ANNALES DE L'INSTITUT FOURIER

PAWAN KUMAR KAMTHAN

On entire functions represented by Dirichlet series. IV

Annales de l'institut Fourier, tome 16, n° 2 (1966), p. 209-223

<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AIF_1966__16_2_209_0>

© Annales de l'institut Fourier, 1966, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Annales de l'institut Fourier » (http://annalif.ujf-grenoble.fr/) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (http://www.numdam.org/conditions). 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/

Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble
16, 2 (1966), 209-223.

ON ENTIRE FUNCTIONS REPRESENTED BY DIRICHLET SERIES (IV)

by Pawan Kumar KAMTHAN

---

1. Let

$$f(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}_n e^{s\lambda_n}, \qquad s = \sigma + it$$

represent an entire function, where

$$\overline{\lim_{n \to \infty}}\, n/\lambda_n = \mathrm{D} < \infty; \tag{1.1}$$

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} (\lambda_{n+1} - \lambda_n) = h > 0, \tag{1.2}$$

such that ([10], p. 201) $h\mathrm{D} \leqslant 1$, and

$$0 = \lambda_0 < \lambda_1 < \cdots < \lambda_n \to \infty \tag{1.3}$$

as $n \to \infty$. Now $f(s)$ represents an entire function and so its abscissa of absolute convergence must be infinite, that is

$$\overline{\lim_{n \to \infty}} \log |\mathcal{A}_n|/\lambda_n = -\infty. \tag{1.3'}$$

Let us define χ_n as follows:

$$\chi_n = \frac{\log |\mathcal{A}_{n-1}/\mathcal{A}_n|}{\lambda_n - \lambda_{n-1}}.$$

Then χ_n is a non-decreasing function of n (see [1]) and $\to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. The fact is similar to what G. Valiron describes about rectified ratio in his book ([12], p. 32). So we have:

$$0 \leqslant \chi_1 \leqslant \chi_2 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \chi_n \leqslant \cdots; \quad \chi_n \to \infty, n \to \infty.$$

Let $\mu(\sigma)$ be the maximum term in the representation of $\Sigma|\mathcal{A}_n|e^{\sigma\lambda_n}$ and call it as the maximum term of $f(\mathrm{S})$. Let $\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}$

be that value of λ_n which makes $|\mathcal{A}_n|e^{\sigma\lambda_n}$ the maximum term and call $\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}$ as the rank of $\mu(\sigma)$. Let us similarly correspond $\mu_{(m)}(\sigma)$ and $\lambda_{\nu^{(m)}(\sigma)}$ to $f^{(m)}(S)$, the m-th derivative of $f(S)$ as we have done about $\mu(\sigma)$ and $\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}$ connecting them with $f(S)$, where $\mu_{(0)}(\sigma) \equiv \mu(\sigma)$, $\lambda_{\nu^{(0)}(\sigma)} \equiv \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}$. It is well-known that ([13]; [4], pp. 1-2)

$$\log \mu(\sigma) = \int_1^\sigma \lambda_{\nu(x)}\, dx. \tag{1.4}$$

We define the order (R)ρ and lower order (R)λ of $f(s)$ as follows:

$$\overline{\lim_{\sigma\to\infty}} \frac{\log\log M(\sigma)}{\sigma} = \frac{\rho}{\lambda};$$

where $M(\sigma) = \underset{-\infty<t<\infty}{\text{l.u.b.}} |f(s)|$.

According to Mandelbrojt ([10], p. 216) we call ρ as the Ritt order (to be written as order (R)ρ) of $f(s)$. We, therefore, naturally call the lower limit in $\log\log M(\sigma)/\sigma$ as $\sigma \to \infty$ to be the lower order (R) λ. However, I shall drop the word (R) in the sequel. The results starting after Theorem C and onwards are expected to be new; Theorems A and B have already appeared but the secretary wishes them to incorporate here. This paper is to be considered as a sequel to my previous papers [6; 7; 8 et 9]. For the sake of completeness I start with the following result ([4], Th. 1).

2. Theorem A. — *For an entire function* $f(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n e^{s\lambda_n}$ *where* $\{\lambda_n\}$ *satisfies* (1.2), *then*

$$\mu(\sigma) \leqslant M(\sigma) < \mu(\sigma)\left[\left(1 + \frac{1}{L\sigma}\right)\lambda_{\nu(\sigma+\sigma/\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)})} + 1\right], \tag{2.1}$$

where $L = h - \varepsilon$, ε *being an arbitrarily taken small positive number.*

We now proceed to prove it. The left-hand inequality in (2.1) is obvious in view of Ritt's inequality:

$$|a_n|e^{\sigma\lambda_n} \leqslant M(\sigma).$$

Let

$$W(\sigma) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-G_n+\sigma\lambda_n}, \qquad G_n = -\log|a_n|.$$

