ON SOME INEQUALITIES FOR THE (p, k)-ANALOGUES OF THE DIGAMMA AND POLYGAMMA FUNCTIONS

K. NANTOMAH *

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we establish several inequalities involving the (p, k)analogues of the Digamma and Polygamma functions. Consequently, we recover some previous results as particular cases of the results of this paper.

1. INTRODUCTION

In [4], the authors introduced a new two-parameter deformation of the classical Gamma function, called the (p, k)-analogue of the Gamma function. It is defined for $p \in \mathbb{N}, k > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$ as

$$\Gamma_{p,k}(x) = \int_0^p t^{x-1} \left(1 - \frac{t^k}{pk}\right)^p dt$$
$$= \frac{(p+1)!k^{p+1}(pk)^{\frac{x}{k}-1}}{x(x+k)(x+2k)\dots(x+pk)}$$

satisfying the identities:

$$\Gamma_{p,k}(x+k) = \frac{pkx}{x+pk+k} \Gamma_{p,k}(x), \qquad (1)$$

$$\Gamma_{p,k}(ak) = \frac{p+1}{p} k^{a-1} \Gamma_p(a), \quad a \in \mathbb{R}^+$$

$$\Gamma_{p,k}(k) = 1.$$

The (p, k)-analogue of the Digamma function is defined as the logarithmic derivative of $\Gamma_{p,k}(x)$. That is

$$\psi_{p,k}(x) = \frac{d}{dx} \ln \Gamma_{p,k}(x) = \frac{1}{k} \ln(pk) - \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{1}{(nk+x)}$$
(2)

$$= \frac{1}{k}\ln(pk) - \int_0^\infty \frac{1 - e^{-k(p+1)t}}{1 - e^{-kt}} e^{-xt} dt$$
(3)

* Corresponding author.

RGMIA Res. Rep. Coll. 19 (2016), Art. 139

Date: Received: xxxxx; Revised: yyyyyy; Accepted: zzzzz.

²⁰¹⁰ Mathematics Subject Classification. 33B15, 26D07, 26D15.

Key words and phrases. Digamma function, Ploygamma function, (p, k)-analogue, inequality.

Also, the (p, k)-analogue of the Polygamma functions is defined as

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x) = \frac{d^m}{dx^m} \psi_{p,k}(x)$$

= $\sum_{n=0}^p \frac{(-1)^{m+1} m!}{(nk+x)^{m+1}}$ (4)

$$= (-1)^{m+1} \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{1 - e^{-k(p+1)t}}{1 - e^{-kt}}\right) t^m e^{-xt} dt$$
(5)

for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\psi_{p,k}^{(0)}(x) \equiv \psi_{p,k}(x)$. It follows easily from (4) that,

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x) = \begin{cases} > 0 & \text{if } m \text{ is odd,} \\ < 0 & \text{if } m \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$
(6)

From the identity (1), the following relations are established.

$$\psi_{p,k}(x+k) - \psi_{p,k}(x) = \frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{x+pk+k},$$

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x+k) - \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x) = \frac{(-1)^m m!}{x^{m+1}} - \frac{(-1)^m m!}{(x+pk+k)^{m+1}}, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Also, from (4), the following properties are deduced for x > 0.

- (i) $\psi_{p,k}(x)$ is increasing. (ii) $\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x)$ is decreasing if m is odd. (iii) $\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x)$ is increasing if m is even.

2. Main Results

We now present the main findings of the paper in this section.

Theorem 2.1. Let x > 0, 0 < y < 1, $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and k > 0. Then the inequality

$$\psi_{p,k}(x+y) > \psi_{p,k}(x) + \psi_{p,k}(y)$$
(7)

holds true.

