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#### Abstract

In this paper we point out an upper and a lower bound for the Csiszár $f$-divergence of two discrete random variables in terms of the Hellinger discrimination. Some paricular cases for the Kullback-Leibler distance, triangular discrimination, $\chi^{2}$-distance and the Rényi $\alpha$-entropy, etc.. are considered.


## 1. Introduction

Given a convex function $f:[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the $f$-divergence functional

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{f}(p, q)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i} f\left(\frac{p_{i}}{q_{i}}\right) \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

was introduced by Csiszár [1]-[2] as a generalized measure of information, a "distance function" on the set of probability distribution $\mathbb{P}^{n}$. The restriction here to discrete distributions is only for convenience, similar results hold for general distributions. As in Csiszár [1]-[2], we interpret undefined expressions by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f(0)=\lim _{t \rightarrow 0+} f(t), \quad 0 f\left(\frac{0}{0}\right)=0 \\
& 0 f\left(\frac{a}{0}\right)=\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+} \varepsilon f\left(\frac{a}{\varepsilon}\right)=a \lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(t)}{t}, a>0
\end{aligned}
$$

The following results (Theorems 1 and 2, and Corollary 1) were essentially given by Csiszár and Körner [3].
Theorem 1. (Joint Convexity) If $f:[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex, then $I_{f}(p, q)$ is jointly convex in $p$ and $q$.
Theorem 2. (Jensen's inequality) Let $f:[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be convex. Then for any $p, q \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{n}$ with $P_{n}:=\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i}>0, Q_{n}:=\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i}>0$, we have the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{f}(p, q) \geq Q_{n} f\left(\frac{P_{n}}{Q_{n}}\right) \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $f$ is strictly convex, equality holds in (1.2) iff

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{p_{1}}{q_{1}}=\frac{p_{2}}{q_{2}}=\ldots=\frac{p_{n}}{q_{n}} \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is natural to consider the following corollary.

[^0]Corollary 1. (Nonnegativity) Let $f:[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be convex and normalised, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(1)=0 \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then for any $p, q \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{n}$ with $P_{n}=Q_{n}$, we have the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{f}(p, q) \geq 0 \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $f$ is strictly convex, equality holds in (1.5) iff

$$
\begin{equation*}
p_{i}=q_{i} \text { for all } i \in\{1, \ldots, n\} \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, if $p, q$ are probability vectors, then Corollary 1 shows that, for strictly convex and normalized $f:[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{f}(p, q) \geq 0 \text { and } I_{f}(p, q)=0 \text { iff } p=q \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

We now give some more examples of divergence measures in Information Theory which are particular cases of Csiszár $f$-divergences.
(1) Kullback-Leibler distance ([12]). The Kullback-Leibler distance $D(\cdot, \cdot)$ is defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
D(p, q):=\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i} \log \left(\frac{p_{i}}{q_{i}}\right) \tag{1.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we choose $f(t)=t \ln t, t>0$, then obviously

$$
I_{f}(p, q)=D(p, q)
$$

(2) Variational distance ( $l_{1}$-distance). The variational distance $V(\cdot, \cdot)$ is defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
V(p, q):=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left|p_{i}-q_{i}\right| \tag{1.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we choose $f(t)=|t-1|, t \in \mathbb{R}_{+}$, then we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{f}(p, q)=V(p, q) \tag{1.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

(3) Hellinger discrimination ([13]). The Hellinger discrimination $h^{2}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
h^{2}(p, q):=\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\sqrt{p_{i}}-\sqrt{q_{i}}\right)^{2} \tag{1.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is obvious that if $f(t)=\frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{t}-1)^{2}$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{f}(p, q)=h^{2}(p, q) . \tag{1.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

(4) Triangular discrimination ([24]). We define triangular discrimination between $p$ and $q$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta(p, q)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\left|p_{i}-q_{i}\right|^{2}}{p_{i}+q_{i}} \tag{1.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is obvious that if $f(t)=\frac{(t-1)^{2}}{t+1}, t \in(0, \infty)$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{f}(p, q)=\Delta(p, q) \tag{1.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

(5) $\chi^{2}$-distance. We define the $\chi^{2}$-distance (chi-square distance) by