Suppose p is a positive integer $> \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}$, such that $\chi_p > \sigma$. Let $q \geqslant p$. Now

$$e^{-G_q e^{\sigma\lambda_q}} < e^{-G_{p-1} e^{\sigma\lambda_{p-1}}} \exp\{(\sigma - \chi_p)(\lambda_q - \lambda_{p-1})\}$$
$$\leqslant \mu(\sigma) \exp\{(\sigma - \chi_p)(\lambda_q - \lambda_{p-1})\}.$$

Hence

$$W(\sigma) < \mu(\sigma)\left[p + \sum_{q=p}^{\infty}\left(\frac{e^{\sigma}}{e^{\chi_p}}\right)^{\lambda_q - \lambda_{p-1}}\right].$$

Hence in view of (1.2), if we write $x = \exp(\chi_p - \sigma)$, then $\chi > 1$ and so

$$\sum_{q=p}^{\infty}\left(\frac{e^{\sigma}}{e^{\chi_p}}\right)^{\lambda_q - \lambda_{p-1}} < \chi^{-L} + \chi^{-2L} + \cdots = \frac{1}{x^L - 1}$$

Therefore

$$W(\sigma) < \mu(\sigma)\left[p + \frac{e^{L\sigma}}{e^{Lx_p} - e^{L\sigma}}\right].$$

Let

$$p = \lambda_{\nu(\sigma + \sigma/\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)})} + 1,$$

we find that

$$e^{L\chi_p} - e^{L\sigma} > e^{L\sigma}\{e^{L\sigma/\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}} - 1\}$$

and therefore the right-hand part in (2.1) follows.

Making use of Theorem A, we prove ([4], Th. 2, p. 5):

THEOREM B. — *Let $f(s)$ be an entire function of order ρ and lower order λ; λ_n satisfies (1.2) in the expansion of $f(s)$. Then*

$$(2.2)\quad \overline{\lim_{\sigma \to \infty}} \frac{\log \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}}{\sigma} = \frac{\rho}{\lambda}; \qquad (0 \leqslant \rho \leqslant \infty;\ 0 \leqslant \lambda \leqslant \infty).$$

As regards the proof, the upper limit is similar to a result proved by Valiron ([12], p. 33), care is only to be taken that during the course of proof, we use the fact that $\log \mu(\sigma)$ is a covex function of σ [2]. From the previous theorem and the fact that if ρ is finite, we notice that

$$\log M(\sigma) \sim \log \mu(\sigma), \qquad \sigma \to \infty.$$

Let

$$\overline{\lim_{\sigma \to \infty}} \frac{\log \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}}{\sigma} = \rho < \infty,$$

so that from (1.4), for $\sigma \geqslant \sigma_0$

$$\log \mu(\sigma) < K + \frac{e^{(\rho+\varepsilon)\sigma}}{\rho+\varepsilon}.$$

Therefore

$$\overline{\lim_{\sigma\to\infty}} \frac{\log\log M(\sigma)}{\sigma} \leqslant \rho.$$

Let us suppose now

$$\overline{\lim_{\sigma\to\infty}} \frac{\log\log M(\sigma)}{\sigma} = \rho_1 \ (\leqslant \rho).$$

Therefore from (1.4) and the relation $\mu(\sigma) \leqslant M(\sigma)$, we find that

$$2\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)} \leqslant \int_{\sigma}^{\sigma+2} \lambda_{\nu(x)}\, dx < (1+\varepsilon)e^{(\sigma+2)(\rho_1+\varepsilon)},$$

and so we find that

$$\overline{\lim_{\sigma\to\infty}} \frac{\log \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}}{\sigma} \leqslant \rho_1.$$

Therefore $\rho = \rho_1$. Therefore the ratios $\log\log M(\sigma)/\sigma$ and $\log \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}/\sigma$ have the same upper limit. To prove that

$$\underline{\lim_{\sigma\to\infty}} \frac{\log \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}}{\sigma} = \lambda,$$

we proceed in some other way. Let

$$\underline{\lim_{\sigma\to\infty}} \frac{\log \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}}{\sigma} = \alpha.$$

With the help of (1.4) and $\mu(\sigma) \leqslant M(\sigma)$, one easily finds that for any constant $C > 0$.

$$C\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)} \leqslant \log \mu(\sigma + c) \leqslant \log M(\sigma + c) < e^{(\lambda+\varepsilon)(\sigma+c)},$$

for an arbitrarily large value of σ. This implies $\alpha \leqslant \lambda$. If $\lambda = 0$, then $\alpha = 0$ and there is nothing to prove. Let $0 \leqslant \alpha < \infty$. Choose β and γ, such that $\alpha < \beta$ and $\alpha/\beta < \gamma < 1$. Hence

$$\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)} < e^{\beta\sigma}, \qquad (\gamma\sigma_n \leqslant \sigma \leqslant \sigma_n) \tag{2.3}$$

where $\{\sigma_n\}$ is a sequence of σ, such that $\sigma_n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. We shall show that

$$\frac{\log M(\sigma)}{\log \mu(\sigma)} \to 1,$$

as $\sigma \to \infty$ through the sequence for which (2.3) holds (it is not assumed that ρ is finite: if ρ is finite we cannot claim necessarily that $\log M(\sigma) \sim \log \mu(\sigma)$).