Proof. Let $F(x) = \psi_{p,k}(x+y) - \psi_{p,k}(x) - \psi_{p,k}(y)$ for a fixed y. Then,

$$F'(x) = \psi'_{p,k}(x+y) - \psi'_{p,k}(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{p} \left[\frac{1}{(nk+x+y)^2} - \frac{1}{(nk+x)^2} \right] < 0.$$

That implies F is decreasing. Further,

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} F(x) = \lim_{x \to \infty} \left[\psi_{p,k}(x+y) - \psi_{p,k}(x) - \psi_{p,k}(y) \right]$$
$$= \lim_{x \to \infty} \left[-\frac{1}{k} \ln(pk) - \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{1}{nk+x+y} + \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{1}{nk+x} + \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{1}{nk+y} \right]$$
$$= -\frac{1}{k} \ln(pk) + \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{1}{nk+y} > 0.$$

Therefore $F(x) \ge 0$ yielding the result (7).

Theorem 2.2. Let x > 0, y > 0, $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and k > 0. Then for a positive odd integer m, the inequality

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x+y) < \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x) + \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(y) \tag{8}$$

holds true.

Proof. Let $G(x) = \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x+y) - \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x) - \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(y)$ for a fixed y. Then,

$$G'(x) = \psi_{p,k}^{(m+1)}(x+y) - \psi_{p,k}^{(m+1)}(x)$$

= $\sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{(-1)^{m+2}(m+1)!}{(nk+x+y)^{m+2}} - \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{(-1)^{m+2}(m+1)!}{(nk+x)^{m+2}}$
= $(-1)^{m+2}(m+1)! \sum_{n=0}^{p} \left[\frac{1}{(nk+x+y)^{m+2}} - \frac{1}{(nk+x)^{m+2}} \right]$
= $-(m+1)! \sum_{n=0}^{p} \left[\frac{1}{(nk+x+y)^{m+2}} - \frac{1}{(nk+x)^{m+2}} \right] > 0$

since m is odd. That implies G is increasing. Further,

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} G(x) = \lim_{x \to \infty} \sum_{n=0}^{p} \left[\frac{(-1)^{m+1} m!}{(nk+x+y)^{m+1}} - \frac{(-1)^{m+1} m!}{(nk+x)^{m+1}} - \frac{(-1)^{m+1} m!}{(nk+y)^{m+1}} \right]$$
$$= -\sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{(-1)^{m+1} m!}{(nk+y)^{m+1}}$$
$$= -\sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{m!}{(nk+y)^{m+1}} < 0$$

Therefore $G(x) \leq 0$ yielding the result (8).

Theorem 2.3. Let x > 0, y > 0, $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and k > 0. Then for a positive even integer m, the inequality

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x+y) > \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x) + \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(y)$$
(9)

holds true.

Proof. Let
$$H(x) = \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x+y) - \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x) - \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(y)$$
 for a fixed y . Then,

$$H'(x) = \psi_{p,k}^{(m+1)}(x+y) - \psi_{p,k}^{(m+1)}(x)$$

$$= \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{(-1)^{m+2}(m+1)!}{(nk+x+y)^{m+2}} - \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{(-1)^{m+2}(m+1)!}{(nk+x)^{m+2}}$$

$$= (-1)^{m+2}(m+1)! \sum_{n=0}^{p} \left[\frac{1}{(nk+x+y)^{m+2}} - \frac{1}{(nk+x)^{m+2}} \right]$$

$$= (m+1)! \sum_{n=0}^{p} \left[\frac{1}{(nk+x+y)^{m+2}} - \frac{1}{(nk+x)^{m+2}} \right] < 0$$

since m is even. Thus, H is decreasing. Further,

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} H(x) = \lim_{x \to \infty} \sum_{n=0}^{p} \left[\frac{(-1)^{m+1} m!}{(nk+x+y)^{m+1}} - \frac{(-1)^{m+1} m!}{(nk+x)^{m+1}} - \frac{(-1)^{m+1} m!}{(nk+y)^{m+1}} \right]$$
$$= -\sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{(-1)^{m+1} m!}{(nk+y)^{m+1}}$$
$$= \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{m!}{(nk+y)^{m+1}} > 0$$

Therefore $H(x) \ge 0$ yielding the result (9).

