the second law is valid for this model system.

Interest in thermodynamic "proofs" of mathematical inequalities appears to have begun with Landsberg's short, citation-free article applying the first and second laws to n identical heat reservoirs initially at different temperatures to affirm the inequality between the arithmetic and geometric means [[5](#page-4-1)]. As noted in a brief historical article by Deakin[[6](#page-4-2)], however, the argument dates back to P. G. Tait in 1868[[7](#page-4-3)], and was used as an exercise in Sommerfeld's book on thermodynamics and statistical mechanics [[8](#page-4-4)]; by 1980 Landsberg had become aware of Sommerfeld's work [[9](#page-4-5)]. A collection by Tykodi of similar inequalities supported by model systems was published in this journal in 1996[[10](#page-4-6)], and a demonstration by Plastino *et al.* of thermodynamic support for Jensen's inequality, of which the inequality of the arithmetic and

geometric means is a consequence, was published the following year[[11](#page-4-7)]. Over time, the framing of these examples has shifted, noting that they are not strictly "proofs" [[6](#page-4-2)], and are more correctly characterized as demonstrating mathematical inequalities[[10](#page-4-6)].

A recent article in this journal by Johal[[12](#page-4-8)] returns to the source from which Tait built his original observation, namely a paper by William Thomson (Lord Kelvin) on the extraction of all available work from an unequally heated space by means of a heat engine[[13](#page-4-9)]. Tait updated and discretized Thomson's result to determine that for a set of identical masses, the final temperature after such a process is the geometric mean of their initial temperatures, while the temperature achieved by thermal equilibration is the higher arithmetic mean[[7](#page-4-3)]. Limiting consideration to two masses for simplicity, Johal notes that a more edifying interpretation of the thermalization process can be obtained by dividing it into two steps: a reversible one in which all available work is extracted until the bodies are at the same temperature (the geometric mean of their original temperatures), and a second one in which the same quantity of energy is returned as heat and the bodies are warmed to the arithmetic mean of their original temperatures. The input of heat in this second step is a useful pedagogical illustration that the final entropy of the system must be higher in accordance with the second law. Similar arguments were made previously by  $Pyun[14]$  $Pyun[14]$  $Pyun[14]$  and Leff[[15](#page-4-11)]. All such arguments depend on the positivity of the heat capacity of material bodies, which may not be universally valid [[16](#page-4-12)]. An additional point made by Leff and worth reiterating here is that although the second law in the form of entropy increase is demonstrated rather than assumed by Vallejo and Bove, it is a central requirement of their example that temperature equilibration - one of the observed macroscopic phenomena leading to the invention of the entropy concept - takes place.

## **References**

- <span id="page-3-0"></span>[1] Andrés Vallejo and Italo Bove. Which is greater:  $e^{\pi}$  or  $\pi^{e}$ ? An unorthodox physical solution to a classic puzzle. *American Journal of Physics*, 92(5):397–398, May 2024. doi: 10.1119/5.0188912.
- <span id="page-3-1"></span>[2] Donald A. McQuarrie and John D. Simon. *Physical chemistry : a molecular approach*. University Science Books, Sausalito, Calif., 1997. ISBN 9780935702996. (p. 826).
- <span id="page-3-2"></span>[3] Eric W. Weisstein. Lambert W-Function, Copyright 1999-2023 Wolfram Research, Inc. URL [https:](https://mathworld.wolfram.com/) [//mathworld.wolfram.com/](https://mathworld.wolfram.com/). Last visited 2024-05-30.
- <span id="page-4-0"></span>[4] R. M. Corless, G. H. Gonnet, D. E. G. Hare, D. J. Jeffrey, and D. E. Knuth. On the Lambert W function. *Advances in Computational Mathematics*, 5(1):329–359, December 1996. doi: 10.1007/BF02124750.
- <span id="page-4-1"></span>[5] P. T. Landsberg. A thermodynamic proof of the inequality between arithmetic and geometric mean. *Physics Letters A*, 67(1):1, 1978. ISSN 0375-9601. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/0375-9601(78)90548-0.
- <span id="page-4-2"></span>[6] Michael A. B. Deakin. Thermodynamic proofs and their history. *Mathematical Gazette*, pages 92 – 94, 1999. ISSN 0025-5572.
- <span id="page-4-3"></span>[7] P. G. Tait. Physical proof that the geometric mean of any number of quantities is less than the arithmetic mean. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, 6:309, 1868/9. Reprinted in Scientific Papers, Vol. 1 (1898) p. 8.
- <span id="page-4-4"></span>[8] A. Sommerfeld. *Thermodynamics and statistical mechanics (Trans. J. Kestin)*. Academic Press, New York, 1964. German original 1952.
- <span id="page-4-5"></span>[9] P.T Landsberg. A generalized mean. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 76(1):209–212, 1980. ISSN 0022-247X. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-247X(80)90073-6.
- <span id="page-4-6"></span>[10] R. J. Tykodi. Using model systems to demonstrate instances of mathematical inequalities. *American Journal of Physics*, 64(5):644–648, 05 1996. ISSN 0002-9505. doi: 10.1119/1.18259.
- <span id="page-4-7"></span>[11] A. R. Plastino, A. Plastino, and H. G. Miller. Thermodynamic paths to Jensen's inequality. *American Journal of Physics*, 65(11):1102–1105, 11 1997. ISSN 0002-9505. doi: 10.1119/1.18739.
- <span id="page-4-8"></span>[12] Ramandeep S. Johal. The law of entropy increase for bodies in mutual thermal contact. *American Journal of Physics*, 91(1):79–80, 01 2023. ISSN 0002-9505. doi: 10.1119/5.0124068.
- <span id="page-4-9"></span>[13] William Thomson. Xvii. on the restoration of mechanical energy from an unequally heated space. *Philosophical Magazine Series 1*, 5:102–105, 1853.
- <span id="page-4-10"></span>[14] Chong Wha Pyun. Generalized means: Properties and applications. *American Journal of Physics*, 42: 896–901, 1974.
- <span id="page-4-11"></span>[15] Harvey S. Leff. Multisystem temperature equilibration and the second law. *American Journal of Physics*, 45(3):252–254, 03 1977. ISSN 0002-9505. doi: 10.1119/1.11002.
- <span id="page-4-12"></span>[16] Emil Roduner. What is heat? can heat capacities be negative? *Entropy (Basel)*, 25(3):530, March 2023.