Let δ and ε' be two positive numbers such that

$$\gamma < \delta < 1; \qquad \gamma/\delta < \varepsilon' < 1.$$

Put $\delta\sigma_n = \xi_n$. Then for $n \geqslant n_0$, $\gamma\sigma_n < \varepsilon'\xi_n < \xi_n < \sigma_n - \frac{1}{2}$.

Further, let $\mu(0) = 1$, which we may without loss of generality. Then from (1.4)

$$\log \mu(\xi_n) = \log \mu(\xi_n\varepsilon') + \int_{\varepsilon'\xi_n}^{\xi_n} \lambda_{\nu(x)}\, dx.$$

But $\log \mu(\varepsilon'\xi_n) < \varepsilon'\xi_n\lambda_{\nu(\varepsilon'\xi_n)}$, so

$$\begin{aligned}\log \mu(\xi_n) &> \log \mu(\varepsilon'\xi_n) + (1 - \varepsilon')\xi_n\lambda_{\nu(\varepsilon'\xi_n)} \\ &> \frac{1}{\varepsilon'} \log \mu(\varepsilon'\xi_n).\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}(1 - \varepsilon') \log \mu(\xi_n) &< \int_{\varepsilon'\xi_n}^{\xi_n} \lambda_{\nu(x)}\, dx \\ &< \frac{1}{\beta}\left[e^{\beta\xi_n} - e^{\beta\varepsilon'\xi_n}\right], \qquad (2.4)\end{aligned}$$

for all $n \geqslant n_0$. But from Theorem A

$$\begin{aligned}\log M(\xi_n) &< \log \mu(\xi_n) + \log \lambda_{\nu(\xi_n + \xi_n/\lambda_{\nu(\xi_n)})} + 0(1) \\ &< \log \mu(\xi_n) + \log \lambda_{\nu(2\xi_n)} + 0(1) \\ &< \log \mu(\xi_n) + 2\beta\xi_n + 0(1).\end{aligned}$$

Hence we get for all $n \geqslant n_0$.

$$\begin{aligned}\log\log M(\xi_n) &< (1 + 0(1)) \log\log \mu(\xi_n) \\ &< (1 + 0(1))\beta\xi_n,\end{aligned}$$

from (2.4). Consequently $\lambda \leqslant \beta$ and as $(\beta - \alpha)$ can be made arbitrarily small we see that $\lambda \leqslant \alpha$; and this, when combined with the already established inequality: $\lambda \geqslant \alpha$, gives the required result.

Next, I give the following result ([5], p. 45).

THEOREM C. — *Let*

$$f(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n e^{s\lambda_n}$$

be an entire function, where $\{\lambda_n\}$ *satisfies* (1.2), *of order* ρ *and lower order* λ $(0 < \rho \leqslant \infty;\ 0 \leqslant \lambda < \infty)$. *Then*

$$\overline{\lim_{\sigma \to \infty}} \frac{\log \mu(\sigma)}{\sigma \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}} \leqslant 1 - \frac{\lambda}{\rho}.$$

Proof. — We have

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mu(\sigma) &= \sum_{\chi_n \leqslant \sigma} (\lambda_n - \lambda_{n-1})(\sigma - \chi_n) \\ &= \sigma \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)} - \sum_{\chi_n \leqslant \sigma} (\lambda_n - \lambda_{n-1})\chi_n. \end{aligned}$$

But for all $n \geqslant n_0$ (from Th. B)

$$\log \lambda_n < (\rho + \varepsilon)\chi_n.$$

So we find

$$\sum_{\chi_n \leqslant \sigma} (\lambda_n - \lambda_{n-1})\chi_n > \sum_{\chi_n \leqslant \sigma,\, n \geqslant n_0} (\lambda_n - \lambda_{n-1}) \frac{\log \lambda_n}{\rho + \varepsilon}.$$

Let N be the largest integer such that $\chi \leqslant \sigma$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\chi_n \leqslant \sigma} (\lambda_n - \lambda_{n-1})\chi_n &> \frac{1}{\rho + \varepsilon} \{\lambda_N \log \lambda_N + 0(\lambda_n)\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\rho + \varepsilon} \{\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)} \log \nu(\sigma)\} + 0(\nu(\sigma)). \end{aligned}$$

Si that for $\sigma \geqslant \sigma_0$

$$\log \mu(\sigma) < \sigma \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)} \left\{1 - \frac{\lambda - \varepsilon}{\rho + \varepsilon} + 0(1)\right\}$$

and the result follows.