Theorem 2.4. Let $x, y > 0, p \in \mathbb{N}$ and k > 0. Then for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the inequality $\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x)\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(y) > \left[\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x+y)\right]^2$ (10)

holds true.

Proof. Suppose that m is odd. Then,

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x) - \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x+y) = (-1)^{m+1} m! \sum_{n=0}^{p} \left[\frac{1}{(nk+x)^{m+1}} - \frac{1}{(nk+x+y)^{m+1}} \right] > 0$$

Hence,

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x) > \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x+y) > 0.$$
(11)

By a similar procedure, we obtain

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(y) > \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x+y) > 0.$$
 (12)

Then by multiplying (11) and (12) we obtain

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x)\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(y) > \left[\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x+y)\right]^2.$$

Next, suppose that m is even. Then

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x) < \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x+y) < 0, \tag{13}$$

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(y) < \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x+y) < 0.$$
(14)

Similarly, by multiplying (13) and (14) we obtain

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x)\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(y) > \left[\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x+y)\right]^2$$

concluding the proof.

Remark 2.5. Let $p \to \infty$ in (7), (8), (9) and (10), then we recover the results of [5] as a particular case.

Remark 2.6. Let $k \to 1$ in (7), (8), (9) and (10), then we recover the results of [6] as a particular case.

Remark 2.7. Let $p \to \infty$ as $k \to 1$ in (7), (8), (9) and (10), then we recover the results of Theorems 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 of [8].

Theorem 2.8. Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$, k > 0, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x_i > 0$ for each $i = 1, 2, ..., \alpha$. If *m* is a positive odd integer, then the inequality

$$\prod_{i=1}^{\alpha} \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x_i) \ge \left[\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} x_i\right)\right]^{\alpha}$$
(15)

holds true.

Proof. We proceed as follows.

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x_1) - \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} x_i\right) = \sum_{n=0}^{p} \left[\frac{(-1)^{m+1}m!}{(nk+x_1)^{m+1}} - \frac{(-1)^{m+1}m!}{(nk+\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} x_i)^{m+1}}\right]$$
$$= m! \sum_{n=0}^{p} \left[\frac{1}{(nk+x_1)^{m+1}} - \frac{1}{(nk+\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} x_i)^{m+1}}\right] \ge 0.$$

Hence,

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x_1) \ge \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} x_i\right) > 0.$$

Continuing with this technique, we obtain the following.

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x_2) \ge \psi_{p,k}^{(m)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} x_i\right) > 0,$$

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x_3) \ge \psi_{p,k}^{(m)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} x_i\right) > 0,$$

$$\vdots \qquad \vdots$$

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x_\alpha) \ge \psi_{p,k}^{(m)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} x_i\right) > 0.$$

Then multiplying these inequalities yields,

$$\prod_{i=1}^{\alpha} \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x_i) \ge \left[\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\alpha} x_i\right)\right]^{\alpha}$$

as required.

K. NANTOMAH

Remark 2.9. Let $\alpha = 2$, $x_1 = x$ and $x_2 = y$ in (15), then we recover the result (10).

Theorem 2.10. Let x, y, a > 1 such that $\frac{1}{x} + \frac{1}{y} \leq 1$ and $\frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b} = 1$. Then for $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and k > 0, the inequality

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(xy) \le \left(\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x)\right)^{\frac{1}{a}} \left(\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(y)\right)^{\frac{1}{b}}$$
(16)

is valid for a positive odd integer m.

