ON THE EXTENDED HILBERT’S INEQUALITY
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Abstract. In this paper, it is shown that the extended Hilbert’s inequality for double series can be refined by the aid of the Euler-Maclaurin summation formula. The extreme cases \( p \to 1^+ \) and \( q \to +\infty \) are discussed.

1. Introduction

Let \( \{a_n\} \) and \( \{b_n\} \) be two sequences of nonnegative real numbers, \( p > 1 \) and \( \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1 \). If \( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n^p < +\infty \) and \( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n^q < +\infty \), then an extended Hilbert’s inequality may be written in the form

\[
\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_m b_n}{m + n} \leq \left( \frac{\pi}{\sin \frac{\pi}{p}} \right) \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.
\]

As is well known, the constant factor \( \frac{\pi}{\sin \frac{\pi}{p}} \) contained in (1) is best possible. In other words, \( \frac{\pi}{\sin \frac{\pi}{p}} \) cannot be replaced by any positive number smaller than it (cf. [1], [2]). But we may move the factor \( \frac{\pi}{\sin \frac{\pi}{p}} \) of the right-hand side of (1) to the inside of the summation and write it in the following form:

\[
\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_m b_n}{m + n} \leq \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{\pi}{\sin \frac{\pi}{p}} - \alpha_n(p) \right) a_n^p \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{\pi}{\sin \frac{\pi}{p}} - \alpha_n(q) \right) b_n^q \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}},
\]

where \( \alpha_n(r) \downarrow 0 \) (\( r = p, q \)). Clearly, it will offer a refined form of (1). In this paper it will be shown that we can take \( \alpha_n(r) = \lambda/n^{1-\frac{1}{r}} \), where \( \lambda \) is a positive real number that is independent of \( r \). Furthermore, we prove also that \( \lambda = 1 - \gamma \), where \( \gamma \) is the Euler constant.

Before proving our results we need to define some functions. Throughout this paper we assume that \( x \in [1, +\infty) \) and \( r \in (1, +\infty) \).

Let us define the following functions:

\[
u(x) = x^{1-\frac{1}{r}} I(x),\]

where \( I(x) \) is defined by

\[
I(x) = \int_{0}^{\frac{1}{x}} \frac{1}{1+t} \left( \frac{1}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} dt,
\]
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and
\[ v(x) = \int_1^\infty \rho(t) F(x, t) \, dt, \]
where \( \rho(t) \) and \( F(x, t) \) are defined respectively by
\[ \rho(t) = t - \lfloor t \rfloor - \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad F(x, t) = \frac{(r + 1)xt + x^2}{r(x + t)^{r+1/r}}. \]

For convenience we define
\[ \lambda_r(x) = u(x) + v(x) - \frac{x}{2(x + 1)} \]
where \( u(x) \) and \( v(x) \) are defined respectively by (3) and (5). Particularly, in the case \( x = 1 \), \( \lambda_r(1) \) is denoted by \( \lambda(r) \). We know from (6) that
\[ \lambda(r) = u(1) + v(1) - \frac{1}{4}. \]
We will show that \( \lambda(r) \) can be written in the form
\[ \lambda(r) = J(r) + R(r), \]
where \( J \) and \( R \) are defined respectively by
\[ J(r) = \int_0^1 \frac{1}{1 + t} \left( \frac{1}{r} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \, dt - \frac{13r + 2}{48r} \]
and
\[ R(r) = \frac{\theta}{5760} \left( 3 + \frac{20}{r} + \frac{18}{r^2} + \frac{4}{r^3} \right) \quad (0 < \theta < 1). \]

2. LEMMAS

The aim of the section is to prove the following inequalities are valid:
\[ \lambda_r(x) \geq \lambda(r) > \lambda \]
where \( \lambda \) is an infimum of \( \lambda(r) \).

**Lemma 1.** Let \( I(x) \) be the function defined by (4). Then
\[ I(x) \geq \frac{r(2r - 1)x^{\frac{1}{r}}}{(r - 1)((2r - 1)x + r - 1)}. \]

