

Math 220C - Lecture 14-15

April 27, 2022

Theorem $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $f \neq 0$ entire. Then

$$h \leq \lambda \leq h+1.$$

Conway x1.3

We already know $\lambda \leq h+1$.

We show $h \leq \lambda$.

We saw $\rho \leq \lambda$ last time.

Suffices If λ is finite, then g polynomial of degree $\leq \lambda$.

Strategy $f(0) = 1$ Let $m \leq \lambda < m+1$.

Write $f(z) = c \cdot g(z) \cdot P(z)$ where $P(z) = \prod_n E_p\left(\frac{z}{a_n}\right)$

We will prove

$$D^{m+1} g = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{C} \setminus \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n, \dots\}. \text{ for } D = \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$$

\Rightarrow g polynomial of degree $\leq m \leq \lambda$.

Take logarithmic derivatives

$$f = e^{gP} \Rightarrow \frac{f'}{f} = g' + \frac{P'}{P}$$

Take m usual derivatives next to get

$$D^m \frac{f'}{f} = D^{m+1} g + D^m \frac{P'}{P}$$

We will show $D^m \frac{f'}{f} = D^m \frac{P'}{P} \Rightarrow D^{m+1} g = 0$ as needed.

Claim

$$D^m \frac{P'}{P} = -m! \sum_n \frac{1}{(a_n - z)^{m+1}}$$

Proof

Recall $E_p(z) = (1-z) \exp\left(z + \frac{z^2}{2} + \dots + \frac{z^p}{p}\right)$.

$$\Rightarrow \frac{E_p'(z)}{E_p(z)} = -\frac{1}{1-z} + 1 + z + \dots + z^{p-1}$$

$$\Rightarrow D^m \frac{E_p'(z)}{E_p(z)} = -\frac{m!}{(1-z)^{m+1}} + 0 \text{ since } p \leq \lambda < m+1 \text{ by.}$$

Part \square

Recall If $u = \prod_n u_n$

converges absolutely & locally uniformly then

$$\frac{u'}{u} = \sum_n \frac{u_n'}{u_n}$$

locally uniformly away from zeroes. (Math 220B)

In our case

$P(z) = \prod_n E_p\left(\frac{z}{a_n}\right)$ converges absolutely & locally unif.

$$\Rightarrow \frac{P'}{P} = \sum_n \frac{\left(E_p\left(\frac{z}{a_n}\right)\right)'}{E_p\left(\frac{z}{a_n}\right)}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow D^m \frac{P'}{P} = \sum_n D^m \frac{\left(E_p\left(\frac{z}{a_n}\right)\right)'}{E_p\left(\frac{z}{a_n}\right)}$$

(switching differentiation & summation by Weierstrass convergence thm).

$$= - \sum_n \frac{m!}{(a_n - z)^{m+1}} \quad \text{as needed.}$$

Lemma f entire, $f(0) = 1$, $m+1 > \lambda$

$$D^m \frac{f'}{f} = -m! \sum_n \frac{1}{(a_n - z)^{m+1}}$$

The Lemma & above computation shows $D^m \frac{f'}{f} = D^m \frac{p'}{p}$ as claimed.

Proof By Poisson-Jensen formula in $\Delta(0, R)$, $z \neq a_k$:

$$\log |f(z)| + \sum_{k=1}^{N(R)} \log \left| \frac{R^2 - \bar{a}_k z}{R(z - a_k)} \right| = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} R e^{\frac{R e^{it} + z}{R e^{it} - z}} \cdot \log |f(R e^{it})| dt$$

Idea (i) differentiate

(ii) make $R \rightarrow \infty$.

The Lemma will follow.

Remark

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} \log |f| &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} \log |f(z)|^2 \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} \log(f \cdot \bar{f}) \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} \log f + \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} \log \bar{f} \\ &= \frac{f'}{f} + \overline{\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \log f} \\ &= \frac{f'}{f} + 0. \end{aligned}$$

This follows because $\log f$ is locally, away from zeroes,

a holomorphic function and thus $\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}} \log f = 0$ by Cauchy-

Riemann equations (Math 220 A).