3. Below I construct an example to exhibit that the result of Th. C is best possible in view of the fact that if $\lambda < \infty$, $\rho = \infty$, then

$$\overline{\lim_{\sigma \to \infty}} \frac{\log \mu(\sigma)}{\sigma \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}} = 1. \tag{3.1}$$

Example 1. — Let

$$f(s) = \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} \left\{\frac{e^s}{I(\lambda_n)}\right\}^{\lambda_n},$$

where $\lambda_{n+1} = \lambda_n$; N is a positive integer, such that $I(\lambda_N) \geqslant e$ and that

$$\log I(x) = \int_{x_0}^{x} \frac{dt}{t\theta(t) \log t} \to \infty,$$

as $x \to \infty$, where further.

(*i*) $\theta(x)$ is a positive, continuous and non-decreasing function for $x \geqslant x_0$ and $\to \infty$ with x, and has a derivative;

$$(ii) \quad \frac{x\theta'(x)}{\theta(x)} \leqslant \frac{1}{\log x \log\log x \log\log\log x}, \qquad x \geqslant x_0.$$

Demonstration of the aim. — According to a result ([10], p. 217, eq. (94)) we see that the order ρ of $f(s)$ is

$$= \overline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} \frac{\lambda_n \log \lambda_n}{\lambda_n \log I(\lambda_n)}$$
$$\geqslant \overline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} \frac{\log \lambda_n}{A \log\log \lambda_n},$$

from (ii) and the integral representation of $I(x)$, A being a finite number. Therefore the order ρ of $f(s)$ is infinite. Let

$$\chi_n = \log\{\{I(\lambda_n)\}^{\lambda_n}/\{I(\lambda_{n-1})\}^{\lambda_{n-1}}\}/(\lambda_n - \lambda_{n-1}),$$

then it is easily found that $\chi_{n+1} > \chi_n (n > n_0)$ and that $\chi_n \to \infty$, as $n \to \infty$. Hence for $\chi_n \leqslant \sigma < \chi_{n+1}$,

$$\log \mu(\sigma) = \{\sigma - \log I(\lambda_n)\}\lambda_n, \qquad \lambda_n = \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}.$$

Therefore

$$\frac{\log \mu(\chi_{n+1})}{\chi_{n+1}\, \lambda_{\nu(\chi_{n+1})}} = 1 - \frac{(1 + 0(1)) \log I(\lambda_n)}{\log I(\lambda_{n+1}) + 0(\log I(\lambda_n))}.$$

Further

$$\log I(\lambda_{n+1}) - \log I(\lambda_n) > (1 + 0(1)) \frac{l_2 \lambda_{n+1}}{l_3 \lambda_{n+1}},$$

and as $\log I(\lambda_n) < A l_2 \lambda_n$, A = *a* constant, we find that

$$\frac{\log I(\lambda_{n+1})}{\log I(\lambda_n)} \to \infty, \qquad (n \to \infty)$$

and so

$$\frac{\log \mu(\chi_{n+1})}{\chi_{n+1}\lambda_{\nu(\chi_{n+1})}} \to 1, \qquad (n \to \infty)$$

and hence

$$\overline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} \frac{\log \mu(\sigma)}{\sigma\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}} \geqslant 1. \tag{3.2}$$

Further

$$\begin{aligned}\log \mu(\chi_{n+1}) &= \frac{\lambda_n\lambda_{n+1} \log \{I(\lambda_{n+1})/I(\lambda_n)\}}{\lambda_{n+1} - \lambda_n} \\ &= (1 + 0(1))\lambda_n \log I(\lambda_{n+1}),\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\log \log \mu(\chi_{n+1}) \sim \log \log I(\lambda_{n+1}) + \log \lambda_n,$$

and as $\chi_{n+1} \sim \log I(\lambda_{n+1})$, it follows that

$$\lambda = \underline{\lim_{\sigma\to\infty}} \frac{\log \log \mu(\sigma)}{\sigma} = 0.$$

Hence from Theorem C

$$\overline{\lim_{\sigma\to\infty}} \frac{\log \mu(\sigma)}{\sigma\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}} \leqslant 1. \tag{3.3}$$

Inequalities (3.2) and (3.3) provide the demonstration of our aim.