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{\chi^{2}}(p, q):=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\left(p_{i}-q_{i}\right)^{2}}{q_{i}} \tag{1.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is clear that if $f(t)=(t-1)^{2}, t \in[0, \infty)$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{f}(p, q)=D_{\chi^{2}}(p, q) \tag{1.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

(6) Rényi $\alpha$-order entropy ([14]). The $\alpha$-order entropy $(\alpha>1)$ is defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{\alpha}(p, q):=\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i}^{\alpha} q_{i}^{1-\alpha} \tag{1.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is obvious that if $f(t)=t^{\alpha}(t \in(0, \infty))$, then

$$
I_{f}(p, q)=R_{\alpha}(p, q)
$$

For other examples of divergence measures, see the paper [22] by J. N. Kapur where further references are given.

## 2. Some Inequalities Between CsiszÁr $f$-Divergence and Hellinger Discrimination

In the recent paper [28], the author proved the following inequality for Csiszár $f$-divergence:
Theorem 3. Let $\Phi: \mathbb{R}_{+} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be differentiable convex. Then for all $p, q \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{n}$ we have the inequality:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi^{\prime}(1)\left(P_{n}-Q_{n}\right) \leq I_{\Phi}(p, q)-Q_{n} \Phi(1) \leq I_{\Phi^{\prime}}\left(\frac{p^{2}}{q}, p\right)-I_{\Phi^{\prime}}(p, q) \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $P_{n}:=\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i}>0, Q_{n}:=\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i}>0$ and $\Phi^{\prime}:(0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the derivative of $\Phi$.
If $\Phi$ is strictly convex and $p_{i}, q_{i}>0(i=1, \ldots, n)$, then the equality holds in (2.9) iff $p=q$,

If we assume that $P_{n}=Q_{n}$ and $\Phi$ is normalised, then we obtain the simpler

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leq I_{\Phi}(p, q) \leq I_{\Phi^{\prime}}\left(\frac{p^{2}}{q}, p\right)-I_{\Phi^{\prime}}(p, q) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Applications for particular divergences which are instances of Csiszár $f$-divergence were also given.

Asimilar result of the above theorem has been presented in antoher paper by the author [29].
Theorem 4. Let $\Phi, p, q$ be as in Theorem 3. Then we have the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leq I_{\Phi}(p, q)-Q_{n} \Phi\left(\frac{P_{n}}{Q_{n}}\right) \leq I_{\Phi^{\prime}}\left(\frac{p^{2}}{q}, p\right)-\frac{P_{n}}{Q_{n}} I_{\Phi^{\prime}}(p, q) \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $\Phi$ is strictly convex and $p_{i}, q_{i}>0(i=1, \ldots, n)$, then the equality holds in (2.3) iff $\frac{p_{1}}{q_{1}}=\ldots=\frac{p_{n}}{q_{n}}$.

Obviously, if $P_{n}=Q_{n}$ and $\Phi$ is normalised, then (2.3) becomes (2.2).
The following result concerning an upper and a lower bound for the Csiszár $f$-divergence in terms of the Kullback-Leibler distance $D(p, q)$ holds.

As in [30], we will say that the mapping $f: C \subset \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $C$ is an interval, (in [30], the definition was considered in general normed spaces) is
(i) $\alpha$-lower convex on $C$ if $f-\frac{\alpha}{2} \cdot|\cdot|^{2}$ is convex on $C$;
(ii) $\beta$-upper convex on $C$ if $\frac{\beta}{2} \cdot|\cdot|^{2}-f$ is convex on $C$;
(iii) $(m, M)$-convex on $C$ (with $m \leq M$ ) if it is both $m$-lower convex and $M$-upper convex.
In [30], amongst others, the author has proved the following result for Csiszár $f$-divergence.
Theorem 5. Let $\Phi: \mathbb{R}_{+} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $p, q \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{n}$ with $P_{n}=Q_{n}$.
(i) If $\Phi$ is $\alpha$-lower convex on $\mathbb{R}_{+}$, then we have the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\alpha}{2} \cdot D_{\chi^{2}}(p, q) \leq I_{\Phi}(p, q)-Q_{n} \Phi(1) \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

