

COMPOSITIO MATHEMATICA

SHANKAR HARI DWIVEDI

Meromorphic functions of regular growth

Compositio Mathematica, tome 22, n° 1 (1970), p. 39-48

http://www.numdam.org/item?id=CM_1970__22_1_39_0

© Foundation Compositio Mathematica, 1970, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Compositio Mathematica » (<http://www.compositio.nl/>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/legal.php>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques

<http://www.numdam.org/>

Meromorphic functions of regular growth

by

Shankar Hari Dwivedi¹

0

Let $f(z)$ be a meromorphic function of order ρ ($0 \leq \rho < \infty$) and lower order λ ($0 \leq \lambda < \infty$). Let $T(r, f)$, $n(r, a)$, $N(r, a)$, ($0 \leq a \leq \infty$) have their usual meanings.

1

Let $\lambda(r)$ be proximate order H of $f(z)$ satisfying the following conditions:

- 1.1 $\lambda(r)$ is non-negative, continuous function of r for $r \geq r_0$.
- 1.2 $\lambda(r)$ is differentiable except at isolated points at which $\lambda'(r-0)$ and $\lambda'(r+0)$ exist.
- 1.3 $\lambda(r) \rightarrow \lambda$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$
- 1.4 $r\lambda'(r) \log r = o(\lambda(r))$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$
- 1.5 $T(r, f) \geq r^{\lambda(r)}$ for all $r \geq r_0$
- 1.6 $T(r, f) = r^{\lambda(r)}$ for a sequence of values of $r \rightarrow \infty$.

From 1.1–1.4 we can easily deduce the following properties

- 1.7 $r^{\lambda(r)}$ is an increasing function of $r \geq r_0$ [3]
- 1.8 $(ur)^{\lambda(ur)} \sim u^\lambda r^{\lambda(r)}$ for $r \geq r_0$.

From 1.1–1.6 we can easily prove that

$$1.9 \quad \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\lambda(r)}} = 1.$$

¹ This paper was presented in the 75th annual meeting of The American Mathematical Society, at New Orleans, Louisiana, 1969.

2

Let $\rho(r)$ be proximate order D of $f(z)$ satisfying the following conditions:

- 2.1 $\rho(r)$ is non-negative, continuous function of r for $r \geq r_0$
- 2.2 $\rho(r)$ is differentiable except at isolated points at which $\rho'(r-0)$ and $\rho'(r+0)$ exist.
- 2.3 $\rho(r) \rightarrow \rho$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$
- 2.4 $r\rho'(r) \log r = o(\rho(r))$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$
- 2.5 $T(r, f) \leq r^{\rho(r)}$ for all $r \geq r_0$
- 2.6 $T(r, f) = r^{\rho(r)}$ for a sequence of values of $r \rightarrow \infty$

From 2.1–2.4 we can easily deduce the following properties.

- 2.7 $r^{\rho(r)}$ is an increasing function of $r \geq r_0$ [3]
- 2.8 $(ur)^{\rho(ur)} \sim u^\rho r^{\rho(r)}$ for $r \geq r_0$

From 2.1–2.6 we can easily prove

$$2.9 \quad \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\rho(r)}} = 1.$$

Since in this paper we study the asymptotic properties, the behaviour of proximate orders plays no role on a finite interval and we shall assume that $r^{\lambda(r)}$ and $r^{\rho(r)}$ are monotonic functions for $r \geq 0$ and we define them to be zero at origin, without any loss of generality.

For the existence of these proximate orders H and D for $f(z)$ see [1]. There these are defined for $\lambda > 0, \rho > 0$. Here our definition is true for $\lambda = \rho = 0$ as well, since we have introduced the condition 1.4 and 2.4 in place of

- 1.4' $r\lambda'(r) \log r \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$
- 2.4' $r\rho'(r) \log r \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$.

For $\lambda > 0, \rho > 0$, the conditions 1.4 and 1.4', 2.4 and 2.4' are equivalent.