Example 2. — Let us consider the function defined by (see Theorem 6 [3], p. 22 where I put $\beta = 1$)

$$f(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{e^s}{\lambda_n}\right)^{\lambda_n}, \quad \lambda_{n+1} = \alpha^{\lambda_n}; \qquad \alpha \geqslant e; \qquad \lambda_1 = \alpha.$$

The function $f(s)$ is certainly an entire function on account of (1.3)′. The order ρ of $f(s)$ is in this case

$$= \overline{\lim_{n\to\infty}} \frac{\lambda_n \log \lambda_n}{\lambda_n \log \lambda_n} = 1.$$

Also

$$\mu(\sigma) = \{e^\sigma/\lambda_n\}^{\lambda_n}; \qquad \lambda_n = \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)},$$

for $\chi_n \leqslant \sigma < \chi_{n+1}$, where

$$\chi_n = \frac{\lambda_n \log \lambda_n - \lambda_{n-1} \log \lambda_{n-1}}{\lambda_n - \lambda_{n-1}}.$$

Then

$$\log \mu(\chi_n) = \lambda_n(\lambda_n - \log \lambda_n)$$
$$= \frac{\lambda_n \lambda_{n-1}}{\lambda_n - \lambda_{n-1}} \log (\lambda_n/\lambda_{n-1})$$
$$= (1 + 0(1))\, \lambda_{n-1} \log \lambda_n; \tag{3.4}$$
$$\log \log \mu(\chi_n) = (1 + 0(1)) + \log \lambda_{n-1} + \log \log \lambda_n.$$

Also $\chi_n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$, we see that

$$\frac{\log \log \mu(\chi_n)}{\chi_n} = 0(1) + \frac{1}{\chi_n} (\log \lambda_{n-1} + \log \log \lambda_n). \tag{3.5}$$

Now

$$\frac{\log \lambda_{n-1}}{\chi_n} = \frac{\log \lambda_{n-1}\,(\lambda_n - \lambda_{n-1})}{\lambda_n \log \lambda_n - \lambda_{n-1} \log \lambda_{n-1}}$$
$$= \frac{\lambda_n \log \lambda_{n-1} + 0(\lambda_n)}{\lambda_n \lambda_{n-1} \log \alpha + 0(\lambda_n)}$$
$$= (1 + 0(1)) \frac{\log \lambda_{n-1}}{\lambda_{n-1} \log \alpha} \to 0 \quad (n \to \infty). \tag{3.6}$$

Also $\log \log \lambda_n = (1 + 0(1) \log \lambda_{n-1}$ and so the right-hand term in (3.5) $\to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ in view of (3.6). Therefore the lower order λ of $f(s)$ is zero on account of (3.5). Hence from Theorem C

$$\overline{\lim_{\sigma \to \infty}} \frac{\log \mu(\sigma)}{\sigma \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}} \leqslant 1. \tag{3.7}$$

Also

$$\frac{\log \mu(\chi_{n+1})}{\chi_{n+1} \lambda_{\nu(\chi_{n+1})}} = 1 - \frac{\log \lambda_n}{\chi_{n+1}}$$
$$= 1 - \frac{(\lambda_{n+1} - \lambda_n) \log \lambda_n}{\lambda_{n+1} \log \lambda_{n+1} - \lambda_n \log \lambda_n} \to 1 \quad (n \to \infty),$$

for the above solution see the technique used in getting (3.6). Hence

$$\overline{\lim_{\sigma \to \infty}} \frac{\log \mu(\sigma)}{\sigma \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}} \geqslant 1. \tag{3.8}$$

Therefore from (3.7) and (3.8) one gets

$$\overline{\lim_{\sigma \to \infty}} \frac{\log \mu(\sigma)}{\sigma \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}} = 1,$$

giving thereby again a best possible nature of Theorem C in case $\lambda = 0$ and $\rho < \infty$.

4. Results involving derivatives of $f(s)$:

I have already spoken in the article 1 about $\mu_{(m)}(\sigma)$ and $\lambda_{\nu^{(m)}(\sigma)}$. I first prove:

THEOREM D. — *For all* $\sigma \geqslant \sigma_0$ (σ_0 *is a fixed large number*) *one should have:*

$$\mu_{(m)}(\sigma) > \mu(\sigma)\left[\frac{\log \mu(\sigma)}{\sigma}\right]^m,$$

m is an integer $\geqslant 0$. *This result I stated in a previous paper* ([6], p. 235) *without proof.*

Proof. — We have:

$$(4.1)\quad \lambda_{\nu^{(m)}(\sigma)} \leqslant \frac{\mu_{(m+1)}(\sigma)}{\mu_{(m)}(\sigma)} \leqslant \lambda_{\nu^{(m+1)}(\sigma)}, \qquad m = 0, 1, \ldots$$

