

**Definition.** A sequence of real numbers  $a_0, \dots, a_n$  is *logarithmically concave* or *log-concave* is

$$a_i^2 \geq a_{i-1}a_{i+1}$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ . We say  $a_0, \dots, a_n$  is *strongly log-concave* if

$$b_i^2 \geq b_{i-1}b_{i+1}$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$  where  $b_i := a_i / \binom{n}{i}$ .

The name *log-concave* comes from the fact that  $a_i^2 \geq a_{i-1}a_{i+1}$  is a multiplicative version of the inequality  $a_i \geq \frac{a_{i-1} + a_{i+1}}{2}$ . An easy calculation shows that strong log-concavity is equivalent to

$$a_i^2 \geq \left(1 + \frac{1}{i}\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{n-i}\right) a^{i-1} a^{i+1},$$

from which it follows that strong log-concavity implies log-concavity.

It is not always true that log-concavity implies unimodality. Consider  $1, 0, 0, 1$ , for instance. A sequence,  $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n$  has *no internal zeros* if whenever  $i < j < k$  and both  $a_i$  and  $a_k$  are nonzero, then  $a_j$  is also nonzero.

**Proposition 5.11** Let  $\alpha = (a_0, \dots, a_n)$  be a sequence of nonnegative real numbers with no internal zeros. If  $\alpha$  is log-concave, the  $\alpha$  is unimodal.

*Proof.* If at most two values of  $\alpha$  are nonzero, then  $a_{i-1}a_{i+1} = 0$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ , and the result holds. Otherwise, assume  $\alpha$  is not unimodal. Then there exists  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$  such that  $a_{i-1} > a_i < a_{i+1}$ . Using the fact that the elements of  $\alpha$  are nonnegative, it follows that  $a_i^2 < a_{i-1}a_{i+1}$ .  $\square$

**Example.** The  $n$ -th row of Pascal's triangle

$$\binom{n}{0}, \binom{n}{1}, \dots, \binom{n}{n}$$

is trivially strongly log-concave with no internal zeros. Hence, it is unimodal. Here is a combinatorial proof of log-concavity of the binomial coefficients from Richard Stanley's paper [Log-concave and unimodal sequences in algebra, combinatorics, and geometry](#), 1989 (see the "Final word of warning" at the end of that paper). Let  $\binom{[n]}{i}$  denote the collection of subsets of  $[n]$  of size  $i$ . We describe an injection

$$\phi: \binom{[n]}{i-1} \times \binom{[n]}{i+1} \rightarrow \binom{[n]}{i} \times \binom{[n]}{i}$$

Log-concavity then follows:

$$a_{i-1}a_{i+1} = \left| \binom{[n]}{i-1} \right| \left| \binom{[n]}{i+1} \right| \leq \left| \binom{[n]}{i} \right|^2 = a_i^2.$$

For any  $X \subseteq [n]$  and  $j = 0, \dots, n$ , define

$$X_j = X \cap [j] = \{x \in X : x \leq j\}.$$

Given  $(A, B) \in \binom{[n]}{i-1} \times \binom{[n]}{i+1}$ , let  $j$  be the smallest nonnegative integer such that  $|A_j| = |B_j| - 1$ . This integer must exist since  $|A_0| = |B_0| = 0$ , and  $|A_n| = |B_n| - 2$ , and the sizes of  $A_j$  and  $B_j$  grow in size by at most one each time  $j$  increases by one. Next, define

$$C := A_j \cup (B \setminus B_j) \quad \text{and} \quad D := B_j \cup (A \setminus A_j).$$

Note that these are disjoint unions since, for instance  $A_j \subseteq [j]$  and  $B \setminus B_j \subset [n] \setminus [j]$ . We also have that  $|C| = |D| = i$ : instance,

$$|C| = |A_j| + |B| - |B_j| = |A_j| + (i+1) - (|A_j| + 1) = i,$$

and similarly for  $|D|$ . Define  $\phi(A, B) = (C, D)$ . For injectivity, note that

$$A_k = C_k \quad \text{and} \quad B_k = D_k$$

for  $k = 0, \dots, j$ , while

$$A_{j+1} \neq C_{j+1} \quad \text{and} \quad B_{j+1} \neq D_{j+1}.$$

Thus, we can recover  $j$ ,  $A_j$ , and  $B_j$  from  $(C, D)$ . But from that information, we can recover  $(A, B)$ . For instance,

$$A = C_j \cup (D \setminus B_j).$$

That completes the proof.

