

A SYSTEM OF INEQUALITIES FOR THE INCOMPLETE GAMMA FUNCTION AND THE NORMAL INTEGRAL¹

BY SHANTI S. GUPTA AND MRUDULLA N. WAKNIS

Purdue University

1. Introduction and summary. In this paper a new set of inequalities and bounds for the incomplete gamma function are obtained. These inequalities and bounds are based on continued fraction expansions of the incomplete gamma function (Sections 2 and 3).

Comparisons between the two sets of inequalities and some other known inequalities are made (Section 4).

Bounds are also obtained for the Mills' ratio for the normal integral (Section 5) and an analogue of Mills' ratio (Section 6) for the gamma distribution. Some other applications of these bounds to distribution theory problems arising in multiple decision theory are described (Section 6).

2. System of inequalities for $\gamma(a, x)$ based on the continued fraction expansion. Let $\gamma(a, x) = \int_0^x t^{a-1} e^{-t} dt$. Various authors (see, Khovanskii (1956)) have derived the following continued fraction expansion

$$(2.1) \quad x^{-a} e^x \gamma(a, x) = \frac{1}{a-1} \frac{ax}{1+a+x} \frac{(1+a)x}{2+a+x} \cdots \frac{(n-1+a)x}{n+a+x} \cdots$$

where the more commonly used notation has been employed for the representation of the continued fraction.

The terminating continued fraction

$$(2.2) \quad \frac{P_n(a, x)}{Q_n(a, x)} = \frac{1}{a-1} \frac{ax}{1+a+x} \frac{(1+a)x}{2+a+x} \cdots \frac{(n-1+a)x}{n+a+x}$$

is called the n th convergent (approximant) of the continued fraction (2.1). Using certain well-known recurrence relations, it can be shown that

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} P_n(a, x) &= \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (n-1+a)_j x^{n-j-1}, \\ Q_n(a, x) &= (n-1+a)_n, \end{aligned}$$

where $(n)_r = n(n-1) \cdots (n-r+1)$, $r \geq 1$, and $(n)_0 \equiv 1$. Since

$$(2.4) \quad [P_n(a, x)/Q_n(a, x)] - [P_{n-1}(a, x)/Q_{n-1}(a, x)] = [x^{n-1}/(n-1+a)_n] > 0, \\ x > 0, a > 0, n \geq 1,$$

$[P_n(a, x)/Q_n(a, x)]$ is a monotonically increasing sequence converging to

Received 1 July 1964.

¹ Research supported by Contract AF 33(657)11737 with the Aerospace Research Laboratories. Reproduction in whole or in part permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.



$e^x x^{-a} \gamma(a, x)$. Again from (2.4),

$$(2.5) \quad \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \left(\frac{P_k(a, x)}{Q_k(a, x)} - \frac{P_{k-1}(a, x)}{Q_{k-1}(a, x)} \right) \\ = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \frac{x^{k-1}}{(k-1+a)_k} < \frac{x^{n-1}(n+a)}{(n-1+a)_n(n+a-x)}, \quad x < (n+a).$$

From (2.5),

$$(2.6) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P_k(a, x)}{Q_k(a, x)} - \frac{P_{n-1}(a, x)}{Q_{n-1}(a, x)} \\ < \frac{x^{n-1}(n+a)}{(n-1+a)_n(n+a-x)}, \quad x < n+a.$$

This leads to the following system of inequalities

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{P_n(a, x)}{Q_n(a, x)} < e^x x^{-a} \gamma(a, x) < \frac{P_n(a, x)}{Q_n(a, x)} \\ + \frac{x^n(n+1+a)}{(n+a)_{n+1}(n+1+a-x)}, \quad x < n+a+1, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

where $x < n+a+1$ is a necessary restriction only on the inequalities on the right hand side of (2.7) and where

$$(2.8) \quad \frac{P_n(a, x)}{Q_n(a, x)} = \frac{1}{a} \left[1 + \frac{x}{1+a} + \frac{x^2}{(1+a)(2+a)} \right. \\ \left. + \dots + \frac{x^{n-1}}{(1+a)(2+a) \dots (n+1+a)} \right].$$