When $m = 0$ in (4.1), it reduces to a result which I have proved in ([3], p., Theorem 2) as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{(1)}(\sigma) &= |a_{\nu^{(1)}(\sigma)}|\lambda_{\nu^{(1)}(\sigma)} \exp(\sigma\lambda_{\nu^{(1)}(\sigma)}) \leqslant \lambda_{\nu^{(1)}(\sigma)}\mu(\sigma);\\ \mu_{(1)}(\sigma) &= |a_{\nu^{(1)}(\sigma)}|\lambda_{\nu^{(1)}(\sigma)} \exp(\sigma\lambda_{\nu^{(1)}(\sigma)}) \geqslant |a_{\nu(\sigma)}|\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)} \exp(\sigma\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)})\\ &= \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}\mu(\sigma).\end{aligned}$$

The case $m \geqslant 1$ can aslo be treated by simple definitions, for let

$$f^{(m)}(S) = \Sigma A_n e^{s\lambda_n}, \qquad \lambda_{\nu^{(m)}(\sigma)} = \lambda_N; \qquad \lambda_{\nu^{(m+1)}(\sigma)} = \lambda_{N_1},$$

then

$$\mu_{(m+1)}(\sigma) = \lambda_{N_1}|A_{N_1}| \exp(\sigma\lambda_{N_1}) \leqslant \lambda_{N_1}\mu_{(m)}(\sigma),$$

and

$$\mu_{(m)}(\sigma) = \frac{1}{\lambda_N}(\lambda_N|A_N| \exp(\sigma\lambda_N)) \leqslant \frac{\mu_{(m+1)}(\sigma)}{\lambda_{\nu^{(m)}(\sigma)}},$$

and so these two inequalities complete (4.1) and from which we have:

$$\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)} \leqslant \frac{\mu_{(1)}(\sigma)}{\mu_{(\sigma)}} \leqslant \lambda_{\nu^{(1)}}(\sigma) \leqslant \frac{\mu_{(2)}(\sigma)}{\mu_{(1)}(\sigma)} \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \lambda_{\nu^{(m-1)}(\sigma)} \leqslant \frac{\mu_{(m)}(\sigma)}{\mu_{(m-1)}(\sigma)} \leqslant \lambda_{\nu^{(m)}(\sigma)}.$$

Multiplying the ratios involving these $\mu's$ one finds that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mu_{(m)}(\sigma)}{\mu(\sigma)} &\geqslant \lambda_{\nu(m-1)(\sigma)} \ldots \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)} \\ &\geqslant (\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)})^m. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Now from (1.3)′ we get, for K to be sufficiently large,

$$\begin{aligned} \log |a_{\nu(\sigma)}| &< - K\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}; \quad \sigma \geqslant \sigma_0 \\ |a_{\nu(\sigma)}| &< \exp(- k\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}) < 1, \quad \sigma \geqslant \sigma_0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Again

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mu(\sigma) &= \log |a_{\nu(\sigma)}| + \sigma\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)} \\ &< \sigma\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}, \qquad \sigma \geqslant \sigma_0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

from (4.3). The inequalities (4.2) and (4.4) result in for $\sigma \geqslant \sigma_0$

$$\frac{\mu_{(m)}(\sigma)}{\mu(\sigma)} > \left(\frac{\log \mu(\sigma)}{\sigma}\right)^m.$$

The above theorem is useful in deducing the following interesting.

THEOREM E. — *One has (with the terms involved in to be known):*

$$\overline{\lim_{\sigma \to \infty}} \frac{\log (\mu_{(m)}(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma))^{1/m}}{\sigma} = \frac{\rho}{\lambda};$$

Proof. — We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mu_{(m)}(\sigma)}{\mu(\sigma)} &\leqslant \lambda_{\nu(1)(\sigma)} \ldots \lambda_{\nu(m)(\sigma)} \\ &\leqslant (\lambda_{\nu(m)(\sigma)})^m. \end{aligned}$$

Now $f^{(m)}(s)$ also posses the same order ρ and lower order λ as $f(s)$ has, and so (cf. Theorem B)

$$\overline{\lim_{\sigma \to \infty}} \frac{\log \lambda_{\nu(m)(\sigma)}}{\sigma} = \frac{\rho}{\lambda};$$

consequently

$$\overline{\lim_{\sigma \to \infty}} \frac{\log (\mu_{(m)}(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma))^{1/m}}{\sigma} \leqslant \frac{\rho}{\lambda}; \tag{4.5}$$

But Theorem D provides us the inequality (to be deduced with the help of Theorem B and (1.4) [1])

$$\overline{\lim_{\sigma\to\infty}} \frac{\log\,(\mu_{\nu(m)}(\sigma)/\mu(\sigma))^{1/m}}{\sigma} \geqslant \frac{\rho}{\lambda}\ ; \tag{4.6}$$

The inequalities (4.5) and (4.6) yield the desired result.