**Example.** Let  $A = \{1, 3, 4, 6\}$ . Then  $A_0 = \emptyset$ ,  $A_1 = A_2 = \{1\}$ ,  $A_3 = \{1, 3\}$ ,  $A_4 = A_5 = \{1, 3, 4\}$ , and  $A_6 = A$ .

There is a surprising connection between log-concavity and polynomials with real zeros:

**Theorem 5.12** (I. Newton) Let

$$P(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n b_i x^i = \sum_{i=0}^n \binom{n}{i} a_i x^i$$

be a real polynomial all of whose zeros are real numbers. Then the sequence  $b_0, \dots, b_n$  is strongly log-concave, or equivalently, the sequence  $a_0, \dots, a_n$  is log-concave. Moreover, if each  $b_i \geq 0$  (so the zeros of  $P(x)$  are non-positive [why?]) then the sequence  $b_0, \dots, b_n$  has no internal zeros.

Note that Stanley's statement here reverses the notation introduced earlier: in the definition of strong log-concavity, we had  $b_i = a_i / \binom{n}{i}$ , and were talking about strong log-concavity of the sequence  $(a_i)$  and here we have  $a_i = b_i / \binom{n}{i}$  and are talking about strong log-concavity of the sequence  $(b_i)$ .

Before proving the theorem, we first prove some preliminary results.

**Proposition.** Let  $F(x) = \sum_{i=0}^m a_i x^i$  be a real polynomial of degree  $m$  with only real zeros. Then its derivative,  $F'(x)$ , has only real zeros.

*Proof.* By long division,  $\alpha$  is a zero of  $F$  of multiplicity  $r \geq 1$  if and only if there exists a polynomial  $G$  such that

$$F(x) = (x - \alpha)^r G(x)$$

where  $G(\alpha) \neq 0$ . So suppose  $\alpha$  is a zero of  $F$  of multiplicity  $r$  and choose  $G$  as above. Then,

$$F'(x) = r(x - \alpha)^{r-1} G(x) + (x - \alpha)^r G'(x) = (x - \alpha)^{r-1} (G(x) + (x - \alpha) G'(x)).$$

Since  $G(x) + (x - \alpha) G'(x)$  evaluated at  $\alpha$  is  $G(\alpha) \neq 0$ , we conclude that  $\alpha$  is a zero of  $F'$  of multiplicity  $r - 1$ .

Say the zeros of  $F$  are  $\alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_k$  with respective multiplicities  $r_1, \dots, r_k$ . By Rolle's theorem, for each  $1 \leq i < k$ , since  $F(\alpha_i) = F(\alpha_{i+1}) = 0$ , there is zero  $\beta_i$  of  $F'(x)$  between  $\alpha_i$  and  $\alpha_{i+1}$ . Thus, we have zeros for  $F'(x)$ :

$$\alpha_1 < \beta_1 < \alpha_2 < \beta_2 < \dots < \alpha_{k-1} < \beta_{k-1} < \alpha_k.$$

where  $\alpha_i$  has multiplicity  $r_i - 1$ . Counting multiplicities, we have found  $(\sum_{i=1}^k r_i) - 1 = \deg(F) - 1 = m - 1$  roots of  $F'$ . Since  $\deg(F') = m - 1$ , we have found all of the roots of  $F'$ , and they are all real.  $\square$

**Proposition.** Let  $F(x) = \sum_{i=0}^m a_i x^i$  be a real polynomial of degree  $m$  with only real zeros. Then the polynomial  $\tilde{F}(x) := x^m F(1/x)$  has only real zeros.

*Proof.* Let  $k \geq 0$  be the multiplicity of 0 as a zero of  $F$ . We can then write  $F(x) = x^k G(x)$  where  $G(0) \neq 0$ . The nonzero zeros of  $F$  and  $G$  are the same, with the same multiplicities. We have

$$\tilde{F}(x) = x^{m-k} G(1/x).$$

So the nonzero zeros of  $\tilde{F}$  are the reciprocals of those of  $F$ . Thus, all of the zeros of  $\tilde{F}$  are real.  $\square$