Proof. From the hypothesis, it follows that $xy \ge x + y$. Then since $\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x)$ is decreasing for odd m, and by using the Hölder's inequality for finite sums, we obtain

$$\begin{split} \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(xy) &\leq \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x+y) = \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{m!}{(nk+x+y)^{m+1}} \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{(m!)^{\frac{1}{a}} (m!)^{\frac{1}{b}}}{(nk+x+y)^{\frac{m+1}{a}} (nk+x+y)^{\frac{m+1}{b}}} \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{(m!)^{\frac{1}{a}}}{(nk+x)^{\frac{m+1}{a}}} \cdot \frac{(m!)^{\frac{1}{b}}}{(nk+y)^{\frac{m+1}{b}}} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{m!}{(nk+x)^{m+1}}\right)^{\frac{1}{a}} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{m!}{(nk+y)^{m+1}}\right)^{\frac{1}{b}} \\ &= \left(\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x)\right)^{\frac{1}{a}} \left(\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(y)\right)^{\frac{1}{b}} \end{split}$$

which completes the proof.

Theorem 2.11. Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$, k > 0, s > 1, $\frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{t} = 1$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{m}{s} + \frac{n}{t} \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, the inequality

$$\left|\psi_{p,k}^{\left(\frac{m}{s}+\frac{n}{t}\right)}\left(x+y\right)\right| \le \left|\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x)\right|^{\frac{1}{s}} \left|\psi_{p,k}^{(n)}(y)\right|^{\frac{1}{t}}$$
(17)

holds for x > 0 and y > 0.

Proof. From the series representation (4), we obtain

$$\begin{split} \left| \psi_{p,k}^{\left(\frac{m}{s}+\frac{n}{t}\right)} \left(x+y \right) \right| &= \left(\frac{m}{s} + \frac{n}{t} \right)! \sum_{i=0}^{p} \frac{1}{(ik+x+y)^{\frac{m}{s}+\frac{n}{t}+1}} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{p} \frac{\left(\frac{m}{s} + \frac{n}{t} \right)!}{(ik+x+y)^{\frac{m+1}{s}} (ik+x+y)^{\frac{n+1}{t}}} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{p} \frac{\left(\frac{m}{s} + \frac{n}{t} \right)!}{(ik+x)^{\frac{m+1}{s}} (ik+y)^{\frac{n+1}{t}}} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{p} \frac{(m!)^{\frac{1}{s}}}{(ik+x)^{\frac{m+1}{s}}} \cdot \frac{(n!)^{\frac{1}{t}}}{(ik+y)^{\frac{n+1}{t}}} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{i=0}^{p} \frac{m!}{(ik+x)^{m+1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{p} \frac{n!}{(ik+y)^{n+1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{t}} \\ &= \left| \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x) \right|^{\frac{1}{s}} \left| \psi_{p,k}^{(n)}(y) \right|^{\frac{1}{t}} . \end{split}$$

Note: In the proof, we have used the Hölder's inequality for finite sums and the fact that $\left(\frac{m}{s} + \frac{n}{t}\right)! \leq (m!)^{\frac{1}{s}} (n!)^{\frac{1}{t}}$, which follows from the logarithmic convexity of the factorial function.

Corollary 2.12. Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$, k > 0 and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the inequality

$$\left|\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x)\right| \left|\psi_{p,k}^{(m+2)}(x)\right| \ge \left|\psi_{p,k}^{(m+1)}(2x)\right|^2$$

holds for x > 0.

Proof. Let x = y, s = t = 2 and n = m + 2 in Theorem 2.11.

Corollary 2.13. Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$, k > 0, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{t} = 1$. Then the inequality

$$\left|\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x+y)\right| \le \left|\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x)\right|^{\frac{1}{s}} \left|\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(y)\right|^{\frac{1}{t}}$$
(18)

holds for x > 0 and y > 0.

Proof. Let m = n in Theorem 2.11.

Remark 2.14. It is interesting to note that, by letting s = t = 2 in (18), we obtain a result which coincides with (10).

Theorem 2.15. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\beta \ge 1$ and x > 0. Then for $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and k > 0, the following inequalities

$$\left(\exp\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x)\right)^{\beta} > \exp\psi_{p,k}^{(m+1)}(x) \cdot \exp\psi_{p,k}^{(m-1)}(x), \quad if \ m \ is \ odd \tag{19}$$

$$\left(\exp\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x)\right)^{\beta} < \exp\psi_{p,k}^{(m+1)}(x) \cdot \exp\psi_{p,k}^{(m-1)}(x), \quad if \ m \ is \ even.$$
(20)

are satisfied.