Remark. — Theorem D has been stated without any proof by Srivastav ([11], p. 89 (i)) and that too under the restrictive condition that $\lambda > 0$. The proof of Theorem D removes this superflous restriction which Srivastav asserts. Secondly, Srivastav claims to prove Theorem E but to the best my surprise there is no clue available to its proof in his paper wherever he mentions it. I whish to add that I have stated Theorem D without proof in a recent paper of mine ([6], Theorem 1).

5. Towards the end of this paper, I would like to add a new result on the mean values of entire Dirichlet functions. To the best of my knowledge I introduced these means and discovered their properties relating to the order and lower order of $f(S)$ in a recent paper [9]. I do here a little more. I define

$$A_k(\sigma) = \lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^{T} |f(S)|^k\, dt,$$

where the sequence $\{\lambda_n\}$ satisfies (1.1)-(1.3); $0 < k < \infty$.

THEOREM F. — *If $f(S)$ satisfies the conditions stated in* § 5, *then we have:*

$$\overline{\lim_{\sigma\to\infty}} \frac{\log\log A_k(\sigma)}{\sigma} = \frac{\rho}{\lambda}\ ;$$

[1] From (1.4), (i)

$$\log \mu(\sigma) \leqslant (1 + 0(1))\sigma\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)} \quad \text{and so} \quad \log\log \mu(\sigma)/\sigma \leqslant 0(1) + \log \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}/\sigma;$$

and (ii) for $k > 0$, $\log \mu(\sigma + k) \geqslant k\lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}$ and so

$$\log\log \mu(\sigma + k)/(1 + 0(1))\,(\sigma + k) \geqslant 0(1) + \log \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}/\sigma.$$

From (i) et (ii) one deduces that

$$\overline{\lim_{\sigma\to\infty}} \log\log \mu(\sigma)/\sigma = \overline{\lim_{\sigma\to\infty}} \log \lambda_{\nu(\sigma)}/\sigma.$$

Remark. — If $k = 2$, I have got the above result in a recent paper ([9], Theorem 1) where I supposed further that χ_n was non-decreasing. Here we need not, as one will soon find, make this supposition.

Proof of Theorem F. — One does have

$$A_k(\sigma) \leqslant \{M_s(\sigma)\}^k,$$

where

$$M_s(\sigma) = \max_{|t| \leqslant T} |f(\sigma + it)|.$$

But (see for references [9] and also [10])

$$\overline{\lim_{\sigma \to \infty}} \frac{\log \log M_s(\sigma)}{\sigma} = \frac{\rho}{\lambda};$$

So we find that

$$\overline{\lim_{\sigma \to \infty}} \frac{\log \log A_k(\sigma)}{\sigma} \leqslant \frac{\rho}{\lambda}; \tag{5.1}$$

To get the other part, it is sufficient to consider $f(S)$ in the representation given by:

$$f(S) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n e^{s\lambda_n}.$$

Then, if $S' = \Delta + ix$; $a_n = \alpha_n + i\beta_n$, we have

$$f(\Delta + ix)$$
$$= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} [(\alpha_n \cos \lambda_n x - \beta_n \sin \lambda_n x) + i(\alpha_n \sin \lambda_n x + \beta_n \cos \lambda_n x)] e^{\Delta \lambda_n};$$

$$Rl\{f(\Delta + ix)\} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\alpha_n \cos \lambda_n x - \beta_n \sin \lambda_n x) e^{\Delta \lambda_n}.$$

Therefore

$$(*) \qquad \alpha_m e^{\Delta \lambda_m} = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{-T}^{T} Rl\{f(\Delta + ix)\} \cos \lambda_m x \, dx, \qquad m > 0.$$

$$(**) \qquad -\beta_m e^{\Delta \lambda_m} = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{-T}^{T} Rl\{f(\Delta + ix)\} \sin \lambda_m x \, dx, \qquad m > 0.$$

$$\alpha_0 = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{-T}^{T} Rl\{f(\Delta + ix)\} \, dx.$$

Therefore from $(_*)$ and $(_{**})$

$$\mathrm{R}l\{f(\sigma+it)\} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\alpha_n \cos \lambda_n t - \beta_n \sin \lambda_n t) e^{\sigma\lambda_n}$$

(5.2)

$$= \lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{-T}^{T} \mathrm{R}l\{f(\Delta+ix)\} \left\{1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \cos\{(x-t)\lambda_n\} e^{(\sigma-\Delta)\lambda_n}\right\} dx.$$

