

A Mean Value Theorem Author(s): Tadashi F. Tokieda Source: *The American Mathematical Monthly*, Vol. 106, No. 7 (Aug. - Sep., 1999), pp. 673-674 Published by: Mathematical Association of America Stable URL: <u>http://www.jstor.org/stable/2589498</u> Accessed: 16/03/2010 03:15

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=maa.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Mathematical Association of America is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to The American Mathematical Monthly.

A Mean Value Theorem

Tadashi F. Tokieda

Several theorems go by this name. The present note adds to the assortment an unusual variant (Theorem 1), which involves the shape of the underlying region in an interesting way.

We work in Euclidean spaces, although Lemma 2 and the second inequality of Lemma 3 carry over to general Riemannian manifolds. ∇ and || denote gradient and norm with respect to the standard inner product \langle , \rangle , and ∂ stands for boundary. All our functions are real-valued. A *gradient curve* of a function f is an integral curve of ∇f .

Theorem 1. Let f be a C^1 -function on a closed ball B. Then there exists $b \in B$ at which $|\nabla f(b)| \cdot \operatorname{diam}(B) = \max f - \min f$.

The proof is obtained via Lemmas 2 and 3.

Lemma 2. Let f be a C^1 -function without critical points on a compact region B. Then every gradient curve of f begins and ends on ∂B .

Proof: Say a gradient curve $\gamma(s)$ is defined for s from s_{-} to s_{+} . We have

$$\lim_{s \to s_{+}} f(\gamma(s)) - \lim_{s \to s_{-}} f(\gamma(s)) = \int_{\gamma} \langle \nabla f, d\gamma \rangle$$
$$= \int_{\gamma} |\nabla f| |d\gamma| \quad \text{because } \gamma \text{ is tangent to } \nabla f (*)$$
$$\geq \min |\nabla f| \cdot \text{length}(\gamma).$$

On compact *B*, *f* is bounded, so if *f* has no critical points $(\min |\nabla f| > 0)$, (*) shows that length(γ) is finite and $\gamma(s_{\pm})$ exist. Unless both $\gamma(s_{-})$ and $\gamma(s_{+})$ lie on ∂B , γ can be extended beyond s_{-} or s_{+} by the existence theorem for solutions of differential equations, contradicting the choice of s_{+} .

Remark. In Lemma 2, compactness is indispensable: think of the height function on an infinite vertical cylinder.

Lemma 3. Let f be a C^1 -function on a closed ball B. Then

$$\min |\nabla f| \le \frac{\max f - \min f}{\operatorname{diam}(B)} \le \max |\nabla f|.$$

Proof: First inequality: If f has critical points on B, then min $|\nabla f| = 0$. Otherwise consider the gradient curve γ through the center of B. γ reaches ∂B by Lemma 2, so that length $(\gamma) \ge \text{diam}(B)$; combine this with (*) to get

$$\max f - \min f \ge \min |\nabla f| \cdot \operatorname{diam}(B).$$

Aug.-Sept., 1999]

NOTES

Second inequality: Let l be a line segment that joins a minimum and a maximum of f. Since length $(l) \le \text{diam}(B)$,

$$\max f - \min f = \int_{l} \langle \nabla f, dl \rangle \leq \int_{l} |\nabla f| |dl| \leq \max |\nabla f| \cdot \operatorname{diam}(B).$$

Remark. In Lemma 3, the first inequality is true only on a ball: f(x, y) = x is a counterexample on $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$. The second inequality holds on any convex region. Both become equalities for affine functions on balls.

Theorem 1 is now immediate:

Proof of Theorem 1 Apply Lemma 3 and the intermediate value theorem to $|\nabla f|$.

I do not know how close the mean value property of Theorem 1 comes to characterizing balls. However, Theorem 1 does admit a partial converse. To state it, we need a definition.

The width $w_B(e)$ of a compact region B in the direction of a unit vector e is defined as follows. 'Sandwich' B by a pair of parallel planes perpendicular to e; $w_B(e)$ is the distance between these planes:

$$w_B(e) = \max_{r \in B} \langle e, r \rangle - \min_{r \in B} \langle e, r \rangle.$$

B has constant width if $w_B(e)$ has the same value for all directions *e*. A ball has constant width, but there are shapes of constant width that are not balls (e.g., Reuleaux's tetrahedron).

Aside. Why are lids on manholes round? Answer: because a lid whose rim is *not* a curve of constant width can fall into the hole if (un)suitably rotated. Of course, the lid and the hole need not be circular; any shape of constant width would be safe.

Return to the partial converse to Theorem 1.

Theorem 4. Let *B* be a compact region such that for every linear function *f* on *it*, there exists $b \in B$ at which $|\nabla f(b)| \cdot \operatorname{diam}(B) = \max f - \min f$. Then *B* has constant width.

Proof: Suppose *B* has maximal width in the direction of e_+ , minimal width in the direction of e_- , and $w_B(e_-) < w_B(e_+)$. Then the linear function $f(\mathbf{r}) = \langle e_-, \mathbf{r} \rangle$ violates the assumed property of *f*, as $|\nabla f| = 1$, diam $(B) = w_B(e_+)$, max $f - \min f = w_B(e_-)$.

University of Illinois, Urbana IL 61801 tokieda@math.uiuc.edu