It should be noted that the length of the interval between the two bounds in (2.7) is $< [x^n(n+1+a)] / [(n+a)_{n+1}(n+1+a-x)]$, $x < n+a+1$. It follows from (2.8) that for fixed x and n , if we let

$$(2.9) \quad \varphi_n(a, x) = P_n(a, x) / Q_n(a, x),$$

then for fixed x , $\varphi_n(a, x)$ decreases monotonically as a increases. Hence

$$(2.10) \quad \varphi_n(a_1, x) \geq \varphi_n(a, x) \geq \varphi_n(a_2, x), \quad a_1 \leq a \leq a_2,$$

$$(2.11) \quad x^{-a_2} \gamma(a_2, x) \leq x^{-a} \gamma(a, x) \leq x^{-a_1} \gamma(a_1, x), \quad a_1 \leq a \leq a_2.$$

In particular, if $a_1 = p$ and $a_2 = p+1$, $p \leq a \leq p+1$, where p is a positive integer,

$$(2.12) \quad x^{-(p+1)} \Gamma(p+1) \left(\sum_{j=p+1}^{\infty} (e^{-x} x^j) / j! \right) \\ \leq x^{-a} \gamma(a, x) \leq x^{-p} \Gamma(p) \left(\sum_{j=p}^{\infty} (e^{-x} x^j) / j! \right).$$

The two bounds in (2.12) can be computed easily from a table of Poisson cumulative distribution.

Table III at the end of the paper illustrates the sharpness of the inequalities (bounds) in (2.7).

It appears that the inequalities (2.7) give close estimates of the function for x small ($x \leq 1$). The bounds improve in precision as a increases. For fixed a , the relative error appears to increase with x . For fixed x , the relative error decreases as a increases.

3. System of inequalities for $\Gamma(a + p, x)$, ($0 < a < 1, p = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) based on a different continued fraction expansion. Let $\Gamma(a, x) = \int_x^\infty e^{-x} x^{a-1} dx$, $0 < a < 1$, then a continued fraction expansion for $\Gamma(a, x)$ (see, for example Wall (1948), Khovanskii (1956) and Erdélyi et al. (1953)) is

$$(3.1) \quad x^{-a} e^x \Gamma(a, x) = \frac{1}{x+} \frac{1-a}{1+} \frac{1}{x+} \frac{2-a}{1+} \frac{2}{x+} \frac{3-a}{1+} \dots \frac{n-1}{x+} \frac{n-a}{1+} \dots$$

The odd and even convergents (approximants) of the above continued fraction are

$$(3.2) \quad \frac{P'_{2n+1}(a, x)}{Q'_{2n+1}(a, x)} = \frac{1}{Q'_1(a, x)} - \frac{1(1-a)}{Q'_1(a, x)Q'_2(a, x)} + \frac{1(1-a)}{Q'_2(a, x)Q'_3(a, x)} - \dots$$

$$+ \frac{(n!)(n-a)_n}{Q'_{2n}(a, x)Q'_{2n+1}(a, x)}, \quad n \geq 0, \quad (\pm t)_0 \equiv 1.$$

$$(3.3) \quad \frac{P'_{2n}(a, x)}{Q'_{2n}(a, x)} = \frac{1}{Q'_1(a, x)} - \frac{1(1-a)}{Q'_1(a, x)Q'_2(a, x)} + \frac{1(1-a)}{Q'_2(a, x)Q'_3(a, x)} - \dots$$

$$- \frac{(n-1)!(n-a)_n}{Q'_{2n-1}(a, x)Q'_{2n}(a, x)}, \quad n \geq 1,$$

where

$$(3.4) \quad Q'_{2n}(a, x) = \sum_{j=0}^n x^{n-j} (n-a)_j \binom{n}{j}$$

and $Q'_{2n+1}(a, x) = \sum_{j=0}^n x^{n+1-j} (n+1-a)_j \binom{n}{j}.$

For $0 < a < 1$, the coefficients of the continued fraction in (3.1) are positive; hence the even order convergents $P'_{2n}(a, x)/Q'_{2n}(a, x)$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) generate a monotonically increasing sequence and the odd order convergents $[P'_{2n+1}(a, x)]/[Q'_{2n+1}(a, x)]$ ($n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) generate a monotonically decreasing sequence. Both sequences converge to the function $e^x x^{-a} \Gamma(a, x)$. Thus, the following system of inequalities (bounds) is obtained,