The above two propositions say that the property of having all real zeros is preserved under taking derivatives and under a certain type of “inversion”. Here is an example illustrating how these operations are useful in relating the property of having all real zeros with strong log-concavity. Say

$$P(x) = b_0 + b_1x + b_2x^2 + b_3x^3 + b_4x^4 + b_5x^5x^5 + b_6x^6 + b_7x^7$$

has all real zeros. We can show that strong log-concavity holds for, say,  $b_2, b_3, b_4$  by using the two operations from the propositions to eliminate all the terms in  $P$  except the three involving  $b_2, b_3$  and  $b_4$ . First take two derivatives to eliminate  $b_0$  and  $b_1$ :

$$P''(x) = (2 \cdot 1)b_2 + (3 \cdot 2)b_3x + (4 \cdot 3)b_4x^2 + (5 \cdot 4)b_5x^3 + (6 \cdot 5)b_6x^4 + (7 \cdot 6)b_7x^5.$$

Now invert to define a polynomial  $Q$ :

$$Q(x) = x^5P''(1/x) = (2 \cdot 1)b_2x^5 + (3 \cdot 2)b_3x^4 + (4 \cdot 3)b_4x^3 + (5 \cdot 4)b_5x^2 + (6 \cdot 5)b_6x + (7 \cdot 6)b_7.$$

Take 3 derivatives to eliminate the terms involving  $b_5, b_6$ , and  $b_7$ :

$$Q^{(3)} = (2 \cdot 1)(5 \cdot 4 \cdot 3)b_2x^2 + (3 \cdot 2)(4 \cdot 3 \cdot 2)b_3x + (4 \cdot 3)(3 \cdot 2 \cdot 1)b_4.$$

To prove strong log-concavity, define  $a_i = b_i / \binom{7}{i}$  and substitute:

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{(3)} &= (2 \cdot 1)(5 \cdot 4 \cdot 3) \binom{7}{2} a_2x^2 + (3 \cdot 2)(4 \cdot 3 \cdot 2) \binom{7}{3} a_3x + (4 \cdot 3)(3 \cdot 2 \cdot 1) \binom{7}{4} a_4 \\ &= (2 \cdot 1)(5 \cdot 4 \cdot 3) \frac{7!}{2!5!} a_2x^2 + (3 \cdot 2)(4 \cdot 3 \cdot 2) \frac{7!}{3!4!} a_3x + (4 \cdot 3)(3 \cdot 2 \cdot 1) \frac{7!}{4!3!} a_4 \\ &= \frac{7!}{2} (a_2x^2 + 2a_3x + a_4) \end{aligned}$$

Since  $Q^{(3)}$  has only real zeros, it must be that the quadratic

$$a_2x^2 + 2a_3x + a_4$$

has only real zeros. By the quadratic equation, this happens if and only if the discriminant is nonnegative:

$$4a_3^2 - 4a_2a_4 = 4(a_3^2 - a_2a_4) \geq 0.$$

That gives log-concavity for  $a_2, a_3, a_4$ , and hence strong log-concavity for  $b_2, b_3, b_4$ .

*Proof of Theorem 5.12.* Given  $P$  as in the statement of the theorem, suppose that  $\deg(P) = m$  (allowing for the fact that  $b_{m+1}, \dots, b_n$  could all be 0). Fix  $1 < i < m$ , and take derivatives and inversions to eliminate all terms in  $P$  except that involving  $b_{i-1}, b_i$ , and  $b_{i+1}$ . The result is the following polynomial which also has only real zeros:

$$\frac{m!}{2}(a_{i-1}x^2 + 2a_ix + a_{i+1}).$$

Therefore, the sequence of  $b_i$  is strongly log-concave.

Next suppose that each  $b_i \geq 0$ . For the sake of contradict, suppose there are internal zeros. Then there exists  $i + 1 < k$  where  $b_i$  and  $b_j$  are positive and  $b_j = 0$  for all  $i < j < k$ . By taking derivatives and inverting, as above, eliminate the terms of  $P$  having degree less than  $i$  or larger than  $k$ . We are left with a polynomial having two terms (since  $b_j = 0$  for all  $i < j < k$ ):

$$c + dx^{k-i}$$

for some positive  $c, d$ , and with  $k - i \geq 2$ . Further, this polynomial has only real zeros. To find them we solve

$$x^{k-i} = -\frac{c}{d}.$$

This equation has  $k - i$  solutions over the complex numbers, with at most one real solution (when  $k - i$  is odd, then  $-\sqrt[k-i]{c/d}$  is a solution). Thus, we reach a contradiction.  $\square$

Answer to the “why?” in Theorem 5.12: If  $P$  is constant, then 0 is the only possible zero of  $P$ . Otherwise, since the  $b_i \geq 0$ , the derivative  $P'(x)$  is positive for  $x > 0$ . Since  $P(0) = b_0 \geq 0$ , it follows that  $P(x) > 0$  for  $x > 0$ .