(ii) If $\Phi$ is $\beta$-upper convex on $\mathbb{R}_{+}$, then we have the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{\Phi}(p, q)-Q_{n} \Phi(1) \leq \frac{\beta}{2} \cdot D_{\chi^{2}}(p, q) \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

(iii) If $\Phi$ is $(m, M)$-convex on $\mathbb{R}_{+}$, then we have the following sandwich inequality

$$
\frac{m}{2} \cdot D_{\chi^{2}}(p, q) \leq I_{\Phi}(p, q)-Q_{n} \Phi(1) \leq \frac{M}{2} \cdot D_{\chi^{2}}(p, q)
$$

where $D_{\chi^{2}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the $\chi^{2}$-divergence.
Of course, if $\Phi$ is normalised, i.e., $\Phi(1)=0$ and $p, q$ are probability distributions, then we get the simpler inequalities:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\alpha}{2} \cdot D_{\chi^{2}}(p, q) \leq I_{\Phi}(p, q), \quad I_{\Phi}(p, q) \leq \frac{\beta}{2} \cdot D_{\chi^{2}}(p, q) \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{m}{2} \cdot D_{\chi^{2}}(p, q) \leq I_{\Phi}(p, q) \leq \frac{M}{2} \cdot D_{\chi^{2}}(p, q) \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

In [30], some applications for particular instances of Csiszár $f$-divergences were also given.

The following result concerning an upper and a lower bound for the Csiszár $f$-divergence in terms of the Hellinger discrimination $h^{2}(p, q)$ holds. These results will complement, in a sense, the ones presented above.
Theorem 6. Assume that the generating mapping $f:(0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is normalized, i.e., $f(1)=0$ and satisfies the assumptions
(i) $f$ is twice differentiable on $(r, R)$, where $0 \leq r \leq 1 \leq R \leq \infty$,
(ii) there exists the real constants $m, M$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
m \leq t^{\frac{3}{2}} f^{\prime \prime}(t) \leq M \text { for all } t \in(r, R) \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $p, q$ are discrete probability distributions verifying the assumption

$$
\begin{equation*}
r \leq r_{i}:=\frac{p_{i}}{q_{i}} \leq R \quad \text { for all } i \in\{1, \ldots, n\} \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

then we have the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
4 m h^{2}(p, q) \leq I_{f}(p, q) \leq 4 M h^{2}(p, q) \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Define the mapping $H_{m}:(0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, H_{m}(t)=f(t)-2 m(\sqrt{t}-1)^{2}$. Then $H_{m}(\cdot)$ is normalised, twice differentiable and since

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{m}^{\prime \prime}(t)=f^{\prime \prime}(t)-\frac{m}{t^{\frac{3}{2}}}=\frac{1}{t^{\frac{3}{2}}}\left(t^{\frac{3}{2}} f^{\prime \prime}(t)-m\right) \geq 0 \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $t \in(a, b)$, implied by the first inequality in (2.9). Thus, the mapping $H_{m}(\cdot)$ is convex on $(r, R)$.

Applying the nonnegativity property of the Csiszár $f$-divergence functional for $H_{m}(\cdot)$ and the linearity, we may state that

$$
\begin{align*}
0 & \leq I_{H_{m}}(p, q)=I_{f}(p, q)-2 m I_{(\sqrt{ } \cdot-1)^{2}}(p, q)  \tag{2.13}\\
& =I_{f}(p, q)-4 m h^{2}(p, q)
\end{align*}
$$

from where we get the first inequality in (2.11).
Define $H_{M}:(0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, H_{M}(t)=2 M(\sqrt{t}-1)^{2}-f(t)$ which obviously is normalised, twice differentiable and, by (2.9), convex on $(r, R)$.

Applying the nonnegativity property of Csiszár $f$-divergence for $I_{H_{M}}$, we obtain the second part of (2.11).