$$(3.5) \quad [P'_{2n}(a, x)]/[Q'_{2n}(a, x)] < e^x x^{-a} \Gamma(a, x)$$

$$< [P'_{2n+1}(a, x)]/[Q'_{2n+1}(a, x)], \quad a < 1, n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

The first two sets of these inequalities are, for any $x > 0, 1 > a$,

$$(3.5a) \quad \frac{1}{x+1-a} < e^x x^{-a} \Gamma(a, x) < \frac{1+x}{x^2+2x-ax}$$

$$\frac{x+3-a}{x^2+2(2-a)x+(2-a)(1-a)} < e^x x^{-a} \Gamma(a, x)$$

$$< \frac{x(x+5-a)+2}{x^3+2x^2(3-a)+x(2-a)(3-a)}.$$

Again, using the recurrence relation

$$(3.6) \quad \Gamma(\nu, x) = (\nu - 1)\Gamma(\nu - 1, x) + e^{-x}x^{\nu-1}, \quad \nu > 1,$$

the following bounds are obtained. For any positive integer p ,

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} (a + p - 1)_p \frac{P'_{2n}(a, x)}{Q'_{2n}(a, x)} + x^{p-1} \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \frac{(a + p - 1)_j}{x^j} &< e^x x^{-a} \Gamma(a + p, x) \\ &< (a + p - 1)_p \frac{P'_{2n\pm 1}(a, x)}{Q'_{2n\pm 1}(a, x)} + x^{p-1} \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \frac{(a + p - 1)_j}{x^j}, \\ & n = 1, 2, 3, \dots \end{aligned}$$

It can be shown that the length of the interval i.e. the distance $d = d(n, p, x)$ between the lower and upper bounds in (3.7) satisfies the inequality

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{(a + p - 1)_p (n - a)_n (n!)}{x(n - a + x)^n (n + 1 - a + x)^n} &< d(n, p, x) \\ &< \frac{(a + p - 1)_p (n - a)_n (n!)}{x(1 - a + x)^n (2 - a + x)^n}. \end{aligned}$$

Table IV at the end of the paper illustrates the sharpness of the bounds in (3.7).

4. Comparison of inequalities and bounds for the gamma integral. In Sections 2 and 3, two different sets of bounds have been obtained for the integrals $\gamma(a, x)$ and $\Gamma(a, x)$, respectively. The lower bounds for $\gamma(a, x)$ for given a and x as given in (2.7) form a monotonically increasing sequence converging to the true value. The upper bounds in (2.7) form a monotonically decreasing sequence converging to the true value for $n \geq n_0$, where n_0 is the smallest positive integer which satisfies $x < n_0 + 1 + a$. The proof of this latter statement is straightforward and hence has been omitted. If x is small as compared to $(1 + a)$, then the lower bounds obtained in (2.7) are very good since the successive terms in the series for this bound rapidly converge to zero. The series for the lower bound was also obtained by Pearson (1922) by a method different from ours. Pearson (1922) used this series expansion for computing the tables of the incomplete gamma function. Pearson and his collaborators (1922) did not obtain explicit expressions for upper and lower bounds.

For selected values of n, x and a , upper and lower bounds in (2.7) were computed. For $n = 2, 3, 4, 7, x = .3, .5, 1.0, 1.5$ and $a = .5, 1.5, 2.5, 5.5$, the values have been included in Table III at the end of the paper. A glance at this table confirms the earlier assertion that the bounds are very good in the range of values x and a for which $x/(1 + a)$ is very small. For example, if $x = .5$ and $a = 5.5$ so that $x/(1 + a) = 1/13$, the upper bound is accurate to 6 decimal places for n as small as 2. For the same case the lower bound is accurate to within one unit in the sixth decimal place for n as small as 3.