3

For convenience we set

$$3.1 \quad n(r) = n(r, a) + n(r, b)$$

$$3.2 \quad N(r) = N(r, a) + N(r, b) \\ \text{where } a \neq b, (0 \leq a \leq \infty), (0 \leq b \leq \infty)$$

$$3.3 \quad H(r) = \exp\left(\int_{r_0}^r \frac{\lambda(r)}{r} dr\right)$$

$$3.4 \quad D(r) = \exp\left(\int_{r_0}^r \frac{\rho(r)}{r} dr\right).$$

4

In [2] we proved

THEOREM A. *If*

$$4.1 \quad \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\rho(r)}} = \beta > 0$$

and

$$4.2 \quad \frac{N(r)}{r^{\rho(r)}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then for $x \neq a, b$

$$4.3 \quad 0 < \beta \leq \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r, n)}{r^{\rho(r)}} \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r, x)}{r^{\rho(r)}} \leq 1$$

and

THEOREM B. *If*

$$4.4 \quad \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\lambda(r)}} = \alpha < \infty$$

and

$$4.5 \quad \frac{N(r)}{r^{\lambda(r)}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow 0$$

Then for $x \neq a, b$

$$4.6 \quad 1 = \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r, x)}{r^{\lambda(r)}} \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r, x)}{r^{\lambda(r)}} \leq \alpha < \infty.$$

If we analyse the conditions 4.1 and 4.4, we notice that they imply some restrictions of regularity on the growth of the function $f(z)$. In fact in proving theorem 1, we have shown that functions satisfying either 4.1 or 4.4 are functions of regular growth.

Apparently it looks that there is no direct relation between

$$\frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\lambda(r)}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\rho(r)}}.$$

From 1.9 and 2.9 we can conclude that

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\lambda(r)}} = 1 = \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\rho(r)}}.$$

It is interesting to know a relation between

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\lambda(r)}} \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\rho(r)}}$$

Using the properties of proximate orders given in 1 and 2 we prove

THEOREM 1.

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{H(r)} < \infty \quad \text{iff} \quad \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{D(r)} > 0.$$

THEOREM 2.

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{H(r)} = \infty \quad \text{iff} \quad \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{D(r)} = 0.$$

As an illustration let us consider the following example when

$$f(z) = \prod_1^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{z}{\Delta_n}\right)^{b p_n}$$

where

$$b = [\rho] + 1$$

$$\Delta_n = n^{n^n}$$

$$p_n = (\Delta_n)^{\rho + \varepsilon}.$$

Then

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r, 0)}{r^{\lambda(r)}} = \infty \quad [2. \text{ pp. } 194].$$

Hence

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\lambda(r)}} = \infty$$

so that by lemma 1, 5.1

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{H(r)} = \infty.$$

Therefore by Theorem 2,

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{D(r)} = 0$$

which we can verify directly.

5

First we prove the following easy lemmas.

LEMMA 1.

$$5.1 \quad H(r) \sim \frac{r^{\lambda(r)}}{r_0^{\lambda(r_0)}}$$

$$5.2 \quad D(r) \sim \frac{r^{\rho(r)}}{r_0^{\rho(r_0)}} \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty.$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 1.

$$\begin{aligned} H(r) &= \exp \left(\int_{r_0}^r \frac{\lambda(r)}{r} dr \right) \\ &= \exp \left[\lambda(r) \log r \Big|_{r_0}^r - \int_{r_0}^r \lambda'(r) \log r dr \right] \\ &= \exp \left[\lambda(r) \log r \Big|_{r_0}^r - o \left(\int_{r_0}^r \frac{\lambda(r)}{r} dr \right) \right] \quad \text{by 1.4} \\ &\sim \frac{r^{\lambda(r)}}{r_0^{\lambda(r_0)}} \quad \text{as } r \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of 5.2 is similar, where we use property 2.4 in place of 1.4.

If $r_0 \rightarrow 1$, $r_0^{\lambda(r_0)} \rightarrow 1$ and we deduce that as $r_0 \rightarrow 1$

$$5.3 \quad H(r) \rightarrow r^{\lambda(r)}$$

$$5.4 \quad D(r) \rightarrow r^{\rho(r)}.$$

LEMMA 2.

$$5.5 \quad \int_{r_0}^r \frac{H(r)}{r^{\alpha+1}} dr \sim \frac{H(r)}{(\lambda-\alpha)r^\alpha} \quad 0 \leq \alpha < \lambda$$

$$5.6 \quad \int_{r_0}^r \frac{D(r)}{r^{\alpha+1}} dr \sim \frac{D(r)}{(\rho-\alpha)r^\alpha} \quad 0 \leq \alpha < \rho$$

$$5.7 \quad \int_r^\infty \frac{H(r)}{r^{\alpha+1}} dr \sim \frac{H(r)}{(\alpha-\lambda)r^\alpha} \quad \alpha > \lambda$$

$$5.8 \quad \int_r^\infty \frac{D(r)}{r^{\alpha+1}} dr \sim \frac{D(r)}{(\alpha-\rho)r^\alpha} \quad \alpha > \rho$$

as $r \rightarrow \infty$.