The following theorem concerning the convexity property of the Csiszár $f$-divergence also holds.
Theorem 7. Assume that $f$ satisfies the assumptions ( $i$ ) and (ii) from Theorem 6. If $p^{(j)}, q^{(j)}(j=1,2)$ are probability distributions satisfying (2.10), that is,

$$
\begin{equation*}
r \leq \frac{p_{i}^{(j)}}{q_{i}^{(j)}} \leq R \quad \text { for all } i \in\{1, \ldots, n\} \quad \text { and } j \in\{1,2\} \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\begin{equation*}
r \leq \frac{\lambda p_{i}^{(1)}+(1-\lambda) p_{i}^{(2)}}{\lambda q_{i}^{(1)}+(1-\lambda) q_{i}^{(2)}} \leq R \quad \text { for all } i \in\{1, \ldots, n\} \quad \text { and } \quad \lambda \in[0,1] \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
& 4 m\left[h^{2}\left(\lambda p^{(1)}+(1-\lambda) p^{(2)}, \lambda q^{(1)}+(1-\lambda) q^{(2)}\right)\right.  \tag{2.16}\\
& \left.-\lambda h^{2}\left(p^{(1)}, q^{(1)}\right)-(1-\lambda) h^{2}\left(p^{(2)}, q^{(2)}\right)\right] \\
\leq & I_{f}\left(\lambda p^{(1)}+(1-\lambda) p^{(2)}, \lambda q^{(1)}+(1-\lambda) q^{(2)}\right) \\
& -\lambda I_{f}\left(p^{(1)}, q^{(1)}\right)-(1-\lambda) I_{f}\left(p^{(2)}, q^{(2)}\right) \\
\leq & 4 M\left[h^{2}\left(\lambda p^{(1)}+(1-\lambda) p^{(2)}, \lambda q^{(1)}+(1-\lambda) q^{(2)}\right)\right. \\
& \left.-\lambda h^{2}\left(p^{(1)}, q^{(1)}\right)-(1-\lambda) h^{2}\left(p^{(2)}, q^{(2)}\right)\right]
\end{align*}
$$

for all $\lambda \in[0,1]$.

Proof. By (2.14), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
r \lambda q_{i}^{(1)} \leq \lambda p_{i}^{(1)} \leq \lambda R q_{i}^{(1)} \text { for all } i \in\{1, \ldots, n\} \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
r(1-\lambda) q_{i}^{(2)} \leq(1-\lambda) p_{i}^{(2)} \leq R(1-\lambda) q_{i}^{(2)} \text { for all } i \in\{1, \ldots, n\} \tag{2.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

Summing the above (2.17) and (2.18), we obtain (2.15).
It is already known that the mappings $H_{m}, H_{M}$ as defined in Theorem 6 are convex and normalised.

Applying the "Joint Convexity Principle" for $I_{H_{m}}(\cdot, \cdot)$, i.e.,

$$
\begin{align*}
& I_{H_{m}}\left(\lambda\left(p^{(1)}, q^{(1)}\right)+(1-\lambda)\left(p^{(2)}, q^{(2)}\right)\right)  \tag{2.19}\\
\leq \quad & \lambda I_{H_{m}}\left(p^{(1)}, q^{(1)}\right)+(1-\lambda) I_{H_{m}}\left(p^{(2)}, q^{(2)}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

and rearranging the terms, we end up with the first inequality in (2.16).
The second inequality follows likewise if we apply the same property to the Csiszár $f$-divergence $I_{H_{M}}(\cdot, \cdot)$.

We omit the details.
Remark 1. If $m>0$ in (2.9), then the inequality (2.11) is a better result than the positivity property of Csiszár divergence. The same will apply for the joint convexity of Csiszár divergence if $m>0$.

Using the inequality (2.2) which holds for $\Phi$, a differentiable convex and normalised function, for $p, q$ probability distributions, we can state the following theorem as well.
Theorem 8. Let $f:[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a normalised mapping. That is, $f(1)=0$ and satisfies the assumption
(i) $f$ is twice differentiable on $(r, R)$, where $0 \leq r \leq 1 \leq R \leq \infty$;
(ii) there exists the constants $m, M$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
m \leq t^{\frac{3}{2}} f^{\prime \prime}(t) \leq M \quad \text { for all } t \in(r, R) \tag{2.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $p, q$ are discrete probability distributions verifying the assumption

$$
\begin{equation*}
r \leq r_{i}:=\frac{p_{i}}{q_{i}} \leq R \text { for all } i \in\{1, \ldots, n\} \tag{2.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