The system of bounds for $\Gamma(a, x)$ as given in (3.5) and (3.7) are monotone.

The lower bounds form a monotone increasing sequence and the upper bounds form a monotone decreasing sequence. Empirical evidence as illustrated in Table IV shows that for small x , the bounds on $\gamma(ax)$ (as obtained from (3.5) and (3.7) and following from the relation that $\gamma(a, x) + \Gamma(a, x) = \Gamma(a)$) are much worse than the bounds using (2.7). The bounds on $\Gamma(a, x)$ improve as x increases. For selected values of n, x and a , the bounds on $\Gamma(a, x)$ were computed and an excerpt from these values is given in Table IV for $n = 2(1)7, x = 1.5, 2.0, 5.0, 10.0$ and $a = .5, 1.5, 2.5, 5.5$. Of course the lower and upper bounds are formed by the pairs of convergents corresponding to $n = (2, 3), (4, 5)$ and $(6, 7)$. A glance at this table shows that for $x \geq 10$, and $n \geq 2$, there is agreement to 6 decimal places for $a \leq 2.5$ and the values agree to 5 decimal places for $a \leq 5.5$. It would be interesting to find out the behaviour of these bounds with respect to a and also with respect to x/a .

Some other bounds on the incomplete gamma function, $\Gamma(a, x), a < 1$, have been derived by Gautschi (1959). Gautschi's inequality gives a lower and an upper bound for fixed a and x . For $a = .5$ and $x = 1, 2$, Table I compares Gautschi's result with our bounds of Sections 2 and 3.

As x increases, Gautschi's bounds improve. From Table I and Table IV, it appears that for x large, the bounds of Section 3 of this paper are as good as Gautschi's and seem to be better for n moderately small ($n \leq 6$) and $x = 2$ and for $a = .5$.

Wilk, Gnanadesikan and Huyett (1962) have discussed the approximation of the incomplete gamma function. These authors studied the truncation error in using the series earlier also given by Pearson (1922) and the partial sum of which forms the left hand side of (2.7) derived in this paper by the method of continued fractions. Thus the right hand side of Equation (5) of their paper gives the upper bound on truncation error at n terms as

$$(4.1) \quad x^n/[a(a + 1) \cdots (a + n)(1 - x/(n + a))], \quad x < n + a,$$

which is greater than the corresponding bound, i.e.,

$$(4.2) \quad x^n/[a(a + 1) \cdots (a + n)(1 - x/(n + 1 + a))], \quad x < n + 1 + a,$$

so that (4.2) is sharper than (4.1). Finally, the upper bound in (2.7) of this paper has been shown to be monotonically decreasing.

TABLE I

n	Method	Lower Bound		Upper Bound		Length of the Interval	
		$x = 1$	$x = 2$	$x = 1$	$x = 2$	$x = 1$	$x = 2$
4	Section 2	.2787	.0747	.2939	.2377	.0152	.1630
	Section 3	.2711	.0804	.2943	.0963	.0232	.0159
	Gautschi	.2693	.0793	.2924	.0840	.0231	.0047
6	Section 2	.2788	.0801	.2792	.0820	.0004	.0019
	Section 3	.2760	.0805	.2830	.0809	.0070	.0004
	Gautschi	.2693	.0793	.2924	.0840	.0231	.0047

Reference should be made to Whittlesey (1963) who gave brief details of some subroutines for computing the incomplete gamma function.

5. System of inequalities for the Mills' ratio and the cumulative distribution function of the normal. Let $\Phi(\cdot)$ and $\varphi(\cdot)$ denote the cumulative distribution function and the density function of the standard normal random variable. Then the Mills' ratio is defined as

$$(5.1) \quad R(x) = (1 - \Phi(x))/\varphi(x).$$

Laplace (1802) gave the following (by now well-known) expansion for $R(x)$,

$$(5.2) \quad R(x) = (1/x +)(1/x +)(2/x +)(3/x +) \cdots \quad (x > 0).$$

For more recent work on the Mills' ratio for the normal, reference should be made to Ruben (1963) and the references contained therein.