Proof. By relation (4), we obtain

$$\begin{split} \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x) &- \psi_{p,k}^{(m+1)}(x) - \psi_{p,k}^{(m-1)}(x) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{(-1)^{m+1}m!}{(nk+x)^{m+1}} - \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{(-1)^{m+2}(m+1)!}{(nk+x)^{m+2}} - \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{(-1)^{m}(m-1)!}{(nk+x)^{m}} \\ &= (-1)^{m} \left[\sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{-m!}{(nk+x)^{m+1}} - \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{(m+1)!}{(nk+x)^{m+2}} - \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{(m-1)!}{(nk+x)^{m}} \right] \\ &= (-1)^{m+1} \left[\sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{m!}{(nk+x)^{m+1}} + \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{(m+1)!}{(nk+x)^{m+2}} + \sum_{n=0}^{p} \frac{(m-1)!}{(nk+x)^{m}} \right] \\ &> (<)0 \end{split}$$

respectively for odd(even) m. This implies,

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x) > \psi_{p,k}^{(m+1)}(x) + \psi_{p,k}^{(m-1)}(x)$$

and

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x) < \psi_{p,k}^{(m+1)}(x) + \psi_{p,k}^{(m-1)}(x)$$

respectively for odd and even m. Then for $\beta \geq 1$, we have

$$\beta \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x) \ge \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x) > \psi_{p,k}^{(m+1)}(x) + \psi_{p,k}^{(m-1)}(x), \tag{21}$$

and

$$\beta \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x) \le \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x) < \psi_{p,k}^{(m+1)}(x) + \psi_{p,k}^{(m-1)}(x).$$
(22)

By exponentiating the inequalities (21) and (22), we obtain the desired results.

Remark 2.16. Let $\beta = 2$ in Theorem 2.15, then we obtain the result of Theorem 2.7 of [4].

Remark 2.17. Let $\beta = 2$, $p \to \infty$ and $k \to 1$ in Theorem 2.15, then we obtain the result of Theorem 3.2 of [1].

Lemma 2.18. Let a, b, c, d, α , β be positive real numbers such that $a + bx \leq c + dx$, $\beta d \leq \alpha b$, $\psi_{p,k}(a + bx) > 0$ and $\psi_{p,k}(c + dx) > 0$. Then

$$\alpha b\psi_{p,k}(c+dx)\psi'_{p,k}(a+bx) - \beta d\psi_{p,k}(a+bx)\psi'_{p,k}(c+dx) \ge 0.$$

Proof. Note that, $\psi_{p,k}(x)$ is increasing and $\psi'_{p,k}(x)$ is decreasing for x > 0. Then, since $0 < a + bx \le c + dx$, we have, $0 < \psi_{p,k}(a + bx) \le \psi_{p,k}(c + dx)$ and $\psi'_{p,k}(a + bx) \ge \psi'_{p,k}(c + dx) > 0$. That implies; $\psi_{p,k}(c + dx)\psi'_{p,k}(a + bx) \ge \psi_{p,k}(c + dx)\psi'_{p,k}(c + dx) \ge \psi_{p,k}(a + bx)\psi'_{p,k}(c + dx)$. Moreover, $\alpha b \ge \beta d > 0$ implies; $\alpha b\psi_{p,k}(c + dx)\psi'_{p,k}(a + bx) \ge \alpha b\psi_{p,k}(a + bx)\psi'_{p,k}(c + dx) \ge \beta d\psi_{p,k}(a + bx)\psi'_{p,k}(c + dx)$. Therefore, $\alpha b\psi_{p,k}(c + dx)\psi'_{p,k}(a + bx) - \beta d\psi_{p,k}(a + bx)\psi'_{p,k}(c + dx) \ge 0$. **Theorem 2.19.** Define a function T for $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and k > 0 by