**Proof.** Using integration by parts we obtain
\[ I(x) = \frac{rx^{\frac{1}{r}}}{(r - 1)(x + 1)} + \frac{r}{r - 1} K(x), \]
where \( K(x) \) is defined by
\[ K(x) = \int_0^{\frac{1}{x}} \frac{t^{1 - \frac{1}{r}}}{(1 + t)^2} \, dt. \]
Define the functions \( f \) and \( g \) respectively by
\[ f(t) = \frac{1}{(1 + t)^2} \left( \frac{1}{x} \right)^{1 - \frac{1}{r}} \quad \text{and} \quad g(t) = (xt)^{1 - \frac{1}{r}}, \quad t \in \left[ 0, \frac{1}{x} \right]. \]
Evidently \( f(t) \) is nonnegative and monotone decreasing in \([0, \frac{1}{r}]\) and \( g(t) \) satisfies the constraint \( 0 \leq g(t) \leq 1 \). According to Steffensen’s inequality we have

\[
(11) \quad \int_{\frac{1}{r} - c}^{\frac{1}{r}} f(t) \, dt \leq \int_{0}^{\frac{1}{r}} f(t) g(t) \, dt = K(x) \leq \int_{0}^{c} f(t) \, dt,
\]

where \( c = \int_{0}^{\frac{1}{r}} g(t) \, dt = \int_{0}^{\frac{1}{r}} (xt)^{1-\frac{1}{r}} \, dt = \frac{x}{(2r-1)}\). Hence

\[
K(x) \geq \int_{\frac{1}{r} - c}^{\frac{1}{r}} \frac{1}{(1+t)^2} \left( \frac{1}{x} \right)^{1-\frac{1}{r}} \, dt = -\frac{x^{\frac{1}{r}}}{x+1} + \frac{x^{\frac{1}{r}}(2r-1)}{x(2r-1) + (r-1)}.
\]

Substituting it in the second term of the right-hand side of (10) we obtain after simplification that (9) is valid.

**Lemma 2.** Let \( \lambda_r(x) \) be the function defined by (6). Then

\[
(12) \quad \lambda_r(n) \geq \lambda(r), \quad n \in N,
\]

where \( \lambda(r) \) is defined by (7).

**Proof.** At first, consider the function \( u(x) \) defined by (3). Taking derivatives and after simplification we have

\[
u'(x) = \frac{r-1}{r} x^{-\frac{1}{r}} I(x) - \frac{x^{1-\frac{1}{r}}}{1+x}.
\]

By Lemma 1 we obtain easily the following inequality:

\[
(13) \quad u'(x) \geq r/(x+1)(2r-1)x + (r-1)).
\]

Define the functions \( F_1 \) and \( F_2 \) by

\[
F_1(t) = \frac{r+1}{r(x+t)^{2t^{1/r}}} \quad \text{and} \quad F_2(t) = \frac{2x}{(x+t)^{3t^{1/r}}}, \quad t \in [1, +\infty).
\]

Obviously \( F_i(t) \downarrow 0 \) \( (t \to +\infty) \) and after calculations \( F_i''(t) > 0 \). In the paper [4] it has been proved that

\[
-\frac{1}{8} F_i(1) < \int_{1}^{\infty} \rho(t) F_i(t) \, dt < -\frac{1}{12} F_i \left( \frac{3}{2} \right), \quad i = 1, 2.
\]

Hence we obtain from (5) that

\[
v'(x) = \int_{1}^{\infty} \rho(t) \left( \frac{x + rt + t - xr}{r(x+t)^{3t^{1/r}}} \right) \, dt
\]

\[
= \int_{1}^{\infty} \rho(t) F_1(t) \, dt - \int_{1}^{\infty} \rho(t) F_2(t) \, dt
\]

\[
> -\frac{1}{8} F(1) + \frac{1}{12} F_2 \left( \frac{3}{2} \right)
\]

\[
= -\frac{r+1}{8r(x+1)^2} + \frac{4x}{3(2x+3)^3} \left( \frac{2}{3} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}.
\]

We can obtain from (13) and (14) that

\[
\lambda'_r(x) = u'(x) + v'(x) - \frac{1}{2(x+1)^2}
\]

\[
> \left( 2r^2 + 3r + 1 \right) x + \left( 3r^2 + 4r + 1 \right) \frac{4x}{8r(x+1)^2(2r-1)x + (r-1))} + \frac{4x}{3(2x+3)^3} \left( \frac{2}{3} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}.
\]
By direct computations we have the following conclusions (see Notes at the end of this paper):

When \( r \geq 4, (\frac{2}{3})^{\frac{1}{r}} > \frac{9}{10}, \lambda'_r(x) > 0 \) is true. And when \( 1 < r < 4, (\frac{2}{3})^{\frac{1}{r}} > \frac{2}{3}, \lambda'_r(x) > 0 \) is also true. This implies that \( \lambda_r(x) \) is monotone increasing. Whence (12) is valid.

**Lemma 3.** Let \( \lambda(r) \) be the function defined by (8). Then if \( \lambda = \inf \{ \lambda(r) \} \) we have \( \lim_{r \to \infty} \lambda(r) = \lambda \).