Now using the fact that

$$(5.3) \quad \Gamma(\frac{1}{2}, x) = 2\pi^{\frac{1}{2}}(1 - \Phi((2x)^{\frac{1}{2}})),$$

we have from (3.5)

$$(5.4) \quad \frac{t P'_{2n}(\frac{1}{2}, t^2/2)}{2 Q'_{2n}(\frac{1}{2}, t^2/2)} < R(t) < \frac{t P'_{2n+1}(\frac{1}{2}, t^2/2)}{2 Q'_{2n+1}(\frac{1}{2}, t^2/2)}, \quad t > 0, n = 1, 2, \dots$$

where the $[P'_n(\frac{1}{2}, t^2/2)]/[Q'_n(\frac{1}{2}, t^2/2)]$ are defined in (3.2) and (3.4). The first few of these convergents are

$$\frac{P'_1(\frac{1}{2}, t^2/2)}{Q'_1(\frac{1}{2}, t^2/2)} = \frac{2}{t^2}, \quad \frac{P'_2(\frac{1}{2}, t^2/2)}{Q'_2(\frac{1}{2}, t^2/2)} = \frac{1}{t^2 + 1}, \quad \frac{P'_3(\frac{1}{2}, t^2/2)}{Q'_3(\frac{1}{2}, t^2/2)} = \frac{2(2 + t^2)}{t^2(3 + t^2)}.$$

It should be pointed out that these inequalities in (5.4) are the same as obtained by using the successive convergents of Laplace's continued fraction expansion (5.2) as was done by Murty (1952). However, our method of derivation is different.

The bounds in (5.4) are reasonably good for large t as illustrated by Shenton (1954). For $t = 4.0$ and $t = 5.0$, the value of n required to achieve an accuracy of the order of 2.5×10^{-7} is 5 and 4 respectively.

We now give a new set of inequalities for the Mills' ratio and the normal integral. Using the fact that

$$(5.5) \quad \gamma(\frac{1}{2}, t^2/2) = 2\pi^{\frac{1}{2}}[\Phi(t) - \frac{1}{2}], \quad t > 0,$$

we obtain, from (2.7),

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2}(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{t^2/2} - \left[t + \frac{t^3}{1 \cdot 3} + \frac{t^5}{1 \cdot 3 \cdot 5} + \cdots + \frac{t^{2n-1}}{1 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdots (2n-1)} \right] \\ & - \frac{t^{2n+1}(2n+3)}{2^{n+1}(2n+3-t^2)(n+\frac{1}{2})_{n+1}} < R(t), \quad t > 0, t^2 < 2n+3. \\ R(t) < & \frac{1}{2}(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{t^2/2} - \left[t + \frac{t^3}{1 \cdot 3} + \frac{t^5}{1 \cdot 3 \cdot 5} \right. \\ & \left. + \cdots + \frac{t^{2n-1}}{1 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdots (2n-1)} \right], \quad t > 0. \end{aligned}$$

TABLE II
Illustrating the bounds on $\bar{R}(t)$ as obtained from (5.6)

t	n	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Exact Value
.1	3	.100,334,000,000	.100,334,000,953	.100,334,000,953
.5	5	.543,826,47	.543,826,52	.543,826,52
1.0	5	1.410,582,01	1.410,686,23	1.410,686,13
3.0	8	105.776,010,93	112.896,452,14	112.515,153,2

It is interesting to note that the expression within the square brackets in (5.6) represents the first n terms in Pólya series (see Formula (2.8) of Pólya (1949)) for $(\Phi(t) - \frac{1}{2})/\varphi(t)$

To illustrate the bounds in (5.6) we give in Table II values for $\bar{R}(t) = ((2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}}e^{t^2/2})/2 - R(t)$.