PROOF OF LEMMA 2. We have

$$5.9 \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dr} (r^{\lambda(r)-\alpha}) &= [\lambda(r)-\alpha+\lambda'(r)r \log r] r^{\lambda(r)-\alpha-1} \\ &\sim (\lambda-\alpha) r^{\lambda(r)-\alpha-1} \end{aligned} \quad \text{by 1.3 and 1.4}$$

and so if $\alpha < \lambda$ we have by Lemma 1

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{r_0}^r \frac{H(r)}{r^{\alpha+1}} dr &\sim \int_{r_0}^r \frac{r^{\lambda(r)-\alpha-1}}{r_0^{\lambda(r_0)}} dr \\ &= \frac{r^{\lambda(r)-\alpha}}{(\lambda-\alpha)r_0^{\lambda(r_0)}} - \frac{r_0^{-\alpha}}{\lambda-\alpha} \quad \text{by 5.9} \\ &\sim \frac{H(r)}{(\lambda-\alpha)r^\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

we omit the proofs of 5.6, 5.7 and 5.8, since they are similar to the proof of 5.5.

LEMMA 3.

$$5.9 \quad H(kr) \sim k^\lambda H(r)$$

$$5.10 \quad D(kr) \sim k^\rho D(r).$$

PROOF.

$$\begin{aligned} \log \frac{H(kr)}{H(r)} &= \int_r^{kr} \frac{\lambda(r)}{r} dr \quad \text{by 3.3} \\ &= \lambda(r) \log r \Big|_r^{kr} - \int_r^{kr} \lambda'(r) \log r dr \\ &= \log (kr)^{\lambda(kr)} - \log (r)^{\lambda(r)} - o \left(\int_r^{kr} \frac{\lambda(r)}{r} dr \right) \quad \text{by 1.4.} \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} [1+o(1)] \log \frac{H(kr)}{H(r)} &= [1+o(1)] \int_r^{kr} \frac{\lambda(r)}{r} dr = \log \left[\frac{(kr)^{\lambda(kr)}}{r^{\lambda(r)}} \right] \\ \therefore \frac{H(kr)}{H(r)} &\sim \frac{(kr)^{\lambda(kr)}}{r^{\lambda(r)}} \sim k^\lambda \quad \text{by 1.8} \end{aligned}$$

and the lemma is proved.

The proof of 5.10 is similar.

6

PROOF OF THEOREM 1. Let

$$\begin{aligned}
 6.1 \quad \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{H(r)} &= \alpha < \infty \\
 \therefore T(r, f) &< (\alpha + \varepsilon)H(r) && \text{for all } r \geq r_0 \\
 &\sim (\alpha + \varepsilon) \frac{r^{\lambda(r)}}{r_0^{\lambda(r_0)}} && \text{by Lemma 1}
 \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\log T(r, f) < \log(\alpha + \varepsilon) + \lambda(r) \log r - \lambda(r_0) \log r_0$$

or

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T(r, f)}{\log r} \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(r) = \lambda$$

i.e. $\rho \leq \lambda$.

But $\rho \geq \lambda$ always

6.2 Hence $\rho = \lambda$ if 6.1 is true, and function is of regular growth.

Since $r^{\lambda(r)} \leq T(r, f) \leq r^{\rho(r)}$ for all $r \geq r_0$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{T(r, f)}{D(r)} &\geq \frac{r^{\lambda(r)}}{D(r)} \\
 &\sim r^{\lambda(r) - \rho(r)} r_0^{\rho(r_0)}
 \end{aligned}$$

by 5.2 of lemma 1

$$\begin{aligned}
 \therefore \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{D(r)} &\geq r_0^{\rho(r_0)} \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} [r^{\lambda(r) - \rho(r)}] \\
 &= r_0^{\rho(r_0)} \quad (\text{since } [\lambda(r) - \rho(r)] \rightarrow \lambda - \rho = 0 \text{ by 6.2}) \\
 &> 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Conversely let