**Proof.** Evidently the function \( J'(r) \) is continuously differentiable in \((1, +\infty)\). Hence

\[
J'(r) = \frac{1}{r^2} \int_0^1 \frac{\ln t}{1 + t} \left( \frac{1}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} dt + \frac{1}{24r^2}.
\]

Substituting \( t = e^{-y} \) in (15) we obtain easily that

\[
J'(r) = -\frac{1}{r^2} \int_0^{+\infty} ye^{-\alpha y} \frac{1}{1 + e^{-y}} dy + \frac{1}{24r^2}
\]

\[
< -\frac{1}{2r^2} \int_0^{+\infty} ye^{-\alpha y} dy = -\frac{1}{2(r-1)^2} + \frac{1}{24r^2} < 0,
\]

where \( \alpha = 1 - \frac{1}{r} \). Hence the function \( J(r) \) is monotone decreasing. Clearly \( R(r) \) is also monotone decreasing. Thus

\[
\lambda = \inf \{ \lambda(r) \} = \lim_{r \to \infty} \lambda(r).
\]

By Lemma 3, we obtain at once the following results:

\[
\lambda(r) > \lambda = \ln 2 - \frac{13}{48} + \frac{\theta}{1920} \quad (0 < \theta < 1).
\]

3. **Main results**

**Theorem 1.** Let \( q \geq p > 1 \) and \( \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1 \). If \( 0 < \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n^p < +\infty \) and \( 0 < \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n^q < +\infty \), then

\[
\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_m b_n < \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{\pi}{\sin \frac{\pi}{p}} - \lambda/n^{\frac{1}{p}} \right) a_n^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{\pi}{\sin \frac{\pi}{q}} - \lambda/n^{\frac{1}{q}} \right) b_n^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}},
\]

where \( \lambda = 1 - \gamma \) and \( \gamma \) is the Euler constant. \( \lambda \) is the largest constant that keeps (17) valid and is independent of \( r \) (\( r = p, q \)).
Proof. We may apply Hölder’s inequality to estimate the left-hand side of (17) as follows:

\[
\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_m b_n}{m+n} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_m}{(m+n)^{\frac{1}{q}}} \left( \frac{m}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \cdot \frac{b_n}{(m+n)^{\frac{1}{p}}} \left( \frac{n}{m} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}
\]

\[
\leq \left\{ \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_m^p}{m+n} \left( \frac{m}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left\{ \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_n^q}{m+n} \left( \frac{n}{m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}
\]

\[
= \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m+n} \left( \frac{n}{m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) a_n^p \right\}^{\frac{1}{p}} \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m+n} \left( \frac{n}{m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) b_n^q \right\}^{\frac{1}{q}}
\]

where \( \omega_r(n) \) \( (r = p, q) \) is defined by

\[
\omega_r(n) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m+n} \left( \frac{n}{m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\]

Applying the Euler-Maclaurin summation formula to \( \omega_r(n) \) and using the relation

\[
\sin \frac{\pi}{p} = \sin \frac{\pi}{q},
\]

we obtain

\[
\omega_r(n) = \int_1^{\infty} g(t) \, dt + \frac{1}{2} g(1) + \int_1^{\infty} \rho(t) g'(t) \, dt
\]

\[
= \int_0^{\infty} g(t) \, dt - \int_0^{1} g(t) \, dt + \frac{1}{2} g(1) + \int_1^{\infty} \rho(t) g'(t) \, dt,
\]

where the function \( g \) is defined by

\[
g(t) = \frac{1}{n + t} \left( \frac{n}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad t \in (0, +\infty).
\]

Note that

\[
\int_0^{\infty} g(t) \, dt = \pi / \sin \frac{\pi}{p}, \quad \int_0^{1} g(t) \, dt = \int_0^{\frac{1}{n+1}} \frac{1}{1 + t} \left( \frac{1}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \, dt = u(n)/n^{1-\frac{1}{p}}
\]

and

\[
\int_1^{\infty} \rho(t) g'(t) \, dt = v(n)/n^{1-\frac{1}{q}},
\]

where \( u(x) \) and \( v(x) \) are the functions defined by (3) and (5) respectively. Hence

\[
\omega_r(n) = \pi / \sin \frac{\pi}{p} - \left( u(n) + v(n) - \frac{n}{2(n+1)} \right) / n^{1-\frac{1}{p}}
\]

\[
= \pi / \sin \frac{\pi}{p} - \lambda_r(n)/n^{1-\frac{1}{p}},
\]

where \( \lambda_r(n) \) is the function defined by (6).