The entries in Table II for $t = .1$ and $t = 3.0$ can be compared with the values given by Shenton (see Table I of Shenton (1954)) which are based on a different continued fraction expansion. These values are

$$t = .1; \quad n = 3, \quad \bar{R}(t) \simeq .100,334,001,3; \quad n = 8, \quad \bar{R}(t) \simeq .100,334,000,953$$

$$t = 3.0; \quad n = 8, \quad \bar{R}(t) \simeq 98.7; \quad n = 15, \quad \bar{R}(t) \simeq 112.515,2$$

Table II indicates that the bounds given in (5.6) are sufficiently close (agree to 7 decimal places with the true value for $n = 5, t \leq .5$) to the true value. As t increases, the value of n has to be increased to achieve the same degree of accuracy. It should be noted that the value of n is subject to the condition $n \geq [(t^2 - 3)/2] + 1$. Comparison with Shenton's results seems to indicate that the bounds in (5.6) are better. It should be pointed that the upper bound in Table II is very close (much closer than lower bound) to the true value.

6. Applications of the bounds.

A. *Analogue of Mills' ratio and the hazard rate function.* Inequalities and bounds have been obtained for the Mills' ratio which is $(1 - \Phi(x))/\varphi(x)$ where $\Phi(\cdot)$ and $\varphi(\cdot)$ refer to the cumulative distribution function and the density function of the standard normal distribution. An analogue of this function for the gamma distribution is

$$(6.1) \quad R(a, x) = e^x x^{-a+1} \int_x^\infty e^{-t} t^{a-1} dt.$$

It should be noted that the reciprocal of the function $R(a, x)$ in (6.1) is the hazard rate (failure rate) which is important in the study of statistical reliability. Barlow, Marshall and Proschan (1963) have studied the properties of distributions with monotone hazard rate. From the results proved in the above paper, it is seen that

(i) $R(a, x)$ is an increasing function of x for $a < 1$.

(ii) $R(a, x)$ is a decreasing function of x for $a > 1$ (for $a = 1, R(a, x)$ is constant for all x).

TABLE III

Lower and upper bounds on $\gamma(a, x)$ based on (2.7)

n	a	$x = .3$	$x = .5$	$x = 1.0$	$x = 1.5$
2	.5	.973831,	1.143685,	1.226265,	1.093110,
		.995133	1.210400	1.500948	1.666993
		.993307,	1.200869,	1.422467,	1.421043,
		.995096	1.210060	1.494542	1.631857
3	.5	.995088,	1.209946,	1.490982,	1.608433,
		.995095	1.210036	1.493659	1.625043
		.995095,	1.210035,	1.493596,	1.624158,
		.944381,*	1.210036	1.493648	1.624874
5	.5	.944381,*	1.195682,*	1.492251,*	1.624643,*
		.995095†	1.230708*	1.496013*	1.625304*
		.995095†	1.210036†	1.493648†	1.624871†
		.995095†	1.210036†	1.493648†	1.624871†
2	1.5	.090891	.171533,	.343354,	.437244,
		.091785	.176148	.379391	.542651
		.091726,	.176137	.378996	.507515,
		.091784	.176136	.378945	.539723
5	1.5	.091784,	.176132,	.378744,	.537327,
		.091784	.176136	.378945	.539170
		.091784,	.176136,	.378942,	.539097,
		.066428,*	.176136	.378945	.539158
7	1.5	.066428,*	.124604*	.378246,*	.539044,*
		.091784†	.186472*	.380127*	.539375*
		.091784†	.176136†	.378945†	.539158†
		.091784†	.176136†	.378945†	.539158†
2	2.5	.015860,	.049015,	.189195,	.351357,
		.015948	.049764	.200614	.399668
		.015943,	.049696,	.198538,	.386492,
		.015948	.049763	.200546	.398950
5	2.5	.015948,	.049762,	.200498,	.398286,
		.015948	.049763	.200538	.398823
		.015948,	.049763,	.200537,	.398807,
		.015948	.049763	.200538	.398821
7	2.5	0	.038997,*	.199490,*	.398650,*
		.065176*	.065267*	.202311*	.399146*
		.015948†	.049763†	.200538†	.398821†
		.015948†	.049763†	.200538†	.398821†
2	5.5	.000188,	.002624,	.077177,	.464381,
		.000188	.002638	.078732	.485527
		.000188,	.002637,	.078549,	.481795,
		.000188	.002638	.078730	.485444
5	5.5	.000188,	.002638,	.078728,	.485353,
		.000188	.002638	.078730	.485433
		.000188,	.002638,	.078730,	.485432,
		.000188	.002638	.078730	.485433
7	5.5	0	.612123,*	.037462,*	.478701,*
		.019386*	.148553*	.148553*	.498222*
		.000188†	.078730†	.078730†	.485433†
		.000188†	.078730†	.078730†	.485433†

* Lower and upper bounds for $\gamma(a, x)$ obtained from the results of Section 3 using the 6th and 7th convergents. Negative lower bounds have been replaced by zero.