then we have the inequality

$$
\begin{align*}
& I_{f^{\prime}}\left(\frac{p^{2}}{q}, p\right)-I_{f^{\prime}}(p, q)-2 M C(p, q)+4 M h^{2}(p, q)  \tag{2.22}\\
\leq & I_{f}(p, q) \\
\leq & I_{f^{\prime}}\left(\frac{p^{2}}{q}, p\right)-I_{f^{\prime}}(p, q)-2 m C(p, q)+4 m h^{2}(p, q)
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\text { where } C(p, q):=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(q_{i}-p_{i}\right) \sqrt{\frac{q_{i}}{p_{i}}} .
$$

Proof. We know (see the proof of Theorem 6), that the mapping $H_{m}:[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $H_{m}(t):=f(t)-2 m(\sqrt{t}-1)^{2}$ is normalised, twice differentiable and convex on $(r, R)$.

If we apply the second inequality from (2.2) for $H_{m}$, we may write

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{H_{m}}(p, q) \leq I_{H_{m}^{\prime}}\left(\frac{p^{2}}{q}, p\right)-I_{H_{m}^{\prime}}(-p, q) \tag{2.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

However,

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_{H_{m}}(p, q) & =I_{f}(p, q)-4 m h^{2}(p, q) \\
I_{H_{m}^{\prime}}\left(\frac{p^{2}}{q}, p\right) & =I_{f^{\prime}(\cdot)-4 m\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{2 \sqrt{*}}\right)}\left(\frac{p^{2}}{q}, p\right) \\
& =I_{f^{\prime}}\left(\frac{p^{2}}{q}, p\right)-2 m+2 m I_{\frac{1}{\sqrt{*}}}\left(\frac{p^{2}}{q}, p\right) \\
& =I_{f^{\prime}}\left(\frac{p^{2}}{q}, p\right)-2 m+2 m \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{p_{i}^{2}}{q_{i}} \cdot \frac{1}{p_{i}}}}\right) \\
& =I_{f^{\prime}}\left(\frac{p^{2}}{q}, p\right)-2 m+2 m \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i} \sqrt{\frac{q_{i}}{p_{i}}} \\
& =I_{f^{\prime}}\left(\frac{p^{2}}{q}, p\right)-2 m+2 m \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{p_{i} q_{i}}
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_{H_{m}^{\prime}}(p, q) & =I_{f^{\prime}}(p, q)-2 m+2 m I_{\frac{1}{\sqrt{*}}}(p, q) \\
& =I_{f^{\prime}}(p, q)-2 m+2 m \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{p_{i}}{q_{i}}}}\right) \\
& =I_{f^{\prime}}(p, q)-2 m+2 m \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i} \sqrt{\frac{q_{i}}{p_{i}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

and then, by (2.23), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& I_{f}(p, q)-4 m h^{2}(p, q) \\
\leq & I_{f^{\prime}}\left(\frac{p^{2}}{q}, p\right)-2 m+2 m \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i} \sqrt{\frac{q_{i}}{p_{i}}}-I_{f^{\prime}}(p, q)+2 m-2 m \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i} \sqrt{\frac{q_{i}}{p_{i}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

which is equivalent to the second inequality in (2.22).
If we consider $H_{M}(t):=2 M(\sqrt{t}-1)^{2}-f(t), t \geq 0$, then we observe that $H_{M}(\cdot)$ is normalised, twice differentiable and convex on $(r, R)$. Applying the second inequality from (2.2), we deduce the first part of (2.22).

The above results have natural applications when the Hellinger distance is compared with a number of other divergence measures arising in Information Theory.

## 3. Some Particular Cases

Using Theorem 6, we shall be able to point out the following particular cases which are of interest in Information Theory.