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{D(r)} = \beta > 0$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 6.3 \quad \therefore T(r, f) &> (\beta - \varepsilon)D(r) && \text{for all } r \geq r_0 \\
 &\sim (\beta - \varepsilon) \frac{r^{\rho(r)}}{r_0^{\rho(r_0)}} && \text{by 5.2 of lemma 1}
 \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\log T(r, f) > \log(\beta - \varepsilon) + \rho(r) \log r - \rho(r_0) \log r_0$$

or

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log T(r, f)}{\log r} \geq \rho$$

i.e. $\lambda \geq \rho$

But $\lambda \leq \rho$ always

6.4 Hence $\lambda = \rho$ if 6.3 is true, and the function is of regular growth. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{T(r, f)}{H(r)} &\leq \frac{r^{\rho(r)}}{H(r)} && \text{by 2.5, for all } r \geq r_0 \\ &\sim r^{\rho(r)-\lambda(r)} r_0^{\lambda(r_0)} && \text{by 5.1 of lemma 1} \\ \therefore \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{H(r)} &\leq r_0^{\lambda(r_0)} && \text{by 6.4} \\ &< \infty \end{aligned}$$

and the proof is complete.

Proof of theorem 2 follows from theorem 1 as corollary.

Now Theorem A and Theorem B, take the following form.

THEOREM 3. *If $f(z)$ is a meromorphic function of regular growth and*

$$N(r) = o(r^{\rho(r)}) \text{ as } r \rightarrow \infty$$

Then for $x \neq a, b$

$$0 < \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\rho(r)}} \leq \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r, x)}{r^{\rho(r)}} \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r, x)}{r^{\rho(r)}} \leq 1.$$

THEOREM 4. *If $f(z)$ is a meromorphic function of regular growth and*

$$N(r) = o(r^{\lambda(r)}) \text{ as } r \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then for $x \neq a, b$

$$1 = \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r, x)}{r^{\lambda(r)}} \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r, x)}{r^{\lambda(r)}} \leq \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(r, f)}{r^{\lambda(r)}} < \infty.$$

PROOF OF THEOREM 3 AND 4.

These can be proved by application of same arguments as used in proving theorem 1 and then Theorem A and Theorem B.

7

Now we prove some more theorems on the distribution of a -points of $f(z)$ of order $\rho > 0$ and lower order $\lambda > 0$.

THEOREM 5.

$$0 < \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n(r)}{H(r)} < \infty \text{ iff } 0 < \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r)}{H(r)} < \infty.$$

THEOREM 6.

$$\frac{n(r)}{H(r)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{iff} \quad \frac{N(r)}{H(r)} \rightarrow 0.$$

THEOREM 7.

$$0 < \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n(r)}{D(r)} < \infty \quad \text{iff} \quad 0 < \limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r)}{D(r)} < \infty.$$

THEOREM 8.

$$\frac{n(r)}{D(r)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{iff} \quad \frac{N(r)}{D(r)} \rightarrow 0.$$

PROOF OF THEOREM 5. Let

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n(r)}{H(r)} = \alpha \quad 0 < \alpha < \infty.$$

Therefore

$$n(r) < (\alpha + \varepsilon)H(r) \quad \text{for all } r \geq r_0.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} N(r) &= A + \int_{r_0}^r \frac{n(r)}{r} dr \\ &< A + (\alpha + \varepsilon) \int_{r_0}^r \frac{H(r)}{r} dr \\ &\sim A + (\alpha + \varepsilon) \frac{H(r)}{\lambda} \quad \text{by 5.5 of lemma 2.} \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r)}{H(r)} \leq \frac{\alpha}{\lambda}.$$

Conversely let

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(r)}{H(r)} = \beta \quad 0 < \beta < \infty$$

$$\therefore N(r) < (\beta + \varepsilon)H(r) \quad \text{for all } r \geq r_0.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} n(r) \log 2 &< \int_r^{2r} \frac{n(r)}{r} dr \\ &< N(2r) \\ &< (\beta + \varepsilon)H(2r) \quad \text{by} \\ &\sim (\beta + \varepsilon)2^\lambda H(r) \quad \text{by 5.9 of lemma 3.} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n(r)}{H(r)} \leq \frac{\beta 2^\lambda}{\log 2}$$

and the theorem is proved.

We omit the proof of theorems 6, 7, 8 since the proofs are similar to the proof of theorem 5.

REFERENCES

SHANKAR HARI DWIVEDI

[1] Proximate orders. *The Mathematics Student*, Vol. 34, No. 3 pp. 147—152, 1966.

SHANKAR HARI DWIVEDI

[2] Proximate orders and distribution of a -points of meromorphic function. *Compositio Mathematica*, Vol. 15, Fasc. 2 pp. 192—202, 1963.

S. H. DWIVEDI and S. K. SINGH

[3] The distribution of a -points of an entire function. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 562—568, 1958.

(Oblatum 21-IV-69)

Department of Mathematics
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma 73069, USA