† Exact value of $\gamma(a, x)$

TABLE IV
Lower and upper bounds on $\Gamma(a, x)$ based on the results of Section 3

n	a	1.5	2.0	5.0	10.00
2, 3	.5	.136639,	.076557,	.002739,	.000014,
4, 5		.151821	.082026	.002782	.000014,
6, 7		.145748,	.080870	.002773,	.000014,
		.148447,	.080695	.002775,	.000014,
		.147149,	.080612,*	0	0
		.147579,*	.084658*	.322277*	.1.467725*
		.147583†	.080647†	.002775†	.000014*
2, 3	1.5	.341597,	.229672,	.016436,	.000150,
4, 5		.349188	.232406	.016457	.000150,
6, 7		.346152,	.231828	.016453,	.000150,
		.347501	.231741	.016454,	.000150,
		.346852,	.231666,	.009574,*	.000150,
		.347069,*	.231714,*	.101877*	0
		.347130*	.232175*	.016454†	.000150†
		.347069†	.231717†		
2, 3	2.5	.922312,	.727293,	.099987,	.001661,
4, 5		.933698	.731395	.100018	.001661,
6, 7		.929144,	.729964,	.100012,	.001661,
		.930168	.730528	.100013,	.001661,
		.930195,	.730285,	.096667,*	.001661,
		.930519,*	.730360,*	.162564*	0
		.930519*	.730505*	.100013†	.001661†
		.930519†	.730361†		
2, 3	5.5	51.5342,	50.6474,	27.7609,	2.37326,
4, 5		51.9825	50.8089	27.7619,	2.37326,
6, 7		51.8032,	50.7747	27.7619,	2.37326,
		51.8446,	50.7696	27.7619,	2.37326,
		51.8573,*	50.7682,*	27.7584,*	0
		51.8573†	50.7682†	27.9371*	.15.6251*
				27.7619†	2.37326†

The index n in column one gives the indices of the convergents used to get the lower and upper bounds respectively.

* Lower and upper bounds for $\Gamma(a, x)$ obtained from Section 2, when $n = 7$. Negative lower bounds replaced by 0.

† Exact value.

The first set of inequalities for $R(a, x)$ is

$$(6.2) \quad e^{+x} x^{-a+1} \left[\Gamma(a) - e^{-x} x^a \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{x^j}{(j+a)_{j+1}} - \frac{e^{-x} x^{n+a} (n+a+1)}{(n+a)_{n+1} (n+a+1-x)} \right] \\ < R(a, x) < e^{+x} x^{-a+1} \left[\Gamma(a) - e^{-x} x^a \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{x^j}{(j+a)_{j+1}} \right], \quad \text{for the first part} \\ x < n + 1 + a,$$

the second being obvious from (3.5), (3.7).

B. *Applications to multiple decision.* For the problems of selecting a subset containing the best of several gamma populations as discussed by Gupta and Sobel (1962) and Gupta (1963) it is found that the following integrals have to be evaluated:

$$(6.3) \quad [\Gamma(a)]^{-(p+1)} \int_0^\infty [\gamma(a, cx)]^p e^{-x} x^{a-1} dx$$

$$(6.4) \quad [\Gamma(a)]^{-(p+1)} \int_0^\infty [\Gamma(a, bx)]^p e^{-x} x^{a-1} dx.$$

Bounds on the above integrals can be obtained by using the results of Sections 2 and 3.