Proposition 1. Let $p, q$ be two probability distributions with the property that

$$
\begin{equation*}
0<r \leq \frac{p_{i}}{q_{i}}=: q_{i} \leq R<\infty \quad \text { for all } i \in\{1, \ldots, n\} \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then we have the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
4 \sqrt{r} h^{2}(p, q) \leq D(p, q) \leq 4 \sqrt{R} h^{2}(p, q) \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Consider the mapping $f:(0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, f(t)=t \ln t$. Then

$$
f^{\prime \prime}(t)=\frac{1}{t}, t \in(0, \infty)
$$

Consider the mapping $g:[r, R] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, g(t)=t^{\frac{3}{2}} \cdot \frac{1}{t}=t^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then

$$
\inf _{t \in[r, R]} g(t)=\sqrt{r}, \sup _{t \in[r, R]} g(t)=\sqrt{R} .
$$

Therefore, applying the inequality (2.11) with $m=\sqrt{r}, M=\sqrt{R}$, we obtain (3.2).

Remark 2. The following inequality is well known in the literature (see for example Dacunha-Castelle [25]):

$$
\begin{equation*}
D(p, q) \geq 2 h^{2}(p, q) \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $p, q$ probability distributions.
From the first inequality in (3.2) we have the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
D(p, q) \geq 4 \sqrt{r} h^{2}(p, q) \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

We remark that if $4 \sqrt{r} \geq 2$, i.e., $r \geq \frac{1}{4}$, then the inequality (3.4) is better than (3.3).

The following proposition also holds.
Proposition 2. Let $p, q$ be two probability distributions with the property (3.1). Then we have the inequality:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{4}{\sqrt{R}} h^{2}(p, q) \leq D(q, p) \leq \frac{4}{\sqrt{r}} h^{2}(p, q) \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Consider the mapping $f:[r, R] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, f(t)=-\ln t$. Define $g(t)=$ $t^{\frac{3}{2}} f^{\prime \prime}(t)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}$. Then obviously

$$
\sup _{t \in[r, R]} g(t)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{r}}, \quad \inf _{t \in[r, R]} g(t)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{R}} .
$$

In addition,

$$
I_{f}(p, q)=-\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i} \ln \left(\frac{p_{i}}{q_{i}}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_{i} \ln \left(\frac{q_{i}}{p_{i}}\right)=D(q, p) .
$$

Now, using the inequality (3.2), we get the desired inequality (3.5).
The following result for the $\chi^{2}$-distance also holds.
Proposition 3. Let $p, q$ be two probability distributions satisfying the condition (3.1). Then we have the inequality:

$$
\begin{equation*}
8 r^{\frac{3}{2}} h^{2}(p, q) \leq D_{\chi^{2}}(p, q) \leq 8 R^{\frac{3}{2}} h^{2}(p, q) \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Consider the mapping $f:(0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, f(t)=(t-1)^{2}$. Define $g:[r, R] \rightarrow$ $\mathbb{R}, g(t)=t^{\frac{3}{2}} f^{\prime \prime}(t)=2 t^{\frac{3}{2}}$. Obviously,

$$
\sup _{t \in[r, R]} g(t)=2 R^{\frac{3}{2}} \text { and } \inf _{t \in[r, R]} g(t)=2 r^{\frac{3}{2}}
$$

Since

$$
I_{f}(p, q)=D_{\chi^{2}}(p, q)
$$

then, applying the inequality (2.11) with $m=2 r^{\frac{3}{2}}, M=2 R^{\frac{3}{2}}$, we get the desired inequality (3.6).

Now, let us consider the $J$-divergence [26]

$$
J(p, q)=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(p_{i}-q_{i}\right) \ln \left(\frac{p_{i}}{q_{i}}\right) .
$$

The following proposition holds.
Proposition 4. Let p, $q$ be two probability distributions. Then we have the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
8 h^{2}(p, q) \leq J(p, q) \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Consider the mapping $f:(0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, f(t)=(t-1) \ln t$. Define $g:[r, R] \rightarrow$ $\mathbb{R}$,

$$
g(t)=t^{\frac{3}{2}} f^{\prime \prime}(t)=t^{\frac{1}{2}}+\frac{1}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}} \geq 2
$$

which shows that

$$
\inf _{t \in(0, \infty)} g(t)=2
$$

Since

$$
I_{f}(p, q)=J(p, q)
$$

then, applying the inequality (2.11) with $m=2$, we get the desired inequality.
If we know more about $r_{i}:=\frac{p_{i}}{q_{i}}(i=1, \ldots, n)$, i.e., the condition (3.1) holds, then we can point out an upper bound for the $J(\cdot, \cdot)$ as follows:
Proposition 5. If $0<r \leq r_{i} \leq R<\infty$ for all $i \in\{1, \ldots, n\}$, then we have the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
J(p, q) \leq 4 \max \left\{\sqrt{r}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{r}}, \sqrt{R}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{R}}\right\} h^{2}(p, q) \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. As above, we have