$$T(x) = \frac{\psi_{p,k}(a+bx)^{\alpha}}{\psi_{p,k}(c+dx)^{\beta}}, \quad x \in [0,\infty)$$

where a, b, c, d, α , β are positive real numbers such that $a+bx \leq c+dx$, $\beta d \leq \alpha b$, $\psi_{p,k}(a+bx) > 0$ and $\psi_{p,k}(c+dx) > 0$. Then T is increasing on $x \in [0,\infty)$ and the inequality

$$\frac{\psi_{p,k}(a)^{\alpha}}{\psi_{p,k}(c)^{\beta}} \le \frac{\psi_{p,k}(a+bx)^{\alpha}}{\psi_{p,k}(c+dx)^{\beta}} \le \frac{\psi_{p,k}(a+b)^{\alpha}}{\psi_{p,k}(c+d)^{\beta}}$$
(23)

holds for $x \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. Let $\lambda(x) = \ln T(x)$. That is,

$$\lambda(x) = \ln \frac{\psi_{p,k}(a+bx)^{\alpha}}{\psi_{p,k}(c+dx)^{\beta}} = \alpha \ln \psi_{p,k}(a+bx) - \beta \ln \psi_{p,k}(c+dx).$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda'(x) &= \alpha b \frac{\psi'_{p,k}(a+bx)}{\psi_{p,k}(a+bx)} - \beta d \frac{\psi'_{p,k}(c+dx)}{\psi_{p,k}(c+dx)} \\ &= \frac{\alpha b \psi'_{p,k}(a+bx) \psi_{p,k}(c+dx) - \beta d \psi'_{p,k}(c+dx) \psi_{p,k}(a+bx)}{\psi_{p,k}(a+bx) \psi_{p,k}(c+dx)} \ge 0 \end{aligned}$$

resulting from Lemma 2.18. That implies T is increasing on $x \in [0, \infty)$ and for every $x \in [0, 1]$ we have,

$$T(0) \le T(x) \le T(1)$$

yielding the result (23).

Remark 2.20. Let $p \to \infty$ in Theorem 2.19, then we obtain the *k*-analogue of (23) as presented in Theorem 3.7 of [7].

Remark 2.21. Let $k \to 1$ in Theorem 2.19, then we obtain the *p*-analogue of (23).

Remark 2.22. Let $p \to \infty$ as $k \to 1$ in Theorem 2.19, then we obtain Theorem 2.3 of [2].

Remark 2.23. Results similar to (23) can also be found in [3] for the (q, k) and (p, q) analogues of the Digamma function.

Lemma 2.24 ([4]). Let m be a positive odd integer. Then the inequality

$$\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x)\psi_{p,k}^{(m+2)}(x) - \left[\psi_{p,k}^{(m+1)}(x)\right]^2 \ge 0.$$

holds for $p \in \mathbb{N}$, k > 0 and x > 0.

Lemma 2.25. For a positive odd integer m, let $H(x) = \frac{\psi_{p,k}^{(m+1)}(x)}{\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x)}$, where $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and k > 0. Then H is increasing for x > 0.

Proof. Direct differentiation yields

$$H'(x) = \frac{\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x)\psi_{p,k}^{(m+2)}(x) - [\psi_{p,k}^{(m+1)}(x)]^2}{[\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x)]^2}.$$

Then by Lemma 2.24, we conclude that $H'(x) \ge 0$ ending the proof.

Lemma 2.26. Let $u \ge w > 0$, $p \in \mathbb{N}$, k > 0 and m a positive odd integer. Then for $0 < x \le y$, we have

$$u\frac{\psi_{p,k}^{(m+1)}(x)}{\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(x)} - w\frac{\psi_{p,k}^{(m+1)}(y)}{\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(y)} \le 0.$$

Proof. Let H(x) be defined as in Lemma 2.25. Then for $0 < x \leq y$ we have, $H(x) \leq H(y) < 0$ since H(x) is increasing. This together with the fact that $u \geq w > 0$ gives $uH(x) - wH(y) \leq 0$ yielding the desired result.