It should be noted that if we equate the integrals in (6.3) to α , then c is the α th percentile of the statistic $F_{\max} = \max(\chi_1^2/\chi_0^2, \dots, \chi_p^2/\chi_0^2)$ where $\chi_0^2, \chi_1^2, \dots, \chi_p^2$ are $(p+1)$ independent chi-square random variables with $2a$ degrees of freedom. Similarly the integral in (6.4) represents the probability integral of $F_{\min} = \min(\chi_1^2/\chi_0^2, \dots, \chi_p^2/\chi_0^2)$.

We now derive explicitly lower bounds for (6.3) for the special case $p = 1$.

$$(6.5) \quad \frac{1}{(\Gamma(a))^2} \int_0^\infty \gamma(a, cx) e^{-x} x^{a-1} dx > \frac{c^a}{(1+c)^{2a} (\Gamma(a))^2} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{\Gamma(2a+j) c^j}{(1+c)^j (a+j)_{j+1}}.$$

It should be pointed out that the left member of (6.5) represents the probability that the random variable F with $2a, 2a$ degrees of freedom does not exceed c .

In order to obtain explicit upper bounds on (6.4), one proceeds in a similar manner as above. It should be pointed out that lower (upper) bounds on the moments of the smallest (largest) order statistic from a gamma distribution can also be obtained in the manner outlined above.

Armitage and Krishnaiah (1964) have been interested in the distribution of the Studentized largest chi-square. The inequalities of Section 2 of the present paper can be used to obtain the bounds on this distribution function and to approximate it.

7. Acknowledgments. The authors wish to acknowledge the assistance of Mrs. Shirley Wolfe of Purdue University for programming and carrying out some of the computations.

REFERENCES

- [1] ARMITAGE, J. V. and KRISHNAIAH, P. (1964). Tables for the Studentized largest chi-square distribution and their applications. Submitted for publication.

- [2] BARLOW, R. E., MARSHALL, A. W. and PROSCHAN, F. (1963). Properties of probability distributions with monotone hazard rate. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **34** 375-389.
- [3] ERDÉLYI, A., MAGNUS, W., OBERHETTINGER, F. and TRICOMI, F. G. (1953). *Higher Transcendental Functions* **2** McGraw-Hill, New York.
- [4] GAUTSCHI, W. (1959). Some elementary inequalities relating to the gamma and incomplete gamma function. *J. Math. Phys.* **38** 77-81.
- [5] GUPTA, S. S. and SOBEL, M. (1962). On selecting a subset containing the population with the smallest variance. *Biometrika* **49** 495-507.
- [6] GUPTA, S. S. (1963). On a selection and ranking procedure for gamma populations. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **14** 199-216.
- [7] KHOVANSKII, A. N. (1956). *The Application of Continued Fractions*. (Translated by P. Wynn (1962)). P. Noordhoff, Ltd. Groningen.
- [8] LAPLACE, P. S. (1802). *Traité de Mécanique Céleste*. t3, livre 10. Paris.
- [9] MURTY, V. N. (1952). On a result of Birnbaum regarding the skewness of X in a bivariate normal population. *J. Indian Soc. Agric. Statist.* **4** 85-87.
- [10] PEARSON, KARL (ed.) (1922). *Tables of the Incomplete Γ -function*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, England.
- [11] PÓLYA, G. (1949). Remarks on computing the probability integral in one and two dimensions. *Proc. Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. Prob.*, Univ. of California Press.
- [12] RUBEN, HAROLD (1963). A convergent asymptotic expansion for Mills' ratio and the normal probability integral in terms of rational functions. *Math. Ann.* **151** 355-364.
- [13] SHENTON, L. R. (1954). Inequalities for the normal integral including a new continued fraction. *Biometrika* **41** 177-189.
- [14] WALL, H. S. (1948). *Analytic Theory of Continued Fractions*. Van Nostrand, New York.
- [15] WHITTLESEY, J. R. B. (1963). Incomplete gamma functions for evaluating Erlang process probabilities. *Math. Comput.* **17** 11-17.
- [16] WILK, M. B., GNANADESIKAN, R. and HUYETT, M. (1962). Probability plots for the gamma distribution. *Technometrics* **4** 1-20.