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The inequalities

$$
\frac{1}{x^{2}+1 /(2 \zeta(3))}<\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2 n}{\left(n^{2}+x^{2}\right)^{2}}<\frac{1}{x^{2}+1 / 6}
$$

hold for all real numbers $x \neq 0$. The constants $1 /(2 \zeta(3))$ and $1 / 6$ are best possible. © 1998 A cademic Press

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In 1890, M athieu [11] conjectured (in connection with work on elasticity of solid bodies) that the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(x):=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2 n}{\left(n^{2}+x^{2}\right)^{2}}<\frac{1}{x^{2}} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

is valid for all real numbers $x \neq 0$. In 1949, Schröder [15] established a weaker form of (1.1) and used his result to solve the problem of the rectangular plate. The first proof of M athieu's inequality was published in 1952 by Berg [2]. An interesting new proof was given by van der Corput and Heflinger [3] in 1956; they established a general integral inequality and showed that (1.1) can be deduced from their theorem. M oreover, they corrected an error in an approach presented by Emersleben [7]. All these proofs are quite intricate. A very short and elementary proof of inequality (1.1) was published by Makai [10] in 1957, who also established that the following converse of (1.1) holds for all real $x$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{x^{2}+1 / 2}<S(x) \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Several interesting extensions, refinements, and results related to (1.1) and (1.2) can be found in $[2-10,14,16,17]$; see also the monographs [12, pp. 360-362] and [13, pp. 629-634]. Recently, Jakimovski and Russell [9] showed that an extended form of $S(x)$ plays a role in examining $M$ ercerian theorems for Cesàro summability.

From (1.1) and (1.2) we conclude that the double inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{x^{2}+a}<S(x)<\frac{1}{x^{2}+b} \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds for all $x \neq 0$, if $a=1 / 2$ and $b=0$. It is natural to look for an improvement of this result. More precisely, we ask for the smallest constant $a$ and the largest constant $b$ such that (1.3) is valid for all $x \neq 0$. In this note this problem is solved. A ccording to numerical results, Elbert [6] conjectured in 1982 that the left-hand inequality of (1.3) holds with $a=1 /(2 \zeta(3))=0.415 \ldots$. In the next section we establish Elbert's conjecture and we show that the right-hand inequality holds with $b=1 / 6=$ 0.166....

## 2. THE MAIN RESULT

The principal tools we need to prove our theorem are an inequality for infinite series and an expansion of $S(x)$ in powers of $1 / x$.

Lemma 1. If $y>0$ is a real number, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n}{\left(n^{2}+y\right)^{3}}<\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n}{\left(n^{2}+y\right)^{2}}\right)^{2} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The validity of this inequality was conjectured by the first two authors [1]. Very recently, Wilkins [18] found a remarkable proof; he used series and integral representations for the trigamma function to establish (2.1).

Lemma 2. For all sufficiently large $x$, the asymptotic estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(x)=\frac{1}{x^{2}}-\frac{1}{6 x^{4}}+O\left(\frac{1}{x^{6}}\right) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

is valid.
The representation (2.2) was proved by $W$ ang and $W$ ang [17] in 1981; see also [13, p. 630]. A generalization of this result was given by Elbert [6] and Russell [14].

U sing the lemmas just stated, we can prove the following theorem, which provides the best possible values of $a$ and $b$ in (1.3).

Theorem. For all real numbers $x \neq 0$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{x^{2}+1 /(2 \zeta(3))}<\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2 n}{\left(n^{2}+x^{2}\right)^{2}}<\frac{1}{x^{2}+1 / 6} . \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The constants $1 /(2 \zeta(3))$ and $1 / 6$ are best possible.
Proof. A simple calculation reveals that (2.3) is equivalent to

$$
\begin{equation*}
1 / 6<f(y)<1 /(2 \zeta(3)), \quad y>0, \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
f(y)=\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2 n}{\left(n^{2}+y\right)^{2}}\right)^{-1}-y .
$$

First, we show that $f$ is strictly decreasing on $[0, \infty)$. For all $y>0$, straightforward differentiation yields

$$
\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n}{\left(n^{2}+y\right)^{2}}\right)^{2} f^{\prime}(y)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n}{\left(n^{2}+y\right)^{3}}-\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n}{\left(n^{2}+y\right)^{2}}\right)^{2},
$$

so that Lemma 1 implies

$$
f^{\prime}(y)<0 \quad \text { for } y>0
$$

Since $f(0)=1 /(2 \zeta(3))$, the second inequality of (2.4) holds for all $y>0$.
Now, we prove the first inequality of (2.4). For this it suffices to show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{y \rightarrow \infty} f(y)=1 / 6 \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 2 implies

$$
S(\sqrt{y})=\frac{1}{y}-\frac{1}{6 y^{2}}+O\left(\frac{1}{y^{3}}\right) .
$$

Therefore,

$$
f(y)=\frac{1}{S(\sqrt{y})}-y=\frac{\frac{1}{6}-y^{2} O\left(\frac{1}{y^{3}}\right)}{1-\frac{1}{6 y}+y O\left(\frac{1}{y^{3}}\right)},
$$

from which (2.5) follows. Since $f$ is monotonic, the bounds given in (2.4) cannot be improved. This completes the proof of the theorem.
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