We can treat (5.2) as an analogue to Poisson's formula in power series. Therefore, if we start our series for $f(s)$ from $n = 1$ to ∞, then

$$|f(s)| \leqslant \lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^{T} |f(\Delta+ix)|2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \exp\{(\sigma-\Delta)\lambda_n\}\, dx,$$

and since the right-hand side is independent of t, one finds that

$$(5.3)\quad \mathrm{M}(\sigma) \leqslant 2\mathrm{A}(\Delta) \left(\sum_{n=1}^{n_0-1} + \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} \right) \exp\{(\sigma-\Delta)\lambda_n\}$$

$$< 2\mathrm{A}(\Delta) \left[(n_0 - 1) \exp\{(\sigma-\Delta)\lambda_1\} + \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} \exp\{(\sigma-\Delta)\lambda_n\} \right].$$

But

$$\sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} \exp\{(\sigma-\Delta)\lambda_n\} < \exp\{(\sigma-\Delta)\lambda_1\}$$

$$\{1 + \exp(\sigma-\Delta)\mathrm{L} + \exp(\sigma-\Delta)2\mathrm{L} + \cdots\}.$$

Therefore

$$\mathrm{M}(\sigma) < 2\mathrm{A}(\Delta)$$

$$\left[(n_0 - 1) \exp(\sigma-\Delta)\lambda_1 + \frac{\exp\{(\sigma-\Delta)\lambda_1\} \exp(\Delta\mathrm{L})}{\exp(\Delta\mathrm{L}) - \exp(\sigma\mathrm{L})} \right].$$

Let $\Delta = \sigma + \eta$, $\eta > 0$. Then on simplifications, one gets

$$(5.4)\qquad \mathrm{M}(\sigma) < 0(1)\, \mathrm{A}(\sigma+\eta).$$

Similarly taking $\{f(s)\}^k$ instead of $f(s)$, one can prove that

$$(5.5)\qquad (\mathrm{M}(\sigma))^k < 0(1)\mathrm{A}_k(\sigma+\eta),$$

where the constants $0(1)$ in (5.4) and (5.5) might not be the same, and so

$$(5.6)\qquad \overline{\lim_{\sigma\to\infty}} \frac{\log\log \mathrm{A}_k(\sigma)}{\sigma} \geqslant \overline{\lim_{\sigma\to\infty}} \frac{\log\log \mathrm{M}(\sigma)}{\sigma} = \frac{\rho}{\lambda};$$

The inequalities (5.1) and (5.6) yield the required result. I might like to discuss further results on the means defined by $A_k(\sigma)$ in a next sequel of my work.

Before I close up the discussion, I would like to express my warm thanks to the University Grants Commission, India about its partial support for the project undertaken by me.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] A. G. Azpeitia, On the maximum modulus and the maximum term of an entire Dirichlet series; *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 12, (1962), 717-721.

[2] G. Doetsch, Uber die obere Grenze des Absoluten Betrages einer analytischen Funktion auf Geraden; *Math. Zeit.*, 8, (1920), 237-240.

[3] P. K. Kamthan, A note on the maximum term and the rank of an entire function represented by Dirichlet series; *Math. Student*, 31, N° 1-2, (1962), 17-33.

[4] P. K. Kamthan, On the maximum term and its rank of an entire function represented by Dirichlet series (II), *Raj. Uni, Studies Jour.*, Phy. Sec. (1962), 1-14.

[5] P. K. Kamthan, A theorem on step function; J. Gakugei, Tokushima Uni., 13, (1962), 43-47.

[6] P. K. Kamthan, On entire functions represented by Dirichlet series, *Monat. für. Math.*, 68, (1964), 235-239.

[7] P. K. Kamthan, On entire functions represented by Dirichlet series (II); *Monat. für. Math.*, 69, (1965), 146-150.

[8] P. K. Kamthan, On entire functions represented by Dirichlet series (III); *Monat. für. Math.*, 69, (1965), 225-229.

[9] P. K. Kamthan, On the mean values of an entire function represented by Dirichlet series, *Acta Math. Aca., Sci. Hung.*, 15, Fasc. 1-2, (1964), 133-136.

[10] S. Mandelbrojt, *Dirichlet Series*, Rice Instt. Paph., Vol. 31, N° 4, (1944).

[11] R. P. Srivastav, On entire functions and their derivatives represented by Dirichlet series; *Ganita (Lucknow)*, 9, (1958), 83-93.

[12] G. Valiron, Integral Functions, *Chel. Pub., New York*, (1949).

[13] Y. C. Yung, Sur les droites de Borel de certaines fonctions entières; *Ann. École Normale*, 68, (1951), 65-104.

Manuscrit reçu le 19 octobre 1965.

Pawan Kumar Kamthan,
Post-Graduate Studies (E),
Delhi University,
Delhi-7 (India).