In view of (12) we have

\[
\omega_r(n) \leq \pi / \sin \frac{\pi}{p} - \lambda(r)/n^{1-\frac{1}{p}}.
\]
When \( n = 1 \) it follows from (18) that
\[
\lambda(r) = \lambda_r(1) = \pi / \sin \frac{\pi}{p} - \omega_r(1).
\]

Applying the Euler-Maclaurin summation formula to \( \omega_r(1) \) we have
\[
\omega_r(1) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1 + m} \left( \frac{1}{m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \int_{1}^{\infty} f(t) \, dt + \frac{1}{2} f(1) + \sum_{k=1}^{s-1} -\rho_s
\]
\[
= \int_{0}^{\infty} f(t) \, dt - \int_{0}^{1} f(t) \, dt + \frac{1}{2} f(1) + \sum_{k=1}^{s-1} -\rho_s
\]
\[
= \pi / \sin \frac{\pi}{p} - \int_{0}^{1} f(t) \, dt + \frac{1}{4} + \sum_{k=1}^{s-1} -\rho_s.
\]

Hence the term \( \lambda(r) \) that appears in (19) can be written in the form
\[
\lambda(r) = \int_{0}^{1} f(t) \, dt - \frac{1}{4} - \sum_{k=1}^{s-1} +\rho_s,
\]
where \( f(t) = \frac{1}{1+t} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \sum_{k=1}^{s-1} = \sum_{k=1}^{s-1} B_{2k} f^{(2k-1)}(1) \) and the \( B_j \)'s are the Bernoulli numbers, viz. \( B_2 = \frac{1}{6}, B_4 = -\frac{1}{30}, B_6 = \frac{1}{42} \) etc., and \( \rho_s \) is the remainder of the form
\[
\rho_s = \frac{B_{2s} \theta}{(2s)!} f^{(2s-1)}(1) \quad (0 < \theta < 1).
\]

For \( s = 2 \) we obtain (8) from (20). By virtue of Lemma 3 and (19) we get that
\[
\omega_r(n) < \pi / \sin \frac{\pi}{p} - \lambda / n^{1-\frac{1}{p}}.
\]

It remains to show that \( \lambda = 1 - \gamma \), where \( \gamma \) is the Euler constant. For \( n = 1 \), using the Euler-Maclaurin summation formula we obtain from (18) that
\[
\lambda(r) = \pi / \sin \frac{\pi}{p} - \left\{ \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{1 + m} \left( \frac{1}{m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sum_{m=k}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1 + m} \left( \frac{1}{m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}
\]
\[
= \pi / \sin \frac{\pi}{p} - \left\{ \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{1 + m} \left( \frac{1}{m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \int_{k}^{\infty} f(t) \, dt + \frac{1}{2} f(k) - \frac{\theta}{12} f'(k) \right\}
\]
\[
= \int_{0}^{k} f(t) \, dt - \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{1 + m} \left( \frac{1}{m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{2} f(k) + \frac{\theta}{12} f'(k) \quad (0 < \theta < 1),
\]
where \( f(t) = \frac{1}{1+t} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \) In accordance with the definition of the Euler constant \( \gamma \), i.e.
\[
\sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{1 + m} = \gamma + \ln(k-1) + \varepsilon_{k-1} \quad (\varepsilon_{k-1} \to 0, \text{ if } k \to +\infty)
\]
and by Lemma 3 we obtain from (22)
\[
\lambda = \lim_{r \to \infty} \lambda(r) = \int_{0}^{k} \frac{1}{1+t} \, dt - \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{1 + m} - \frac{1}{2(1+k)} - \frac{\theta}{12(1+k)^2}
\]
\[
= 1 - \gamma + \Delta R,
\]
where $\Delta R$ is the error of the form
$$\Delta R = \ln \frac{k+1}{k-1} - \frac{1}{2(1+k)} - \frac{\theta}{12(1+k)^2} \quad (0 < \theta < 1).$$
This implies that the bigger we take the value of $k$, the smaller the value of $|\Delta R|$. Let $k \to +\infty$. Then we obtain that $\lambda = 1 - \gamma$.

Based on Lemma 3 and (21), it follows that $\lambda$ is the largest constant that keeps (17) valid and is independent of $r$ ($r = p, q$).

Thus we have completed the proof of the theorem. □

The value of $\lambda$ is given numerically as follows:
$$\lambda = 0.422784335098467 \ldots$$
In particular, in the case $r = 2$, it follows from (8) that
$$\lambda(2) = J(2) + R(2) = \frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{7}{24} + \frac{\theta}{320}.$$ In view of (19) we have
$$\omega_2(n) \leq \pi - \lambda(2)/\sqrt{n}.$$ Therefore we obtain a sharp result of Hilbert’s inequality.