$$
g(t)=t^{\frac{1}{2}}+\frac{1}{t^{\frac{1}{2}}}
$$

For the mapping $h(u)=u+\frac{1}{u}$, we have

$$
h^{\prime}(u)=\frac{u^{2}-1}{u^{2}}
$$

which shows that the mapping is strictly decreasing on $(0,1)$ and strictly increasing on $(1, \infty)$ Therefore

$$
\sup _{t \in[r, R]} g(t)=\max [g(r), g(R)]=\max \left\{\sqrt{r}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{r}}, \sqrt{R}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{R}}\right\}
$$

Applyig Theorem 6 we deduce the desired result.

Remark 3. We observe that

$$
\sqrt{R}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{R}}-\sqrt{r}-\frac{1}{\sqrt{r}}=\frac{(\sqrt{R}-\sqrt{r})(\sqrt{r R}-1)}{\sqrt{r R}}
$$

and then the inequality (3.8) can be rewritten in the equivalent form as

$$
J(p, q) \leq 4 h^{2}(p, q) \times\left\{\begin{array}{ccc}
\sqrt{R}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{R}} & \text { if } & R \geq \frac{1}{r}  \tag{3.9}\\
\sqrt{r}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{r}} & \text { if } & 1 \leq R<\frac{1}{r}
\end{array} .\right.
$$

Let us now consider the harmonic distance

$$
M(p, q):=\sum_{i=0}^{n} \frac{2 p_{i} q_{i}}{p_{i}+q_{i}}
$$

The following proposition holds.
Proposition 6. Let $p, q$ be two probability distributions. Then we have the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
0 \leq 1-M(p, q) \leq \frac{1}{2} h^{2}(p, q) \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Consider the function $f:(0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, f(t)=1-\frac{2 t}{t+1}$. Then

$$
f^{\prime}(t)=-\frac{2}{(1+t)^{2}}, f^{\prime \prime}(t)=\frac{4}{(t+1)^{3}}
$$

Define the mapping

$$
g(t)=t^{\frac{3}{2}} f^{\prime \prime}(t)=\frac{4 t^{\frac{3}{2}}}{(t+1)^{3}}
$$

A simple calculation shows that

$$
g^{\prime}(t)=\frac{6 \sqrt{t}(1-t)}{(t+1)^{4}}
$$

Consequently, the mapping $g$ is increasing on the interval $(0,1)$ and decreasing on $(1, \infty)$. Moreover,

$$
\sup _{t \in(0, \infty)}=g(1)=\frac{1}{2} \text { and } I_{f}(p, q)=1-M(p, q)
$$

Applying the inequality (2.11) for $M=\frac{1}{2}$, we deduce (3.10).
If we know more about $r_{i}:=\frac{p_{i}}{q_{i}}$, that is, the condition (3.1) holds, then we can improve the first inequality in (3.10) as follows.
Proposition 7. Assume that the probability distributions $p, q$ satisfy (3.1). Then we have the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
16 \min \left\{\frac{r^{\frac{3}{2}}}{(r+1)^{3}}, \frac{R^{\frac{3}{2}}}{(R+1)^{3}}\right\} h^{2}(p, q) \leq 1-M(p, q) . \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Taking into account that the mapping $g(t)=\frac{4 t^{\frac{3}{2}}}{(t+1)^{3}}$ is monotonic increasing on $(0,1)$ and decreasing on $(1, \infty)$, we may assert that

$$
\inf _{t \in[r, R]} g(t)=\min \{g(r), g(R)\}=4 \min \left\{\frac{r^{\frac{3}{2}}}{(r+1)^{3}}, \frac{R^{\frac{3}{2}}}{(R+1)^{3}}\right\}
$$

Using the inequality (2.11), we deduce the desired lower bound (3.11).
Remark 4. Similar results can be stated by Applying Theorem 8, but we omit the details.
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