Step 1: Apply $2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ to Poisson-Jensen

$$\log |f(z)| + \sum_{k=1}^n \log \left| \frac{R^2 - \bar{a}_k z}{R(z - a_k)} \right| = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} R e^{\frac{R e^{it} + z}{R e^{it} - z}} \cdot \log |f(R e^{it})| dt$$

Compute

$$\left(\frac{R e^{it} + z}{R e^{it} - z} \right)' = \left(-1 + \frac{2R e^{it}}{R e^{it} - z} \right)' = \frac{2R e^{it}}{(R e^{it} - z)^2}$$

Differentiating, we obtain

$$\frac{f'}{f} = \sum_{k=1}^{N(R)} \frac{-\bar{a}_k}{R^2 - \bar{a}_k z} - \sum_{k=1}^{N(R)} \frac{1}{a_k - z} + \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} R e^{\frac{2R e^{it}}{(R e^{it} - z)^2}} \log |f(R e^{it})| dt$$

Steps: Estimate term I.

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N(R)} \frac{\overline{a_k}^{m+1}}{(R^2 - \overline{a_k}^2)^{m+1}} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty.$$

Let $R > 2/2$. Since $\lambda < m+1$, we can pick ε with $\lambda + \varepsilon < m+1$

Note

$$|R^2 - \overline{a_k}^2| \geq R^2 - |\overline{a_k}| \cdot |2| > R^2 - R \cdot \frac{R}{2} = \frac{R^2}{2}.$$

$$\Rightarrow \left| \frac{\overline{a_k}}{R^2 - \overline{a_k}^2} \right|^{m+1} \leq \frac{R^{m+1}}{\left(\frac{R^2}{2}\right)^{m+1}} = \frac{2^{m+1}}{R^{m+1}}.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow \left| \sum_{k=1}^{N(R)} \left(\frac{\overline{a_k}}{R^2 - \overline{a_k}^2} \right)^{m+1} \right| &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{N(R)} \left| \frac{\overline{a_k}}{R^2 - \overline{a_k}^2} \right|^{m+1} \\ &\leq N(R) \cdot \frac{2^{m+1}}{R^{m+1}} \leq (3R)^{\lambda+\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{2^{m+1}}{R^{m+1}} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

since $m+1 > \lambda + \varepsilon$.

Here, we used

$$N(R) < \log M(3R) < \log c (3R)^{\lambda+\varepsilon} = (3R)^{\lambda+\varepsilon}.$$

Step 4 - Estimate the Integral (term II).

$$\int_0^{2\pi} R e^{it} \frac{2R e^{it}}{(R e^{it} - 2)^{m+2}} \log |f(R e^{it})| dt. \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty$$

Claim

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \frac{2R e^{it}}{(R e^{it} - 2)^{m+2}} dt \stackrel{w = R e^{it}}{=} \int_{|w|=R} \frac{2w}{(w-2)^{m+2}} \frac{dw}{iw} = 0$$

because the integrand admits an antiderivative.

Rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Term II} &= \int_0^{2\pi} 2R e^{it} \frac{1}{(R e^{it} - 2)^{m+2}} \log |f(R e^{it})| dt \\ &= \int_0^{2\pi} 2R e^{it} \cdot \frac{1}{(R e^{it} - 2)^{m+2}} \left(\log |f(R e^{it})| - \log M(R) \right) dt \end{aligned}$$

Claim \downarrow

$$\left| \text{Term II} \right| \leq \int_0^{2\pi} 2R \cdot \frac{1}{|Re^{it} - z|^{m+2}} \left(\log M(R) - \log |f(Re^{it})| \right) dt$$

using $|z| < R/2$

$$\leq \int_0^{2\pi} 2R \cdot \frac{1}{(R/2)^{m+2}} \left(\log M(R) - \log |f(Re^{it})| \right) dt$$

$$= \frac{2^{m+3}}{R^{m+1}} \cdot 2\pi \cdot \log M(R) - \frac{2^{m+3}}{R^{m+1}} \int_0^{2\pi} \log |f(Re^{it})| dt$$

Jensen's formula

$$\leq \frac{2^{m+3}}{R^{m+1}} \cdot 2\pi \cdot R^{\lambda+\varepsilon} - \frac{2^{m+3}}{R^{m+1}} \cdot 2\pi \left(\underbrace{\sum_{|a_k| < R} \log \left| \frac{R}{a_k} \right|}_{\text{positive contributions}} + \log |f(0)| \right)$$

$$\leq \frac{2^{m+3}}{R^{m+1}} \cdot 2\pi \cdot R^{\lambda+\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } R \rightarrow \infty.$$

This completes the proof.