**Theorem 2.** If $0 < \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n^2 < +\infty$ and $0 < \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n^2 < +\infty$, then
$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_m b_n}{m+n} < \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\pi - \alpha/\sqrt{n}) a_n^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\pi - \alpha/\sqrt{n}) b_n^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}},$$
where $\alpha = \frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{7}{24} + \frac{\theta}{320} \quad (0 < \theta < 1)$.

Finally, the extreme cases $p \to 1^+$ and $q \to +\infty$ are discussed. Note that $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ and $q \geq p > 1$. In the paper [3] it has been proved that $\lambda(p) > \frac{1}{p-1}$, where $\lambda(p)$ is defined by (20). Now we may prove that $\lambda(p) \sim \frac{1}{p-1}$ when $p \to 1^+$. In fact, for $r = p$ and $x = 1$ we consider the function defined by (4) and denote it by $h(p)$. We have
$$h(p) = \int_0^1 \frac{1}{1+t} \left( \frac{1}{t} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \; dt.$$ From (10) we obtain
$$h(p) = \frac{p}{2(p-1)} + \frac{p}{p-1} k(1), \quad \text{where} \; k(1) = \int_0^1 t^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \frac{dt}{(1+t)^2}.$$ Use (11) to estimate $k(1)$. When $x = 1$ we have
$$c = \int_0^1 g(t) \; dt = \int_0^1 t^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \; dt = \frac{p}{2p-1},$$
$$\int_{1-c}^{1} f(t) \; dt = \int_{1-c}^{1} \frac{dt}{(1+t)^2} = \frac{p}{2(3p-2)},$$
and $\int_0^c f(t) \; dt = \frac{p}{3p-1}$. Hence
$$\frac{p}{2(3p-2)} \leq k(1) \leq \frac{p}{3p-1}.$$
Since \( \lim_{p \to 1^+} \frac{p}{(3p-2)^2} = \lim_{p \to 1^+} \frac{p}{3p-1} = \frac{1}{2} \), it follows that \( \lim_{p \to 1^+} k(1) = \frac{1}{2} \).

Whence \( \lim_{p \to 1^+} (p-1)h(p) = 1 \). It follows from (8) that \( \lim_{p \to 1^+} \lambda(p)/p = 1 \).
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**Notes**

\[ \lambda'(x) > g(x) \text{, where} \]
\[ g(x) = \frac{(-2r^2 + 3r + 1)x + (3r^2 + 4r + 1)}{8r(x + 1)^2((2r - 1)x + (r - 1))} + \frac{4x}{3(2x + 3)^3} \left( \frac{2}{3} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \quad r > 1, x \geq 1. \]

When \( r \geq 4 \), \( \left( \frac{2}{3} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} > \frac{9}{11} \). Hence
\[
\begin{align*}
g(x) &> \frac{(-2r^2 + 3r + 1)x + (3r^2 + 4r + 1)}{8r(x + 1)^2((2r - 1)x + (r - 1))} + \frac{6x}{5(2x + 3)^3} \\
&= \frac{A_1 x^4 + A_2 x^3 + A_3 x^2 + A_4 x + A_5}{40r(x + 1)^2(2x + 3)^3((2r - 1)x + (r - 1))} > 0,
\end{align*}
\]

where
\[
A_1 = 16r^2 + 72r + 40, \quad A_2 = 556r + 220, \\
A_3 = 192r^2 + 1386r + 450, \quad A_4 = 588r^2 + 1437r + 405, \\
A_5 = 13r(3r^2 + 4r + 1)
\]

when \( 1 < r < 4 \), \( \left( \frac{2}{3} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} > \frac{2}{3} \). Hence
\[
\begin{align*}
g(x) &> \frac{(-2r^2 + 3r + 1)x + (3r^2 + 4r + 1)}{8r(x + 1)^2((2r - 1)x + (r - 1))} + \frac{8x}{9(2x + 3)^3} \\
&= \frac{B_1 x^4 + B_2 x^3 + B_3 x^2 + B_4 x + B_5}{72r(x + 1)^2(2x + 3)^3((2r - 1)x + (r - 1))} > 0,
\end{align*}
\]

where
\[
B_1 = -16r^2 + 152r + 72, \quad B_2 = -112r^2 + 1068r + 396, \\
B_3 = 256r^2 + 2562r + 810, \quad B_4 = 1036r^2 + 2609r + 729, \\
B_5 = 243(3r^2 + 4r + 1).
\]

Consequently, we have \( \lambda'(x) > g(x) > 0 \).
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