Theorem 2.27. Define a function U for $p \in \mathbb{N}$, k > 0 and m a positive odd integer by

$$U(x) = \frac{\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(a+bx)^{\alpha}}{\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(c+dx)^{\beta}}, \quad x \in [0,\infty)$$

where a, b, c, d, α , β are positive real numbers such that $a + bx \leq c + dx$ and $\beta d \leq \alpha b$. Then U is decreasing on $x \in [0, \infty)$ and the inequality

$$\frac{\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(a)^{\alpha}}{\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(c)^{\beta}} \ge \frac{\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(a+bx)^{\alpha}}{\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(c+dx)^{\beta}} \ge \frac{\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(a+b)^{\alpha}}{\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(c+d)^{\beta}}$$
(24)

is valid for $x \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. Let $\delta(x) = \ln U(x)$. That is,

$$\delta(x) = \alpha \ln \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(a+bx) - \beta \ln \psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(c+dx).$$

Then,

$$\delta'(x) = \alpha b \frac{\psi_{p,k}^{(m+1)}(a+bx)}{\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(a+bx)} - \beta d \frac{\psi_{p,k}^{(m+1)}(c+dx)}{\psi_{p,k}^{(m)}(c+dx)}$$

Since $0 < a + bx \le c + dx$ and $0 < \beta d \le \alpha b$, then by Lemma 2.26, we conclude that $\delta'(x) \le 0$. Thus, $\delta(x)$ is decreasing on $x \in [0, \infty)$. Therefore, U is also decreasing on $x \in [0, \infty)$ and for $x \in [0, 1]$, we have $U(0) \ge U(x) \ge U(1)$ yielding the result (24).

Remark 2.28. Let $b = d = \alpha = \beta = 1$ in Theorem 2.27. Then by allowing $p \to \infty$ as $k \to 1$, we recover the result of Theorem 2.9 of [2].

3. CONCLUSION

In this work, we have established several inequalities involving the (p, k)-analogues of the Digamma and Polygamma functions. As a consequence, some previous results are recovered as particular cases of the results of this paper.

References

- C. Mortici, Turan type inequalities for the Gamma and Polygamma functions, Acta Universitatis Apulensis, 23 (2010), 117-121.
- [2] K. Nantomah, Inequalities for the Psi and k-Gamma functions, arXiv.org, Available online at http://arxiv.org/abs/1602.05117v1.
- [3] K. Nantomah, Some Inequalities for the Ratios of Generalized Digamma Functions, Advances in Inequalities and Applications, Vol. 2014 (2014), Article ID 28.
- [4] K. Nantomah. E. Prempeh and S. B. Twum, On a (p,k)-analogue of the Gamma function and some associated Inequalities, Moroccan Journal of Pure and Applied Analysis, 2(2)(2016), 79-90.
- [5] K. Nantomah and E. Prempeh, The k-Analogues of Some Inequalities for the Digamma Function, Mathematica Aeterna, 4(3) (2014), 269-273.
- [6] K. Nantomah and E. Prempeh, The p-Analogues of Some Inequalities for the Digamma Function, Mathematica Aeterna, 4(3) (2014), 275-279.
- [7] K. Nantomah and M. M. Iddrisu, The k-Analogue of Some Inequalities for the Gamma Function, Electron. J. Math. Anal. Appl., 2(2)(2014), 172-177.
- [8] W. T. Sulaiman, Turan inequalities for the digamma and polygamma functions, South Asian Journal of Mathematics, 1(2)(2011), 49-55.

¹ DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY FOR DEVELOPMENT STUDIES, NAVRONGO CAMPUS, P. O. BOX 24, NAVRONGO, UE/R, GHANA.

E-mail address: mykwarasoft@yahoo.com, knantomah@uds.edu.gh